

Animal Health and Welfare Board for England

Bovine TB:

**Call for views on future bovine TB
strategy and how to meet the challenges
ahead**

Exeter

Workshop outputs

Date: 18 September 2012

Contents

Animal Health and Welfare Board for England.....	1
About the workshop and this report	3
▪ Purpose of the workshop.....	3
▪ About this report.	3
▪ Why sort the outputs?.....	3
1 Imagine it is 2025. You are at the market talking about how bovine TB is handled now compared to way back in 2012. For you the best two things are.....	5
2 Questions to clarify what you have just heard in the presentations	7
3 What's working and new ideas	9
3.1 What is working well now?.....	9
3.2 How could this be strengthened, enhanced or improved further?	11
3.3 What else needs to happen?	13
3.4 What new innovations or ideas can you suggest?.....	16
4 What do you think?	18
4.1 What do you think about the idea of reducing compensation combined with greater ability for farmers to remove reactors and negotiate salvage payments?	18
4.2 What do you think about the idea of an insurance type scheme to help farmers meet any additional cost?	20
4.3 What do you think about the idea of cattle keepers arranging their own tests and negotiating prices directly with an AHVLA approved veterinary practice?.....	21
4.4 What do you think about the idea of areas being able to get 'TB free status'.....	22
4.5 Minimising the geographical spread of TB in cattle:	24
4.6 Different types and providers of support and advice.	26
5 Out of everything you have seen and discussed today what two things would you most want to see happen?	27
6 Parking place (other issues)	29
Annex 1 Agenda.....	30
Annex 2: Attendee List	32

About the workshop and this report

▪ Purpose of the workshop

The TB Eradication Programme for England was published in 2011. Key principles include partnership working between Government, industry and the veterinary profession, giving farmers more control and choice, empowering industry to take greater responsibility for tackling TB, sharing and reducing the cost of TB, and ensuring that farmers have the right incentives.

The purpose the regional workshops was to widen the opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback on and actively contribute innovative solutions on

- The strategic direction of TB policy, including future measures to strengthen disease control
- achieving a fair and effective balance of roles and responsibilities between livestock keepers, the veterinary profession and Government

The workshops form part of the AHWBE engagement which begins an open and informal dialogue with a wide audience about the challenges faced by Government and industry, and looking at options for the future.

We are still in the early stages of developing policy on new ways of working. To address these challenging circumstances, we need new ways of working with more partnership and sharing of responsibilities.

The engagement and particularly these workshops will provide those affected by and who have experience of dealing with bovine TB the opportunity to share suggestions and innovative ideas to help us address these challenges together.

Participants' contributions will form part of a Final Engagement Report to the AHWBE later this year, along with the written responses. The AHWBE will consider and make recommendations to Ministers in early 2013.

▪ About this report.

During workshops the essence of everything that is said is noted in writing on flip charts, 'post-it notes or forms. Following the workshop these are typed up, 'word for word' and then sorted to put similar ideas together. This report follows the same order as the event.

▪ Why sort the outputs?

Conversations do not progress in a linear fashion but go off at tangents, circle back and change direction suddenly. As a result, it can be difficult to make sense of a discussion when it is reported in the order in which it happens, and important themes and ideas can be obscured.

For this reason the outputs of each session are sorted and clustered.

The sorting is done by 'emergent processing' ie seeing what themes emerge rather than organising the text to a predetermined set of titles. The ideas could have been grouped differently or different titles chosen, so no weight should be attached to them.

Whilst this report serves as a record of what was discussed, and an *aide memoir* for those who took part in the workshop, the contents are inevitably quite cryptic in places so it is strongly recommended that it is not used as a means of communicating people who were not at the workshops without proper explanation.

Acronyms used in this report	Meaning
AFU	Approved Finishing Unit
AHVLA	Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency
AHWBE	Animal Health and Welfare Board for England
AQU	Approved Quarantine Unit
BCVA	British Cattle Veterinary Association
BCMS	British Cattle Movement Service
bTB	bovine tuberculosis
BVA	British Veterinary Association
CTS	Cattle Tracing System
Defra	Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs
DIVA test	Differentiate between Infected and Vaccinated Animals test
DRF	Disease Report Form
EU	European Union
FCN	Farm Crisis Network
ISO Units	Isolation Units
MHS	Meat Hygiene Service
NBA	National Beef Association
NFU	National Farmers Union
OTF	Officially TB Free
OTF-W	Officially TB Free - Withdrawn
OTF-S	Officially TB Free - Suspended
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health (Office International des Epizooties)
OV	Official Veterinarian (private vet)
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction
PrMT	Pre Movement Testing
RDPE	Rural Development Programme for England
SFP	Single Farm Payment
SOA	Sole Occupancy Authority
SWTBFAS	South West TB Farm Advisory Service
TBEAG	TB Eradication Advisory Group
VMD	Veterinary Medicines Directorate
VO	Veterinary Officer (AHVLA vet)

1 Imagine it is 2025. You are at the market talking about how bovine TB is handled now compared to way back in 2012. For you the best two things are.....

.....the way people work together to tackle the problem

United and working together

- The government took their time but listened and helped us out in the END
- We're working together to control TB
- Industry and government are united in approach
- All interested groups working together
- I'm glad that common sense prevailed and we worked with others to get rid of TB

Common sense

- Common sense approach
- Whoop whoop! At last they listened to some sense

We did the right thing

- I wish I could look back and say, we did the right thing

More joined up management

- More joined up. Management of testing test results (etc)

Public awareness

- Communication with public improved so they understand the issues re TB
- Public are fully aware of the truth and facts

Learning from good practice

- We learned by studying the herds in the S.W. that do not have TB

.....practical measures are working

No TB

- No TB in cattle
- Remember when we used to have TB?
- At last we can now run our livestock business practically and effectively without the burden of bTB
- Tb in UK eradicated
- No TB full stop
- It's sorted now we just need to keep it sorted
- All animals free of TB
- No TB in cattle
- TB is eradicated (or nearly) by cull/vaccine

Reduced/Lower TB

- TB is now under control and regulations are simpler as a result
- Bovine TB rates have fallen to minimum
- TB in cattle is substantially reduced
- TB rate falling so less cattle control measures
- TB incidents is nearly non-existent
- TB is less than half the level of 2012
- Farmers can operate freely with the disease under control

Testing

- Continued and substantially more accurate testing

Vaccine

- That cattle vaccine has saved us
- We have a legal cattle vaccine and a reliable oral vaccine
- The whole UK is under an obligatory cattle vaccination programme for TB
- A vaccine for cattle was developed in 2015 allowing us to export all livestock to anywhere in world
- Vaccine has helped, but we still have a long way to go

Other controls

- There is control of TB transmission other than TB testing

Little cattle transmission

- It was recognised that there was little cattle to cattle transmission

Effective control in wildlife

- Effective wildlife controls
- No vaccine developed. Badgers controlled by identifying disease and eliminating!
- Thank god for Bryan Hill!! (*a farmer who works on identifying infected badgers and wants targeted culling to be trailed*)
- Wildlife controlled. Biosecurity on cattle farms improved
- Improved management of cattle disease through biosecurity and effective testing
- TB in wildlife controlled
- Control of wildlife reservoirs in addition to cattle
- Thank goodness we made a start in controlling TB in wildlife
- Removal of badger protection
- Farmers control own wildlife controls
- substantial progress on legal disease control in wildlife

Healthy wildlife and cattle

- Healthy wildlife and healthy cattle co-existing

Rapid removal of few reactors

- All administration works allowing fast removal of the 'very few' reactors that are discovered

All subject to same regulations

- All subject to same regulations

..... worried its worse

No industry

- If we have the same scientist rules/regulations up until 2012 there won't be a livestock industry in 2025!! (P.S Government/farmers worked together post war -> Late 1970's early 80's we nearly eradicated TB)
- Unless we really get our act together we won't be going to market

Human health outbreaks

- Human health outbreaks from bTB

..... no longer involved

I've retired

- I've retired so I don't have any involvement

2 Questions to clarify what you have just heard in the presentations

(What do you mean by...? Or please explain...? Please write your question on one of the white cards. There will be plenty of opportunity to give your views during the workshop.)

Q – Accepting vaccinating cattle may give false positives why can't herds testing clear then be vaccinated

A – There is a vaccination being produced.
– There is an EU prohibition on vaccination
– There are tradability issues re vaccinated animals & animal products
– Wider strategy needed like brucellosis eradication
– Vaccines are not fully approved or legal to use yet work continuing apace at present. It is a tool
– Much research going into it

Q – In other diseases it is positive that animals are vaccinated
– Effectiveness of vaccination for TB is only 60% effective
– Question is reasonable only if vaccination is 100% to be able to differentiate but no vaccine is 100%
– No testing is 10% either

Q – Please clarify when pre-movement testing (2008) was introduced? and impact

A – Pre movement testing
– It identified 400 animals last year
– Was said it would be effective and hasn't been. DEFRA wasn't looked at the results as TB just gone up over the last 6 years
– Some areas aren't tested pre-movement
– Surveillance testing also done tracing tests to determine TB sources by geographical area also occur but others know more about the science

Q – In future why do vaccinated herds have to be tested? Public etc. and media don't understand that it isn't 100% effective.

A – No absolute guarantee

Q – EU. – Why hasn't it already given permission to trade with vaccinated animals

A – Not fully approved yet by EU & industry stakeholders – by end of this year
– OIE and VMD
– 80% is needed cf. only 60%
– Need to deal with in the wildlife population
– & eradicate in badgers

Q – EU not happy with our Government approval are we at risk of losing funding

A – Yes we have to submit detailed records last year they said not good enough
– Came back July 2012 with yr improvements
– Tightening up since to address concerns. We think we shouldn't go further on all their concerns
– EU says don't re-stock until whole herd clear – but we would lose herd size & business & contracts so we can't agree but must satisfy the commission

Q – What are the thresholds for risk intervention
– Financial or epidemic terms risks thresholds must get crossed

A – Try to tighten on pre-movement testing. Difficult to work out why animal contracts TB. The obvious opportunity is to find exemptions – but on risk can be more deregulatory eg. Finishing units approved for slaughter do we need to keep carrying out tests. Sellers & business benefits
– Risks if found to be contaminated later
– Unique to the UK. We need to find de-regulatory solutions too

Cards with answers written on them

Q – Has pre-movement testing done any good / harm?

A – It has identified infected animals before they go to someone else's farm

Q – How much transparency, accountability & control can we expect from the DEFRA / Animal Health Budget?

- If not how can you expect the industry to cost share?
- A – Yes – the board has started this
- Q – How are the results of today to be weighted within the 4 meetings
- A – Not weight but inform the regional approach
- Q – Is the much heralded badger vaccine as ineffective as the cattle vaccine?
- A – It's the same vaccine with similar outcome
- Q – Does partnership working mean more of a financial burden on the farmer
- A – Not always the case
- Q – Has there been any R&D been done on TB in silage and hay and haylage bales as this is a means of transmission as you can't keep badgers out of your silage fields
- A – Yes, though not in the last few years.
– We want ideas for R&D too
- Q – Is there going to be a test that is more accurate?
- A – We hope so! Lots of R&D is promised on this
- Time ran out before these could all be covered:
- Q – Pre movement testing was introduced in 2006 TB has spread since then, yet we were told by DEFRA 6 years ago it would reduce it by 70% over 4 years it hasn't worked why pursue it / cost!!!
- Q – Please clarify when pre-movement testing was introduced & its effect (or lack of) on the TB spread
- A – *(answer to both PrMT questions above):* Compulsory pre-movement testing was introduced in England and Wales in 2006, and in Scotland in 2005. A comprehensive review of the effects of the policy in England, carried out in 2009 (the report can be found on Defra's website [here](#)) concluded that the policy was beneficial and cost-effective. For example, modelling work by the Centre for Epidemiology and Risk Analysis determined that pre-movement testing may have reduced the number of TB herd breakdowns in low TB incidence areas by almost 50% up to the end of 2008.
- Q – 1st graph shows us 1992 how we reduced nearly eradicated TB since the war 1940's / 50's. Why are we not going back to policies that nearly eradicated the disease then IT WORKED. They have no vaccine then!
- A – Compulsory cattle TB eradication schemes were introduced in the 1950s and by 1979 GB recorded the lowest bTB incidence although it remained about three times higher in South West England. Much has changed since the 1950s (e.g. cattle industry, science and public opinion) and our TB Eradication Programme for England published in 2011 sets out a comprehensive and balanced package of measures to tackle bTB in cattle, badgers and other animals.
- Q – Risk based – what are the thresholds
- A – The risk based trading group are looking at the different measures of risk, and ways of communicating these, that would enable farmers to make informed decisions about the risk level of animals that they are introducing into their herds. The group are aware that risk a relative term and it is important for farmers to understand their own level of risk as well as that of the animals they are purchasing. Measures that can contribute to an overall risk-rating include testing history, number of movements into the herd, background risk level (PTI) and biosecurity.
- Q – Why do herds that have been vaccinated have to be tested
- A – BCG vaccination of cattle is not 100% effective in preventing TB, so vaccinated animals could still be infected and surveillance for bTB would have to continue in vaccinated herds. Vaccination of cattle against TB is currently banned under EU law.
- Q – I understand Europe is not happy with our Governments approach to TB are we at risk of losing their funding?
- A – Yes. The Commission has pressed the UK to strengthen its TB Eradication Plan for 2013 in order for it to be approved for co-financing (worth £12m in 2012). This includes a tightening of cattle movement controls and a revised herd testing strategy in England.
- Q – Why haven't the EU already given permission to trade with vaccinated animals and products
- A – Vaccination of live cattle against TB is currently banned under EU law. As most other EU member states are officially free of bTB and there is no international- or EU-validated test to distinguish between TB-vaccinated and TB-infected cattle, other member states are understandably reluctant to allow trade in cattle that have been vaccinated against TB but

can potentially be infected as well.

- Q – Vaccinating risks – eg badgers
– Operators using face masks etc.

A – *(answer to both questions above)*: Badgers trapped for vaccination may already be infected with bTB and so vaccinators use personal protective equipment such as facemasks and gloves as a sensible health and safety precaution. Facemasks minimise the (low) risk of respiratory infection.

- Q – Could the vaccinated badgers be reservoirs too?

A – We have no evidence that vaccinating previously infected badgers can 'cure' them. But annual vaccination campaigns will we hope have a positive re-enforcing effect by building immunity to disease in social groups.

- Q – Accepting that vaccinating cattle might give false positive in a subsequent test – why cannot herds that test clear then be vaccinated and protected?

A – Firstly, the skin test does not guarantee that an animal or herd is free of infection. Secondly, BCG vaccination of cattle is not 100% effective in preventing TB, so vaccinated animals could still be infected and surveillance for bTB would have to continue in vaccinated herds.

3 What's working and new ideas

3.1 What is working well now?

Nothing

- Not a lot
- Very little
- Nothing. DEFRA

Collaboration/communication

Listening and collaboration

- That Defra is consulting
 - talking and listening
- Government and industry working together. Start of a process
- Important that we do listen
- Listen to industry, farmers, vet
- Collaboration is the key rather than interference
- Benefits where industry and Government work together to tackle disease issue on all fronts

Relationships

- Trust needed
- Has been 'us' against 'them'
- Groups of people working together to talk about it

Organisations

EU policy

- Our policy with the EU is working well

South West TB Farm Advisory Service (SWTBFAS)

- SWTBFAS

Sole Occupancy Authorities (SOA) working well and room for improvement

- Sole Occupancy Authorities (SOA) working well where applied in same testing regime area (e.g. 1 year)
- SOA work well within reasonable distance. But 10 miles too short, should be 20 miles
- Would not agree to move within SOA from 1 year zone to 4 year zone
- SOAs – needed to manage business but needs to be risk-based
- Sole Occupancy Authority./BCMS links – weak link but tightening of rules has helped

AHVLA

- Local AHVLA staff are communicating pretty well - ?
- Some staff are working well but some need to be more diplomatic

Testing

Using local vets and build up a relationship with them

- Using local vets
- Allowing local vets to do testing
 - Can look at cattle – health circumstances
 - Know your farm and system
- Use your local vet – you must do for TB testing. Local vets have local knowledge. You know each other – he/she has local knowledge
- Working well with vets without getting in others. Very important that get own vet. Know the set up and chance to discuss other herd issues. An independent person would not understand these issues
- Relationship between farmers and vet. (testing)
- Disasters if you, as a vet, get sent to other regions. Farmers don't like interference from other areas – need to fit into precise timescales and windows of opportunity. Outsiders would be less welcomed and less efficient
- Must protect relationship with local vets and support
- If outsiders are brought in to undercut finances it would not work

Other testers

- Qualified lay testers who have been trained and organised by local vets practice are also valuable
- Waste of resources to use highly qualified vets so using approved testers is more efficient
- Other advice – other diseases dealt with, with private vets
- NB. Local vets aren't always experienced in skin testing camelids so a team in this case trained is better off with cattle
- Government vets did testing but private capacity went
 - Improved now

Test is good and needs to be done early

- TB testing is looked at as a necessary evil
- Test is good – from practical experience – once clear the lumps on skin seem to be accurate indications of detection
- On contrary - tests can show clear but at abattoir be badly infected so tests are better if done early.

Ability to submit test-improves procedure

- Ability to submit test-improves procedure

Screening all herds (wales)

- Wales screened all herds – idea. Scale of problem
 - Health check
 - Have local offices to get responses (1)
 - Cornwall very good. Quick Answers

Dealing with reactors/diseased cattle

Reactor removal - mixed views

- Reactor removal improved since abattoir arranges
- Reactor removal is 'ok'. Better than it was
- Mixed views over reactor removals

Compensation

- Compensation (table valuations) better for commercial animals. Issue around pedigree animals – affects business decisions
- ? Does it have £12k figure include loss of production as well? Does it cover everything? <1>
- £25k – Exeter figure <1>

Farmers negotiating slaughter price with abattoir?

- Would individual farmers be strong enough to negotiate slaughter price with abattoir?

Trading/moving

Approved Quarantine Units, Approved Finishing Unit

- TB restricted markets
 - AFUs, AQUs and ISO units
 - Enabling farmers to trade

- AQUs/AFUs
- Approved Finishing Units/markets – good idea. Helps to relieve pressure on business. Breed more replacements
- AFUs allowed farmers to stay financially viable
- AFUs and PrMT are working well in TB controls

Trading

- Trading working well – orange markets are one thing that kept us trading and possibly saved life or two. Before that ripped off. Now proper price in market place. Now EU pulling Defra's tail – 30 day will have a negative impact.

Disease in wildlife

Badger cull

- Starting to control wildlife
- First culls going ahead
 - Risk over retailers not taking products
- Removal of infected badgers (legally)
- Pilot cull

3.2 How could this be strengthened, enhanced or improved further?

Improved communication/collaboration

Better information provision

- Better liaison/with vets
 - More info
 - Interactive maps
 - Bigger areas to consider what to do
- Stats required
- Need better info on where the disease is occurring on a farm

Improved education for farmers

- Strength education of farmers, particularly in emerging areas – Biosecurity. Good but could improve further

Better information provision

- Better communications needed with public – needs to be clear and simple
 - Countryfile, write to councils/schools
- Telling public to appreciate farmer's perspective – why it's so important to farmers

Need consistent advice

- Lack of consistency of advice

More communication between farmers and official vets

- More communication between farmers, VO's and OV's after a breakdown – and quicker

Local TB centres set up

- Local TB centres could be set up to look at disease picture/take action
 - Needs to be sold correctly
 - Alpacas – should they be included in testing?

Simplified/common sense approach

Use more common sense approach

- We should have a more common sense approach

Make control measures less bureaucratic

- Make wildlife control less bureaucratic and simpler
- Make whole process of TB control less bureaucratic and simpler
- Don't unnecessarily burden the farm business

Licensing confusing

- Licensing process can be confusing, duplicates

Criteria to get yourself in cull area needs to be less onerous

- Criteria to get yourself in cull area needs to be less onerous

Individual approach

- It's not 'one size fits all'
- Approach tailored to the farm
- Individual farm solutions which don't increase the risk

Organisations

Improvements to be made by AHVLA

- Letters from AHVLA about testing deadlines could be more diplomatic – tone down terminology
- AHVLA = too many mistakes, too often
- AHVLA could improve communication between offices and to farmers and vets
- Worked better when AH was operating at county level (not regional)

Improve Defra AHVLA systems

- Improve Defra AHVLA's computerised systems and communications
- AHVLA paperwork is inaccurate and confusing and not credible

Testing

More responsibility to vets

- Give more responsibility to vet so vet working with farmer in overall herd package
- Using veterinary expertise

Using local vets

- Consider using local lay testers and local vets. At present they can't
 - This may have economical value
- If TB testing was removed from local vets it could spell the end of local practices so need to use them to keep demand up and protect vet business
- Vets understand more about what the results can mean and can employ people to analyse the info and data – with local contact and feedback link to follow up indications would be invaluable
- Decisions by vet practices re. what to do with reactors would be better dealt with locally
 - More prompt, efficient and less bureaucracy. (In cooperation with Defra)

Qualified lay-testing

- Qualified lay-testing
- Possible use of lay testers may help strengthen link with practices

Need health check and PrMT in England

- Need health check and pre-move testing throughout England
- Get Orange Day Pre Movement testing back to 60 days.Won't make any difference to disease

Should be more leeway on delayed testing

- Should be more leeway on delayed test where genuine reasons ie. Upland areas

Improve testing process

- Improving accuracy of tuberculosis/gamma interferon test
- Identify and expand the edge area
- Get results on-farm, by OV/VO – with certificate
- No difference between testing animal and going clear – it's got 60 days. If it doesn't go clear you can't increase the testing frequency. If you want an annual sale you need to fix the date 60 days before, if don't go clear you need to move the sale date.
- Could work with those doing deer testing to send in samples
 - Specialist stalkers
- Need English tuberculin not Dutch - too many false positives. Different spoligotype

Testing frequency

- Increase background testing frequency in four year areas
 - or introduce PrMT in four-year
 - in low incidence areas, if 'go clear' for (ie) 2 years, then do have less stringent controls
 - "get ahead of the disease"
- Allowing farmers in 3-4 year testing to test and check
- 4 year testing too long

Speed of finding out

- Vet tells you instantly you've got TB, you get the letter the next day but when it comes to going clear it takes far longer. Took until calf (following calving) was 3 weeks old to get it and

- it was too late to move it
- Limits trading activity

Tracing

- Tracing – out of date
- Tracing tests should be quicker

Dealing with reactors

Dealing with reactors

- Reactor removal needs speeding up
- Improve reactor removal by making OV responsible
- Pay for animals detected with lesions in more than 2 places in slaughterhouse within 60 days of test

Disease in wildlife

Focus on diseased badgers

- Identifying diseased badgers and removing them
- Need target culling

Badger cull

- Improve security for farmers (re. badger cull)
- Only reason for badger protection was badger baiting
- Strengthen wildlife control
- Strengthening population control of wildlife
- Why not roll out cull to whole country after first pilot

Badger protection

- Lift badger protection act
- Q: Is there an appetite/are you looking to remove protected status of badgers?

Cattle to Cattle transmission

Cattle to cattle

- All policies geared to cattle to cattle
- The cattle to cattle transmission is minimal
- Ability to demonstrate animal health through TB Health Certificates could improve movement confidence and reduce risks considerably
- Linking SAM and BCMS and developing 'last test date' information at markets - would begin to provide test history for trading.

New Research

More research on organic matter transmission

- More research on transmission of TB in hay, silage and haulage. Research in America says it will stay in haulage <36>

General observations/comments

- Get rid of the disease
- TB is now a way of life – not an embarrassment/stigma
- Prior to 1992 only 2 areas left with tb

3.3 What else needs to happen?

Collaboration and communication

Collaborative approach

- Farmers to work with Government
- Too little communication/info about cases
- Timely communication needed
- Educate EU on UK problems – not black and white issues
- Educate public on the rationale for the cull and the facts

Defra work with Camelid authority

- Camelid authorities one trying to be responsible but Defra not working with them

Public Understanding

- Communicate the whole range of what farmers have to do, and what the benefits are and why
 - this needs to be put in front of public
 - 2nd amongst industry, livestock, keepers, farmers
- Make the public more aware of whole picture
- The facts about vaccination need to be communicated to the public – where we are now, what are the risks/accuracy of the vaccination, etc.
- Not celebrities to do communications.

Communication around the cull

- Comms around blanket cull concern cull

Organisations

AHVLA

- AHVLA staffing capacity
- AHVLA SAM system issues – compounded by reduction in staff

Role of Vets

- OV tendering will be a long change. Could affect OV/farmer relationship
 - Could be ads of tendering – tests could be done at different times to normal
- Generalisations/one size fits all methods don't work – the key is to use local vets to improve that
- Allow vets to become involved with TB control (and as previous license threats existed)
- Vet to issue certificate lifting restrictions. Limits bureaucracy
 - Local not central
- Taking TB testing away from vets could have impact on other diseases

Meat Hygiene Service

- MHS – Meat Hygiene Service need better tracing and testing

Testing

Camelids

- Registration and testing programme for camelids in line with that for cattle

Better testing

- Need more humane methods of testing setts
- Testing needs to fit with farming calendar
- Need less testing of cattle that came you clear & are kept groups
- Focus testing on herds under restriction
- Stop taking tests for animals in fattening herds. It has no benefit and should be optional

Testing frequency

- Just keep 12 months testing
- At the moment paying lots to test 6 times a year and allowing others to test every 4 years. If tested on 12 month testing you would test nationally the same amount

Sort non-compliance on testing

- Non-compliance on testing needs addressing
- But need to recognise issues around practicalities/could rearrange

Why test

- What good does testing do? Testing fatigue – not dealing with the problem

Dealing with reactors/diseased cattle

Approved Finishing Units and Quarantine Units

- Simplify regulation of AFU and AQU. And bring back AQUs
- The decision on AQU's is taking too long
- Remove testing on AFUs

Compensation

- Compensation by weight for commercial cattle could be an idea

Trading/moving

Camelids

- Movement controls on camelids

New rules of livestock movement

- Bring in new rules for livestock movements e.g. scrap CPH and replace with livestock management units

Tracing animals

- Get rid tracing animals, stress animals
 - Already tested, so it's been done
 - Waste of time

Disease in wildlife

Vaccination of badgers in East

- Need vaccination of badgers in East not west to stop spread

Target Cull

- Target cull badgers from infected setts
- Need to decide how to legislate for driving back spread of disease by taking out infected setts and allowing healthy setts to remain undisturbed.

Badger cull/wildlife control

- Continue and rollout wildlife control
- Must have government investments in wildlife control
 - 'invest now to save in the future' – would lead to more coherent and consistent government policy
- Rapid roll out of other cull areas
- Urgent need to expand badger cull
- Need TB control to clear areas as a basis and chief aim
 - Can reduce by 95% by using the 'countryman method' <32>

Learn from what worked to tackle TB in wildlife

- Need effective ways of tackling TB in wildlife so look at historical solutions that worked until controls were removed (Purbeck in Dorset) <18>

Test other species

- Random testing of other species. Especially deer

Healthy Badgers

- We want healthy badgers as well as eradicating TB. TB is the enemy not the badger which is also a victim. Need to effectively deal with sick badgers

Biosecurity through practical measures

- Biosecurity wish to avoid fortress farming against badgers. So to improve practice instead/as well to reduce contact in first place and encourage farmers to comply and not be lax

New research/

TB in wildlife

- Priorities change over time/disease
 - New priorities/evidence needed and info is historic
 - Update badger and other evidence
 - What happens in other countries on wildlife
 - What is happening now
- How to identify infected badgers for certain
- More research into alternative culling methods which are more effective
- Continued research vital, in particular use of PCR and foam gas for improving control methods. Make more use of PCR testing through faeces, urine or air from inside the setts.

TB in cattle

- Find out why the 40% haven't got TB
- What is the impact of the disease other than a farmers income?
- What we know; what we need to know
- More credible, scientific info on PrMT and AQU's
 - if AQU's removed. Then what replaces them
 - evidence based policy making
- Need study of Disease Report forms done on an area of outward spread, including TB in deer.

Insurance

- Insurance

3.4 What new innovations or ideas can you suggest?

Communication/collaboration

Start with feedback on this meeting

- Need to feedback the info from meeting to people here plus what did with info?

Better relationship between farmers and DEFRA

- Restoration of trust between farmers and DEFRA
- Changes of government create problems
- TB independent of politics
- Streamline DEFRA letters – don't need one to say need to test and another to say phone the vet

Collaborative approach

- Collaboration between everyone not being dictated to
- Bottom up not top down

Public Understanding

- A concerted effort is needed to educate the public related to the facts of stories/media especially that vaccinating is not going to solve the problem in cattle let along badgers for TB eradication
- Re-educate adults and politicians so true facts are known – then that could mean realistic solutions that are vote winners not losers
- Education is needed in schools to link awareness of milk meat, cattle etc. and farmers love healthy badgers and wildlife too but it's TB that needs eradicating. And it is one method
- Silence wildlife objectors lift the Badger Protection Act – temporary or permanent
 - Voice is too loud. Wildlife objectors too much (celebrity) influence
 - people who don't understand ways of the countryside
 - more education needed

Heard Health

- More consultation on general herd health planning needed. SWHILI PROJECT – but 5 year projects
- Needs funding. Disjointed and temporary. Need something longer term

Role of organisations and vets

Vets advice on reducing risks

- Vet can have proactive role in assessing - more control to advise on isolation units etc. to allow movement
- Local vets could make the judgement about your farm for TB risk (1)
 - know if it's a closed herd etc.
- Local vet would help to manage the farm in terms of breaking it up into risk factors
- The vet could put restrictions on groups of cattle on single farms

Cut out AHVLA as middle man

- Treat as disease where work directly with vets. Cut out AHVLA middle man
- Farmers and vets deal with the disease – remove government

Vets have more say

- Vets better knowledge & they would have better say than DEFRA in London

Vets coordinate communication

- Better communication needed – local vets could coordinate it better

Better use of data

- Make more use of data held by private vets

Testing

- Improve accuracy of TB test

Dealing with reactors/diseased cattle

Compensation

- Compensation can create more of an issue for disease
- Fairer compensation system including loss of income

Slaughter

- If to slaughter- don't need testing (AFU) Reg housing
- Use abattoir as a frontline policy

Trading/moving

- Open license to buy in stock where low disease risk e.g. in animal testing areas
- Zone the country
- Link SAM and BCMS records - would be a start to developing binding movements and testing data.

Vaccine

Work on vaccination

- Continued development of the vaccine and the DIVA test to make more effective
- Vaccination of cattle – when it works?
- Too many 'ifs or buts' on vaccination regarding trade worldwide
- Vaccination waste of time until deal with wildlife reservoir
- Improve efficacy of TB vaccine

Disease in wildlife

Aim for healthy system

- Healthy badgers, healthy cattle

Test others species

- Widespread testing of other species

Farmers deal with problem

- License individual farmers for wildlife control
- License farmers to sort out the badger problem
- Lift badger protection act

Law against badger baiting

- Have law against badger-baiting

Improve culling bureaucracy

- Culling bureaucracy needs to improve
- Remove requirement for landlords to agree to be in cull area

Funding

- Utilise RDPE funding to pay for badger cull

New research

New testing

- More R and D on other tests available to improve effectiveness eg gamma test and statK pack

Research gassing badgers

- Urgent research into humane gassing (acceptable) of badgers

Learn from others

- More research
- Learn from other countries
- Links with what other governments in GB are doing

Links with other disease

- Link needs to be done between Johnes disease and immune effects linked with TB
 - Scientific research into immunosuppression and inter-current disease* effects on skin test and vaccination for TB
 - BVD too. Bovine Viral Diarrhoea etc*

More data on TB in other species

- More data on TB incidence in other species

Incentives to change behaviour

- Create a method of earned recognition for vet/farmer collaboration for progress achieved eg. Tracings etc badger proofing buildings and boundaries etc

- Incentive for risk based training

Funding

- Adequate government funds to address problem

4 What do you think?

Some ideas emerged from workshops AHWBE held with key industry representatives (including NFU, BVA, NBA, & Dairy UK). People were asked to consider these and say what they thought. When answering, people were asked to think as broadly and widely as they could (for example: short & long term, for personal interests and for the industry as a whole, initial and knock on effects/consequences).

4.1 What do you think about the idea of reducing compensation combined with greater ability for farmers to remove reactors and negotiate salvage payments?

1. What are the benefits and positives of this idea

Collaboration/communication

More empowerment to farmers

- More choice and more empowerment must be a good thing

More collaboration

- All parties must collaborate (this can be a negative as well)
- Government has funded wildlife control, so farmers should/could contribute more (?)

Dealing with reactors/diseased animals

Better removal of reactors

- If farmers could get rid of reactors quicker, would be content to bear haulage costs
- Some abattoirs want the ability to take reactors = more choice for farmer, good for abattoir

Benefits to farmers

Better value for farmer

- If more control with farmers, reducing comp may make sense, introduce market forces
- Simpler if value can be returned to farmers
- Efficiencies may be improved, including delivery under the correct conditions.

2. What are the negatives, challenges and difficulties?

Why reduce compensation?

- Why is compensation being reduced – cost saving alone?

Less practical for abattoirs

Less practical for abattoirs

- Decrease in availability of abattoir space
- Abattoirs probably not in favour, not practical
- Abattoirs rely on subsidy of salvage value versus market value

Trouble to farmers

Less negotiating power to some farmers

- Negotiating power comes with numbers (so why can't government negotiate better)?
- Some farmers would be able to negotiate improved/increased salvage prize
- Some farmers – depending on business/farm type – would have less/no negotiating power

More for farmers to deal with

- Farmers would have to deal with price volatility
- Further reduction in comp would alienate more farmers as they already shoulder large costs

- of TB control
- Farmers bear cost of TB testing, therefore comp at present rates only takes account of average animals and nothing for breed animals or related costs of testing/income/resource/time – ie a day a months for testing

Wouldn't work

Wouldn't work for certain situations

- Difference between dairy and beef salvage values and market values especially pedigree
 - Would not work for the pedigree sector

Too complicated

- Far too complicated

Compliance

- May adversely affect compliance

Consumer/supermarket resistance

- Consumer/supermarket resistance

Dealing with reactors/diseased animals

What if there's no market for reactors?

- If there is no market for reactors (because of impact on local abattoirs) what happens then? Government steps in?

Risks or reactors to herds whilst negotiating

- Risks reactors remaining on-farm while negotiating etc

3. Any amendments or refinements you can think of?

Phased input

- Need a timescale of comp reduction introduction so businesses/people can organise and plan ahead ie 3 years (notice)

More co-operation between OVs and VOs

- More co-operation between OVs and VOs (and farmer) in terms of renewing reactors – so take away the need for AHVLA process and reactor goes quicker. Local, fast, OV and VO better

Dealing with removing reactors

- Farmers book in their reactors at end of test (R2) – Fast – for slaughter
- Own haulage possibilities, would make farmers lives easier
- Payments for breeding animals and young stock should be protected

4. Any alternatives or innovations you can suggest?

Compensation value

- Compensation should be paid on weight for beef commercial cattle
- More transparency on compensation calculation (in current table values)
- Pay market value would be fairer
- If culture negative animal should have full market value as comp

Remove all controls

- Remove all controls, including dealing with source of infection, and farmers receive no compensation

Revert to English tuberculin

- Revert to using English tuberculin (not Dutch) as anecdotal evidence suggests issues

Incentives and proactive management

- Need incentives and proactive management to improve efficiencies not reducing compensation.

5. What would you want to know about the idea to consider it further?

Defining compensation

- How would the reduction in comp be defined? Must be clear and straight forward

Improving the test

- Efficacy of test itself. Must be improved to support any changes too complex

4.2 What do you think about the idea of an insurance type scheme to help farmers meet any additional cost?

1. What are the benefits and positives of this idea

Save Defra and taxpayer

- Saving to Defra/taxpayer

Flexibility

- Flexibility in valuation

Less stressful for farmers

- Covered if you have a TB breakdown – reduce stress
- Assurance about value of your annuals and their income

Way out of compensation issue

- Way out of the compensation issue

Support for insurance

- Support this

2. What are the negatives, challenges and difficulties?

Risk quantification

- Risk quantification

Lack of insurance

- Can't get insurance on bovine animals that go down with TB
- Can't get insurance in not spot areas
- Won't get low risk areas to take it out
- Availability of insurance
- Insurance not available in certain areas where it is needed most

May not work

- How's it going to work (especially commercial sector)
- Won't work until wildlife is free of TB/or tools to control it

Suspicion

- Suspicion of Defra
- Confidence in valuations

Cost

- Making it affordable for the farmer
- Cost prohibitive

3. Any amendments or refinements you can think of?

Needs to cover all stock

- Needs to cover all stock detected in slaughterhouse and on farm

4. Any alternatives or innovations you can suggest?

Outside help

- Defra to act as broker guarantor
- Non profit organisations to run it

Levy

- Levy (risk status or not?)

5. What would you want to know about the idea to consider it further?

More information

- Need for information/transparency

Implications

- Who would take you on and at what cost
 - Difference in value – so many questions but I'm afraid no answers!

Cost benefits

- Cost benefit analysis before starting

If it's mandatory

- Mandatory or not?

How do you reduce the risk

- How do you reduce the risk? And what control does the insurer have in controlling those risks

4.3 What do you think about the idea of cattle keepers arranging their own tests and negotiating prices directly with an AHVLA approved veterinary practice?

1. What are the benefits and positives of this idea

Vet – farmer relationship

- The relationship between vet and farmer is very important (move so the farmer and AHVLA)
- Very good to reinforce relationship between vet and farmer
- Vet has the skills and farmers trust vets plus better dialogue about controls, biosecurity, boundary management (2)
- Local vet has local knowledge of surrounding farms that have gone down and TB history
- If vets had more power when comes on farm instead of central farm and letter; the vet could give you all clear etc straight away. It would be more acceptable to farmers

Efficient

- Having lay testers is more economical
- Quicker turnaround – cuts out administration

As long as it fits in

- As long as farmer can fit it into their own farming calendar

Open market up

- Enable farmers to shop around – open up market

Farmers would be prepared to arrange tests

- Farmers would be prepared to arrange own tests and negotiate price of testing.

2. What are the negatives, challenges and difficulties?

Loss of power

- Why pay with no control over eradication
- Wouldn't have same negotiating power
- If got subsidy of testing from government they will just set the price

Frustration at government

- Arrived here through government negligence
- Government responsibility to clear up mess

Going to negatively affect smaller farms

- Nail in coffin of small farmer with negotiation, power, discrimination
- Discriminates against smaller farmers because
- issue for small farmers – hourly rate on Dartmoor with small number of cattle
- Vested interests – bigger herds more likely to influence vet

Negotiation with vets

- There would be negotiations with vets to get the vet who would negotiate
- How negotiate prices with vets as individual businesses
- Would end up with recommended price for the tuberculin

Viability of vet practice

- Small vet practices during testing – they are also doing your routine stuff. You want vets to be economically viable enough though current testing revenue to remain in business

Would affect relationship with vet

- It changes the relationship between farmer and own vet. Vet could be pressurised into "looking the other way"

- If shop around won't have same relationship with vet
- issue end up with inexperienced E. European vets with little local knowledge and no experience

Would still hear from AHVLA

- Would still get letter from AHVLA to give you window

Not right to

- Not right to

3. Any amendments or refinements you can think of?

Change in timing

- Need to be able to change testing time to different times of year
- Widen window for testing
- Need 13 months not 12 month window

Take away SFP link

- Take away link to SFP
 - Penalises bigger farmers more with bigger SFP. No deterrent to small producers

More responsibility to vets

- Need to take the link to penalising vets
- Need vets to be able to give you clear notice to lift restrictions there and then. Can serve you with them on farm but not lift them

4. Any alternatives or innovations you can suggest?

Change payment system

- Should give farmer eg 50p per animal when tested and leave it to farmer to negotiate with vet who will do it on hourly basis – if quicker the farmer will gain; cost saving to Defra; those with bad facilities will improve them (make it safer too)

Only apply certain test

- should only apply to routine tests
- on 60 days they get very difficult to handle over time

Certificate

- Why isn't the testing data included on passports? Like MOT certificate.

5. What would you want to know about the idea to consider it further?

Questions about testing

- How can you arrange your own test – need to know logistics
- Are there going to be any maximum numbers of cattle per testing day? This would cause problems if it stretches over 2 days etc.
- How much would the test cost? Hourly or headage?

There are differences between herd types

- Headage vs. time. Dairy vs. beef. Dairy have handling facilities and they are more accessible to gather

How would it work with AHVLA

- How would "AHVLA approval" work

4.4 What do you think about the idea of areas being able to get 'TB free status'

1. What are the benefits and positives of this idea

Should be the aim

- Should be the end game
- Point we would like to be at in the future
- As long as necessary controls are in place and no unforeseen consequences this could be advantageous move

How to define

- What is a TB free areas
 - Local area – 100 miles?
 - As big as it can be?

Concentrates resources

- Local eradication – concentrate resource on areas where disease, gather info on herds

How to achieve

- TB-free = zero risk of TB but difficult to achieve
- Need more controls when TB-free area is proved? E.g. more frequent testing
- Once one area is free; an incentive for others are

Being careful about moving animals

- Move marketable animals
- 1 test, 1 movement allowed. (have no multiple movements on the back of one test)

Less restrictions

- Less bureaucracy
- Fewer controls

Good for EU links

- EU should see that UK is getting a grip

Relationships

- Honesty needed from farmers
- Local groups could be identified/organised through vet practices

More working across networks

- Cumbria – TB-free means more trade with Scotland
- More collaboration/emerges quickly

2. What are the negatives, challenges and difficulties?

Need more information

- Don't know where TB is. Need maps/info from Defra

Areas that aren't TB free are seen as less than TB free areas

- Non-TB-free areas could be seen as second-class (but could also be an incentive)/alienated
- More restrictions on non-TB free areas as other areas become TB-free
- Two-tier market – supermarkets will want to focus on TB-free areas
- Non TB-free areas stigmatised
- Red markets – prices reduced – insurance? To make up difference – Defra organised system can't see private insurers taking on the risk

It's years away

- Thinking about having TB-free animals is years away

Openness about TB

- Farmers etc need to be more open about TB situation

Compliance

- Compliance with controls needed – noncompliance could make matters worse

Affects collaboration

- Who is in and out of the areas affects collaboration across areas

Status may not be permanent.

- Four-yearly testing – don't know if are clear or not
- Still TB risks in TB-free areas, need to be minimised

Risk of it getting worse

- Four-yearly testing allows infection to get worse and possibly get into wildlife

Difficult to control

- Larger the size of area you are looking to eradicate TB in, more difficult to control
- Bigger than county?
- TB free areas – could lead to complacency

3. Any amendments or refinements you can think of?

TB free farms not areas

- Should be TB free farms rather than areas

Target those with disease

- Target help at those with disease, not everywhere

Target those with and without

- Equal effort on areas with disease as with those that are free

Develop Defra/scientists/farmers relationship

- Develop relationship between Defra/scientists/farmers

Don't test AFUs

- No testing of animals in finishing units (within could be a timescale of 90 days of slaughter) cost saving could be used to fund annual testing.
 - Cattle can only go to slaughter verified by vet on farm assurance
 - Test whole herd if a slaughterhouse case found

Change when testing occurs

- Finishing units in TB-free areas – either pre-movement test before, risk-based testing if source from high risk areas

Redirecting funds to biosecurity

- Use money saved from testing on better biosecurity

4. Any alternatives or innovations you can suggest?

Annual testing

- Annual testing in areas/farms?
 - We did that post-war
- Annual testing over a number of years. Until recognised as low level

Risk-based trading

- Risk-based trading – trading with herds of equal or better health status

5. What would you want to know about the idea to consider it further?

Benefits

- What are benefits?

Differential effects

- Could affect different parts of the country in different ways. Need further discussion

Meaning

- What does it mean?

4.5 Minimising the geographical spread of TB in cattle:

1. What else can Government and Industry do?

Meaning of the word 'spread'

- NB. In the question the "spread" of TB is measured by the farms under restriction not the number of cattle culled
- If you minimise/eradicate the disease you will minimise the spread

Widen membership of AHWBE

- The AHWBE board of England has no one on it involved with TB in the SW
 - Many of them are passionate and knowledgeable and it isn't a desk exercise. County committees should be set up with vets/farmers re practitioners – i.e. an action group, talking shop

Educate Ministers

- The politicians that keep themselves informed often more on to other areas and subjects so farmers need to keep to get solutions and strategies implemented
- Political awareness and education of ministers and public votes
 - But votes and public perception and politicians fear of challenging the public misinformation
 - Oversimplification of issues in media and misinformation will make the problems worse

Zoning

- Zoning for movement isn't working

- Issues of zoning trade restrictions need to be tackled as movement of cattle from the S West doesn't mean the problem also moves
- Zoning needs to be off the agenda as it is irrelevant to TB spread

Work from the boundary of the disease in

- Get ahead of the disease start at the boundary-edges and work inwards (as per map) and make boundaries by using natural obstacles e.g. rivers etc as well as man-made
- Use military strategies as a worked with foot and month

Control via landownership

- Land owners other than cattle need to also take responsibility for controlling problem on other land e.g. flower growers
 - But mechanism needs to go on beyond land ownership of a problem exists to deal with wildlife issues

Research into cattle to cattle transmission

- If cattle to cattle link is disproved by urgent research it will turn the whole planned programme on its head
- Where is the science that proves the cattle-cattle infection link? It doesn't exist. Very important

Frequency of testing

- Increase the testing in the areas. Reduce from a 4 year testing programme to annual like in Wales
- Yearly testing over the whole of England
 - Relaxing some existing controls for pre-movement and trading testing risk based to reduce costs

Effective widespread process to sort the problem

- The funding issues are a secondary issue though important to establishing an effective widespread and thorough process

Research around AQU and AFU

- (AQU) quarantine areas and finishing/AFU units to fit into a TB free area and if it would cause a problem – 'dirty' animals in a 'clean' area. Does this need to be separated?
- AQU (and AFU?) restrictions on being set up may link – more research is needed to assess real risks of infection levels

Assessment of TB

- TB needs to be assessed alongside and focus on severity not only geography
- Find out the source(s) of TB

Impartial research

- Research organisations who could demonstrate effective case studies are bound by need to not upset Defra as need funding

Communication about reactors

- A perceived and real risk if reactors are tested positive. Communication is needed re infected animals

Badger Cull

- Badger spread – reduce bureaucracy to license badger cull. At present rate only two counties will have an effective cull
- Badger act to be invoked to protect stock return the right to owners
- Annual 300k badgers die of all causes per year
- Protecting the continued trials and controlled pilot badger culls

Research ecology/behaviour relevant to targeted badger culls

- Badger behaviour and ecology needs to be studied and used
 - Demonstrating good practice case studies is low cost in comparison with expensive trials as done in the past and not as affordable now i.e. a cost-effective solution
- Demonstrate the healthy badger communities keep themselves disease free by evicting unhealthy animals
- By removing only evicted badgers ie those living outside of communities, demonstrate that this reduces TB in the cattle
- Sustainable, cost saving solutions to only remove affected diseased badgers
 - Counter-effective otherwise e.g. cost for vaccination in Wales
- Accurate research into badgers physiology and life cycles needed. 12-15 years of age. 3-5 years as quoted
- Study healthy badger setts and study when disease hits and correlate disease spread of TB

Promote badger health and protect healthy setts

- More funding to detect infected badgers. The aim is to have healthy badgers as a true firewall
- Badger welfare association created for healthy badgers – if all sick ones the population health and disease resistance will increase
- Protect healthy setts by culling any diseased individuals. Badger behaviour can be worked with to defend their setts/territories and help eradicate disease
 - Much more effective than randomised badger culls which will kill healthy ones as well as diseased and mainly slower elderly ones

Firewall against badgers

- Like controlling mink against water voles a firewall against badgers could be initiated to absolutely limit movement. This worked in Ireland (Shannon) in 14 months. The government didn't respond to use these lessons <14>

Research

- More scientific research is needed to determine the absolute wildlife link

4.6 Different types and providers of support and advice.

What support or advice would you like and who could provide it

Listed by organisations

Local Vets

- Support based from local vets who have local knowledge. Not one size fits all
- Own vets give lot of advice and support
- TB testing must stay with local vets. Possibility of reducing costs by farmers paying for testing by lay testers under control of local vets
- Local vets should be more part of solution. Are key to making life easier for farmers
- Vet – farmer relationship key
- Local vet who does the testing is best placed to provide advice

TB Advisory Group SW

- Essential that funding is extended
- As far as concerned is waste of £1.3 m
- Not sure whether TB Advisory Group effective and get free and independent advice from AHVLA
- Without TB Advisory Group SW, farmers would be without free and independent source of advice and support
- TB Advisory Group visited farm and available on phone. Given good advice on biosecurity. Essential that have independent body that people can talk too
- Tb Advisory Group useful e.g. if problem with AHVLA paperwork etc.
- TB Advisory Group not useful – from practical experience
- SW TB Advisory Group working well in south west - use this as an example for good delivery.

AHVLA

- Biggest problem with AHVLA is understaffed. Need to communicate quicker
- Not getting any information back from epi survey (but can request it)
- Would like more interaction and advice from AHVLA. Less farm filling
- Need more advice from on how to manage business most effectively and minimise impact of restrictions. OR be able to get advice from TB Advisory Group

Listed by topic

Badger survey information

- Interesting for everyone to know how many badgers in area – need badger population census
- Where healthy and sick setts are. Advises farmers to get rid of sick ones and look after healthy ones
- Need support for badger surveying technique
- Need to think outside box and use 'country man method' to deal with TB
- Need trust between all providing advice

Food safety

- Need effective risk communication to public on food safety issues. (FSA). Need to be prepared. Not for industry to provide this advice
- Emphasis on local solutions. Regional or national are too big

- Need for flexibility where people want to retire for example – flexibility for sales where herds restricted

Consistent advice

- Need provision of consistent, central advice, taken through close working with industry.

5 Out of everything you have seen and discussed today what two things would you most want to see happen?

Communication/collaboration

Defra

- Better communications both Defra – farmers and Defra – general public
- Acceptance by Defra and government that more needs to be done or we will be overrun by TB

Develop trust between Defra and farmers

- The development of trust between the farmer – Defra and the vets involved (understanding each other by regular communication)
- Keep talking to industry

Listen to farmer knowledge

- The AHWBE and Defra listening to us
- More value for farmers opinions. Better communication Defra – AHVLA

Public Understanding

- Education – need public to better understand the issue in particular that vaccination is only 60% effective and is not a simple solution

New Policy and Programme

- Constructing a coherent policy that farmers will know will lead to the eradication of TB
- Scrap the current TB eradication programme, 10 years hasn't worked. Listen to farmers work with us and start again from scratch

Reduce bureaucracy

- Keep restrictions/regulations to a minimum

Common sense

Common sense approach

- Common sense approach to further policy decisions minimising impact on farmers

Organisation and vets

Dedicated support service

- Continuation of a dedicated advice and support service to provide free and independent help to farmers working

Local vets and farmers manage at a local level

- Increased involvement of local vets in TV testing of controls – decentralisation
- Greater LVI = Local vet involvement at more levels
- Local TB management 10 miles x10 miles with vets and their farmer clients
- Increased control in the hands of vets and farmers
- Allowing the industry with their vets, to manage the problem at the local level under national co-ordination

Vets advise on risk management

- Utilisation of local vet knowledge and expertise in break downs and also low incidence areas to advise farms on biosecurity and risk based trading
- You must keep local vets in control of TB tooling, results and control of disease

Meat Hygiene Service

- MHS need training of difference between lung worm damage and TB lesions. This is a problem in SW abattoirs as bad year for lung worm

Testing

- Test other animals which are likely to catch TB
- Sounds as though there is no need to test at AFUs
- More accurate testing

Dealing with reactors/diseased animals

Reactor removal

- Quicker notification and quicker disposal of TB reactors from farms
- Look at improving reactor removal – allow owner to arrange (bear cost of haulage list of approved houses and kill days). Vet authorise at time reactor found and notifies AHVLA. Look at pressure on FSA to get meat inspectors there when needed

Compensation

- Fairer compensation include “Loss of income” – possible insurance based
- Removal of compensation – gradually! Balanced with industry-led policy not government enforced! Needs co-operation within industry

Targeted resources

- Better targeted resources for farms/areas which are affected by TB

Trading/Moving

Pre-movement tests

- Pre-movement tests and tracings to be renewed and relaxed to save money to agriculture and government

Disease in wildlife

Target culls on infected badgers

- Demonstration area of good practice – an area not just individual farms
- Give Bryan the chance to prove/disprove his theory. If everyone truly want to see the end of this terrible disease
- The situation is so serious we need to take almost a military approach – secure borders by testing – then ‘enlightened’ targeted culls
- Wildlife – need to develop better strategy to cull infected badger setts. Not individual healthy badgers. Local knowledge and trust farmers who want healthy badgers on their farms
- Badger cull of infected animals
- Focussed analysis of diseased badgers in relation to herds with outbreaks
- Target removal of infected badgers
- Why does Defra (AHVLA) not want to openly discuss “Diseased Badger Removal”
- Progress on legal disease control in wildlife

Lift Badger Protection Act

- Control of wildlife reservoir of bTB. Lifting of Badger Protection Act
- Removal of Badger Protection Act (or correct interpretation) – with licenses issued for farmers to clean-up their own farms ie wildlife
- Badger Protection Act removed
- Badger Act lifted less talk, more action
- Make sure the badger act licences farmer to protect livestock from badger TB

Farmers cull badgers

- Return the means of controlling TB to farmers. This is already possible under the badger act
- Let farmers cull sick badgers
- Defra/the government must use the countryman’s method to reduce TB

Cull License

- Reduce bureaucracy and thresholds required to achieve a cull license

Roll out the cull

- Wider role out of a workable badger control policy and more education of the general public
- Pilot culls rolled out across SW
- Widen the cull. Keep cattle farming alive
- Rapid roll out of badger cull
- Rapid implementation if badger control programme
- Issue licenses to control badgers in all TB infected areas. No reservoir -> no TB -> no costs

Stream lined/common sense approach

- Common sense prevails regarding culls and wildlife controls (possibly with farmer help)
- Tackle the problems have streamlined policy, widen the cull don’t restrict farmers enable them to trade

Po-active approach to wildlife management

- A pro-active approach to wildlife management and control to work toward a total eradication of bTB

Research

Learn from History

- Analysis of risk/benefit/cost of each control measure
- Learn from history. How was TB all but eradicated in the UK in the 1980's – repeat those measures
- Look at how they eradicated TB post 1945 -> 1970s/1980s. It worked!! ~ (10 cases early 80s!!)

Learn from other countries

- Read "Making TB History", a booklet and CD produced by the New Zealand Animal Health Board

Evaluate pre movement testing

- Pre-movement testing evaluated scientifically

Badger cull related

- Solid evidence from an target objective badger cull ready
- Rapid research into PCR and gas filled foam

Locating edge of disease

- Locating the edge of the disease

Incentivise behaviour change

- Earned recognition using local vets and assurance schemes. One size does not fit all

TB eradication

Action

- Control and eradication of TB using all means possible including cattle and wildlife control! ASAP!!!!
- No TB
- Farmers able to make business decisions without spectre of TB looming
- Stop talking and get on with it

6 Parking place (other issues)

- More trusting relationship between farmers and DEFRA. Cut some red tape!
- Badger culling should be of infected setts rather than individual animals. Need to research and develop humane gassing techniques
- Badger cull:
 1. Must be simplified
 2. Must be accelerated to achieve any meaningful impact on S.W. Region over the next 4 years
 - Hear hear
- Work needs to done on the possible link between. Johne's disease and false positive reactors to SKIN TEST
- Should remove movement restrictions from Store (PrMT) and fattened cattle (slaughter house) within herd breakdowns?

Annex 1 Agenda

Bovine TB Where do we go from here? Agenda

12.30 **Doors open for registration. Coffee and tea will be available (Please have lunch before you arrive).**

Starting activity:

Imagine it is 2025. You are at the market talking about how bovine TB is handled now compared to way back in 2012. For you the best two things are.....

1:00 **Welcome and how the workshop will be run.
Setting the scene
Context and key information**

Lead Facilitator
Chair of AHWBE
Defra Team Leader

Questions to clarify what you have just heard

(What do you mean by...? Or Please explain...? Please write your question on one of the white cards. There will be plenty of opportunity to give your views during the workshop.)

What's working and new ideas – work in small groups to discuss the following:

- **What is working well now?**
- **How could this be strengthened, enhanced or improved further?**
- **What else needs to happen?**
- **What new innovations or ideas can you suggest?**

2:40 20 **Tea and coffee**

3:00 **What do you think?**

Some ideas have emerged from workshops AHWBE held with key industry representatives (including NFU, BVA, NBA, & Dairy UK). Please visit each of the different topics below and have your say. When answering the questions aim to think as broadly and widely as you can (for example: short & long term, for your personal interests and for the industry as a whole, initial and knock on effects/consequences).

PLEASE NOTE: It is unlikely that you will be able to get around all of the questions so do prioritise the ones you most want to respond to.

1. **What do you think about the idea of reducing compensation combined with greater ability for farmers to remove reactors and negotiate salvage payments?**
2. **What do you think about the idea of an insurance type scheme to help farmers meet any additional cost?**
3. **What do you think about the idea of cattle keepers arranging their own tests and negotiating prices directly with an AHVLA approved veterinary practice?**
4. **What do you think about the idea of areas being able to get 'TB free status'?**

For each of the above four topics you will be asked the following questions:

1. What are the benefits and positives of this idea
2. What are the negative, challenges and difficulties?

3. Any amendments or refinements you can think of?
 4. Any alternatives or innovations you can suggest?
 5. What would you want to know about the idea to consider it further?
- 5. Minimising the geographical spread of TB in cattle:**
- What else can Government and Industry do?
- 6. There could be different types and providers of support and advice.**
- What support or advice would you like?
 - Who could provide it?

Out of everything you have seen and discussed today what two things would you most want to see happen?

Finishing tasks

What happens next

No
later
than
4.45

Finish

Annex 2: Attendee List

Organisation / sector

AVS Hayle
British Alpaca Society
Dairy Co
Farmers and livestock keepers (beef, suckler, pedigree and dairy)
Local Authority / Trading Standards
National Beef Association
NFU South West
NFU Dorset
NFU Head of Food and Farming Policy
NFU Gloucestershire
NFU Somerset
Penbode vets
RCVS Council/Cornwall Vet Association
South West TB Farm Advisory Service
South Devon Herd Book Society
St David's Farm Practice Ltd

Officials

AHWBE Chair and Board member
Acting Director, Defra's TB Programme
Regional Veterinary Lead, AHVLA

Numbers attending:

40

Farmers or farming organisations:

30

Veterinary practices or organisations:

5

Other:

5