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1. Executive Summary

Berkshire

The data for the last three years (2014 to 2016) in Berkshire are similar, incidence is the same as reported in 2015 (5.5%) with few dairy farms being affected.

- Two persistently infected dairies in the area of presumed endemic wildlife region of the county continued their breakdown throughout 2016.
- One additional dairy herd became infected (OTFW) in 2016 with genotype 9:d with an obscure origin. There is no indication of spread and all co-located camelids and other susceptible species tested negative and OTF status was regained. Given the current data, there is no indication that this constitutes an easterly move of 9:d.

The area with the highest cattle density coincides with the area of presumed endemic wildlife infection (genotype 10:a and 10:u) in the western half of the county. The 2015 cluster north of the A34 and M4 junction (Chievely) continues with the two aforementioned dairy farms and surrounding beef units. One farm’s co-located pigs had visible lesions found at slaughter. The most likely origin of infection for the pigs was determined to be either wildlife or cattle.

Despite high-risk buying/movement (45% of all breakdowns were attributed to the introduction of cattle with undisclosed infection) and presumed endemic wildlife infection continuing, the incidence appears to have plateaued after a slight rise (4.5 to 5.5%) from 2014 to 2015.

Hampshire

The data for the last three years (2014 to 2016) in Hampshire, show a large increase in incidence from 2015 (3.0 to 5.5%) and surpasses the 2014 incidence of 4.5%. Thirty one percent (5/16) of all new breakdowns were attributed to wildlife as the infection source in 2016. There was no indication that there has been an expansion of the area of presumed endemic TB infection in the north-west of Hampshire (along the Berkshire border); however, there were two clusters of OTFS breakdowns of interest in 2016:

- Winchester to Fawley: Group of 10 breakdowns that do not appear to have a common cause. The group is comprised of four dairies, four suckler herds, and two fattening units. All except two have high risk purchasing histories from HRA and Edge holdings. The two without recent risky moves are currently of ‘obscure’ origin. Wildlife is possible, but other sources such as recrudescence from previous breakdown or indirect contact via knacker yard are more likely. There is no indication that spread from any of those breakdowns? has occurred.

- West of Winchester: A cluster of OTFS TB incidents continued into 2016 in a group of three farms that oscillate from OTF to OTFS regularly. There is a history of cattle straying in the areas between the three. One of the holdings, a dairy, had an OTFW breakdown in 2007, a suckler unit continues to engage in high risk-buying from the HRA and Edge, and the third is a closed dairy herd with adjacent grazing.

High-risk moves and buying practices from the HRA and Edge Area appear to be increasing. Many fatteners are now sending finished cattle directly to slaughter, as a model to allow business to continue ‘as usual’ whether OTF or not. This reduces the impact of a breakdown and may make purchasing from the ‘occasionally’ OTF Edge Area farms more likely in the future.
2. **Introduction**

A key action in the implementation of the Government’s strategy to achieve Officially Bovine Tuberculosis Free (OTF) status for England by 2038 was to recognise the different levels of bTB in different parts of the country and vary the approach to control accordingly. To this end three management regions or zones have been established. This report describes the epidemiology of bovine bTB in the ‘Edge’ counties of Berkshire and Hampshire (see Appendix 1). The Edge Area in England has a low, but recently rising, incidence of infected farms and control efforts are seeking to slow down and reverse geographic spread, and reduce the incidence rate, with the aim of obtaining OTF status for this area as soon as possible.

**Data statement**

All data are derived directly from the transactional database ‘Sam’ and so may differ slightly from similar data quoted in other reports, which were downloaded later in the year so are more complete, and have had additional review to remove duplicates and correct errors.

3. **Cattle industry in the Edge Area of Berkshire and Hampshire**

**Berkshire**

The highest herd density is in the south and west, along the borders with Hampshire and Wiltshire, but Berkshire is one of smallest Edge counties in size and cattle population. Berkshire has about 250 herds (24,500 cattle): 15% dairy and remainder split evenly between beef finishers and suckler.

**Hampshire**

There is a high herd density in the central-south and south-west of Hampshire. Large herds are mainly dairy, small herds are mainly beef finishers. Over 60% of dairy farms are >200 cattle in size, whereas 65% of beef suckler and 65% of beef finisher herds have between 1-50 cattle.
4. Overview of the bTB epidemic in the Edge counties of Berkshire and Hampshire

History of bTB in the Berkshire and Hampshire

Figure 1. Annual breakdown numbers for Hampshire and Berkshire.

The figure above shows the annual number of breakdowns in Berkshire and Hampshire over recent years. In both counties, numbers have fluctuated but there has been an increasing trend recently, particularly in Hampshire.
Geographical distribution of bovine bTB cases (new and ongoing) in Berkshire and Hampshire

Figure 2. Geographical distribution of bTB cases in 2016 and spoligotyphes

The figure above shows the distribution of breakdowns in Berkshire and Hampshire in 2016, and the spoligotypes found. The home range for genotype 10:a edges into western Berkshire and north west Hampshire.

5. Descriptive epidemiology of bovine bTB in in the Edge Area of Berkshire and Hampshire

Level of bovine bTB

The incidence of bovine bTB breakdowns in Berkshire and Hampshire was calculated for 2014-2016 and these are shown in Figure 3 below. The incidence level in Berkshire has not changed much. In
Hampshire, on the other hand, there was a decrease from 2014 to 2015, but in 2016 an increase compared to the preceding year and a slight increase compared to 2014.

Figure 3. Incidence in Berkshire and Hampshire for 2014 to 2016 (calculated for all new breakdowns (OTFS and OTFW) in the reporting period as a percentage of unique OTF cattle herds tested in that period)

Risk pathways for bTB infection

The source of infection, determined by APHA field vets, in 2016 for OTFW herds in Berkshire is shown in Figure 4 below. It shows the predominance of wildlife infections, followed by purchased and obscure.

Figure 4. Source of infection of OTFW in Berkshire in 2016

The graph below (Figure 5) shows the source of purchased animals in Berkshire in 2016 for herds that subsequently became infected (OTFW) was entirely from HRA
Figure 5. Source of purchased cattle for OTFW breakdowns in Berkshire for 2016 where cattle movements were the most likely origin of infection.

The source of infection for OTFW herds in Hampshire was predominantly purchases, followed by wildlife and one obscure source (Figure 6). The purchases were mainly from HRA, and Edge (Figure 7).
iii. Source of infection for OTFS herds in Berkshire was mainly from purchase of infected animals, with wildlife contributing a quarter of the total (Figure 8). The purchases were mainly from the HRA and only one from the Edge (Figure 9).
Figure 8. Proportion of purchased sources comparing to wildlife sources for OTFS herds in Hampshire

Figure 9. Purchased source of infection in Berkshire in 2016 for OTFS herds where cattle movements were the most likely origin of infection

For OTFS herds in Hampshire, the main source of infection in 2016 was purchases, with some wildlife and obscure sources. Figure 10 shows the predominance of purchased infection cases over the other sources. The purchase source was dominated by movements from the Edge area, and HRA with a small number from the LRA (Figure 11).
Role of other species

Badgers and other wildlife

In 2016, a New Forest deer stalker submitted a Fallow deer carcass with visible lesions (VLs) found at post mortem examination (PME). However, samples submitted were culture negative for *M. bovis*.

Other domestic species

No domestic species reports were received from Berkshire, There were two cases of domestic non-bovine species (cat and alpaca) in Hampshire reported in 2016. The infected cat was identified in Tadley by a private veterinary surgeon (PVS) and had genotype 10:u. This genotype had been identified in the area in 2014 and 2015 (another cat), so does not indicate further spread. The alpaca case in northern Hampshire, was a ‘hot’ trace from the South West HRA. Although positive on the blood test, no VLs were found at PME and the rest of the ‘herd’ tested clear and restrictions were lifted.

Other Farm animal species

In northern Hampshire, near Andover, an area with endemic wildlife disease, infection was detected at slaughter in an outdoor pig unit (900 pigs). Genotype 10:a was cultured.

Detection of cases

Routine herd tests identified the majority of breakdown herds in both Berkshire and Hampshire. In Berkshire the annual whole herd test (WHT) (n=10) was the main method of identification of breakdown herds. Only one was identified through PRMT (Figure 12).

In Hampshire, on the other hand, which had more than three times as many breakdowns, figure 13 illustrates the higher contribution of 6M, then PRMT, followed by TR, SLH, CON and 12M tests.
As indicated in Appendix 4, in Berkshire, there were two OTFW breakdowns most likely triggered by purchased cattle with no further spread. In Hampshire, there were 10 breakdowns attributed to introduction of cattle with undisclosed infection, with no evidence of secondary spread of infection to other herds.

**Burden of bTB**

Berkshire: of 33,272 cattle tested, 401 reactors were detected, 152 of these were reactors to a comparative skin test and 249 were disclosed by a gamma interferon blood test (g-IFN) (Appendix 3). Compared to 2015, more cattle were tested and more reactors detected, with a greater proportion detected by the IFN test.

The average number of reactors per breakdown increased substantially from 20 to 36. This is explained by large numbers of skin and g-IFN reactors disclosed in half a dozen farms with ongoing or new breakdowns.
Hampshire: Of 94,602 cattle tested, 317 reactors were disclosed, of which 168 were by the comparative skin test and 149 using g-IFN. (Appendix 3). Hampshire also saw an increase in numbers tested, compared to 2015, though not as great as Berkshire. The high ratio of OTFS to OTFW (28 to 16) breakdowns with corresponding reduced g-IFN testing compared to 2015 (11 to 13) explains the fall in the proportion detected by the g-IFN test, 47% compared to 67% in 2015. A small number of herds with high numbers of reactors was responsible for a doubling of the number of skin test reactors in the county.

In 2016 FSA reported 5 SLH cases in Berkshire and 3 in Hampshire. (Appendix 3)

Key drivers of the bTB epidemic

As previously discussed in the 2015 Edge Report, presumed wildlife endemicity and the purchase of cattle with undisclosed infection continues to be the likely major cause of breakdowns in both Berkshire and Hampshire.

The main source for OTFW herds in Berkshire in 2016 was most likely wildlife whereas for OTFS herds the main source was purchased cattle. In Hampshire, purchase was the main source of infection in both OTFW and OTFS herds. See figures 4 to 11.

County descriptions

As previously discussed in the 2015 Edge Area Report for Berkshire, two dairy herds remain with persistent TB breakdowns of presumed wildlife origin. Greenham Common became OTF in 2016 and animals were removed for the winter in order to avoid the scenario of supplementary feeding on the common, which may have increased wildlife-cattle interaction in the past.

In Hampshire, the farm-based wildlife biosecurity plans and increased awareness of HRA purchases should lead to the reduction of future infection. The TB control plan for the New Forest was refreshed in 2016 and continues to have Verderer and Agister support.

The key challenge for both counties to achieve 2025 OTF status will be the endemic wildlife regions along the western Hampshire-Berkshire border.

Summary of risks to the Low Risk Area (LRA) and any mitigating factors

As previously discussed in the 2015 Edge Area Report, the river Thames still plays an important part in slowing down the infection going east.

Movement of breeding cattle from endemic areas carries extra risk of bringing infected animals that will live longer compared to fattening stock, into the LRA. Compulsory post-movement testing of cattle moved into the LRA from higher TB risk areas, which was introduced in April 2016, should partially mitigate some of the risks from cattle movements.

North-east Hants and eastern Berks remain low density areas for cattle premises and cattle per square km. Currently there are two premises with OTFS breakdowns along the eastern border with the LRA. These breakdowns were attributed to the purchase of undisclosed infected animals through high-risk cattle buying practices, but there was no indication of spread which could have threatened the LRA.
Summary of the risk to the Edge Area from the HRA

Purchase of cattle from the HRA has been identified as the most likely cause of infection in two thirds of OTFW herds in Hampshire. In Berkshire, all the breakdowns caused by introduction of infected cattle originated from cattle brought in from the HRA. For the OTFS breakdown herds in Berkshire, two thirds of those caused by cattle movements originated from the HRA whereas in Hampshire only 40% of breakdowns caused by cattle movements were from the HRA.

As previously discussed in the 2015 Edge Area Report, the spread of wildlife infection from the HRA still remains the most significant risk to the Edge Area in Hampshire from Dorset and Wiltshire, but there is little evidence of this happening in 2016.

Only one breakdown holding (OTFW, genotype 9:d) in Hampshire has a link with Wiltshire, which was used for grazing heifers and ‘dry’ cows during the summer of 2016. Tests of contiguous cattle herds were negative, so there is currently no indication of local spread. As discussed in the 2015 Edge Report, the risk posed by movements of cattle from areas that straddle the HRA and Edge Area have been mitigated by the reduction in exemptions for pre-movement testing achieved by the development of 10 mile radius limits for Temporary Land Associations (TLAs) and temporary County Parish Holding Numbers (tCPH), following the elimination of Sole Occupancy Authorities (SOAs).

The 2015 Edge Area report mentioned the importance of cattle density where cattle are acting as sentinels of wildlife infections, so that the low cattle density areas on the eastern side of Berkshire and Hampshire, might mask moving wildlife infection fronts. Some areas in Berkshire and Hampshire appear to have little bTB, but that may be an artefact resulting from low cattle densities.

Common grazing poses a significant risk of spreading infection both into and out of the commons because of the introduction of higher risk cattle originating from the HRA. The existing approach of post-movement testing off the commons should mitigate this risk for the majority of commons in Berkshire and Hampshire. The New Forest bTB control plan offers a different and more rigorous approach and it was updated in October 2016. No major changes were made, but the wording was clarified to assist the Common Grazers. All member herds have their WHT during the New Forest common ‘open window’ of October to January. Any purchases into member herds must be isolated for 60 days and then post-movement tested (additional to their compulsory PRMT on herd of origin). Cattle that are exempt from the PRMT requirement must not be mixed with, nor have contact on the home premises with other cattle with a lower or unknown health status. The New Forest plan was reviewed by APHA and the NF authorities in order to ensure clarity especially in relation to movement of bulls. In 2016, one bull on the final ‘entry’ skin test that would have allowed access to NF herd was disclosed as a reactor. The breakdown herd effectively isolated the direct contact animals which all tested clear prior to entry onto the NF.

As previously mentioned in the 2015 report, wildlife relocations from HRA into the Edge Area could seed new infection into local wildlife populations. Whether this has occurred recently is unknown, but there have been anecdotal reports that relocations have happened in the past.

6. Assessment of effectiveness of controls and forward look

As discussed in the Edge 2015 report, it is unlikely that current measures focussing on cattle (and not wildlife) will be fully effective in reducing the incidence of cattle bTB in Berkshire and Hampshire. To date there has been limited stakeholder take up of badger vaccination.
Appendices

Appendix 1: Overview of risk and surveillance areas of England and Edge Area objectives and controls

Figure A1: Bovine bTB risk and surveillance areas of England (in effect from January 2013, as set out in the strategy for achieving Officially Bovine Tuberculosis Free status for England)

1.1 Policy objectives for the Edge Area:

Short to medium term:

- Slow down geographic spread
- Maintain crude herd incidence of OTFW breakdowns <2% overall by 2019
Begin to reduce the incidence rate

Longer term:
- Reduce geographic spread of bTB and push the Edge Area boundaries westward
- Reduce OTFW herd incidence to <1% by 2025
- Attain OTF status (incidence of indigenous OTFW herd breakdowns <0.1) for the lowest incidence counties in the Edge Area.

1.2 Key Control Measures

Surveillance
- Survey of badgers found dead in the Edge area

Management of cases (‘breakdowns’)
- Increased sensitivity of breakdown herd testing:
  - OTFS breakdowns to pass 2 consecutive short interval tests at severe interpretation to regain OTF status
  - Mandatory IFN-g parallel testing in OTFW herds
  - Enhanced epidemiological investigation & data analysis

Preventive measures
- Compulsory pre-movement bTB testing
- CTS links between HRA and Edge areas removed
- Approved Finishing Units (AFUs) with grazing not permitted
- Promote risk based trading of cattle
- Badger (Edge) vaccination scheme
- bTB biosecurity review project (underway)
- Local bTB awareness events and Eradication Boards

Information sharing – location of breakdown herds published

Appendix 2: Relevant changes in the cattle industry in the Berkshire and Hampshire since 2015

There have been no significant changes in the cattle industry in either Berkshire or Hampshire since 2015.
### Table A3.2. Herd-level statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herd-level statistics</th>
<th>Berkshire (02)</th>
<th>Hampshire (15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Total number of cattle herds live on Sam at the end of the reporting period</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Total number of herd tests carried out in the period</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Total number of OTF cattle herds bTB tested during the period for any reason</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Total number of OTF cattle herds at the end of the report period (i.e. herds not under any type of bTB02 restrictions)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Total number of cattle herds that were not under restrictions due to an ongoing bTB breakdown at the end of the report period.</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Total number of new bTB breakdowns detected in cattle herds during the report period</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- OTF status suspended (OTF-S)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- OTF status withdrawn (OTF-W)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Of the OTF-W herd breakdowns:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How many can be considered the result of movement, purchase or contact from/with an existing breakdown based on current evidence?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New OTF-W breakdowns triggered by skin test reactors or 2xIRs at routine herd tests</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New OTF-W breakdowns triggered by skin test reactors or 2xIRs at other bTB test types (forward and back-tracings, contiguous, check tests, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New OTF-W breakdowns first detected through routine slaughterhouse bTB surveillance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Number of new breakdowns revealed by enhanced bTB surveillance (radial testing) conducted around those OTF-W herds (may not be applicable to every county in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Edge Area)

- OTF-S  N/A  N/A
- OTF-W  N/A  N/A

i. Number of OTF-W herds still open at the end of the period (including any ongoing OTF-W breakdowns that began in a previous quarter)

|                | 10 | 8 |

j. New confirmed (positive M. bovis culture) incidents in non-bovine species detected during the report period (indicate host species involved)

|                | 2 pig units (one co-located with cattle) | 1 cat (submitted by PVS) |

Table A3.2. Animal-level statistics

Animal-level statistics (cattle)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Total number of cattle tested in the period (animal tests)</td>
<td>33272</td>
<td>94602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reactors detected:</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tuberculin skin test</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• additional IFN-gamma blood test reactors (skin-test negative or IR animals)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Reactors per breakdown</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Reactors per 1000 animal tests</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Additional animals identified for slaughter for bTB control reasons (DCs, including any first-time IRs)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. SLH cases (tuberculous carcasses) reported by FSA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. SLH cases confirmed by culture of M. bovis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4: Suspected sources of M. bovis infection for all the new OTF-W breakdowns identified in the report period

Table A4. Suspected sources of M. bovis infection for all the new OTF-W breakdowns identified in the report period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most likely origin</th>
<th>Berkshire</th>
<th>Hampshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TR398 (Rev. 08/16) 17
| Introduction (e.g. purchase) of infected animal(s) | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Local - lateral spread from neighbouring holdings | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| • exposure to infected wildlife | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| • other farmed species | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| • recrudescence of residual infection from a previous bTB breakdown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| • infected human source | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Undetermined/obscure | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Other (explain) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

2016 OTFW bTB breakdowns identified in Berkshire and Hampshire were categorised using the following risk matrix, according to (a) the probability of them being the result of introduced infection (inward cattle movements) and (b) the strength of evidence that we are dealing with an isolated incident without further propagation from the index farm to neighbouring herds (or vice versa).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berkshire</th>
<th>Probability of isolated, sporadic ('one-off') breakdown, without secondary cattle to cattle spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likely (no secondary breakdowns detected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of introduced M. bovis infection</td>
<td>Definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not likely (indigenous infection in the locality)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Probability of isolated, sporadic ('one-off') breakdown, without secondary cattle to cattle spread

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hampshire</th>
<th>Probability of isolated, sporadic ('one-off') breakdown, without secondary cattle to cattle spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likely (no secondary breakdowns detected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of introduced <em>M. bovis</em> infection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not likely (indigenous infection in the locality)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 5: Overview of the bTB Control Programme in Berkshire and Hampshire of the SE Edge Area

#### 5.1 Edge Testing Policy

Slaughter of IRs in OTFW herds has continued where there has been farmer co-operation.

IFN-g has been discontinued in OTFW breakdowns identified as a wildlife source unless biosecurity measures to protect cattle from wildlife contact are agreed and instigated by the owner (e.g. CCTV to identify wildlife access onto the farm, selective grazing of certain fields to minimise contact, etc.). IFN-g testing has continued on one farm in Berkshire that has had more than one skin test negative and IFN-g positive animal where Visible Lesions were found at PME.

Berkshire continues to have two persistently infected dairy herds in the wildlife endemic area.

Hampshire currently has no persistently infected herds.

#### 5.2 Unusual bTB breakdowns

In Berkshire, a pedigree Dexter (extensive show travel and hire bulls) WHT disclosed 19 reactors, 16 with visible lesions (number tested was 73). There is no indication that the introduced genotype, 17:e, has spread.

In Hampshire, a PVS suspected ‘skin TB’ (a condition rarely caused by *M.bovis* and usually caused by atypical mycobacteria) in one OTFW breakdown finishing herd in Hampshire. Reactors were disclosed at the 12M test (previously OTFS). To date, 3 reactors with visible lesions have been identified, culture negative. There have been a total of 31 reactors identified (all NVL) using IFN-g and skin testing.
Two farm shops in North Hampshire had OTFS breakdowns in 2016. Both went clear following two SI tests. Purchased infection is most likely with recrudescence from previous infection a possibility. In Hampshire there is a large number of OTFS breakdown herds occurring due to 2xIR disclosure 43% of all breakdowns (17/28 OTFS and 2/16 OTFW). None in Berkshire.

5.3 Other Testing Measures
No hotspots were established in Berkshire or Hampshire in 2016.
Levels of overdue testing continues to be kept low and is intensively managed. Hampshire Trading Standards actively assists with enforced tests.

5.4 Other Control Measures
Badger Road Traffic Surveillance via Surrey University continues and will continue with carcases collection and cultures until September 2017.
Regional meetings held with farmers and OVs, as requested and co-ordinated by the regional NFU representative.
Hampshire Trading Standards continues to actively assist with monitoring movements and licensing of breakdown cattle.

The Animal and Plant Health Agency is an Executive Agency of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs working to safeguard animal and plant health for the benefit of people, the environment and the economy.