

**Animal Health and Welfare Board for England**

# **Bovine TB:**

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

**York**

**Workshop outputs**

Date: 11<sup>th</sup> October 2012

## Contents

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 .....	6
3 What's working and new ideas .....	7
3.1 What's working well now?.....	7
3.2 How could this be strengthened, enhanced or improved further? .....	10
3.3 What else needs to happen? .....	13
3.4 What new innovations or ideas can you suggest?.....	17
4 What do you think? .....	21
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? .....	21
4.2 What do you think about the idea of an insurance type scheme to help farmers meet any additional cost? .....	22
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?.....	24
4.4 What do you think about the idea of areas being able to get 'TB free status' .....	25
4.5 Minimising the geographical spread of TB in cattle: .....	27
4.6 Different types and providers of support and advice. ....	28
5 Out of everything you have seen and discussed today what two things would you most want to see happen? .....	29
Annex 1 Agenda .....	32
Annex 2: Attendee List .....	34

## 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 with non-participants without proper explanation.

<b>Acronyms used in this report</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
AH	Animal Health (now AHVLA)
AIA	Animal Industry Act
AHVLA	Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency
BCG	Bacille Calmette-Guerin
BCMS	British Cattle Movement Service
BSE	Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy
bTB	Bovine Tuberculosis
CPD	Continuous Professional Development
BVD	Bovine Viral Diarrhoea
CTS	Cattle Tracing System
CVO	Chief Veterinary Officer
DEFRA	Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs
DG-Sanco	European Commission Directorate-General for Health and Consumers <i>(DG-SANCO for the French words Santé [Health] &amp; Consommateurs [Consumers])</i>
DIVA test	Differentiate Infected from Vaccinated Animals test
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
EBLEX	English Beef and Lamb Executive
EC	European Community (now European Union)
EID	Electronic Identification
EU	European Union
FMD	Foot and Mouth Disease
LIA	Low Incidence Areas
NFU	National Farmers Union
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health (Office International des Epizooties)
OTF	Officially Tuberculosis Free
OTF-W	Officially Tuberculosis Free - Withdrawn
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction
PrMT	Pre-Movement Testing
PTI	Parish Testing Interval
RPA	Rural Payments Agency
R&D	Research and Development
SAM	AHVLA's core IT system
SOAs	Sole Occupancy Authorities
VMD	Veterinary Medicines Directorate
RTA	Road Traffic Accident

# 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.....

## **Culling**

- Effective culling of wildlife reservoir
- Where badger culling infection >15% culling mandatory
- A sensible approach to controlling badger numbers has become accepted, sweetened by the acceptance of a DIVA test in cattle and the advent of a suitable cattle vaccine

## **Defra no longer involved in control**

- Defra is not involved in micro-managing control anymore
- Defra is no longer involved in control measures. The livestock industry and environmental bodies finally managed to reach a consensus on control measures and we are left with three small pockets of infection proving difficult to clear.

## **Less of a disaster**

- It was a disaster back in 2012, if the powers that were about had moved quicker TB would now be left for the history books.

## **Reliable testing**

- Pre- and post-movement testing
- Reliable testing
- Accurate and reliable testing method which has improved from what we have today and educational supporting help for the farmers

## **Public understanding**

- Public to have full information about bTB facts and its effects/risks

## **Eradication in cattle and wildlife**

- TB routinely controlled in all vectors. NOT ONLY CATTLE!!
- Eradication of Bovine TB from cattle and wildlife populations in UK
- Healthy cattle. Healthy Wildlife
- The move away from talk of eradication and towards control using effective vaccines and improved biosecurity in both cattle and wildlife
- We have finally made progress and broken the link between cattle and wildlife which has enabled us to control the disease

## **Investment**

- Correct investment level in fight TB

## **Accurate diagnosis in wildlife**

- Accurate diagnostic test (quick) for live wildlife

## **Animal health dealing with bTB consistently**

- AH are dealing consistently across the UK

## **Biosecurity improvements**

- Funded biosecurity improvements on TB hotspots

## **Oral vaccine for badgers and badger trust assist**

- Badger trust assisting in deploying an oral vaccine
- Effective oral vaccine for badgers

## **Working together**

- TB eradicated and farmers and AHVLA have worked together
- Farmers and Defra working together
- Farmers to work together with Defra and Defra listen to farmers

## **Rigorous movement restrictions**

- More rigorous movement restrictions between high and low risk areas

## **Educate farmers**

- Educate all farmers on the facts about bTB in Yorkshire region

## **No longer a political football**

- Taken the politics out of disease. No longer a political football.

## **Vaccination**

- Vaccination for all cattle

- Vaccination. No PMT
- Vaccination available and in use
- Effective uptake of TB vaccine for cattle by industry. Excellent DIVA test

#### **Monitoring for all species**

- UK officially free. Strategic monitoring in places for all “species”

#### **TB under control...eradicated**

- TB under control
- We are making progress towards TB free England
- A concentrated attack on all aspects of the disease is finally having some success in controlling the disease
- UK TB free
- We no longer need to worry about bovine TB which was finally eradicated last year
- TB levels to have dramatically reduced if not eradicated from the UK
- Don't have to think about TB now. No Defra funds [needed?] to track cattle after movements. Now TB free.

#### **Areas with TB free status**

- Geographical areas being able to go for freedom from disease status
- Zoning UK into TB clear and Endemic areas
- The model has changed from a test and cull model to one of assessing the risk on each farm and helping OTF farms to remain so, as well as continuing to help OTW farms to regain OTF status

## **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 | - The EC provides some funds towards TB eradication process, is that included in the figures for cost?  |
| A | - Yes. It accounts for roughly £12mn (part of the £100mn quoted in the document). The deficit would be more without it.   |
| Q | - Where is the disease in cattle and in wildlife?   |
| A | - We need to chase background in <u>all</u> wildlife. Surveys some years ago showed which counties.   |
| Q | - Can we have R&D for a quick test for live wildlife?   |
| A | - Already PCR research going on to address this.  |
| Q | - Do we have confirmation yet if the movement to county based testing intervals from the current PTIs and if so is this still scheduled for January 2013?   |
| A | - There will be an announcement about this next week [w/c 15/10/2012]   |
| Q | - You state disease must be addressed in wildlife. How can the current criteria for cull areas address the spread of disease and how do we deal with cleared areas within the endemic areas after the 4 year cull?  |
| A | - Hold the pilot cull in two areas and government to evaluate after the cull.   |
| Q | - How to stop it spreading to Lincolnshire/Yorkshire? Plus, efficiency pre-shooting?  |
| A | - The cull is designed to reduce disease and risk in those areas<br>- [AHWBE:] The endemic area control is different and we are aiming to work more intensively. There have been suggested checks in the outer area and moving back in.<br>- We having been work on an “Edge Strategy” to restrict the spread.<br>- [TBEAG:] It's very important that the cull is not on its own. We need to completely re-look at Edge zone to stop the red line moving towards you. |
| Q | - Why is not more emphasis being placed on vaccination of cattle?   |
| A | - Authorisation and research is on-going but it is prohibited by EU laws. Like in humans, BCG's interfere with skin tests. Likewise in cattle. The test needs evaluating at OIE level (DIVA test). Cattle vaccines have had lots of funding thrown at it. £15mn is being invested.  |
| Q | - Suggestion that AHVLA have developed a DIVA test.   |
| A | - It has still to be approved internationally, but this is underway.  |
| Q | - The European dimensions are complicated and need to be considered; we should be   |

- investing more in that area.
- Q – Tests to separate vaccine from test - when will the DIVA test be available to use? Dates?
- A – No date is possible yet. The vaccine is there and the dossier has been submitted for approval to VMD.
- [AHWBE:] Ministers have talked to commissioner in recent months. It has to be a formal process.
  - [TBEAG:] We must not lose sight that we need to do this with Europe. If trade sanctions are put on UK livestock, this affects our global reputation. We should not go it alone – we need to do it with Europe.
  - There is an info sheet on vaccines (both cattle and badger vaccines) on the Defra website: <http://www.defra.gov.uk/animal-diseases/a-z/bovine-tb/vaccination/>
- Q – Has the one year testing area for Wales changed the number of cases and has it now reduced the number of cases?
- A – Can't answer that – but can come back with an answer. There has been a spike. But, need to be careful about interpreting figures/data.
- *[Post-meeting response: detailed statistical information on TB incidence levels, across the whole of GB and broken down to the national level, are published and regularly updated on Defra's website*
  - <http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/foodfarm/landuselivestock/cattletb/national/>
- Q – Skin testing [isn't perfect], would you find all cases that would be picked up?
- A – Cases are also picked up via slaughterhouse surveillance.
- Q – What do you mean by “controlling disease” by 2015? How does the government define “under control”?
- A – We use incidence figures as a measure.
- [AHWBE:] Also, if we test more, we may likely find more disease. So are you going to measure on the number of cases or a more relative figure?
- Q – Has the incidence of TB gone up?
- A – By 60%

### 3 What's working and new ideas

#### 3.1 What's working well now?

##### Improved communications/collaboration

###### Increased publicity & support through industry

- Word is spreading. Publicity
- Education for farmers is not good enough
- Understanding of disease roadshow <36>
- Some of what is happening in Europe may be good but knowledge of what and other areas that have eradicated isn't widespread
- The industry-wide empathy with farmers who have TB and who are going through it and how serious the disease is

###### Improved technology for ID & tracking

- Cattle ID better than it was, supports good testing
- Computer tracing system is more efficient (most of the time)

##### Vets

###### Improved relationship & contact between vets and farmers

- Relationship between farmers and vets
- Local vets increased /improved contract
- Relationship between farmers and vets is generally pretty good
- Don't want to lose having own vet to do the testing – she knows the farm; good trust; knows us; knows the animal

###### Information support from vets to farmers

- Vets need to sit down with the farmers and explain the whole situation – epidemiology and logistics

## Testing

### Testing working well

- Testing is working well
- Ability to test cattle
- We have the ability to test the cattle
- Annual testing is good
- Pre-movement testing
- Pre-movement testing
  - But can give a false sense of security

### Limitations of Pre-Movement testing

- Pre-movement testing and current movement restrictions are working partly (North UK still clear) so working in some areas
- Testing is working within its limitations, although it needs to be and can be improved
- Not everyone agrees that testing is working well
- Pre-movement testing needs to be improved

## Dealing with diseased animals well

- At best, we're managing the disease
- Speed of removing reactor cattle
- We kill cattle very well

## Compensation

### Compensation working well

- Compensation system is working well

### Compensation link with incentives – bio-security & openness/honesty

- Compensation (Some think that if withdrawn, people would be more careful) – but a risk that people would hide that they had the disease if no compensation

### Economic & welfare costs if no compensation

- Also significant costs
  - And welfare issues

## Trading/Moving

### Restrictions working well

- Movement restrictions work well, unless they are not abided by
- Number of animals prevented from moving into area
- This is a contentious point, but the movement controls are having a good effect. This is a fairly TB Free zone but look at area encroaching

### ID & Tracing systems working well

- BCMS system works because can trace animals – Welsh sticker system – passports<1>

## Disease in wildlife

### Wildlife control methods

- Cull – good
- Australia and New Zealand have eradicated (and Southern Ireland is addressing) so proves it can be done by using wildlife control
- We could and we can't/won't use those same methods/measures

### Risk to wildlife of catching TB from cattle

- We have TB free area (breakdowns are from affected area not wildlife here) – and put wildlife at risk
- Keeping disease out of wildlife – removing reactor cattle to prevent spread to wildlife



- Identify badger setts clear of disease and leave alone so they repopulate with healthy badgers – need to cooperate with badger groups.
- Some vets could do this with some badger groups
- Promote healthy badgers and healthy cattle

#### **Limits of Wildlife reservoir control**

- Have gone through BSE, Foot & Mouth – get 100% control, but can't eradicate TB because badgers get from moles
- 85% control should be the aim

### **Cattle to cattle transmission**

#### **Natural barriers**

- Natural boundaries are working well now – rivers, hills. Impediments to movement

#### **Main spread from imported cattle not wildlife**

- AHVLA Newcastle – knowledge that every case of TB can be traced back to imports of cattle from imported areas so problem may not be from wildlife <2>
- This may not be conclusive but needs investigating

### **Bio-security and control measures**

#### **Keeping TB clear strategy**

- Scotland TB free and the North so something is being done right
- Up to 1984 we had a clean ring strategy for badgers <20>

#### **Improved farmer awareness & compliance**

- Increased farmer interest and awareness in bio-security
- Better farmer compliance with TB controls

#### **Handling systems and testing**

- Cattle handling systems are improving
- Grants helpful for improving handling facilities
- Improves throughput for testing and it's safer
- Isolate animals and test them 8 weeks after they have arrived on farm – particularly important for young calves

#### **Bio-security issues within & around buildings**

- Biosecurity where affordable (there is a challenge with old buildings)
- Have designated separation units – best inside (to avoid spread to wildlife)
- Abattoir surveillance is working well

### **Effect on farmers**

#### **Less complacency, more awareness**

- Farmers are starting to wake up and recognise it is affecting them
- Less complacency in the North of England now. Those who have had it are more cautious
- Not as complacent

#### **Movement reductions – breeding own replacements**

- More and more farmers breeding their own replacements. Wider benefits than TB

### **Public health implications**

#### **Animal to human contact**

- Public health protection

#### **Potential of infection via food chain**

- Pasteurisation
- Meat inspection

### **General comments**

- Agreed knowledge that we don't want TB in any affected or free areas of the UK

- Don't know what is working
- Question – what does Animal Health think is working?

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

#### Collaboration / communication

##### Informing and educating the public

- Public not educated in what it means, what farmers go through. Both need educating in 'the truth'
- Need to improve public image
- Need to show pictures of sick badgers
- Need more education

##### EU compliance & approval

- More likely to get Brussels approval if doing something
- We need to look more proactive – stay clear and prove that we're clear

##### Open collaboration between all bodies

- Understanding disease needs more work – working together, like today
- Be more open – farmers are afraid of Defra. When Defra turns up think something wrong
- Working together – farmers, vets, AHVLA, Defra

##### IT systems helping data collection & interpretation

- CTS and SAM need to be compatible and communication between them improved to help solve. So, an IT issue
- Not yet enough information. Should be strengthened
- High-risk numbering system e.g. '3' (SW) and '7' (Wales)

##### Identification methodology

- Cattle ID – technology needs to be embraced... DNA, electronic tags
- Stamp on a passport to show where an animal came from and the test history of the animal

##### Improved monitoring systems

- Live time-based monitoring system

#### Vet relationship

##### Communication with vets

- Communication between farmer and vets – notification of testing go back to vets together with farmers

##### Communication with AHVLA

- Improve AHVLA communications with farmers and vets (SAM)
- Communication within AHVLA offices to overcome 'glitches'
- More working with vets – drive down costs of testing rather than use AHVLA

#### Testing

##### Compliance with testing

- (1) Compulsory or voluntary [testing]?
- Encourage general compliance with testing regimes – and more restrictions combined with penalties for those who don't comply – needs to be flexible, so don't penalise unfairly
  - AHVLA need to provide evidence and information to local authorities quickly

##### Better quicker tests

- Need a quick PCR test
- Testing - better way of testing - machine reading of reaction to ensure consistency
- More stringent testing to identify areas
  - Vets would say that because they make more money from testing

##### Lay-testing

- Is it necessary for vets to TB test? Could be cheaper to use qualified lay tester
  - But this could undermine quality in testing

### **Increase testing**

- Someone will always be shut down unnecessarily if increase testing
- What about false positives associated with increased testing?
- There will be a proportion of animals you don't pick up
- Testing should be more risk-based, especially regarding tracing

### **Changing testing intervals**

- Clean areas tested more to stay clean
- Risk from 4 year areas moving into 2 year area – better controls needed?
- 1-2 year test animals moving to 4 year area without subsequent test
- Would need to be a lot tighter

### **Annual Testing intervals**

- 4 year testing interval is too long. All herds should be on annual testing
- Or just breeding animals tested annually
- At least 6 years of annual testing needed to get OTF status, so start now
- Need for a complete annual test

### **Locating the disease**

- NE Dairy and Livestock Board for NFU said don't know where disease is – would like a one year test across the whole area to map the existing picture (it's been done in Wales) – a health assessment setting a baseline of where the infection is
- [consequence of not testing:] Trading restrictions if stop testing; miss false negatives already missed; don't know where disease is
- Current testing not chasing the disease out – need a national health check

### **Camelids**

- Need camelids tested
- - absolutely vital
- - loads in N Yorkshire

### **Pre-movement testing**

- Get rid of pre-movement potentially and emphasise post if only one is possible – adjust priority
- More pre-movement testing
- Consistency of rules for pre-movement testing across the country
- Pre-movement testing rules better for 'clean' area
- Pre-movement testing should be introduced everywhere
- But this could be unnecessary/wasteful
- Need copy of PrMT from all animals to assess risk

### **Pre & post-movement testing**

- No movement out of high risk (annual testing areas) areas to low risk unless pre-movement testing then post-movement testing to pick up animals who have the disease on movement (because can't pick up during a 6 week period)
- Pre-movement testing - cattle can be moved after 60 days which should be strengthened to isolation post-movement testing
- Pre- and post-movement testing out of high-risk areas e.g. if post-movement at 100 days
- Pre- and post- movement testing too flaky – mixing at markets, constraints associated with showing
- More testing, including post-movement testing

### **Bio-security**

- Start the fight from clean areas
- Don't trust anything bring on farm despite PrMT
- Don't buy animals because cheap, consider disease risk

### **Compensation**

#### **Table valuation system**

- Compensation – the table valuation system is difficult

#### **Attitudes towards compensation profits**

- Some like TB on their property – make money from it . Need mentality change
- <Others in group disagree> TB costs a small fortune
- Certain mentality in a small minority
- bTB is not FMD economics, yet same mentality

## Trading/Moving

### Passport showing testing history

- Farmers more aware of where they are buying stock from and their testing history – passport
- Have identification of testing history on the passport – by the farmer selling the animals – but would farmers do this if they want to sell on TB animal
- Farmers more aware of where they are buying stock from and their testing history – passport

### Markets & auctions

- Passport information] - so farmer knows what he is bidding for before he buys
- Passport - there is a suggestion that consumer should know the history too, so there is a risk that if you start doing info for markets and then extends to this...
- Passport go to auctioneer before he sells it
- The markets should indicate where stock are from
- At auction need a full description of where that animal has been

### Designation of markets

- Designated high risk markets to prevent spread at market

### Information/education for farmers about risks

- More education to farmers about risk-based trading
- It starts as something farmers would like but a risk if it becomes a marketing ploy by retailer

## Vaccine

- People don't know what direction to go in, what to support (in terms of vaccination, controls etc)
- Leave testing to one side and vaccinate – what would the risks be?

## Disease in Wildlife – avoidance & control

### Badger control policy PR

- Current badger policy is a PR nightmare

### Testing badgers

- Need a good badger test
- Risk of raiding cattle feed. Test the sett don't need to disturb badgers to test?

### Protection in clean areas – surveillance & vaccines

- Better badger vaccine needed in clean areas
- Improved surveillance of wildlife and livestock in clear areas, including farmed deer

### Badger movement

- Unlikely to be unhealthy badgers that move out of area – did the previous RTA badgers collect the right animals?
- Rumour - trapping of badgers in pilot areas and release into “clean areas” [by wildlife groups]

### Badger control

- Trap – cull/vaccinate scheme
- Cull from the edge rather than the centre
- Gassing would be more effective than shooting in badger cull

### Research needed

- Research needed into badger prevalence
- Where is the disease? In cattle or badgers?
- More research needed into non-bovine species
- How long do infected setts stay infected for? Need to understand their risk to new residents [i.e. new badgers moving in]. How do you stop re-colonisation without shooting them?

## Grants

- Maintain grants for cattle handling systems

## **Cattle husbandry**

### **Handling and testing facilities**

- Handling facilities [need improvements] – education in use with local vets etc to improve testing
- Improving knowledge of animals on farm

## **Costs to industry**

### **Support for cattle handling**

- Older farmers unable to manage animals, they have no crushes. Will need money/service provision

## **3.3 What else needs to happen?**

### **Collaboration and communication – Farmers & Government**

#### **Communication terminology**

- More judicious use of terminology; be clearer about the words we use. e.g. the CVO Wales confusing OTF with TB Free and “Closed herds”

#### **Incentivise farmers - legislation or education?**

- More education in areas re. the consequences of TB arriving to farmers to realise the seriousness and significance
- Maybe not legislation, education enough to stop negative impact on high risk area
- But, there’s a difficult decision to be made soon
- You can’t legislate for people’s attitudes; you drive it underground. Need education

#### **How to reach farmers to educate**

- It’s the group that never get reached
- Understand how to get message across to farmers – it’s a challenge to engage beyond usual suspects

#### **How to present information -Target information**

- Need to target information to different groups – 1. Dairy; 2. Pedigree; 3. Commercial
- Need facts to jump out at them and they will read it
- Target three areas separately (Dairy, Pedigree, Commercial) and target different ages with different information

#### **How to present information -Variety of Formats**

- Got to be different formats – digital etc
- How to present information – case studies
- Present case studies on different things

#### **Educate about risk**

- Issue – farmers not here at workshop because not affected
- Education –any animal number that starts with high risk number
- Education – need open information on transfer of animals; on the risk
- Farmers in East of country - need awareness that buying in beef from high endemic areas has risks

#### **Raise farmer awareness**

- Education – county herd numbers map overlaid on disease maps to increase awareness

#### **Overcoming farmer reluctance to communicate**

- Need to get farmers to speak up more; or allow them to feel more confident to do it
- Reluctance to speak up because think that they will be penalised

#### **Government/Defra communications/collaboration**

- Defra seen as the enemy and they need to be seen as more assistive/helpful

#### **Quality of communications from Government – improve accuracy & co-ordination**

- Letters need to be consistent. E.g. given different testing dates on different letters
- Political will (towards tackling Bovine TB)**
- Politicians must have an agreed position and not keep using this as a political football

## Communication - Public Understanding & education

### Education around Badgers

- Create a better story around badgers – there are healthy ones in part of the country and we need to protect them
- Public needs to know in TB free areas the badgers will not be culled. Only the sick ones
- Improve public awareness of huge population increases since protection measures introduced
- No longer 'rare' species - Government needs to support farmers so PR is not down to farmers alone
- Sell the action to the public and invest in public education and information

### Education around Public health

- Mitigate against public misinformation e.g. beef eating and milk drinking. Carefully manage messages to avoid food scares
- Need to involve the supermarkets so they support dairy farmers and the eradication of TB. Current milk prices squeeze farmers and make disease management measures harder to afford.

### Education around Breadth of issues

- Engage all parts of the situation

### Communication with & via the media

- Better communication with the media

### Historical communication/PR

- In the 1950s they tackled things parish by parish and got a big drop
- what can we learn from what happened then

## Vets as interpreters for farmers?

- The vet is used to interpret information sent from Defra
- Vets under too much time pressure to do it [offer information etc]

## Testing

### Locate infections

- Find out where the infection is
- Develop the PCR test and find out which badger setts are infected

### Testing at edge areas

- (Strategy for the edge area) -gamma testing
- (Strategy for the edge area) -cattle testing

### Widen test areas

- More testing in clean areas and infected areas
- Health test for whole of England in one go

### Testing positive

- One in 2000 of the tracing come out positive
- Risk of testing specificity leading to false positives

### Improve consistency of tests

- Those doing the testing are trained – consistent and effective
- Improve blood sampling to give more consistent results

### Fast tracking through EU

- Fast tracking of tests through the EU

## Dealing with reactors

- Would like swifter response to outbreaks and contiguous testing (e.g. pig going down)

- Identifying and taking out infected animals

## Trading/moving

### Risk of movement

- No cattle moved into TB free areas
- An animal can move out of 1 and 2 yearly testing areas under 42 days. It can move to clean areas without testing. Happens especially in dairy
- Issue – cant be tested satisfactorily pre-42 days
- Most dairy units are moving them off to rearing units within the first week

### Penalties for high risk to clean area movement

- Disincentivise people from bringing cattle in from high risk areas
- Need legislation to stop movement into clean areas
- (1) Issue – people will find ways around legislation

### Regulate to protect integrity of edge areas

- (Strategy for the edge area) –movement
- (Strategy for the edge area) -provenance of stock

### Trading & economic implications

- Clean could trade with clean areas
- Could sell [test] failures into non-clean area but not into clean areas
- If no zoning, must be post-movement testing 120 days for all cattle
- Any alteration of day's movements need to take account of the industry. Otherwise illegal/black market will arise. Can live with minimum of what we have

### Zoning accreditation & financial implications

- Zoning/ partitioning/movement controls...become TB free area with Scotland
- But zoning could adversely affect prices – particularly for dairy farmers
- But higher health cattle should be dear
- Farmer choice
- Increase potential for farmers to choose their slaughterhouse

## Vaccine

- Effective cattle vaccine
- Not happy with response about vaccination – need to put pressure on government to accelerate action on vaccination

## Disease in wildlife

### Identify infected badgers

- We have several species that have TB – we know where infected cattle are, also need to know where infected badgers are
- There is a test of badgers' urine – PCR (DNA testing) but this may not be accurate enough? We need a quick test to be done by a technician (not a vet)
- A field test (like a pregnancy test type kit)
- What other livestock?
  - all mammals
  - badgers targeted because free ranging but other mammals less so
- and badgers urinate on grass that cows eat

### Vaccinate rather than cull

- Exit strategy from cull – vaccinate badgers
- Start on northern edge of endemic area and go south
- Oral badger vaccine
- Long-term – oral badger vaccine

### Communication & collaboration with badger groups

- AHWBE – to invite badger groups to TB workshops to enhance understanding and working relationship

### Increase public understanding

- Raise awareness farmers aren't out to eradicate badgers just ill/sick badgers
- General public understanding and very clear communication about TB and role of badgers
- The enemy is not the badgers it's the TB which is the enemy of badger as well
- If don't control TB it affects badgers
- The strategy for the edge area where disease moving needs to be strengthened includes
  - badger cull

#### **Badger culling**

- Stamp on a previously free parish hard – cull, test, put whole parish on testing
- Work with NFU to ensure badger cull is effective
- Repeal the protection of badgers act. Germany shoots 40k badgers a year <24>
- Culling wildlife
- Identify and remove infected setts in one go

### **Research**

#### **Timescales for scientific results**

- Something. There is enough money, but it is the time needed to develop the science
  - Need to push that (to) accelerate the pace of the science

#### **EU incentives/penalties**

- Also there are EU politics

#### **Research subjects**

- Investigate effectiveness of dogs to sniff out infection
- How does UK compare to other countries and what are they doing?
- Why is it lower (in) other countries?
  - is it less (/fewer) badgers?
  - is it because they kill everything?

### **Incentivise behavioural change**

#### **Increase monitoring**

- Need to find framework of changing mentality [i.e. find ways to change mentality]
- Tightening of documentation of disease testing -compulsory for private farmers who can lie and sell stock found to be TB positive

### **Bio-security**

#### **Maintain low TB incidence**

- TB surveillance in low incidence areas must be maintained

#### **Reasons for breakdowns**

- There are too many breakdowns where it doesn't seem possible to get to the bottom of why it happens
- When Defra go through records and spoligotype, it doesn't seem like they can say 'why' it happened
- Store animals for finishing is the main breakdowns in Cumbria

#### **Cattle and other species potential risks**

- Breaking the link between cattle and wildlife (biosecurity, culling, vaccinating)
- Control disease in all vectors
- Control disease in other farm species e.g. deer, camelids etc. TB in pigs, sheep, cats, dogs etc. i.e. make sure all vectors possible are identified – i.e. are there other not yet identified reservoirs that need to be also tackled?

#### **Farm management**

- Enhance biosecurity on farms
- Old buildings can be difficult to make biosecure within listed building rules
- Building design – e.g. feed barriers are on the outside – which is more accessible to badgers
- (Strategy for the edge area) –bio-security
- (Strategy for the edge area) -Double fencing so you have a 'sneezing' distance between farms



- (Strategy for the edge area) -Cordon sanitaire

### **Financial investment long-term**

- Invest more financially now in methods as will cost more in the long run if hold finances back

### **Human health issues publicise**

- All pasteurised milk is OK but this message is not understood
- Risk that milk from hotspots could become unsellable – so need to be very careful
- No health risk to human health from pasteurised milk

## **3.4 What new innovations or ideas can you suggest?**

### **Collaboration/communication**

#### **DEFRA communicate better with farmers**

- Make letters less blunt, aggressive and uncompromising. For some educational groups the letters are difficult to understand
- Need to be nice!

#### **Defra support collaboration with farmers**

- More resources to allow farmers to come to meetings
- Need national statement to farmers to say we want to hear your thoughts on this – perhaps advertise it on Countryfile.

#### **Support farmers to understand importance of issues**

- Need a simple approach
- With TB you don't know who to communicate with
- People don't know which way to go/decide, if they don't understand it. Need education
- More knowledge of biosecurity and effective communication
- Farmer ignoring the issue is a significant factor especially in the clean areas
- Risk to farmers, abattoir workers and others' health needs to be recognised/emphasised to get all farmers to take it seriously

#### **Useful information provision for farmers**

- Get number of NUL because that intimates they are TB free
- Cattle passports to include date when whole herd last passed TB test
- Farmers need more information on the stock, the disease status of animals they might buy
- TB health status - needs to be an ID database
- Need a live movement database, including EID

#### **Political will**

- TB should not be a political football
- Stop using issue as a scoring point like a football between political parties
- Politicians defer to say "Not under their administration"

### **Vet communication**

#### **AHVLA feedback on what is working**

- Q: What does AHVLA think is working?

#### **Increase vet training to be able to support farmers**

- Vet education – on biosecurity

#### **Increase AHWBE consultation by Government**

- AHWBE should be listened to by politicians as they are a-political. Food prices increasing over winter; could flag it up as urgent and not take farmers as much for granted
- Strengthen the voice and respect for them across the government as a whole, regardless of party politics

## Testing

### Quality of skin testing - discerning subtle results

- Is inclusion of avian masking true bovis infection?
- Often get massive avian responses
- Sensitivity of feeling for lumps greater than callipers will ever be
- Need for standardisation, eliminates situations where can feel larger lump but measures the same
- Q. Why not have callipers which apply the same pressure on each test? [A: From vet in the group - It was tried and it didn't work]

### Accuracy of test dependent on no time pressure

- Need the emphasis to be on technical excellence not time [take to do the test] etc
- Fear that if transfer payment to farmers they will push the vet on [to do the test quicker]
- Need farmers to understand what the test should be
- Need to make sure that people doing the test aren't put under time pressures
- A quicker test so get a negative
- Quality assurance of testers
- Standard vs. severe interpretation, needs latter and more draconian measures

### Transfer from OV to private vets

- Transferring responsibility for TB testing to private vets could be more efficient

### Ideal testing regime

- Better risk assessments on what needs to be tested and when they are tested
- Testing regime follows the individual animal
- A better test for individual animals that is accurate – doesn't currently exist
- 100% sensitive and 100% specific and not dependent on one person doing the test

### Effective testing

- Talk about infection and testing not disease
- Pre-movement test – bovine only test
- Annual testing across the country
- Annual TB test – one year test to map the disease

### Zoning implications

- Would pre- and post-movement testing and isolation reduce the need for zoning?
  - But this has to be economic for the cheapest, most effective test

## Dealing with reactors/diseased animals

### Infected herd culling

- Whole herd culling

### Political will to take action

- Less talking, more action
- The innovation needed is only purely the political will to get it done. Everything else is rearranging deck-chairs

## Compensation incentives to collaborate

- Compensation methods would bring farmers who aren't admitting to it out of the woodwork

## Trading/Moving

### Risk based trading

- Q: Risk-based trading. What's happening?
- Tools to enable risk-based trading

### Documentation of cattle history/provenance to reduce risk

- Markets to put up where cattle have come from
- Testing/location history also needs to be on passport
- Be careful where country buys stock from e.g. Ireland
- Electronic ID of cattle with all info held on animal

### **Reduce movement risks**

- Q: Movement between shows is a minefield. Animals are going straight from one big show to another without being tested
- Address movement of cattle regionally as areas of dairy, arable etc tend to be regional. Cattle produced in the main in the West get moved East for finishing. Slaughterhouses also need to be contained
- Risk that parts of West country and all Wales and SW would have levels that crossed a threshold, which meant they were declared unsale-able (currently the animals are dispersed)
- Semen – conception rates needs to be improved to make it more acceptable/used. Farmers then breed more replacement stock

### **Movement controls to create & maintain TB free areas**

- Much stricter movement controls in TB free areas
- Currently free TB area to adjoin e.g. NE and NW to join Scotland
- Aim of being TB free should be more urgently addressed. Don't be aiming for 50 years. We were almost TB Free in the 1970s. Aim should be higher i.e. to eradicate not just slow it down
- NE group policy would like to declare a TB free area

## **Vaccine**

### **Vaccine protection**

- Need vaccine to protect herd. Currently have no faith in testing
- Need an effective cattle vaccine that is being used
- We need to get EU and rest of the world to agree vaccination approach

### **Do vaccines supersede need for testing?**

- Q: If just vaccinated, would you need to test? What are the dangers of not testing?

### **Economic limitations of vaccinating**

- Vaccination – trade implications imposed on us would make us lose trade plus our testing costs would affect profit
- Therefore vaccination is not the answer, eradication is
- It would provide part of a programme

## **Tackling wildlife reservoir**

### **Testing badger setts**

- Q: Is it right to test road kill animals that might be the healthier, more mobile ones? Need to test setts instead?
- Use test to identify infected badger setts and cull those
- You would still need wildlife controls but relying on vaccination as a solution would be worse in the long run and ineffective

### **Research into health of badgers (& other species)**

- Q: How much money is being spent on research into healthy badgers? On the general state of wildlife
- Q: How much work is being done on non-bovines?

### **Badger welfare group action risks**

- Q: It's rumoured that groups will be trapping badgers and moving them to clean areas to protect them – is this true?

## **Incentivise behaviour change**

### **Prevent ID fraud & inherent transmission risks**

- Tag swapping – need to prevent fraud

### **Beneficial movement control of breeding stock**

- Farmers need to be more aware of the benefits of breeding heifers for themselves so a higher level of control of breeding stock movement

### **Farmer engagement about urgency, effectiveness**

- i.e. overall bio-security needs to be 'sold' as urgent to farmers
- ways to make costs to farmers be efficient and effective so don't ignore issues

- Farmers paying for testing could focus thoughts and actions to prevent the disease i.e. incentives

### **Economic support for local industry**

#### **Government investment needed in short-term**

- Short term government investment needed for long-term gains. Industry could then take costs on once it is clear

#### **Increased value of stock if given TB free status**

- North of England becoming TB free

### **Bio-security**

#### **Focus on maintaining infection-free herds**

- Focus on herds not infected and help push risk status down

#### **Grant incentives**

- Make grants available for biosecurity and to set up on farm rearing units in hotspot areas

#### **Catchment sensitive farming to reduce risk**

- Could use example of catchment sensitive farming where agronomists were used to interpret [what farmers needed to do]

### **Implications for farmers**

#### **Support farmers in improving handling facilities & staffing levels**

- Need farmers to have adequate facilities [e.g. handling facilities]
- Need the right facilities
- Need innovation in handling facilities to cut time and improve health and safety
- Need a system for handling facilities. Perhaps encouraging younger people to go round with decent mobile facilities to cover it
- Don't have the staff to help with handling the animals

#### **Financial support for improving handling facilities**

- Handling facilities cost a lot, so need national scheme to enable better facilities
- Issue – money needs to be available

#### **Providing emotional support & advice to farmers**

- After BSE ban was lifted farmers didn't realise how stressful it was – provide support to them to face it

## 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

##### Economic implications

###### Economic benefits to farmers

- There is more to be had from salvage – so, in principle is ok
- Farmer could retain cattle in isolation for longer to realise salvage benefits

#### 2. What are the negatives, challenges and difficulties?

###### Financial burden to farmers

- Compensation already not high enough, this system would make it worse
- Cannot negotiate high salvage if no market for them. Particularly if got high value stock
- Individual farmer cannot negotiate on equal terms with abattoir. No economies of scale
- New middlemen tier would be created – only they would come off well
- Slaughterhouse would play hard-ball with farmers, pay lesser rates than to the government
- Farmers would get ripped off

###### More for farmers to deal with

- Too bureaucratic
- Would need to post-mortem at many more abattoirs

##### Dealing with reactors/diseased animals

###### Reduced demand for reactor salvage

- Reactors not culling in prime condition
- Reactor value not same as value for healthy animal

###### Infection risk from delayed reactor removal

- Reduced compensation would be a bad thing – would encourage farmers not to comply with TB controls e.g. release reactors
- If compensation goes down then there's no incentive to get rid of reactors
- Could increase reactor removal time

###### PR implications for farmers

- PR problem if it becomes widely known that reactors go into the food chain

#### 3. Any amendments or refinements you can think of?

###### Adapt system for rapid testing

- Adapt system to encourage timely testing

###### Compensation value

- Individual values should be used to determine value of reactors based on breeding potential etc
- Compensation needed for entrepreneurial losses etc
- Consequential losses – compensation needed
- Compensation needs to go up
- Compensation should not be based on age, but on what animal is worth e.g. weight

- Individual valuations should be used
- Base compensation on carcase weight

#### 4. Any alternatives or innovations you can suggest?

##### **Compensation**

- Higher compensation for those that take right steps to reduce risks
- Start with a base level compensation payment and then increase compensation paid to those that have good biosecurity
- Use compensation to encourage good practice – carrot rather than stick
- Compensation should = value of animal. If farmer received lower receipt Defra should be higher <?>
- Introduce farmer accreditation i.e. identify those that have invested in biosecurity

##### **Publication of values**

- Publicise what slaughterhouses are currently paying - 'league table'

##### **Speedy reactor removal**

- Contracted slaughterhouses must be required to remove reactors immediately

##### **Electronic auctions for reactors**

- Electronic auctions for TB reactors

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

##### **Re-tendering of slaughterhouses**

- Re-tender slaughterhouse contracts

##### **Implication for reactor removal time**

- Would it speed up or slow down the removal of reactors?

### 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

##### **Realistic true value**

- If it worked then you wouldn't be reliant on £750 payment, you'd get true value (unless they turned round and said "it's got TB, it's worth nothing")

##### **Improvement over compensation**

- Insurance not compensation would help farmers in business because e.g. pedigree herds need better/more accurate valuation

##### **Viability through standardisation countrywide**

- It's only viable once it's controlled throughout the country
- There are precedents – FMD and Salmonella insurance, but don't think that you would get TB insurance

#### 2. What are the negatives, challenges and difficulties?

##### **Government opt-out**

- Allows government to get out of cost and responsibilities

##### **Feasibility for farmers**

- Wouldn't work – farmers couldn't afford the premiums
- Companies would offer rate that farmers couldn't afford

##### **Conditions and amendments**

- We need government to realise that the disease needs to be controlled prior to insurance scheme being viable
- It will just be another drain on industry
- Need wildlife reservoir taken out first

- Would be impossible to do nationwide
- Would be impossible to rule out what neighbours are doing. If you are in the wrong neighbourhood, with the wrong neighbour...

#### **Adequate funding available**

- A lot of herds in high-risk areas are TB-free and that would need to be accounted for
- Would never have enough money to fund it
- Bluetongue in Germany – the first 5% got paid out and rest of the 95% didn't.
- Schmallenberg was the same issue. Most people didn't get paid out because there wasn't enough cash
- In Germany they tried this for bluetongue and it didn't work. They paid out for the first few and then there was no money left
- No commercial company would touch it in Devon
- What would happen if you had one breakdown – the insurance would go up
- Levy very unpopular with industry

#### **Cost of Premium**

- At the moment we have compensation, so insurance is of no benefit
- Size of premium would probably cancel out potential gains over what might lose on table valuation
- Premiums prohibitive

#### **May not work**

- Insurance risk would be bigger than compensation
- It would be very expensive in high risk areas
- If had top-end bull lost to TB then the pay-out would need to be huge
- The disease is there and spreading – who would insure?
- No insurance company would touch it under the disease was under control
- Until we know what the level of disease (cattle and badgers) is no-one will underwrite it – actuarial tables
- Devon – insurance companies would tell you need to be TB free before start to insure you i.e. reduce risk prior to insuring you
- It would lead to more quangos being set up

#### **Confidence in cover**

- Insurance schemes don't engender trust – you're never quite sure what you've bought until you make a claim

#### **Quantifying risk**

- It's all based upon unquantifiable risk
- Not quantifiable
- Would need to know about the 'risk' e.g. if you were in a low-risk area you wouldn't take it out
- Lack of understanding about their own risk – there is a split between educated and non-educated
- Risk would be too high for e.g. NFU Mutual (although if underwritten by government, it may work better)

#### **Limited applicability**

- Would need to know from Defra which herds are under restrictions within which parishes – would get a better judge of insurance
- You would only choose to insure top 2 or 3 animals

### 3. Any amendments or refinements you can think of?

#### **Insurance target**

- Insurance would be a second stage. The government needs to pay until it's under control and then insurance
- Insurance could be for higher value animals to top up table valuation

#### **Viability**

- Need to control disease first and then insurance becomes viable

#### **Would rectify compensation unfairness**

- Compensation doesn't work at the moment – there isn't fair payment at the moment
- Insurance would stop abuse of the system (e.g. playing on overcompensation for lower-value

animals) and keep farmers in business

#### **Standardisation**

- It would need to be an industry standard requirement e.g. sugar beet frost insurance through British Sugar and the NFU. 'Assurance' rather than insurance

#### **Premium calculations**

- Need to put loss of earnings into this as well as loss of individual animal
- Would need zoning to enable insurers to calculate premiums

#### 4. Any alternatives or innovations you can suggest?

##### **Government responsibility**

- Government needs to take on responsibility because of food security reasons
- Can't blame farmers for disease that they can't control e.g. Schmallenberg, bluetongue etc

##### **Not feasibility when significant TB problem**

- Could be done in TB free areas but not where we have huge amounts of TB

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

- No responses

### 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**

- Fully support. Would like to keep own vet doing testing. Doesn't mean vet can't use cheaper labour to do test. If they have problem can go back to them
- If have breakdown, own vet can explain process, what happening next etc. Support
- Vet could simultaneously do an appraisal of herd health e.g. condition, fluke etc
- Would work for those working closely with vets and use for all disease issues
- One vet: dealing with a known quantity
- Ongoing/better working relationship - can assist you better than a state vet
- May encourage more large animal vet practices

##### **Incentive to invest in handling facilities**

- Could encourage farmer to have better handling facilities depending on how testing is charged for i.e. animal vs. time

##### **Farmers flexibility & choice**

- If pay more, could have more control over what actions take to control disease on farm e.g. badger control, biosecurity etc

##### **Government reduces responsibility**

- Allows government to get out of cost and responsibility
- Government could save money by tendering for TB testing

##### **Costs**

- If farmers pay, what do they get back?
- Suggests a cost to farmer, which would be a disadvantage
- Quid pro quo

#### 2. What are the negatives, challenges and difficulties?

##### **Insert title of cluster**

- How would paperwork chain of testing be maintained by AHVLA?
- How would AHVLA maintain oversight?
- Sharp end of industry paying for own tests
- Challenge around ensuring quality of testing
- Would need to be done on time – tests efficiency



- Pay per head/versus time. Animal type makes a difference
- Balance of speed vs. efficiency
- Loss of personal vet/one vet on farm, could have numerous vets on farm – breakdown of long-term relationship, knowledge of disease history?
- Some people will cut corners – conflict of interest – will want to maintain customer base. Need to assure quality assurance
- Can't see clear advantage – benefits already exist and don't cost anything
- Can cattle-keepers be relied upon to organise timely testing?
- Can't be a 'free for all', need an overall body monitoring it
- Who would monitor it/enforce it?
- Farmers need to still be advised when need a test
- How deal with farmers who don't use vets?
- How tackle hobby-farmers? Non-bovine species?
- Hard to keep track of testing

### 3. Any amendments or refinements you can think of?

#### **Incentive for improving handling**

- Grants for improved handling systems

#### **Incentive for accreditation**

- Farm accreditation scheme – more efficient positive system: less time required to test. Points scheme?

#### **Improve consistency**

- Breed/species specific testers. Greater consistency of testing
- Testers retrained every 4-5 years to ensure consistency/repeatability of testing
- Farmers to be given a copy of test results as standard, not just on request

#### **Improve record keeping**

- EID cattle tags – improve recording and ID of cattle
- RPA/BCMA tests – keep as history of where animals have been/testing history

### 4. Any alternatives or innovations you can suggest?

#### **Holistic health benefit for herd**

- Own vet, essentially carrying out consistent surveillance [response to SAG]. Could bolt-on other 'whole herd health' issues i.e. a more comprehensive/holistic approach to herd screening. Could include all endemic diseases

#### **AHVLA role**

- AHVLA continue to tender. Will have more buying power than individual farmers

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

#### **Questions re testing quality**

- What would be the minimum qualifications of those doing the testing?
- What quality assurance of testers?
- How define a 'vet practice' in this context? Could a test only company set up and be approved?

#### **How would payment system work?**

- Pay per head of cattle or on time taken to test?
- Pay per type of animal (affects time)

## 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

#### **Defining through vigorous testing**

- Test vigorously to establish the disease-free areas then push disease backwards to constrain it

#### **Marketing & value of stock**

- Explain clearly and accurately to farmers what the benefits of being OTF i.e. marketing the idea solidly
- Sell positives of TB free areas to consumers so can use in positive marketing. So an incentive for greater profits from buying power i.e. added value

#### **Geographical division**

- North-West/South East divide and there are mixed positives and negatives

#### **Incentive**

- Yes! 100% join scheme in Scotland to become totally TB free
- Encourage areas which at the moment couldn't be classified as TB-free i.e. an incentive to aim for free status
- In non-compliance areas this needs encouraging by e.g. local peer pressure and emphasis of risks for the industry
- Excellent idea – essential or will just get worse!
- Cheap and cost-effective for government if areas don't get any worse

## 2. What are the negatives, challenges and difficulties?

#### **Restricting trade freedom**

- Trade issues – restricting within country becomes less economic. Keeping cattle as a business needs to remain viable. Applies to dirty areas which have too many cattle and clean areas too few.

#### **It's years away**

- For the last 30 years vaccination has always been 15 years away!

#### **Incentivizing continued bio-security & control/testing**

- What measures need protecting i.e. isolation and post-movement testing
- The OTF herd in a heavily infected area – how to reward any good behaviour and practice if that is what is happening i.e. reward incentive

#### **Affects marketing relationship between auctions & farmers**

- Re-emphasise back to sellers back from the buyers, and get auctioneers and markets to accurately record provenance of stock i.e. get marketing to auctioneers re: benefits to farmers. Then markets can get higher trade costs and a quality system to rate markets re: safety i.e. 1\*, 2\*\*, 3\*\*\* markets etc

#### **Areas not TB free will be disadvantaged in markets**

- If areas declared free then other areas may not be able to sell cattle or milk i.e. understanding EU regulations
- Get over the limited thinking that it can't be eradicated. Don't settle for less and be resigned

## 3. Any amendments or refinements you can think of?

#### **Expand TB free target**

- Make whole country TB free by addressing all vectors

#### **Need more accurate movement recording**

- Better access to and reliance on accurate movement information
- When large areas are clear other 'dirty' areas must stop movement to those areas to maintain the free status areas
- Enforce this legally especially around natural boundaries like rivers. 'close the borders'.

#### **Penalties for contravening restrictions**

- Prosecution of farmers who illegally move cattle under these restrictions, like what happened with foot and mouth disease

## 4. Any alternatives or innovations you can suggest?

#### **Research into accurate immune testing for new calves**

- New born cattle under 42 days of age may be moved without pre-movement test which

presents a risk of disease spread. Find a way of identifying at 2-4 months of age and test (i.e. early immune system identification when it works).

- TB database flagged re. Where moved to and from i.e. work back to where came from. Trace markets and record.

#### **Raise funding priority for research**

- Funding issues – get Bill Gates or others to fund it alongside e.g. human health research issues. Take with similar seriousness as all relates to future food security

#### **Auctions to publish test history**

- Work with auctioneers to publicise whole testing history

#### **Make sure all stakeholders have input**

- i.e. have any livestock auctioneers attended workshops or given input ?

#### **National coordination to eradicate other diseases**

- National coordination of other disease eradication e.g. sheep scab, BVD

#### **Create more physical barriers to spread**

- 'more Hadrian's Walls', i.e. barriers

#### **Public awareness raising to raise political will**

- If general public understood the cost that the government spend on TB, public pressure would raise the priority and politicians respond to taxpayers/voting public i.e. raise awareness for public. And maintain trade with EU to raise profile

#### **Liaise with media to promote accurate information**

- Get media on board with accurate information rather than oversimplifying into soundbites as they do

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

#### **Definition of TB free status**

- The definition of 'TB free status' and how do you reach this decision? What determines how a 1yr, 2yr, 3yr, 4yr test parish is calculated?

## 4.5 Minimising the geographical spread of TB in cattle:

### 1. What else can Government and Industry do?

#### **Zoning**

- Zone the country into TB-free and infected area
- Zoning: should ensure it wouldn't disrupt market prices and values too much
- Zoning: would be unpopular and economically hard on non-OTF, BUT from a disease perspective, zoning makes sense
- Zoning: prices would be unsustainable, too high

#### **Borders/firewalls for cattle movement**

- 'Total' border: i.e. no cattle from infected area [into clean]
- Movement (free) from clean and infected
- Use natural boundaries to stop spread of disease and have TB-free areas
- Remove linked holdings

#### **Identify Official TB free areas**

- Identify the OTF areas
- OTF starter areas: Scotland and Northumberland
- Whole herd slaughter applicable in low incidence areas/OTF areas
- Whole herd slaughter: i.e. if one reactor, whole herd goes
- Annual test to define the TB-free areas
  - Would trade have to be stopped to allow for a while

#### **Bio-security for TB free herds**

- 92% of herds are TB free: why aren't we working with those herds to identify high risk behaviour and reduce that risk?
- Only purchase from herds with a lower risk than yourself
- No movements at all from high-risk to low-risk areas
- Increase the frequency of testing on the edge of endemic with changes so farmer behaviour

- to improve e.g. bio-security.
- Fattening units aren't as concerned about TB as other herd types (as cattle don't live as long etc): this could have knock-on effects on wildlife
- Eliminate linked holdings
- Specialised heifer and youngstock rearing units in OT free areas which are specifically to re-stock TB-affected. This may mean some form of government subsidy
- Close loophole of under 42 days old calves not being tested, so: 1. use SAM to indentify/flag when 2-4 months old, then 2. Mandatory test them
- Stopping movements from infected to clean areas
- Promote own heifer and young stock rearing on farms in LIA. So no/reduce bought-in replacements from AIA
- Controlling trade
- Tighten up removal of reactors

#### **Movement documentation & cattle passport**

- More information at the point of sale of animals = testing history and where they've come from
- Declaration of TB herd status to accompany the cattle passport

#### **Reduce contact between high & low risk herds**

- State support to help reduce the risk of the 'high-risk' herds, whether behaviour/trading practices etc
- CTS links and SOAS – withdraw those between high-low risk now (don't wait for MacDonald)
- Put hurdles in the way of movements from low incidence to high incidence areas

#### **Uniqueness of TB**

- Why is TB a special disease, why don't we control it the way we do other diseases?

#### **Test effectiveness**

- More accurate and quicker identification of infected animals (i.e. test efficacy)
- Compulsory PrMT for all cattle
- Should we use the single skin test on the Edge area (then roll out)
- Increase herd testing intervals (i.e. annual)
- Need a more reliable test
- Shouldn't be whole herd slaughter for one reactor
- Improve the enforcement of testing and movements regimes
- i.e. see DG Sanco report 2011
- Current test – may mean eradication is impossible
- Mandatory post-movement tests of cattle from high-risk areas into low-risk areas
- More testing in clean areas as well as endemic (1-2 year test) areas

#### **Public understanding**

- Communications with public: we are failing to give key messages about TB in cattle, wildlife and why it's important

#### **Transmission**

- Close loopholes around alpacas (for example), non-bovines
- Non-bovine disease/infection is unknown
- We talk about disease, but should be talking about infection

#### **Break TB link with badgers**

- Break the link with wildlife spread

#### **Government brief**

- Government should do three things: 1. Movements control, 2. Testing, 3. Wildlife control
- Working from the 'outside' inwards i.e. see (4) and enforcing the three areas

## **4.6 Different types and providers of support and advice.**

### **PR support**

- PR support for culling – from government

### **Emotional support**

- Social/emotional guidance and support – especially initially when first breakdown occurs

### **Networking**

- A network for owners independent of Defra to give access to advice

- Invite badger groups to meeting to discuss epidemiology

#### **Support from own vets**

- Support from own vets at breakdowns – personal communication other than phone call and email

#### **Records & paperwork**

- Simplifying paperwork and paperwork is right first time

#### **Information & data access**

- Integration of BCMS and SAM

#### **Web searches**

- Knowledge transfer improved – for disease, risk etc [internet]

#### **Advice & support on bio-security**

- Support on bio-security measures, restocking post-TB
- Stress to clean areas how much an outbreak may affect their business therefore take bio-security seriously

### **Listed by organisations**

#### **Industry network**

- Network – NFU?
- NFU! County advisor/Group secretary role for emotional/social support!

#### **Food quality**

- DairyCo, EBLEX

#### **Vets**

- Quality assured vets with local knowledge. Additional training and validation for these vets provided as CPD by Defra approved third party
- Defra funding could be given to local charity groups who can assist more vulnerable keepers to have their herds tested
- Communicate with vets e.g. over testing frequency

#### **AHVLA**

- AHVLA (information about breakdowns)
- Better management of change – removal of exotic disease alert replaced by AHLVA subscription which was not communicated well
- Opportunity for informal discussion between local vet and AHVLA <20> <13>
- Better communication between AHVLA vets and local vets

#### **Defra & AHVLA**

- User-friendly Defra and AHVLA websites
- Better communication within the area once there is a problem – from Defra/AHVLA to vets
- Sort out Data Protection issues so Defra/ AHVLA can share information

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

#### **Cross-sector discussion & co-operation**

- Cooperation of all involved – farmers, vets, Defra (and wildlife groups)
- Better communication between DEFRA/AHVLA and livestock producers and general public of what problems we face with TB, the difficulties in control and eradication and a good clear explanation of the way forward and why we need to take these measures
- Continued discussion with farmers by authorities. Work together

#### **Co-operative AHVLA/vet relationship with farmers**

- For AHVLA and farmers to work together for the good of the industry
- Maintenance of local vet/farmer relationship through TB testing

#### **Research and publish evidence & formulate strategy**

- Establish and agree on “facts” that can begin to send out the correct messages

#### **Importance of appropriate education for farmers**

- Education for all farmers at levels they can understand
- Improved education on the need for good biosecurity and movement controls so there is a change in attitude to disease risk and the economics of buying ‘cheap’ animals from endemic areas

### **Value of public communication & education**

- Public education regarding the cost to the taxpayer of TB and the effect of bTB on the national herd. The public have influence
- Better ways of communication TB issues with the general public

### **Emphasise development of cattle vaccine**

- Vaccination/DIVA test available to use by choice
- Development of cattle vaccine with accompanying alterations in EU legislation to support vaccine and DIVA as a sensible firebreak strategy towards eradication
- Enthusiastic support for the introduction of cattle vaccination

### **Test & vaccine wildlife**

- Oral badger vaccine
- Live wildlife test

### **Effective cattle testing**

- Annual test across whole country or 4 year become 2 year test areas
- Pre- and post-movement testing from 1 and 2 year testing to clean areas
- Development of more reliable individual animal tests
- Testing times to follow individual animals, not by area
- Annual test to find where TB is and be proactive not reactive
- Annual testing on at least 2 year testing to stop the spread into wildlife
- Do away with your yearly testing areas!

### **Cattle passports with provenance & test history**

- TB area and herd status accompany cattle passport

### **Comprehensive Infection control strategy**

- A shift in rhetoric away from “disease/elimination” and towards “infection/control
- A change of focus away from badger culling and towards a scientifically led, effective and long-term strategy to control TB in cattle and wildlife
- ‘Three legged stool, if don’t do all three you fall off’ 1. Testing; 2. Movement; 3. Vector (wildlife) control improved

### **Government supportive to farmers in breakdown crisis**

- For government to notice there is a social/emotional need for support somewhere along the line when breakouts first occur

### **Eradicate TB in all vectors**

- Comprehensive cattle and wildlife controls for bovine TB, in particular on the edge area
- Control and eradicate TB in all vectors, both wildlife and farmed species
- Clear aim – eradicate bTB

### **Cull badgers to keep cattle free**

- Take political interference out of controlling this complex and dangerous zoonosis, so that a consistent national eradication strategy is implemented
- Cull badgers in from clean area into infected area to allow clean badgers in behind
- Intensive action on clean/infected boundaries including badger culling
- We must make a start on culling – see whether it makes a difference or we will never know
- Break the disease link between wildlife and cattle

### **Political will – invest long-term in science & strategy**

- Long term political commitment to tackle bovine TB

### **Science/evidence led rather than political battle**

- Politics completely removed from the debate. Everything science-led to eradicate disease

### **Restrict movements to reduce infection spread**

- Restrictions on the movement of cattle from high risk areas to low risk areas (i.e. no movements)
- Tighter restrictions on post-movement testing and isolation/moving of stock from high to low risk areas

### **Zoning to reduce spread of infection**

- Zone UK into OTBF and infected area and stop all movements into OTBF, unless isolation and pre- 30 day – and post movement testing 120 days later
- Reassurance/measures for farmers in TB areas that if “zoning” happens prices for replacement cattle will be controlled i.e. not get too expensive to buy from a TB Free zone
- “zoning” of the UK – stop movement of cattle from infected areas into non-infected areas

- Zoning of cattle movements
- Restricted movement of breeding stock from TB infected area into 'free' areas
- Reduction of diseases regions

**Designating, protecting, and expanding TB free areas**

- TB free areas in England
- More information [with] regard to possibility of the worth of being TB free
- Work harder to protect OTF herds either in endemic or non-endemic areas by investing in risk reduction strategies
- North of England (Yorkshire) designated TB Free as in Scotland
- NE and NW be declared a TB Free area
- The clean areas kept clean so as to work on the other areas, outside in

**Fair compensation**

- Farm/herd accreditation linked to compensation scheme that guides compensation values
- To save money compensation on value rather than age
- Fair compensation scheme that enables the industry to continue successfully

## 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.** Lead Facilitator  
**Setting the scene** Chair of AHWBE  
**Context and key information** 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**

Alnorthumbria Veterinary Practice Ltd  
British Alpaca Society  
BVA  
DairyCo  
Farmers and livestock keepers (beef finishers, pedigree and dairy)  
Humane Society International  
IDEXX  
Kingsway Veterinary Group  
Local Authority Trading Standards  
Longbridge Veterinary Services  
National Beef Association  
NFU Doncaster  
NFU North East  
NFU West Riding of Yorkshire  
NFU York  
Swale Vets  
The Goat Veterinary Society  
The Green Veterinary Surgery  
VetCo

### **Officials**

AHWBE Chair  
TBEAG Chair  
TB Programme, Defra  
Regional Veterinary Lead, AHVLA

### **Numbers attending:**

31

### **Farmers or farming organisations:**

20

### **Veterinary practices or organisations:**

8

### **Wildlife and conservation groups:**

1

### **Commercial companies:**

1

### **Other:**

1