



Our Ref: ATIC1951

[REDACTED]
{By Email}

29 January 2020

Dear [REDACTED]

PROVISION OF REQUESTED INFORMATION

Thank you for your request for information on risk pathways analysis which we received on 10 January 2020. Your request has been handled under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004(EIR).

The information you requested and our response is detailed below:

The risk pathway analysis for Derbyshire, referenced above, indicates that only one herd, 104, was allocated “definite” as the final hazard for any risk pathway.

Q. What was the evidence to confirm that the breakdown of herd 104 was “definitely” attributed to badgers ?

The definite ranking is based on the herd/farm and area observational evidence of badger contact points (direct and indirect) badger prevalence (live and dead sightings, presence of setts and latrines, diggings on farm, badger pathway attribution on surrounding breakdown farms), local spoligotype in reactors from main holding etc.

Q. How many of the 120 herd locations were visited by an APHA vet ?

Q. How many Disease Report Forms (DRF) were completed by telephone ?

Q. How many DRFs were completed during site visits ?

One DRF is completed per site visit. There is no record of DRFs having been completed by telephone. All 120 herd locations included in the risk pathway assessment analysis reported will have received a visit for the completion of the DRF.

Q. How many of the breakdown herds had spoligotype confirmation before completion of the final assessment.

OTF-S breakdowns will not have spoligotype information. A small percentage of OTF-W breakdowns may not have a spoligotype identified.

Q. How many breakdown herds had incomplete epidemiological evidence at the final assessment ?

Q. Typically, what epidemiological evidence is missing at the final assessment ?

The value of pieces of epidemiological information which make up the overall evidence base, on which a veterinary assessment and judgement is made, will be different in each case. The following information is sought:

Evidence for hazard and risk pathway selection – data to collect

History of reactors over their entire lifetime: Date of birth, movement history
History of herd: type, hire bulls, contract rearing, movements and source locations, grazing, buildings etc.

History of area: TB background all reactor locations, epi reports available
Epidemiological groups: location, management, movements, reactor groups
Wildlife (badgers, deer, wild boar): locations, proximity to cattle, buildings, feeding, mitigations (e.g. biosecurity)

Co-location with other farmed species: contact, management (purchase history etc.) likelihood of infection

Contiguous farms

Additional Epi information including farm level reports (herd TB history and movements), M. bovis genotyping

DRF page 13 does not include a box for reasons/evidence for exclusion of risk pathways, whereas selected risk pathways, page 12 has ample space for such information.

Q. Please explain this omission on page 13.

The form is designed to balance the needs of data collection and evidencing with time and resource considerations of data collection on this scale. The process requires the robust evidencing of selected pathways and can also include exclusion evidence which led to the final selected risk pathway assessment.

Q. Were hair traps employed on any of the 97 breakdown farms where the weighted score assigned to hazard was badgers only ?

APHA does not routinely employ hair traps.

Q. Was trap and test employed on any of the farms to determine the disease status of badgers ?

APHA does not routinely employ trap and test of badgers.

Q. Was CCTV used to monitor buildings, pasture, water or feed points for the frequency of badger activity ?

APHA does not routinely employ CCTV monitoring.

Q. Were badger faeces submitted by any farm for PCR testing ?

APHA does not routinely submit badger faeces for PCR testing.

Information disclosed in response to this EIR request is releasable to the public. In keeping with the spirit and effect of the EIR and the government's Transparency Agenda, this letter and the information disclosed to you may be placed on GOV.UK, together with any related information that will provide a key to its wider context. No information identifying you will be placed on the GOV.UK website.

An Annex is attached which explains the copyright that applies to the information being released to you and contact details should you be unhappy with the service you have received.

If you have any queries about this letter, please contact the Access to Information Team at the email address below or postal address at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely

ACCESS TO INFORMATION TEAM

Email: enquiries@apha.gov.uk

Annex

Copyright

The information supplied to you continues to be protected by copyright. You are free to use it for your own purposes, including for private study and non-commercial research, and for any other purpose authorised by an exception in current copyright law. Documents (except photographs or logos) can also be used in the UK without requiring permission for the purposes of news reporting. Any other re-use, for example commercial publication, would require the permission of the copyright holder.

Most documents produced by APHA will be protected by Crown Copyright. Most Crown copyright information can be re-used under the [Open Government Licence](#). For information about the OGL and about re-using Crown Copyright information please see [The National Archives website](#).

Copyright in other documents may rest with a third party. For information about obtaining permission from a third party see the [Intellectual Property Office's website](#).

Complaints

If you are unhappy with the service you have received in relation to your request, you may make a complaint or appeal against our decision under section 17(7) of the FOIA or under regulation 11 of the EIRs, as applicable, within 40 working days of the date of this letter. Please write to the Access to Information Manager at the address at the top of this letter or email enquiries@apha.gov.uk and the team will arrange for an internal review of your case.

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, section 50 of the FOIA and regulation 18 of the EIRs gives you the right to apply directly to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) for a decision. Please note that generally the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have first exhausted APHA's own complaints procedure. The ICO can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF