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I was asked by Ben Bradshaw, Minister of Local Environment, Marine and Animal Welfare at the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to review current policy in England on the movement of farmed livestock, except pigs and poultry. My terms of reference were:

“To review and make recommendations on the degree to which current rules in England and Wales on the movement of cattle, sheep and deer deliver a sufficiently reduced risk of disease, taking account of the need to support the sustainability of the livestock industry. In particular the review should address the risks being managed by the controls, the benefits of the controls, the administrative burden created by them, and the way in which they have influenced farmer behaviour, including the levels of compliance with them, and make recommendations.

Out of scope of the review is consideration of the length of movement standstills applicable to any species. This is because the six day standstill periods were introduced in 2003 following extensive work to identify the costs and benefits of having such an approach. The Report recommended that a standstill period of 20 days provided the best disease protection, but that a six day standstill period provided worthwhile protection against the spread of disease. These results are still valid.

The secretariat for the review will be provided by Animal Identification and Movements Division of Defra. The review will commence in February 2006, and report by the end of June 2006”.

I have addressed each of the issues in my terms of reference. Perhaps inevitably I received less data on levels of compliance, although I am grateful to those who supplied me, in confidence, details of ways the current rules are being evaded. I have not covered this subject explicitly in my report. But the detail that I have been given has strongly influenced my conclusions in other areas. Whilst consideration of the length of movement standstill is still out of scope of my review, I have made a recommendation on an alternative way to achieve the standstill.

To achieve my objective I sent a short questionnaire (see Annex A) to a number of organisations and individuals, and met several of them. To those who completed the questionnaire, or who took the time to meet me, I am profoundly grateful.

Finally I should like to thank Andrew Beech, Lyn Haywood, Olu Ogunbadejo, Renée Raiser and Stephanie Jean from Defra who assisted me in my work.

Throughout this report a number of acronyms have been used for the sake of brevity. These are all explained in the glossary.

Bill Madders
Stafford
July 2006
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Livestock Movements

Introduction

1.1 Each time livestock move from one location to another there is a risk of spreading disease. This risk can be greater when stock move into a breeding flock or herd; also when stock are brought together from many farms to a market or other central point before being dispersed to many different locations.

1.2 Healthy livestock are an essential element of a prosperous livestock industry. The industry has been devastated in the recent past by a major foot and mouth disease outbreak and is just emerging from 10 years of trading restrictions caused by BSE. Cattle keepers have the ongoing scourge of bovine TB to contend with. In addition less headline grabbing diseases can be spread from farm to farm, for example IBR, BVD, leptospirosis and sheep scab amongst others.

1.3 However moving stock from breeding and rearing farms to finishing units, from the hills to the lowlands, from rearing farms to sheep flocks and dairy and suckler herds are all essential elements to a successful livestock industry.

1.4 The pig and poultry industries have vertically integrated to great extent. The scope for the cattle and sheep industries to do so is more limited. It has happened to a degree in the dairy sector but even here calves and other stock often move to other farms for rearing and further finishing.

1.5 The aim must be to facilitate the necessary economic activities of the livestock industry, including the movement of stock, while mitigating the risk of disease spread. Auction markets have an important role to play in matching buyer and seller and also in establishing values of stock traded, both through the markets and elsewhere.

1.6 Livestock marketing groups and dealers/stock agents provide a valuable service in sourcing and supplying stock, matching the needs of rearing farms and others selling and for example fattening units buying.

1.7 The keys to the prevention and control of disease are good biosecurity, not allowing animals to move more than once per week, the appropriate use of isolation facilities and knowing what is where and when i.e. as near to a real time database as possible.

The Livestock Movements Rules

1.8 The animal health movement controls currently imposed by Defra and WAG collectively have as their main objectives to achieve improved notifiable disease control through:

- a lower risk of outbreaks
- quicker control of outbreaks
- reduced cost of outbreaks

A second objective is to achieve this by imposing as low an administrative burden for farmers as possible, with minimum compliance costs both for farmers and regulators.
1.9 The rules in place have been built up piecemeal over a number of years. Those applicable to cattle were put in place in the late 1990s to control BSE. Essentially all movements of cattle between businesses, and within a business between separate premises (holdings) managed by that business should be reported to BCMS, now part of the RPA. Details of such movements are entered onto CTS, a database owned by BCMS. In the interest of reducing the burden imposed on cattle farmers, a number of exemptions have been made to this basic rule, involving movements between what have come to be known as “linked holdings”. These are summarised at Annex B. It will already have become clear that there is confusion over the terminology used to describe places, with “premises” and “holdings” especially causing difficulty. This issue, and a solution to it, is described later in this report.

1.10 These controls remained in place during and after the major outbreak of FMD that affected large parts of GB in 2001. Other controls were introduced at that time that have, as will be explained later, served to complicate matters for those farming cattle.

1.11 The rules applicable to the movement of sheep and goats were minimal prior to 2001. But FMD acted as the catalyst for a major overhaul of the rules then, and a number of changes have been made to the rules since.

1.12 These rules applicable to the movement of sheep have been complicated by the rules for the identification of sheep. These have changed a number of times since 2001, notably with the introduction of EU rules in 2005, but the new rules have never been applied retrospectively to sheep from before their introduction. There are thus four distinct age cohorts of sheep subject to different ID rules. This complicates the reporting of sheep movements, as will be described below.

1.13 The primary change made at the time of the FMD outbreak in 2001 was the introduction of livestock movement standstills. At first these were set at the level that has applied in the pig industry since 1975- 20 days. This confusingly, is also known as a 21 day standstill – the difference resulting from whether or not the day on which the movements takes place is included. The 20 day standstill was reduced to six for cattle, sheep and goats, and to zero for deer in March 2003.

1.14 The default rule for the movement of these species is:

- no movement may take place off a premises that is under movement standstill;
- all movements must be reported (sheep, goat and deer to the LA, cattle to BCMS);
- all movements will impose a standstill on the premises of destination.

Movements of species other than cattle are entered onto AMLS by the LA. This is another database, now owned by BCMS. AMLS checks each movement reported to it to ensure that it took place from a premises that was not under standstill, and records the existence of a standstill on the premises of destination. AMLS captures cattle movements by means of a daily download of data from CTS, and carries out standstill checks on these movements.

1.15 There are a considerable number of exemptions to these rules. These are set out at Annex C.

1.16 In the Spring of 2006, pre-movement testing of cattle over 15 months for bovine TB was introduced. From March 2007 this will apply to cattle over 6 weeks. Pre-movement testing is generally required when cattle move from farms in parishes subject to one or two year testing frequency.
1.17 A different movement regime applies in Scotland. The Disease Control (Interim Measures) (Scotland) Order 2002 was introduced in February 2002 when Foot and Mouth Disease restrictions were lifted. It provides that animals may only move under licence and imposes standstills when animals are brought onto holdings. The standstill period is 13 days for cattle, sheep and goats, but 20-days for pigs. Animals placed in approved separation units trigger a standstill on the unit rather than the entire holding.

1.18 Scotland has a number of exemptions from the standstill provisions e.g. the movement of animals going direct to slaughter or animals moving direct from premises to a market for animals intended for immediate slaughter; young lambs and calves for fostering; breeding bulls, rams and goats; animals going to AI centres or for veterinary treatment; show/exhibition animals unless going to another show within 13 days; away-wintered sheep returning home from wintering and animal movements between premises on which a right of grazing in common with other proprietors.

1.19 Pre and post-movement testing of cattle for bovine TB is required for cattle over 6 weeks coming from parishes in England and Wales where one or two year testing frequency applies.
2.1 For any movement reporting system to work it is important to know where animals are moving between. The system of identifiers used throughout GB originated in the 1940s, and allocated, for each country and each parish within that country, a holding number to each farm. This is the farm’s CPH number.

2.2 The structure of the agriculture industry has changed markedly since the 1940s, but the CPH number structure has not kept pace. Many farming businesses occupy several parcels of land at a distance from each other. A family farm may have a number of distinct businesses operating from it. Each family member will have been treated as a separate business for subsidy payment and taxation purposes. Each of these would have been allocated a separate CPH.

2.3 In England the allocation of CPHs is the responsibility of RPA and in Wales this is undertaken by WAG Rural Payments Division. Their rules state that, where a business has two parcels of land that are less than ten miles apart these can be included within a single CPH. If the two parcels are more than ten miles apart they must be given separate CPHs. With the pressure to simplify the previous subsidy payment arrangements it is clear that these rules have not been universally applied. There are many businesses that have land more than ten miles apart under a single CPH. The RPA are now applying their rules more rigorously.

2.4 Livestock movements, where they have to be reported, are currently reported as being from one CPH to another. The AMLS database checks that first CPH to see whether it is under standstill, and imposes as standstill on the second. For some farmers there is clearly a temptation to avoid effective movement standstills by having more than one CPH. In this way a movement could be reported onto one of the CPHs, but a second movement could take place off the same farming unit, within the standstill period, by being reported as being made off the second CPH. Evidence has been presented to the Review that this is happening.

2.5 A word about definitions is needed at this point. The basic building block of land identification is the “land parcel”. This is a piece of land with a definably boundary that can be readily identified in situ. Usually a field, it can also be a building. The word “holding” has traditionally (in GB) been used to refer to the whole of a business. This is the way the word is used by those within the industry themselves. Thus, however widespread the land used by a business may be, it is all considered to be one “holding”.

2.6 But “holding” has a much looser definition in the European law relating to livestock movements. In this “holding” means “any establishment, any structure, or in the case of free-range farming, any environment, in which animals are held, reared or handled on a permanent or temporary basis, except veterinary practices or clinics”. This has been interpreted by the European Commission, and especially by their auditors the FVO, in a much narrower way than the traditional understanding of the term. Essentially any group of land parcels managed by one business, but separated from the other land parcels managed by the same business, is considered to be a separate “holding”. Thus, in the Commission’s interpretation, a business may constitute more than one holding.
2.7 As part of its work to define businesses, and the land they farm, the RPA has defined a three-tier structure to enable consistent identification of pieces of land and to link these to a farm business. This is shown diagrammatically at Figure 1.

2.8 The recommendations in respect of the Livestock Movement Units that are made in chapter 4 of this report depend upon consistent treatment of premises identifiers. The three-tier structure designed by the RPA would provide this essential baseline although for the purposes of reporting livestock movements the production unit layer would be replaced by Livestock Movement Units that consist of land parcels which are epidemiologically linked.

**Recommendation 1**

I recommend that Defra and WAG ensure that for all existing and new livestock businesses, their land occupancy be recorded in the format of the new structure, and that livestock movements be reported to the livestock movement databases using the new Livestock Movement Unit identifiers.
3.1 The evidence presented to the Review pointed to a desire on the part of most livestock farmers to comply with the rules, subject to a number of conditions:
   a) that they understand why the rules are in place and agree that these are necessary;
   b) that they are seen to impose the minimum constraints on farming businesses to achieve their objective;
   c) that they are consistent as between livestock species; and
   d) that they are enforced consistently.

3.2 It is clear that many livestock farmers find the existing rules highly confusing. The summaries at Annexes B and C show the complexity of the rules. It is also clear, however, that removing complexity altogether would make it impossible for some businesses to continue. The basic rule is a simple one; that all movements must be reported, that only movements from premises not under standstill are allowed, and that all movements will impose a standstill on the premises of destination. The complexity arises from the various exemptions from this basic rule. Removing these exemptions would cause serious difficulty for the many businesses that benefit from them. (See Annex C).

Linkages between Premises

3.3 Many of the exemptions are straightforward, readily understandable and it would seem sensible to allow them to continue. In this review I have concentrated on the three that are inter-related, that are the most complicated and confusing, that could be exploited by the unscrupulous few to avoid the impact of the movement standstills, and that cause the greatest difficulty for the management of mixed farms. These are:
   - SOAs
   - Linked holdings for cattle; and
   - The five mile rule for sheep and goats.

What each of these are, and how they work, is explained in Annexes B and C. The problem for farmers seems to be in how they work together. The following diagram demonstrates the complexity of it all. Despite appearances this is by no means an unlikely scenario, although Defra are unable to provide data on how many such complex cases actually exist.

3.4 In Figure 2, premises A, B, C and D are all under the management and control of a single business. All four are populated with sheep; D also has a dairy unit. A, B and C also have beef cattle. E is also a dairy farm, but under the management and control of a different business. A and B are within five miles of each other; C and D are not, and are also more than five miles from A or B. A, B, C and D are linked in a SOA; D and E are linked cattle holdings, because E has no milking parlour and, by agreement, uses that at D twice a day. A, B, C and D are also linked to cattle holdings.
3.5 Under the existing rules:

- movements of sheep between either A or B do not have to be reported, and do not impose a standstill;
- movements of sheep between either A or B and either of C and D do have to be reported, but do not impose a standstill;
- movements of cattle between A, B, C and D not have to be reported, and do not impose a standstill;
- movements of cattle between D and E do not have to be reported, and do not impose a standstill;
- movements of cattle between A, B, C or D and E do have to be reported, and do impose a standstill;
- movements of sheep between A, B, C or D and E do have to be reported and do impose a standstill.

Given this, it is hardly surprising that farmers find the rules confusing.

3.6 Furthermore, these arrangements are intended to allow an exemption from movement reporting and standstill where disease risk is sufficiently low. But they do so imprecisely, and inconsistently. The five mile rule for sheep and goats contains an arbitrary cut-off at five miles. But there will be some businesses with premises closer than that between which it would be desirable to require reporting of movements (because of the way the business is operated); there will be others where it would be acceptable to allow movements of over five miles not to be reported. For cattle linked holdings the equally arbitrary cut-off point was set at 25 miles, and for SOA’s there is no cut-off point at all. There used to be one, set at 50km, but this was abolished in 2003.
3.7 In my terms of reference I was asked to report on the level of compliance with the existing controls. As in any case of attempting to assess the level at which illegal activity is taking place this is fraught with difficulty, and it is certain that there are no reliable figures available for the level of non-compliance.

3.8 Evidence has been given to the review that some keepers have obtained multiple CPHs, which are routinely used to circumvent the movement standstill rules. One keeper admitted to having six CPHs, effectively one for each day of the week. Those CPHs are not necessarily on an identical piece of land but they are on land that is epidemiologically linked. Because these CPHs are not linked on AMLS, stock is effectively moving on and off this keepers’ premises on a continuous basis. It is not known how widespread this practice is, but it seems to be used by some at least of those who deal in livestock or who act as purchasing agents on behalf of others. This practice increases disease risk, because diseased animals bought onto a dealers or traders; premises would spread disease to other livestock that are moved off without the standstill delay during which disease could become evident. Were there to be another FMD outbreak, this practice could mean that the disease would have spread further before discovery than would have been the case had the standstills been observed.

3.9 Evidence has also been presented that the three-day rule for reporting movements of cattle to BCMS is laxly applied. Thus a movement off a premises may be reported correctly, as having been made off a premises on day 1, and the same cattle reported having arrived on another premises on day 3 or even later. It is inconceivable that these cattle will have been on a truck for all that time. It is highly likely that the cattle will have spent some time on an interim premises (perhaps those of a dealer or trader) whose identity is never reported.

3.10 This practice, too, risks expanding the scale of a disease outbreak. If one or other of these cattle were to be found to be carrying disease, the premises from which they were reported to have moved off would, correctly, be investigated as a possible source of disease. But, because its very existence is unknown, the interim premises on which the cattle had been would not be investigated, neither could all the other animals on that premises with which those cattle might have had contact be able to be investigated. This practice, therefore, adds significantly to the risk that agriculture departments are seeking to reduce.
Recommendations – Livestock Movements

4.1 It is clear from the evidence present in Chapter 3 that changes need to be made to the rules relating to livestock movements. These take three forms:
   a. simplification of the rules to enable livestock keepers to understand them, and their own responsibilities under them;
   b. measures to enable trading practices that the industry find convenient or necessary to enable them to retain (or to maximise) profitability to continue or to become legitimate whilst minimising disease risk;
   c. measures that Defra and its agencies can themselves take to identify more accurately the places between which livestock are moved, to improve traceability, and to improve the chances that livestock keepers will understand and comply with their reporting obligations.

4.2 I have not considered it within my terms of reference to recommend that the livestock industry should restructure itself and its activities so as to minimise disease risk. Accordingly my recommendations are primarily designed to enable the industry in its present form to comply better with simpler movement rules. However, there is pressure from food retailers and others to reduce the number of livestock movements and to shorten the red meat chain. For example, it is more common in some countries for livestock to be finished on the farm of birth and go direct to slaughter. Also while the experience of electronic auctions and internet trading of livestock in the UK has been mixed, other countries successfully use these methods which can reduce animal contact and hence disease risk.

4.3 The review will deal first with the complexity of the existing rules. This complexity is especially acute for keepers who have mixed holdings of cattle and sheep. It is clear that the existing rules have a degree of arbitrariness about them that needs to be replaced by a measure that requires movements to be reported only where the risk can objectively be assessed to be higher.

Recommendation 2

I recommend that all existing SOAs and linked holdings for cattle, and the five mile rule for sheep and goats be abolished and replaced by Livestock Movement Units (LMUs). These will consist of all those land parcels and buildings which are farmed as a single unit and are linked epidemiologically.

Recommendation 3

I recommend that LMUs be registered on a database (e.g. RITA). Changes in occupancy of Land Parcels including seasonal lets, should be reported to the database, which should then be updated accordingly. SVS and Local Authorities to get appropriate access to the database.
4.4 An LMU would in most cases be a single premises or linked premises under the management and control of a single business. But in the case of common land or shared seasonal grazing, there is a case where it would be desirable to allow them to include premises managed and controlled by more than one business.

4.5 The criteria for defining an LMU are simple. All premises must be linked epidemiologically, biosecure and been found to be so by a qualified person. This could include self declaration for those keepers that do not have a SOA or CTS linked premises. However, these must be followed up by an inspection by a qualified person.

a. Movements of stock **between** the premises within an LMU:
   - would not have to be recorded in the farm movement records;
   - would not have to be reported to the LA or BCMS as appropriate;
   - would not have to respect any standstill on the premises of departure; and
   - would not impose a standstill on the premises of destination.

A change of keeper of livestock within an LMU would have to be recorded and reported but would not impose a standstill.

b. Movements of stock **onto** the LMU from outside **and** movements of stock **off** the LMU to a destination outside it including movements between LMUs within the same farm business:
   - would have to be recorded in the farm movement records;
   - would have to be reported to the LA or BCMS as appropriate;
   - would have to respect any standstill on the premises of departure; and
   - would impose a standstill on the premises of destination.

No premises should be in more than one LMU.

4.6 For premises to qualify for inclusion in an LMU:
   - all of the animals should be under the day-to-day control of the same person(s);
   - should only include premises between which stock are regularly moved.

Furthermore, all of the premises concerned:
   - should share such of the farm machinery as comes regularly into contact with livestock;
   - should share facilities such as cattle crushes or sheep handling facilities;
   - should have stock-proof barriers against adjacent land not within the proposed LMU;
   - should have a named veterinary practice responsible for the livestock in the LMU;
   - where cattle are present on any of the premises in the LMU all the premises must fall either within a one or two year TB testing regime or a three or four year TB testing regime and the herd testing interval on all parts should be that of the “highest” risk.
Within each LMU there must be adequate facilities for the purpose of inspection, isolation, loading, marshalling, watering, feeding and housing of stock, and for the treatment of sick or injured animals. Once approved the existence and extent of an LMU should be recorded on the appropriate Defra livestock movement databases. It would be good practice for cattle kept within the proposed LMU not to be able to have nose to nose contact with cattle outside the proposed LMU.

4.7 The purpose of allowing any exemptions form the basic rule applicable to livestock movements is to allow farming activity to take place whilst keeping disease risk to acceptable levels. A knowledge of, and compliance with, basic on-farm biosecurity is an important part of minimising disease risk.

**Recommendation 4**

I recommend that the keeper responsible for the animals in the LMU should:

- demonstrate that he or she understands the rules relating to biosecurity, animal movements and good farming practice;
- have and follow a control strategy to minimise the risk of introducing or spreading disease.

4.8 Each potential LMU needs to be assessed by a properly qualified person to ensure that the criteria for inclusion are met. Veterinary surgeons are clearly qualified to determine whether premises are epidemiologically linked. But, given a clear set of criteria such as those set out in paragraphs 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 above, I believe that other groups of people could also be suitably qualified e.g. surveyors, land agents, UKAS approved farm inspectors and SVS Animal Health Officers. Self declaration by the keeper should also be considered where a keeper does not have a SOA or CTS linked premises. However, this must be followed up by an inspection by a qualified person. It will take time to approve all of the LMUs.

**Recommendation 5**

I recommend that Defra and WAG set a time limit by when the approval process should be complete. The existing SOAs, cattle linked holdings and the five mile rule for sheep to continue during this period.

4.9 Some dairy enterprises that are not under the same management and control share a milking parlour. It would clearly be absurd to require the movement of cattle to be reported each time they are taken for milking. And the imposition of a standstill would effectively mean that cattle, having been taken for milking, could not return home for six days.

**Recommendation 6**

I recommend that such moves be exempt from movement reporting and standstill under the Disease Control (England) Order 2003 and Disease Control (Wales) Order 2003, but only where they occur between approved pairs of premises within a single LMU. To prevent any inadvertent spread of disease, that the premises involved, both the one with the milking parlour and the one without, be excluded from eligibility for inclusion in another LMU. As stated above, any given premises could only form part of one LMU.
Common land

4.10 Each common with livestock grazing rights is effectively a shared resource between a closed number of businesses. At times of the year animals may well wander freely around the common, mixing with animals from the other businesses that have grazing rights. In some circumstances, notably when the commoner has land adjacent to the common, animals from all the businesses involved may wander to and from that in-bye land as well. The common, and the in-bye land of all of the businesses grazing that common, could effectively be regarded as a single epidemiological unit. There are large common land areas which can be effectively split into separate epidemiological units because of natural boundaries in the landscape.

4.11 But equally it is important that those exercising rights of common pay proper attention to biosecurity, and the need to protect their own business and those of others from the potential spread of disease.

Recommendation 7

I recommend that an LMU or LMUs be created, at the request of the commoners or a commons council, that would encompass the common or parts of the common and the in-bye land of those grazing it. If any commoner declines to include his/her in-bye land within the LMU then all movements between that in-bye and the common must be reported, must respect any standstill on the premises of departure (including the common), and would impose a standstill on the premises of destination, except where an approved isolation facility is used (see paragraph 4.13 below). Where a commons council or equivalent body with statutory powers, has been established they take on responsibility for regulating the movement of stock to and from the common concerned. It is noted that there will need to be some flexibility in creating LMUs on commons. The LMUs on common land may have to be broken down into sub-epidemiological units for disease control purposes e.g. in the case of a TB breakdown.

Isolation Facilities and Standstill

4.12 With some exceptions most movements of livestock between businesses are subject to reporting and standstill.

4.13 Some of the existing exemptions provide for the use of an approved isolation facility in order to qualify. I believe that greater use could be made of approved isolation facilities (isolation facilities can be either biosecure fields or buildings). In this case where one or more animals are brought onto an LMU and held separately from other animals on that LMU, the standstill period would apply only to those animals, and not to others on the unit. Equally stock could be placed in isolation six or 20 days (if pigs) before their intended sale (if, for example, it were known that stock was to be brought onto the farm in the intervening period) and could then leave even though the farm was under standstill. To qualify the animals would have to be placed in an approved isolation facility for the entire duration of the standstill period applicable to them. If other animals were to be introduced to the facility during this period, all the animals in the facility must remain until the standstill period applicable to the animals last introduced into the facility has expired. The current rules for the construction and operation of isolation facilities are set out in Annex D.
Recommendation 8

I recommend the use of approved isolation facilities within LMUs. A movement onto the isolation facility will put that facility under a standstill rather than impose a standstill on the whole LMU. Movements into/out of the approved isolation facilities must be recorded in the on farm record. The use of approved isolation facilities will also allow a review of the current exemptions to the standstill rules as set out at Annex C.

4.14 However, I recognise that young lambs and calves for fostering need to be moved at short notice. Because of their age moving them presents a lower disease risk than with other animals.

Recommendation 9

I recommend that an exemption to the use of isolation facilities and standstill rules be given for young lambs and calves for fostering. These moves must be recorded and reported.

Multiple pick-up and drop-off

4.15 A vehicle picking up stock at more than one premises, for onward transmission to another, risks spreading disease from animals already on the vehicle to the places at which it stops. To control this risk Defra introduced rules that require the construction of a separate installation at the perimeter of a premises before multiple pick-ups or drop-offs were permitted at that premises.

4.16 The continued existence of this rule is hindering the effective running of a number of livestock and haulage businesses. In particular, data protection legislation is preventing Defra from publishing a list of which premises have an approved multiple pick-up and drop-off facility. This causes particular difficulty for hauliers, who may inadvertently commit an offence by picking up at non-approved premises.

4.17 Where transport companies can provide biosecure stock handling facilities it should be possible for these to be used as part of the chain in the movement of livestock.

Recommendation 10

I recommend that:

a. in the absence of disease or a heightened disease state of alert the need for approval of multiple pick-ups and drop-offs should be suspended;

b. a journey can only be for (i) multiple drop offs or (ii) multiple pick ups except dropping off to abattoirs;

c. hauliers should keep records of journeys e.g. physical information from an invoice or an ATC.
Reporting Movements

4.18 Livestock movements are reported as follows:

- sheep, goats, pigs and deer moves are reported using a movement document (forms AML 1, 2 or 24). The completed document is sent to the appropriate Local Authority (LA) within three days of the movement;
- cattle movements are reported to BCMS within three days of the movement.

4.19 The AML movement documents listed in 4.18 require the keeper at both departure and destination premises to complete the appropriate parts before it is sent to the LA. Defra and LAs therefore have information on where sheep, goats, pigs and deer have moved between thus allowing traceability of the animals.

Recommendation 11

I recommend that all AML forms be available electronically. Consideration should be given to allow information to be sent electronically to AMLS.

4.20 However, this is more complex when reporting cattle movements. At present the keeper at the premises of departure reports that the cattle have left that premises, but does not report where they have gone to. The keeper at the premises of destination reports their animals, but not where they have come from. Markets report the movement of cattle through the market, but neither where they have come from nor where they have gone to. This not only results in poor traceability during the time in which these various reports are finding their way to the database, it also allows cattle to be moved temporarily to a third premises (such as a dealer’s premises) without CTS ever becoming aware that they have been there. With the possibility that such animals mixed with other animals whilst on the dealer premises there is clearly an enhanced and unacceptable disease risk.

Recommendation 12

I recommend that livestock markets, collecting centres and abattoirs be required to play a larger roll in movement reporting. Markets and collecting centres should be required to notify CTS not only the premises of departure for cattle arriving in the market or collecting centre but also the premises of destination once an animal leaves the market or collecting centre. Abattoirs should be additionally required to report the premises of departure of all cattle received as well as the move to the abattoir.

4.21 Data submitted electronically can be validated faster and more accurately than data submitted by other means. It also arrives faster, leading to a significant improvement in traceability.

Recommendation 13

I therefore recommend that livestock markets, collecting centres and abattoirs be required to submit data electronically to CTS and keepers be encouraged to do so.
4.22 The Animal Health Act 1981 allows local authorities, Defra and WAG three years in which to bring a prosecution under the Act. It is important, therefore, that keepers be required to retain movement records, including copies of movement documents, for at least this time. At present some documents may be destroyed after six months.

**Recommendation 14**

I recommend that the retention period for movement documents be set at a minimum of three years.
Findings – Animal Identification

5.1 The Rules on the identification of livestock are largely set out in EU law, and therefore do not lie at the discretion of Defra, or indeed any other administration in the British Isles. I have not therefore examined the appropriateness of these rules.

5.2 It is clear, however, that problems do exist in the field of animal identification. In particular, ear tags sold to farmers are frequently not of sufficient quality to last the life of the animal in a readable condition. Some have particularly low retention rates.

Recommendation 15

I recommend that the British Cattle Movement Service (BCMS), who are responsible for approving ear tags for all species, review the current specifications. Having done so, BCMS should take steps to identify those tags that demonstrate poor field performance and revoke their authorisation.

5.3 In April 2006 Defra launched a consultation exercise on amendments to the Cattle Identification Regulations. Amongst other measures, Defra have proposed:

- the abolition of the use of CPP12’s as temporary cattle passports; and
- to allow the issue of cattle passports to late applicants if the parentage of the calf can be proven by a DNA test.

Recommendation 16

I recommend that the Cattle Identification Regulations are amended so that they no longer allow the use of CPP12’s as temporary cattle passports and allow the issue of cattle passports to late applicants where the parentage of the calf can be proven e.g. by a DNA test.

5.4 Cattle sent to abattoirs can be rejected if they only have one tag even though their identity may be secure. I am told that if there is a valid passport plus one ear tag and evidence that a second tag having been applied that an OV at the abattoir will not reject an animal. I am also told that this is not being consistently applied.

Recommendation 17

I recommend that if there is a valid passport plus 1 correct tag and evidence of a second tag having been applied when an animal arrives at an abattoir that this should be sufficient in establishing the identification of the animal.
Findings – Collecting Centres

6.1 Collecting centres serve a number of purposes in the livestock industry. In many respects they are similar to markets, in that animals arrive from a number of different points, mix together and then leave for one or a number of different points. In this respect the disease risk is also similar to those of markets, in that a diseased animal, if mixed with others at collecting centre risks spreading the disease around a wide number of places. Not all collecting centres activity that currently takes place is legal. The activity of dealers or traders referred to in 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10 is tantamount to collecting centre activity, although not recognised as such in the Animal Gatherings (England) Order 2004 (AGO) and Animal Gatherings (Wales) Order 2004 under which collecting centres are licensed.

6.2 There are approximately four categories of collecting centres:

a. those where relatively small numbers of animals from a number of sources are brought together in a single place for onward transmission in a larger vehicle to, say, an abattoir. This brings significant economies in the cost of haulage to those using this facility;

b. is the same except that the animals have to be delivered to one or more abattoirs from the collecting centre. This brings the same economies in the cost of haulage, but enables the collecting centre to be used additionally by those whose premises is under a movement standstill;

c. the premises of a dealer or trader, where stock acquired at a number of farms (or markets) is mixed and sorted prior to onward carriage to the premises of the dealer or trader's customer(s);

d. Assembly Centres at which animals are gathered prior to export.

Of these a. b. and d. are licensed by Defra and WAG.

With the exception of animals going for export, collecting centres are not required to tag animals passing through them. Neither does the arrival of stock at a collecting centre trigger a movement standstill on those premises.

The conditions for the approval of collecting centres can be found at Annex E.

6.3 I believe that Defra should recognise the role that dealers and traders play in ensuring that those who need to purchase livestock, but who may not be able to afford to spend time visiting farms and markets some way from home, can do so. But at the same time dealers and traders need to recognise that they have a responsibility to themselves, their customers, the livestock industry and the public at large, to ensure that their activities are carried out in a way that minimises disease risk.

6.4 The disease risk is less if stock are moved direct from farm of origin to farm of destination and this should be the preferred option. If livestock have to move through a dealers or traders premises these premises should be licensed as a collecting centre. However, by using one or more approved isolation facilities it should be possible for them to operate without having to ensure that all stock leave the premises before new stock enters. In this specific circumstance animals would not have to remain in the isolation facility for the full
standstill period, but to minimise the spread of disease animals destined for more than one customer must not be mixed in any one isolation facility. Neither after the departure of the animals would the isolation facility have to remain empty for 27 days (if on grass) before re-use. At times of heightened disease state of alert the 27 day rule should be re-introduced. These provisions could be applied to any premises licensed under AGO.

Recommendation 18

I recommend that dealers and traders premises be licensed as collecting centres and include the use of isolation facilities as set out above.

6.5 There are cases where animals are notified to CTS as having left the premises of departure on one date, and as having arrived at the premises of destination two or more days later. Such a movement would be incompatible with the rules on animal welfare, and raise serious questions about whether the animals might have spent time on a third (unreported) premises. This is quite clearly a disease risk, as the full movement history of these animals could not be traced.

Recommendation 19

I recommend that BCMS should identify all cases where cattle are reported as arriving at their premises of destination two or more days after leaving the premises of departure. These cases should be investigated.

Movement to abattoirs

6.6 For some years prior to the FMD outbreak in 2001 animals arriving at an abattoir were required to be slaughtered within 72 hours of arrival. During the FMD outbreak this period was reduced to 24 hours, to reduce the risk of disease spreading from animals in the abattoir lairage. In 2002 the time limit was raised to 48 hours.

6.7 For most purposes this time limit is sufficient, but abattoirs operating on a Monday have found it particularly difficult to manage the flow of stock, notable because such stock is usually purchased at market the previous Friday. The Animal Gatherings (England) Order 2004 allows stock to remain at a market no longer than 48 hours after the arrival of the first animal. Allowing time for deliveries to be completed, and sale, animals generally have to leave the market within 24 hours or so of being sold. If they move to an abattoir, abattoir operators found that this gave them little flexibility and constrained their operations.

6.8 The problem set out in 6.7 above has now been resolved. Council Regulation 853/2004 entered into force on January 2006. This states simply that animals arriving at an abattoir shall be slaughtered “without undue delay”, replacing the previous fixed time limit. Effectively each case now has to be considered on its merits, which has led to problems of inconsistency in interpretation by the Meat Hygiene Service (MHS).
Recommendation 20

I recommend that the 48 hour limit for stock to remain on a market be extended (at the discretion of the DVM in each case). However, no other stock may enter the market premises until all stock from a previous gathering have been removed, and the market has been cleansed and disinfected in accordance with AGO.

6.9 I have been given evidence that a number of unlicensed collecting centres operate to take stock from a market late in the week for delivery to an abattoir early the following week. Because they are operating illegally, the quality of biosecurity at such gatherings is an unknown quantity, but it would be reasonable to assume that the disease risk is higher than is acceptable.

6.10 It should be possible to bring such gatherings with the law, so that biosecurity standards can be properly policed. This could be achieved by permitting movements to take place from a market to a collecting centre (these being currently prohibited). The existing rules applicable to the licensing of collecting centres should be applied. This provision should not apply at times of heightened disease state of alert.

Recommendation 21

I recommend that the existing movement licences be amended to permit stock to move from a livestock market to a collecting centre.
Questionnaire

1. How do the rules on livestock identification and movements affect your business?

2. Have you made any changes to the way you operate in order to be able to reduce the impact of these rules? If so, what are they?

3. What was your experience of the enforcement of these rules? Have you found this burdensome? Has there been little noticeable enforcement? Or has the level of enforcement been about right to deter those wishing to circumvent the rules from doing so?

4. Is there still a need for linking premises such as Sole Occupancy Authorities or linked holdings for cattle?

5. Should there be a distance limit for linking premises such as Sole Occupancy Authorities?

6. Should there be a distance limit for reporting all livestock movements along the lines of the 5 mile rule for sheep and goats?

7. The movement documents (AML forms) were designed in conjunction with the sheep and pig industries. Are there any improvements you would wish to suggest?

8. Is it burdensome to have different movement rules in Scotland from those in England and Wales? If so, please explain what the impact is?

9. Defra allocates premises identifiers in the form of County/Parish/Holding numbers. Has the way these are allocated enable your business to adopt to the livestock movement rules? If so, how? If not, why not?

10. Could Defra/RPA/SVS/local authority inspection activity be better targeted? If so, how?

11. Could enforcement activity be better targeted? If so, how?

12. Given that livestock identification and movement rules are in place to enable animal disease to be controlled, do you have any suggestions as to how this objective might be achieved in any other way?
The Cattle Tracing System – Linked Holdings

Issue
B.1 This paper provides a brief outline of the current rules for linking holdings and their purpose.

Background
B.2 Holdings are identified on the Cattle Tracing System (CTS) database by CPH number. Movements of cattle between holdings must normally be reported to the British Cattle Movement Service (BCMS). However, movements of cattle between certain “CTS linked holdings” do not need to be reported.

B.3 Centralised Cattle movement reporting procedures were introduced in 1998 and CTS linked holdings were introduced at this point to mitigate the reporting burden on some keepers. Reporting every movement – even daily movements between grazing and milking parlours – was considered to be an onerous and unreasonable burden on industry. For some keepers, strict application of EU movement reporting requirements would have meant reporting hundreds of movements backwards and forwards between holdings every day.

B.4 Cattle keepers (except markets and abattoirs) may apply to BCMS to have CPH numbers linked on CTS for the purpose of exempting them from reporting the movements of cattle between linked CPHs. The procedure does not alter the requirements for birth, import and death reporting from each holding. It means that on inspection the presence of cattle on any linked holding rather than the main holding is not considered a non-compliance and does not attract subsidy penalty or movement restrictions. Farmers must, though, record the movements between linked holdings in their herd farm records (except for movements daily between shared milking parlours).

Current Rules
B.5 A keeper must nominate a main holding for administrative purposes. All other holdings to be linked are flagged as ‘closed’ on CTS. CTS then shows which holdings are linked. Once the link is established the keeper can use the main holding’s CPH for other birth, movement and death reporting purposes.

B.6 There are two types of link that a keeper can have on CTS, they are:

- **Shared Facility Links (SF’s):** used when a keeper does not want to report movements between several holdings he/she owns or between holdings which share facilities. The arrangement must be “permanent” (longer than 364 days) and the movements frequent. Such holdings have to be within 25 miles of each other.

  All holdings involved are registered to the same keeper (i.e. registered to the same trading name or business). The procedure sees the keeper nominating a main CPH number. All other CPH’s (secondary holdings) will then be closed and linked to the main CPH. Administratively all animals are moved off all secondary holdings onto the
main CPH number, with an agreed movement date. The keeper is required to update the movement summary pages for the animals in the cattle passports. Once the SF link is in place movements between the holdings do not need to be reported to BCMS.

- **Additional Land Links (AL’s):** This link is used when a keeper wants to use another holding for summer grazing and winter housing. This link cannot be used if the holdings are owned by the same business. There are no mileage restrictions for this type of link. This link cannot be open for longer than 364 days.

  Once an AL link has been entered, movements to and from the land do not need to be reported. All births will be reported to the keeper’s own holding number. However, the keeper is still obliged by law to keep his own farm records up-to date. The LH rules for AL require the keeper to specify the start and end dates for the letting period. During this period cattle can move any distance between seasonal lets without being reported. Once the end date has elapsed CTS removes the link and the keeper has to re-apply again.

  NB There are no set limits on how many links a keeper can have at any given time. Also it is not uncommon for a keeper to have both a SF and an AL.

**Problems associated with Linked Holdings (LH)**

**Standstill**

B.7 Once the LH has been agreed movements between premises within the link needn’t be reported to BCMS. This causes difficulties for the monitoring of livestock movement standstills generated by the movement of cattle – because as the system does not receive notification of these moves it cannot impose a standstill. This may well mean that cattle (and other species) may move off a linked holding in defiance of a standstill.

**Legislative Issues**

B.8 EU Regulation 1760/2000 and the Cattle Identification Regulations 1998 (as amended) state that all cattle movements should be notified. There has never been a formal derogation for the use of ‘linked holdings’, which allows cattle movements to go unreported. The current practice of ‘linked holdings’ therefore under implements EU Legislation.

**Disease Control**

B.9 The existence of LH arguably increases the risk of disease spreading (because of the concomitant failure to impose standstill) and increase the difficulty of tracing any cattle because movements over long distances are unreported to the central database. As it stands the database can only tell us which linked CPH’s the animals could be on; only direct enquiry of the keeper and looking at his records will tell us exactly where they are. Every LH potentially increases the number of premises, which must be assumed as being contiguous to an infected premise, and thus LHs could increase the costs associated with containing a major disease outbreak.
Inspections and Enforcement

B.10 The RPA and veterinary inspectors need to inspect all cattle at the location at any given time. The current practice of creating a main holding and ‘closing’ satellite holdings on CTS does not allow the RPA inspectorate to get a clear understanding of where the cattle are located. Time is therefore wasted prior to the inspection by inspectors contacting the farmer to see if the cattle are located where the system thinks they should be.

Confusion between a LH and a SOA

B.11 People confuse LHs and Sole Occupancy Authorities (SOAs). A SOA (issued by the SVS) permits livestock keepers to move sheep, goats, pigs and cattle within a group of holdings forming an agreed epidemiological unit without respecting any movement standstill imposed on that group. A SOA is granted to join premises for movement licence purposes only. A SOA does not always correspond with links set up on CTS. If a keeper wishes to move cattle between premises without informing BCMS of the movements they must also have set up a CTS link. Confusion has been caused with keepers who mistakenly believe that if they have a SOA agreement, they no longer have to report cattle movements to BCMS. This is incorrect. If cattle are moved from one holding to another and the 2 holdings are not CTS linked, the movement must be reported to BCMS. All movements between holdings in a SOA have to be recorded in the farm records as do all movements of cattle between linked holdings.
Livestock Movements Regime – the Existing Provisions

The Background

C.1 Before the outbreak of Foot and Mouth disease (February 2001), there were relatively few restrictions on the movements of livestock. This disease outbreak showed that more needed to be done to prevent the outbreak of disease and to reduce its impact when an outbreak occurs.

C.2 Livestock movement controls were put in place immediately after the 2001 outbreak. A 20 day standstill was imposed on all livestock, on the basis of scientific and veterinary advice that it both slowed down the spread of any disease present and improved the chances of detecting disease within a flock or herd before animals moved.

C.3 The Government commissioned two independent inquiries into the 2001 FMD outbreak, a Lessons Learned Inquiry chaired by Dr Iain Anderson and a scientific review by the Royal Society chaired by Sir Brian Follett. Both inquiries endorsed the retention of the 20 day standstill on disease control grounds until the Government had carried out a detailed risk assessment and wide-ranging cost-benefit analysis of the impact of different standstill periods.

The Current Regime

C.4 On 1 August 2003 as a result of the findings from a risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis of standstill regimes, the Standing Movement Arrangements for England and Wales came into force. Under the regime, whenever cattle and sheep are brought onto a holding, no cattle or sheep may move off that holding for 6 days afterwards, unless the movement is one of those listed as an exemption (see the list of exemptions below).

Sole Occupancy Authorities

C.5 A group of premises within the same management and control may be granted a Sole Occupancy Authority (SOA). When sheep, goat, pigs and cattle are brought onto any one of the premises within the SOA a standstill is imposed on all of them. However, they may move between premises in the SOA without observing the standstill. These movements must be recorded and reported. Cattle moves within a SOA do need to be reported unless there is also a CTS link.

C.6 Applications for a SOA must be made to the Divisional Veterinary Manager (DVM), who must be satisfied that the premises within the SOA are truly linked in terms of management and control. This will be confirmed by a Local Veterinary Inspector (LVI) who will visit the premises. There are no distance limits on the premises which make up a SOA.
Eligible group of premises.

C.7  a. Premises owned or rented by an individual, partnership or company on which all cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, deer or camelids are under the same sole control and management. This includes individual fields or buildings, so long as they have separate access points and are securely stock-proofed, or

b. several geographically separate plots of land controlled and managed by a farmer, or

c. a family farm where several family members each have their own land separately registered but who work in partnership sharing manpower and equipment and make common management decisions, or

d. a small farming partnership where the applicant can demonstrate management and control of all the farming units.

C.8 All premises included on the application for a SOA must be epidemiologically linked (this means that there must be common management, shared staff, equipment, procedures) and managed together.

C.9 A group of unrelated farmers cannot band together to obtain a SOA even if there had been occasional sharing of equipment or manpower in the past. In exceptional circumstances joint applications may be considered from no more than two applicants if land or facilities are shared as a part of routine and regular management practice and alternative arrangements cannot be made.

Movements permitted under a SOA

C.10  a. Movement of FMD susceptible livestock for husbandry and management reasons. For instance to move dry dairy cows to grazing or returning cows for parturition; sheep moving between grazings or to lambing sheds and ram and billy goat movements or pigs between associated sites,

b. Movement of FMD susceptible livestock between and within grazings, premises or groups of premises owned or rented, which are in the same sole occupancy, management and control.

SOA conditions

C.11  a. no premises can be included in more than one SOA

b. common or shared grazing cannot be included in a SOA

c. all movements of animals under a SOA must be in accordance with the conditions of the appropriate General Licence to move cattle or sheep.

d. During all movements, animals must not come into contact with other animals that are not under the same sole control. Movement across land, including fields, where the owner of the SOA does not have sole control over all such animals is not permitted.

e. In order to add or delete premise(s) to a SOA, a new application form with the details of the applicant, the previous SOA number and the details of the additional/deleted premise(s) must be completed.
5 mile rule for sheep and goats and SOAs

C.12 The five mile boundary is measured as the crow flies, from the nearest points on the borders of the main site and the outlying land. That is, the distance from the outside edges. Land wholly or partially within the five mile radius may be classed as part of the holding. It is the keeper's responsibility to determine whether outlying land falls within the 5 mile boundary or not.

Figure 3 below is an illustrative picture of how the 5 mile rules is calculated

SOAs that include parcels of land within 5 miles are no longer valid as they are seen to be part of your main holding. However, those that include land outside the five-mile boundary remain valid and keepers will have to record movements between those holdings.

Other exemptions to the Standstill

C.13 From 1 August to 30 November every year, breeding rams and bulls will:

a. be allowed to leave premises that are under a six day standstill for a market, provided they have been placed in a Defra approved isolation facility for six days beforehand. The sender of the animals being moved must certify (by way of a declaration on the movement licence) that the animals have been confined in a Defra approved isolation facility for 6 days. The declaration must be sent to the Local Authority, who will note its arrival on AMLS;
b. not trigger a six day standstill on their home premises if they are returning unsold from a market, provided that they are placed in a Defra approved isolation facility for six days. The recipient of the animals being moved must certify (by way of a declaration on the movement licence) that the animals intended for breeding purposes have been confined in a Defra approved isolation facility for 6 days;

c. not trigger a six day standstill on the premises for breeding that they are being bought onto, (e.g. moving from a farm, or from a market they have been bought from and onto a farm) provided they are isolated for six days in a Defra approved isolation facility. In the case of breeding rams, ewes placed in isolation with those rams will themselves have to spend six days in isolation. The recipient of the animals must certify (by way of a declaration on the movement licence) that the animals have been received and will be confined in a Defra approved isolation facility for 6 days.

**Moves to markets, collecting centres, shows, breed inspections**

C.14 The movement of an animal onto premises licensed under the Animal Gatherings (England) Order 2004 and Animal Gatherings (Wales) Order 2004 for a sale, show or exhibition, for onward consignment within Great Britain for further rearing, finishing or slaughter or for an inspection to confirm specific breed characteristics will not trigger a standstill on that premises.

**Imported animals and animals destined for export**

C.15 Imported livestock will not trigger a standstill at the first premises they are kept at (after the port or airport of entry itself, to which no standstill will apply either). Livestock for export will have to comply with EU residence time requirements, but (except for sheep and goats to be exported for breeding or fattening) need not respect a standstill on the premises of departure.

**Movements to slaughter**

C.16 Cattle or sheep may move off premises direct to an abattoir, slaughter collecting centre, dedicated slaughter collection or dedicated slaughter market irrespective of whether livestock have moved onto those premises in the previous 6 days. From a dedicated slaughter market or dedicated slaughter collection, no animal may return to its premises of origin or move to any premises other than an abattoir.

**Movements for veterinary treatment**

C.17 Cattle and sheep may move to premises for veterinary treatment irrespective of whether livestock have moved onto the premises of origin in the previous 6 days. Once at the veterinary treatment centre the animals must be held in complete physical isolation from all other animals present at the premises.
C.18 The premises where veterinary treatment is carried out are not subject to standstill requirements and cattle and sheep (including offspring born at the veterinary premises), may return to the premises of origin without triggering a standstill on their return there, provided they have been isolated from other animals whilst undergoing veterinary treatment.

Movements to/from an Artificial Insemination Centre

C.19 Sheep and goats, moving to an Artificial Insemination (AI) Centre can do so irrespective of whether livestock have moved onto the premises of departure in the previous 6 days provided they have been in a Defra approved isolation facility for 6 days prior to departure onto an AI Centre. Cattle moving to an artificial insemination centre can do so irrespective of whether livestock have moved onto the premises of departure in the previous 6 days.

C.20 The premises where artificial insemination is carried out are not subject to standstill requirements. Cattle can return to their original premises of departure without triggering a standstill on those premises. If sheep and goats have been isolated from all other animals while at the AI Centre they can return to their original premises of departure without triggering a standstill provided they are placed in a Defra approved isolation facility on their return, otherwise they will trigger a standstill. The recipient of the sheep must declare that the animals were isolated from all other animals while at the AI centre and that they have been placed in an isolation facility on return.

Movements to a laboratory for diagnostic tests

C.21 Cattle or sheep being moved to a laboratory for diagnostic tests to be carried out to ascertain whether the animal is affected by, or has been exposed to, disease need not respect any standstill on the premises of departure, and will not trigger a standstill on arrival at the laboratory. Once at the laboratory the animals must be held in complete physical isolation from all other animals present at the premises.
Conditions for Approving On – Farm Isolation Facilities – Current Rules

Construction for Standards

D.1 Buildings used for the on-farm isolation facilities must be dedicated for the on-farm isolation and be physically separate from any buildings used for other livestock.

a. Pastures used for on-farm isolation facilities must be dedicated for on-farm isolation and be physically separate from any pastures or buildings used for other livestock on the premises. A minimum distance of 3 metres is required between the perimeter of the isolation fields and any other livestock. This 3 metre separation would be satisfied with stockproof double fencing.

b. Animals should only be moved between isolation facilities on the same farm with veterinary or official permission.

D.2 a. Any buildings used in the isolation facility must be designed such that any discharges, effluent and manure are retained there or disposed of in such a manner that they do not come into contact with other livestock.

b. A dedicated loading/off loading facility must be provided for each isolation facility. This facility shall be fully cleansed and disinfected after each use.

D.3 Operating procedures

a. Dedicated protective clothing for staff must be provided for the isolation facility.

b. Protective clothing to be provided for visitors.

c. Disinfectants footbaths to be provided and used at the entrance(s) to the isolation facilities.

d. Any person entering the isolation facility must wear protective clothing and footwear and use the disinfectant footbaths at the entrance(s).

e. Any unused feeding stuffs, fodder, bedding etc. intended for animals in the isolation facility must remain in the isolation facility while there are animals present.

f. All equipment, pens, hurdles, etc, in the isolation facility must remain there until the 6 or 20 day standstill period, as appropriate, has been satisfactorily completed.

g. Special rules apply to any lactating animals that are in these isolation facilities. The welfare of these animals must be safeguarded and it may be necessary to take these animals to a milking parlour on the farm if other means of milking them cannot be found. The following conditions apply in these circumstances:

- The animals in isolation must be brought to the parlour after any other resident stock have been milked and have been returned to their accommodation or fields. A minimum of 3 metres separation must be maintained between the resident animals and the animals in isolation.
The animals in isolation must be put through the parlour after all other resident milking stock.

Any farm yards, the parlour collecting area, the parlour itself and the milking equipment e.g. clusters must be thoroughly washed down after the animals in isolation have passed through. A ‘full standard wash cycle’ as required under the dairy Hygiene Regulations must be applied to the milking equipment in the parlour after the isolation animals have been through and before it is used again for the resident lactating animals.

The animals in isolation must be returned to their own accommodation immediately after they have been milked.

h. After an isolation facility has been emptied of stock it must be thoroughly cleansed and disinfected before any new stock is placed in the facility.

D.4 Recording

A record must be kept in the farm movement records of the date each animal (identified individually) entered an isolation facility, and the date it leaves.
Collecting Centres

E.1 A Collecting Centre is where there is a collection of animals for onward consignment within GB. These are governed by the Animal Gatherings (England) Order 2004 and the Animal Gatherings (Wales) Order 2004.

E.2 Once a premises has been approved by the State Veterinary Service a licence will be issued. The type of licence issued will be dependent on whether the premises can be cleansed and disinfected.

E.3 The following sets out the conditions.

Please note that the conditions highlighted in bold do not apply to collecting centres that are non cleansable and those that are in italics only apply to non cleansable premises.

E.4 General Conditions:

a) The licensee must ensure that the current contingency plan agreed between the Divisional Veterinary Manager and the licensee for dealing with a suspect/confirmed case of notifiable disease is complied with.

b) The licensee shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that any person attending the licensed premises complies with the terms of this licence.

c) The licensee shall appoint a biosecurity officer to monitor compliance with this licence and with the Animal Gatherings (England) Order 2004 and the Animal Gatherings (Wales) Order 2004.

d) The licensee shall take all reasonable steps to prevent the spread of disease on to, in and off the premises during the animal gathering.

e) No person shall allow an animal gathering to take place on premises on which animals have been kept until 27 days have passed from the day on which –

(a) the last animal left those premises; and

(b) after the last animal has left the premises, all equipment to which animals have had access has been cleansed of visible contamination.

E.5 Facilities at Licensed Premises:

The licence holder must ensure that:

a) animal pens can be properly secured;

b) animals cannot escape from the licensed premises onto adjacent land and no direct contact is possible with animals on adjacent land;

c) the floor of the animal area and all fixtures and fittings in the animal area are in a good state of repair such that they remain capable of being cleansed and disinfected in accordance with The Animal Gatherings (England) Order 2004 and the Animal Gatherings (Wales) Order 2004;
d) there is a discrete area for the cleansing and disinfection of vehicles transporting animals which is itself capable of being cleansed and disinfected;

e) there is a discrete area for the cleansing and disinfection of vehicles transporting animals identified within the licensed premises which:
   i) is identified on the site plan;
   ii) is itself capable of being cleansed and disinfected;
   iii) has adequate drainage; and
   iv) has equipment sufficient to allow the requirements of the Transport of Animals (Cleansing and Disinfection) (England) (No. 3) Order 2003 and the Transport of Animals (Cleansing and Disinfection) (Wales) (No.3) Order 2003.

f) there are facilities for cleansing and disinfecting wheels, mudguards and wheel arches of livestock vehicles at the exit of the licensed premises, and their location is identified on the site plan;

g) a system of communicating with the Local Authority has been agreed with the Local Authority and is in place at the licensed premises.

E.6 Premises staff

The licence holder must ensure that:

a) all staff employed on the licensed premises have provided information of their regular contact with susceptible livestock to enable tracing in the event of a suspect case of a notifiable disease at the premises and that the information is kept up to date;

b) a record is kept for six months of the names and addresses of all staff of the licensed premises (including casual staff) present at each animal gathering;

c) all persons employed on the licensed premises to handle animals shall use the personal washing and disinfecting facilities on entering and leaving the licensed premises.

E.7 Operations on any day on which a gathering of animals occurs

The licence holder must ensure that:

a) all reasonable steps are taken to ensure that no person handles animals, (including mouthing sheep) or enters stock pens unless he:
   i) is employed by the licence holder for the purpose of handling animals on the licensed premises,
   ii) is a vendor or buyer approved by the operator
   iii) is an inspector or person accompanying inspectors
   iv) have purchased those animals;

b) sufficient records are kept to allow the tracing of animals and vehicles in the event of a suspect case of a notifiable disease at the premises;

c) all livestock vehicles have their tyres, mudguards and wheel arches cleansed and disinfected on leaving the licensed premises;
d) all vehicles transporting animals which enter the premises loaded are cleansed and disinfecte

According to the Transport of Animals (Cleansing and Disinfection) (Wales) (no. 3) Order 2003 before loading any further animals unless they are entering the premises as part of a multiple pick-up operation and are not unloading animals there;

e) only premises staff or animal transport personnel or owners or agents are permitted to load, or unload animals;

f) vehicles transporting animals that are not fully cleansed and disinfected on the licensed premises remain within the animal area unless the intended movement off the premises is for cleansing and disinfection in accordance with the Transport of Animals (Cleansing and Disinfection) (England) (No. 3) Order 2003 and the Transport of Animals (Cleansing & Disinfection) (Wales) (no. 3) Order 2003.

E.8 If the only animals present at the gathering are for the purpose of onward consignment of animals within Great Britain, in addition to the other conditions the licence must take all reasonable steps to ensure that the public are excluded from the animal area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGO</td>
<td>Animal Gatherings (England) Order 2004 (AGO) and Animal Gatherings (Wales) Order 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMLS</td>
<td>Animal Movements Licensing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC</td>
<td>Animal Transport Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCMS</td>
<td>British Cattle Movements Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>Bovine Spongiform encephalopathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTB</td>
<td>Bovine tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVD</td>
<td>Bovine Viral Diarrhoea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPH</td>
<td>County/Parish/Holding number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP12</td>
<td>Application for a Cattle Passport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS</td>
<td>Cattle Tracing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVO</td>
<td>Chief Veterinary Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARD</td>
<td>Department for Agriculture and Rural Development, Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defra</td>
<td>Department for Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVM</td>
<td>Divisional Veterinary Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMD</td>
<td>Foot-and-mouth disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVO</td>
<td>Food and Veterinary Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBR</td>
<td>Infections bovine rhinotracheitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMU</td>
<td>Livestock Movement Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>Livestock Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>Meat Hygiene Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV</td>
<td>Official Veterinarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RITA</td>
<td>Rural Payments IT Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA</td>
<td>Rural Payments Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBI</td>
<td>Single Business Identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>Sole Occupancy Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKAS</td>
<td>United Kingdom Accreditation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAG</td>
<td>Welsh Assembly Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>