

# Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

## Summary of responses to the consultation on the simplification of livestock movement rules and identifiers in England (31 March to 30 June 2010).

### 1. Background

1.1 The purpose of this consultation is to examine ways in which the livestock movements regime in England can be simplified and holding identification improved. This will help give a clearer picture of when and where livestock are moved and located whilst maintaining robust systems for livestock traceability and disease control.

1.2 Sir Ian Anderson's reviews of the handling of the Foot and Mouth Disease outbreaks in 2001 and 2007 highlighted the need for:

- further work on collection of livestock data; and
- the need to improve the CPH system of location identifiers to give a clearer and more accurate understanding of the actual physical location of stock was particularly singled out.

1.3 Against this background the Report of the Review of Livestock Movement Controls (delivered by Bill Madders in 2006) addressed the risks managed by the controls, the benefits of the controls, the burdens created by the controls and the way they have influenced farmer behaviour and compliance.

### 2. Responses

A total of 41 responses were received from the following:

AFS Beef and Lamb  
Association of Government Veterinarians  
BAE Systems  
BPEX  
British Cattle Veterinary Association  
British Veterinary Association  
Country Land and Business Association  
Castlemilk Moorit Sheep Society  
Central Association of Livestock Valuers  
Cheshire Wildlife Trust  
Dartmoor Commoners' Council  
East of England Trading Standards Association  
Federation of Cumbria Commoners  
Hebridean Sheep Society

Jim Gribble  
Kevin Hawes  
New Forest Commoners Defence Association  
LACORS  
Leeds City Council  
Livestock Auctioneers Association  
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine  
Mrs Middleton  
National Beef Association  
National Farmers Union  
National Pig Association  
National Sheep Association  
Norfolk County Council  
Pig Finca Ltd.  
Pig Veterinary Society  
Rendalls  
Rare Breed Survival Trust  
Royal Association of British Dairy Farmers  
SE Regional Animal Health and Welfare Panel  
Small Shepherds Club  
Southdown Sheep Society  
Tenant Farmers Association  
Trading Standards Institute  
The Federation of Yorkshire Commoners & Moorland Graziers  
The Goat Veterinary Society  
The Wildlife Trust Bed. Cambs. Northants. And Peterborough  
University of Warwick

### **3. Summary of Responses**

3.1 Chapter 2 of the consultation document sought views on the simplification of livestock movement rules and holding identifiers. The responses to each of the questions are summarised below.

#### **Question 1. Views are invited on the impact of the proposals on individual businesses/sectors.**

There was broad agreement with the principle but several had reservations about 10 mile rule and abolition of links. A Local Authority was concerned about the practicalities of enforcement. .

#### **Question 2. Views are invited on the use of 'place of business' as the point for measuring the 10 mile radius.**

The majority agreed with place of business being used for measurement. However, some commented that the place of business may not be where the livestock are kept and that there should be flexibility for such keepers to fix their own central point for measurement.

#### **Question 3. Views are invited on the proposals for:**

**(a) the allocation of CPH numbers for land and buildings up to and including a 10 mile radius of the main holding**

There was a mixed response to this question but the majority disagreed with this proposal. They felt that 10 miles was too restrictive. Specific responses were that distance would have implications for future TB testing and that land contiguous to a CPH should be considered as part of that CPH.

**the allocation of CPH numbers for land and buildings beyond a 10 mile radius of the main holding**

There was broad agreement with this proposal

**Commons**

There was general agreement with the principle but several said that animals returning to the common from away wintering should not be required to .serve a standstill on the main holding before being moved to the common as risk is low and some farmers have little in-bye land.

**Question 4. Views are specifically invited on how long any rented land should be associated with the main holding, or temporary CPHs remain valid, before a review/renewal is needed:**

**(a) 6 months**

**(b) 1 year**

**(c) Other, please specify**

Overall response was that the association of rented land with the main holding should be based on the period of tenancy.

**Question 5. Views are invited on how your business would be affected by the abolition of:**

**(a) CTS Links**

There were mixed views on the abolition of CTS links. Some stakeholders said that abolition would affect larger cattle keepers whilst others said that they should be abolished as they cause confusion and approvals have been inconsistent.

**(b) SOAs**

The majority were in favour of retaining SOAs as abolition would have an impact on businesses. If they are abolished there will need to be a lead in time for transition. Issues for TB testing were raised. .

**Question 6. Views are invited on the timing of the abolition of:**

**(a) CTS Links and**

**(b) SOAs.**

Overall view was that CTS Links and SOAs should not be abolished until the new system has operated effectively for some time.

**Question 7. Views are invited on:**

**(a) the proposals for extending the use of Isolation Facilities**

There was broad agreement to this proposal.

**(b) the application process**

The majority agreed that a fee of £250 was high and that farm assured schemes should be considered for approval of isolation facilities. There was broad agreement that annual re-application is not necessary.

**(c) how they might be operated**

There were mixed comments from those who responded. Comments related mainly to the operation of isolation facilities as set out in Annex B of the consultation document namely, 3 metre separation will not stop spread of Foot and Mouth Disease and it isn't necessary to apply annually.

**Question 8. In what specific circumstances would Isolation Facilities as proposed be useful to you/livestock businesses?**

They would be used for attending shows, breeding animals, injured animals and bringing on external stock.

**Question 9. Views are invited on the proposals for permanent sheep and goat movement reporting arrangements.**

There was mixed comments on this question but several would like to retain current batch movement recording where the keepership does not change. Several also responded that they would prefer the 10 mile proposal to be reduced to 5.

**4. The way forward**

Further action following the consultation will be dependent on the outcome of the Spending Review and also on any recommendations the Task Force on Farming Regulation may make.