

# Consultation on tuberculosis (TB) animal disease controls for deer and camelids.

**April 2014** 

### © Crown copyright 2014

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <a href="www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/">www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/</a> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: <a href="mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk">psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk</a>

This document/publication is also available online at:

### http://www.gov.uk/defra

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication should be sent by e-mail to bTBengage@defra.gsi.gov.uk, or by post to:

Deer/Camelid Consultation
TB Programme
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Area 5D, Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR

### Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	4
Purpose of the consultation	4
Who will the proposals affect?	4
Why changes are needed?	4
Defra's Policy Intention	5
How these proposals will be taken forward	5
Consultation	5
Disclosure	6
Confidentiality and Freedom of Information	6
Responding to the consultation document	6
Chapter 2: Background to the Policy and Legislation and Proposed Changes	8
General Background to TB Policy in non-bovine domestic species	8
Question 1: Do you have evidence to support a different approach to TB in non-bot farmed species? (please specify)	
Deer: Background to the Legislation	8
Question 2: Does the current deer legislation provide a satisfactory framework of essential controls on TB in deer? – If not, why not and what is missing?	9
Question 3: Does the current legislation create unnecessary burdens on deer farmers? – What is your evidence; and what would you do about it?	10
Camelids: Background to the policy	10
Proposed legislative changes: The changes we propose to make:	10
Question 4: Are the safeguards proposed (para 2.10(b)) the right ones and are the others that should be put in place to protect the public?	
Question 5: How can we best ensure that all camelid owners are aware of these proposed new powers?	11
Legislative changes that we do not propose to make at this time but will keep under review	

Question 6: Are there any other comments you wish to make about these proposals? (Please provide evidence in support of further changes you are proposing)
Administrative changes to the current arrangements for TB testing of camelids12
Question 7: Do these administrative changes in TB testing of SAC go: too far, far enough, not far enough? Explain why13
Annex A: List of consultees14
Annex B: Response Form15
Annex C: Consultation criteria18
Annex D: Economic analysis for a statutory compensation scheme for South American  Camelids (SAC)19
Question 8 Do you know of any further sources on camelid numbers, herd sizes and businesses in England?20
Question 9 Do you have any information on how long it takes farmers to gather and present camelids for testing?21
Question 10 Do you know any further sources on the sale values of camelids, particularly llamas, in England?21
Question 11 Do you know any sources of information on the economic returns of different camelid enterprises in England?21
Question 12 Do you know of any evidence on the economic impact of TB in camelid herds in England?21

### **Summary of Proposals**

# A consultation issued by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

### Scope of the consultation

Topic of this	This consultation sets out proposals:	See
consultation	(i) to consolidate the two current Tuberculosis (TB) Deer	Chapter
	Orders into a single new Order without further alteration in	2
	England. This consolidation would streamline the regulatory	
	framework in England and in particular reduce the burden on	
	deer keepers and their veterinary advisers. For information on	
	relevant Orders please see:	
	www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1989/878/article/9/made	
	www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1989/1316/contents/made	
	www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1993/2010/contents/made	
	(ii) for a statutory compensatory payment for positive tested	
	camelids (in particular llamas and alpacas) to keepers for	
	animals that the Secretary of State decides to remove as TB	
	reactors or suspect animals together with proposals for the	
	marking of camelids that react to the TB test; and prohibition	
	of vaccination and therapeutic treatment for TB in camelids.	
	We also propose to introduce statutory powers similar to	
	those already applied in the case of deer to test and slaughter	
	camelids suspected of being affected by TB.	
	(iii) for revised administrative arrangements for testing camelids in TB breakdown situations.	
Coope of this		Coo
Scope of this consultation	The main purpose of the consultation is to set out proposals	See
Consultation	and seek your views on the consolidation of the various Deer Orders, and the inclusion of provisions relating to statutory	Chapter 2
	compensation of camelid keepers for the removal of TB	۷
	infected animals in England. The consultation also includes	
	proposals for changes to the administrative arrangements	
	concerning the testing of camelids in TB breakdown	
	situations. The outcome of the consultation will assist the	
	Department in drafting the replacement Order; and the	
	drawing up of administrative guidance for handling TB	
	breakdown situations.	
	broakaown oktationo.	
	Subject to the outcome of the consultation, it is proposed that	
	an Order is laid before Parliament in summer 2014. The three	
	existing GB-wide Deer Orders will remain in force in Scotland.	
	The administrative changes are proposed to be introduced	
	concurrently with the replacement Order coming into effect.	
Geographical	The changes only apply to England.	
scope		
·		

Economic Analysis	The proposed changes have been supported by economic analysis. Further information is sought from consultees.	See Annex
		D

### **Basic information**

То	This consultation will be of particular interest to deer and camelid keepers and vets in England and those bovine and non-bovine animal keepers that farm nearby to such kept animals.	
Body/Bodies responsible for the consultation	This consultation is being carried out by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.	
Duration	Consultation starts: 9th April 2014 Consultation closes: 6th May 2014	
Enquiries	During the consultation, if you have any enquiries, or wish to receive hard copies of the consultation documents, please contact:	
	Camelid/Deer Consultation TB Programme Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Area 5D, Nobel House Smith Square London SW1P 3JR	
	Email: bTBengage@defra.gsi.gov.uk	
How to respond	Any comments on the proposals and the economic analysis (Annex D) in this consultation document can be communicated to Defra by responding to an on-line survey on the 'Citizen Space' website. The survey is accessed via the following address: <a href="https://consult.defra.gov.uk/bovine-tb/consultation-on-tb-controls-for-deer-and-camelids">https://consult.defra.gov.uk/bovine-tb/consultation-on-tb-controls-for-deer-and-camelids</a> . The deadline for comments is 6th May 2014.	
	Alternatively, comments can be e-mailed. To do this, you can either copy the 'response form' (Annex B) into a separate attachment, or copy the questions into an e-mail message, and send - with your answers - to:-bTBengage@defra.gsi.gov.uk	
	You may wish to print off the response form and send your comments by post to:	
	Camelid/Deer Consultation TB Programme Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Area 5D, Nobel House Smith Square London SW1P 3JR	

After the consultation	When this consultation ends, we will send respondents a summary of the responses received and our proposed way forward and publish the results on the GOV.UK website. If you do <i>not</i> want your response - including your name, contact details and any other personal information – to be publicly available, please tick the box in the on-line survey or (if you're replying by e-mail or by post) on the response form or otherwise say so clearly in writing when you send your response to the consultation. Please note, if your computer automatically includes a confidentiality disclaimer that will not count as a confidentiality request. Please explain why you need to keep details confidential. We will take your reasons into account if someone asks for this information under freedom of information legislation. But, because of the law, we cannot promise that we will always be able to keep those details confidential.  The summary of responses will be put on GOV.UK at <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications?publication filteroption=consultations">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications?publication filteroption=consultations</a> This summary will include a list of names of organisations that responded but not individual contact details.	
Compliance with the Consultation Principles	This consultation is being conducted in accordance with the terms of the Government's Consultation Principles – see:- <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/60937/Consultation-Principles.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/60937/Consultation-Principles.pdf</a>	See Annex C

### **Chapter 1: Introduction**

### Purpose of the consultation

- 1.1 This consultation sets out the Government's proposals for consolidating the provisions of the GB-wide Tuberculosis (Deer) Orders in England. These Orders have already been revoked in Wales by Tuberculosis (Wales) Order S.I. 2011/692. Scottish Government's intention for these Orders is to revoke and replace these Orders in due course. They comprise:
  - The Tuberculosis (Deer) Order 1989 SI 1989 No 878;
  - The Tuberculosis (Deer) Notice of Intended Slaughter and Compensation Order 1989 SI 1989 No 1316; and
  - The Tuberculosis (Deer) (Amendment) Order 1993 SI 1993 No 2010
- 1.2 This consolidation also provides an opportunity to look across the piece in England at tuberculosis (TB) regulation of non-bovine animals generally (particularly goats, pigs and sheep). We have concluded that the current approach to the disease in non-bovines is proportionate, but we will continue to keep the situation under close review. Nevertheless, this consolidation of the three Deer Orders in England does create an opportunity to introduce a statutory TB compensation scheme for camelids (in particular alpacas and llamas) and other statutory measures similar to those that already apply to deer. This proposal for a statutory compensation scheme replaces the present non-statutory TB payment where keepers agree to hand over reactors for slaughter in return for Government TB testing their animals.
- 1.3 This consultation on a statutory compensation scheme for camelids is also an opportunity to consult widely on proposals for improved testing of these animals in TB breakdown situations.

### Who will the proposals affect?

1.4 Those owning or keeping deer or camelids on land in England that may be affected or suspected of being affected by TB caused by *Mycobacterium bovis* (*M. bovis*), the bacterium that causes TB in cattle and other animals.

### Why changes are needed?

- 1.5 English deer farmers and their vets have to consult three separate Orders to understand what they need to do when TB affects a deer herd. This proposal consolidates these Orders into one document without making any substantive change to the present arrangements.
- 1.6 The non-statutory slaughter arrangements with payment made to camelid keepers to remove animals suspected to be infected with TB was introduced in 2008 as a

temporary measure. There is an ongoing need to remove animals suspected of having TB in order to prevent the spread of this disease that can devastate small businesses. This consolidation of the deer Orders provides an opportunity to establish statutory compensation and to introduce other measures where camelids are tested positive or suspected of TB.

1.7 Research has shown that the tuberculin skin test used on camelids is only moderately successful in detecting animals infected with the bovine TB bacterium *M.bovis*, but that sensitivity of detection of the bacterium can be dramatically increased (to approximately 80 percent by using a combination of two antibody (blood) tests in parallel interpretation It is proposed to introduce administrative changes in the testing regime of TB-infected camelid herds and other at-risk herds to reflect this new situation.

### **Defra's Policy Intention**

- 1.8 The policy objectives for these changes are to-
  - reduce administrative burdens for deer farmers vets and relevant external stakeholders by consolidating old Animal Health Act 1981 Orders;
  - increase certainty about the basis on which compensatory payments are made to camelid keepers for the removal of their TB-affected animals; while providing better safeguards for the public; and
  - o administratively deploy better, mandatory, tests and improve the clarity over roles and responsibilities.

### How these proposals will be taken forward

1.9 We propose to revoke the Deer Orders in England in line with the Departmental commitment to the Government's "Red Tape Challenge"; and to use the opportunity to utilise this non-bovine TB Order to introduce: statutory testing of camelids; a power to slaughter animals testing positive; a compensation scheme; and other measures regarding marking, and the prohibition of vaccination and therapeutic treatments for camelids. Alongside the legislative changes the main administrative change on camelid testing (mandatory antibody testing along with the existing skin test) will be delivered by the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) following a suspicion of exposure of animals to the *M.bovis* bacterium.

### Consultation

- 1.10 The list of consultees, including the devolved administrations, to which this document has been sent, is at Annex A.
- 1.11 Comments are invited from all interested parties, and not just from those to whom the document has been sent.

1.12 This consultation document follows the format recommended by Better Regulation Executive for such proposals. The criteria applicable to all UK public consultations under the Consultation Principles are set out in Annex C.

### **Disclosure**

- 1.13 Normal practice will be for details of representations received in response to this consultation document to be disclosed, and for respondents to be identified.
- 1.14 You should note that:

If you request that your representation is not disclosed, the Minister will not be able to disclose the contents of your representation without your express consent and, if the representation concerns a third party, their consent too. Alternatively, the Minister may disclose the content of your representation but only in such a way as to anonymise it.

In all cases where your representation concerns information on a third party, the Minister is not obliged to pass it on if he considers that disclosure could adversely affect the interests of that third party and he is unable to obtain the consent of the third party.

1.15 Please identify any information which you or any other person involved do not wish to be disclosed. You should note that many facsimile and e-mail messages carry, as a matter of course, a statement that the contents are for the eyes only of the intended recipient. In the context of this consultation such appended statements will not be construed as being requests for non-inclusion in the post consultation review unless accompanied by an additional specific request for confidentiality, such as an indication in the tick-box provided for that purpose in the on-line survey or in the response form at Annex B, or – if you choose to send an e-mail – make it clear in your message.

### **Confidentiality and Freedom of Information**

1.16 It is possible that requests for information contained in consultation responses may be made in accordance with access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004). If you do not want your response to be disclosed in response to such requests for information, you should identify the information you wish to be withheld and explain why confidentiality is necessary. Your request will only be acceded to if it is appropriate in all the circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not of itself be regarded as binding on the Department.

### Responding to the consultation document

1.17 As mentioned under 'Basic Information' on page 2, any comments on the proposals and the economic analysis (Annex D) in this consultation document should be submitted to

Defra by 6th May 2014. This can be done in a variety of ways:

- By responding to an on-line survey on the 'Citizen Space' website. The survey is accessed via the following address: <a href="https://consult.defra.gov.uk/bovine-tb/consultation-on-tb-controls-for-deer-and-camelids">https://consult.defra.gov.uk/bovine-tb/consultation-on-tb-controls-for-deer-and-camelids</a>.
- Alternatively, comments can be e-mailed. To do this, you can either complete the 'response form' (Annex B) and copy into a separate attachment or copy the questions into an e-mail message and send - with your answers - to: bTBengage@defra.gsi.gov.uk
- We should also be grateful for any comments on the economic analysis which accompanies the consultation document.
- You may wish to print off the response form and send your comments, or any requests for further copies of this document, to:

Camelid/Deer Consultation
TB Programme
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Area 5D, Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR Tel: 020 7238 6735

# Chapter 2: Background to the Policy and Legislation and Proposed Changes

# **General Background to TB Policy in non-bovine domestic species**

- 2.1 The TB Strategy published on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2014<sup>1</sup> explains that many species of non-bovine farmed South American Camelids (SAC), captive deer, goats, pigs and sheep, companion animals (e.g. cats, dogs and ferrets), zoo and wild mammals are susceptible to *M. bovis* infection. Only a relatively small number of such animals are identified as infected each year through scanning surveillance and the evidence suggests that, with the exception of the badger, these species are generally "spillover" hosts and appear to pose a very small risk of spreading *M. bovis* to cattle and badgers.
- 2.2 Defra keeps the evidence under ongoing review but the current policy approach to surveillance and TB testing of non-bovines is a proportionate one. Now that the TB Strategy has been published we will revisit the matter of TB in non-bovine species generally but, as a first step, the Government is proposing to consolidate the existing Deer Orders in England. We are also proposing to introduce statutory testing and slaughter of camelids testing positive; a statutory compensation scheme; a power to mark animals that are to be removed and a statutory prohibition on vaccination and therapeutic treatments that may adversely affect TB testing. We also plan to update administrative TB testing arrangements.

Question 1: Do you have evidence to support a different approach to TB in non-bovine farmed species? (please specify)

### **Deer: Background to the Legislation**

- 2.3 The *Tuberculosis (Deer) Order 1989* contains provisions relating to tuberculosis in deer and, in particular, provides for
  - a. the compulsory notification of tuberculosis in deer and in carcasses of deer (articles 5 and 6);
  - b. the investigation by a veterinary inspector into the existence of tuberculosis in deer and the examination by him of deer and their carcasses for this purpose (article 6(1), (2) and (3));

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/300447/pb14088-bovine-tb-strategy-140328.pdf

- c. the imposition (by notice in Form A served by a veterinary inspector) of certain requirements in respect of deer which are affected or suspected of being affected with tuberculosis, including the isolation of such deer from all other deer and from cattle (article 6(4), (5) and (6));
- d. the testing of deer (if required by notice) and the reporting of the results of such tests (article 7);
- e. the prohibition of the vaccination and treatment of deer for tuberculosis (article 8);
- f. precautions which may be required (by notice) to be taken against the spread of tuberculosis in deer, including the isolation of deer and the cleansing and disinfection of premises (articles 9 and 10);
- g. the marking and identification of deer (article 13);
- h. the prohibition of the exposure for sale in a market of a deer by its owner unless it is marked or identified in accordance with the provisions of the Order and the mark or identification is clearly legible (article 14); and
- i. offences (article 17).

We intend to make minor changes to the notice provisions (f) above to tailor them more closely to comparable provisions in Article 18 of the Tuberculosis Order (England) 2007<sup>2</sup> which mainly deals with TB in bovine animals.

- 2.4 The Tuberculosis (Deer) Notice of Intended Slaughter and Compensation Order 1989 prescribes the amount of compensation payable for deer slaughtered by the appropriate Minister due to tuberculosis infection under section 32 of the Animal Health Act 1981. The compensation payable is £600 or 50 per cent of its market value (calculated in accordance with the provisions of the Order), whichever is the less (article 4). Compensation payable for the slaughter of deer which are required to serve as controls during the quarantine of imported deer is limited to their carcass value, less reasonable expenses (article 5). The Order also requires the appropriate Minister, where he intends to cause a deer to be slaughtered under section 32, to serve a notice of intended slaughter on the owner or person in charge of the deer requiring him to detain and isolate the deer pending such slaughter (article 3 and Schedule).
- 2.5 The Tuberculosis (Deer) (Amendment) Order 1993 amends the Tuberculosis (Deer) Order 1989 to remove the general requirement for marking or identifying farmed deer. Marking is required for deer carcasses (other than wild deer) and live deer which are to be moved on or off premises, and deer which are to be tested for tuberculosis.

Question 2: Does the current deer legislation provide a satisfactory framework of essential controls on TB in deer? – If not, why not and what is missing?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2007/740/made

Question 3: Does the current legislation create unnecessary burdens on deer farmers? – What is your evidence; and what would you do about it?

### **Camelids: Background to the policy**

- 2.6 Camelid keepers have since 2008 received a non-statutory payment when agreeing to the testing and slaughter of a TB confirmed or suspect animal. The non-statutory payment was always seen as a temporary measure to meet an immediate need; and that a statutory payment scheme should be introduced in due course. This consolidation of the Deer Orders provides just such an opportunity.
- 2.7 The proposed statutory compensation scheme is being introduced alongside administrative changes to AHVLA's TB testing regime, the details of which are set out below. To safeguard the public interest, as in the case of deer, we propose to introduce statutory controls to mark animals that are to be removed for slaughter as TB reactors and to prohibit vaccination and the use of therapeutic or prophylactic TB treatment as these may affect TB testing results. With the introduction of the statutory compensation scheme we propose that the new Order should contain explicit provisions in one piece of legislation to make it clear what keepers can expect in terms of testing of their animals and the removal of TB reactors.
- 2.8 Because of the low sensitivity of the tuberculin skin test in camelids an antibody (blood) test has been used to supplement the skin test on a research basis since 2006. As a piece of research it was reasonable to seek the voluntary agreement of keepers to its deployment. In 2011 antibody tests for TB in camelids were validated by AHVLA, since when discussions with the industry have taken place regarding their wider deployment. Separately the industry has sought to develop proposals for a voluntary health surveillance scheme on which discussions are continuing but Defra reserves its position to look again at options for statutory surveillance if the voluntary industry scheme cannot deliver the desired results. With all the necessary research complete the Government proposes for now to continue to pay for skin and blood testing in herds in which TB has been identified or is suspected, and compensate keepers for the removal of their affected animals for slaughter.

## Proposed legislative changes: The changes we propose to make:

- (i) Deer
- 2.9 Taken together, we believe the current Deer Orders made under the Animal Health Act 1981 set out a sensible and proportionate structure for controlling TB in the farmed and park deer sector. There has been no major pressure for change since their introduction in 1989. For that reason we are proposing in England to consolidate all of the current provisions into a single Order which will make it easier for the deer keeper, their vet and other stakeholders to establish their duties and legislative requirements.

### (ii) Camelids

### 2.10 We propose to:

- (a). Introduce statutory payment of compensation to camelid keepers for the slaughter of affected animals under section 32(3) of the Animal health Act 1981 at the same fixed rate as currently paid under the non-statutory arrangement (£750 per animal).
- (b). Also introduce safeguards:
  - i. that provide for the marking of animals that are to be removed for slaughter and prohibition of vaccination, and
  - ii. prohibit the use of therapeutic or prophylactic TB treatments of camelids since these may affect TB testing results and increase the risk of developing *M. bovis* strains that are resistant to drugs used to treat TB in humans.

### Question 4: Are the safeguards proposed (para 2. 10(b)) the right ones and are there others that should be put in place to protect the public?

- (c). Introduce statutory powers of testing and removal of TB reactors alongside the statutory compensation. We propose in addition that where a keeper:
- fails to co-operate with the AHVLA testing requirements then they will under the proposed new Order be responsible to reimburse the Government for any testing costs and expenses reasonably incurred by the Secretary of State for the purpose of making good the keeper's default (similar to the position under article 8(4) of the bovine TB Order S.I. 2007/740).
- refuses to allow their animals to be tested the keeper will be committing an offence under the Animal Health Act 1981 and the herd will be placed under movement restriction until such time as the disease risk is determined to have ended.

The proposed Order is made under the Animal Health Act 1981 and therefore inspector powers of entry, testing, seizure and slaughter are all contained in the parent Act and therefore are not replicated in the Order. As with other 1981 Act Orders this proposed Order will be enforced by local authorities. Obstruction of inspectors in the exercise of their duties and non-compliance with any requirements of the Order will be prosecuted under the 1981 Act.

### Question 5: How can we best ensure that all camelid owners are aware of these proposed new powers?

## Legislative changes that we do <u>not</u> propose to make at this time but will keep under review

### (i) Deer

- 2.11 From our conversations with stakeholders we are aware that some in the deer farming industry would like changes made: to the level of TB compensation; to arrangements for the TB testing of deer to allow for blood testing; and to remove the requirement for deer farmers to pay for TB tests.
- 2.12 The Animal Health and Welfare Board for England (AHWBE) has been reviewing compensation generally and we propose to revisit compensation for deer when that review has completed its work.
- 2.13 The tuberculin skin test is currently the only internationally recognised standard for TB testing of deer. We have encouraged the deer industry to consider carrying out their own research to validate blood tests as supplementary ante-mortem diagnostic tools for TB in captive deer, and if that happens successfully we will look again at whether to provide for such additional validated tests.
- 2.14 The costs of TB testing of deer are currently borne by deer farmers and we propose to look again at the whole issue of who pays for testing as part of a wider consultation on TB in non-bovine animals.
- (ii) Camelids
- 2.15 From our conversations with stakeholders we are aware that some in the industry would like changes made to the level of TB compensation.
- 2.16 AHWBE has been reviewing compensation generally and we propose to revisit this when that review has completed its work.

Question 6: Are there any other comments you wish to make about these proposals? (Please provide evidence in support of further changes you are proposing)

# Administrative changes to the current arrangements for TB testing of camelids

2.17 Based on all the available evidence the Government does not propose to change the current arrangements and introduce a statutory surveillance scheme for TB in camelids like the one we have for cattle. But the Government is proposing to deploy better tests to identify disease and to do this within a statutory framework similar to that which has successfully been used for deer for more than 20 years. To date AHVLA staff have in many cases been prepared to invest extra time and effort to persuade keepers to have their animals TB tested only to find some keepers change their minds about testing or the removal of reactors when the results are known. We intend that with the introduction of

statutory compensation the present voluntary form of agreement should be replaced by a notice requiring camelid keepers to test animals, and those that test positive to TB will be subject to a notice of intended statutory slaughter.

- 2.18 We propose the new testing regime for known infected herds will comprise a tuberculin skin test with injection of bovine tuberculin only (i.e. a more severe interpretation than that currently used) followed by two antibody blood tests in <u>parallel</u> interpretation (i.e. with animals positive to either or both tests being considered infected and removed). The Government will continue to pay for this skin and blood testing and compensate keepers for the removal of their affected animals with the same level of payment for animals that are culled until the outcome of the AHWBE review of compensation is known. By making these more sensitive tools available the Department will expect keepers to cooperate with veterinary inspectors carrying out the timely testing of their animals.
- 2.19 At present TB screening of any animal that may have been moved out of a TB-infected herd before the infection was diagnosed on the premises of origin is by comparative skin testing only. With the availability of validated antibody TB tests, the Government proposes that any 'spread-tracings' instigated by AHVLA from herds with confirmed *M. bovis* TB will be subject to the same TB testing regime as the infected herd of origin. In other words, animals identified as TB 'spread-tracings' will have to pass a single (bovine tuberculin only) intradermal test followed by two antibody blood tests in parallel interpretation, at the Government's expense.
- 2.20 There are other cases where *M. bovis* infection is only suspected in a camelid herd, but not confirmed by laboratory culture, or where a herd are identified by AHVLA as being at risk of TB because of their proximity or epidemiological links (known as 'backtracing') to infected, cattle, deer, goats or other camelids. In those situations, the Department proposes to use the current comparative skin test followed by the dual antibody test with <u>serial</u> interpretation (i.e. removing only SAC that are positive on <u>both</u> antibody tests) at the Department's expense.
- 2.21 As llamas and alpacas are traded internationally and any TB breakdowns abroad caused by undetected TB-infected animals exported from the UK could have serious implications for the reputation of UK plc, particularly in Europe. The Department is proposing that the guidance for exporters is amended so that they should undertake (and pay for) private pre-export TB testing using the existing skin and an antibody TB test of their choice in the 30 days prior to date of export. If exporters fail to act in accordance with the revised guidance the Department will consider other actions, including regulation, to protect the UK's export market.
- 2.22 The changes proposed here will be complemented by revised guidance on the TB testing of camelids, to ensure that keepers of these animals have the best available information to inform the important decisions that they may be called upon to make.

Question 7: Do these administrative changes in TB testing of camelids go: too far, far enough, not far enough? Explain why

### **Annex A: List of consultees**

**British Alpaca Society** 

British Deer Farms and Parks Association

British Llama Society

**British Veterinary Association** 

**British Veterinary Camelid Society** 

Camelid TB Support & Research Group

Country Land and Business Association

National Farmers Union

Scottish Government

**Veterinary Deer Society** 

Welsh Government

# Annex B: Defra Consultation on tuberculosis (TB) animal disease controls for deer and camelids - Response Form

### **Questions**

Question 1: Do you have evidence to support a different approach to T in non-bovine farmed species? Yes/No* (*delete as appropriate)	В
(If yes, please specify)	
Question 2: Does the current deer legislation provide a satisfactory framework of essential controls on TB in deer? Yes/No*	
If not, why not and what is missing?	
Question 3: Does the current legislation create unnecessary burdens of deer farmers? Yes/No*	'n
If yes, what is your evidence; and what would you do about it?	

Question 4: Are the safeguards proposed (para 2.10(b)) the right ones and are there others that should be put in place to protect the public? Yes/No*
Question 5: How can we best ensure that all camelid owners are aware of these proposed new powers?
Question 6: Are there any other comments you wish to make about these proposals? Yes/No* (Please provide evidence in support of further changes you are proposing)
Question 7: Do these administrative changes in TB testing of SAC go: too far/far enough/not far enough?* Explain why.
Question 8: Do you know of any further sources on camelid numbers,
herd sizes and businesses in England? Yes/No* (If yes, please specify)

to gather and present camelids for testing? Yes/No* (If yes, please specify)
Question 10: Do you know any further sources on the sale values of camelids, particularly llamas, in England? Yes/No* (If yes, please specify)
Question 11: Do you know any sources of information on the economic returns of different camelid enterprises in England? Yes/No* (If yes, please specify)
Question 12: Do you know of any evidence on the economic impact of TB in camelid herds in England?
If you do <i>not</i> want your response - including your name, contact details and any other personal information – to be publicly available, please tick the box or otherwise say so clearly in writing when you send your response.

### **Annex C: Consultation criteria**

The criteria in the "Consultation Principles" (<a href="http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/resource-library/consultation-principles-guidance">http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/resource-library/consultation-principles-guidance</a>) apply to all UK national public consultations on the basis of a document in electronic or printed form.

Though they have no legal force, and cannot prevail over statutory or other mandatory or external requirements (e.g. under European Community law) they should otherwise generally be regarded as binding on UK Departments and their agencies unless Ministers conclude that exceptional circumstances require a departure.

The key Consultation Principles are:

departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before;

departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and consult with those who are affected;

consultation should be 'digital by default', but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy; and

the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

Defra believes that in relation to this particular consultation that we have followed the criteria. If you have any comments in relation to Defra's approach to consultation then they may be contacted at: consultation.coordinator@defra.gsi.gov.uk.

Please do not send specific responses to this consultation to the consultation co-ordinator. We will be happy to receive those at: BTBengage@defra.gsi.gov.uk.

# Annex D: Economic analysis for a statutory compensation scheme for South American Camelids (SAC)

#### Rationale for intervention and intended effects

Bovine TB (TB, caused by *Mycobacterium bovis*) is a serious infectious, often fatal, bacterial disease of cattle and other mammals, including South American camelids: alpacas and llamas. In England, around 9 camelid herds per year are identified by Animal Health & Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) with confirmed new TB infections caused by *M. bovis*. The government intervenes generally because actions taken by one animal keeper in relation to TB on his or her premises may allow onward spread that causes losses and costs to others (including keepers of other susceptible species). Such interventions are in proportion to the risks involved.

Current government intervention with herds of camelids that have TB is partly based on voluntary agreement with keepers. The law does not specify the flat £750 public-funded non-statutory payment that is currently offered for each animal identified as affected and culled. Section 32(3) of the Animal Health Act 1981 requires compensation to be set down in an Order and the lack of a statutory compensation scheme leaves the government unable to invoke other statutory control measures (powers of entry, testing and removal of animals) in a limited number of cases. Defra lawyers have advised that a statutory compensation scheme must be placed in law.

The primary aim is to improve disease management by ensuring all camelid keepers with animals affected by TB undergo a new enhanced testing regime (comprising compulsory skin and double blood testing); and for those who currently refuse to have their herd tested to comply. TB blood testing of infected camelid herds has been voluntary. Camelid keepers could get their animals de-restricted on the back of negative skin test results alone, thus increasing the risk of leaving infected animals undetected in the herd compared with the far more sensitive combined skin and blood TB testing regime.

#### **Policy options**

Defra has considered the risks of retaining the current (business as usual) arrangements as well as those associated with withdrawing all government support for TB in camelids. On balance Defra's preferred option is to establish a statutory compensation scheme with compensation at the current non-statutory payment level of £750 per animal culled.

The introduction of a statutory scheme will enable AHVLA to invoke other statutory powers to enter premises and test when there is a suspicion of TB, and remove animals where necessary.

### Benefits from the preferred option

- a) Improved control of TB.
- b) Reducing the potential spread of TB as infected animals could further spread the disease in the herd, or even off the premises, particularly in the final stages of the disease.
- c) A possible welfare gain of quickly culling infected animals rather than leaving them to die of TB.

#### **Risks and Uncertainties**

Future levels of TB in camelids are uncertain, as is the future number of camelids slaughtered due to additional testing along with their potential value given the wide range of infection prevalence within affected herds. There is a risk of non-cooperation when mandatory blood testing is rolled out, as some in industry are known to be sceptical of blood testing.

### **Economic analysis**

### South American Camelids in England

We have limited evidence of the impact of TB and the controls on the camelid industry. As a result, a number of assumptions have been made to estimate the economic impact of introducing a statutory compensation scheme for camelid keepers.

Based on advice from the British Llama Association (BLA) and British Alpaca Society (BAS) we estimate there are between 28,000 and 34,000 camelids in England, a third of which are kept by 250-300 commercial businesses. This suggests an average business herd size of 37. These businesses are mainly breeders plus fleece producers, meat producers, and trekking establishments.

### Question 8: Do you know of any further sources on camelid numbers, herd sizes and businesses in England?

Defra statistics show that around 65 camelid businesses were affected by TB in England in 2012 and there have been on average 9 new breakdowns confirmed by culture in England per year. Per breakdown, around 8 animals are slaughtered with 74 slaughtered in total per year on average. This has led to £55,500 paid in compensation per year.

#### Impacts on businesses of TB controls

TB controls in camelids include: testing for disease; movement restrictions on premises that are found to have disease or refuse testing; and, the removal and slaughter of TB affected animals. These controls, whilst they are designed to control and prevent further disease, will impose costs on keepers.

The majority of the costs of testing are currently paid by AHVLA including vet fees, transport of samples and culture. However, we recognise that keepers face costs in

gathering and presenting animals for testing. This has been estimated at an average of 2 hours per test, monetised using standard farm labour wage rates from Nix 2013.

### Question 9: Do you have any information on how long it takes farmers to gather and present camelids for testing?

Early identification and culling of camelids that are infected with TB may impose costs on keepers where they could have gained further enjoyment and economic value from them. This will depend upon the length of time a camelid could live undetected with TB and the economic value of the animal over that time. Whilst the current non-statutory payment takes some account of the replacement value of camelids, the true economic loss is measured by their economic potential.

We have limited information on the economic returns for different camelid enterprises. We have used the sales values of cria (young camelids) from <a href="www.alpacaseller.co.uk">www.alpacaseller.co.uk</a> and production costs from Nix to estimate the potential economic value for breeding stock.

Question 10: Do you know any further sources on the sale values of camelids, particularly llamas, in England?

### Question 11: Do you know any sources of information on the economic returns of different camelid enterprises in England?

Any costs need to be viewed against the benefits of earlier disease detection, prevention of onward spread within the herd or into neighbouring farms/wildlife and the possible welfare gain of culling infected animals sooner.

### Question 12: Do you know of any evidence on the economic impact of TB in camelid herds in England?

#### Sources of evidence

- Defra stats: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/other-tb-statistics">https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/other-tb-statistics</a>
- Nix (2014) "John Nix Farm Management Pocketbook", 44<sup>th</sup> Edition, Agro Business Consultants.
- Sensitivity of combined skin and blood testing: Veterinary advice, based on AHVLA's report of TB blood test evaluation study in alpacas (Rhodes et al. 2012)

and peer-reviewed published research: <a href="http://cvi.asm.org/content/19/10/1677">http://cvi.asm.org/content/19/10/1677</a> and <a href="http://cvi.asm.org/content/18/12/2143">http://cvi.asm.org/content/18/12/2143</a>

- Dean et al. (2009) "Use of serological techniques for diagnosis of *Mycobacterium bovis* infection in a llama herd" <a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19749210">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19749210</a>
- Alpaca sale value: <u>www.alpacaseller.co.uk</u>