

Title: PIR on single occupancy authorities and ibTB in the Tuberculosis (England) Order 2014 PIR No: 2014/2383 Original IA/RPC No: IA: DEFRA1788 Lead department or agency: Defra Other departments or agencies: Contact for enquiries: Samuel.farnham@defra.gov.uk	Post Implementation Review
	Date: 27/08/2019
	Type of regulation: Domestic
	Type of review: Statutory
	Date measure came into force: 01/10/2014
	Recommendation: Keep
RPC Opinion: N/A	

1. What were the policy objectives of the measure? (Maximum 5 lines)

The provisions of the Tuberculosis (England) Order 2014 mirrored those in the 2007 Order except for two additional measures that: a) removed the compulsory pre-movement testing exemption for cattle moved within a Single Occupancy Authority (SOA); and b) enabled publication of information on the locations of all cattle herds in England that have suffered a TB breakdown, which was achieved by the launch of the information bovine TB website.

2. What evidence has informed the PIR? (Maximum 5 lines)

[Professor Sir Charles Godfray's review](#) of the Government's bTB Strategy published in November 2018 including [extensive stakeholder feedback](#); other stakeholder feedback (e.g. meetings with industry reps, attendance at agricultural shows and correspondence); and the APHA and Environmental Research Group Oxford ibTB project team report '*An analysis of ibTB data and information requirements*' based on stakeholder feedback from workshops in each bTB risk area (High, Edge and Low) in Autumn 2018.

3. To what extent have the policy objectives been achieved? (Maximum 5 lines)

ibTB receives around 200 hits a day and has five distinct user categories (four apply to farmers and vets). One farmer uses ibTB to "...look on my phone before or whilst at market to see whether the farm has had TB reactors in the last 5 years."¹ The Godfray review suggests increasing ibTB use and we are developing plans to do this. SOAs ceased to be issued from 1st July 2012 in England and those remaining were removed between July 2016 and late 2017.

Sign-off for Post Implementation Review: Chief economist/Head of Analysis and Minister

I have read the PIR and I am satisfied that it represents a fair and proportionate assessment of the impact of the measure.

¹<http://www.tbas.org.uk/endorsements/>

Signed: 

Date: 27/08/2019

Further information sheet

Please provide additional evidence in subsequent sheets, as required.

4. What were the original assumptions?(Maximum 5 lines)

Before the pre-movement testing exemption for SOAs was removed cattle could move freely from higher to lower TB risk areas resulting in increased bovine TB disease spread risk. The assumption is that requiring pre movement testing would reduce risk of disease by identifying risky cattle before they moved.

5. Were there any unintended consequences? (Maximum 5 lines)

Some farmers have noted that displaying bovine TB breakdowns can stress the negative at the expense of the positive i.e. would it be possible to include a map showing low TB risk herds to support risk based trading? We are looking into this.

6. Has the evidence identified any opportunities for reducing the burden on business? (Maximum 5 lines)

Displaying information on TB free farms would facilitate better-informed trading choices and be the next step in using ibTB for risk-based trading. IbTB does not produce a burden for industry and SOAs would have had to pay for a pre-movement test but that burden no longer exists following the removal of SOAs.

7. For EU measures, how does the UK's implementation compare with that in other EU member states in terms of costs to business? (Maximum 5 lines)

N/A.