

<p>Title: The Sheep and Goats (Records, Identification and Movement) (England) Order 2009, as amended</p> <p>PIR No: PIR-67756</p> <p>Original IA/RPC No: RIA - 25/11/2009</p> <p>Lead department or agency: Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs</p> <p>Other departments or agencies: Animal & Plant Health Agency (Defra Group) Rural Payments Agency (Defra Group)</p> <p>Contact for enquiries: patrick.brophy@defra.gov.uk</p>	Post Implementation Review
	Date: 16/04/2024
	Type of regulation: Domestic
	Type of review: Statutory
	Date measure came into force: 31/12/2009
	Recommendation: Amend
	RPC Opinion: N/A

1. What were the policy objectives of the measure?

The measure ([SI 2009/3219¹](#)) implements Council Regulation EC 21/2004 on the identification and registration of sheep and goats. Its objectives were to facilitate traceability via a keeper operated regime and to enhance Defra Group's capability to control future disease outbreaks. It included requirements for: mandatory electronic ID (EID - of sheep), individual animal movement recording in holding registers, and reporting of moves to an official database. Subsequent amendments by SIs 2014/331 and 2016/76 introduced: online reporting for markets, abattoirs, collection, and assembly centres, ended the use of a *non*-EID tag for slaughter lambs, inserted a review clause, and closed an enforcement gap. The traceability regime it underpins remains essential for disease control.

2. What evidence has informed the PIR?

Three impact assessments: [RIA \(2009\) - Introduction of sheep EID](#), [IA 1398 \(2014\) - EID slaughter tag](#), & [IA 1532 \(2014\) – New movement reporting service](#). Also, data on the use of different types and combinations of official ID devices including ear tags - provided from an official database which allocates official tag ID numbers (used by approved tag suppliers). Data sourced from the statutory movement reporting database used by all keepers/industry. An extensive suite of management information reports also allows for the monitoring of movement data and compliance. The Traceability Design User Group (TDUG) has provided regular industry/stakeholder feedback on the regime underpinned by this measure.

3. To what extent have the policy objectives been achieved?

This measure continues to meet its objectives in its current form. All sheep in England are now electronically identified. Substantially more sheep are individually recorded and traceable than prior to the measure. The Animal and Plant Health Agency have improved data to assist tracings of sheep that may be disease suspects. 80% of sheep/goat moves are reported online.

Nancy Race - Lead economist for livestock identification and traceability

Sign-off for Post Implementation Review:

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

Signed:

Date: 16 April 2024



LORD DOUGLAS-MILLER - Minister for Biosecurity, Animal Health & Welfare

¹ This a link to the consolidated version on Legislation.Gov.UK

Further information

4. What were the original assumptions?

In the above IAs assumptions were included on:

- sheep and lamb populations (pre/post 2010),
- slaughter volumes, lifespans/mortality rates,
- volumes of moves through gatherings,
- tagging deadlines, and efficacy of tags, and time to tag,
- time taken to complete holding registers, and movement documents.

For the single slaughter lamb ear tag that allows farmers to batch record/report their moves an assumption that 20% only would be identified with the EID version is not valid anymore as Defra phased out the *non*-EID version (to improve traceability) in 2015.

5. Were there any unintended consequences?

No. Defra persuaded the EU to delay an excessively burdensome requirement to individually report moves of sheep already identified before 2010 with non-EID ear tags. Most, if not all, of these animals are now dead. That delay saved industry an estimated £5m - £14.5m. Keepers are complying with the measure and supporting its objectives. There has not been a significant disease outbreak in the national flock/herd during the operation of this measure.

6. Has the evidence identified any opportunities for reducing the burden on business?

The introduction of a new movement reporting service in 2014, enabled by this measure, as amended, resulted in a modest net benefit to industry estimated at £71k p/a (IA 1532) and delivered significant improvements to traceability.

Although the non-EID slaughter tag was phased out in 2015 (S.4 above) farmers can still batch record/report those moves using the EID version. An *individual* ID number in the tag's transponder is scanned at markets/collection centres/abattoirs significantly improving traceability. The annual cost to sheep farmers was c.£1.712 m, but reduced costs to livestock markets and abattoirs of £1.907m resulted in an overall net benefit of £195k p/a (IA 1398).

Following commissioned research Defra agreed to permit the use of injectable EIDs for *non*-food chain goats. None have yet been submitted by manufacturers for approval.

After EU exit Defra determined it was appropriate to adopt lower subsidy reduction penalties for minor/inadvertent record keeping errors found at on-farm traceability inspections. From 2024 any delinked payments a farmer claims will not be subject to cross compliance inspections. Also, during 2024 an additional more proportionate enforcement option of fixed penalty notices will become available.

A Defra programme to reform livestock traceability IT systems will use a new multi species delivery platform, the Livestock Information Service (LIS). It will provide an opportunity for Defra and Industry/TDUG to work on improved traceability. Burden reducing options already identified include improved digital systems and paperless movement reporting. These and other ideas will be developed over c.2-3 years. Delivery is anticipated during 2026. That will eventually require reform/replacement of this measure pursuant to impact assessments and public consultation.

With the advent of LIS, improved data on sheep and goat ID can also be made available to industry bodies as and when they may wish to develop value adding information services.

7. How does the UK approach compare with the implementation of similar measures internationally, including how EU member states implemented EU requirements that are comparable or now form part of retained EU law, or how other countries have implemented international agreements?

The assimilated law this measure implements has been replaced with new, similar measures in the EU. Following EU exit it is no longer appropriate to compare this measure against past EU implementation. The objective for its replacement will be to continue to provide effective and enhanced traceability for disease control purposes in a proportionate and balanced manner.