THIS MONTH

- A piece of spinal cord was found still attached to a health-marked bovine carcase in Northern Ireland. The material was removed and disposed of in accordance with SRM rules.

- SVS audits have found no cases of bovine spinal cord attached to health marked carcasses in Great Britain this month.

- 99% SRM compliance by slaughterhouses in GB with 1 failure.
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This month

On 26 October, the Report of the BSE Inquiry was presented to Parliament on behalf of the Government by Agriculture Minister, Nick Brown. He announced a package of measures for the victims of variant CJD and explained that the Government’s substantive response would come later. Separately, Food Standards Agency Chairman, Sir John Krebbs pledged “never again will vital information on food safety be withheld from the public”.

Also in the news section this month, we report on the second bovine spinal cord failure this year at a UK slaughterhouse, this time in Northern Ireland. A health marked carcase was found by inspectors at a cutting premises in Northern Ireland. The material was disposed of in accordance with the SRM rules. Elsewhere in Northern Ireland there had been five similar incidents relating to imports from the Republic of Ireland. This prompted extensive action by the RoI authorities to ensure similar failures in the SRM controls do not happen again.

Other news items report on the 29 September SEAC meeting, implementation of the latest SRM measures, progress with the Agency’s review of BSE controls, so called “private kills”, and a significant development in food law enforcement by local authorities with the publication of the Framework Agreement.

In legal action, we have reports on completion of a number of cases, including several taken by local authorities and one by the RSPCA which involved the illegal slaughter of sheep.

Jill Wilson
Editor
BSE: status report

This section is designed to provide a quick reference to basic BSE statistics and a context for the enforcement results presented in the Bulletin.

Confirmed BSE cases (by date of restriction)

Figures represent cases confirmed and in each year relate to cattle first placed under restriction in that year. For example, an animal that first showed clinical signs and was placed under restriction in December 1999 would, if confirmed, be included in the 1999 total. The figures are therefore provisional.

Great Britain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 1994</td>
<td>20,323</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>23,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1995</td>
<td>12,308</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>14,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1996</td>
<td>7,076</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>8,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1997</td>
<td>3,845</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1998</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1999</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative total (to 30 September 2000)</td>
<td>152,651</td>
<td>16,377</td>
<td>8,203</td>
<td>177,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which born after the ban on ruminant protein in cattle feed (18.7.88)</td>
<td>41,717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As at 30 September 2000
2 GB total includes 57 private submissions and 27 from OTMS surveys (see Bulletin #36)

Northern Ireland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 1994</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1995</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1996</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1997</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1998</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total to August 2000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative total (since 1988):</td>
<td>1,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which born after the ban on ruminant protein in cattle feed (11.1.89)</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OverThirty Month Slaughter Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Animals presented for slaughter from 29 April 1996 to 1 October 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abattoirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2,511,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>408,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>599,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>647,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4,167,464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selective cull

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Animals slaughtered from 24 February 1997 to 8 October 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abattoirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>64,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>5,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>72,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>73,495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offspring cull

The BSE Offspring Slaughter Regulations 1998 (SI No. 1998/3070), implemented a compulsory cull of offspring born on or after 1 August 1996 to confirmed BSE cases superseding the voluntary cull that started in August 1998.

Cumulative data as at 23 October 2000 for both the voluntary and compulsory phases of the cull is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Backlog cases</th>
<th>Non Backlog cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offspring born after 1 August 1996 to BSE cases</td>
<td>7,529</td>
<td>10,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offspring already dead</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td>4,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offspring slaughtered under the cull</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>5,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals awaiting slaughter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Offspring born after 1 August 1996 to dams in which BSE was confirmed before 25 November 1998
2 Offspring born to BSE cases confirmed after 25 November 1998

For further information on the offspring cull, contact Jill Powys on +44 (0)20 7904 6312 email: j.powys@ahvg.maff.gsi.gov.uk
Cattle Identification Inspections

Inspections for Great Britain between April and 25 October 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holdings inspected</th>
<th>1,871</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animals physically inspected and records checked</td>
<td>119,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records checked for animals no longer on farm born after 1/1/98 and animals born before 1/1/98</td>
<td>148,192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information about the Cattle Tracing System contact the BCMS Helpline between 8.00am - 5.30pm Monday to Friday and 9.00am - 1.00pm Saturday on 0845 050 1234 (UK calls charged at local rate) or +44 900 702 222 (from outside the UK).

Information can also be found on the BCMS website at: www.maff.gov.uk/animalh/tracing/bcms

Cattle Passports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cattle Passports issued</th>
<th>12,370,015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of which</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Agricultural Departments in GB July 1996 - Sept 1998</td>
<td>6,388,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by BCMS between 28 September 1998 and 30 September 2000</td>
<td>5,981,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle movements processed by BCMS 28 September 1998 to 30 September 2000</td>
<td>8,887,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captured on Passport application forms</td>
<td>2,656,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notified by postcard</td>
<td>4,749,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notified electronically</td>
<td>1,480,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For general information on BSE, visit the MAFF website at: www.maff.gov.uk/animalh/bse/index.html

Alternatively, contact the MAFF Helpline on 0645 33 55 77 (UK local rate) +44 20 7270 3000 (if calling from outside the UK)

News Items

BSE Inquiry Report published

The Report of the BSE Inquiry, chaired by Lord Phillips of Worth Matravers, was presented to Parliament on behalf of the Government by Agriculture Minister, Nick Brown on 26 October. The 16 volume, 4,000 page Report is the output of a very thorough three year investigation.

What the Inquiry team did

The purpose of the Inquiry was to establish and review the history of the emergence and identification of BSE and new variant CJD in the UK up to 20 March 1996 and to reach conclusions on the adequacy of the authorities’ response. Ministers have welcomed its important findings, which add greatly to the understanding of BSE and vCJD.

What the Inquiry found

The Inquiry found a number of shortcomings in the way things were done. Measures to address human and animal health risks were not always timely nor adequately implemented and enforced. Other criticisms focused on the Government’s campaign of reassurance about the risks posed by BSE, and the variable treatment of victims of vCJD in the early days of the disease.

In the course of the Inquiry, Lord Phillips and his team examined more than 3,000 files of official documents, over a thousand statements and contributions from the public. There were 138 days of public oral evidence involving 333 witnesses.
What the Inquiry recommends

The Inquiry's Report contains many important lessons for public administration. Some of the key areas it identifies are the implementation of policy decisions, Government's approach to contingency planning, the assessment, management and communication of risk, the need for openness and transparency, the role of scientific advisory committees, and Government's assessment and use of scientific advice.

The Report also emphasises that victims of vCJD and their families have special needs, which should be addressed.

What about current BSE policy?

It was beyond the remit of the Inquiry to examine current public protection measures. However, the Food Standards Agency has examined the Report and confirmed that there is no immediate need for new food safety measures. This aspect of the Report will be discussed at the next public meeting of the Agency's ongoing review of BSE controls on 2 November.

What next?

Ministers have already announced plans for improved support for victims of variant CJD and their families. Elsewhere, the Inquiry's findings will be studied carefully by departments across Whitehall, including SEAC and the Food Standards Agency Board. Ministers have emphasised that they are determined to learn the lessons of the Report. The Government will announce its substantive response in the coming months, allowing Parliament to debate both the Report and the Government's response.


Information on the work of the Inquiry including witness statements, transcripts of oral evidence, and factual documents can be found on the BSE Inquiry website at: www.bse.org.uk

Printed copies of the Report (£325 for all 16 volumes) and a CD-Rom version (£235) are available from the Stationery Office website at: www.thestationeryoffice.com/bse or by telephoning 08457 023474 (UK local rate)

The full text of the Government's announcement and 26 October debate in the House of Commons on the BSE Inquiry Report website at: www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/cmhansrd.htm

For further information, contact Mark Filley in MAFF's BSE Inquiry Unit on +44 (0)20 7270 8838 email: m.filley@piu.maff.gsi.gov.uk

Spinal cord found on health marked beef in Northern Ireland

The Food Standards Agency has taken urgent action following the detection of spinal cord in beef carcasses originating in the Republic of Ireland and one carcass from Northern Ireland.

The most recent incident occurred on 29 September when one of DARD's veterinary inspectors discovered a health marked beef quarter with a small piece of spinal cord still attached. The carcass had originated from a slaughterhouse in Northern Ireland. The inspector made the discovery at a cutting plant also in Northern Ireland. A full investigation into this incident is underway with a view to possible prosecution of the slaughterhouse concerned. The controls operating at meat plants are also being reviewed.
Five similar breaches of BSE controls were discovered in meat imported from the Republic of Ireland between February and September this year. On each occasion, DARD officers ensured that the remnants of spinal cord were removed and disposed of in accordance with the SRM controls and the carcasses were seized and destroyed.

On 2 October Morris McAllister NI Director of the Food Standards Agency met all the key agencies involved, including senior veterinary officials from both jurisdictions and the Chief Executive of the Food Safety Authority of Ireland. At that meeting it was agreed that all the necessary actions would be taken to prevent further breaches in the regulations. In the Republic of Ireland, inspectors have been provided with additional training material and been told there must be 100% SRM compliance.

Review of BSE controls
Food Standards Agency Chairman, Sir John Krebs updated the Committee on the progress of the Agency’s review of BSE controls.

A draft report of the review had been discussed at the last stakeholders meeting on 14 September where there had been a good degree of agreement and general support for the draft. It would be further discussed at a public meeting in York on 9 October, at which SEAC Members would be welcome. The Committee raised a few technical points in discussion of the draft. Sir John reported that a revised draft report taking account of comments made by SEAC and other interested parties would be prepared in time for discussion at a final stakeholders meeting on 2 November. The report, after taking account of recommendations from the Phillips Inquiry, would then be submitted to the Agency’s Board for approval before being published and submitted to Health and Agriculture Ministers.

Consideration of recent Scientific Publications

Species barrier - independent prion replication in apparently resistant species

Members considered recent published work from Professor Collinge’s group demonstrating that asymptomatic mice that were not thought to be susceptible to TSE infection were still able to replicate prion protein to high levels and could transmit disease to other mice. SEAC noted the implications of the work in regard to the possibility that prion disease may exist in a sub-clinical form. Members noted that existing UK control measures with respect to the safety of beef products took account of the possibility that animals with no clinical signs may be incubating the disease. They agreed that the experiment did not raise immediate public or animal health concerns. However the Committee was concerned about the possible implications of subclinical infection in countries where BSE was present and where less stringent control measures were in place than in the UK. The Committee also recommended that further research on pigs and poultry should be undertaken to extend earlier findings indicating that these species did not harbour TSE infectivity when orally exposed.

SEAC: 29 September 2000 meeting

This is SEAC’s own report of their 29 September meeting. A list of scientific papers sent to SEAC Members for information between 18 July and 29 September 2000 has also been issued.

The Spongiform Encephalopathy Advisory Committee (SEAC) met at the offices of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF), Whitehall Place West, London on 29 September 2000.
Transmission of BSE By Blood Transfusion In Sheep

SEAC considered the recent publication of ongoing work at the Institute of Animal Health examining transmission of experimental BSE between sheep through blood transfusion. Members noted that the experiment was at an early stage and positive transmission was limited to a single sheep. Therefore further work would be required before the result could be fully interpreted. However, the Committee considered whether, in the light of this initial finding, further measures to protect human or animal health were needed.

On the question of the safety of human blood and blood products, the Committee concluded that the measures the Committee had previously advised should be taken on a precautionary basis had, to a considerable extent, anticipated such a finding and the previous recommendation with respect to leucodepletion remained appropriate. The Committee recommended no additional control measures at this time, but noted that it would be important to ascertain the extent to which leucodepletion reduced or eliminated infectivity in the blood of sheep experimentally infected with BSE.

In relation to food safety, the Committee concluded that the finding reported did not present grounds for recommending any changes to the current controls. The Committee considered that the finding did not change their view on bovine products, in the absence of any indication of infectivity in bovine blood, but grounds for additional caution would arise if BSE were ever to be found in commercial sheep.

In relation to animal health, SEAC reviewed the use of dried mammalian blood in animal feed, which is currently permitted under EU legislation. SEAC agreed that there was no evidence to suggest the presence of BSE infectivity in cattle blood. Additionally, the Committee was informed that blood products are rarely used in farm animal feed in the UK and any bovine blood for animal feed would be sourced from animals under 30 months of age. Therefore, SEAC concluded that, although within species recycling should be discouraged, in the case of dried bovine blood, the risks were extremely small and hence there was no compelling need to change previous advice.

Also, because source material for gelatin and tallow was tightly controlled and subject to processing that would reduce any infectivity present, Members were also content for gelatin and tallow to remain exempt from the current feed ban. However, Members considered there was a theoretical possibility that if blood meal derived from a sheep infected with scrapie were included in a sheep ration, this could present a risk to animal health. If so, it may theoretically compromise current efforts to eradicate scrapie from the national flock. SEAC asked that this potential risk and its implications be considered within the context of the national scrapie eradication plan.

DH R&D and vCJD update

The Committee conducted its regular review of research findings and epidemiological information on vCJD. The Committee was informed that the total number of cases of confirmed and probable cases of vCJD now stood at 84, of which 7 were still alive.

The Committee was informed that the investigation into the apparent cluster of vCJD cases in Leicestershire was well underway, and likely to report its findings by the end of the year.

Risk assessment for surgical instruments

The Committee returned to the question of the draft report assessing the theoretical risk of person to person transmission of vCJD from surgical instruments. This was to follow up a decision at its meeting in May 2000 to endorse the methodology but to remit some of the draft report's key assumptions to a Sub-Group for further consideration. The Committee endorsed revisions to the draft report which took account of conclusions since reached by the Sub-Group. In particular they endorsed the input value ranges to be used within the modelling on which the report would be based. These value ranges reflected estimates of relative levels of pre-clinical infectivity theoretically possible within various body tissues.
In the light of the revised draft report, the Committee revisited its earlier statements on steps it would recommend to reduce the risk of person-to-person transmission. The Committee reiterated its earlier view that rigorous implementation of washing, decontamination and general hygiene procedures were key steps in reducing any risk, and stressed the importance of ensuring that such steps were fully implemented within the health care setting. It further concluded that although the theoretical risk could depend on a number of factors, it was likely to be greatest from operations involving central nervous system and posterior ophthalmic tissue, followed by lymphoid and anterior ophthalmic tissue. Where discrete surgical procedures can be identified as suitable for single use instruments, for example tonsillectomy, and provided patient safety would not be compromised, the Committee considered that such use should be considered wherever practicable.

**MAFF R&D update**

The Committee conducted its regular review of research findings and epidemiological information on BSE. SEAC noted that in ongoing experiments to examine the pathogenesis of experimental BSE in sheep, Suffolk sheep of susceptible genotype had shown evidence of infectivity in their tissues from 10 months post inoculation. However, encouragingly, no tissues from resistant or semi-resistant sheep had yet been found to be positive.

The Committee briefly considered the cases of suspected BSE reportedly found in sheep in the US. Members noted that an EU mission had recently concluded that on the basis of current information, there was no reason to suspect that the sheep were infected with BSE.

The Committee noted that a correction needed to be made to the figures presented in Table 1 at the end of the November 1999 SEAC Public Summary on the predicted BSE case incidence, including those cases in animals born after mid 1996. The figures presented in the table did not take account of the estimated effects of the offspring and selective culls. This did not have a significant impact on the majority of the data presented in the table, however, for column 3 - ‘Predicted cases in animals born after mid 1996’ - the predicted numbers of cases for 1999-2001 should be reduced to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Predicted cases in animals born after mid 1996 (95% prediction interval)</th>
<th>Actual to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2 (0 - 5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6 (3 - 16)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9 (5 - 23)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data assume 10% maternal transmission occurs where calves are born to infected dams within 6 months of clinical onset. A case of BSE was confirmed on 27 June 2000 in a Holstein/Friesian dairy cow born on 25 August 1996. To date this is the only recorded case of BSE in a cow born after 1 August 1996, the date when further measures to improve feed security were considered to be fully effective (the actual number of cases is therefore below the predicted level). Members briefly reviewed the recent report on investigations on the likely route of exposure in this case, which concluded that no definite transmission route could be implicated.

**Sheep and cattle surveillance**

A SEAC sub-group had been asked to consider surveillance strategies to better define the incidence of scrapie in the UK sheep flock. Members concurred with the sub-group's initial recommendations, which were to repeat an anonymous postal survey of farmers to establish how reproducible previous results were regarding scrapie incidence. SEAC also agreed that there should be a pilot study to identify the costs and practical constraints of performing a large-scale longitudinal study to establish a baseline for the incidence of scrapie. Finally SEAC underlined the importance of carrying out an abattoir survey to monitor changes in the prevalence of scrapie in sheep going into slaughterhouses. Members felt that this had the highest priority.

SEAC also considered options for an abattoir survey of cattle brains from animals born after 1 August 1996 to check the effectiveness of the feed ban. Members recommended that a survey should begin in August 2001. Timing the survey to start then would ensure that the samples to be analysed would come from 5 year old cattle, thus coinciding with the peak incidence of clinical BSE. It would therefore be most likely to pick up animals developing BSE, should there be any.
**Dicalcium Phosphate**

Members agreed that imported bovine bones and bones from UK cattle under thirty months of age could be used to produce dicalcium phosphate for poultry feed. However, because of concerns about intra-species recycling, Members felt that this practice could only be allowed if it could be assured that the material would not be included in feed for any other livestock. If this could not be guaranteed then it should not be used.

**Risk Assessment on the use of small incinerators to burn SRM**

Members were asked to consider the terms of reference for an independent study on the potential risks to human health from small incinerators burning SRM. Such incinerators are commonly found at hunt kennels and knackers yards and typically handle small numbers of casualty animals and fallen stock. Members agreed the terms of reference, but considered that the scope of the study should be widened to include the incineration of sheep SRM and to assess potential risks to animal as well as human health.

**Committee procedures - Openness**

SEAC agreed to publish future agendas from each meeting prior to the release of the public summary and the associated press briefing. Members also signalled their intention to hold an open meeting sometime next year. Members agreed to discuss any implications for the working of the Committee arising from the BSE Inquiry report at their next meeting in November.

**Updates on agenda items from previous meetings and other matters arising**

Members noted that:

i. the consultation document on phase 1 of the national scrapie plan for Great Britain had been published. The closing date for comments is 31 October 2000;

ii. that the British Dental Association has advised dentists to take account of the Committee's advice stressing the importance of thorough decontamination procedures on dental instruments;

iii. invitations to tender for the risk assessment work in sheep had been issued to six prospective contractors. Proposals were due to be returned in the next few days.

The next meeting of the Committee will be held on 28 November 2000. The press briefing for the November meeting will be held on 19 December when the public summary of the Committee's discussions at that meeting will be published.

---

3. Leucodepletion - removal of white blood cells

Further information about SEAC and SEAC's list of scientific papers is available on MAFF's BSE website at: [www.maff.gov.uk/animalh/bse/index.html](http://www.maff.gov.uk/animalh/bse/index.html)

Alternatively, contact Dr Lucy Harbron on +44 (0)20 7904 6254

email: l.harbron@ahvg.maff.gsi.gov.uk
Specified Risk Material – new legislation now in place

New legislation implementing the EU-wide definition of Specified Risk Material (SRM) came into force in October.

Depending on the animal's age, certain parts of the carcase are no longer classified as SRM and so no longer need to be disposed of as SRM or barred from import into the UK. These are:

- thymus and intestine of cattle aged up to 6 months;
- whole heads of sheep and goats aged up to 12 months; and
- except the skull (including brain and eyes/the heads), the heads of sheep and goats aged over 12 months.

Other changes require that, where the SRM is not removed, the entire carcase must be treated as SRM and either rendered or incinerated.

The spinal column (including dorsal root ganglia) of cattle aged over 30 months has now been designated as SRM. The over 30 month rule, which prevents such animals going into the human food chain and requires their destruction, means that this has no practical effect other than for Beef Assurance Scheme (BAS) cattle. In England, Wales and Northern Ireland, the exemption continues for cattle accompanied by a BAS certificate at the time of slaughter. However, there is no exemption for BAS cattle in Scotland but, the Regulations do provide for this particular type of bovine SRM from BAS animals to be removed either in the abattoir, or in a licensed cutting plant. Those cutting plants in Scotland wishing to undertake this removal would have to be specially authorized to deal appropriately with the SRM. The special provisions in Scotland and exemptions in the rest of the UK ensure that meat from BAS animals slaughtered at up to 42 months of age can continue to be marketed.

The EU Decision also requires SRM to be processed to a higher standard before disposal by burial at a licensed landfill site. However, because the new processing standard requires the installation of new pressure-cooking facilities, implementation of this aspect of the Decision has been postponed.

Products from third countries imported into the Community after 1 April 2001 must meet the EU standards for the removal and disposal of SRM and all meat and meat based products identified within the Decision from third countries must be accompanied by certification declaring freedom from SRM. Until superseded by these Community rules, the UK will maintain its existing controls on third country imports, which have been extended in the light of the Decision to include bovine ileum (part of the intestine, used for sausage casings). Products from other Member States no longer need certification stating they do not contain SRM as exporting Member States are now responsible for the removal and disposal of SRM. Additionally, any SRM imported into the UK for destruction purposes must be either sent directly to a collection point and then forwarded for incineration or sent directly for incineration.

The Specified Risk Material (Amendment) (England) Regulations came into force on 1 October and the Specified Risk Material (Amendment) (England) Order on 25 October and apply only to England. The devolved administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are in the process of introducing provisions identical to those in the Order. Parallel legislation with identical provisions to the Regulations have been introduced in Wales and Northern Ireland. The differences in the way the Regulations have been implemented in Scotland are due to the provisions of the Scotland Act 1998 which requires Scottish Ministers to transpose EU legislation in its entirety into domestic law.

The new legislation together with a summary of responses will be available shortly on the FSA website at: www.foodstandards.gov.uk

For further information on the domestic SRM controls, contact Martin Roberts in the Food Standards Agency's Meat Hygiene Division on +44 (0)20 7238 6489 email: martin.roberts@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

For further information on the import controls, contact Angus Cragg in MAFF's BSE Division on +44 (0)20 7904 6294 Fax +44 (0)20 7904 6272 email: a.s.cragg@maff.gsi.gov.uk
Food Standards Agency review of BSE controls

The public consultation meeting to discuss the Agency's review of BSE controls was held on Monday 9 October at the Royal York Hotel in York.

The meeting was chaired by Sir John Krebs, with an expert panel drawn from the Agency. The meeting was attended by members of the public and the media.

After a general outline by Sir John, the draft report was discussed in some detail.

The main discussion points were:

- scientific research: uncertainty and independence
- vCJD: likely future size and costs of the epidemic
- public communication of risk/risk awareness
- effectiveness of BSE controls
- possible maternal transmission of BSE
- imported meat products
- mechanically recovered meat
- use of tallow and gelatin in animal feed
- use of bovine blood in agriculture

The FSA's open approach to public consultation was generally well received. Sir John thanked everyone for contributing and reminded them that they were welcome to attend the final public Stakeholder Group meeting in London on 2 November. He assured everyone that the comments they had made at the meeting in York would be influential in the production of the BSE Controls Review report.

A revised draft of the report was published on 30 October and is available on the Agency's dedicated BSE review website. Also available on the website are a number of documents prepared as background papers for the Stakeholder Group meetings. These are:

- Proposed working methods and timetable
- Proposed areas and questions to be covered by the review
- Revised list of questions to be addressed
- Issues influencing possible changes to the Over Thirty Month Rule for cattle
- Specified Risk Material: factors which might influence reconsideration of present controls
- Issues relating to the feed ban

Following the Stakeholder Group meeting 2 November, the report will be discussed by the Food Standards Agency Board at its meeting in Cardiff on 9 November. The final version is expected to be published in November following approval of the contents and recommendations by the Agency's Board.

A copy of the draft report, background information and documents, comments, details of meetings, news and a link for submitting comments are available on the BSE controls review website at: www.bsereview.org.uk.

If you are interested in attending the next Stakeholder Group meeting or have difficulty getting access to the documents on the website, contact the Agency's Food Standards Helpline on 0845 757 9012 (UK local rate) or +44 20 7972 2400 (if calling from outside the UK) email: helpline@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

Details of the 9 November meeting of the Food Standards Agency Board are available in the “Events” area of the Agency's website at: www.foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk
Private kills

On Radio 4’s Farming Today programme earlier this month Food Standards Agency Chairman, Sir John Krebs spoke about concerns that meat from over 30 month cattle may be entering the food chain via so called "private kills". He warned consumers not to buy or accept meat from anything other than a reputable source, and if in doubt, to check that the meat came from a source that allows it to carry the health mark. The health mark means that the animal has been slaughtered in a licensed abattoir in accordance with meat hygiene legislation and inspected by the Meat Hygiene Service.

A background paper on the issues surrounding private kills, including those related to BSE, has been prepared for the next meeting of the Food Standards Agency’s Stakeholder Group which forms part of the review of BSE controls. The paper sets out the existing legal framework for private slaughter in licensed abattoirs, and the interpretation of the law as it applies to slaughter on farm and in unlicensed abattoirs. It also covers the application of the SRM and over 30 month controls in these premises. In addition to this paper, the Food Standards Agency is planning shortly to issue guidance to local authorities who are responsible for enforcement outside licensed abattoirs. In licensed premises, the Meat Hygiene Service has enforcement responsibility.

The background paper is available on the Agency’s BSE controls review website at: www.bsereview.org.uk

If you do not have access to the Internet and would like further information, contact Adrian Dally in the Food Standards Agency’s Meat Hygiene Division on +44 (0)20 7238 6420 email: adrian.dally@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

Framework Agreement for local authority food law enforcement

Local authorities throughout the UK have been asked to take the necessary action to implement the new Framework Agreement on local authority food law enforcement, operational from 1 April 2001.

The Framework sets out the Food Standards Agency’s expectations on the planning and delivery of food law enforcement by local authorities, reflecting both recognised good practice and existing requirements. It also sets out enhanced arrangements for the provision of monitoring information on local enforcement activity and the arrangements for audits by the Agency. The Framework has been developed in close partnership with local authority organisations and has received the support of consumer and food industry representatives.

The Framework Agreement consists of four elements:

• Service Planning Guidance - a model format for local authority food law enforcement service plans, ensuring that key areas of the service are covered whilst allowing flexibility for local priorities. The plans must be approved by the relevant forum of elected local Councillors thus increasing local transparency;

• Standard - clear standards for local authority food law enforcement services which build on existing central guidance and statutory Codes of Practice. The Standard sets out the key areas of food law enforcement and the relevant management arrangements and targets;

• Monitoring Scheme - enhanced arrangements for local authorities to submit quarterly reports of their food law enforcement activity. The new system builds on current arrangements but with a greater focus on data related to results. The Agency will use the information to identify and target areas of concern; and finally

• Audit Scheme - a rolling programme of audits by the Agency to provide a more complete and qualitative assessment of food law enforcement, looking at how local authorities perform against the Standard and identifying good practice. Selection for audit will be based on a number of
factors, including information from the Monitoring Scheme. The audit programme will be published on a quarterly basis. The Agency’s audit reports, together with agreed action plans will also published. The Agency intends to issue final details of the programme and arrangements early next year.

The Framework Agreement has been the subject of extensive consultation which began shortly after the publication in January 1998 of the White Paper “The Food Standards Agency – A Force for Change” (see MHER #36 and 39). The Framework was agreed by the Agency Board at their meeting on 21 September and was published on 29 September. The Agency is planning a series of seminars for local authority enforcement staff early next year. The seminars will cover a number of issues related to food law enforcement, including implementation of the Framework Agreement.

European Commission website

The following documents are now available on the Commission’s website:

- Final report of a 10 – 14 April 2000 mission to Spain to look at BSE controls.
- Proposal for a Regulation laying down the rules concerning animal by-products not intended for human consumption.
- Short report of the Standing Veterinary Committee (SVC) meeting on 19 – 20 September 2000.
Enforcement results

SRM audit

The Bulletin gives results of SRM audit surveillance for a rolling year. This issue contains the most up-to-date results from October 1999 to September 2000, the latest month for which figures are available. Entries that have changed since previous editions are shown in italics.

Specified Risk Material

Great Britain (State Veterinary Service)

Slaughterhouses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>12 months total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfactory</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visits</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory visits</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unsatisfactory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate separation from other animal by-products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate staining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate separation from materials fit for human consumption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which findings of spinal cord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate record keeping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement to inappropriate destination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate weight records</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentition test/young lamb stamp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation failure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non removal of spinal cord/vertebral column, head and spleen (sheep only)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was one unsatisfactory visit to a slaughterhouse in September due to a failure to adequately remove a sheep spleen and failing to separate SRM from tissues destined for human consumption. Local veterinary staff have since made a follow up visit, which was fully satisfactory.
Knackers/hunt kennels

The SVS audit is designed to safeguard the human and animal food chains. In the case of knackers and hunt kennels, whose products are not eligible for the human food chain, the audit is aimed mainly at the protection of animal health. The main throughput of hunt kennels is made up of casualty animals and dead stock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>12 months total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of visits: 284 277 271 280 294 260 268 277 283 262 248 241
Satisfactory visits: 281 274 265 277 292 256 266 275 281 262 246 241

Incinerators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>12 months total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of visits: 223 211 219 238 246 230 237 232 257 235 209 221
Satisfactory visits: 222 211 219 227 244 229 236 231 256 234 206 221

All visits were satisfactory.

Outstanding follow ups

Follow up visits to two incinerators were fully satisfactory. The approvals of both a knacker and a co-located SRM incinerator have been suspended following a number of unsatisfactory visits reported in the June and August editions of the Bulletin. The visits found multiple ongoing breaches of both the SRM legislation and the Animal By-Products Order 1999.
Rendering plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th></th>
<th>12 months total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfactory</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visits</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory visits</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unsatisfactory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate separation from other animal by-products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate staining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate record keeping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate weight records</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendering plant not operating satisfactorily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation failure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All visits were satisfactory.

Collection centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th></th>
<th>12 months total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfactory</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visits</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory visits</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unsatisfactory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate separation from other animal by-products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate staining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate record keeping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement to inappropriate destination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate weight records</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All visits were satisfactory.

Article 10 premises

Article 10 premises are defined in the Specified Risk Material Order 1997 as suitable to process SRM for use in a manufacturing process which is not producing any food or feedingstuff, cosmetic, pharmaceutical or medical product or anything intended or likely to come into direct contact with any of them.

At present there are 3 premises approved under Article 10. There were no visits made in September.

For further information on the SRM controls in Great Britain, contact Martin Roberts on +44 (0)20 7238 6489 email: martin.roberts@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk
Northern Ireland (DARD Veterinary Service)

Slaughterhouses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>12 months</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visits</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory visits</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unsatisfactory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate separation from other animal by-products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate staining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate separation from materials fit for human consumption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which findings of spinal cord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate record keeping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement to inappropriate destination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate weight records</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Failure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this table shows all audit visits in September were satisfactory, as we report elsewhere in this edition of the Bulletin, DARD inspectors found a 3 inch piece of spinal cord attached to a health-marked carcase at a cutting plant.

Rendering plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>12 months</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Satisfactory</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visits</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory visits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unsatisfactory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate separation from other animal by-products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate storage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate staining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate record keeping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate weight records</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendering plant not operating satisfactorily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation failure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All visits were satisfactory.
The list of GB premises authorised for removal of sheep spinal cord is available on the MAFF website at: www.maff.gov.uk/animalh/bse/index.html

For further information, contact Martin Roberts on +44 (0)20 7238 6489
e-mail: martin.roberts@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

For further information on the SRM controls in Northern Ireland, contact Valerie Allen on +44 (0)28 9052 4663
e-mail: valerie.allen@dardni.gov.uk

There was one unsatisfactory visit in September due to failure to stain bovine SRM immediately on removal from carcasses and its inadequate separation from other animal by-products. Legal action is being considered.

Authorisation of plants for removal of sheep spinal cord

The Specified Risk Material Regulations 1997 (as amended) provide that sheep spinal cord may be removed only in abattoirs or cutting premises specifically authorised for this purpose. The table below gives the number of premises in respect of which an application for authorisation had been received by 16 October 2000 and of these the numbers

- authorised
- refused (because either they were not licensed under the Fresh Meat (Hygiene and Inspection) Regulations 1995 or there were good reasons to doubt the applicant's capacity adequately to carry out the operation)
- void (because the application was withdrawn or the applicant had gone into liquidation)
- for which further information is required before authorisation can be considered
- authorisations which have lapsed because the licence issued under the Fresh Meat (Hygiene and Inspection) Regulations 1995 has been revoked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slaughterhouses</th>
<th>Applications received</th>
<th>Authorised</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Void</th>
<th>Further information required</th>
<th>Authorisations lapsed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stand-alone cutting plants</th>
<th>Applications received</th>
<th>Authorised</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Void</th>
<th>Further information required</th>
<th>Authorisations lapsed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feed sampling programme

Great Britain

It has been illegal to feed ruminants with all forms of mammalian protein in Great Britain since November 1994 and to feed any farmed livestock with mammalian meat and bone meal (mammalian MBM) since 4 April 1996. Mammalian protein may still be fed to non-ruminant animals, such as pigs and poultry, in forms other than mammalian MBM (e.g., as processed catering waste). The ban on feeding mammalian MBM to all farmed livestock was introduced to avoid inadvertent feeding to ruminants.

The legal controls covering farmed livestock are summarised below, together with those that apply in the EU, for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feed type</th>
<th>Under UK legislation:</th>
<th>Under EU controls:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mammalian MBM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammalian protein (other than MBM)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood meal, tallow, fish meal, poultry offal meal, feather meal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Commission Decision 94/381 provides for the ban on mammalian protein to be restricted to the feeding of ruminant protein to ruminants where a system is in place that can distinguish between ruminant and non-ruminant protein.

2 Except milk, gelatin, amino acids, dicalcium phosphate, dried plasma and other blood products

3 Except milk, gelatin, hydrolysed proteins (as defined in Commission Decision 199/129/EC), dicalcium phosphate, dried plasma and other blood products.

Feed Survey

Since February 1996, the State Veterinary Service (SVS) has been conducting a statistically based survey of feed mills to monitor compliance with the feed controls. The test used is an Enzyme Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) designed to detect the presence of ruminant or porcine protein in compound feed. The survey currently includes 2,823 premises, covering feedmills, on-farm mixers and other premises handling livestock feed. The target number of samples per year is 20,000. The survey includes premises milling or mixing feed for any species of farmed livestock. The number of samples to be taken from each premises is determined in proportion to the amount of feed produced or used. 9,000 samples a year are taken from large commercial mills producing all types of farmed livestock feed - the maximum number of samples is 3 per week. 11,000 samples a year are taken from smaller feed premises - the minimum number of samples for very small and intermittent producers is 1 per week. Survey samples continue to be taken from premises under investigation.

Results

The results of the feed survey have been encouraging, indicating widespread compliance with the feed ban, and revealing a very low proportion of positive and inconclusive results from the number of samples tested. Since sampling began in February 1996, 65,877 samples have been tested, of which 99.73% tested negative for mammalian protein. The results of the feed survey during the last 12 months are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month in which sample was collected</th>
<th>No. premises visited</th>
<th>No. samples taken</th>
<th>No. +ve or inconclusive results</th>
<th>No. +ve or inconclusive results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1999</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1999</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1999</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2000</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2000</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2000</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2000</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2000</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2000</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2000</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2000</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2000</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months Total</td>
<td>16,702</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Samples of Feedstuffs which are not part of the Survey
Samples of livestock feedstuffs or ingredients can be submitted to the laboratory for testing for a variety of reasons. These will include:

- samples taken by the SVS where there were grounds for suspicion that an infringement had taken place,
- samples submitted by enforcement authorities; and,
- private submissions by feed mills etc.

Whenever a sample which is not part of the survey gives a positive or inconclusive result, the SVS carry out an investigation in the same way as they would for a survey sample.

Investigation of Positive or Inconclusive results from the Feed Survey
A positive result does not necessarily show a breach of the ban. The legal incorporation of, for example, blood products or other protein (i.e. not in the form of MBM) in non-ruminant rations may give a positive ELISA test result. A full on-site investigation is carried out by a Veterinary Officer of the SVS in the case of all samples which do not give a negative result, in order to identify the cause of the positive or inconclusive result. During such visits an assessment is made to determine if there is any evidence of either:

- accidental or deliberate addition of mammalian proteins to ruminant feeds
- accidental or deliberate addition of mammalian meat and bone meal to any livestock feed.

Premises are subject to additional sampling until the matter has been satisfactorily resolved. This additional, investigational, sampling is not reported in the above Feed Survey Summary table, but routine survey samples continue to be taken from plants under investigation but in which production continues, and these samples are included in the Feed Survey Summary table.

At the end of September 2000, two investigations into positive or inconclusive results are currently in progress to determine if there has been a breach of the ban.

Completed Investigations
There were no investigations completed in September 2000. In all, since sampling began in February 1996, 75 investigations into positive or inconclusive results have been completed. Four breaches of UK regulations have been detected, which are briefly summarised below. These all related to the presence of mammalian meat and bone meal in non-ruminant rations, and are not, therefore, a breach of EU legislation.

- April 1996 - a breach was detected which related to mammalian MBM in non-ruminant rations.
- February 1998 - this breach also related to the presence of mammalian MBM in non-ruminant rations. The company had been successfully prosecuted for an earlier offence, but this breach was primarily associated with a renderer which was subsequently declared bankrupt.
- January 1999 - this breach was associated with the investigation completed in February 1998, and involved contaminated meal from the same source. Subsequent samples were negative, and the company at which the breach was detected is no longer producing feed.
- January 2000 - porcine protein was detected in poultry meal being fed to pigs. Waste from a poultry meat factory was found to occasionally include waste pork products in the preparation of the poultry meal. Again, as this involved non-ruminant feed only, this was a breach of UK domestic legislation, and not of EU legislation.

The Feed Survey Summary Table presented here covers the last 12 months of sampling. The survey summary covering 1996 - 1999 was last published in Bulletin #42

Further details of the feed sampling programme can be found on the MAFF website at: [www.maff.gov.uk/animalh/bse/bse-statistics/level-4-feedsamp.html](http://www.maff.gov.uk/animalh/bse/bse-statistics/level-4-feedsamp.html)

Alternatively, contact Roy Smith in MAFF on +44 (0)20 7904 6284
email: r.d.smith@ahdc.maff.gsi.gov.uk
Northern Ireland

Feeding ruminant protein to ruminants was prohibited in Northern Ireland in January 1989 and extended to all mammalian protein in March 1995. In March 1996 inclusion of mammalian meat-and-bone meal (MBM) in any farm livestock feed was banned as in the rest of the U.K.

Enforcement of the ban is under the control of the Veterinary Service with routine inspection and collection of samples from feed mills being carried out by the Quality Assurance Division of the Department of Agriculture. Samples are collected in proportion to the output of ruminant feed in each mill with two samples collected each week from the largest mills. All samples are sent to Luddington VI Centre for testing for the presence of ruminant and porcine proteins using the ELISA method.

Laboratory results are as follows (based on date of laboratory report).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Number and result of samples tested</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 month total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1999 - September 2000</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total from July 1996 - September 2000</td>
<td>9,153</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On-farm controls

The Department has implemented a scheme to check the source of feed used on all ruminant holdings in Northern Ireland. This is divided into three areas of diminishing priority as follows:

1. Known home mixers particularly those who in the past used MBM. These are visited on a quarterly basis and samples of feed or ingredients collected for ELISA testing. 280 home mixers are recorded at present.
2. Herds with any association with a BSE case.
3. All other herds.

During September 2000, 182 farms had their feed sources checked. 15 were home mixers and 26 samples were taken, 3 of which was from material imported from the Republic of Ireland.

For further information on the feed controls in Northern Ireland, contact Valerie Allen on +44 (0)1232 524 663 email: valerie.allen@dardni.gov.uk

The Bovines and Bovine Products (Trade) Regulations 1999

These Regulations (as amended) implement the beef export controls laid down by Council Decision 98/256/EC as amended. Amongst other things, they permit the export of de-boned fresh meat derived from bovines slaughtered in the UK which meet the requirements of the Date-based Export Scheme (DBES). All stages of preparation (including processing, storage, distribution etc.) from slaughter through to final export must take place in officially approved “XAPD” establishments. Approval is currently limited to slaughterhouses and cutting plants only.

The Regulations also permit, under the XAP scheme, the export of fresh meat, minced meat, meat preparations, meat products, petfood and ‘other products of animal origin’ derived from bovines slaughtered outside the UK, as well as petfood containing foreign origin mammalian meat and bone products.
meal. Again, all stages of preparation, from import into the UK to final re-export, must take place in officially approved establishments.

These Regulations also set out the rules applying to UK producers of gelatin, collagen, tallow derivatives, amino acids and peptides for food, feed, cosmetic, medical and pharmaceutical uses from non-U.K. cattle. Producers must be approved and are subject to regular inspections. In addition, approval is also required for any other company which wishes to export such products.

**Approved to produce and/or export gelatin or amino acids/peptides (from imported raw materials)**

- Gelatine Products Ltd.*
  - Sutton Weaver
  - Runcorn
  - Cheshire
  - WA7 3EH

- PB Gelatins UK Ltd.
  - Treforest Industrial Estate
  - Treforest
  - Mid Glamorgan
  - CF37 5SU

- Healan Ingredients Ltd.*
  - 19 Londesborough Road
  - Market Weighton
  - York
  - YO4 3HW

- Oxoid Ltd.
  - Kingsland Business Park
  - Wade Road, Basingstoke
  - Hampshire
  - RG24 8PW

* These companies do not manufacture gelatin from raw materials, but import gelatin and blend it in the UK for export.

There have been 7 inspections by the SVS since last month, making the total 816 since January 1997. The inspections continue to show that the approved plants are operating in accordance with the controls laid down in the Regulations and, in particular, are using only imported raw materials for the manufacture of gelatin/collagen/amino acids and peptides for food, feed, cosmetic, medical and pharmaceutical uses.

**Approved to produce and/or export collagen (from imported raw materials)**

- Devro Teepak Ltd
  - 5 Belgrave Street
  - Bellshill Industrial Estate
  - Bellshill
  - ML4 3LD

- Johnson and Johnson Ltd
  - 5 Belgrave Street
  - Bellshill Industrial Estate Bellshill
  - ML4 3LD

There have been 3 inspections since last month, making the total 362 since May 1998. All have been satisfactory.

**Registered to produce tallow (from UK slaughtered bovine raw materials)**

- De Mulder and Sons Ltd
  - Mancetter Road
  - Hartshill
  - Nuneaton
  - CV10 0TA

- McIntosh Donald
  - The Meat Factory
  - Portlethen
  - Aberdeen
  - AB12 4QB

There have been 10 inspections since last month, making the total 488 since September 1997. Since the last edition of the Bulletin, the results show that all plants continue to meet the requirements of their registration.

Full lists of XAP and XAPD approved premises - which are inspected and audited on a regular basis - are available in the "product exports" section of the MAFF website at: [www.maff.gov.uk/animalh/int-trde/default.htm](http://www.maff.gov.uk/animalh/int-trde/default.htm)

For further information on the DBES scheme, contact Helen Guedalla on +44 (0)20 7904 3316 email: h.k.guedalla@ahvg.maff.gsi.gov.uk

For further information on the XAP scheme, contact Richard Mabbitt on +44 (0)20 7904 6391 email: r.t.mabbitt@ahvg.maff.gsi.gov.uk

For further information, contact Daniel Gauntlett on +44 (0)20 7904 6391 email: d.m.gauntlett@ahvg.maff.gsi.gov.uk
SRM Order: controls on imports

The Specified Risk Material Order prohibits the import of SRM unless it is sent direct to approved premises. Premises may be approved to process SRM for use in a manufacturing process which is not producing food, feed, cosmetic, pharmaceutical or medical products, or anything likely to come into direct contact with any of them. Further information on premises approved under these provisions which are set out in Article 10 of the Order can be found in the SRM section of Enforcement Results.

Imports from third countries

The Order requires imports into Great Britain of certain animal products (including beef, sheepmeat, goatmeat and petfood) which are destined for food or animal feed use to be accompanied by a supplementary official veterinary certificate confirming that the product does not contain, and is not derived from, SRM.

Every consignment of animal products, not just those requiring SRM certificates, arriving at one of the 43 Border Inspection Posts (BIPs) in the UK is subject to veterinary checks. BIP staff - normally officers of the Port Health Authority - have been instructed to check that all consignments which require SRM certification have it.

For the period 1 January 1998 - 30 September 2000 returns from the BIPs listed below record the following checks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIP</th>
<th>No. consignments checked for compliance with the SRM order</th>
<th>No. consignments rejected for reasons of non-compliance with the SRM order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belfast Port</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Airport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felixstowe</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>10 (no SRM certificate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatwick Airport</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>5 (no SRM certificate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimsby-Immingham</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Airport</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1 (incorrect certification) 16 (no SRM certificate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Airport</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 (no SRM certificate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>2 (no SRM certificate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesport</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilbury</td>
<td>28,454</td>
<td>4 (no SRM certificate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No imports of animal products which require SRM certification have been recorded at other border inspection posts.

Imports from, or via, other EU Member States

Commission Decision 2000/418/EC came into force, in regard to intra-Community trade, from 1 October 2000. This Decision implements Community-wide measures in regard to SRM. From 1 October the UK no longer required importers to notify us of consignments from other Member States, nor do such consignments need to be accompanied by an SRM declaration.

UK national rules in regard to SRM will continue to apply for third country imports until 31 March 2001 when the provisions of Decision 2000/418/EC applicable to third countries will come into effect.

For further information, contact Nigel Widden on +44 (0)20 7904 6406 email: n.e.widden@ahbse.maff.gsi.gov.uk
Legal action

Actions completed

MAFF
Exports
Exports from the UK of beef and beef products are subject to stringent conditions. Compliance is monitored by regular checks at ports, and is backed up by special enforcement powers provided by the Bovines and Bovine Products (Trade) Regulations 1999.

Where any consignment is found to be in breach of export conditions it may be detained or seized by MAFF Inspectors, who then apply to a Magistrates Court to order whether the goods should be destroyed or disposed of within the UK. There was 1 hearing in September 2000 and the Magistrates granted MAFF’s application.

Investigations into a number of cases of alleged illegal exports are continuing.

Gale

At Carmarthen Magistrates’ Court on 25 September 2000, Mr Carmelo Gale of Peralltfachnog, Bangor Teifi, was found guilty of two offences under the Animal By-Products Order 1999 and three offences under the Specified Risk Material Regulations 1997. Mr Gale had allowed sheep access to the carcase of a young calf, failed to dispose of decomposing blood and carcases, and was not storing sheep heads in accordance with the requirements of the legislation. Mr Gale was fined a total of £3,000 and ordered to pay £1,250 costs. He has given notice of appeal.

IBEA - Director of Public Prosecutions, Northern Ireland

McGuigan

At Cookstown Magistrates’ Court on 11 September, Mr Ronald McGuigan of Dungannon, Northern Ireland, pleaded guilty to seven charges of presenting substitute animals into the OTMS. Mr McGuigan was fined £7,000. His appeal against sentence was heard on 24 October.

Local Authority

Croxford-Adams – Northumberland County Council

At Tynedale Magistrates’ Court on 26 September 2000, Mr Stephen Croxford-Adams, a farmer from Whitley, Northumberland, pleaded guilty 36 offences under the Cattle Identification Regulations 1998, five offences under the Animal By-Products Order 1996, one offence under the Sheep and Goats (Record, Identification and Movement) Order 1996 and one offence under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) Regulations 1997. The various offences related to failing keep records of cattle births, deaths and movements, failure to apply ear tags, failure to apply for cattle passports, failure to dispose of cattle and sheep carcasses, allowing ruminant animals to have access to unrendered animal by-products, failure to record movement of sheep and failure to keep a veterinary medicine administration record. He was fined £4,650 in total and ordered to pay £943.70 costs.

Bulman – Northumberland County Council

At Tynedale Magistrates’ Court on 26 September 2000, Mr Dennis Bulman, a farmer from Simonburn, Hexham pleaded guilty 5 offences under the Animal By-Products Order 1999 and 2 offences under the Cattle Identification Regulations 1998. The offences related to Mr Bulman’s failure to dispose of cattle and sheep carcases, allowing ruminant animals access to unrendered animal by-products and his failure to record the birth and death of a bovine animal. He was fined a total of £400 and ordered to pay £400 costs.

Greenwood – Kirklees Metropolitan Council

At Bradford Crown Court on 12 September 2000, Mr Alan Greenwood, a farmer from Flockton, Huddersfield was sentenced to three years probation for seven offences under the Cattle Identification Regulations 1998, one offence under the Animal By-Products Order 1992 and one under the Agriculture (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1968. At a hearing on 28 October last year, Mr Greenwood had pleaded guilty to obstructing an animal health inspector, failing to apply cattle ear tags, apply for cattle passports, and failing to dispose of animal by-products.
Investigations

By the Food Standards Agency, MAFF and Intervention Board are continuing into a number of alleged offences under the SRM Regulations 1997, the Cattle Identification Regulations and the Over 30 Months Slaughter Scheme. A number of further investigations have been completed (mainly regarding alleged SRM offences) and the reports are under consideration for possible prosecution. Several investigations are being carried out by Local Authorities. Staff from the Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department continue to liaise closely with the local enforcement and prosecution authorities in investigations involving irregularities, and the possible misuse of animal documentation. The Department provides technical assistance to facilitate the prosecuting authorities’ investigations.

Further details will be published as each case reaches the judicial stages.

Frankland – North Yorkshire County Council
At Skipton Magistrates’ Court on 20 September 2000, Mr David Frankland, a farmer from Settle, North Yorkshire, pleaded guilty to one offence under the Animal By-Products Order 1999 and one offence under the Cattle Identification Regulations 1998. On 8 June this year, Mr Frankland failed to dispose of a bovine carcass without undue delay and failed to send its passport to the British Cattle Movement Service within 7 days of its death. He was fined £75 and ordered to pay £201 costs.

Paul – North Yorkshire County Council
At Skipton Magistrates’ Court on 20 September 2000, Mr Richard Paul, a farmer from Skipton, North Yorkshire pleaded guilty to 7 offences under the Dogs Act 1906. In May this year, Mr Paul had left several sheep carcasses unburied in a place where dogs could gain access. He was fined a total of £350 and ordered to pay £188 costs.

Bell – North Yorkshire County Council
At Northallerton Magistrates’ Court on 6 October 2000, Mr Christopher Bell, a farmer from Overton, North Yorkshire pleaded guilty to five offences under the Animal By-Products Order 1999 for failing to correctly dispose of sheep carcasses and two offences under the Protection of Animals Act 1911. He was fined a total of £1,500 and ordered to pay £575 costs.

Readman – North Yorkshire County Council
At Whitby Magistrates’ Court on 12 October 2000, Vera Readman, from Whitby, North Yorkshire, pleaded guilty to two offences under the Dogs Act 1906 and three offences under the Animal By-Products Order 1999. In May this year, Ms Readman had failed to correctly dispose of a number of sheep carcasses. She was fined a total of £500 and ordered to pay £328.18 costs.

RSPCA

Gathercole

At Thetford Magistrates’ Court on 9 October 2000, Mr Mark Gathercole, a farmer at Stow Bedon in Norfolk was sentenced to 12 weeks in prison and banned from keeping sheep and goats for life. At an earlier hearing, Mr Gathercole had pleaded guilty to 20 charges of cruelty, running an illegal slaughterhouse and failing to dispose of animal by-products. Acting on a tip off, RSPCA inspectors and Norfolk police raided the farm in April and found Mr Gathercole slaughtering sheep. Mr Gathercole has lodged an appeal against sentence.

Non prosecutions

North Yorkshire County Council
Two men from Cleveland were formally cautioned earlier this month under The Welfare of Animals (Transport) Order 1997 and the Animal Health Act 1981 for failing to ensure in July this year, that a consignment of 16 cattle was accompanied by the correct documentation.
Glossary

BSE
Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy

DARD
Northern Ireland’s Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

ELISA test
Enzyme-Linked ImmunoSorbent Assay, a specially developed test used to detect mammalian protein in animal feed

FSA
Food Standards Agency

MAFF
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food

Mammalian Meat and Bone Meal (mammalian MBM)
Mammalian protein obtained by rendering, or an equivalent process in the case of imported products, whole or part of a dead mammal

MHS
Meat Hygiene Service. Agency of the FSA responsible for enforcement of hygiene, welfare at slaughter and SRM controls at premises licensed under the Fresh Meat (Hygiene and Inspection) Regulations 1995 (as amended). Also carries out meat inspection and health marking, and provides export certification where required by importing country or Community rules. Full details given in an article in Bulletin #1

NAWAD
National Assembly for Wales - Agriculture Department

SERAD
Scottish Executive - Rural Affairs Department

SRM
Specified Risk Material. Broadly speaking for cattle, the head (including brain but excluding tongue), spinal cord, tonsils and spleen from cattle over 6 months old and the thymus and intestines from cattle of any age. For sheep and goats the head (including brains but excluding tongue), and spleen of any sheep and goats, and the tonsils and spinal cord of sheep and goats over 12 months of age or with first permanent incisor erupted

Spongiform encephalopathy
A progressive degenerative disease which causes microscopic holes in the brains of affected animals. The animals become uncoordinated, nervous and eventually die. BSE is a spongiform encephalopathy

Further Information

If you would like to receive regular monthly copies of the BSE Enforcement Bulletin, or know of anyone who would like to do so, if you require back issues, or if you have any general comments, queries or suggestions on the Bulletin, please contact Jill Wilson on + 44 (0)20 7238 6498 or 6410. Alternatively, write to the following address:-

Mrs J Wilson
BSEEB Editor
Room 517
Ergon House
PO Box 31037
LONDON
SW1P 3WG
Fax: +44 (0)20 7238 6487
e-mail: jill.wilson@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

The contents of this Bulletin, together with back issues and related material, can be found on MAFF’s website: http://www.maff.gov.uk/maffhome.htm

The Food Standards Helpline can assist with general enquiries on BSE Tel: 0845 757 012 (UK local rate) or +44(0)20 7972 2400 (for non UK callers)
e-mail: helpline@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

Recipients should note that copyright restrictions are waived and this Bulletin can be freely reproduced in whole or in part. Acknowledgement of source would be appreciated.