1. **Exchange of views of the Committee on the evolution of animal diseases in the Community including:**

**Classical swine fever**

**Luxembourg**

Luxembourg distributed and presented a report, with epidemiological information, on the 3 outbreaks reported earlier, the cause of which could probably be attributed to indirect contacts with wild boar. Due to a positive disease evolution, there has been a partial release of movement restrictions. The Committee agreed not to extend the protective measures in force expiring on 15.03.2002. The Luxembourg delegate declared that the measures would not be lifted before 01.04.2002.

At the French border, two new CSF outbreaks in wild boar have been detected. As a consequence, the surveillance zone has been extended. The Commission asked Luxembourg to consider extending the surveillance zone to the South of the A1 motorway.

**Germany**

The German delegation distributed and presented a report on the disease situation. No further outbreaks have been detected since the last report.

A wild boar vaccination campaign has already been carried out in Northrhine-Westphalia and another has started in Rhineland-Palatinate. 250.000 bates have already been scattered, others will be in the next few days. Further vaccination waves are due to follow. Vaccination has not yet started in Saarland.

Germany requested an amendment to the buffer zone listed in the Annex to 2001/161/EC, with an extension of the protective measures, and a derogation for the marking and use of pigmeat in Rhineland-Palatinate.

The Commission invited the German delegation to present the results of its vaccination campaigns at the next meeting.

**Spain**

The Spanish delegation distributed and presented an update report. Two further outbreaks have been detected in the province of Barcelona, a high-density area. The total slaughter amounts to 148 holdings (126.399 animals), including preventive
slaughter of 136 holdings (105,404 animals). A prohibition of movement of animals outside the provinces of Gerona and Barcelona is currently into force. Spain also gave information on its serological testing.

**France**
The French delegation stated that there were no clinical findings leading to suspect farms in surveillance zones situated in France. Surveillance in wild boar is carried out and on farms, appropriate measures are taken.

**Swine vesicular disease**

**Italy**
The Italian delegation distributed and presented a report on its surveillance and eradication plan for SVD, focusing on the 2001 outbreaks in Campania and Puglia.

The total number of outbreaks for 2002 amount to 21, most of them situated in Campania, Basilicata and Calabria.

**Foot-and-mouth disease**

**United Kingdom**
The British delegation distributed and presented an update report (n° 24), providing information on the restocking procedures. It appeared from the data provided that out of the 1257 premises that have completed restocking with sheep and goats, only 3 showed singleton seropositive sheep. There were no clinical signs suggestive of FMD and further tests were all negative. The full report is attached to the present document.

On 26 February 2002, an official veterinary inspector reported mouth lesions and slightly elevated temperatures in 2/372 sentinel sheep on a farm undergoing restocking in North Yorkshire. The two affected sheep were killed. Virological and serological tests were carried out on the two affected animals and on sheep in all the management groups on the holding. The results were FMD negative. Detailed information is also available in the report attached.

**Infectious haematopoietic necrosis**

**France**
Two IHN outbreaks have been notified between the month of July 2001 and the beginning of 2002 (outbreak 2001/8 in the département Somme and outbreak 2002/1 in the département Seine-Maritime).


The French delegation gave an overview of the results of the 1992-2001 epidemiological surveillance of CSF in feral pigs in the “Vosges du nord”. These results led to consider the Vosges outbreak as extinct. France subsequently requested that the measures in place be lifted (Commission Decision 94/141/EC). The former outbreak zone could then be integrated in the national CSF
epidemiological surveillance programme on hunted feral pigs, that was also presented by France.

The Commission announced that a proposal to repeal Decision 94/141/EC would be presented at the next Committee meeting.


The Commission distributed and presented working document SANCO/714/2002. The Task Force and its subgroups agreed on a number of conclusions and recommendations. They include general points concerning all programmes and points related to specific diseases.

4. **INFORMATION TO THE MEMBER STATES ON THE REPORTS RECEIVED FOR THE 2001 ERADICATION PROGRAMME**

The Commission distributed and presented a table listing the intermediary reports received from Member States as regards eradication programmes 2001. Some reports were still missing. The Commission urged the Member States concerned to send them.

5. **THE COMMISSION DISTRIBUTED THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS FOR INFORMATION**

   – Fish disease Contingency plans for the United Kingdom (SANCO/593/2002)

   – Application from Germany for achieving approved status of the farm Pöpke with regard to viral haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN) (SANCO 630/2002)

   – Application from France for achieving approved status of the zone “Bassin Versant de la Gouaneyre“ with regard to viral haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN) (SANCO 639/2002)

   – Application from France for achieving approved status of the zone “Bassin Versant Amont du Vignac“ with regard to viral haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN) (SANCO 640/2002 LB)

   – Application from France for achieving approved status of the farm “Rénon à Parné sue Roc “ with regard to viral haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN) (SANCO 631/2002 LB)

   – Application from Italy for achieving approved status of the farm “Ittica Acqua Sagra“ with regard to viral haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN) (SANCO 632/2002 LB)

   – Application from Italy for achieving approved status of the farm “Cappello Paolo“ with regard to viral haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN) (SANCO 633/2002 LB)
6. **Exchange of Views and Possible Opinion of the Committee on a Draft Commission Decision on the Evolution of Animal Diseases in the Community and in Third Countries.**

The Commission introduced the following proposal:

*Draft Commission Decision amending for the ninth time Decision 2001/327/EC concerning restrictions to the movements of animals of susceptible species with regard to foot-and-mouth disease (Doc. SANCO/727/2002)*

This proposal aimed at prolonging the remaining restrictive measures laid down in Decision 2001/327/EC until 31 December 2002.

Before that date, the Commission would submit a proposal on staging points to the Council.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour**


The following proposal were introduced:


The purpose of the proposal was to prolong the existing measures in the concerned area of Spain until 30.04.2002 and to reduce the restricted area in the province of Gerona to three *comarcas*, the whole of the Barcelona Province remaining restricted.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**


The purpose of the proposal is twofold:

- update the conditions for the granting of authorisation for the removal of pigs from holdings located in the protection and surveillance zone established in Spain in relation to CSF;
– introduce conditions on the marking and use of pigmeat coming from pigs from holdings located in the protection and surveillance zone established in Spain in relation to CSF.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**


The purpose of the proposal was to grant a derogation to Germany concerning marking and use of pigmeat coming from pigs kept on holdings in the surveillance zones established in Rhineland-Palatinate.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**


The Commission’s representative referred to a presentation made by the German delegation at a previous SVC and from which it was concluded that Bavaria could be considered free from Aujeszky’s disease.

The additional guarantees in intra-Community trade of pigs relating to Aujeszky’s disease, and the lists of territories in the Member States which are free from this disease and where approved disease control programmes are in place were proposed to be amended accordingly.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**


The vote was postponed pending further information on import conditions from the Turkish authorities.

The Commission explained that certain problems have arisen concerning import conditions for birds, and in particular as regards conditions for quarantine. The Commission therefore proposed:

1. to lay down a model for the written attestation of quarantine which has to be submitted by the importers to the border inspection post officials, and
2. to establish a model for the list of quarantine facilities to be transmitted to the Member States and the Commission.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**


The purpose of the draft Decision was to extend to 15 days the validity period of the animal health certificate for specified pathogen free eggs.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**


With a view to facilitate implementation of Directive 92/65/EEC in relation to movement of animals between approved bodies, centres and institutes, the Commission explained that there appears to be a need to make some technical adaptations to clarify the conditions governing their approval and to include certain quarantine provisions. The proposal also intends to introduce a specific certificate for trade in these animals and to clarify the list of notifiable diseases. The Commission therefore proposed to amend Annexes A, C and E of the above Directive accordingly. The final date for implementation of the new requirements was set at 01.03.2003.

The vote was postponed.

As a general point, the Commission requested the Member States to consult their national legal services on the appropriateness to adopt Regulations instead of Decisions.
13. **Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Decision approving programmes with the view to obtaining the status of approved zones and of farms in non-approved zones with regard to viral haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN) (doc. SANCO/159/2002 – Rev.1)**

The proposal intended to list, in a single Decision, all the zones and farms in the Community in which an approved programme is applied with the view to obtaining approved status as regards VHS and/or IHN.

The Commission also distributed, for information, working document SANCO/686/2002.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**

14. **Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Decision establishing the list of approved zones with regard to one or more of the diseases Bonamia ostreae and Marteilia refringens (doc. SANCO/160/2002 – Rev.1)**

The draft Decision intends, for the sake of clarity and simplification, to list in a single Decision all zones approved within the Community with regard to bonamiosis and marteiliosis and to repeal Decisions approving programmes earlier applied to the zones that subsequently have achieved approved status.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**

The Commission also distributed working document SANCO/634/2002.

15. **Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Decision establishing the list of approved zones and approved fish farms in the European Community with regard to one or more of the diseases viral haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN) (doc. SANCO/32/2002-Rev.2)**

The draft Decision intends, for the sake of clarity and simplification, to draw up a single list of approved zones and a single list of approved farms in non-approved zones with regard to VHS and IHN and to repeal Decisions approving programmes earlier applied to farms that subsequently have achieved approved status.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**


The proposal aims to grant financial aid for the eligible expenses supported by Germany in the framework of the eradication of classical swine fever in 1999.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**

17. **Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Decision amending Decision 92/452/EEC as regards the lists of embryo collection teams and embryo production teams approved in third countries for export of bovine embryos to the Community (Doc. SANCO/456/2002-REV.3)**

The purpose of the draft Decision was to add a Canadian embryo collection team officially approved for export of bovine embryos to the EU to the list.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**


The purpose of the draft Decision was to add one Canadian and four equine semen collection centres in the USA to the above list. Furthermore, the approval has been withdrawn from three centres in the USA. They were therefore deleted from the list.

**Vote: unanimous vote in favour.**


Postponed.


The Commission distributed and presented the above proposal for study and observation. The aim of the draft Decision was to update the list of units in the ANIMO computer network.

The Member States were requested to verify the correctness of the list and to send comments.

The point was withdrawn from the agenda, as Italy stopped vaccination on 1 March 2002.


The Commission distributed and presented the above proposal for study and observation. The activities of the Community Reference Laboratory for avian influenza will be expanded with a special monitoring for avian influenza in poultry and wild birds to be carried out in 2002. The Commission therefore proposed to increase the Community’s financial assistance.

23. **Exchange of views on a draft Commission Decision on the implementation of surveys for avian influenza in poultry and wild birds in the Member States (Doc. SANCO/529/2002)**

The Commission distributed and presented the above proposal for study and observation. The purpose of the proposal was to provide a legal framework to the Member States to submit for approval to the Commission plans for the implementation of surveys for avian influenza in poultry and wild birds in accordance with the guidelines drawn up by the Community Reference Laboratory.

The Commission also distributed a document titled “Information on surveillance programmes in poultry and birds for avian influenza to be carried out in Member States” (Doc. SANCO/765/2002)

24. **Miscellaneous**

   (1) Spain tabled an application to include the brucellosis RB51 vaccine.

   (2) Germany sought clarification in relation to import conditions for alpacas and lamas. The Commission informed the Member States that an ad hoc working group might be organised.

   (3) The Commission provided information in relation to the foot-and-mouth disease situation in South American countries:

       - distribution for discussion of Doc. SANCO/777/2002 “Submission by Argentina to the OIE requesting designation of Patagonia as free of FMD without vaccination”

       - information on the outcome of an FVO mission carried out in Paraguay.

   (4) The Commission distributed and presented the following proposal for study and observation: “Draft Commission Decision concerning certain additional
measures relating to cleansing and disinfection of vehicles transporting pigs into certain areas of the Community” (Doc. SANCO/608/2002)

(5) The Commission also distributed the following document for information: “Information on the identification of birds” (Doc. SANCO/764/2002)

N.B. The proposals on which the Committee expressed an opinion are subject to a defined procedure in relation to the formal adoption by the Commission.

Mission reports are available on the Internet at the following address:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/index_en.html
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1. RESTOCKING PROCEDURES

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Premises on which outbreaks of FMD occurred (FMD infected premises [IP]) or which were depopulated because of links with an IP, remain under official control until they have completed final C&D. Preliminary C&D generally occurs within a few days of the farm being depopulated but final disinfection can be a much more protracted event and take several months.

1.1.2 If farmers decide to restock, the earliest this can commence is 3 weeks after final C&D and then only under official control, using sentinel animals and in accordance with a restocking plan agreed with the local Divisional Veterinary Manager (DVM) of the Competent Veterinary Authority. The premises remain under official control for a further 4 weeks and official controls are lifted at the end of this period only if there is no evidence of FMD in the sentinel animals.

1.1.3 Alternatively, farmers can choose not to restock until 4 months have elapsed after final C&D. Official controls on the premises are lifted at the end of the 4 month period and farmers are free to restock at anytime after that date without the stock being tested for evidence of FMD.

1.1.4 If a farmer decides not to complete final C&D, usually because he does not intend to restock or because the buildings are so fragile that C&D would prove too costly or result in the buildings being destroyed, the premises remains under official control for 12 months after preliminary C&D and no livestock may move onto or off the premises for that length of time.

1.2 Restocking with sentinels

1.2.1 Farmers are allowed to restock with sentinel animals at any time after a period of three weeks has elapsed since final C&D was completed. Farms that restock with sentinel sheep, goats or cattle are subject to four official clinical inspections at weekly intervals after the sentinel animals enter the premises. In the case of pigs, these are inspected twice weekly for the first two weeks and once a week for the remaining two weeks. If sheep are involved, blood sampling is also carried out at the fourth official inspection. Following the receipt of negative serological results a final clinical inspection is carried out prior to restrictions being lifted.

1.2.2 The shortest time scale for the removal of restrictions following completion of final C&D under this regime is therefore eight weeks (3 weeks rest period after final C&D, one week restocking, weekly...
inspections for four weeks) and provided no sheep are involved. If the premises is restocked with sheep, these would need to be blood tested at the end of the four week restocking period and the results of that testing could take a further 4-7 days.

1.3 Restocking without sentinels

1.3.1 Following satisfactory completion of final C&D the owner can chose not to restock with sentinels. In these cases, a period of four months must elapse before official controls on the premises are lifted and livestock can be moved onto the premises.

1.4 Time for restocking and lifting official controls

1.4.1 In summary, using sentinel animals the shortest time scale for the removal of official controls following completion of final C&D is 8 weeks. The longest time scale is six months which would occur if the owner chose to restock just before the end of the 4 month period. If final C&D did not take place, the premises would remain under official control for 12 months during which time no livestock could move onto or off the premises.

1.5 Livestock used for restocking

1.5.1 Before the country was declared FMD free, sheep and goats used to restock premises and that originated from holdings which either (a) were or had been in a previous infected areas or (b) were in at risk areas, were required to be individually serologically tested with negative results before movement to the premises to be restocked. In addition, all management groups of sheep and goats on the premises of origin were required to be serologically tested at 95%:5% with negative results. Such sampling was not required in the management group or groups from which the restocking animals were drawn if the drawn animals were sufficient to represent a 95%:5% statistical sample of the management group they were in.

1.5.2 This prior serological testing of source sheep and goats was not required if they came from other areas or after the country had been declared free of FMD

1.6 Serological testing of sentinel sheep and goats on restocked premises

1.6.1 Sheep and goats on restocked premises are required be tested at 95%:5% of management groups, 28 days after the last group of sentinel animals has been moved on to the premises.
2 SEROLOGICAL METHODS AND INTERPRETATION OF SEROLOGICAL RESULTS

2.1 Serological tests used

2.1.1 The serological tests used have been the competitive solid phase ELISA (cspELISA) developed by the World Reference Laboratory, IAH Pirbright and the virus neutralisation test (VNT) as prescribed in the by OIE Manual of Standards for Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines 2000. The OIE Standards Commission, having examined data submitted by the UK, has since agreed that the cspELISA should be adopted as a prescribed test for FMD.

2.1.2 Serological sampling has normally been carried out only on sheep and goats and, unless requested for epidemiological or other specific reasons, at a level aimed at detecting a 5% prevalence of seropositive animals with 95% confidence in each management group on a holding.

2.1.3 Flow charts showing the decision trees for the interpretation of serological test results and the action taken in respect of seropositive flocks were provided in the Report No 17 to the SVC dated 15 September 2001 and in the UK’s Report to the OIE dated 22 January 2002.

2.2 Definition of a seropositive animal and procedures to identify them

2.2.1 The cspELISA has been used as a screening test. A positive cspELISA is one giving 70% or more inhibition: an inconclusive result is one giving 60 - 69% inhibition: a negative result is one giving <60% inhibition.

2.2.2 Where a batch of samples from a management group are tested and 5 or less samples are positive to cspELISA, IAH Pirbright automatically carries out a VNT on those samples. If a sample gives a VNT positive result, the sample is considered positive.

2.2.3 Where 6 or more samples from a management group are cspELISA positive, the cspELISA test is repeated on those samples. If the 6 or more samples remain cspELISA positive, then the samples are considered serologically positive. If the repeat cspELISA samples are negative or inconclusive, then they are subject to the VNT test. If the VNT test is positive, then the samples are considered serologically positive: if negative, then they are considered serologically negative.

2.2.4 Where 5 or less animals in a group are seropositive then all the animals in that management group are individually identified and then resampled. The resampling is undertaken 7 days after the first samples are taken. The same testing procedure above is followed. This process allows an assessment to be made of whether or not there
is a developing disease situation and for the identification of any singleton seropositive animal.

2.3 Singleton seropositive animals

2.3.1 A singleton seropositive animal defines the situation where only a single seropositive result is found in a management group on a holding. Such animals will have been sampled on two occasions at least 7 days apart. On the second occasion, the animal will have been individually identified. By the procedures set out above, it will have been subjected to a VNT test.

2.3.2 Depending on the epidemiological circumstances in which the animal is found, it could be considered either a false positive or a true positive. In either case, the animal is slaughtered and at slaughter it is subject to a probang test for virus isolation at IAH Pirbright. If virus is isolated, disease is confirmed on the premises.

2.3.3 If virus is not isolated, the presence of disease is not confirmed but an epidemiological enquiry is carried out. In the absence of any active disease and no known epidemiological link it is considered to be a false positive.

2.4 Procedures where more than one serologically positive animal is found on a holding

2.4.1 Where more than one serological positive animal is found in a management group on a holding, then the holding is considered to have been exposed to infection. Depending on the epidemiological circumstances in which the seropositive animals is found, either:

- the whole management group is killed, or
- all sheep and goats in all management groups on the holding are killed, leaving other susceptible livestock standing, or
- all FMD susceptible livestock on the holding are killed
- FMD is confirmed on the holding and all susceptible livestock on the holding are killed.

2.4.2 At slaughter, all serologically positive animals are probanged and tested for FMD virus. If virus is found, then disease will be confirmed on the premises. If virus is not found, no further action is taken.
3 RESULTS OF SEROLOGICAL TESTING ON RESTOCKED PREMISES TO 5 MARCH 2002

3.1 Table 1 shows the results of all the serological testing carried out to 5 March 2002 as a consequence of the FMD epidemic in 2001, including the results of serological testing carried out on holdings being restocked with sheep.

3.2 Table 2 shows the number of seropositive flocks and the number of flocks with singleton seropositive animals identified by County, in the course of serosurveillance during the course of the 2001 FMD epidemic.

3.3 Table 3 shows the total number of farms that have undergone restocking with sheep by County and the number with singleton sero-positive animals identified during the course of serological testing at the end of the 4 week restocking period.

3.4 Table 6 gives details of the serological testing carried out on restocked farms where singleton sero-positive animals were identified during the course of serological testing at the end of the 4 week restocking period.

3.5 From Tables 1, 2 and 3 it will be seen that 1,257 premises have completed restocking with sheep and goats. Of these 1,257, on only 3 premises were singleton seropositive sheep found when the sheep were serologically tested at the end of the 4 week restocking period. On none of these premises were clinical signs suggestive of FMD detected in the sentinel sheep at any time in the course of the 4 official clinical inspections conducted at weekly intervals following restocking.

3.6 Table 6 gives details of the serological and virological examinations that took place on both these 3 premises. On one premises in Gwynedd, a singleton seropositive animal was found in one of three management groups when the sheep were serologically tested at the end of the 4 week restocking period. Blood samples taken from all the sheep in the management group were serologically negative when they were retested 7 days later. No further action was taken.

3.7 On 2 premises in Cumbria and Lancashire, singleton seropositive sheep were found at the end of the 4 week restocking period. These single sheep remained seropositive when the sheep in the management group were rebled 7 days later. The two singleton seropositive sheep were slaughtered and virological examinations carried out on probang samples taken from them. In neither case was FMD virus isolated. In both cases it was concluded that the seropositive results were false positives.
4 INVESTIGATION OF SUSPECT FMD ON A FARM UNDERGOING RESTOCKING IN NORTH YORKSHIRE

4.1 Background

4.1.1 On 26 February 2002, an official veterinary inspector reported mouth lesions and slightly elevated temperatures in 2/372 sentinel sheep on a farm undergoing restocking in North Yorkshire. One sheep had epithelial loss on the dental pad and small areas of epithelial loss were noted below the incisors. It had a temperature of 102.2°F. There was no evidence of lameness. The second animal had lesions similar to the first with second area of epithelial loss on the hard palate. No lameness or other clinical signs suggestive of FMD were noted in the rest of flock.

4.1.2 The farm was immediately placed under official control and in accordance with national legislative requirements, movement controls were imposed on all farms within an 8 km radius of the premises. This was the first farm undergoing restocking in which clinical suspicion of FMD had been reported.

4.1.3 The two affected sheep were killed and samples of epithelial tissue and blood from the two animals were submitted to IAH Pirbright for virological (PCR and virus isolation) and serological examination (cspELISA and VNT).

4.1.4 In addition, blood samples from the 4 management groups on the premises were taken and submitted to IAH Pirbright on 26 February 2002 for virological and serological examination.

4.2 FMD history of the premises

4.2.1 The premises in question had been compulsorily depopulated (142 cattle and 2,010 sheep) on 2 August 2001 because of personnel links with outbreak FMD 1924, 1.34 km away. The owner of the farm had managed the sheep on FMD 1924 and had been making daily visits to it.

4.2.2 Final C&D on the premises had been completed on 29 December 2001 and 372 sentinel sheep were moved onto the premises under official control between 2-5 February 2002.

4.2.3 The sheep came from 3 source farms in the North Yorkshire. These were immediately identified and placed under official control on 26 February 2002. Official veterinary inspections of all three farms carried out on 27 February 2002 revealed no evidence of clinical signs suggestive of FMD.

4.2.4 The 372 sentinel sheep were divided into 4 management groups located around the premises. On the previous two official inspections
all the sheep had been clinically normal. There was no evidence of lameness in any of the sheep.

4.2.5 Two of the three source farms had been clinical examined and bled as part of Protection Zone surveillance around FMD outbreaks in November 2001. The serological tests were all negative for FMD.

4.3 Results of laboratory examinations

4.3.1 The results of all the virological and serological tests carried out on the two affected animals and sheep in all the management groups on the holding were FMD negative (Tables 4 and 5).

4.3.2 As a consequence, official controls on all the farms within 8 km of the premises and on the 3 source flocks were lifted at mid-day on 3 March 2002.
Table 1: Results of all serological testing carried out during the FMD epidemic to 5 March 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for testing</th>
<th>No of farms tested</th>
<th>No of adult sheep on farms</th>
<th>No of samples tested</th>
<th>No of samples +ve</th>
<th>% samples serologically +ve</th>
<th>No of flocks +ve</th>
<th>% of flocks +ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-km protection zone testing</td>
<td>10,213</td>
<td>1,838,920</td>
<td>771,308</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10-km zone testing</td>
<td>11,799</td>
<td>2,695,940</td>
<td>1,101,814</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-movement testing</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>1,535,978</td>
<td>588,095</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>632,044</td>
<td>258,329</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restocking</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,257</strong></td>
<td><strong>258,206</strong></td>
<td><strong>178,268</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.003</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>619,918</td>
<td>251,637</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>32,659</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,581,006</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,149,451</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,404</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.076</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2: The number of seropositive flocks, including those with singleton seropositive animals identified during the course of 2001 FMD epidemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>No. of positive flocks</th>
<th>No of flocks with single seropositive animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PZ testing</td>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Yorkshire excluding Selby district</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Powys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Powys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Ynys Mon - Isle of Anglesey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Fynwy - Monmouthshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SZ testing</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Yorkshire excluding Selby district</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-movement testing</td>
<td>North Yorkshire excluding Selby district</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restocking</td>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: The total number of farms that have undergone restocking with sheep by County and the number with singleton seropositive animals identified during the course of serological testing at the end of the 4 week restocking period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>No of farms restocked with sheep</th>
<th>No of farms with singleton seropositive animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradford district</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerffi - caerphilly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire county</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castell-nedd port talbot - neath port talbot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire county</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy - conwy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall county</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of herefordshire</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry district</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria county</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire county</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon county</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and galloway</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham county</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East lothian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East riding of yorkshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex county</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateshead district</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire county</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater london authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent county</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire county</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire county</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr tudful - merthyr tydfil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Powys</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire district of selby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire excluding Selby district</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire county</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland county</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire county</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda, cynon, taf - rhondda, cynon, taff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish borders</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire county</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir fynwy - monmouthshire</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir ymys mon - isle of anglesey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset county</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ayrshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>No of farms restocked</td>
<td>No of farms with singleton seropositive animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Powys</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire county</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk county</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey county</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swindon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire county</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1257</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: The number of sheep in each management group and the number of animals in each group blood sampled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management group</th>
<th>No. of sheep</th>
<th>No. of sheep blood sampled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>372</strong></td>
<td><strong>185</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Results of virological and serological tests carried out on the samples taken from the 2 affected animals and a samples of animals from each management group on the premises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No of samples</th>
<th>Virological tests</th>
<th>Serological tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ag-ELISA</td>
<td>PCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 affected sheep &amp; probang &amp; blood</td>
<td>2/2 -ve</td>
<td>2/2 -ve</td>
<td>2/2 -ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>49 bloods</td>
<td>10/49 -ve*</td>
<td>49/49 -ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>47 bloods</td>
<td>47/47 -ve</td>
<td>47/47 -ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>49 bloods</td>
<td>49/49 -ve</td>
<td>49/49 -ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>40 bloods</td>
<td>40/40 -ve</td>
<td>40/40 -ve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* only 10 samples tested

** one sample cspELISA inconclusive (inhibition 63%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date Reported</th>
<th>Management groups and no. of animals</th>
<th>Total no. of samples</th>
<th>No. of samples seropositive</th>
<th>Details of seropositive samples by group</th>
<th>Species of seropositives</th>
<th>Rebleed requested Y/N (date reported)</th>
<th>Rebleed Positive/Negative</th>
<th>21 day rebleed cattle/sheep requested/result</th>
<th>Probangs taken Y/N</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Sera on slaughter</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Serological status</th>
<th>Management groups / animals culled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>16/01/2002</td>
<td>A-48 B-55 C-D-49 (Total = 158 in 4 groups)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1 (ELISA = 97%; VNT =64)</td>
<td>Group A 1/48 sheep</td>
<td>Y (23/01/2002)</td>
<td>1 Positive</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y No Virus Detected</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Taken as a DC</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>1 sheep culled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>14/02/2002</td>
<td>A-157, B-15 (Total = 172 in 2 groups)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1 (ELISA =98%; VNT &gt; 90)</td>
<td>Group B 1/15 sheep</td>
<td>Y (21/02/2002)</td>
<td>1 Positive</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y No Virus Detected</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Taken as a DC</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>1 sheep culled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>27/07/2000</td>
<td>CATTLE: A-82; SHEEP: A-500 B-100 C-400 (Total 1000)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1 (ELISA =69%; VNT =64)</td>
<td>Group A 1/42 cattle</td>
<td>Y - all cattle (09/08/2001); 95/5 sheep (10/08/2001)</td>
<td>All results Negative</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Details of the serological testing carried out on restocked farms where singleton seropositive animals were identified during the course of serological testing at the end of the 4 week restocking period.