

Issue and sectors affected	Current Position/ Baseline	New derogation/ provision	Use of derogation/ provision	Costs and Benefits relative to current position/baseline	Overall impact
<p>1. New Provision/ Derogation</p> <p>Articles 16 (b) and 17: Use of ABPs for exhibitions, artistic activities, and for diagnostic, educational or research purposes</p> <p>Affected sectors: Research institutes, educational establishments, artists, etc</p>	<p>The derogation from the previous regulation allowed MSs to set conditions for disposal of these ABPs to control the risks to public and animal health.</p> <p>Previously we set minimal conditions on use and disposal, except where high risk material was used.</p>	<p>The derogation from the new regulation allows MSs to set conditions for use and disposal of these ABPs to control the risks to public and animal health.</p> <p>New provision: There is a new requirement for premises using these materials to register and some conditions laid down which operators must follow when the derogation is implemented.</p>	<p>Government intend to take advantage of this derogation in full.</p> <p>Will continue to set conditions on use and disposal, consistent with the minimum required by the regulation</p>	<p>The new mandatory requirement to register will be a new one off cost to business and government. The regulation also lays down controls which must be complied with by operators even when Member States implement the derogation in full. This may also impose some costs on operators.</p>	<p>Although the Government proposes to implement the derogation in full, there are costs to these operators resulting from the directly applicable legislation with regard to the requirement to register. However, registration requirements should be minimal and the conditions laid down in the legislation should in any case be followed by most operators already.</p> <p>Operators have been asked to estimate compliance costs but no information has been received. Given this lack of information we have based costs of registration on reasonable assumptions –(see IA for details - although note this covers costs for all registered operators not just those covered by these sectors)</p>
<p>2. Derogation</p> <p>Articles 16 (c) and 18 (1): Use of certain ABPs for feeding to animals</p> <p>Affected sectors:</p>	<p>The derogation from the previous regulation allowed MSs to set conditions to control public and animal health risks for the collection</p>	<p>The derogation from the new regulation allows MSs to set conditions to control public and animal health risks for the collection and use of these materials for</p>	<p>Government intend to take advantage of this derogation in full, including feeding to wild animals with the exception of feeding to wild boar</p>	<p>Compared with current position, there will be a very small benefit as this largely regularises the current position. There should be no associated increase in disease risks if conditions are followed.</p>	<p>Small net benefit to householders and others wishing to feed wild animals which is very difficult to quantify in monetary terms. To allow unlimited feeding to wild boar which are small in number in England would be a</p>

<p>Fishing bait producers/ users, those feeding certain wild animals /birds, cat & dog shelters</p>	<p>and use of Category 2 material from animals which were not killed or did not die from actual or suspected disease communicable to humans or animals, and of Category 3 material for feeding to the following animals: (a) Zoo animals (b) Circus animals (c) Reptiles/birds of prey other than zoo or circus animals (d) Dogs from recognised kennels or packs of hounds (e) Maggots for fishing bait (f) wild animals (not currently in use in England)</p>	<p>the following additional categories of animals: 1) Fur animals (not applicable in UK in any case); 2) Cats and dogs in shelters (applicable); 3) Worms for fishing bait (applicable).</p>	<p>which will be banned given the potential risk of spreading exotic diseases via this route., Will also use the derogation to allow feeding to cats & dogs in shelters, (although we are not aware of any demand for this), and to allow feeding to worms used for fishing bait, which will regularise the current position. NB: Government will not use the derogation which refers to fur animals, as animals are not permitted to be farmed for fur in the UK.</p>		<p>very small restriction on the derogation but would avoid the potential risk from such feeding causing an exotic disease outbreak (2001 FMD outbreak cost £3 billion) . NB As we would expect take up of the opportunity to feed wild boar as negligible in any case we have not tried to assess costs/benefits</p>
<p>3. Derogation Articles 16 (c) and 18 (2): Feeding of Category 1 material to zoo animals & necrophagous birds Affected sectors: Zoos,</p>	<p>The previous Regulation did not allow Cat 1 material to be fed to zoo animals. There are no programmes approved in the UK for feeding Cat 1</p>	<p>The derogation from the new Regulation allows MSs to authorise the feeding to zoo animals of Category 1 material under Article 8(b) (ii) (i.e. entire bodies/parts of dead animals containing</p>	<p>Government intend to take advantage of this derogation in full. This would allow zoos etc to “re-cycle” their own fallen stock that fall under Category 1</p>	<p>Compared with the current position, there will be a small benefit to those few zoos which want to feed carnivorous animals in this way. Many zoos will be unaffected as they do not keep carnivorous species.</p>	<p>We asked bodies representing zoos for an estimate of benefits. They indicated there would be a very small take up of the benefit which whilst useful was not significant to their businesses. Very small net benefit overall</p>

	material to necrophagous bird species- so does not apply	SRM at time of disposal), and of material derived from zoo animals.	(e.g. entire deceased antelopes, zebras) to their carnivorous animals (e.g. big cats) in addition to the Cat 2 material that is already permitted. Additional controls would be attached to feeding animals containing SRM.		
4. Derogation Articles 16(d) and 19(1)(a): Burial of pet animals Affected sectors: Pet owners, horse owners	The derogation from the previous Regulation allowed the burial of pet animals. The UK applied this derogation, and included 'pet horses' under the description of 'pet animals'. Other equidae were not included in derogation.	The derogation from the new Regulation allows MSs to authorise the disposal by burial of dead pet animals and all equidae.	Government intend to take advantage of this derogation in full. Government will allow the burial of all equidae, addressing the small potential increased disease risk by issuing guidance on safe burial. Waste controls will still apply.	Costs of burial are likely to be lower than rendering/ incineration in most cases, but burial is not always practical and the horse industry does not anticipate there will be a major increase in burial from horse owners. There will be a negligible associated increase in disease risk of burial, as opposed to incineration.	Small reduction of costs associated with burial rather than incineration. Statistics on annual number of horse deaths are not available or on the number which are currently buried annually or may do so in future. Incineration of horses can cost £250 -£500 per animal depending on the type of service provided. Cost of burial may vary considerably depending on location and equipment available.(e.g it may be necessary for the owner to hire an excavator to dig a hole) although it is likely to be lower on average than incineration We have concluded there will be a small increase in benefits associated with wider choice of method of disposal. See IA for more detail
5. Derogation	The derogation from the previous	The derogation from the new Regulation	Government intend to take advantage	In practice few dead diseased wild animals will	No information is available on numbers of diseased wild

<p>Articles 16(d) and 19(1)(b): Disposal in remote areas by burning/burial on site or by other means under official supervision of Category 1 material under Article 8(a)(v) (i.e. wild animals) and 8(b)(ii) (i.e. entire bodies or parts of dead animals containing SRM at time of disposal), and Category 2 + 3 material.</p> <p>Affected sectors: Landowners</p>	<p>Regulation is the same as the one presented in the new Regulation- but the previous derogation did not allow MSs to authorise disposal of diseased wild animals in remote areas, instead requiring their disposal by rendering or incineration.</p>	<p>now includes Cat 1 wild animals, when suspected of being infected with diseases communicable to humans or animals.</p> <p>It also allows for burial.</p>	<p>of this derogation in full.</p> <p>We consider that burial is the most expedient and practical method of disposal in remote areas.</p>	<p>come to the attention of landowners and the effect should be minimal.</p>	<p>animals and species which are found, Based on cost of disposal by rendering or incineration of livestock under the National Fallen Stock Scheme, costs would be in the region of £25-£150 per carcase depending on species of animal and area. There will therefore be a very small reduction in the costs to landowners.</p>
<p>6. Derogation</p> <p>Articles 16 (d) and 19 (1) (c): Disposal of fallen Stock carcasses in areas where <u>access is practically impossible or where access would only be possible under circumstances</u>, related to geographical or climatic reasons or due to a natural disaster, which</p>	<p>The previous Regulation said that fallen stock must be collected and disposed of in line with the Regulations, except in a very few specific circumstances.</p>	<p>The derogation from the new Regulation says that MSs may now authorise the disposal by burning/burial on site or by other means under official supervision of Category 1 material under Article 8(b)(ii), (i.e. entire bodies/parts of dead animals containing SRM at time of disposal), Category 2 and Category 3 material in areas</p>	<p>The Government intend to take advantage of this derogation in full, where the farmer is able to demonstrate that the appropriate criteria are met. Will provide guidance on the conditions to apply to ensure the derogation is not subject to abuse.</p>	<p>There will be a small reduction in costs for livestock farmers who will be now able to dispose of fallen stock in areas meeting these criteria by burial on site or leaving them to degrade naturally (depending on the circumstances), rather than being obliged to arrange for their collection & disposal by rendering/ incineration. There should be no increase in disease risk.</p>	<p>There is a lack of information on numbers of livestock which die under circumstances where this derogation would be of benefit and by definition it is also difficult to predict areas subject to disaster where the derogation may be applied and the number of fallen stock likely to be involved. Based on cost of disposal by rendering or incineration under the National Fallen Stock Scheme, costs would be in the region of £25-£150 per carcase depending on species of animal and area. However, these costs are likely</p>

<p>would pose a risk to the health and safety of the personnel carrying out the collection or where access would necessitate the use of disproportionately onerous means of collection.</p> <p>Affected sectors: Livestock farmers, fallen stock collection and disposal sector</p>		<p>where <u>access is practically impossible</u> or where <u>access would only be possible under circumstances</u>, related to geographical or climatic reasons or due to a natural disaster, which would pose a risk to the health and safety of the personnel carrying out the collection or where access would necessitate the use of disproportionately onerous means of collection.</p>			<p>to be higher in the circumstances where this derogation applies and therefore avoiding having to bear these costs whilst probably of small benefit overall might locally be significant for some farmers</p>
<p>7. Derogation</p> <p>Articles 16(d) and 19(1)(d): Small Quantities of ABPs</p> <p>Affected sectors: Small Retailers</p>	<p>The previous Regulation said that all ABPs must be disposed of in line with the Regulation.</p>	<p>The derogation from the new Regulation says that MSs may authorise the disposal of 20kg (or potentially 50kg) per week of raw meat and fish arising from retailers outside of the control of the ABPR (50kg only permissible where MS have provided detailed justification to the Commission).</p>	<p>The Government intend to take advantage of this derogation in full using the 20kg limit, as the terms which the Commission has set out for the detailed justification required to apply the 50kg limit cannot be met in the UK</p> <p>In any case bodies representing retailers have said</p>	<p>There will be considerable reduction in costs to small retailers and food manufacturers. There should be no increase in disease risk.</p>	<p>Evidence provided by the British Retail Consortium and the Association of Convenience Stores suggests the cost saving to this sector could be in the range £30m to £40m a year. This is based on a cost saving of about £1,000 a year per shop across the sector. This is an area where consultees provided useable information. The big financial incentive to the small retail sector suggests that uptake of this derogation will be high (we estimate 80%).</p> <p>NB Within the sector there</p>

			that the 20kg limit will accommodate the requirements of most small retail outlets.		might be in the order of 20,000 non-affiliated independent convenience stores which would probably fall within the definition of 'small business' which would benefit
<p>8. Derogation</p> <p>Article 16 (f): Use of ABPs in Bio-Dynamic preparations</p> <p>Affected sectors: Farmers & landowners, those wishing to prepare & apply bio-dynamic preparations to land</p>	The previous Regulation did not authorise the use of bio-dynamic preparations.	<p>The derogation from the new Regulation says that MSs may allow Cat 2 and 3 materials to be used for the preparation and application to land of bio-dynamic preparations as per Article 12(1) (c) of Regulation 834/2007.</p> <p>MS have discretion to set conditions.</p>	The Government intend to take advantage of this derogation in full in order to meet specialist demand in this area.	There will be a small benefit to those wishing to prepare and apply bio-dynamic preparations to land, (although in practice this change largely regularises the current position.)	Information is not available on use of ABPs in biodynamic farming and no information was provided by the sector which has a very small niche in the farming sector
<p>9. Derogation</p> <p>Article 16 (g): Use of ABPs for Pet Food</p> <p>Affected sectors: Pet food manufacturers , individuals wishing to feed such material</p>	Under the previous Regulation only "petfood", (processed or raw) which had been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the regulation was permitted to be fed to pet animals.	<p>The derogation from the new Regulation allows MSs to set out conditions which permit Category 3 material to be used for feeding to pets (instead of the regulation's requirements which apply to manufacturers of raw and processed petfood products).</p> <p>MS have discretion to set conditions.</p>	The Government intend to take advantage of this derogation	There will be a small benefit to those wishing to feed such material, (but potentially at a disadvantage to established pet food manufacturers) as this would provide more potential source material for use as pet food –although this will be limited as there are already outlets for purchasing this material approved under the regulation . Widespread uptake therefore not anticipated. Providing guidance is followed, a veterinary risk assessment shows there will should be no	No information was provided in response to a request for the impact of permitting such feeding indicating a small take up is likely. Overall a small net benefit likely to certain generators of category 3 material for use as raw petfood (abattoirs and cutting plants and consumers).

				associated increase in disease risk if conditions attached to derogation are followed	
<p>10. Derogation</p> <p>Article 16 (h): Disposal of ABPs on farm</p> <p>Affected sectors: Livestock farmers</p>	<p>The previous Regulation did not permit the disposal of ABPs arising from surgical intervention or birth of animals on farm, they were required to be disposed of in line with the Regulation (rendering/incineration).</p>	<p>The derogation from the new Regulation allows MSs to authorise ABPs (except Category 1 material) arising from surgical intervention on live animals or during birth of animals on farm to be disposed of on that farm.</p> <p>MS have discretion to set conditions.</p>	<p>The Government intend to take advantage of this derogation in part.</p> <p>We propose to allow material to be disposed of on farm, with the exception of foetuses or placenta, where there may be a risk of spreading disease to humans or animals (e.g. aborted calf foetuses/placenta where there may be a risk of diseases such as brucellosis).</p>	<p>The derogation as proposed would bring a small benefit to livestock farmers who would benefit from a reduction in certain disposal costs (although to some extent this may just regularise current practice). There would be a very small associated increase in disease risk.</p> <p>If the derogation were fully implemented, there might be a further slight reduction in costs to farmers , but a veterinary risk assessment showed potential disease risks which might then result in higher costs, e.g. if animals were suffering from a notifiable disease, or burial was not carried out correctly.</p>	<p>No information is available on quantities of such material generated on farm but it is unlikely to be large. No information was provided in response to a request during consultation. It is possible to extrapolate costs to farmers of using collection and disposal services for such ABPs from the National Fallen Stock Scheme (see typical costs above) suggesting a small benefit to farmers from burial rather than using such services. Being able to bury foetuses and placenta would maximise short term benefits further (cost of foetus disposal would be similar to lower end of costs for adult carcasses under the scheme (again see costs above) but if these were allowed the benefits could be far outweighed by the costs of dealing with a disease outbreak and compensation (e.g. 75% of the animal's value in case of brucellosis). See IA</p>
<p>11. New Provision</p> <p>Article 13 (e) (ii):</p>	<p>The previous Regulation permitted the</p>	<p>The new Regulation maintains this regime and expands it</p>	<p>The Government intend to take advantage of this</p>	<p>There will be a small benefit to compost and biogas plants and those who supply them,</p>	<p>Despite requests during consultation, no quantitative information was available on</p>

<p>ABPs used for Composting & biogas</p> <p>Affected sectors: Biogas plants, those supplying them with raw material</p>	<p>composting or anaerobic digestion (biogas) of Category 3 ABPs. A limited number of Category 2 materials such as manure and milk could also be composted or anaerobically digested, provided they were not considered a disease risk.</p>	<p>slightly to include milk products, and Category 2 egg and egg products.</p>	<p>new provision in full.</p> <p>The new provision allows a wider range of material to be used without increasing the disease risk. It also removes a previous anomaly where Category 2 milk could be composted but not products derived from the milk.</p>	<p>who will now be able to supply/use a wider range of material.</p>	<p>potential uptake for the additional ABPs but it is unlikely to be large. Small net benefit</p>
<p>12. Relaxation of current domestic controls</p> <p>National provisions on composting of catering waste on the premises on which it originates.</p> <p>Affected sectors: Composting/ anaerobic digestion community (including domestic householders), specifically small community composting or anaerobic digestion projects.</p>	<p>The previous Regulation said that catering waste intended for composting or anaerobic digestion should be sent to an AH approved plant.</p> <p>There was an exception for 'home composting' which permitted the composting of catering waste on the premises of origin without the need for an approval from AH, provided that the resultant compost was used only on</p>	<p>The Government will broaden the home composting exception to allow for composting and anaerobic digestion on the premises of origin or elsewhere, without approval from AH, provided that livestock cannot gain access to this material.</p>	<p>The Government intend to relax the current national controls to allow for off-site disposal of 'home composting'</p>	<p>Compared with the current position, if Government implement this new provision there will be a significant benefit to the composting/ anaerobic digestion community particularly for small-scale community composting and anaerobic digestion projects who may be able to operate without the requirement for a full plant approval from Animal Health</p>	<p>The composting sector has indicated that moving in this direction could potentially remove barriers to small scale composting operations and hence increase the market for certain ABPs driving down costs and increasing benefits for operators and consumers . However, the sector has been unable to quantify this impact which at an aggregate level is still likely to be small</p>

	those premises.				
<p>13. New Provision</p> <p>Article 13 (f): Application of ABPs to land</p> <p>Affected sectors: Landowners, users/ suppliers of certain waste ABP material</p>	<p>The previous Regulation allowed Category 2 digestive tract content separated from digestive tract, milk and colostrum to be applied to land without processing, if the MS considered this did not present a risk of spreading serious transmissible disease.</p>	<p>The new Regulation maintains this regime, also now enables Category 2 milk-based products to be spread to land unprocessed, and also certain lower risk Category 3 materials.</p>	<p>The Government intend to take advantage of this new provision in full.</p> <p>With milk and milk products there may be a potential risk of disease spread when they are applied to land in the case of a notifiable disease outbreak. A requirement to allow restrictions relating to animal and public health to be imposed in such circumstances to mitigate the increased disease risk would be provided.</p>	<p>There would be a small benefit to suppliers/users of this waste ABP material derived from its increased potential use. There should be no increase in disease risk.</p>	<p>Extending the derogation from the current position to permit milk based products to be spread to land is likely to be of very marginal benefit. There was no information or comment on this from operators to help quantify this.</p>
<p>14. New provision</p> <p>Article 14 (h): Use of shellfish shells</p> <p>Affected sectors: Shellfish sector</p>	<p>The previous Regulation required all shellfish shells to undergo at least "Method 7" processing (i.e. rendering) before use.</p>	<p>1) The new Regulation enables MSs to determine conditions for disposal of shells from shellfish in which soft tissue remains.</p> <p>2) Article 2.2(d) in any case removes from scope shells where no soft</p>	<p>The Government intend to take advantage of this new provision subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>1) Any shells with flesh present would need to be processed (subject to rendering/heat</p>	<p>There would be a substantial benefit to the shellfish sector from the potential sale of shells without flesh remaining for productive uses, and from the less costly disposal requirements, compared with current requirement (rendering).</p>	<p>Net benefit to industry of removing shells from scope of the regulation. Information on costs and potential uptake was provided by Seafish. This suggested a net benefit of about £4.4m a year as a consequence of shell disposal cost savings of about £70/t See annex for more detail</p>

		tissue remains.	<p>treatment) in accordance with the Regulation to ensure there is no public and animal health risk.</p> <p>2) operators will be required to demonstrate that the shells are “free of flesh” (using criteria to be laid down), in which case controls on their use would be removed from the scope of the regulation. .</p>		
<p>15. New provision</p> <p>Article 14 (h): Egg shells to land</p> <p>Affected sectors: Egg Processing Industry, farmers</p>	<p>The previous Regulation required eggshells to undergo at least “Method 7” processing (i.e. rendering) before use.</p>	<p>The new Regulation allows Category 3 egg shells to be used under conditions determined by the MS which prevent risks arising to public and animal health.</p>	<p>The Government intends to take advantage of this new provision, to put in place less burdensome control measures which operators may use as an alternative to processing but which will still protect animal and public health.</p>	<p>There will be a benefit to industry, as the cost of rendering is approximately twice that of putting shell onto land without processing. There will also be some potential reduction in the carbon footprint from not needing to render product, as well as a benefit to the land to which shell would be applied.</p> <p>This will create additional avenues for disposal of egg shell, making the industry more viable.</p> <p>There will also be an additional saving to</p>	<p>Egg sector acknowledge benefit likely but unable to quantify, particularly as actual use bound up with future environmental controls on spreading such material to land</p>

				landowners using shells as a soil improver for application to the land.	
<p>16. New Provision</p> <p>Article 32: Use of organic fertilisers</p> <p>Affected sectors: Landowners, renderers</p>	<p>The previous Regulation permitted the application to land of organic fertilisers and soil improvers (OF/SI) derived from processing Cat '2 or Cat '3 material in an approved processing (rendering) plant. Cat' 1 material could not be used for the production of OF/SI. Cat' 2 material could only be used where it was pressure-rendered in accordance with the Regulation. Cat 3 materials could use any of the processing standards set out in the Regulation.</p>	<p>The new Regulation allows MSs to adopt national rules imposing conditions or restrictions on the use of organic fertilisers and soil improvers if they are justified to protect public or animal health.</p> <p>The Implementing Regulation sets down conditions that must be complied with.</p>	<p>The Government do not intend to impose additional national restrictions(which it does at present in relation to certain material)</p> <p>However, would propose to keep a grazing restriction of two months in the case of pigs, and 21 days for other livestock after application of OF/SI to land (the regulation permits MSs to set a minimum period of 21 days).</p>	<p>Compared with the current position there will be a small benefit to industry, permitting the use of category 2 and category 3 processed animal protein in organic fertilisers and soil improvers provided that they are mixed with a suitable material so that they are not palatable to livestock and cannot be used in animal feed.</p>	<p>Small net benefit provided agreement can be reached with the rendering sector on a suitable mixing component which achieves the aims of the regulation at a reasonable cost. Although the legislation provides the possibility for such use, the authorisation putting this into effect will only be drawn up a time when such an agreement is reached</p>
<p>17. New Requirements</p> <p>Article 41 Imports of ABPs from third countries into the EU</p>	<p>The previous Regulation set down detailed rules for the importation of ABPs from third countries and the documentation which needed to</p>	<p>The new Regulations requirements update and consolidate the existing import rules. Notable changes are:</p> <p>1) Scope has been increased (and</p>	<p>The Government will fully implement the changes in the new Regulation, which tend to simplify and consolidate the requirements for</p>	<p>Compared with the previous position the Government expects that when the changes are considered in aggregate they should have a positive benefit/outcome (with any small costs being out-weighed by the benefits)</p>	<p>Small net benefit</p>

<p>Affected sectors: Importers of ABPs,</p>	<p>accompany the consignments (usually in the form of health certificates).</p>	<p>correspondingly the model declaration) for use of intermediate products (ABPs which have undergone a degree of processing but are not finished). For example, the definition now includes medicinal products, veterinary medicinal products and active implantable medical devices; some Cat 1 & Cat 2 materials are now specifically included; and blood from live animals (including from livestock species) is now listed for use as an intermediate product.</p> <p>2) Import authorisation requirements for specific ABPs (such as aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates, rodentia and lagomorpha) are now less prescriptive.</p> <p>3) Research and</p>	<p>both importers and for the Competent Authority.</p>	<p>for both Government and Industry, since the changes tend to be de-regulatory, allowing industry to make greater use of ABPs with less intervention from Government.</p> <p>These changes should enable greater use of intermediate products with savings for both industry and Government (e.g. more widespread use of the model declaration rather than individual authorisations).</p> <p>The reclassification of ABPs from e.g. Cat' 2 to 3 and the relaxation around some of the rules for Cat' 1 material, should increase the scope for imports and their usage, which should be beneficial for industry and Government.</p>	
--	---	--	--	---	--

		<p>diagnostic samples imported via another Member State need to be presented to a BIP on entry to the EU, but not vet checked, and the Member State of destination notified via TRACES. Most research and diagnostic samples are imported directly into the UK, so likely to have little impact,</p> <p>4) Trade samples and display items need to be imported via a BIP for vet checks. Trade samples also need to be channelled to their final destination. It is estimated that in 2010 only 18 trade samples and 8 display items were imported, leading to a small additional cost to industry.</p>			
<p>18. Implementing Regulation</p> <p>Annex XIV section II, Chapter IV, Part II: Colostrum for feeding</p>	<p>The previous Regulation did not permit the supply of colostrums directly from one farm to another farm within the same MS for feeding purposes.</p>	<p>The new Implementing Regulation provides by way of derogation from controls on colostrum for the competent authority to authorise the</p>	<p>The Government will apply this derogation under conditions which prevent the potential spread of animal diseases</p>	<p>There will be a small benefit to livestock owners due to the increased availability and reduced cost of obtaining commercial colostrum. The likely demand for transferring colostrum from one farm to another is not, according to</p>	<p>Small net benefit</p>

<p>Affected sectors: Livestock owners</p>		<p>supply of colostrum from one farm to another farm within the same MS for feeding purposes under conditions which prevent the transmission of health risks.</p>	<p>A VRA was developed for this issue and is available.</p>	<p>the dairy industry, thought to be very great. Providing guidance is followed, there should be no increase in disease risk.</p>	
<p>19. Implementing Regulation Annex XVII, Chapter VII: Unprocessed wool Affected sectors: Wool industry</p>	<p>The previous Regulation did not permit unprocessed wool to be placed on the market.</p>	<p>The new Implementing Regulation provides for the competent authority to authorise the placing on the market of unprocessed wool under conditions which prevent the transmission of health risks.</p>	<p>The Government will apply this derogation without restrictions, provided the operator registers with Animal Health to enable tracing of the wool in case restrictions need to be put in place in the case of a notifiable disease outbreak.</p> <p>Otherwise, no controls are proposed as the risks, are minimal.</p> <p>A VRA was developed for this issue and is available.</p>	<p>There will be a small benefit to the wool sector who can take advantage of the new potential for movement, storage and placing on the market of wool without restrictions (including for example composting of wool without restrictions). There should be no associated increase in disease risk.</p>	<p>Small net benefit</p>