



EQUINE STUDBOOKS ASSOCIATION

Representing Horse and Pony Studbooks of the UK

Chair: Celia Clarke (WBSUK), Vice-Chair: Natalie Meredith (AHS), Secretary: Jane Murray (NFPBCS), Treasurer: Lorraine Amor

MEETING NUMBER 3, INCORPORATING THE 2019 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

FRIDAY 12 APRIL 2019, 11 AM

HELD AT THE BRITISH HORSE SOCIETY HEADQUARTERS,
ABBAY PARK, KENILWORTH CV8 2XZ

1 PRESENT AT THE MEETING AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Name	Organisation	Name	Organisation
Present		Present	
Celia Clarke	WBSUK	Andrea Betteridge	TGCA
Natalie Meredith	AHS	Hannah Wilson	WPCS
Jane Murray	New Forest		
Catherine Burdock	SHBGB	John Shenfield	Consultant
Simon Cooper	Weatherbys/ISBC	Anne Vestey	Welfare
		Sue Dawson	BHS
Eva-Maria Broomer	AES / BB	Gina Dent	Central Prefix Register
Karin Swanson	AHS	Roger Truelove	NASTA
Karen Coleman	AQHAUK		
Mary McBryde	BAPSH	Jane Nixon	Veterinary Surgeon, Speaker
Kate Eaton	BHHS	Stewart Everett	CED/ER, Speaker
Sandra Lawrence	BSPA		
Carole Foster-Gill	CHAPS		
Ruth Staines	Caspian	<i>Apologies for Absence</i>	<i>Organisation</i>
Jo Ashby	Dales	Lorraine Amor	CHAPS
Tom Brown	Dartmoor	Geth Tillin	BCPS
Rosemary Clarke	Donkey	Gemma Stanford	BHS
Judith Harris	Eriskay	Carol Morse	DBS
Susan McGeever	Exmoor	Sandra Mansell	Exmoor
Freya Glansdorp	Icelandic	Zoe McCrum	NIHB
Tikki Adorian	IMHA	Hugh McClusker	NIHB
Heather Abrahall	NPS	Lynn Jarvis	USAUK
Sacha Shaw	NPS / BB	Rachel Palmer	USAUK
Angela Whiteway	Shire	Gill Wright	CPR
Philippa Cole	SPSS	Anna Goodwin	WPCS

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

On the proposal by Catherine Burdock, seconded by Karin Swanson, the minutes of Meeting Number 2 held on 12 October 2018 were unanimously approved as a correct record.

3 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising other than items being covered in the agenda later.

4 CHAIR'S REPORT

Celia Clarke read her report (which is circulated with these Minutes) outlining the activities of the Association in 2018. It was unanimously adopted.

5 COMMITTEE AND OFFICER ROLES

Normally, officer and committee elections occur once every three years but over the past twelve months certain ad hoc changes have had to be made owing to changing work commitments etc. For this reason, 826ESA voting member representatives voted on the following revisions of posts and responsibilities. On the proposal of Celia Clarke, seconded by Sacha Shaw, each was passed unanimously.

- a. To accept with sadness the resignation of Catherine Burdock as Vice-Chair and agree to her continuing membership of the 826ESA committee in a non-officer role.
- b. To confirm the appointment of Natalie Meredith (currently Secretary) as Vice-Chair.
- c. To confirm the appointment of Jane Murray (currently non-officer committee member) as Secretary.
- d. To confirm the co-option of Simon Cooper as a member of the committee.

6 TREASURER'S REPORT

Celia Clarke presented the report on behalf of Lorraine Amor. At the end of 2018 there was a bank balance of £543. To this, £900 in 2019 subscriptions had been added, plus £150 in observers' fees, making a total of £1443. Gina Dent of the Central Prefix Register reported that £1200 would be transferred shortly from the former BAES.

The costs of the meeting venue

It was noted that attendance was now too high for the BHS building, which had been made available gratis, and thanks were extended to Gemma Stanford for making this possible. It was hoped that the NPS would be able to make a room available, for which there would be a charge, for the next meeting. It was felt that a suitable venue in London would still be too expensive, although this would be kept under review. Simon Cooper also offered a room at Weatherbys.

A vote of thanks was extended to Lorraine Amor for her work as Treasurer.

7 REPORT ON THE BRITISH HORSE COUNCIL MEETING, DECEMBER 2018

Celia Clarke attended as the sole representative of the 826 ESA. Because of the limited seating available at the meeting. A number of 826 ESA member organisations also sent representatives in their own right. As usual a wide variety of topics had been covered.

- Defra's work in trying to achieve a High Health Status for the country, following exit from the EU.
- The ongoing issue of horses not being reported/recorded as deceased.
- Lack of lairage at points of exit (all very confused at the time of the BHC meeting, as the Brexit vote was looming, and was then cancelled during the meeting).
- A number of welfare issues.
- Zootechnics kept coming up, with Defra unable to give precise answers.

8 FORMAT OF ZOOTECHNICAL CERTIFICATES

This discussion became an agenda item in its own right. The background to the discussion is that the format and required information to be contained within the Zootechnical Certificate has been set down in EC2017/1940, but it has not been made clear how this is to be incorporated within the horse passport, either newly-issued ones, or, more especially those already issued.

There is confusion about whether the format should be portrait or landscape; and given that all the required information is already there in the passport whether the set-out format is required. However, the issue arises when an equine is going abroad and whether a certificate stapled to the passport is sufficient or whether the whole passport should be re-issued – and who then bears the cost. Another issue arises when a passport has been overstamped on arrival of the equine in the UK, but it then later goes back to its original country.

The situation is a little clearer with germinal products, for which a Part II Zootechnical Certificate is required, and would go with the covering certificate. However, the MOPS document does not yet reflect this, and breed societies need a mechanism to get involved at the correct early stage to issue a semen zootechnical certificate.

Overall, breed societies need to know whether they should issue Part I certificates up-front to all equines as part of the passport-issuing process, and whether they should be bound in as one document. At this point there is no consensus among the member societies on how this should be done, and the confusion continues. There is also a need to educate breeders and wider publicity is needed. There is still no clear advice from Defra but 826ESA will continue to press for this and will advise member societies accordingly as and when the situation becomes clearer.

9 PRESENTATION BY JANE NIXON ON BIOSECURITY AND PREVENTION OF EQUINE INFECTIOUS DISEASES

The presentation considered the why and how of those endemic and emerging equine infectious diseases that are of greatest significance to our equine population, equine sports and equine industries. These diseases can often be fatal and require obligatory movement restrictions and have a potentially huge impact at global, national and local levels. Endemic diseases include Equine Influenza and Herpes, and the emerging diseases of main concern are African Horse Sickness and West Nile Virus.

Since 2000, the European horse industry has become more aware of the emerging diseases, which are spread by biting insects and which are becoming more of a threat with global warming and changes in the distribution and migratory patterns of mosquitos and birds.

African Horse Sickness virus is transmitted by biting midges and is highly fatal with 90% of cases dying within a week from heart failure. No vaccination is available. There is no treatment for West Nile Virus, with death occurring in 50% of clinical cases. These are notifiable diseases which must be reported to Animal and Plant Health Agency.

The spread of infectious diseases can be reduced by: surveillance, biosecurity, identification, isolation, quarantine, treatment. AHT/BEVA/Defra produce a quarterly equine disease surveillance report which gives a unique insight into equine disease in UK. Biosecurity is a matter of developing good habits.

Some shifts in attitude and methods of disease control have occurred in the UK, for example, there are now many mandatory vaccination schedules for equine flu among the sporting bodies, various codes of practice and general acceptance that strangles is endemic. The sudden awareness of midge-borne viruses in northern Europe and the need for contingency plans has led the BEF to establish a High Health Steering Group, which met for the first time in early February 2019, co-

incidentally just as the Equine Influenza outbreak became apparent. This was a wake-up call for impending exotic diseases, and highlighted the importance of reaching out to every horse-carer in the UK.

Most worryingly, some 75% of horses/owners have no affiliation to any of the equine bodies which could provide education on disease prevention. The problem is how to reach these people. The HHSG proposes that all sections of the equine industry unite with a common interest and for mutual benefit to provide education on effective husbandry to prevent disease spread, and to establish, with immediate effect through the AHT, an Emergency Response Committee, to give rapid guidance in the event of a disease outbreak. Since this initial meeting, HHSG has been raising awareness through press releases, workshops, presentations, and magazine articles. To date, all of the HHSG work has been done free of charge, with no financial input from anywhere. A funding review has highlighted the need for funds for education and awareness, vaccination research, disease surveillance, emergency response group expenses.

Following this presentation, societies were keen to know what they could do to help, and how they could best advise breeders in a cost-effective way. JN advised keeping the message simple and engaging everyone. AES and World Horse Welfare are working on a joint leaflet which could be sent out with all passports.

It was thought that insurance policies would be declared void if there was an outbreak of WNV or AHS. JN commented that insurance companies were looking at discounting schemes for equines proven to be non-carriers of strangles, and this approach may be a way forward, although uptake would have to be sufficient for it to be practicable, given that strangles is not a notifiable disease.

It was noted that there is no vaccine for AHS in the northern hemisphere, although there is one available in Africa. It was unlikely that racehorses would be given preferential treatment, and the Official Veterinarian would control quarantine.

10 PRESENTATION BY STEWART EVERETT, CEO OF EQUINE REGISTER, ON RECENT, CURRENT AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE CENTRAL EQUINE DATABASE

Stewart Everett (SE) opened his presentation with a 'Myth Busting' question on what the forthcoming Digital Stable will be able to do, by asking whether owners will be able to effect a transfer of ownership directly on the CED – they will not be able to do so.

SE acknowledged that PIOs had an issue with the flow of information, and that PIOs would prefer that owners went first to the PIO which then amended the data on CED, whereas the Digital Stable invited the owner to make a notification direct on CED, which then alerted the PIO. SE said that the Digital Stable supported GDPR, as people have a right to see their data that is held on a government server, and to request a correction to that data if appropriate. That request goes into Amber Data, which does not of itself change a record, but gives notice that there may be an inaccuracy, or that a change is needed. There are a lot of people on CED associated with horses that they no longer own, so this data is inaccurate, and the Digital Stable is a method of cleaning this data. SE stated that the Digital Stable would be helpful to people who own horses holding passports with multiple PIOs, as it provides a single portal.

SE explained that before owners could access their data, they would have to undergo rigorous identity checks, including biometric and address checks.

The PIO will get a notification of updating requests, and it is the PIO's business to deal with those requests according to their own protocols. Data could be locked while ownership is in dispute, in accordance with GDPR legislation. The option to push to enforcement is also now available.

Passports that are not on the system at all may now get picked up. All this should help to get data moving and to 'stabilise the chaos of the data'.

SE claimed that the biggest risk to Equine Register as a business is GDPR with its huge fines, and that the Digital Stable provides a conduit for data to be checked. The perennial problem for PIOs is getting people to do their transfers of ownership and the Digital Stable opened up another avenue of communication with owners.

Catherine Burdock (CB) commented that she had no problem with the concept but expressed concern that it would add another process to deal with, and could lead to additional work. SE later responded that bespoke automated data processes would be available.

CB also asked at what point an owner could choose which PIO to access or alert. SE explained that the request is linked to the UELN, so it has to go to that PIO. However, for many horses, there is an issuing PIO, and a controlling PIO. Comments were made that this difference between the issuing and controlling PIOs should be apparent, but SE responded that the law does allow any PIO to make amendments, and that Defra had set up the CED system and rules and Equine Register must follow these. There is no legal basis for setting up an amber data field which would enable an originating PIO to see that an amendment is being done, although technically it is possible.

On the question of data ownership and control, SE firmly made the point that the owner/person owns their own personal data on society databases, and consent must be given to change that data. Individuals have the right to clean their own data. Sophisticated and powerful checks ensure public security in the Digital Stable and there are five different levels of response which determine whether access is allowed by an individual. When access is granted, they will be able to see a list of horses they own, and they can then compare this to the actual passports they hold. Requests for amendment go into amber data while the PIO carries out its own checks and balances.

Equine Register/CED cannot do anything legally about a PIO that amends another PIO's data, and it is up to studbooks to agree through this meeting protocols to manage their own data only and respect other society's business, whilst recognising the law.

SE's concluding comment was that the real risk to PIOs is non-compliance with GDPR and MOPS, and that the Digital Stable offered one solution to enable compliance.

A query was raised about food chain status when there might be a discrepancy between CED (because of a notification in amber data) and the society's database, because the passport had not been physically checked. A suggested solution was for the society to ask for a scan of Section II/IX.

(The following two items were discussed later in the meeting, after SE had left)

The order of events – Simon Cooper felt that SE had not fully addressed his concern that an individual could engage with the Digital Stable without the original PIO being aware that action was being instigated until after the event, despite the claim that the CED is only holding a notification.

Changing another society's data - all representatives understood that the law states that any PIO can update data. No-one likes it, and it is not our fault that that is what the law says. An example was given where one attending member society had changed the data of another attending member society; CED accepted the change and only then was the original PIO notified. The original PIO had lost out on the income and could not reclaim it from the PIO that had made the amendment. In their defence, the representative from the 'altering' PIO said they had been experiencing internal problems at the time. All present felt very strongly that the original studbook holds the correct data and that they may be aware of welfare situations or potential fraud problems which could be

jeopardized by another PIO making an amendment – it is even possible that an individual owner could choose deliberately to use a different PIO for fraudulent purposes.

It was felt that all studbooks should work together to agree to handle only their own data and that this should be regarded as 'best practice' and a proposal to develop this as a protocol for 826 ESA members was then circulated with most members present signing it. It was agreed therefore that Celia Clarke should work on this protocol and circulate it to committee members for approval and then to each 826 ESA member studbook for signature. It was also agreed that this decisions should be conveyed to Equine Register.

11 DISCUSSION ON MINIMUM OPERATING PROCEDURES

(This discussion picked up some of the threads from the earlier item 8 above).

The main issue of concern is that the MOPS document, produced by the Defra Equine Identification team, is not compliant with Zootechnical requirements. This will become increasingly critical as the UK moves to third country status following exit from the EU, and Celia Clarke thought that Defra is actively looking at regularly auditing studbooks. 826ESA took positive action in ensuring that studbook information reached not only Defra but also Dr Fuessel of the EU Commission in good time, and Defra had replied with a very rare letter of gratitude for this assistance. It was now important to keep pressing the Equine ID and Zootechnics teams at Defra to co-operate and issue clear instructions to breed societies.

The Dartmoor society were concerned that rescinding of passports was becoming a free for all, and that the MOPS was not clear enough.

12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- **Central Prefix Register:** All studbooks who are not yet a member of the CPR were urged to consider joining.
- **Questionnaire:** Celia Clarke asked for a return of the questionnaire, especially as it was important to get an indication of the size of the non-TB breeding population.

13 NEXT MEETING

Confirmed post-meeting as **Wednesday 23 October 2019** at the National Pony Society HQ, Arthur Rank Centre, Stoneleigh Park, Warks CV8 2LG, starting at 11.00 am, coffee from 10.30 am.