RURAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

AGENDA

21st Meeting, 2000 (Session 1)

Tuesday 27 June 2000

The Committee will meet at 10.00 am in Committee Room 2.

1. **The Scottish Forestry Strategy**: The Committee will hear from the Deputy Minister for Rural Affairs regarding the outcome of consultation on the draft Forestry Strategy for Scotland.

2. **Digital Scotland**: The Committee will consider a report from Elaine Murray MSP outlining a possible response to the Digital Scotland Taskforce Report.

3. **Subordinate Legislation**: The Committee will consider the following negative instruments:

   a) **The Transport of Animals (Cleansing and Disinfection) (Scotland) Regulations 2000 SSI 2000/167**

   b) **The Loch Moidart, North Channel, Scallop Several Fishery (Scotland) Order, 2000 SSI 2000/173**

   c) **The Bovine and Bovine Products (Trade) Amendment (Scotland) Regulations 2000 SSI 2000/184**

4. **Petition**: The Committee will consider PE148 from Mr William Anderson on exposure to organophosphate chemicals

Richard Davies
Clerk to the Committee

The following papers are relevant to this meeting:

- Item 1: Paper from the Forestry Commission
- Item 2: Paper to follow
- Item 3: Copies of SSI’s and Executive Notes/Regulatory Impact Assessment
- Item 4: **SPICe note on organophosphates** and copy of petition
DRAFT SCOTTISH FORESTRY STRATEGY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Vision

The Scottish Forestry Strategy is the Scottish Executive’s framework for taking forestry forward, through the first part of the new century and beyond. Its vision is that Scotland will be renowned as a land of fine trees, whose valuable forest resource both strengthens the economy and enriches the natural environment, and where people are proud of their trees, woods and forests. The intention is to promote confidence in the future of forestry, encouraging investment that will benefit current and future generations. High quality trees, woods and forests can help make Scotland a better place for people to live and work and visit.

Policy context and principles

The wider policy context for the Strategy is set by the United Kingdom’s international commitments to sustainable forestry. These commitments are enshrined in the UK Forestry Standard.

During the initial consultation exercise, broad support emerged for five general principles.

The overarching principle for the Strategy is sustainability. Scottish forestry must contribute positively to sustainable rural development, and meet internationally recognised standards of sustainable forest management. The other principles are:-

- integration: forestry should fit well with other rural activities in Scotland, such as agriculture, conservation, deer management, fishing, recreation and tourism;

- positive value: forests and woodlands should contribute to the well being of the people of Scotland;

- community support: forests and woodlands should be managed in ways which enjoy broad public support;

- diversity and local distinctiveness: different types of forest will suit different places.
ANNEX A

Developing the Strategy

At present about one-sixth of Scotland is covered by woods and forests, and forestry and wood-processing directly provide about 10,000 jobs. Timber production will double over the next fifteen years. The Strategy explains how the forest and woodland resource can be developed to realise the vision, using forestry to:-

- contribute to the economy;
- conserve and improve the environment;
- enhance the quality of life of all communities.

The interaction between these themes is important. Positive interactions give rise to opportunities. Opportunities for multi-benefit forestry exist where, for example, forests can be used to grow timber and at the same time provide recreation and habitats for wildlife. There are also opportunities for creating employment by integrating forestry with other rural activities and for promoting the use of wood as an environmentally-friendly raw material. A more diverse forest resource should increase options for taking advantage of such opportunities in the future. On the other hand, there are areas of tension. There may be local concerns about the impact of timber traffic, or where the economic benefits of forestry do not remain within the community. The cumulative impact of forestry expansion on other land uses is also a source of tension in some parts of Scotland. Another tension is the issue of paying for the cost of providing environmental and other “non-market” benefits.

Strategic Directions

The Strategy proposes five Strategic Directions for Scottish forestry. They are:-

- to maximise the value to the Scottish economy of the wood resource becoming available for harvesting over the next 20 years;
- to create a diverse forest resource of high quality that will contribute to the economic needs of Scotland throughout the 21st century and beyond;
- to ensure that forestry in Scotland makes a positive contribution to the environment;
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- to create opportunities for more people to enjoy trees, woods and forests in Scotland;

- to help communities use woods and forests to promote development.
**ANNEX A**

**Priorities for Action**

The Strategy also identifies Priorities for Action.

It stresses that much is already happening and needs to continue: indeed many of these current activities are vitally important to the health and value of Scotland’s trees, woods and forests. But the Priorities reflect areas where more action is needed.

Under the heading of each Strategic Direction, the Strategy outlines the range of current activity before identifying Priorities for Action.

For each Priority, a summary is provided saying why it is a priority, the benefits of action, what needs to be done (and the associated costs), who needs to be involved and suggesting indicators of progress.

The proposed Priorities for Action, listed under each Strategic Direction, are shown overleaf.

**Delivery**

Successful implementation of the Strategy will depend upon effective partnership and cooperation - between the private sector, central and local Government and the voluntary sector. The Strategy is intended as a framework for action which contributors will be able to use in determining their priorities. For example:

- The Forestry Commission will use its Corporate Plan for Scotland to set out how it intends to take the Strategy forward year by year.

- Other Departments of the Scottish Executive will take account of the Strategy when developing policies that may have an impact on forestry.

- Scottish Enterprise will publish an action plan for the forestry industries cluster by October 2000.

During 2001, a baseline statement will be published for monitoring the indicators of progress. The Priorities for Action will be reviewed within five years, and - as a basis for this review - there will be further consultation to assess stakeholder satisfaction with implementation of the Strategy.

**Comments on draft Strategy**
Please send comments on the draft Strategy by 6 June 2000 to Richard Broadhurst, Secretary, Scottish Forestry Strategy Working Group at the National Office for Scotland, Forestry Commission, 231 Corstorphine Road, Edinburgh EH12 7AT, (e-mail: richard.broadhurst@forestry.gov.uk).

### PRIORITIES FOR ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To maximise the value of the wood resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Improve competitiveness by developing a strong forest industries network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secure investment in wood processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop the timber transport infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promote more use of timber.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop products that meet market needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To create a diverse forest resource for the future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Expand the area of well-designed productive forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve timber quality through following good forest practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop forests of mixed species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exploit non-timber outputs and benefits of woods and forests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tackle deer problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To make a positive contribution to the environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Improve management of semi-natural woodlands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Extend and enhance native woodlands by developing forest habitat networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase the diversity of the farmed landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aid recovery of acidified rivers and lakes and improve riparian habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encourage alternatives to clear felling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contribute to a radical improvement in the quality and setting of urban areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To create opportunities to enjoy trees, woods and forests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Provide woodland recreation opportunities near towns.
- Improve availability of information about opportunities.
- Increase forestry’s contribution to tourism.

To help communities use woods and forests to promote development
- Create wider employment opportunities.
- Increase opportunities for community consultation.
- Provide opportunities for greater community involvement in forestry.
- Support community ownership where this will bring local benefits.
EXECUTIVE NOTE

The Transport of Animals (Cleansing and Disinfection) (Scotland) Regulations 2000

The above instrument was made in exercise of the powers conferred by section 2 (2) of the European Communities Act 1972. This instrument is subject to negative resolution procedure.

Policy Objectives

The purpose of this instrument is to consolidate and simplify existing legislation into one single piece of legislation and implements cleansing and disinfection provisions in EC Directives. This is required by law firstly on animal health grounds to prevent the spread of notifiable and other diseases of farm livestock, and secondly to protect the welfare of animals.

Consultation

SNFU
COSLA
Livestock Hauliers
Livestock Farmers
Ferry Companies

Financial Effects

There will be additional costs to farming and livestock industries but these will be minimal. We were unable to to carry out a risk assessment of what these were likely to be but from the response to our consultations no major increases were envisaged.

There will be no additional costs to Local Authorities or SERAD.

SERAD
Animal Health and Welfare Branch
Room 350
Pentland House

1 June 2000
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REGULATORY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1. **Title:** The Transport of Animals (Cleansing And Disinfection) (Scotland) Regulations 2000.

2(i) **The Issue and Objective**

**Issue:** The cleansing and disinfection of animal transport is required (i) to prevent the spread of notifiable diseases of farmed animals and poultry, and (ii) to protect the welfare of animals and birds. At present the legislation requiring cleansing and disinfection of animal transport is fragmented in a number of orders made under the Animal Health Act 1981 or its predecessors. This poses difficulties both for the industry which has to work within these provisions and for those who have to enforce them.

**Objective:** To consolidate and simplify the legislation on cleansing and disinfection of animal transport. Also to bring in some cleansing and disinfection requirements of two EU Directives relating to trade in livestock which have not yet been implemented.

2(u) **Risk Assessment**

The purpose of cleansing and disinfection of animal transport is to prevent the spread of disease between farms or the import of disease into the United Kingdom and to provide the necessary conditions to ensure good animal welfare. If vehicles and containers used to transport animals are not effectively cleansed and disinfected after use, there is a significant risk that bacteria and viruses which cause disease in animals and birds could be spread to the livestock which next use the transport. This risk applies to imports into the UK and to transport from farm to farm within the country.

Outbreaks of disease have costs in terms of animal health, animal welfare, medicines used and decreased productivity. Moreover, an outbreak in the UK of a notifiable disease from which the UK is currently free would have serious consequences not just for the farmers directly concerned but, because of the damage to the UK’s health status, to international trade and the economy. This is not a theoretical risk; there have been recent outbreaks of the notifiable pig disease Classical Swine Fever and the notifiable poultry disease Avian Influenza, from which the UK is free, on the mainland of Europe.
Two options have been identified. Option 1 do nothing

Option 2 consolidate all relevant legislation.

3(u) Issues of equity and fairness

Fairness to the affected businesses requires that the legislation should be simplified and clarified.

4(i) Identify the benefits

This exercise will result in clearer legislation on the cleansing and disinfection of transport for animals and birds. The proposed legislation will be simpler for those transporting animals to understand and for local authorities to enforce. It will implement EU obligations on cleansing and disinfection and will be of general benefit to animal health and welfare.

4(u) Quantify and value the benefits

Option 1 would save money in the short term, but would not meet the objective of making the legislation simpler to understand. Option 2 consolidates the legislation, reducing the likelihood of confusion and increasing the likelihood that affected businesses will comply with it. The major benefit of this option will be in reducing the risk of the import or spread of animal diseases.

The most recent outbreaks of exotic notifiable disease in Great Britain, the outbreaks of Newcastle Disease in 1997, are believed to have been introduced by migratory wild birds but spread by farm to farm contact. They are estimated to have cost government about £4 million in compensation for the affected businesses. There will also have been significant incidental costs for the businesses concerned.
3(i) Options

A very wide range of businesses will be affected by these Regulations. Those likely to be directly affected are listed below. Standard Industrial Classifications (1992) for the business sectors are also given.1

(a) Livestock farmers: sectors 01.21, 01.22, 01.23, 01.24, 01.25 and 01.30, depending on the type of animal kept;
(b) Circuses: sector 92.34/9 (other entertainment activities);
(c) Livestock hauliers: sector 60.24/9 (freight transport by road);
(d) Ferry companies when animals/birds carried: sector 61.10/2 (freight sea and coastal transport), 61.20/9 (other inland water transport);
(e) Air transport when animals/birds carried: sector 62.10/9 (other scheduled air transport) and 62.20/9 (other non-scheduled air transport);
(f) Rail transport when animals/birds carried: sector 60.10/1, 60.10/9;
(g) Import/Export companies: sector 51.11 (agents involved in the sale of.. live animals); and
(h) Other supporting transport activities: sectors 63.21, 63.22, 63.23 and 63.40.

The size and turnover of the businesses involved varies widely, from a smallholder who may occasionally transport small numbers of animals, to a road haulage firm with twenty or thirty lorries carrying hundreds of thousands of animals every year.

At present about 825 businesses hold specific authorisations under the Welfare of Animals in Transport Order 1997 to transport cattle, sheep, goats, horses and pigs for journeys over 8 hours by road and for all journeys by rail sea and air. We cannot quantify the number of farms transporting animals for minor journeys.

5(u) Compliance costs for a “typical business”

This is largely a consolidation measure and compliance costs will reflect costs which have applied to the industry for many years. However, we have extended the scope of cleansing and disinfection legislation to implement EU commitments that have not previously been implemented as follows:

5(i) Business sectors affected

(a) Disinfection as well as cleansing always required of vehicles for ratites (birds of the ostrich family);
(b) New requirement for livestock vehicles to be cleansed and disinfected before animals or poultry are loaded onto it, if this is necessary (e.g., if the transport has been unused for a time and become soiled); and
(c) Dead animals and soiled litter to be removed from transport as soon as possible to apply to all journeys.

Recurring costs
We believe that the costs to business arising from the additional provisions above will be minimal, because the requirements represent current good practice. The result of the consultation exercise supports this view.

Because of the wide range of businesses involved in the transport of animals, we have been unable, despite consultation, to identify a “typical business” for whom to assess the new costs of the Regulations, nor to quantify the number of journeys affected by the new provisions in the Regulations. We included a possible costing for a company transporting ostriches four times a year in the draft RIA circulated with the consultation document, estimating a maximum cost of £152. A breakdown of this figure is attached at the Appendix to this Assessment. Of the eight organisations commenting on these costs, two were content with the estimate but six felt they were too low.

One 14-vehicle haulage firm provided us with annual figures for cleansing and disinfection activity, including the water rates, sewerage and waste disposal, of approximately £1 6k under current legislation. The following further costings for typical cleansing and disinfection activity have been drawn from responses to the consultation exercise. Because we could not determine how many animal journeys take place in a given time period, we have been unable to compare them directly with the figure of £1 6k above.

Cost of cleansing and disinfection of commercial livestock transport vehicles (e.g. a double deck lorry)

a) during the day away from base (e.g. at an abattoir charging £5 per fifteen minutes, and including loss of earnings): £25 £50
b) at own facilities: £19 (3 hours’ work) plus cost of disinfectant and water

Costs of cleansing and disinfection at abattoirs and markets are reported by the Road Haulage Association to vary from £10 to £25 without labour costs. The activity takes at least two hours and takes place once or twice a day.
5(i) Business sectors affected

The cost of daytime cleansing and disinfection of a modular poultry vehicle with a capacity of 6,000 birds: £114. The cost at overnight pay rates is estimated at £158.

We noted that some consultees in the pig and poultry industry reported that for operational reasons they were not cleansing and disinfecting vehicles in certain circumstances where they were required to do so by law. They reported that, were they to comply fully with current laws, they would have to cleanse and disinfect vehicles more frequently than at present, and would consequently face additional costs and changes in working practice. However, the extent of the additional costs was not given.

Non-recurring costs
We do not envisage any non-recurring costs arising from the new provisions of the Regulations.

5(iii). Total compliance costs

Given the diverse range of businesses involved in the transport of animals and the varying nature of journeys made, it is not possible to calculate the total compliance costs of the additional provisions in the Regulations. They are however estimated to be minimal as the requirements represent good practice.


We discussed this proposals, with the help of the NFU, with representatives of a haulage firm and a poultry farmer.

7. Identify any other costs

No additional costs have been identified as arising to local authorities or to SERAD as a result of the Regulations.

8. Results of consultations

In 1997, interested organisations were consulted on an earlier version of the Regulations, which did not include the provisions currently in the Welfare of Animals during Transport Order 1997. Of 163 organisations consulted, 15
responded, and the response was generally favourable.
In the second consultation exercise beginning on 29 December 1998, 38 organisations responded of 528 consulted. The response remained generally favourable. The replies received indicated that the limited new provisions in the legislation would not cause problems.

9. Summary and Recommendations

We believe that following Option 2 and making Regulations consolidating and simplifying existing animal health and animal welfare legislation requiring cleansing and disinfection of means of transport will not impose significant additional costs on the farming or livestock haulage industries. Indeed the consolidated Regulations will have positive benefits by bringing fragmented legislation into one place, and making it simpler to understand, to comply with and to enforce.

10. Enforcement, sanctions, monitoring and review

The legislation will continue to be enforced by local authorities, and non-compliance can be prosecuted. We will seek feedback from the industry and enforcement authorities on the effectiveness of the Regulations, and plan to review it in 2006.

Regulatory Quality

Declaration. I have read the Regulatory Impact assessment and I am satisfied that the balance between cost and benefit is the right one in the circumstances.

Signed by the responsible Minister

Date

Contact point: Nancy Logan, SERAD, Animal Health and Welfare Branch, Room 350, Pentland House, 47 Robb’s Loan, Edinburgh, EH14 1TW. Tel. No. 0131 244 6178.

Date: May 2000
Extract from section 5 of the draft RIA circulated in the consultation exercise: estimated compliance costs:

The cost of cleansing and disinfecting a vehicle in a commercial truck-wash has been estimated to be £15 on average, but might be as low as £3 to wash out a trailer and as high as £21 for an articulated lorry, not including manpower costs. A driver may be paid £8/hour and it may take thirty minutes to wash out a lorry. Using these figures in one worked example, a haulier transporting ostriches a short distance four times a year, who will be required to cleanse and disinfect the vehicle after transport for the first time under the Order, might thus be faced with additional costs of £60 per annum for cleansing and disinfection, and £16 for manpower £76 in all. This would double to £152 if the truck had been unused for a period and needed to be cleansed and disinfected before the animals were loaded.
EXECUTIVE NOTE

The Loch Moidart, North Channel, Scallop Several Fishery (Scotland) Order 2000

Introduction

1. The above instrument was made in exercise of the powers conferred by section 1 of the Sea Fisheries (Shellfish) Act 1967. The instrument is subject to negative resolution procedure.

Background

2. Under the Sea Fisheries (Shellfish) Act 1967, the Scottish Ministers have powers to make Regulating and Several Fishery Orders. Several Fishery Orders confer exclusive rights to named grantees to cultivate and harvest certain types of shellfish over a prescribed time and area, so that a 'severed' fishery can be established or enhanced. There are currently 7 Several Orders in Scotland with another 7 applications currently under consideration.

3. The Scottish Executive supports the concept of Several Fishery Orders as a means of establishing or improving shellfish fisheries with the aim of promoting economic development in rural and remote communities. Several Orders offer small-scale business and employment opportunities. There is also some evidence that the establishment of a shellfish fishery under a Several Order improves shellfish recruitment in adjoining areas.

4. The Sea Fish Industry Authority’s previous Several Order in Loch Moidart expired in May after 10 successful years of operation. As was the case with the previous Order, the new Order will protect scallop stocks used in the Authority’s scientific work on behalf of the fishing industry and will cover an identical area to the previous Order for another 10 year period. Such “follow-on” Orders require to revisit the full application process.

5. The Order area is sited within a proposed Special Area of Conservation (SAC). A draft management scheme document produced by the SAC Management Forum comments that harvesting of shellfish in the area by diving would not be affected by implementation of the SAC. Diving will be the method of harvesting used by the SFIA.

6. Members will be aware of the other Several Order legislation currently subject to consideration in the Scottish Parliament. A stage 1 debate on an amendment to the 1967 Act took place on 18 May and stage 2 consideration by the Rural Affairs Committee is being scheduled. The Amendment, which would allow creel and other compatible types of fishing by others to continue over a Several Order site, has no bearing on the Moidart proposal as there has been no recent history of creel fishing in the Order area and fishermen have not objected to the new Order.

Consultation and Consent

7. The 1967 Act specifies that the draft Several Order should be published and circulated and that objections received within 1 month of publication should be
considered. The applicant is also required to carry out preliminary consultations with interested parties such as the local authority, Scottish Natural Heritage and local fishing interests. A full list of those consulted by SFIA is attached. The Department carries out internal consultations including that of colleagues in the Marine Laboratory Aberdeen and the Scottish Fisheries Protection Agency.

8. The draft Order was published on 4 May. It appeared in the Press and Journal, the Highland News and the Oban Times. A public notice was placed at the local Post Office in Acharacle. No objections to the Order were received.

9. In addition, the 1967 Act requires that the Order will only be made if the consent of the Crown Estate Commissioners has been obtained. In the case of the Loch Moidart Order, the Crown Estate Office gave its consent by letter on 8 May, a copy of which is attached to this note.

Financial Effects

10. The instrument has no financial implications for the Scottish Executive or local government.

Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department
June 2000
EXECUTIVE NOTE

The Bovines and Bovine Products (Trade) Amendment (Scotland) Regulations 2000 (S.S.I. 2000/184)

The above Instrument was made in exercise of the powers conferred by section 2 (2) of the European Communities Act 1972 (1) and of all the other powers enabling them in that behalf.

The instrument is subject to negative resolution procedure.

Policy Objective

The purpose of the instrument is to amend the previous provisions which prevent the despatch of bone-in beef from any establishment approved under the Date Based Export Scheme (DBES) to the UK market.

Consultation

Although under no statutory obligation to do so, the Executive has consulted the following bodies on a draft of the instrument:

- All Full Throughput Slaughterhouses and Cutting Plants in Scotland
- All XAP Approved Plants in Scotland
- All Scottish Principle Agricultural Officers
- British Veterinary Association
- CBI Scotland
- Crofter’s Commission
- Convention of Scottish Local Authorities
- GRASS
- Highlands and Islands Enterprise
- Highlands and Islands Livestock Ltd
- Independent Farming Group
- Institute of Auctioneers and Appraisers in Scotland
- Livestock Services (UK) Ltd
- Meat and Livestock Commission
- Meat Hygiene Service
- National Farmers Union of Scotland
- National Livestock Traders and Producers Association
- North Eastern Farmers Ltd
- Royal Environmental Health Institute of Scotland
- Royal Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland
- Scotch Quality Beef & Lamb Association
- Scottish Association of Meat Wholesalers
- Scottish Agricultural College
- Scottish Agricultural Organisation Society Ltd
- Scottish Beef Council

1 1972 c.68; section 2(2) was amended by the Scotland Act 1998 (c.46), Schedule 8, paragraph 15 (3). The functions conferred on a Minister of the Crown under section 2(2) of the European Communities Act 1972, insofar as within developed competence, were transferred to the Scottish Ministers by virtue of Section 53 of the Scotland Act 1998.
Scottish Consumer Council  
Scottish Crofter’s Union  
Scottish Enterprise  
Scottish Federation of Meat Traders Association  
Scottish Landowners Association  
Shetland Agricultural Association  
UKASTA (Scottish Representative)  
Wholesale Grocer’s Association  
Women’s Food and Farming Union

Financial Effects

The instrument has no financial effects on the Scottish Executive. It will have a positive financial effect on the trade as it will allow any DBES approved establishment in Scotland to despatch bone-in beef to the UK market.

Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department

13 June 2000
REGULATORY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Title

1. The Bovines and Bovine Products (Trade) (Amendment) (Scotland) Regulations 2000

Purpose and intended effect of the measure

(i) issue and objective

2. Establishments approved under the Date-based Export Scheme (DBES) in Scotland are currently unable to despatch bone-in beef derived from DBES eligible animals to the UK market.

3. The objective of the measure is to give DBES approved establishments increased flexibility in the type of product which they may supply by removing the prohibition on despatch of bone-in beef to the domestic market.

(ii) risk assessment

4. There is a risk that if not properly controlled DBES approved establishments could despatch ineligible bone in beef for export. However, the strict controls laid down in the required methods of operation for DBES approved establishments will remain in place and ensure that bone-in-beef cannot be despatched abroad.

Benefits

Quantifying and valuing the benefits

5. Although at an industry level benefits will be small due to the low rates of participation in the Scheme, DBES approved slaughterhouses will benefit from reduced costs and the additional flexibility from being able to supply their domestic customers with bone-in product.

Compliance costs for business

Business sectors affected

6. The meat industry (slaughterhouses and cutting plants) will be affected. Although currently there are only two businesses participating in the DBES, the proposed amendment will help increase the viability of the Scheme for them and others who may be considering participating in the future.

Results of Consultation

7. The consultation on the proposed amendments to the regulations has not yet been completed.
Summary and recommendations

8. It is recommended that the Bovines and Bovine Products (Trade) (Amendment) (Scotland) Regulations 2000 be adopted to permit DBES approved establishments in Scotland to supply bone-in beef from DBES approved cutting premises to the domestic market.

A member of the Scottish Executive

June 2000
PETITION PE 148: Mr William Anderson

Date Received: 23 March 2000

Date Referred: 2 May 2000

Subject: Treatment of exposure to organophosphate chemicals

1. Petition PE 148 calls for the Scottish Parliament to investigate the alleged failure by the Health Department to provide appropriate specialist referral for clinical diagnosis and treatment of the after effects of exposure to organophosphate chemicals. The Petitioner also states that there has been a failure to provide training and guidance to GP’s in assessing and diagnosing ill health caused by exposure to organophosphates.

2. A copy of the Petition, and a SPICe note on the subject is attached.

Action Required

3. The Petition has been referred to the Health and Community Care Committee in the first instance. The Rural Affairs Committee is required to pass any comments on this petition to that Committee. The Committee should consider whether it wishes to express support for the principles of the petition, or highlight any issues contained in the petition to the Health Committee.

Tracey Hawe
Assistant Clerk
June 2000