

THE WOOL PRESS

December 2006

Volume 204

£1.00

Telephone +500 27355

Fax +500 27352

sferguson@doa.gov.fk

In this issue...

EDITORIAL.....	2
HOW DO I RANK MY SHEEP? USING A SHEEP INDEX!	3
PROPOSED DOG DOSING REPORTING SYSTEM	4
SELLING WOOL IN 2006/2007	8
FLEECE WOOL SALES RATING.....	9
LUMPS AND BUMPS	10
LOGGING IN A POLY TUNNEL	12
PROPOSED CHANGES IN BOVINE TB MONITORING.....	13
WOOL WAREHOUSE	15
NEW AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT	16
SHEEP BREED PERFORMANCE SNAPSHOT.....	16
ENTROPION – A PROBLEM TO WATCH FOR.....	17

EDITORIAL

The longer sunny days are a reminder that wool is accumulating in shearing sheds and farmers need to consider how to transport and sell wool this season. Neil Judd's succinct article on the subject shows how many choices there are now that there is a double dumping machine installed on FIPASS. Neil's chart on sales differential is food for thought as well. For farmers on the East with wool heading for the warehouse on FIPASS, please note Lucy's useful proposals for stacking wool this season.

Please read SVO, Vic Epstein's article on a dog dosing reporting system. His paper was discussed at the last Agricultural Advisory Committee meeting and it was agreed that voluntary reporting would be introduced from next dog dosing day (**20 December**) for Camp dog owners. All the experts consulted as to why hydatidosis is still persisting in small numbers of sheep here in the Falklands after years of dog treatment state that non-compliance has to be the most likely cause. We would like to eliminate this from the list of possibilities so Vic is asking that to prove to the experts all farmers are compliant, they report that they have dosed their dogs. This can be done by simply leaving a phone message at the DoA. **We would be very grateful if all Camp dog owners would support the scheme.**

Another paper presented at the last AAC meeting concerns TB testing in cattle. Many farmers are keen to develop a broader beef industry, selling to wider local markets and then possibly overseas. To do this there has to be disease monitoring data as early as possible to provide evidence of our disease status. There is much to discuss on this subject so let's have your views for the next committee meeting.

I was interested to learn from Joe Hollins' article, "Lumps and Bumps" the problems that stray cats cause with the spread of disease. I was aware that they cause the transmission of toxoplasma but Joe explains in his article that they are also responsible for the spread of a disease called Sarcocystis. Another good reason for controlling any feral cats on your farm.

Vikki Lee has joined the team this month and I am pleased to see from her introductory article that we are working her hard!

All good wishes with lambing, calving, shearing and of course.....Christmas and have a prosperous New Year.

Best regards,

Phyl Rendell
Director of Minerals & Agriculture

HOW DO I RANK MY SHEEP? USING A SHEEP INDEX!

By Peter Johnson

The DoA has created a programme that can provide you with a simplified sheep index and ranking sheet for your animals on your farm. This information can be used to make selection decisions for both Rams and Ewes and is vital for ensuring that you get the best animals to do the job you want.

What do I need to have my sheep indexed?

You need a number of things, the most important being a breeding objective of what you are aiming to achieve with your sheep in the medium to long term. You also need objective data on individually tagged animals such as body weights, greasy fleece weights and fibre diameter for that sheep.

What is my breeding objective?

Breeding objectives are different for each farm business. They dictate what emphasis you wish to place on your breeding, whether it be for micron, wool weight, bodyweight or a combination somewhere in between. The DoA has 16 basic indexes that span the range that you can choose from with advice available to get the right one for you. Breeding objectives need to be set for the medium to long term, as chopping and changing year-in year-out can lead to your genetic trend going round in circles.

How do I get the other information I need?

You measure it! You weigh your animals to find out how much they weigh, you get your samples tested to see what micron their fleece is, and you weigh their fleeces at shearing time. Yes it does take effort, but if you want to make genetic gain, you need to measure what you have!

What happens when I have my information and my breeding objective?

You send it in to the DoA or I come out and discuss it with you and we do the calculations. I have a Microsoft Excel based program that will crunch the numbers and put the relative weightings on the different traits according to your breeding objective. Although it is a complex calculation, it is quick and easy to run and a list of the sheep with their tag numbers, rankings and index score can be printed off to use down in the yards when you are going through your sheep.

I'm still not sure what breeding objective suits my business?

We can discuss this at length by looking at historic market prices and trends for both wool and meat, use the gross margin model to get a few numbers for each scenario and then run 2 or 3 different breeding objectives through the index calculator to see what animals perform best for different breeding objectives.

Once I have the rankings, is that the end of it? Do I just take my top twenty sheep?

No, no, no! The best objective measurements need to be used in conjunction with some traditional classing. One way to use this tool may be to test a group of say, ram hoggets for fleece weight, fibre diameter and body weight. We can do the calculations based on your breeding objective then draft off say the top 50 animals from the group based on the index and go through them to select the 20 replacement rams that you want using *both* the **figures** and what you **see** before you in the animal. The highest ranking animals may

not be the best overall when you look at the other traits you consider important, but are not part of the index.

I'm interested, what other information is available?

I have more information on the specifics of the selection indexes if you want to know more about them. If you think you would like to have some of your animals indexed, get in touch and I will go through the process with you. If you would like any assistance with deciding breeding objectives, planning the testing/weighing of animals or selection advice, please contact me at the DoA.

PROPOSED DOG DOSING REPORTING SYSTEM

- In the AAC meeting on 15 November, the following proposal was discussed.
- The committee decided that dog owners on camp report to the DoA that their dogs have been pilled after dog dosing day.
- The reporting system will be implemented from next dog dosing day ie 20 December 2006 and continue for a trial period of 12 months
- **All camp dog owners please advise that their dogs have been pilled by:**
 - **phone vet phone 27366: if after hours leave message**
 - **email: imports @doa.gov.fk**
 - **fax 27352**

If one person is responsible for an entire community only one phone call is necessary.

Please advise by the end of the week in which dog dosing day occurred.

When leaving a message please simply state:

1. Name
2. Location
3. Number and names of dogs
4. Actual day pills were administered

If you would like to raise any issues please contact Ian Hansen, Richard Stevens, Terrance McPhee or Justin Knight

Introduction:

- Advice received from experts overseas always comes back that 'non-compliance' i.e. the dogs not being restricted from offal and/or not receiving their tablets is the primary suspect cause of non-eradication
 - All other avenues of persistence of tapeworm infections and hydatidosis are being investigated
 - I have undertaken some small surveys last dog dosing day. They indicate
-

- Only 5 (out of) of the 'registered' dogs are fed camp killed meat and visit camp. ie 5/59 dogs could possibly spreading hydatids or bladder cysts
 - these 5 dogs are wormed every 6 weeks by Sarah so the chances of registered dogs being responsible is even less
 - 8 dog owners had to be reminded to present their dogs for treatment.
 - I can only assume camp dwelling dog owners would have the same 'forgetting' rate.
 - There are 495 dogs in camp of which 481 are fed camp killed meat.
 - These dogs all are capable of spreading hydatids and bladder cysts
 - It they are not pillled every 6 weeks this increases the chance of transmission
 - It was proposed that if all camp owner advice the DoA by any means (phone/fax/email) after the dog dosing day that their dogs have been treated that this may be a good way of ensuring compliance and getting rid of hydatidosis and bladder cysts
-

AAC meeting of 15 November 2006

PROPOSED DOG DOSING REPORTING SYSTEM

1. Purpose

- 1.1 Discussion paper on the implementation of a 'dog dosing' reporting system for camp dogs (ie unregistered dogs).

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Delegates of the AAC discuss the concept of a 'dog dosing' reporting system for camp dogs with their constituents (RBA members, farmers) and other interested parties. Following consultation, advise the DOA whether there is support for the introduction of the system.
- 2.2 Delegates report back to the SVO before the next AAC meeting. If the proposal has support a paper can be prepared and presented at the next AAC meeting. If agreed, the process of implementing any necessary changes could be started immediately.

3. Background

a. Current situation

- 3.1 Hydatid cysts were seen in 5 sheep, coming from 5 unrelated properties processed at the Sand Bay Abattoir (SBA) between January and May 2006.
 - i. All camp dogs (unregistered dogs) are 'pilled' every 6 weeks with worm tablets for the prevention and ultimate eradication of hydatidosis in the Falkland Islands.

- ii. This system has been in place for over 30 years.
- iii. Based on the life cycle of this parasite this disease should have been eradicated from the Falkland Islands many years ago.
- iv. Camp dogs are fed mutton more frequently than town dogs and are more likely to be involved with the transmission of hydatidosis than town dogs.
- v. No recording or reporting system is currently in place to know if 'pilling' has or has not been carried out for camp dogs. It is an honour system.
- vi. No recording system is in place for changes in the dog population in camp as these dogs do not require registration.
- vii. Registered dogs are 'pilled' by the Veterinary services every 6 weeks either directly or under supervision.
- viii. Many times the DoA staff have to ring parties that have not presented their dogs as required, indicating there is not 100% compliance without reminding

b. Possibilities on why hydatidosis persists in the Falkland Islands.

- i. Non- compliance ie dogs are not wormed and restricted from access to offal.
 - Overseas experts always have consistently stated that this as the most likely cause **or**
- ii. - There is a residue of hydatids in the Falkland Islands. This could be the fox.
 - This is currently under investigation **or**
- iii. The strain of hydatids worm in the Falklands is unique and its life cycle is different to hydatids found elsewhere in the world.
 - This is currently under investigation **or**
- iv. Introduction of new infections with the importation of new dogs into the Falklands. There are no wild dogs in the Falklands (let me know if I am wrong) and dog importation is under a protocol where it is 'pilled' before arrival **or**
- v. The hydatids worm is resistant to the 'pills'.
 - Resistance has not been found anywhere in the world to-date

4. Proposed changes

- a. Farmers report the dosing of all camp dogs to the Veterinary Services Officer (Sarah Bowles) by phone, fax or email on the day they are 'pilled'.

4.1 Advantages

- It would rule out 'non-compliance' as a cause of hydatids persisting.
- This will ensure compliance is maintained as non- reporting can be followed up by the DoA.
- This can help rule out non- compliance as a reason hydatidosis persists in the Falkland Islands.

4.2 Disadvantages

- Extra work for the DoA.
- Extra responsibilities and work for the camp dog owners.
- Other proposals may be made depending on the outcome of other investigations into hydatidosis so protocols may change in the future.
- Follow up may have to be done in the evenings and involve extra costs.
- It may have to be compulsory through legislation if compliance is low.

SELLING WOOL IN 2006/2007

By Neil Judd

A - Selling Options

Farmers in the Falkland Islands are faced with a number of options regarding the sale of their wool this year, as follows;

Option	Contact Person	Email
David Midgley Wools	David Midgley	david.wool@btinternet.com
Falkland Islands Wool Company	David Lambert	dlambert@blueyonder.co.uk
Falkland Islands Wool Marketing	Adam Holdsworth	adam@dbholdsworth.demon.co.uk
Falkland Wool Growers	Robert Hall	roberthall@falklandwoolgrowers.co.uk
Individual Farmers	Individuals	Individuals

It is clear that responsibility rests with each individual farmers to choose the agent/merchant to sell their farms' wool. Obviously many issues have an influence on this decision, as follows; relationship with the agent/merchant, money security, speed of payment, performance of the selling option relative to benchmarks and so on.

Once a farm has made the decision as to who is going to sell their wool this season, it is believed that a series of questions need to be asked quite quickly to help ensure that the whole process happens efficiently and effectively. Again, as follows;

- Should wool be core-sampled in the Falkland Islands, if so all of it or just the main fleece lines?
- What should happen to wool that is not core-sampled in the Falkland Islands?
- For lots core-sampled in the Islands, what should happen after core test results are received?
- Which freight company and which destination?
- If using FIC service, freight based on weight hence there would not appear to be any advantage in double dumping any wool
- If using SAAS freight service, should some of your wool be double dumped?
- How will the merit of wool price offers be evaluated? For example, benchmark price compared to gross Bradford, net Bradford, gross Czech Republic, net Czech Republic, gross Chile, net Chile or maybe benchmark price compared to Net Stanley?

Due to the difficulty in comparing many different selling options and delivery destinations with different freight, commissions and other selling costs, the DOA recommends that farmers attempt to bring their wool price offers back to a 'Net Stanley' basis. By doing this, farmers will be able to compare offers from anywhere going to any destination on an equal basis.

The following hypothetical examples may help to explain the concept;

1. Wool Sold ex-warehouse Bradford

Gross Bradford price	250 pence/kg clean
Selling costs <i>(including core test in UK)</i>	20 pence/kg clean
Freight - Stanley to UK <i>(warehousing in UK)</i>	<u>25 pence/kg clean</u>
Net Stanley price banked	<u>205 pence/kg clean</u>

2. Same Wool Sold Delivered to Czech Republic

Gross delivered Czech Republic	258 pence/kg clean
Selling costs	20 pence/kg clean
Core test costs <i>(based on 8 bales at 70% yield & £65 per test)</i>	6 pence/kg clean
Freight Stanley to Czech Republic	<u>27 pence/kg clean</u>
Net Stanley	<u>205 pence/kg clean</u>

Note - these examples are **not real**, they are intended to try and demonstrate the principles only. Price offered may vary with destination, costs do vary between agents; selling costs should vary as to whether or not wool is core-sampled in the Falkland Islands or in the UK and freight costs depend on whether or not some of the wool is double dumped or no as well as where the wool is going.

All of these facts need to be considered - hence the point, '**Net Stanley**' price is considered a fair analysis of comparing prices when circumstances can vary so much.

FLEECE WOOL SALES RATING

By Neil Judd

Over the last few years the DOA has been working with farmers on wool marketing efficiency. The following table summarises the general results of this work to day;

Note - 'Net Stanley' is the basis of the scale. The difference between the benchmark price and net Stanley price achieved on the day of sale being the key (this is referred to as the sales differential).

FALKLAND ISLANDS FLEECE WOOL SALES RATING	
Sales Differential (p/kg clean)	Sales Rating
20 or less	Outstanding
20 - 30	Excellent
30 - 40	Good
40 - 50	Average
50 - 60	Poor
60 or less	Very poor

Note - Sales Differential equals benchmark price less Net Stanley price achieved.

One of the most important opportunities of using the DOA wool sales ratings system (including the concept of sales differentials) is that over a season, the ability exists for farms to compare their wool selling efficiency against other farms and also against alternative selling options. Surely such scrutiny is a good thing? Please do not hesitate to contact the DOA to discuss this service or if further explanation is required.

LUMPS AND BUMPS

By Joe Hollins

The idea of this article is to provide a brief guide to the commoner lumps or fluid filled cysts to be found in a sheep carcass.

Sarcocystis:

Not a very enthralling name, but most of you will have seen this and wondered what it is. Sarcocystis is a parasite, not a worm but a small multicellular organism called a protozoa, which relies on two hosts - a carnivore and a herbivore - to complete its life cycle. Around the world there are 4 main types to be found in sheep, the small or microcyst variety transmitted by dogs and foxes, and the large or macrocyst variety transmitted by cats. The good news is that the microcyst form is the type most likely to cause ill thrift and the Falklands have the macrocyst form (the fox populated islands are probably an unknown on this). The bad news is that the macrocyst variety is extremely common here. In the abattoir most carcasses showed signs of sarcocystis.

The Falkland variety, *Sarcocystis gigantea*, is large and readily visible to the eye, forming 1cm elongate cysts which resemble fat, overcooked rice grains. Fortunately these cysts generally do not affect the prime abattoir meat, unless they are aberrant, and are to be found almost exclusively in the tongue and the gullet/oesophagus (Plate 1) where they protrude from the surface.

The life cycle is an impressive multiplication process. Each cyst contains thousands of infective organisms. A stray cat finds a carcass, eats a cyst, and the thousands of organisms attach to the cat's gut lining. Within 2 weeks these organisms produce hundreds of thousands of infective oocysts in the faeces for several weeks. The oocysts are scattered on the pasture where they form spore-like organisms that can survive for many months, ample opportunity for a grazing sheep to ingest at least a few. Each ingested sporocyst migrates from the gut of the sheep into the tissues where it multiplies again for several generations. The offspring then migrate to the tongue and gullet, each forming a cyst and multiplying yet again to many thousands of new infective organisms. It is a life cycle that leaves little to chance, sheer numbers making it very successful. Sheep eventually become immune or they would be overwhelmed, but cats never do and go on linking the cycle.

Although the Falkland variety is considered non-pathogenic, it is actually open to question. Worldwide the research has not been done, and it is thought likely that heavy burdens are a contributory cause to ill thrift. Looking at the picture, it does not take a great deal of imagination to see that it probably does affect grazing and swallowing.

The abattoir findings confirm therefore that there is a massive stray cat problem in the islands. Stray cats are undesirable for many reasons: the destruction of birdlife; the

transmission of sarcocystis; and the transmission of toxoplasma. Toxoplasma is the second commonest cause of abortion in sheep in the UK, and is prevalent here. It is a very similar organism to sarcocystis, and is transmitted to sheep by cats in the same way. The main difference is that cats tend to acquire it by hunting rodents. Control of stray cats is therefore beneficial to sheep farming, although difficult to achieve in Camp.

Boils:

'Boils' were covered in great detail before (Wool Press August 2006). Suffice to say that they are commoner in older sheep and affect about 10% of carcasses going through the abattoir. Although the majority are to be found in the external glands of the body, representing the drainage areas of infected shearing nicks, 50% of infected sheep will also have internal abscesses, sometimes deep within the meat. It is a major problem for the abattoir and meat exports, as well as for the animal on farm which may suffer from ill thrift and wool breaks. Not all abscesses are 'boils' as they can be caused by a number of other organisms, but the true mature 'boil' tends to be firm and have a characteristic onion ring pattern in cross section. The organism, *Corynebacterium pseudotuberculosis*, is hardy and persistent, but readily killed with disinfectants. Control measures for boils (see back issue) can be disheartening in their results, but don't give up. Even with full vaccination programmes it takes four years to see any difference. With no controls (in extensive grazing conditions) infection rates can reach 30% - so continue the battle!

Bladder cysts:

The widely recognised non-pathogenic bladder cyst is caused by a tapeworm *Taenia hydatigena*, or 'false hydatid'. This is a long tapeworm of dogs which infects sheep via dog faeces and grazing. Ingestion of the cysts when a dog finds a carcass completes the cycle. The cyst in the sheep is found almost exclusively attached to the outside of the lining, organs and membranes of the abdomen.

It is of particular interest though because it is considered by some authorities to be a good marker of effective hydatid control - both are tapeworms and rely on an almost identical cycle, and both are killed by the dog wormers. As there is a persisting albeit statistically small hydatid problem, and a high prevalence of bladder cysts, it poses many questions. True, it is probable that the life cycle is less than 6 weeks, but how are dogs getting access to the cysts to complete the cycle? And even if the life cycle proves to be 4 weeks (the DoA is undertaking a trial to try to establish this), the 6 weekly worming sessions should still decimate it. Its strength is a massive egg production in the dog, but how is it getting around to infect so many sheep? It is the sort of paradox that suggests there may be an unknown factor involved.

Hydatid:

There has been much written about hydatid. The most important thing is to recognise it (Plate 2). The life cycle of this small tapeworm (just 5-7mm long in the dog) is very similar to the bladder cyst. The abattoir found 5 confirmed cases of hydatid out of 33,000 carcasses, an incidence of 0.015%. This is a big, and therefore statistically significant or accurate sample. Island wide - ignoring age bias at killing - this may represent 100 cases. Cysts can vary in size from a gooseberry to a grapefruit, and most are to be found buried in the substance of the liver (often visible) or the lungs. They may be less obvious in the lungs because of the lack of contrast, so it is worthwhile having a closer look when they are removed. This may be of particular importance if you know you have sheep from the fox islands (such as Beaver or Weddell) - the cysts are long lived. A very small percentage can occur almost anywhere else, even in the muscle. So any large, opaque cysts are of interest.

Sheep measles:

This is yet another tapeworm, *Taenia ovis*, which relies on the dog/sheep relationship. It has a very similar life cycle to the hydatid and the bladder cyst, its strength being that each worm in the dog can produce ¼ million eggs per day. Generally sheep measles are seen as small pale multiple cysts within the muscle, most easily found in the jaw muscles, diaphragm, tongue and flaps. Each cyst is an infective tapeworm head. Cysts die relatively quickly (less than 1 year) but leave small gritty lumps in the meat. It is non-pathogenic, but clearly of great significance for the meat export industry. Fortunately it is less common as it has a relatively long life cycle and has been hit hard by the 6 weekly worming programme.

A plea:

Here at the Veterinary Service we love to see samples of what you are finding out in Camp. Please send them in ('boils' apart!) and at no cost to yourselves we will investigate them. There is a stigma attached to having a hydatid on your farm, but there shouldn't be. We will not assume that you have been non-compliant with worming. The cysts can be old and inherited from brought in sheep, and many farms are over-crossed by other farms' stock and dogs during gathering. Please send anything interesting or suspicious in. There are many other types of benign cysts and occasional tumours to be found, and we are happy to check them all.

LOGGING IN A POLY TUNNEL

By Peter Johnson

One of the environmental data loggers recently purchased by the DoA has been placed inside a poly-tunnel at the Stanley Garden Centre. The poly-tunnel is not heated and has a soil floor. It is hoped that the logger will remain in place for a period of around 6 months.

The data logger will record the following measurements every 10 minutes –

- air temperature
- humidity
- soil temperature (top soil)
- soil temperature (10 cm)
- soil moisture

It is hoped that the resulting data can be analysed to show the extremes and averages of temperature and moisture found within a poly-tunnel in the Falkland Islands. This data may prove valuable when looking into varieties of horticultural crops that can be grown in the Falkland Islands within a semi-controlled environment such as a poly-tunnel.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN BOVINE TB MONITORING

Please discuss this proposal with Ian Hansen, Richard Stevens, Terrance McPhee or Justin Knight.

A decision will then be made to implement or forget the project

In the AAC meeting on 15 November, the following proposal was discussed. Please discuss/make your thoughts known to....

Introduction:

-
- Between 1987 and 2005 every year only a small percent of farms with cattle have been tested for TB.
 - Approximately 36% of farms stocking cattle have not been tested for TB since 1987.
 - Based on these figures the current system of monitoring TB is inadequate.
 - Based on a small survey every cattle farm kills some cattle on farm each year so this could act as a better monitoring programme than the current one.
 - An examination of slaughtered animals would give a better monitoring system for TB in the Falkland Islands.
 - TB in cattle is a human health hazard so cattle with TB lesions should not be presented for human consumption
 - Farmers need not become experts on the diagnosis of TB but with basic knowledge they can identify abnormalities and advise the DoA
-

Proposed changes in bovine TB monitoring

Purpose

1.2 Discussion paper on the implementation of a new strategy to monitor bovine TB within the Falkland Islands. The new strategy involves post-mortem (PM) examination of camp and abattoir killed beef and reporting of the results to the DOA. The strategy replaces the vaccination reaction monitoring system that is currently in place.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Delegates of the AAC discuss the proposal with their constituents (RBA members and farmers) plus other interested parties and advise the DOA whether there is support for the introduction of the new strategy.

3.0 Background

3.1 Current situation:

- 3.1.1 TB testing for cattle within the Falkland Islands is undertaken by intradermal antigen testing.
- 3.1.2 This testing requires the cattle to be injected and the reaction to the injection examined 4 days later.
- 3.1.3 This presents difficulties as cattle have to be yarded and reyarded 4 days later – yarding facilities are poor on many farms.
- 3.1.4 Records indicate that between 1988 and 2006, 36 % of farms stocked with cattle have never been tested.
 - In 2003 14% of the cattle population were tested
 - In 2004 8% were tested
 - In 2005 10% were tested
- 3.1.5 Between 1988 and 2005 the number of tests on each farm varies from 10 (the dairy) to 1.
- 3.1.6 The last positive test case was in 2003 and was not confirmed as the cow died and the farm changed management.
- 3.1.7 The second last suspect case was in 1998 but this case could not be confirmed by laboratory culture in UK so can be considered negative.
- 3.1.8 The Sand Bay abattoir (SBA) is now killing approximately 350 head of cattle each year. These are mostly 'young' stock.
- 3.1.9 The SBA employs a person with meat hygiene inspection (MHI) qualifications. Currently each beast slaughtered is inspected for evidence of TB (either examined by the person with MH qualifications or an employee trained by him).
- 3.1.10 The SBA is submitting a monthly report to the DoA on beef kills and PM inspection findings.
- 3.1.11 'Home killing' is allowed in the Falklands for sale and personal consumption.
- 3.1.12 There is currently no inspection requirements imposed on 'farm killed' stock although there is no restrictions on the sale or consumption of that meat.

3.2 Difficulties with the current TB testing campaign:

- 3.2.1 It is thought that FI is bovine TB free but wild cattle exist on the Falkland Islands.
- 3.2.2 A monitoring programme has to be in place to prove and demonstrate the Falkland Island claim that it is TB free.
- 3.2.3 Many farms have not been tested.
- 3.2.4 Yarding facilities on many farms make it unlikely that this situation will change under the current practice.
- 3.2.5 Cattle being slaughtered at the SBA are 3 years old and under so this population bias is less likely to find an infected animal.

4.0 Proposed new strategy

4.1 Run training sessions on the PM inspection of cattle for farmers

- training days run by the DoA.
- training days may involve the MHI who has technical expertise in this matter (this will involve negotiations with SBA management).

- training will involve development of literature for farmers on PM examination and sample preparation.
 - 4.2 Only farmers who undergo 'training' can slaughter animals for sale.
 - 4.3 Farmers submit a slaughter return each time they kill a beast.
 - 4.4 Farmers submit any suspicious lesions or advise the DoA so they can collect samples.
 - 4.5 Suspicious samples will be sent to UK for laboratory analysis
 - 4.6 Advantages of proposed changes
 - 4.6.1 A 'rudimentary' meat hygiene inspection programme will be introduced into farm killed beef for sale and domestic consumption.
 - 4.6.2 The current testing system can be abandoned or used only on dairy cattle which will save time and is inefficient.
 - 4.6.3 This system of surveillance should be as effective as the current system at monitoring TB in cattle in the Falkland Islands.
 - 4.7 Disadvantages
 - 4.7.1 The education programme will have to be ongoing so more work time will be taken up by farmers and Veterinary Section.
 - 4.7.2 The management of SBA may not be willing to share MHI as the MHI gives a 'market advantage' for SBA.
 - 4.7.3 Farmers must co-operate willingly unless the system is legislated and penalties are imposed.
-

WOOL WAREHOUSE

By Lucy Ellis

The D.o.A has received numerous calls from farmers asking about the Wool Warehouse and what instructions to give to carriers as to where to put their bales.

Whilst the D.o.A has no official say in the management of the wool warehouse, we did think it prudent to get some sort of plan in place for the interim, especially now that core sampling is underway. These plans, which we sent to everybody 2 or 3 years ago, are basically the same but have been slightly modified to take into account SAAS and the double dumper.

May I also remind growers that it is very important to inform your carrier where your bales are to go in the warehouse i.e: in the coring area, not to be cored and shipped with FIC/SAAS or, at this stage, uncertain so can go in the "Unknown" area etc.

These floor plans are in no way definitive, they could very well change drastically, but for the time being could carriers/hauliers and individuals bringing bales into the warehouse

please follow the guidelines.

If anyone has questions/comments or an improved floor plan, please do not hesitate to call me on 27355.

NEW AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANT

By Vikki Lee

Hi folks. As most of you may already know I am the new Agricultural Assistant here at the DOA. I started on the 14th of November. My first day included going out to Home Farm with Andy P to weigh about 550 hoggets for one of the feeding trials. It turned out to be a little bit frustrating as the weighing scales were not working according to plan, plus the windy conditions didn't help. We then headed off to Cape Dolphin to look at some suitable land to grow swedes. Finally getting home at 7.30!! I did expect some early mornings and late nights, but on my first day. How cruel!!

The next day it was mostly involved formal paper work in the office and also being Nyree's run around ringing farmers for the forthcoming AI and ET programme.

The following day it was snowing!! Not just a little bit considering it was the middle of November!! But here at the DOA the weather doesn't stop the works. So off Peter and I go to Saladero to pick fifteen sheep up to bring back to Stanley for the Imported Feeding Trial. We recorded their weights and ear tag numbers before putting them in back of the Landrover. The day was brightened when it came to lunch time and I was lucky enough to sample one of Viv's fantastic lunches.

This is only my first week; I've really enjoyed it and already learnt loads about the different trials that are going on. Most people at the DOA will tell you I am very excited to be working here and really look forward to working with you in the near future.

SHEEP BREED PERFORMANCE SNAPSHOT SALADERO & GOOSE GREEN 2006

By Neil Judd & Lucy Ellis

A number of sheep breed/crosses have been located at Saladero over the last year. In addition Goose Green has continued to manage the National Corriedale Stud Flock. All animals have recently been shorn for the first time; animals have also been weighed. Results are shown in Table 1.

It should be noted that the ewe hoggets were all run as 1 mob (under the same conditions). As a result comparisons between the various breeds/crosses are possible. It should also be noted that the Polwarth and Corriedale ram hoggets were run on different farms, hence different comparisons are not as appropriate for some characteristics (such as liveweight).

Breed or Cross	Micron	Liveweight (kg)	GFW (kg)	CFW (kg)	Yield (%)
*Polwarth NSF Ewes	20.35	(11/10/06) 31.0	2.67	1.92	72
*Corriedale x Dohne Ewes	22.47	(11/10/06) 33.0	2.44	1.65	68
*Dohne Ewes	19.26	(11/10/06) 32.0	2.33	1.64	70
*SAMM Ewes	22.57	(11/10/06) 35.0	1.78	1.18	66
*Poll Dorset Ewes	29.53	(11/10/06) 38.0	1.67	1.00	60
**Polwarth NSF Rams	20.32	(23/11/06) 39.0	3.04	2.08	68
**Corriedale NSF Rams	24.31	(13/11/06) 38.0	2.84	1.81	63

Please do not hesitate to contact Lucy Ellis or Neil Judd if you would like further details on the conditions under which the breeds/crosses were run.

Note: * Run under the same conditions

** Run under different conditions

ENTROPION – A PROBLEM TO WATCH FOR

By Nick Pitaluga

With lamb marking now on us, (for those who haven't yet done it), it seems timely to raise the subject of something which may (and should) be of interest, if not concern to people as they mark this year's crop.

Now that some of the bloodlines from the AI/ET progeny stock must be starting to produce the next generation, & be put across local flock lines, there will be considerable anticipation to see what's coming out of it. Something that is, it seems, seen by many people in small, but occasional quantities in their lambs, is what appears to be a runny or watery eye or both eyes.

It is well worth looking to see if it is just pen dust, or unfortunately, an affliction which is endemic in Falklands flocks that have pushed finer, especially those that have had looser-skin sheep crossed into them. Apart from putting lambs off drinking when new born & ultimately causing ulceration of the eyeball, blindness, ill thrift & possibly death, its not an issue that has merited serious consideration in areas it might have done, hence this short note of caution for those who *may* just be becoming aware of it.

This inturned lower eyelid, or "entropion", is hereditary, albeit recessive, like black spots, so it *can* jump a generation & come out in later crosses. It is a serious, but not insurmountable problem, which can cause a variety of % -age damaging issues in flocks, so it really needs to be weighed up if you happen to see a lot of it.

There are treatments for it, for affected animals; this really should involve veterinary advice, so it is not the intention of this article to get too deep into that, although rolling out

& pinching of the skin, is the simplest, but not always guaranteed to work. It also needs to be considered whether, particularly in the case of rams, if the interests of your flock (or others, if you sell sheep), are best served if these sheep are not marked, given the recessive & potentially damaging effect they can have.

It is NOT, as thought, confined to any one breed; it is there in many, & please, do not be kidded by anyone who suggests it's not important; it IS! You would not want to use rams with one testicle, or ewes with no teats, so lambs that can't see or focus properly are at greater risk, as well as considerable discomfort.

The effect is much the same having a piece of gravel, or a grass seed in your eye. (It was even present in one eye of a massive Corriedale ram judged Grand Champion at the Pastoral Show in Punta Arenas back in 1998...where it was passed off as being caused by the bosal he was wearing for the show...!!) Good luck with your marking.