

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "xxxxx xxxxxxxxxx" <xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

To: enquiries@naturalengland.org.uk

Sent: 15/04/2015 08:07:55

Subject: Bovine TB: Distribution of badger removals across the cull zones

Dear Sir / Madam,

The following is an extract taken from Reference 1.

[START OF EXTRACT]

35.A brief overview of how cull rates will be monitored is as follows.

36.The cull companies will be obliged to provide sufficient data from the field regarding levels of culling effort applied (e.g. contractors deployed, hours spent shooting, number of traps set) and the number of badgers removed as well as the location where such effort was deployed.

37.It is anticipated that a reliable estimate will not be available until towards the end of the 6-week cull. A similar method was used after the RBCT by Smith and Cheeseman in order to determine what proportion of the population was removed in the first cull.

[END OF EXTRACT]

Please send to me the proportion of squares on a 1 square kilometre grid in the second year of culling where there were no badgers removed. Another words, please take the number of squares in which no badgers were removed and divide this number by the total number of squares. Please only consider squares where access was given.

Please provide this proportion for the two cull zones separately. Another words please provide me with data which in total consists of two numbers.

Uniformity of contractor effort is in doubt in view of the concerns expressed for year 1 in Table 6.1 on Page 38 of Reference 2. As such this information should be valuable and of public interest. The following shows an extract taken from Reference 2.

[START OF EXTRACT]

On some land holdings, few or no badgers were shot. Because data on Contractor effort are lacking, we cannot assess whether this resulted from lack of Contractor effort in these areas or from low badger densities. However, in some land holdings where no badgers were shot, hair traps successfully collected samples. This suggests that heterogeneous Contractor effort was a contributing factor.

[END OF EXTRACT]

Yours faithfully,

XXXXXXXXXXXX,
XXXXXXXXXXXX,
XXXXXXXXXXXX,
XXXXXXX,
XXXXXXX.
XXXXXXX

Reference

1. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/347536/badger-cull-setting-min-max-numbers-2014.pdf
2. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300382/independent-expert-panel-report.pdf

06 May 2014

[REDACTED]



BM 6283
London
WC1N 3XX

Dear [REDACTED]

Access to information – Request No RFI 2911

Thank you for your request for the information detailed below which we received on 15 April 2015. Your request has been considered under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

You specifically requested the following information:

1. Please send to me the proportion of squares on a 1 square kilometre grid in the second year of culling where there were no badgers removed. Another words, please take the number of squares in which no badgers were removed and divide this number by the total number of squares. Please only consider squares where access was given.

Please provide this proportion for the two cull zones separately. Another words please provide me with data which in total consists of two numbers.

The proportion of 1km squares in the two cull zones where no badgers were dispatched are as follows:

WS – 0.15
WG – 0.23

The numbers have been calculated in the format requested.

Yours sincerely

BTB Team

Bovine TB Licensing Unit

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "xxxxxxxxxxxx" <xxxxxxxxxxxx>
To: "BTB (NE)" <BTB@naturalengland.org.uk>
Sent: 06/05/2015 21:00:33
Subject: Re: Response to RFI 2911

Dear Sir / Madam,

Further to my email below, would you be able to give me some extra information so I can interpret the information which you have sent to me.

What I would like to know is have you only included squares which are accessible over their whole square and then looked at the proportion of these where no badger was removed. Another words have you excluded all squares which contain urban area or have you included all squares which are partly accessible as well as those which are wholly accessible.

I am interested in wholly accessible squares only because I do not want the result to be influenced by the extent to which the overall pilot area is urban.

Yours faithfully,

xxxxxxxxxx.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "xxxxxxxxxxxx" <xxxxxxxxxxxx>
To: "BTB (NE)" <BTB@naturalengland.org.uk>
Sent: 06/05/2015 21:25:13
Subject: Re: Response to RFI 2911

Dear Sir / Madam,

Sorry it would be clearer if the last sentence in my email below reads as follows.

"I am interested in wholly accessible squares only because I do not want the result to be influenced by the extent to which the included squares are accessible."

Yours faithfully,

xxxxxxxxxxxx.

18 May 2014



BM 6283
London
WC1N 3XX

Dear [REDACTED]

Access to information – Request No RFI 2911

Thank you for your request for the information detailed below which we received on 06 May 2015. Your request has been considered under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

You specifically requested the following information:

1. What I would like to know is have you only included squares which are accessible over their whole square and then looked at the proportion of these where no badger was removed. Another words have you excluded all squares which contain urban area or have you included all squares which are partly accessible as well as those which are wholly accessible.

I am interested in wholly accessible squares only because I do not want the result to be influenced by the extent to which the included squares are accessible.

Using a grid of 1km squares across each cull zone, 1km squares with only 100% participant coverage were considered. The proportion of these 1km squares where there is no record of a badger being culled is as follows:

West Gloucestershire – 0.25

West Somerset – 0.13.

Yours sincerely

BTB Team

Bovine TB Licensing Unit

----- Original Message -----

From: "xxxxxxxx" <dxxxxxxxxk>

To: "BTB (NE)" <BTB@naturalengland.org.uk>

Sent: 18/05/2015 16:54:59

Subject: Re: Response to RFI 2911

Dear bTB Team,

Thank you for your response.

I see that the proportions in each cull zone is different to those sent in your earlier response sent on 6th May.

Is this intentional?

Kind regards,

xxxxxxxx.

19 May 2015

[REDACTED]



BM 6283
London
WC1N 3XX

Dear [REDACTED]

Access to information – Request No RFI 2911

Thank you for your follow up request for the information detailed below which we received on 18 May 2015. Your request has been considered under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

You specifically requested the following information:

- 1. I see that the proportions in each cull zone is different to those sent in your earlier response sent on 6th May. Is this intentional?**

Yes, the proportions are different because the first response (dated 6 May 2015) included 1km squares with any level of participant coverage but the second response (dated 18 May 2015 and in line with the question asked) only considered 1km squares with 100% of participant coverage. Once culled badgers were taken into consideration, the proportions then changed.

Yours sincerely

BTB Team

Bovine TB Licensing Unit