

Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru

Pwyllgor Amaethyddiaeth a Datblygu Gwledig

The National Assembly for Wales

Agriculture and Rural Development Committee

**Clwy'r Traed a'r Genau
Foot and Mouth Disease**

Cwestiynau 267-565

Questions 267-565

Dydd Mercher 13 Mawrth 2002

Wednesday 13 March 2002

Aelodau o'r Cynulliad yn bresennol: Glyn Davies (Cadeirydd), Mick Bates, Jocelyn Davies, Ron Davies, Delyth Evans, John Griffiths, Elin Jones, Peter Rogers, Janet Ryder.

Tystion: Huw Brodie, Pennaeth yr Adran Amaethyddiaeth, Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru; Tony Edwards, Prif Swyddog Milfeddygol Cynorthwyol (Cymru); Sue Essex, Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd; Michael German, cyn Weinidog dros Ddatblygu Economaidd; Carwyn Jones, Gweinidog dros Faterion Gwledig a Threfnydd y Cynulliad; Gareth Jones, cyn-gyfarwyddwr Canolfan Weithrediadau Clwy'r Traed a'r Genau Cymru; Havard Prosser, Is-adran Diogelu'r Amgylchedd, Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru; Emyr Roberts, Pennaeth yr Is-adran Polisi Economaidd, Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru; Jasper Roberts, Pennaeth yr Is-adran Polisi Cefn Gwlad, Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru; Gerry Quarrell, Pennaeth y Gangen Cefn Gwlad a'r Arfordir, Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru.

Assembly Members present: Glyn Davies (Chair), Mick Bates, Jocelyn Davies, Ron Davies, Delyth Evans, John Griffiths, Elin Jones, Peter Rogers, Janet Ryder.

Witnesses: Huw Brodie, Head of Agriculture Department, National Assembly for Wales; Tony Edwards, Assistant Chief Veterinary Officer (Wales); Sue Essex, Minister for Environment; Michael German, former Minister for Economic Development; Carwyn Jones, Minister for Rural Affairs and Assembly Business; Gareth Jones, former director of the Foot and Mouth Disease Operations Centre in Wales; Havard Prosser, Environmental Protection Division, National Assembly for Wales; Emyr Roberts, Head of Economic Policy Division, National Assembly for Wales; Jasper Roberts, Head of Rural Policy Division, National Assembly for Wales; Gerry Quarrell, Head of Countryside and Coastal Branch, National Assembly for Wales.

*Dechreuodd y cyfarfod am 2 p.m.
The meeting began at 2 p.m.*

[267] **Glyn Davies:** Welcome to the meeting. The first item on the agenda is apologies, substitutions and declarations of interest. As in the last meeting, I declare a general interest as a partner in a farming business and a more specific interest, given the subject under discussion, in that my farm was subject to a D-notice for about eight months during the foot and mouth disease crisis. Are there any other interests to declare?

[268] **Peter Rogers:** I declare an interest as a farmer. My farm was also subject to foot and mouth disease restrictions, and was within a preventative cull area.

[267] **Glyn Davies:** Croeso i'r cyfarfod. Yr eitem gyntaf ar yr agenda yw ymddiheuriadau, dirprwyadau a datganiadau o fuddiant. Fel ag yn y cyfarfod diwethaf, datganaf fuddiant cyffredinol fel partner mewn busnes ffermio, a buddiant mwy penodol yng ngolwg y pwnc sydd dan ystyriaeth, sef bod fy fferm yn ddarostyngedig i rybudd-D am oddeutu wyth mis yn ystod argyfwng clwy'r traed a'r genau. A oes unrhyw fuddiannau eraill i'w datgan?

[268] **Peter Rogers:** Datganaf fuddiant fel ffermwr. Yr oedd fy fferm innau'n ddarostyngedig i gyfyngiadau clwy'r traed a'r genau, ac yr oedd o fewn ardal difa ataliol.

[269] **Mick Bates:** I declare an interest as a farmer. My farm was also under a form-A notice for a week.

[270] **Glyn Davies:** Thank you. I wish to make one or two points before I ask the Minister to comment. As there is a verbatim record of the meeting, it is important that we wait until the microphones are switched on before we speak. Secondly, we can correct any silly things that we have said. If I read a verbatim record of what I have said, there are all sorts of odd words thrown in. We can alter that, as we normally can, before it is made public and make it sound more logical. You cannot alter the meaning of what you said, but you can change some silly words. I would quite like to strike out what I have just said, actually.

[271] **Ron Davies:** I am not sure whether that would be a good idea, Chair. I have been reading the transcript of our last proceedings, and I think that the accuracy achieved by our transcribers was very impressive. It gives a flavour of what the process is like. I know that, as you are a dyed-in-the-wool Conservative, Chair, you will want to ensure that these proceedings reflect glory on you and your party, but I think that the rest of us have a greater interest in the truth.

[272] **Glyn Davies:** I think that you have misunderstood what I was trying to say. I am suggesting that the normal practice applies, whereby we can make our comments tidier. I wanted to draw that to members' attention, because it is normal procedure. I would not want to go beyond that. Is that alright, or do you want to introduce some new, abnormal practice?

[269] **Mick Bates:** Datganaf fuddiant fel ffermwr. Yr oedd fy fferm innau'n ddarostyngedig i rybudd ffurflen-A am wythnos.

[270] **Glyn Davies:** Diolch i chi. Dymunaf wneud un neu ddau o bwyntiau cyn imi ofyn i'r Gweinidog wneud sylw. Gan fod cofnod gair am air o'r cyfarfod, mae'n bwysig ein bod yn disgwyl nes bod y meicroffonau wedi'u troi ymlaen cyn inni siarad. Yn ail, gallwn gywiro unrhyw bethau gwirion yr ydym wedi'u dweud. Os darllenaf gofnod gair am air o'r hyn a ddywedais i, mae pob math o eiriau rhyfedd wedi'u taflu i mewn. Gallwn newid hynny, fel y gallwn wneud fel arfer, cyn ei gyhoeddi a pheri iddo swnio'n fwy rhesymegol. Ni allwch newid ystyr yr hyn a ddywedaso, ond fe allwch newid rhai geiriau gwirion. Byddwn yn eithaf hoffi dileu'r hyn yr wyf newydd ei ddweud, a dweud y gwir.

[271] **Ron Davies:** Nid wyf mor sicr y byddai'n syniad da, Gadeirydd. Bûm yn darllen trawsgrifiad ein trafodion diwethaf, a chredaf fod y cywirdeb a sicrhawyd gan ein trawsgrifwyr yn drawiadol iawn. Mae'n rhoi blas o sut y mae'r broses yn gweithio. Gwn y byddwch, gan eich bod yn Geidwadwr rhonc, Gadeirydd, yn dymuno sicrhau bod y trafodion hyn yn rhoi bri arnoch chi a'ch plaid, ond credaf fod gan y gweddill ohonom fwy o ddiddordeb yn y gwirionedd.

[272] **Glyn Davies:** Credaf eich bod wedi camddeall beth yr oeddwn yn ceisio'i ddweud. Yr wyf yn awgrymu defnyddio'r arfer arferol, lle y gallwn dacluso'n sylwadau. Yr oeddwn am dynnu sylw'r aelodau at hynny, am mai hwnnw yw'r arfer arferol. Ni hoffwn fynd ymhellach na hynny. A yw hynny'n iawn, neu a ydych yn dymuno cyflwyno rhyw arfer newydd, afreolaidd?

[273] **Ron Davies:** No, that is fine.

[274] **Glyn Davies:** Good. The other point that I want to make relates to timing. In handling today's meeting, I would quite like to deal with the vaccination issue first. My hope is that it will take about an hour. For the two items after that, we would benefit greatly from the presence of the Minister for Environment, Sue Essex. She tells me that there are a number of issues being discussed in the Environment, Planning and Transport Committee today for which she wants to be present. So, to some extent, she may be coming in and out of this meeting. I was informed of that in a letter today. My plan in terms of timing is to try to end our discussion on vaccination as near to 3 p.m. as possible, which would meet the timings that suit Sue Essex. However, when our discussions on those two items end is a matter for us, and it is a matter for Sue whether she is here or not. I have no control over that.

Do you have anything that you wish to say, Minister, before we begin questions?

Carwyn Jones: We will be dealing with vaccination first, I understand. I will say a few words before I hand over to Tony for him to describe the science behind the policy that was implemented, and as to why vaccination was not used. First of all, the aim of the culling policy was, of course, to get rid of the disease as quickly as possible for the good of the whole rural economy, not just of farming. As far as vaccination is concerned, it was something that was always kept under consideration. It was never the case that it was rejected out of hand, but the scientific advice was never in favour of vaccination, and the scientific advice was always followed. In terms of the legal situation regarding

[273] **Ron Davies:** Nac ydwyf, mae hynny'n iawn.

[274] **Glyn Davies:** O'r gorau. Mae'r pwynt arall yr wyf am ei wneud yn ymwneud ag amseru. Wrth drafod y cyfarfod heddiw, byddai'n dda iawn gennyf drin pwnc brechu'n gyntaf. Fy ngobaith yw y bydd yn cymryd tuag awr. Ar gyfer y ddwy eitem ar ôl hynny, byddem yn elwa'n fawr o gael presenoldeb y Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd, Sue Essex. Dywed wrthyf fod nifer o eitemau a drafodir ym Mhwyllgor yr Amgylchedd, Cynllunio a Thrafnidiaeth heddiw y mae'n dymuno bod yn bresennol ar eu cyfer. Felly, i ryw raddau, mae'n bosibl y bydd yn mynd a dod o'r cyfarfod hwn. Rhoddwyd gwybod i mi am hynny mewn llythyr heddiw. Fy mwriad o ran amseru yw ceisio dod â'n trafodaeth ar frechu i ben mor agos ag y bo modd at 3 p.m., a fyddai'n cydweddu ag amseriadau Sue Essex. Fodd bynnag, mater i ni yw pa bryd y daw'n trafodaethau ar y ddwy eitem hynny i ben, a mater i Sue yw a fydd yma ai peidio. Nid oes gennyf reolaeth dros hynny.

A ydych yn dymuno dweud rhywbeth, Weinidog, cyn inni ddechrau'r cwestiynau?

Carwyn Jones: Byddwn yn delio â brechu'n gyntaf, yr wyf yn deall. Dywedaf ychydig o eiriau cyn imi drosglwyddo hyn i Tony iddo ef gael disgrifio sail wyddonol y polisi a weithredwyd, a pham na ddefnyddiwyd brechu. Yn gyntaf oll, nod y polisi difa, wrth gwrs, oedd cael gwared â'r clefyd mor gyflym â phosibl er budd yr economi wledig yn ei chyfanrwydd, nid ffermio'n unig. O ran brechu, yr oedd yn rhywbeth a oedd dan ystyriaeth bob amser. Ni chafodd erioed ei wrthod yn ddifeddwl, ond nid oedd y dystiolaeth wyddonol erioed o blaid brechu, a dilynwyd y cyngor gwyddonol bob amser. O ran y sefyllfa gyfreithiol ynghylch brechu, ni fuasai'n bosibl i'r Cynulliad orchymyn

vaccination, it would not have been possible for the Assembly to have ordered vaccination on its own. Vaccination in Wales is a joint function of the Assembly and of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, but vaccination cannot take place without the express permission of the European Commission. Some members will remember that, in Cumbria and in Devon, permission was sought to vaccinate cattle only. That permission was forthcoming but, of course, the vaccination never took place. At no time was there ever any attempt to seek permission to vaccinate sheep, only cattle.

As far as the situation regarding vaccination is concerned, there are three matters on which members will wish to be informed. First, is it possible to blanket vaccinate against foot and mouth disease, even when the disease is not present, as a prophylactic measure? Secondly, what is the current legal status and scientific status surrounding vaccination to slaughter—vaccination to die, in other words? Thirdly, what is the scientific and legal situation regarding vaccination to live, whereby the animals are vaccinated and they are not slaughtered as a result of that vaccination? Tony will outline those three situations to the Committee today, with regard to the science and also with regard to the framework in which vaccination operates.

Mr Edwards: Thank you, Minister. I did circulate a paper earlier on at the request of the Committee, which I think covered most of the issues concerned, but we can go through them again just so that everybody understands exactly where we are. I will start with prophylactic vaccination, which is preventative vaccination when a disease does not exist in the country. This is illegal within the European Union under the current rules. A case was taken in Holland early on in the outbreak when somebody challenged

brechu ar ei ben ei hun. Mae brechu yng Nghymru'n swyddogaeth ar y cyd i'r Cynulliad ac Adran yr Amgylchedd, Bwyd a Materion Gwledig, ond ni all brechu ddigwydd heb ganiatâd pendant gan y Comisiwn Ewropeaidd. Bydd rhai o'r aelodau'n cofio bod cais wedi'i wneud, yn Cymbria ac yn Nyfnaint, i frechu gwartheg yn unig. Cafwyd y caniatâd hwnnw ond, wrth gwrs, ni ddigwyddodd y brechu. Ni fu erioed unrhyw ymgais i geisio caniatâd i frechu defaid, dim ond gwartheg.

O ran y sefyllfa ynghylch brechu, mae tri mater y bydd yr aelodau'n dymuno cael eu hysbysu amdanynt. Yn gyntaf, a oes modd brechu'n gynhwysfawr yn erbyn clwy'r traed a'r genau, hyd yn oed pan nad yw'r clwyf yn bresennol, fel cam i rwystro'r clwyf? Yn ail, beth yw'r statws cyfreithiol a'r statws gwyddonol presennol ynghylch brechu i ladd—brechu i farw, mewn geiriau eraill? Yn drydydd, beth yw'r sefyllfa wyddonol a chyfreithiol ynghylch brechu i fyw, lle y caiff anifeiliaid eu brechu a lle na leddir hwy o ganlyniad i'r brechu hwnnw? Bydd Tony yn amlinellu'r tair sefyllfa honno i'r Pwyllgor heddiw, o ran y materion gwyddonol a hefyd o ran y fframwaith y mae brechu'n gweithredu oddi mewn iddo.

Mr Edwards: Diolch i chi, Weinidog. Dosbarthais bapur yn gynharach ar gais y Pwyllgor, y credaf ei fod yn ymdrin â'r rhan fwyaf o'r materion dan sylw, ond gallwn fynd drwyddynt eto fel bod pawb yn deall yn union beth yw'n sefyllfa. Dechreuaf gyda brechu clwyfrwystrol, sy'n frechu ataliol pan nad yw clefyd yn bod yn y wlad. Mae hyn yn anghyfreithlon yn yr Undeb Ewropeaidd o dan y rheolau presennol. Cafwyd achos yn yr Iseldiroedd yn gynnar yn yr achosion o'r clwyf

the Dutch policy on vaccination and the European court judged against it.

The other ways in which vaccination can be used are as either a suppressive or a protective measure. Suppressive vaccination, which is what the Dutch used during the outbreak, is, effectively, to create a ring around an outbreak to prevent the disease spreading, but the ultimate aim is to kill the vaccinated animals. If vaccination is used in this way, exports are not allowed until three months after the last animal is killed. So, in order to do it, you have to define your area, you have to vaccinate all the animals in the area, you have to identify every animal that has been vaccinated, and you then have to prove to the commission subsequently that you have killed all those animals before consideration would be given to restoring your disease-free status.

If the vaccine to live policy is practised, not only do you have to define the zone in which you are going to carry out the policy, but that zone must be policed, because movement of animals in and out of the zone is forbidden, at least in the initial stages. Movement of animals out of the zone is only permitted later on, when they are going direct to slaughter. Again, the animals would all have to be identified, so that we would know which animals had been vaccinated and which animals had not been vaccinated. Restoration of disease-free status would not be considered until at least 12 months after the last case. This would also involve stamping out active clinical cases of the disease in the vaccination zone. Before that disease-free status could be restored, there would have to be a huge programme of sero surveillance to prove that the vaccination programme had done the job which it set out to do in the first place. So the 12 months is only an initial period. We would need to prove that the vaccine had done the job.

pan heriodd rhywun bolisi'r Iseldiroedd ar frechu a dyfarnodd y llys Ewropeaidd yn ei erbyn.

Y dulliau posibl eraill o ddefnyddio brechu yw fel mesur ataliol neu fesur amddiffynnol. Yr hyn a olyga brechu ataliol, sef yr hyn a ddefnyddiodd yr Iseldirwyr yn ystod yr achosion o'r clwyf, i bob pwrpas, yw creu cylch o gwmpas achos o'r clwyf i atal y clwyf rhag ymledu, ond y nod yn y pen draw yw lladd yr anifeiliaid a frechwyd. Os defnyddir brechu felly, ni chaniateir allforion tan dri mis ar ôl lladd yr anifail olaf. Felly, er mwyn ei wneud, rhaid ichi ddiffinio'r ardal dan sylw, a rhaid ichi frechu'r holl anifeiliaid yn yr ardal, rhaid ichi ddynodi pob anifail a frechwyd, ac wedyn rhaid ichi brofi i'r comisiwn eich bod wedi lladd yr holl anifeiliaid hynny cyn y byddid yn rhoi ystyriaeth i adfer y statws rhydd oddi wrth y clwyf.

Os arferir y polisi brechlyn i fyw, yn ogystal â diffinio'r parth lle y byddwch yn gweithredu'r polisi, mae'n rhaid plismona'r parth hwnnw, oherwydd gwaherddir symud anifeiliaid i mewn ac allan o'r parth, ar y dechrau o leiaf. Ni chaniateir symud anifeiliaid allan o'r parth yn ddiweddarach heblaw pan ydynt yn mynd yn syth i gael eu lladd. Unwaith eto, byddai'n rhaid dynodi'r holl anifeiliaid, fel y gwyddem ba anifeiliaid a oedd wedi'u brechu a pha anifeiliaid a oedd heb eu brechu. Ni fyddid yn ystyried adfer y statws rhydd oddi wrth y clwyf tan o leiaf 12 mis ar ôl yr achos olaf. Byddai hyn hefyd yn golygu dileu achosion clinigol gweithredol o'r clwyf yn y parth brechu. Cyn y gellid adfer y statws rhydd oddi wrth y clwyf, byddai'n rhaid wrth raglen helaeth iawn o arolygiaeth serolegol i brofi bod y rhaglen frechu wedi cyflawni'r hyn a fwriadwyd yn y lle cyntaf. Felly dim ond cyfnod cychwynol yw'r 12 mis. Byddai'n rhaid inni brofi bod y brechlyn wedi gwneud ei waith.

At the moment, the current status of serology is such that there are no tests currently validated that can detect the difference between antibodies in animals as a result of vaccination and antibodies in animals as a result of field challenge. So, if you vaccinate animals, thereby creating antibodies, which is the point of the vaccine, any sero surveillance that would be carried out would have to be delayed until the antibodies as a result of the vaccine had died away completely, otherwise the tests would be showing positive all the time, and you could not prove that the disease had been eradicated from the vaccination zone.

So, the year starts from the completion of the vaccination programme and, as I say, you would have to carry out the sero surveillance programme. In the meantime, there would be no movements in or out, except for slaughter a month after the vaccination programme had been completed. Any meat from slaughtered animals could only be used for human consumption if it is deboned and if it is matured to a pH below 6, in order for any virus that might be in the flesh to be killed. The maturation process works well for beef and, indeed, this is one of the conditions of trade with countries that still have foot and mouth disease. However, the maturation process does not work well for lamb or pork, so it is extremely complicated to use in the context of sheep. There has never been an eradication policy in the world based on the vaccination of sheep.

Carwyn Jones: Thank you for that, Tony. I hope that that gives members some idea of the basis for the view that was taken on vaccination at the time. People may now ask questions, if they want to.

[275] **Glyn Davies:** Do you want to come in first, Ron?

Ar hyn o bryd, y sefyllfa mewn seroleg yw nad oes unrhyw brofion a ddilyswyd sy'n gallu canfod y gwahaniaeth rhwng gwrthgyrff mewn anifeiliaid sy'n ganlyniad i frechu a gwrthgyrff mewn anifeiliaid sy'n ganlyniad i her yn y maes. Felly, os brechwch anifeiliaid, gan greu gwrthgyrff, sef pwrpas y brechlyn, byddai'n rhaid gohirio unrhyw arolygiaeth serolegol hyd nes y byddai'r gwrthgyrff sy'n ganlyniad i'r brechlyn wedi marw'n llwyr, neu fel arall byddai'r profion yn rhoi canlyniad cadarnhaol bob tro, ac ni allech brofi bod y clwyf wedi'i ddileu yn y parth brechu.

Felly, mae'r flwyddyn yn dechrau pan gwblheir y rhaglen frechu ac, fel y dywedais, byddai'n rhaid ichi gynnal rhaglen arolygu serolegol. Yn y cyfamser, ni fyddai unrhyw symud i mewn nac allan, ar wahân i ladd fis ar ôl cwblhau'r rhaglen frechu. Ni ellid defnyddio unrhyw gig o anifeiliaid a laddwyd i'w fwyta gan bobl oni bai fod yr esgyrn wedi'u tynnu ohono a'i fod wedi aeddfedu i pH o dan 6, er mwyn lladd unrhyw feirws a allai fod yn y cig. Mae'r broses aeddfedu'n gweithio'n dda ar gyfer cig eidion ac, yn wir, dyma un o'r amodau masnach â gwledydd lle y mae clwy'r traed a'r genau'n dal i fodoli. Fodd bynnag, nid yw'r broses aeddfedu'n gweithio'n dda ar gyfer cig oen neu borc, felly mae ei defnyddio yng nghyd-destun defaid yn gymhleth iawn. Ni chafwyd erioed yn unman yn y byd bolisi dileu a oedd yn seiliedig ar frechu defaid.

Carwyn Jones: Diolch i chi am hynny, Tony. Gobeithiaf fod hynny'n rhoi rhyw amcan i'r aelodau o'r sail i'r safbwynt a gymerwyd ar frechu ar y pryd. Gellir gofyn cwestiynau'n awr, os oes rhywun yn dymuno.

[275] **Glyn Davies:** A ydych am ddweud rhywbeth yn gyntaf, Ron?

[276] **Ron Davies:** Yes, I would love to. May I just ask Tony first—if that is all right with you, Carwyn—you, personally, believe in the slaughter policy, do you, and are committed to that?

Mr Edwards: No, I am committed to the correct policy according to the circumstances of an individual outbreak. As I said at the previous meeting, it is an extremely contagious disease. There are three currently available ways of dealing with it. One is the immediate, rapid stamping out in the area—

[277] **Ron Davies:** Can we come to that in a moment? I think that it is worth establishing—I do not disrespect you in any way for having a commitment to the policy; obviously, as an employee of the Government, you would—but I just want to establish, in my own mind, that we are not treating you as an independent witness. That is not to question your technical or your scientific judgment, but you are wedded to the policy and, therefore, we should not treat you as an objective witness. Would that be fair?

Mr Edwards: My role is to provide the best veterinary advice that I can to the Minister, and that would take into account all the factors.

[278] **Ron Davies:** Okay. It would be true to say, however, that it would be perfectly possible to get other veterinary experts who would have an entirely different view.

Mr Edwards: Absolutely.

[276] **Ron Davies:** Ydwyf, byddwn wrth fy modd yn gwneud. A gaf ofyn i Tony yn gyntaf—os yw hynny'n iawn gennyh chi, Carwyn—yr ydych chi'n bersonol yn credu yn y polisi lladd, ydych chi, ac wedi ymrwymo iddo?

Mr Edwards: Nac ydwyf, yr wyf wedi ymrwymo i'r polisi cywir yn ôl amgylchiadau'r achos unigol. Fel y dywedais yn y cyfarfod blaenorol, mae'n glwyf heintus dros ben. Mae tri dull o ddelio ag ef ar gael ar hyn o bryd. Un yw ei ddileu'n gyflym, ar unwaith yn yr ardal—

[277] **Ron Davies:** A gawn ddod at hynny mewn eiliad? Credaf ei bod yn werth darganfod—nid oes gennyf unrhyw amarch tuag atoch o gwbl am eich bod wedi ymrwymo i'r polisi; mae'n amlwg, fel un sy'n gweithio i'r Llywodraeth y byddech—ond yr wyf am gadarnhau, yn fy meddwl i, nad ydym yn eich trin fel tyst annibynnol. Nid yw hynny'n gyfystyr ag amau'ch barn dechnegol neu wyddonol, ond yr ydych wedi ymgysylltu â'r polisi ac, felly, ni ddylem eich trin fel tyst gwrthrychol. A yw hynny'n deg?

Mr Edwards: Fy rôl i yw darparu'r cyngor milfeddygol gorau y gallaf ei roi i'r Gweinidog, a byddai hynny'n cymryd yr holl ffactorau i ystyriaeth.

[278] **Ron Davies:** O'r gorau. Byddai'n wir dweud, fodd bynnag, y byddai'n gwbl bosibl cael arbenigwyr milfeddygol eraill a chanddynt farn hollol wahanol?

Mr Edwards: Yn hollol.

[279] **Ron Davies:** Okay. That is helpful. May I just clarify one or two things following on from that? What concerns me, Carwyn, is the evidence that we had at the last session—and it is recorded in the transcript—which said that the purpose of the Government's response was to stamp out the disease as quickly as possible. That was presented to us as the principal objective and, interestingly enough, we have heard it being repeated this afternoon. I am not entirely sure that that is a sound basis for a policy. Speed is important, but it cannot be everything, can it? There must be other considerations, such as, for example, cost effectiveness, proportionality, and a whole range of questions to do with welfare and ethics. I asked myself whether it is really adequate to say, 'speed is of the essence and to hell with the cost', for example. I wanted to look at a few figures about the cost of this policy, and I was horrified to find that the cost works out at about £1,000 an animal. If you count the £107 million direct cost of the policy itself, in terms of slaughter and compensation, and disregard civil service costs, that works out at about £350 for every animal that was killed, which is not a bad price when you look at the price that is available for cull ewes. Then, there is about another £200 million, which is the oncosts to the producers themselves, to the food sector and the loss to tourism industries and so on. That works out at about £1,000 an animal. I think that it is not unreasonable for us to ask ourselves whether speed is everything, or whether we should not take into consideration these other issues. That is why I am concerned about it. Therefore, I would just like to explore with Tony, if I could, some of the evidence that he gave. I thought that the paper was very good but, of course, we have to look at it—this is paper 2, I think—in the sense that it is a paper that is not presented objectively. That is not to diminish in any way the integrity of Tony Edwards, but it is a paper that reflects the thinking that underlines the Government's policy

[279] **Ron Davies:** O'r gorau. Mae hynny o gymorth. A gaf egluro un neu ddau o bethau yn sgîl hynny? Yr hyn sy'n peri pryder i mi, Carwyn, yw'r dystiolaeth a gawsom yn y sesiwn ddiwethaf—ac fe'i cofnodwyd yn y trawsgrifiad—a ddywedodd mai pwrpas ymateb y Llywodraeth oedd dileu'r clwyf cyn gynted â phosibl. Hynny a gyflwynwyd i ni fel y prif amcan ac, yn ddigon diddorol, clywsom ei ailadrodd y prynhawn yma. Nid wyf yn gwbl sicr bod hynny'n sail gadarn i bolisi. Mae cyflymder yn bwysig, ond ni all fod yn bob dim, oni all? Rhaid wrth ystyriaethau eraill fel, er enghraifft, cost-ffeithiolrwydd, cymesuredd, ac amrywiaeth eang o gwestiynau sy'n ymwneud â lles a moeseg. Fe'm holais fy hun a yw'n ddigonol dweud, mewn gwirionedd, 'mae cyflymder yn hollbwysig ac i'r diawl â'r gost', er enghraifft. Yr oeddwn am edrych ar ychydig o ffigurau ynghylch cost y polisi hwn, a dychrynais o ddarganfod bod y gost yn dod i tua £1,000 yr anifail. Os cyfrifwch y £107 miliwn ar gost uniongyrchol y polisi ei hun, o ran lladd ac iawndal, a diystyru costau'r gwasanaeth sifil, mae hynny'n dod i tua £350 am bob anifail a laddwyd, nad yw'n bris gwael os edrychwch ar y pris sydd ar gael am famogiaid a ddifawyd. Wedyn, mae tua £200 miliwn arall, sef yr argostau i'r cynhyrchwyr eu hunain, i'r sector bwyd a'r golled i'r diwydiannau twristiaeth ac yn y blaen. Mae hynny'n dod i tua £1,000 yr anifail. Credaf nad yw'n afresymol inni ofyn i ni'n hunain ai cyflymder yw pob dim, neu a ddylem gymryd y materion eraill hyn i ystyriaeth. Dyna pam yr wyf yn pryderu yn ei gylch. Felly, hoffwn edrych gyda Tony, os caf, ar ryw faint o'r dystiolaeth a roddodd. Credaf fod y papur yn dda iawn ond, wrth gwrs, rhaid inni edrych arno—papur 2 yw hwn, yr wyf yn credu—yn yr ystyr ei fod yn bapur sydd heb ei gyflwyno'n wrthrychol. Nid yw hynny'n gyfystyr â bychanu uniondeb Tony Edwards o gwbl, ond mae'n bapur sy'n adlewyrchu'r meddwl sy'n sail i

on this matter. I want to look at it in that sense.

On the question of the express permission from Europe about vaccination, Tony, there are conditions that are laid down, are there not? Provided that those conditions are met, the UK Government would have been able to proceed. So, it is not a matter of having to ask, 'can we please do it?' It is a matter of saying, 'these are the conditions, which are laid down by Europe, and provided that we meet those conditions, we can proceed.'

Mr Edwards: That is correct.

[280] **Ron Davies:** And vaccination has been used as a very successful policy, has it not? I know that we have heard a lot about the Netherlands and the excessive cull that was used there, but vaccination has been used, in recent years, very successfully in Greece, Macedonia and, most recently, in Uruguay. In fact, exports from Uruguay were reintroduced well within the 12-month limit that we have talked about. So I would not like the Committee, Glyn, to think that the policy is so destructive that it cannot be used, because it has been used. Neither am I entirely happy with the suggestion that has been put to us that there are three options—we either have the prophylactic use of vaccine, the vaccinate to kill policy or the vaccinate to live policy—because, in fact, you can mix and match; you can use a bit of one and a bit of the other to suit the circumstances. So it would have been quite possible to say 'we will have vaccination'. If we had decided to use it in this country, we could have had, as was agreed in south-west England, a vaccination policy to protect cattle, or to protect breeds or, indeed, to protect areas. Simultaneously, you could have a policy of ring vaccination around hot spots, where the intention was to withhold the disease, to reduce the incidence of plumes and to move in and eradicate

bolisi'r Llywodraeth ar y mater hwn. Yr wyf am edrych arno yn yr ystyr honno.

Ynghylch cwestiwn y caniatâd pendant oddi wrth Ewrop ynghylch brechu, Tony, mae amodau sydd wedi'u gosod, onid oes? Os oedd yr amodau hynny wedi'u cyflawni, byddai Llywodraeth y DU wedi gallu mynd ymlaen. Felly, nid yw'n fater o orfod gofyn, 'a allwn ei wneud, os gwelwch yn dda?' Mae'n fater o ddweud, 'dyma'r amodau, sydd wedi'u gosod gan Ewrop, ac os gallwn gyflawni'r amodau hynny, gallwn fynd ymlaen.'

Mr Edwards: Mae hynny'n gywir.

[280] **Ron Davies:** Ac mae brechu wedi'i ddefnyddio fel polisi llwyddiannus iawn, onid yw? Gwn ein bod wedi clywed llawer am yr Iseldiroedd a'r difa gormodol a ddefnyddiwyd yn y fan honno, ond mae brechu wedi'i ddefnyddio'n llwyddiannus dros ben, yn y blynyddoedd diwethaf hyn, yng Ngwlad Groeg, Macedonia ac, yn fwyaf diweddar, yn Wrwgwái. Mewn gwirionedd, ailgyflwynwyd allforion o Wrwgwái ymhell cyn diwedd y cyfyngiad 12 mis yr ydym wedi'i drafod. Felly ni fyddwn am i'r Pwyllgor feddwl, Glyn, fod y polisi mor ddinistriol fel na ellir ei ddefnyddio, oherwydd mae wedi'i ddefnyddio. Nid wyf yn gwbl hapus chwaith â'r awgrym a roddwyd i ni fod tri dewis—y cawn un ai'r defnydd clwyfrwystrol o'r brechlyn, y polisi brechu i ladd neu'r polisi brechu i fyw—oherwydd, mewn gwirionedd, gallwch gymysgu a chydweddu; gallwch ddefnyddio ychydig o un ac ychydig o'r llall i gyfateb i'r amgylchiadau. Felly buasai'n gwbl bosibl dweud 'fe gawn frechu'. Pe byddem wedi dewis ei ddefnyddio yn y wlad hon, byddem wedi gallu cael polisi brechu i amddiffyn gwartheg, fel y cytunwyd yn ne-orllewin Lloegr, neu i amddiffyn bridiau neu, yn wir, i amddiffyn ardaloedd. Ar yr un pryd, gallech gael polisi o frechu cylch o gwmpas manau trafferthus, lle'r

it. So, it would be possible to mix and match. We should not be led to believe that the policy is either vaccinate to kill or vaccinate to live. If we were labouring on that, we would be trying to resolve a false dichotomy. I wonder if Tony or Carwyn want to respond to any of those points.

Carwyn Jones: It is correct to say that each circumstance has to be looked at individually to see what is the best policy. Turning to what you said about speed, yes, there are other considerations. However, if you look, for example, at the Netherlands, where they had a policy of vaccinate to slaughter, they killed something like 10,000 animals per holding, compared with about 3,000 in Wales. So, in fact, vaccinate to slaughter as a policy does not lead to fewer animals being killed. The experience in the Netherlands was that it led to more animals being slaughtered per holding than was the case in the UK. Similarly, I think that we have to accept—and, as far as I am aware, this has never been disputed by anybody—that if you have a vaccinate to live policy and you wish to export, you have to wait 12 months before you can do so.

On that basis, it is right to say, I believe—well, I assert—that we would not be exporting now if a vaccinate to live policy had been implemented. It is possible for some countries, where foot and mouth disease is present and where they have vaccinated, to export, but it is done under very strict circumstances. The meat, as Tony has already said, has to be deboned and matured. It does not work very well for lamb in any event. There are other difficulties also. The result of the deboning and maturing process is that the price of the meat is at rock-bottom. The countries that produce such meat are able to compete in that market because their production costs are

oedd yn fwriad atal y clwyf, i leihau amllder y plu ac i symud i mewn a'i ddileu. Felly, byddai'n bosibl cymysgu a chydweddu. Ni ddylem gael ein harwain i gredu mai'r polisi yw un ai brechu i ladd neu frechu i fyw. Pe byddem yn rhygnu ar hynny, ceisio datrys deubarthiad ffug a fyddem. Tybed a yw Tony neu Carwyn yn dymuno ymateb i unrhyw un o'r pwyntiau hyn.

Carwyn Jones: Mae'n gywir dweud bod yn rhaid edrych ar bob amgylchiad yn unigol i weld beth yw'r polisi gorau. Gan droi at yr hyn a ddywedasoch am gyflymder, oes, mae ystyriaethau eraill. Fodd bynnag, os edrychwch ar yr Iseldiroedd, er enghraifft, lle'r oedd ganddynt bolisi o frechu i ladd, fe laddasant tua 10,000 o anifeiliaid y ddaliadaeth, o'i gymharu â thua 3,000 yng Nghymru. Felly, mewn gwirionedd, nid yw polisi o frechu i ladd yn arwain at ladd llai o anifeiliaid. Y profiad a gafwyd yn yr Iseldiroedd oedd ei fod yn arwain at ladd mwy o anifeiliaid y ddaliadaeth nag yn y DU. Yn yr un modd, credaf fod yn rhaid inni dderbyn—a, hyd y gwn i, nid oes neb erioed wedi amau hyn—os oes gennych bolisi brechu i fyw a chithau'n dymuno allforio, fod yn rhaid ichi aros 12 mis cyn y gallwch wneud hynny.

Oherwydd hynny, mae'n gywir dweud, yr wyf yn credu—wel, yr wyf yn haeru—na fyddem yn allforio'n awr pe byddai polisi brechu i fyw wedi'i weithredu. Mae rhai gwledydd, lle y ceir clwy'r traed a'r genau a lle y maent wedi brechu, yn gallu allforio, ond gwneir hynny o dan amgylchiadau caeth dros ben. Fel y dywedodd Tony, rhaid tynnu'r esgyrn o'r cig a'i aeddfedu. Nid yw'n gweithio'n dda iawn yn achos cig oen, beth bynnag. Mae anawsterau eraill hefyd. Canlyniad y broses tynnu esgyrn ac aeddfedu yw bod pris y cig yn digyn i'r gwaelod un. Mae'r gwledydd sy'n cynhyrchu cig o'r fath yn gallu cystadlu yn y farchnad honno am fod eu costau

extremely low, whereas in Wales our production costs are not low. So we must get rid of as many obstacles as possible to allow our farmers to export.

The other important point is that it is important to get rid of the disease as quickly as possible. We could look at it, for example, from the viewpoint of walking. A large number of people come to Wales to walk. If it is known that foot and mouth disease is present—and it would have been present for a long period of time if we had implemented a vaccinate to live policy—there would have been a disincentive for those people to come in the first place because, in going back to their own countries, they would have had to go through biosecurity measures. The message that would have been conveyed was that the whole countryside, in some way, was tainted, and we could not have tolerated that for a long period of time.

I suppose that there is a fourth option, which would be to do nothing and leave foot and mouth disease to take root. That is, technically, a fourth option, but it would not be in the best interests of anyone or any sector of the rural economy.

[281] **Ron Davies:** That is what they did with the Duke of Westminster herd in the 1920s; they nursed the animals through.

Carwyn Jones: Things were very different in the 1920s and 1930s. We had an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in this country almost every year up until 1967. Subsequently, there was an outbreak in 1981 on a small scale in the Isle of Wight as a result of airborne spread from France. However, the situation in the 1920s was very different to the situation now. Countries that are free of foot and mouth disease intend to stay that way. It is taken very seriously in New Zealand and the United States of America, because—and I think that I am right to say this—foot and

cynhyrchu'n isel iawn, tra nad yw ein costau cynhyrchu ni yng Nghymru'n isel. Felly rhaid inni gael gwared â chynifer o rwystrau ag y bo modd i alluogi'n ffermwyr i allforio.

Y pwynt pwysig arall yw ei bod yn bwysig cael gwared â'r clwyf mor gyflym â phosibl. Gallem edrych ar hynny o safbwynt cerdded, er enghraifft. Daw nifer fawr o bobl i Gymru i gerdded. Os gwyddys bod clwy'r traed a'r genau'n bresennol—a byddai wedi bod yn bresennol am gyfnod hir pe byddem wedi gweithredu polisi brechu i fyw—buasai gwrthanogaeth i'r bobl hynny ddod yn y lle cyntaf oherwydd, wrth fynd yn ôl i'w gwledydd eu hunain, byddent wedi gorfod mynd drwy gamau diogelwch biolegol. Y neges a fyddai wedi'i chyfleu oedd bod y cyfan o gefn gwlad, ar ryw ystyr, wedi'i lychwino, ac ni fyddem wedi gallu goddef hynny'n hir.

Mae'n debyg fod pedwerydd dewis, sef gwneud dim a gadael i glwy'r traed a'r genau ymwreiddio. Mae hynny, yn dechnegol, yn bedwerydd dewis, ond ni fyddai er budd neb nac unrhyw sector yn yr economi wledig.

[281] **Ron Davies:** Dyna a wnaethant â gyr Dug Westminster yn y 1920au; fe ofalasant am yr anifeiliaid nes eu bod wedi gwella.

Carwyn Jones: Yr oedd pethau'n wahanol iawn yn y 1920au a'r 1930au. Cawsom achosion o glwy'r traed a'r genau yn y wlad hon bob blwyddyn bron hyd 1967. Wedi hynny, bu nifer fach o achosion yn 1981 yn Ynys Wyth o ganlyniad i ymlediad drwy'r awyr o Ffrainc. Fodd bynnag, yr oedd y sefyllfa yn y 1920au'n dra gwahanol i'r sefyllfa bresennol. Mae'r gwledydd sy'n rhydd oddi wrth glwy'r traed a'r genau'n bwriadu aros felly. Maent yn rhoi ystyriaeth ddifrif iawn iddo yn Seland Newydd ac Unol Daleithiau America, oherwydd—a

mouth disease is the most virulent disease known among any species, not just among animals. It can spread very, very quickly. It is a disease that is very harmful to cattle in particular, and is something that countries have done their best to get rid of.

[282] **Ron Davies:** I would like to ask one or two more questions.

[283] **Glyn Davies:** Just ask one or two. I am quite keen to spread questions around the room.

[284] **Ron Davies:** Okay. I will try to be as brief as I can, but it is a technical and complicated issue, obviously. Tony, there are three species of deer that are pretty widespread in Wales at the moment, are there not?

Mr Edwards: Yes. There are red deer, muntjac deer and fallow deer.

[285] **Ron Davies:** I thought that we had roe deer rather than red deer.

Mr Edwards: And roe deer, yes, I beg your pardon.

[286] **Ron Davies:** I do not think that there are any red deer.

Mr Edwards: No, not in Wales. I meant roe deer not red deer. You are correct.

[287] **Ron Davies:** So we have three, not including red deer. They are cloven-hoofed animals are they not?

Mr Edwards: Yes.

chredaf fy mod yn iawn wrth ddweud hyn—clwy'r traed a'r genau yw'r clwyf mwyaf ffyrnig y gwyddys amdano mewn unrhyw rywogaeth, nid ymysg anifeiliaid yn unig. Gall ymledu'n gyflym dros ben. Mae'n glwyf sy'n niweidiol iawn i wartheg yn benodol, a gwnaeth y gwledydd eu gorau i gael gwared ag ef.

[282] **Ron Davies:** Hoffwn ofyn un neu ddau o gwestiynau'n rhagor.

[283] **Glyn Davies:** Gofynnwch un neu ddau. Yr wyf yn eithaf awyddus i ledaenu'r cwestiynau o amgylch yr ystafell.

[284] **Ron Davies:** O'r gorau. Ceisiaf fod mor gryno ag y gallaf, ond mae'n fater technegol a chymhleth, wrth gwrs. Tony, mae tair rhywogaeth o geirw sy'n eithaf cyffredin yng Nghymru ar hyn o bryd, onid oes?

Mr Edwards: Oes. Ceir ceirw coch, ceirw myntjac a hyddod brith.

[285] **Ron Davies:** Yr oeddwn yn tybio mai iyrchod a oedd gennym ni'n hytrach na cheirw coch.

Mr Edwards: Ac iyrchod, ie, mae'n ddrwg gennyf.

[286] **Ron Davies:** Ni chredaf fod unrhyw geirw coch.

Mr Edwards: Nac oes, nid yng Nghymru. Iyrchod yr oeddwn yn ei feddwl, nid ceirw coch. Yr ydych yn gywir.

[287] **Ron Davies:** Felly mae gennym dair, heb gynnwys ceirw coch. Anifeiliaid ewinhollt yw'r rhain, onid ef?

Mr Edwards: Ie.

[288] **Ron Davies:** Do we have a county in Wales, do you think, where we do not have a pretty substantial population of wild deer?

Mr Edwards: I should suspect, knowing the geography, that most of the counties in Wales would have some deer in them. Yes, that is correct.

[289] **Ron Davies:** Have you made any assessment of the relative risks of foot and mouth disease being spread by walkers as opposed to deer?

Mr Edwards: Yes, veterinary risk assessments have been done on both counts.

[290] **Ron Davies:** And what do they say in respect of deer?

Mr Edwards: That there is no evidence of deer being involved in the spread of foot and mouth disease.

[291] **Ron Davies:** There is no evidence of them being involved in the spread?

Mr Edwards: Of foot and mouth disease, no.

[292] **Ron Davies:** Is there evidence of walkers having been involved in the spread of the disease?

Mr Edwards: No. There is no evidence at the moment of walkers being involved in the spread.

[293] **Ron Davies:** In your scientific opinion, would you think that the risk of deer—being cloven-hoofed animals and therefore susceptible to the disease—carrying the disease would be greater than walkers doing so?

[288] **Ron Davies:** A oes gennym sir yng Nghymru, a ydych yn credu, lle nad oes gennym boblogaeth eithaf mawr o geirw gwyllt?

Mr Edwards: Byddwn yn amau, o adnabod y ddaearyddiaeth, fod rhyw nifer o geirw yn y rhan fwyaf o siroedd Cymru. Ydyw, mae hynny'n gywir.

[289] **Ron Davies:** A wnaethoch unrhyw asesiad o'r risgiau cymharol o ledaenu clwy'r traed a'r genau gan gerddwyr yn hytrach na cheirw?

Mr Edwards: Do, gwnaethpwyd asesiadau risg milfeddygol ar y ddau gyfrif.

[290] **Ron Davies:** A beth maent yn ei ddweud am geirw?

Mr Edwards: Nad oes tystiolaeth bod ceirw wedi bod â rhan mewn lledaenu clwy'r traed a'r genau.

[291] **Ron Davies:** Nid oes tystiolaeth iddynt fod â rhan yn y lledaeniad?

Mr Edwards: O ledaenu clwy'r traed a'r genau, nac oes.

[292] **Ron Davies:** A oes tystiolaeth bod cerddwyr wedi bod â rhan yn lledaeniad y clwyf?

Mr Edwards: Nac oes. Nid oes tystiolaeth ar y funud i gerddwyr fod â rhan yn y lledaeniad.

[293] **Ron Davies:** Yn eich barn wyddonol chi, a fydddech yn credu bod y perygl i geirw gario'r clwyf—gan eu bod yn anifeiliaid ewinholtt ac felly bod perygl iddynt ddiodef o'r clwyf—yn fwy nag y byddai i gerddwyr?

Mr Edwards: On the face of it, because, as you say, deer are cloven hoofed and therefore more susceptible, then yes, the risk would be higher, I would estimate, than it would be for walkers.

[294] **Ron Davies:** At the root of that question, Chair, is my questioning the extent to which Wales was devastated by this infectious plume of foot and mouth disease virus. Certainly, the evidence that we had at our last session indicated that, out of 400 plus holdings, foot and mouth disease was only confirmed in 40 plus of them as a result of serological testing.

Mr Edwards: It was 60.

[295] **Ron Davies:** It was 60, I am sorry. We had a dispute about whether it was 60 or 61. It was 60 out of 400. I think that what we have had, if I can coin a phrase, is overkill. There has just been this determination to follow a policy of ruthlessly exterminating the disease for historical reasons and to protect the industry. However, in fact, it has just been a knee-jerk reaction. We have overreacted and we have not been sufficiently rigorous and scientific in our approach. I think that the result of that has been very expensive. I think that, in the pursuance of that policy, we have actually pushed to one side the policy of vaccination. If that policy had been applied scientifically and, certainly, if we had concentrated since the last outbreak on developing not only pen-side tests, but also a means of subsequently testing whether vaccinated animals had been exposed to the virus or not, we would have a far better mechanism for responding to foot and mouth disease than we have. I just think, Chair, that, given the experience that we have now had, we must not repeat the errors of 1967-68 and the years following. If it is the case that we believe that

Mr Edwards: Ar yr olwg gyntaf, oherwydd, fel y dywedwch, mae ceirw'n ewinhollt ac felly'n fwy agored iddo, yna byddai, fe fyddai'r perygl yn fwy, byddwn yn amcangyfrif, nag y byddai i gerddwyr.

[294] **Ron Davies:** Yr hyn sydd wrth wraidd y cwestiwn hwnnw, Gadeirydd, yw'r ffaith fy mod yn cwestiynu'r graddau yr oedd y bluen heintus hon o feirws clwy'r traed a'r genau wedi anrheithio Cymru. Yn sicr, yr oedd y dystiolaeth a gawsom yn ein sesiwn ddiwethaf yn dangos, o 400 a mwy o ddaliadaethau, mai dim ond yn 40 a mwy ohonynt y cafwyd cadarnhad o glwy'r traed a'r genau o ganlyniad i brofi serolegol.

Mr Edwards: Trigain ydoedd.

[295] **Ron Davies:** Trigain ydoedd, mae'n ddrwg gennyf. Cawsom ddadl ynghylch a oedd yn 60 neu'n 61. Yr oedd yn 60 o 400. Credaf mai'r hyn a gawsom, os caf fathu ymadrodd, oedd gorddifa. Cafwyd y penderfyniad hwn i ddilyn polisi o ddifa'r clwyf yn ddiarbed am resymau hanesyddol ac i amddiffyn y diwydiant. Fodd bynnag, mewn gwirionedd, bu'n ymateb difeddwl. Yr ydym wedi gorymateb ac ni fu ein dull o weithredu'n ddigon trwyadl a gwyddonol. Credaf fod y canlyniad i hynny wedi bod yn ddrud iawn. Credaf ein bod, wrth ddilyn y polisi hwnnw, wedi gwthio o'r neilltu'r polisi o frechu. Pe byddai'r polisi hwnnw wedi'i gymhwyso'n wyddonol ac, yn sicr, pe byddem wedi canolbwyntio ers yr achosion diwethaf o'r clwyf ar ddatblygu profion ger y gorlan, a hefyd ddull o roi prawf wedyn i ganfod a oedd anifeiliaid a frechwyd wedi bod yn agored i'r feirws ai peidio, byddai gennym fecanwaith gwell o lawer i ymateb i glwy'r traed a'r genau nag sydd gennym yn awr. Nid wyf ond yn meddwl, Gadeirydd, o ystyried y profiad a gawsom bellach, fod yn rhaid inni beidio ag ailadrodd camgymeriadau 1967-68 a'r blynyddoedd

vaccination should have been more actively considered, we should state that now so that, if we do see any reoccurrence in two, three, four or five years' time, then hopefully the research would have been done to deal with these outstanding scientific questions.

Carwyn Jones: I have three points to make. First, as Tony has said, there is no evidence of walkers spreading the disease but, on the other hand, the fact that action was taken to close down the footpaths may be the reason for that. It is impossible to prove a negative in that way.

[296] **Ron Davies:** Back to reindeers.

Carwyn Jones: Well, if we can put it this way, I have no doubt whatsoever that, had steps not been taken to allow local authorities to close the footpaths, people would have been asking why, because it was an avenue that was open. In the Republic of Ireland, I note, they closed down every footpath before the disease had even arrived. That was the response on 28 February by Joe Walsh, the Minister in the Republic of Ireland, before the disease was even known to be in the republic. The other point to make is that we have to operate within the rules that exist at the moment. I have read documents, for example, from the National Foot and Mouth Group, which makes the point that the rules as they exist are wrong. Well, that may be right, one way or the other. That is a matter for argument. The point is that they exist. We have to operate within the rules as they exist. If the rules change, then a different view can be taken as to what policy is the most effective in getting rid of the disease. However, as the rules stand at the moment, it does make it extremely difficult for vaccination to be a useful tool in getting rid of the disease if it is not carried out as a vaccinate to slaughter policy.

dilynol. Os ydym yn credu y dylesid bod wedi ystyried brechu'n fwy gweithredol, dylem ddatgan hynny'n awr fel y bydd ymchwil wedi'i wneud, yr wyf yn gobeithio, os gwelwn hyn yn digwydd eto ymhen dwy, tair, pedair neu bum mlynedd, i ddelio â'r cwesiynau gwyddonol hyn sy'n aros .

Carwyn Jones: Mae gennyf dri phwynt i'w gwneud. Yn gyntaf, fel y dywedodd Tony, nid oes tystiolaeth bod cerddwyr wedi lledaenu'r clwyf ond, ar y llaw arall, mae'n bosibl mai'r ffaith bod camau wedi'u cymryd i gau'r llwybrau cyhoeddus oedd y rheswm am hynny. Mae'n amhosibl profi negydd mewn modd felly.

[296] **Ron Davies:** Yn ôl at geirw Llychlyn.

Carwyn Jones: Wel, os cawn ei roi fel hyn, nid wyf yn amau o gwbl, pe na fyddai camau wedi'u cymryd i ganiatáu i'r awdurdodau lleol gau'r llwybrau cyhoeddus, na fyddai pobl wedi bod yn gofyn pam na wnaethpwyd hynny, oherwydd yr oedd yn opsiwn a oedd ar gael i ni. Yng Ngweriniaeth Iwerddon, sylwaf eu bod wedi cau pob llwybr cyhoeddus cyn i'r clwyf gyrraedd hyd yn oed. Hwnnw oedd yr ymateb ar 28 Chwefror gan Joe Walsh, y Gweinidog yng Ngweriniaeth Iwerddon, cyn ei bod yn hysbys bod y clwyf yn y weriniaeth, hyd yn oed. Y pwynt arall y dylid ei wneud yw bod yn rhaid inni weithredu o fewn y rheolau sy'n bod ar y pryd. Yr wyf wedi darllen dogfennau, er enghraifft, oddi wrth y Grwp Traed a'r Genau Cenedlaethol, sy'n gwneud y pwynt bod y rheolau fel y maent yn anghywir. Wel, efallai fod hynny'n gywir, rywfodd neu'i gilydd. Mae hynny'n destun dadl. Y pwynt yw eu bod yn bodoli. Rhaid inni weithredu o fewn y rheolau fel y maent. Os yw'r rheolau'n newid, yna gellir ailystyried pa bolisi yw'r un mwyaf effeithiol i gael gwared â'r clwyf. Fodd bynnag, fel y mae'r rheolau ar hyn o bryd, mae'n anodd iawn i frechu fod yn arf defnyddiol i gael gwared â'r clwyf os na weithredir ef fel polisi brechu i

The other point, I suppose, that needs to be made, is that, in the Netherlands, where the vaccinate to slaughter policy was carried out, it is actually a lot easier to vaccinate the animals because they are not roaming around the hills. For example, on the Brecon Beacons, when we carried out the testing process there, a great deal of fencing was put up in order for that to be done. The fact that that has to be done on a very large scale, together with the cost of policing, the cost of putting up fencing and the fact that a much larger number of animals would be in the vaccination ring than were in the cull ring—those factors also need to be taken into account.

The point that you make about the need for further research is well made and is something that has certainly been taken up. It would help tremendously if there was a validated test to tell the difference between an animal that has been vaccinated and an animal that has had the disease. Such a test does not yet exist. Hopefully, it will in the future, but, as the technology changes, it is perfectly right, of course, that the viewpoint on dealing with a disease should change as well. We must be flexible in that way, but we must accept the rules as they are.

[297] **Ron Davies:** I am grateful for your tolerance, Chair. I have one very last point—

[298] **Glyn Davies:** You may make one small point. I do need to move on.

ladd.

Y pwynt arall y dylid ei wneud, mae'n debyg, yw ei bod yn llawer haws brechu'r anifeiliaid yn yr Iseldiroedd, lle y gweithredwyd y polisi lladd, am nad ydynt yn crwydro'r bryniau. Er enghraifft, ar Fannau Brycheiniog, pan wnaethom weithredu'r broses profi yn y fan honno, fe godwyd llawer iawn o ffensiau er mwyn gwneud hynny. Mae'r ffaith bod yn rhaid gwneud hynny ar raddfa helaeth iawn, ynghyd â chost y plismona, cost codi ffensiau a'r ffaith y byddai nifer fwy o lawer o anifeiliaid o fewn y cylch brechu nag a oedd yn y cylch lladd—rhaid cymryd y ffactorau hynny i ystyriaeth hefyd.

Mae'r pwynt a wnaethoch am yr angen am ymchwil pellach yn un da ac yn rhywbeth sydd wedi'i godi'n sicr. Byddai o gymorth aruthrol pe byddai prawf a ddilyswyd i ganfod y gwahaniaeth rhwng anifail a frechwyd ac anifail sydd â'r clwyf. Nid yw prawf o'r fath yn bod eto. Yr wyf yn gobeithio y bydd yn y dyfodol, ond, wrth i'r dechnoleg newid, mae'n berffaith briodol, wrth gwrs, fod y safbwynt ar ddelio â chlefyd yn newid hefyd. Rhaid inni fod yn hyblyg yn hynny o beth, ond rhaid inni dderbyn y rheolau fel y maent.

[297] **Ron Davies:** Yr wyf yn ddiolchgar am eich goddefgarwch, Gadeirydd. Mae gennyf un pwynt olaf—

[298] **Glyn Davies:** Cewch wneud un pwynt bach. Rhaid imi symud ymlaen.

[299] **Ron Davies:** Absolutely. I am grateful. I think, however, that we should be very cautious about drawing parallels with the Netherlands because, of course, the whole geography and the whole pattern of husbandry in the Netherlands is quite different from the situation that we face in Wales. I would be very cautious about drawing parallels. A technical question has just occurred to me: if we had a policy which meant vaccinating one species of animal—if we had had a vaccinating policy for cattle and a slaughter policy for sheep—would that have impacted then on our ability to renew exports of sheep, or would the fact that we had been vaccinating cattle invalidate all exports?

Mr Brodie: It would have affected the whole of the vaccination area.

[300] **Ron Davies:** The area, not the species?

Mr Brodie: That is right. Just to build on what the Minister has said, there is a test at the moment that can detect whether the antibodies are due to the vaccine or to the actual disease. That test, as Tony has said, is not currently validated. If that test can now be validated and if the Office International des Epizooties recognises that validated test and takes that into account in changing its guidance on international trade, and if other countries take account of that and embody that in their trading relationships, then it is possible that, in the future, if we were facing this situation again, we would have a different context and a different set of options available to us. However, as has been rightly said, vaccination options need to be considered in the light of every concrete, individual case on the ground. So I think that it is quite important to underline that it is not as if we have some instinctive personal opposition to vaccination at all. In terms of Wales's interests within the

[299] **Ron Davies:** Yn hollol. Yr wyf yn ddiolchgar. Credaf, fodd bynnag, y dylem fod yn ofalus iawn wrth wneud cymariaethau â'r Iseldiroedd oherwydd, wrth gwrs, mae holl ddaearyddiaeth a holl batrwm hwsmonaeth yn yr Iseldiroedd yn gwbl wahanol i'r sefyllfa a wynebwn yng Nghymru. Byddwn yn ofalus iawn ynghylch gwneud cymariaethau. Mae cwestiwn technegol newydd ddod i'm meddwl: pe buasai gennym bolisi a olygai frechu un rhywogaeth o anifail—pe buasai gennym bolisi brechu ar gyfer gwartheg a pholisi lladd ar gyfer defaid—a fyddai hynny wedi effeithio ar ein gallu i aildechrau allforio defaid, neu a fyddai'r ffaith ein bod wedi brechu gwartheg yn golygu diddymu'r holl allforion?

Mr Brodie: Byddai wedi effeithio ar y cyfan o'r ardal frechu.

[300] **Ron Davies:** Yr ardal, nid y rhywogaeth?

Mr Brodie: Mae hynny'n gywir. Dim ond i ymhelaethu ar yr hyn a ddywedodd y Gweinidog, mae prawf ar hyn o bryd sy'n gallu darganfod a yw'r gwrthgyrff yn ganlyniad i'r brechlyn neu i'r clwyf ei hun. Fel y dywedodd Tony, nid yw'r prawf hwnnw wedi'i ddilysu ar hyn o bryd. Os gellir dilysu'r prawf hwnnw'n awr ac os yw'r Office International des Epizooties yn cydnabod y prawf dilysedig hwnnw ac yn cymryd hwnnw i ystyriaeth wrth newid ei gyfarwyddyd ar fasnach ryngwladol, ac os yw gwledydd eraill yn cymryd hynny i ystyriaeth ac yn ei ymgorffori yn eu cysylltiadau masnachu, yna mae'n bosibl, yn y dyfodol, pe byddem yn wynebu'r sefyllfa hon eto, y byddai gennym gyd-destun gwahanol a set wahanol o ddewisiadau ar gael inni. Fodd bynnag, fel y dywedwyd, rhaid ystyried y dewisiadau brechu yng ngoleuni pob achos unigol, pendant yn y maes. Felly credaf ei bod yn eithaf pwysig pwysleisio nad oes gennym ryw wrthwynebiad personol greddfoll i frechu o gwbl.

trading rules that existed at the time that this outbreak took place, we were very clear that Wales's economic interests were in line with the policy that was being advocated in the veterinary and scientific advice from London.

[301] **Ron Davies:** I just cannot accept that; spending £1,000 to destroy an animal that is worth £20 to protect an international trade, 90 per cent of which goes to Europe and is not affected by the trade organisation rules to which you refer.

Mr Brodie: No, it was. The European Commission—

[302] **Ron Davies:** There was a reason for the slaughter policy, but, with the greatest respect to you, that is not it.

Mr Brodie: The commission would have applied those rules to our trade with other member states. So, it would have affected our trade with France, Spain and all the others.

[303] **Glyn Davies:** May I bring Jocelyn in on that?

Carwyn Jones: I want to make one small point.

[304] **Glyn Davies:** Carwyn, I do need to move on. We cannot have just one member contributing. I am sure that the point that you wanted to make—

O ran buddiannau Cymru mewn rheolau masnach a oedd yn bod ar adeg y cafwyd yr achosion hyn o'r clwyf, yr oeddem yn sicr iawn bod buddiannau economaidd Cymru'n unol â'r polisi a argymhellwyd yn y cyngor milfeddygol a gwyddonol o Lundain.

[301] **Ron Davies:** Ni allaf dderbyn hynny; gwario £1,000 i ddifa anifail sy'n werth £20 er mwyn amddiffyn masnach ryngwladol, yr aiff 90 y cant ohoni i Ewrop ac nad effeithir arni gan reolau'r corff masnach y cyfeiriwch ato.

Mr Brodie: Nace, fe'i heffeithiwyd. Y Comisiwn Ewropeaidd—

[302] **Ron Davies:** Yr oedd rheswm dros y polisi lladd ond, gyda phob parch atoch chi, nid hwnnw ydoedd.

Mr Brodie: Byddai'r comisiwn wedi cymhwyso'r rheolau hynny at ein masnach ag aelod-wladwriaethau eraill. Felly, byddai wedi effeithio ar ein masnach â Ffrainc, Sbaen a'r holl wledydd eraill.

[303] **Glyn Davies:** A gaf ddod â Jocelyn i mewn ar hynny?

Carwyn Jones: Dymunaf wneud un pwynt bach.

[304] **Glyn Davies:** Carwyn, rhaid imi symud ymlaen. Ni allwn gael dim ond un aelod yn cyfrannu. Yr wyf yn siwr bod y pwynt yr oeddech am ei wneud—

Carwyn Jones: I just wanted to make a point about something that Ron said. It became clear throughout the whole of the epidemic that the OIE, which is the world body that deals with disease control, was treating the UK as one zone. Northern Ireland found that it could not export before anybody else because it was part of one zone. So, that means that, if you vaccinated in one part of the UK, it would have been difficult for the whole of the UK to actually claim that we were foot and mouth disease free. So, vaccination, for example, in Cumbria, might well have had an effect on the ability of Wales to call itself foot and mouth disease free. That is another factor that had to be taken into account.

[305] **Jocelyn Davies:** I wanted to ask Mr Edwards, following on from the questions that Ron asked, as you are a vet and a scientist, why does the maintenance of the export market concern you at all? Is that not an economic consideration rather than a veterinary one, or was your brief to advise on the eradication of the disease while restoring the export market as soon as possible? The point that I want to make is that, if you close down all the footpaths and you carry out this mass slaughter of many thousands of animals and then burn them in the countryside, you can hardly be surprised when people do not go to the countryside. Had your brief been to eradicate the disease as soon as possible while maintaining tourism in the countryside, would you have still said that the best way to do it was by cull rather than by vaccination?

Carwyn Jones: Nid oeddwn ond am wneud pwynt ynghylch rhywbeth a ddywedodd Ron. Daeth yn amlwg drwy gydol yr epidemig fod yr OIE, sef y corff byd-eang sy'n delio â rheoli haint, yn trin y DU fel un parth. Cafodd Gogledd Iwerddon na allai allforio o flaen neb arall am ei fod yn rhan o un parth. Felly, mae hynny'n golygu, pe byddech wedi brechu mewn un rhan o'r DU, byddai'n anodd i'r DU gyfan haeru ein bod yn rhydd o glwy'r traed a'r genau. Felly, mae'n ddigon posibl y byddai brechu yn Cymbria, er enghraifft, wedi effeithio ar allu Cymru i ddweud ei bod yn rhydd o glwy'r traed a'r genau. Mae hynny'n ffactor arall y mae'n rhaid ei ystyried.

[305] **Jocelyn Davies:** Yr oeddwn am ofyn i Mr Edwards, yn sgîl cwestiynau Ron, gan eich bod yn filfeddyg ac yn wyddonydd, pam bod cynnal y farchnad allforion yn fater i chi o gwbl? Onid yw hynny'n ystyriaeth economaidd yn hytrach nag yn un filfeddygol, neu ai'ch brîff chi oedd cynghori ar ddileu'r clwyf gan adfer y farchnad allforion cyn gynted â phosibl? Y pwynt yr wyf am ei wneud yw, os caewch yr holl lwybrau cyhoeddus a lladd miloedd lawer o anifeiliaid ac wedyn eu llosgi yng nghefn gwlad, na ddylech synnu pan nad yw pobl yn mynd i gefn gwlad. Os mai'ch brîff oedd dileu'r clwyf cyn gynted â phosibl gan gynnal twristiaeth yng nghefn gwlad, a fyddech wedi dweud o hyd mai'r dull gorau o wneud hynny oedd drwy ddifa yn hytrach na thrwy frechu?

Mr Edwards: My brief, as I said earlier, is to provide the best veterinary advice that I can to the Minister. Clearly, in deciding what the appropriate policy is, that is only one factor that the Minister has to take into account in deciding which policy is appropriate, and that is the line that I have taken all the way through this outbreak.

[306] **Jocelyn Davies:** So, if you had been asked, ‘How do we get rid of the disease as soon as possible while maintaining our tourist trade in this country?’, would you have said, ‘No, do not vaccinate, we must kill all these animals and burn them in the countryside because I am sure that that will be the best way of maintaining tourism and getting rid of this disease’? Or would you possibly have considered a more positive attitude towards vaccination?

Mr Edwards: With respect, I do not think that that judgment comes into it. My judgment was to offer the Minister the best veterinary advice that I could, which was to lay out all the options and all the implications of those options. However, that is only one factor in a stream of events that the Minister has to consider in arriving at a decision.

[307] **Jocelyn Davies:** So I will put this question to you, Carwyn: would you have taken a different view of vaccination if a top priority of yours would have been to maintain the tourism trade in this country?

Mr Edwards: Fy mrîff, fel y dywedais yn gynharach, yw rhoi'r cyngor milfeddygol gorau y gallaf i'r Gweinidog. Wrth gwrs, wrth benderfynu beth yw'r polisi priodol, dim ond un ffactor ydyw y mae'n rhaid i'r Gweinidog ei ystyried wrth benderfynu pa bolisi sy'n briodol, a dyna'r safbwynt a arddelais drwy gydol yr achosion hyn o'r clwyf.

[306] **Jocelyn Davies:** Felly, pe byddech wedi cael y cwestiwn, ‘Sut y cawn wared â'r clwyf cyn gynted â phosibl gan gynnal y fasnach dwristiaeth yn y wlad hon?’, a fyddech wedi dweud, ‘Na, peidiwch â brechu, rhaid inni ladd yr holl anifeiliaid hyn a'u llosgi yng nghefn gwlad gan fy mod yn sicr mai dyna'r dull gorau o gynnal twristiaeth a chael gwared â'r clwyf? Neu a fyddech o bosibl wedi ystyried agwedd fwy cadarnhaol at frechu?

Mr Edwards: Gyda pharch, ni chredaf fod y dyfarniad hwnnw'n codi. Fy nyfarniad i oedd y dylwn gynnig i'r Gweinidog y cyngor milfeddygol gorau a allwn, sef nodi'r holl ddewisiadau a holl oblygiadau'r dewisiadau hynny. Fodd bynnag, dim ond un ffactor yw hwnnw mewn llif o ddigwyddiadau y mae'n rhaid i'r Gweinidog ei ystyried wrth benderfynu.

[307] **Jocelyn Davies:** Felly rhoddaf y cwestiwn hwn i chi, Carwyn: a fyddai'ch barn am frechu'n wahanol pe bai cynnal y fasnach dwristiaeth yn y wlad hon yn flaenoriaeth bennaf gennych?

Carwyn Jones: I do not believe that the tourism trade in this country would have been maintained if we had vaccinated. If we had followed a vaccinate to live policy, we would have had to police the vaccinated area, as Tony has said, which means building a fence around it. Effectively, that would probably have meant keeping people out. That would have meant that the Brecon Beacons would still be closed to walkers now, if that policy had been put into place.

As I said at the very beginning, the consideration has to be, of course, to get rid of the disease, not just for farming, but for the whole of the tourist economy of Wales. There is no easy way to get rid of the disease. It is simply not possible to magic it away so that it will all suddenly go away. It is unpleasant to see pyres—there is no question about that. That much has to be conceded but, in view of the options that were available, it is my belief that that is all that could be done in order to get rid of the disease as effectively as possible, because, if you follow a vaccinate to live policy, what then follows? As I have already mentioned, first of all, large parts of Wales may well have been closed to walkers in any event, and the message would have been that Wales would remain closed. Secondly, of course, many sheep farmers in Wales would not have been able to make a living, not just this year, but also the following year because, not being able to bring a ram into the area as the ram would not have been able to leave, they would not have had a lamb crop for the following year either.

Carwyn Jones: Ni chredaf y byddai'r fasnach dwristiaeth yn y wlad hon wedi'i chynnal pe baem wedi brechu. Pe baem wedi dilyn polisi brechu i fyw, buasai'n rhaid inni blismona'r ardal lle y bu brechu, fel y dywedodd Tony, sy'n golygu codi ffens o'i hamgylch. I bob pwrpas, byddai hynny wedi golygu cadw pobl allan. Byddai hynny'n golygu y byddai Bannau Brycheiniog yn dal i fod ar gau i gerddwyr yn awr, pe bai'r polisi hwnnw wedi'i weithredu.

Fel y dywedais ar y dechrau un, yr ystyriaeth angenrheidiol, wrth gwrs, yw cael gwared â'r clwyf, nid yn unig er mwyn ffermio, ond er mwyn holl economi dwristiaeth Cymru. Nid oes dull rhwydd o gael gwared â'r clwyf. Nid oes modd ei swyno ymaith fel y bydd y cyfan yn diflannu'n sydyn. Peth annymunol yw gweld coelcerthi—nid oes amheuaeth am hynny. Rhaid addef cymaint â hynny ond, yng ngolwg yr opsiynau a oedd ar gael, fy marn i yw mai hynny oedd y cyfan y gallesid bod wedi'i wneud er mwyn cael gwared â'r clwyf mor effeithiol â phosibl, oherwydd, os dilynwch bolisi brechu i fyw, beth sy'n dilyn wedyn? Fel y soniais eisoes, yn gyntaf oll, mae'n bosibl y byddai rhannau helaeth o Gymru ar gau i gerddwyr beth bynnag, a'r neges a roddid oedd y byddai Cymru'n dal i fod ar gau. Yn ail, wrth gwrs, byddai llawer o ffermwyr defaid yng Nghymru na fyddent yn gallu gwneud bywoliaeth, nid yn unig eleni, ond yn y flwyddyn ddilynol hefyd oherwydd, am na allent ddod â hwrdd i'r ardal gan na fyddai'r hwrdd wedi gallu gadael, ni fyddai ganddynt wyn ar gyfer y flwyddyn ddilynol chwaith.

Given the fact that sheep meat exports—and I choose this farming example—are so important to Wales, there is no question in my mind that a vaccinate to live policy would have seen the end of the sheep meat industry in Wales. It would also have meant that, certainly in the short to medium term, the tourism industry would have suffered far more than it has already suffered, because large parts of the countryside would still be closed.

[308] **Elin Jones:** What about a vaccinate to die policy? How would that compare?

Carwyn Jones: Again, I come back to the example of practical difficulties. As I understand it, the vaccination procedure is this: first, you have to identify the ring area that you are going to vaccinate. When vaccinating the area, you have to take into account the fact that the disease may spread for five days, because it takes up to five days for the vaccine to work. That means that the vaccinated area will be larger than the immediate infected area. You can imagine, if that had been done on the Beacons, that there would have been court battles from farmers who had never been affected by the disease, who suddenly found that their animals were going to be vaccinated. Whichever way you do it, there will still be people who are going to protest in that way. That is not a reason for not doing it, of course, but that is a factor that needs to be realised.

O wybod bod allforion o gig dafad—ac yr wyf yn dewis yr enghraifft hon o ffermio—mor bwysig i Gymru, nid oes dwywaith yn fy marn i y byddai polisi brechu i fyw wedi dod â'r diwydiant cig dafad yng Nghymru i ben. Byddai hefyd wedi golygu, yn sicr yn y tymor byr i ganolig, y byddai'r diwydiant twristiaeth wedi dioddef yn fwy o lawer nag a wnaeth eisoes, oherwydd byddai rhannau helaeth o gefn gwlad ar gau o hyd.

[308] **Elin Jones:** Beth am bolisi brechu i farw? Sut y byddai hynny'n cymharu?

Carwyn Jones: Unwaith eto, dychwelaf at yr enghraifft o anawsterau ymarferol. Fel a ddeallaf, dyma'r weithdrefn brechu: yn gyntaf, rhaid ichi ddynodi ardal y cylch lle y byddwch yn brechu. Wrth frechu yn yr ardal, rhaid ichi roi ystyriaeth i'r ffaith y gall y clwyf ymledu am bum niwrnod, oherwydd cymer hyd at bum niwrnod i'r brechlyn weithio. Golyga hynny y bydd yr ardal brechu'n fwy na'r ardal heintiedig gyfagos. Gallwch ddychmygu, pe gwneid hynny ar Fannau Brycheiniog, y byddai ymladd yn y llysoedd gan ffermwyr nad oedd y clwyf erioed wedi effeithio arnynt, a ddarganfu'n sydyn fod eu hanifeiliaid i gael eu brechu. Pa ffordd bynnag yr ewch o'i chwmpas, bydd rhai bob amser a fydd yn gwrthdystio felly. Nid yw hynny'n rheswm dros beidio â'i wneud, wrth gwrs, ond mae hynny'n ffactor y mae'n rhaid ei gofio.

Once that area has been identified, you effectively have to fence it in, and that includes the in-byland of the farms, so that sheep can move around in that way. So, you fence it in. Then you have to vaccinate and have the difficulties of not being able to move animals in and out for, I think, 30 days. For 12 months, you do not have the ability to export. The area affected has to be policed. You have to police everyone going into the area, as well as animals. On top of that, of course, the experience in the Netherlands shows that, because the vaccinated area is larger than the immediate infected area, many more animals will be slaughtered, because they are inside the ring vaccinated area. So it does not mean that fewer animals will be slaughtered. It actually means that, because the vaccinated area is wider, at least the same amount of animals will be slaughtered in any event.

[309] **Elin Jones:** Yes, but I am asking the question in the context of your brief having been to ensure as little effect on tourism as possible. You compared the slaughter policy with the vaccinate to die policy in your answer. I am now asking you to compare the slaughter policy with the vaccinate to live policy, if your brief, and major concern, had been the protection of the wider rural economy, including tourism.

Carwyn Jones: That was part of my brief and, had we followed a vaccinate to live policy, large parts of rural Wales would still be closed. I have no doubt about that, because there would still be areas where there would be vaccinated animals and under no circumstances could vaccinated animals leave those areas, because of the difficulties that Tony has outlined. Therefore, large parts of Wales would be fenced in, and walkers would not be able to walk through them in reality, and the tourism industry would still be suffering.

Ar ôl dynodi'r ardal honno, rhaid ichi ei hamgáu â ffens, i bob pwrpas, ac mae hynny'n cynnwys tir cysylltiedig y ffermydd, fel y gall defaid symud o gwmpas fel hynny. Felly, yr ydych yn codi ffens o'i hamgylch. Wedyn rhaid ichi frechu a chewch yr anawsterau o fod methu â symud anifeiliaid i mewn ac allan am, yr wyf yn credu, 30 diwrnod. Am 12 mis, ni allwch allforio. Rhaid plismona'r ardal a effeithiwyd. Rhaid ichi blismona pawb sy'n mynd i'r ardal, yn ogystal â'r anifeiliaid. Ar ben hynny, wrth gwrs, mae'r profiad yn yr Iseldiroedd yn dangos, am fod yr ardal lle y bu brechu'n fwy na'r ardal heintiedig gyfagos, y caiff llawer mwy o anifeiliaid eu lladd, am eu bod o fewn cylch yr ardal brechu. Felly nid yw'n golygu y caiff llai o anifeiliaid eu lladd. Mewn gwirionedd, mae'n golygu, am fod yr ardal lle y bu brechu'n ehangach, y caiff o leiaf yr un nifer o anifeiliaid eu lladd beth bynnag.

[309] **Elin Jones:** Ie, ond yr wyf yn gofyn y cwestiwn yng nghyd-destun y ffaith mai'ch brîff oedd sicrhau cyn lleied o effaith ar dwristiaeth â phosibl. Gwnaethoch gymharu'r polisi lladd â'r polisi brechu i farw yn eich ateb. Yr wyf yn gofyn yn awr ichi gymharu'r polisi lladd â'r polisi brechu i fyw, os mai'ch brîff, a'ch gofal pennaf, oedd amddiffyn yr economi wledig ehangach, gan gynnwys twristiaeth.

Carwyn Jones: Yr oedd hynny'n rhan o'm brîff a, phe baem wedi dilyn polisi brechu i fyw, byddai rhannau helaeth o'r Gymru wledig yn dal i fod ar gau. Nid wyf yn amau hynny o gwbl, oherwydd byddai ardaloedd o hyd lle y byddai anifeiliaid a frechwyd ac ni allai anifeiliaid a frechwyd adael yr ardaloedd hynny o dan unrhyw amgylchiadau, oherwydd yr anawsterau a amlinellodd Tony. Felly, byddai rhannau helaeth o Gymru wedi'u hamgáu â ffensiau, ac ni fyddai cerddwyr yn gallu cerdded drwyddynt mewn gwirionedd, a byddai'r diwydiant

Let us face it, Chair, there is no way of our being able to say to those in rural Wales, ‘We can get rid of this disease without any effect at all’. Yes, it was very painful and yes, people did see their businesses affected, but that was inevitable. That was always going to be the case. So, bearing that in mind, it was important that the difficulties that they were experiencing were kept to as short a period of time as possible. I do not believe that a vaccinate to live policy would have done that, because we would still be in a position where the disease was still around in Wales. We would still not be in a position to say that we were foot and mouth disease free. Clearly, not only does that affect farming, but it also affects the tourism industry. How easy is it to sell us as a country if foot and mouth disease is still present? We saw the difficulties of that last summer—last year I mean—and the effect of that on rural Wales. The last thing that I would have wanted to see was for that to still be the case today.

[310] **Elin Jones:** May I come back in on that?

[311] **Glyn Davies:** Could you just ask a brief question, please? I want to bring Mick in as soon as I can.

[312] **Elin Jones:** Could I ask a technical question on vaccination to die? Why, if the animals have been vaccinated, is it not then possible to allow walkers—given that there is no proven case of walkers transmitting the disease—to walk the footpaths in areas that had been designated as vaccinated areas?

twristiaeth yn dal i ddiodef.

Gadewch inni wynebu’r peth, Gadeirydd, ni fuasai modd inni ddweud wrth y sawl yn y Gymru wledig, ‘Gallwn gael gwared â’r clwyf hwn heb unrhyw effaith o gwbl’. Oedd, yr oedd yn boenus a do, fe welodd pobl effaith ar eu busnesau, ond yr oedd hynny’n anochel. Yr oedd yn sicr o fod felly. Gan gofio hynny, yr oedd yn bwysig cyfyngu’r anawsterau yr oeddent yn eu profi i gyfnod mor fyr â phosibl. Ni chredaf y byddai polisi brechu i fyw wedi gwneud hynny, oherwydd byddem yn dal i fod mewn sefyllfa lle’r oedd y clwyf yn dal i fod yng Nghymru. Byddem yn dal i fod mewn sefyllfa lle na allem ddweud ein bod yn rhydd o glwy’r traed a’r genau. Wrth gwrs, nid effeithia hynny ar ffermio yn unig, ond ar y diwydiant twristiaeth hefyd. Pa mor hawdd yw ein marchnata fel gwlad os yw clwy’r traed a’r genau’n bresennol o hyd? Gwelsom anawsterau hynny yr haf diwethaf—y llynedd yr wyf yn ei feddwl—ac effaith hynny ar y Gymru wledig. Y peth olaf a ddymunwn oedd i hynny barhau i fod yn wir heddiw.

[310] **Elin Jones:** A gaf gyfrannu eto ar hynny?

[311] **Glyn Davies:** A allech ofyn cwestiwn byr, os gwelwch yn dda? Yr wyf am ddod â Mick i mewn cyn gynted ag y gallaf.

[312] **Elin Jones:** A gaf ofyn cwestiwn technegol ar frechu i farw? Pam, os yw’r anifeiliaid wedi’u brechu, nad oes modd wedyn caniatáu i gerddwyr—o wybod na phrofwyd achos o drosglwyddo’r clwyf gan gerddwyr—gerdded y llwybrau cyhoeddus mewn ardaloedd a ddynodwyd yn ardaloedd lle y bu brechu?

Mr Edwards: It is because, although the animals are vaccinated, until you know that the vaccination programme has had the desired effect—namely, that it has protected the animals and allowed the infection to die out in that area—you still do not know whether there is active infection in the area. As long as there is active infection around, you obviously cannot afford to allow any possible vehicle of transmitting that infection elsewhere.

[313] **Glyn Davies:** Mick, do you want to come in on this?

[314] **Mick Bates:** I have a couple of questions. First, I would like to know about the internal process involving documents on vaccination. For example, at long last we have been given this document from the scientific committee on animal health and animal welfare, which was adopted on 10 March 1999 and which relates specifically to emergency vaccination against foot and mouth disease. My first question to the Minister is: what had happened internally to discuss the recommendations of that paper, in particular, on dealing with an outbreak of foot and mouth disease? The second issue relates specifically to different areas of the world. I think that it is worth noting that the nature of the disease here was very different to that in many other areas of the world—to that in all other areas of the world where there has been an outbreak, as far as I can see. So I am not sure that general comparisons to our situation hold fast. I think that, with hindsight, we are looking at places like Holland, which seems to have used vaccination effectively, but that may not have been applicable in our case.

Mr Edwards: Y rheswm am hynny yw, er bod yr anifeiliaid wedi'u brechu, hyd nes y gwyddoch fod y rhaglen frechu wedi cael yr effaith ddymunol—sef ei bod wedi amddiffyn yr anifeiliaid ac wedi gadael i'r haint farw yn yr ardal honno—na wyddoch eto a oes haint byw yn yr ardal. Cyhyd ag y bo haint byw o gwmpas, mae'n amlwg na allwch fforddio caniatáu unrhyw gyfrwng i drosglwyddo'r haint hwnnw i rywle arall.

[313] **Glyn Davies:** Mick, a ydych yn dymuno dweud rhywbeth am hyn?

[314] **Mick Bates:** Mae gennyf ychydig o gwestiynau. Yn gyntaf, hoffwn wybod am y broses fewnol sy'n ymwneud â dogfennau ar frechu. Er enghraifft, o'r diwedd cawsom y ddogfen hon oddi wrth y pwyllgor gwyddonol ar ieched anifeiliaid a lles anifeiliaid, a fabwysiadwyd ar 10 Mawrth 1999 ac sy'n ymwneud yn benodol â brechu brys rhag clwy'r traed a'r genau. Fy nghwestiwn cyntaf i'r Gweinidog yw: beth a ddigwyddodd yn fewnol i drafod argymhellion y papur hwnnw, yn benodol, ar ddelio ag achosion o glwy'r traed a'r genau? Mae'r ail fater yn ymwneud yn benodol â gwahanol rannau o'r byd. Credaf ei bod yn werth nodi bod natur y clwyf yma yn wahanol i'r hyn ydoedd mewn sawl rhan arall o'r byd—i'r hyn a oedd yn yr holl rannau eraill o'r byd lle y bu achosion, hyd y gallaf weld. Felly nid wyf yn sicr a yw'r cymariaethau cyffredinol â'n sefyllfa ni'n ddibynadwy. Credaf ein bod yn edrych, gyda synnwyr trannoeth, ar leoedd fel yr Iseldiroedd, y mae'n ymddangos ei bod wedi defnyddio brechu'n effeithiol, ond a allai fod yn amherthnasol i'n hachos ni.

However, there are instances where vaccination may well have been applicable. I will take as an example the Brecon Beacons where, although I am only responding to hearsay, there were only a very tiny number of sheep with antibodies. I want to know what the decision-making process was in order to say, 'Right, we have got thousands and thousands of sheep here and two or three of them have got antibodies and we are going to kill the whole lot'. How was that decision made?

Finally, what, in your view, would have been the impact of earlier detection of the disease—you know my view on this, as someone who tried the Genesis test—because it often took a long time to find out whether the disease was there?

Carwyn Jones: I will ask Tony to come in on some of the points that you have raised but, of course, the point about the Genesis test is that it does not work, as you found yourself. It is not a validated test.

[315] **Mick Bates:** It will be validated soon.

Carwyn Jones: Your experience, Mick, would suggest otherwise, but there we are. The fact is that it is not a validated test. We know that, but the answer to your question is 'yes'. Clearly, if there were a validated test that could be relied on to detect the disease earlier, that would assist in dealing with the disease. With regard to the other matters that you raised, in terms of the internal process and so on, before Tony does answer that question, I will just give some background information as to what was happening on the Beacons.

Fodd bynnag, mae achosion lle y mae'n ddigon posibl y byddai brechu'n berthnasol. Cymeraf Fannau Brycheiniog yn enghraifft, lle nad oedd ond nifer fach iawn o ddefaid â gwrthgyrff, er mai dim ond achlust a gefais o hynny. Dymunaf wybod beth oedd y broses benderfynu er mwyn dweud, 'Iawn, mae gennym filoedd ar filoedd o ddefaid yma ac mae gwrthgyrff gan ddwy neu dair ohonynt ac yr ydym yn mynd i'w lladd bob un'. Sut y gwnaethpwyd y penderfyniad hwnnw?

Yn olaf, beth fuasai'r effaith, yn eich barn chi, pe bai'r clwyf wedi'i ddarganfod yn gynt—gwyddoch fy marn ar hyn, fel un a roddodd gynnig ar y prawf Genesis—oherwydd cymerai amser hir yn aml i gael gwybod a oedd y clwyf yno?

Carwyn Jones: Gofynnaf i Tony ddweud rhywbeth ar rai o'r pwyntiau a godwyd gennych ond, wrth gwrs, y pwynt am y prawf Genesis yw nad yw'n gweithio, fel y gwelsoch eich hun. Nid yw'n brawf dilys.

[315] **Mick Bates:** Fe gaiff ei ddilysu cyn hir.

Carwyn Jones: Byddai'ch profiad chi, Mick, yn awgrymu fel arall, ond dyna ni. Y ffaith amdani yw nad yw'n brawf a ddilyswyd. Gwyddom hynny, ond yr ateb i'ch cwestiwn yw 'byddai'. Wrth gwrs, pe bai prawf a ddilyswyd yn bod y gellid dibynnu arno i ddarganfod y clwyf yn gynharach, byddai hynny o gymorth wrth ddelio â'r clwyf. O ran y materion eraill a godasoch, ar y broses fewnol ac yn y blaen, cyn i Tony ateb y cwestiwn hwnnw, rhoddaf rywfaint o wybodaeth gefndir ar yr hyn a oedd yn digwydd ar y Bannau.

The situation in the Beacons, as far as we were concerned, was an almost luxurious situation for us, because we were in a position where it was known where the disease was, it was known how it was spreading and it was known where it was spreading. That was not something that had been possible to determine in the past. I met with the graziers on the Beacons and we explained to them what we were trying to do—that, effectively, if the preventative cull was put into place, we would be able to get rid of the disease within days, and we did. We also explained that a testing programme would be put into place. That testing programme was carried out, and the results of the testing programme were good. At the time, it was very difficult to know where the disease was, but the testing programme showed that the disease was not as widespread as was originally feared. Some people had said that it had spread as far as Rhayader and so forth, but it had not done. So that was a very useful process.

Again, on the Beacons, in terms of vaccination, there would have been farms on the Beacons that never had the disease that would have been vaccinated, and their animals would still be vaccinated. They would not be able to trade as a result of being vaccinated in that way. When the marts finally opened for sheep, those sheep would not have been in the marts. I think that that is something that has to be considered. There are people who may well be in a situation in the future whereby they are able to trade their animals when, had they been vaccinated, they would not have been able to do so.

Could you answer in terms of the science, Tony?

Yr oedd y sefyllfa ar y Bannau, o'n rhan ni, yn un foethus bron i ni, oherwydd yr oeddem mewn sefyllfa lle yr oedd yn hysbys ymhle'r oedd y clwyf, yr oedd yn hysbys sut yr oedd yn ymledu ac i ble. Yr oedd hynny'n rhywbeth na fu modd ei bennu yn y gorffennol. Cyfarfûm â'r porwyr ar Fannau Brycheiniog ac esbonio wrthynt beth yr oeddem yn ceisio'i wneud—sef, i bob pwrpas, os gweithredwyd y difa ataliol, y gallem gael gwared â'r clwyf o fewn dyddiau, ac fe wnaethom. Eglurwyd hefyd y câi rhaglen brofi ei rhoi ar waith. Cyflawnwyd y rhaglen brofi honno, ac yr oedd canlyniadau'r rhaglen brofi'n dda. Ar y pryd, yr oedd yn anodd iawn gwybod ymhle'r oedd y clwyf, ond dangosodd y rhaglen brofi nad oedd y clwyf wedi ymledu cymaint ag yr ofnwyd yn wreiddiol. Dywedodd rhai ei fod wedi ymledu mor bell â Rhaeadr Gwy ac yn y blaen, ond nid oedd. Felly yr oedd honno'n broses ddefnyddiol iawn.

Unwaith eto, ar Fannau Brycheiniog, o ran brechu, byddai brechu wedi digwydd ar ffermydd ar Fannau Brycheiniog lle na fu'r clwyf erioed, a byddai eu hanifeiliaid wedi'u brechu er hynny. Ni fyddent yn gallu masnachu o ganlyniad i gael eu brechu fel hynny. Pan agorodd y marchnadoedd i ddefaid o'r diwedd, ni fyddai'r defaid hynny yn y marchnadoedd. Credaf fod hynny'n rhywbeth y mae'n rhaid ei ystyried. Mae'n ddigon posibl y gallai rhai fod mewn sefyllfa yn y dyfodol lle y gallent werthu eu hanifeiliaid, na fyddent wedi gallu gwneud hynny pe byddent wedi'u brechu.

A allech ateb yng nghyd-destun y wyddoniaeth, Tony?

[316] **Mick Bates:** Could I just say, Chair, that the question was at what point, when you tested these animals—let us say that there was a tiny number, two or three out of 10,000, say—did you detect antibodies, or did you detect the live virus there? How did that process work?

Carwyn Jones: I will ask Tony to tell us that.

Mr Edwards: I think that there are two issues. Could we go back to the one that you raised at the beginning about the document in 1999? On the internal processes, there is a constant process of discussion with Europe on the latest position on a whole range of diseases. This is just one, as you know, of what we call the 'list A' diseases published by OIE. Perhaps, just in that context, I could make it clear, Chair, that the OIE lays down the rules—if I can put it that way—on defining whether a country is disease-free and what rules must apply to international trade. The World Trade Organization uses those rules, and the European Union uses those rules. Until those rules are changed, as the Minister said, we have to abide by what those rules say. They are, as we discussed before, very strict.

That is not to say that there are not constant discussions about what the latest position is. On the test to distinguish between vaccinated animals and animals that have been exposed to field challenge, there is a test that is well on the way to being developed but, as the Minister has said, until it is validated and until it is accepted internationally and the rules are changed to accommodate it, we are still going to be stuck with the set of rules that we have at the moment.

[316] **Mick Bates:** A gaf ddweud, Gadeirydd, mai'r cwestiwn oedd pa bryd, pan wnaethoch brofion ar yr anifeiliaid hynny—gadewch inni ddweud ei bod yn nifer fechan, dau neu dri o blith 10,000, dyweder—y darganfuoch wrthgyrff neu'r feirws byw yno? Sut y gweithiodd y broses honno?

Carwyn Jones: Gofynnaf i Tony ddweud hynny wrthym.

Mr Edwards: Credaf fod dau fater yn codi. A allem fynd yn ôl at yr un a godwyd gennych ar y dechrau am y ddogfen yn 1999? Ynghylch y prosesau mewnol, mae proses barhaus o drafod gydag Ewrop ar y sefyllfa ddiweddaraf ar amrywiaeth eang o glefydau. Fel y gwyddoch, nid yw hwn ond yn un o'r rhai a alwn yn glefydau 'rhestr A' a gyhoeddir gan OIE. Efallai, yn y cyd-destun hwnnw, y gallwn roi ar ddeall, Gadeirydd, mai OIE sy'n gosod y rheolau—os gallaf ei roi felly—ar ddiffinio a yw gwlad yn rhydd o glefyd a pha reolau y mae'n rhaid eu cymhwyso at fasnach ryngwladol. Mae Corff Masnachu'r Byd yn defnyddio'r rheolau hynny, ac mae'r Undeb Ewropeaidd yn defnyddio'r rheolau hynny. Hyd nes y caiff y rheolau hynny eu newid, fel y dywedodd y Gweinidog, rhaid inni lynu wrth y rheolau hynny. Maent yn gaeth iawn, fel y trafodwyd eisoes.

Nid yw hynny'n gyfystyr â dweud nad oes trafodaethau cyson am y sefyllfa ddiweddaraf. Ynghylch y prawf i wahaniaethu rhwng anifeiliaid a frechwyd ac anifeiliaid a fu'n agored i her yn y maes, mae prawf sydd ymhell ar y ffordd at ei ddatblygu ond, fel y dywedodd y Gweinidog, hyd nes y caiff ei ddilysu a'i dderbyn yn rhyngwladol, a hyd nes y newidir y rheolau i'w gynnwys, byddwn o hyd yn gaeth i'r rheolau sydd gennym ar hyn o bryd.

If we turn to the Brecon Beacons, we knew that we had live disease up on the Beacons; we had actually found virus from some of the sheep that were moved in the Beacons. In fact, in one particular group of animals, 90-odd per cent of those animals came back positive on the tests, or were strong positive. We had strong evidence that there was disease that had moved up onto the Beacons. What was not clear was how far it had spread on the Beacons. With respect to Mick, it is easy to be wise with hindsight. We did not know what the results were until we had carried out the tests. Given the practical difficulties on the Beacons of actually penning these sheep and holding them while we waited for test results, it rapidly became clear that that policy was not sustainable in those circumstances.

There is one final point that I would make on vaccination, and on the techniques. The outbreak in the UK, and particularly in Wales, was in sheep. It was not confined to single outbreaks dotted here and there; they were spotting up all over the place. If we had actually run vaccinations—and we are talking now about 3 km protection zones around each of those outbreaks—the whole of Wales would effectively have been a vaccination area, or certainly large parts of it. Powys would have been.

Os trown at Fannau Brycheiniog, fe wyddem fod gennym glwyf byw ar y Bannau; daethom o hyd i'r feirws ymysg y defaid a symudwyd i'r Bannau. Mewn gwirionedd, mewn un grwp penodol o anifeiliaid, yr oedd tua 90 y cant o'r profion ar yr anifeiliaid hynny'n gadarnhaol neu'n tueddu'r gryf i fod yn gadarnhaol. Yr oedd gennym dystiolaeth gadarn bod haint wedi symud i Fannau Brycheiniog. Yr hyn nad oedd yn eglur oedd pa mor bell yr oedd wedi ymledu ar Fannau Brycheiniog. Gyda pharch at Mick, mae'n hawdd bod yn ddoeth gyda synnwyr trannoeth. Ni wyddem y canlyniadau hyd nes yr oeddem wedi gwneud y profion. O ystyried yr anawsterau ymarferol ar Fannau Brycheiniog o gorlannu'r defaid hynny a'u dal tra yr oeddem yn disgwyl canlyniadau'r profion, daeth yn amlwg yn fuan nad oedd y polisi hwnnw'n gynaliadwy yn yr amgylchiadau hynny.

Mae un pwynt olaf y carwn ei wneud ar frechu, ac ar y technegau. Yr oedd yr achosion yn y DU, ac yn enwedig yng Nghymru, ymysg defaid. Nid oedd yn gyfyngedig i achosion unigol yma ac acw; yr oeddent yn codi ym mhobman. Pe baem wedi brechu—ac yr ydym yn sôn yn awr am barthau amddiffyn 3 km o gwmpas pob un o'r cychwyniadau hynny—byddai Cymru gyfan yn ardal brechu, neu rannau helaeth ohoni'n sicr. Fe fyddai Powys.

Just to go back to the statement about zones, the UK is a member state, and the OIE regards the UK as a single epidemiological entity in disease control terms. So any particular programme of events that takes place in one part of the UK has implications for the whole of the UK in terms of trade. We could approach the OIE to zone, as we call it, into certain areas; we could separate Wales off and Scotland off and so on. However, there would be very strict rules governing the borders between the zones that are being treated by vaccination or whatever and those that might be regarded as disease free. There is a whole raft of implications for following that route, which would not be obvious at first.

[317] **Glyn Davies:** I have a small point to make before I move on to Peter. I ask Committee members to indicate to me whether they want to speak specifically on the vaccination issue before we move on to the access issue, in which other members are very interested. This is simply for reasons of timing, so that I know whether I need to hurry things along. If other members want to raise their points under the other items that we will discuss later on, I am comfortable with that pace and I will let members pursue their points in the same way as at present. Mick, do you have a point to raise?

[318] **Mick Bates:** I am still not clear about the issue of antibodies in sheep, particularly on the Beacons. I was told that there were flocks where there were only antibodies in very small numbers of sheep. Did you then decide, because there were antibodies there, to kill them? How many were there? The other point—and this is one of the lessons to be learned—is what serology capacity do we need in Wales as a result of this experience?

Gan fynd yn ôl at y datganiad am barthau, mae'r DU yn aelod-wladwriaeth, ac mae OIE yn ystyried y DU yn un endid epidemiologol o ran rheoli clefydau. Felly mae i unrhyw raglen benodol o ddigwyddiadau mewn un rhan o'r DU oblygiadau i'r DU gyfan o ran masnachu. Gallem ofyn i OIE ei rhannu'n barthau penodol, fel y dywedwn; gallem roi Cymru ar wahân a rhoi'r Alban ar wahân ac yn y blaen. Fodd bynnag, byddai rheolau caeth iawn yn rheoli'r ffiniau rhwng y parthau sy'n cael eu trin drwy frechu neu beth bynnag a gellid ystyried y rheini'n rhydd oddi wrth y clwyf. Mae nifer fawr o oblygiadau o ddilyn y llwybr hwnnw, na fyddent yn amlwg ar yr olwg gyntaf.

[317] **Glyn Davies:** Mae gennyf bwynt bach i'w wneud cyn imi fynd ymlaen at Peter. Gofynnaf i aelodau'r Pwyllgor ddweud wrthyf a ydynt yn dymuno siarad yn benodol ar fater brechu cyn y symudwn ymlaen at fater mynediad, y mae aelodau eraill yn ymddiddori'n fawr ynddo. Mae hynny er mwyn amseru'n unig, fel fy mod yn gwybod a oes angen imi brysuero pethau. Os yw aelodau eraill am godi eu pwyntiau o dan yr eitemau eraill a drafodwn yn ddiweddarach, yr wyf yn fodlon ar y cyflymder hwnnw a byddaf yn gadael i'r aelodau ddilyn eu pwyntiau yn yr un modd ag y maent ar hyn o bryd. Mick, a oes gennych bwynt i'w godi?

[318] **Mick Bates:** Nid yw mater y gwrthgyrff mewn defaid yn glir i mi eto, yn enwedig ar y Bannau. Dywedwyd wrthyf fod preiddiau o ddefaid yno nad oedd gwrthgyrff ond mewn nifer fach ohonynt. A wnaethoch benderfynu eu lladd wedyn, am fod gwrthgyrff yno? Faint ohonynt a oedd yno? Y pwynt arall—a dyma un o'r gwersi i'w dysgu—yw pa gapasiti y mae arnom ei angen yng Nghymru o ran seroleg o ganlyniad i'r profiad hwn?

Mr Edwards: On the first point, if we start from the premise that the country is disease free, the only way there can be antibodies in animals is if they have been exposed to the foot and mouth disease virus. The test that we used on the Beacons actually detects the level of antibodies in the virus—I beg your pardon, the level of antibodies in the animal. Because viremia is very transient, once the antibody levels have risen, the viremia itself can go down very quickly. That does not mean to say that, if the virus is in the bloodstream, the animal is still not infectious; it can be carrying virus elsewhere on it. So antibodies in an animal mean that it has been exposed to virus at some point in its career, which is why we use an antibody test and, because the antibodies last longer, it gives us a better picture.

On the second point, you talked about laboratory capacity in Wales. There is a difficulty in that, because of the nature of the virus, every sample that is sent for testing is presumed—has to be presumed—to be infected until the test proves otherwise. Therefore, they can only be tested in laboratories that are fitted out to a very high safety standard—what we call category 4—in practice. The capital cost of producing or putting a category 4 laboratory in is very high. Therefore, provided that the facility is available nationally, as it currently is, I do not think that we necessarily need to have a separate facility in Wales.

Mr Edwards: Ynghylch y pwynt cyntaf, os dechreuwn ar y cynsail bod y wlad yn rhydd o'r clwyf, yr unig fodd y gellir cael gwrthgyrff mewn anifeiliaid yw os buont yn agored i feirws clwy'r traed a'r genau. Mae'r prawf a ddefnyddiasom ar Fannau Brycheiniog yn darganfod lefel y gwrthgyrff yn y feirws—mae'n ddrwg gennyf, lefel y gwrthgyrff yn yr anifail. Am fod firemia'n fyrhoedlog iawn, wedi i lefelau'r gwrthgyrff godi, gall y firemia ei hun ddisgyn yn gyflym iawn. Nid yw hynny'n gyfystyr â dweud bod anifail yn dal i fod yn anheintus os yw'r feirws yn y llif gwaed; gall gario'r feirws yn rhywle arall yn ei gorff. Felly mae gwrthgyrff yn yr anifail yn golygu iddo fod yn agored i'r feirws ar ryw adeg yn ei oes, a dyna pam yr ydym yn defnyddio prawf am wrthgyrff, oherwydd mae'r gwrthgyrff yn parhau'n hwy, mae'n rhoi gwell darlun i ni.

Ar yr ail bwynt, yr oeddech yn sôn am gapasiti labordai yng Nghymru. Mae anhawster yn hynny, oherwydd natur y feirws, mae'r broses yn rhagdybio—rhaid rhagdybio—bod pob sampl a anfonir i'w brofi wedi'i heintio hyd nes y bydd y prawf yn dangos fel arall. Felly, ni ellir ond eu profi'n ymarferol mewn labordai sydd wedi'u cyfarparu i safon ddiogel dros ben—yr hyn a alwn yn gategori 4. Mae cost cyfalaf gwneud neu osod labordy categori 4 yn uchel iawn. Felly, ar yr amod bod y cyfleuster ar gael yn genedlaethol, fel y mae ar hyn o bryd, ni chredaf fod angen o reidrwydd inni gael cyfleuster ar wahân yng Nghymru.

[319] **Peter Rogers:** One of the most interesting things that you have said today is that you realise that this is one of the most contagious animal diseases. The length of time from when the disease first came to the United Kingdom to the time when there was control over the movement of animals is probably the greatest contributory factor to the situation that we have ended up with. You mentioned Joe Walsh, who brought in an immediate ban on the use of footpaths in Ireland. He recognised that. You also mentioned how Holland tackled the problem. Carwyn talked about using a vaccination programme. You keep reverting back to the vaccinate to live policy. The suppressive vaccine, which was used in Holland, was used under an article of a European directive because it could not dispose of carcasses under a slaughter policy nor could it remove those carcasses where they had foot and mouth disease. Therefore, they had to look at a way of controlling foot and mouth disease. It was done by vaccination to kill, as you quite rightly say. Are you aware that, if slaughter contravenes article 5(2)(a) of the directive 85/511/EEC, we have to look at other ways of controlling foot and mouth disease—that is, suppressive vaccination, which will give you time to slaughter the animals in your own time and incinerate them, although you have stopped the infection? When talking about vaccination, you mentioned the difficulties across Wales. I agree with you, particularly on how widespread the infection was. However, you must remember that, in north Wales, there was only one real centre of foot and mouth disease.

[319] **Peter Rogers:** Un o'r pethau mwyaf diddorol a ddywedasoeh heddiw yw eich bod yn sylweddoli mai hwn yw un o'r clefydau anifeilaidd mwyaf heintus. Mae'n debyg mai hyd y cyfnod rhwng dyfodiad cyntaf y clwyf i'r Deyrnas Unedig a'r adeg yr oedd rheolaeth dros symud anifeiliaid yw'r ffactor cyfrannol mwyaf at y sefyllfa sydd gennym bellach. Soniasoch am Joe Walsh, a gyflwynodd waharddiad ar unwaith ar ddefnyddio llwybrau cyhoeddus yn Iwerddon. Yr oedd yn sylweddoli hynny. Soniasoch hefyd sut yr aeth yr Iseldiroedd i'r afael â'r broblem. Soniodd Carwyn am ddefnyddio rhaglen frechu. Yr ydych yn dal i droi'n ôl at y polisi brechu i fyw. Yr oedd y brechlyn ataliol, a ddefnyddiwyd yn yr Iseldiroedd, wedi'i ddefnyddio o dan erthygl cyfarwyddeb Ewropeaidd am na châi waredu carcasau o dan bolisi lladd ac ni allai symud y carcasau hynny os oedd clwy'r traed a'r genau arnynt. Felly, bu'n rhaid iddynt ystyried dull o reoli clwy'r traed a'r genau. Gwnaethpwyd hynny drwy frechu i ladd, fel yr ydych yn dweud. A ydych yn ymwybodol bod yn rhaid inni ystyried dulliau eraill o reoli clwy'r traed a'r genau, os yw'r lladd yn groes i erthygl 5(2)(a) o gyfarwyddeb 85/511/EEC—sef brechu ataliol, a fydd yn rhoi amser ichi ladd yr anifeiliaid yn eich amser eich hun a'u llosgi, er eich bod wedi atal yr haint? Wrth sôn am frechu, soniasoch am yr anawsterau ledled Cymru. Cytunaf â chi, yn enwedig ynghylch pa mor gyffredin oedd yr haint. Fodd bynnag, rhaid ichi gofio mai dim ond un wir ganolfan clwy'r traed a'r genau a oedd yng ngogledd Cymru.

I listened to what Mick had to say about vaccination in Europe—that you could not make a comparison to other countries. I would like to highlight the case in Algeria, where there were over 165 cases spread across the country. I do not think that they commenced suppressive vaccination for a week. They vaccinated nearly 2 million animals and brought the disease under control within a month. What I am asking is, do you accept that, in terms of the problems we have had in Wales, we should be considering seriously ring vaccination, which would have given us time to adhere to the rules we learnt in 1967, one of them being that animals need to be slaughtered within 24 hours to stop the spread of the disease?

Carwyn Jones: I have three points to make before Tony answers. It is not a National Assembly function to control animal movements. That is clear and well known to every member of this Committee, and we have been discussing it for some time. It is entirely a matter for DEFRA in Wales, and that is precisely the point I have been trying to make since last summer—we need the ability to control animal movements in Wales. That has been abundantly clear to all who can listen.

As far as vaccination is concerned, I am not aware what the agricultural economy of Algeria rests upon, but ours rests upon export, particularly sheep meat exports. If there are no sheep meat exports for any great length of time, there is no sheep meat industry in Wales. Peter is right to say that vaccination was carried out in the Netherlands—and this is precisely why it was sought in Cumbria and Devon—in order to slow down the number of carcasses that had to be disposed of. That much is true. However, on the basis of what Tony has already said, that would have meant vaccinating across almost all of Wales, with a consequent effect on the whole rural economy, not just farming.

Gwrandewais ar yr hyn a ddywedodd Mick am frechu yn Ewrop—na allech gymharu â gwledydd eraill. Hoffwn dynnu sylw at yr achos yn Algeria, lle'r oedd dros 165 o achosion ar wasgar ledled y wlad. Ni chredaf iddynt ddechrau brechu ataliol am wythnos. Gwnaethant frechu ymron i 2 filiwn o anifeiliaid ac yr oedd y clwyf o dan reolaeth ganddynt o fewn mis. Yr hyn yr wyf am ei ofyn yw, a ydych yn derbyn, yng nghyd-destun y problemau a gawsom yng Nghymru, y dylem roi ystyriaeth o ddifrif i frechu cylch, a fyddai wedi rhoi amser inni lynu wrth y rheolau a ddysgasom yn 1967, ac un o'r rheini oedd bod rhaid lladd anifeiliaid o fewn 24 awr i atal ymlediad y clwyf?

Carwyn Jones: Mae gennyf dri phwynt i'w gwneud cyn i Tony ateb. Nid yw rheoli symudiadau anifeiliaid yn swyddogaeth i'r Cynulliad Cenedlaethol. Mae hynny'n glir ac yn dra hysbys i bob aelod o'r Pwyllgor hwn, ac yr ydym wedi bod yn ei drafod ers cryn amser. Mae'n fater i DEFRA yng Nghymru yn llwyr, a dyna'r union bwynt y ceisiais ei wneud ers yr haf diwethaf—mae angen y gallu i reoli symudiadau anifeiliaid arnom yng Nghymru. Bu hynny'n gwbl glir i bawb a all wrando.

O ran brechu, nid wyf yn gwybod ar beth y mae economi amaethyddol Algeria'n dibynnu, ond mae'n heconomi ni'n dibynnu ar allforio, yn enwedig allforion cig dafad. Os nad oes allforion cig dafad am gyfnod hir, nid oes diwydiant cig dafad yng Nghymru. Mae Peter yn gywir wrth ddweud bod brechu wedi digwydd yn yr Iseldiroedd—a dyna'n union pam y bu cais i'w wneud yn Cymbria a Dyfnaint—er mwyn gostwng nifer y carcasau yr oedd yn rhaid eu gwaredu. Mae cymaint â hynny'n wir. Fodd bynnag, ar sail yr hyn a ddywedodd Tony eisoes, byddai hynny wedi golygu brechu ledled Cymru bron, gydag effaith ganlynol ar yr holl economi wledig, nid ffermio'n unig.

[320] **Glyn Davies:** Do you want to come back on that, Peter?

[321] **Peter Rogers:** Yes. I am not going to lecture Carwyn on the economics or agriculture of Algeria. However, Holland is very dependent on agriculture, particularly the dairy sector, as is Ireland, which is why they responded accordingly by bringing in powers to ring vaccinate and why they were so successful. When we are talking about vaccination, we ought to understand that there is no way that any decision in the future would allow the mass slaughter of animals that happened as a result of the last outbreak. There is no way that anyone would pay for that again, or ever allow it to happen. Are we in the Assembly now going to look closely at ring vaccination as one way of controlling the disease?

The other major point that must be made is that you are using figures—and I know very well that you can use figures in whichever way you want to use them—that you quoted last time in relation to slaughtered animals. You talked about the fact that one case equated to 10,000 animals in Holland, while one case equated to 3,000 animals in Wales. I do not think that that takes into consideration the amount of animals slaughtered in the welfare cull. You know very well that, in the welfare cull, none of the offspring—none of the lambs—were counted. In the preventative cull in Anglesey, where valuations were done on one ewe with triplets, one ewe with twins or one ewe with a single lamb, the individual animal was counted as one. For the welfare cull, the figures from the Meat and Livestock Commission confirm that none of the lambs were counted in that cull. I know very well that, in Anglesey, from the time that valuations were made to the time stock was removed from farms, all baby lambs were put down by vets, placed

[320] **Glyn Davies:** A ydych yn dymuno cyfrannu eto ar hynny, Peter?

[321] **Peter Rogers:** Ydwyf. Nid wyf am roi darlith i Carwyn ar economeg nac amaethyddiaeth Algeria. Fodd bynnag, mae'r Iseldiroedd yn ddibynnol iawn ar amaethyddiaeth, yn enwedig y sector llaeth, fel y mae Iwerddon, a dyna pam y gwnaethant ymateb yn unol â hynny drwy gyflwyno pwerau i frechu cylch a phaham y buont mor llwyddiannus. Pan soniwn am frechu, dylem ddeall nad oes unrhyw bosibilrwydd y byddai unrhyw benderfyniad yn y dyfodol yn caniatáu lladd y niferoedd mawr o ddefaid fel y digwyddodd o ganlyniad i'r achosion diwethaf o'r clwyf. Ni fyddai neb yn barod i dalu am hynny eto, na chaniatáu iddo ddigwydd. A ydym ni yn y Cynulliad am edrych yn fanwl yn awr ar frechu cylch fel un dull o reoli'r clwyf?

Y pwynt pwysig arall y mae'n rhaid ei wneud yw eich bod yn defnyddio ffigurau—a gwn yn iawn y gallwch ddefnyddio ffigurau ym mha fodd bynnag y dymunwch—yr oeddech wedi'u dyfynnu y tro diwethaf mewn cysylltiad ag anifeiliaid a laddwyd. Soniasoch am y ffaith bod un achos yn cyfateb i 10,000 o anifeiliaid yn yr Iseldiroedd, tra yr oedd un achos yn cyfateb i 3,000 o anifeiliaid yng Nghymru. Ni chredaf fod hynny'n cyfrif nifer yr anifeiliaid a laddwyd yn y difa er lles anifeiliaid. Fe wyddoch o'r gorau, yn y difa er lles anifeiliaid, na chyfrifwyd yr un o'r epil—yr un o'r wyn. Yn y difa ataliol yn Ynys Môn, lle y prisiwyd un famog â thripledi, un famog â gefeilliaid neu un famog ag un oen, fe gyfrifwyd yr anifail unigol yn un. Ar gyfer y difa lles, mae'r ffigurau oddi wrth y Comisiwn Cig a Da Byw yn cadarnhau nad oedd yr un o'r wyn wedi'i gyfrif yn y difa hwnnw. Gwn yn iawn fod yr holl wyn bach yn Ynys Môn, o adeg y prisio hyd adeg mynd â'r stoc o'r ffermydd, wedi'u difa gan filfeddygon, eu rhoi mewn bagiau a'u casglu

into bags and collected by the army. There is no way that they were included in the figures. What I am saying is that, if you take into consideration that one case equated to 10,000 animals in Holland—and I am going back to what Ron Davies said about the cost of this—what we have paid is horrendous. You say that, in Wales, one case equated to 3,000 animals but, if you were to take the slaughter of animals in Anglesey or north Wales alone, and divide that by the number of clinically confirmed cases—we must accept that there were three, four or five confirmed cases in Anglesey at the very most—it will be far higher than what the Dutch Government paid. I think that that is an important point to take away from here today; these figures that you are floating are absolutely incorrect in relation to what it has cost our farming industry.

[322] **Glyn Davies:** I would like to raise a point myself, Carwyn. It is much the same as Peter's, so I may as well make it now. It involves the credibility of this figure, which I have heard you use before, of 10,000 per case in Holland and 3,000 in the United Kingdom. In a sense, my question is in the form of a challenge to the integrity of those figures. Peter is challenging whether they are right in terms of the way you counted them. However, my view is that, inevitably, where there are few cases, the number will be much higher. When you concentrate the cases that we have had in Britain, it is going to be lower. I just think that you are using that argument and I would say that you are giving a very false impression of the effect. I am saying the same thing as Peter, in a way. That is certainly my view. Peter has stated his view on the way it was counted. I say it as an assertion, while he asks it as more of a question.

gan y fyddin. Nid yw hi'n bosibl eu bod wedi'u cynnwys yn y ffigurau. Yr hyn yr wyf yn ei ddweud yw, os ystyriwch fod un achos yn cyfateb i 10,000 o anifeiliaid yn yr Iseldiroedd—ac yr wyf yn mynd yn ôl at yr hyn a ddywedodd Ron Davies am y gost—ein bod wedi talu swm aruthrol. Fe ddywedwch fod un achos yng Nghymru'n cyfateb i 3,000 o anifeiliaid ond, pe byddech yn cymryd nifer yr anifeiliaid a laddwyd yn Ynys Môn neu ogledd Cymru yn unig, a rhannu hynny â nifer yr achosion a gadarnhawyd yn glinigol—rhaid inni dderbyn bod tri, pedwar neu bump o achosion a gadarnhawyd yn Ynys Môn ar y mwyaf—bydd yn llawer mwy nag a dalodd Llywodraeth yr Iseldiroedd. Credaf fod hynny'n bwynt pwysig y dylid ei ystyried wedi'r cyfarfod hwn heddiw; mae'r ffigurau hyn yr ydych yn eu crybwyll yn gwbl anghywir o ran yr hyn a gostiodd i'n diwydiant ffermio.

[322] **Glyn Davies:** Hoffwn godi pwynt fy hun, Carwyn. Mae'n debyg iawn i un Peter, felly cystal imi'i wneud yn awr. Mae'n ymwneud â hygrededd y ffigur hwn, y'ch clywais yn ei ddefnyddio o'r blaen, o 10,000 yr achos yn yr Iseldiroedd a 3,000 yn y Deyrnas Unedig. Ar un ystyr, mae fy nghwestiwn yn rhyw fath o her i gywirdeb y ffigurau hynny. Mae Peter yn herio a ydynt yn iawn o ran eich dull o'u cyfrif. Fodd bynnag, fy marn i yw ei bod yn anorfod, lle y mae ychydig o achosion, y bydd y nifer yn uwch o lawer. Pan ydych yn crynhoi'r achosion a gawsom ym Mhrydain, mae'n mynd i fod yn is. Credaf eich bod yn defnyddio'r ddadl honno ac fe ddywedwn i eich bod yn rhoi camargraff fawr o'r effaith. Yr wyf yn dweud yr un peth â Peter, ar ryw ystyr. Dyna fy marn i'n sicr. Mae Peter wedi datgan ei farn ar y modd y'i cyfrifwyd. Yr wyf yn ei ddweud fel haeriad, ac mae ef yn ei ofyn yn debycach i gwestiwn.

Carwyn Jones: What is the point that you are trying to make, Chair? I do not quite follow.

[323] **Glyn Davies:** My point is that, if you have one case in Holland, clearly it could be 20,000 or 30,000. The cases in Holland were only, what was it, in the teens?

Carwyn Jones: Twenty-six.

[324] **Glyn Davies:** Well, 26, or whatever it was. Clearly, if there had been a more intensive outbreak, as there was in Britain, that figure would drop dramatically because, in a certain area, you have many more cases to make the division. That is my point. I am worried that, by using that figure, you make vaccination seem to be a not credible option. It is the same as Peter's point; we are challenging that 10,000:1 and 3,000:1 figure.

Mr Brodie: Chair, can I just explain? First of all, everything—

[325] **Glyn Davies:** Do not lose Peter's point on this.

Mr Brodie: No, this is it precisely. Everything that was done was done in the light of the veterinary and scientific advice. In the spring, when ring vaccination was being considered—and it was seriously considered—the advice from the scientific modellers to the UK Government was that the radius of the ring that you would have to vaccinate would be larger than the ring that you would have to cull. The basis for that is that it takes between four and five days for the level of resistance to build up in the antibodies after the vaccination. So, the scientific judgment that was offered to the UK Government—I cannot judge

Carwyn Jones: Beth yw'r pwynt yr ydych yn ceisio'i wneud, Gadeirydd? Nid wyf yn deall yn hollol.

[323] **Glyn Davies:** Fy mhwynt i yw, os oes gennyh un achos yn yr Iseldiroedd, mae'n amlwg y gallai fod yn 20,000 neu'n 30,000. Nid oedd nifer yr achosion yn yr Iseldiroedd ond, beth ydoedd, yn y degau?

Carwyn Jones: Chwech ar hugain.

[324] **Glyn Davies:** Wel, 26, neu beth bynnag ydoedd. Wrth gwrs, pe bai llawer mwy o achosion, fel yr oedd ym Mhrydain, byddai'r ffigur hwnnw'n is o lawer oherwydd, mewn ardal benodol, mae gennyh fwy o lawer o achosion i wneud y rhaniad. Dyna fy mhwynt i. Yr wyf yn bryderus eich bod, drwy ddefnyddio'r ffigur hwnnw, yn peri i frechu ymddangos yn ddewis nad oes hygredd iddo. Mae yr un fath â phwynt Peter; yr ydym yn herio'r ffigur hwnnw o 10,000:1 a 3,000:1.

Mr Brodie: Gadeirydd, a gaf egluro? Yn gyntaf oll, mae popeth—

[325] **Glyn Davies:** Peidiwch â cholli pwynt Peter ar hyn.

Mr Brodie: Na wnaf, dyma ef yn union. Gwnaethpwyd popeth yng ngoleuni'r cyngor milfeddygol a gwyddonol. Yn y gwanwyn, pan oedd brechu cylch o dan ystyriaeth—ac fe'i hystyriwyd o ddifrif—y cyngor oddi wrth y modelwyr gwyddonol yn Llywodraeth y DU oedd y byddai cwmpas y cylch y byddai'n rhaid ichi frechu ynddo'n fwy na'r cylch lle y byddech yn gorfod difa. Y sail i hynny yw ei bod yn cymryd rhwng pedwar a phum niwrnod i lefel yr ymwrthedd godi yn y gwrthgyrff ar ôl y brechu. Felly, y farn wyddonol a gynigiwyd i Lywodraeth y DU—ni allaf farnu a oedd yn gywir neu'n anghywir, ond dyma'r ffaith—oedd

whether it was correct or incorrect, but this is the fact—was that it was better to go for a contiguous cull policy than for ring vaccination. This is not just a retrospective, ‘Oh, let us look at Holland’s figures and see that they actually happen to be suitable’. That was the basis of the scientific advice at the time.

[326] **Glyn Davies:** I will just try to wrap up with small points. There are about three or four points that I want to pick up. Peter, has a small point, as do Elin and Ron, I think.

[327] **Peter Rogers:** You talk about scientific evidence or advice. There can be no scientific evidence to justify the slaughter that happened in Anglesey, and I will tell you why—

[328] **Glyn Davies:** Is this a small point?

[329] **Peter Rogers:** Yes it is, and it is a very important point as well.

[330] **Glyn Davies:** I do not want this to extend into a long description.

[331] **Peter Rogers:** The whole issue, which I tried to highlight before, is the speed of the spread of foot and mouth disease. You say that it is four or five days by the time we find a clinical case, and we have probably been missing the virus for those four or five days.

Mr Brodie: No. That was not what I was saying, Chair. What I was saying was that, once you vaccinate an animal, it takes a certain period for the vaccine to show the response—

ei bod yn well dewis polisi difa ar ffermydd cyffiniol na brechu cylch. Yr oedd hyn yn fwy na dim ond edrych yn ôl a dweud, ‘O, gadewch inni edrych ar ffigurau’r Iseldiroedd a gweld eu bod yn digwydd bod yn addas’. Dyna oedd sail y cyngor gwyddonol ar y pryd.

[326] **Glyn Davies:** Ceisiaf gau pen y mwdwl gyda phwyntiau bach. Mae tua thri neu bedwar o bwyntiau y dymunaf eu codi. Mae gan Peter bwynt bach, ac Elin a Ron, yr wyf yn credu.

[327] **Peter Rogers:** Yr ydych yn sôn am dystiolaeth neu gyngor gwyddonol. Ni ellir cael dystiolaeth wyddonol i gyfiawnhau’r lladd a fu yn Ynys Môn, ac fe roddaf y rheswm ichi—

[328] **Glyn Davies:** Ai pwynt bach yw hwn?

[329] **Peter Rogers:** Ydyw, ac mae’n bwynt pwysig iawn hefyd.

[330] **Glyn Davies:** Nid wyf am i hyn fynd yn ddisgrifiad hir.

[331] **Peter Rogers:** Y mater sydd dan sylw, y ceisiais dynnu sylw ato o’r blaen, yw cyflymder ymlediad clwy’r traed a’r genau. Yr ydych yn dweud bod pedwar neu bum niwrnod yn mynd heibio cyn inni ddarganfod achos clinigol, a’i bod yn debygol ein bod wedi methu canfod y feirws yn y pedwar neu bum niwrnod hynny.

Mr Brodie: Na. Nid hynny yr oeddwn yn ei ddweud, Gadeirydd. Yr hyn a ddywedais oedd, ar ôl ichi frechu anifail, ei bod yn cymryd cyfnod penodol i’r brechlyn ddangos yr ymateb—

[332] **Peter Rogers:** I am sorry, this is nothing to do with vaccination. I am talking about the scientific evidence for culling in Anglesey. There is no evidence that I have heard from any of you that it is wind spread. I am not even sure how it ever was spread in Anglesey, to be quite honest. There is no evidence of wind spread. You took a line on the new A5. If you remember, you had about 12 suspected cases on that line. Some of those places were closed for up to 12 days. You manned the gates there. None of those cases were confirmed. You then decided that you would perform a preventative cull, to take out that corner of Anglesey. There is no evidence at all that you can ever do a cut-out like that without doing it within a radius. If you were going to do it scientifically, you would have started from the outside of the radius and cleared the stock working inwards. You did not do that. You started all over the place. So, in consequence, considering the length of time that it took, a ring vaccination would have stopped it much more quickly—immediately. You must remember that one of the things that you are saying about vaccination is that you do not have the expertise. Some of us, as farmers, vaccinate at least twice a year, so, if it is about scientific evidence, ring vaccination would have been much more effective.

[333] **Glyn Davies:** I want to ensure that we have enough time to consider all these issues. Therefore, I will take all the points from members now, and we can then wrap up this part of the meeting.

[332] **Peter Rogers:** Mae'n ddrwg gennyf, nid oes a wnelo hyn ddim o gwbl â brechu. Yr wyf yn sôn am y dystiolaeth wyddonol dros ddifa yn Ynys Môn. Nid wyf wedi clywed tystiolaeth gan yr un ohonoch ei fod yn cael ei ledaenu gan y gwynt. Nid wyf yn sicr sut y cafodd ei ledaenu o gwbl yn Ynys Môn, a bod yn gwbl onest. Nid oes tystiolaeth o ledaenu gan y gwynt. Tynasoch linell ar yr A5 newydd. Os cofiwch, yr oedd gennyh tua 12 o achosion posibl ar hyd y llinell honno. Caewyd rhai o'r lleoedd hynny am hyd at 12 niwrnod. Yr oedd gennyh staff wrth y gatiau yno. Ni chadarnhawyd yr un o'r achosion hynny. Wedyn, penderfynasoch gyflawni difa ataliol, fel na fyddai achos o'r clwyf yn y gornel honno o Ynys Môn. Nid oes tystiolaeth o gwbl y gallwch neilltuo lle felly heb wneud hynny o fewn cwmpas. Os oeddech am ei wneud yn wyddonol, byddech wedi dechrau y tu allan i'r cwmpas ac wedi clirio'r stoc gan weithio tuag at i mewn. Ni wnaethoch hynny. Dechreuasoch mewn gwahanol leoedd. Felly, o ganlyniad, gan gofio'r amser a gymerodd, byddai brechu cylch wedi'i atal yn gyflymach o lawer—ar unwaith. Rhaid ichi gofio mai un o'r pethau yr ydych yn eu dweud am frechu yw nad yw'r arbenigedd gennyh. Mae rhai ohonom ni, fel ffermwyr, yn brechu o leiaf ddwywaith y flwyddyn, felly, os oes a wnelo hyn â thystiolaeth wyddonol, buasai brechu mewn cylch yn fwy effeithiol o lawer.

[333] **Glyn Davies:** Dymunaf sicrhau bod gennym ddigon o amser i ystyried yr holl faterion hyn. Felly, cymeraf yr holl bwyntiau gan yr aelodau'n awr, ac wedyn gallwn ddod â'r rhan hon o'r cyfarfod i ben.

[334] **Elin Jones:** Yr wyf am holi, yn debyg i'r hyn a wnaeth Peter Rogers, am frechu cylch. Dywedodd Huw Brodie y byddai'r ardal fyddai angen brechu cylch yn fwy o ardal na'r ardal ar gyfer lladd. A ddywedodd y Gweinidog, neu un ohonoch, y byddai hynny wedi golygu Cymru gyfan, fwy neu lai? Pe byddem wedi mabwysiadu polisi brechu cylch ar sail yr achosion a oedd gennym, byddem wedi gorfod brechu a lladd pob anifail yng Nghymru. Ai dyna'r hyn a ddywedwch? Yr wyf yn ceisio deall pa mor fawr fyddai'r ardal honno'n gorfod bod, a faint mwy o anifeiliaid fyddai hynny'n ei olygu. I asesu brechu cylch o'i gymharu â lladd, mae'n rhaid deall faint o ardal sydd dan sylw.

Huw Brodie: Yr hyn y byddwn i'n—

[335] **Elin Jones:** Yr wyf eisiau holi un cwestiwn arall, cyn ichi ateb.

[336] **Glyn Davies:** I ask the officials to be patient. I need to take all these points now, and you can come back to them all at the end. That is the only way I can move on effectively.

[337] **Elin Jones:** Yr wyf hefyd am gael ateb clir i fy nghwestiwn nesaf. Dywedodd y Gweinidog ar y dechrau mai ei fwriad, wrth ystyried pa bolisi oedd fwyaf perthnasol, oedd cael gwared ar glwy'r traed a'r genau cyn gynted ag y bo modd. Nid wyf yn sôn am ailagor marchnadoedd allforio, gan eich bod wedi cyfeirio digon at hynny eisoes y prynhawn yma. A ydych yn gwbl hyderus mai'r polisi o ladd anifeiliaid oedd y polisi mwyaf effeithiol i gael gwared ar y clwyf yn gyflym, o ystyried y gellid bod wedi cymryd camau mwy effeithiol o ran amser? Mae'n cymryd llai o amser i frechu anifail nag i'w ladd. Byddai hynny wedi cyflwyno effeithlonrwydd amser i'r system. A ydych yn dweud mai lladd anifeiliaid yw'r ffordd fwyaf effeithiol o ran

[334] **Elin Jones:** I want to ask a similar question to that asked by Peter Rogers, about ring vaccination. Huw Brodie said that the area that would need ring vaccination would be greater than the area for a cull. Did the Minister, or one of you, say that that would have meant the whole of Wales, more or less? If we had adopted a ring vaccination policy based on the cases that we had, we would have had to vaccinate and cull all the animals in Wales. Is that what you are saying? I am trying to understand how large that area would have to be, and how many more animals that would mean. In order to assess ring vaccination as compared to a cull, we must understand what size area is under consideration.

Huw Brodie: What I would—

[335] **Elin Jones:** I want to ask one more question, before you answer.

[336] **Glyn Davies:** Gofynnaf i'r swyddogion fod yn amyneddgar. Rhaid imi gymryd yr holl bwyntiau hyn yn awr, ac wedyn gallwch ddod yn ôl atynt yn y diwedd. Dyna'r unig fodd y gallaf symud ymlaen yn effeithiol.

[337] **Elin Jones:** I also want a clear answer to my next question. The Minister said at the beginning that his intention in considering the most relevant policy was to eradicate foot and mouth disease as quickly as possible. I am not talking about reopening export markets, because you have already made enough reference to that this afternoon. Are you wholly confident that an animal cull was the most effective policy to eradicate the disease quickly, considering that more effective steps could have been taken with regard to the time it took? It takes less time to vaccinate an animal than to cull it. That would have introduced time efficiency into the system. Are you saying that culling animals is the most effective method of eradicating the disease

amser wrth ddod â'r clwyf i ben? Nid wyf yn sôn am ailagor marchnadoedd tramor.

[338] **Glyn Davies:** Okay. Ron, do you want to make one last point?

[339] **Ron Davies:** Yes. As I understand it, at the outset, Carwyn, you said that the process of approving vaccination had to be handled jointly by DEFRA and the National Assembly. Presumably, you agreed to the submission being made in respect—

Carwyn Jones: In Wales, it is a joint function, but in England it is only DEFRA.

[340] **Ron Davies:** I see. So it is an anomaly. I will not pursue that point then.

The particular question I want to ask is, if we had pursued the policy of using vaccination—not specifically vaccination to kill or exclusively vaccination to live—as appropriate to control and for prophylactic purposes outside the controlled area, in other words using both to stamp out the disease, how long after the cessation of vaccination and following the last outbreak would it be deemed that the policy had been successful? In other words, at what point would it have been declared that the outbreak was over? Following from that, once that was achieved, would it not then have been possible—notwithstanding that the normal limit would be 12 months—to negotiate a recommencement of trade, within the 12 month period, provided that the outbreak had been deemed to have been successfully dealt with?

quickly? I am not talking about reopening foreign markets.

[338] **Glyn Davies:** O'r gorau. Ron, a ydych yn dymuno gwneud un pwynt olaf?

[339] **Ron Davies:** Ydwyf. Fel yr wyf fi'n ei ddeall, ar y cychwyn, Carwyn, fe ddywedaso ch fod yn rhaid i'r broses o gymeradwyo brechu gael ei drafod ar y cyd gan DEFRA a'r Cynulliad Cenedlaethol. Gellir tybio eich bod yn cytuno â'r cais a wneir ynghylch—

Carwyn Jones: Yng Nghymru, mae'n swyddogaeth ar y cyd ond, yn Lloegr, mater i DEFRA ydyw.

[340] **Ron Davies:** Gwelaf fi. Felly mae'n anomaledd. Nid af ar ôl y pwynt hwnnw felly.

Y cwestiwn penodol y dymunaf ei ofyn yw, pe byddem wedi dilyn polisi o ddefnyddio brechu—nid brechu i ladd yn benodol neu frechu i fyw yn unig—yn ôl y gofyn i reoli ac at ddibenion clwyfrwystrol y tu allan i'r ardal reoledig, mewn geiriau eraill, defnyddio'r ddau i ddileu'r clwyf, pa mor hir ar ôl rhoi'r gorau i frechu ac ar ôl yr achos diwethaf o'r clwyf y byddid yn barnu bod y polisi hwnnw wedi bod yn llwyddiannus? Mewn geiriau eraill, ar ba adeg y byddid wedi datgan bod y clwyf wedi diflannu? Gan ddilyn hynny, ar ôl ei gyflawni, oni fuasai'n bosibl wedyn—er mai'r terfyn arferol fyddai 12 mis—negodi i aildechrau masnachu, o fewn y cyfnod o 12 mis, ar yr amod bod pobl yn barnu bod y clwyf wedi'i drin yn llwyddiannus?

Mr Edwards: May I just clarify one or two points about ring vaccination? The point about ring vaccination is that it has to have a much wider radius than a contiguous cull because even the high-strength vaccine takes four or five days to take effect. So you have to vaccinate an area of at least 3 km around the outbreak if you are to be sure that you are stopping the disease, because while the vaccine is taking effect the disease still has the opportunity to spread if you are not careful. Then you kill all the animals that you have vaccinated within that 3 km area. So, if you actually added a 3 km area around all the outbreaks we had in Wales—perhaps I overstressed the point in saying most of Wales—that would have meant that large parts of the country would have been affected because of the area we would have had to vaccinate. If you vaccinate to live, again, because of the nature of the disease, you have to have a boundary that can be effectively policed, because there must be no movements in and out of that boundary for at least three months.

If I can move on to Ron Davies's point about vaccine and the 12-month period, the only way that you can prove that the vaccine programme has been effective and that there is no disease present is by carrying out the sero surveillance, which is the blood test we talked about earlier. As long as there is no test available to detect the difference between antibodies from vaccine and antibodies from field challenge, the only way that you can do that is to wait for all the antibodies to disappear. The period for that to happen in sheep is up to a year, so you would have to do extensive sero surveillance and keep on doing it until you got to the point where you could show that there were no antibodies left. Only at that point would the international trade people accept that the outbreak was completely over, and was completely under control.

Mr Edwards: A gaf egluro un neu ddau o bwyntiau am frechu cylch? Y pwynt am frechu cylch yw bod yn rhaid cael cwmpas ehangach o lawer ar ei gyfer na difa ar ffermydd cyffiniol oherwydd mae hyd yn oed y brechlyn cryf yn cymryd pedwar neu bum niwrnod i gael effaith. Felly rhaid ichi frechu mewn ardal o o leiaf 3 km o gwmpas yr achos o'r clwyf os ydych am fod yn sicr o atal y clwyf, oherwydd tra bo'r brechlyn yn cael effaith mae cyfle o hyd i'r clwyf ymledu os nad ydych yn ofalus. Wedyn yr ydych yn lladd yr holl anifeiliaid yr ydych wedi'u brechu o fewn yr ardal honno o 3 km. Felly, pe byddech yn ychwanegu ardal o 3 km o gwmpas yr holl achosion a gawsom yng Nghymru—efallai fy mod wedi gorbwysleisio'r pwynt wrth ddweud y rhan fwyaf o Gymru—byddai hynny wedi golygu y byddai rhannau helaeth o'r wlad wedi'u heffeithio oherwydd maint yr ardal y byddem wedi gorfod brechu ynddi. Os ydych yn brechu i fyw, unwaith eto, oherwydd natur y clwyf, mae'n rhaid cael ffin y gellir ei phlisma'n effeithiol, oherwydd ni ellir caniatáu symudiadau i mewn ac allan dros y ffin honno am o leiaf dri mis.

Os caf symud ymlaen at bwynt Ron Davies ynghylch y brechlyn a'r cyfnod 12 mis, yr unig fodd y gallwch brofi bod y rhaglen frechu wedi bod yn effeithiol ac nad oes clwyf yn bresennol yw drwy gynnal yr arolwg serolegol, sef y prawf gwaed a drafodasom yn gynharach. Tra nad oes prawf ar gael i ganfod y gwahaniaeth rhwng gwrthgyrff o frechlyn a gwrthgyrff o her yn y maes, yr unig fodd i wneud hynny yw disgwyl i'r holl wrthgyrff ddiflannu. Y cyfnod y mae'n rhaid disgwyl i hynny ddigwydd mewn dafad yw hyd at flwyddyn, felly byddech yn gorfod cynnal arolwg serolegol helaeth a pharhau i wneud hynny nes y gallech ddangos nad oedd gwrthgyrff ar ôl. Dim ond bryd hynny y byddai'r bobl masnach ryngwladol yn derbyn bod yr achosion o'r clwyf wedi diflannu'n llwyr, a'u bod o dan reolaeth llwyr.

Carwyn Jones: On Peter's point on Anglesey, he said that there was no scientific evidence behind the cull in Anglesey. I obviously refute that entirely. Everything that was done in Anglesey was based on scientific evidence. Peter, if I remember correctly, suggested that vaccination was a policy that could be pursued, and said so, to be fair, in a Plenary session of the Assembly. I remember asking him in an intervention whether he meant vaccinate to slaughter or vaccinate to live, and he did not pursue the question of vaccination again.

The second point that I have to make—I have tried to resist doing this, Chair, believe me—is that I cannot see how a member of this Committee, who received money as part of the preventative cull, can fail to declare that as an interest.

[341] **Glyn Davies:** He did declare it.

Carwyn Jones: I mean the amount of money that he received.

[342] **Glyn Davies:** I am not sure about that. I would not want to comment on whether that is right or not. There were declarations of interest made by members, and I, personally, was satisfied with the declaration. I will have to take advice as to whether that was inappropriate.

The clerk has confirmed that his view is the same as mine—that Peter's declaration earlier was a proper and right declaration, and it is acceptable for him to make his point in the Committee.

Carwyn Jones: In that case, I ask Peter if he will voluntarily tell us how much he has received.

Carwyn Jones: Ynghylch pwynt Peter am Ynys Môn, dywedodd nad oedd tystiolaeth wyddonol o blaid y difa yn Ynys Môn. Gallaf wrthbrofi hynny'n llwyr, wrth gwrs. Yr oedd popeth a wnaethpwyd yn Ynys Môn yn seiliedig ar dystiolaeth wyddonol. Os cofiaf yn iawn, awgrymodd Peter fod brechu'n bolisi y gellid ei ddilyn, a dywedodd hynny, a bod yn deg, yng Nghyfarfod Llawn y Cynulliad. Cofiaf ofyn iddo mewn ymyriad a oedd yn golygu brechu i ladd ynteu brechu i fyw, ac nid aeth ar ôl mater brechu eto.

Yr ail bwynt yr wyf yn gorfod ei wneud—ceisiais beidio â gwneud hyn, Gadeirydd, credwch chi—yw na allaf weld sut y gall aelod o'r Pwyllgor hwn, a dderbyniodd arian fel rhan o'r difa ataliol, fethu â datgan hynny fel buddiant.

[341] **Glyn Davies:** Fe'i datganodd.

Carwyn Jones: Yr wyf yn sôn am y swm o arian a dderbyniodd.

[342] **Glyn Davies:** Nid wyf yn sicr am hynny. Ni ddymunwn wneud sylw ynghylch a yw'n gywir neu beidio. Gwnaeth aelodau ddatganiadau o fuddiant, ac yr oeddwn i, fy hun, yn fodlon ar y datganiad. Bydd yn rhaid imi gymryd cyngor ynghylch a oedd hynny'n amhriodol.

Mae'r clerwr wedi cadarnhau ei fod o'r un farn â mi—bod datganiad Peter yn gynharach yn ddatganiad priodol a chywir, a'i fod yn dderbyniol iddo wneud ei bwynt yn y Pwyllgor.

Carwyn Jones: Os felly, gofynnaf i Peter a wnaiff ddweud wrthym o'i wirfodd faint a dderbyniodd.

[343] **Glyn Davies:** That is a matter for Peter, and is not something I want to pursue at this meeting.

[344] **Peter Rogers:** There is one point—

[345] **Glyn Davies:** I do not want you to come back on that point, as I have dismissed it.

[346] **Peter Rogers:** I am not coming back on that.

[347] **Glyn Davies:** Well, I am not satisfied as yet that all the answers have been given to the points raised. As I want to be as helpful as I can, I may come back to you. However, I do not really want to go back to anyone because, unless we move on and try to adhere to our timetable, we will not be able to deal with the final items.

[348] **Peter Rogers:** It is six words.

[349] **Glyn Davies:** I will hold you to that. First of all, have all the points that were raised been dealt with?

[350] **Ron Davies:** I have a supplementary question for Tony—just for clarification. In the case of the Brecon Beacons, where you are continuing with the serological testing, if you find animals—oh, it has finished now? Okay, if you found animals with antibodies, were they then culled?

Mr Edwards: They would have been.

[351] **Ron Davies:** But they are now clear?

[343] **Glyn Davies:** Mae hynny'n fater i Peter, ac nid yw'n rhywbeth y dymunaf fynd ar ei drywydd yn y cyfarfod hwn.

[344] **Peter Rogers:** Mae un pwynt—

[345] **Glyn Davies:** Nid wyf am ichi siarad eto ar y pwynt hwnnw, gan fy mod wedi'i adael.

[346] **Peter Rogers:** Nid wyf am sôn am hynny eto.

[347] **Glyn Davies:** Wel, nid wyf yn fodlon eto fod yr holl atebion wedi'u rhoi i'r pwyntiau a godwyd. Gan fy mod am fod mor gymwynasgar ag y gallaf, efallai y deuf yn ôl atoch. Fodd bynnag, nid wyf am fynd yn ôl at neb mewn gwirionedd, oherwydd os na symudwn ymlaen a cheisio cadw at ein hamserlen, ni fyddwn yn gallu delio â'r eitemau olaf.

[348] **Peter Rogers:** Chwe gair ydyw.

[349] **Glyn Davies:** Fe'ch daliaf at hynny. Yn gyntaf oll, a ddeliwyd â'r holl bwyntiau a godwyd?

[350] **Ron Davies:** Mae gennyf gwestiwn atodol i Tony—dim ond er mwyn bod yn glir. Yn achos Bannau Brycheiniog, lle'r ydych yn parhau â'r profi serolegol, os dewch o hyd i anifeiliaid yn awr—o, mae wedi gorffen bellach? O'r gorau, pe baech yn dod o hyd i anifeiliaid â gwrthgyrff, a fyddent yn cael eu difa?

Mr Edwards: Byddent.

[351] **Ron Davies:** Ond maent yn glir yn awr?

Mr Edwards: The procedure that was followed on the Brecon Beacons was the same as that followed anywhere else, that is, in the light of epidemiological evidence, Page Street in London would determine whether or not a place should be declared infected, and if it was, they would give instructions for culling. That was the procedure.

[352] **Ron Davies:** So there may have been 10 sheep out of 100 that tested positive?

Mr Edwards: Page Street's professional judgment would determine whether or not the premises had to be declared as infected, according to the level of test result that it was getting.

[353] **Ron Davies:** So would you have culled 10 or 100?

Mr Edwards: In the case of an infected premises, the instructions were to cull all of them.

[354] **Ron Davies:** But, by implication, therefore, there might have been circumstances where you had 10 positive sheep out of a flock, and the instructions were not to kill.

Mr Edwards: No, that never happened.

Mr Jones: Perhaps I could just clarify that. There were circumstances where premises were tested where sero positives were found and it was Page Street's professional judgment that a retest was necessary. That was done on occasion and the whole premises not culled. However, this is a matter for judgment. If there had been 10 on a premises, frankly, it is almost inconceivable that Page Street would not have declared that an infected premises.

Mr Edwards: Yr oedd y weithdrefn a ddilynwyd ar Fannau Brycheiniog yr un fath â honno a ddilynwyd ym mhobman arall, sef, yng ngolwg y dystiolaeth epidemiolegol, byddai Page Street yn Llundain yn penderfynu a ddylid datgan bod rhywle'n heintiedig neu beidio, ac os câi, byddent yn rhoi cyfarwyddiadau difa. Dyna oedd y weithdrefn.

[352] **Ron Davies:** Felly mae'n bosibl y buasai canlyniad 10 dafad o blith 100 a brofwyd yn gadarnhaol?

Mr Edwards: Barn broffesiynol Page Street a benderfynai a oedd yn rhaid datgan bod y safle'n heintiedig, yn ôl lefel canlyniad y prawf a dderbyniodd.

[353] **Ron Davies:** Felly a fyddech wedi difa 10 ynteu 100?

Mr Edwards: Yn achos safle heintiedig, y cyfarwyddiadau oedd y dylid eu difa i gyd.

[354] **Ron Davies:** Ond, drwy oblygiad, mae'n bosibl y buasai amgylchiadau lle'r oedd gennych 10 o ddefaid cadarnhaol mewn praidd, a bod cyfarwyddiadau i beidio â'u lladd.

Mr Edwards: Na, ni ddigwyddodd hynny erioed.

Mr Jones: Efallai y gallwn roi gwedd eglurach ar hynny. Yr oedd amgylchiadau lle y profwyd safleoedd lle y cafwyd canlyniadau serolegol cadarnhaol a barn broffesiynol Page Street oedd bod angen ailbrofi. Gwnaethpwyd hynny weithiau ac ni chafodd yr holl safle ei ddifa. Fodd bynnag, mater i'w ddyfarnu yw hynny. Pe buasai 10 ar y safle, mae bron yn amhosibl dychmygu, a dweud y gwir, na fyddai Page Street wedi'i ddatgan yn safle heintiedig.

[355] **Ron Davies:** There might have been two.

Mr Brodie: That is precisely what I was saying, Chair. It was Page Street's veterinary judgment.

[356] **Ron Davies:** I understand that. What if there were two which were testing positive?

Mr Brodie: It is down to Page Street's judgment.

[357] **Glyn Davies:** We have to move on from this issue, Ron. I know that this is important.

[358] **Ron Davies:** It is straightforward. I understand that it is down to Page Street, but I am asking whether there were circumstances in which a decision was taken that animals which were testing positive were not culled.

Mr Jones: The animals themselves or the whole premises?

[359] **Ron Davies:** The individual animals which had been tested and found to be sero positive.

Mr Jones: If animals tested sero positive, they were culled.

[360] **Ron Davies:** So the rest of the cohorts were not. You might have culled two out of 100 and left the 98.

Mr Jones: That was the matter that was for professional judgment.

[361] **Ron Davies:** I understand that. But was the professional judgment, in some circumstances, to cull two and leave 98?

[355] **Ron Davies:** Efallai y buasai dwy.

Mr Brodie: Dyna'n union yr oeddwn yn ei ddweud, Gadeirydd. Barn filfeddygol Page Street oedd hynny.

[356] **Ron Davies:** Yr wyf yn deall hynny. Beth a ddigwyddai pe byddai dwy y cafwyd prawf cadarnhaol arnynt?

Mr Brodie: Mater i'w farnu gan Page Street ydyw.

[357] **Glyn Davies:** Rhaid inni symud ymlaen o'r mater hwn, Ron. Gwn fod hyn yn bwysig.

[358] **Ron Davies:** Mae'n syml. Yr wyf yn deall mai mater i Page Street ydyw, ond yr wyf yn gofyn a oedd amgylchiadau lle y penderfynwyd peidio â difa anifeiliaid y cafwyd prawf cadarnhaol arnynt.

Mr Jones: Yr anifeiliaid eu hunain neu'r safle i gyd?

[359] **Ron Davies:** Yr anifeiliaid unigol a brofwyd ac y cafwyd canlyniadau serolegol cadarnhaol arnynt.

Mr Jones: Os profwyd bod anifeiliaid yn gadarnhaol yn serolegol, fe'u difawyd.

[360] **Ron Davies:** Felly ni ddifawyd gweddill y carfanau. Fe allech fod wedi difa dau o'r 100 ac wedi gadael y 98.

Mr Jones: Hwnnw oedd y mater ar gyfer dyfarniad proffesiynol.

[361] **Ron Davies:** Yr wyf yn deall hynny. Ond ai'r farn broffesiynol, mewn rhai amgylchiadau, oedd y dylid difa dau a gadael 98?

Mr Jones: There were circumstances where individual animals which had tested sero positive were culled as a preventative measure and, on a retest of samples taken from those animals, it was decided not to cull the rest of the flock.

[362] **Glyn Davies:** That is a simple answer.

[363] **Ron Davies:** No, it is not a simple answer, because the implication is that the retest actually showed that the first test was false.

Mr Jones: Yes.

[364] **Ron Davies:** Well, with respect, that is giving a very interesting answer to a question which I did not ask. What I would like to do is to put the question again, if I may. Were there circumstances where it was determined that some animals were testing positive, and on retesting were deemed to be positive, when those animals, and those animals alone, out of a flock or off a premises, were culled and the rest of the flock on those premises not culled?

Mr Edwards: Shall I deal with that?

Mr Jones: Yes, okay.

Mr Edwards: The very fact—

[365] **Ron Davies:** It is not all that difficult, is it?

[366] **Glyn Davies:** Can we just try answering it, so that we can move on?

Mr Jones: Yr oedd amgylchiadau lle y difawyd anifeiliaid unigol y cafwyd prawf serolegol cadarnhaol arnynt fel cam ataliol a lle y penderfynwyd, ar ôl ailbrofi samplau a gymerwyd o'r anifeiliaid hynny, peidio â difa gweddill y praidd.

[362] **Glyn Davies:** Mae hynny'n ateb syml.

[363] **Ron Davies:** Nac ydyw, nid yw'n ateb syml, oherwydd y goblygiad yw bod yr ail brawf wedi dangos bod yr un cyntaf yn anghywir.

Mr Jones: Ie.

[364] **Ron Davies:** Wel, gyda pharch, mae hwinnw'n ateb diddorol iawn i gwestiwn nas gofynnais. Yr hyn yr hoffwn ei wneud yw gofyn y cwestiwn eto, os caf. A oedd amgylchiadau lle y penderfynwyd bod prawf cadarnhaol ar rai anifeiliaid, ac a farnwyd yn gadarnhaol ar ôl eu hailbrofi, pan ddifawyd yr anifeiliaid hynny, a'r anifeiliaid hynny'n unig, o blith praidd neu o safle, heb ddifa gweddill y praidd ar y safle hwinnw?

Mr Edwards: A ddeliaf fi â hynny?

Mr Jones: O'r gorau.

Mr Edwards: Mae'r ffaith—

[365] **Ron Davies:** Nid yw mor anodd â hynny, onid yw?

[366] **Glyn Davies:** A allwn geisio'i ateb, fel y gallwn symud ymlaen?

Mr Edwards: I am trying to answer. The very fact that some animals were positive implies that there is infection in the flock. However, quite possibly, there will be other sheep in the flock which would have virus in them, but would not have developed the antibody response yet. Therefore, you do not know at that stage, so you take the flock out. So if you get a group of animals that are antibody positive in a flock where there has been direct contact between those animals and the rest of the flock—that is, one unit of livestock—you take them all out. Does that help?

[367] **Ron Davies:** Yes, but again, that is not specifically addressing the question that I was asking. Presumably, if you had one or two cases, you would then test more and more until you were satisfied?

Carwyn Jones: The question is, just to clarify it so that we can get an answer: in circumstances where the test came back positive, were there occasions when a flock was not taken out—when the test came back as positive?

Mr Edwards: As I have said before, the test is not black and white—it is a test that only has a degree of sensitivity and specificity—so if you get one positive out of a large group of animals, you would go back and retest before you took any action. If, on the retest of the same statistical proportion you got positives again, then you would take the flock out at that time.

[368] **Ron Davies:** What if all the rest were negatives, but that one initial one was still positive?

Mr Edwards: Yr wyf yn ceisio ateb. Mae'r ffaith bod rhai anifeiliaid yn gadarnhaol yn awgrymu bod haint yn y praidd. Fodd bynnag, mae'n gwbl bosibl y bydd defaid eraill yn y praidd y mae'r feirws ynddynt, ond na fyddent wedi datblygu ymateb y gwrthgyrff eto. Felly, ni wyddoch ar yr adeg honno, felly yr ydych yn difa'r praidd. Felly os cewch grwp o anifeiliaid y profwyd bod ganddynt wrthgyrff mewn praidd lle y bu cysylltiad uniongyrchol rhwng yr anifeiliaid hynny a gweddill y praidd—sef un uned o dda byw—yr ydych yn eu difa i gyd. A yw hynny o gymorth?

[367] **Ron Davies:** Ydyw, ond unwaith eto, nid yw hynny'n ymdrin yn benodol â'r cwestiwn a ofynnais. Gellir tybio, os oedd gennych un neu ddau o achosion, y byddech wedyn yn rhoi prawf ar fwy a mwy nes eich bod yn fodlon?

Carwyn Jones: Y cwestiwn yw, dim ond i roi gwedd eglurach arno fel y gallwn gael ateb: mewn amgylchiadau lle y cafwyd bod prawf yn gadarnhaol, a oedd adegau pan na ddifawyd y praidd—pan oedd canlyniad y prawf yn gadarnhaol?

Mr Edwards: Fel y dywedais o'r blaen, nid yw'r prawf yn un du a gwyn—mae'n brawf nad oes iddo ond rhyw raddau o sensitifrwydd a phenodoldeb—felly os cewch un cadarnhaol o blith grwp mawr o anifeiliaid, fe aech yn ôl ac ailbrofi cyn cymryd unrhyw gamau. Os oeddech yn cael canlyniadau cadarnhaol eto, ar ôl ailbrofi'r un gyfran ystadegol, wedyn byddech yn difa'r praidd bryd hynny.

[368] **Ron Davies:** Beth a ddigwyddai pe byddai'r gweddill yn negyddol, ond bod yr un cyntaf hwnnw'n dal i fod yn gadarnhaol?

Mr Edwards: If the initial one was still positive, we would take that one out perhaps and look at it in more detail. However, in all the records and all the ones that we have had to date, if there has been one single positive and we have gone in and retested and have come back, they have either cleared completely or more animals have become positive. In other words, there is evidence of spreading infection.

[369] **Glyn Davies:** We will have to leave this point. You may be dissatisfied, Ron, but I have to leave this point. Peter, you had a question?

[370] **Peter Rogers:** Yes. Just to highlight what Mr Edwards said about the ring vaccination taking five days to take effect, that is exactly the point I am making about the preventative cull, which took 11 or 12 days to do. Exactly the same thing happened with that: there was no control over the spread of that disease while the actual cull was going on. That is why I am saying that it was futile.

[371] **Glyn Davies:** Elin, you had a point?

[372] **Elin Jones:** Yes. It is on the question that remained unanswered. Carwyn said that his objective was to get rid of the disease as quickly as possible. Scientifically, then, is a slaughter policy the most effective way of getting rid of the disease as quickly as possible? Is it more effective than a ring vaccination policy?

Mr Edwards: Os oedd y cyntaf yn dal i fod yn gadarnhaol, byddem yn difa hwnnw efallai ac yn edrych arno'n fanylach. Fodd bynnag, yn yr holl gofnodion a'r holl rai a gawsom hyd yn hyn, os oedd un cadarnhaol a ninnau wedi mynd i mewn ac ailbrofi a dod yn ôl, yr oeddent naill ai wedi clirio'n llwyr neu yr oedd mwy o anifeiliaid wedi troi'n gadarnhaol. Mewn geiriau eraill, mae tystiolaeth o haint sy'n ymledu.

[369] **Glyn Davies:** Bydd yn rhaid inni adael y pwynt hwn. Efallai nad ydych yn fodlon, Ron, ond rhaid imi adael y pwynt hwn. Peter, yr oedd gennyh gwestiwn?

[370] **Peter Rogers:** Oedd. I dynnu sylw at yr hyn a ddywedodd Mr Edwards am y pum niwrnod y cymerai brechu cylch i gael effaith, dyna'r union bwynt yr wyf yn ei wneud ynghylch y difa ataliol, a gymerodd 11 i 12 diwrnod. Digwyddodd yr un peth yn union wrth wneud hynny: nid oedd rheolaeth dros ymlediad y clwyf tra yr oedd y difa'n digwydd. Dyna pam y dywedaf ei fod yn ofer.

[371] **Glyn Davies:** Elin, yr oedd gennyh chi bwynt?

[372] **Elin Jones:** Oedd. Mae'n ymwneud â'r cwestiwn a oedd heb ei ateb. Dywedodd Carwyn mai ei amcan oedd cael gwared â'r clwyf mor gyflym â phosibl. Yn wyddonol, felly, ai polisi lladd yw'r dull mwyaf effeithiol o gael gwared â'r clwyf mor gyflym â phosibl? A yw'n fwy effeithiol na pholisi brechu cylch?

Carwyn Jones: That is the scientific advice that we have been receiving. Of course, this matter is being reviewed by the Follett inquiry, which is the Government's scientific inquiry. However, certainly, in terms of the policy that was pursued, we have no reason to say that that policy was incorrect in terms of getting rid of the disease quickly. I think that, ultimately, there is one other factor to consider, which is not a scientific factor, but nevertheless a relevant factor, and that is that vaccination did not have the support of farmers. It did not have the support of farmers in Anglesey. The contiguous cull did have the support of farmers in Anglesey, because I think that farmers realised, quite sensibly, that it was better to have their animals culled and receive compensation than to have their animals vaccinated and not have compensation and have the difficulties with regard to trade. I think that, on top of that, people understood—and this is why there was so little resistance in Anglesey and, indeed, elsewhere in Wales—that this was a fast and effective way of getting rid of the disease. I am not suggesting for one moment that this is the only way possible—that would be wrong. However, certainly, in terms of the results, not just in Wales, but elsewhere—and I said this a fortnight ago—we would say that the contiguous cull policy is a successful way of dealing with the disease.

[373] **Glyn Davies:** I need to move on to the next item, which is access. I welcome the Minister for Environment to the meeting. Do you want to say anything as an introduction, Sue? I will then call John Griffiths to ask his questions.

Sue Essex: Thank you, Glyn. I will say a couple of sentences, and I will then be glad to respond to comments and questions from members.

Carwyn Jones: Dyna'r cyngor gwyddonol y buom yn ei dderbyn. Wrth gwrs, mae'r mater hwn yn cael ei adolygu gan ymchwiliad Follett, sef ymchwiliad gwyddonol y Llywodraeth. Fodd bynnag, yn sicr, o ran y polisi a ddilynwyd, nid oes gennym reswm dros ddweud bod y polisi hwnnw'n anghywir o ran cael gwared â'r clwyf yn gyflym. Credaf, yn y pen draw, fod un ffactor arall y dylid ei ystyried, nad yw'n ffactor gwyddonol, ond sydd er hynny'n ffactor perthnasol, a hwnnw yw nad oedd y ffermwyr o blaid brechu. Nid oedd y ffermwyr yn Ynys Môn yn ei gefnogi. Yr oedd y ffermwyr yn Ynys Môn o blaid y difa ar ffermydd cyffiniol, oherwydd credaf fod y ffermwyr yn sylweddoli, yn gwbl synhwyrol, ei bod yn well cael difa eu hanifeiliaid a derbyn iawndal na chael brechu eu hanifeiliaid a pheidio â chael iawndal a phrofi'r anawsterau o ran masnachu. Credaf, ar ben hynny, fod pobl yn deall—a dyma pam yr oedd cyn lleied o wrthwynebiad yn Ynys Môn ac, yn wir, yn unman arall yng Nghymru—fod hyn yn ddull cyflym ac effeithiol o gael gwared â'r clwyf. Nid wyf yn awgrymu am eiliad mai hwn yw'r unig ddull posibl—byddai hynny'n anghywir. Fodd bynnag, yn sicr, o ran y canlyniadau, nid yng Nghymru'n unig, ond mewn mannau eraill—ac fe ddywedais hyn bythefnos yn ôl—byddem yn dweud bod y polisi difa ar ffermydd cyffiniol yn ddull llwyddiannus o ddelio â'r clwyf.

[373] **Glyn Davies:** Rhaid imi symud ymlaen at yr eitem nesaf, sef mynediad. Croesawaf y Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd i'r cyfarfod. A ydych yn dymuno dweud rhywbeth fel rhagymadrodd, Sue? Wedyn galwaf ar John Griffiths i ofyn ei gwestiynau.

Sue Essex: Diolch i chi, Glyn. Dywedaf frawddeg neu ddwy, ac wedyn byddaf yn falch o ymateb i sylwadau a chwestiynau gan yr aelodau.

I am sure that it has come through in the discussion that we were not expecting the foot and mouth disease outbreak, so all sorts of agencies had to be involved in the response to this. From my point of view as Minister for Environment, I was involved in the access situation, and also on the environmental side, particularly in terms of the disposal of animals. On access, overall, I think that the closure of access and then the restoration of access on a phased basis as the disease position improved worked well. I would be less than honest if I said that the restoration went through faster than I had hoped. Nevertheless, for the most part, in Wales the restoration of access to paths went well. The guidance issued by the Assembly Government was generally welcomed and was regarded as both practical and timely. Access to the countryside, including to key public footpaths, was restored across most of Wales by the end of June. So that is the kind of timescale that we were working on—that is, in time for the main holiday season. That was clearly very important from my discussions on the ground.

Valuable lessons for the future have been learned. For example, the need for reliable and readily available information on which footpaths are open, the need for effective lines of communication between the State Veterinary Service and local authorities on disease control and countryside access issues, and the importance of rights of way to local communities. I think that that was one of the main lessons that came out—the importance of rights of way, both in terms of the ability of local communities to access them, and also for visitors and tourists, and how that links to the economy. The way that we handled it here was that Gerry Quarrell and Angharad Huws and the team were

Yr wyf yn sicr ei bod wedi dod i'r amlwg yn y drafodaeth nad oeddem yn disgwyl yr achosion o glwy'r traed a'r genau, felly yr oedd yn rhaid i bob math o asiantaeth gymryd rhan yn yr ymateb i hyn. O'm safbwynt i fel Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd, yr oeddwn yn ymwneud â'r sefyllfa mynediad, a hefyd â'r ochr amgylcheddol, yn enwedig o ran gwaredu anifeiliaid. Ynghylch mynediad, at ei gilydd, credaf fod terfynu mynediad ac wedyn adfer mynediad fesul cam wrth i'r sefyllfa o ran y clwyf wella, wedi gweithio'n dda. Ni fyddwn yn gwbl onest pe dywedwn fod yr adferiad wedi mynd ymlaen yn gyflymach nag yr oeddwn wedi gobeithio. Er hynny, yr oedd adfer y mynediad i lwybrau yng Nghymru wedi llwyddo gan mwyaf. Croesawyd y canllawiau a gyhoeddwyd gan Lywodraeth y Cynulliad at ei gilydd ac fe'u hystyriwyd yn ymarferol ac yn amserol. Adferwyd y mynediad i gefn gwlad, gan gynnwys llwybrau troed cyhoeddus allweddol, yn y rhan fwyaf o Gymru erbyn diwedd Mehefin. Felly dyna'r math o amserlen yr oeddem yn ei dilyn—hynny yw, mewn pryd ar gyfer y prif dymor gwyliau. Yr oedd yn amlwg bod hynny'n bwysig iawn yn ôl fy nhrafodaethau ar lawr gwlad.

Dysgwyd gwersi pwysig at y dyfodol. Er enghraifft, yr angen am wybodaeth ddibynadwy sydd ar gael yn rhwydd ar y llwybrau troed sy'n agored, yr angen am linellau cyfathrebu effeithiol rhwng y Gwasanaeth Milfeddygol Gwladol a'r awdurdodau lleol ynghylch materion rheoli clefydau a mynediad i gefn gwlad, a phwysigrwydd hawliau tramwy i gymunedau lleol. Credaf mai honno oedd un o'r prif wersi a ddysgwyd—pwysigrwydd hawliau tramwy, o ran gallu cymunedau lleol i'w defnyddio, a hefyd i ymwelwyr a twristiaid, a chysylltiad hynny â'r economi. Ein dull o drafod hynny oedd bod Gerry Quarrell ac Angharad Huws a'r tîm yn ei drin yn uniongyrchol iawn. Buont yn gweithio

very much hands on. They worked with local authorities, the national parks, the Countryside Council for Wales, farmers' groups, and others, trying to get information, to assimilate that information quickly, and respond, if guidance had to be updated, quickly. That was the kind of approach that we had in Wales, and, clearly, that was working with Carwyn and the agricultural team. I think that that is probably all I need to say at the moment.

[374] **Glyn Davies:** John, do you want to come in on this now?

[375] **John Griffiths:** Yes. Thank you, Chair. All of this, obviously, is a question of balance between the need to eradicate the disease and the need to make sure that the wider rural economy suffered as little damage as possible. I think that, as events wore on, it became apparent that the relative impact of the difficulties faced by the agricultural sector, in terms of the overall economic impact, was much less than the impact on the wider rural economy, when things like tourism were considered. I think that that became more apparent as events wore on. Obviously, we were learning as we were going along. Certainly, the whole thing flagged up the crucial importance of things such as walking, for example, to tourism in the rural areas. We have heard many times already—last week and this week—that there is no evidence that walkers spread the disease. So, against that sort of background—and I think, obviously, with hindsight—we have to ask were the correct decisions made in terms of when it was possible, and advisable, to reopen the countryside. Were the messages given that the countryside was open for business again strong enough? Obviously, there was potential for a conflict of interests between Sue's department and Carwyn's, although they worked together very closely. One question that I would like to ask is, what was the

gyda'r awdurdodau lleol, y parciau cenedlaethol, Cyngor Cefn Gwlad Cymru, grwpiau ffermwyr, ac eraill, wrth geisio cael gwybodaeth, amgyffred y wybodaeth honno'n gyflym, ac ymateb yn gyflym, os oedd angen diweddarau'r canllawiau. Dull gweithredu o'r math hwnnw a oedd gennym yng Nghymru ac, wrth gwrs, yr oedd hynny wrth weithio gyda Carwyn a'r tîm amaethyddol. Credaf mai dyna'r cwbl y mae angen imi ei ddweud ar y funud, yn ôl pob tebyg.

[374] **Glyn Davies:** John, a ydych yn dymuno dweud rhywbeth ar hyn yn awr?

[375] **John Griffiths:** Ydwyf. Diolch i chi, Gadeirydd. Wrth gwrs, mae hyn i gyd yn fater o gydbwysedd rhwng yr angen i ddileu'r clwyf a'r angen i sicrhau cyn lleied o ddifrod â phosibl i'r economi wledig ehangach. Credaf iddi ddod yn amlwg, wrth i'r digwyddiadau fynd ymlaen, fod effaith gymharol yr anawsterau a wynebwyd gan y sector amaethyddol, o ran yr effaith economaidd gyffredinol, yn llai o lawer na'r effaith ar yr economi wledig ehangach, pan ystyriwyd pethau fel twristiaeth. Credaf fod hynny wedi dod yn fwy amlwg wrth i'r digwyddiadau fynd ymlaen. Wrth gwrs, yr oeddem yn dysgu wrth inni fynd ymlaen. Yn sicr, yr oedd yr holl beth yn tynnu sylw at hollbwysigrwydd pethau fel cerdded, er enghraifft, i dwristiaeth yn yr ardaloedd gwledig. Clywsom lawer gwaith eisoes—yr wythnos diwethaf a'r wythnos hon—nad oes tystiolaeth bod cerddwyr wedi lledaenu'r clwyf. Felly, ar gefndir o'r fath—ac yr wyf yn meddwl, wrth gwrs, gyda synnwyr trannoeth—rhaid inni ofyn a wnaethpwyd y penderfyniadau cywir o ran pa bryd yr oedd yn bosibl, ac yn ddoeth, ailagor cefn gwlad. A oedd y negeseuon a roddwyd bod cefn gwlad yn agored ar gyfer busnes eto'n ddigon pendant? Wrth gwrs, yr oedd posibilïad o wrthdaro rhwng buddiannau rhwng adran Sue ac adran Carwyn, er iddynt weithio'n agos iawn â'i

relationship between Sue's role and Carwyn's role in terms of executive decision-making on when it was wise to reopen footpaths and reopen access to the countryside? For example, regarding south Powys, I met tourism operators there and they were obviously in dire straits. This was fairly late in the outbreak and there were people with pony-trekking businesses and with walking tourism businesses who were just unable to operate at all. So, obviously, they were in dire straits and they felt very strongly that the footpaths, towpaths and so on could have been reopened before they were and that the role of the local authority, Powys County Council, was crucial. They certainly felt that the strength of representation among the councillors from the agriculture sector and the farming industry was such that there was perhaps an overemphasis on biosecurity, if you like. We know that that is crucial, but they felt that that was overemphasised at the expense of the wider rural economy and tourism interests. We know from the report that some local authorities were more co-operative, shall we say, than others in terms of reopening the countryside. Can you tell us what the difficulties were specifically in relation to Powys County Council, but to others also?

In general terms, Chair, the report itself states that the majority of local authorities responded positively to guidance by the end of June. Obviously, there were different factors in south Powys compared to other counties. I do not want to go into fine detail but, in general terms, given the lessons that we have learned, Chair, how well did all the different organisations work together in responding to the difficulties facing tourism and the wider rural economy? We know that Education and Learning Wales, Business Connect, the Benefits Agency, the small firms loan guarantee scheme, the Inland Revenue, HM

gilydd. Un cwestiwn y carwn ei ofyn yw, beth oedd y berthynas rhwng rôl Sue a rôl Carwyn o ran gwneud penderfyniadau gweithredol ynghylch pa bryd yr oedd yn ddoeth ailagor llwybrau troed ac ailagor y mynediad i gefn gwlad? Er enghraifft, ynghylch de Powys, cyfarfûm â busnesau twristiaeth ac yr oedd yn amlwg eu bod mewn cyfyngder mawr. Yr oedd hyn yn eithaf hwyr yn ystod yr achosion o'r clwyf ac yr oedd rhai â busnesau merlota a busnesau twristiaeth cerdded na allent weithredu o gwbl. Felly, wrth gwrs, yr oeddent mewn cyfyngder mawr a theimlent yn gryf iawn y galleid bod wedi ailagor y llwybrau troed, y llwybrau halio ac yn y blaen yn gynt a bod rôl yr awdurdod lleol, Cyngor Sir Powys, yn hollbwysig. Yr oeddent yn sicr yn teimlo bod cryfder y gynrychiolaeth ymysg y cynghorwyr o'r sector amaethyddiaeth a'r diwydiant ffermio'n gyfryw fel bod gorbwyslais efallai ar ddiogelwch biolegol, os hoffech chi. Gwyddom fod hynny'n hollbwysig, ond teimlent fod gorbwyslais ar hynny ar draul yr economi wledig ehangach a buddiannau twristiaeth. Gwyddom o'r adroddiad fod rhai awdurdodau lleol yn fwy cydweithredol, dywedwn, nag eraill o ran ailagor cefn gwlad. A allwch ddweud wrthym am yr anawsterau penodol mewn cysylltiad â Chyngor Sir Powys, ac eraill hefyd?

Yn gyffredinol, Gadeirydd, mae'r adroddiad ei hun yn datgan bod y rhan fwyaf o'r awdurdodau lleol wedi ymateb yn gadarnhaol i'r canllawiau erbyn diwedd Mehefin. Wrth gwrs, yr oedd ffactorau gwahanol yn ne Powys o'i chymharu â'r siroedd eraill. Nid wyf am fanylu ond, yn gyffredinol, o ystyried y gwersi yr ydym wedi'u dysgu, Gadeirydd, pa mor dda y cydweithiodd yr holl gyrff gwahanol wrth ymateb i'r anawsterau a oedd yn wynebu twristiaeth a'r economi wledig ehangach? Gwyddom fod Dysgu ac Addysgu Cymru, Cyswllt Busnes, yr Asiantaeth Budd-daliadau, y cynllun gwarantu benthyciadau

Customs and Excise and so on were involved. How easy was it to get all these bodies to work together effectively? Sue, I think, very fairly said that valuable lessons have been learned and I just wonder whether that could be fleshed out a bit in terms of some of the points that I have raised, Chair.

Sue Essex: Can I just ask, John; you were referring to a report. What report are you referring to?

[376] **John Griffiths:** The report that is before us today.

[377] **Glyn Davies:** We have had a memorandum circulated to us today.

Sue Essex: Okay. That is fine. It is just that I have a couple of reports here.

I think that Carwyn can come in on the points that refer to him. As we saw that the foot and mouth disease situation was obviously going to be here for some time—Carwyn was originally dealing with access—I took over the access issue because it was a heavy burden of work. I will make a couple of general comments. I think, as John rightly said and as I hinted at, one of the things that the outbreak did bring home very forcibly in Wales is the importance of walking and gaining access to the countryside to the economy of Wales. That was not just for, if you like, the traditional tourist operators, namely the hotels, the pony-trekking operators and many of the organisations that I saw. It also became very clear that tourism was very important for farmers. I have met many farmers who survive by providing bed and breakfast or other tourist accommodation. So, it was very important, as John said, that, as soon as we had the State Veterinary Service's advice that paths could be

busnesau bach, Cyllid y Wlad, Tollau Tramor a Chartref Ei Mawrhydi ac yn y blaen yn gysylltiedig. Pa mor hawdd ydoedd i gael y cyrff hyn i gydweithio'n effeithiol? Credaf mai Sue a ddywedodd, yn deg iawn, fod gwersi gwerthfawr wedi'u dysgu ac yr wyf yn meddwl tybed a ellid rhoi mwy o fanylion am hynny o ran rhai o'r pwyntiau a godais, Gadeirydd.

Sue Essex: A gaf ofyn, John; yr oeddech yn cyfeirio at adroddiad. At ba adroddiad yr oeddech yn cyfeirio?

[376] **John Griffiths:** Yr adroddiad sydd ger ein bron heddiw.

[377] **Glyn Davies:** Cylchredwyd memorandwm i ni heddiw.

Sue Essex: O'r gorau. Mae hynny'n iawn. Yr unig beth oedd bod gennyf ddau o adroddiadau yma.

Credaf y gall Carwyn ddweud rhywbeth ar y pwyntiau sy'n cyfeirio ato ef. Wrth inni weld ei bod yn amlwg y byddai sefyllfa clwy'r traed a'r genau gyda ni am gryn amser—Carwyn a oedd yn delio â mynediad yn wreiddiol—cymerais fater mynediad drosodd oherwydd yr oedd yn faich gwaith trwm. Gwnaf ychydig o sylwadau cyffredinol. Credaf, fel y dywedodd John yn gywir ac fel y lled awgrymais i, mai un o'r pethau a ddangosodd yr achosion o'r clwyf yn gryf iawn yng Nghymru yw pwysigrwydd cerdded a chael mynediad i gefn gwlad i economi Cymru. Yr oeddent yn bwysig i eraill heblaw'r busnesau twristiaeth traddodiadol, os hoffech chi, sef y gwestai, y busnesau merlota a llawer o'r cyrff a welais. Daeth yn amlwg hefyd fod twristiaeth yn bwysig iawn i ffermwyr. Yr wyf wedi cyfarfod â llawer o ffermwyr sy'n dal i fynd drwy ddarparu llety gwely a brecwast neu lety twristiaeth arall. Felly, yr oedd yn bwysig iawn, fel y dywedodd John, fod y llwybrau'n cael eu

opened up, that was done. Through all this we—whether it was Carwyn or myself—were guided by the State Veterinary Service. I have to say that that is so important. Having that extra information is important. I am not an expert in this area. We have to be guided by the professionals. However, as soon as the information was there, then opening up footpaths and encouraging visitors was done with great vigour. I will mention one example, which was the opening up of the paths up Snowdon for Easter. Carwyn and I discussed this and the likelihood that the infected area could be rolled back. I also had a meeting with Elliot Morley in London about doing just this and had his encouragement to do it. I spoke to national park representatives, who in turn liaised with Gwynedd Council. We spoke to Gwynedd Council, Conwy County Borough Council and the Countryside Council for Wales with a view to conducting a proper risk assessment to open the footpaths in Snowdonia in time for Easter. That was not universally welcomed, I have to say. The farming unions had some reservations about that, but it was, in my view, and was proved to be, I think, the right thing to do at the time. That kind of liaison that was going on with local authorities and others was key to working with authorities and using advice as to how some degree of normality, where it was appropriate, could be restored to the countryside.

hailagor cyn gynted ag y rhoddai'r Gwasanaeth Milfeddygol Gwladol gyngor y gellid gwneud hynny. Drwy hyn oll cawsom—naill ai Carwyn neu fi fy hun—ein harwain gan y Gwasanaeth Milfeddygol Gwladol. Rhaid imi ddweud bod hynny'n bwysig iawn. Mae'n bwysig cael yr wybodaeth ychwanegol honno. Nid wyf yn arbenigwr yn y maes hwn. Cawsom ein harwain gan y gweithwyr proffesiynol. Fodd bynnag, cyn gynted ag yr oedd y wybodaeth yno, buwyd yn egniol iawn wrth agor y llwybrau troed a denu ymwelwyr. Soniaf am un enghraifft, sef agor y llwybrau i fyny'r Wyddfa ar gyfer y Pasg. Trafododd Carwyn a minnau hyn a'r tebygolrwydd y gellid gwthio'n ôl yr ardal heintiedig. Cefais gyfarfod hefyd ag Elliot Morley yn Llundain ynghylch gwneud hyn ac fe'm hanogodd i wneud hynny. Siaradais â chynrychiolwyr y parc cenedlaethol, a gysylltodd yn eu tro â Chyngor Gwynedd. Siaradasom â Chyngor Gwynedd, Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Conwy a Chyngor Cefn Gwlad Cymru o ran cynnal asesiad risg priodol i agor y llwybrau troed yn Eryri mewn pryd ar gyfer y Pasg. Nid oedd croeso cyffredinol i hynny, rhaid imi ddweud. Yr oedd gan yr undebau ffermio rai amheuan am hynny, ond yr oedd, yn fy marn i, ac fe brofodd, yr wyf yn credu, yn beth iawn i'w wneud ar y pryd. Yr oedd y math hwnnw o gysylltu a oedd yn mynd ymlaen â'r awdurdodau lleol ac eraill yn allweddol wrth weithio gyda'r awdurdodau a defnyddio cyngor ynghylch y modd y gellid adfer rhyw raddau o normalrwydd yng nghefn gwlad, lle'r oedd hynny'n briodol.

John asked about messages being sent out. We were very fortunate in opening Snowdonia that morning. I remember it well. It was an absolutely beautiful morning. It was broadcast live on breakfast television. It was shown, I understand, in many places across the world and, being Snowdon, it had a really symbolic impact. It came after people in New York and in other places were seeing images of animals burning. To get the message across to say that, when the time comes, we will have the proper assessment and we will open up the countryside in Wales, I think, was important. In fact, it was more than important; it was crucial.

In terms of the other parts of the economy and how we dealt with this, again, there was a whole series of guidance that was issued, as and when was appropriate and as and when we were advised by the State Veterinary Service, which gave advice to local authorities about how they could deal with rights of way. One of the things that I particularly want to mention is that I was approached by Nick Wheeler, from Pembrokeshire National Park, to say that it had worked out a risk assessment model and asking whether I was interested in looking at it. I said that, yes, I really was. Almost straightaway, Nick came down and I saw that it was a very useful way of going forward. We then introduced that into the guidance. So, there was that close working relationship with many local authorities and operators on the ground to see how we could roll out the reopening programme as soon as possible.

Holodd John am gyfleu negeseuon. Buom yn ffodus iawn wrth agor Eryri y bore hwnnw. Fe'i cofiaf yn dda. Yr oedd yn fore hyfryd dros ben. Fe'i darlledwyd yn fyw ar deledu brecwast. Fe'i dangoswyd, yr wyf yn deall, mewn llawer man ledled y byd a, gan mai'r Wyddfa ydoedd, cafodd effaith wirioneddol symbolaidd. Daeth hynny ar ôl i bobl yn Efrog Newydd ac mewn manau eraill weld lluniau o anifeiliaid yn llosgi. Yr oedd yn bwysig, yr wyf yn credu, cyfleu'r neges y cawn asesiad priodol, pan ddaw'r adeg, ac y byddwn yn agor cefn gwlad yng Nghymru. Mewn gwirionedd, yr oedd yn fwy na phwysig; yr oedd yn hanfodol.

O ran y rhannau eraill o'r economi a sut yr oeddem wedi delio â hyn, unwaith eto, cyhoeddwyd cyfres hir o ganllawiau, fel yr oedd yn briodol ac yn ôl y cyngor a gawsom gan y Gwasanaeth Milfeddygol Gwladol, a roddodd gyngor i'r awdurdodau lleol ynghylch sut y gallent ddelio â hawliau tramwy. Un o'r pethau y dymunaf sôn amdanynt yn benodol yw bod Nick Wheeler o Barc Cenedlaethol Sir Benfro wedi cysylltu â mi, i ddweud ei fod wedi dyfeisio model asesu risg gan ofyn a oedd o ddiddordeb i mi. Dywedais ei fod. Ar unwaith bron, daeth Nick i lawr a gwelais ei fod yn ddull buddiol iawn o fynd ymlaen. Rhoesom hynny yn y canllawiau wedyn. Felly, yr oedd perthynas weithio agos o'r fath â llawer o'r awdurdodau lleol a'r busnesau ar lawr gwlad i weld sut y gallem ymestyn y rhaglen ailagor mor fuan â phosibl.

In terms of Brecon, I think that that was very unfortunate. I remember being there opening Pen y Fan on Friday only to get a call from Gareth on the Saturday night—he was still working—with a desperately sad message, saying that foot and mouth disease had been found again and that we had to close the area. I think that Brecon was a particular problem. I went out and met many of the operators and we went through all the options, as you say, such as opening the towpaths and so on, but they really were caught in a difficult conundrum there.

So, I think that the main message that has come out is that access to the countryside is very valuable for all sorts of reasons. Prompt guidance—heaven forbid that we have another situation—and prompt support to local authorities and others working on the ground is also crucial. That two-way communication is one of the things that is really important at times of crisis. Perhaps, in the future, we need to make sure that those channels are more structured than they have been, but channels of communication are quite important.

[378] **Glyn Davies:** I want to ask a question that I think was part of John's question. The Minister for Rural Affairs has told us that it would have been far better if the advice that you were getting, and that he was getting, had rested in Wales. Your professional advice, I imagine, was coming from the same source. Was your professional advice also coming from—

Sue Essex: It was coming from Tony.

Mewn cysylltiad ag Aberhonddu, credaf fod hynny'n anffodus iawn. Cofiaf fod yno'n agor Pen y Fan ar ddydd Gwener dim ond i gael galwad gan Gareth ar nos Sadwrn—yr oedd yn dal i weithio—gyda neges ofnadwy o drist, gan ddweud bod clwy'r traed a'r genau wedi'i ailddarganfod a bod yn rhaid inni gau'r ardal. Credaf fod Aberhonddu'n broblem benodol. Euthum allan a chw'rdd â llawer o'r busnesau ac aethom drwy'r holl ddewisiadau, fel y dywedwch, fel agor y llwybrau halio ac yn y blaen, ond yr oeddent wedi'u dal mewn cyfyng-gyngor anodd yn y fan honno.

Felly, credaf mai'r brif neges a ddaeth i'r amlwg yw bod mynediad i gefn gwlad yn werthfawr iawn am bob math o resymau. Mae arweiniad prydlon—y nefoedd a'n gwaredo rhag cael sefyllfa arall—a chymorth prydlon i'r awdurdodau lleol ac eraill sy'n gweithio yn y maes yn hollbwysig hefyd. Y cyfathrebu dwyffordd hwnnw yw un o'r pethau sy'n wirioneddol bwysig ar adegau o argyfwng. Efallai, yn y dyfodol, y bydd angen inni sicrhau bod y sianeli hynny'n fwy trefnus nag y buont, ond mae sianeli cyfathrebu'n eithaf pwysig.

[378] **Glyn Davies:** Dymunaf ofyn cwestiwn a oedd yn rhan o gwestiwn John, yr wyf yn credu. Mae'r Gweinidog dros Faterion Gwledig wedi dweud wrthym y buasai'n well o lawer pe byddai'r cyngor yr oeddech yn ei gael, ac yr oedd ef yn ei gael, wedi'i leoli yng Nghymru. Yr oedd eich cyngor proffesiynol chi, gallwn feddwl, yn dod o'r un ffynhonnell. A oedd eich cyngor proffesiynol yn dod hefyd oddi wrth—

Sue Essex: Deuai oddi wrth Tony.

[379] **Glyn Davies:** Are you of the same view that it would have been better for you, in exercising decisions, if the professional advice that you had was also located within the National Assembly, and that it also ought to be transferred?

Carwyn Jones: I never said that, with respect. I have never said that the SVS should be devolved.

[380] **Glyn Davies:** No, no.

Carwyn Jones: That is what you are implying. The devolution of animal health powers is quite a different thing.

[381] **Glyn Davies:** Yes. I do not want to lose the point that I am trying to make. Regarding the professional advice that you have, I want to find out whether you think that there is any scope for improving the relationship between Cardiff and London in terms of what might be transferred. Does that apply at all to the professional advice that you had, as it did in relation to the Minister for Rural Affairs?

Sue Essex: I honestly do not see that that was the issue on access, because we were issuing guidance here, and I am quite content with the professional advice that we had from the State Veterinary Service, so I would not say that that was the issue.

[382] **Glyn Davies:** Elin, do you have a question on this?

[379] **Glyn Davies:** A ydych o'r un farn y buasai'n well i chi, wrth wneud penderfyniadau, pe byddai'r cyngor proffesiynol a gawsoch wedi'i leoli hefyd o fewn y Cynulliad Cenedlaethol, ac y dylid trosglwyddo hwnnw hefyd?

Carwyn Jones: Ni ddywedais hynny erioed, gyda pharch. Ni ddywedais erioed y dylai'r Gwasanaeth Milfeddygol Gwladol gael ei ddatganoli.

[380] **Glyn Davies:** Naddo, naddo.

Carwyn Jones: Dyna'r ydych yn ei awgrymu. Mae datganoli pwerau iechyd anifeiliaid yn beth cwbl wahanol.

[381] **Glyn Davies:** Ydyw. Nid wyf am gollu'r pwynt yr wyf yn ceisio'i wneud. Ynghylch y cyngor proffesiynol sydd gennych, dymunaf gael gwybod a ydych o'r farn bod unrhyw le i wella'r berthynas rhwng Caerdydd a Llundain o ran beth y gellid ei drosglwyddo. A yw hynny'n berthnasol o gwbl i'r holl gyngor proffesiynol a gawsoch, fel yr oedd mewn cysylltiad â'r Gweinidog dros Faterion Gwledig?

Sue Essex: A dweud y gwir, nid wyf yn ystyried mai hwnnw oedd y mater a oedd yn codi ynghylch mynediad, oherwydd yr oeddem yn cyhoeddi canllawiau yma, ac yr wyf yn eithaf bodlon â'r cyngor proffesiynol a gawsom oddi wrth y Gwasanaeth Milfeddygol Gwladol, felly ni ddywedwn mai hwnnw oedd y mater a gododd.

[382] **Glyn Davies:** Elin, a oes gennych gwestiwn ar hyn?

[383] **Elin Jones:** Oes. O ran y gwersi a ddysgwyd ar fynediad, pe bai achos yn cael ei gadarnhau yn Lloegr, fel y tro diwethaf, a fyddech yn cymryd yr un penderfyniad i gau pob llwybr cyhoeddus yng Nghymru yn syth? A fyddech yn gwneud union yr un peth â'r hyn a wnaethoch y llynedd? O ran y ffaith bod yn rhaid gwneud penderfyniadau ynglyn â chau llwybrau cyhoeddus ar y cyd â DEFRA, a fyddech chi, yn sgîl eich profiad y tro diwethaf, am weld y pwerau perthnasol yn cael eu trosglwyddo i'r Cynulliad er mwyn ichi allu gwneud penderfyniadau yn gyfan gwbl yng Nghymru? Nid wyf yn sôn am ble y cewch chi gyngor, ond am ble y gwneir penderfyniadau, er mwyn ichi allu gweithredu—os yr ydych yn credu y dylid gwneud hynny—yn wahanol i Loegr o ran mynediad i gefn gwlad.

Carwyn Jones: Ynglyn â'r ffaith bod yn rhaid gwneud Gorchymnion ar hyn o bryd ar y cyd gyda DEFRA, unwaith y trosglwyddir y pwerau i'r Cynulliad o dan y Mesur Iechyd Anifeiliad, bydd hynny'n cael ei ddatrys. Penderfyniad y Cynulliad yn unig fydd hynny wedyn, yn ôl yr hyn a ddeallaf.

Ynglyn â chau llwybrau, cafwyd yr achos cyntaf yng Nghymru ar 25 Chwefror. O fewn tridiau, yr oedd y Gorchymyn wedi ei wneud, a hynny ar ôl i sawl person bwysu amdano, a thrwy gefnogaeth Parc Cenedlaethol Eryri a sawl corff arall. Y broblem ar y pryd oedd nad oedd neb yn gwybod ble yr oedd y clwyf. Yr oeddem yn gwybod ei fod yn Ynys Môn, ond nid oedd neb yn gwybod ble arall yr oedd yng Nghymru. Felly, o wybod bod cerddwyr yn gyfrwng i ledu'r clwyf, a chan wrando ar gyngor Tony a'r Gwasanaeth Milfeddygol Gwladol, gwnaethpwyd y penderfyniad i gau'r llwybrau yn syth ac, wrth ddod i wybod mwy am y clwyf, i ddechrau eu hailagor wedi hynny.

[383] **Elin Jones:** Yes. In terms of the lessons learned on access, if a case were to be confirmed in England, like the last time, would you take the same decision to close all public footpaths in Wales immediately? Would you do exactly the same as you did last year? Regarding the fact that decisions on closing footpaths have to be made jointly with DEFRA, would you, given your experience last time, want to see the relevant powers transferred to the Assembly so that you could make decisions entirely within Wales? I am not talking about where you get your advice from, but about where decisions are made, so that you can act—if you believe it to be necessary—differently to England in terms of access to the countryside.

Carwyn Jones: Regarding the fact that Orders must currently be made jointly with DEFRA, once powers are transferred to the Assembly under the Animal Health Bill, that will be resolved. It will then be a decision for the Assembly alone, as far as I understand it.

In terms of the closure of footpaths, the first case in Wales was on 25 February. Within three days, the Order had been made, after several people had brought pressure to bear, and through the support of Snowdonia National Park and a number of other bodies. The problem at the time was that no-one knew where the disease was. We knew that it was in Anglesey, but no-one knew in which other parts of Wales it could be found. Therefore, given that walkers are a means to spread the disease, and by taking advice from Tony and the State Veterinary Service, the decision was made to close the footpaths immediately and, as we came to know more about the disease, we would start to reopen them.

Nid oes amheuaeth, yn fy marn i, y byddai pobl, pe na bai'r Gorchymyn hwnnw wedi ei wneud, wedi holi pam na fu inni gau'r llwybrau. Mae pobl yn gofyn pam na chafodd symudiadau anifeiliaid eu hatal yn gynharach, a gallem fod wedi cael sefyllfa debyg gyda symudiadau pobl. Er bod y risg yn llai, rhaid derbyn bod yna risg. Bu imi wneud datganiad i'r Cynulliad ar 8 Mawrth yn dweud y byddem, wedi inni ddysgu mwy am y clwyf, yn cyflwyno rheoliadau ac yn rhoi cyngor i awdurdodau lleol er mwyn iddynt allu llacio'r rheoliadau a oedd yn ymwneud â chau'r llwybrau. Fodd bynnag, gan nad oeddem yn gwybod ble'r oedd y clwyf—ac, o gofio'r hyn ddigwyddodd ledled Prydain Fawr, yr oeddem yn erfyn i'r clwyf ddod i'r amlwg mewn rhannau eraill o Gymru—yr oedd yn gwneud synnwyr ar y pryd i gau popeth ar y dechrau ac yna llacio'r rheoliadau, yn lle peidio gwneud digon ar y dechrau a gweld y clwyf yn lledu ymhellach na'r hyn a wnaeth.

[384] **Elin Jones:** Gyda phob parch i'r Gweinidog, yr wyf yn ymwybodol o'r hyn a ddigwyddodd y llynedd. Y cwestiwn oedd, pe bai achos arall, dyweder, yn Sir Fôn yfory, a fyddech yn gwneud union yr un peth eto, o ystyried yr hyn a ddywedodd John Griffiths ynghynt, sef bod gwersi wedi eu dysgu ynglyn ag effeithiau sylweddol cau pob llwybr cyhoeddus yng Nghymru?

There is no doubt in my mind that, had that Order not been made, people would have asked why did we not close the footpaths. People ask why animal movements were not stopped sooner, and a similar situation could have arisen with the movement of people. Even though there is less of a risk, we must accept that there is a risk. I made a statement to the Assembly on 8 March saying that, once we knew more about the disease, we would issue regulations and provide local authorities with guidance so that they could relax the regulations governing the closure of footpaths. However, because we did not know where the disease was present—and, bearing in mind what happened throughout Great Britain, we expected the disease to be found in other parts of Wales—it made sense at the time to close everything down and to subsequently relax the regulations, instead of not doing enough at the beginning and seeing the disease spread further than it did.

[384] **Elin Jones:** With all due respect to the Minister, I am aware of what happened last year. My question was, if there were another case, say, in Anglesey tomorrow, would you do exactly the same thing again, bearing in mind what John Griffiths said earlier, namely that lessons have been learned about the far-reaching effects of closing every public footpath in Wales?

Carwyn Jones: Mae hynny'n dibynnu, wrth gwrs, ar yr amgylchiadau. Pe bai'r clwyf yn dod i'r amlwg eto mewn rhan gyfyngedig o Brydain Fawr neu pe bai'n ymddangos ei fod wedi ei ddal mewn un rhan o'r wlad, gallem ddweud nad oes angen cau'r llwybrau. Pe bai sefyllfa y llynedd yn digwydd eto a bod y clwyf yn dod i Gymru a'i bod yn amlwg ei fod yn lledu'n bell, byddai'r penderfyniad yn gorfod bod yn wahanol. Mae hynny'n dibynnu ar yr amgylchiadau. Pe bai'r sefyllfa'n codi eto, a'r clwyf yn lledu dros Brydain Fawr i gyd, byddai'n rhaid edrych ar y mater yn fanwl, a chymryd cyngor milfeddygon ynglyn â'r amgylchiadau.

[385] **Delyth Evans:** On this point, Chair, my problem with this is that there is not a single proven case of a walker having spread the disease. If we are talking about trying to achieve proportionate responses, would you not agree that closing down the entire countryside—with the devastating effect that that had on the rural economy—was a disproportionate response in view of the fact that there has never been a single case of a walker transmitting the disease? Would it have been possible to have continued with the same policy of eliminating the disease without having to close down the countryside?

Carwyn Jones: This comes back to the point I made earlier, Chair. The fact that no walker is known to have spread the disease could well be because of the action that was taken. It is impossible to prove one way or the other. If it had been the case that action was not taken quickly enough, and then it was shown that a walker had spread the disease, then, frankly, people would have been very concerned about that—and that is an understatement. It is not possible to know one way or the other. It is right to say, however, that it is possible for

Carwyn Jones: That depends, of course, on the circumstances. If the disease reappeared but was confined case to a part of Great Britain or if it appeared to be restricted to one part of the country, we could say that there was no need to close the footpaths. If we were to have a repeat of last year's situation and that the disease appeared in Wales and that it was obvious that it was spreading, the decision would have to be different. That depends on the circumstances. If the situation were to arise again, with the disease spreading over the whole of Great Britain, the matter would have to be considered carefully, with veterinary advice taken on the circumstances.

[385] **Delyth Evans:** Ar y pwynt hwn, Gadeirydd, yr hyn sy'n peri anhawster i mi yn hyn o beth yw nad oes yr un achos profedig o gerddwr a ledaenodd y clwyf. Os ydym yn sôn am geisio sicrhau ymatebion cymesur, oni fyddech yn cytuno bod cau'r cyfan o gefn gwlad—gyda'r effaith ddinistriol a gafodd hynny ar yr economi wledig—yn ymateb anghymesur yng ngolwg y ffaith na fu erioed yr un achos o gerddwr yn lledaenu'r clwyf? A fyddai wedi bod yn bosibl parhau â'r un polisi o ddileu'r clwyf heb orfod cau cefn gwlad?

Carwyn Jones: Mae hyn yn mynd yn ôl at y pwynt a wneuthum yn gynharach, Gadeirydd. Mae'n ddigon posibl bod y ffaith na wyddys am yr un cerddwr a ledaenodd y clwyf yn ganlyniad i'r camau a gymerwyd. Mae'n amhosibl ei brofi'r naill ffordd neu'r llall. Pe na fyddai camau wedi'u cymryd yn ddigon buan, a'i bod wedi'i ddangos wedyn fod cerddwr wedi lledaenu'r clwyf, yna, a dweud y gwir, fe fuasai pobl yn bryderus iawn ynghylch hynny—a thanosodiad yw hwnnw. Nid oes modd gwybod y naill ffordd neu'r llall. Mae'n

walkers to spread the disease. The risk factor is much lower than it is for animals—or, indeed, people who are in contact with animals—spreading the disease. That much is true. However, given that an avenue existed by which the disease could be spread, and given that it was not known where the disease was at that time, a decision was taken, following veterinary advice, that this was a proportionate response. If it had been the case that the footpaths had been shut for a long period of time, then it could be argued that that was a disproportionate response. However, given the circumstances at the time, I believe that the response was appropriate. Again, it is impossible to prove one way or the other whether the action taken actually meant that no walkers spread the disease. However, it is possible to argue that it did. That is the dilemma that we face.

[386] **Glyn Davies:** What does the Minister for Environment think? If this were to happen again, it would be her responsibility.

Sue Essex: As Carwyn has said, we have to be guided by advice and the circumstances. One of the lessons from last time, if we are looking at lessons, is an appreciation of the precautionary approach. That is the way that it happened last time. If I remember correctly, all of us in the Assembly Chamber agreed that the precautionary approach was the right way forward. Then it is a matter of speed, once you have some degree of certainty that the disease is not there or not spreading there, in terms of the paths being reopened. That is one of the interesting areas for me. In effect, 70 or 75 per cent of the paths in Wales were reopened, I think, after four months. Heaven forbid that it should happen again, but I suspect that next time, with the realisation of how important

gywir dweud, fodd bynnag, ei bod yn bosibl i gerddwyr ledaenu'r clwyf. Mae'r ffactor risg yn llai o lawer nag ydyw yn achos anifeiliaid—neu, yn wir, pobl sydd mewn cysylltiad ag anifeiliaid—sy'n lledaenu'r clwyf. Mae cymaint â hynny'n wir. Fodd bynnag, o wybod bod cyfrwng yn bodoli y gellid lledaenu'r clwyf drwyddo, ac o wybod nad oedd yn hysbys ym mhle'r oedd y clwyf ar y pryd, gwnaethpwyd penderfyniad, ar ôl cael cyngor milfeddygol, fod hyn yn ymateb cymesur. Pe byddai'r llwybrau troed wedi'u cau am gyfnod hir, yna gellid dadlau bod hynny'n ymateb anghymesur. Fodd bynnag, o ystyried yr amgylchiadau ar y pryd, credaf fod yr ymateb yn briodol. Unwaith eto, mae'n amhosibl profi'r naill ffordd neu'r llall a oedd y camau a gymerwyd wedi golygu na ledaenwyd y clwyf gan unrhyw gerddwyr. Fodd bynnag, mae modd dadlau eu bod. Dyna'r cyfyng-gyngor yr ydym yn ei wynebu.

[386] **Glyn Davies:** Beth yw barn y Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd? Pe byddai hyn yn digwydd eto, byddai'n gyfrifoldeb iddi hi.

Sue Essex: Fel y dywedodd Carwyn, rhaid inni gael ein harwain gan y cyngor a'r amgylchiadau. Un o'r gwersi o'r tro diwethaf, os ydym yn ystyried gwersi, yw y dylid gwerthfawrogi'r dull rhagofalus. Felly y digwyddodd y tro diwethaf. Os cofiaf yn iawn, yr oedd pawb ohonom yn Siambr y Cynulliad yn cytuno mai'r dull rhagofalus oedd y ffordd gywir ymlaen. Wedyn mae'n fater o gyflymder, wedi ichi gael rhywfaint o sicrwydd nad yw'r clwyf yno neu'n ymledu i'r fan honno, o ran ailagor y llwybrau. Dyna un o'r meysydd sydd o ddiddordeb i mi. I bob pwrpas, yr oedd 70 neu 75 y cant o'r llwybrau yng Nghymru wedi'u hailagor, fe gredaf, ar ôl pedwar mis. Y nefoedd a'n gwaredo rhag i hynny ddigwydd eto, ond yr wyf yn amau, y

access to the countryside is—and I have just come from a Committee meeting where we were discussing the regulations and legislation in this area—there would be a greater emphasis from some of the less enthusiastic people on reopening paths. The issue is the speed of reopening paths once you know what the situation is. I think that one of the lessons is that the kind of risk assessment models that would develop the kind of guidance on priorities that we were giving to local authorities need to be taken up consistently by local authorities across the area. What took up my time was speaking on the phone and going out to local authorities and saying, ‘look, please believe us, we have this veterinary advice that you can reopen footpaths’. The reality on the ground was that people were worried—farmers and landowners were worried. I understand that. However, we must be guided by the advice, and people have to have confidence in that advice. The Snowdon example sent out some very good messages to other local authorities that this could be achieved, as did the work that Pembrokeshire Coast National Park did. I suspect that, next time round, there will be a much greater degree of confidence, if we have a situation of blanket closure, that, once the guidance is that it is time to reopen paths, we could go through the process consistently and rapidly across Wales.

[387] **Glyn Davies:** That is an interesting response. Are you happy with that response, Delyth? Then Mick is next.

tro nesaf, gan sylweddoli mor bwysig yw mynediad i gefn gwlad—ac yr wyf newydd ddod o gyfarfod Pwyllgor lle'r oeddem yn trafod y rheoliadau a'r ddeddfwriaeth yn y maes hwn—y byddai mwy o bwyslais gan rai o'r bobl lai brwdfrydig ar ailagor llwybrau. Y mater sy'n codi yw pa mor gyflym y caiff llwybrau eu hailagor pan wyddoch beth yw'r sefyllfa. Credaf mai un o'r gwersi yw bod yn rhaid i'r math o fodolau asesu risg a fyddai'n datblygu'r math o ganllawiau ar flaenoriaethau yr oeddem yn eu rhoi i'r awdurdodau lleol gael eu dilyn yn gyson gan yr awdurdodau lleol ledled yr ardal. Yr hyn a gymerodd amser oedd siarad ar y ffôn a mynd allan at yr awdurdodau lleol a dweud, ‘edrychwch, coeliwch ni, os gwelwch yn dda, yr ydym wedi cael cyngor milfeddygol y gallwch ailagor y llwybrau troed’. Y realiti ar lawr gwlad oedd bod pobl yn poeni—yr oedd y ffermwyr a'r perchnogion tir yn poeni. Yr wyf yn deall hynny. Fodd bynnag, rhaid inni ddilyn y cyngor, a rhaid i bobl fod â hyder yn y cyngor hwnnw. Yr oedd yr esiampl ar yr Wyddfa wedi cyfleu rhai negeseuon da iawn i'r awdurdodau lleol eraill i'r perwyl y gellid cyflawni hyn, fel y gwnaeth y gwaith a wnaed gan Barc Cenedlaethol Arfordir Sir Benfro. Yr wyf yn amau, y tro nesaf, pe byddai gennym sefyllfa o gau cyffredinol, y bydd llawer mwy o hyder, ar ôl cael cyfarwyddyd ei bod yn bryd ailagor llwybrau, yn ein gallu i ddilyn y broses yn gyson ac yn gyflym ledled Cymru.

[387] **Glyn Davies:** Mae hynny'n ymateb diddorol. A ydych yn fodlon ar yr ymateb hwnnw, Delyth? Mick sy'n nesaf felly.

[388] **Mick Bates:** I am pleased to hear the Minister for Environment say that there was a great deal of sensitivity in the agricultural industry about the spread of the disease. I would like to pursue the question of co-ordination, because, while footpaths were closed, one of the lessons learned during the outbreak was that people were at first asking for roads to be disinfected and for the whole area to be closed down, effectively. Eventually, the concept of the blue box was invented. I wonder if the Minister for Environment would care to comment on whether or not she would consider that concept of the blue box—the disinfecting of all vehicles travelling in and out of an area—to be something that would be used if there were another outbreak?

The second part of my question, Chair, if I may, is to also ask about the role of the Environment Agency in this, in terms of the co-ordination between the various Ministers. It appeared to me at the time that there was a lack of co-ordination on the disposal sites for animals. There were a great many problems. I would just like to hear whether you have received recommendations from the Environment Agency—and this is to the Minister for Environment—in view of all the problems that we encountered, regarding, let us say, the amount of rendering capacity in Wales, or the effect of pyres on human health, for example.

Sue Essex: I would be happy to, but I thought that we were taking—

[389] **Glyn Davies:** I would rather stick with access, if we can.

[388] **Mick Bates:** Yr wyf yn falch o glywed y Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd yn dweud bod llawer iawn o sensitifrwydd yn y diwydiant amaethyddol ynghylch ymlediad y clwyf. Hoffwn fynd ar ôl mater cyd-drefnu, oherwydd, tra oedd y llwybrau ar gau, un o'r gwersi a ddysgwyd yn ystod yr achosion o'r clwyf oedd bod pobl yn gofyn yn gyntaf am ddiheintio ffyrdd ac am gau'r ardal gyfan, i bob pwrpas. Yn y pen draw, dyfeisiwyd cysyniad y blwch glas. Tybed a fyddai'r Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd yn hoffi gwneud sylw ynghylch a yw o'r farn bod cysyniad y blwch glas—diheintio'r holl gerbydau sy'n mynd i mewn ac allan o ardal—yn rhywbeth a ddefnyddid pe byddai cychwyniad arall?

Yr ail ran o'm cwestiwn, Gadeirydd, os caf ei gofyn, yw holi hefyd am rôl Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd yn hyn, o ran y cyd-drefnu rhwng y gwahanol Weinidogion. Yr oedd yn ymddangos i mi ar y pryd fod diffyg cyd-drefnu ar y safleoedd gwaredu anifeiliaid. Yr oedd llawer iawn o broblemau. Hoffwn glywed a ydych wedi cael argymhellion gan Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd—a chwestiwn i'r Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd yw hwn—o gofio'r holl broblemau a brofasom ynghylch, gadewch inni ddweud, maint y capasiti rendro yng Nghymru, neu effaith y coelcerthi ar iechyd dynol, er enghraifft.

Sue Essex: Byddwn yn falch o wneud, ond yr oeddwn yn tybio ein bod yn cymryd—

[389] **Glyn Davies:** Byddai'n well gennyf lyngu wrth fynediad, os gallwn.

[390] **Mick Bates:** Okay. I just wanted to know whether the Minister for Environment had received any advice from the Environment Agency on that.

[391] **Glyn Davies:** We will come to that later on.

Sue Essex: Do you want to say anything about the blue box scheme, Tony?

Mr Edwards: The blue box scheme proved to be very effective as a control measure. It is very much referred to in the latest version of the interim contingency plan that we have put in place at the moment. Yes, it is something that will be instituted next time round, should circumstances dictate it.

[392] **Glyn Davies:** Do you want to come back on that, Mick? Are you happy with that?

[393] **Mick Bates:** Fine. If there is another outbreak, then, will you adopt the more stringent pattern of the blue box, rather than just close the footpaths? By that means, the roads are disinfected and there are checks on all vehicles.

Sue Essex: What do you reckon, Gareth?

Mr Jones: It is a separate issue, Chair. The blue box system will undoubtedly be implemented, but it is not an issue of stopping walkers or access for casual visitors. That is an issue about biosecurity measures, effectively, as well as movement restrictions.

[390] **Mick Bates:** O'r gorau. Roeddwn am wybod a oedd y Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd wedi derbyn unrhyw gyngor gan Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd ar hynny.

[391] **Glyn Davies:** Deuwn at hynny'n ddiweddarach.

Sue Essex: A ydych yn dymuno dweud rhywbeth am y cynllun blwch glas, Tony?

Mr Edwards: Profodd y cynllun blwch glas yn effeithiol iawn fel mesur rheoli. Mae llawer cyfeiriad ato yn y fersiwn diweddaraf o'r cynllun wrth gefn dros dro sydd ar waith gennym ar y funud. Ydyw, mae'n rhywbeth a sefydlir y tro nesaf, os bydd yr amgylchiadau'n galw am hynny.

[392] **Glyn Davies:** A ydych yn dymuno cyfrannu eto ar hynny, Mick? A ydych yn fodlon ar hynny?

[393] **Mick Bates:** Iawn. Os oes achos arall, felly, a fyddwch yn mabwysiadu patrwm mwy caeth y blwch glas, yn hytrach na dim ond cau'r llwybrau troed? Drwy hynny, caiff y ffyrdd eu diheintio a cheir gwiriadau ar bob cerbyd.

Sue Essex: Beth feddyliwch chi, Gareth?

Mr Jones: Mae'n fater ar wahân, Gadeirydd. Mae'n sicr y caiff y system blwch glas ei gweithredu, ond nid yw'n fater o atal cerddwyr neu fynediad i ymwelwyr achlysurol. Mae hynny'n fater sy'n ymwneud â mesurau diogelwch biolegol, i bob pwrpas, yn ogystal â chyfyngiadau ar symud.

[394] **Janet Ryder:** Just to take the point on this development of the contingency plan a little bit further, is it going to cover all aspects? That is just to take up the point that Mick has just made. Will it also include risk assessment and a plan that everybody will be able to go to, to know how to follow that risk assessment and when to open up footpaths?

Mr Jones: The DEFRA interim contingency plan has been published and is available for people to see. It is not as detailed a document as perhaps you describe, but all those issues are covered.

[395] **Janet Ryder:** In what respect is it not as detailed? Is it just a very broad outline? Does it contain the risk assessment that the Minister has been talking about?

Mr Jones: It is an overarching contingency plan, which is given effect—I think I explained this at the last meeting—by local contingency plans, which are being developed in regions throughout the UK.

Mr Brodie: However, as we explained last time, the work that we have initiated in preparing a distinctively Welsh contingency plan would really come into its own if the animal health powers were transferred. Then, I can certainly assure you that we would be wanting to tackle all of these issues about access as part of it, in consultation with the local authorities and a whole range of other interests.

[396] **Janet Ryder:** So you have started work with local authorities on this area of the plan in Wales?

[394] **Janet Ryder:** I fynd â'r pwynt ar ddatblygu'r cynllun wrth gefn ychydig ymhellach, a fydd yn ymdrin â phob agwedd? Mae hynny i ddilyn y pwynt y mae Mick newydd ei wneud. A fydd hefyd yn cynnwys asesu risgiau a chynllun y bydd pawb yn gallu troi ato, i wybod sut i ddilyn yr asesiad risg a pha bryd i agor llwybrau troed?

Mr Jones: Mae cynllun wrth gefn dros dro DEFRA wedi'i gyhoeddi ac mae ar gael i'w weld. Nid yw'n ddogfen mor fanwl â'r un a ddisgrifiwch, efallai, ond ymdrinnir â'r materion hynny.

[395] **Janet Ryder:** Ym mha ystyr y mae heb fod mor fanwl? Ai amlinelliad bras yn unig ydyw? A yw'n cynnwys yr asesiad risg y bu'r Gweinidog yn sôn amdano?

Mr Jones: Mae'n gynllun wrth gefn cyffredinol, a roddir ar waith—yr wyf yn credu imi egluro hyn yn y cyfarfod diwethaf—drwy'r cynlluniau wrth gefn lleol, a ddatblygir yn y rhanbarthau ledled y DU.

Mr Brodie: Er hynny, fel yr oeddem wedi egluro'r tro diwethaf, byddai'r gwaith a ddechreuasom ar baratoi cynllun wrth gefn neilltuol i Gymru yn dod i'w hawl ei hun os trosglwyddir y pwerau iechyd anifeiliaid. Wedyn, gallaf eich sicrhau'n bendant y byddem yn dymuno mynd i'r afael â'r holl faterion hyn sy'n ymwneud â mynediad fel rhan ohono, mewn ymgynghoriad â'r awdurdodau lleol ac amrywiaeth mawr o fuddiannau eraill.

[396] **Janet Ryder:** Felly yr ydych wedi dechrau gweithio gyda'r awdurdodau lleol ar y rhan hon o'r cynllun yng Nghymru?

Mr Brodie: There have been a number of meetings so far.

[397] **John Griffiths:** When we are talking about lessons learned, is one of them that, in areas where there was not any infection, such as Ceredigion, access could have been restored more quickly? Obviously, the outbreak began in February and I think that access was fully restored in September in Ceredigion. So, in retrospect, could it have been done more quickly? I appreciate that we have 20:20 hindsight today, Chair.

On another matter, when Sue mentioned that farmers were perhaps a little suspicious about whether it was a good idea to reopen footpaths and restore access when that was done, was part of the problem inconsistent advice and that farmers were being advised on the need for very tight biosecurity on the one hand, and then on the other being advised that it was okay to restore access and allow walkers to cross farmland? If lessons have been learned on that, what would be the mechanics of ensuring more consistent advice in the event of a future outbreak?

[398] **Glyn Davies:** Can I just say, before I pass this on, because this is an area that I am quite interested in, that, listening to the answers you have been giving us, the impression I get is that, were there to be another outbreak—and that is a key issue, and we are using 20:20 vision to try to see how we would behave then—what you are saying, really, is that you would probably implement the closure of footpaths even more quickly, but that there might be a more relaxed regime in terms of opening them? Is that a fair assessment?

Mr Brodie: Bu sawl cyfarfod hyd yn hyn.

[397] **John Griffiths:** Pan ydym yn sôn am y gwersi a ddysgwyd, ai un ohonynt yw, mewn ardaloedd lle nad oedd haint o gwbl, fel Ceredigion, y gallesid bod wedi adfer mynediad yn gynt o lawer? Wrth gwrs, dechreuodd yr achosion o'r clwyf yn Chwefror a chredaf fod mynediad wedi'i adfer yn llwyr ym Medi yng Ngheredigion. Felly, wrth edrych yn ôl, a allesid bod wedi gwneud hynny'n gynt? Yr wyf yn sylweddoli ein bod yn edrych ar hyn ag ôl-welediad 20:20, Gadeirydd.

Ar fater arall, pan soniodd Sue fod y ffermwyr braidd yn amheus efallai ynghylch a oedd yn syniad da ailagor llwybrau troed ac adfer mynediad pan wnaethpwyd hynny, ai rhan o'r broblem honno oedd cyngor anghyson a bod y ffermwyr yn cael eu cynghori ar yr angen am ddiogelwch biolegol tynn iawn ar un llaw, ac wedyn yn cael eu cynghori ei bod yn iawn adfer mynediad a chaniatáu i gerddwyr groesi tir ffermio? Os dysgwyd gwersi ar hynny, beth fyddai'r mecanwaith wrth sicrhau cyngor mwy cyson os digwydd achos yn y dyfodol?

[398] **Glyn Davies:** A gaf ddweud, cyn imi ei basio ymlaen, gan fod hyn yn faes y mae gennyf gryn ddiddordeb ynddo, wrth wrando ar yr atebion yr ydych wedi'u rhoi i ni, yr argraff a gaf yw, pe byddai achos arall yr clwyf—ac mae hynny'n fater allweddol, ac yr ydym yn arfer golwg 20:20 i geisio gweld sut y byddem yn ymddwyn bryd hynny—yr hyn a ddywedwch, mewn gwirionedd, yw y byddech yn cau'r llwybrau troed yn gynharach byth yn ôl pob tebyg, ond y gellid cael cyfundrefn lai caeth o ran eu hagor? A yw hynny'n asesiad teg?

Carwyn Jones: It depends entirely on the circumstances, Chair, as I indicated to Elin.

[399] **Elin Jones:** So, if we faced the same circumstances as last time, you would do exactly the same?

Carwyn Jones: Unless you are faced with the situation, you cannot speculate. If you are asking me about what happened last year, I believe that what was done last year was a proportionate response.

[400] **Elin Jones:** So, with exactly the same circumstances as last year, you would do exactly the same again?

Carwyn Jones: Those circumstances are unlikely to replicate themselves.

[401] **Glyn Davies:** That is not an answer at all, Minister. The only reason I am asking this is because, the next time this happens, if it were to happen again, it is the Minister for Environment who would be making decisions relating to this matter, I suppose, and the question was initially directed at Sue Essex. I can only say that you gave me the impression that, with 20:20 vision or hindsight, next time we could expect to see a regime that was more enthusiastic about opening up access. I am combining this with John's point on how it would apply to Ceredigion, but it is also this problem of when access is closed off. It sounds to me as if you still believe that it is right to close off access as quickly as possible in the early stages—that is your view.

Carwyn Jones: Mae'n dibynnu'n llwyr ar yr amgylchiadau, Gadeirydd, fel y dywedais wrth Elin.

[399] **Elin Jones:** Felly, pe wynebem yr un amgylchiadau â'r tro diwethaf, fe wnaech yr un peth yn union?

Carwyn Jones: Oni bai'ch bod yn wynebu'r sefyllfa, ni allwch ddyfalu. Os ydych yn fy holi am yr hyn a ddigwyddodd y llynedd, credaf fod yr hyn a wnaethpwyd y llynedd yn ymateb cymesur.

[400] **Elin Jones:** Felly, o dan yr un amgylchiadau'n union â'r llynedd, fe wnaech yn union yr un peth eto?

Carwyn Jones: Mae'r amgylchiadau hynny'n annhebygol o gael eu hailadrodd.

[401] **Glyn Davies:** Nid yw hynny'n ateb o gwbl, Weinidog. Yr unig reswm yr wyf yn gofyn hyn yw, y tro nesaf y digwydd hyn, pe byddai'n digwydd eto, y Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd a benderfynai ynghylch y mater hwn, mae'n debyg, ac yr oedd y cwestiwn wedi'i gyfeirio i ddechrau at Sue Essex. Y cwbl y gallaf ei ddweud yw eich bod wedi rhoi'r argraff i mi, o feddu ar olwg 20:20, y gallem ddisgwyl gweld cyfundrefn y tro nesaf a fyddai'n fwy brwdfrydig ynghylch rhoi mynediad. Yr wyf yn cyfuno hyn â phwynt John am y modd y câi ei gymhwyso at Geredigion, ond mae'r broblem hon hefyd o atal mynediad. Mae'n swnio i mi fel pe baech yn dal i gredu ei bod yn iawn atal mynediad mor gyflym â phosibl yn y cyfnodau cynnar—dyna'ch barn chi.

Sue Essex: I used the word precautionary. If the advice is—and I cannot judge that—that that is the most precautionary thing to do, then I think that I, or any Minister, would take that advice, because, clearly, that is coming from the people who are employed to give that advice. What I was trying to hint at—and bearing in mind that it is local authorities that deal with the closure and the reopening—is that I think that it is not just for me. I think that everyone in this room will know that I am very pro-access, although I do appreciate that access takes place where people live and earn their livelihood. I have also been in favour of the access community and the farming community working together. I think that one of the consequences of what happened last year—I think and I hope that this is true—is that some of the people on the ground who were very worried about what opening the paths would do, would feel more relaxed next time that there was not the same kind of spread in how that happened, and that when the advice comes from the professionals that it is safe to open, they can have confidence in that advice. That is what I said. Therefore, I believe that, were we to be faced with a similar situation again, and although we had roughly three-quarters of the paths open within four months, which was a credit to local authorities, our staff and others, working this problem through in the communities—I have to say that this is not top-down, we have to be very sensitive to the communities out there—I feel that we probably would not have that tail, if you like, of authorities or areas within Wales that were very slow to open their paths.

Sue Essex: Defnyddiais y gair rhagofalus. Os mai'r cyngor yw—ac ni allaf farnu ar hynny—mai hwnnw yw'r peth mwyaf rhagofalus i'w wneud, yna credaf y byddwn i, neu unrhyw Weinidog, yn derbyn y cyngor hwnnw gan ei fod, wrth gwrs, yn dod oddi wrth bobl a gyflogir i roi'r cyngor hwnnw. Yr hyn yr oeddwn yn ceisio ei led awgrymu—a chan gofio mai'r awdurdodau lleol sy'n delio â'r cau a'r ailagor—yw nad yw'n fater i mi'n unig. Credaf fod pawb yn yr ystafell hon yn gwybod fy mod yn bleidiol iawn i fynediad, er fy mod yn sylweddoli bod mynediad yn digwydd lle y mae pobl yn byw ac yn ennill eu bywoliaeth. Bûm hefyd o blaid cydweithio rhwng y gymuned mynediad a'r gymuned ffermio. Un o ganlyniadau'r hyn a ddigwyddodd y llynedd—a chredaf a gobeithiaf fod hyn yn wir—yw y byddai rhai o'r bobl ar lawr gwlad a oedd yn bryderus iawn ynghylch beth fyddai effaith ailagor y llwybrau, yn teimlo'n fwy esmwyth y tro nesaf am nad oedd yr un math o ymlediad yn y modd y digwyddodd hynny, a phan ddaw cyngor gan y gweithwyr proffesiynol ei bod yn ddiogel agor, y gallant ymddiried yn y cyngor hwnnw. Dyna a ddywedais. Felly, yr wyf yn credu, pe byddem yn wynebu sefyllfa debyg eto, ac er bod tua thri chwarter o'r llwybrau'n agored o fewn pedwar mis, sy'n glod i'r awdurdodau lleol, ein staff ac eraill, drwy ddatrys y broblem hon yn y cymunedau—rhaid imi ddweud nad rhywbeth o'r pen i'r gwaelod yw hwn, rhaid inni fod yn sensitif iawn tuag at y cymunedau sydd allan yn y fan honno—teimlaf na fyddai gennym, yn ôl pob tebyg, y gweddill hwnnw o awdurdodau neu ardaloedd yng Nghymru a oedd yn araf iawn yn agor eu llwybrau.

John mentioned Ceredigion in particular. I wrote to the council on a couple of occasions and I think that there were one or two phone calls as well. It was our view that Ceredigion could have opened those paths much more quickly, but it did not feel confident to do so. I hope that, should it happen again, it would feel that it could rest assured about the kind of advice that we were giving and which was coming through. There was also a situation in Pembrokeshire, where I went and met people there, whereby it had an arrangement that, when it was reopening paths, it got a forum together of land interests—the local ramblers group, the Country Land and Business Association, I think; the various people that had interests—and it took proposals to reopen through that forum. It, in fact, proved quite a laborious system. It was important to them in terms of keeping the community together but, in practice, it took quite a long while. I am sure that Pembrokeshire would have reconsidered that and perhaps found a more streamlined process. This is what I am saying. The lessons from last time have shown that we have to depend on the advice and, if the advice is that there needs to be that closure, because at that stage it is not known where the disease is or how it is spreading, then I think that we owe it to people to do that. However, we have learned, very strongly, as John said, that there are many people out there who depend on access to the countryside for their livelihoods. So there needs to be a strong presumption that, when they can be opened, those paths are opened because people's livelihoods depend on that. I think that that is the clear message that has come home.

[402] **John Griffiths:** Chair, just on the point about consistency—

Soniodd John am Geredigion yn benodol. Ysgrifennais at y cyngor ar un neu ddau achlysur a chredaf fod un neu ddwy o alwadau ffôn hefyd. Ein barn ni oedd y gallai Ceredigion fod wedi agor y llwybrau hynny'n gynt o lawer, ond ni theimlai'n hyderus i wneud hynny. Yr wyf yn gobeithio, pe digwyddai eto, y teimlai y gallai fod yn dawel ei feddwl ynghylch y math o gyngor yr oeddem yn ei roi ac a oedd yn dod drwodd. Yr oedd sefyllfa yn sir Benfro hefyd, pan euthum i gwrdd â rhai yno, lle'r oedd ganddi drefniant, wrth ailagor llwybrau, o gynnull fforwm o fudd-ddeiliaid tir—y grwp crwydrwyr lleol, Cymdeithas Tir a Busnes Cefn Gwlad, yr wyf yn credu; y gwahanol bobl a chanddynt fuddiannau—ac aeth â chynigion i'w hailagor drwy'r fforwm hwnnw. Mewn gwirionedd, profodd yn system eithaf llafurus. Yr oedd yn bwysig iddynt o ran cadw'r gymuned â'i gilydd ond, yn ymarferol, cymerai gryn amser. Yr wyf yn siwr y byddai sir Benfro wedi ailystyried hynny ac efallai wedi dod o hyd i broses symlach. Dyma'r hyn yr wyf yn ei ddweud. Mae'r gwersi o'r tro diwethaf wedi dangos bod yn rhaid inni ddibynnu ar y cyngor ac, os mai'r cyngor yw bod angen cau yn y fath fodd, am nad yw'n hysbys ar y pryd ym mhle y mae'r clwyf ac i ble y mae'n ymledu, yna credaf fod dyletswydd arnom tuag at bobl i wneud hynny. Fodd bynnag, yr ydym wedi dysgu, yn bendant, fel y dywedodd John, fod llawer o bobl sy'n dibynnu ar fynediad i gefn gwlad am eu bywoliaeth. Felly mae angen rhagdybiaeth gryf, pan ellir eu hagor, fod y llwybrau hynny i'w hagor am fod bywoliaeth pobl yn dibynnu ar hynny. Credaf mai honno yw'r wers glir a ddysgwyd.

[402] **John Griffiths:** Gadeirydd, ynghylch y pwynt am gysondeb—

Sue Essex: Oh, consistency. I will ask Carwyn to come in on that. However, there is a distinction between those people—as we have heard today, the risk associated with walkers is pretty low in terms of spreading the disease. So there was a distinction between the advice or guidance that was coming from the countryside side, if you like—our side here—on access as we would understand access, and the biosecurity advice that Carwyn was having for farmers and so on. There was a little window in time of a couple of days where we were quite clear as to the different groups that were meant. However, I appreciate that perhaps not everyone was clear about that on the ground, and further guidance was set. That is a situation where we understood access and walkers as visitors to the countryside and there was another interpretation of farmers who were getting regular supplies and so on.

[403] **Glyn Davies:** It seems that Huw Brodie wants to make a point urgently.

Mr Brodie: I just wanted to reinforce what Sue was saying earlier on, namely, that we would not be facing the same situation again because the commission is going to be proposing, very shortly, approved systems for individual sheep identification.

[404] **Glyn Davies:** Is that what the Minister meant earlier?

Mr Brodie: No, I think that it was a different point. However, with improved traceability of sheep, we should be, if, heaven forbid, there were another outbreak, in a much better position, hopefully, to understand what its distribution was and, therefore, to take that into account.

Sue Essex: O, cysondeb. Gofynnaf i Carwyn ddweud rhywbeth ar hynny. Fodd bynnag, mae gwahaniaeth rhwng y bobl hynny—fel y clywsom heddiw, mae'r risg sy'n gysylltiedig â cherddwyr yn eithaf isel o ran lledaenu'r clwyf. Felly yr oedd gwahaniaeth rhwng y cyngor neu'r cyfarwyddyd a ddeuai o'r ochr cefn gwlad, os hoffech chi—ein hochr ni yma—ar fynediad fel y byddem ni'n deall mynediad, a'r cyngor ar ddiogelwch biolegol yr oedd Carwyn yn ei gael ar gyfer y ffermwyr ac yn y blaen. Yr oedd cyfnod byr iawn o ychydig ddyddiau pan oeddem yn deall yn eithaf clir y gwahanol grwpiau a olygid. Fodd bynnag, sylweddolaf nad oedd pawb yn deall hynny mor glir ar lawr gwlad, efallai, a gosodwyd cyfarwyddyd pellach. Yr oedd honno'n sefyllfa lle'r oeddem yn ystyried mynediad a cherddwyr yn ymwelwyr â chefn gwlad ac yr oedd dehongliad arall, sef ffermwyr a oedd yn cael cyflenwadau rheolaidd ac yn y blaen.

[403] **Glyn Davies:** Ymddengys fod Huw Brodie yn dymuno gwneud pwynt ar frys.

Mr Brodie: Roeddwn am ategu'r hyn a ddywedodd Sue yn gynharach, sef, na fyddem yn wynebu'r un sefyllfa eto gan y bydd y comisiwn yn cynnig systemau cymeradwyedig, cyn hir, i ddynodi defaid unigol.

[404] **Glyn Davies:** Ai hynny yr oedd y Gweinidog yn ei olygu'n gynharach?

Mr Brodie: Nace, credaf ei fod yn bwynt gwahanol. Fodd bynnag, o allu olrhain defaid yn well, os bydd achos arall o'r clwyf, y nefoedd a'n gwaredo, mae'n debyg y byddwn mewn llawer gwell sefyllfa, gobeithiaf, i ddeall ei ddosbarthiad ac, felly, cymryd hynny i ystyriaeth.

[405] **Glyn Davies:** Okay, good point.

Carwyn Jones: Chair, on the point that John was raising in terms of consistency, the advice given out was not, in fact, inconsistent. There is a hierarchy of risk that exists, according to which categories of people are more likely to spread the disease. Walkers are in that hierarchy, but far above them are people who come into contact with animals, quite naturally, and, indeed, farm machinery. It is not known whether walkers spread the disease or not. It is a known fact that farm machinery spreads the disease. That much is well known, and the epidemiologists have traced that in many circumstances. That said, the conclusion that must be drawn is that farm machinery and those who come into contact with animals are a higher risk for spreading the disease. Therefore, the advice has to be different. If the advice given to walkers was the same as that given to farmers, people would rightly ask why, when they are different in the hierarchy of risk, the advice is the same. So in fact it was not inconsistent to say on the one hand to walkers, 'do go to the countryside', while at the same time saying to farmers and those potentially in contact with the disease, including through their vehicles, to be vigilant in terms of biosecurity.

[405] **Glyn Davies:** O'r gorau, pwynt da.

Carwyn Jones: Gadeirydd, ynghylch y pwynt yr oedd John yn ei godi am gysondeb, nid oedd y cyngor a ddosbarthwyd yn anghyson, mewn gwirionedd. Mae hierarchiaeth risg yn bodoli, ac yn ôl honno mae rhai categorïau o bobl yn fwy tebygol o ledaenu'r clwyf. Mae cerddwyr yn yr hierarchiaeth honno, ond yn uwch o lawer na hwy y mae'r rhai sy'n dod i gysylltiad ag anifeiliaid, wrth gwrs, ac, yn wir, peiriannau fferm. Ni wyddys a yw cerddwyr yn lleadaenu'r clwyf ai peidio. Mae'n ffaith hysbys bod peiriannau fferm yn lleadaenu'r clwyf. Mae cymaint â hynny'n dra gwybyddus, ac mae'r epidemiolegwyr wedi olrhain hynny mewn llawer o amgylchiadau. Wedi dweud hynny, y casgliad y mae'n rhaid dod iddo yw bod peiriannau fferm a'r rhai a ddaw i gysylltiad ag anifeiliaid yn fwy o risg o ran lleadaenu'r clwyf. Felly, rhaid i'r cyngor fod yn wahanol. Pe byddai'r cyngor a roddid i gerddwyr yr un fath â hwnnw a roddid i ffermwyr, byddai'n iawn i bobl ofyn, pan ydynt yn wahanol yn yr hierarchiaeth risg, pam y mae'r cyngor yr un fath. Felly, mewn gwirionedd, nid yw'n anghyson dweud ar un llaw wrth gerddwyr, 'ewch i gefn gwlad', ac ar yr un pryd dweud wrth ffermwyr a'r rhai a allai fod mewn cysylltiad â'r clwyf, gan gynnwys cysylltiad drwy eu cerbydau, am fod yn wyliadwrus o ran diogelwch biolegol.

That was the message that we were trying to get across. On occasion, we would see situations where farmers were exceptionally vigilant as to their biosecurity, but had missed one thing that nobody had thought of, for example, the footwell on the Landrover would not be disinfected, while the rest of the vehicle would be, and the disease was spread as a result. So it was exceptionally important to reinforce the message about biosecurity to those in the high risk category, while at the same time giving out different advice to those who were in a lower risk category.

[406] **Glyn Davies:** Thank you. I will just take two small points before we break. John and Elin both have points that they want to make.

[407] **John Griffiths:** It is only on the consistency of advice. I obviously accept—

[408] **Glyn Davies:** You are happy with what the Minister has said, are you?

[409] **John Griffiths:** Absolutely, but—

[410] **Glyn Davies:** I will call Elin, then.

[411] **John Griffiths:** No. I wanted to make the additional point that, obviously, that hierarchy of advice was not put over as clearly as it could have been to some individuals. I guess that it is just about making a connection. When the advice goes to one particular sector, such as farmers, they should be aware, I think, of the difference in the need for biosecurity from others such as walkers, because it did cause some heated exchanges, shall we say, at the time.

Honno oedd y neges yr oeddem yn ceisio'i chyfleu. Ar brydiau, byddem yn gweld sefyllfaoedd lle'r oedd ffermwyr yn eithriadol o wylriadwrus o ran eu diogelwch biolegol, ond wedi methu un peth nad oedd neb wedi'i ystyried, er enghraifft, ni fyddai'r lle i draed y gyrrwr yn y Landrover wedi'i ddiheintio, er bod gweddill y cerbyd wedi'i drin, a byddai'r clwyf yn ymledu o ganlyniad. Felly yr oedd yn eithriadol o bwysig ategu'r neges am ddiogelwch biolegol ymysg y rhai yn y categori risg uchel, ac ar yr un pryd rhoi cyngor gwahanol i'r rhai a oedd mewn categori risg is.

[406] **Glyn Davies:** Diolch i chi. Cymeraf ddau bwynt bach cyn inni gael egwyl. Mae gan John ac Elin bwyntiau y maent yn dymuno'u gwneud.

[407] **John Griffiths:** Nid yw ond yn ymwneud â chysondeb y cyngor. Yr wyf yn derbyn, wrth gwrs—

[408] **Glyn Davies:** Yr ydych yn fodlon ar yr hyn a ddywedodd y Gweinidog, a ydych?

[409] **John Griffiths:** Yn hollol, ond—

[410] **Glyn Davies:** Galwaf ar Elin, felly.

[411] **John Griffiths:** Nace. Yr oeddw'n am wneud pwynt ychwanegol sef, wrth gwrs, na chyflewyd yr hierarchiaeth cyngor honno mor glir ag y gallesid i rai unigolion. Tybiwn fod hynny'n ymwneud â gwneud cysylltiad. Pan aiff y cyngor at un sector penodol, fel y ffermwyr, dylent fod yn ymwybodol, yr wyf yn credu, o'r gwahaniaeth yn yr angen am ddiogelwch biolegol gan eraill fel cerddwyr, oherwydd fe achosodd rai geiriau croes, dywedwn, ar y pryd.

[412] **Elin Jones:** Yr wyf yn meddwl bod y polisi hwn o gau'r llwybrau cyhoeddus i gyd, ac wedyn eu hailagor yn raddol neu'n gyflym, braidd yn gymhleth. Nid wyf yn anghytuno â'ch barn chi ynglyn â Chyngor Sir Ceredigion ond, os caf ei amddiffyn rhywfaint, yr hyn a ddigwyddodd y llynedd oedd i chi orfodi Cyngor Sir Ceredigion i gau pob llwybr cyhoeddus pan oedd achos yn Sir Fôn. Wedyn, yn y cyfnod pan oedd achosion yn dal i fod yn y sir agosaf ato, Brycheiniog a Maesyfed, neu Bowys, bu ichi ofyn i Gyngor Sir Ceredigion agor y llwybrau cyhoeddus. Felly, dyna realiti'r negeseuon cymhleth yr oedd awdurdodau lleol yn eu derbyn oddi wrthyh.

Carwyn Jones: Mae'n rhaid cofio, wrth gwrs, pan aeth y Gorchymyn cyntaf trwyddo, nid oedd neb yn gwybod os oedd y clwyf yng Ngheredigion neu beidio. Yr oedd straeon bod moch yn Nhregaron wedi dal y clwyf ac yn y blaen. Nid oedd neb yn gwybod. Erbyn, i'r sefyllfa ar y Bannau ddigwydd, er enghraifft, yr oedd pobl yn gwybod, fwy neu lai—nid 100 y cant, wrth gwrs—ble yr oedd y clwyf. Felly, yr oedd y sefyllfa wedi newid erbyn hynny. Ynglyn â chau'r llwybrau, yr oedd hynny'n rhywbeth a gafodd gefnogaeth ar y pryd. Nid oedd neb yn siarad yn erbyn hynny ar y pryd, ac yr oedd hynny'n rhywbeth a ystyrid yn synhwyrol ar y pryd.

Wrth edrych yn ôl, wrth gwrs, yr ydym yn gwybod yn awr ble yr oedd y clwyf, ond nid oeddem yn gwybod hynny ar y pryd. Felly, ar y pryd, yr oedd hynny'n bolisi a oedd, yn fy marn i—ac, os wyf yn cofio, nid oedd neb yn anghytuno â'r pwynt hwn—yn hollol synhwyrol.

[413] **Glyn Davies:** Does the Minister for Environment agree with that?

[412] **Elin Jones:** I find this policy of closing all the public footpaths, and then reopening them gradually or quickly, quite complicated. I do not disagree with your view on Ceredigion County Council but, if I can defend it somewhat, what happened last year was that you forced Ceredigion County Council to close every public footpath when there was an outbreak in Anglesey. Then, in the period when there were still outbreaks in the nearest county to it, Brecon and Radnorshire, or Powys, you asked Ceredigion County Council to open the public footpaths. Therefore, that was the reality of the complicated messages that local authorities were receiving from you.

Carwyn Jones: It must be remembered, of course, that, when the first Order went through, no-one knew if the disease was in Ceredigion or not. There were stories that pigs from Tregaron had contracted the disease and so on. No-one knew. By the time of the situation in the Beacons, for example, people knew, more or less—not 100 per cent, of course—where the disease was. Therefore, the situation had changed by then. On closing the footpaths, that was something that received support at the time. No-one spoke against that at the time, and that was something that was seen as being sensible at the time.

With hindsight, of course, we now know where the disease was, but we did not know that at the time. Therefore, at the time, that was a policy that, in my opinion—and, if I remember, no-one disagreed with this point—was completely sensible.

[413] **Glyn Davies:** A yw'r Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd yn cytuno â hynny?

Sue Essex: I just want to make one point on Ceredigion, and all local authorities. Just to repeat, it was up to the local authorities to actually do that work. I could have issued a direction. In fact, in the Environment, Planning and Transport Committee, when we were discussing this—I think that John was a member of the Committee at the time—I was regularly reporting back on progress on access and other issues related to foot and mouth disease. There was the question of whether we should have put a direction on local authorities. It is not something which I supported doing, because my view is always to work with local authorities and to work with local communities to try to persuade them that they should go along the lines that we are suggesting. I think that people will have learned from last year. However, what I would say in terms of Ceredigion—and I did have discussions with other authorities, I do not want to pick out Ceredigion, and I honestly do appreciate the issues. I remember with Powys, I felt very sorry about the situation that some local authorities found themselves in, because there was real tension in local communities. What I was trying to get over is that this was strong advice that was coming from the State Veterinary Service. It was not a flippant kind of view that was taken; it was very carefully considered and there was logic behind it. I hope that, next time, as I said, there would be that degree of confidence going through, and that when we say that it is right to reopen paths—in whatever community that may be, and on whatever scale it is—local authorities will feel confident that they are able to do that.

Sue Essex: Yr wyf am wneud un pwynt ynghylch Ceredigion, a'r holl awdurdodau lleol. Dywedaf eto mai mater i'r awdurdodau lleol oedd gwneud y gwaith hwnnw. Gallaswn fod wedi cyhoeddi cyfarwyddyd. Mewn gwirionedd, ym Mhwyllgor yr Amgylchedd, Cynllunio a Thrafnidiaeth, pan oeddem yn trafod hyn—credaf fod John yn aelod o'r Pwyllgor ar y pryd—yr oeddwn yn adrodd yn ôl yn rheolaidd ar y cynnydd ar fynediad a materion eraill a oedd yn ymwneud â chlwy'r traed a'r genau. Yr oedd cwestiwn ynghylch a ddylem fod wedi rhoi cyfarwyddyd i'r awdurdodau lleol. Nid oedd yn rhywbeth yr oeddwn o blaid ei wneud, oherwydd yn fy marn i, dylid bob amser gweithio gyda'r awdurdodau lleol a gweithio gyda chymunedau lleol i geisio eu perswadio y dylent ddilyn y llwybr yr ydym yn ei awgrymu. Credaf fod pobl wedi dysgu oddi wrth y llynedd. Fodd bynnag, yr hyn a ddywedwn yng nghyd-destun Ceredigion—a chefais drafodaethau ag awdurdodau eraill, ac nid wyf am sôn am Geredigion yn neilltuol, ac yr wyf wir yn deall y materion. Cofiaf, fel yn achos Powys, ei bod yn ddrwg iawn gennyf am y sefyllfa yr oedd rhai o'r awdurdodau lleol yn eu cael eu hunain ynddi, oherwydd bod gwir dyndra yn y cymunedau lleol. Yr hyn yr oeddwn yn ceisio'i gyfleu oedd mai cyngor cadarn oedd hwnnw a ddeuai oddi wrth y Gwasanaeth Milfeddygol Gwladol. Nid rhyw fath o farn anystyriol oedd honno; fe'i hystyriwyd yn ofalus iawn ac yr oedd sail resymegol iddi. Gobeithiaf, y tro nesaf, fel y dywedais, y bydd rhyw raddau o hyder yn mynd drwodd, a phan ddywedwn ei bod yn iawn i ailagor llwybrau—ym mha bynnag gymuned y gallai hynny fod, ac ar ba bynnag raddfa—y bydd yr awdurdodau lleol yn teimlo'n ffyddiog y gallant wneud hynny.

[414] **Glyn Davies:** I think that we got that. We will now take a break.

[414] **Glyn Davies:** Credaf ein bod wedi deall hynny. Cawn egwyl yn awr.

Cafwyd egwyl rhwng 4 p.m. a 4.20 p.m.

A break was held between 4 p.m. a 4.20 p.m.

[415] **Glyn Davies:** Welcome back. We will move on to the next general section.

[415] **Glyn Davies:** Croeso'n ôl. Awn ymlaen at yr adran gyffredinol nesaf.

[416] **Ron Davies:** Before we do, Chair, may I just raise a point of order? I am wondering how we are going to proceed. We have had several sessions now, which have been fairly interesting in terms of having a discussion and a question and answer session. However, presumably, at some point or other, we will have to decide what we are going to do with these valuable nuggets of information that we have before us. I am just wondering whether it is your intention, at some time or other, to attempt to pull together a consensus, if one exists in this Committee, on what we have discovered.

[416] **Ron Davies:** Cyn inni wneud hynny, Gadeirydd, a gaf godi pwynt o drefn? Yr wyf yn meddwl tybed sut y byddwn yn mynd ymlaen. Cawsom sawl sesiwn bellach, a fu'n eithaf diddorol o ran cael trafodaeth a sesiwn hawl ac ateb. Fodd bynnag, gellid meddwl, ar ryw adeg neu'i gilydd, y byddwn yn gorfod penderfynu beth yr ydym am ei wneud â'r darnau gwerthfawr o wybodaeth sydd gennym o'n blaen. Yr wyf yn meddwl tybed ai'ch bwriad, ar ryw adeg neu'i gilydd, yw ceisio tynnu consensws at ei gilydd, os oes un yn y Pwyllgor, ynghylch yr hyn a ddarganfuom.

[417] **Glyn Davies:** This is a matter on which I want Committee members to contribute. At the end of today's session would probably be the best time; I would like to leave a little bit of time at the end. The two things that I have in mind to do as a sort of minimum is to make the transcript of both meetings available to the Anderson inquiry and, working with the clerk, I was going to spend some time finding those areas where there is some consensus on what we have learned and then write to the appropriate Minister to say 'this is what we thought'. There may be steps beyond that which we may want to take, and I am open to suggestions on that. However, those are two things that I think we should do as a minimum. That is my suggestion; you may well have others.

[417] **Glyn Davies:** Mae hyn yn fater yr wyf am i aelodau'r Pwyllgor gyfrannu ato. Diwedd y sesiwn heddiw fyddai'r adeg orau, yn ôl pob tebyg; hoffwn adael ychydig o amser ar y diwedd. Y ddau beth y bwriadaf ei wneud fel rhyw fath o leiafswm yw darparu trawsgrifiad y ddau gyfarfod i ymchwiliad Anderson a, gan weithio gyda'r clerc, yr oeddwn am dreulio rhywfaint o amser gyda'r clerc yn canfod y meysydd hynny lle y mae rhywfaint o gonsensws ar yr hyn a ddysgasom ac wedyn ysgrifennu at y Gweinidog priodol i ddweud 'dyma ein barn ni'. Efallai y bydd camau ar ôl hynny y gallwn ddymuno eu cymryd, ac yr wyf yn agored i awgrymiadau ar hynny. Fodd bynnag, dyna ddau beth y credaf y dylem eu gwneud fel lleiafswm. Dyna fy awgrym i; mae'n eithaf posibl y bydd gennych chi rai

eraill.

[418] **Ron Davies:** I have no difficulty with that. I just wondered whether you had given any consideration to the process whereby you would work out what it is on which we are agreed.

[419] **Glyn Davies:** Before I send any correspondence to Ministers on behalf of the Committee, I will circulate it to all members to see, first of all, whether you agree with it and, secondly, whether you have anything to add to it. I would always do that anyway. Have you finished your point, Ron?

[420] **Ron Davies:** Well, I think so.

[421] **Glyn Davies:** Peter, do you want to come in on this? I was going to leave this until the end, but we will do it now.

[422] **Peter Rogers:** I wanted to make the point that, in terms of the Anderson inquiry, Friday is the last day for submissions.

[423] **Glyn Davies:** Yes, but we have an arrangement. We have worked out an arrangement with the inquiry team whereby we can submit the transcripts. That is why I made the point at the beginning; the transcript of our meetings may well have more coverage than it would normally have. If anyone feels that they want to tidy up their grammar—mine needs tidying up quite a lot—that may not be a bad thing to do. That is the only reason why I raised that point at the beginning.

[418] **Ron Davies:** Mae hynny'n dderbyniol i mi. Yr oeddwn yn meddwl tybed a oeddech wedi ystyried o gwbl drwy ba broses y byddech yn canfod beth yr ydym wedi cytuno arno.

[419] **Glyn Davies:** Cyn imi anfon unrhyw ohebiaeth at y Gweinidogion ar ran y Pwyllgor, byddaf yn ei chylchredeg i'r holl aelodau, yn gyntaf oll, i weld a ydych yn cytuno â hi ac, yn ail, a oes gennych rywbeth i'w ychwanegu ato. Byddwn yn gwneud hynny bob amser beth bynnag. A ydych wedi gorffen eich pwynt, Ron?

[420] **Ron Davies:** Wel, ydwyf, yr wyf yn meddwl.

[421] **Glyn Davies:** Peter, a ydych yn dymuno dweud rhywbeth ar hyn? Yr oeddwn wedi bwriadu gadael hyn tan y diwedd, ond fe'i gwnawn yn awr.

[422] **Peter Rogers:** Yr oeddwn am wneud y pwynt, yng nghyd-destun ymchwiliad Anderson, mai dydd Gwener yw'r diwrnod olaf i gyflwyno sylwadau.

[423] **Glyn Davies:** Ydyw, ond mae gennym drefniant. Yr ydym wedi gwneud trefniant gyda thîm yr ymchwiliad fel y gallwn gyflwyno'r trawsgrifiadau. Dyna pam y gwneuthum y pwynt ar y dechrau; mae'n ddigon posibl y bydd trawsgrifiad ein cyfarfodydd yn derbyn mwy o sylw nag y byddai fel arfer. Os yw rhywun yn teimlo ei fod am dacluso ei ramadeg—mae angen tacluso fy ngramadeg i gryn dipyn—mae'n bosibl y byddai'n beth da gwneud hynny. Dyna'r unig reswm y codais y pwynt hwnnw ar y dechrau.

I am open to suggestions on this. There are other things that we could do—we could suggest a debate in Plenary and all sorts of things. I have just put before you the two things that I would quite like to do as a minimum.

[424] **Ron Davies:** May I come back on that? I think that it is very important that, having gone through this process, we spend some time deliberating whether there are findings, recommendations or conclusions that we, as a Committee, would want to establish.

[425] **Glyn Davies:** Yes. It is an issue and, in a sense, we can deal with it today, but I would like to ask members to reflect on it over the next day or so. Clearly, the transcripts can go to the Anderson inquiry. That will be done immediately, because that is the arrangement that we have. I think that we will also prepare the letters that I mentioned. However, you may well, after a day or two of reflection, have one or two other suggestions. I do not think that we should confine this just to today's meeting. If you have any suggestions about what else we might do, I am quite happy to consider them.

[426] **Ron Davies:** I think that we should have some findings. I would hate to think that we have sat here for however long it is and not come to any findings.

[427] **Glyn Davies:** That is a fair point. Have you got a clear idea of what form that might take? A report that we would then present to a Plenary session, or one that we would just make public?

Yr wyf yn agored i awgrymiadau ar hyn. Mae pethau eraill y gallem eu gwneud—gallem awgrymu dadl yn y Cyfarfod Llawn a phob math o bethau. Yr wyf wedi rhoi o'ch blaen y ddau beth yr hoffwn eu gwneud fel lleiafswm.

[424] **Ron Davies:** A gaf gyfrannu eto ar hynny? Credaf ei bod yn bwysig iawn, ar ôl mynd drwy'r broses hon, ein bod yn treulio peth amser yn cyd-drafod a oes canfyddiadau, argymhellion neu gasgliadau y dymunem, fel Pwyllgor, eu cadarnhau.

[425] **Glyn Davies:** Ie. Mae'n fater sy'n codi ac, ar un ystyr, gallwn ddelio â hynny heddiw, ond carwn ofyn i'r aelodau ei ystyried dros y diwrnod neu ddau nesaf. Wrth gwrs, gall y trawsgrifiadau fynd at ymchwiliad Anderson. Gwneir hynny ar unwaith, oherwydd dyna'r trefniant sydd gennym. Credaf y byddwn hefyd yn paratoi'r llythyrau a grybwyllais. Fodd bynnag, ar ôl diwrnod neu ddau o ystyried, mae'n ddigon posibl y bydd gennyh awgrym neu ddau arall. Ni chredaf y dylem gyfyngu hyn i'r cyfarfod heddiw'n unig. Os oes gennyh unrhyw awgrymiadau am bethau eraill y gallem eu gwneud, yr wyf yn fodlon iawn eu hystyried.

[426] **Ron Davies:** Credaf y dylai fod gennym rai canfyddiadau. Byddai'n gas gennyf feddwl ein bod wedi eistedd yma am ba bynnag amser heb ddod i unrhyw ganfyddiadau.

[427] **Glyn Davies:** Mae hynny'n bwynt teg. A oes gennyh unrhyw syniad pendant ynghylch pa ffurf a allai fod ar hynny? Adroddiad y byddem yn ei gyflwyno i'r Cyfarfod Llawn, neu un na fyddem ond yn ei gyhoeddi?

[428] **Ron Davies:** Indeed. I think that the way in which we deal with it is less important than the process or the intention to have some conclusions. Whether we write it down and send it to the Minister or Ministers or to the First Minister, or present it to Plenary as a report—I do not think that that really matters. I think that what is important is that, having gone through this process, we try to work out, as a Committee, whether we have any common ground on which we would want to comment.

[429] **Glyn Davies:** That, in a sense, is an alternative and, perhaps, preferred strategy to me writing to the various Assembly Ministers. It may well be what we, as a Committee, would prefer to do. It does involve the preparation of a report, and possibly even a discussion on it in a future Committee meeting, I would have thought. There is almost bound to be such a discussion, because there would be quite a lot of work on officials' part to prepare such a report. It is probably right that we should discuss it, I think, before we pass that on. I think that that is right. I am happy with that; if that is what we want to do, that is what we will do.

[430] **Elin Jones:** I think that it would be useful, in a future meeting early on, for us to look at the various aspects of work that we have gone through—such as contingency planning and the access issue—and decide whether, as a Committee, we want to come to any conclusion on the various aspects of that, and make suggestions for future reference to the Minister or elsewhere.

[428] **Ron Davies:** Yn wir. Credaf fod ein dull o ymdrin ag ef yn llai pwysig na'r broses neu'r bwriad i gael rhai casgliadau. Pa un a ydym yn ei ysgrifennu a'i anfon at y Gweinidog neu'r Gweinidogion neu at Brif Weinidog Cymru, neu'n ei gyflwyno i'r Cyfarfod Llawn fel adroddiad—ni chredaf fod hynny o bwys gwirioneddol. Yr hyn sy'n bwysig, yr wyf yn credu, yw ein bod, ar ôl mynd drwy'r broses hon, yn ceisio canfod, fel Pwyllgor, a oes gennym unrhyw dir cyffredin y dymunem wneud sylw arno.

[429] **Glyn Davies:** Mae hynny, ar un ystyr, yn strategaeth amgen ac, efallai, yn un well na phetawn i'n ysgrifennu at y gwahanol Weinidogion Cynulliad. Mae'n ddigon posibl mai hynny a fyddai orau gennym ei wneud, fel Pwyllgor. Mae'n golygu paratoi adroddiad, a hyd yn oed cael trafodaeth arno o bosibl mewn cyfarfod o'r Pwyllgor yn y dyfodol, byddwn yn tybio. Mae bron yn sicr y bydd trafodaeth o'r fath, oherwydd byddai angen cryn dipyn o waith gan y swyddogion i baratoi adroddiad o'r fath. Mae'n debyg ei bod yn briodol inni ei drafod, yr wyf yn meddwl, cyn ei drosglwyddo. Credaf fod hynny'n iawn. Yr wyf yn fodlon ar hynny; os mai hynny y dymunwn ei wneud, hynny a wnawn.

[430] **Elin Jones:** Credaf y byddai'n fuddiol, mewn cyfarfod yn fuan yn y dyfodol, inni edrych ar y gwahanol agweddau ar y gwaith y buom yn ei drafod—fel cynllunio wrth gefn a mater mynediad—a phenderfynu a ydym, fel Pwyllgor, yn dymuno dod i unrhyw gasgliad ar y gwahanol agweddau ar hynny, a rhoi awgrymiadau i gyfeirio atynt yn y dyfodol i'r Gweinidog neu eraill.

[431] **Glyn Davies:** I think that that is right. I think that it is probably best if we have the officials prepare the main structure of a report, so that we have something to work on. If we just had a discussion on what we might put in a report, it would delay things a lot and we would not really have anything clear to bat for or against. It will be a lot easier if we have a draft report that we can criticise or approve and change. Can we do that for the next meeting, or not?

Adrian Crompton (Clerk to the Committee): Yes.

[432] **Glyn Davies:** I am quite happy to go down that course, if that is what we want. Peter, do you want to come back on this?

[433] **Peter Rogers:** I was just going to agree with that, because otherwise we are going to have to have another meeting to discuss what we want to say in the report. If there were a skeleton there—

[434] **Glyn Davies:** No, more than a skeleton.

[435] **Peter Rogers:** No, no—but if a skeleton report were there, we could just okay it and go through it and check it out.

[436] **Glyn Davies:** Okay. Are you happy with that, Ron?

[431] **Glyn Davies:** Credaf fod hynny'n iawn. Credaf mai'r hyn sy'n orau yn ôl pob tebyg yw i'r swyddogion baratoi prif fframwaith yr adroddiad, fel bod gennym rywbeth y gallwn weithio arno. Pe na fyddem ond yn cael trafodaeth ar yr hyn a roddem mewn adroddiad, byddai hynny'n peri llawer o oedi ac ni fyddai gennym ddim byd pendant y gallem ddadlau drosto neu'n ei erbyn. Bydd yn haws o lawer os oes gennym adroddiad drafft y gallwn ei feirniadu neu'i gymeradwyo a'i newid. A allem wneud hynny ar gyfer y cyfarfod nesaf, neu beidio?

Adrian Crompton (Clerc y Pwyllgor): Gallem.

[432] **Glyn Davies:** Yr wyf yn fodlon iawn dilyn y llwybr hwnnw, os dyna'n dymuniad. Peter, a ydych yn dymuno cyfrannu eto ar hyn?

[433] **Peter Rogers:** Yr oeddwn am gytuno â hynny, oherwydd fel arall cawn gyfarfod arall i drafod yr hyn y dymunwn ei ddweud yn yr adroddiad. Pe byddai ysgerbwd yno—

[434] **Glyn Davies:** Nace, mwy nag ysgerbwd.

[435] **Peter Rogers:** Nace, nace—ond os oedd amlinelliad o adroddiad, gallem ei gymeradwyo a mynd drwyddo a'i wirio.

[436] **Glyn Davies:** O'r gorau. A ydych yn fodlon ar hynny, Ron?

[437] **Ron Davies:** Yes. My final point on this is that I do not think that we should be looking to have a lengthy report. I think it should just be our findings, because—I think we can agree relatively easily on findings and it is far better if we have a consensus on this—the problem is that the more detail you have in the report, the more avenues for disagreement that you are going to open up. So, rather than us thinking in terms of a very lengthy report, I think that just a couple of pages of findings would probably suffice, certainly from my point of view.

[438] **Glyn Davies:** Yes. There are some areas, probably in any report, of disagreement that would have to be referred to. I do not know if we could have a consensus on everything. I suppose that the discussion on vaccination might be one where there may be different views. However, I do not see any reason why you should not have a report with reference to two different views. What I will do, as we have agreed, is spend some time with the clerk—I will not do any of the work, I hasten to add—on the preparation of a report which may come to our next meeting. It is quite easy to make these commitments when all the work has to be done by somebody else. Is that issue dealt with now? I had planned to come to it at the end. Thank you, Ron.

[437] **Ron Davies:** Ydwyf. Fy mhwynt olaf ar hyn yw na chredaf y dylem ystyried cael adroddiad hir. Credaf mai'n canfyddiadau'n unig a ddylai fod ynddo, oherwydd—credaf y gallwn gytuno'n gymharol rwydd ar y canfyddiadau ac mae'n well o lawer os oes gennym gonsensws ar hyn—y broblem yw, po fwyaf o fanylion sydd gennyh yn yr adroddiad, mwyaf fydd y lle i anghytuno yr ydych yn ei greu. Felly, yn hytrach nag ystyried cael adroddiad hir iawn, credaf y byddai ychydig dudalennau o ganfyddiadau'n ddigon o bosibl, yn sicr o'm safbwynt i.

[438] **Glyn Davies:** Ie. Ceir rhai meysydd o anghytundeb ym mhob adroddiad, yn ôl pob tebyg, y byddai'n rhaid cyfeirio atynt. Ni wn a allem gael consensws ar bopeth. Yr wyf yn tybio y byddai'r drafodaeth ar frechu'n un lle y gellid cael gwahanol farnau. Fodd bynnag, ni welaf unrhyw reswm pam na ddylech gael adroddiad gyda chyfeiriad at ddwy farn wahanol. Yr hyn a wnaf, fel y cytunasom, yw treulio ychydig o amser gyda'r clerck—ni wnaf ddim o'r gwaith, prysuraf i ychwanegu—ar baratoi adroddiad a allai ddod i'n cyfarfod nesaf. Mae'n eithaf hawdd gwneud yr ymrwymadau hyn pan yw'r holl waith i'w wneud gan rywun arall. A ydym wedi delio â'r mater hwnnw'n awr? Yr oeddwn wedi bwriadu dod ato ar y diwedd. Diolch i chi, Ron.

Can we now move on to the other issue where the Minister for Environment's presence is very helpful to us, namely the issue relating to environmental issues? Does anyone want to open the discussion on this issue? I have not discussed with anyone where we might start on this. Does anyone want to raise any issues relating to disposal, I suppose, and the problems that surrounded that? Did you want to come in on that, Peter?

[439] **Peter Rogers:** Yes. I will start off. I think that that is a big issue. My contention is that never again will we be faced with the possibility of slaughtering these numbers of animals and getting rid of them, as we did in 1967—no country will ever accept that again. We will therefore be looking for other ways. One of the problems that we had this time—compared to 1967, when we were able to burn and bury on the farm and keep up-to-date—is that we faced a tremendous battle in finding alternatives, once the rendering or incinerator plants were taken out. Burning was then a great problem. I think that the big question is how we could tackle this again. There is no getting away from it. Consultation is needed. I do not believe that there was any problem with tips which were properly regulated, and carcasses certainly were not going to take up the amount of room in council tips that we perhaps envisaged in the first place. I take it that we will never do it again, but I am just wondering what the Minister would say in respect of making provision to dispose, or having a better understanding, where quick decisions must be made, of what we can do to dispose of these carcasses?

A gawn symud ymlaen yn awr at y mater arall lle y mae presenoldeb y Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd o gymorth mawr i ni, sef y mater sy'n ymwneud â materion amgylcheddol? A oes rhywun yn dymuno agor y drafodaeth ar y mater hwn? Nid wyf wedi trafod â neb arall ym mhle y gallem ddechrau ar hyn. A oes rhywun yn dymuno codi unrhyw faterion ynghylch gwaredu, mae'n debyg, a'r problemau a oedd yn ymwneud â hynny? A ydych yn dymuno dweud rhywbeth ar hynny, Peter?

[439] **Peter Rogers:** Ydwyf. Dechreuaf fi. Credaf fod hyn yn fater mawr. Fy nadl i yw na fyddwn byth eto'n wynebu'r posibilïad o ladd y fath nifer o anifeiliaid a chael gwared â hwy, fel y gwnaethom yn 1967—ni wnaiff yr un wlad dderbyn hynny eto. Felly byddwn yn chwilio am dduiliau eraill. Un o'r problemau a gawsom y tro hwn—o'i gymharu â 1967, pan allasom losgi a chladdu ar y fferm a chadw'n wastad—oedd ein bod yn wynebu brwydr aruthrol wrth ganfod dewisiadau eraill, ar ôl diddymu'r gweithfeydd rendro neu losgi. Yr oedd llosgi'n broblem fawr bryd hynny. Credaf mai'r cwestiwn mawr yw sut y gallem ddelio â hyn eto. Ni ellir osgoi hyn. Mae angen ymgynghori. Ni chredaf fod unrhyw broblem ynghylch tomenni a oedd wedi'u rheoleiddio'n briodol, ac yn sicr nid oedd y carcasau'n mynd i gymryd cymaint o le ar domenni'r cyngor ag y rhagwelem ar y dechrau efallai. Cymeraf na fyddwn byth yn ei wneud eto, ond yr wyf yn meddwl tybed beth a ddywedai'r Gweinidog ynghylch gwneud darpariaeth i waredu, neu gael gwell dealltwriaeth, lle y mae'n rhaid penderfynu'n gyflym, o'r hyn y gallem ei wneud i gael gwared â'r carcasau hyn?

[440] **Glyn Davies:** To make a general comment, clearly, in terms of lessons learned from last time, the Minister for Rural Affairs will be responding. However, I suppose what is also of interest to us is who would be responsible for the same area if we came upon this issue in the future. I guess that might be the Minister for Environment. So both of you can make a helpful contribution to these questions.

Sue Essex: Thank you, Chair, and Peter. There is a distinction between us, as to where we get involved and where it is my responsibility and where it is Carwyn's. However, if I could start with Peter's starting point, it was an absolutely horrendous problem. It was extremely distressing and a very difficult problem to deal with. Clearly, as you hinted, Peter, the understanding since 1967 of the impact certain methods and processes have on the environment meant that the kind of disposal methods that were used in 1967 were not the preferred options last year. So what we had in front of us was, if you like, that same kind of hierarchy of best practice that needed to be followed. The major difficulty was the lack of rendering capacity within Wales. I think that everybody is agreed—Mick mentioned this earlier—that that needs to be here. That is something that needs to be followed through. We had a particular circumstance, I think, in west Wales; it was a kind of a double whammy that we were not necessarily expecting to have.

[440] **Glyn Davies:** A gwneud sylw cyffredinol, mae'n amlwg, o ran y gwersi a ddysgwyd ers y tro diwethaf, mai'r Gweinidog dros Faterion Gwledig a fydd yn ateb. Fodd bynnag, tybiaf mai'r hyn sydd o ddiddordeb i ni hefyd yw pwy a fyddai'n gyfrifol am yr un maes pe byddem yn dod ar draws y mater hwn yn y dyfodol. Y Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd fyddai honno, gallwn feddwl. Felly caiff y ddau ohonoch wneud cyfraniad buddiol i'r cwestiynau hyn.

Sue Essex: Diolch i chi, Gadeirydd, a Peter. Mae gwahaniaeth rhyngom o ran y rhan a gymerwn ac ym mhle y mae'n gyfrifoldeb i mi ac yn gyfrifoldeb i Carwyn. Fodd bynnag, os caf ddechrau gyda phwynt cyntaf Peter, yr oedd yn broblem ddychrynlyd. Yr oedd yn peri gofid mawr iawn ac yn broblem anodd iawn ymdrin â hi. Wrth gwrs, fel y lled awgrymasoch, Peter, yr oedd y ddealltwriaeth ers 1967 o effaith rhai dulliau a phrosesau ar yr amgylchedd yn golygu nad y math o ddulliau gwaredu a ddefnyddiwyd yn 1967 oedd y dewisiadau a ffafriwyd y llynedd. Felly, yr hyn a oedd gennym o'n blaen, os hoffech, oedd yr un math o hierarchiaeth o arfer gorau yr oedd angen ei ddilyn. Y prif anhawster oedd diffyg capasiti rendro yng Nghymru. Credaf fod pawb yn gytûn—soniodd Mick am hyn yn gynharach—fod angen cael hwnnw yma. Mae hynny'n rhywbeth y mae'n rhaid ei ddilyn i'r pen. Yr oedd gennym amgylchiad penodol, yr wyf yn credu, yn y Gorllewin; yr oedd yn fath o ergyd ddwbl nad oeddem yn ei disgwyl o reidrwydd.

I was mainly involved in terms of, I suppose, disposal on the welfare cull side, when we were having large numbers of animals to be disposed of. So, in terms of my portfolio, I was responsible for the Environment Agency in terms of ensuring that the tips were acceptable for disposal. That was an area that, as I say, I was closely involved in. Indeed, there was a considerable amount of local concern and public concern, understandably enough, from people who lived around tips. However, it was at the time—and the Environment Agency still maintains this—the way forward that it had to take. As I said, I think that the main lesson learned is that we need to increase capacity, particularly rendering and possibly incineration—although I know that incineration has its own difficulties—but certainly rendering, to be able to deal with circumstances. Also, I would have to say, on the welfare cull, there was a situation whereby many animals were transported to England, and co-operation there was important in enabling us to deal with what were very difficult circumstances. I do not know whether Carwyn wants to add anything.

Carwyn Jones: I do not think I can add to what Sue has said. She has already made the point about rendering, particularly, and how an increase in rendering capacity would be useful. In Scotland, of course, there was sufficient rendering capacity, which was of great help to them. Clearly, it would be of assistance in future if we had greater rendering capacity in Wales, because of the time factor. During most of the foot and mouth disease outbreak we did not have a rendering plant; it was the subject of an injunction, which was not lifted until quite late on. The rendering plant then began taking carcasses from the livestock welfare disposal scheme.

Yr oeddwn yn ymwneud yn bennaf, mae'n debyg, â'r gwaredu ar yr ochr difa er lles anifeiliaid, pan oedd gennym niferoedd mawr o anifeiliaid i'w gwaredu. Felly, o ran fy mhortffolio, yr oeddwn yn atebol dros Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd o ran sicrhau bod y tomenni'n dderbyniol ar gyfer gwaredu. Yr oedd hwnnw'n faes, fel y dywedais, yr oedd gennyf gysylltiad agos ag ef. Yn wir, yr oedd cryn bryder lleol a phryder cyhoeddus, yn ddigon naturiol, ymhlith y rhai a oedd yn byw yng nghyffiniau'r tomenni. Fodd bynnag, ar y pryd—ac mae Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd yn dal at hyn o hyd—hon oedd y ffordd ymlaen yr oeddwn yn gorfod ei dilyn. Fel y dywedais, credaf mai'r brif wers a ddysgwyd yw bod angen inni gynyddu'r capasiti, yn enwedig o ran rendro ac o bosibl o ran llosgi—er fy mod yn gwybod bod anawsterau penodol ynglyn â llosgi—ond o ran rendro, yn sicr, er mwyn gallu delio â'r amgylchiadau. Hefyd, rhaid imi ddweud, ynghylch y difa er lles anifeiliaid, yr oedd sefyllfa lle y cludwyd llawer o anifeiliaid i Loegr, ac yr oedd cydweithredu yn y fan honno'n bwysig wrth ein galluogi i ddelio ag amgylchiadau a oedd yn anodd iawn. Tybed a yw Carwyn yn dymuno ychwanegu rhywbeth?

Carwyn Jones: Ni chredaf y gallaf ychwanegu dim at yr hyn a ddywedodd Sue. Gwnaeth y pwynt eisoes ynghylch rendro, yn benodol, a sut y byddai cynnydd yn y capasiti rendro o gymorth. Yn yr Alban, wrth gwrs, yr oedd digon o gapasiti rendro, a oedd o gymorth mawr iddynt. Wrth gwrs, byddai o gymorth yn y dyfodol pe byddai gennym fwy o gapasiti rendro yng Nghymru, oherwydd y ffactor amser. Yn ystod y rhan fwyaf o'r achosion o glwy'r traed a'r genau, nid oedd gennym waith rendro; yr oedd gwaharddeb arno, na chafodd ei chodi hyd yn eithaf hwyr. Wedyn dechreuodd y gwaith rendro dderbyn carcassau oddi wrth y cynllun gwaredu lles da byw.

[441] **Glyn Davies:** On that point, has devolution meant that it was not possible to share rendering plants? Scotland had its own rendering capacity; was that not available to other parts of the UK? Is the rendering capacity across Britain available to be shared?

Carwyn Jones: In terms of rendering plants in Scotland, Scotland would have fought for its own time, as it were, in those plants. What we had to do was to fight for time, or try to bid for time, effectively, in the rendering plants in England. Clearly, there were areas where the disease had taken greater hold, such as Cumbria and Devon, and which were seen, at times, as a greater priority. Towards the end of the outbreak, everything was rendered, in effect. The disease had begun to abate and there were not as many carcasses to be disposed of. Subsequently, of course, we were able to start rendering carcasses in Wales. Clearly, rendering was the preferred option and, where it was available, it was used.

[442] **Glyn Davies:** I am quite interested in that point, because we all know of cases where stock was lying about for up to a fortnight; in my own village, stock was lying on the ground for days and days. I am interested to know whether there was rendering capacity available or whether, in Scotland, stock was lying around for only a day or so and therefore, in a sense, there was very unequal treatment across Britain. Was that the case?

Carwyn Jones: I think it is worth adding that the rendering capacity in Scotland was also overwhelmed. There was a large mass burial site in Scotland that was also used.

[441] **Glyn Davies:** Ynghylch y pwynt hwnnw, a yw datganoli wedi golygu nad oes modd rhannu gweithfeydd rendro? Yr oedd gan yr Alban ei chapasiti rendro ei hun; onid oedd hynny ar gael i rannau eraill o'r DU? A yw'r capasiti rendro ledled Prydain ar gael i'w rannu?

Carwyn Jones: O ran y gweithfeydd rendro yn yr Alban, byddai'r Alban wedi ymladd am ei hamser ei hun, fel petai, yn y gweithfeydd hynny. Yr hyn yr oeddem ni'n gorfod ei wneud oedd ymladd am amser, neu wneud cais am amser, i bob pwrpas, yn y gweithfeydd rendro yn Lloegr. Wrth gwrs, yr oedd ardaloedd lle'r oedd gan y clwyf fwy o afael, fel Cymbria a Dyfnaint, ac a ystyrid, ar brydiau, yn flaenoriaeth uwch. Tua diwedd yr achosion o'r clwyf, yr oedd popeth yn cael ei rendro, i bob pwrpas. Yr oedd y clwyf wedi dechrau gwanhau ac nid oedd cynifer o garcasau i'w gwaredu. Wedyn, wrth gwrs, yr oeddem yn gallu dechrau rendro carcasau yng Nghymru. Rendro oedd y dewis a ffafriwyd, wrth gwrs, ac fe'i defnyddiwyd lle'r oedd ar gael.

[442] **Glyn Davies:** Mae'r pwynt hwnnw'n eithaf diddorol, oherwydd gwyr pob un ohonom am achosion lle'r oedd stoc yn gorwedd am oddeutu pythefnos; yn fy mhentref i, yr oedd stoc yn gorwedd ar lawr am ddyddiau. Mae o ddiddordeb imi wybod a oedd capasiti rendro ar gael neu a oedd stoc yn yr Alban yn gorwedd am ddiwrnod neu ddau'n unig ac felly, ar un ystyr, a oedd triniaeth anghyfartal iawn ledled Prydain. Ai felly'r oedd?

Carwyn Jones: Credaf ei bod yn werth ychwanegu bod y capasiti rendro yn yr Alban wedi'i orlwytho hefyd. Yr oedd safle claddu mawr yn yr Alban a ddefnyddiwyd hefyd.

[443] **Glyn Davies:** I see. Okay.

[444] **Mick Bates:** To pursue the point of disposal, I mentioned earlier that I am keen to know about the co-ordination between Ministers and the Environment Agency. Has the Environment Agency made any recommendations in view of the experience of disposal? I would also like to hear about what rendering capacity we may need in Wales as a result of this. I think that everyone was disgusted with the medieval way in which these pyres appeared and were burnt. It appears to me that that is one of the crucial points that we will have to answer in the event of another outbreak.

Further to that, you will recall that there was a particularly anxious moment in Welshpool when stock was removed from a burial site and it had to be burnt in a portable incinerator. That incinerator seemed to work very well, and I wonder whether any thought has been given to looking at the number of those incinerators we might need in order to dispose of stock as an alternative to burial.

Carwyn Jones: In terms of the case to which you refer in Powys, there were, I think, three occasions in Wales when animals were buried on-farm. That was done with the approval of the Environment Agency, which was obviously consulted. The carcasses had to be exhumed because of a problem with blood leakage from the premises, and they could not be moved for rendering. There was also difficulty with regard to building a pyre, because of the proximity of the premises to a railway line and houses. So we managed to get our hands on an incinerator from Gloucestershire—an air curtain incinerator. It was brought to the premises and the carcasses were burned. However, that is a very slow process, and there

[443] **Glyn Davies:** Gwelaf fi. O'r gorau.

[444] **Mick Bates:** Er mwyn dilyn y pwynt ar waredu, soniais yn gynharach fy mod yn awyddus i wybod am y cyd-drefnu rhwng y Gweinidogion ac Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd. A yw Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd wedi gwneud unrhyw argymhellion yng ngolwg y profiad o waredu? Hoffwn glywed hefyd am y capasiti rendro y gallai fod arnom ei angen yng Nghymru o ganlyniad i hyn. Credaf fod pawb wedi ffieiddio at olwg ganoloesol y coelcerthi hynny a'r dull o'u lloggi. Ymddengys i mi mai hwn yw un o'r pwyntiau hollbwysig y bydd yn rhaid inni ei ateb os bydd achos arall o'r clwyf.

Ymhellach i hynny, byddwch yn cofio bod adeg arbennig o bryderus yn y Trallwng pan symudwyd stoc o safle claddu ac y bu'n rhaid ei lloggi mewn llosgydd symudol. Yr oedd yn ymddangos bod y llosgydd yn gweithio'n dda iawn, ac yr oeddwn yn meddwl tybed a fu unrhyw ystyriaeth o'r nifer o'r llosgyddion hynny y gallai fod arnom eu hangen i gael gwared â stoc fel dewis yn lle claddu.

Carwyn Jones: O ran yr achos y cyfeiriwch ato ym Mhowys, bu tri achlysur yng Nghymru, yr wyf yn credu, pan losgwyd anifeiliaid ar y fferm. Gwnaethpwyd hynny gyda chymeradwyaeth Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd, yr ymgynghorwyd â hi wrth gwrs. Bu'n rhaid datgladdu'r carcasau oherwydd problem ynghylch gwaed a oedd yn gollwng o'r safle, ac ni ellid eu symud i'w rendro. Yr oedd anhawster hefyd o ran gwneud coelcerth, am fod y tir yn agos i linell rheilffordd a thai. Felly llwyddasom i gael gafael ar losgydd yn swydd Gaerloyw—llosgydd llen awyr. Daethpwyd ag ef i'r tir a llosgwyd y carcasau. Fodd bynnag, mae'n broses araf iawn, a nifer fach iawn o losgyddion o'r fath sydd ar gael. Felly, fel y

are a very small number of such incinerators available. So, as things stand, it is not a viable alternative to the methods that had to be used, because there are only a small number of them and the process is too slow to keep up with the disease.

[445] **Glyn Davies:** I think that the question was whether or not it would be a sensible strategy to have more such incinerators.

Mr Jones: May I answer that, Chair? There were only a handful of air curtain incinerators in the UK during the crisis, and they were mostly manufactured in the United States of America. They can only cope with 300 sheep, effectively—in terms of capacity—a day, which is nowhere near the amount that you can either put through a rendering capacity or, indeed, dispose of on an on-farm pyre. The contingency plan that we were working to, and the instructions that we were working to, meant that animals from infected premises could only either be taken away to rendering or incineration, or disposed of on-farm. That meant that, without the rendering capacity being available, the medieval pyres, as Mick refers to them, were effectively the only solution for disposing of those animals—certainly in the early days—because it was impossible to bury on-farm in Wales because of the geological constraints that we were facing. The Environment Agency, which I pay tribute to for the sort of advice and the speed of advice that we were given throughout the crisis, was working incredibly long hours and incredibly hard to give us and the Minister the sort of advice that we needed in the short order that we needed it to dispose of animals from infected premises and contiguous premises. However, its hands were tied to a great degree by either geological constraints or our inability to get access to the sort of

mae pethau, nid yw'n ddewis dichonol yn lle'r dulliau y bu'n rhaid eu defnyddio, am nad oes ond nifer fach ohonynt ac mae'r broses yn rhy araf i gadw'n wastad â'r clwyf.

[445] **Glyn Davies:** Credaf mai'r cwestiwn oedd ai strategaeth synhwyrol fyddai cael rhagor o losgyddion o'r fath.

Mr Jones: A gaf ateb hynny, Gadeirydd? Dim ond llond llaw o losgyddion llen awyr oedd yn y DU yn ystod yr argyfwng, a gwnaethpwyd y rhan fwyaf ohonynt yn Unol Daleithiau'r America. Ni allant ond ymdopi â 300 o ddefaid, i bob pwrpas—o ran capasiti—y diwrnod, sydd ymhell iawn o'r nifer y gallwch ei roi drwy gapasiti rendro neu, yn wir, ei waredu ar goelcerth ar y fferm. Yr oedd y cynllun wrth gefn yr oeddem yn ei ddilyn, a'r cyfarwyddiadau yr oeddem yn eu dilyn, yn golygu na ellid ond mynd ag anifeiliaid o safleoedd heintiedig i gael eu rendro neu eu llosgi, neu eu gwaredu ar y fferm. Yr oedd hynny'n golygu, am nad oedd y capasiti rendro ar gael, mai'r coelcerthi canoloesol, fel y cyfeiria Mick atynt, oedd yr unig ateb, i bob pwrpas, i gael gwared â'r anifeiliaid hynny—yn y dyddiau cynnar yn sicr—am ei bod yn amhosibl claddu ar ffermydd yng Nghymru oherwydd y cyfyngiadau daearegol yr oeddem yn eu hwynebu. Yr oedd Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd, y talaf deyrnged iddi am y math o gyngor a chyflymder y cyngor a roddwyd i ni drwy gydol yr argyfwng, yn gweithio oriau rhyfeddol o hir ac yn rhyfeddol o galed i roi i ni a'r Gweinidog y math o gyngor yr oedd arnom ei angen ar unwaith er mwyn cael gwared ag anifeiliaid o safleoedd heintiedig a safleoedd cyffiniol. Fodd bynnag, yr oedd ei dwylo wedi'u clymu i raddau helaeth un ai gan gyfyngiadau daearyddol neu

disposal facilities that were actually at the top of its hierarchy. Throughout the crisis, the Environment Agency wanted us to access rendering, incineration, or managed landfill. The difficulty that we had was either that we did not have access to those rendering or incineration facilities, or we had to adhere to the policy that Ministers had entered into not to take infected animals in Wales to managed landfill sites. Members of the Committee will all know about the difficulties that we had with local councils and local residents—understandable difficulties—in accessing landfill sites for large numbers of carcasses.

[446] **Glyn Davies:** May I make the point, Gareth, that what we have asked—given all this information, which I think we probably know already—is whether it would have been a good idea to have more of these mobile incinerators or not. It is difficult for us to make any recommendations unless you give us some indication of whether it would be a good idea.

Mr Jones: Well I think that I made the point that they will only take 300 sheep a day.

[447] **Glyn Davies:** So it is not a good idea then?

Mr Jones: It is a very, very small number, a very small throughput, and very expensive.

ein hanallu i gael mynediad i'r math o gyfleusterau gwaredu a oedd ar ben yr hierarchiaeth hon. Drwy gydol yr argyfwng, yr oedd Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd am inni gael mynediad i gyfleusterau rendro, llosgi neu dirlenwi dan reolaeth. Yr anhawster a oedd gennym oedd un ai nad oedd gennym fynediad i'r cyfleusterau rendro neu losgi, neu fod yn rhaid inni lynu wrth y polisi yr oedd y Gweinidogion wedi cytuno arno o beidio â mynd ag anifeiliaid a heintwyd yng Nghymru i safleoedd tirlenwi dan reolaeth. Bydd holl aelodau'r Pwyllgor yn gwybod am yr anawsterau a gawsom gyda'r cynghorau lleol a'r trigolion lleol—anawsterau dealladwy—wrth gael mynediad i safleoedd tirlenwi ar gyfer niferoedd mawr o garcasau.

[446] **Glyn Davies:** A gaf wneud y pwynt, Gareth, mai'r hyn a ofynasom—ar ôl derbyn yr holl wybodaeth hon, y credaf ein bod yn ei gwybod eisoes, yn ôl pob tebyg—yw a fuasai'n syniad da cael rhagor o'r llosgyddion symudol hyn neu beidio. Mae'n anodd inni wneud unrhyw argymhellion os na allwch roi rhyw arwydd i ni o ba un a fyddai'n syniad da.

Mr Jones: Wel, credaf fy mod wedi gwneud y pwynt na fyddant ond yn cymryd 300 o ddefaid y diwrnod.

[447] **Glyn Davies:** Felly nid yw'n syniad da?

Mr Jones: Mae'n nifer fach iawn, iawn, yn drwygyrch bach iawn, ac yn ddrud iawn.

[448] **Mick Bates:** But if you had more of them, you could obviously deal with greater numbers—that goes without saying. Could I come to the issue about the recommendations for rendering capacity in Wales? You have been in discussions with the Environment Agency as to what type of capacity we may need. There are other outbreaks of disease in which you need to dispose of dead stock.

Mr Jones: Effectively, whether to establish a rendering facility is a commercial decision for people to take. We have already heard that the single rendering plant in Wales is now open. The rural payments agency in England has entered into a call-off agreement with a major rendering company in the UK to enable it to take up to 4,000 tonnes, with the ability to add to that capacity should there be a major outbreak in the future. However, the new contingency plan that DEFRA has developed places great reliance on incineration, rendering and managed landfill.

[449] **Mick Bates:** I am asking a simple question. Have we got an estimate of the requirement in Wales for rendering? Is there an estimate within that?

Carwyn Jones: It depends on the size of the outbreak.

Mr Jones: I am not sure that that is possible, Chair, unless one knows what sort of outbreak one is facing.

[450] **Mick Bates:** So nobody is attempting to find out what rendering capacity we may need in Wales?

Mr Jones: In what circumstances?

[448] **Mick Bates:** Ond pe bai gennyh ragor ohonynt, yna'n amlwg gallech ddelio â niferoedd mwy—mae hynny'n amlwg. A gaf ddod at y mater ynghylch yr argymhellion ar gyfer capasiti rendro yng Nghymru? Buoch mewn trafodaethau ag Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd ynghylch pa fath o gapasiti y gallai fod arnom ei angen. Ceir achosion o glefydau eraill pan ydyh yn gorfod cael gwared â stoc farw.

Mr Jones: Penderfyniad masnachol, i bob pwrpas, i bobl ei wneud yw a ddylid sefydlu cyfleuster rendro. Clywsom eisoes fod yr un gwaith rendro yng Nghymru ar agor yn awr. Mae'r asiantaeth taliadau gwledig yn Lloegr wedi gwneud cytundeb datgyhoeddi gyda chwmni rendro mawr yn y DU i'w alluogi i gymryd hyd at 4,000 o dunelli, gyda'r gallu i ychwanegu at y capasiti hwnnw os bydd nifer fawr o achosion yn y dyfodol. Fodd bynnag, mae'r cynllun wrth gefn newydd a ddatblygwyd gan DEFRA yn dibynnu'n helaeth ar losgi, rendro a thirlenwi dan reolaeth.

[449] **Mick Bates:** Yr wyf yn gofyn cwestiwn syml. A oes gennym amcangyfrif o'r angen am rendro yng Nghymru? A oes amcangyfrif o fewn hynny?

Carwyn Jones: Mae'n dibynnu ar nifer yr achosion.

Mr Jones: Nid wyf yn sicr a yw hynny'n bosibl, Gadeirydd, oni bai fod rhywun yn gwybod faint o achosion y mae'n ei wynebu.

[450] **Mick Bates:** Felly nid oes neb yn ceisio darganfod pa gapasiti rendro y gallai fod arnom ei angen yng Nghymru?

Mr Jones: Ym mha amgylchiadau?

[451] **Mick Bates:** Well, under normal circumstances, there is a baseline disposal of dead stock anyway, let us say from BSE.

Mr Jones: Yes, which, indeed, is handled, as you know, via incineration in the plants that we have, or, indeed, via export, as it were, to England for rendering.

[452] **Mick Bates:** I want to raise one other issue, Chair.

[453] **Glyn Davies:** One more, then I want to move on.

[454] **Mick Bates:** On the issue of communication, there were sites like Eppynt—we had one in my constituency—where it came as a great shock to people to find out that the site had been chosen. Could you explain the process of choosing these sites and what communication took place with local people, representatives and environmental health officers, for example?

Mr Jones: I can give the Eppynt site as an example, if you like. The choice of that location began with a meeting of army training camp commandants in England. Each of them was instructed to go back and look at their sites to see whether or not they might be suitable for mass disposal of carcasses. That was not just a Wales issue; that was happening all over the UK. This was at a point in the process when we were facing a considerable backlog of animals for culling as a result of the introduction of the contiguous cull policy, and the prospect of considerably more cases; we were being led to believe by mathematical modellers that the incidence of the disease might increase very rapidly. I was in daily contact with the army at this point—indeed, army representatives were in the daily

[451] **Mick Bates:** Wel, o dan yr amgylchiadau arferol, mae gwaelodlin ar gyfer y nifer o stoc farw a waredir beth bynnag, o ganlyniad i BSE, dyweder.

Mr Jones: Oes, yn wir, ac ymdrinnir â hynny, fel y gwyddoch, drwy losgi yn y gweithfeydd sydd gennym neu, yn wir, drwy allforio, fel petai, i Loegr i'w rendro.

[452] **Mick Bates:** Dymunaf godi un mater arall, Gadeirydd.

[453] **Glyn Davies:** Un arall, ac wedyn yr wyf am symud ymlaen.

[454] **Mick Bates:** Ynghylch mater cyfathrebu, yr oedd safleoedd fel Epynt—yr oedd gennym un yn fy etholaeth i—lle y cafodd pobl fraw mawr wrth ddarganfod bod y safle wedi'i ddewis. A allech egluro'r broses o ddewis y safleoedd hyn a pha gyfathrebu a fu â'r bobl leol, cynrychiolwyr a swyddogion iechyd yr amgylchedd, er enghraifft?

Mr Jones: Gallaf roi safle Epynt yn enghraifft, os hoffech. Dechreuodd y broses o ddewis y lleoliad hwnnw mewn cyfarfod o benaethiaid gwersylloedd hyfforddi'r fyddin yn Lloegr. Cyfarwyddwyd pob un ohonynt i fynd yn ôl ac edrych ar eu safleoedd i weld a allent fod yn addas i waredu nifer fawr o garcasau. Nid mater i Gymru'n unig oedd hynny; yr oedd hynny'n digwydd ledled y DU. Yr oedd hynny ar adeg yn y broses pan oeddem yn wynebu ôl-groniad sylweddol o anifeiliaid i'w difa o ganlyniad i gyflwyno'r polisi difa ar ffermydd cyffiniol, a'r rhagolwg am fwy o lawer o achosion; yr oeddem yn cael ein harwain i gredu gan fodelwyr mathemategol y gallai amllder achosion o'r clwyf godi'n gyflym iawn. Yr oeddwn mewn cysylltiad bob dydd â'r fyddin ar yr adeg hon—yn wir, yr oedd

operations room. I was also in daily contact with the commandant of the training camp at Sennybridge. He identified, with the help of a number of agencies, a couple of prospective sites and the Environment Agency looked at those prospective sites in order to advise us—frankly, in the very short space of time that we had in which to take a decision—on which of those sites might be appropriate for either burn or burial. It did this, and its report is widely available and was published at the time. I emphasise that it was in a very short space of time, certainly considerably less time than it would normally have to advise on such matters. That advice was given to me, on the basis of which, after discussion with the Minister, a decision was taken to press on with commissioning those sites.

[455] **Mick Bates:** May I confirm, Chair, that there was no discussion with local people.

[456] **Glyn Davies:** Yes, you may, but keep it brief. It is an important issue.

Mr Jones: There was a great deal of discussion, both with local representatives and local people. There was no discussion with local people before the decision was taken, though the graziers who used that area were fully consulted about using that area for disposal. There was, however, discussion with the county council and there was subsequently a great deal of discussion with the locals, which was either done directly by the Minister or by officials.

cynrychiolwyr o'r fyddin yn yr ystafell weithrediadau dyddiol. Yr oeddwn mewn cysylltiad bob dydd hefyd â phennaeth y gwrsyll hyfforddi ym Mhontsenni. Gyda chymorth nifer o asiantaethau, dynododd ef rai darpar safleoedd ac edrychodd Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd ar y darpar safleoedd hynny er mwyn ein cynghori—yn y cyfnod byr iawn a oedd gennym, a dweud y gwir, i wneud penderfyniad—ynghylch pa un o'r safleoedd hynny a allai fod yn addas ar gyfer llosgi neu gladdu. Fe wnaeth hynny, ac mae ei hadroddiad ar gael yn eang ac fe'i cyhoeddwyd ar y pryd. Pwysleisiaf ei fod o fewn cyfnod byr iawn, llawer llai o amser, yn sicr, nag a fyddai ar gael iddi fel arfer i gynghori ar faterion o'r fath. Rhoddwyd y cyngor hwnnw i mi, ac ar sail hynny, ar ôl trafod gyda'r Gweinidog, penderfynwyd bwrw ymlaen i gomisiynu'r safleoedd hynny.

[455] **Mick Bates:** A gaf gadarnhau, Gadeirydd, na fu trafodaeth â phobl leol.

[456] **Glyn Davies:** Cewch, ond cadwch ef yn fyr. Mae'n fater pwysig.

Mr Jones: Bu llawer iawn o drafodaeth, gyda chynrychiolwyr lleol a phobl leol. Ni fu trafodaeth â phobl leol cyn gwneud y penderfyniad, er y bu ymgynghori llawn â'r porwyr a ddefnyddiai'r ardal honno ynghylch defnyddio'r ardal honno ar gyfer gwaredu. Fodd bynnag, bu trafodaeth gyda'r cyngor sir a bu llawer o drafod wedyn gyda'r bobl leol, a wnaed naill ai'n uniongyrchol gan y Gweinidog neu gan swyddogion.

[457] **Glyn Davies:** I have quite a few members who want to come in on various issues, but this is an important issue, and if anyone wants to ask a question about the Epynt issue specifically, you can do so now. Mick, do you want to come back on this before I move on?

[458] **Mick Bates:** No, that is fine.

[459] **Glyn Davies:** Okay, you are happy. Does anyone else want to come in on this issue?

[460] **Delyth Evans:** On burial?

[461] **Glyn Davies:** Yes, on burial and, to some extent, the choice of sites and how that might relate to Epynt.

[462] **Delyth Evans:** I would be interested to know whether the issue of identifying burial sites was included in the contingency plan that we discussed last week. Were any burial sites identified in that plan?

Mr Jones: No.

[463] **Delyth Evans:** That is pretty astonishing, really, is it not, when you consider that that was always going to have to be an option for disposal. In the discussions going on at the moment in terms of planning for any future outbreaks, do you think that burial will still have a part to play in disposal? Will it have a part to play?

[457] **Glyn Davies:** Mae gennyf gryn nifer o aelodau sy'n dymuno dweud rhywbeth ar wahanol faterion, ond mae hyn yn fater pwysig, ac os oes rhywun yn dymuno gofyn cwestiwn am fater Epynt yn benodol, cewch wneud hynny'n awr. Mick, a ydych am gyfrannu eto ar hyn cyn imi symud ymlaen?

[458] **Mick Bates:** Na, mae hynny'n iawn.

[459] **Glyn Davies:** O'r gorau, yr ydych yn fodlon. A oes rhywun arall sy'n dymuno dweud rhywbeth ar y mater hwn?

[460] **Delyth Evans:** Ar gladdu?

[461] **Glyn Davies:** Ie, ar gladdu ac, i ryw raddau, y dewis o safleoedd a sut y gallai hynny ymwneud ag Epynt.

[462] **Delyth Evans:** Byddai o ddiddordeb imi wybod a oedd y mater o ddynodi safleoedd claddu wedi'i gynnwys yn y cynllun wrth gefn a drafodasom yr wythnos diwethaf. A ddynodwyd unrhyw safleoedd claddu yn y cynllun hwnnw?

Mr Jones: Na.

[463] **Delyth Evans:** Mae hynny'n eithaf syfrdanol, a dweud y gwir, onid yw, pan ystyriwch y byddai bob amser yn rhaid i hynny fod yn ddewis o ran gwaredu. Yn y trafodaethau sy'n mynd ymlaen ar hyn o bryd o ran cynllunio ar gyfer unrhyw achosion yn y dyfodol, a gredwch y bydd lle o hyd i gladdu mewn gwaredu? A fydd ganddo ran i'w chwarae?

Carwyn Jones: As things stand at the moment, the situation is no different to last year. We would be unfortunate, indeed, to see an outbreak of the disease on the same level as we saw last year. Clearly, there are other options, higher up the hierarchy, if you like, that would need to be examined first. I do not think that anyone would wish to go back to a situation where mass burning or burial were the only options, even though that was the situation that we were in fact in last year. I think that there are a number of factors that will need to be looked at in terms of planning for the future, such as, for example, changes in trade rules and so forth, and, of course, seeing whether assistance or encouragement can be given to increasing the rendering capacity that we have available to us.

[464] **Glyn Davies:** That is fair, but what about choosing sites and so on? Does the Minister for Environment want to make a comment on future policy in terms of how we will choose sites in future?

Sue Essex: I could ask Havard to come in here, because the Environment Agency has completed its report. I think that it is quite important to perhaps hear from him on the main conclusions in that because, clearly, we are very dependent on the Environment Agency for technical advice. As I understand it, it is still talking about the same hierarchy that we had before. So, there is the issue of rendering capacity. We have a problem, in that it is a commercial exercise, but I do think that the issue of rendering capacity is critical. However, perhaps I would ask Havard to come in on the Environment Agency's report.

Carwyn Jones: Fel y mae pethau ar hyn o bryd, nid yw'r sefyllfa'n ddim gwahanol i'r llynedd. Byddem yn anffodus, yn wir, pe gwelem yr un nifer o achosion o'r clwyf â'r hyn a welsom y llynedd. Wrth gwrs, mae dewisiadau eraill, yn uwch yn yr hierarchiaeth, os hoffech, y byddai'n rhaid eu harchwilio'n gyntaf. Ni chredaf y byddai neb am fynd yn ôl at sefyllfa lle mai llosgi neu gladdu nifer fawr o garcasau oedd yr unig ddewisiadau, er mai honno oedd y sefyllfa yr oeddem ynddi, mewn gwirionedd, y llynedd. Credaf fod sawl ffactor y bydd yn rhaid ei ystyried o ran cynllunio at y dyfodol, fel newidiadau mewn rheolau masnach ac yn y blaen, er enghraifft, ac, wrth gwrs, gweld a ellir rhoi cymorth neu anogaeth i gynyddu'r capasiti rendro sydd ar gael i ni.

[464] **Glyn Davies:** Mae hynny'n deg, ond beth am ddewis safleoedd ac yn y blaen? A yw'r Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd yn dymuno gwneud sylw am y polisi yn y dyfodol o ran sut y byddwn yn dewis safleoedd yn y dyfodol?

Sue Essex: Gallwn ofyn i Havard ddweud rhywbeth ar hyn, gan fod Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd wedi cwblhau ei hadroddiad. Credaf ei bod yn eithaf pwysig clywed ganddo ef, efallai, am y prif gasgliadau sydd ynddo oherwydd, wrth gwrs, yr ydym yn dibynnu'n helaeth ar Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd am gyngor technegol. Fel yr wyf yn ei deall, mae'n dal i sôn am yr un hierarchiaeth a oedd gennym o'r blaen. Felly, mae mater y capasiti rendro. Mae gennym broblem, i'r graddau ei fod yn ymarfer masnachol, ond yr wyf yn credu bod mater y capasiti rendro'n hollbwysig. Fodd bynnag, efallai y gallwn ofyn i Havard sôn yn awr am adroddiad Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd.

[465] **Glyn Davies:** Could I just say that we do not need a long report.

Sue Essex: No, he was just going to cover the main conclusions. Mick actually raised that earlier; he asked what the conclusions from the Environment Agency were, looking to the future, as it were.

Mr Prosser: Briefly, Chairman, the agency published a report on the environmental impact of foot and mouth disease—an interim assessment—last month. I think that, from the point of view of this discussion, the main point is that it does see a need to re-evaluate the whole hierarchy, to look at the environmental risks and what it has learned from all the environmental monitoring that occurred, and to look at what is the best practical environmental option for disposal to make sure that human health and the environment is protected. So it sees that, and identifies that, as a research need on which to do further work.

[466] **Janet Ryder:** To follow up on that, it does sound as if, if this sort of thing were to happen again, you might have to consider burial. One of the criticisms of the Epynt situation was that there was not really time to research the ground itself to see whether it was suitable. So, is there any work being done now to identify sites, should they be needed in the future? I think that that report does highlight the problems associated with leakage into groundwater courses and the long-term effects of burial and pyre ash and the effect that it might have on watercourses. I would like to know what action, if any, is being taken to monitor that situation and what action might need to be taken in future.

[465] **Glyn Davies:** A gaf ddweud nad oes arnom angen adroddiad hir.

Sue Essex: Na, nid oedd ond am ymdrin â'r prif gasgliadau. Codwyd hynny gan Mick yn gynharach; gofynnodd beth oedd casgliadau Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd, gan edrych tua'r dyfodol, fel petai.

Mr Prosser: Yn fyr, Gadeirydd, cyhoeddodd yr asiantaeth adroddiad ar effaith amgylcheddol clwy'r traed a'r genau—asesiad dros dro—y mis diwethaf. Yr wyf yn credu, o safbwynt y drafodaeth hon, mai'r prif bwynt yw ei bod yn gweld bod angen ailwerthuso'r hierarchiaeth gyfan, i edrych ar y risgiau amgylcheddol a beth y mae wedi'i dysgu o'r holl fonitro amgylcheddol a ddigwyddodd, ac ystyried beth yw'r dewis amgylcheddol ymarferol gorau ar gyfer gwaredu er mwyn amddiffyn iechyd pobl ac amddiffyn yr amgylchedd. Felly mae'n gweld hynny, ac yn dynodi hynny, yn rhywbeth y mae angen gwneud gwaith ymchwil pellach arno.

[466] **Janet Ryder:** Gan ddilyn hynny, mae'n swnio fel pe bai'n bosibl y byddwch yn gorfod ystyried claddu, os bydd rhywbeth fel hyn yn digwydd eto. Un o'r beirniadaethau ar y sefyllfa yn Epynt oedd nad oedd digon o amser mewn gwirionedd i ymchwilio i'r tir ei hun i ganfod a oedd yn addas. Felly, a wneir unrhyw waith yn awr i ddynodi safleoedd, rhag ofn y bydd eu hangen yn y dyfodol? Credaf fod yr adroddiad yn tynnu sylw at y problemau sy'n gysylltiedig â gollwng i gyrsiau dwr daear ac effeithiau tymor hir claddu a lludw coelcerthi ac effaith bosibl hynny ar gyrsiau dwr. Hoffwn wybod pa gamau a gymerir, os o gwbl, i fonitro'r sefyllfa honno a pha gamau a allai fod yn angenrheidiol yn y dyfodol.

Mr Prosser: In terms of actions, what has happened in Wales since those disposals took place is that we have gone through a complete risk assessment of those sites in terms of their proximity to groundwater, surface water and, quite importantly, private water supplies in Wales. That was done in conjunction with the agency and local authorities, so, in fact, all the disposal sites have been assessed and, in the case of 20 sites, ash has been removed because of the possible higher risks to groundwater and private water supplies. In terms of the future, the Environment Agency, in conjunction with DEFRA, is currently looking at a programme of groundwater monitoring across the UK, which will be looking at boreholes being drilled and groundwater being monitored.

There are some sites that continue to be monitored, even though ash has been removed, to make sure that we pick up any problems with groundwater.

[467] **Janet Ryder:** May I just ask what would you do if you did pick up any problems?

Mr Prosser: We would have to look at going back to the source of the problem and removing it.

Mr Jones: Just so that we are clear, Chair, as far as Eppynt is concerned, and other sites where there have been burials of animals—and those are very few indeed; indeed, as you know, in Eppynt, those animals were taken out and eventually burned—there is no evidence at all of any microbiological contamination of private water supplies. All routine monitoring of private water supplies has shown no contamination. As far as water quality is concerned, there were short-term impacts, as we all know, on local watercourses, but no adverse effect whatsoever was found in the

Mr Prosser: O ran y camau, yr hyn a ddigwyddodd yng Nghymru ers y gwarediadau hynny yw ein bod wedi cynnal asesiad risg cyflawn o'r safleoedd hynny o ran eu hagosrwydd at ddwr daear, dwr wyneb ac, yn bwysig iawn, cyflenwadau dwr preifat yng Nghymru. Gwnaethpwyd hynny ar y cyd â'r asiantaeth a'r awdurdodau lleol, felly, mewn gwirionedd, mae'r holl safleoedd gwaredu wedi'u hasesu ac, yn achos 20 o'r safleoedd, symudwyd lludw oherwydd y risgiau uwch posibl i ddwr daear a chyflenwadau dwr preifat. O ran y dyfodol, ar hyn o bryd mae Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd, ar y cyd â DEFRA, yn ystyried rhaglen monitro dwr daear ledled y DU, a fydd yn ystyried drilio tyllau turio a monitro dwr daear.

Mae rhai safleoedd yn cael eu monitro o hyd, er bod lludw wedi'i symud, i sicrhau ein bod yn sylwi ar unrhyw broblemau sy'n ymwneud â dwr daear.

[467] **Janet Ryder:** A gaf ofyn beth a wnaech pe byddech yn sylwi ar unrhyw broblemau?

Mr Prosser: Byddai'n rhaid inni ystyried mynd yn ôl at wraidd y broblem a chael gwared arno.

Mr Jones: Dim ond i sicrhau ein bod yn deall hyn yn iawn, Gadeirydd, o ran Epynt, a'r safleoedd eraill lle y claddwyd anifeiliaid—ac mae'r rheini'n brin iawn; yn wir, fel y gwyddoch, yn Epynt, fe godwyd yr anifeiliaid hynny a'u llosgi yn y pen draw—nid oes tystiolaeth o gwbl o unrhyw ddifwyno microbiolegol ar gyflenwadau dwr preifat. Mae'r holl fonitro rheolaidd ar gyflenwadau dwr preifat wedi dangos na fu difwyno. O ran ansawdd y dwr, yr oedd effeithiau tymor byr, fel y gwyddom i gyd, ar gyrsiau dwr lleol, ond ni chanfuwyd unrhyw ddrwgeffraith o gwbl yn

general ecosystem.

[468] **Glyn Davies:** I want to move on to John, but can I just ask, simply because time is limited, for questions to be as succinct as possible? John, you wanted to ask a question?

[469] **John Griffiths:** No. Delyth, in fact, has raised the point about contingency plans that I wanted to raise.

[470] **Delyth Evans:** May I just make the point, Chair, that this is another example of the inadequacy of the contingency plan.

[471] **Glyn Davies:** I think that that is right.

[472] **Delyth Evans:** It is absurd that people such as Gareth and Ministry of Defence officials are having to scramble around, under that kind of pressure and under the conditions in which they were working, with a map, looking for suitable sites. That point needs to be made, I think.

[473] **Glyn Davies:** I would be surprised if that point is not made in a report. When we discussed the contingency plan, it seemed quite clear to me that there was not a contingency plan to deal with the scale of the outbreak that we saw. That is not a criticism. It is just something that should be in place for the future because, clearly, the scale of the outbreak that we have seen this time could suggest that outbreaks do not happen very often, but they could be much more severe when they do happen in the future. We could have to look at them in that way. Do you want to make another point, Delyth?

[474] **Delyth Evans:** No.

yr ecosystem gyffredinol.

[468] **Glyn Davies:** Yr wyf am symud ymlaen at John, ond a gaf ofyn, dim ond am fod yr amser yn gyfyngedig, am gael cwestiynau mor gryno â phosibl? John, yr oeddech am ofyn cwestiwn?

[469] **John Griffiths:** Nac oeddwn. A dweud y gwir, mae Delyth wedi codi'r pwynt am gynlluniau wrth gefn yr oeddwn i am ei godi.

[470] **Delyth Evans:** A gaf wneud y pwynt, Gadeirydd, fod hyn yn enghraifft arall o annigonolrwydd y cynllun wrth gefn.

[471] **Glyn Davies:** Credaf fod hynny'n iawn.

[472] **Delyth Evans:** Mae'n afresymol fod rhai fel Gareth a swyddogion y Weinyddiaeth Amddiffyn yn gorfod sgrialu o gwmpas, o dan bwysau o'r fath ac o dan yr amodau yr oeddent yn gweithio ynddynt, gyda map, yn chwilio am safleoedd addas. Mae angen gwneud y pwynt hwnnw, yr wyf yn credu.

[473] **Glyn Davies:** Byddwn yn synnu os na wneir y pwynt hwnnw mewn adroddiad. Pan wnaethom drafod y cynllun wrth gefn, yr oedd yn ymddangos yn eithaf clir i mi nad oedd cynllun wrth gefn i ddelio â'r nifer o achosion a welsom. Nid yw hynny'n feirniadaeth. Nid yw ond yn rhywbeth a ddylai fod ar gael yn y dyfodol oherwydd, wrth gwrs, gallai'r nifer o achosion a gawsom y tro hwn fod yn awgrym nad yw achosion yn digwydd yn aml iawn, ond fe allent fod yn fwy difrifol o lawer pan fyddant yn digwydd yn y dyfodol. Mae'n bosibl y byddem yn gorfod edrych arnynt felly. A ydych am wneud pwynt arall, Delyth?

[474] **Delyth Evans:** Nac ydwyf.

[475] **Glyn Davies:** Is that the point that you wanted to make?

[476] **Delyth Evans:** Yes.

[477] **Glyn Davies:** Ron, you wanted to come in?

[478] **Ron Davies:** My point is not on disposal.

[479] **Glyn Davies:** Well, I think that we have to move away from that. I want to talk about the economic issues.

[480] **Ron Davies:** Fine. I will be very brief. It is the only opportunity on the agenda that I have to raise this particular matter, which relates to animal welfare issues. Clearly, the whole time was very difficult and distressing. I certainly know of the difficult circumstances in which the veterinarians and others were working. However, I think that there are serious issues about animal welfare which have arisen and I would be grateful if either Carwyn or Gareth could comment on them, particularly with a view as to whether there were any discussions going on at the time and whether there was any mechanism for looking at these animal welfare issues. What was the relationship like with the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, for example? If it was the case that there were no discussions going on at the time because of time pressure, which I fully understand, has there been any retrospective analysis of what was happening? The sort of issues that I am referring to, Glyn, are the problems that arose right at the outset, with sheep and lambs starving to death in muddy fields—not to put too fine a point on it. Then we had other issues, such as the case in Monmouthshire where some unlicensed operator was going around taking pot shots at sheep and then treating

[475] **Glyn Davies:** Ai hwnnw yw'r pwynt yr oeddech yn dymuno'i wneud?

[476] **Delyth Evans:** Ie.

[477] **Glyn Davies:** Ron, yr oeddech yn dymuno dweud rhywbeth?

[478] **Ron Davies:** Nid yw fy mhwynt yn ymwneud â gwaredu.

[479] **Glyn Davies:** Wel, credaf fod yn rhaid inni symud oddi wrth hynny. Yr wyf am siarad am y materion economaidd.

[480] **Ron Davies:** O'r gorau. Byddaf yn gryno iawn. Hwn yw'r unig gyfle sydd gennyf ar yr agenda i godi'r mater penodol hwn, sy'n ymwneud â materion lles anifeiliaid. Wrth gwrs, yr oedd y cyfnod yn un anodd a gofidus iawn ar ei hyd. Yr wyf yn gwybod yn sicr am yr amgylchiadau anodd yr oedd y milfeddygon ac eraill yn gweithio oddi tanynt. Fodd bynnag, credaf fod materion difrifol wedi codi ynghylch lles anifeiliaid a byddwn yn ddiolchgar pe byddai Carwyn neu Gareth yn gallu gwneud sylw arnynt, yn enwedig ynghylch a oedd unrhyw drafodaethau'n mynd ymlaen ar y pryd ac a oedd unrhyw fecanwaith i ystyried y materion lles anifeiliaid hynny. Sut berthynas oedd â'r Gymdeithas Frenhinol er Atal Creulondeb i Anifeiliaid, er enghraifft? Os nad oedd trafodaethau'n mynd ymlaen ar y pryd oherwydd pwysau amser, sy'n gwbl ddealladwy i mi, a fu unrhyw ddadansoddi adolygol ar yr hyn a oedd yn digwydd? Y math o faterion yr wyf yn cyfeirio atynt, Glyn, yw'r problemau a gododd ar y dechrau un, pan oedd defaid ac wyn yn marw o newyn mewn caeau lleidiog—heb fynd i ormod o fanylion. Wedyn cawsom faterion eraill, fel yr achos yn Sir Fynwy lle'r oedd rhyw weithredwr heb drwydded yn mynd o gwmpas yn saethu ar antur at ddefaid a'u trin wedyn yn eithaf

them in a pretty abominable way after they had been shot and wounded. We had reports of the army engaged in a pretty unpleasant set of circumstances in mid Wales when it was trying to cull, as I recall, a large number of uncastrated bulls, which turned into a pretty disastrous state of affairs. The veterinary profession, I understand, was also making strong representations about the method which it was required to use for the destruction of young stock, namely a lethal injection to the heart, which, I am told, as well as being lethal, is painful. The process itself is painful. There were professional concerns expressed by the profession at the time about the method that it was required to use. Those are just four examples of animal welfare concerns. The question is, really, was there any process at the time that was looking at these animal welfare issues? Were there any discussions with bodies such as the RSPCA? If there were not—which I fully understand, because, under the circumstances, it might have been difficult—what steps have now been taken towards undertaking a retrospective review of these welfare issues?

[481] **Glyn Davies:** May I just say one thing, Ron? That is a crucial point and we will get to that. However, what I would quite like to do—mainly because the Minister for Environment is here—is, if there are any questions that specifically relate to the Minister for Environment, to take those before we move on to deal with the question that you have just asked. As soon as we deal with those questions, I will come back to this point that you have made, which is very important. Are there any issues that we specifically need to raise with the Minister for Environment, as I know that she has other things that she wants to go and do?

ffiaidd ar ôl eu saethu a'u hanafu. Cawsom adroddiadau am gysylltiad y fyddin ag amgylchiadau eithaf annymunol yn y Canolbarth pan oedd yn ceisio difa nifer fawr o deirw anghyweiriedig, os cofiaf yn iawn, a drodd yn sefyllfa eithaf trychinebus. Yr wyf yn deall bod y proffesiwn milfeddygol hefyd yn cyflwyno sylwadau cryf am y dull yr oedd yn ofynnol iddo'i ddefnyddio i ddifa da byw ifanc, sef chwistrelliad angheuol i'r galon sydd, fe'm hysbyswyd, yn ogystal â bod yn farwol, yn boenus. Mae'r broses ei hun yn boenus. Mynegwyd pryderon proffesiynol gan y proffesiwn ar y pryd ynghylch y dull yr oedd yn ofynnol iddo'i ddefnyddio. Dim ond pedair enghraifft yw'r rhain o bryderon am les anifeiliaid. Y cwestiwn, mewn gwirionedd, yw a oedd unrhyw broses ar y pryd a oedd yn ystyried y materion lles anifeiliaid hyn? A oedd unrhyw drafodaethau â chyrrff fel yr RSPCA? Os nad oedd—sy'n gwbl ddealladwy i mi oherwydd, o dan yr amgylchiadau, gallasai fod yn anodd—pa gamau a gymerwyd bellach tuag at gynnal arolwg adolygol o'r materion lles hyn?

[481] **Glyn Davies:** A gaf ddweud un peth, Ron? Mae hynny'n bwynt hollbwysig a deuwn at hynny. Fodd bynnag, yr hyn y carwn yn fawr ei wneud—yn bennaf am fod y Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd yma—yw cymryd unrhyw gwestiynau sy'n ymwneud yn benodol â'r Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd, os oes rhai, cyn inni symud ymlaen i ymdrin â'r cwestiwn yr ydych newydd ei ofyn. Cyn gynted ag y byddwn wedi delio â'r cwestiynau hynny, byddaf yn dod yn ôl at y pwynt hwn a wnaethoch, sy'n bwysig iawn. A oes unrhyw faterion y mae angen inni eu codi gyda'r Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd yn benodol, oherwydd gwn fod ganddi bethau eraill y mae'n dymuno'u gwneud?

[482] **Jocelyn Davies:** I wonder whether Sue saw the HTV programme *Wales This Week*, which showed that pyres were kept going with coal and wood after the contractors had run out of carcasses to give the impression that they were still burning carcasses, because payment was related to the length of time that the pyres were burning, rather than the number of carcasses that were being disposed of. I do have a video of that programme if anybody around this table has not seen it and would like to see it. I understand that DEFRA was to investigate the matter. There must have been an environmental impact from that.

Sue Essex: I would be grateful if I could borrow the video. I do not know anything about it. Clearly, I was not involved in the payment side, but I do not know whether the Environment Agency came across anything in its report.

[483] **Glyn Davies:** It is unacceptable practice, anyway, is it not?

Sue Essex: Yes, of course. This is the first—

[484] **Jocelyn Davies:** Yes, but it did have an environmental impact—

[485] **Glyn Davies:** Yes, it did.

Sue Essex: This is the first that I have heard of it, so I just wondered whether the Environment Agency had picked it up at all in its report.

Mr Prosser: No, there is no mention of it, as far as I can recall.

[486] **Jocelyn Davies:** I know that Carwyn saw the programme.

Carwyn Jones: No, I did not.

[482] **Jocelyn Davies:** Tybed a welodd Sue raglen HTV, *Wales This Week*, a ddangosodd fod y coelcerthi'n cael eu porthi â glo a choed ar ôl i'r contractwyr losgi'r holl garcasau a oedd ganddynt er mwyn rhoi'r argraff eu bod yn dal i losgi carcassau, am fod y tâl yn gysylltiedig â hyd yr amser yr oedd y coelcerthi'n llosgi, yn hytrach na nifer y carcassau a waredwyd. Mae gennyf fideo o'r rhaglen os oes rhywun o gwmpas y bwrdd hwn sydd heb ei gweld ac a hoffai ei gweld. Deallaf fod DEFRA i fod i ymchwilio i'r mater. Rhaid bod hynny wedi cael effaith amgylcheddol.

Sue Essex: Byddwn yn ddiolchgar pe cawn fenthyg y fideo. Nid wyf yn gwybod dim am hynny. Wrth gwrs, nid oeddwn yn ymwneud â'r ochr taliadau, ond ni wn a ddaeth Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd ar draws unrhyw beth yn ei hadroddiad.

[483] **Glyn Davies:** Mae'n arfer annerbyniol, beth bynnag, onid yw?

Sue Essex: Ydyw, wrth gwrs. Dyma'r cyntaf—

[484] **Jocelyn Davies:** Ydyw, ond cafodd effaith amgylcheddol—

[485] **Glyn Davies:** Do, fe gafodd.

Sue Essex: Dyma'r cyntaf i mi glywed amdano, felly yr oeddwn yn meddwl tybed a oedd Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd wedi sôn amdano o gwbl yn ei hadroddiad.

Mr Prosser: Na, nid oes sôn amdano, hyd y gallaf fi gofio.

[486] **Jocelyn Davies:** Gwn fod Carwyn wedi gweld y rhaglen.

Carwyn Jones: Naddo, ni wneuthum.

[487] **Jocelyn Davies:** Yes, you did, because you referred to it one day in Committee. There were a number of issues apart from the fact that—

Carwyn Jones: I am aware of the issues—I cannot remember whether I saw the programme or not, but I know of the issues that were raised in it.

[488] **Glyn Davies:** The only point I want to make in terms of this Committee is that we are talking about a subject where there may have been, or are alleged to have been, some wholly unacceptable practices which nobody would be in favour of.

[489] **Jocelyn Davies:** I know that these are often matters for DEFRA, but people who work for the Assembly were the agents on the ground, and although I am not suggesting that they colluded with anybody, they may well have been aware of the allegations that were made.

Carwyn Jones: Before Gareth answers that question and the RSPCA question that Ron has raised, I want to clarify that what we saw at Gilwern was not a foot and mouth disease cull, but a cull of strays organised by the county council.

[490] **Glyn Davies:** I want to come back to this, though. Ron has asked a question—

[487] **Jocelyn Davies:** Do, fe wnaethoch, oherwydd cyfeiriasoch ati un diwrnod yn y Pwyllgor. Yr oedd sawl mater ar wahân i'r ffaith bod—

Carwyn Jones: Yr wyf yn ymwybodol o'r materion—ni allaf gofio a welais y rhaglen ai peidio, ond gwn am y materion a godwyd ynddi.

[488] **Glyn Davies:** Yr unig bwynt y dymunaf ei wneud o ran y Pwyllgor hwn yw ein bod yn sôn am bwnc lle y bu o bosibl, neu lle yr honnir y bu, rhai arferion cwbl annerbyniol na fyddai neb yma o'u plaid.

[489] **Jocelyn Davies:** Gwn mai materion i DEFRA yw'r rhain yn aml, ond rhai sy'n gweithio i'r Cynulliad oedd yr asiantiaid yn y maes, ac er nad wyf yn awgrymu eu bod wedi cynllwynio â neb, mae'n ddigon posibl iddynt fod yn ymwybodol o'r cyhuddiadau a wnaethpwyd.

Carwyn Jones: Cyn i Gareth ateb y cwestiwn hwnnw a'r cwestiwn am yr RSPCA a gododd Ron, dymunaf roi ar ddeall nad oedd yr hyn a welsom yng Ngilwern yn ddifa mewn cysylltiad â chlwy'r traed a'r genau, ond mai difa anifeiliaid crwydr a drefnwyd gan y cyngor sir ydoedd.

[490] **Glyn Davies:** Dymunaf ddod yn ôl at hyn, er hynny. Gofynnodd Ron gwestiwn—

Carwyn Jones: It was not something that was a result of the foot and mouth disease cull, nor was it something that was carried out by DEFRA or, indeed, by the Assembly acting as agents of DEFRA—it was a county council cull. May I ask Gareth to answer some of the points that have been raised by Ron and Jocelyn?

[491] **Glyn Davies:** Could you leave those points? I specifically want to leave the point that Ron raised until after we have addressed those matters that Sue Essex can deal with, because I know that she wants to leave after dealing with those issues. I do not want to lose Ron's point, as it is important; I want to come back to it, but I specifically said that I would like to leave it to one side temporarily.

Mr Jones: Perhaps I could just answer the point made by Jocelyn. There was no question of contractors being paid by the length of the pyre—indeed, there were very strict controls on contractors working on-farm. Committee members will remember me saying in the past that we put army incident commanders at every incident and every cull, who were specifically responsible for supervising what was going on on the ground. We also had animal health officers and veterinary staff there—animal health officers were there for longer because they were dealing with things like preliminary cleansing and disinfection on the farm. There were no instances reported to me of contractors trying to stay on-farm longer than they should have done to try to inflate the rate at which they were being paid—indeed, all contractors subsequently had to submit invoices to us, which were looked at very carefully by DEFRA staff to ensure that what the Government was paying for was work that was actually done.

Carwyn Jones: Nid oedd yn rhywbeth a oedd yn ganlyniad i ddifa mewn cysylltiad â chlwy'r traed a'r genau, nac yn rhywbeth a wnaethpwyd gan DEFRA nac, yn wir, gan y Cynulliad gan weithio fel asiant i DEFRA—difa gan gyngor sir ydoedd. A gaf ofyn i Gareth ateb rhai o'r pwyntiau a godwyd gan Ron a Jocelyn?

[491] **Glyn Davies:** A allech adael y pwyntiau hynny? Yn benodol, yr wyf am adael y pwynt a gododd Ron hyd nes byddwn wedi ymdrin â'r materion hynny y gall Sue Essex ddelio â hwy, oherwydd gwn ei bod yn dymuno ymadael ar ôl delio â'r materion hynny. Nid wyf yn dymuno colli pwynt Ron, gan ei fod yn bwysig; yr wyf am ddod yn ôl ato, ond fe ddywedais yn benodol yr hoffwn ei adael o'r neilltu dros dro.

Mr Jones: Efallai y gallwn i ateb y pwynt a wnaeth Jocelyn yn unig. Nid oedd posibilidod o gontractwyr yn cael eu talu yn ôl hyd y goelcerth—yn wir, yr oedd rheolaethau caeth iawn ar y contractwyr a oedd yn gweithio ar ffermydd. Bydd aelodau'r Pwyllgor yn cofio fy mod wedi dweud yn y gorffennol ein bod wedi gosod cadlywyddion digwyddiadau o'r fyddin ym mhob digwyddiad a phob difa, a oedd yn gyfrifol yn benodol am oruchwylio'r hyn a oedd yn mynd ymlaen yn y maes. Yr oedd gennym swyddogion ieched anifeiliaid a staff milfeddygol yno hefyd—yr oedd swyddogion ieched anifeiliaid yno'n hwy am eu bod yn delio â phethau fel glanhau a diheintio rhagarweiniol ar y fferm. Nid adroddwyd unrhyw achosion i mi o gontractwyr a oedd wedi ceisio aros ar fferm yn hwy nag y dylent i geisio chwyddo maint eu tâl—yn wir, yr oedd yn rhaid i'r holl gontractwyr gyflwyno anfonebion i ni wedyn, ac edrychodd staff DEFRA yn ofalus iawn ar y rhain i sicrhau mai'r hyn yr oedd y Llywodraeth yn talu

[492] **Mick Bates:** Have they all been paid? Have these contractors all been paid?

Mr Jones: Well, that is a matter for DEFRA, Mick, but, as you know, there are some invoices still being looked at very carefully by DEFRA.

[493] **Glyn Davies:** I am keen to deal with the questions that relate to the Minister for Environment, who is here and is prepared to answer questions. Are there any specific questions? If not, we can release Sue Essex.

[494] **Peter Rogers:** I have just one quick question. The more I listen to details of the provision for disposing of carcasses in any future outbreak, the more I understand the absolutely dire circumstances you are in, in trying to find somebody to dispose of carcasses. Could I ask you to undertake to make sure that we will never again see, in Wales particularly, the disposing of carcasses in this way? We must put all our emphasis on and resources into stopping this disease coming in from other countries. That would be—because you do not have the resources to counteract it—inspections on ports and docks and so on, as is done in New Zealand, America and Australia to safeguard their farmers. That is the answer, because there is no answer in what you are being asked to do. Disposing of carcasses in the way we have seen during this epidemic is not the answer. We must never again be faced with this crisis.

amdano oedd gwaith a wnaethpwyd mewn gwirionedd.

[492] **Mick Bates:** A dalwyd pob un ohonynt? A dalwyd yr holl gontractwyr hyn?

Mr Jones: Wel, mae hynny'n fater i DEFRA, Mick, ond, fel y gwyddoch, mae rhai anfonebion yn dal i gael eu hystyried yn ofalus iawn gan DEFRA.

[493] **Glyn Davies:** Yr wyf yn awyddus i ddelio â'r cwestiynau sy'n ymwneud â'r Gweinidog dros yr Amgylchedd, sydd yma ac sy'n barod i ateb cwestiynau. A oes unrhyw gwestiynau penodol? Os nad oes, gallwn ryddhau Sue Essex.

[494] **Peter Rogers:** Mae gennyf un cwestiwn cyflym. Po fwyaf y gwrandawaf ar fanylion y ddarpariaeth ar gyfer gwaredu carcasau mewn unrhyw achosion yn y dyfodol, po fwyaf y deallaf yr amgylchiadau cwbl enbyd yr ydych ynddynt, wrth geisio dod o hyd i rywun i gael gwared â charcasau. A allwn ofyn ichi addo sicrhau na welwn byth eto, yng Nghymru'n arbennig, waredu carcasau fel hyn? Rhaid inni roi pob pwyslais ar atal y clwyf hwn rhag dod i mewn o wledydd eraill, a rhaid inni roi'n holl adnoddau at hynny. Byddai hynny—am nad oes gennych adnoddau digonol i'w ymladd—yn golygu archwiliadau mewn porthladdoedd a dociau ac yn y blaen, fel y gwneir yn Seland Newydd, America ac Awstralia i ddiogelu eu ffermwyr. Dyna'r ateb, oherwydd nid oes ateb yn yr hyn y gofynnir i chi ei wneud. Nid gwaredu carcasau yn y modd a welsom yn ystod yr epidemig hwn yw'r ateb. Ni ddylem wynebu'r argyfwng hwn byth eto.

Sue Essex: I think that Peter makes a very valid point. I do not know about stopping the disease coming in, but, clearly, in any rational society, that would make sense, bearing in mind the kind of situation that we were in. When you are in that situation, though, as Havard has said, you have to make difficult decisions on the basis of the best environmental options available. The one thing I would say—I think that this is quite important, and may not be clear—is that the Cabinet, particularly as the welfare cull went on, worked very closely together, because this issue affected Jane Hutt, and it also affected Edwina Hart in terms of local government. So, in terms of how we dealt with that, particularly in terms of the prescribed waste regulations, we did work as a team in dealing with what was, as Peter said, a difficult situation in terms of disposal. However, we were very dependent on the Environment Agency, and I echo what Gareth said—as an organisation it was put under great pressure in terms of giving advice quickly and doing assessments where they needed to be done. As you say, we need to work to ensure that we are not put in that position again. However, should we be put in that situation again, we must ensure that, next time, we have the best environmental and other practical advice available to us. That is the benefit of learning from these dreadful experiences, is it not?

[495] **Jocelyn Davies:** You mentioned the prescribed waste regulations; those were the ones that you revoked, and you have now issued them again under the urgency procedure.

Sue Essex: No.

Sue Essex: Credaf fod Peter yn gwneud pwynt dilys iawn. Nid wyf yn sicr ynghylch atal y clwyf rhag dod i mewn ond, wrth gwrs, mewn unrhyw gymdeithas resymol, byddai hynny'n gwneud synnwyr, gan gofio'r math o sefyllfa yr oeddem ynddi. Er hynny, pan ydych yn y sefyllfa honno, fel y dywedodd Havard, rhaid ichi wneud penderfyniadau anodd ar sail y dewisiadau amgylcheddol gorau sydd ar gael. Yr un peth a ddywedwn i—credaf fod hyn yn eithaf pwysig, ac efallai nad yw'n glir—yw bod y Cabinet, yn enwedig wrth i'r difa er lles anifeiliaid fynd yn ei flaen, wedi cydweithio'n agos iawn, am fod y mater hwn wedi effeithio ar Jane Hutt, a hefyd ar Edwina Hart mewn cysylltiad â llywodraeth leol. Felly, o ran y modd y gwnaethom ddelio â hynny, yn enwedig o ran y rheoliadau gwastraff rhagnodedig, gwnaethom weithio fel tîm wrth ddelio â'r hyn a oedd, fel y dywedodd Peter, yn sefyllfa anodd o ran gwaredu. Fodd bynnag, yr oeddem yn ddibynnol iawn ar Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd, ac ategaf yr hyn a ddywedodd Gareth—fel corff yr oedd dan bwysau mawr o ran rhoi cyngor yn gyflym a gwneud asesiadau lle'r oedd angen eu gwneud. Fel yr ydych yn dweud, rhaid inni weithio i sicrhau na chawn ein rhoi yn y sefyllfa honno eto. Fodd bynnag, os rhoddir ni yn y sefyllfa honno eto, rhaid inni sicrhau, y tro nesaf, fod y gorau o gyngor amgylcheddol a chyngor ymarferol arall ar gael i ni. Dyna'r fantais o ddysgu oddi wrth y profiadau ofnadwy hyn, onid ef?

[495] **Jocelyn Davies:** Soniasoch am y rheoliadau gwastraff rhagnodedig; rheini oedd y rhai a ddiddymwyd gennych, ac yr ydych wedi'u cyhoeddi eto'n awr o dan y weithdrefn frys.

Sue Essex: Nace.

[496] **Jocelyn Davies:** I have a letter upstairs from the Minister for Assembly Business saying that you have issued those again under the urgency procedure. I can take it up with Sue out of Committee, then, as she does not know about that.

[497] **Glyn Davies:** Are there any other questions that we need Sue to answer? No? Okay. Thank you, Minister, for coming along and helping us this afternoon. Can we go back to Ron Davies's question? Minister, were you asking Gareth to respond to that? Thank you, Gareth.

Mr Jones: I will probably ask Tony to come in on this, because his people were actually on the ground dealing with these issues. However, I would just say that, as far as the RSPCA is concerned, I spoke myself to Kevin Manning on 23 April, when he telephoned me to ask whether the RSPCA could be allowed to go on to farms to witness some of the culls and make sure that animal welfare issues were being handled to its satisfaction. I said that, of course, that could be arranged, and I did arrange it. It subsequently visited a number of culls in the Brecon area.

[498] **Glyn Davies:** I am quite interested in this, because anybody, such as Peter Rogers, Mick Bates or myself, who were quite closely involved as farmers in this, saw the most appalling cruelty. I have to say that the level of cruelty to farm animals was just appalling. Under normal circumstances, it would never have been tolerated; people would have been up in court. That is the area we are concerned about. What sort of steps are we particularly looking at to try to avoid these sorts of examples of really gross cruelty? I mean, animals were just stuck in fields and they were just dying there at the rate of 10 or 20 a day.

[496] **Jocelyn Davies:** Mae gennyf lythyr i fyny'r grisiau oddi wrth Drefnydd y Cynulliad sy'n dweud eich bod wedi cyhoeddi'r rheini eto o dan y weithdrefn frys. Gallaf godi hynny gyda Sue y tu allan i'r Pwyllgor, felly, gan nad yw'n gwybod am hynny.

[497] **Glyn Davies:** A oes unrhyw gwestiynau eraill y mae arnom angen Sue i'w hateb? Nac oes? Iawn. Diolch i chi, Weinidog, am ddod yma a'n helpu'r prynhawn yma. A gawn fynd yn ôl at gwestiwn Ron Davies? Weinidog, a oeddech yn gofyn i Gareth ymateb i hynny? Diolch i chi, Gareth.

Mr Jones: Byddaf yn gofyn i Tony ddweud rhywbeth ar hyn, yn ôl pob tebyg, oherwydd yr oedd ei bobl ef yn y maes yn delio â'r materion hyn. Fodd bynnag, yr hyn a ddywedwn, o ran yr RSPCA, yw fy mod wedi siarad fy hun â Kevin Manning ar 23 Ebrill, pan ffoniodd fi i ofyn a ellid caniatáu i'r RSPCA fynd i ffermydd i dystio i rai o'r achosion o ddifa a sicrhau bod y materion lles anifeiliaid yn cael eu trafod er ei boddhad. Dywedais y gellid trefnu hynny, wrth gwrs, ac fe'i trefnais. Ar ôl hynny daeth i nifer o'r achosion difa yn ardal Aberhonddu.

[498] **Glyn Davies:** Mae hyn o gryn ddiddordeb i mi, oherwydd byddai rhywun, fel Peter Rogers, Mick Bates neu finnau, a oedd â chysylltiad agos fel ffermwyr â hyn, wedi gweld y creulondeb mwyaf ofnadwy. Rhaid imi ddweud bod graddau'r creulondeb at anifeiliaid fferm yn frawychus. O dan yr amgylchiadau arferol, ni fyddai byth yn cael ei oddef; byddai pobl o flaen eu gwell. Dyna'r maes yr ydym yn pryderu yn ei gylch. Pa fath o gamau yr ydym yn eu hystyried yn benodol i geisio osgoi'r fath enghreifftiau o greulondeb gwirioneddol enbyd? Yr hyn a olygaf yw bod anifeiliaid yn sownd yn y caeau a'u bod yn

Carwyn Jones: May I say that that is a very serious allegation, Chair.

[499] **Glyn Davies:** It is not an allegation; it is fact.

Carwyn Jones: It is not something you have told us before now.

[500] **Glyn Davies:** Well, crikey, it is pretty obvious to anybody.

Carwyn Jones: It is not something that Gareth has had communicated to him. However, if there are instances that you wish to report, obviously, they will be taken up.

[501] **Glyn Davies:** I think that you are misjudging what I am saying. These are not accusations that people were inflicting cruelty; it was just that the circumstances that people were under meant that cruelty was being inflicted. I think that all of us saw sheep in fields just standing there, and there were probably entire flocks lambed in those fields and hardly any of the lambs survived. We saw that happening all over the place.

Carwyn Jones: In that case, Chair, I misunderstood what you said.

marw yno fesul 10 neu 20 y diwrnod.

Carwyn Jones: A gaf ddweud bod hwnnw'n honiad difrifol iawn, Gadeirydd.

[499] **Glyn Davies:** Nid honiad ydyw; mae'n ffaith.

Carwyn Jones: Nid yw'n rhywbeth y dywedasoeh wrthym amdano cyn hyn.

[500] **Glyn Davies:** Wel, diawch, mae'n eithaf amlwg i bawb.

Carwyn Jones: Nid yw'n rhywbeth y rhoddwyd gwybod i Gareth amdano. Fodd bynnag, os oes achosion y dymunwch roi gwybod amdanynt, rhoddir sylw iddynt, wrth gwrs.

[501] **Glyn Davies:** Credaf eich bod yn camfarnu ynghylch yr hyn a ddywedaf. Nid cyhuddiadau bod pobl yn peri creulondeb yw'r rhain; y cwbl oedd bod yr amgylchiadau yr oedd pobl ynddynt yn golygu bod creulodeb yn cael ei achosi. Credaf fod pob un ohonom wedi gweld defaid mewn caeau a hwythau dim ond yn sefyll yno, ac mae'n debygol bod preiddiau cyfan wedi bwrw eu hwyn yn y caeau hynny a bron ddim o'r wyn hynny wedi byw. Gwelsom hynny'n digwydd mewn llawer man.

Carwyn Jones: Os felly, Gadeirydd, yr wyf wedi camddeall yr hyn a ddywedasoeh.

Mr Brodie: All of us had to take very distressing phone calls from farmers whose animals were, as you say, in the most appalling circumstances. That was one of the reasons why, in the early weeks, so much attention was given to introducing the special movement arrangements, which, although they were imperfect, were a key motivation. A hell of a lot of activity in the first few weeks went into thinking about how we could live—how the industry could live—with the animal movement ban that had originally been put in place. One of the awkward things is that there was, I think, a consensus in your first meeting that the animal movement ban was essential and, if anything, should have been brought in on 20 February, rather than a few days later. That is something that clearly does mean that these animal welfare issues are difficult to avoid. The contingency planning for the future is clearly going to have to think through how we can try to address that and ameliorate it.

[502] **Glyn Davies:** Do you want to come back on that, Ron?

[503] **Ron Davies:** Well, I am not scalp hunting.

[504] **Glyn Davies:** No, I realise that.

Mr Brodie: Bu'n rhaid i bob un ohonom gymryd galwadau ffôn ingol iawn oddi wrth ffermwyr yr oedd eu hanifeiliaid, fel y dywedwch, yn yr amgylchiadau mwyaf ofnadwy. Dyna un o'r rhesymau, yn yr wythnosau cynnar, y rhoddwyd cymaint o sylw i gyflwyno'r trefniadau symud arbennig a oedd, er eu hamherffeithed, yn gymhellant allweddol. Yr oedd llawer iawn o'r gweithgaredd yn yr wythnosau cyntaf hynny'n ymwneud â meddwl sut y gallem ddygymod—sut y gallai'r diwydiant ddygymod—â'r gwaharddiad ar symud anifeiliaid a weithredwyd yn wreiddiol. Un o'r pethau chwithig oedd bod consensws, yr wyf yn credu, yn eich cyfarfod cyntaf fod y gwaharddiad ar symud anifeiliaid yn hanfodol ac, os rhywbeth, y dylai fod wedi'i gyflwyno ar 20 Chwefror, yn hytrach nag ychydig ddyddiau'n ddiweddarach. Mae hynny'n rhywbeth sy'n amlwg yn golygu bod y materion lles anifeiliaid hyn yn anodd eu hosgoi. Mae'n amlwg y bydd y cynllunio wrth gefn at y dyfodol yn gorfod ystyried sut y gallwn geisio ymdrin â hynny a'i leddfu.

[502] **Glyn Davies:** A ydych yn dymuno cyfrannu eto ar hynny, Ron?

[503] **Ron Davies:** Wel, nid wyf am waed neb.

[504] **Glyn Davies:** Nac ydych, yr wyf yn sylweddoli hynny.

[505] **Ron Davies:** I fully understand the set of circumstances. Certainly, with the welfare cull, given the decisions that were taken—which were quite proper—there were obviously going to be very difficult circumstances that you and people with the responsibility of looking after animals had to face. I accept the fact, Gareth, that, on a couple of occasions, the RSPCA was allowed access onto farms. However, I think that a lot of people in the RSPCA would feel that they were sidelined during the whole process and that, where there was room for them to make representations, they were unable to do so. I fully understand that it may well be that, at the time, you were working under enormously difficult circumstances every hour of the day and night, with unpredictable circumstances being thrown at you all the time. Under such conditions, it is probably not always uppermost in your mind to take advice from well-meaning amateurs, or however else you regard the RSPCA. Therefore, it is not in any way critical, and I phrased my question as best I could, Chair, to indicate the areas of concern that I had.

I understand your answer, Carwyn, about Monmouthshire, but it is not the way in which local authorities would normally deal with stray animals, is it? If that were the case, I could tell you that my own borough would be echoing to the sound of gunshots every day and every night. We do not normally deal with stray stock by taking pot shots at them; in that sense, with regard to what happened in Monmouthshire, it was obviously a response to foot and mouth disease. I find it difficult to believe that, under those circumstances, nothing happened. I find it difficult to believe that, under some of the circumstances of which I know that you are aware, Glyn, for example, the cull of bulls—. Pretty awful things happened. As I understand it, from my reading

[505] **Ron Davies:** Yr wyf yn llwyr ddeall y set o amgylchiadau. Yn sicr, yn achos y difa er lles anifeiliaid, o ystyried y penderfyniadau a wnaethpwyd—a oedd yn gwbl briodol—yr oedd yn amlwg y byddai amgylchiadau anodd iawn y byddech chi a'r rhai a oedd yn gyfrifol am ofalu am anifeiliaid yn gorfod eu hwynebu. Yr wyf yn derbyn y ffaith, Gareth, fod mynediad i ffermydd wedi'i roi i'r RSPCA, ar un neu ddau achlysur. Fodd bynnag, credaf fod llawer o bobl yn yr RSPCA yn teimlo eu bod wedi'u gwthio o'r neilltu drwy gydol y broses, a phan oedd lle iddynt gyflwyno sylwadau, na allent wneud hynny. Yr wyf yn llwyr ddeall ei bod yn ddigon posibl eich bod yn gweithio, ar y pryd, o dan amgylchiadau aruthrol o anodd bob awr o'r dydd a'r nos, a'ch bod yn wynebu amgylchiadau annisgwyl drwy'r amser. O dan y fath amgylchiadau, mae'n debyg nad yr hyn sydd ym mlaen eich meddwl yw cymryd cyngor gan amaturiaid da eu bwriad, neu sut bynnag yr ydych yn ystyried yr RSPCA. Felly, nid yw hyn yn feirniadol o gwbl, a geiriais fy nghwestiwn orau y gallwn, Gadeirydd, i nodi'r meysydd a oedd yn peri pryder i mi.

Yr wyf yn deall eich ateb, Carwyn, am sir Fynwy, ond nid felly y mae'r awdurdodau lleol yn delio ag anifeiliaid crwydr fel arfer, nace? Pe byddai felly, gallwn ddweud wrthy ch y byddai fy mwrdeistref i'n atseinio ergydion dryll bob dydd a phob nos. Nid ydym fel arfer yn delio â da byw crwydr drwy saethu atynt ar antur; yn yr ystyr honno, o ran yr hyn a ddigwyddodd yn sir Fynwy, yr oedd yn amlwg yn ymateb i glwy'r traed a'r genau. Yr wyf yn ei chael yn anodd credu, o dan yr amgylchiadau hynny, na ddigwyddodd dim. Yr wyf yn ei chael yn anodd credu, o dan rai o'r amgylchiadau y gwn eich bod chi'n ymwybodol ohonynt, Glyn, er enghraifft, difa teirw—. Digwyddodd pethau eithaf dychrynlyd. Fel yr wyf fi'n ei ddeall, drwy

of the veterinary record and so on, there is widespread concern on the part of the veterinary profession about the methods that it was required to use for the disposal of young stock. Are you just saying, 'Well, okay, these issues have been raised now, so we will look at them'? Has there not been any prior consideration of these widespread issues, or do you just compartmentalise them and say, 'We will have to deal with that there and that here and we should not look at the welfare issues in their entirety; we do not have a process for dealing with them'? Where are you on this?

Carwyn Jones: A number of these matters are part of the discussions about the contingency plan. No-one could argue that what happened at Gilwern was right. I have a report from Monmouthshire County Council about what happened; it did not happen again. Clearly, what was done to those strays was distressing for the people who saw it, and it was not right. No-one could seek to defend that.

In terms of what you say about the vets, perhaps I could ask Tony to enlighten us on that.

Mr Edwards: These are extremely difficult circumstances. On all premises where animals are being put down there should always be a vet supervising the process. That is primarily because the State Veterinary Service, as a body, has the legal responsibility for the welfare of animals on farms, during slaughter and transit and so on. It is our legal duty. Clearly, under these circumstances, there is time pressure; that does not mean that welfare should be compromised in any way. You specified, I think, the putting down of very young animals. This is very distressing and there is no 100 per cent satisfactory way of

ddarllen y cofnod milfeddygol ac yn y blaen, mae pryder cyffredinol ymysg y proffesiwn milfeddygol am y dulliau yr oedd yn ofynnol iddo'u defnyddio i waredu stoc ifanc. Ai dim ond dweud yr ydych, 'Wel, iawn, codwyd y materion hyn yn awr, felly edrychwn arnynt'? Oni fu unrhyw ystyriaeth o flaen llaw o'r materion cyffredinol hyn, neu a ydych yn eu rhannu'n adrannau ac yn dweud, 'Bydd yn rhaid inni ddelio â hynny yn y fan honno a hynny yn y fan hon ac ni ddylem edrych ar y materion lles yn eu cyfanrwydd; nid oes gennym broses i ddelio â hwy'? Beth yw eich safbwynt ar hyn?

Carwyn Jones: Mae nifer o'r materion hyn yn rhan o'r trafodaethau am y cynllun wrth gefn. Ni allai neb ddadlau bod yr hyn a ddigwyddodd yng Ngilwern yn iawn. Mae gennyf adroddiad oddi wrth Gyngor Sir Fynwy am yr hyn a ddigwyddodd; ni ddigwyddodd eto. Wrth gwrs, yr oedd yr hyn a wnaethpwyd i'r anifeiliaid crwydr hynny'n peri gofid i'r rhai a'i gwelodd, ac nid oedd yn iawn. Ni allai neb geisio amddiffyn hynny.

O ran yr hyn a ddywedwch am y milfeddygon, efallai y gallwn ofyn i Tony ein goleuo ar hynny.

Mr Edwards: Mae'r amgylchiadau hyn yn anodd dros ben. Ar bob safle lle y caiff anifeiliaid eu difa, dylid cael milfeddyg bob amser i arolygu'r broses. Y rheswm pennaf am hynny yw mai'r Gwasanaeth Milfeddygol Gwladol, fel corff, sydd â'r cyfrifoldeb cyfreithiol dros les anifeiliaid ar ffermydd, yn ystod lladd a chludo ac yn y blaen. Mae'n ddyletswydd gyfreithiol arnom. Wrth gwrs, o dan yr amgylchiadau hyn, ceir pwysau amser; nid yw hynny'n golygu y dylid peryglu lles o gwbl. Cyfeiriasoch yn benodol, yr wyf yn credu, at ddifa anifeiliaid ifanc iawn. Mae hynny'n peri gofid mawr ac nid oes dull hollol

putting down young lambs that is totally painless. However, it has for some time been generally accepted that a short intra-cardiac dose of barbiturates is probably the most effective way of doing it under the circumstances. That is not to say that these things are not being reviewed in the context of any future planning in terms of asking whether we did it properly. This is one of the things that I am quite sure the lessons learned inquiry will be picking up on, as to how we dealt with these circumstances when they took place.

[506] **Ron Davies:** So the whole range of veterinary and welfare-related—

[507] **Glyn Davies:** This will be the last point; I want to move on to the economy.

[508] **Ron Davies:** Indeed. So the answer is that you are conscious of these issues, and that they have been specifically incorporated in the review that you are now undertaking?

Mr Edwards: Yes. The whole range of veterinary issues is up for discussion, if I can put it that way.

[509] **Ron Davies:** Including, perhaps, relations with bodies such as the RSPCA?

Mr Edwards: Yes.

[510] **Ron Davies:** Thank you very much.

[511] **Glyn Davies:** I will allow two brief points. They must be brief, as we have another section to deal with in relation to the rural economy. We must spend some time on that.

foddhaol o ddifa wyn ifanc sy'n gwbl ddi-boen. Fodd bynnag, derbynir yn gyffredinol ers cryn amser mai dogn bach o farbitwradau yw'r dull mwyaf effeithiol o wneud hyn, yn ôl pob tebyg, o dan y fath amgylchiadau. Nid yw hynny'n gyfystyr â dweud nad adolygir y pethau hyn yng nghyd-destun unrhyw gynllunio yn y dyfodol o ran gofyn a wnaethom hyn mewn modd priodol. Dyma un o'r pethau yr wyf yn gwbl sicr y bydd yr ymchwiliad i'r gwersi a ddysgwyd yn ei godi, o ran sut yr oeddem wedi delio â'r amgylchiadau hyn wedi iddynt godi.

[506] **Ron Davies:** Felly mae'r holl amrediad o faterion sy'n ymwneud â milfeddygaeth a lles—

[507] **Glyn Davies:** Y pwynt olaf fydd hwn; yr wyf am symud ymlaen at yr economi.

[508] **Ron Davies:** Yn wir. Felly yr ateb yw eich bod yn ymwybodol o'r materion hyn, a'u bod wedi'u cynnwys yn benodol yn yr adolygiad yr ydych yn ei wneud yn awr?

Mr Edwards: Ie. Mae'r holl amrediad o faterion milfeddygol yn agored i'w trafod, os caf ei roi felly.

[509] **Ron Davies:** Gan gynnwys, efallai, gysylltiadau â chyrrff fel yr RSPCA?

Mr Edwards: Ie.

[510] **Ron Davies:** Diolch yn fawr i chi.

[511] **Glyn Davies:** Byddaf yn caniatáu dau bwynt byr. Rhaid iddynt fod yn fyr, gan fod gennym adran arall i'w thrafod mewn cysylltiad â'r economi wledig. Rhaid inni dreulio rhywfaint o amser ar hynny.

[512] **Peter Rogers:** This is just to take up Mr Gareth Jones's point about the actual bills for work undertaken on farms. I asked about the work on one particular farm, which must have cost many hundreds of thousands of pounds. What happened there with regard to those lagoons was criminal. I have never received a reply about that. If it has just been swept under the carpet, then I think that that is an absolute disgrace, because I made Huw absolutely aware of that. There was no checking on the people who were there. There are records of people standing all day, doing absolutely nothing for weeks because there was nobody there to supervise them. I would just like to make that point.

The other issue, of course, with regard to burial and disposal, is about listening to local people. I raised last time the issue about using a runway without any provision for run-off, and run-off going straight into the river. It is unbelievable that things like that can be allowed to happen.

[513] **Glyn Davies:** Jocelyn, you had a point?

[514] **Jocelyn Davies:** I was just going to make a plea on behalf of Mr Rogers that he be allowed to ask his question.

[515] **Glyn Davies:** So I have already acceded to your request, without even knowing what it was.

[516] **Jocelyn Davies:** Yes, you have.

[512] **Peter Rogers:** Mae hyn i ddilyn pwynt Mr Gareth Jones am y biliau am y gwaith a wnaethpwyd ar ffermydd. Holais am y gwaith ar un fferm benodol, y mae'n rhaid ei fod wedi costio cannoedd o filoedd o bunnoedd. Yr oedd yr hyn a ddigwyddodd o ran y merllynnoedd hynny'n warthus. Nid wyf erioed wedi derbyn ateb am hynny. Os yw wedi'i ysgubo o'r golwg, yna credaf fod hynny'n gwbl warthus, oherwydd sicrheais fod Huw yn gwbl ymwybodol o hynny. Nid oedd dim gwirio ar y bobl a oedd yno. Mae cofnodion am bobl a oedd yn sefyll drwy'r dydd, yn gwneud dim byd o gwbl am wythnosau am nad oedd neb yno i'w harolygu. Hoffwn wneud y pwynt hwnnw.

Y mater arall sy'n codi, wrth gwrs, o ran claddu a gwaredu, yw'r un am wrando ar y bobl leol. Y tro diwethaf codais y mater ynghylch defnyddio rhedfa a oedd heb unrhyw ddarpariaeth ar gyfer goferiad, a bod y goferiad yn mynd yn syth i'r afon. Mae'n anhygoel y gellir caniatáu i bethau felly ddigwydd.

[513] **Glyn Davies:** Jocelyn, yr oedd gennyhych bwynt?

[514] **Jocelyn Davies:** Yr oeddwn am apelio ar ran Mr Rogers iddo gael gofyn ei gwestiwn.

[515] **Glyn Davies:** Felly yr wyf eisoes wedi cydsynio â'ch cais, heb hyd yn oed wybod beth ydoedd.

[516] **Jocelyn Davies:** Ydych.

Carwyn Jones: To come back to the point, I have to emphasise again, about what happened at Mona, that Mona was not the first choice disposal point, as far as we were concerned. It had been looked at by the Environment Agency, but Penhesgyn was the first choice. The council did not wish us to use Penhesgyn. It subsequently changed its mind, and the process was then carried through at Penhesgyn without difficulty, as far as the landfill site was concerned. So it is not the case to suggest that Mona would have been the first choice. That is simply not right.

[517] **Glyn Davies:** I think that the issue was to do with the use of lagoons somehow, was it not?

Carwyn Jones: Yes. Gareth will come in on that.

[518] **Glyn Davies:** This will have to be the last point.

Mr Jones: I simply want to say, Chair, that Committee members, and Assembly Members generally, have taken up a number of specific cases with me. Peter did take up with me, during the crisis, the issue to which he is referring. I followed that issue up with the cleansing and disinfecting team at the time. That was a long-running case, with specific problems relating to the lagoons. As far as I am aware—although I am no longer responsible for these issues—that case was concluded to the satisfaction of the farmer.

However, if any other information comes to light that suggests that there is longer-term damage, I know that DEFRA is only too happy to take up these issues.

Carwyn Jones: Gan ddod yn ôl at y pwynt, rhaid imi bwysleisio eto, am yr hyn a ddigwyddodd ym Mona, nad Mona oedd y dewis cyntaf fel pwynt gwaredu, o'n rhan ni. Yr oedd Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd wedi edrych arno, ond Penhesgyn oedd y dewis cyntaf. Nid oedd y cyngor yn dymuno inni ddefnyddio Penhesgyn. Newidiodd ei feddwl wedyn, a chwblhawyd y broses ym Mhenhesgyn yn ddidrafferth, o ran y safle tirlenwi. Felly nid yw'n gywir awgrymu mai Mona oedd y dewis cyntaf. Nid yw hynny'n gywir o gwbl.

[517] **Glyn Davies:** Credaf fod y mater yn ymwneud â defnyddio merllynnoedd rywsut, onid oedd?

Carwyn Jones: Oedd. Bydd Gareth yn dweud rhywbeth ar hynny.

[518] **Glyn Davies:** Bydd yn rhaid i hwn fod yn bwynt olaf.

Mr Jones: Nid wyf ond am ddweud, Gadeirydd, fod aelodau'r Pwyllgor, a'r Aelodau Cynulliad yn gyffredinol, wedi codi nifer o achosion penodol gyda mi. Fe gododd Peter y mater y mae'n cyfeirio ato gyda mi, yn ystod yr argyfwng. Euthum ynghylch y mater hwnnw gyda'r tîm glanhau a diheintio ar y pryd. Yr oedd hwnnw'n achos hir, gyda phroblemau penodol a oedd yn ymwneud â'r merllynnoedd. Hyd y gwn i—er nad wyf yn gyfrifol bellach am y materion hyn—daethpwyd â'r achos hwnnw i ben er boddhad i'r ffermwr.

Fodd bynnag, os daw unrhyw wybodaeth arall i'r golwg sy'n awgrymu bod difrod tymor hwy, gwn fod DEFRA yn fodlon iawn i ddilyn y materion hyn.

[519] **Glyn Davies:** Peter may well want to take that one up again. We are going to have to move on now to the last section that we wanted to discuss, which was the impact upon the rural economy. I wrote to the Minister responsible at the time, Rhodri Morgan, asking him to attend this meeting. He did tell me that he was going to come. What he originally told me was that he was going to come, together with the Minister for Economic Development who was in post during the crisis, Mike German. As it happens, Rhodri Morgan—or the First Minister as he is now—is not with us today. He is not able to attend after all, but Mike German is. So, the position we are in is that any questions relating to the period when Mike German was in post, I suppose he will answer, and any questions relating to the—

[520] **Jocelyn Davies:** Chair.

[521] **Glyn Davies:** Let me finish the sentence. Any questions relating to the period afterwards, I suppose officials will have to respond to.

[522] **Jocelyn Davies:** May I just register my protest at this? I do not think that it is fair to scrutinise someone who is now, effectively, a backbench member of the Government on a matter of Cabinet responsibility. I think that the First Minister should really have attended himself, or the current Minister for Economic Development, or, even better, the Deputy Minister for Economic Development who was the deputy at the time, rather than us having to put questions to Mike today. I am sure that his knowledge will be excellent, and that he will be well briefed—he has first-hand knowledge—but I do think that, as a matter of

[519] **Glyn Davies:** Mae'n ddigon posibl y bydd Peter yn dymuno codi hynny eto. Bydd yn rhaid inni symud ymlaen yn awr at yr adran olaf yr oeddem am ei thrafod, sef yr effaith ar yr economi wledig. Ysgrifennais at y Gweinidog a oedd yn gyfrifol ar y pryd, Rhodri Morgan, gan ofyn iddo ddod i'r cyfarfod hwn. Fe ddywedodd wrthyf ei fod am ddod. Yr hyn a ddywedodd wrthyf yn wreiddiol oedd ei fod ef am ddod, ynghyd â'r Gweinidog dros Ddatblygu Economaidd a oedd yn y swydd honno yn ystod yr argyfwng, sef Mike German. Fel y mae'n digwydd, nid yw Rhodri Morgan—neu Brif Weinidog Cymru fel y mae'n awr—gyda ni heddiw. Nid yw'n gallu ymbresenoli wedi'r cwbl, ond mae Mike German. Felly, y sefyllfa yr ydym ynnddi yw y bydd Mike German yn ateb unrhyw gwestiynau sy'n ymwneud â'r cyfnod pan oedd yn y swydd, mae'n debyg, ac y bydd unrhyw gwestiynau sy'n ymwneud â'r—

[520] **Jocelyn Davies:** Gadeirydd.

[521] **Glyn Davies:** Gadewch imi orffen y frawddeg. Mae'n debyg y bydd y swyddogion yn gorfod ateb unrhyw gwestiynau sy'n ymwneud â'r cyfnod ar ôl hynny.

[522] **Jocelyn Davies:** A gaf wrthdystio yn erbyn hyn? Ni chredaf ei bod yn deg holi rhywun sydd, i bob pwrpas, yn aelod maincgefn o'r Llywodraeth ar fater sy'n gyfrifoldeb i'r Cabinet. Credaf y dylai Prif Weinidog Cymru fod wedi ymbresenoli ei hun, a dweud y gwir, neu'r Gweinidog dros Ddatblygu Economaidd presennol, neu, yn well byth, y Dirprwy Weinidog dros Ddatblygu Economaidd a oedd yn ddirprwy ar y pryd, yn lle ein bod yn gorfod gofyn cwestiynau i Mike heddiw. Yr wyf yn siwr y bydd ei wybodaeth yn rhagorol, ac y bydd wedi'i friffio'n dda—mae ganddo wybodaeth o lygad y

process, it is not right to scrutinise a backbencher about the Cabinet's responsibility for something.

[523] **Glyn Davies:** All that I described was the position that we are in. To explain, I wrote on 3 January inviting the then Minister for Economic Development to come to the Committee meeting, making it very clear what the date was. As far as I was concerned, that invitation was accepted.

[524] **Elin Jones:** In writing?

[525] **Glyn Davies:** Yes, actually. If you want to see a copy of the letter, I have it with me.

[526] **Jocelyn Davies:** No, we will take your word for it.

[527] **Glyn Davies:** It is simply factual. However, later on, circumstances changed, and, as it happens today, the then Minister for Economic Development is not able to attend because the date is not convenient. He would be able to attend on a different date. However, in actual fact, Wednesday 13 March was in bold type and printed very clearly in the first letter that I sent on 3 January and which was accepted. So that is just the position that we are in. Mike German is here today. Although Mike would be considered a backbencher at the moment, he clearly was the Minister for Economic Development up until a period sometime in July, was it, Mike?

Michael German: July, yes.

ffynnon—ond yr wyf yn credu, fel mater o broses, nad yw'n iawn holi meinciwr cefn am gyfrifoldeb y Cabinet dros rywbeth.

[523] **Glyn Davies:** Y cwbl a ddisgrifiais oedd y sefyllfa yr ydym ynddi. Er mwyn egluro, ysgrifennais ar 3 Ionawr gan wahodd y Gweinidog dros Ddatblygu Economaidd ar y pryd i ddod i gyfarfod y Pwyllgor, gan roi ar ddeall am y dyddiad. O'm rhan i, fe dderbyniwyd y gwahoddiad hwnnw.

[524] **Elin Jones:** Mewn ysgrifen?

[525] **Glyn Davies:** Ie, a dweud y gwir. Os ydych am weld copi o'r llythyr, mae hwnnw gennyf.

[526] **Jocelyn Davies:** Nac ydym, byddwn yn derbyn eich gair ar hynny.

[527] **Glyn Davies:** Mae'n gwbl ffeithiol. Fodd bynnag, yn ddiweddarach, newidiodd yr amgylchiadau, ac, fel y mae'n digwydd heddiw, nid yw'r Gweinidog dros Ddatblygu Economaidd ar y pryd yn gallu bod yn bresennol am nad yw'r dyddiad yn gyfleus. Byddai'n gallu bod yn bresennol ar ddyddiad gwahanol. Fodd bynnag, mewn gwirionedd, yr oedd dydd Mercher 13 Mawrth mewn teip du ac wedi'i argraffu'n glir iawn ar y llythyr cyntaf a anfonais ar 3 Ionawr ac a dderbyniwyd. Felly honno yw'r sefyllfa yr ydym ynddi. Mae Mike German yma heddiw. Er y byddid yn ystyried Mike yn feinciwr cefn ar hyn o bryd, mae'n amlwg mai ef oedd y Gweinidog dros Ddatblygu Economaidd hyd at gyfnod rywdro yng Ngorffennaf, onid ef, Mike?

Michael German: Gorffennaf, ie.

[528] **Glyn Davies:** Something like that. For the period afterwards, what the now First Minister has said is that he is content for officials to answer any questions that we might have. You may have a view on that, I may have a view on it and I am sure that other members will, but that is factually the position.

[529] **Jocelyn Davies:** Well, I have expressed my view.

[530] **Glyn Davies:** Does anyone else want to say anything about that or ask any questions?

[531] **Peter Rogers:** Well, yes, certainly, now that it has been raised by Jocelyn. It is a very important question. I think that the problems that we have with the Cabinet here have run for a long time and I think that, with all due respect to Mike, he has taken a fair hammering, and I do not think that he should be put in a position now, as a backbencher, where he has to come here today to talk about this. I think that the person who is responsible at the moment should be here. Certainly, since July, a lot of developments have taken place with the rural recovery plan.

[532] **Glyn Davies:** Well, that is a view. I am not going to respond to that; there is nothing more for me to say beyond what I have already said. Does anybody else want to say anything on that or actually ask questions relating to the impact on the rural economy?

[528] **Glyn Davies:** Rhywbeth felly. Am y cyfnod wedyn, mae Prif Weinidog Cymru wedi dweud bellach ei fod yn fodlon i'r swyddogion ateb unrhyw gwestiynau a allai fod gennym. Efallai fod gennych farn am hynny, efallai fod gennyf fi farn am hynny ac yr wyf yn sicr y bydd gan aelodau eraill, ond dyna'r sefyllfa ffeithiol.

[529] **Jocelyn Davies:** Wel, yr wyf fi wedi datgan fy marn.

[530] **Glyn Davies:** A oes unrhyw un arall sy'n dymuno dweud rhywbeth am hynny neu ofyn unrhyw gwestiynau?

[531] **Peter Rogers:** Wel, oes, yn sicr, gan fod Jocelyn wedi'i godi'n awr. Mae'n gwestiwn pwysig iawn. Credaf fod y problemau sydd gennym â'r Cabinet yma wedi mynd ymlaen yn hir a chredaf, gyda phob dyledus barch tuag at Mike, ei fod wedi cael eithaf curfa, ac ni chredaf y dylai gael ei roi mewn sefyllfa'n awr, fel meinciwr cefn, lle y mae'n gorfod dod yma heddiw i sôn am hyn. Credaf mai'r sawl sy'n gyfrifol ar y pryd a ddylai fod yma. Yn sicr, ers Gorffennaf, bu llawer o ddatblygiadau o ran y cynllun adfer gwledig.

[532] **Glyn Davies:** Wel, mae honno'n un farn. Nid wyf am ymateb i hynny; nid oes dim arall imi ei ddweud heblaw'r hyn a ddywedais eisoes. A oes rhywun arall sy'n dymuno dweud rhywbeth ar hynny neu am ofyn cwestiynau ynghylch yr effaith ar yr economi wledig?

[533] **Ron Davies:** I think that the difficulty is that we are being asked to just look at a slice of time, are we not, which culminates in July and, with the greatest of respect to Mike, I think that a lot of the questions that I would want to ask are about now and about the future and about forecasts and current policy and intentions and so on. Mike is just not in a position to answer on anything other than that slice of time for which he had responsibility. I find it difficult to phrase a question which is actually relevant and that complies with the cut-off point of July of last year.

[534] **Glyn Davies:** Well, I think that that is a difficult issue, and I think that what I was expecting to happen, in terms of the response, is that the First Minister and Mike would have been here. The suggestion that Mike come here was the First Minister's suggestion, as a way of covering the whole issue. I was not anticipating that Mike German would be answering any questions that related to the period after July. That would be, as far as I am concerned, a matter for officials. That is the position, I think. That is where we are.

Do you have a question, Delyth?

[535] **Delyth Evans:** Just to kick off, then, Chair, I will just ask Mike and Emyr whether, when the announcement was made that, effectively, the countryside was closed for business, they really anticipated at that point the dreadful impact that that would have on the rural economy. Secondly, how did you immediately respond to that? Did you immediately sit down and start thinking about financial resources for a recovery plan, or did it take a while to sink in once you started hearing the pleas for help that were coming from rural businesses? How was that dealt with?

[533] **Ron Davies:** Credaf mai'r anhawster yw y gofynnir inni edrych ar gyfran o amser sy'n dod i ben yng Ngorffennaf, a chyda'r parch mwyaf tuag at Mike, credaf fod llawer o'r cwestiynau y dymunwn eu gofyn yn ymwneud â'r presennol a'r dyfodol a rhagolygon a'r polisi presennol a'r bwriadau ac yn y blaen. Nid yw Mike mewn sefyllfa i allu ateb ynghylch dim heblaw am y gyfran o amser yr oedd yn gyfrifol amdani. Yr wyf yn ei chael yn anodd geirio cwestiwn sy'n berthnasol mewn gwirionedd ac yn cyd-fynd â'r pwynt terfyn yng Ngorffennaf y llynedd.

[534] **Glyn Davies:** Wel, credaf fod hynny'n fater anodd, a chredaf mai'r hyn yr oeddwn yn ei ddisgwyl, o ran yr ymateb, oedd y byddai Prif Weinidog Cymru a Mike yma. Awgrym Prif Weinidog Cymru oedd y dylai Mike ddod yma, fel modd i ymdrin â'r mater cyfan. Nid oeddwn yn disgwyl y byddai Mike German yn ateb unrhyw gwestiynau a oedd yn ymwneud â'r cyfnod ar ôl Gorffennaf. Byddai hynny, o'm rhan i, yn fater i'r swyddogion. Dyna'r sefyllfa, yr wyf yn credu. Dyna lle'r ydym.

A oes gennych gwestiwn, Delyth?

[535] **Delyth Evans:** I gychwyn pethau, felly, Gadeirydd, gofynnaf i Mike ac Emyr a oeddent wedi rhagweld ar y pryd, pan gyhoeddwyd y byddai cefn gwlad, i bob pwrpas, wedi ei gau ar gyfer busnes, yr effaith ofnadwy a gâi hynny ar yr economi wledig. Yn ail, sut y gwnaethoch ymateb i hynny ar y pryd? A wnaethoch eistedd ar unwaith a dechrau meddwl am adnoddau ariannol ar gyfer cynllun adfer, neu a gymerodd amser i wneud argraff arnoch wedi ichi ddechrau clywed yr apeliadau am gymorth oddi wrth fusnesau gwledig? Sut y deliwyd â hynny?

Michael German: I think that the crucial issue of the fragility of the rural economy in respect of foot and mouth disease was immediately apparent. It did not take long for businesses to realise that their customers were cancelling and were being turned away. This was, I think, different from how it would have been in 1967, because, clearly, the relationship of the tourism industry, in particular, to the rural economy was in a different and a weaker position back in 1967, whereas now, of course, it is a major part of the economy and the relationship has changed and moved on quite considerably. My calendar is before you and, in fact, if you look at the dates of the meetings, the first meeting that I had with the Wales Tourist Board was on 5 March. I had also made an announcement to the Assembly on that same day on the likely impact on tourism. So it was within a very short period of time that we made our assessment and started to take action accordingly. The development of the activity related primarily, at the beginning, to ensuring that we could provide, first of all, as much information as possible about what was open and what could be done inside Wales, because that was what our customers—the people coming into Wales—wanted to know. The second issue was to provide as much information as we could to those tourists about what they could do and where they could get information on that. Thirdly, of course, was to provide information to the providers of tourism activity on what would be the best thing that they could do at the time. So, the activity at the very beginning was concentrated on making sure that we could try to retrieve as much of the Easter season as possible. That is why the initial money was put into a campaign for Easter.

Michael German: Credaf fod mater hollbwysig y breuder yn yr economi wledig mewn cysylltiad â chlwy'r traed a'r genau yn amlwg ar unwaith. Ni chymerodd lawer o amser i'r busnesau sylweddoli bod eu cwsmeriaid yn canslo ac yn cael eu troi ymaith. Yr oedd hyn yn wahanol, yr wyf yn credu, i sut y buasai yn 1967, oherwydd, wrth gwrs, yr oedd perthynas y diwydiant twristiaeth, yn benodol, â'r economi wledig yn wahanol ac yn wannach yn ôl yn 1967, tra bo'n rhan bwysig yn awr, wrth gwrs, o'r economi ac mae'r sefyllfa wedi newid ac wedi symud ymlaen yn eithaf pell. Mae fy nghalendr ger eich bron ac, mewn gwirionedd, os edrychwch ar ddyddiadau'r cyfarfodydd, yr oedd y cyfarfod cyntaf a gefais â Bwrdd Croeso Cymru ar 5 Mawrth. Yr oeddwn hefyd wedi rhoi datganiad i'r Cynulliad ar yr un diwrnod ar yr effaith debygol ar dwristiaeth. Felly yr oeddem wedi gwneud asesiad o fewn cyfnod byr iawn ac wedi dechrau cymryd camau'n unol â hynny. Yr oedd datblygiad y gweithgaredd yn ymwneud yn bennaf, ar y dechrau, â sicrhau y gallem ddarparu, yn gyntaf oll, gymaint o wybodaeth ag yr oedd modd am yr hyn a oedd yn agored a beth y gellid ei wneud yng Nghymru, oherwydd dyna'r oedd ein cwsmeriaid—y bobl a oedd yn dod i Gymru—am ei wybod. Yr ail fater oedd darparu cymaint o wybodaeth ag y gallem i'r twristiaid hynny am yr hyn y gallent ei wneud ac ym mhle y gallent gael gwybodaeth am hynny. Yn drydydd, wrth gwrs, yr oedd darparu gwybodaeth i ddarparwyr gweithgaredd twristiaeth ar yr hyn a fyddai orau iddynt ei wneud ar y pryd. Felly, yr oedd y gweithgaredd ar y dechrau un yn canolbwyntio ar sicrhau y gallem geisio adfer cymaint â phosibl o dymor y Pasg. Dyna pam y rhoddwyd yr arian cyntaf at ymgyrch ar gyfer y Pasg.

[536] **Delyth Evans:** Thank you for that. May I ask another question to do with business support? Initially, the decision was made that rate relief resources would be spread fairly evenly across the different counties, whereas, in fact, Powys took a very disproportionate hit in terms of the effect on businesses. From an outside point of view, it is hard to justify the fact that Cardiff, for instance, would have received an equal amount of support to Powys and, similarly, Carmarthenshire, which was free of foot and mouth disease. So I just wondered what the thinking was behind that. I know that measures were taken afterwards to redress that, but it did seem a rather strange decision at the time.

Michael German: The first decision was taken to create speed because, unlike in England, most of the support that we provided directly to businesses in Wales came through local authorities. The idea was to try to get as much help as we could in place as quickly as possible. The second of the two special grant reports then moved the money around and allocated it separately. The first grant report was based upon the standard distribution formula for local authorities in Wales. The second one had a very much more weighted element to it in relation to rurality and tourism, so it was able to make that readjustment. It was to do with speed. I think that that was the initial reaction. Do you want to add anything to that, Emyr?

[536] **Delyth Evans:** Diolch i chi am hynny. A gaf ofyn cwestiwn arall sy'n ymwneud â chymorth busnes? Ar y dechrau, penderfynwyd taenu'r adnoddau rhyddhad rhag trethi'n eithaf gwastad ar draws y gwahanol siroedd, er bod Powys wedi'i tharo'n llawer mwy na'r cyfartaledd o ran yr effaith ar fusnesau. Wrth edrych o'r tu allan, mae'n anodd cyfiawnhau'r ffaith y byddai Caerdydd, er enghraifft, wedi derbyn yr un maint o gymorth â Phowys ac, yn yr un modd, sir Gaerfyrddin, a oedd yn rhydd oddi wrth glwy'r traed a'r genau. Felly yr oeddwn yn meddwl tybed beth oedd y meddwl a oedd yn sail i hynny. Gwn fod camau wedi'u cymryd wedyn i wneud iawn am hynny, ond yr oedd yn ymddangos yn benderfyniad eithaf rhyfedd ar y pryd.

Michael German: Gwnaethpwyd y penderfyniad cyntaf i greu cyflymder oherwydd, yn wahanol i Loegr, yr oedd y rhan fwyaf o'r cymorth yr oeddem yn ei ddarparu'n uniongyrchol i fusnesau yng Nghymru'n dod drwy'r awdurdodau lleol. Y bwriad oedd ceisio rhoi cymaint o gymorth â phosibl ar waith mor gyflym â phosibl. Wedyn yr oedd yr ail o'r ddau adroddiad grant arbennig wedi symud yr arian o gwmpas ac wedi'i ddyrannu ar wahân. Yr oedd yr adroddiad grant cyntaf yn seiliedig ar y fformiwla ddsbarthu safonol i awdurdodau lleol yng Nghymru. Yr oedd elfen llawer mwy pwysol yn yr ail un o ran gwledigrwydd a thwristiaeth, felly yr oedd yn gallu gwneud yr ailgymhwysiad hwnnw. Yr oedd yn ymwneud â chyflymder. Credaf mai hwnnw oedd yr ymateb cyntaf. A ydych yn dymuno ychwanegu rhywbeth at hynny, Emyr?

[537] **Glyn Davies:** Can I just ask you, because this is what is interesting to me, whether you had any part in that, because that decision, as far as we know, was taken by the Minister for Finance, Local Government and Communities—certainly she announced it? You, with your hat on, may have taken a different view. You may have thought that it should have been more prioritised. Were you involved in the decision by the Minister for Finance to allocate that via the normal distribution formula for local authorities?

Michael German: I do not think that I was involved in the discussion about how it would be distributed, but the fact that it would be distributed and the use of local authorities was certainly part of a discussion that I had.

[538] **Glyn Davies:** Emyr?

Mr E. Roberts: I can certainly confirm that second point—that we were, as officials, closely involved in this. Just to clarify, the initial distribution was 75 per cent: 25 per cent in favour of the nine rural areas, whereas the second special grant report was 90:10. I think that the initial decision was largely taken with the view that we became aware quite quickly that there was an impact on some of the businesses in urban areas as well. Some of the wholesalers, for instance, who supply rural areas were being affected. Clearly, at that time, which was within a month of the actual outbreak, we were not sure how the disease would actually develop. So, that is why we went for the 75:25 split initially. Obviously, when we did the second one in July, we were a lot clearer about which areas were the most badly affected, and that is why we adjusted the formula in the light of that.

[537] **Glyn Davies:** A gaf ofyn i chi, oherwydd hyn sydd o ddiddordeb i mi, a oedd gennych unrhyw ran yn hynny, oherwydd gwnaethpwyd y penderfyniad hwnnw, hyd y gwyddom ni, gan y Gweinidog dros Gyllid, Llywodraeth Leol a Chymunedau—yn sicr, hi a'i cyhoeddodd? Efallai fod eich barn chi, yn rhinwedd eich swydd, yn wahanol. Efallai'ch bod wedi meddwl y dylai fod wedi'i flaenoriaethu'n fwy. A oeddech yn gysylltiedig â phenderfyniad y Gweinidog dros Gyllid i ddyrannu hwnnw drwy'r fformiwla ddsbarthu arferol i awdurdodau lleol?

Michael German: Nid wyf yn credu imi fod yn gysylltiedig â'r drafodaeth ar y dull o'i ddsbarthu, ond yr oedd y ffaith y câi ei ddsbarthu a defnyddio'r awdurdodau lleol yn sicr yn rhan o drafodaeth a gefais.

[538] **Glyn Davies:** Emyr?

Mr E. Roberts: Gallaf gadarnhau'r ail bwynt hwnnw, yn sicr—bod gennym ni, fel swyddogion, gysylltiad agos â hyn. Dim ond i egluro hynny, y dosbarthiad cychwynnol oedd 75 y cant: 25 y cant o blaid y naw ardal wledig, tra roedd yr ail adroddiad grant arbennig yn 90:10. Credaf fod y penderfyniad cyntaf wedi'i wneud yn bennaf am inni ddod yn ymwybodol yn eithaf buan fod effaith ar rai o'r busnesau yn yr ardaloedd trefol hefyd. Yr oedd effaith ar rai o'r cyfanwerthwyr sy'n cyflenwi ardaloedd gwledig, er enghraifft. Wrth gwrs, bryd hynny, sef o fewn mis ar ôl yr achos cyntaf, nid oeddem yn sicr sut y byddai'r clwyf yn datblygu. Felly, dyna pam yr aethom am y rhaniad 75:25 i ddechrau. Wrth reswm, pan wnaethom yr ail un yng Ngorffennaf, yr oeddem yn deall yn llawer gwell am yr ardaloedd a effeithiwyd waethaf, a dyna pam y newidiasom y fformiwla yng ngolwg hynny.

Michael German: The figures for each local authority are, I think, quite telling, because they show that there was, indeed, an impact in areas in which people would not have expected an impact, but that was not to the level and the extent experienced in other parts of Wales.

[539] **Glyn Davies:** Can I just ask this for clarity—I am sorry if I pursue things too much myself—but I had it in my mind that, for the first special grant report, distribution was based, really, on a fairly standard distribution formula. You are actually telling me now that it was based on a special formula. Did we know that, or is that just news to us now? I did not know that before.

Mr E. Roberts: I would have to check the transcript of what was said at the time. It was done on an estimate of the number of businesses in each local authority. As I say, it was skewed 25 per cent to non-rural areas and 75 per cent to the rural areas.

[540] **Glyn Davies:** I did not know that. Are you happy with that Delyth?

[541] **Delyth Evans:** Yes.

[542] **Glyn Davies:** Elin is next.

Michael German: Mae'r ffigurau am bob awdurdod lleol yn eithaf dadlennol, yr wyf yn credu, am eu bod yn dangos bod effaith mewn ardaloedd lle na fyddai rhywun yn disgwyl effaith, ond nid oedd hynny i'r un graddau nac mor eang ag a brofwyd mewn rhannau eraill o Gymru.

[539] **Glyn Davies:** A gaf ofyn hyn er mwyn cael eglurdeb—mae'n ddrwg gennyf os wyf yn mynd ar ôl pethau ormod fy hun—ond yr oedd gennyf syniad, yn achos yr adroddiad grant arbennig cyntaf, fod y dosbarthu'n seiliedig, mewn gwirionedd, ar fformiwla ddsbarthu eithaf safonol. Yr ydych yn dweud wrthyf yn awr ei fod yn seiliedig ar fformiwla arbennig. A oeddem yn gwybod hynny, neu a yw hynny'n newydd i ni'n awr? Ni wyddwn hynny o'r blaen.

Mr E. Roberts: Byddai'n rhaid imi wirio trawsgrifiad o'r hyn a ddywedwyd ar y pryd. Fe'i gwnaethpwyd ar sail amcangyfrif o nifer y busnesau ym mhob awdurdod lleol. Fel y dywedaf, yr oedd wedi'i gogwyddo 25 y cant at yr ardaloedd anwledig a 75 y cant at yr ardaloedd gwledig.

[540] **Glyn Davies:** Ni wyddwn hynny. A ydych yn fodlon ar hynny, Delyth?

[541] **Delyth Evans:** Ydwyf.

[542] **Glyn Davies:** Elin sy'n nesaf.

[543] **Elin Jones:** Os y caf holi'r cyn-Weinidog ar y pecyn adfywio gwledig yr oeddech yn rhan o'i greu; a gredwch ei fod yn ddigonol i gwrdd ag effaith clwy'r traed a'r genau ar Gymru wledig? O gymryd un sir benodol a gafodd ei bwrw yn sylweddol gan glwy'r traed a'r genau, sef Powys, £3.9 miliwn a gafodd ei wario ar ddigolledu busnesau, ond mae'r amcangyfrifon ynglyn â'r colledion i fusnesau yn sylweddol fwy na hynny. A ydych yn credu bod y £3.9 miliwn hwnnw oddi wrth y Llywodraeth hon o ran arian uniongyrchol i fusnesau yn ddigonol?

Mae gennyf ail gwestiwn mwy manwl i'r swyddog. A aeth unrhyw elfen o'r arian ym mhecyn adfywio gwledig Bwrdd Croeso Cymru ac Awdurdod Datblygu Cymru tuag at arian cyfatebol cynlluniau Amcan 1?

Michael German: There are three questions then: one on compensation, the second on assistance in Wales and its relative levels and whether it was satisfactory, and the third one on detail on the WDA and the WTB. First of all, on compensation, it has never been the practice, and it has certainly never been the case, that there was an intention to compensate rural businesses for losses that occurred as a result of foot and mouth disease. There is a legal obligation, obviously, on the Assembly to compensate for the loss of livestock, but there is no legal obligation to compensate businesses. In fact, the decision was taken fairly early on, not just in Wales, but also in the UK, that what we would do would be to seek ways of recovery. That is why it was called the rural recovery plan; because it was about recovering, not about compensating.

[543] **Elin Jones:** If I may question the former Minister on the rural recovery plan that you had a part in creating; do you think that it is sufficient to deal with the effects of foot and mouth disease on rural Wales? To take one specific county that was hit significantly by foot and mouth disease, namely Powys, £3.9 million was spent on compensating businesses, but the estimated losses to businesses are significantly more than that. Do you think that that £3.9 million from this Government in expenditure directly for businesses was sufficient?

I have a second, more detailed, question to the official. Did any element of the funding in the Wales Tourist Board's and the Welsh Development Agency's rural recovery plan go towards match funding for Objective 1 schemes?

Michael German: Mae tri chwestiwn felly: un ar iawndal, yr ail ar y cymorth yng Nghymru a'i lefelau cymharol ac a oedd yn foddhaol, a'r trydydd ynghylch manylion am y WDA a Bwrdd Croeso Cymru. Yn gyntaf oll, ar iawndal, ni fu erioed yn arfer, ac yn sicr ni fu erioed yn wir, fod bwriad i ddigolledu busnesau gwledig am y colledion a ddigwyddodd o ganlyniad i glwy'r traed a'r genau. Mae'r Cynulliad dan rwymedigaeth gyfreithiol, wrth gwrs, i ddigolledu am golli da byw, ond nid oes rhwymedigaeth gyfreithiol i ddigolledu busnesau. A dweud y gwir, penderfynwyd yn eithaf cynnar, nid yng Nghymru'n unig, ond hefyd yn y DU, mai'r hyn a wnaem oedd chwilio am ddulliau adfer. Dyna pam y'i galwyd yn gynllun adfer gwledig; am ei fod yn ymwneud ag adfer ac nid â digolledu.

I am able to tell you that the estimate that we have now been able to put together of the amount of assistance that was provided for recovery to businesses throughout the whole of England was somewhere in the region of £80 million. As you know from section D of the memorandum before you, the assistance to Wales was in fact about £65 million, which, given the comparative sizes of England and Wales, and the number of outbreaks, was very favourable indeed. Of that £65 million, approximately £60 million was new money. Much of that money was used to help people to get through the short-term problems that they faced with business rates, VAT deferral and so forth. A lot of assistance was given in that direction, but the major thrust in tourism, of course, was to work out the way forward for the future. I am hopeful and pleased to note that the Wales Tourist Board reports that, in fact, that has worked and that it seems as if things are looking quite good for this season at present. We will know, certainly by Easter, whether or not that has made the impact that we think that it has made. I will leave the WDA issue to Emyr to deal with.

[544] **Elin Jones:** A oedd yn ddigon? A ydych yn credu ei fod yn ddigonol?

Michael German: Well, you could never say that you have as much money as you could possibly want. However, given the comparison with England, I think that £65 million for Wales and £80 million for England certainly shows how well Wales had performed and how well the Government in the National Assembly committed resources to this problem. That had not been done perhaps in the same way and to the same level and extent in England. I think that, in that comparative sense, the answer is 'yes'. If we had infinite resources or were able to raid the larder of every other department,

Gallaf ddweud wrthyfch mai'r amcangyfrif yr ydym wedi gallu'i wneud bellach o faint y cymorth a ddarparwyd ar gyfer adfer i fusnesau ledled Lloegr yw tua £80 miliwn. Fel y gwyddoch oddi wrth adran D o'r memorandwm sydd ger eich bron, y cymorth i Gymru oedd tua £65 miliwn, a oedd, o ystyried meintiau cymharol Cymru a Lloegr, a nifer yr achosion, yn ffafriol dros ben. O'r £65 miliwn hwnnw, yr oedd tua £60 miliwn yn arian newydd. Defnyddiwyd llawer o'r arian hwnnw i helpu pobl i oresgyn y problemau tymor byr a wynebent o ran trethi busnes, gohirio TAW ac yn y blaen. Rhoddwyd llawer o gymorth yn y cyfeiriad hwnnw, ond y prif bwyslais mewn twristiaeth, wrth gwrs, oedd canfod y ffordd ymlaen ar gyfer y dyfodol. Yr wyf yn obeithiol ac yn falch o nodi bod Bwrdd Croeso Cymru'n adrodd bod hynny wedi gweithio ac mae'n ymddangos bod gwedd eithaf da ar bethau ar gyfer y tymor hwn ar hyn o bryd. Byddwn yn gwybod, yn sicr erbyn y Pasg, a yw hynny wedi cael yr effaith y credwn iddo'i chael. Gadawaf y mater ynghylch y WDA i Emyr ei drafod.

[544] **Elin Jones:** Was it enough? Do you believe that it was sufficient?

Michael German: Wel, ni allech byth ddweud bod gennych gymaint o arian ag y gallech ddymuno. Fodd bynnag, o ystyried y gymhariaeth â Lloegr, credaf fod y £65 miliwn i Gymru a'r £80 miliwn i Lloegr yn sicr yn dangos pa mor dda y perfformiodd Cymru a pha mor dda y neilltuodd y Llywodraeth yn y Cynulliad Cenedlaethol yr adnoddau at y broblem hon. Ni wnaethpwyd hynny yn yr un modd efallai ac i'r un lefel a graddau yn Lloegr. Credaf, yn yr ystyr gymharol honno, mai'r ateb yw 'oedd'. Pe byddai gennym adnoddau di-ben-draw neu pe gallem ysbeilio

then, obviously, it might have been different. However, I think that you can certainly say that £65 million was a substantial resource to commit to this process and it seems to have borne fruit in terms of the tourism market, given, of course, that much of that expenditure would not have been seen in Wales and, I am glad to say, would not have been in Wales, because the tourist market for Wales is elsewhere.

[545] **Glyn Davies:** Emyr, did you want to come in on the match funding issue?

Mr E. Roberts: Dim ond i ddweud bod dim arian wedi cael ei nodi'n benodol fel cyllid cyfatebol ar gyfer Amcan 1, ond mae rhaglen Amcan 1 yn ddigon hyblyg, os daw rhaglenni o dan y cynllun hwnnw. Serch hynny, nid yw Amcan 1 ar ei ben ei hun yn helpu rhyw lawer oherwydd, er enghraifft, mae Powys y tu allan i ardal Amcan 1. Felly, ni fedrwn ddibynnu'n ormodol ar gynllun Amcan 1.

[546] **Elin Jones:** Y cwestiwn yr oeddwn yn ei ofyn oedd a yw'r WDA, y Bwrdd Croeso neu'r Cynulliad Cenedlaethol wedi defnyddio unrhyw elfen o'r arian yn y pecyn adfywio gwledig ar gyfer cyllid cyfatebol i gynlluniau sydd wedi mynd drwy'r broses Amcan 1 ac wedi derbyn arian Amcan 1? Yr wyf yn meddwl yn benodol, er enghraifft, am gynllun marchnata twristiaeth Bwrdd Croeso Cymru o dan Amcan 1. A oedd unrhyw elfen o'r cyllid hwnnw yn y pecyn adfywio yn rhan o gyllid cyfatebol Amcan 1?

cist pob adran arall, yna, wrth gwrs, gallasai fod yn wahanol. Fodd bynnag, credaf y gallwch ddweud yn sicr fod £65 miliwn yn adnodd sylweddol i'w neilltuo at y broses hon ac ymddengys ei fod wedi dwyn ffrwyth o ran y farchnad dwristiaeth, o ystyried, wrth gwrs, na fyddai llawer o'r gwariant hwnnw wedi'i weld yng Nghymru ac, yr wyf yn falch o ddweud, na fyddai wedi bod yng Nghymru, oherwydd bod y farchnad dwristiaeth i Gymru mewn manau eraill.

[545] **Glyn Davies:** Emyr, a oeddech yn dymuno dweud rhywbeth ar y mater o gyllid cyfatebol?

Mr E. Roberts: Only to say that no money has been specifically noted as match funding for Objective 1, but the Objective 1 programme is sufficiently flexible, if programmes come under that scheme. However, Objective 1 on its own does not help overly much because, for example, Powys is outside the Objective 1 area. Therefore, we cannot depend too much on the Objective 1 scheme.

[546] **Elin Jones:** The question that I was asking was: has the WDA, the Wales Tourist Board or the National Assembly used any element of the money in the rural recovery package to match fund schemes that have gone through the Objective 1 process and have received Objective 1 funding? I am thinking specifically, for example, about the Wales Tourist Board's tourism marketing scheme under Objective 1. Was any element of that funding in the recovery package a part of Objective 1 match funding?

Mr E. Roberts: Nac oedd. Nid yw'r pecyn adfywio na'r pecyn cyffredinol yn rhan o hynny. Mae Bwrdd Croeso Cymru'n cael arian arbennig o'r Cynulliad ar gyfer y cyllid cyfatebol ar gyfer y cynllun twristiaeth.

[547] **Elin Jones:** Iawn.

[548] **Glyn Davies:** Can I just say to members that, clearly, we have one or two more questions, but we were always going to find it difficult to fit everything that we wanted into the two meetings. We are approaching the time now when our meeting should end. If it goes a little beyond that, I do not mind too much. However, any questions now will have to be very short and to the point and, indeed, so will the answers. I know that it is unsatisfactory, but I must say that, on virtually every subject that we have discussed, I feel that the same has applied and that we have not explored as much as we would have liked to have done. However, two members have had to go because they have other meetings. We were scheduled to finish at 5.30 p.m.

[549] **Ron Davies:** I am a third just waiting to give you his apologies because he has to go.

[550] **Glyn Davies:** I accept that that is inevitable. Mick, do you want to come in on this?

Mr E. Roberts: No. Neither the recovery package nor the general package is part of that. The Wales Tourist Board receives special funding from the Assembly for match funding for the tourism scheme.

[547] **Elin Jones:** Okay.

[548] **Glyn Davies:** A gaf ddweud wrth yr aelodau fod gennym un neu ddau o gwestiynau'n rhagor, wrth gwrs, ond ein bod wedi sylweddoli cyn hyn y byddem yn ei chael yn anodd ffitio pob dim yr oedd arnom ei angen i'r ddau gyfarfod. Yr ydym yn dod at yr adeg yn awr pan yw'n cyfarfod i fod i ddod i ben. Os aiff ychydig ymhellach na hynny, nid wyf yn poeni gormod. Fodd bynnag, bydd yn rhaid i unrhyw gwestiynau o hyn ymlaen fod yn gryno iawn ac yn bwrpasol a'r atebion hefyd, yn wir. Gwn fod hynny'n anfodhaol, ond rhaid imi ddweud fy mod yn teimlo bod hynny'n wir am bron bob pwnc yr ydym wedi'i drafod ac nad ydym wedi ymchwilio gymaint ag y dymunem. Fodd bynnag, mae dau aelod wedi gorfod mynd am fod ganddynt gyfarfodydd eraill. Yr oeddem wedi'n hamserlennu i orffen am 5.30 p.m.

[549] **Ron Davies:** Yr wyf yn drydydd sydd yn disgwyl i ymddiheuro i chi am ei fod yn gorfod mynd.

[550] **Glyn Davies:** Derbyniaf fod hynny'n anochel. Mick, a ydych yn dymuno dweud rhywbeth ar hyn?

[551] **Mick Bates:** Thank you, Chair. Fundamentally, we are trying to look at lessons learned here. Reference has been made to the differential impact of foot and mouth disease throughout Wales and the distribution of funds under rate relief and so on. Would you say that, in view of the fact that, for example, Powys had over 60 per cent of the cases, in any future outbreak the distribution of support should be revisited to make sure that support matches the number of outbreaks and the impact on that area? The second issue—

[552] **Glyn Davies:** Can we just deal with the first one? We simply cannot have a whole series of issues now. That point, to some extent, has already been made, I think.

Michael German: I think that the point is well made. I think that the reason that the second distribution formula was used was, clearly, because it approximated better to the needs than the first one.

[553] **Mick Bates:** It was only a third though, was it not? We were talking about a 60 per cent impact in Powys and 20 per cent of the funding.

[554] **Glyn Davies:** It is a good question, Mick, for the answer given us previously.

Mr E. Roberts: Clearly, the Assembly has discretion as to how to allocate funding through special grant reports. However, it needs to be linked to a formula. It is difficult to get a formula which precisely matches need. I think that that was the difficulty. We did try to weight it as far as we could in favour of rural areas and in favour of areas which had a high number of agricultural businesses and tourism businesses, and which also contained infected areas. However, there is a limit to which you can actually go with a formula.

[551] **Mick Bates:** Diolch i chi, Gadeirydd. Yn y bôn, yr ydym yn ceisio edrych ar y gwersi a ddysgwyd yma. Cyfeiriwyd at effaith wahaniaethol clwy'r traed a'r genau ledled Cymru a dosbarthiad y cyllid drwy ryddhad o'r dreth ac yn y blaen. A ddywedech, yng ngolwg y ffaith mai Powys, er enghraifft, a gafodd dros 60 y cant o'r achosion, y dylid ailystyried y dosbarthiad o gymorth mewn unrhyw achos o'r clwyf yn y dyfodol i sicrhau bod y cymorth yn cyfateb i nifer yr achosion a'r effaith ar yr ardal dan sylw? Yr ail fater—

[552] **Glyn Davies:** A gawn ddelio â'r un cyntaf yn unig? Ni allwn gael cyfres hir o faterion yn awr. Mae'r pwynt hwnnw wedi'i wneud eisoes, i ryw raddau, yr wyf yn credu.

Michael German: Credaf fod y pwynt wedi'i wneud yn dda. Credaf mai'r rheswm dros ddefnyddio'r ail fformiwla ddosbarthu oedd ei bod, wrth gwrs, yn cyfateb yn well i'r anghenion na'r un gyntaf.

[553] **Mick Bates:** Ond dim ond un rhan o dair ydoedd, onid ef? Yr ydym yn sôn am effaith o 60 y cant ym Mhowys ac 20 y cant o'r cyllid.

[554] **Glyn Davies:** Mae'n gwestiwn da, Mick, ar gyfer yr ateb a roddwyd i ni o'r blaen.

Mr E. Roberts: Wrth gwrs, mae gan y Cynulliad ryddid i benderfynu o ran sut i ddyrannu cyllid drwy adroddiadau grant arbennig. Er hynny, rhaid ei gysylltu â fformiwla. Mae'n anodd cael fformiwla sydd yn cyfateb yn union i'r angen. Credaf mai hynny oedd yr anhawster. Gwnaethom geisio ei phwysoli gymaint ag y gallem o blaid yr ardaloedd gwledig ac o blaid ardaloedd lle'r oedd nifer fawr o fusnesau amaethyddol a busnesau twristiaeth, a oedd hefyd yn cynnwys ardaloedd heintiedig. Fodd bynnag, mae pen

Michael German: It is worth saying also that areas in the rural economy which did not have any disease outbreaks also suffered in the tourism context because tourists stayed away universally.

[555] **Glyn Davies:** That was the point that you made earlier on, Mike. Mick, you have another question?

[556] **Mick Bates:** Yes. Thank you, Chair. With regard to support lines and the development of links with the voluntary sector, there was tremendous stress at the time. Some funding has been allocated to provide extra outreach workers to provide support through mental health services. Following this experience, would you recommend that more money needs to be put into rural areas to provide rural support structures in relation to mental health?

[557] **Glyn Davies:** That is a question for an official, really; I do not want Mike German to answer general questions like that, which do not apply to his period in office.

[558] **Mick Bates:** I am sorry, it was.

[559] **Glyn Davies:** Was it?

[560] **Mick Bates:** It was Jasper who dealt with it.

[561] **Glyn Davies:** Okay.

draw i'r hyn y gallwch ei wneud drwy fformiwla.

Michael German: Mae hefyd yn werth dweud bod ardaloedd yn yr economi wledig lle nad oedd unrhyw achosion o'r clwyf wedi dioddef hefyd yng nghyd-destun twristiaeth am fod y twristiaid wedi cadw draw'n gyffredinol.

[555] **Glyn Davies:** Dyna'r pwynt a wnaethoch chi'n gynharach, Mike. Mick, a oes gennych gwestiwn arall?

[556] **Mick Bates:** Oes. Diolch i chi, Gadeirydd. O ran llinellau cymorth a datblygu cysylltiadau â'r sector gwirfoddol, yr oedd pwysau aruthrol ar y pryd. Dyrannwyd rhywfaint o gyllid i ddarparu gweithwyr allanol ychwanegol i ddarparu cymorth drwy wasanaethau iechyd meddwl. Yn sgîl y profiad hwn, a fyddech yn argymhell bod angen rhoi rhagor o arian i'r ardaloedd gwledig i ddarparu strwythurau cymorth gwledig mewn cysylltiad ag iechyd meddwl?

[557] **Glyn Davies:** Mae hynny'n gwestiwn i swyddog, a dweud y gwir; nid wyf yn dymuno i Mike German ateb cwestiynau cyffredinol fel hwnnw, nad ydynt yn berthnasol i'w gyfnod ef yn ei swydd.

[558] **Mick Bates:** Mae'n ddrwg gennyf, yr ydoedd.

[559] **Glyn Davies:** Ai ef?

[560] **Mick Bates:** Jasper a ddeliodd ag ef.

[561] **Glyn Davies:** O'r gorau.

Mr J. Roberts: I will take that question. Money has gone into addressing rural stress in three ways: the rural hardship fund; the rural stress scheme, which is being managed by the Wales Council for Voluntary Action; and the outreach workers to whom you referred. Most of the recruitment for those is now more or less in place. As well as those schemes in the recovery fund, we have provided some funding to bodies such as the rural stress information network for facilitating the application of those schemes. We had a useful meeting in Llandinam a couple of weeks ago with the voluntary sector. We are looking at how some of these issues can be mainstreamed in the longer term. We are working on an evidence-based approach to what rural stress in rural communities is. It is an issue that existed prior to foot and mouth disease; that has exacerbated it. You will recall from the report to the Gregynog conference that Rhodri Hughes is attempting to reconvene the all-Wales committee from that, which will form a basis for reviewing how to take some of that work forward, and look to good practice from the rural stress scheme on how to mainstream that after the rural recovery plan. So the work is being done.

[562] **Glyn Davies:** Are there any other questions?

Mr J. Roberts: Cymeraf fi'r cwestiwn hwnnw. Mae arian wedi'i neilltuo i roi sylw i straen gwledig mewn tri modd: y gronfa caledi gwledig; y cynllun straen gwledig, a reolir gan Gyngor Gweithredu Gwirfoddol Cymru; a'r gweithwyr allanol y cyfeiriasoch atynt. Mae'r rhan fwyaf o'r recriwtio ar gyfer y rheini ar waith bellach fwy neu lai. Yn ogystal â'r cynlluniau hynny yn y gronfa adfer, yr ydym wedi darparu rhywfaint o gyllid i gyrff fel y rhwydwaith gwybodaeth straen gwledig i hwyluso gweithrediad y cynlluniau hynny. Cawsom gyfarfod buddiol yn Llandinam ychydig o wythnosau'n ôl gyda'r sector gwirfoddol. Yr ydym yn ystyried sut y gellir rhoi rhai o'r materion hyn yn y brif ffrwd yn y tymor hwy. Yr ydym yn gweithio ar ddull gweithredu sy'n seiliedig ar dystiolaeth i ganfod beth yw'r straen gwledig mewn cymunedau gwledig. Mae'n fater a oedd yn bodoli cyn clwy'r traed a'r genau; mae hwnnw wedi'i waethygu. Byddwch yn cofio, o'r adroddiad i gynhadledd Gregynog, fod Rhodri Hughes yn ceisio ailgynnull y pwyllgor Cymru gyfan ar hynny, a fydd yn sail i adolygu sut i fwrw ymlaen â pheth o'r gwaith hwnnw, ac i ystyried yr arfer da yn y cynllun straen gwledig o ran y modd i roi hynny yn y brif ffrwd ar ôl y cynllun adfer gwledig. Felly mae'r gwaith yn mynd ymlaen.

[562] **Glyn Davies:** A oes unrhyw gwestiynau eraill?

[563] **Peter Rogers:** I have a quick question. One of the anomalies that came out of the rural recovery fund is that there is a limit in Europe on businesses not receiving in excess of £60,000. We never foresaw businesses being closed down—some for up to almost 12 months. An appeal was, in fact, made to Europe. What has been the result of trying to get an understanding in the EU with regard to lifting the ceiling on those businesses that were closed down?

Mr E. Roberts: Very early on, after the outbreak, the UK Government approached the European Commission to obtain special permission to run a state aid scheme (1). That was turned down. We then had to operate under *de minimus*, which is the £60,000 limit. That remains the position at the moment.

[564] **Peter Rogers:** It is a closed issue, then; there are no more appeals and that is the decision?

Mr E. Roberts: Well, I think that we will continue to raise it, but, for the moment, we have to operate under the £60,000 rule.

[565] **Glyn Davies:** Thank you, Emyr. Any further questions? No? Okay. Thank you all, and thank you Mike for coming along to help. That brings the meeting to a close.

[563] **Peter Rogers:** Mae gennyf fi gwestiwn cyflym. Un o'r anghysonderau a gododd o'r cynllun adfer gwledig yw bod cyfyngiad yn Ewrop sy'n golygu na chaiff busnesau dderbyn mwy na £60,000. Nid oeddem erioed wedi rhagweld y byddai busnesau'n cau—rhai am ymron i 12 mis. Cyflwynwyd apêl i Ewrop, a dweud y gwir. Beth fu'r canlyniad i'r ymgais i gael cyd-ddealltwriaeth â'r UE mewn cysylltiad â chodi'r terfyn uchaf ar gyfer y busnesau hynny a gaewyd?

Mr E. Roberts: Yn gynnar iawn, ar ôl achosion o'r clwyf, cysylltodd Llywodraeth y DU â'r Comisiwn Ewropeaidd i gael caniatâd arbennig i redeg cynllun cymorth gwladol (1). Gwrthodwyd hynny. Wedyn yr oedd yn rhaid inni weithredu yn ôl *de minimus*, sef y cyfyngiad o £60,000. Dyna'r sefyllfa o hyd ar hyn o bryd.

[564] **Peter Rogers:** Mae'r mater wedi cau, felly; ni fydd rhagor o apeliadau a dyna'r penderfyniad?

Mr E. Roberts: Wel, yr wyf yn credu y byddwn yn dal i'w godi, ond, am y tro, rhaid inni weithredu o dan y rheol £60,000.

[565] **Glyn Davies:** Diolch i chi, Emyr. A oes unrhyw gwestiynau pellach? Nac oes? O'r gorau. Diolch i bob un ohonoch, a diolch i chi, Mike, am ddod yma i helpu. Daw hynny â'r cyfarfod i ben.

Daeth y cyfarfod i ben am 5.36 p.m.

The meeting ended at 5.36 p.m.

(1) Hoffai'r tyst ei gwneud yn glir mai cyfeirio at gynllun cymorth rhagnodedig i adfer busnesau yr ydoedd.

(1) The witness would like to clarify that he was referring to a notified aid scheme for business recovery.