**From:** Vets Against Live Export <info@vale.org.au>

**Subject: Re Tues 27th Nov 2012**

**Date:** 28 November 2012 3:40:21 PM AWST

**To:** Haydn.Roeger@aqis.gov.au

Dear Dr Roeger,

I wish to apologise for not introducing myself to you yesterday at Fremantle Port. Unfortunately, I did not realise that you were a veterinarian, let alone a senior veterinarian for DAFF Biosecurity. Had I realised who you were, I would have referred Ms Saklani’s question to you and also introduced myself. I am the spokesperson for Vets Against Live Export (VALE) but have been intermittently observing conditions at Fremantle Port in an independent capacity for the last 12 months.

For what it is worth, my advice to Ms Saklani was that the sheep had bilateral mucopurulent nasal discharge with significant crusting ventral to the nostrils and that nasal discharge, as you would know, is a rejection criterion under ASEL 2.3. It was also my opinion that this would not have occurred during transport and appeared to be of a chronic nature. As such, the sheep should not have been transported to Fremantle Port unless the condition was inadvertently missed at loading. I appreciate that you and your colleagues would have rejected this sheep from the shipment.

Interestingly, there seemed to be quite a high prevalence of nasal discharge in the sheep on each of the five trucks I observed during my short visit to Fremantle Port. Some of these sheep also had a milder ocular discharge. Quick limited observations did not permit me to comment on the possibility of pneumonia. I would be interested in any comment you could make regarding this possibility.

Yours sincerely

Sue Foster BVSc MVetClinStud FANZCVS