



Organisation
Mondiale
de la Santé
Animale

World
Organisation
for Animal
Health

Organización
Mundial
de Sanidad
Animal

Original: English

February 2014

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION

Paris, 11–20 February 2014

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at the OIE Headquarters in Paris from 11 to 20 February 2014. The list of participants is attached as [Annex I](#).

The Code Commission thanked the following Member Countries for providing written comments on draft texts circulated after the Commission's September meeting: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Canada, Chile, China, Chinese Taipei, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Japan, Kazakhstan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, the Philippines, the United States of America (USA), Uruguay, the 28 Member States of the European Union (EU), the African Union–Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of the OIE Delegates of Africa, and the Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA). Comments were also received from the Comité Veterinario Permanente del Cono Sur (CVP). In addition, the International Embryo Transfer Society (IETS) and the International Coalition for Farm Animal Welfare (ICFAW) submitted comments.

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments that had been submitted by 10 January 2014 and amended texts in the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Terrestrial Code*) where appropriate. The amendments are shown in the usual manner by 'double underline' and '~~striketrough~~' and may be found in the Annexes to the report. Amendments made at the February 2014 meeting are highlighted with a coloured background in order to distinguish them from those made previously. All Member Countries' comments were considered by the Code Commission. However, because of the very large volume of work, the Commission was not able to draft a detailed explanation of the reasons for accepting or not every proposal received. Member Countries are reminded that if comments are resubmitted without modification or new justification, the Commission will not, as a rule, repeat previous explanations for decisions. The Commission encourages Member Countries to refer to previous reports when preparing comments on longstanding issues. The Commission also draws the attention of Member Countries to those instances where the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (the Scientific Commission) has addressed Member Countries' comments and proposed amendments. In such cases, the rationale for such amendments is described in the Scientific Commission's report and the Code Commission encourages Member Countries to review its report together with those of the Scientific Commission and *ad hoc* groups.

Member Countries should note that texts in Part A of this report are proposed for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014. Texts in Part B are submitted for comment by Member Countries and comments received will be addressed during the Commission's meeting in September 2014. The reports of meetings (Working Group and *ad hoc* Groups) and other related documents are attached for information in Part B of this report.

The Code Commission again strongly encourages Member Countries to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by submitting comments on this report, and prepare to participate in the process of adoption at the General Session. Comments should be submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a structured rationale. Proposed deletions should be indicated in '~~striketrough~~' and proposed additions with 'double underline'. Member Countries should not use the automatic 'track-changes' function provided by word processing software as such changes are lost in the process of collating Member Countries' submissions into the Commission's working documents.

Comments on this report must reach OIE Headquarters **by 8 August 2014** to be considered at the September 2014 meeting of the Code Commission. All comments should be sent to the OIE International Trade Department at: trade.dept@oie.int.

A. MEETING WITH THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

The Code Commission met Dr Bernard Vallat, the Director General of the OIE, on 11 February 2014 to discuss several key topics as follows.

1. Coordination among Specialist Commissions

Dr Alejandro Thiermann noted that the participation of the Code Commission members as observers in relevant *ad hoc* Group meetings has proven very useful in ensuring early alignment of the work of *ad hoc* Groups with the needs of the Code Commission. It was also agreed that the welcome return to scheduling overlapping Scientific and Code Commission meetings to allow joint meetings in both February and September 2014 will enable greater cohesion and alignment of the work of both Commissions. Dr Vallat also noted that the imminent appointment of Deputy Director General Dr Evans will contribute to improve coordination between the Specialist Commissions and relevant OIE Headquarters' departments.

2. High health status horse subpopulation

Dr Vallat outlined the background to the current work programme with the Fédération Equestre Internationale (FEI) and the International Federation of Horseracing Authorities (IFHA). The expectation is that once the concept and principles are adopted, more detailed guidelines will be developed as needed. The Code Commission welcomed this approach and agreed with the importance of highlighting and applying existing standards to facilitate temporary movement of these high health status horses.

The growing issue of smuggling and necessary controls at border inspection posts was also discussed.

B. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The adopted agenda of the meeting is attached as [Annex II](#).

C. REPORT ON THE JOINT MEETING OF THE CODE COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION (14th February)

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission met together on 14th February to discuss various issues of mutual interest. The minutes of this joint meeting are attached as [Annex III](#).

D. EXAMINATION OF MEMBER COUNTRY COMMENTS AND WORK OF RELEVANT EXPERT GROUPS

Item 1. General comments of Member Countries

General comments were received from Australia, Bangladesh, Japan, New Zealand, the Philippines, and AU-IBAR.

Under this item, the Code Commission noted Member Countries' endorsement of the proposals in the report of the September 2014 meeting.

In response to a Member Country's comment on the consistency and accuracy of the use of the terms embryos/oocytes, embryos/ova and embryos throughout the *Terrestrial Code*, it was agreed that the International Trade Department would identify where these terms are used, and seek an expert's advice on which term is appropriate in each instance for review by the Code Commission at its September 2014 meeting.

A Member Country observed an inconsistency in the way commodities are classified as safe amongst various chapters of the *Terrestrial* and *Aquatic Codes*. The Code Commission proposed that 'safe commodities' in each chapter should refer to those commodities that, regardless of the specific disease status of the exporting country or zone, are safe for trade without treatment or with generic treatments such as canning, pasteurisation, ante- and post-mortem inspection, etc. Commodities that require pathogen specific treatment are excluded. The Code Commission will take this into consideration as chapters are reviewed, and liaise with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (the Aquatic Animals Commission) as appropriate.

In response to a Member Country's concern on variations to the cycle of standard development, including shorter than normal periods for consultation on draft texts, the Code Commission agreed that the OIE should minimise such irregularities.

In response to a Member Country's observation on the inconsistent use of the terms 'disinsection', 'disinsectisation', and 'disinfestation' in the *Terrestrial Code*, the Commission recognised each of these terms has a specific meaning and requested the International Trade Department to review where these terms are used in the *Terrestrial Code*, and provide recommendations for appropriate amendments for the Code Commission to consider at its September 2014 meeting. The Code Commission recognised that the title of Chapter 4.13. should be 'disinsection' rather than 'disinsectisation', as this is the term used by WHO, IATA and numerous other organisations, and proposes that amendment.

Item 2. Horizontal issues

a) User's Guide

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, China, EU, New Zealand, Switzerland, and AU-IBAR.

In response to a Member Country's comment requesting definition of the term 'standard', the Code Commission recalled the clarification of this issue made in the report of the February 2013 Code Commission report as follows:

"While recognising that the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization does not make a legal distinction between the terms standards, guidelines and recommendations, the Commission considered that there should be clear differentiation when they are used in the OIE texts: 'standards' means any texts which have been subjected to the official procedure of the OIE for adoption by the World Assembly of Delegates, and thus are found in *Codes* and *Manuals*, while 'guidelines' and 'recommendations' are used for other texts published by the OIE Headquarters".

The Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to amend point 2 of the introduction to use the active voice and improve readability, but rejected Member Countries' suggestion to replace "ones" with "pathogenic agents" in the same point as inferior syntax.

The Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to delete unnecessary words from the end of point 3 of the introduction.

The Commission accepted the OIE Headquarters' suggestion to insert new point 5 into the introduction to remind readers that the *Terrestrial Code* is available on the OIE website.

The Code Commission made additional changes to improve harmonisation with the *Aquatic Animal Health Code* (the *Aquatic Code*) where appropriate.

A Member Country's comment on the use of the *Terrestrial Code* triggered a discussion on those instances in which there are no recommendations on a specific issue in the *Terrestrial Code*. The Code Commission considered that the absence of recommendations does not mean that measures may not be applied. For example, the absence of a recommendation on trade in a particular chapter does not mean that the commodity in question should not be traded. Also, absence of an entire chapter on a specific disease does not mean a Member Country may not apply animal health measures relevant to the disease in question to protect its territory. However, such measures should be based on a risk analysis. The Code Commission drafted a new point 4 in Section A to clarify this point.

With respect to point 4 of Section B, the Code Commission agreed with Member Countries' view that the meaning of 'to justify import measures which result in a higher level of protection than would be achieved by measures based on existing OIE trade standards' is not clear. The Code Commission revised the text to clarify that its focus is on the extent to which different measures restrict trade.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's proposal to change 'disinsection' to 'disinfestation' in point 6 of Section B as these terms are not synonyms. 'Disinsection' is a broader term than 'disinfestation'.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission modified the language of points 9 and 10 of Section B to improve clarity and readability, and accepted a Member Country's suggestion to correct the Spanish version of point 10.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestions to improve wording and grammar of the text in Section C on Notification, Diagnostic tests and vaccines, and Prevention and control. It rejected a Member Country's suggestion to add 'infestations' to the text on Prevention and control for Chapters 4.5. to 4.11. since these chapters deal with semen and embryos for which only 'diseases' and 'infections' are relevant.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to split the text in Section C 3 on Prevention and Control referring to Chapters 6.4. and 6.5. into separate sentences and delete an unnecessary phrase from the end of the sentence referring to Chapter 6.5.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's comment on the first paragraph of Section C 4 on Trade requirements to improve the structure of the sentence. It also accepted another comment on the text with respect to safe commodities to use stronger and more direct wording about expectations.

In Section C 5 on International Veterinary Certificates, the Code Commission accepted, but modified, Member Countries' comments to improve sentence structure, grammar and readability.

Similarly, the Code Commission accepted, but modified, a Member Country's suggestion to improve sentence structure in the text in Section C 6 on Guidance notes for importers and exporters.

The revised User's Guide is attached as [Annex IV](#) to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

b) General obligations related to certification

The Code Commission accepted the OIE Headquarters' suggestion to reword Article 5.1.2. points 1 and 2 to improve clarity.

The revised Chapter 5.1., as attached in [Annex V](#), is presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

c) Harmonisation of articles on disease status determination

The Commission agreed with the OIE Headquarters' suggestion to harmonise currently inconsistent language in various chapters introducing the criteria to be applied to determine the disease status of a country or zone. It decided to use 'should be determined on the basis of' instead of other phrases for the recommendation to the Veterinary Authority and to use 'is' instead of 'should be' for the criteria, which are facts. These amendments will be incorporated as and when other changes are proposed in the relevant chapters.

Item 3 Glossary

Comments were received from Argentina, Belarus, Chile, EU, Kazakhstan, New Zealand, Russia, Switzerland, USA and OIRSA.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestions to improve the clarity and specificity of the definition of emerging disease, but rejected one comment suggesting the additions of further text to specify the types of changes of a known pathogenic agent as too restrictive. Similarly it rejected Member Countries' suggestion to replace 'pathogenic' with 'aetiologic', which it considered a less specific adjective.

The Code Commission accepted the OIE Headquarters' suggestion to add 'scientific' to the definition of risk assessment.

For the definition of 'stamping out' the Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to replace 'premises' with 'establishment' (which is defined in the glossary), and suggested improvements to the Spanish version but rejected a Member Country's suggestion to add 'Total' to the term 'Stamping out' as unnecessary since 'modified stamping out' is defined.

In response to Member Countries' divergent and irreconcilable comments on the definition of 'veterinarian', the Code Commission noted that none of the proposed changes could be applied to all Member Countries, given that many Member Countries do not yet have Veterinary Statutory Bodies or education requirements for veterinarians specified in legislation. The Code Commission also noted that this issue is likely to be considered further in progressing the recommendation from the 2013 OIE Global Conference on Veterinary Education and the Role of the Veterinary Statutory Body to develop a global register of Veterinary Education Establishments. Considering these points, the Code Commission decided not to propose any change to the current definition of 'veterinarian'.

The revised Glossary is attached as Annex VI to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 4 Notification of diseases, infections, infestations and epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, EU, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland, USA and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to differentiate obligatory notification and voluntary information in the title of Chapter 1.1.

It also accepted Member Countries' suggestion to add reference to Article 1.1.3. bis to Articles 1.1.2. point 2, and 5.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestions to re-arrange the wording of Article 1.1.2. points 4 and 5 to improve readability.

The Code Commission decided to refer Member Countries' questions and comments on the formatting of reports to the OIE Information Department to review and report back to the September 2014 meeting of the Commission.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' suggestion to replace the word 'unusual' with 'novel' or 'new' in Article 1.1.3. point e as too restrictive given that new or novel may be interpreted as the first occurrence only at either global or individual country level.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' suggestion to split Article 1.1.3. point d into two paragraphs as unnecessary.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to require notification in Article 1.1.3. bis point 1 within 24 hours, since an emerging disease is extremely unlikely to be recognised as such within 24 hours of first occurrence. The Code Commission reflected that it can take weeks or months before it is realised that an observed disease is new and emerging as described in the glossary. It also noted that the WAHIS notification system ensures all Member Countries are notified of a new emerging disease report as soon as the information is confirmed.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to re-format Article 1.1.3. bis point 2 to improve readability.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' suggestion to reference 'event closure' in Article 1.1.3. bis point 2, since this situation is included in the existing provisions referencing 'eradication' or 'sufficiently stable'.

Similarly, the Code Commission rejected as unnecessary a Member Country's suggestion to add to this chapter language already provided in the WAHIS instructions.

The revised Chapter 1.1. is attached as Annex VII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 5 Criteria for listing diseases

a) Criteria for the inclusion of diseases, infections and infestations on the OIE list (Chapter 1.2.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, China, EU, Guatemala, Japan, Russia, Switzerland, USA, AU-IBAR and OIRSA.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' requests to retain Swine Vesicular Disease and Vesicular Stomatitis as listed diseases, as none provided an adequate rationale based on the listing criteria of Article 1.2.2. Justification for the delisting of these two diseases is provided in the following extract from a submission from a Member Country:

Swine vesicular disease

International spread

Swine vesicular disease virus (SVDV) is exceptionally stable outside the host and indirect contacts such as transport vehicles or waste feeding play an important role in the spread of disease (Hedger and Mann, 1989). Experimental inoculation or exposure to a contaminated environment is followed by the rapid development of viraemia (Dekker *et al.*, 1995).

The between farm spread of SVD is mainly related to movements of infected animals or contaminated trucks, but also to the introduction of contaminated material or persons (EFSA, 2012).

Maes *et al.* (2008) noted that artificial insemination using SVDV-infected semen failed to transmit disease to sows. Similarly, van Rijn *et al.* (2004) were unable to isolate virus directly from the semen of boars artificially infected with SVDV intravenously although virus isolation carried out following the blind passage of semen samples in cell culture did detect SVDV. PCR testing of semen from artificially infected boars gave weak positive results, suggesting low numbers of SVDV RNA (van Rijn *et al.*, 2004).

Country freedom

Many countries, several with general or targeted surveillance, report that SVD has never occurred (OIE, 2012).

SVD first emerged in Italy in 1966 (Nardelli *et al.*, 1968) and was subsequently diagnosed in a number of European countries (Lubroth *et al.*, 2006; Sabirovic *et al.*, 2009; Sabirovic *et al.*, 2010a; Sabirovic *et al.*, 2010b).

The disease is likely to be present in various parts of eastern Asia; the last reported case of SVD from the Far East being in Taiwan in 2000 (EFSA, 2012).

Significant mortality

Infection of pigs with SVDV results in vesicular lesions whose severity may be heavily influenced by environmental factors (Hedger and Mann, 1989). These lesions may be accompanied by fever, lack of appetite and general malaise.

Recovery from infection is usually complete in 2–3 weeks, with the only evidence of infection being a dark, horizontal line on the hoof where growth has been temporarily interrupted. Disease caused by mild strains may remain unobserved, particularly in pigs kept on grass or housed on deep straw. Younger animals are more severely affected, although mortality due to SVD is very rare. Nervous signs have been reported, but are unusual. Recent outbreaks of SVD have been characterised by less severe or no clinical signs; infection has been detected when samples are tested for a serosurveillance programme or for export certification (OIE, 2008).

Diagnosis

Where a vesicular condition is seen in pigs, the demonstration by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) of SVD viral antigen in a sample of lesion material or vesicular fluid is sufficient for a positive diagnosis. If the quantity of lesion material submitted is not sufficient (less than 0.5 g), or if the test results are negative or inconclusive, a more sensitive test, such as the reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) or isolation of virus (VI) in porcine cell cultures, may be used. If any inoculated cultures subsequently develop a cytopathic effect, the demonstration of SVD viral antigen by ELISA or by RT-PCR will suffice to make a positive diagnosis. Subclinical infection may be detected by random sampling of pen-floor faeces followed by identification of SVD viral genome using RT-PCR or VI tests (OIE, 2008).

Serological tests can be used to help confirm clinical cases as well as to identify subclinical infections. Specific antibody to SVD virus can be identified using the microneutralisation test or ELISA. Although the microneutralisation test requires 2–3 days to complete, it remains the definitive test for antibody to SVD virus. A small proportion (up to 0.1%) of normal, uninfected pigs will react positively in serological tests for SVD. The reactivity of these singleton reactors is transient, so that they can be differentiated from infected pigs by resampling of the positive animal and its cohorts (OIE, 2008).

Conclusion

SVD is not associated with human infection, significant morbidity or mortality in domestic animals, or significant morbidity or mortality in wildlife. Using the criteria in Article 1.2.2. for determining if a disease should be listed, SVD should not be included in the OIE list.

References

- Dekker A., Moonen P., de Boer-Luijtz E.A. Terpstra C. (1995).** Pathogenesis of swine vesicular disease after exposure of pigs to an infected environment. *Veterinary Microbiology*, 45, 234–50.
- EFSA (2012).** Scientific Opinion on Swine Vesicular Disease and Vesicular Stomatitis. *EFSA Journal* 10, 2631.
- Hedger R.S. and Mann J.A. (1989).** Swine vesicular disease virus. In Pensaert MB (ed) *Virus Infections of Vertebrates, Volume 2. Virus Infections of Porcines*. Pp 241–50, Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Lubroth J., Rodríguez L. and Dekker A. (2006).** Vesicular diseases. In: Straw BE, Zimmerman JJ, D’Allaire S, Taylor DJ (eds) *Diseases of Swine 9th Edition*, pp 517–35, Blackwell Publishing.
- Maes D., Nauwynck H., Rijsselaere T., Mateusen B., Vyt P., de Kruif A. and Van Soom A. (2008)** Diseases in swine transmitted by artificial insemination: An overview. *Theriogenology*, 70, 1337–45.
- Nardelli L., Lodetti E., Gualandi G.L., Burrows R., Goodridge D., Brown F. and Cartwright B. (1968).** A foot and mouth disease syndrome in pigs caused by an enterovirus. *Nature*, 219, 1275–6.
- OIE (2012).** **WAHID interface.**
http://www.oie.int/wahis_2/public/wahid.php/Diseaseinformation/Diseasedistributionmap
- OIE (2008) Swine vesicular disease.** *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals*. Chapter 2.8.9. Available at:
http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Health_standards/tahm/2.08.09_SVD.pdf
- Sabirovic M., Roberts H., Papadopoulou C., Lopez M., Hancock R. and Calistri P. (2009).** International disease monitoring, July to September 2009. *Veterinary Record*, 165, 552–5.
- Sabirovic M., Roberts H., Lopez M., Hancock R. (2010a).** International disease monitoring, October to December 2009. *Veterinary Record*, 166, 160–2.

Sabirovic M., Roberts H., Lopez M. and Hancock R. (2010b). International disease monitoring, January to March. *Veterinary Record*, 166, 483–6.

van Rijn P.A., Wellenberg G.J., der Honing R.H., Jacobs L., Moonen P.L.J.M. and Feitsma H. (2004). Detection of economically important viruses in boar semen by quantitative RealTime PCR technology. *Journal of Virological Methods*, 120, 151–60.

Vesicular stomatitis

International spread

Vesicular stomatitis is primarily an insect-borne virus but it can also be transmitted by contact (Lubroth *et al.*, 2006). Outbreaks of disease occur sporadically in the USA and are always associated with insect transmission (Lubroth *et al.*, 2006; Rodriguez 2002; Rodriguez *et al.*, 1996). The virus is found in epithelial tissues of the mouth, nose, coronary region of the hooves, teats and lymph nodes (Lubroth *et al.*, 2006). It is not found in blood (Lubroth *et al.*, 2006). There are no references to it being excreted in semen. There is no evidence of a carrier state in cattle, horses, or swine (EFSA, 2012), suggesting that international spread through trade in animals is highly unlikely.

Country freedom

Vesicular stomatitis is restricted to the Americas, but in the past it has also been reported in France (1915 and 1917) and in South Africa (1886 and 1897) (EFSA, 2012).

Significant mortality

Infection in animals generally is typified by a short febrile period and full recovery. The incubation period is short, ranging from 2 to 8 days after infection with an average of 3–5 days. The most common early signs are excessive salivation and drooling. The disease is characterised by vesicles, papules, erosions and ulcers. Vesicles are caused by the action of the virus on the tongue, lips, buccal mucosa, teats, and in the coronary band epithelium of cattle, horses, pigs and many other species of domestic and wild animals. Vesicular lesions in horses generally occur on the upper surface of the tongue, lips, around nostrils, corners of the mouth, and gums. Lesions in horses may also be expressed as crusting scabs on the muzzle, lips or ventral abdomen. Affected pigs usually first show signs of lameness caused by foot lesions (EFSA, 2012).

Observational studies on outbreaks indicated several subclinical infections with limited observed clinical signs, both in equidae and cattle. The mortality is negligible. The data on production losses are limited, but they seem to be variable (EFSA, 2012).

In humans, vesicular stomatitis is an acute, self-limiting infection with signs similar to influenza. The incubation period is usually 3 to 4 days, but it can be as short as 24 hours or as long as 6 days. The symptoms can include fever, muscle aches, headache and malaise. Vesicles are rare, but can occasionally be found on the mouth, lips or fingers. Deaths have not been reported, and most people recover without complications in 4 to 7 days (EFSA, 2012).

Diagnosis

Vesicular stomatitis virus can be readily isolated by the inoculation of several tissue culture systems, unweaned mice or embryonated chicken eggs. Viral RNA can be detected from epithelial tissue and vesicular fluid by conventional and real-time reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (PCR). Viral antigen can be identified by an indirect sandwich enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (IS-ELISA) which is the least expensive and most rapid test. The complement fixation (CF) test is also a good alternative. The virus neutralisation (VN) test may be used, but it is elaborate and time-consuming (OIE, 2010).

Convalescent animals develop serotype-specific antibodies within 4–8 days of infection that are demonstrated by a liquid-phase blocking ELISA (LP-ELISA), a competitive ELISA (C-ELISA) and VN. Other tests are CF, agar gel immunodiffusion and counter immunoelectrophoresis (OIE, 2010).

Conclusion

Natural transmission of vesicular stomatitis to humans is recognised although subsequent disease is inconsequential. Infection is not associated with significant morbidity or mortality in domestic animals, or significant morbidity or mortality in wildlife. Using the criteria in Article 1.2.2., vesicular stomatitis should **not** be included in the OIE list.

References

EFSA (2012). Scientific Opinion on Swine Vesicular Disease and Vesicular Stomatitis. *EFSA Journal* 10, 2631.

Lubroth J., Rodriguez L. and Dekker A. (2006). Vesicular stomatitis. *In*: Straw B.E., Zimmerman J.J., D'Allaire S. & Taylor D.J. (eds), *Diseases of Swine*. 9th edition, Pp. 525–535, Blackwell Publishing, Ames, Iowa.

OIE (2010). Vesicular stomatitis. *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals*. Chapter 2.1.19 Available at: http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Health_standards/tahm/2.01.19_VESICULAR_STOMITIS.pdf

Rodriguez L.L. (2002). Emergence and re-emergence of vesicular stomatitis in the United States. *Virus Research*, 85(2), 211–219.

Rodriguez L.L., Fitch W.M. and Nichol S.T. (1996). Ecological factors rather than temporal factors dominate the evolution of vesicular stomatitis virus. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 93(23), 13030–13035.

The Code Commission also rejected a Member Country's suggestion to amend Article 1.2.2. point 3 b) because the proposed amendment would not add any value to the existing text.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' suggestion to reinsert the previous point 5 of Article 1.2.2. because the new Article 1.1.3. bis clarifies the requirements for notification of emerging diseases, and Article 1.2.2. provides the criteria by which all diseases, including emerging diseases, are considered for listing.

In response to a Member Country's question as to why 'Infection with *Trichinella* spp.' remains a listed disease, the Code Commission noted that point 2 of Article 1.2.2. applies to populations of susceptible animals rather than an entire country; and in the case of *Trichinella* spp. there are countries which could demonstrate freedom of populations of susceptible animals from particular species of *Trichinella*.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to replace 'Rift Valley Fever' with 'Infection with Rift Valley Fever Virus' in Article 1.2.3. point 1 and similarly in point 6 to replace 'Newcastle disease' with 'Infection with Newcastle disease virus'.

The Commission rejected Member Countries' suggestion to revert to a single listing of avian influenza, as it considers the current dual listing helps distinguish the different obligations with respect to detection of avian influenza viruses in poultry, and detection of influenza A viruses of high pathogenicity in birds other than poultry.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion to review the listing criteria, without providing any rationale, the Code Commission recalled that the current listing criteria were reviewed and adopted only recently, in 2011.

The revised Chapter 1.2., together with the deletion of Chapters 8.16. and 15.4., is attached as Annex VIII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

b) Report of the ad hoc Group on Schmallenberg virus infection and the Scientific Commission's view on it

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* group had rigorously assessed Schmallenberg virus against the criteria for listing and agreed with the *ad hoc* group's well-supported conclusion that Schmallenberg virus does not meet the criteria in Article 1.2.2.

Item 6 Import risk analysis (Chapter 2.1.)

Comments received from Australia, China, EU and Switzerland.

The Code Commission accepted a Commission member's proposal to delete 'potential' from the term 'potential hazard' throughout the chapter where the hazard has clearly been recognised (and therefore use of the qualifier 'potential' is redundant). This change is logical and aligns with the terminology used in the OIE *Handbook on Import Risk Analysis* and with Codex Alimentarius Commission.

In response to Member Countries' suggestion to change the title of the chapter to reflect the point that risk analysis is no longer restricted to imports, the Code Commission agreed to reflect on this issue and re-consider how it may be dealt with at their September 2014 meeting.

In response to a Member Country's request to reinsert language referring to the SPS Agreement in Article 2.1.1., the Code Commission noted that this language is now in Chapter 5.3., and does not need to be duplicated here.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' and OIE Headquarters' editorial comments to improve clarity in Articles 2.1.1., 2.1.5. and 2.1.6.

The revised Chapter 2.1. is attached as Annex IX to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 7 Support for Veterinary Services

The Code Commission was updated on the Global Conference on Veterinary Education and the Role of Veterinary Statutory Body held in December 2013. It was also updated on activities under the OIE PVS Pathway.

Item 8 Semen and embryos

a) Collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen (Chapter 4.6.)

Comments were received from Australia, New Zealand and Switzerland.

In response to Member Countries' comments highlighting inconsistencies between Chapter 4.6. and some disease-specific chapters, the Code Commission recommended that Chapter 4.6. should be referred to an expert for review, and then reconsidered at the September 2014 meeting of the Code Commission.

b) Collection and processing of *in vivo* derived embryos from livestock and equids (Chapter 4.7.)

Comments were received from Australia, EU and IETS.

The Code Commission recalled that a Member Country's comments concerning the process used by the IETS to determine categorisation of agents subsequently adopted in the *Terrestrial Code* was dealt with at its September 2013 meeting and, demonstrating that process in action, the Code Commission added Q fever (*Coxiella burnetii*) to category 4 on the basis of the reference:

Fieni *et al.* (2013). Can *Coxiella burnetii* be transmitted by embryo transfer in goats? *Theriogenology*, **80** (6), 571–575.

Similarly, the Code Commission moved porcine circovirus type 2 to category 3 on the basis of the reference:

Bielanski A., Algire J. *et al.* (2013). *Non transmission of porcine circovirus 2 (PCV 2) by embryo transfer. Theriogenology*, **80** (2), 77–83.

The revised Chapter 4.7. is attached as Annex X to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 9 Trade measures, import/export procedures and veterinary certification

a) Certification procedures (Chapter 5.2.)

Comments were received from EU.

The Code Commission accepted proposed amendments to Article 5.2.4. point 1 to better describe the procedures for electronic certification.

The revised Chapter 5.2. is attached as Annex XI to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

b) Animal health measures applicable before and at departure (Chapter 5.4.)

Based on the proposal by the OIE Headquarters, the Code Commission amended reference to the *Terrestrial Code* chapters on model veterinary certificates in this chapter.

The revised Chapter 5.4. is attached as Annex XII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 10 Antimicrobial resistance

a) Introduction to the recommendations for controlling antimicrobial resistance (Chapter 6.6.)

Comments were received from EU, Norway and Switzerland.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to replace the words 'animal husbandry' with 'animals' in the opening paragraph of Article 6.6.1., and to replace the words 'entire animal sector' with 'all animal sectors' at the end of the third paragraph of the same article to more clearly indicate that pets and non-food producing animals are included in this objective.

The revised Chapter 6.6. is attached as Annex XIII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

b) Harmonisation of national antimicrobial resistance surveillance and monitoring programmes (Chapter 6.7.)

Comments were received from Australia, China, EU, Norway, Switzerland and USA.

Many detailed comments were received on this chapter, and these have been referred to *ad hoc* group experts to address. Amendments proposed as a result of these comments will be submitted for Member Countries' review and comment at a later date.

c) Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine (Chapter 6.9.)

Comments were received from Australia, EU, Norway, Switzerland and USA.

The Code Commission noted that this chapter had been thoroughly revised and adopted in May 2013, with a few pending points.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's observation of incorrect editing of the plural for agents and products in a number of places in the previous draft, and made the necessary corrections.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's suggestion to delete the unnecessary words 'as far as possible' from Article 6.9.2. point 3.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to add the qualifying words 'biologically active' to 'residues' in Article 6.9.2. point 5 as unnecessary detail.

Similarly the Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to add the words 'when indicated' to the end of point 2 d of Article 6.9.3. as unnecessary qualification.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to add the words 'strive to' and delete the words 'that all' from Article 6.9.3. point 9 as contrary to the prudent use objective of this chapter.

In response to a Member Country's question on who may be designated 'authorised persons' in Article 6.9.3. point 9 c, the Code Commission advised this is a matter for the relevant Competent Authorities to manage.

In response to a Member Country's observation, the Code Commission corrected the cross reference article points of Article 6.9.4. point 4 and 5, Article 6.9.5. point 3, and Article 6.9.6. point 6.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to include a new sentence in Article 6.9.6. related to a veterinarian's independence, impartiality, integrity and objectivity as these points are all addressed in Chapter 3.1.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's suggestion to delete the unnecessary word 'ideally' from Article 6.9.6. point 2 a.

In response to a Member Country's request for improved clarity the Code Commission amended Article 6.9.8. point 3.

The revised Chapter 6.9. is attached as Annex XIV to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

d) Risk assessment for antimicrobial resistance arising from the use of antimicrobial agents in animals (Chapter 6.10.)

Comments were received from Australia, China, EU, Switzerland, USA and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to re-arrange the first paragraph of point 1 of Article 6.10.1. to more clearly highlight the points of emphasis. It rejected a Member Country's request to replace the word 'non-therapeutic' with 'production' as unnecessary.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestions to improve the grammar of Article 6.10.1. point 5. However, they rejected the suggestion to delete the last paragraph of this point as they consider this usefully cross references this article to Chapter 2.1.

In Article 6.10.2. the Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to replace 'release assessment' with 'entry assessment' in point 3 because in this case the hazard is released. They accepted Member Countries' suggestions to add 'entertainment' to the category of animal species considered, and to clarify the reference to sex in this point. However, the Code Commission and the *ad hoc* group rejected a Member Country's suggestion to merge the clause on data on extra-label and off-label use with the clause on data on trends in *antimicrobial* use in point 3, since data on extra-label and off-label use are often difficult to obtain and insufficient to recognise usage trends. In the 9th indent of the list of factors to be considered in the release assessment, the Code Commission changed 'animal host' to 'animal species' in response to a Member Country's suggestion.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's request to replace the term probability with 'likelihood' in the chapeau text of Article 6.10.2. point 4 since, as noted on page 1 of the OIE *Handbook on Import Risk Analysis for Animals and Animal Products*, these are interchangeable terms.

In the list of factors to be considered in the exposure assessment (Article 6.10.2. point 4), the Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to delete the unnecessary words 'or other exposure' from the 2nd and 3rd indents, and to add the words 'that have the capacity to become established in the animals, thus leading to contamination of foods of animal origin' to the 5th indent. They rejected a Member Country's request to specify the type of waste referred to in the 10th indent as unnecessary and potentially restrictive.

In the list of factors to be considered in the consequence assessment (Article 6.10.2. point 5), the Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to reword the indent on 'microbial dose' to improve clarity.

In the list of factors to be considered in the risk estimation (Article 6.10.2. point 6) the Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestions to add 'pregnant' to the subpopulations listed in the second indent'. The Code Commission also amended the text on deaths to include 'reduced life expectancy' and 'compared with deaths linked to sensitive organisms of the same species', and to add 'and cost' to the 7th indent on availability.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to add substantial new text suggesting lists of final outputs that may be included for quantitative and qualitative risk assessments to point 6 of Articles 6.10.2. and 6.10.3., since the chapter with the existing articles has already been adopted, and the adopted chapter format aligns with Chapter 2.1.

The Code Commission amended Article 6.10.2. point 7 a to align with the change proposed in Article 2.1.6.

In response to comments from a Member Country and the *ad hoc* group, the Code Commission amended Article 6.10.2. point 7 b to improve clarity.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to delete the words 'due to antimicrobial usage in animals' in Article 6.10.3. since those words align this article with the scope of the chapter.

Clauses in Article 6.10.3. that are identical to those in Article 6.10.2. were amended in response to Member Countries' comments so that the clauses in both articles remain aligned.

The revised Chapter 6.10. is attached as Annex XV to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 11 Animal welfare

a) Draft new chapter on animal welfare and dairy cattle production systems (Draft Chapter 7.X.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, EU, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, USA, AU-IBAR and ICFAW.

The Code Commission acknowledged the excellent Member Country and non-governmental organisations (NGO) participation and contribution of suggestions and comments on this draft chapter, despite the shorter than normal period for comment on this draft. Unfortunately a number of the comments offered no supporting rationale which made them difficult for both the Code Commission and the *ad hoc* Group to evaluate. Comments with no supporting rationale or obvious logic were rejected.

The Code Commission refers Member Countries and NGOs to the excellent report of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal welfare and dairy cattle production systems for detailed responses to comments and suggestions received, and reminds Member Countries that bibliographic references included in the draft chapter will be removed when the chapter is adopted.

In response to the question from the *ad hoc* Group on the need for a definition of ‘calf’, the Code Commission agreed that no definition of ‘calf’ is required for this chapter (or previously adopted chapters) as the term is used with its standard dictionary meaning.

The Code Commission noted that some of the requests for additional detail to be included in the chapter were overly prescriptive, or could not be accurately assessed and were therefore inappropriate for inclusion in this chapter.

In response to Member Countries’ concerns about the development of this chapter leading to the imposition of unjustified trade barriers, the Code Commission reiterated that the objectives for developing the chapters on animal welfare and various production systems are to develop science-based animal welfare standards that are globally applicable and should, therefore, assist in overcoming any unjustified trade barriers based on animal welfare. It is not the presence of animal welfare chapters in the *Terrestrial Code* that leads to trade barriers; it is the existence of animal welfare concerns. The animal welfare chapters are designed to address such concerns.

The Code Commission edited the draft chapter to be consistent with established Code structure, format and content. In this context, the list of criteria or measurables in Article 7.X.4. was expanded to include all measurables cited in subsequent articles.

In response to a Member Country’s question on the scope of ‘system design’ in Article 7.X.5. point 1, the Code Commission advised that system design is understood to include structure and management. To clarify this point, the words ‘and management’ were added to the heading of point 1 in this article.

The Code Commission referred Member Countries’ and the *ad hoc* group’s requests for inclusion of specific threshold levels for ammonia concentration (Article 7.X.5. point 1c to experts for advice as for the same question in Chapter 7.10.).

In response to Member Countries’ request to include a specific noise threshold in Article 7.X.5. point 1d, the Code Commission considered that the current text and suggested outcome-based measurables give sufficient guidance.

The revised Chapter 7.X. is attached as [Annex XXXIV](#) for Member Countries’ comment.

The Code Commission endorsed the report of the OIE *ad hoc* Group, which is attached in [Annex XXXV](#) for Member Country information.

b) Restructuring of Chapters 7.5. and 7.6.

i) Slaughter of animals (Chapter 7.5.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, China, EU, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand, USA and ICAFW.

The Code Commission recalled that Chapters 7.5. and 7.6. were circulated for consideration of removal or retention of the extensive tables and figures included in both chapters. There is clear support for retention of the tables and figures in this article.

The Code Commission also noted that many Member Countries and NGOs had used the opportunity of circulation of these chapters to put forward a large number of comments on text already adopted, many of which repeat comments and suggestions previously rejected by the World Assembly of Delegates.

Considering this history, the Code Commission decided to address new comments only, and refer clauses and articles where there is clearly significant divergence of opinion between the various Member Countries and NGOs to the Animal Welfare Working Group (or experts) for consideration.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country’s request for ‘slaughter of seals’ to be included in this chapter, since seals are killed for their fur rather than slaughtered, and are therefore beyond the scope of the chapter. Note: ‘slaughter’ is a defined term which is clearly not applicable to the killing of seals in the wild.

In response to a Member Country's request to include slaughter without stunning standards in this chapter, the Code Commission noted that provisions for slaughter without stunning are already included.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestions to delete the word 'conveyer' from Article 7.5.1. points 4b and 4f.

The Code Commission accepted a NGO's suggestion to include 'and water' in Article 7.5.2. point 3c, and Article 7.5.4. point 6.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to amend the Spanish version of Article 7.5.3. point 1.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' requests to modify the captions of the figures showing stunning methods wherever necessary to unambiguously distinguish the figures for penetrative captive bolt stunning and non-penetrative captive bolt stunning.

The Code Commission also accepted Member Countries' suggestion to clarify the species applicability of the text on signs for correct stunning using a mechanical instrument at the end of Article 7.5.7. point 2.

Member Countries' and a NGO's comments on the figures and diagrams for stunning, a Member Country's request for stunning diagrams for farmed deer and camelids, and Member Countries' and a NGO's comments on electrical stunning were all referred to the Animal Welfare Working Group for consideration.

The revised draft of Chapter 7.5. will be circulated for Member Countries' comment when the Code Commission has received the advice of the Animal Welfare Working Group on those matters referred to it.

ii) **Killing of animals for disease control purposes (Chapter 7.6.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Chile, China, EU, New Zealand, Switzerland, USA and ICAEW.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' and a NGO's suggestion to add further indicators of death to the list in Article 7.6.1. point 7 since this is not an exhaustive list, and they consider the current list sufficient for the purpose of this standard. The Code Commission also noted that *rigor mortis* usually takes some time to develop and so is not particularly applicable to the case in point.

A Member Country's suggestion to include 'monitoring animal welfare and biosecurity procedures' in the responsibilities for animal killing personnel and carcass disposal personnel in Article 7.6.3. was also rejected as the Commission considers the inclusion of this item in the responsibilities for animal handlers in this article is sufficient for the purpose of this standard.

A Member Country's request to add further text dealing with the planning of 'killing' to Article 7.6.4. was also rejected as unnecessary given the text already present in the chapeau text of this article.

Member Countries' and a NGOs' suggestions to add further detail to Article 7.6.6. points 1e and 4 were rejected as unnecessary detail given the text already includes the clause 'should only be used by properly trained and competent marksmen'.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' requests to modify the captions of the figures showing stunning methods wherever necessary to unambiguously distinguish the figures for penetrative captive bolt stunning and non-penetrative captive bolt stunning (corresponding with the same amendments made in Chapter 7.5.).

Member Countries' request to change the species age parameters in Article 7.6.8. point 2 on the basis of a 1996 reference was rejected because the current text is supported by a more recent EFSA report referenced to Finnie *et al.*, 2000.

In response to a Member Country's comment the reference point of Article 7.6.8. point 5 was changed from 'a maximum weight of 10 Kg' to 'a maximum age of 6 months' to align with the introduction to this article.

A NGO's request to add further detail to Article 7.6.9. point 2c was rejected, given the comprehensive nature of the text 'competent personnel who are appropriately trained' already included in that point.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission changed 'cattle' to 'calves' in the table in Article 7.6.10. point 2a to align with the tables in Article 7.6.5.

Member Countries' suggestion to add text indicating 'that neither cervical dislocation nor decapitation should be used routinely....' after the title of Article 7.6.17. was rejected as unnecessary duplication of the text already included in the second paragraph of Article 7.6.17. point 1a.

In response to a Member Country's request for a reference to support the weight parameters given in Article 7.6.17. point 1, the Code Commission cites; "Practical Slaughter of Poultry – A Guide for the Small Producer" 2nd edition: 18–19 (Humane Slaughter Association).

Member Countries' and a NGO's comments on the figures and diagrams for stunning, a Member Country's request for inclusion of text on killing horses for disease control, and Member Countries and a NGO's comments on electrical stunning, Member Countries' comments on the use of CO₂ and low density foam with inert gas, were all referred to the Animal Welfare Working Group for consideration.

The revised draft of Chapter 7.6. will be circulated for Member Countries' comment when the Code Commission has received the advice of the Animal Welfare Working Group on those matters referred to them.

c) Animal welfare and broiler chicken production systems (Chapter 7.10.)

Comments were received from Australia, Chile, China, EU, Norway, Switzerland, USA, ICFAW, and a member of the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group.

The Code Commission rejected the suggestion from a Member Country and a NGO to change the definition of broiler in this chapter because the current definition was adopted by consensus in 2013, following rejection of earlier definitions. The Commission also noted that most of the animal welfare issues of broiler chickens do not apply to village chickens.

The Code Commission also rejected a Member Country's suggestion to replace 'day old birds' with 'day old chicks', given the World Assembly of Delegates' choice of 'day old birds', which is also defined in the Glossary.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion, the Code Commission removed the sentence 'Broilers in commercial flocks should be assessed for gait anomalies' from point 2 of Article 7.10.3., and introduced similar generic wording to the opening chapeau text of Article 7.10.3., so that the recommendation applies to the entire article, rather than gait abnormalities only.

A NGO's request to reinstate text now located at Article 7.10.4. point 2e in Article 7.10.3. was rejected as an unnecessary duplication.

Minor changes were made to Article 7.10.3. points 6c and 8a in response to Member Countries' comments.

A Member Country's request to introduce a clause to the effect that 'acceptable performance criteria may not necessarily be an indicator of good welfare' was rejected as unnecessary, and inconsistent with standard Code format.

Article 7.10.3. point 8b was amended in response to Member Countries' suggestion that the point should cover a broader range of situations, and the Code Commission noted that the key point is the reference to expected feed conversion rate in the specific situation. As pointed out by Member Countries there are situations where higher than expected feed conversion rates can be an indicator of welfare problems, and other situations where higher feed conversion rates can be an indicator of improved welfare.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to include variation in bird weight or size as a new measurable, as that can be adequately addressed in the growth rate measurable.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to specifically include 'contact dermatitis' in Article 7.10.3. point 9.

The Code Commission referred questions from a Member Country, an Animal Welfare Working Group member and a NGO on what is an adequate period of darkness and continuous light, what is an appropriate upper reference point for ammonia concentration, and what is an appropriate upper reference point for carbon dioxide, to experts for advice.

The Code Commission amended the language of Article 7.10.4. point 2f in response to Member Countries' and a NGO's comments.

A NGO's suggestion to direct Article 7.10.4. point 2g to breeders rather than broilers was rejected as unnecessary given the opening sentence that feather pecking and cannibalism are rarely seen in broilers because of their young age.

Similarly a Member Country's suggestion to include a new measurable for 'level of activity and movement' was rejected as unnecessary given the option to measure those indicators under the behaviour measurables in Article 7.10.4. point 2h.

The Code Commission expanded Article 7.10.4. point 2i to take account of a Member Country's comments.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' suggestion to delete growth rate from the factors to consider in choice of broiler strain (Article 7.10.4. point 2k) because it is an important factor, as described in Article 7.10.3. (performance).

In response to Member Countries and a NGO's comments requesting reinsertion of the examples in Article 7.10.4. point 2k, the Code Commission recalled that World Assembly of Delegates had declined to adopt this chapter with the clause containing those examples.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to amend the language of Article 7.10.4. point 2m.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to change 'emergency killing procedures' to 'killing for disease control procedures' in Article 7.10.4. point 2n, since this point applies to all emergency killing situations, not just those associated with disease control.

A Member Country's and a NGO's suggestion to add text referring to listed disease outbreak situations to Article 7.10.4. point 2o, to space requirements during transport to Article 7.10.4. point 2q, and a new outcome-based measurable for injury rate to Article 7.10.4. point 2q, were rejected as those matters are all addressed elsewhere in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The revised Chapter 7.10. is attached as Annex XVI to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

d) Disaster management and preparedness

i) Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.1.)

Comments were received from China, EU, Norway and Switzerland.

The Code Commission modified Article 3.1.2. point 9d in response to Member Countries' comments. The Commission also noted that the order of example procedures and standards listed in Article 3.1.2. point 9 should not be considered to be an order of priority or importance.

The revised Chapter 3.1. is attached as Annex XVII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

ii) Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2.)

Comments were received from EU and Norway.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' request to specifically reference 'animal welfare surveillance' in the capabilities listed in Article 3.2.3. point 3 since this is not a widely recognised capability distinct from the epidemiologic capability already included.

Similarly the Code Commission rejected Member Countries' request to add the words 'unless there are effective electronic communications which preclude this need' to the end of Article 3.2.6. point 2a as too restrictive to the wide range of benefits of co-location.

Member Countries' suggestion to add a point 'd) Animal welfare research centres' to Article 3.2.6. point 3 was referred to the Animal Welfare Working Group for consideration.

Article 3.2.7. point 1 was amended to take account of Member Countries' suggestions.

In response to Member Countries' suggestions the Code Commission also inserted 'animal welfare' at multiple points through the chapter, and referred their more detailed suggestions for referencing animal welfare in this chapter to the Animal Welfare Working Group for deeper consideration of how animal welfare in those settings is appropriately referenced throughout the chapter.

The revised Chapter 3.2. is attached as Annex XVIII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

iii) Communication (Chapter 3.3.)

Comments were received from EU, Norway and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' suggestion to replace 'combined' with 'mutually supportive' in Article 3.3.2. point 2, and to amend the language of Article 3.3.4. since they considered both suggestions significantly diminished the intention of text previously adopted by the World Assembly of Delegates.

On the basis of Member Countries' comments the Code Commission amended the newly proposed text of Article 3.3.2. point 2 to correspond with the same amendment made in Chapter 3.1, Article 3.1.2. point 9.

The revised Chapter 3.3. is attached as Annex XIX to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 12 Harmonisation of three vector-borne diseases

a) Infection with African horse sickness virus (Chapter 12.1.)

Comments were received from Australia, China, EU, Norway, Switzerland, USA and AU-IBAR.

A Member Country's request for the OIE to convene a small group of experts to examine the implications of a recently published study demonstrating persistent infection in naturally infected or partially immune horses was referred to the Scientific Commission for consideration.

A Member Country's request to change the definition of the disease was rejected as the text proposed was inconsistent with the title of the chapter.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' and the Scientific Commission's request to replace 'infection' with 'case' in Article 12.1.1. points 2 and 3.

Member Countries' request to add a new clause e to Article 12.1.2. point 1 to cover 'continental' historical freedom was rejected as historical freedom should be demonstrated on a country-by-country basis.

In response to Member Countries' request to qualify the surveillance requirements of Article 12.1.2. point 2, the Code Commission added the words 'as relevant' to the end of this clause.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to amend the language of Article 12.1.2. point 4 to be consistent with the title of this article.

To avoid ambiguity and supporting the recommendation of the *ad hoc* Group and the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission added the words 'in accordance with Article 1.4.6.' to the end of Article 12.1.2. point 4 c i.

In response to Member Countries' request for an explanation of the deletion of the previous Article 12.1.3. AHSV seasonally free zone, the Code Commission advised that this article was deleted because the OIE process for official recognition of AHS freedom does not recognise seasonal freedom. The Commission also noted that as explained in the proposed new text in User's guide (see Annex IV), absence of recommendation in the *Terrestrial Code* does not mean that the Veterinary Authorities may not apply appropriate measures.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's request to revert to the previous (now deleted) text of Article 12.1.4. point 1 e, and noted that all clauses of Article 12.1.4. point 1 must be addressed. In the context of this request, it is important that both clauses e and f are addressed, and it may not always be possible to pinpoint the first case of an outbreak.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's request to add the word 'infection' to Article 12.1.4. point 5.

The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that it is preferable to keep the outcome focus in Article 12.1.10. point 1b, rather than specific insect and mesh sizes as requested by a Member Country.

The Code Commission re-formatted Article 12.1.12., and edited Articles 12.1.11., 12.1.12., and 12.1.13. to improve clarity and for consistency with other surveillance articles in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The revised Chapter 12.1. is attached in Annex XX to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

b) Harmonisation of three vector-borne diseases (bluetongue, epizootic haemorrhagic disease and African horse sickness)

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed that prior to circulation of the revised chapters on bluetongue and epizootic haemorrhagic disease, the OIE Scientific and Technical Department and the OIE International Trade Department would clarify the outstanding differences to be examined by the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission at their September meetings. The Code Commission expects that these revised chapters will be circulated to Member Countries with the September 2014 Code Commission report.

Item 13 Zoonotic parasites

a) Infection with *Trichinella* spp. (Chapter 8.14.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, China, Chinese Taipei, EU, New Zealand and Switzerland.

In response to a Member Country's request for additional articles pertaining to country and zone freedom, the Code Commission recalled again that experts were unable to develop generic guidelines for country or zone freedom applicable to all species of *Trichinella* (as would be expected with the expanded scope of the new chapter). However, as explained in the User's Guide, the absence of such articles does not preclude Member Countries from developing their own case for population, zone or country freedom (or negligible risk status) for individual *Trichinella* species.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to add other species to the definition of *Trichinella* infection for this chapter, since the chapter is deliberately focused on epidemiologically significant species which determines the scope of recommendations to Veterinary Authorities with respect to notification, status requirements, prevention and control, trade conditions, etc. Species susceptibility to infection by itself is, therefore, insufficient reason to include a host species in the definition of infection in specific chapters.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to restrict the scope of Article 8.14.3. point b to preventing waste of animal origin only to 'being fed to pigs' as being too narrow.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to amend the Spanish language in point 3 of Article 8.14.4. replacing 'dispone de datos' with 'tenga conocimiento'. In addition the English text of the same point was modified reading 'the *Veterinary Authority* has current knowledge of the distribution of susceptible species of *wildlife*' in order to harmonise the language on this clause with similar requirements in other chapters (e.g. ASF, CSF). The Code Commission also noted that this clause should not be interpreted as meaning that precise knowledge of the distribution of all susceptible species over the whole country is required.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to delete Article 8.14.6. point 2c, since a standard on inactivation of *Trichinella larvae* is being developed by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, and once approved will be cross referenced in this OIE standard. The Code Commission also noted that as long as this clause is qualified with 'under study' it is not considered part of the standard.

The revised Chapter 8.14. is attached in Annex XXI to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

b) Infection with *Taenia solium* (Chapter X.X.)

The Code Commission reviewed the *ad hoc* Group report, and the draft text. It made minor editorial amendments to the draft chapter to align it with established format.

The Code Commission noted that the listing name of the disease in Chapter 1.2. would need to be amended when this chapter is adopted.

The proposed new draft Chapter X.X. is attached as Annex XXXVI for Member Countries' comments.

The Code Commission endorsed the Report of the Meeting of the OIE *ad hoc* Group on Porcine Cysticercosis, which is attached in Annex XXXVII for Member Country information.

Item 14 Foot and mouth disease (Chapters 8.6. and 1.6.)

The Code Commission received the latest extensive revision of this chapter from the Scientific Commission during the course of their meeting. In discussion with the Scientific Commission and the Director General, it was agreed that the Code Commission should complete its review of the revised chapter at their September 2014 meeting. The revised chapter will then be circulated for Member Countries' review and comment with the September 2014 Code Commission meeting report, with a view to having the finished text ready to propose for adoption at the 83rd General Session in 2015.

Item 15 Infection with Rift valley fever virus (Chapter 8.12.)

Comments were received from EU, Switzerland and USA.

The Code Commission gratefully acknowledges a Member Country's thanks and congratulations to the *ad hoc* Group on Rift Valley Fever. The Member Country concerned noted: "The proposed changes in the Code chapter drew comments and questions from our experts, but the answers could all be found in the report of the *ad hoc* Group. It is a very clear report that explains the rationale for the changes and provides references."

In response to a Member Country's question, the Code Commission clarified that the reference to ruminants in Article 8.12.1. point 2 does not include camelids. It also rejected Member Countries' suggestions to include dromedary and Bactrian camels in the definition of Rift Valley Fever, since the *ad hoc* group considered that camels do not play a significant epidemiological role in Rift Valley Fever, and mere susceptibility to infection is insufficient basis to include them in this chapter definition. For further explanation of this point, Member Countries are referred to the *ad hoc* group report appended to the September 2013 Scientific Commission report.

The Code Commission changed the words, as appropriate, 'animals' to 'ruminants' to align with the definition of Article 8.12.1. point 2.

In response to Member Countries' requests to change the infective period for Rift Valley Fever throughout the chapter, the Code Commission referred Member Countries to the *ad hoc* group report appended to the September 2013 Code Commission report where the infective period of 14 days is fully justified.

The Commission also refers Member Countries seeking clarification of "an incidence substantially exceeding that during the inter-epizootic period" to the *ad hoc* group report. *Veterinary Authorities* are left to define this term taking account of the considerations highlighted in the *ad hoc* group report.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission changed the word 'may' to 'can' in Article 8.12.1. point 7.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission specified 'point 1 of Article 1.4.6.' in Article 8.12.3. point 1 and split the second point of the same article into two separate points to acknowledge the fact that *Veterinary Services* are not responsible for surveillance in humans. In reviewing this article, the Commission also noted the possibility of detecting an imported case in the absence of an epizootic.

In response to Member Countries' suggestion to list predisposing factors or examples in Article 8.12.4., both the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed that such a list does not fit the established Code format and structure, and should be sought in more detailed references beyond the scope of this chapter.

Member Countries' request to insert additional words on isolation requirements in Article 8.12.8. point 3b was considered unnecessary additional detail.

The Code Commission amended the title of Article 8.12.10.bis, and re-worded point 3 to improve its grammar. Following Member Countries' suggestion, the Code Commission moved this article after Article 8.12.12. to align with other disease specific chapters.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' suggestion to specify temperature and time recommendations for pasteurisation in Article 8.12.13., since there are multiple temperature and time combinations in regular use which are available elsewhere, and the current presentation is consistent with similar recommendations of other chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to note that examination of vectors for the presence of RVFV is not recommended in Article 8.12.14.

The revised Chapter 8.12. is attached as Annex XXII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 16 Tularemia (Chapter 8.15.)

The Code Commission accepted the OIE Headquarters' suggestion for minor reformatting of Article 8.15.3.

The revised Chapter 8.15. is attached as Annex XXIII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 17. Infection with *Brucella abortus*, *B. melitensis* and *B. suis* (Chapter 8.X.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China, Ecuador, EU, New Zealand, Russia, Switzerland, USA and AU-IBAR. Member Countries are urged to read the *Report of the OIE Ad Hoc Group on Brucellosis* for supporting rationale for the changes proposed to this chapter.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries' suggestion to improve the title of the chapter.

The Code Commission drew to the attention of Member Countries that, for the purpose of this chapter, 'bovid' includes cattle, bison and water buffaloes and excludes sheep and goats, as defined in point 2b)i) of Article 8.X.1.

The Code Commission included 'caribou' in point 5 of Article 8.X.1. following a convincing a Member Country's suggestion.

In response to a Member Country request to keep three *Brucella* species separate in different chapters, the Code Commission reiterated the fact that, majority of Member Countries had been in favour of combining three species in one chapter before an *ad hoc* Group launched review of the chapter in 2012.

The Code Commission also did not agree with a Member Country proposing to specify test as 'OIE prescribed' when referred in this chapter because Article 8.X.1. clarifies that standards for diagnostic tests are described in the *OIE Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals (Terrestrial Manual)*.

The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country's suggestion to exclude European hares from the definition of 'animals' for the purpose of this chapter because the *ad hoc* Group and Scientific Commission considered that this species has epidemiological importance.

A Member Country's proposal to replace 'identification' with 'confirmation' in the definition of infection was not accepted as the Code Commission considered identification of *Brucella* in a sample is adequate to defining *Brucella* infection. In the same point, the Code Commission changed 'animal or a product derived from that animal' to 'a sample from an animal' for simplification and clarification.

A Member Country comment suggesting a sentence to exclude research animals from the definition of infection was not taken because the Code Commission was of the view that research facilities are considered equivalent to 'quarantine station' defined in the Glossary, in which the presence of infection does not affect the disease status of the country or zone.

Agreeing with a Member Country comment, the Code Commission deleted ' , zone, herd or flock' from the introductory text of Article 8.X.2.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's proposal to include *in vivo* derived bovine embryos in the safe commodities, as IETS does not consider bovine embryos pose negligible risk with respect to all *B. species*.

The Code Commission added an article on historical freedom following a Member Country's suggestion.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's suggestion to re-order the points of Articles 8.X.3. through 8.X.8. and 8.X.11. with respect to the requirements for qualification as free status.

It also made several changes in these articles for improved clarity and better syntax in response to Member Country comments.

The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country proposing a more generic recommendation with respect to regular and periodic testing in Articles 8.X.3., 8.X.5., 8.X.6., 8.X.7. and 8.X.8. as the Commission considered it necessary to provide specific guidance to Member Countries.

The Code Commission also did not take a Member Country's suggestion to add 'under official veterinary control' in the first requirement for qualifying as freedom in all relevant articles, because official veterinary control is ensured in the subsequent requirements.

The Code Commission accepted a suggestion from several Member Countries to change the titles of Articles 8.X.9. and 8.X.10. for better syntax and consistency among articles.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's suggestion to add the words 'with negative results' to Article 8.X.9. point 1c iv.

A Member Country's proposal to include Article 8.X.9. point 1c vi in the requirements for maintaining the free status laid down in Article 8.X.9. point 2a was not accepted by the Code Commission because point 1c vi is required when establishing freedom rather than maintaining the status.

The Code Commission, the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* group rejected a Member Country's suggestion that the tests in Article 8.X.9. point 1c vi, Article 8.X.10. point 1b vi, and Article 8.X.11. point 3b be separated by a parturition season, since there may not be a defined 'parturition season' for these species in many countries.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's recommendation for including in the qualification requirements for free status with vaccination the use of official animal identification devices to enable permanent identification of vaccinated animals. However, text was modified to ensure that vaccinated animals are permanently identified as such.

The Code Commission clarified the text referring to animals, herds and flocks throughout this chapter.

The Code Commission declined Member Countries' request to amend the language of Article 8.X.10, point 1b vi, and noted that Member Countries need to consider age, vaccination, and testing history when interpreting results to prove herd or flock freedom with vaccination.

A Member Country's comments suggesting change in the title of Article 8.X.11. was not accepted due to the inconsistent format against other articles.

In response to a Member Country comment, the Code Commission amended point 2 of Article 8.X.12. to clarify that the investigation has been performed within 60 days of disease confirmation.

A Member Country's request to add a new section on a process to regain pig herd freedom from *Brucella* infection was rejected as the measures proposed are not applicable to pigs. Member Countries are referred to the *ad hoc* group report for further background to this issue.

In response to a Member Countries' comment, the Code Commission replaced 'eliminated' with 'culled' for clarity in several articles.

In response to a Member Countries' comment on point 2 of Article 8.X.16., the Code Commission added reference to Chapter 4.5. With this amendment, the Code Commission declined another Member Country request to revert point 3 of the same article.

Article 8.X.21. was deleted because the entire digestive tract is recognised as a safe commodity.

The revised Chapter 8.X. is attached as Annex XXIV to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014. The Commission noted that this revised chapter would replace Chapters 11.3., 14.1. and 15.3. upon the adoption.

Item 18 Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4.)

Comments were received from Australia, China, EU, New Zealand and Switzerland.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestions to remove a redundant word from Article 10.4.14., and correct grammar in Article 10.4.20.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to remove pasteurisation from Article 10.4.21. point 2 on the grounds that the term 'pasteurisation' is normally used in reference to food products.

It also accepted a Member Country's suggestion to specify 'moist heat' treatment in Article 10.4.21. point 2.

In response to Member Countries' comments questioning the inclusion of provisions for fumigation with formalin and irradiation in Articles 10.4.22. and 10.4.23., the Code Commission acknowledged that the references previously provided to support these treatments were inadequate and now offers the following reference to correct that omission:

De Benedictis P. *et al.* (2007). *Inactivation of Avian Influenza Viruses by Chemical Agents and Physical Conditions: A Review. Zoonoses and Public Health*, **54**, 51–68.

The Code Commission also noted that these measures are already successfully applied by several Member Countries and that the recommendation to include these measures in both of these articles had been endorsed by the Scientific Commission.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' suggestion to include a time period in Article 10.4.24. point 2c as unnecessary because inactivation is achieved once the specified temperature is attained.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' and Commission Members' suggestions to correct syntax and grammar, and improve clarity in Articles 10.4.25., 10.4.26., 10.4.27., and 10.4.28., 10.4.31. and 10.4.32.

The Code Commission also accepted a Member Country's suggestion to delete 'infected compartment' from Article 10.4.28., since compartments are, by definition, only maintained when they are free from infection.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to delete the words 'and water' from Article 10.4.29. point 2, since in the context of this clause inclusion of reduced water consumption is given as one of a number of possible indicators of infection.

The Code Commission referred a Member Country's comment suggesting an increase in the number of recognised haemagglutinin and neuraminidase subtypes in Article 10.4.33. to the Biological Standards Commission for review and advice.

The revised Chapter 10.4. is attached as Annex XXV to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 19 Newcastle disease (Chapter 10.9.)

Comments were received from EU, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to change the title of this chapter to 'Infection with Newcastle disease virus'.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to remove pasteurisation from Article 10.9.16. point 2 on the grounds that the term 'pasteurisation' is normally used in reference to food products.

It also accepted a Member Country's suggestion to specify 'moist heat' treatment in Article 10.9.16. point 2.

In response to Member Countries' comments questioning the inclusion of provisions for fumigation with formalin and irradiation in Articles 10.9.17. and 10.9.18., the Code Commission noted that these measures are already successfully applied by several Member Countries, and that the recommendation to include these measures in both of these articles had been endorsed by the Scientific Commission.

The Code Commission rejected a Member Country's suggestion to include x-log kill data in brackets to the inactivation methods listed in Article 10.9.17. point 2, as this information is simply not available for the application of these inactivation methods in industrial settings.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' and Commission Members' suggestions to correct syntax and grammar, and improve clarity in Articles 10.9.22., 10.9.23., and 10.9.24., and 10.9.25.

The revised Chapter 10.9. is attached as Annex XXVI to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 20 Infection with *Mycoplasma mycoides* subsp. *mycoides* SC (Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia) (Chapters 11.8. and 1.6.)

Comments were received from Australia, China, EU, Switzerland and USA.

In response to a Member Country's request for clarification of the list of susceptible species the Code Commission replaced the word 'cattle' with 'bovids' which includes cattle (*Bos indicus* and *Bos Taurus*) and yaks (*Bos grunniens*), and aligned the remainder of the chapter with this nomenclature.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's request for additional language in Article 11.8.7. which is provided as new point b.

The Code Commission amended several articles to correct syntax and grammar, and improve clarity.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to use more specific language in Article 1.6.12. point 7c iv.

The revised Chapters 11.8. and 1.6. are attached as Annex XXVII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 21 Equine diseases

a) High health status horse subpopulation (draft Chapter 4.X.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Chile, EU, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Switzerland, Uruguay and USA.

The Code Commission received extensive comments on this draft chapter, including significant contradictory positions. The Code Commission also sought advice from the Scientific Commission which believes that the most significant comments can be addressed sufficiently well to propose this chapter for adoption in May 2014.

Both the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission reiterated the point that the purpose of this chapter is to set the concept framework without giving implementation details. These details will be developed in the future, either as guidelines or *Terrestrial Code* chapters, as appropriate. The intention is to focus this chapter on key principles and concepts that Member Countries can adopt as a platform to guide future development of those agreed principles and concepts.

With this philosophy, the Code Commission reviewed all Member Countries' comments, and made significant amendments which should make this chapter adoptable.

Member Countries' comments requesting incorporation of 'high performance' in the title and Article 4.X.1. were rejected as the Code Commission considers the provisions of this chapter should be determined on the basis of health status rather than performance. The Code Commission also noted that since the scope of this chapter is restricted to international competition, the concept of high performance is implicit.

In response to a Member Countries' comment on the opening paragraph of Article 4.X.1., the Code Commission added 'certified by the Veterinary Authorities' to clarify the *Veterinary Authorities*' role in certification of the health status of this population. However, the Commission rejected other proposed amendments because the purpose of this chapter is to set the concept framework without details.

A Member Country's request to replace 'high health' with 'negligible risk' was rejected because that suggested language does not accurately describe this population.

In response to Member Countries' suggestions the second paragraph of Article 4.X.1. was modified as follows: '... biosecurity measures to create and maintain a functional separation between horses within the defined subpopulation and all other equids at all times.' The Code Commission noted that the responsibility for creation and maintenance of a functional separation rests with the Member Country, and further details should be developed within the international biosecurity plan.

Member Countries' comments requesting more detail in Article 4.X.1. were not accepted, given the intent to focus this chapter on principles and concepts.

The Code Commission noted that horses are expected to belong to this compartment (or subpopulation) for only a part of their lives.

- a) In response to Member Countries' comments, Article 4.X.2. point 1 was amended to improve clarity, and now reads: 'Each horse in the *subpopulation* is subjected to specific measures to establish and maintain its health status and preserve that of the other horses in the subpopulation.'
- b) These measures comprise a specific set of laboratory tests, treatments and vaccinations appropriate to the disease status of the horse's region of origin, regions visited and the regions that it will visit. Records of all treatments and vaccinations, and results of tests and clinical inspections are documented in an individual passport that complies with Chapter 5.12.'

Member Countries' request to include reference to continual veterinary supervision in point 1 of Article 4.X.2. was rejected, as that is covered in point 3b of this article.

Member Countries' comments requesting clarification of *Veterinary Services* authority with respect to identification and issuing passports were rejected since these points are addressed in Chapters 4.1 and 4.2., which apply in all situations.

Article 4.X.2. point 2a was amended to read: 'Each horse bears a permanent unique identifier' in response to Member Countries' comments.

Member Countries' request to add the words 'information on' to Article 4.X.2. point 2b was accepted for accuracy.

Article 4.X.2. point 2c was amended to read: 'Each horse has an attachment to its passport that identifies it as a member of the high health status *subpopulation*' on the basis of a Member Country's comment for clarification.

A Member Country's request for additional detail in Article 4.X.2. point 2d was rejected on the grounds that all relevant information should be included in the passport.

Article 4.X.2. point 3a was amended to clarify the record details required, the words 'all official' were replaced with 'any' and a new sentence cross referenced to Chapter 5.2. was added to clarify the purposes of certification. Member Countries' request that each veterinarian examination referred to in this point should be undertaken by an *official veterinarian* was rejected as impractical.

The Code Commission also noted that each Member Country is free to apply additional measures to suit their circumstances for management of the subpopulation.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission clarified Article 4.X.2. point 3b to indicate that the international biosecurity plan referenced in this point is expected to be approved by the importing and exporting *Veterinary Authorities* in accordance with relevant recommendations of the OIE.

A Member Country's request to delete 'continual' from Article 4.X.2. point 3b was rejected because continual does not mean 'uninterrupted'.

Member Countries' request to replace 'authorised *veterinarian*' with '*official veterinarian*' in Article 4.X.2. 3b was rejected because 'authorised' still requires a process of authorisation, but with potentially more flexibility than the process for authorisation of an *official veterinarian*.

Member Countries' request to insert 'training' into Articles 4.X.1. and 4.X.2. was rejected because training is an integral part of competition.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission amended Article 4.X.2. points 3c and 3d to include reference to the international Biosecurity Plan.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' request to add a new point to Article 4.X.2. on an equine disease free zone as beyond the scope of the current chapter.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission amended Article 4.X.3. to read 'Organisations that are responsible for ensuring compliance with this chapter should be approved by the Veterinary Authorities. Veterinary Authorities are also.....equestrian events and for their return to their country of origin.'

Member Countries' request for a timeline for development of the biosecurity guidelines was referred to the Director General and the Scientific Commission for advice.

The Code Commission also noted that the 'biosecurity guidelines' referred to in the last paragraph of Article 4.X.3. are not the same as the 'international Biosecurity Plan' referred to in Article 4.X.2. point 3b. To emphasise this distinction it amended the last paragraph of Article 4.X.3. to read:

'*Veterinary Authorities* are encouraged to recognise the international Biosecurity Plan developed by the FEI and the IFHA on the basis of the relevant OIE guidelines (under study)'.

The Code Commission noted that the OIE, FEI, and IFHA are working together to develop the biosecurity guidelines referred to in Article 4.X.3.

The proposed new draft Chapter 4.X. is attached as Annex XXVIII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

b) Infection with equid herpesvirus 1 (Equine rhinopneumonitis) (Chapter 12.8.)

Comments were received from Australia, China, EU, Switzerland and USA.

In response to Member Countries comments, the title of this chapter was amended to align with the nomenclature committee of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses.

The Code Commission disagreed with Member Countries' rationale for re-wording Article 12.8.1., and retained the current version which is clinically accurate.

The Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to delete 'and during the 21 days prior to shipment' from Article 12.8.2. point 1 since a clinical presentation such as nasal discharge, which is one of the clinical signs of EHV1, is a common non-specific clinical sign for several equine diseases and could therefore make it difficult to certify this clause if this phrase were retained.

The revised Chapter 12.8. is attached as Annex XXIX to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

c) Infection with equine arteritis virus (chapter 12.9.)

Comments were received from Chile, EU, Switzerland and USA.

In response to suggestions from a Member Country, the Code Commission checked and revised the use of the acronym EVA throughout the chapter and, to avoid confusion, removed the acronym EAV from the chapter.

Suggestions from Member Countries to replace the word 'sign' with 'signs' in Article 12.9.2., and the word 'donors' with 'stallions' in Article 12.9.4. were rejected as unnecessary.

The revised Chapter 12.9. is attached as Annex XXX to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

d) Glanders (Chapter 12.10.)

The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that resolution of the outstanding issues concerning tests that can be used to define an infection with *Burkholderia mallei* is an essential prerequisite to detailed consideration of this draft text. The Code Commission will review this draft chapter in detail when those diagnostic issues have been resolved by the Biological Standards Commission.

Item 22 Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus (Chapter 14.8.)

Comments were received from EU, New Zealand, Switzerland, AU-IBAR and OIRSA.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries' suggestion to split point 1c of Article 14.8.3. into two points (c and d) to deal with the issues of vaccination and importation separately.

The Code Commission rejected Member Countries' suggestion to introduce a new point to deal with historical freedom in point 1 of Article 14.8.3., since historical freedom should be demonstrated on a country-by-country basis. Point 2a of the same article covers the requirement for historical freedom.

The Code Commission added a new clause to Article 14.8.3. point 2b ii in response to a Member Country's suggestion for consistency and full respect of the *Terrestrial Code* when applying for freedom status.

With respect to a Member Country's suggestion to amend the temperature specified in Article 14.8.26. from 20⁰C to 12⁰C, the Commission sought the Scientific Commission's advice on justification.

The Commission also made syntax, and grammar changes to Articles 14.8.27., 14.8.28., 14.8.31. and 14.8.32. to improve clarity of these articles.

The revised Chapter 14.8. is attached as [Annex XXXI](#) to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 23 Classical swine fever (Chapter 15.2.)

In agreement with the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission decided not to circulate minor amendments to this chapter for Member Countries' review pending an update of the *Terrestrial Manual* to include DIVA vaccination.

Item 24. Infection with porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (Chapter X.X.)

The Commission reviewed the *ad hoc* group reports (which Member Countries are urged to read when examining the draft chapter) and the draft text. It made amendments to the draft chapter to align it with established Code format.

The proposed new draft Chapter X.X. is attached as [Annex XXXVIII](#) for Member Countries' comments.

Item 25. Report of the Animal Production and Food Safety Working Group meeting

Dr Gillian Mylrea, Deputy Head of the International Trade Department, updated the Code Commission on the activities of the Working Group. The Code Commission endorsed the report of the Group, which is attached in Annex [XXXIX](#) for Member Country information.

Item 26 Update of the Code Commission work programme

Comments were received from EU.

The Code Commission reviewed and updated its work programme, taking account of Member Countries' comments within the Code Commission's scope, and work completed.

The revised work programme is attached as Annex XL for Member Countries' comments.

Item 27 Review of applications for recognition as an OIE collaborating centre

The Code Commission reviewed the dossiers submitted by the following applicants for recognition as OIE Collaborating Centres (CC) and recommended that the OIE presents them for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014:

- a) CC for food-borne parasites in Asian-Pacific region (China);
- b) CC for food-borne zoonotic parasites in Europe region (France).

The Commission encouraged the applicants to closely collaborate each other and with the one in Canada on the same topic as well.

The Code Commission requested that the OIE contacts another applicant for recognition as a CC to provide additional detailed information so that the Commission can review the application in depth at its September 2014 meeting.

Item 28. Other issues**a) Prevention, detection and control of *Salmonella* in poultry (Chapter 6.5.)**

The Code Commission reviewed Chapter 6.5. and made amendments to Articles 6.5.7., 6.5.8. and 6.5.9. to take account of the point that this chapter is intended primarily for disease control rather than trade.

The revised chapter is appended as Annex XXXII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

b) General recommendations on disinfection and disinsectisation (Chapter 4.13.)

As discussed in Item 1 (General comments), the Code Commission proposed to amend the title of Chapter 4.13.

The revised chapter is appended as Annex XXXIII to be presented for adoption at the 82nd General Session in May 2014.

Item 29 Proposed dates for 2014 meetings

The September 2014 meeting is scheduled for September 9–18, and the February 2015 meeting for February 10–19.

.../Annexes