



Organisation Mondiale de la Santé Animale

World Organisation for Animal Health

Organización Mundial de Sanidad Animal

Original: English  
October 2008

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

Paris, 29 September–10 October 2008

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at the OIE Headquarters in Paris on 29 September–10 October 2008.

The members of the Code Commission are listed in [Annex I](#) and the agenda adopted is in [Annex II](#).

The Code Commission reviewed the documents identified in the agenda, addressing comments that Members had submitted by 15 August and amended texts in the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Code*) where appropriate. The amendments are shown in the usual manner by double underline and ~~strikeout~~ and may be found in the Annexes to the report. In Annexes XXVII, XXVIII, XXX (classical swine fever, West Nile fever, control of hazards of animal health and public health importance in animal feed), amendments made at this meeting (October 2008) are shown with a coloured background to distinguish them from those made prior to the 76<sup>th</sup> General Session in May 2008.

Members should note that, unless stated otherwise, texts submitted for comment may be proposed for adoption at the 77<sup>th</sup> General Session. Depending on the comments received on each text, the Code Commission will identify, in the report of its March 2009 meeting, the texts proposed for adoption in May 2009.

The Code Commission strongly encourages Members to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by submitting comments on this report. It would be very helpful if comments were submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a scientific rationale. Proposed deletions should be indicated in ~~strikeout~~ and proposed additions with 'double underline'. Members **should not use the automatic 'track-change' function** provided by word processing software as such changes are lost in the process of collating Members' submissions into the Code Commission's working documents. Comments on this report must reach OIE Headquarters by **30 January 2009** to be considered at the March 2009 meeting of the Code Commission. Comments should be sent to the International Trade Department at: [trade.dept@oie.int](mailto:trade.dept@oie.int).

Dr Vallat, Director General of the OIE, welcomed members of the Code Commission to OIE Headquarters. He emphasised the need for collaboration between specialist commissions and proposed to convene a joint meeting of the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (SCAD). Dr Thiermann, President of the Code Commission, welcomed this proposal. He commented that the Code Commission had a heavy workload for this meeting and thanked members for taking the responsibility to lead the discussion on particular agenda items.

The Code Commission acknowledges comments submitted by Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chinese Taipei, the European Union (EU), Guatemala, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, South Africa, Thailand and the United States of America (USA). The comments submitted to the previous meeting from Malaysia, the People's Republic of China, Serbia, Sudan and Switzerland were also noted.

## **A. JOINT MEETING OF THE CODE COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION**

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission held a joint meeting, with participation of Dr Vallat, on 2 October and discussed several important points. A summary of these discussions appears below.

### **1. Inclusion of official disease status questionnaires in the Code**

Dr Vallat indicated that for reasons of transparency and to strengthen the legal basis of decisions granting official status for bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), foot and mouth disease (FMD), rinderpest and contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (CBPP), the relevant OIE questionnaires should be formally adopted by the International Committee and published in the *Code*. Accordingly, the Code Commission agreed to circulate the four existing questionnaires, provided by the Scientific Department, for Member comments.

The Code Commission asked the International Trade Department to review Articles 11.6.23. to 11.6.29. inclusive (BSE risk assessment) to identify any provisions in the questionnaire that are inconsistent with the provisions in these articles.

The questionnaires, which are presented at Annexes XXXII to XXXV of this report, are provided for Member comments.

### **2. Discussion on buffer zone**

The definitions of 'buffer zone' and 'surveillance zone' were discussed and it was proposed that the term 'buffer zone' be replaced by the term 'protection zone' and that there was no need to define the term 'surveillance zone' as this concept is included in the current definition of '*protection zone*'.

The term 'buffer zone' is currently only found in Chapter 8.5. (Foot and mouth disease) and Chapter 12.1. (African horse sickness). The Code Commission reviewed all occurrences of the term in these chapters and decided that 'buffer zone' could be replaced by 'protection zone' in both chapters. No specific changes were made to the text defining the 'protection zone'. The Code Commission requested that the International Trade Department review the entire *Terrestrial Code* and check that this amendment has no unforeseen implications for other chapters.

The term 'surveillance zone' is currently found in Chapter 8.5. (Foot and mouth disease) and Chapter 8.3. (Bluetongue). The Code Commission reviewed all occurrences of the term in these chapters and deleted the definition of 'surveillance zone'. The Code Commission requested that the International Trade Department review the entire *Terrestrial Code* and check that this amendment has no unforeseen implications for other chapters.

### 3. Disease surveillance in wildlife and classical swine fever

The recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology, endorsed by SCAD, on these topics were presented to the Code Commission. Surveillance in wildlife is an issue of growing importance and there are many questions concerning the approach and the implication of findings for country status and trade. In the case of classical swine fever, the Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group's view that it is possible to maintain the disease free status of the domestic pig population with effective biosecurity measures to prevent the spread of infection between wild and domestic pigs.

### 4. Guidelines on surveillance of vector-borne diseases

It was agreed that guidance on surveillance for vector-borne diseases should be included in the *Code*, at an appropriate level of detail. There was general agreement that more detailed guidance could be provided in another OIE publication, such as the *Handbook on Surveillance for Diseases of Terrestrial Animals*, which is currently under development. The text proposed by the *ad hoc* Group on Climate Change and Vector-borne Disease Surveillance was also discussed by the Code Commission.

## B. EXAMINATION OF MEMBERS' COMMENTS AND WORK OF RELEVANT EXPERT GROUPS

### 1. Glossary

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina, Australia, Canada, the European Union (EU), Japan, South Africa, the USA, the Comité Veterinario Permanente del CONOSUR (CVP) and an expert. The discussions on 'buffer zone' and 'animal welfare' may be found under the relevant issues elsewhere in this report.

Members commented that 'flock' and 'herd' should be combined in a single definition because these two definitions are similar. The Code Commission reiterated the need to maintain separate definitions because these two terms are used throughout the *Code* in different sections, with different implications. Therefore there is a need to maintain the two definitions in the Glossary.

Following consideration of a Member's comment, the Code Commission decided to revert to the definitions of risk assessment and sanitary measure found in the 2007 edition of the *Code*.

The Code Commission did not agree to delete the reference to animal welfare as a responsibility of the Veterinary Authority, as proposed by one Member, as the OIE considers that Veterinary Authorities should accept responsibility for animal welfare (working in collaboration with other government agencies as appropriate).

After careful consideration of the use of the term 'official veterinary control of live animals' in the *Code* it was found that this term is not always linked to live animals. Therefore the definition was amended to delete 'of live animals' as the specific purpose of the official veterinary control (whether it covers live animals or other aspects) is defined in the text whenever this term is used in the *Code*.

The Code Commission discussed the issue of Members making self declarations of freedom from OIE listed diseases and compared the approach of the *Terrestrial Code* with that of the *Aquatic Code*, which contains a definition of the term 'self declaration'. It was agreed that a definition was not needed in the *Terrestrial Code* as the term is not used in this *Code*. The Code Commission decided to develop a new article (see below) for inclusion in Chapter 1.1. (Notification of Diseases and Epidemiological Information).

#### **New article on self declaration**

Members may make a self declaration that a country, zone or compartment is free from a listed disease, based on the implementation of the provisions of the *Terrestrial Code* and the *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals* (the *Terrestrial Manual*). The Veterinary Authority may wish to transmit this information to the OIE Central Bureau, which may publish the information.

The revised Glossary, which is presented at [Annex III](#), is provided for Member comments.

## 2. Criteria for listing diseases (Chapter 1.2.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and New Zealand.

Dr Ben Jebara joined the Code Commission for this discussion. The Code Commission reviewed Member comments and noted that the list of diseases notifiable to the OIE currently includes notifications covering both domestic animals and wildlife. Dr Ben Jebara introduced the discussion in the *ad hoc* Group on Wildlife Disease Notification and advised that the OIE Annual Questionnaire on Wildlife will be merged into the WAHIS reporting system.

The Code Commission decided that no amendment to the *Code* was required.

The report of the July 2008 meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Wildlife Disease Notification is attached in [Annex XLI](#) for information of Members.

## 3. Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.)

The Code Commission reviewed relevant information in the reports of the September 2008 meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology and the January 2008 meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Wildlife Disease Surveillance and made some appropriate modifications.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex IV](#), is provided for Member comments.

## 4. Horizontal chapters

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina, Canada, the EU, South Africa, Sudan, Switzerland, the USA and an expert.

### a) Import risk analysis (Chapter 2.2.)

Dr Sarah Kahn updated the Code Commission on the OIE decision to convene an *ad hoc* Group to produce a revised edition of the OIE *Handbook on Risk Analysis*. It is expected that this Group will hold its first meeting in 2009. The Code Commission noted that the Group would review Members' comments on Chapter 2.2. at its first meeting.

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

The Code Commission modified Chapter 5.4. as appropriate.

### c) Border posts and quarantine stations in the importing country (Chapter 5.6.)

The Code Commission modified Chapter 5.6. as appropriate.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at [Annex V](#), are provided for Member comments.

## 5. Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapters 3.1. and 3.2.)

### a) Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Evaluation of Veterinary Services

### b) Community animal health worker

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Evaluation of Veterinary Services and the paper submitted by Prof. A. M. Hassan on the role of 'community animal health workers' (CAHW). The Code Commission noted the particular relevance of CAHW in several African countries and the variability of the tasks and the institutional framework for CAHW from country to country. The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group recommended against developing a definition of CAHW for inclusion in the *Code*. Noting the important role of CAHW in some countries and that the term 'community animal health worker' is not currently used in the *Code*, the Code Commission proposed to the Director General to convene an expert group to address this issue.

The Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group's thinking on the current definition of 'veterinary para-professional' and proposed a modified definition, which may be found in [Annex III](#).

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached in [Annex XXXVII](#) for information of Members.

**c) Report of the *ad hoc* Group on communication**

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Communication and further modified the definition of 'outbreak' by deleting words already included in the definition of 'case'. The new or modified definitions may be found in [Annex III](#).

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached in [Annex XII](#) for information of Members.

**6. Design and implementation of systems for animal identification and traceability (Chapter 4.2.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina, Australia and the EU.

The Code Commission modified the text as appropriate. In response to a Member's comment, the Code Commission noted that items j), k) and l) of point 5 had been deleted from Article 4.2.3., based on advice from the *ad hoc* Group on Identification and Traceability, as reported previously.

Dr Sarah Kahn provided an update on progress in organizing the OIE International Conference on Animal Identification and Traceability. She noted that the dates for the Conference have been changed; it will take place on 23-25 March 2009 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The Code Commission noted the status report of the Conference.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex VI](#), is provided for Member comments.

**7. Zoning and compartmentalisation**

**a) Zoning and compartmentalisation (Chapter 4.3.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU, Japan and South Africa.

The Code Commission modified the text as appropriate. Members' comments calling for controls to provide for auditing of animal movements were not accepted as it was felt that this exceeds the OIE's current policies for zoning.

**b) Application of compartmentalisation (Chapter 4.4.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and Japan.

The Code Commission deleted a paragraph that introduces the use of the glossary on the basis that, since these guidelines have been incorporated in the *Code*, it is not necessary to repeat information relating to the use of the glossary.

The Code Commission accepted comments of Members regarding the inclusion of a reference to HACCP but modified the proposed insertion for clarity.

Member comments on Article 4.4.7. were accepted with modifications for clarity.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at [Annex VII](#), are provided for Member comments.

## 8. Surveillance for vector-borne diseases

The Code Commission noted the report of the November 2007 meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Climate Change and Vector-borne Disease Surveillance, including draft general guidelines for surveillance of arthropod vectors of animal diseases.

The Code Commission provided the existing draft text for Member comments and asked the International Trade Department to reformat the text as required for inclusion in the *Code*. Members' comments will be considered and the reformatted text discussed at the Code Commission's March 2009 meeting.

The new draft text, which is presented as a clean text at [Annex VIII](#), is provided for Member comments.

## 9. Chapters on semen and embryos (Chapters 4.5., 4.6., 4.7., 4.8., 4.9., 4.10., 4.11.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and experts.

The Code Commission reviewed new texts on bovine and porcine semen and embryos that had been provided by experts. The Code Commission noted that the International Trade Department had also restructured the chapters on semen to create a new chapter entitled 'General Hygiene in Semen Collection and Processing Centres'.

The Code Commission noted comments from Members and an expert regarding proposed changes to the categorization of scrapie and porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS) by the International Embryo Transfer Society (IETS) and asked the International Trade Department to forward appropriate requests to the IETS for consideration.

The Code Commission noted comments of experts regarding the lack of detailed information regarding *in vivo* derived embryos of cervids and noted that a further review may be required to address Article 4.7.13.

Because of the extensive revisions made, the Chapters 4.5. and 4.6 are presented as a clean text. The revised Chapters, which are presented at [Annex IX](#), are provided for Member comments.

## 10. Somatic cell nuclear transfer (SCNT) in production livestock and horses (Chapter 4.12.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and an expert.

The Code Commission noted the opinion of an expert and accepted the new text with a small modification.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex X](#), is provided for Member comments.

## 11. Model certificates

### a) General obligations related to certification (Chapter 5.1.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina and the EU.

The Code Commission considered the comments and modified point 1 a) of Article 5.1.3. accordingly, taking into account the need to recognize disease free compartments.

### b) Certification procedures (Chapter 5.2.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and modified the text as appropriate.

c) **Model veterinary certificates for international trade in live animals, hatching eggs and products of animal origin (Chapter 5.10.)**

The Code Commission noted the comment from Australia. Although the Code Commission agreed that the contents of the certificate, not the format on paper, are paramount, no specific text modifications were recommended and therefore no changes were made to the model veterinary certificates.

The revised Chapters (5.1. and 5.2.), which are presented at [Annex XI](#), are provided for Member comments.

**12. The role of the Veterinary Services in food safety (Chapter 6.1.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina and modified the text as appropriate.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XII](#), is provided for Member comments.

**13. Salmonellosis**

a) **The detection, control and prevention of *Salmonella* spp. in poultry (new chapter)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chinese Taipei, the EU, Guatemala, Japan, New Zealand and the USA and made a number of amendments to the text. Some comments of a highly technical nature were forwarded to the *ad hoc* Group for consideration.

In response to a request of a Member, the Code Commission clarified that the new chapter does not cover breeding flocks for the production of pet birds. The same Member requested that the OIE develop recommendations on the inactivation of *Salmonella* spp. in egg products. The Code Commission noted this request but considered that it would be more appropriate for Codex Alimentarius to address such standards and asked the International Trade Department to raise this matter with Codex.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XIII](#), is provided for Member comments.

b) **Hygiene and biosecurity procedures in poultry production (Chapter 6.3.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia, Canada, Chinese Taipei, the EU, Guatemala, Japan, New Zealand, Thailand and the USA.

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group on Salmonellosis is scheduled to meet early in 2009 and referred all Member comments to the Group for consideration.

**14. Introduction to the recommendations for controlling antimicrobial resistance**

The Code Commission noted an introductory text drafted by an expert and decided to incorporate this as appropriate into the *Code*.

The new draft Chapter, which is presented as a clean text at [Annex XIV](#), is provided for Member comments.

**15. Animal welfare**

a) **Animal welfare definition (Chapter 7.1.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia, Canada, the EU, Japan and the USA.

The Code Commission noted that some Members had submitted comments calling for significant changes to the definition adopted in May 2008. These comments reflected diverse points of view and the Code Commission had difficulty in reconciling them. The Code Commission also recalled that the definition of animal welfare adopted in May had already been the subject of extensive discussion and reflected a carefully balanced consensus. The Code Commission therefore decided to make no changes to the animal welfare definition.

**b) Stray dog population control (new chapter)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia, Canada, the EU, Japan, Kuwait, Malaysia, New Zealand, the People's Republic of China, Serbia, the USA and two NGOs.

A large number of comments had been received and had been considered by the Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG) at its June 2008 meeting. The Code Commission reviewed the revised text developed by the AWWG and made a number of modifications.

Because of the extensive revisions made, the revised Chapter is presented as a clean text at [Annex XV](#) for Member comments.

**c) Report of the *ad hoc* Group on the Welfare of Animals used in Research, Testing and Teaching (laboratory animals)**

The Code Commission noted that Argentina and the USA had submitted comments on the document circulated after its March meeting. As noted by a Member, this document was incomplete and it had been provided to Members for information only. The *ad hoc* Group will hold a second meeting in December 2008. It is expected that the Group's final report will be circulated for a first round of Member comment early in 2009.

The Code Commission noted a comment from a Member regarding the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to define 'genetically altered animals' and requested that the International Trade Department consult with the Scientific Department on this issue to ensure that all issues relevant to the OIE mandate were properly addressed in developing such a definition.

**d) Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare and Livestock Production Systems**

The Code Commission noted the report of the *ad hoc* Group and supported the proposal to work on broiler chickens and dairy cattle as initial priorities.

The report is attached in [Annex XXXVI](#) for information of Members.

**e) Report of the 7th Meeting of the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group**

The Code Commission noted the report of the Working Group.

Concerning modification of the existing Chapters on Animal Welfare in the *Terrestrial Code*, the EU proposed to include a third method for killing poultry by the use of gas. The Code Commission supported the advice of the AWWG and asked the International Trade Department to hold electronic consultations with the appropriate experts on this item.

The report is attached in [Annex XXXVI](#) for information of Members.

**16. Anthrax (Chapter 8.1.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia, New Zealand and an expert. Advice from the SCAD was also taken into account.

The Code Commission agreed that the tables cited by a Member could provide a useful basis for advice on the inactivation of anthrax spores and requested that the International Trade Department incorporate relevant information into the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission reviewed comments of Members and noted an inconsistency between the recommendations in the *Terrestrial Code* and those in the *Terrestrial Manual* regarding the withholding of cattle from slaughter following vaccination for anthrax. The Code Commission noted advice of the SCAD that concerns about the use of vaccination relate to the use of live vaccine and not to inactivated vaccine.

The Code Commission reviewed Article 8.1.7. in light of the advice of an expert to the effect that, even though the probability that *B. anthracis* is excreted via milk is low, and the number of excreted organisms likely to be low, pasteurisation could not be relied upon to guarantee the inactivation of *B. anthracis* spores in milk. The Code Commission considered that, in any case, the importation of milk and milk products for human consumption from animals showing clinical signs of anthrax at the time of milking was inadvisable and Article 8.1.7. should be modified accordingly.

The Code Commission decided to review additional references with a view to developing recommendations on the inactivation of *B. anthracis* spores in meat and meat products, wool and hair, bristles, animal manure, hides and skins, and milk for animal consumption.

Unfortunately there was not sufficient time to complete the revision. The Code Commission will continue to work on this Chapter at the next meeting.

#### **17. Bluetongue (Chapter 8.3.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU, the SCAD and the Biological Standards Commission (BSC).

The Code Commission noted the BSC's advice that the *Terrestrial Manual* chapter on bluetongue had been scheduled for review in 2008-2009. Members' questions on the use of inactivated vaccines were addressed and changes were made accordingly.

Based on advice from the SCAD, the Code Commission modified articles dealing with the northern geographic range of bluetongue.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XVI](#), is provided for Member comments.

#### **18. Foot and mouth disease (Chapter 8.5.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina, the EU, Japan, the CVP and an expert. The report of the September 2008 meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology was also taken into consideration.

Most of the comments on Chapter 8.5. related to the concept of the 'buffer zone' and the Code Commission considered that these had been addressed via modification of the definition of 'buffer zone' (see discussion above). The Code Commission modified several articles in Chapter 8.5., to reflect the discussion and agreement of the two Commissions.

The Code Commission also considered that the comments provided by an expert were helpful in establishing general recommendations for the preservation of FMD free status of a country or zone. To assist Members in understanding the Code Commission's thinking on this issue, the expert's comments are reprinted below:

##### ***Introductory comments***

*A country free from a disease (with or without vaccination) either throughout the country or in a part of the country (a free zone) has the right to take appropriate biosecurity measures to prevent the entry and spread of the relevant pathogen. The country may apply the measures in respect of a country of a different health status (whether that country is contiguous or not) or in respect of a zone of a different health status within its territory.*

*The objectives of these measures are to:*

1. *prevent the entry of the pathogen into the free country/zone;*
2. *facilitate early detection if the pathogen gains entry;*
3. *help the veterinary services to respond quickly and to minimise the spread of the pathogen if it gains entry.*

*To meet the first objective, the following measures are relevant:*

- o conditions for the import of commodities to prevent the entry of the pathogen from a country /zone of lower health status (whether contiguous or not);*
- o animal movement controls, which may include the exclusion of animals susceptible to the disease in question, in a defined area near the border of the free country/zone. Note: this would apply in the case where there is a contiguous country/zone of lower health status;*
- o reliance on existing physical or geographical barriers. Note: this would apply in the case where there is a contiguous country/zone of lower health status;*
- o implementation of legal and/or administrative procedures (such as border check points).*

*The most important activity to address the second objective is increased and/or targeted surveillance near the border of the free country/zone.*

*To help address the third objective, vaccination could be applied at and/or near the border or throughout the country if the country is free with vaccination.*

*In the case of a free zone within a country, the national veterinary services are responsible for the implementation and monitoring of these measures as part of the country's management and justification of the free zone. These activities are essential to convince trading partners that the free zone is being effectively maintained.*

*In the case of a free country that has an agreement with a contiguous country/trading partner of lower health status, the relevant measures could be applied by the veterinary services of the partner i.e. outside the free country. The country that is disease free (or contains the free zone) would be expected to monitor effective application of the measures by its partner.*

*In the case of a free country that has not established an agreement with a contiguous country/trading partner of lower health status, the relevant measures should be applied by the national veterinary services at the national borders and, as appropriate, within the country. The application of measures such as import restrictions and border check points is a key component of national disease control and eradication programmes and is required to justify claims of disease freedom. These measures are also important to support international trade in animals and animal products.*

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the July 2008 meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Camelidae diseases, which was endorsed by SCAD, and made an appropriate modification to the introduction to Chapter 8.5. (Foot and mouth disease).

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XVII](#), is provided for Member comments.

The Code Commission intends to include the concept of compartmentalisation into the Chapter on FMD during its next meeting.

## 19. Paratuberculosis (Chapter 8.10.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina and Japan.

The Code Commission noted Members' comments but did not consider itself able to amend Chapter 8.10. The Code Commission had no objection to a Member's request that the OIE develop a guidance document (not for inclusion in the *Terrestrial Code*) on the management of paratuberculosis and asked the International Trade Department to refer this request to the Scientific Department for consideration.

## 20. Rabies (Chapter 8.11.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from South Africa and SCAD.

The Code Commission noted that the current focus of the Code is on highlighting the importance of the presence of diseases in domestic animals when providing recommendations relevant to international trade, while at the same time encouraging the reporting of epidemiologic events in wildlife. The Code Commission was of the opinion that the current Chapter on rabies needs to be redrafted in order to consider all viruses capable of causing rabies in mammals, rather than referring to certain (but not all) lyssaviruses. Furthermore, for the purpose of international trade and for determining the status of a country with respect to rabies, the new Chapter should differentiate between the presence of infections in wildlife and infections in domestic animals and man. Therefore, the Code Commission requested the Director General to convene an *ad hoc* Group to draft a new chapter on rabies.

In the interim, the Code Commission agreed with the comment of a Member and decided to modify Article 8.11.2. to provide that the finding of any bat lyssavirus should not affect the rabies free status of a country.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XVIII](#), is provided for Member comments.

## 21. Rinderpest (Chapter 8.13.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU.

While no changes were made to Chapter 8.13., the Code Commission recalled that the surveillance provisions for rinderpest had not been adopted at the 76<sup>th</sup> General Session and decided to propose this text for adoption in 2009.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XIX](#), is provided for Member comments.

## 22. Avian influenza (Chapter 10.4.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments of Australia, Guatemala, the EU, Japan, South Africa and the USA.

The Code Commission made a number of text modifications.

The Code Commission considered but did not accept Members' suggestions to change some time periods and other text, as no scientific rationale was provided.

The Code Commission examined but did not accept a request from a Member to change the heading of Article 16 to read 'Regardless of the NAI status of the country, zone or compartment', as provisions for egg products from an NAI free country, zone or compartment are given separately under Article 15.

A Member's recommendation for modifying Article 10.4.21. was not accepted, in the absence of a rationale for the change.

A Member commented regarding the need to modify Article 10.4.23. point 2 (i.e. to remove 'under study') based on the proposal that avian influenza virus can be inactivated using commercial pet food processing methods as specified. The Code Commission noted that this article covers the importation of products of poultry origin intended for use for agricultural and industrial uses as well as for use in animal feed. The Code Commission considered that the data provided on the processing parameters used by the pet food industry should be taken into account in any future work to develop OIE recommendations on pet food.

A Member's request to delete 'under study' from Article 10.4.24. was not accepted by the Code Commission as the Member only provided justification relevant to the processing of feather meal and not to the processing of feathers and down of poultry, which are also covered by this article. However, the Code Commission proposed a new Article 10.4.24.bis 'Recommendations for the importation of feather meal' based on the Member's recommendations.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at Annex XX, is provided for Member comments.

### **23. Newcastle disease (Chapter 10.13.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia, the EU and South Africa.

The Code Commission made a number of modifications to the text with the goal of harmonizing the approach with that taken to Chapter 10.4. (Avian influenza).

At the request of Members, the Code Commission incorporated into Chapter 10.13. a table showing the time and temperature parameters required to inactivate Newcastle disease virus in eggs, egg products and poultry meat. This information is based on a Member's submission and comments of experts.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at Annex XXI, is provided for Member comments.

### **24. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.6.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Canada, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Pakistan and the USA. Several industry associations also commented on the articles relating to by-products.

The Code Commission considered comments and decided that text changes were only warranted in regard to two specific issues, i.e., point 1. g) of Article 11.6.1. (meat from cattle 30 months of age or less) and Article 11.6.15 (by-products, including gelatine). Several requests for modifications that had been submitted previously and had been resubmitted were reviewed by the Code Commission. The Code Commission decided to adopt no further changes to Chapter 11.6. on the grounds that the Members' recommendations did not address new risks and adoption would not significantly improve the current text.

#### **a) Discussion on the '30 month rule'**

Although the Code Commission noted that a 30 month age restriction had added an element of safety regarding possible contamination with SRM, a careful examination of the science shows that maintenance of the 30 month age restriction is unwarranted. The Code Commission emphasised that the removal and avoidance of contamination with SRM, as defined in Article 11.6.14., are paramount to manage the human and animal health risks associated with BSE.

The most accurate assessment of the risks to humans from consuming BSE affected cattle can be made by considering the situation in the United Kingdom (UK), where there have been more than 180,000 cases of BSE. (In the rest of the world combined, there have been fewer than 6,000 cases.) It has been estimated that in the UK somewhere between 1.6 and 4 million cattle infected with BSE were consumed. Even though around 45% of Britons are of the genotype considered most susceptible to BSE, fewer than 170 people have died from the disease since 1996. Further, it is now generally accepted that most human exposure to BSE in the UK was through the consumption of mechanically-recovered meat contaminated with central nervous system tissues. That is, humans in the UK were not, in all probabilities, exposed to BSE through eating muscle meat.

Thanks to the proper handling of SRM, including appropriate feed-ban and feed testing provisions, BSE is in decline and is now a rare disease. It is now far less likely that BSE infected cattle will be presented for slaughter than had been the case in the UK through the 1990s. The application of the recommendations in the *Terrestrial Code* (Article 11.6.1.) very significantly reduce the risk of meat being contaminated with central nervous system tissue. While the 30 month restriction may have provided some measures of risk reduction at the peak of the BSE epidemic, these days there can be no significant effect on risk by excluding meat from cattle over 30 months of age, provided the recommendations in this Chapter are properly enforced.

**b) Definition of SRM (Article 11.6.14.)**

Because scientific knowledge on the infectivity of tissues defined in Article 11.6.14. is very well established and the appropriate management of these tissues provides the most appropriate approach to the control of BSE related risks, the Code Commission decided not to modify this Article.

**c) Importation from a country, zone or compartment posing a controlled BSE risk**

In point 4 b) of Article 11.6.11. the Code makes reference to cattle over 30 months of age in relation to mechanically separated meat (MSM) from the skull and vertebral column. It is a well established fact that BSE infectivity in the central nervous system manifests, on average, at 30 months of age. On the basis that the disease risk with MSM is associated with nervous tissue, not with meat, the Code Commission decided to maintain this article unchanged.

**d) Risk management for gelatine**

The OIE received several comments on risk management for gelatine pointing out that the OIE had, at the 76<sup>th</sup> General Session, adopted more stringent risk management measures than warranted. The Code Commission was of the opinion that gelatine manufactured according to the conditions described in Article 11.6.15. was safe, regardless of the origin of the raw materials, as long as skulls had been removed. The Code Commission failed to find any reason as to why bones from countries with an undetermined risk status for BSE would be riskier than bones from countries with a controlled risk status, as long as the conditions in Article 11.6.12. had been satisfied. Therefore the Code Commission decided to revert to the text proposed for adoption at the 76<sup>th</sup> General Session.

**e) Other comments**

The Code Commission noted a comment from an industry organisation and agreed to remove the words 'protein-free' from Article 11.6.1. in order to avoid confusion.

The Code Commission reviewed a comment on point 4 of Article 11.6.20. (cattle subpopulations for surveillance purposes) but did not recognize a need to adopt the proposed text changes. However, the Code Commission added text to Article 11.6.22. advising on surveillance points for small cattle populations, as suggested by a Member.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XXII](#), is provided for Member comments.

## 25. Bovine tuberculosis (Chapter 11.7.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina, Australia, the EU, New Zealand, South Africa and the USA.

The Code Commission considered comments of Members and made some amendments to Chapter 11.7. The Code Commission reviewed the definition of compartmentalisation, which provides for one or more establishments to be considered as a compartment. The Code Commission deleted 'under study' from Article 11.7.3. and deleted all of Article 11.7.4., based on the view that a free herd should be dealt with as a compartment. Based on this reasoning, the Code Commission also removed the reference to compartment from Article 11.7.7.

In response to Member comment, the Code Commission also reviewed the previous text relating to bovine tuberculosis in farmed cervidae and produced a new draft chapter.

The revised and new chapters, which are presented at [Annex XXIII](#), are provided for Member comments.

## 26. Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (Chapter 11.8.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and New Zealand.

The Code Commission incorporated several comments with a view to clarifying the existing text.

The Code Commission noted the advice from the *ad hoc* Group on Trade in Animal Products on the listing of milk and milk products as safe commodities. It also asked the *ad hoc* Group on Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia to provide advice on other products including meat and meat products.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XXIV](#), is provided for Member comments.

## 27. Equine diseases

### a) African horse sickness (Chapter 12.1.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and modified the text as appropriate following the advice of SCAD and BSC.

### b) Equine influenza (Chapter 12.7.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and modified the text as appropriate.

### c) Equine rhinopneumonitis (Chapter 12.9.)

The Code Commission reviewed a comment from New Zealand.

The Member commented that the terminology for equine rhinopneumonitis should be revised to consider Equid herpesvirus 1 (EHV 1) to be the agent of equine abortion and Equid herpesvirus 4 (EHV 4) to be the agent of equine rhinopneumonitis. Based on the BSC advice that the description contained in the *Terrestrial Manual* is accurate, the Code Commission incorporated appropriate text into Article 12.9.1.

### d) Equine viral arteritis (Chapter 12.10.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU, South Africa and an expert.

The Code Commission modified the text as appropriate following the advice of an expert.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at [Annex XXV](#), are provided for Member comments.

## 28. Scrapie (Chapter 14.9.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina, Australia, Canada, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and the USA.

The Code Commission noted that many comments had been received on Chapter 14.9. and reviewed these carefully. Unlike BSE, scrapie does not pose a human health risk. The management of scrapie is primarily based on preventing contagion at the time of birth and in the period immediately after, and controls over live animals and semen, not via the control of specified risk materials and meat and bone meal, as with BSE. Other approaches to control involve managing the genotype of flocks. The Code Commission therefore decided that the preferred model for the revised chapter on scrapie was Chapter 2.4.8. in the 2007 edition of the *Code*, rather than the BSE chapter in the 2008 edition of the *Code*.

Atypical scrapie is a sporadic degenerative condition occurring in aged sheep and goats. This condition is not thought to be contagious and it is important to distinguish it from classical scrapie in the *Code*, as the trade implications of finding an atypical scrapie case are completely different.

In accordance with Members' recommendations, the Code Commission deleted the reference to cattle in regard to the scope of Chapter 14.9. and replaced 'small ruminant' with 'sheep and goats' throughout. The Code Commission also modified Article 14.9.1. in line with the modification of Article 11.6.1. (BSE) dealing with safe commodities and removed 'in vivo derived embryos' from the list of products that are safe for trade.

The primary main mode for the transmission of scrapie is from mother to offspring immediately after birth. In response to several Members' comments regarding the lack of evidence for the transmission of scrapie through meat and bone meal, the Code Commission modified the text on meat and bone meal in Article 14.9.2.

Some Members proposed that the OIE provide, in Article 14.9.3., a table showing the number of samples to be tested according to population size. The Code Commission was not in a position to develop such a table but invited Members to submit a draft text for consideration.

Although there is a good scientific consensus that scrapie does not present a human health risk, it has recently been demonstrated that scrapie may be transmitted to lambs in sheep's milk. Therefore, the Code Commission added text (Article 14.9.9.bis) on milk and milk products intended for use in animal feeds.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XXVI](#), is provided for Member comments.

## 29. African swine fever (Chapter 15.1.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and South Africa.

The Code Commission acknowledged the requests of Members for advice on surveillance and inactivation procedures for African swine fever virus in swine products, similar to the approach taken in Chapter 15.3. (Classical Swine Fever). The Code Commission is awaiting the provision of advice from the SCAD on these points. In the interim, the Code Commission made no changes to Chapter 15.1.

## 30. Classical swine fever (Chapter 15.3.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU, Japan and South Africa. The Code Commission also took into account the report of the September 2008 meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology.

The Code Commission developed a revised text on classical swine fever (CSF), taking into account the following key considerations:

- o For the purposes of international trade, CSF should be considered as an infection of domestic pigs;
- o ‘Domestic pig’ should be defined as including both housed and farmed free range pigs, i.e. all domesticated pigs used for the production of meat for consumption and other commercial products and for breeding these categories of pigs;
- o It is important to encourage Members to conduct appropriate surveillance (as defined in the *Terrestrial Code*) and report findings of CSF infection in wild pigs;
- o It is possible to establish separation between domestic and wild pig populations and to maintain a distinct CSF status in the two populations;
- o The OIE has undertaken to incorporate the concept of compartmentalisation into disease chapters as appropriate to the epidemiology of the disease. This concept can and should be applied in the case of CSF;
- o Members should be able to export pigs and pig products from a CSF free domestic population regardless of the presence of CSF in wild pigs, providing that the surveillance, reporting and disease control provisions of the *Terrestrial Code* have been satisfied.

Article 15.3.3. was modified to remove the provision for historical CSF freedom as the Code Commission considered this not to be a disease for which freedom can be maintained without appropriate surveillance.

The Code Commission modified the text of several articles in Chapter 15.3.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XXVII](#), is provided for Member comments.

### **31. West Nile fever (new Chapter)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina, Australia, Canada, the EU, New Zealand, the People’s Republic of China, South Africa, Switzerland and the USA.

Following a discussion with the SCAD, the Code Commission relocated Article 2 in front of Article 1.

The Code Commission noted Members’ comments regarding the susceptibility of humans, horses and day old poultry to infection with West Nile fever (WNF). While horses and humans are dead end hosts, they are nonetheless susceptible to infection, as are day old poultry. The Code Commission included new text asking that Members should not place trade restrictions on horses on account of WNF. Even though there is a low likelihood of day old poultry being exposed to infection, studies show that they are susceptible to infection and they cannot, therefore, be included on the list of safe commodities.

Some Members called for guidance on surveillance for WNF. The Code Commission agreed that such guidance should be provided and that this would be considered once the SCAD has advised on requirements for surveillance of vector-borne diseases.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XXVIII](#), is provided for Member comments.

### **32. Small hive beetle infestation (Chapter 9.4.) and other bee diseases (Chapters 9.1., 9.2., 9.3., 9.5., 9.6.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and modified the text as appropriate.

Text modifications regarding the responsibility of the Competent Authority will be reflected as appropriate in other Chapters on bee diseases in the *Code*.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at [Annex XXIX](#), are provided for Member comments.

### **33. The control of hazards of animal health and public health importance in animal feed (new Chapter)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Canada, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland and the USA and modified the text as appropriate.

The revised Chapter, which is presented at [Annex XXX](#), is provided for Member comments.

The Code Commission discussed representations made by the pet food industry, seeking OIE advice on pet food standards. The Code Commission noted Dr Vallat's advice that the OIE would consider developing specific advice on feed for animals not used for food production (pet animals) in 2009.

### **34. Swine vesicular disease (Chapter 15.5.)**

The Code Commission noted that an *ad hoc* Group has prepared a revised chapter on swine vesicular disease and that the SCAD will further review this text in light of changes made to Chapter 15.3. (CSF).

### **35. OIE-FAO Guide to Good Farming Practices**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina and the EU.

The Code Commission noted that the Guide has been finalised and is currently being printed by FAO. The Guide will also be published in the OIE *Bulletin*. Therefore, the Code Commission did not address Members' comments.

## **C. OTHER ISSUES**

### **36. Ad hoc Group on Trade in Animal Products ('Commodities')**

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the July 2008 meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Trade in Animal Products ("Commodities"). The Code Commission noted the report and agreed that the conclusions were generally sound.

The Code Commission addressed the recommendations of the Group by making a number of amendments to disease chapters in the *Code* (Rift valley fever [RVF], bovine cysticercosis, Teschovirus encephalomyelitis, contagious bovine pleuropneumonia, equine influenza) in order to emphasise the safety of trade in certain commodities.

The Code Commission also supported a number of recommendations made by the Group for scientific research to be conducted to clarify the effectiveness of various risk management regimes, such as the development of risk management provisions for sheep and goat milk and milk products, the food safety risks associated with RVF virus in milk and dairy products, and the use of deboning, maturing and pH testing of pig meat as a risk management measure for FMD.

The Code Commission addressed a BSE related impediment to trade in commodities with the proposed amendment of the '30-month rule' (Article 11.6.1. item 1 g)) and expressed a strong desire that Members accept this amendment as proposed.

Notwithstanding the good work done by the *ad hoc* Group, the Code Commission expressed some disappointment that it had not provided clear recommendations on a key trade impediment, i.e. the safety of deboned, matured pH-tested bovine meat, regardless of the FMD status of the country/zone from which the cattle came and regardless of whether the cattle were vaccinated against FMD or not. Accordingly, over and above the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group, the Code Commission recommended that the OIE commission expert studies to demonstrate the scientific rationale for listing deboned, matured pH-tested bovine and porcine products as a safe commodity in regard to FMD, taking into account the recommendations from the *ad hoc* Group, as well as specific scientific publications cited by experts.

The revised Chapters (other than discussed in B. of this report), which are presented at [Annex XXXI](#), are provided for Member comments.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached in [Annex XXXVIII](#) for information of Members.

### **37. Applications for OIE Collaborating Centres and Reference Laboratories**

The Code Commission acknowledged two applications for a new Collaborating Centres, one for Animal Feed Safety and Analysis, submitted by the Food and Agricultural Materials Inspection Centre, Saitama (Japan) and another for animal welfare submitted jointly by Universidad Austral de Chile and Universidad de la Republica Oriental del Uruguay. The Code Commission endorsed these submissions and recommended that the International Trade Department forward the applications according to the normal OIE procedure.

### **38. The Commission's reporting procedures**

The Code Commission noted the comments from Australia and the USA. Collaboration between the SCAD and the Code Commission is of critical importance and it was proposed to the Director General that SCAD meetings should precede Code Commission meetings whenever possible and that there should be a coordination meeting between the two Commissions (or at least the two Presidents) at least once per year.

Pending further discussion within the OIE, no changes were proposed to the schedule of Code Commission meetings.

### **39. Report of the OIE *ad hoc* Group on Wildlife Disease Notification**

Dr Karim Ben Jebara, Director of the Disease Information Department, joined the Code Commission for this discussion.

The Code Commission noted the report of the *ad hoc* Group but did not consider that any modification to the *Code* was warranted at this stage.

The report is attached in [Annex XL](#) for information of Members.

### **40. Future work programme**

The updated work programme is shown in [Annex XLI](#).

### **41. Other business**

The next meeting of the Code Commission is scheduled for 2-6 March 2009.

---

.../Annexes