



Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Annex XXII A

Original: English  
June 2014

## FOURTH MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL HORSE MOVEMENT FOR EQUESTRIAN SPORT

Paris, 2–4 June 2014

### 1. Opening

Dr Gardner Murray, Chair of the *ad hoc* Group (AHG), welcomed participants to the meeting. Dr Brian Evans, Deputy Director General and Head of the Scientific and Technical Department of the OIE, welcomed all participants to this fourth meeting. He noted that the adoption of the new chapter 4.16 *High Health Status Subpopulation* in the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code)* during the OIE General Session was a great achievement. He encouraged the Group to work on the details of implementation of the concept. Furthermore, the Group should consider a critical review of the list of diseases of concern, make recommendations for updates of *Terrestrial Code* chapters and involve the Biological Standards Commission in matters regarding diagnostic tests and vaccines.

Dr Murray outlined the objectives of the meeting, namely to: (i) discuss the comments on the newly adopted *Terrestrial Code* chapter; (ii) continue working on the practical implementation of the concept; (iii) discuss the further development of the EDFZ<sup>1</sup> concept; (iv) discuss proposed research projects and the way forward to implement them; and (v) develop a communication strategy for this project.

At Dr Murray's request, all participants briefly introduced themselves.

Dr Murray thanked Dr Etienne Bonbon, vice President of the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission, and Dr Kris De Clercq, vice President of the Scientific Commission on Animal Diseases, for making themselves available and for providing comments on behalf of the respective OIE Commissions.

### 2. Adoption of the agenda

The adopted agenda for the meeting is given in [Appendix I](#) and the list of participants in [Appendix II](#).

### 3. Record of the third meeting

The minutes of the third meeting were approved.

### 4. Review of actions arising and achievements

Dr Susanne Münstermann presented an overview of the work completed since the last meeting. She highlighted that since the third meeting of the AHG, two expert sub-group meetings had been convened, namely on (i) HHP<sup>2</sup> health certificate in January 2014 and (ii) HHP operationalisation in April 2014. The reports of both meetings had been circulated to the members of the AHG. The report of the January meeting on HHP health certificate had been presented to the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (SCAD) and the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (Code Commission) in February in order to get their views.

<sup>1</sup> EDFZ: Equine disease free zone.

<sup>2</sup> HHP: High health high performance (horse sub-population).

Annex XXII A (contd)

Dr Münstermann indicated that key actions arising from the third AHG meeting will be followed up at this fourth AHG meeting and therefore she reported only on those activities that were not covered by this meeting's agenda:

- (i) Biosecurity Guidelines (BSG) for the FEI<sup>3</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> World Equestrian Games, to be held in Normandy, France in August 2014, had been developed and made available to the OIE. Dr Sarah Kahn reported on their similarities and differences with the OIE BSG.
- (ii) An *ad hoc* Group on Glanders met in November 2013; some members of this AHG participated in the meeting. The draft *Terrestrial Code* chapter was presented to SCAD in February 2014 and was not accepted because SCAD wished to have more evidence of interest by industry for official status recognition for glanders by the OIE.
- (iii) The HHP concept was presented to the World Customs Organisation's (WCO) General Assembly in November 2013. WCO proposed to convene a joint Working Group once the database for the HHP horse concept has been developed, in order to integrate it into the WCO database.
- (iv) Since the last AHG meeting, the HHP concept has been presented at several important meetings, namely to:
  - International Horse Movement Committee of IFHA<sup>4</sup> meeting in Hong Kong, December 2013
  - The New Zealand Veterinary Services, November 2013
  - FEI General Assembly, November 2013
  - OIE/FEI/IFHA Regional Conference on International Horse Movement for Asia, the Far East and Oceania, Hong Kong, February 2014
  - FEI Veterinary Committee, March 2014
  - Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale Palermo, Italy, Equine Diseases Laboratory Diagnosis Training Course, April 2014
  - Asia Racing Conference, Hong Kong, May 2014
- (v) Dr Münstermann provided an update on the equestrian competitions that will take place during the Asian Games, to be held in late September in Korea (Rep. of). The Veterinary Authorities of Korea have embraced the HHP and EDFZ concept by developing *International health regulations* in line with HHP and by establishing an EDFZ around the venue.
- (vi) Dr Münstermann informed the Group that a separate webpage has been established on the OIE website and invited Group members to provide her with comments and suggestions to continually improve this page (<http://www.oie.int/en/our-scientific-expertise/specific-information-and-recommendations/international-competition-horse-movement/>)

## 5. Outcome of the OIE 82<sup>nd</sup> General Session

Dr Kahn summarised the introduction to the new *Terrestrial Code* chapter that Dr Alejandro Thiermann, President of the Code Commission, had given to the Assembly of OIE Delegates and the comments that OIE Member Countries had voiced. She explained that the chapter will be inserted into Section 4 of the *Terrestrial Code* where the chapters on zoning and compartmentalisation can also be found. The Group discussed several of the issues that had arisen:

<sup>3</sup> FEI: Fédération Equestre Internationale.

<sup>4</sup> IFHA = International Federation of Horseracing Authorities.

Annex XXII A (contd)

- a) Europe had suggested changing the acronym for the subpopulation to HHS in line with the title of the chapter (high health status horse subpopulation).

After lengthy discussion, the Group opted to retain the acronym HHP mainly for the following reasons:

- (i) performance is an expression of fitness to compete, which is primarily determined by health
- (ii) “status” has a defined meaning in the *Terrestrial Code* for diseases with official recognition of health status (country or zone), e.g. for African horse sickness (AHS);
- (iii) the HHP acronym is now widely known and accepted, e.g. it comes up on internet search straight away linked to the OIE.

It was, however, agreed and highlighted that it is the industry that defines the level of performance for HHP horses and competitions/races. To integrate the HHP acronym into the HHS, Dr Etienne Bonbon proposed the following: *the status is given to the subpopulation of HHP horses.*

- b) The text of the draft chapter had been changed to include an *international biosecurity plan*. Clarification was given that it is the task of the public–private partnership to develop this plan in line with the OIE BSG and have it approved by the national Veterinary Authorities (VA). The term *biosecurity plan* is defined in the *Terrestrial Code* glossary.
- c) One country had commented that the use of microchips should be made compulsory rather than “preferably” as stated in the current *Terrestrial Code* chapter text. The Group was of the opinion not to limit the identification to microchips in view of problems reading them and new technologies, such as retina scanning, which could replace microchips in the future.
- d) The need for a designated official within the VA with responsibility for liaison with the equine performance sector was reiterated. There is an important need for a strategy to communicate the HHP concept to VAs, particularly during this period of development of the concept.

## 6. Operationalisation of the HHP concept

The Group was provided with a discussion paper that had been prepared on the basis of the report of the expert sub-group that met in January to develop Guidelines on operationalisation of the HHP concept..

Before going into the different elements of the management plan, Dr Anthony Kettle pointed out that not enough consideration has been given to diseases of concern to event organisers, such as strangles, and requested that highly contagious diseases and those with carrier status (equid herpesvirus: EHV) should be included in the list of diseases. The consensus was that those should be dealt with in the BSG. The industry should also assume responsibility for preventing those diseases, e.g. through their respective FEI and racing veterinary rules.

The VA could also request evidence of reporting history, e.g. for 3 years prior to an event and seek information through WAHIS<sup>5</sup> and PVS<sup>6</sup> reports.

The Guidelines on operationalisation of the HHP concept make a distinction between “countries of known health status” and those of “unknown health status”. Some members of the Group proposed to differentiate the former into “with diseases of concern” and “without diseases of concern”. In this regard, some experts wished to include contagious or ‘carrier state’ diseases additional to the six diseases for which the health status of an HHP horse is defined. In conclusion the Group agreed that there would be two distinct statuses – countries of known health status and countries of unknown health status. The HHP preparation period is 90 days (76 plus 14 days isolation) for the former and 104 days (90 plus 14 days isolation) for the latter group of countries.

<sup>5</sup> WAHIS: World Animal Health Information System (of the OIE)

<sup>6</sup> PVS: Performance of Veterinary Services

Annex XXII A (contd)

It was also agreed that horses originating in a population that historically meets the defined health criteria for HHP can qualify for inclusion in the HHP by performing a 14 day period of isolation, providing that all health testing and certification requirements (other than the provision to be separated for a period of 90 days from horses that do not have HHP-equivalent status).

With respect to the criteria for stables that will be used for holding HHP horses during the 76/90 day qualifying period ('preparation stables'), it was agreed that there were no particular construction and equipment requirements for these stables, as compared with the stables for the last 14 days isolation. However, during the preparation period, the health status of other horses in the stable needs to be verified by surveillance. For this surveillance to be reliable in countries of "unknown health status", no horses may be allowed to enter the preparation stable during the period of qualification and the horse under preparation cannot be moved to other stables or events. For countries of "unknown health status", the 14 day isolation period must be done using an "all in – all out" management system and in a stable that is registered with the industry body as an HHP approved premise. Conversely, for countries of "known health status", horses under preparation can move to participate in events, providing they are in contact only with horses of health status equivalent to HHP. Movement during the 14 days of isolation should not be permitted.

The need for vector protection in the registered HHP stable used for the 14-day isolation period was discussed and it was concluded that it was not necessary to specify a standard for vector protection.

In considering the completion of a 90-day cycle of international movement and the minimum period in the country of usual residence before the beginning of a new cycle of international movement, the Group decided that there was no need to specify an exact time period of residence, as horses would not have lost their HHP status during the 90 days of previous travel. However, the VAs in the countries of usual residence may require reconfirmation of the health status of a HHP horse (e.g. for dourine, equine viral arteritis (EVA), equine infectious anaemia (EIA), glanders, piroplasmosis and, in Asia, for Japanese encephalitis (JE)) within 42 hours of re-entry to the country of usual residence. Dr Füssel reiterated that the entire system is based on the precondition that the country of usual residence must take the horse back.

For consistency with the draft HHP health certificate (see point 7 below), it was agreed to make reference to four diseases (Eastern and Western equine encephalomyelitis (EEE, WEE), JE and rabies) as diseases that should be notifiable in the country of usual residence (or country of export, meaning usual residence plus countries visited).

The Group discussed the respective responsibilities of the industry and the VA and confirmed that there the veterinary presence should comprise at least a treating veterinarian (private sector), an official veterinarian (as defined in the *Terrestrial Code*) and a veterinarian accredited by the VA to issue health certification of HHP horses and registration of HHP premises and venues.

**7. HHP health certificate**

The proposal to modify Section IV point 1b)<sup>7</sup> (on AHS) was discussed. The OIE has established a system of official recognition of countries and zones for freedom from infection with AHS. Given that this system has only recently been introduced and many OIE Member Countries have not had the time to assemble the dossiers for official recognition, it would be appropriate to introduce an alternative option as a transitional measure. The Group agreed that the existing provisions in the *Terrestrial Code* should be applied. This covers official health status and the possibility of importation from infected countries/zones, as stipulated in Article 12.1.9, more specifically in 3c) (14 days in vector protected stable and agent identification test).

---

<sup>7</sup> Now reading: "The country or zone is officially free from African horse sickness and no case has been reported in the country/zone in 12 months preceding the date of export of the horse" - which effectively eliminates most of Africa from the HHP concept

Annex XXII A (contd)

It was proposed to amend Section IV point 2 c)<sup>8</sup> to read “Immediately prior to export” and add a point e) stating that horses have been held at HHP premises and venues throughout the period of continuous travel. In addition, point 2a) should be further clarified by adding “the disease certification requirements of 3 months free from VEE<sup>9</sup>, glanders and EIA” and deleting “HHP premises” from the same sentence.

Section IV point 3c)<sup>10</sup> on equine influenza (EI) was discussed with respect to the risk that horses travelling regularly will be subject to repeated vaccination for EI. Dr Ann Cullinane suggested that it would be appropriate to offer owners the alternative option of presenting evidence that the horse has antibody levels that are consistent with protection. Testing the horses after completion of a 90-day cycle of international travel therefore appears to be an option and the SRH<sup>11</sup> test as listed in the *OIE Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals (Terrestrial Manual)* should be recommended, as it is fully validated. This option should be included in the HHP health certificate.

## 8. Revised biosecurity guidelines

The BSG had been revised in view of the outcomes of the two expert sub-group meetings, which enabled the chapter on “home stables” to be written and the introduction to be revised as well as adjustments to be made to some other chapters.

The Group discussed whether these BSG were targeting a wide audience, combined of industry and VAs, or whether they should be specific for the HHP sub-population. The Group concluded that this comprehensive document has a lot of value and can be seen as a reference document for both stakeholders, but that its further development should be put on hold for the moment and an HHP-specific, short and concise document for use by VAs should be extracted, with the objective of assisting them in the different certification tasks of the HHP system.

Dr Barcos proposed a definition of the HHP sub-population for discussion with the Terrestrial Code Commission with a view to potential adoption in the *Terrestrial Code* in 2015.

### Draft Definition

*Includes registered horses (equidae) that are under permanent veterinary supervision to ensure the application and implementation of OIE standards specific to this subpopulation, that include the cooperation work between Veterinary Services and equestrian clubs, and also vaccination, laboratory analyzes, quarantine, individual identification, monitoring, performance, biosecurity and welfare, among others, for the sole purpose of participating in international equestrian competences and races through temporary movements.*

Prof. Peter Timoney pointed out that there is an urgent need to raise awareness about the importance of biosecurity amongst industry, owners and event organisers. Dr Murray added that for all these reasons, the BSG need to be reviewed and fully endorsed by FEI and IFHA before they can be published.

<sup>8</sup> Now reading: “Prior to export...”

<sup>9</sup> VEE : Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis

<sup>10</sup> Now reading: “The horse was immunized.... between 21 and 90 days before export...”

<sup>11</sup> SRH = single radial haemolysis

Annex XXII A (contd)

Some specific points in the document that needed clarification were discussed and resolved as follows:

- Page 4, definition, remove the word “status”
- Section 2.2.2, page 23, 8<sup>th</sup> bullet: change the word “exporting” to “host” and add surra (*Trypanosoma evansi*) to the diseases that need vector protection; change to “vector protected” rather than “insect proof”
- Section 2.2.4, page 24, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet: remove the word “internationally”
- Section 2.8.5, page 42. Dr Kettle disagreed with parts of this section and agreed to provide an alternative wording

### 9. The need for additional *Terrestrial Code* chapters

It was agreed that there was a need for a new chapter on surra (*Trypanosoma evansi*) as well as a chapter introducing the overall approach to the six priority diseases for the HHP horses’ movement certification. SCAD should be requested to set up an *ad hoc* Group for Surra (*Trypanosoma evansi*).

### 10. Equine disease free zones (EDFZ)

Dr Münstermann provided a brief summary on the developments regarding the temporary EDFZ established by the Republic of Korea for the Asian Games 2014 and the application by Azerbaijan to set up a permanent EDFZ in Absheron Peninsula. This led to the question of the need for more formalised EDFZ guidelines as compared with those published on the OIE website. More formalised guidelines could have a questionnaire with issues that the country needs to address when setting up an EDFZ, such as the structure of Veterinary Services, existence of legislation providing a legal basis for establishing zones and surveillance capacities (e.g. laboratories and other infrastructure). As the declaration of the EDFZ is a “self-declaration of freedom” in line with *Terrestrial Code* Article 1.6, the question was raised of whether more detailed guidance is required. The Group agreed to develop both types of guidelines, but after the more urgent documents, such as HHP health certificate and Operationalisation Plan and HHP BSG, have been finalised.

In this context the question of the feasibility of using an EDFZ approach in AHS-endemic countries was discussed. Given that it is a *self-declaration*, nothing can stop a country from doing this for AHS; however, the question remains of whether this declaration would be accepted by other countries. Dr Kris de Clercq highlighted the importance of following OIE policy on the matter of official recognition and noted that the OIE will not publish a self-declaration for freedom from foot and mouth disease or any other disease that is the subject of official recognition.

The Group concluded that the declaration to the OIE of official freedom of a Zone or an entire country is preferable under all circumstances; however, as a transitional measure, the option of certifying horses according to Article 12.1.9 (point 3c) (see Agenda item 7), was supported. The Group was aware of the problems the horse might face during onward travelling due to its AHS-vaccinated status.

This discussion led to an update on the state of play regarding the 2016 Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil). Dr Alberto Gomez da Silva informed the Group that Brazil is building a new arena for the equestrian events and that the country intends to use HHP and EDFZ concept approaches. The National Equestrian Federation has not yet advised on the dates of the test event to be held in 2015. Brazil has not yet started to develop the official import requirements for the Olympic Games.. Dr Barcos supported the view of Dr da Silva regarding the need to engage the Mercosur<sup>12</sup> countries in the preparatory work and proposed to contact the Secretary of Mercosur to accelerate the development of harmonised conditions for the temporary importation of horses from the region into Brazil.

<sup>12</sup> Mercosur = Mercado Común del Sur ; member countries are Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela

## 11. Research projects

Equine Influenza (EI): EI had already been identified as the priority disease for research support during the previous AHG meeting.

Dr Cullinane summarised the outcomes of the OFFLU<sup>13</sup> STAR-IDAZ<sup>14</sup> meeting held at OIE Headquarters in April 2014 to develop a global animal influenza research agenda. The immediate research priorities identified for EI were the validation of a reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) test to OIE standards and the development of evidence-based vaccination regimes. Dr Cullinane informed the Group that subject to funding, the four OIE Reference Laboratories for EI had agreed to work together to validate an RT-PCR assay under the auspices of the Expert Surveillance Panel. Countries from all continents would be engaged in the process so that the application for designation as the prescribed test would be based on broad international consensus. Prof. Alan Guthrie queried whether the test would be specific for EI or a pan-influenza test. It was explained that the consensus of the Expert Surveillance Panel was that it should be a pan-influenza test with the capacity to detect other Type A influenza viruses, for example avian influenza viruses that have the potential to cross the species barrier into equidae. This was demonstrated in China (People's Rep. of) in 1989 and, more recently, with the highly pathogenic avian H5N1 virus in Egypt.

Dr Cullinane also summarised the vaccination regimes study that had originally been submitted to the AHG at its meeting in October 2013. The aim of the study is to determine when in a horse's vaccination career it is of benefit to administer an influenza vaccine at 6-monthly intervals and at what stage annual boosters suffice. After discussion it was agreed that the study should be expanded to determine the effect of administering booster vaccines every 90 days as could occur with HHP health certificate. The Group recommended that both studies be funded.

Glanders: Dr Stéphan Zientara summarised progress on a project to develop an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) for glanders, as already presented during the AHG October 2013 meeting. A prototype ELISA based on a crude antigenic fraction of *B. mallei* has been developed. Pakistani sera composed of sera from truly infected and potentially exposed equines (horses and mules), Brazilian sera collected in a farm with an ongoing outbreak of glanders as well as sera from glanders-free areas were tested. Preliminary results show a good specificity and sensitivity for this new ELISA test. The specificity, measured with 485 sera from glanders-free areas, was 98,8%. The 6 sera that gave a doubtful or positive result had a S/P value comprised between 43 and 70%. A slight adaptation of the cut-off would greatly improve the specificity to 99,6%. For the complete validation of the test, fresh sera from infected animals are needed and could allow a better definition of the interpretation criteria.

He indicated that although this EU funded project was progressing, additional funding could expedite developments. Dr Murray asked that he submit details for AHG consideration.

Dourine: Dr Zientara summarised a research proposal on treatment of *T. equiperdum* which was discussed during the OIE ad-hoc group meeting on non-tsetse transmitted Trypanosomiasis in May 2014, and which concluded that in the near future it is not to be expected that a test will be available that clearly differentiates between *T. evansi* and *T. equiperdum*. A successful outcome of such a study could lead to important changes in the regulations for this disease, as infected horses are either castrated (male) or euthanized. There was no great enthusiasm from the Group for progressing this proposal, at least at this point in time.

African horse sickness: Dr Münstermann informed the Group that a ring trial on different RT-PCR tests will be carried out by the four OIE Reference Laboratories to which the laboratory of Prof. Guthrie at the University of Pretoria and of Dr Zientara at Anses<sup>15</sup>, Paris, would also be invited.

She also encouraged the Group to support initiatives to develop improved AHS vaccines, including DIVA<sup>16</sup> vaccines.

<sup>13</sup> OFFLU: OIE/FAO Network of expertise on animal influenza

<sup>14</sup> STAR-IDAZ: Global Strategic Alliances for the Coordination of Research on the Major Infectious Diseases of Animals and Zoonoses

<sup>15</sup> Anses: Agence nationale de sécurité sanitaire de l'alimentation, de l'environnement et du travail

<sup>16</sup> DIVA: differentiate infected from vaccinated animals

Annex XXII A (contd)**12. Communication strategy for HHP concept**

Ms Inka Sayed presented an outline for a planned Diploma study to develop a communication strategy for the HHP concept. The Group agreed that this offers a valuable opportunity to improve communication with Veterinary Services, especially the CVO<sup>17</sup>/OIE Delegate. Dr Barcos commented on the rapid turnover of OIE Delegates in the Americas (13 CVOs changed since 2012), which demonstrates the need to produce clear messages for different stakeholders and distribute them accordingly.

The need for an “equine liaison person” within Government was reiterated and Dr Barcos reminded the Group that this was one of the recommendations of the OIE-FEI Panama meeting on international horse movement in 2012. Prof. Timoney added that this position had existed in the United States of America, was then removed, and had recently been reinstated due to pressure by the industry. Dr Münstermann suggested to carry out a survey with the OIE Regional Representatives to find out how many Veterinary Services have such an “equine liaison officer”, so that industry could focus its lobbying efforts on those countries that do not have one.

Dr Murray concluded that communications is a key element to take the HHP concept forward and that industry needs to play a key role in dissemination of these messages. He added that, following consideration by OIE and FEI of Ms Sayed’s Report, AHG would be prepared to overview the implementation of the communications strategy.

**13. Update on the HHP project workplan**

Dr Münstermann presented the HHP project workplan and highlighted points that should be modified to reflect the decisions of the AHG. Dr Barcos identified three planned meetings in the Americas that could provide a forum for discussion of the HHP concept. These are the seminar for OIE Focal Points on Communication; the seminar of Laboratory Focal Points and a proposed follow-up to the Regional Conference on international horse movement held in Panama in 2012. The Group agreed that a meeting in Africa should also be envisaged and Dr Füssel suggested it be planned for end of 2015 in view of possible participation in the Brazil Olympics. Dr Murray added that there will be an inter-regional Conference on international horse movement held in Dubai at the end of September and that some African countries could already be invited to this meeting. Dr Graeme Cooke added that Eastern European countries had also expressed great interest in such a Conference.

**14. General discussion and next meetings**

In an attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of this AHG, Dr Murray opened the discussion on whether the approach needs to be changed. There was general agreement that a large group representing industry, governments and equine disease experts is needed to “pressure test” the progress, however, concrete results should be produced by smaller expert sub-groups. Dr Barcos proposed to include the OIE Regional Representatives into the distribution of the AHG reports so that they can also better disseminate the results. Dr McEwan encouraged the AHG to establish rapid turnaround of all correspondence and electronic discussions and Dr de Clercq added that discussions on topics such as the HHP health certificate and the Operationalisation guidelines should not be prolonged – they would receive sufficient country comments anyway!

Dr Murray again emphasised the critical importance of Members responding to draft papers or questions put to them in a timely manner. This was particularly important as it would enable the AHG to understand and take in to account the views of others at AHG or Sub Group Meetings.

The next full AHG meeting will be held in April 2015, dates will be advised closer to the time.

An expert sub-group meeting to finalise the HHP Certificate and the Operationalisation Guide will have to convene in July in order to meet the deadline for submission of the documents to SCAD and Code Commission in August.

---

<sup>17</sup> CVO: Chief Veterinary Officer



## 15. Conclusions and resulting action

Dr Murray led the discussion summarising the key conclusions, as follows:

### Sub Group Meeting

- Convene in July to finalise report on the HHP Health Certificate for international movement and Guidelines on the Operationalisation of the HHP Concept, to be considered by the SCAD and Terrestrial Code Commission at their meetings in September 2014.

### Comments on new *Terrestrial Code* chapter:

- Retain acronym HHP rather than change to HHS

### Revision or development of *Terrestrial Code* chapters:

- Review *Terrestrial Code* Chapter 8.8 (JE) and Chapter 12.4 (WEE and EEE) to include text similar to that in Chapter 8.17 (West Nile fever) “*Member Countries should not impose trade restrictions on dead-end hosts such as horses*”
- Develop a new Chapter on surra (*Trypanosoma evansi*)
- Revise Chapter 12.6 (EI) to include the option of post vaccination testing to detect poor responders
- Develop chapter on the HHP critical six diseases by starting with a scientific paper
- Develop chapter on the HHP health certificate with an accompanying “HHP horse management handbook”

### Revision of *Terrestrial Manual* chapters:

- Prepare a request to the OIE Biological Standards Commission to consider restricting Chapter 2.5.13 to pathogenic strains of VEE only

### Development/finalisation of other guidelines:

- Extract a short and concise HHP certification guideline for VAs from the more comprehensive full BSG
- Revise and expand the current EDFZ guidelines by adding a questionnaire-type check list, for inclusion on the OIE internet site, dealing with all requirements for an EDFZ
- Develop a guide to the self-declaration of an EDFZ

### Research projects:

- Develop a call for proposals for the two prioritised EI projects
- Invited AHG Members to submit proposals or revised proposals for research projects

Annex XXII A (contd)Communication strategy:

- A pilot communication strategy to be developed by end of August through interviews with representatives of VA and national equestrian federations.

Work Plan

- Update the Action Plan to take account of the outcomes of the AHG Meeting.

**16. Recommendations**

In drawing the meeting to a close, Dr Murray reiterated the need for industry to fully endorse the work of this AHG as most of the implementation of the Group's recommendations will have to be done by FEI and IFHA. He once again stressed the need for an "equine liaison person" in the VAs, and also encouraged the industry to support this proposal.

He thanked the participants for the contributions that they have made, was particularly happy with progress in a difficult and new area, and acknowledged the significant support that the OIE has given to the Group.

---

.../Appendices

Annex XXII A (contd)

Appendix I

**FOURTH MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL HORSE MOVEMENT  
FOR EQUESTRIAN SPORT**

**Paris, 2–4 June 2014**

—

**Agenda**

1. Opening
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Record of the third meeting
4. Review of actions arising and achievements
5. Outcome of the OIE 82<sup>nd</sup> General Session
6. Operationalisation of the HHP concept
7. HHP health certificate
8. Revised biosecurity guidelines
9. The need for additional *Terrestrial Code* chapters
10. Equine disease free zones (EDFZ)
11. Research projects
12. Communication strategy for HHP concept
13. Update on the HHP project workplan
14. General discussion and next meetings
15. Conclusions and resulting action
16. Recommendations

—



Annex XXII A (contd)Appendix II**OIE AD HOC GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL HORSE MOVEMENT  
FOR EQUESTRIAN SPORT****Paris, 2–4 June 2014****List of participants****MEMBERS**

**Prof. Ann Cullinane**  
Head of the Virology Unit  
Irish Equine Centre  
Johnstown  
Naas - Co. Kildare  
IRELAND  
Tel: +353-45 86.62.66  
Fax: +353-45 86. 62.73  
acullinane@equine-centre.ie

**Dr Richard Newton**  
Head of Epidemiology and Disease Surveillance  
Animal Health Trust, Lanwades Park, Kentford  
Newmarket, Suffolk CB8 7UU  
UNITED KINGDOM  
Tel: +01638 751000 ext 1266  
richard.newton@aht.org.uk

**Dr Alberto Gomes da Silva**  
Responsible for Equine Movement Control and  
Equine Health  
Coordination for Animal Quarantine and  
Movement Control  
Ministério da Agricultura,  
Pecuária e Abastecimento  
Espanada dos ministérios  
Bloco-d, Anexo A, Sala 305  
70043-900 Brasília, DF  
BRAZIL  
Tel.: + 61 2182735  
Fax: + 61 2244180  
alberto.gomes@agricultura.gov.br

**Prof. Peter Timoney**  
Maxwell H. Gluck Equine Research Center  
Department of Veterinary Science  
University of Kentucky  
108 Gluck Equine Research Center  
Lexington, Kentucky 40546-0099  
United States of America  
ptimoney@uky.edu

**Representative SCAD**

**Dr Kris De Clercq**  
Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Vétérinaires  
et Agrochimiques de Ukkel  
CODA/CERVA/VAR  
Department of Virology  
Section Epizootic Diseases  
Groeselenberg 99  
B-1180 Ukkel  
BELGIUM  
Tel.:+32-2 379.04.00  
krdec@codac-cerva.be

**Prof. Alan J. Guthrie**  
Equine Research Centre  
Private Bag X04  
Onderstepoort 0110  
SOUTH AFRICA  
Tel: (27-12) 529-8068  
Fax: (27-12) 529-8301  
alan.guthrie@up.ac.za

**Dr Alf-Eckbert Füssel**  
Head of Sector  
DG SANCO/D1  
Rue Froissart 101-3/67  
B-1040 Brussels  
BELGIUM  
Tel: +32-2 295 08 70  
Fax: +32-2 295 31 44  
alf-eckbert.fuessel@ec.europa.eu

**Dr Stéphane Zientara**  
ANSES/INRA/ENVA  
Directeur de l'UMR 1161  
23 Avenue du Général de Gaulle  
94703 Maisons-Alfort  
FRANCE  
Tel: + 33 - (0)1 43 96 72 80  
s.zientara@vet-alfort.fr

**Dr Graeme Cooke**  
Director of Veterinary Department  
Fédération Equestre Internationale  
HM King Hussein I Building  
Chemin des Délices 9  
1006 Lausanne  
SWITZERLAND  
graeme.cooke@fei.org.jp

**Dr John McEwan**  
FEI first vice president and chair of the FEI  
veterinary committee  
Fédération Equestre Internationale  
HM King Hussein I Building  
Chemin des Délices 9  
1006 Lausanne  
SWITZERLAND  
johnmcewen@theglyn.fsnet.co.uk  
johnmcewen1@me.com

**Dr Anthony Kettle**  
BVSc BSc DipSc MSc MBA MRCVS MACVSc  
Head of Veterinary Department  
Dubai Racing Club  
Tel: (971) 4 336 1626  
Fax: (971) 4 336 1579  
Mob: (971) 50 459 4348  
anthony.kettle@dubairacingclub.com

**Dr Kenneth Lam**  
Veterinary Consultant  
Hong Kong Jockey Club  
Department of Veterinary Regulation and  
International Liaison  
Sha Tin Racecourse, Sha Tin, NT  
HONG KONG  
Mobile: +852- 9497 1303  
kenvet@usa.net

**Dr Gardner Murray**  
OIE Special Adviser  
4, Weingarth Street, Holder  
Canberra, ACT 2611  
AUSTRALIA  
gardner.murray@grapevine.com.au

**Representative Code Commission**

**Dr Etienne Bonbon**  
Direction générale  
European External Action Service (EEAS)  
12 Avenue d'Eylau  
75116 Paris  
FRANCE  
Tel.:+33(0)1 44 05 31 68  
Etienne.bonbon@eeas.europa.eu

Annex XXII A (contd)Appendix II (contd)**Observers**

---

**Dr Caterina Terminie**  
Fédération Equestre Internationale  
HM King Hussein I Building  
Chemin des Délices 9  
1006 Lausanne  
SWITZERLAND  
caterina.terminie@fei.org.jp

**Dr Inka Sayed**  
Fédération Equestre Internationale  
HM King Hussein I Building  
Chemin des Délices 9  
1006 Lausanne  
SWITZERLAND  
inka.sayed@fei.org.jp

**OIE Headquarters**

---

**Dr Brian Evans**  
Deputy Director General  
Head, OIE Scientific and Technical Department  
12 rue de Prony  
75017 Paris  
France  
b.evans@oie.int

**Dr Susanne Münstermann**  
OIE Scientific and Technical Department  
s.munstermann@oie.int

**Dr Sarah Kahn**  
OIE Consultant  
Argentina  
s.kahn@oie.int

**Dr Luis Osvaldo Barcos**  
OIE Representative for the Americas  
Argentina  
l.barcos@oie.int



Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Annex XXII B

Original: English

April 2014

## REPORT OF THE MEETING OF AN EXPERT SUB-GROUP TO THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL HORSE MOVEMENT FOR EQUESTRIAN SPORT

Paris, 10–11 April 2014

A meeting of an expert sub-group of the *ad hoc Group* on International Horse Movement for Equestrian Sport was held at the OIE Headquarters on 10–11 April 2014. The objective of this sub-group was to describe the operationalization of the HHP concept at home stable, event venue and during transport.

Note: in this report, ‘home stable’ and ‘premises (or place) of usual residence’ are equivalent terms.

### 1. Opening

Dr Brian Evans, Deputy Director General and Head of the Scientific and Technical Department, welcomed the members of the sub-group on behalf of the Director General. Apologies were received from Dr Gardner Murray, Chair of the *ad hoc Group*, who was unable to attend the meeting.

Dr Susanne Munstermann of the Scientific and Technical Department provided an update of activities since the last *ad hoc Group* (AHG) meeting in October 2013. The key points of this update were (i) a meeting organised by International Federation of Horse racing Authorities (IFHA) in Hong Kong, attended by several members of the AHG, in which the High Health, High Performance (HHP) concept was presented to the International Movement of Horses Committee (IMHC) of IFHA; (ii) OIE in collaboration with FEI and IFHA organised a regional meeting in Hong Kong in February 2014 to compare the current import regulations in the Region, based on a questionnaire to Member countries (iii) the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases and the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission discussed OIE Member countries’ comments on the draft code chapter on the *High Health status horse sub-population* during their meetings in February and (iv) OIE and FEI visited Azerbaijan to assess the feasibility of establishing an Equine Disease Free Zone (EDFZ) in the Absheron Peninsula.

Dr Münstermann explained that the outcome of the discussions of this meeting will be included in the Biosecurity Guidelines.

### 2. Appointment of a chair and rapporteur

The meeting was chaired by Dr Alf Fuessel and Dr Munstermann, with support from Dr Kahn, acted as rapporteur.

The Agenda is presented in [Appendix I](#), the Terms of Reference in [Appendix II](#) and the list of participants in [Appendix III](#).

Annex XXII B (contd)**3. Biosecurity measures and management at the home stable**

The starting point for the discussion was the preparation period of 90 days, which is defined in the draft HHP health certificate as “the horse was kept continuously for at least 90 days on a premise or premises that meet (s) the disease certification requirements for an HHP premise”. For a horse to become an HHP horse, the health checks that need to be carried out during this preparation period comprise a glanders test (in the case where the country of origin is not free from the disease), a test for equine infectious anaemia (EIA) and a vaccination against equine influenza (EI). The requirements also include that the country or zone of residence of the horse is free from AHS<sup>18</sup> (either official country freedom or 2 years freedom from the disease and vaccination not practiced during the last 12 months) and freedom from VEE for at least 2 years.

The equine disease health status of the country of residence of the horse is the basis for determining the surveillance required for all other equidae in the home stable and the requirement to test for glanders and EIA. All equidae in the home stable should be vaccinated against equine influenza unless the country is free of the disease. In a situation where the country or zone health status is unknown, the individual horse seeking to qualify as an HHP horse must be moved at the end of the 90 day preparation period to a separate HHP facility, where it will undergo the 14 day isolation period. During this period, the horse is considered to have qualified for membership of the HHP subpopulation and therefore it must be held only with HHP horses or horses of equivalent or higher health status. In this case the period of preparation prior to international movement consists of 90 plus 14 days.

In a situation where the equine disease health status of the country of residence of the horse is well known, or the country holds prior approval from the Veterinary Authority of the country organising the event (into which the HHP horse will be temporarily imported), the horse seeking recognition as an HHP horse can qualify for export in a total period of 90 days. This is based on the horse being confirmed as free from infectious diseases, specifically glanders and EIA.

In addition, the health status is also determined by the performance or “fitness to compete” of a horse, which is a result of controlled health conditions.

In this case, the horse can be held in a premise or premises that fulfil the disease certification requirements for an HHP premise for 76 days and can remain in this stable or go to a registered HHP stable for the last 14 days. In this case the entire preparation period consists of 76 plus 14 days.

In the case where the horse seeking recognition is a long term resident of a population of at least equivalent health status to an HHP population, based on a documented negative EIA test and vaccination against equine influenza, the period of qualification for recognition as an HHP horse comprises only 14 days.<sup>19</sup>

It was agreed that horses could be moved during the period of preparation providing that the conditions for the first part (90 or 76 days) as given in 2a of the draft HHP health certificate (*..premises meet the disease requirements for an HHP premise*) and for the second part of 14 days as indicated in 2c (*.. premises that have a current HHP number*) are respected.

Dr Kettle mentioned that for race horses, the HHP stable number will be linked to a trainer and his entire stable will become an HHP stable, comprising all horses, whether they will travel internationally or not.

The entire 90 day period of preparation must be under continuous veterinary supervision, defined as being at least one visit by the accredited veterinarian per week, an inspection on Day 1 of the 14 day isolation period and a final visit 48 hours before exportation of the horse. The responsibility for the veterinary inspection should lie with the stable veterinarian, who ideally should be registered with the FEI or IFHA and, preferably, accredited by the national Veterinary Authority (VA).

<sup>18</sup> This part of the health certificate needs to be amended accordingly

<sup>19</sup> This statement was not as such concluded during the meeting, but it appears the logical consequence of all other statements and has been accepted by the group during email consultations



Annex XXII B (contd)

The Official Veterinarian should be informed prior to the start of the 14-day isolation period and alerted to the date for the pre-export visit for the purpose of health certification. It is important that the VA be well informed about the process of preparation of horses for export under the HHP conditions.

The VA will have the right to conduct audits of all parts of the HHP system (premises, venues, stop-over points). This may include unannounced visits.

In the case that different veterinarians are responsible for supervising the 90 day (or 76 day) and the 14 day isolation periods are taking place in different stables, a hand over report should be provided by the veterinary supervisor of the first period to the supervisor of the second period.

During the entire preparation period, records of the veterinary supervision should be kept. During the preparation period all new horses entering the stables should be vaccinated against equine influenza and of an equivalent or higher health status or cannot be allowed into the stable.

The stable unit in which the horse spends the last 14 days (or the entire period if it was carried out in a single stable) must be separated from all other units on the property that hold non-HHP horses. A supervisor that is dedicated to this unit must be designated as responsible for ensuring that it complies with the criteria listed below. Once qualified as an HHP premise, the stable should be registered with the FEI or IFHA as an **HHP stable**. The registered number of the HHP stable will be contained in the HHP database.

The criteria for a stable unit to qualify for registration as an HHP stable are as follows:

- Name and contact details of owner/trainer, location (GPS details) of the unit, contact details of the supervising veterinarian (including out of hours contact information)
- Construction and equipment
  - Unit is at a minimum distance of 50 meters and fenced off from any other unit containing horses on the property
  - Means of controlling entry of people and animals into the unit are provided
  - Facilities for training / exercising horses are available. If they have to be shared with other horses that are not in preparation for membership of the HHP subpopulation, operational measures to separate HHP and non HHP horses must be established (e.g. first to train)
  - There is equipment dedicated to the use of the horses in the HHP unit
  - There are means to allow for the isolation of horses with signs of infectious or contagious disease
  - The unit must have access to vehicles suitable to transport HHP horses and means to clean and disinfect these vehicles
- Management procedures
  - Access for horses and people to the unit is restricted; if personnel enter also other stables, they must clean and disinfect or change outer clothing and boots and wash and disinfect hands before coming into contact with horses being prepared to qualify for HHP membership
  - Daily health and temperature check of each horse shall be carried out by grooms dedicated to this stable unit; (SOP for this check to be developed and provided to grooms)

Annex XXII B (contd)

- Records should be kept showing the results of daily inspections as well as veterinary visits and interventions; these records should be made available to the FEI/IFHA or VA for audit as may be requested
- Procedures for cleaning, disinfection, feeding and horse management should be documented
- Transportation of HHP horses is done according to documented procedures

Once a stable unit can fulfil these conditions, the owner/person responsible can apply to the FEI or IFHA for registration of the facility as an HHP premise. The FEI/IFHA may, if appropriate, request approval of the Veterinary Authority. Once the facility is approved, the stable unit will be allocated an HHP registration number.

For FEI, the conditions that apply to HHP home stables will eventually be covered in the FEI Veterinary Regulations.

**Discussion points:**

The conditions under which new horses could enter a yard or property during the 90 day preparation period were discussed. New entrants could potentially compromise the health status of the group under preparation, particularly regarding EIA, in light of the extended (commonly 40 day ) period of seroconversion (e.g. a horse could have been tested negative during this period, but becomes infectious once introduced into the stable).

The requirements for training facilities at HHP stables was discussed. If they are constructed in such a way that HHP horses share airspace with non-HHP horses (e.g. in the case of indoor arenas), they could present a risk to the health status of horses in preparation for membership of the HHP subpopulation. In this situation, despite the availability of a separate stable unit, horses would need to be moved to other properties during the preparation period.

Concern was raised about the possibility of over-vaccination for EI. The draft health certificate stipulates “the horse was immunized between 21 and 90 days prior to export”. Horses making several 90-day HHP travel tours would be vaccinated every 3 months. A pilot study suggests that for horses that have been vaccinated for several years there is a negative correlation between antibody level and number of vaccine doses received. However, it was agreed that further studies are required and that at present the majority of importing countries currently require vaccination within 90 days prior to export.

Concern was raised that the draft certificate does not include a statement from the veterinarian “to the best of my knowledge, the horse has not been in contact with equidae suffering from an infectious or contagious disease in the 14 days prior to this declaration”. Such certification is essential to minimize the risk of conditions such as strangles and equine herpesvirus neurological disease.

**4. Biosecurity measures and management at the venue**

The Group agreed on the general principle that HHP horses at event venues must be held in separate stable units with similar characteristics to those of the home stable. The stable units must have dedicated personnel, feed, and isolation facilities and must be separate from stable units holding horses that do not have an equivalent health status. If physical separation of 50 m distance is not possible, other management or physical measures must be put in place to prevent the transmission of vector borne and respiratory diseases. Otherwise the same criteria as listed for the home stable apply.

While HHP horses must be stabled separately, they may be in the same area as other horses while training or competing / racing (“under tack”).

It was realized that the physical separation of HHP horse stables might be difficult in certain FEI events, particularly when they are indoors and space for stabling is limited. This situation should be addressed by the FEI by ensuring that these events are either limited to HHP horses or HHP horses are excluded from them.

## **5. Biosecurity measures and management during transport**

The discussions touched on two aspects of transportation: (i) the actual transport means, e.g. airplanes, vehicles, trains, boats and (ii) lay-over points where HHP horses can be held temporarily during journey breaks.

It was agreed that HHP horses may only be transported with equids of equivalent or higher health status. The final decision on combining horses in consignments rests with the VA of the importing country.

Current import conditions normally stipulate “horses should not travel with other horses of different health status”. Therefore, the shipment of HHP horses with, for example, horses intended for permanent importation that have not achieved HHP or equivalent status, would present a problem for the latter horses!

Transporters of HHP horses shall follow a documented SOP for their transport. There is no need to register transporters as “HHP transporters”.

Examples were given for long-haul road transport e.g. from Belgium to Morocco with a minimum of 3 stops. For these situations a network of HHP approved lay-over points needs to be established. These points should meet biosecurity requirements sufficient to ensure that HHP horses will not be exposed to equids that are not of equivalent health status. The biosecurity measures should be guided by the conditions that apply for the HHP home stables (see point 2) and should be listed in the HHP database. These lay-over points can be stables en route, show grounds, veterinary clinics, animal hotels, Government quarantine stations or control points. All these premises should be HHP registered in order to be used by HHP horses.

### **Discussion points**

Concern was expressed over the apparent logistical difficulty of establishing a network of registered lay-over points for HHP horses. It was concluded that the setting up of this network would be step wise and event driven. In the preparation period for a big event with known participating countries, the routes used by those horses coming by road would be established and HHP lay-over points along these routes be created.

The scenario in which a HHP horse would need to transit through a country that either does not subscribe to the HHP principle or is not accepted by the importing country was discussed. The example of UAE was illustrated. This country has a list of approved countries and would not accept horses from or transiting through non-approved countries. The same holds true for the EU, which has a list of 56 approved countries.

This problem can only be addressed in the long term once the HHP concept is accepted by many countries, as it will require modification of national laws or regional agreements (e.g. EU, Mercosur) to allow for the importation of HHP horses from otherwise non-approved countries.

## **6. Finalisation and adoption of the draft report**

The Group finalised the report by correspondence.

---



**MEETING OF A SUB GROUP TO THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON  
INTERNATIONAL HORSE MOVEMENT FOR EQUESTRIAN SPORT**

**Paris, 10–11 April 2014**

---

**Agenda**

1. Opening
  2. Appointment of a chair and rapporteur
  3. Biosecurity measures and management at the home stable
  4. Biosecurity measures and management at the venue
  5. Biosecurity measures and management during transport
  6. Finalisation and adoption of the draft report
-



**MEETING OF A SUB GROUP TO THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON  
INTERNATIONAL HORSE MOVEMENT FOR EQUESTRIAN SPORT**

**Paris, 10–11 April 2014**

---

**Terms of Reference**

The **objective** of this meeting is to develop operationalisation guidelines for HHP horses which will form part of the Biosecurity Guidelines currently being finalised.

The members of this expert group shall consider the following tasks during this meeting:

1. Biosecurity measures to be put in place at the HOME STABLE
  - During the 90 days preparation period to qualify as an HHP horse
  - During the last 14 days isolation within these 90 days
  - During normal times, while the HHP horse is travelling, so that the horse can return to this stable
  - What are the criteria to be fulfilled for a stable to be registered as an HHP stable?
  - Consider possible differences between FEI horses and Racehorses for all of the above points
2. Biosecurity measures to be put in place at the VENUE
  - Requirements to be put in place to guarantee that HHP horses are at all times separated from non-HHP horses
    - For the stables at the venue
    - For the competition arena / race course
  - What are the criteria to be fulfilled for a venue to be registered as an HHP venue?
  - Consider possible difference between FEI events and races
3. Biosecurity measures to be put in place during TRANSPORT
  - How do we guarantee that HHP horses are separated from non-HHP horses during transport?
    - i) Air transport
    - ii) Road transport
  - Is there a need to register transporters as “HHP transporters”? if yes, what are the criteria they must fulfil?
  - Consider possible differences between FEI horses and race horses

If time allows, some open questions:

- Who else should be included in the registration for the HHP concept?
    - Veterinarians who assess compliance with biosecurity measures?
    - Handlers of HHP horses?
-





**MEETING OF A SUB GROUP TO THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON  
INTERNATIONAL HORSE MOVEMENT FOR EQUESTRIAN SPORT**

**Paris, 10–11 April 2014**

**List of participants**

**MEMBERS**

---

**Dr Alberto Gomes da Silva**

Responsible for Equine Movement  
Control and Equine Health  
Coordination for Animal Quarantine and  
Movement Control  
Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e  
Abastecimento  
Esplanada dos ministérios  
Bloco-d, Anexo A, Sala 305  
70043-900 Brasília, DF  
BRAZIL

Tel.: + 61 2182735  
Fax: + 61 2244180  
alberto.gomes@agricultura.gov.br

**Prof. Ann Cullinane**

Head of the Virology Unit  
Irish Equine Centre  
Johnstown, Naas, Co. Kildare  
IRELAND

Tel.: +353-45 86.62.66  
Fax: +353-45 86. 62.73  
acullinane@equine-centre.ie

**Dr Alf-Eckbert Füssel**

Head of Sector  
DG SANCO/D1  
Rue Froissart 101-3/67  
B-1040 Brussels  
BELGIUM  
Tel: +32-2 295 08 70  
Fax: +32-2 295 31 44  
alf-eckbert.fuessel@ec.europa.eu

**Dr Graeme Cooke**

Director of Veterinary Department  
Fédération Equestre Internationale  
HM King Hussein I Building  
Chemin des Délices 9  
1006 Lausanne  
SWITZERLAND  
graeme.cooke@fei.org.jp

**Dr Anthony Kettle**

BVSc BSc DipSc MSc MBA MRCVS  
MACVSc  
Head of Veterinary Department  
Dubai Racing Club  
DUBAI  
Tel: (971) 4 336 1626  
Fax: (971) 4 336 1579  
Mob: (971) 50 459 4348  
anthony.kettle@dubairacingclub.com

**Dr Kenneth Lam**

Veterinary Consultant  
Hong Kong Jockey Club  
Department of Veterinary Regulation  
and International Liaison  
Sha Tin Racecourse, Sha Tin, NT  
HONG KONG  
Mobile: +852- 9497 1303  
kenvet@usa.net

**OBSERVERS**

---

**Mr Sami Al Duhami**

Team Director  
Saudi Equestrian  
PO Box 804  
11421 Riyadh  
SAUDI ARABIA  
sami.duhami@gmail.com

**Mr Guido Klätte**

Unnerweg 76  
49688 Lastrup, GERMANY  
gk@gklatte.de

**Mr Alberto Malda**

Cerrada de Santa Monica No.8 Int. 1  
Lomas de los Angeles de Tetelpan,  
01700, Mexico City, MEXICO  
info@albertomalda.com

**Mr Rogier van Iersel**

Saudi Equestrian Team manager  
Ds. van Rhijnstraat 79  
8166 AL Ernst  
THE NETHERLANDS  
rvaniersel@saudiequestrian.com

**HEADQUARTERS**

---

**Dr Bernard Vallat**

Director General  
12 rue de Prony  
75017 Paris  
FRANCE  
Tel: + 33 - (0)1 44 15 18 88  
Fax: + 33 - (0)1 42 67 09 87  
oie@oie.int

**Dr Susanne Münstermann**

Scientific and Technical Department  
s.munstermann@oie.int

**Dr Sarah Kahn**

OIE Consultant  
ARGENTINA  
s.kahn@oie.int





Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Annex XXII C

Original: English

July 2014

## REPORT OF THE MEETING OF AN EXPERT SUB-GROUP TO THE OIE *AD HOC* GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL HORSE MOVEMENT FOR EQUESTRIAN SPORT

Paris, 23–25 July 2014

A meeting of an expert sub-group of the *ad hoc* Group on International Horse Movement for Equestrian Sport was held at the OIE Headquarters on 23–25 July 2014. The objective of this sub-group was to finalise the operationalization of the HHP concept and in this context, to revise the HHP Certificate. Furthermore, a definition for the HHP horse was to be agreed upon.

### 1. Opening

Dr Brian Evans, Deputy Director General and Head of the Scientific and Technical Department, welcomed the members of the sub-group on behalf of the Director General. Apologies were received from Dr Alberto Gomez, who was unable to attend the meeting.

In his opening remarks, Dr Evans highlighted that the work of the *ad hoc* Group and its sub-groups has arrived at a critical stage as it is expected to deliver its outputs to the Code Commission meeting in September. Since the members of the Code Commission are elected by the General Assembly, it reflects the opinion of the OIE Member countries. This means that the quality of the products to be delivered to the Commissions need to be well thought through and of highest standard. He alluded to the situation that will present itself in 2015, the election year for all critical positions and Commissions in the OIE and advised to get the Group's output to the Commissions before this complete turn-over.

Dr Thiermann, President of the Code Commission, also welcomed the participants and recalled that the Group is developing a pilot concept which, if it works well, can be used as a show case for the compartmentalization concept. He alluded to the fact that the new Chapter 4.16 was accepted by the General Assembly with the expectation that answers to the questions of the Member countries will be provided in due course. Regional events such as the OIE Conferences, but also Regional Commission meetings with Delegates, are good opportunities to raise awareness for the concept and the details that are being developed by the Group.

Dr Murray, Chair of the *ad hoc* Group, concluded the introductions by promising to deliver a comprehensive package of management guidelines and a revised HHP Certificate in time for consideration by SCAD and Code Commission.

### 2. Appointment of a chair and rapporteur

The meeting was chaired by Dr Gardner Murray and Dr Munstermann acted as rapporteur.

The Agenda and the list of participants are presented as Appendices I and II respectively.

Annex XXII C (contd)**3. Definition of the sub-population and the members of the sub-population**

In the last meeting of the *ad hoc* Group in June 2014, the issue of agreeing on a definition and integrating such definition into the adopted Chapter 4.16 had been raised, but could not be finalized. The Group had resorted to moderated email discussion that lasted for 3 weeks. A draft definition as basis for the discussion was provided by Dr Barcos. This email discussion had produced 2 proposals for a definition, which were tabled to this expert group and discussed.

Based on the argument that a definition has to link the High Health Status Sub-population, as shown in the title of Chapter 4.16, to the individual animals populating this sub-population, which have since the beginning of the work on this concept, been termed *High health, high performance horse* = HHP horse, and that the definition should not reiterate what is already contained in the Chapter, the definition that was finally agreed upon is as follows:

For the purpose of this chapter, High health, high performance (HHP) horse means a horse registered by the FEI or IFHA as member of a High health status subpopulation of horses, eligible to perform in international competitions and races and kept in establishments approved by the Veterinary Authority as applying biosecurity management systems that ensure, through surveillance, control and biosecurity measures, a distinct health status with respect to specific diseases.

**4. Management of the HHP horse****4.1. Background**

A management proposal had been developed by an expert group that met in April 2014, in line with the output of the expert group that developed the draft HHP Certificate in January. These documents had been commented on by members of the AHG after they had been finalized and during the full AHG meeting in June 2014. The key argument on the side of industry was that the conditions proposed in both documents are more difficult to fulfil than current conditions prevailing in many countries, particularly those where racing circuits are already well established and bilateral protocols agreed, as well as in Europe and its approved third countries. Furthermore, during the 2014 OIE General Assembly, the Regional Commission meeting for Africa gave a clear recommendation to the OIE not to exclude Africa from the concept.

These comments had been taken into consideration by Dr Münstermann when preparing an alternative proposal in preparation for this July expert group meeting. The alternative proposal also considered that the HHP concept must have universal application and provide opportunities for international competition horse movements from all parts of the world subject to appropriate and rigorous risk management measures.

The alternative approach presented considers a qualifying period for the entire horse population of a given premises that wishes to register and takes into account the equine disease status of the country in which it is located. Once such premises have successfully undergone a 90-day approval period of **all resident horses**, they become an “approved premises” holding “high health status subpopulation horses” to be registered in the international FEI / IFHA database. From this high health status subpopulation the individual horses that wish to travel on the conditions of non-stop 90 days travel, can apply for their HHP registration.

**4.2. Specific points of discussion on the management concept**

A key point raised in the discussions was the lack of confidence between countries when it comes to certification and the complexity of managing a compartment in such a way that it can be trusted. Dr Bonbon explained that confidence is a pre-assumption. The OIE assumes that Veterinary Services comply with what the Code states, hence the group should try and develop the standards in such a way that they can be complied with; however, it should also be in accordance with other *Code* Chapters on certification.

Annex XXII C (contd)

Another important discussion point was how to convince the clients to use the HHP concept, particularly those that are operating in facilitated conditions such as EU countries and racing circuits. Dr Cooke suggested that big events will create the need to apply the concept more than anything else. He mentioned that the Asian Games for which HHP-like conditions were put in place, have worked well and that such success must be highlighted through the next steps. He added that in his view big events will be the first to use the concept, followed by medium sized events. Racing did not contribute any such proposals.

To describe the phased approach explained below, the use of the acronym HHS for the “high health status subpopulation” was proposed. The usefulness of this, however, might require further discussion and acceptance by OIE Member Countries.

Dr Murray summarised this discussion by stating that the HHP concept is one of a number of options for international competition horse movements; for example using existing OIE standards, applying EDFZs or a combination of approaches. The choice is a business decision for industry, but the HHP horse concept provides real opportunities for developing areas with equestrian and racing interest to engage in international competitions using simplified but scientifically based certification arrangements. However, the system must be rigorous and consistent in its application recognizing differences in risk between countries and regions.

To be both attractive to industry and acceptable to veterinary authorities, the approach needs to be developed and progressed in an achievable and attractive manner. Importantly it provides opportunities for countries currently with poor prospects of engaging in international competitions, to do so subject to meeting specified conditions.

- **The proposed management system**

The attached document ([Appendix III](#)) elaborates the system as agreed during this meeting. In summary, the proposed management system can be outlined as follows:

- I. The premises

- All resident horses on premises that wish to register as holding a “high health status subpopulation” with the HHP system have to undergo a 90-day approval period in order to establish their high health status.
- It was agreed that such premises will be approved by the Veterinary Authorities and registered with the FEI and IFHA international database at the end of this 90-day approval period.
- If a premises hosts only HHP horses, it can be registered as HHP premises.
- The requirements during the 90-days differ according to the health status of the country in which the premises are located, in regards to the 5 diseases of relevance to the HHP system.
- Regardless to the country situation, the piroplasmosis serological status of an individual horse needs to be identified.
- Tests or vaccinations to be carried out during the approval period:
  - In countries of known health status for AHS, VEE, EIA, EI and glanders, the approval period includes a test for EIA and glanders and a vaccination for EI (note: these requirements apply to all other country situations also).
  - In countries of unknown health status for glanders, all animals will be tested for glanders twice.
  - In countries or zones not free from VEE, options are given to either vaccinate the animals or to keep them in vector protected quarantine and test twice.

Annex XXII C (contd)

- In countries or zones not officially free from AHS, the preparation period includes a quarantine period. It envisages a first PCR test of the horse under vector protected conditions before the horse is moved to a vector protected quarantine station where it will stay for at least 14 days and will be re-tested (*Code* Chapter 12.1.7/3c. applies) .
- Regardless of the equine health situation in a given country, the following general requirements apply:
  - Clear identification of all horses on the premises.
  - No breeding activities on the premises in the 90 days prior to registration.
  - Biosecurity plan and contingency plan in place.
  - No clinical signs of infectious diseases discovered during regular veterinary supervision
  - New entrants into the premises have to undergo the same tests before entering the premises and be kept in isolation from the other horses inside the premises for at least 2 weeks (Note: if they enter the premises before the resident animals are tested, they can be included in the testing; if they enter after the resident horses have already been tested, they need to be isolated).
  - A documented record of origin and movement of any new entrant has to be provided.

II. The HHP horse

- When high health status subpopulation premises are approved by the Veterinary Authorities and have been registered with the international database, individual horses are eligible, with the appropriate testing and isolation, to be registered as HHP horses with the FEI and IFHA database.
- However, in countries not known to be free from glanders:
  - Horses must remain residents on the registered premises after the second serological test (a minimum of 10 days)
- Once a horse has been registered as HHP horse and received its entry into the database (= ticket to travel), it must travel, otherwise the entry in the database has to be cancelled after 10 days.
- Once a horse is a registered HHP horse, it can only stay together with other HHP horses or horses of at least equal health status.

III. The Certificate

- The Certificate makes reference only to the fact that a horse is registered as a **HHP horse** and does not explain the careful assurance of its health status that has taken place during its preparation period. It was therefore decided that a brief explanatory note shall accompany the Certificate to explain the tests done at the subpopulation level from which the HHP horse originates.

**5. The Model HHP Certificate****5.1. Background**

The key revisions to the previous draft Certificate were (i) the clauses on AHS and VEE country freedom as compulsory requirements and (ii) the required 14-day residence period of an HHP horse before its start of travel. Furthermore the Certificate is now presented with options per diseases that allow for different choices in line with disease status of the country of origin.

Key points of discussion were the following:

- While it is well understood that HHP horse movement can happen due to the facilitation inbuilt into the system, between countries, there could be many situations in which intra-country movements could take place during the 90 day travel period. This problem was addressed by adding a “movement record” part in the owners declaration of the Certificate.
- The certificate contains a clause that in the country of dispatch a list of diseases must be notifiable. Equine Influenza was removed from this list, as it is not notifiable in many countries despite it being an OIE notifiable disease. It was included into the clause pertaining to “good records of OIE reporting”.
- The situation could arise that Japanese Encephalomyelitis and rabies are not notifiable diseases in a country, hence the clause on the notifiability of these diseases could not be met. It was concluded that Veterinary Authorities would need to make a case and give evidence that all animals in the subpopulation are vaccinated.
- The point of including options for travel from AHS infected countries was controversial and a member of the group considered this clause a “deal-breaker”, as it would be difficult to comply with for African countries on one hand and on the other hand possibly unacceptable for officially free countries. Dr Bonbon clarified that OIE standards have to be written in such a way that they include all Member countries. He further pointed out that conditions for compartments have to be negotiated on a bilateral basis and do not fall under WTO arbitration procedures.
- In order to give more assurance to the proposed health measures for AHS, the clause for agent identification testing was changed to qualify the tests as “validated”, a condition not yet achieved by any of the PCR tests currently in use. It is expected that with some of the ongoing activities of proficiency testing of existing PCR protocols, this condition might be in place once the HHP Certificate is approved by the General Assembly.

The Certificate is attached as Appendix IV.

## 6. Points for discussion by the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission

Dr Murray concluded the meeting by saying that with a positive attitude, the framework approach could be made to work. Certification proposals and management principles fit within the umbrella of the *Code* Chapter 4.16 and the proposed HHP definition. In short, subject to meeting specific requirements, high health status subpopulations in registered premises would be established from which HHP horses would be selected to engage in international competitions in accordance with detailed certification and management arrangements. The approach would permit industry flexibility in countries with a good and well understood health situation, while at the same time providing opportunity for those countries with known or unknown health status in respect of specified diseases to participate in international equestrian and racing events subject to meeting strict conditions. At first glance, the concept appears complex; however, proposals are consistent with approaches in other areas such as Artificial Insemination Centres and compartmentalisation. Critical to success will be communication and the need for Veterinary Authorities to work in tandem with industry, at the same time assuming their full responsibilities for legislative and compliance matters.

In light of the comments of Dr Bonbon, it was agreed that any recommendation of the sub-group that differs from the current conditions in the *Terrestrial Code* should be brought to the attention of the Code Commission in the report of this meeting. The following points are referred to the Code Commission for consideration:

**Testing for piroplasmiasis:** Article 12.7.2 stipulates that the horse was subjected to diagnostic tests with negative results during the 30 days prior to shipment. The sub-group recommended to improve safety by testing with both of the tests prescribed in Chapter 1.3 (i.e. IFAT and ELISA) and to modify the timing of the test to require that it be conducted within 14 days prior to export.

Annex XXII C (contd)

**Timing of the issuance of the health certificate:** The sub-group agreed with Appendix H of Chapter 12.6, which provides that the inspection should be done and the health certificate signed within the 48 hours prior to the international movement of the horse. However, *Terrestrial Code* Article 5.4.4 stipulates that an Official Veterinarian should provide an international veterinary certificate within the 24 hours prior to shipment of live animals. The sub-group requested that the Code Commission clarify this apparent inconsistency.

**Vaccinations for EI:** The conditions of the certificate for EI vaccination differ from the *Terrestrial Code*. The *Terrestrial Code* recommends for temporary movement (where horses are kept in isolation) that the horse be vaccinated in accordance with the manufacturers' recommendations whereas the AHG recommends vaccination within 21 to 90 days of export. The AHG is of the opinion that the facilitated movement of the HHP horse with contact with horses from potentially multiple regions requires a higher level of protection.

**7. Finalisation and adoption of the draft report**

The Group agreed that the report would be subject to a period of circulation within the Group for comments. The report will be finalised through correspondence.

---

.../Appendices



**MEETING OF A SUB GROUP TO THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON  
INTERNATIONAL HORSE MOVEMENT FOR EQUESTRIAN SPORT**

**Paris, 23–25 July 2014**

---

**Agenda**

1. Opening
2. Appointment of a chair and rapporteur
3. Definition of the sub-population and the members of the sub-population
4. Management of the HHP horse
  - 4.1. Background
  - 4.2. Specific points of discussion on the management concept
5. The Model HHP Certificate
6. Points for discussion by the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission
7. Finalisation and adoption of the draft report



**MEETING OF A SUB GROUP TO THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON  
INTERNATIONAL HORSE MOVEMENT FOR EQUESTRIAN SPORT**

**Paris, 23–25 July 2014**

---

**List of participants**

**MEMBERS**

---

**Dr Alf-Eckbert Füssel**

Head of Sector  
DG SANCO/D1  
Rue Froissart 101-3/67  
B-1040 Brussels  
BELGIUM  
Tel: +32-2 295 08 70  
Fax: +32-2 295 31 44  
alf-eckbert.fuessel@ec.europa.eu

**Dr Graeme Cooke**

Director of Veterinary Department  
Fédération Equestre Internationale  
HM King Hussein I Building  
Chemin des Délices 9  
1006 Lausanne  
SWITZERLAND  
graeme.cooke@fei.org.jp

**Dr Anthony Kettle**

BVSc BSc DipSc MSc MBA MRCVS  
MACVSc  
Head of Veterinary Department  
Dubai Racing Club  
Tel: (971) 4 336 1626  
Fax: (971) 4 336 1579  
Mob: (971) 50 459 4348  
anthony.kettle@dubairacingclub.com

**Dr Kenneth Lam**

Veterinary Consultant  
Hong Kong Jockey Club  
Department of Veterinary Regulation  
and International Liaison  
Sha Tin Racecourse, Sha Tin, NT  
HONG KONG  
Mobile: +852- 9497 1303  
kenvet@usa.net

**Dr Gardner Murray**

OIE Special Adviser  
4, Weingarh Street, Holder  
Canberra, ACT 2611  
AUSTRALIA  
gardner.murray@grapevine.com.au

**Dr Richard Newton**

Head of Epidemiology and Disease  
Surveillance  
Animal Health Trust, Lanwades Park,  
Kentford, Newmarket,  
Suffolk CB8 7UU  
UNITED KINGDOM  
richard.newton@aht.org.uk

**OIE REPRESENTATIVES**

---

**Dr Brian Evans**

Deputy Director General  
Head  
OIE Scientific and Technical  
Department  
b.evans@oie.int

**Dr Susanne Münstermann**

OIE Scientific and Technical  
Department  
s.munstermann@oie.int

**Dr Alex Thiermann**

President of the Code Commission for  
Animal Diseases  
a.thiermann@oie.int

**Dr Etienne Bonbon**

Terrestrial Animal Health  
Standards Commission  
Etienne.bonbon@eeas.europa.eu  
e.bonbon@oie.int

---



Annex XXII C (contd)

Appendix III

*[Note: Annex III has been replaced by Annex XXI D in the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 9–18 September 2014.]*

---



Annex XXII C (contd)

Appendix IV

*[Note: Annex IV has been replaced by Annex XXI E in the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 9–18 September 2014.]*





**GUIDE TO THE MANAGEMENT  
OF THE HIGH HEALTH STATUS EQUINE SUB-POPULATION<sup>20</sup>  
AND THE HIGH HEALTH-HIGH PERFORMANCE HORSE**

**Introduction**

**1. Phased procedure to register with the HHP system**

- 1.1. Procedure to register premises in the international database
- 1.2. Procedure to register an HHP horse
- 1.3. Procedure to apply for an HHP health Certificate

**2. Veterinary supervision**

- 2.1. The role of the private Veterinarian
- 2.2. The role of the official Veterinarian

**3. The international biosecurity plan**

**4. Procedures that apply when an HHP horse is not at its place of usual residence.**

- 4.1. Biosecurity measures and management during transport
- 4.2. Biosecurity measures and management at HHP equestrian venues

**5. Return to the country of usual residence**

-----  
**Key principles**

- The STABLE becomes the compartment i.e. a horse sub-population kept in registered premises with only horses of a high health status.
- The compartment, if effectively isolated from the rest of the equine population, is the point of reference and is considered “healthy” even if in the surrounding the disease situation might be different.
- A phased approach is applied, in which during the first phase (premises approval period), the health status of the entire resident population of horses is brought up to the high health status. In a second phase, the horses destined to travel are selected from this sub-population and registered as HHP horses. For certification purposes they need to undergo additional health measures.
- Once qualified as an HHP horse, the HHP horse can only reside together with other HHP horses on HHP registered premises.

---

<sup>20</sup> High health status subpopulation might be referred to as HHS.

Appendix XXII D (contd)**Introduction**

To facilitate the safe international movement of competition horses, the OIE in collaboration with the Federation Equestre Internationale (FEI) and the International Federation of Horseracing Authorities (IFHA) has developed the concept of the high health status sub-population based on the principles of compartmentalisation described in the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*<sup>21</sup>. From this subpopulation, individual high health-high performance (HHP) horses can be selected. HHP horses are subjected to veterinary and management controls that do not apply to the equine population at large. Horses that are being used for reproduction are not eligible as HHP horses.

The health status of HHP horses is maintained by the application of specific measures pertaining to:

- Veterinary supervision and certification
- Identification and traceability
- Biosecurity at the place of usual residence (home stable), at all places of temporary residence, including equestrian events, and during transport.

HHP horse registration with the industry bodies provides Veterinary Authorities with assurance that a horse is healthy and free from infectious contagious diseases.

This paper describes the implementation of the HHP concept.

**1. Phased procedure to register with the HHP system****1.1. 1<sup>st</sup> Step: Procedure to register premises in the international FEI / IFHA database****a) Health status of country or zone where premises is located**

The equine health status of the country or zone is relevant to the registration of premises. Countries and zones should meet the following criteria:

- African horse sickness (AHS), Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis (VEE), Equine infectious anaemia (EIA), glanders, Western equine encephalomyelitis (WEE), Eastern equine encephalomyelitis (EEE), Japanese encephalomyelitis (JE)<sup>22</sup> and rabies<sup>3</sup> are notifiable in the country.
- The country has a good record of compliance with its OIE disease reporting obligations (in particular AHS, VEE, EIA, glanders, WEE, EEE, JE, rabies and EI), based on the information on diseases affecting equids provided to the OIE during at least the three years preceding the initial application of premises for qualification. The record with respect to diseases of other species is not taken into account, as this criterion relates to the health status of the domestic equid population.

For the purpose of describing the application of the HHP concept in countries of different health status countries are grouped in four categories.

The first group of countries are those with a well-defined health status and no occurrence of glanders, VEE and AHS. The second group are those countries which cannot substantiate a claim of freedom from glanders, the third group are those countries which cannot substantiate a claim of freedom from VEE and the fourth group is comprised of countries not officially free from AHS. These conditions are described in the HHP Health Certificate as options to choose from, so it is left to the countries to place themselves in the correct category.

<sup>21</sup> *Terrestrial Code* Chapter 4.16.

<sup>22</sup> If Japanese encephalitis is not notifiable in a country, the VA must provide evidence that animals are vaccinated; the same applies to rabies.

**b) Assessment of health status of resident horses in the premises that wish to register on the international database**

All horses residing in the premises need to be examined during the 90 days before the registration as follows:

**i) Countries of known health status**

- Test for EIA  
*or*  
Free from EIA
- Vaccinate against EI  
*or*  
no clinical signs of EI during the entire approval period  
*or*  
Test for presence of protective antibodies (note: more details on protective titers need to be provided for this point to be further elaborated)  
*or*  
Country free from EI

**ii) Countries that cannot substantiate to be free from glanders<sup>23</sup>**

- Same as under i) plus:
- no case of glanders will have occurred within the 6 months of the registration date on the international database and 2 serological tests are to be carried out; the first sample is taken not earlier than 21 days after the start of the approval process and at an interval of at least 21 days to the the second sample that is taken within 10 days of approval of the premises

**iii) Countries that cannot substantiate to be free from VEE<sup>4</sup>**

- Same as under i) plus:
- No clinical cases of VEE in the last 6 months in the premises  
*and*
- All horses are sampled for VEE by serological testing while they are stabled under vector protection during the approval period; and at least 3 weeks before registration of the premises all horses are kept under vector protection at all times; and within 7 days of approval of the premises the horses are then retested for VEE with either a negative result or a stable or declining titre. (Note: it is advisable to register the selected HHP horses with the industry database as soon as possible after the premises is approved in order to avoid excessive length of stabling in vector protection at all times)  
*or*  
Vaccination with an inactivated licensed vaccine against VEE of all horses in the premises with primary course at least 60 days prior to the approval of premises and a record of regular revaccination according to manufacturers instructions

<sup>23</sup> By self-declaration to the OIE or by clear evidence of negative reporting to WAHIS indicative of an existing surveillance programme.

Appendix XXII D (contd)*iv) Countries not officially free from AHS<sup>24</sup>*

- Same as under i) plus:
- All horses are vaccinated 40 days before the introduction into a vector protected stable.
- No clinical signs of AHS upon inspection before introduction into a vector protected stable.
- During the 90 days approval period of the premises one agent identification validated test is done under vector protected stabling, while the last 14 days are managed under the conditions of a quarantine station before a 2<sup>nd</sup> test is done (note: this is proposed based on the understanding that a quarantine station of the type “Kenilworth” in South Africa is available; hence the premises can be any other stable that provides vector protection, but horses are allowed to train during low vector activity periods of the day, under chemical vector protection).

In addition to these specific tests for the five diseases identified as crucial for the qualification as an HHP horse, the following general requirements need to be fulfilled by the premises in order to apply for registration, regardless to the category described above:

- All horses must have a passport by which they can be clearly identified
- There are no breeding activities in the stable and horses must not be used for breeding
- All horses show no signs of a contagious or infectious disease at the time of registration
- There is a biosecurity plan and a contingency plan in place
- There are isolation stables available

A supervisor dedicated to the premises applying for registration in the international database is designated as responsible for ensuring that all horses fulfil these health criteria. The registration application can then be submitted to the FEI/IFHA, who, if they support the application, request approval of the Veterinary Authority. Once the premises is approved, it will be allocated a registration number from the international database.

The step-wise procedure to register premises can be summarised as follows:

1. On request of a premises / stable operator, who wishes to register his premises as holding a high health status subpopulation on the international database, the Veterinary Authority are informed and they record this intention.
2. An inspection of the Veterinary Services of the premises is undertaken, the Biosecurity measures are examined and the premise is approved as compliant. (Day minus 90).
3. The national Federation/Racing Authority is informed and the premise is registered as holding a high health status subpopulation in the appropriate international database (not yet activated).
4. Start of regular veterinary supervision by accredited veterinarian and testing programme for all resident horses.
5. All new entrants have to come from premises that are under veterinary supervision, did not have a EIA outbreak in the previous 3 months, no glanders outbreak for 6 months and must undergo the same testing as resident horses<sup>25</sup> before entering the stables undergoing the approval process. Within the stables they must be isolated from the other horses for at least 2 weeks (EI vaccination status must be the same).
6. Registration by the industry of an approved high health status subpopulation in the qualified premises (activate in the database) after official inspection by the Veterinary Authorities (Day 0).

<sup>24</sup> By submitting a country freedom declaration to the OIE.

<sup>25</sup> If entry after the herd testing – test outside. If entry before herd testing – test together with herd.

7. After registration (Day 0) maintain the regular veterinary supervision.
8. Maintenance of approval and registration with the database requires a minimum of annual audit by the Veterinary Authorities.

In addition, the premises has to comply with certain management conditions:

- There is access control for people and other animals to the registered premises
- A daily health and at least a daily temperature check of each horse is carried out by responsible persons dedicated to the stable and these checks are documented
- Procedures for cleaning, disinfection, feeding and horse-management are documented

### c) Registration as HHP premises

While under normal circumstances the initial selection of an HHP horse will be from within its stable in the country of usual residence, which has undergone the qualification process as premises holding a high health status horse subpopulation (a compartment), the HHP horse, once its 90-day travel has started, can only reside on premises shared with other HHP horses, hence there is a need to establish also dedicated HHP stables.

These can be sub-units of registered high health status subpopulation premises or be set up particularly for this purpose. The only difference to registered high health subpopulation premises is that they house only HHP horses and that they are isolated from other stables, should there be non-HHP horses on the same premises.

HHP stables also need to be registered in the international database.

## 1.2 2<sup>nd</sup> Step: Procedure to register a horse as HHP horse

All horses need to reside in an approved premises, registered in the international database that has undergone the 90-day approval process. They are selected on the basis of having qualified for competitions that are managed under HHP conditions.

For the purpose of explaining the application of the HHP concept, the same different categories of countries apply:

- i) Horses in registered stables<sup>26</sup> in countries of known health status
  - a) All horses in these premises qualify in principle; they should have the required performance level
  - b) Selected HHP horses should be tested for piroplasmosis to establish the serological status
  - c) After registration of approved premises in the international database, resident horses can be certified as HHP horses, registered in the database and are ready to be presented for inspection by an official veterinarian for health certification purposes and subsequent travel
- ii) Horses in registered stables<sup>7</sup> in countries that cannot substantiate to be free from glanders
  - a) Horses remain residents in the registered stable after the second sample (Day 0 minus at least 10 days)
  - b) HHP horse registration on Day 0 of premises registration

<sup>26</sup>

“Registered stables” refers to premises that have undergone the approval period described in 1.1. and that are registered to hold a high health status subpopulation in the international FEI/ IFHA database.

Appendix XXII D (contd)

- iv) Horses in registered stables<sup>7</sup> in countries that cannot substantiate to be free from VEE
  - a) It is advisable to register HHP horses at Day 0 of premises registration; otherwise horses have to remain in vector protection throughout until registration as HHP horse and subsequent travel
- v) Horses in registered stables<sup>7</sup> in countries not officially free from AHS
  - a) HHP horse registration after 14 days in vector protected quarantine and horses remain in this quarantine station until dispatch<sup>27</sup>

**1.3 3<sup>rd</sup> Step: Intention to travel and application for HHP Health Certificate**

After the registration of the horse as an HHP horse in the international database, the official veterinarian can issue the HHP Health Certificate. The official veterinarian should be notified of this intention at least 7 days prior to intended day of inspection.

In case a horse has been registered in the international database as HHP horse and does not travel within 10 days after registration, the entry into the database has to be cancelled.

**2. Veterinary supervision**

Compliance with the policies and procedures of the HHP concept is assured and validated through continual veterinary supervision of horses at the home stables, during transport and at all temporary venues. This supervision is provided by authorised veterinarians.

**2.1. The role of the private veterinarian**

The responsibility for veterinary inspection of horses that are intended for qualification as HHP horses (see 1.1 and 1.2) lies with the authorised veterinarian, who is engaged by the owner / Responsible Person to provide veterinary inspection to all horses on the premises. This veterinarian should be registered with the FEI or IFHA (if appropriate) and should preferably be accredited for this purpose by the Veterinary Authority.

The entire approval period towards registration of premises holding high health status horses is under continuous veterinary supervision, defined as being at least one visit per week by the authorised veterinarian. In addition, a veterinary check is carried out on Day 0 of the approval period and a final inspection is done 48 hours before export of the HHP horse.

Records of veterinary supervision should be kept throughout the approval period. In the case that more than one veterinarian is responsible for supervising the period of approval, the supervising veterinarian should make a 'hand over report' to the veterinarian responsible for the subsequent period.

In the course of each veterinary examination of a horse, its passport is checked, its identity verified and the details of any official tests and treatments, including vaccinations, are recorded and signed by the examining veterinarian.

---

<sup>27</sup> Batches of horses need to be fully separated and managed as an "all in – all out" system.

## 2.2. The role of the official veterinarian

The Official Veterinarian<sup>28</sup> should be informed prior to the intended start of the approval period and the end of the 90-day period and also alerted on the date on which a pre-export visit for the purpose of health certification will be required. The Veterinary Authority should be fully informed about the process of preparation of horses for export under the conditions that apply to HHP horses. In accordance with *Terrestrial Code* Article 5.2.2, for the purposes of official certification, the passport is examined, verified and signed by an official veterinarian.

The Veterinary Authority may conduct audits, including unannounced visits, of all parts of the HHP system (home stables and other premises, event venues, stop-over points).

## 3. The international biosecurity plan

The health status of HHP horses is maintained by ensuring compliance at all times with an international biosecurity plan approved by the Veterinary Authorities of the importing and exporting countries, in accordance with the Biosecurity Guidelines of the OIE. Non-compliance can result in suspension of the horse's membership of the HHP sub-population.

## 4. Procedures that apply when an HHP horse is not at its place of usual residence

When a HHP horse is not at its place of usual residence (home stable) it may be in the course of transport or at an equestrian event venue. The Biosecurity Guidelines describe the procedures that apply. Key points are summarised below.

### 4.1. Biosecurity measures and management during transport

Transportation entails the implementation of biosecurity and management in relation to:

- (i) the means of transport, e.g. airplanes, vehicles, trains, boats and
- (ii) temporary holding premises or lay-over points where HHP horses are held during journey breaks. These may be stables, show grounds, veterinary clinics, animal hotels, government quarantine stations or official control points.

HHP horses may only be transported with equids of equivalent or higher health status. Transporters should follow a documented SOP for the transport of HHP horses. Lay-over points should be approved and registered by relevant industry bodies before use by HHP horses. These temporary premises should comply with biosecurity criteria (see 3 above) to avoid the exposure of HHP horses to equids that are not of equivalent health status.

The final decision on the conditions that apply during transport, including the combining of horses in consignments, routes and lay-overs, rests with the Veterinary Authority hosting the equestrian event i.e. of the country into which the horse will be temporarily imported.

### 4.2. Biosecurity measures and management at HHP equestrian venues

The stables for HHP horses at equestrian events must meet similar criteria to those for HHP registered home stables. They should have dedicated personnel, biosecure arrangements for the provision of feed, and access to isolation facilities.

---

<sup>28</sup> In the *Terrestrial Code*, Official Veterinarian means a veterinarian authorised by the Veterinary Authority of the country to perform certain designated official tasks associated with animal health and/or public health and inspections of commodities and, when appropriate, to certify in conformity with the provisions of Chapters 5.1. and 5.2.

Appendix XXII D (contd)**5. Return to the country of usual residence**

When a HHP horse returns from international competition to the country of usual residence, its status as a member of the HHP may follow one of two options:

- 1) membership of the HHP is maintained, based on compliance with all criteria, or
  - 2) membership of the HHP is suspended. In this case, when the horse is required to regain its active HHP membership, it must follow the procedures outlined above under step 1 and 2 for initial qualification.
-



**MODEL VETERINARY CERTIFICATE  
FOR THE INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT OF NOT MORE THAN 90 DAYS  
OF A HIGH HEALTH-HIGH PERFORMANCE HORSE FOR COMPETITION OR RACES**

Certificate number: .....

Import Permit No. (if applicable): ..... issued by  
..... (insert name of Government Authority) of  
..... (insert name of Country of destination)

This certificate is issued for a High Health-High Performance (HHP) horse

- dispatched from the country of usual residence to a country of temporary residence<sup>29</sup>
- dispatched from a country of temporary residence to another country of temporary residence<sup>1</sup>
- dispatched from a country of temporary residence temporarily to an HHP premises in the country of usual residence<sup>1</sup>
- returning from a country of temporary residence to the country of usual residence<sup>1</sup>

Numbers of attached reference certificates (if applicable): .....

Movement from: ..... Movement to: ..... Ref Cert No: .....

Movement from: ..... Movement to: ..... Ref Cert No: .....

Movement from: ..... Movement to: ..... Ref Cert No: .....

Movement from: ..... Movement to: ..... Ref Cert No: .....

**I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE HORSE**

I.1. Name: .....

I.2. Colour: .....

I.3. Sex: .....

I.4. Microchip Number: ..... Reading system other than ISO: .....

I.5. HHP<sup>30</sup> identification number: .....

I.6. Number of accompanying Passport:.....  
issued by .....  
(insert authority that issued the passport)

<sup>29</sup> Select as appropriate.

<sup>30</sup> The number attributed to the High Health-High Performance horse by the Fédération Equestre Internationale or the International Federation of Horseracing Authorities.

**II. ORIGIN OF THE HORSE**

II.1. Country of dispatch: .....

II.2. Name and Address of Consignor: .....

.....

<sup>3</sup>II.3. Address and registration<sup>31</sup> number of the premises of dispatch in the country of usual residence:

.....

.....

<sup>3</sup>II.3. Address and registration<sup>32</sup> number of the premises of dispatch in the country of temporary residence:

.....

.....

**III. DESTINATION OF THE HORSE**

III.1. Country of destination: .....

III.2. Name and Address of Consignee: .....

.....

<sup>3</sup>III.3. Address and registration number<sup>5</sup> of the premises of destination in the country of temporary residence:

.....

.....

<sup>3</sup>III.3. Address and registration number<sup>4</sup> or <sup>5</sup> of the premises of destination in the country of usual residence:

.....

.....

**IV. TRANSPORT INFORMATION**

**Identification of Transport: AEROPLANE (Type of aircraft and flight number)<sup>6</sup> / VEHICLE (Registration number)<sup>6</sup> / SHIP (name or registration number)<sup>6</sup>**

.....

<sup>31</sup> High health subpopulation registered premises of usual residence approved by the veterinary authority and registered on the international database of the Fédération Equestre Internationale or the International Federation of Horseracing Authorities.

<sup>32</sup> High Health-High Performance registration of the premises of temporary residence approved by the veterinary authority and registered on the international database of the Fédération Equestre Internationale or the International Federation of Horseracing Authorities.

<sup>6</sup> Select the appropriate options and delete those not applicable.

## V. DECLARATION BY THE CERTIFYING OFFICIAL VETERINARIAN

I, the undersigned official veterinarian, hereby certify that the horse described above:

- V.1. has been examined today, this being within 48 hours prior to dispatch, and found free of clinical signs of infectious or contagious disease, free of obvious signs of ectoparasitic infestation and fit to travel the intended journey;
- V.2. is a registered HHP horse accompanied by its passport in which all vaccinations related to this certificate are documented;
- V.3. has during the 90 days prior to qualification as an HHP horse and during the period of registration as HHP horse not been used for natural or artificial reproduction and has not been kept on premises where natural or artificial reproduction activities are carried out;
- V.4. since HHP registration has not come into contact with any horse that was not a registered HHP horse and has originated from registered premises<sup>4</sup> and has been resident on HHP registered premises throughout its travel period
- V.5. has not visited premises in the country of dispatch under official restriction for health reasons;
- V.6. to the best of my knowledge for at least 15 days prior to certification has not come into contact with animals showing signs of infectious or contagious disease;
- V.7. comes from the country of dispatch in which the following diseases are compulsorily notifiable: African horse sickness, Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis, Eastern equine encephalomyelitis, Western equine encephalomyelitis, Japanese encephalitis, Equine infectious anaemia, glanders (*Burkholderia mallei*) and rabies;
- V.8. comes from the country of dispatch, which:

<sup>3</sup>*either* [V.8.1. is officially free of African horse sickness in accordance with the requirements of the OIE;]

<sup>3</sup>*or* [V.8.1. is not officially free of African horse sickness in accordance with the requirements of the OIE, and the horse was not vaccinated within 40 days prior to the introduction into the HHP approved vector protected quarantine station where it was isolated for at least 14 days and has been subjected to a validated PCR test carried out with negative results on samples taken on two occasions on .....<sup>7</sup>and on .....<sup>7</sup>, the first sample been taken immediately prior to or on entry into the quarantine station and the second sample been taken within 48 hrs prior to direct vector protected transport from the quarantine station to the place of dispatch;]

<sup>3</sup>*either* [V.8.2. has been free of Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis for at least the last two years;]

<sup>3</sup>*or* [V.8.2. has not been free of Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis for at least the last two years, and the horse was:

<sup>3</sup>*either* [V.8.2.1. vaccinated with a registered inactivated vaccine against Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions at least 60 days prior to dispatch;]]

<sup>3</sup>*or* [V.8.2.1. during the three weeks prior to dispatch kept under vector protection at all times and was subjected to a haemagglutination inhibition test for Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis carried out on .....<sup>7</sup> on paired samples taken on .....<sup>7</sup>and on .....<sup>7</sup>, at least 14 days apart, with either negative results or a stable or declining titre, the second sample been taken within 7 days of direct vector protected transport to the place of dispatch;]]

And appropriate vector protection is applied during transportation

<sup>3</sup>*either* [V.8.3. is the country of usual residence and is free of glanders for at least 3 years, and the horse was subjected to a complement fixation test for glanders carried out with negative result at a serum dilution of 1 in 5 on a sample taken on .....<sup>7</sup> during the 30 days prior to dispatch;]

<sup>3</sup>*or* [V.8.3. is the country of usual residence and is not known to be free of glanders for at least 3 years, and the horse has been permanently resident for at least 3 weeks prior to dispatch on a single establishment free of glanders for at least the past 6 months and has been subjected to a complement fixation test for glanders carried out with negative results at a serum dilution of 1 in 5 on samples taken on two occasions on .....<sup>7</sup> and on .....<sup>7</sup>, at least 21 days apart, the second sample been taken within 10 days of dispatch;]

<sup>3</sup>*or* [V.8.3. is the country of temporary residence, and the horse was kept on HHP premises which have been free from glanders for at least 6 months;]

<sup>3</sup>*either* [V.9. has been subjected to the indirect fluorescent antibody test (IFAT) and the competitive enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (c-ELISA) for equine piroplasmosis (*Babesia caballi* and *Theileria equi*) carried out with negative results on a sample taken on .....<sup>6</sup> within 14 days of dispatch;]

<sup>3</sup>*or* [V.9. has previously been subjected to the indirect fluorescent antibody test (IFAT) or the competitive enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (c-ELISA) for equine piroplasmosis (*Babesia caballi* and *Theileria equi*) carried out with positive result and does not show clinical signs of piroplasmosis on the day of examination and has been examined and treated against ticks during the 7 days prior to dispatch;]

V.1.10. has been subjected to an agar gel immunodiffusion test for Equine infectious anaemia carried out with negative result on a sample taken on .....<sup>7</sup> within 120 days of dispatch;

V.1.11. has been vaccinated against equine influenza within 21 to 90 days of dispatch with either two consecutive inoculations with the same vaccine given 21 to 42 days apart on .....<sup>7</sup> and on .....<sup>7</sup> or with a booster given on .....<sup>7</sup> at least on an annual basis after a primary course;

V.1.12. was found free of external parasites following a systematic and thorough examination in particular of ears, false nostrils, intermandibular space, mane, lower body areas, including axillae, groin, and the perineum and tail, and was treated within 48 hours of dispatch with a broad spectrum parasiticide licenced or registered for use on horses according to the manufacturer's recommendations.

## VI. TRANSPORT CONDITIONS

After due enquiry and to the best of my knowledge the transport of the horse has been arranged to ensure that:

VI.1. the horse is consigned directly from the premises of dispatch to the premises of destination;

VI.2. during transport to destination the horse will not come into contact with horses that have no current HHP registration or are not accompanied by the required veterinary health certificate;

VI.3. the horse will be transported in vehicles cleansed and disinfected in advance with a disinfectant approved in the country of dispatch and designed to prevent the escape of droppings, litter or fodder during transportation;

VI.4. during transport to destination the health and welfare of the horse will be protected effectively.

**VII. AUTHENTICATION OF CERTIFICATE**

This certificate is valid for 10 days from the date of signature.

The Declaration signed by the owner or person responsible for the horse is part of this certificate.

Name in capitals of official veterinarian: .....

Position: .....

Office address: .....

.....

Telephone: ..... Fax: .....

Email address: .....

Signature:

Date: .....

Place: .....

Official Stamp:

### VIII. DECLARATION TO BE SIGNED BY THE OWNER OR DESIGNATED PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR THE HORSE

I, the undersigned, .....(insert name in capitals) declare:

1. The horse described in this Veterinary Certificate, will be outside its country of usual residence for not more than 90 days.
2. Since the current registration as HHP horse, the horse has not been in direct contact with horses which had not a current HHP registration.

3. The horse has

resided in ..... (country of usual residence) since.....<sup>33</sup>

entered ..... (country of temporary residence) on .....

4. During its temporary stay in the country of dispatch the horse has been kept only in the following premises that have a current HHP registration and are under supervision of the Competent Veterinary Authority of that country:

Address of premises	HHP Registration number	Date of entry	Date of exit

5. The horse will be sent directly from the premises of dispatch to the premises of destination under conditions that ensure it will not come into contact with horses other than those that have current HHP registration, accompanied by the required veterinary health certificate, in a vehicle that was cleansed and disinfected in advance with a disinfectant approved in the country of dispatch.

Date: ..... Place: .....

Signature:

## DRAFT CHAPTER 6.X.

**PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF *SALMONELLA*  
IN PIG HERDS**

## Article 6.X.1.

**Introduction**

Nontyphoidal salmonellosis is one of the most common food-borne bacterial diseases in the world with *Salmonella* Enteritidis and *S. Typhimurium* the predominant serotypes identified in most countries.

As is the case in most food producing *animals*, *Salmonella infection* in pigs is mostly subclinical and of variable duration. Pigs with subclinical *infection* play an important role in the spread of *Salmonella* between *herds* and pose a public health risk.

*Salmonella* serotypes and their prevalence in pigs may vary considerably between farms, regions and countries. It is important for *Veterinary Authorities* to consider the serotypes and their prevalence in pig populations when developing and implementing *Salmonella* reduction strategies.

## Article 6.X.2.

**Purpose and scope**

To combat the occurrence of food-borne salmonellosis, a pre-harvest pathogen reduction strategy can assist in reducing the presence of *Salmonella* in pig *meat*.

This chapter provides recommendations on the prevention and control of *Salmonella* in domestic pigs kept for commercial breeding and production from farm to slaughter. It should be read in conjunction with the Codex Alimentarius Guidelines for the Control of Nontyphoidal *Salmonella* spp. in Pork Meat (under development) and the Codex Alimentarius Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat (CAC/RCP 58-2005).

## Article 6.X.3.

**Surveillance in pig herds for *Salmonella***

Where justified by *risk assessment*, *surveillance* should be carried out to identify the occurrence and distribution of *Salmonella* in pig *herds*. *Surveillance* data will provide information to assist the *Competent Authorities* in their decision making regarding the requirement for, and design of, control programmes. Sampling and testing methods, frequency and type of samples required should be determined by the *Veterinary Services* based on the *risk assessment*.

Serological testing, usually using 'meat juice' at slaughter, is a common method for assessing exposure to *Salmonella* in pig *herds*. Benefits of serological testing include low cost per test, high throughput capability and the potential for automation of tests. Collection of samples at the *slaughterhouse/abattoir* enables centralised sampling of multiple *herds*. Serological testing does not detect exposure to all serotypes and does not provide information on the serotypes present.

Annex XXIII (contd)

Microbiological testing identifies serotypes present in pig *herds* and can provide epidemiological information on likely sources of *Salmonella* and on the presence of strains with higher public health risk, including those with enhanced virulence or resistance to *antimicrobial agents*. Bacteriological sampling of individual pigs has low sensitivity but this can be overcome by repeated sampling, by pooling of samples (such as individual faecal samples or mesenteric lymph nodes) or sampling naturally pooled material (such as sampling of faeces from the floor of pig pens).

Communication of the results of post-mortem *Salmonella* testing that are relevant to the *Salmonella* status of pigs at *herd* level to the *herd* manager or *veterinarian* is an important element of a *Salmonella* control programme.

Article 6.X.4.

**Definitions**

**Feed:** means any material (single or multiple), whether processed, semi-processed or raw, which is intended to be fed directly to terrestrial *animals* (except bees).

**Feed ingredient:** means a component part or constituent of any combination or mixture making up a feed, whether or not it has a nutritional value in the *animal's* diet, including feed additives. Ingredients are of plant (including aquatic plants) or terrestrial or aquatic animal origin, or other organic or inorganic substances.

Article 6.X.5.

**Prevention and control measures**

Articles 6.X.6. to 6.X.14. provide recommendations for the prevention and control of *Salmonella* at *herd* level. Contamination of pig *meat* can be reduced by measures taken during the *slaughter* process. Reduction of *Salmonella* in pigs entering the *slaughterhouse/abattoir* enhances the effectiveness of such measures.

These recommendations will also have beneficial effects on the occurrence of other *infections* and *diseases*.

Article 6.X.6.

**Biosecurity measures**

It is important to have biosecurity measures in place to reduce the risk of introduction of *Salmonella* or the entry of new strains of *Salmonella* into pig *herds*, the spread of these strains across the *herd*, as well as to minimise prevalence of existing strains.

It is recommended that biosecurity measures include the following:

- 1) Development and implementation of a *biosecurity plan* including management strategies for the prevention and control of *Salmonella*.
- 2) Training of personnel regarding their responsibilities and the significance of their role in improving animal health, human health and food safety.
- 3) Maintenance of records including data on pig health, production, movements, medications, *vaccination*, mortality, *surveillance*, and cleaning and *disinfection* of farm buildings and equipment.
- 4) Veterinary supervision of pig health and *Salmonella* control.
- 5) Removal of unwanted vegetation and debris that could attract or harbour pests around pig housing.
- 6) Prevention of entry of wild birds into pig houses and buildings.



Annex XXIII (contd)

- 7) Cleaning and *disinfection* procedures for pig housing, general equipment, transportation equipment and animal walkways. The cleaning and *disinfection* procedures for pig housing after emptying should include at least feeders, drinkers, floor, walls, aisles, partitions between pens, and ventilation ducting. All visible organic material should be removed before *disinfection* with a suitable *disinfectant* at an effective concentration. *Disinfectants* should be used in accordance with Chapter 4.13.
- 8) Procedures for the control of vermin such as rodents and arthropods should be in place and regular checks should be carried out to assess effectiveness. When the presence of vermin is detected timely control actions should be taken to prevent the development of unmanageable populations; for example, the placement of baits for rodents where they are nesting.
- 9) Controlled access of persons and *vehicles* entering the *establishment*.
- 10) Biosecurity measures applied to all personnel and visitors entering the *establishment*. This should include hand washing and changing into clean clothes and footwear provided by the *establishment*. Similar precautions are recommended when moving between separate *epidemiological units* on large farms.
- 11) *Vehicles* and equipment identified as a *risk* in the *biosecurity plan* should be cleaned and *disinfected* before entering the *establishment*.
- 12) Pig carcasses, bedding, faeces and other potentially contaminated farm waste should be stored and disposed of in a safe manner to minimise the risk of dissemination of *Salmonella* and to prevent the direct or indirect exposure of humans, livestock and *wildlife* to *Salmonella*. Particular care should be taken when pig bedding and faeces are used to fertilise horticultural crops intended for human consumption.

## Article 6.X.7.

**Facility design**

Good design of pig units facilitates the management and control of pathogens.

It is recommended that facility design consider the following:

- 1) location of other livestock *establishments* in relation to wild bird and rodent populations;
- 2) adequate drainage for the site and control of run-off and untreated waste water;
- 3) use of smooth impervious materials for construction to enable effective cleaning and *disinfection*;
- 4) surrounding indoor pig houses with concrete or other impervious material to facilitate cleaning and *disinfection*;
- 5) a controlled entry point to prevent the entry of unwanted *animals* and people;
- 6) a sign indicating restricted entry at the entrance to the *establishment*;
- 7) pig flow to minimise stress and spread of *Salmonella infection*;
- 8) prevention of entry of wild birds, rodents and *feral animals*;
- 9) location of delivery and collection points away from pig housing or feed storage.

Annex XXIII (contd)

## Article 6.X.8.

**Feed**

*Salmonella* contaminated feed and feed ingredients are known to be important sources of *infection* for pigs. Therefore, feed and feed ingredients should be produced, handled, stored, transported and distributed according to Good Manufacturing Practices, considering Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HACCP) principles and recommendations in accordance with Chapter 6.3.

For the effective control of *Salmonella* it is recommended that:

- 1) Feed and feed ingredients should come from monitored sources.
- 2) Heat treated feeds are used and may also include the addition of bactericidal or bacteriostatic treatments, e.g. organic acids. Where heat treatment is not possible, the use of bacteriostatic or bactericidal treatments or processes should be considered.
- 3) Cooling systems and dust control in feed ingredient processing plants and compound feed mills should be managed to avoid recontamination of feed and feed ingredients with *Salmonella*.
- 4) Feed should be stored and transported in a hygienic manner that prevents exposure to possible residual *Salmonella* contamination.
- 5) Access to feed by wild birds and rodents should be prevented.
- 6) Spilled feed should be cleaned up immediately to remove attractants for wild birds, rodents and other pests.

## Article 6.X.9.

**Water**

For the effective control of *Salmonella* it is recommended that:

- 1) The drinking water supply should be monitored and controlled to maintain it free from *Salmonella* contamination.
- 2) Water holding tanks are enclosed.
- 3) The water delivery system is regularly cleaned and disinfected. For example in an 'all-in-all-out' system this would occur before restocking.

## Article 6.X.10.

**Feed composition**

For the control of *Salmonella* it is recommended that the following be considered when determining feed composition:

- 1) Slower gastric transit time of ingested feed increases exposure of *Salmonella* to stomach acid resulting in decreased survival.
- 2) Modified fermentation conditions in the gastrointestinal tract may enhance colonisation by protective bacteria and thereby suppress the colonisation and multiplication of *Salmonella*.
- 3) Liquid feed that is fermented has a protective effect due to the presence of beneficial bacteria and low pH levels; for example, the inclusion of fermented *milk products*.

Annex XXIII (contd)

Where *Salmonella* is present in a pig *herd*, the composition of feed may influence the occurrence of *Salmonella* in individual pigs. For the effective control of *Salmonella* it is recommended that:

- 4) Feed should be coarsely ground.
- 5) Where feed is wheat based, reducing the proportion of wheat may reduce the occurrence of *Salmonella* in pigs.
- 6) Coarsely ground material may be added to pelleted feed.

Article 6.X.11.

**Pig flow management**

The movement and mixing of pigs increase the risk of spread of *Salmonella*. For the effective control of *Salmonella* it is recommended that:

- 1) The number of pig movements and mixing of pigs between weaning and dispatch for *slaughter* should be minimised.
- 2) If possible, the 'all-in-all-out' single age group principle should be used. In particular, the addition to younger groups of pigs held back from older groups should be avoided.

Article 6.X.12.

**Management of new pig introductions**

To minimise the risk of new introductions of *Salmonella* in replacement pigs in a *herd*, it is recommended that:

- 1) There is good communication along the pig production chain to ensure that steps are taken to minimise the introduction and dissemination of *Salmonella*.
- 2) A closed *herd* policy is applied with the introduction of new genetic material by semen only.
- 3) The number of separate sources for both replacement breeding stock and rearing pigs are as few as possible.
- 4) Newly introduced pigs are kept separate from the rest of the *herd* for a suitable period before incorporating with other pigs, e.g. four weeks.
- 5) Replacement breeding pigs are of a similar *Salmonella* status to that of the *herd*, for example a *Salmonella* free *herd* should source replacements from *Salmonella* free *herds*; or *herds* that are free of specific *Salmonella* serotypes such as *S. Typhimurium* should avoid introducing pigs from breeding *herds* infected with such serotypes.
- 6) Where appropriate, pooled faecal samples from introduced pigs are taken to assess their *Salmonella* status.

Article 6.X.13.

**Stress reduction**

Given that stress may increase the multiplication and shedding of *Salmonella* by pigs and their susceptibility to *infection*, it is important to consider management measures that reduce stress.

Annex XXIII (contd)

## Article 6.X.14.

**Pig treatments**

- 1) *Antimicrobial agents* may modify normal flora in the gut and increase the likelihood of colonisation by *Salmonella*. If *antimicrobial agents* are used for the control of clinical *infections* in pigs, they should be used in accordance with Chapters 6.7., 6.8., 6.9. and 6.10.

*Antimicrobial agents* should not be used to control subclinical *infection* with *Salmonella* in pigs because the effectiveness of the treatment is limited and can contribute to the development of antimicrobial resistance.

- 2) *Vaccination* may be used as part a *Salmonella* control programme. Vaccine production and use should be in accordance with Chapter 2.9.9. of the *Terrestrial Manual*.

Vaccines for *Salmonella* in pigs may increase the threshold for *infection* and reduce the level of excretion of the organism. The protective effect of vaccines is serotype specific and few licensed vaccines are available for pigs.

If serology is used as the *surveillance* method, it may not be possible to distinguish between *vaccination* and *infection* with a field strain.

If live vaccines are used:

- a) it is important that field and vaccine strains be easily differentiated in the laboratory;
  - b) the vaccine strain should not be present at the time of *slaughter*.
- 3) Organic acids, probiotics and prebiotics may be added to feed or water to reduce shedding of *Salmonella* by pigs. However, efficacy is variable.

## Article 6.X.15.

**Transportation**

The relevant recommendations in Chapter 7.3. apply.

## Article 6.X.16.

**Lairage**

*Lairage* can be used at various stages in pig production, for example accumulation of weaned pigs before movement to nursery *herds*, holding finisher pigs before transport to *slaughter* and holding pigs at the *slaughterhouse/abattoir* before *slaughter*. Important aspects of *lairage* management include effective cleaning and *disinfection* between groups, minimising mixing of separate groups and managing stress.

In addition, the relevant recommendations in Articles 7.5.1., 7.5.3., and 7.5.4. apply.

## Article 6.X.17.

**Prevention and control in low prevalence regions**

In regions where *Salmonella infection* of pigs is uncommon it may be possible to eliminate *infection* from individual *herds* by means of a test and removal policy. This can be accomplished by placing movement controls on the *herd*, repeated bacteriological sampling of groups of pigs and culling of persistently infected pigs. Movement controls can be lifted after two rounds of negative tests and confirmation of implementation of effective prevention and control measures as described in Articles 6.X.5. to 6.X.14.

Annex XXIII (contd)

It may be possible to attempt this approach in individual *herds*, for example in valuable breeding *herds*, in higher prevalence regions. However, the risk of reintroduction of *infection* must be low to achieve success with this approach.

Article 6.X.18.

**Outdoor pig production**

As far as possible the prevention and control measures described in Articles 6.X.5. to 6.X.14. should also be applied to outdoor pig production to reduce *Salmonella infection* in pigs. It is recommended that:

- 1) field rotation programmes be used to minimise *Salmonella* contamination and accumulation in soil and surface water and therefore ingestion by pigs;
- 2) feed be provided using troughs or bird proof hoppers to minimise attraction of wild birds;
- 3) location of other outdoor pig *herds* and the concentration and behaviour of wild birds in the area be considered when establishing outdoor pig *herds*.

Article 6.X.19.

**Live animal markets**

Live animal markets pose a significant risk of spreading *Salmonella* and other *infections* and *diseases* among pigs. If possible, sourcing replacement pigs from live animal markets should be avoided. Precautions should be taken to prevent the spread of *Salmonella* from markets to pig *herds* by personnel or *vehicles*.

---



**FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME FOR THE  
TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION**

Topic		
Action	How to be managed	Status (Sep. 2014)
<b>Restructuring of the <i>Terrestrial Code</i>, including Harmonisation of the <i>Terrestrial and Aquatic Codes</i></b>		
1) Work with AAHSC towards harmonisation, as appropriate, of the Codes 2) CH rename by disease agents 3) Revision and formatting of Section 7 4) Revision of the Users' guide 5) OIE policy on wildlife	TAHSC & ITD  3) TAHSC & AWWG 4) TAHSC & SCAD 5) TAHSC with WG on Wildlife & SCAD	1) Ongoing 2) Ongoing 3) Ongoing 4) Revised User's guide for MC 5) Ongoing
<b>Listed diseases</b>		
Criteria for listing	TAHSC & SCAD & SIS	AHG to be convened
<b>Evaluation of VS and OIE PVS pathway</b>		
Veterinary education aspect	TAHSC & AHG & ITD	Ongoing
<b>Veterinary products (AMR)</b>		
1) Updating CH 6.9. 2) Updating CH 6.10. 3) Updating CH 6.7.	TAHSC & SCAD & AHG	1) Ongoing 2) Ongoing 3) Ongoing
<b>FMD</b>		
Revise chapter	SCAD & TAHSC	Revised CH for MC
<b>AHS</b>		
Harmonisation with BT and EHD	SCAD & TAHSC	Ongoing
<b>Horse diseases</b>		
1) International movement of competition horses 2) Update Dourine CH 3) Update Glanders CH	1) AHG/SCAD & TAHSC 2) SCAD/TAHSC 3) AHG/SCAD/TAHSC	1) Revised CH and draft certificate for MC 2) Pending expert advice 3) Revised CH for MC
<b>CWD</b>		
Decision on listing (new CH)	TAHSC & SCAD & AHG	Pending AHG on listing criteria
<b>PRRS</b>		
New CH	TAHSC/SCAD/AHG	Ongoing
<b>Other <i>Terrestrial Code</i> texts on diseases in need of revision</b>		
Review CH on BSE	SCAD/TAHSC	Ongoing

Annex XXIV (contd)

<b>Topic (contd)</b>		
<b>Action</b>	<b>How to be managed</b>	<b>Status (Sep. 2014)</b>
Update BT and EHD in line with AHS	SCAD & AHG	Ongoing
Update CH on brucellosis	AHG/SCAD & TAHSC	Revised CH for MC
Update CH on tuberculosis	AHG/SCAD & TAHSC	Ongoing
Update CH on avian mycoplasmosis	SCAD and TAHSC	Seek expert opinion
Update CH on ASF	SCAD	Ongoing
Pet food certificate CH	TAHSC	On hold
Update CH on Scrapie	TAHSC	Ongoing

<b>Animal production food safety</b>		
1) Collaboration with Codex	1) TAHSC and ITD	1) Ongoing
2) <i>Taenia solium</i> (Porcine cysticercosis)	2) AHG & TAHSC	2) Draft new CH for MC
3) Salmonellosis in pig herds	3) AHG & TAHSC	3) Draft CH for MC
<b>Animal welfare</b>		
1) Broiler production systems	AWWG & AHGs	1) Revised CH 7.10. for MC
2) Dairy cattle production systems	&TAHSC	2) Draft new CH for MC
3) CH 7.5. and 7.6.		3) Ongoing
4) Disaster management		4) Ongoing
5) Working equids		5) Draft CH for MC

Note: MC: Member comments; CH: chapter; Q: questionnaire; SURV: surveillance; ITD: International Trade Department; S&T Dept: Scientific & Technical Department.



## ITEM, ANNEX, CHAPTER NUMBERS AND CURRENT STATUS

Item	Annex	Chapter	Title	Provided for comments	GS83	
1			General comments			
2	IV		User's guide	Sep 14	C	
	V	5.1.	General obligations related to certification	Sep 14	C	
3	VI		Glossary	Sep.14	C	
4		1.2.	Criteria for listing diseases			
5		2.1.	Import risk analysis			
6	VII	3.2.	Evaluation of Veterinary Services	Sep 14	C	
7	VIII	4.6.	Collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen	Sep 14	C	
	IX	4.7.	Collection and processing of <i>in vivo</i> derived embryos from livestock and equids	Sep 14	C	
8	X	5.2.	Certification procedures	Sep 14	C	
9	XI	6.5.	Prevention, detection and control of <i>Salmonella</i> in poultry	Sep 14	C	
10		6.7.	Harmonisation of national antimicrobial resistance surveillance and monitoring programmes		E	
		6.9.	Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial		E	
		6.10	Risk assessment for antimicrobial resistance arising from the use of antimicrobials in animals		E	
11	XII	7.X.	Animal welfare and dairy cattle production systems	Feb. 13	C	
	XIII	7.10.	Animal welfare and broiler chicken production systems	Sep. 14	C	
	XXV		Report of AHG on disaster management		I	
	XIV	New		Animal welfare of working equids	Sep 14	C
		3.4.		Veterinary legislation	Sep 14	
		7.1.		Introduction to the recommendations for animal welfare	Sep 14	
	XXVI		Report of AHG on AW of working equids		I	
XXVII		Report of AWWG		I		
12	XV	X.X.	Infection with <i>Taenia solium</i>	Feb 14	C	
13	XVI	8.7.	Foot and mouth disease	Feb. 13	C	
		1.6.	Procedure for self declaration and for official recognition by the OIE			
14	XVII	8.13.	Infection with Rift Valley fever virus	Sep. 14	C	
15	XVIII	8.4.	Infection with <i>Brucella abortus</i> , <i>B. melitensis</i> and <i>B. suis</i>	Sep. 14	C	
16	XIX	10.4.	Infection with avian influenza viruses	Sep. 14	C	
17	XX	12.10.	Infection with <i>B. mallei</i>	Sep. 14	C	
	XXI	4.16	High health status horse subpopulation	Sep. 14	C	
	XXII		Report of AHG on international horse movement	Sep 14	C	
18		15.X.	Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome	Feb 14	E	
19	XXIII	New	Prevention and control of <i>Salmonella</i> in pig herds	Sep 14	C	
	XXVIII		Report of the AHG on <i>Salmonella</i> in pig herds		I	
20	XXIV		Work programme		C	

Annex XXIV (contd)

A: proposed for adoption at 83rd General Session; C: For Member comments; E: under expert consultation (*ad hoc* groups, Specialist Commissions, etc.), D: deferred to Feb 2015 meeting; I: For Member Country information.

List of abbreviations	
AAHSC	Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission
AHS	African horse sickness
APFSWG	Animal Production Food Safety Working Group
AWWG	Animal Welfare Working Group
EHD	Epizootic haemorrhagic disease
FMD	Foot and mouth disease
PPR	Peste des petits ruminants
PRRS	Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome
SCAD	Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases
TAHSC	Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission



Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Annex XXV

Original: English  
April 2014

**REPORT OF THE FIRST AD HOC GROUP  
ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND RISK REDUCTION  
IN RELATION TO ANIMAL HEALTH AND WELFARE AND VETERINARY PUBLIC HEALTH**

**Paris, 15–17 April 2014**

The OIE *ad hoc* Group on disaster risk reduction and management in relation to animal health and welfare (the *ad hoc* Group) met at the OIE Headquarters on 15–17 April 2014. Dr Gary Vroegindewey chaired the meeting.

**1. Welcome and introduction**

The members of the *ad hoc* Group and other participants at the meeting are listed at [Annex I](#). The adopted Agenda is provided as [Annex II](#).

On behalf of Dr Bernard Vallat, Director General of the OIE, the Head of the International Trade Department, Dr Derek Belton, welcomed all members and thanked them for their agreement to work with the OIE on this important topic. He indicated how the work done in animal welfare had been addressed by the OIE through its permanent Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG), which provides advice and draft texts to the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (Code Commission) and, for aquatic animals, to the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission. Draft texts are provided by the Code Commission to OIE Members for comment and consideration, with a view to final adoption in the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code)*.

Dr Belton indicated to the *ad hoc* Group that in the first instance OIE is keen to develop a Guidelines document for the use of the Member Countries Veterinary Services that take account of the existing guidelines and standards in this area at the global level.

An extract from relevant section of the report of the Twelfth meeting of the AWWG is presented in [Annex IV](#).

**2. Objectives of the meeting**

Dr Gary Vroegindewey, chair of the meeting, indicated that the work of the *ad hoc* Group is clearly stated through the draft Terms of Reference prepared by the OIE Headquarters, which the *ad hoc* Group should review, amend as necessary and confirm.

Dr Philippe Ankers asked for clarification as to whether the Group will use a livelihood based approach or will focus on animals. The latter applies. Dr Maurice Kiboye and Maria Percedo also asked for clarification on the extent of the work to be undertaken and noted the inclusion of transboundary diseases (TAD's) as an important aspect to include.

Dr Percedo highlighted the TAD's should be consider as threat, or potential perils, of disaster because its emergence, or reemergence, may be cause a negative economic and societal impact, as the same as when it is derived for a bioterrorism act. In the developing countries the TAD's would be a cause of sanitary or biological disaster and affect the poverty alleviation and sustainable development.

Annex XXV (contd)

Dr Ankers expressed the opinion that transboundary animal diseases (TADs) should not be considered under these guidelines as there will be confusion between existing standards to address notifiable diseases and those guidelines meant to address disasters defined as events involving widespread human, material, economic or environmental losses and impacts. The group should consider using “epizootics” rather than “transboundary animal diseases”.

Dr Ian Dacre supported Dr Ankers comments noting that ‘pandemics’ should still be included due to their impact on the health of human populations as opposed to TADs which focus on disease affecting primarily animal populations.

Dr Alex Thiermann noted the importance of using the existing work of other relevant organisations which has work in this area.

Dr Percedo highlighted that the disaster risk reduction should be looking with transversal character through the different OIE’s working areas, such as the laboratory biosecurity, animal rearing conditions, skill evaluations of Veterinary Services, veterinary educations, etc.

Dr Paolo Dalla Villa expressed his appreciation for being given the opportunity to contribute with his expertise to support the OIE in taking charge in a new leadership role in such an important area of Veterinary Public Health, given the need for a stronger integration of community based approaches to disaster management, whether it concerns companion, production or wild animals.

### 3. Terms of Reference

Dr Vroegindewey opened the discussion indicating that the area of Veterinary Public Health should also be specifically included in the discussions and the development of the guidelines.

The Group discussed the scope of their work, and agreed they should include natural and manmade disasters. Dr Thiermann clarified that it is important to address the effects of the disaster events, as whether natural or manmade disasters, many of the consequences are the same.

Dr Ankers asked as to whether the guidelines are meant to be technical guidelines. The group agreed that the guidelines will focus on strategic, organisational and operational issues and not technical issues.

In relation to the last point of the proposed TOR Dr Dalla Villa highlighted the crucial importance of including the competent organisation(s) that work with people in disaster situation. This is important also because in some situations Veterinary Services or Veterinary Professionals and Paraprofessionals are forgotten by those taking care of the people response in a disaster event. Dr Ankers recalled that the mandate of OIE focuses on Veterinary Services as it is defined in the *Terrestrial Code* which was confirmed by Dr Stuardo. As such the guidelines should be for Veterinary Services only.

Dr Dacre drew the group’s attention to the recent proposal by the Code Commission to include into Chapter 3.1 of the *Terrestrial Code* in Article 3.1.2. point 9.d) the example for Veterinary Services to develop and document appropriate procedures and standards including ‘emergency preparedness for disasters which could have impact on animal health and welfare. If agreed by delegates at the forthcoming 82<sup>nd</sup> General Session this will support the above comments by Drs Ankers and Stuardo that the focus is to be on Veterinary Services.

Dr Percedo commented the importance of the Veterinary Services dedication to disaster risk reduction systematically, not only when the disaster hit, because it is better to work in prevention more than in disaster response management. She also highlighted that the Veterinary Services should include their activities planning in the disaster reduction platforms in all levels, from local to national level, as well as the human and materials resources needed. The aim is to facilitate the logistical and financial support by other sectors engaged in the platform. So, the disasters reduction is a priority for the sustainable development of our countries and requires the whole society cooperation.

Annex XXV (contd)

Dr Shiro Inukai told that expansion of the definition of Disaster may cause a lack of knowledge by *ad hoc* group members, especially in the field of man-made disaster. However, he proposed to take skip and back approach to accelerate the work.

Dr Leopoldo Stuardo recalled that the OIE has been working on several topics which could be important input for the work of the Group and for the future guidelines, such as the OIE PVS tool and the support to OIE Members on Veterinary Legislation, Veterinary Education (potentially including 'day-one competencies') and Veterinary Statutory Bodies among others. The *ad hoc* Group should take this work into consideration and cross reference as necessary to avoid replications within OIE documents.

Dr Ankers presented both the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) prepared by the LEGS Project and the Good Emergency Management Practices (GEMP) prepared by FAO to the group and highlighted FAO's role and expertise in capacity development on disaster related matters. Both LEGS and GEMP were seen by the group as relevant documents to refer to in the guidelines.

The *ad hoc* Group made some modifications to the Term of Reference and adopted the final version as shown in Annex III

#### **4. Discussion of working documents and other relevant documents**

Dr Vroegindewey noted, as mentioned in the discussion paper, the development of definitions should be foreseen when developing guidelines on disaster management and risk reduction. These should be operational definitions.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed that guidelines for Veterinary Services should be a very useful tool to develop for the OIE and their Member Countries. It was also suggested that a toolkit (data base) where key documents, relevant for this important area are kept could be useful.

Dr Dacre enquired into the status within the group of current bibliographical software in use such as 'Mendeley', 'End-Note' or 'Reference Manager' and that a common platform which the group could use as a resource would be beneficial. WSPA had started to develop such a database that could be shared within the group.

Dr Inukai explained Japan's experience after the Great East Japan Earthquake. He told that to conduct disaster response efficiently with limited resources, prioritization is essential and worker's safety is a one of element need to be considered. He also told the necessity of flexibility of resources especially for human resources and budget, the importance of record keeping to improve the disaster management system with experience-based data.

Dr Dalla Villa presented the experience of the Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale 'G. Caporale' (IZSAM) in the coordination of the veterinary crisis unit during the response and recovery phases of the 2009 earthquake in L'Aquila city. He also described the basic principles of the European Community Civil Protection Mechanism and emphasised that a communication strategy should be one key aspect to consider in the guidelines. Dr Dalla Villa also emphasised that a communication strategy should be one key aspect to consider in the guidelines.

After in depth consideration of the discussion document provided by the OIE, the *ad hoc* Group agreed that the way to continue the work in this area should be in line with the Option N° 2 proposed in the discussion document which is the OIE to develop a set of guidelines for publication on the OIE website. This text would be developed by the *ad hoc* expert Group reporting to elected Commission(s). Member Countries would be appraised of progress but would not be asked to formally adopt the text for inclusion in the OIE Codes. The Group in discussion with Dr Belton and Dr Thiermann agreed that this option will be the most appropriate way of beginning this work, but that the potential also existed for further possibilities such as those outlined in Option 1.

Annex XXV (contd)

Dr Thiermann at the end of the meeting, noted that after having a good product in terms of guidelines, then the OIE could then explore the possibility to use these as a starting point for the preparation of Standards or to refer to the Guidelines in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The discussion paper on the future role of the OIE with respect to animals in disasters is provided as Annex V.

**Meeting with Dr Bernard Vallat, Director General of the OIE**

Following his return from mission travel, Dr Vallat participated in the *ad hoc* Group meeting on the morning of Wednesday 16 April. After thanking the *ad hoc* Group members for their cooperation with the OIE in this important and new area of work, Dr Vallat commented on the importance of the OIE's standard setting work in the frame work of the work of their Specialised Commissions and the OIE World Assembly.

Dr Vroegindewey welcomed Dr Vallat and reviewed the work that the group had undertaken thus far. Dr Vroegindewey highlighted the importance for Veterinary Services to effectively deal with disaster situations through risk reduction and disaster preparedness planning and implementation.

Dr Vroegindewey indicated that the guidelines will be based on the disaster cycle and also taken into account the risk analysis pathway. The definition or scope of the animal species that should be considered the guidelines are the same as ones considered in the OIE *Terrestrial Code*.

Finally, Dr Vroegindewey indicated that the Group is focused on working according to the agreed revised Terms of Reference.

Dr Vallat explained the horizontal and transverse standards including in the *Terrestrial Code*, and specifically mentioned the importance of some Chapters such as Animal Welfare and Veterinary Services.

Dr Vallat noted that the OIE places high priority on supporting OIE Members in the implementation of the OIE animal health and welfare standards.

Dr Vallat also noted the importance of strategic alliances under the OIE Biological Threat Reduction Strategy (Biological Strengthening Global Security). He indicated that the scope and content of the guidelines should be very clear and science based. He emphasised the fact that Veterinary Services need a tool to prepare for and deal with animal health and animal welfare as well with veterinary public health issues in disasters situations. Dr Vallat indicated that relevant references from other sources should also be considered when developing the guidelines and that all species included in the texts, should be considered within the scope of the guidelines.

**5. Development of draft guidelines**

The *ad hoc* Group drafted the guiding principles to develop this new OIE work and a draft guideline document. The *ad hoc* Group agreed that both documents need more detailed work.

**6. Proposed strategy for the use of the developed guidelines by the *ad hoc* Group**

The *ad hoc* Group discussed the strategy provided in Annex VI to facilitate the use of the future guidelines by OIE Member Country Veterinary Services and their relevant partners.

Dr Dacre identified the use of these guidelines had the potential to generate an overall increased awareness and uptake of OIE Standards and Guidelines due to the novel subject matter. Dr Thiermann agreed and indicated that the *ad hoc* Group were well placed to identify such areas to the OIE for their further consideration.

Annex XXV (contd)

**7. Review and finalise report of meeting**

The *ad hoc* Group discussed and agreed on further work needed to complete the meeting report

**8. Next meeting**

It was proposed that a second meeting of the *ad hoc* Group be needed, and it could take place during the fourth quarter of 2014.

---

.../ Appendices





Annex XXV (contd)

Annex I

**OIE AD HOC GROUP ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND RISK REDUCTION IN RELATION TO ANIMAL HEALTH AND WELFARE AND VETERINARY PUBLIC HEALTH**

**Paris, 15–17 April 2014**

---

**List of participants**

**MEMBERS OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP**

---

**Dr Gary Vroegindewey (chair)**  
Director, Global Health Initiatives  
Center for Public and Corporate  
Veterinary Medicine  
Virginia-Maryland Regional College of  
Veterinary Medicine  
University of Maryland, College Park  
UNITED STATES  
Tel: 301-314-6821  
drvroeg@gmail.com

**Dr Philippe Ankers**  
Livestock Production Systems Branch -  
FAO HQ  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
Rome 00153, Italy  
Tel: +39 06 570 56214  
philippe.ankers@fao.org

**Dr Ian Dacre**  
Senior Veterinary Advisor Asia-Pacific  
WSPA 7th Floor, Olympia Thai Plaza  
444 Ratchadaphisek Road, Samsenok  
Huay Kwang, Bangkok 10310  
THAILAND  
Tel: +662 513 0475  
Iandacre@wspa-asiapacific.org

**Dr Paolo Dalla Villa**  
European Commission  
Directorate -General for Health and  
Consumers  
Animal Welfare  
BELGIUM  
Phone: + 32 (0) 2 29 87 629  
Paolo-Felice.Dalla-Villa@ec.europa.eu

**Dr Shiro Inukai**  
Director for Risk Management  
Livestock Industry Department  
Agriculture and Production Bureau  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and  
Fisheries  
JAPAN  
shiro\_inukai@nm.maff.go.jp

**Dr Maurice K. Kiboye**  
Programme coordinator/  
Veterinarians without Borders Germany  
Piedmont Plaza  
671 Ngong Road  
P.O.Box 25653-00603  
Nairobi  
KENYA  
mkiboye@yahoo.com

**Dr María Irian Percedo Abreu**  
Investigadora Titular  
Dirección Salud y Producción Animal  
Centro Nacional de Sanidad  
Agropecuaria (CENSA)  
OIE Collaborating Centre for Disaster  
Risk Reduction in Animal Health  
Mayabeque, CUBA  
Tel: 047-849136 849134  
percedo@censa.edu.cu

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

---

**Dr Alejandro Thiermann**  
President of the Code Commission  
a.thiermann@oie.int

Annex XXV (contd)

Annex I (contd)

## **OIE HEADQUARTERS**

---

**Dr Bernard Vallat**

Director General  
12, rue de Prony  
75017 Paris  
FRANCE  
Tel.: 33 - (0)1 44 15 18 88  
Fax: 33 - (0)1 42 67 09 87  
oie@oie.int

**Dr Derek Belton**

Head  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
d.belton@oie.int

**Dr Leopoldo Stuardo**

Chargé de mission  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
l.stuardo@oie.int

**Dr Tomasz Grudnik**

Chargé de mission  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
t.grudnik@oie.int

Annex XXV (contd)

Annex II

**OIE AD HOC GROUP ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND RISK REDUCTION IN RELATION TO ANIMAL HEALTH AND WELFARE AND VETERINARY PUBLIC HEALTH**

**Paris, 15–17 April 2014**

---

**Agenda**

1. Welcome and introduction – Dr Derek Belton
2. Objectives of the meeting – Dr Derek Belton and Chair of the *ad hoc* Group
3. Confirmation of Terms of Reference and comments from Chair of *ad hoc* Group
4. Discussion of working documents and other relevant documents provided by the *ad hoc* Group Members
5. Development of draft guidelines.
6. Proposed strategy for the use of the developed guidelines by the *ad hoc* Group.
7. Review and finalise report of meeting
8. Programme for further work after this meeting

---



Annex XXV (contd)

Annex III

**OIE AD HOC GROUP ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND RISK REDUCTION IN RELATION TO ANIMAL HEALTH AND WELFARE AND VETERINARY PUBLIC HEALTH**

**Paris, 15–17 April 2014**

---

**Terms of Reference**

- To develop OIE Guiding Principles on disasters management and risk reduction with respect to animal health and welfare and veterinary public health taking account of all aspects of the Disaster Cycle and existing Guidelines and Standards (e.g. LEGS and Standards in the OIE *Terrestrial Code*);
  - To advise strategies for supporting Veterinary Services in OIE Member Countries to undertake disaster management and risk reduction;
  - To identify any significant gaps in existing guidelines and standards available to Veterinary Services on disaster management and risk reduction with respect to animal health and welfare and veterinary public health and to develop guidelines addressing those gaps;
  - To advise how disaster management and risk reduction with respect to animal health and welfare and veterinary public health should be addressed in OIE veterinary education recommendations;
  - To make recommendations on how the OIE can strengthen linkages with key international stakeholders in the field of disaster management and risk reduction with respect to animal health and welfare and veterinary public health.
-



Annex XXV (contd)

Annex IV

### **Extract from the report of the twelfth meeting of the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group June 2013**

#### **6. Working animals and disaster management: New OIE's approaches**

The AWWG acknowledged the discussion papers written on these two topics by Dr Sarah Kahn, former Head of the OIE International Trade Department.

- **Welfare of working animals**

Dr Sira Abdul Rahman introduced the subject by mentioning the OIE meeting that was held in Accra, Ghana, in March 2012, where the role and importance of working animals was discussed. Dr Rahman also recalled the FAO experts' meeting that was held in June 2011 in which he participated along with Dr Varas. Although the report of this meeting has not yet been published, he recalled that the meeting recommended OIE develop a specific standard on the welfare of working animals.

The AWWG Group discussed which species should be included in the scope, and agreed with the suggestions from Dr Kahn and Dr Rahman that the proposed standards should include: horses, donkeys, cattle, buffalo and camelidae initially and to consider other species later on. Given the excellent work that is readily available on the welfare of working equids (including donkeys), the AWWG recommended that an *ad hoc* group be established to develop a standard on working equids that could then also serve as a model for other working animal species which have not been the subject of such extensive study to date.

Dr Vallat noted the importance of having a clear understanding of which species of animals to include in the definition of working animals and supported the approach recommended by the AWWG.

- **Disaster management**

The Working Group acknowledged the need for guidance on the role of Veterinary Services during disaster management. They also recognised that the inclusion of new text in the *Terrestrial Code* for disaster management would enable assessment of Veterinary Services preparedness and performance in this field to be included under the PVS Pathway in the future.

Dr Molomo supported the development of clear guidelines that could be used by countries to ensure adequate investment by Veterinary Services in this field while Dr Thornber noted the important role of NGOs in disaster management. Dr Bayvel also highlighted the active involvement of WSPA in this topic, and noted the forthcoming FAO hosted experts meeting that is scheduled for the end of the year.

Dr Andrea Gavinelli indicated that the OIE CC in Teramo recently applied to be recognized by the Italian Ministry of Health as National Reference Centre for veterinary urban hygiene and disaster management

The Working Group acknowledged that in this field cooperation with other relevant disaster management entities is essential.

The recommendations of the meeting of the Regional Commission for the Americas in Barbados and the 3rd OIE Global Conference on Animal Welfare in Malaysia, both held in November 2012, were also noted; and the AWWG decided to advance work on this topic by:

- Utilising the Disaster Management session at the 13th Australasia/Oceania Commonwealth Veterinary Association (CVA) meeting, to be held on 2-6 September 2013 in Fiji to seek comment from relevant stakeholders with a view to the OIE taking a lead on this issue in relation to Veterinary Services involvement;

Annex XXV (contd)Annex IV (contd)

- Preparing a paper to be published in the *Veterinaria Italiana*, a quarterly peer-reviewed journal published by the CC Italy and indexed in the National Library of medicine's MEDLINE/Pubmed system, amongst other databases ([http://www.izs.it/vet\\_italiana/authors.pdf](http://www.izs.it/vet_italiana/authors.pdf));
- OIE headquarters drafting new text for inclusion in relevant chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* that reference Chapter 7.1. 'Introduction to the recommendations for animal welfare', for consideration by the Code Commission, review by OIE Members and subsequent adoption by the World Assembly of Delegates according to the normal OIE standard setting process;
- That OIE headquarters subsequently appoint an *ad hoc* group of experts on animal welfare and health to review existing guidelines such as the LEGS (<http://www.livestock-emergency.net/>) and develop complementary international guidelines and principles to assist competent authorities improve their plans for animals in national emergencies, in liaison with NGOs, the private sector and the communities.



## Discussion paper on the future role of the OIE with respect to animals in disasters

### Summary

The OIE has a well-recognised leadership role in protecting the world against biological disasters, whether of natural or man-made origin, through its work in the elaboration of standards for diagnosis, early detection, reporting and control of animal diseases and zoonoses. However, planning and preparedness in relation to animals affected by disasters is not specifically addressed in OIE standards or guidelines, nor is this topic mentioned in the OIE Tool for the Evaluation of Performance of Veterinary Services (PVS Tool). Moreover, no other international organisation has elaborated standards for Veterinary Services on this topic, nor is another international organisation as well placed as the OIE to address this important issue.

At its June 2012 meeting, the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group recommended that the OIE provide guidance to Member Countries on the management of animals in disasters. In November 2012, the 21<sup>st</sup> Conference of the OIE Regional Commission for the Americas discussed a technical item on ‘Disaster management: the role and preparedness of Veterinary Services’ and adopted a Resolution urging the OIE to do more to support the activity of national Veterinary Services in disaster prevention and response. In 2013, the Director-General commissioned this Discussion Paper on possible future actions for the OIE in the field of disaster management.

In response to the UN Resolutions and global strategies that have been adopted during the past two decades, government policies on disasters are becoming more focused on prevention, facilitating response and improving resilience. Risk assessment, risk mitigation and risk communication techniques are increasingly being used in the field of preparedness and planning for disasters.

The mandate of veterinary services for the prevention and control of animal diseases and zoonoses; safeguarding food safety and environmental health; and animal welfare is well recognised. Many of the technical requirements and veterinary skills that are relevant to disaster planning and management are covered (without specific reference to disaster management) in the *Terrestrial Code* Section 3 (Quality of Veterinary Services) and in the OIE PVS Tool.

In light of the relevance of these issues to disaster management and relief, there is a possible rationale for involvement of the Veterinary Services in disaster management more generally.

In support of this proposition, it is clear that some sub-sets of veterinary knowledge and skills are particularly relevant to preparedness and planning for disasters, and to disaster response. For example, risk assessment, risk management and risk communication are routinely used in disease prevention and control and can have more general application to disaster management. Epidemiological surveillance of animal diseases (including zoonoses) and the environment, and programmes for the control of the food production chain are based upon the types of activities that can be applied to early warning, forecasting and prevention of emergencies. There is scope to improve animal welfare by focusing on the mitigation and preparedness stages of disaster management – specifically, in the case of slow-onset disasters, such as droughts and famines. The chain of command that is vital to the veterinary response to disease outbreaks is comparable to the incident command system that is used in responding to disasters and emergencies. Finally, the training of veterinarians, with its strong emphasis on assessment, diagnosis and problem solving, provides a sound basis for involvement in disaster prediction and response actions.

It is recommended that the OIE consider the following options:

- Option 1.** A draft text could be developed by an *ad hoc* expert Group for submission to the relevant elected Commission(s). Following the OIE democratic procedures for standard setting, the new text would be the subject of consultation with Member countries during a 2 year period and, if accepted by Member countries, would be adopted as new text in the *Terrestrial Code*. If appropriate, new competencies could be added to the PVS Tool to reflect the adopted standard.

Annex XXV (contd)Annex V (contd)

- Option 2.** The OIE could develop a set of guidelines for location in the OIE website. The text would be developed by an *ad hoc* expert group reporting to elected Commission(s) and Member Countries could be apprised of progress but would not be asked to formally adopt the text. This approach would provide information and guidance to Member countries on technical requirements, without introducing an obligation to implement new systems or upgrade existing ones. In this case, the PVS Tool would not be modified, as the critical competencies in the PVS Tool are directly based on adopted texts in the *Terrestrial Code*.
- Option 3.** If there is no desire to develop standards or guidelines at this time, the OIE could provide additional, more detailed input to the revision of the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) Handbook. The second edition of the Handbook will come out in 2014 so, if the OIE wishes to propose major modifications or new chapters, the LEGS Secretariat should be contacted as soon as possible. It is noted that, based on the existing LEGS Handbook, major modification would be needed if the Handbook were to provide the type of information that is typically found in OIE standards or guidelines.

In view of the arguments in favour of the Veterinary Services taking on a stronger role in planning and preparedness for disasters and emergencies, and considering the lack of standards currently available on the design and implementation effective systems, it is recommended that the OIE follow option 1.

**Background**

The OIE has a well-recognised leadership role in protecting the world against biological disasters, whether of natural or man-made origin, through its work in the elaboration of standards for diagnosis, early detection, reporting and control of animal diseases and zoonoses. The OIE also makes standards for animal production food safety and for animal welfare. At present, the OIE does not give Member countries specific recommendations on preparedness for and response to disasters, either in the OIE standards for Veterinary Services (*Terrestrial Code* Section 3) nor in the OIE Tool for the Evaluation of Performance of Veterinary Services PVS Tool (PVS Tool).

The direct involvement of the OIE in the development of specific recommendations animals in disasters likely dates from 2006, when the OIE provided input to the LEGS Handbook (see below). At its June 2012 meeting, the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group recommended that the OIE provide guidance to Member Countries on the management of animals in disasters. In November 2012, the 21st Conference of the OIE Regional Commission for the Americas discussed a technical item on 'Disaster management: the role and preparedness of Veterinary Services' and adopted a Resolution urging the OIE to do more to support the activity of national Veterinary Services in disaster prevention and response. In 2013, the Director-General requested the preparation of a Discussion Paper on possible future actions for the OIE.

This paper reviews current approaches to animals in disasters and proposes options for future action by the OIE in this field.

**Discussion****1. Definitions and terminology**

There are many definitions of 'disaster'. In this paper, the definitions and terminology used are those of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). According to the OCHA, a disaster is 'a sudden, calamitous event that seriously disrupts the functioning of a community or society and causes human, material, economic or environmental losses that exceed the community's or society's ability to cope using its own resources'<sup>34</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> <http://www.eird.org/cd/on-better-terms/docs/OCHA-Definitions.pdf>

Annex XXV (contd)

Annex V (contd)

OCHA advises that although disasters are often due to natural causes, they can be due to human causes, either deliberate (e.g. bioterrorism) or accidental (e.g. chemical spills). For a disaster to be entered into the database of the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR), at least one of the following criteria must be met:

- a report of 10 or more people killed
- a report of 100 people affected
- a declaration of a state of emergency by the relevant government a request by the national government for international assistance.

The combination of hazard, vulnerability and inability to mitigate risk results in disaster. The classification of disasters includes natural disasters (e.g. flooding, hurricane, drought), human disasters (e.g. fire, conflict) and technical disasters (e.g. failure of nuclear reactor, chemical spill). Biological disasters, which are a subset of natural disasters, result from processes of organic origin or those conveyed by biological vectors, including exposure to pathogenic microorganisms, toxins and bioactive substances, which may cause loss of life or injury, property damage, social and economic disruption or environmental degradation. These include epidemics and insect infestations.

In considering future OIE action, it is useful to look at what exists in terms of approaches, organisations and standards relevant to disaster management at the international, regional and national level.

## **2. Organisations and standards at the international and regional level**

This section gives a brief overview of the key actors in disaster planning and management, and relevant activities at the international, regional and national level.

### **2.1. The United Nations**

The United Nations (UN) provides global leadership on disasters, through the adoption by the UN General Assembly of various Resolutions that establish the international framework for disaster planning and management.

The International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) builds upon the experience of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (1990-1999), which was launched by the UN General Assembly in 1989. The International Strategy embodies the principles articulated in a number of major documents adopted during the Decade, including, in particular, the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World: Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation and its Plan of Action, and the report "A Safer World in the 21st Century: Disaster and Risk Reduction". <http://www.unisdr.org/who-we-are/international-strategy-for-disaster-reduction>

The ISDR reflects a major shift from the traditional emphasis on disaster response to disaster reduction, and in effect seeks to promote a "culture of prevention". UNISDR is the secretariat of the International Strategy and mandated by the UN General Assembly to ensure its implementation.

The Hyogo Framework for Action (2005–2015) is a 10-year plan to make the world safer from natural hazards. It was endorsed by the UN General Assembly in the Resolution A/RES/60/195 following the 2005 World Disaster Reduction Conference. <http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/hfa>

On 9 April 2013, at its 67th session, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 67/231, 'International cooperation on humanitarian assistance in the field of natural disasters, from relief to development'. Noting that local communities are the first responders in most disasters, underlining the critical role played by in-country capacities in disaster risk reduction, the UN acknowledged the need to support efforts of Member States to develop and enhance national and local capacities. The Resolution encourages Member States, the UN system and other humanitarian and development actors to increase funding and cooperation for disaster risk reduction activities, including preparedness. It also calls for further steps to review and strengthen operational and legal frameworks for international disaster relief.

Annex XXV (contd)Annex V (contd)**2.1.1. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)**

[www.unocha.org](http://www.unocha.org)

The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) supports mobilization, funding and coordination of humanitarian action in response to complex emergencies and natural disasters. OCHA's objectives are to:

- alleviate human suffering caused by disaster or conflict;
- promote better preparedness for and, where possible, prevention of, disasters;
- help provide timely and effective international assistance to those who need it;
- ensure that those affected by disasters and conflicts find sustainable solutions;
- advocate for those in need.

OCHA supports and facilitates the work of UN agencies and NGOs in delivering humanitarian services. OCHA works closely with governments to support them in their lead role in humanitarian response: at the start of a crisis; at the country level; and on policy issues related to humanitarian action.

OCHA plays a key role in operational coordination in crisis situations. This includes assessing situations and needs; agreeing common priorities; developing common strategies to address issues such as negotiating access, mobilizing funding and other resources; clarifying consistent public messaging; and monitoring progress.

Working through its regional and country offices, OCHA deploys staff at short notice to emergencies. It also supports several surge-capacity mechanisms and networks that enable the humanitarian community to respond rapidly to disasters and conflicts.

Amongst its 18 thematic areas, OCHA lists food security. However, there is scant reference in the OCHA website to the contribution of veterinary services or veterinarians to humanitarian activities. The provision of access to veterinary services depends on linkages with FAO programmes – for example, see <http://www.unocha.org/top-stories/all-stories/cerf-emergency-response-funds-darfur>.

**2.1.2. UN Food and Agriculture Organization**

FAO is an important global actor in the field of humanitarian relief, with a focus on reducing vulnerability to hazards before, during and after disasters through risk assessment, risk reduction, emergency response and rehabilitation.

FAO programmes specifically address recovery and rehabilitation to increase the resilience of livelihoods through longer-term interventions that facilitate the transition from relief to development.

FAO supported the livelihoods of 1.1 million herders, distributing emergency veterinary inputs, multivitamins and mineral food supplements for livestock. FAO also helped restock herds by providing vaccinated small ruminants and poultry. FAO worked with the Governments of Chad, Mali, Mauritania and the Niger to monitor desert locust infestations and to take pre-emptive measures to minimize damages to food crops and pasture.

Annex XXV (contd)

Annex V (contd)

FAO's Sub-regional Emergency and Rehabilitation Office for West Africa/Sahel (REOWA), based in Dakar, Senegal, played a crucial role in strengthening early warning systems in the Sahel, helping to analyse the immediate and underlying causes of food insecurity, evaluate risks and early warning to inform decision-making at national and regional level. REOWA also guided FAO's emergency and rehabilitation programme on the ground, acting as a liaison between the various FAO offices and the network of humanitarian actors in the sub-region.

[http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/emergencies/docs/FAOs%20Response%20to%20the%202012%20Sahel%20Crisis.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/emergencies/docs/FAOs%20Response%20to%20the%202012%20Sahel%20Crisis.pdf)

## **2.2. The Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards Project (LEGS)**

The LEGS Project is an independent initiative, established in 2005, that aims to improve the quality and positive impact on livelihoods of livestock-related projects in humanitarian situations. It is overseen by a Steering Group that includes representatives from the African Union, FAO, the Red Cross, Tufts University, WSPA, and Vetwork UK. LEGS activities are coordinated by Vetwork UK and the project is funded by various donors and in-kind contributions. LEGS addresses all types of slow and rapid onset emergency, included those compounded by conflict. The central concept of LEGS is 'save lives and livelihoods'.

### **2.2.1. The LEGS Handbook**

The key output of the LEGS project is the LEGS Handbook, which is supported by a global training programme and other awareness raising activities. In 2007, the OIE contributed to the first edition of the LEGS Handbook. In 2013 the Handbook is being revised, using a consultative process based on the LEGS website (<http://www.livestock-emergency.net/>) and mailing List. The OIE has already submitted some preliminary comments on content of the Manual to the LEGS coordinator. The second edition of the Handbook will be published in 2014.

The LEGS Handbook provides guidelines for responses to emergencies based on three 'livelihoods objectives':

- Providing immediate assistance to crisis-affected communities
- Protecting the livestock-related assets of crisis-affected communities
- Assisting the re-building of key assets among crisis-affected communities

Within each of these objectives, the Handbook makes recommendations on: destocking; veterinary care; supplementary feeding; provision of water; livestock shelter and settlement; and the provision of livestock or restocking. The LEGS Handbook also makes recommendations on 'Minimum standards for veterinary services'. While it is encouraging to see that the topic of Veterinary Services is seen as important and relevant, the recommendations in the LEGS Handbook do not resemble OIE recommendations in terms of level of approach, content or level of detail.

## **2.3. The Sphere Project**

The Sphere Project was initiated in 1997 by humanitarian NGOs whose aim was to improve the quality of their actions during disaster response and to be held accountable for them. Sphere tenets are that people affected by disaster or conflict have a right to life with dignity and, therefore, a right to assistance; and that all possible steps should be taken to alleviate human suffering arising from disaster or conflict. The LEGS Handbook is a key reference to the Sphere Project. The Sphere Humanitarian Charter and minimum standards for humanitarian response are published as the Sphere Handbook: <http://www.sphereproject.org/handbook/>

Annex XXV (contd)Annex V (contd)**2.4. The World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA)**

Several international animal welfare NGOs are involved in disaster relief and some play an important role in response by putting operational teams with emergency veterinary aid and feed into the field.

WSPA is the largest association of animal welfare NGOs globally. It has a longstanding collaboration with the OIE and the two organisations signed an official cooperation agreement in 2007.

WSPA has been involved in disaster relief for more than 40 years and is active in preparedness, response and rehabilitation. WSPA works with governments and local animal welfare groups to help prepare communities in disaster-prone areas, by setting up national warning systems and showing people how to prepare for disasters.

WSPA has a global network of disaster response teams, working with national partners to help in the rapid implementation of relief programmes. WSPA provides emergency veterinary care, animal feed and services to reunite animals with their owners. In the aftermath of an emergency situation, WSPA puts in place preparation plans to minimise the impact of future disasters in the area; these plans can serve as models for other countries.

See: <http://www.wspa-international.org/wspaswork/disastermanagement/>

**2.5 Other NGOs**

In addition to WSPA, several NGOs are active in disaster management at the international and regional level. For example, the Humane Society International (HSI) worked in Japan, to provide aid for animals affected by the Tohoku disaster. In Japan, the HSI worked with a central response team which included the Japan VMS, Japan SPCA, Japan Animal Welfare Society, and Japan Pet Care Association – see: [http://www.hsi.org/news/news/2012/03/organizing\\_japan\\_response\\_030912.html](http://www.hsi.org/news/news/2012/03/organizing_japan_response_030912.html)

**3. Organisations and standards at the national level**

This section presents information on structures and standards relevant to the management of animals in disasters at the national level. There are many different approaches to the organisation of services and it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide exhaustive information on approaches used by OIE Member countries. Instead, the paper makes reference to the approach used in the United States, to illustrate some possible key actors, with whom the Veterinary Services must cooperate and collaborate, at the national level.

**3.1. The US Federal Emergency Management Authority**

The Federal Emergency Management Authority (FEMA) is the US agency dedicated to the management of emergency situations. FEMA has a comprehensive website, with information in 12 languages ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov)). Some of the information on the website that is relevant to animals in disasters, includes:

- Helping pets (<http://www.fema.gov/helping-pets>);
- Caring for animals (<http://www.ready.gov/caring-animals>);
- Brochure on planning for disasters and pets prepared in collaboration between FEMA; American Kennel Club, AVMA, HSUS and ASPA. ([http://www.ready.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/pets\\_brochure.pdf](http://www.ready.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/pets_brochure.pdf))
- The Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Program



Annex XXV (contd)

Annex V (contd)

The Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Program makes an important contribution to disaster preparedness and response in the United States, and is supported by FEMA. CERT educates people about disaster preparedness and trains them in basic disaster response skills, such as fire safety, search and rescue, team organization, and disaster medical operations. CERT includes training modules on all animals (not just pets).

### **3.2. The American Veterinary Medical Association**

The American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) promotes the involvement of veterinarians in emergency management, including in planning and response operations. Citing the linkages between the health of animals, humans, and the environment (i.e. One Health) and the veterinary role in assuring food safety, the AVMA considers that veterinarians are vital to the success of the overall emergency management process.

The AVMA encourages and fosters veterinary leadership in local, state and federal efforts to deal with "all hazards / all species"— preparing for disasters and emergencies involving animals, animal and public health, and other veterinary issues.

AVMA established the Committee on Disaster and Emergency Issues in 2001 to:

- Address the veterinarian's role in emergency and disaster issues
- Address the effects of disasters on animal health, public health, and the veterinary profession
- Contribute to the development of AVMA position statements on disaster and emergency issues that affect the veterinary profession
- Develop guidelines for the veterinary profession to use regarding various aspects of disaster situations

#### **3.2.1. AVMA Veterinary Medical Assistant Team programme**

The Veterinary Medical Assistance Team (VMAT) program provides volunteers who serve as first responders to ensure high-quality care of animals during disasters and emergencies. The VMAT program, which is supported through funding from the American Veterinary Medical Foundation (AVMF), was created after Hurricane Andrew in 1992. It began as a public-private partnership with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, but evolved into a program operated solely by the AVMA.

The VMAT program serves three primary functions: Early Assessment Volunteer Teams; Basic Treatment Volunteer Teams; and Training.

### **3.3. Department of Health and Human Services and Department of Agriculture**

Extensive resources are provided by the US Department of Health and Human Services (with particular reference to the public health dimension of disasters) and the US Department of Agriculture (USDA). As an example of USDA's programmes, the Centre for Food Safety and Public Health (CFSPH), with the support of USDA APHIS Animal Care Emergency Programs, offers a 10 part course for Animal Care employees on emergency planning and response roles. Animal Care conducts periodic Web-based training using these modules.

### **3.4. NGOs**

NGO's may play an active role in the care and welfare of animals affected by disasters at the national level. An example of direct advice to the public is found in the HSA website, under the rubric 'disaster planning for pets, horses and livestock' - see:

[http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/disaster\\_preparedness.html](http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/disaster_preparedness.html)

Annex XXV (contd)Annex V (contd)**3.5. Academia**

In the United States, veterinary schools and colleges may have significant involvement in the field of disaster management, including input to the development and implementation of preparedness plans at state and local level.

**4. The OIE role with respect to animals in disasters****4.1. Background**

The OIE's central role in the prevention and management of infectious diseases has been well recognised for decades and, in more recent years, the OIE has turned its attention to disasters caused by natural events and by human intervention.

Relevant reports published in the *Scientific and Technical Review* include:

- Vol. 18 (1) 'Management of animal health emergencies' (1999)
- Vol. 25 (1) Biological disasters of animal origin. The role and preparedness of veterinary and public health services.
- Vol. 28(2) Preparing for veterinary emergencies: disaster management and the Incident Command System. Madigan, J. and Dacre, I. (2009).

Many authors consider that the involvement of the veterinary profession in emergency preparedness, with a focus on animals, is essential for the profession to meet its obligations to animals and humans.

The direct involvement of the OIE in the development of specific recommendations on animals in disasters likely dates from 2006, when the OIE provided input to the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) Handbook. In 2007 the OIE participated in an International Working Group on Animals in Disasters (IWGAID). This Group, which was formed at the initiative of WSPA, included international organisations active in the humanitarian response to disasters, such as UNESCO, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and the OECD. In 2008 WSPA published a brochure based on the work of this Group.

At its September 2010 meeting, the OIE Council discussed the question of what the OIE could and should do in relation to the issue of animals in disasters, and concluded that:

- in light of the OIE mandate, the subject of animals in disasters is a relevant and appropriate topic for OIE involvement;
- capacity building of national Veterinary Services so that they are trained and ready to carry out interventions in serious disaster situations could be integrated as a criterion in the PVS Tool (noting that OCHA, like the OIE, encourages the designation and training of national focal points); and
- it could be useful for the OIE to develop guidelines as a support for OIE Members, in addition to responding to OCHA recommendations.
- Note: In this case, 'OCHA recommendations' refers to the Guidelines for the Domestic Facilitation and Regulation of International Disaster Relief and Initial Recovery Assistance, adopted by the state parties to the Geneva Conventions and the International Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in November 2007<sup>35</sup>.

At its June 2012 meeting, the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group recommended that the OIE provide guidance to Member Countries on the management of animals in disasters.

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/idrl/idrl-guidelines/>



Annex XXV (contd)

Annex V (contd)

At the 21st Conference of the OIE Regional Commission for the Americas (Barbados, 26 – 29 November 2012), Dr Ernesto Fabian Mendoza Mainegra, of the OIE Collaborating Centre on the Reduction of the Risk of Disasters in Animal Health, Cuba, presented a technical item (with questionnaire) on ‘Disaster management: the role and preparedness of Veterinary Services’. The Regional Commission adopted a Resolution urging the OIE to do more to support the activity of national Veterinary Services in disaster prevention and response.

In 2013, the Director-General commissioned this Discussion Paper on possible future actions for the OIE.

#### **4.2 Future role of the OIE**

In response to the UN Resolutions and global strategies that have been adopted during the past two decades, government policies on disasters are becoming more focused on prevention, facilitating response and improving resilience. Risk assessment, risk mitigation and risk communication techniques are increasingly being used in the field of preparedness and planning for disasters.

In emergencies and disasters, humanitarian efforts focus on saving human life. However, there is a growing awareness that actions to ‘save livelihoods’ should also be considered if donors wish to achieve sustainable improvements through their interventions. When considering animals in disasters, the emphasis in developing countries may be on livestock, due to the importance of food and draft animals for livelihoods. However, the importance of the human-companion animal bond should not be overlooked in any community. Experience in some countries has shown that management and support of communities in disasters is more effective if plans are in place for companion animals, and this is now a routine element of preparedness in many countries.

Traditionally, veterinarians and veterinary services are mainly involved in prevention and management of biological disasters relating to outbreaks of disease, including zoonoses. In disasters of non-biological origin, veterinarians are primarily recognised for their participation in ‘First response’. This includes operational support to rescuers and working animals, rescued animals and the provision of advice and prophylaxis in relation to health risks associated with animals, food and water.

The mandate of veterinary services for the prevention and control of animal diseases and zoonoses; safeguarding food safety and environmental health; and animal welfare is well recognised. In light of the relevance of these issues to disaster management and relief, there is a possible rationale for involvement of the Veterinary Services in disaster management more generally.

In support of this proposition, it is clear that some sub-sets of veterinary knowledge and skills are particularly relevant to preparedness and planning for disasters, and to disaster response. For example, risk assessment, risk management and risk communication are routinely used in disease prevention and control and can have more general application to disaster management. Epidemiological surveillance of animal diseases (including zoonoses) and the environment, and programmes for the control of the food production chain are based upon the types of activities that can be applied to early warning, forecasting and prevention of emergencies. There is scope to improve animal welfare by focusing on the mitigation and preparedness stages of disaster management – specifically, in the case of slow-onset disasters, such as droughts and famines. The chain of command that is vital to the veterinary response to disease outbreaks is comparable to the incident command system that is used in responding to disasters and emergencies. Finally, the training of veterinarians, with its strong emphasis on assessment, diagnosis and problem solving, provides a sound basis for involvement in disaster prediction and response actions.

Experience with disasters and emergencies in OIE Member countries suggests that Veterinary Services could play a more significant role, not only in response but also in planning, preparedness and risk mitigation.

Annex XXV (contd)Annex V (contd)

If the Veterinary Services are to play a significant role in national disaster preparedness and response, their responsibilities and powers should be defined in legislation. The relevant programmes and activities integrated into the general disaster planning processes at national, regional and local level. Veterinary services are one part of the overall government framework and it is important that they collaborate closely with lead agencies for disaster management, in addition to human health agencies and emergency services.

In the planning and management of disasters, as in many areas of government activity, collaboration with the private sector (for example, the livestock industry and private veterinary associations) and with NGOs is an essential element.

Consideration should be given to the need for training veterinary students to deal with emergencies and disasters. Large-scale incidents can have grave consequences not only for humans but also for domestic and wild animals. It has been argued that emergency preparedness is essential for the veterinary profession to meet its obligations to both animals and humans. The most important skills that are taught in the field of disaster management are problem solving, leadership, organisational thinking, project management and effective communications – all of which are relevant to the lifelong learning of veterinarians.

## 5 Options for OIE future action and recommendation

The OIE has not to date developed standards, guidelines or recommendations to Veterinary Services with specific respect to disasters and emergencies. Moreover, no other international organisation has elaborated standards for Veterinary Services on this topic, nor is another international organisation as well placed as the OIE to address this important issue.

Many of the technical requirements and veterinary skills that are relevant to disaster planning and management are covered (without specific reference to disaster management) in the *Terrestrial Code* Section 3 (Quality of Veterinary Services) and in the OIE *PVS Tool*.

It is recommended that the OIE consider the following options:

- Option 1.** A draft text could be developed by an *ad hoc* expert Group for submission to the relevant elected Commission(s). Following the OIE democratic procedures for standard setting, the new text would be the subject of consultation with Member countries during a 2 year period and, if accepted by Member countries, would be adopted as new text in the *Terrestrial Code*. If appropriate, new competencies could be added to the PVS Tool to reflect the adopted standard
- Option 2.** The OIE could develop a set of guidelines for location in the OIE website. The text would be developed by an *ad hoc* expert group reporting to elected Commission(s) and Member Countries could be apprised of progress but would not be asked to formally adopt the text. This approach would provide information and guidance to Member countries on technical requirements, without introducing an obligation to implement new systems or upgrade existing ones. In this case, the PVS Tool would not be modified, as the critical competencies in the PVS Tool are directly based on adopted texts in the *Terrestrial Code*.
- Option 3.** If there is no desire to develop standards or guidelines at this time, the OIE could provide additional, more detailed input to the revision of the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) Handbook. The second edition of the Handbook will come out in 2014 so, if the OIE wishes to propose major modifications or new chapters, the LEGS Secretariat should be contacted as soon as possible. It is noted that, based on the existing LEGS Handbook, major modification would be needed if the Handbook were to provide the type of information that is typically found in OIE standards or guidelines.

Annex XXV (contd)

Annex V (contd)

In view of the arguments in favour of the Veterinary Services taking on a stronger role in planning and preparedness for disasters and emergencies, and considering the lack of standards currently available on the design and implementation effective systems, it is recommended that the OIE follow option 1.

### List of references

*OIE Scientific and Technical Review:*

Vol. 18 (1) 'Management of animal health emergencies' (1999)

Vol. 25 (1) Biological disasters of animal origin. The role and preparedness of veterinary and public health services.

Vol. 28(2) Preparing for veterinary emergencies: disaster management and the Incident Command System. Madigan, J. and Dacre, I. (2009)

BVA paper In Practice 2006

[http://www.bva.co.uk/public/documents/sprayson\\_disaster\\_relief.pdf](http://www.bva.co.uk/public/documents/sprayson_disaster_relief.pdf)

Veterinary Education in Disaster Management AAVMC 2003

<http://www.utpjournals.com/jvme/tocs/302/157.pdf>

Veterinary medicine in disasters.

Leonardi M, Borroni R, di Gennaro M.

[http://www.iss.it/binary/publ/cont/417-ANNALI\\_06\\_43.1172761225.pdf](http://www.iss.it/binary/publ/cont/417-ANNALI_06_43.1172761225.pdf)

<http://www.eird.org/cd/on-better-terms/docs/OCHA-Definitions.pdf>

<http://www.unisdr.org/who-we-are/international-strategy-for-disaster-reduction>

<http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/hfa>

[http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/emergencies/docs/FAOs%20Response%20to%20the%202012%20Sahel%20Crisis.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/emergencies/docs/FAOs%20Response%20to%20the%202012%20Sahel%20Crisis.pdf)

<http://www.livestock-emergency.net/>

<http://www.sphereproject.org/handbook/>

<http://www.wspa-international.org/wspaswork/disastermanagement/>

FEMA website

AVMA website

[http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/disaster\\_preparedness.html](http://www.humanesociety.org/about/departments/disaster_preparedness.html)



Annex XXV (contd)

Annex VI

**Proposed strategy for the use of the guidelines developed by the *ad hoc* Group**

The strategy should primarily be to address how *Veterinary Services* in OIE Member Countries deal with and prepare for disasters situation:

- Identify the current capacity of the *Veterinary Services* within the member country in regard to disaster management and risk reduction.
- Identify and address critical gaps in *Veterinary Services* disaster management and risk reduction process. Strategy will be based upon several generic components.
- Planning based upon the “national plan” and ‘ministerial plan(s)’ to identify the areas of focus for animal health, welfare and veterinary public health in all phases of Disaster Cycle.
- Identification of lines of authority with risk-based approach.
- Leadership roles and responsibilities (including line of command) should be established to determine direction for the implementation of the specific activities in disaster management and risk reduction. Maintain / increase capacity of *Veterinary Services* to plan, prepare and respond to disasters. Assist in prioritization of disaster related activities.
- For early warning to coping biological risks whatever disaster situation, rapid diagnosis, medicines, disinfectants, rodenticides, personnel, finances, logistics and materials.
- Build relationships and engage the plan of *Veterinary Services* with key “stakeholders” and / or “responders” (e.g. other key government departments, national Red Cross/Red Crescent, emergency services, private sector, local non-governmental organizations, as well as international response stakeholders: United Nations, international NGOs, International Federation of Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies, private sector, regional platforms, and other appropriate bodies)
- Identify the actions (and resources) needed for external support and include agreements with stakeholders/suppliers in the plan in each level.
- Develop a risk communication strategy for both “response” period and “non-response” period .
- Assess the impacts of disasters on animal health, welfare and veterinary public health to guide the international cooperation efforts for the recovery
- Develop effective record management to allow effective monitoring, evaluation and communication.
- Maintain an updated plan reviewed at appropriate intervals.





Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Annex XXVI

Original: English  
June 2014

## REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE WELFARE OF WORKING EQUIDS

Paris, 17–19 June 2014

The OIE *ad hoc* Group on the welfare of working equids (the *ad hoc* Group) met at the OIE Headquarters on 17–19 April 2014. Dr David Bayvel chaired the meeting.

### 1. Welcome, adoption of the agenda

The members of the *ad hoc* Group and other participants at the meeting are listed at [Annex I](#). The adopted Agenda is provided as [Annex II](#).

On behalf of Dr Bernard Vallat, Director General of the OIE, Dr Derek Belton, Head of the International Trade Department, welcomed all members and thanked them for their agreement to work with the OIE on this important topic. He indicated how the work done in animal welfare had been addressed by the OIE through its permanent Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG), which provides advice and draft texts to the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (Code Commission) and, for aquatic animals, to the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission. Draft texts for terrestrial animals are provided by the Code Commission to OIE Members for comment and consideration, with a view to final adoption in the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code)*. He added that all relevant existing guidelines on working equids should be taken into account.

Dr Belton indicated to the *ad hoc* Group that, in the first instance, OIE is keen to develop a draft chapter for the *Terrestrial Code* for the use of the Member Countries Veterinary Services in this area at the global level. He also recognised the close collaboration with the Brooke, especially in the identification of experts in this area.

An extract from a relevant section of the report of the twelfth meeting of the AWWG is presented in [Annex IV](#).

### 2. Objectives of the meeting

Dr Bayvel confirmed that the objective of the meeting of the *ad hoc* Group was to develop an OIE standard to be included in the *Terrestrial Code*. Dr Bayvel emphasised the opportunity to prepare a draft for the next Code Commission meeting in September 2014.

### 3. Terms of Reference

Mrs Karen Reed indicated that the proposed terms of reference were based on the existing OIE chapters, notably on the ones in which the responsibility of the different actors involved in the standards is as detailed in Chapter 7.8. of the *Terrestrial Code*. Dr Suresh Honnappagol agreed with the importance of highlighting the responsibility of owners and the different actors who are related with working equids, while developing the standards.

Annex XXVI (contd)

Dr Bayvel recommended developing some additional guiding principles for this area of working animals, which is a new one in the standard development work of the OIE.

Dr Graeme Cooke noted that the biosecurity aspect should also be taken into account in the future standards. Mrs Reed noted the importance to also include and develop recommendations related to research and education.

Mrs Daniela Battaglia proposed harmonising a future standard on working equids with the recommendations and outcomes of the report “The Report of the FAO-the Brooke Expert Meeting, Role, impact and welfare of working animals.”

The terms of reference for the *ad hoc* Group are presented in Annex III.

**4. Discussion of working documents and other relevant documents**

Dr Bayvel mentioned that the Group has received a significant number of documents to analyse the problem of working animals and in particular working equids. He also emphasised the importance of taking into consideration the recommendations of the FAO and the Brooke report.

Mrs Reed indicated that there are common features in most of the documents analysed such as the definitions of the responsibilities, the needs for research, especially research adapted to local realities, and also education. These items should be taking into consideration when developing the recommendations.

Dr Susanne Munstermann indicated that working equids should be recognised as mostly “invisible/unrecognised”, but often represent a large equid animal population whose health status needs to be improved and maintained as a key measure to address welfare. Dr Munstermann noted that there is a lack of knowledge on the national equid health status in many developing countries and recommended that emphasis should be put on using this population also for gathering this information by including them in the Veterinary Services surveillance plans. This would not only shift the focus of dealing with working equids from mainly reactive treatment (or non-treatment) to a preventative, strategic approach, but also increase disease reporting of equids to the OIE. Recognising that Official Veterinary Services in developing countries are shrinking, she suggested that the role of NGOs, veterinary paraprofessionals and other private groups (e.g. Racing Clubs, national equestrian federations engaging in the welfare of equids, including working equids) in this task should be acknowledged and strengthened.

The discussion paper on the future role of the OIE and other relevant documents presented during the meeting are provided in Annex V and Annex VI respectively.

**Meeting with Dr Alejandro Thiermann (President of the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission)**

Dr Thiermann joined the group on the last day of the meeting. Dr Thiermann mentioned how important this work is for the OIE and the Member Countries where working equids are an important source of employment, income and social cohesion. He indicated, however, that it is important to think about how other working animals, not just equids will be incorporated into future work.

Upon inquiry, of one of the Group Members in respect to which Commission this report will be forwarded, Dr Thiermann indicated that the Report will be submitted to the Code Commission and if there are any aspects that touch other areas of the work of the OIE, the necessary coordination will take place.

Mrs Battaglia asked Dr Thiermann how the priorities for work on other working animals will be established. Dr Thiermann indicated that the AWWG will be taking into account this concern and will propose to the Director General the priorities for the next working animals to be covered.



Annex XXVI (contd)**5. Development of draft standard**

The *ad hoc* Group considered that some modification of the *Terrestrial Code* should be proposed in order to include the Working Animals perspective in some other chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*. The proposals for modifications are included as Annex VII.

The *ad hoc* Group developed a draft standard document, which is included as Annex VIII. The *ad hoc* Group agreed to carry out more detailed work on the draft standard out of session and specific responsibilities and deadlines were agreed.

**6. Proposed strategy for the use of the developed standard by the *ad hoc* Group**

The *ad hoc* Group discussed the strategies outlined in Annex IX to facilitate use of the future standard on working equids by OIE Member Country Veterinary Services and their relevant partners.

**7. Review and finalise report of meeting**

The *ad hoc* Group discussed and agreed on a work programme needed to complete the meeting report and draft standard for submission to the September Code Commission meeting.

**8. Next meeting**

It was proposed that a second meeting of the *ad hoc* Group was likely to be needed, and it could take place prior to, or after, the AWWG in June 2015.

---

.../ Appendices



Annex XXVI (contd)Annex I**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE WELFARE OF WORKING EQUIDS****Paris, 17–19 June 2014****List of participants****MEMBERS OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP**

---

**Dr David Bayvel** (chair)  
Chief Veterinary Adviser  
World Animal Protection  
47 Karu Cres  
Waikanae, 5036,  
NEW ZEALAND  
david.bayvel@gmail.com  
Tel.: +64 4 2938812

**Mrs Daniela Battaglia**  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the  
United Nations (FAO)  
Livestock Production Officer  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla - 00153  
Rome  
ITALY  
Daniela.Battaglia@fao.org  
Tel.: +39 0657056773

**Dr Graeme Cooke**  
Director of the Veterinary Department  
International Equestrian Federation  
HM King Hussein I Building  
Chemin de la Joliette 8  
1006 Lausanne  
SWITZERLAND  
graeme.cooke@fei.org  
Tel.: +41 21 310 47 47

**Dr Abdou Fall**  
Regional Representative for West Africa  
International Livestock Research  
Institute|ilri.org  
Ouagadougou  
BURKINA FASO  
A.Fall@cgiar.org  
Mobile: +226 66455695

**Dr Suresh S. Honnappagol**  
Animal Husbandry Commissioner  
Chief Veterinary Officer  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Department of Animal Husbandry,  
Dairying & Fisheries  
Room N° 234 Krishi Bhwan  
New Delhi 110 001  
INDIA  
sskvafsu@yahoo.co.in  
ahc-dadf@nic.in

**Mrs Karen Reed**  
Head of Animal Welfare and Research  
The Brooke  
5th Floor Friars Bridge Court  
41-45 Blackfriars Road  
London  
SE1 8NZ  
UNITED KINGDOM  
Tel.: +44 (0)20 7653 5864  
Karen.reed@thebrooke.org

**Prof. Mohammed Ouassat**  
Directeur de la Filière de Formation en  
Médecine Vétérinaire  
Institut Agronomique et vétérinaire  
Hassan II  
BP: 6202, Rabat - Instituts  
Rabat 10101  
MAROC  
Tel.: 212 6 61297870  
m.ouassat@iav.ac.ma

**REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CODE COMMISSION**

---

**Dr Alejandro Thiermann**  
President of the Terrestrial Animal Health  
Standards Commission  
OIE  
12, rue de Prony  
75017 Paris  
FRANCE  
Tel.: 33 - (0)1 44 15 18 68  
a.thiermann@oie.int

Annex XXVI (contd)

Annex I (contd)

## OIE HEADQUARTERS

---

**Dr Derek Belton**  
Head  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
d.belton@oie.int

**Dr Susanne Munstermann**  
Charge de mission  
Scientific and Technical Department  
OIE  
s.munstermann@oie.int

**Dr Leopoldo Stuardo**  
Chargé de mission  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
l.stuardo@oie.int

Annex XXVI (contd)

Annex II

## MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE WELFARE OF WORKING EQUIDS

Paris, 17–19 June 2014

---

### Agenda

- 1) Welcome and introduction – Dr Derek Belton.
- 2) Objectives of the meeting – Dr Derek Belton.
- 3) Confirmation of Terms of Reference and comments from the Chair of the *ad hoc* Group.
- 4) Discussion of working documents and other relevant documents provided by the *ad hoc* Group Members.
- 5) Development of draft standard.
- 6) Proposed strategy for the use of the developed standard by the *ad hoc* Group.
- 7) Programme for further work after this meeting.
- 8) Review and finalise report of meeting.

---



Annex XXVI (contd)Annex III**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE WELFARE OF WORKING EQUIDS****Paris, 17–19 June 2014**

---

**Terms of Reference**

- The *ad hoc* Group is asked to elaborate draft animal welfare standards for working equids for eventual inclusion in the *Terrestrial Code*. These standards should cover, inter alia:
  - Guiding Principles.
  - Definitions, covering but not limited to the following areas:
    - What is a working equid?
    - Species.
    - Work types, including general descriptions of use to livelihoods – in agriculture, rural and urban transport, small scale commerce, industry, domestic working animals.
    - Geography.
    - Ownership – users, handlers, families, men, woman, children, and young adults.
  - Welfare issues affecting working equids:
    - Feeding and watering.
    - Shelter – homestead housing, workplace shelter, environmental considerations, protection from predators.
    - Disease and injury management – management of endemic disease, infectious disease, work-related wounds and injuries, planning for disease outbreaks, health service provision.
    - Handling and driving practice, handling facilities, personnel expertise and training, mutilations and other management practice.
    - Behaviour and social interactions.
    - End of life issues – euthanasia, slaughter (including end of working life, abandonment).
    - Appropriate workloads.
    - Farriery and harnessing.

Annex XXVI (contd)Annex III (contd)

- Responsibilities and competencies – veterinary authorities and other governmental agencies, private sector vets, NGOs, local government authorities, higher education institutions owners and users, wider communities.
  - These standards must:
    - Be based on science (scientific references must be provided).
    - Use criteria that address the outcome at the animal level (animal - based).
-



Annex XXVI (contd)Annex IV**Extract from the report of the twelfth meeting of the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group of June 2013****6. Working animals and disaster management: New OIE approaches**

The AWWG acknowledged the discussion papers written on these two topics by Dr Sarah Kahn, former Head of the OIE International Trade Department.

- **Welfare of working animals**

Dr Sira Abdul Rahman introduced the subject by mentioning the OIE meeting that was held in Accra, Ghana, in March 2012, where the role and importance of working animals was discussed. Dr Rahman also recalled the FAO experts' meeting that was held in June 2011 in which he participated along with Dr Varas. Although the report of this meeting has not yet been published, he recalled that the meeting recommended OIE develop a specific standard on the welfare of working animals.

The AWWG Group discussed which species should be included in the scope, and agreed with the suggestions from Dr Kahn and Dr Rahman that the proposed standards should include: horses, donkeys, cattle, buffalo and camelidae initially and to consider other species later on. Given the excellent work that is readily available on the welfare of working equids (including donkeys), the AWWG recommended that an *ad hoc* group be established to develop a standard on working equids that could then also serve as a model for other working animal species which have not been the subject of such extensive study to date.

Dr Vallat noted the importance of having a clear understanding of which species of animals to include in the definition of working animals and supported the approach recommended by the Animal Welfare Working Group.

---



Annex XXVI (contd)Annex V

## DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE OIE WITH RESPECT TO THE WELFARE OF WORKING ANIMALS

---

**Dr Abdul Rahman (Chair, AWWG) and Dr Sarah Kahn (Consultant to the OIE)**

**(June 2013)**

### **Purpose**

At its June 2012 meeting the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group proposed that the OIE develop recommendations on working animals. The Director General commissioned this paper as a basis for discussion at the Working Group's meeting in June 2013.

### **Background**

The relationship between humans and working animals is an important part of the history of mankind. Working animals are kept as a source of valuable products (e.g. meat, fibre, fertiliser), services (transport and draught power, or traction), financial security and capital. Animals are also kept for company and leisure activities. A working animal may be considered as virtually a member of the family (e.g. guide dogs) or may be kept only for work (e.g. logging elephants). A wide range of animal species is used in a very wide range of activities. At the end of its useful life, a work animal (e.g. equids and ruminants) may be slaughtered for meat and other products. In poor communities, working animals can particularly help to improve the lives of women (and children) by taking over tasks that traditionally fall to them (e.g. transport of water and firewood) and by allowing them to access local markets to sell home products. This reality is reflected in the African proverb 'A woman who has no donkey is a donkey' (anon.).

Approximately 1 billion people, including many of the world's poorest, depend directly on animals for their livelihoods. In India, for example, draught animals are the main support for farm operations for the small and marginal farmers who make up 83% of the farming community.

In many countries the use of working animals is expanding. Even in countries that are rapidly becoming urbanised and industrialised, such as India, China, Mexico, Brazil and South Africa, working animals remain important. In these countries, large-scale farms use modern equipment and transport systems while small-scale farmers and local transporters continue to use animals for transport and draught power.

In developed countries, the use of animals for traction may be preferred for reasons relating to environmental stewardship or social values. Official EU recognition of the 'renewable' nature of animal-derived energy may in future provide an impetus for promoting the use of working animals, and their welfare.

There are many qualitative reports and case studies that illustrate how working animals can contribute to alleviating poverty but very few detailed economic studies of the type needed to convince governments or donors to invest. Public sector investment in research, education and training relevant to working animals has declined in the past 25 years. Furthermore, society and the media in developing countries, and those in transition, often view animal traction as old-fashioned and associated with poverty and ignorance. In these countries, working animals may be overlooked in or excluded from animal health programs in the same way that their owners are overlooked in or excluded from social and public health programs<sup>36</sup>.

---

<sup>36</sup> The role, impact and welfare of working (traction and transport) animals FAO/ The Brooke Electronic Consultation. 1 – 28 February 2011

Annex XXVI (contd)Annex V (contd)

The commonly identified causes of poor welfare of working animals include: poor nutrition and inadequate basic health care (including foot and hoof care); inappropriate harness and other equipment (e.g. cattle yokes used on equids); and poor management practices, including overwork, ill treatment and the working of animals that are unfit or immature. Contributing factors include poverty and ignorance of the animal owner and lack of attention from veterinary or veterinary paraprofessionals. In some cases, traditional practices contribute to poor animal welfare (e.g. the practice of firing horses' legs).

Inadequate nutrition, poor management and cruel practices contribute to health and welfare problems that reduce the working animal's productivity (capacity to work) and perceived value. The reaction of the owner may be to mistreat or neglect the animal, so that welfare declines even further and the animal finally dies or is destroyed in a miserable state. This situation must be addressed. There is much room for much improvement in the welfare of working animals, via the provision of basic veterinary care and technical advice on health and husbandry, including foot care and the design and maintenance of harness and equipment.

The question is: who in government or in society at large sees the welfare of working animals as a priority? Some NGOS consider this as a top priority, and do very good work, but much remains to be done. The Veterinary Services (VS), being part of the national government, may identify poverty alleviation as a top priority but, in the absence of government policies that specifically address working animals (in terms of economic benefits, health or welfare), the VS normally focus on the rearing of livestock and poultry as sources of protein and a basis to improve human health and livelihoods.

The OIE is well placed to raise the profile of working animals as a strategy that can help in alleviating poverty and to propose that action to improve the health and welfare of these animals is an important issue for governments and demands an engagement by national Veterinary Services.

The context and relevance of OIE recommendations can be very different for rich and poor countries. The OIE must take this into account not only in developing recommendations but also in its activities to support Member countries in the implementation of the standards. The OIE Regional Animal Welfare Strategies attempt to take account of these regional specificities. For example, the *Terrestrial Code* and *Manual* already contain standards relevant to equidae. The *Terrestrial Code* contains provisions on the health and certification of horses for international trade and on welfare in chapters on transport, slaughter and killing for sanitary purposes. It could be argued that the OIE standards, to date, reflect the situation in wealthy countries, where horses are valuable animals that are generally kept under good conditions of welfare. The main welfare concerns for horses in these countries relate to transport and slaughter but this may represent a minority of the national horse population. Working equids in poor countries present an opposite case. As stated above, horses and donkeys may suffer serious health and welfare problems throughout their working life, arising from the poverty and ignorance of owners and absence of attention from veterinary or veterinary paraprofessionals. The *Terrestrial Code* is silent on this aspect of horse welfare.

At its June 2012 meeting the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group proposed that the OIE develop recommendations on working animals. The Director General commissioned this paper as a basis for discussion at the Working Group's meeting in June 2013.

**Discussion points for the Animal Welfare Working Group**

The following points should be considered:

- What is the definition of 'working animal' for the purpose of the OIE recommendations? What is the scope of the work in terms of animal species and context? The field is potentially very large. For example, consider the commercial uses of dogs (i.e. dogs that are not kept as companion animals). Dogs pull sleds, find missing and dead people in all types of emergency situation, guard premises, participate in therapeutic support to people with health problems; they are used to hunt, including foxhounds, they are raced, they are used in circuses and movies, security and policing, including the detection of explosives; dogs are used to manage sheep and other livestock and they are used in veterinary and medical research. The list of uses is long. Recommendations on the welfare of working dogs would need to be broad enough to consider all possible uses but specific enough to be meaningful. This is a challenge and it is even greater when the range of animal species is considered.

Annex XXVI (contd)Annex V (contd)

- If it is proposed to define the subject and scope in broad terms, it may be necessary to develop recommendations in a stepwise manner, starting with general principles and then considering species or sectors of activity.
- What form should the OIE recommendations take? Should a text be developed for the *Terrestrial Code*, that is, a standard for adoption and eventual implementation by OIE Member Countries? Would it be preferable to develop Guidelines, which would be in the public domain via the OIE internet page but would not be formally adopted by OIE Members? To what extent should the OIE make recommendations on subjects that fall outside its traditional scope of animal health and veterinary medicine? Should the OIE develop recommendations on husbandry and management? For example, inadequate foot care and badly fitting harness are common causes of problems in
- Working equids. These problems can lead to seriously compromised animal welfare, as a horse that is lame or sore may be beaten to make it work and left to die if it is considered useless. To be comprehensive, OIE recommendations on the welfare of working equids must address foot care and harness design and maintenance. These are not veterinary matters, which raises the question of whether these are appropriate topics for OIE recommendations.
- In addition to its ongoing engagement with Veterinary Services, should the OIE try to engage national governments more generally, as well as donors, regarding the potential economic benefits of working animals and the value of investments in their health and welfare?

**Recommendations**

1. The OIE should convene an expert group, including representatives of NGOs and non-veterinary organisations (or experts) with practical knowledge and experience on working animals.
  2. The final form of the recommendations (a standard in the *Terrestrial Code* or guidelines on the OIE website) should be decided by the Code Commission in consultation with OIE Members.
  3. The welfare of animals used in transport and traction in poor communities, including in rural and urban settings, should be addressed as a matter of high priority due to the contribution that these animals can make to livelihoods and in light of the urgent need to improve the welfare of these animals. In this context, it is proposed to deal with horses, donkeys, cattle, buffalo and camelidae initially and to consider other species later on.
  4. In developing the recommendations, the OIE should identify actions to promote the welfare of working animals and, with this objective, to secure engagement not only of Veterinary Services but also of government agencies responsible for social and economic development, and of donor organisations. The OIE should promote research that could demonstrate the economic contribution of working animals and the cost/benefit of programs to improve animal health and welfare. In collaboration with a donor organisation, perhaps the OIE could commission a small research project in this area.
-



Annex XXVI (contd)

Annex VI

**List of other relevant documents presented and discussed during the meeting**

1. Report of the FAO - The Brooke Expert Meeting. The Role, Impact and Welfare of Working (Traction and Transport) Animals. FAO Headquarters. Rome. 13<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> June 2011.
2. Draught animal power: an overview (available at [www.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/ags/publications/draught\\_ap\\_overview.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/ags/publications/draught_ap_overview.pdf)).
3. Animal traction for agricultural development (<http://www.fao.org/wairdocs/ilri/x5455b/x5455b00.htm#Contents>).
4. Research for Development of Animal Traction in West Africa - Recherche pour le développement de la traction animale en Afrique de l'Ouest (<http://www.fao.org/wairdocs/ilri/x5483b/x5483b00.htm#Contents>).
5. Draught animal power (<http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/programmes/en/lead/toolbox/Mixed1/DAP.htm>);
6. Draught Animal Power (DAP) ([www.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/ags/publications/draught\\_ap\\_overview.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/ags/publications/draught_ap_overview.pdf)).
7. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) / The Brooke. Electronic Consultation on The role, impact and welfare of working (traction and transport) animals. 1<sup>st</sup> - 28<sup>th</sup> February 2011.
8. Current policy work addressing working animals in Ethiopia; Bojia. The Donkey Sanctuary Ethiopia. Power Point Presentation.
9. WSPA, Guidelines and Licensing Regulations for: Riding schools, equine tourist establishments, carriage operators and owners.
10. WSPA, Human behaviour change toolkit.
11. The Relationship Between Behavioral and Other Welfare Indicators of Working Horses Silvana Popescu DVM, PhD, Eva-Andrea Diugan DVM, Department of Animal Hygiene and Welfare, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Cluj-Napoca, Romania.
12. Assessment of the welfare of working horses, mules and donkeys, using health and behaviour parameters. J.C. Pritchard *et al.* / Preventive Veterinary Medicine 69 (2005), 265–283.
13. Observer reliability for working equine welfare assessment: problems with high prevalences of certain results CC Burn, JC Pritchard and HR Whay. *Animal Welfare* 2009 (18), 177–187.
14. The Brooke. The Working Equid Veterinary Manual, 2013. Whittet publishing, UK.





Annex XXVI (contd)

Annex VII

*[Note: this Annex has been replaced by Annex XIV to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 9–18 September 2014.]*



Annex XXVI (contd)

Annex VIII

*[Note: this Annex has been replaced by Annex XIV to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 9–18 September 2014.]*



Annex XXVI (contd)Annex IX**Proposed strategy for the use of the standard developed by the *ad hoc* Group**

The *ad hoc* Group held a brainstorming session to address this issue. This session identified that effective promulgation of the standard requires high level contextual recognition of the societal importance of all working animals, at a strategic policy level. Currently, working animals are essentially “invisible” in terms of national government and relevant international policy, which inevitably focuses primarily on production animals. Dialogue on the subject often involves “preaching to the converted”, rather than creating high level policy awareness of significance to livelihoods and communities amongst the “unconverted”. OIE progress with High Performance Horse standards was noted, along with the benefits of developing partnerships between like-minded equine groups and the possible establishment of an Equine Matters Liaison Officer role within the OIE. The following strategies and specific initiatives were identified to address this issue:

**Strategies**

- Recognition that this is the first proposed standard dealing with working animals and that the OIE plans to develop additional standards for other species. These are likely to involve Bovids, Camelids and an “Other Species” Group;
- Need to be proactive at global, regional and national levels, due to the largely “invisible” nature of working animal issues;
- Opportunity to use the FAO Committee for Agriculture as a forum to emphasise the policy significance of working animals/equids and to mainstream the subject into the operational work of FAO field staff;
- Opportunities to seek FAO research funding support e.g. by ILRI;
- Recognition of the benefits of partnerships involving e.g. OIE, FAO, Equine organisations such as FEI, NGOs such as the Brooke and World Animal Protection, ILRI, etc.;
- Opportunity to follow up “International Partnership for the Working Equid” proposal made at FAO meeting in 2011;
- Recognition of important role of working animals/equids in OIE RAWs and proposed GAWs.

**Specific initiatives**

- Inclusion of details of OIE standards and significance in Focal Point training meetings and key conferences e.g. Chile (2016) and Colloquium (2018);
- Involvement of Veterinary Associations i.e. WVA, FAVA, CVA, etc. and International Forum for Working Equids (IFWE);
- Provision of “publication coaches/mentors” for working animal/equid scientists, in developing countries, to assist them in contributing more extensively to the peer- reviewed literature;
- Recognition of OIE Collaborating Centre with expertise in working animals/equids;
- Recognition of importance of working animals/equids in relation to DM policy and practice;
- Possible contributions to WAHAW Fund linked to working animal/equid initiatives;
- Possible use of professional communications advice.





Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Annex XXVII

Original: English

June 2014

## REPORT OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING OF THE OIE ANIMAL WELFARE WORKING GROUP

Paris (France), 24–26 June 2014

---

On behalf of Dr Bernard Vallat, OIE Director General, Dr Derek Belton, Head of the International Trade Department, welcomed members and participants to the meeting of the Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG).

The meeting was also attended by Dr Bernard Vallat who introduced Dr Brian Evans, recently appointed Deputy Director General of the OIE. Dr Etienne Bonbon, Vice-President of the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (Code Commission), attended the full meeting.

The list of participants and the adopted agenda are attached as [Annex I](#) and [II](#).

### 1. **AWWG 12th meeting report, agreed actions, informal meeting at the General Session & Teleconferences**

The Working Group noted the report of the previous meeting, as well as the minutes of the teleconferences and the informal meeting, held at the General Session.

The approach taken to progress the agreed annual work programme, i.e. regular teleconferences; a side-meeting during the General Session; and electronic exchange and regular review of a list of agreed actions, was noted and considered to be very effective.

It was agreed that OIE Headquarters, through the AWWG Secretariat, would continue to be responsible for the programming of teleconferences and informal meetings, as well as ensuring updates of the work programme and agreed actions.

The minutes of the informal meeting are attached as [Annex III](#).

### 2. **OIE 82nd General Session 2014 outcomes**

#### • **General Session AWWG Report and Resolution on Animal Welfare**

The AWWG acknowledged the adoption of the Report of the AWWG and Resolution N° 26, Animal Welfare, and that there were no questions or comments from Member Countries on either document.

The clarification of the expectation that Member Countries implement all standards in the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code)* including animal welfare was noted.

It was also noted that development of a Regional Animal Welfare Strategy (RAWS) for Africa was not included in the agenda for the OIE Regional Commission for Africa meeting.

Annex XXVII (contd)

- **Preparation of OIE Strategic Plan 2016–2020**

The Working Group noted that the draft sixth OIE Strategic Plan circulated for Member Countries comment includes animal welfare as a mainstream OIE activity. They noted with interest the intention to review terms of reference and the criteria for selection and maintenance of OIE Reference Centres, and see that as an opportunity to improve the contribution of the OIE Collaborating Centres for Animal Welfare to keeping the animal welfare standards up to date, and to enhance OIE's animal welfare programme in general.

### 3. Report of the Working Group on Animal Production Food Safety and Wildlife Diseases

The AWWG noted the reports of the Working Group on Animal Production Food Safety and of the Working Group on Wildlife, and noted the change of the name of the latter.

After discussing the importance of animal welfare in wildlife the AWWG suggested the OIE establish an *ad hoc* Group to discuss the welfare implications of culling pest animals, but noted that this would probably not be possible for many years given other domestic animal welfare priorities.

### 4. Addressing Member comments

- **Draft Chapter 7.X. on Animal Welfare and Dairy Cattle Production System**

The AWWG noted the draft chapter and congratulated the *ad hoc* group on its work.

The AWWG discussed the general comments of several Member Countries, including the absence of parameters for the majority of many animal welfare outcome measurables listed in the draft standard. Although they share those concerns, they agreed that currently there is insufficient data to define globally applicable parameters for these measurables, and noted that even for those measurable for which parameters are provided (e.g. ammonia levels) there are major challenges to routinely measure them in the field production situation.

The AWWG proposed to develop some guiding principles for the use of outcome-based measurables. The AWWG agreed that Dr Luc Mirabito would draft a text to be proposed to the Code Commission and Member Countries after the next AWWG meeting.

The AWWG agreed that guidance and research evidence from the Animal Welfare Collaborating Centres should be sought to improve our knowledge on useful globally applicable parameters for the animal welfare measurable identified in the various animal welfare chapters.

The AWWG also noted their preference to avoid the use of wording in standards that can lead to confusion, or not give any meaningful guidance at all.

The AWWG agreed to provide further specific recommendations to the *ad hoc* group.

- **Chapter 7.5. Slaughter of animals**

In respect to comments on the mechanical stunning diagrams and pictures in Chapters 7.5. and 7.6., the AWWG recommended that OIE convene a "virtual" *ad hoc* group of experts led by Mr Mirabito to review the range of information available and recommend appropriate amendments to the relevant sections of both chapters. The AWWG considered this would also be a useful pilot study to evaluate this approach to keeping all of the animal welfare standards up to date.

Similarly in response to Member Countries comments on electrical stunning of animals (particularly poultry), the AWWG recommended that OIE convene an electronic *ad hoc* group of experts, led by Mr Mirabito, to review the current recommendation in Chapters 7.5. and 7.6. and recommend amendments as appropriate.



Annex XXVII (contd)

Dr Andrea Gavinelli offered to organise a meeting with these experts on electrical stunning to discuss the latest advances on this stunning method with the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), which is also working on this subject. It was suggested that this meeting could be held back to back with the Better Training for Safer Food meeting scheduled to be held in Brazil in November this year.

- **Chapter 7.6. Killing of Animals for Disease Control Purposes**

In response to the request to add recommendations for horses in this chapter, the AWWG decided to request the New Zealand-Australia Collaborating Centre to develop new text on this subject for the AWWG to consider at their next meeting. Dr Peter Thornber agreed to contact the Collaborating Centre to initiate this request.

Dr Leopoldo Stuardo noted that the *ad hoc* Group on Working Equids proposed to include in its standard a specific article on euthanasia methods, which should be taken into account in the development of this new text for Chapter 7.6.

Finally, in response to comments concerning the use of gas filled foam to kill poultry, the AWWG decided to wait for further results from scientific studies currently underway before making further recommendations on this subject.

The AWWG also recommended that OIE ask the electronic *ad hoc* Group of experts convened to deal with Chapter 7.5. to recommend amendments as appropriate on Chapter 7.6.

- **Chapter 7.10. Animal Welfare and Broiler Chicken Production Systems**

In response to comments from Member Countries, an NGO and a member of the Working Group, the AWWG proposed revised wording for Article 7.10.4, point 2 b) as highlighted in Annex IV for consideration by the Code Commission at their September meetings.

They rejected requests to reduce the threshold of acceptable ammonia concentrations in Article 7.10.4, point 2 c) in the absence of sufficient supporting evidence.

The proposed modifications to this chapter are presented in Annex IV.

- **Chapter 3.1. Veterinary Services**

The AWWG noted the modification adopted at the 82nd OIE General Session, in order to specifically include animal welfare in this chapter.

- **Chapter 3.2. Evaluation of Veterinary Services**

In response to Member Countries comments, the AWWG proposed new text to explicitly include animal welfare in relevant clauses throughout this chapter for consideration by the Code Commission at its September meeting.

The proposed modifications to this chapter are presented in Annex V.

- **Chapter 3.3. Communication**

As in the previous chapter the AWWG noted the modification adopted at the 82nd OIE General Session in order to specifically include animal welfare in this chapter.

## 5. RAWs and the AW Platform for Europe: update from the regions

Dr Gavinelli updated the AWWG on the activities of the AW Platform for Europe, informing them about the 2nd meeting of the group held in Moscow. The main issues discussed were the membership of the Steering Group, progress on the already identified priorities, particularly the seminar on national strategies for stray dog population control in the Balkan countries, to be held in Bucharest (Romania).

Annex XXVII (contd)

On the Americas Region, Dr Stuardo advised that an electronic consultation is planned to review the adopted strategy and also develop an implementation plan. This work will be discussed at the next meeting of the OIE Regional Commission for the Americas in Guadalajara (Mexico). The AWWG propose that the Headquarters asked the Regional Representation of the Americas, to keep Professor Fraser informed on the developments and activities in the framework of the RAWS.

Dr Hassan Aidaros advised that the Middle East Region RAWS document has been sent to Member Countries for a final review, and, in the absence of any significant new comments, will be considered adopted within two weeks.

Dr Thornber and Dr David Bayvel advised that the Secretariat function for the AFEO RAWS has now been picked up by the OIE Regional Representation in Tokyo. Planning is underway for next animal welfare focal points seminar in Canberra (Australia) in November along with the eighth meeting of the Regional Animal Welfare Strategy Coordination Group.

The AWWG again expressed its concern about the lack of progress in developing a RAWS for Africa. However the group were encouraged to hear informal advice from Dr Belton that funding for the Pan African Animal Welfare Alliance (PAAWA) proposal to develop a RAWS for East Africa has recently been approved under the Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) VETGOV grants programme.

## 6. Global Animal Welfare Strategy

The AWWG discussed an environmental scan, a SWOT analysis and the draft OIE global animal welfare strategic plan developed out of session. They also reviewed the draft 6th OIE strategic plan, and agreed the global animal welfare strategic plan should follow the format of the 6th OIE strategic plan. Having agreed the key points to be included they agreed to finalise the draft Global Strategy for consideration by the Code Commission at its February 2015 meeting. Professor David Fraser will lead this work and other AWWG members will provide contributions to specific sections.

## 7. OIE Collaborating Centres (CC)

### *Joint meeting with the Collaborating Centres*

- **CC New-Zealand/Australia** Dr Mark Fisher, Chair of the New Zealand Australia OIE Collaborating Centre on Animal Welfare Science and Bioethical Analysis, joined the meeting and outlined key activities, drawing on the annual report to OIE. He mentioned the progress in the following activities.
  - *Scientific & Technical Review* Series publication “Animal Welfare: Focusing on the Future” now published. Efforts of Professor David Mellor & Dr Bayvel in coordinated and editing acknowledged. Also valuable was the number of younger centre staff also exposed as co-editors.
  - Major focus is the Cooperative Project between the universities of Queensland and Putra Malaysia supporting the RAWS strategy. Aim is to enhance stakeholder knowledge of OIE standards, especially transport and slaughter, and train key personnel in transport and slaughter practices to improve animal welfare in Malaysia, China, Thailand and Vietnam and is supported by the New Zealand, Australian, Malaysian and EU governments, the University of Putra Malaysia, and World Animal Protection. The project involves workshops for livestock producers, managers of livestock operations and trainers workshops and local stakeholder meetings through veterinary services. Currently, speakers, from both within the region and elsewhere, are being identified and contacted, workshops are being arranged, the importance of translating OIE material into local languages has been noted and is being explored and measures of effectiveness and aligned research initiatives are being considered.
  - The Centre has postponed holding a residential training programme until the Cooperative Project is completed. This is due to the proposed content being found to overlap with the above Project and the need to collate and understand the number of similar regional initiatives to enhance animal welfare also being undertaken by various groups.

Annex XXVII (contd)

- **CC from Italy**

The OIE Collaborating Centre for Veterinary Training, Epidemiology, and Animal Welfare was represented by Barbara Alessandrini, who attended the meeting connected through Skype.

She gave an overview of the current activities being carried out in Teramo under the animal welfare/training/knowledge management domain.

- The inclusion of the Teramo OIE CC in the OIE Regional Platform for Animal Welfare for Europe;
- VII Framework Programme project “CALLISTO” (Companion Animals Multisectorial Interprofessional Interdisciplinary Strategic Think-Tank on Zoonoses);
- Study of the effectiveness of stray dog population control strategies;
- Technological systems for dog population control and management;
- European Commission Study on the welfare of dogs and cats involved in commercial practices;
- Modules for e-learning training courses under the EC programme "Better Training for Safer Food" initiative;
- Training activities on animal welfare under the EC “Better Training for Safer Food” initiative.

Mrs Alessandrini also informed that six scientific publications have been published in 2014 until now.

Apologies were received from the CC from Chile-Mexico-Uruguay and ILAR, who already had previous commitments for that day.

The annual Reports 2013/2014 are available at the OIE website: <http://www.oie.int/en/our-scientific-expertise/collaborating-centres/annual-reports/>.

## **8. *Ad hoc* Group on Disaster Management and Risk Reduction in relation to Animal Health and Welfare and Veterinary Public Health**

Dr Stuardo informed that the *ad hoc* Group had its first meeting from 15–17 April 2014. The meeting was chaired by Dr Gary Vroegindewey, the Group discussed extensively the problems of dealing with disasters within the framework of the paper prepared by Dr Sarah Kahn, and agreed with the approach of developing a set of guidelines for OIE Member Countries for publication on the OIE website. Dr Stuardo also advised that the group agreed that the guidelines will focus on strategic, organisational and operational issues rather than technical issues, and cover animal health, welfare and veterinary public health. A second meeting of the *ad hoc* Group is proposed for the fourth quarter of 2014.

## **9. OIE *ad hoc* Group on the Welfare of Working Equids**

Dr Bayvel updated on the *ad hoc* Group on Working Equids held from 17–19 June 2014. He noted that the *ad hoc* Group on Working Equids had decided to develop its standard using animal based criteria, which address outcomes at the animal level, rather than prescribe measures to be applied. The standard is also envisaged to be a model for other working animal standards.

Finally, Dr Bayvel commented that the *ad hoc* Group agreed to structure their standard according to the pattern established by the existing production animal standards, and advised that the draft text under development is expected to be sent for consideration by the Code Commission at its September 2014 meeting. If required, a second meeting of the *ad hoc* Group will be held in June 2015.

Annex XXVII (contd)**10. Animal welfare and trade**

- **OIE Regional Conference on Animal Welfare and International Trade, Montevideo (Uruguay) October 2013**

This conference focused on the implementation of OIE standards in production, transport and slaughter, focusing on beef cattle, and taking into account the vision of the OIE, the Veterinary Services and the private sector partners.

Animal Welfare bilateral trade requirements were also examined including technical specifications developed by the private sector, including ISO, Eurep-GAP, RSPCA (Freedom Food) among others, and their relationship with the OIE standards and national regulations of the Veterinary Services.

The Conference also considered the costs and benefits of the implementation of animal welfare covering the stages of production, transport and slaughter, including the point of view of traders and consumers.

This Conference was held back to back with the OIE animal welfare focal point seminar, which, with the support of the European Commission, enabled participation of the OIE animal welfare focal points from Europe.

The Recommendation and other information on this Conference can be found in the following web link: [http://www.oie.int/eng/A\\_MONTE/objectifs.htm](http://www.oie.int/eng/A_MONTE/objectifs.htm)

- **Update and discussions on the WTO Panel Report on the "EU Measures prohibiting the importation and marketing of seal products"**

The AWWG discussed many aspects of this case, and it was agreed that OIE should gather more information and share the key points and implications of the ruling on this case with OIE Member Countries.

Dr Gavinelli commented that we have yet to fully appreciate the implications of the report of the Appellate Body on the issue of human rights. More information on the WTO Panel "EU Measures prohibiting the importation and marketing of seal products" can be found at [http://www.wto.org/english/news\\_e/news13\\_e/400\\_401r\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news13_e/400_401r_e.htm) and the Appellate Body report can be found at: [http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/dispu\\_e/400\\_401abr\\_e.pdf](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/400_401abr_e.pdf).

NB: The Director General of the OIE decided to prepare an in-depth analysis of this Panel report.

**11. ISO/TC 34/WG 16 on Animal Welfare**

Dr Stuardo summarised the fourth meeting of the ISO/TC 34/WG on animal welfare held in the OIE Headquarters on the 23rd of May immediately prior to the 82nd OIE General Session. Dr Stuardo advised that the main topics discussed during the meeting were the conclusions and achievements of the New Work Item Proposal ballot, the results of the impact study, the membership of the drafting group and the proposed calendar of work which aims to finalise a draft technical specification by the end of 2014.

**12. Implementing OIE AW standards**

- **Progress on the toolbox for implementing the OIE slaughter standard**

Dr Thornber updated the AWWG on progress with developing the toolbox to assist implementation of OIE standards for slaughter including the draft document he had circulated to members for comment.

The Group discussed the need for Member Countries to have easy access to operational and scientific references that support all OIE animal welfare standards.

Annex XXVII (contd)

Dr Gavinelli suggested the possibility of reaching an agreement between the European Commission, the Animal Welfare Science Hub, the AWIN (Animal Welfare Indicators) project and OIE Animal Welfare Collaborating Centres to develop a web based repository of validated scientific information. The Group supported this proposal and also foresaw the possibility of the Animal Welfare Collaborating Centres acting as key reviewers of the information included in this repository. OIE Headquarters will follow up this proposal with further discussion and exploration of what may be possible with the various interested parties.

- **Improved Animal Welfare Programme**

Dr Tomasz Grudnik updated the AWWG on this programme which started in 2012, based around “trains the trainers” to improve implementation of OIE standards on transport and slaughter. Trainings have been conducted in Indonesia (including one follow-up), Philippines (two rounds), Turkey, Vietnam, Jordan and Thailand. The Jordan programme included Egyptian participants, and a participant from Bangladesh participated in the Thailand programme. There is also a programme in progress in Oman which includes representatives from Kuwait, Lebanon and Yemen. Further trainings in 2014 are planned for Iran, Korea and Israel. Although this training programme has been very well received in all countries in which it has been held, funding for the continuation of this programme beyond mid 2015 is uncertain. The AWWG encouraged OIE to explore all funding options to enable continuation of this programme.

- **AWIN meeting feedback**

Prof. Fraser reported back to the group on the third AWIN Conference held in Prague (Czech Republic) last April. This project financed by the EU VII Framework Programme follows the Welfare Quality® project and covers species that were not covered by the WQ (sheep, goats, horses, donkeys and turkeys). It aims to develop, integrate and disseminate animal-based welfare indicators with an emphasis on pain assessment and pain recognition. It uses new indicators and hosts an Animal Welfare Science Hub to gather and share available information at <http://www.animal-welfare-indicators.net/site/>. As it was discussed and agreed in a previous point, the Animal Welfare Science Hub will be part of a discussion to foresee their inclusion in a repository of scientific information based at the OIE website.

Dr Stuardo commented that the project had some interesting developments, in particular on the use of new technologies for the animal welfare assessments.

### 13. Other business

- **Feedback from IATA**

Dr Belton updated the AWWG on changes the IATA Live Animals and Perishables Boards introduced to the 40th edition of the Live Animals Regulations (LAR) to avoid situations where pregnant dogs give birth in flight. Unfortunately an unintended consequence of the changes introduced resulted in some concern that airlines would refuse to transport pregnant mares up to 300 days gestation, which would impact on the normal international transport of high value thoroughbred breeding mares. As a result of the OIE participation at the last meeting of the IATA Live Animals and Perishables Board in April a proposed addendum was agreed which effectively re-aligns the LAR with Article 7.4.2. of the *Terrestrial Code*, and introduces new maximum limits to the days since service for air transport of pregnant cats and dogs.

- **OIE Global Conference on Animal Welfare, Chile 2016**

Dr Stuardo advised that the Director General has written to the Chilean Ministry of Agriculture confirming that the OIE is pleased to accept the Chilean proposal to host the fourth OIE Global Conference on Animal Welfare in Chile in 2016, and advised that OIE will be in contact with the Chileans in the second semester of 2015 to initiate arrangements. Financial participation of the Country will be requested.

Annex XXVII (contd)

The AWWG noted its strong support for the next OIE Global Animal Welfare Conference, and its keenness to contribute to the preparation of the Conference Concept Note and Scientific Programme.

- **Scientific and Technical Review, Vol. 33 (1)**

Dr Bayvel updated the AWWG on the recent publication of the issue of the OIE *Scientific and Technical Review*, “Animal welfare: focusing on the future”. He noted that the original idea of this publication was suggested by the New Zealand – Australia OIE Collaborating Centre for Animal Welfare Science and Bioethical Analysis. The Review outlines contemporary thinking about factors that promote or jeopardise the productivity, health and welfare of the wide range of animals used for human purposes. It also considers likely future developments in animal welfare thinking and management and, where possible, references influences of the diverse practical, economic, political, socio-cultural and religious factors that may be encountered globally in various cultural contexts.

Dr Stuardo advised that the electronic version of this number of the *Scientific and Technical Review* is available, for free in PDF version at [http://web.oie.int/boutique/index.php?page=ficprod&id\\_produit=1307&fichrech=1&lang=en](http://web.oie.int/boutique/index.php?page=ficprod&id_produit=1307&fichrech=1&lang=en).

- **Animal Welfare Focal Point Seminars and agenda for OIE meetings**

Dr Stuardo reported that two seminars for the OIE focal points for animal welfare were scheduled for the year 2014. The first was held in Amman (Jordan) in April. This Seminar was held immediately before the final session of the IAWP Training Programme. The second seminar is scheduled for November for the Asia, Far East and Oceania region, and will be held in Canberra, Australia in conjunction with the eighth RAWS Group Coordination Meeting.

- **Information on other meetings**

The AWWG shared information on future meetings and activities in which members of the Group will participate actively.

#### 14. Work programme 2014–2015

Members reviewed and updated the current AWWG work programme through to June 2015. The updated work programme will be provided to the September 2014 meeting of the Code Commission.

#### 15. Dates of next meeting

It was agreed that the next full meeting of the AWWG will be held on 2–4 June 2015.

A Working Group teleconference will be scheduled in early January to provide input to the February and March meetings of the Code Commission and Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission.

---

.../Annexes

Annex XXVII (contd)Annex I**MEETING OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP ON ANIMAL WELFARE****Paris, 24–26 June 2014****List of participants****MEMBERS OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP**

---

**Dr Sira Abdul Rahman (Chair)**

Retd. Dean Bangalore Veterinary College  
No 123, 7<sup>th</sup> B Main Road  
4th Block(West)  
Jayanagar, Bangalore 560 011  
INDIA  
shireen@blr.vsnl.net.in

**Dr David Bayvel**

Chief Veterinary Adviser  
World Animal Protection  
47 KaruCres,  
Waikanae,5036,  
NEW ZEALAND  
david.bayvel@gmail.com

**Prof. Hassan Aidaros**

Professor of Hygiene and Preventive  
Medicine. Faculty of Veterinary Medicine  
Banha Univ.  
5 Mossadakst  
12311Dokki  
EGYPT  
Haidaros@netscape.net

**Prof. David Fraser**

Professor and NSERC Industrial  
Research Chair in Animal Welfare  
Faculty of Land and Food Systems  
University of British Columbia  
2357 Main Mall  
Vancouver V6T 1Z4  
CANADA  
dfraser@mail.ubc.ca

**Dr Andrea Gavinelli**

Head of Unit  
European Commission  
Directorate General Health and  
Consumers  
Unit D5 – Animal Welfare,  
Rue Froissart 101 – 6/168  
1040 Brussels  
BELGIUM  
Andrea.Gavinelli@ec.europa.eu

**Dr Jacques Servièrè**

International Meat Secretariat  
132 rue du Théâtre  
75015 Paris  
FRANCE  
jacques.serviere@agroparistech.fr

**Dr Marosi Molomo**

Director of Livestock Services  
Department of Livestock Services  
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security  
PO Box A 82  
Maseru 100  
LESOTHO  
marosi\_molomo@yahoo.com

**Dr Peter Thornber**

Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and  
Forestry  
Australian Government  
GPO Box 858  
Canberra, ACT 2601  
AUSTRALIA  
Peter.thornber@daff.gov.au

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

---

**Dr Vincent Guyonnet**

International Egg Commission  
89 Charterhouse Street  
London, EC1M 6HR  
UNITED KINGDOM  
vincent@internationalegg.com

**Mr Luc Mirabito**

International Dairy Federation  
Institut de l'Élevage  
149 rue de Bercy  
75013 Paris  
FRANCE  
luc.mirabito@inst-elevage.asso.fr

Annex XXVII (contd)

Annex I (contd)

## TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION

---

**Dr Etienne Bonbon**

Vice-President of the Terrestrial Animal  
Health Standards Commission  
OIE  
oie@oie.int

## OIE HEADQUARTERS

---

**Dr Bernard Vallat**

Director General  
OIE  
oie@oie.int

**Dr Derek Belton**

Head  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
d.belton@oie.int

**Dr Leopoldo Stuardo**

Chargé de mission  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
l.stuardo@oie.int

**Dr Tomasz Grudnik**

Chargé de mission  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
t.grudnik@oie.int



**MEETING OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP ON ANIMAL WELFARE****Paris, 24–26 June 2014**

---

**Agenda****Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup>**

- 09:30 Introduction and priorities / Dr Belton
- 09:45 Administrative arrangements / Dr Belton
- 10:00 1) AWWG 12th meeting report, agreed actions, informal meeting at GS & teleconferences
- 10:45 2) OIE General Session 2014 Outcomes
- General Session AWWG Report / Resolutions on Animal Welfare
  - Preparation of OIE Strategic Plan 2016–2020
- 11:30–11.45 Break
- 11:45 3) Report of the Working Groups on Food Safety and Wildlife Diseases
- 13:00–14:00 Lunch
- 14:00 4) Addressing Members comments:
- Draft Chapter 7.X. on Animal Welfare and Dairy Cattle Production System
  - Chapters 7.5. and 7.6.
- 16:00–16:15 Break
- Chapter 7.10. on Broiler Chicken Production Systems
  - Chapter 3.1. Veterinary Service
  - Chapter 3.2. Evaluation of Veterinary Services
  - Chapter 3.3. Communication
- 17:00 5) RAWS: update from the regions

**Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup>**

- 9:30 6) Global Animal Welfare Strategy
- 13:00–14:00 Lunch
- 14:00 7) Joint session with Collaborating Centres
- 15:00 8) OIE *ad hoc* Group on Natural Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in Relation to Animal Health and Welfare
- 15:30 9) OIE *ad hoc* Group on the Welfare of Working Equids

Annex XXVII (contd)Annex II (contd)

- 16:00–16:15 Break
- 16:15 10) Animal welfare and trade
- Recommendations of the OIE Regional Conference on Animal Welfare and International Trade, Montevideo (Uruguay), October 2013
  - Update and discussions on the WTO Panel Report on the “EU Measures prohibiting the importation and marketing of seal products”
- 17:00 11) ISO/TC 34/WG 16 on Animal Welfare
- 19:00 Dinner
- Thursday 26<sup>th</sup>
- 09:30 12) Implementing OIE AW standards
- P. Thornber – Progress on toolbox for implementing slaughter welfare standards
  - Improved Animal Welfare Programme
  - D. Fraser AWIN meeting feedback
- 11:00 13) Other Business
- AW chapters organization
  - D. Belton feedback from IATA
- 11:30–11.45 Break
- 11:45 Other Business (contd)
- 2014 SATRS Issue N°33
  - OIE Global Conference on animal Welfare, Chile 2016
  - Animal Welfare Focal Point Seminars and agenda for OIE meetings
  - Information on other meetings
- 13:00–14:00 Lunch
- 14:00 Work programme 2014–2015
- 16:00–16:15 Break
- 16:15 Meeting report
- 17:00 Next Meeting

Annex XXVII (contd)

Annex III

**Minutes of the Informal Meeting of the OIE AWWG**May 27<sup>th</sup> 2014 13:00 - Maison de la Chimie**Participants**

<i>AWWG Members</i>	<i>OIE</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
Abdul Rahman (AR)	Derek Belton (DB)	Marosi Molomo (MM)
Andrea Gavinelli (AG)	Leopoldo Stuardo (LS)	David Fraser (DF)
David Bayvel (DB)	Tomoko Ishibashi (TI)	Peter Thornber (PT)
Hassan Aidaros (HA)	Ratislav Kolesar (RK)	Vincent Guyonnet (VG)
Luc Mirabito (LM)	Tomasz Grudnik (TG)	
Hassan Aidaros (HA)	Ma. Elaine Joy Villareal (MV)	
Jacques Servièrè (JS)		

**Start of the meeting 13:05 hrs.****1. Introduction**

AR, Chair of the AWWG, welcomed the participants and shares the objectives of the meeting, which mainly is to take this opportunity to prepare the meeting of the working group in June. Each of the attendees introduced themselves.

**2. Agenda (Annex I)**

The Agenda was revised and no new items were added.

**3. Thirteenth Working Group Meeting Proposed Agenda (Annex II)**

LS presented a draft Agenda for the June meeting and agreed to circulate among members for comments and additions of new points in the other business item. It was agreed to set a teleconference with Collaborating Centres (CC) on Wednesday at 14h00.

Also it was agreed to include time and hour of discussion of each item. Finally it was agreed, to book a complete morning of the Agenda, to discuss the proposed of the Global Animal Welfare Strategy of the OIE. LS will send a Draft Agenda at earliest convenience.

**4. Update ISO/TC 34/WG 16 work on animal welfare**

LS informed about the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the ISO/TC 34 Working Group on Animal Welfare, which was held at the OIE Headquarters the 23<sup>rd</sup> of June. The agenda included among other points the presentation of the results of the impact study and the membership of the drafting Group for develop the draft of the Technical Specification.

Annex XXVII (contd)Annex III (contd)**5. Summary February TAHSC February meeting**

**DB** summarised the Animal Welfare discussion during the last February Code Commission Meeting. Informing that the Code Commission had received an important number of comments on the Code Chapters 7.X, 7.5 and 7.6, where some of the more relevant, were sent for the AWWG looking for an opinion.

**AG**, in relation to one of the aspect comments by Members Countries in relation to the Water Bath Stunning method for poultry is in this moment being analysed by EFSA. This is a good example for the use of scientific information to solve some normative difficulties.

**6. Information on the development of OIE Strategic Plan 2015 – 2020**

**DB** informed that a draft have been discussed in the OIE Council, and this will be discuss during the General Session with Member Countries Delegates, and indicated also that as soon a discussion document will be available, this one will be presented to the AWWG.

**7. Preparation for GAWS Planning Session at AWWG 13**

**AR** recalls that there is a draft document prepared by DF and proposes to recirculate that document for further analysis and comments. The Members of the AWWG also proposed that DF to take the lead on the discussion of the GAWS at the June meeting.

**AG** indicates that the result of the Seal panel at WTO could have an impact on the way that the AWWG is going to develop the GAWS. It was also agreed to circulate the summary of the Appellate Body report. (Annex III).

**DB** proposed to conduct an environmental scan as a preparatory work for the GAWS discussion and he will circulate before the AWWG meeting in June.

(For information, bellow you can find the links where you can find the complete Panel Report and the full Appellate Body Report:

[https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/FE\\_Search/FE\\_S\\_S006.aspx?Query=\(@Symbol=%20wt/ds401/r\\*%20not%20rw\\*\)&Language=ENGLISH&Context=FomerScriptedSearch&languageUIChanged=true#](https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/FE_Search/FE_S_S006.aspx?Query=(@Symbol=%20wt/ds401/r*%20not%20rw*)&Language=ENGLISH&Context=FomerScriptedSearch&languageUIChanged=true#)

[http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/dispu\\_e/400\\_401abr\\_e.pdf](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/400_401abr_e.pdf)

**8. Animal Welfare and Livestock production systems ad hoc Groups update and Member Country Comments**

**DB** informed that the Dairy Cattle ad hoc Group met in November last year and their Report was included in the February Code Commission Report. An important number of comments were received and some of them were sent to the AWWG for have a final decision.

**9. Update on the OIE new ad hoc Groups (Disaster management and risk reduction and Working equids)**

**LS** informed that the ad hoc Group met in April this year. With members coming from FAO (LEGS), EC, Japan, Cuba, Kenya and World Animal Protection (Asia) and under the Presidency of Dr Gary Vroegindewey, Virginia-Maryland Regional College of Veterinary Medicine. The Group agreed to propose some modifications to the TOR to reflect the initial discussion. Finally they elaborated a Report which includes a draft Guidelines on disaster management and risk reduction in relation to animal health and welfare and veterinary public health. This Report will be available for the AWWG meeting in June. The *ad hoc* Group also decided that a second meeting will take place in November this year.

**AG** noted the importance to discuss the Report of the ad hoc Group jointly with other Groups of the OIE system as there are others aspects that have been considered than only animal welfare.

**LS** finally informed that the ad hoc Group on AW on working equids will meet one week before the AWWG.

Annex XXVII (contd)

Annex III (contd)

#### **10. AWWG pilot work on developing toolboxes to assist implementation of OIE animal welfare standards**

LS informed about the reception of a draft proposal from PT and enriched by LM. The AWWG agreed to discuss this proposal broadly and jointly with the information coming from the AWIN project.

#### **11. Improved animal welfare programme (IAWP) update**

RK mentioned that an important numbers of trainings have been already conducted in eligible and non-eligible countries for the project. MV completed the IAWP team together with TG. Also informed that the training material in CD-ROM, will be available in next months.

#### **12. RAWs and EU Platform on animal welfare updates**

LS summarised the activities of the Regional Commission in term of the RAWs.

In Europe, the 2nd meeting of the AW Platform for Europe was held in Moscow and the main discussed issues were the membership of the SG, the work on the already identified priorities such as the Control of Stray Dogs Population. A Seminar on this topic is planned for countries in the Balkan area for the month June.

In the Americas Region an electronic consultation is planned to start the process of review of the adopted strategy and also for the development of an implementation document. This work will be discussed at the next Regional Commission meeting in Guadalajara Mexico.

In the Middle East Region a final RAWs document was sent for comment for Regional Member comments for a period of two weeks and after that period will be consider adopted.

TI gives an update on the next AW FP Seminar in Canberra, Australia next November. This will be also a back to back meeting of the AFEO RAWs, to which the OIE Regional Representation in Tokyo took the responsibility of the Secretariat.

#### **13. Collaborating Centres update**

The group agreed to fix the meeting with the CC (face to face or video conference) for the second day of the AWG meeting at 13:00 hrs.

#### **14. Other Business**

- **Report on the AWIN Project (Animal Welfare Science Hub)**

LS informed about the 3rd Annual Meeting of the AWIN project. DF also participated at that meeting. The OIE only participated at the stakeholders meeting in which took place very positive interactions, and an important number of tools were presented, especially in the AW assessment techniques. It was agreed at the meeting, to share the Web site of the project, which is the following: <http://www.animal-welfare-indicators.net/site/>

- **Future of the OIE AWWG and future priorities;**

JS asked about the priorities on future Chapters on AW on Animal production Systems. AR indicated also that captive and non-captive wild life species could be also been considered as a future priority of the OIE work.

DB indicated that as there are already two ad hoc Groups working at this moment. Other ad hoc Groups, covering other productive species will probably start after one more year.

- **Working Programme and Agreed Actions;**

This point will be discussed at the June meeting.

**End of the Meeting 14:10 hrs.**



Annex XXVII (contd)

Annex III (contd)

Annex I

### Final agenda

---

1. Introduction / Meeting Objective
  2. Agenda Review
  3. Thirteenth Working Group Meeting Proposed Agenda
  4. Update ISO/TC 34/WG 16 work on animal welfare
  5. Summary February TAHSC February meeting
  6. Information on the development of OIE Strategic Plan 2015–2020
  7. Preparation for GAWS Planning Session at AWWG 13
  8. Animal Welfare and Livestock production systems *ad hoc* Groups update and Member Country Comments
  9. Update on the OIE new *ad hoc* Groups (Disaster management and risk reduction and working equids)
  10. AWWG pilot work on developing toolboxes to assist implementation of OIE Animal Welfare Standards
  11. Improved animal welfare programme (IAWP) update
  12. RAWs and EU Platform on AW Updates
  13. Collaborating Centres update
  14. Other Business
    - Report on the AWIN Project (Animal Welfare Science Hub)
    - Future of the OIE AWWG and future priorities
    - Working Programme and Agreed Actions
-





Annex XXVII (contd)

Annex III (contd)

Annex II

## MEETING OF THE OIE ANIMAL WELFARE WORKING GROUP

Paris, 24–26 June 2014

---

### Agenda

Introduction and priorities / Dr Vallat

Administrative arrangements / Dr Belton

25<sup>th</sup> June - 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm: Joint Session with Representatives of OIE Animal Welfare Collaborating Centres (to be confirmed)

1. **AWWG 12<sup>th</sup> meeting report, agreed actions, informal meeting at GS & teleconferences**
2. **OIE General Session 2014 Outcomes**
  - General Session AWWG Report/ Resolutions on Animal Welfare
  - Preparation of OIE Strategic Plan 2016–2020
3. **Report of the Working Groups on Food Safety and Wildlife Diseases**
4. **Addressing Member comments:**
  - Draft Chapter 7.X. on Animal Welfare and Dairy Cattle Production System
  - Chapters 7.5. and 7.6.
  - Chapter 7.10. on Animal Welfare and Broiler Chicken Production Systems
  - Chapter 3.1. on Veterinary Services
  - Chapter 3.2. on Evaluation of Veterinary Services
  - Chapter 3.3. on Communication
5. **Joint session with Collaborating Centres (to be confirmed)**
6. **OIE *ad hoc* Group on Natural Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in Relation to Animal Health and Welfare**
7. **OIE *ad hoc* Group on the Welfare of Working Equids**
8. **Animal Welfare Strategies**
  - RAWS: update of the regions
  - Global AW strategy

Annex XXVII (contd)

Annex III (contd)

Annex II (contd)

**9. Animal welfare and trade**

- Recommendations of the OIE Regional Conference on Animal Welfare and International Trade, Montevideo (Uruguay), October 2013.
- Update Fur Seals WTO

**10. ISO/TC 34/WG 16 on Animal Welfare**

**11. Implementing OIE AW standards**

- Improved Animal Welfare Programme
- Animal Welfare Resources Stocktake
- D. Fraser AWIN meeting feedback

**12. Other business**

- AW Chapters organization
- D. Belton feedback from IATA
- Membership of the World Farmers Organisation
- 2014 SATRS Issue
- Animal Welfare Focal Point Seminars and agenda for OIE meetings
- Animal Health and Welfare Fund
- Information on other meetings

**13. Work programme 2014–2015**

**14. Meeting report**

**15. Next meeting**

---

Annex XXVII (contd)

Annex IV

*[Note: this Annex has been replaced by Annex XIII to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 9–18 September 2014.]*



Annex XXVII (contd)

Annex V

*[Note: this Annex has been replaced by Annex VII to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 9–18 September 2014.]*





Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Annex XXVIII

Original: English  
August 2014

## REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON SALMONELLA IN PIGS

Paris (France), 27–29 August 2014

The OIE *ad hoc* Group on *Salmonella* in pigs (the *ad hoc* Group) met at the OIE Headquarters in Paris from 27 to 29 August 2014.

The members of the *ad hoc* Group and other participants are listed at [Annex I](#). The Agenda and Terms of Reference adopted are given at [Annex II](#) and [Annex III](#), respectively.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed that to combat the occurrence of food-borne salmonellosis, a pre-harvest pathogen reduction strategy is important in reducing the presence of *Salmonella* in pig meat and therefore considered that the development of the chapter on the prevention and control of *Salmonella* in pigs was appropriate.

The *ad hoc* Group developed the draft chapter that provides recommendations on the prevention and control of *Salmonella* in domestic pigs kept for commercial breeding and production from farm up to slaughter to supplement the Codex Alimentarius Commission ‘Guidelines for the control of nontyphoidal *Salmonella* spp. in pork meat’, currently under development.

The aim of the chapter is to contribute to the reduction of food-borne illness in humans by controlling and where possible, reducing the prevalence of *Salmonella* infection in pigs. The *ad hoc* Group recognised the diversity of pig production systems, the variability of prevalence of *Salmonella* in pigs and the differing country approaches to the public health control of *Salmonella*. Therefore in developing the recommendations the *ad hoc* Group tried not to be prescriptive but rather produce a chapter that is relevant to all Member Countries.

The *ad hoc* Group developed recommendations for the control of *Salmonella* infection in pigs that considered the steps along the food chain from feed production and use, through primary breeding farms to lairage prior to slaughter, including transport and included both basic biosecurity procedures and specific *Salmonella* prevention and control measures. Recommendations are tailored and based on the strength of the scientific evidence available.

The *ad hoc* Group included specific recommendations for feed since it is an important means for the introduction of *Salmonella* into a pig herd. The *ad hoc* Group also included articles on transport and lairage because they considered that these activities increase the risk of *Salmonella* in the pigs. The *ad hoc* Group included cross references to articles in relevant chapters on animal welfare as these contain relevant recommendations.

The *ad hoc* Group included in the chapter definitions for ‘feed’ and ‘feed ingredients’ that are used in the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* Chapter 6.3. ‘The control of hazards of animal health and public health importance in animal feed’.

Annex XXVIII (contd)

In the development of this chapter the *ad hoc* Group used information available in the ‘FAO/OIE/World Bank, 2011. Good practices for biosecurity in the pig sector – Issues and options in developing and transition countries. FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No. 169. Rome, FAO’ and wished to highlight this valuable resource to Member Countries.

The new Chapter 6.X. Prevention and control of *Salmonella* in pigs is presented in Annex IV.

*[Note: this Annex has been replaced by Annex XXIII to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 9–18 September 2014.]*

---

.../...Annexes



Annex XXVIII (contd)

Annex I

## MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON SALMONELLA IN PIGS

Paris (France), 27–29 August 2014

## List of participants

## MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC GROUP

**Dr Rob Davies (Chair)**

Animal Health and Veterinary  
Laboratories Agency  
New Haw, Addlestone  
Surrey KT15 3NB  
Weybridge  
UNITED KINGDOM  
Rob.Davies@ahvla.gsi.gov.uk

**Dr Marisa Caipo**

Food Safety Officer  
Agriculture and Consumer Protection  
Department  
Food Safety and Quality Unit  
FAO  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome  
ITALY  
Marisa.Caipo@fao.org

**Prof. Martin Wierup**

Senior Professor  
Dep. Biomedical Sciences and  
Veterinary Public Health  
Swedish University of Agricultural  
Sciences  
P.O. Box 7036, 75007 Uppsala  
SWEDEN  
Martin.Wierup@slu.se

**Dr Marisa Cardoso**

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do  
Sul  
Faculdade de Veterinária.  
Av. Bento Gonçalves 9090  
Agronomia  
91540-000 - Porto Alegre, RS  
BRASIL  
mcardoso@ufrgs.br

**Dr Julie Funk**

Associate Dean  
Professional Academic Programs &  
Student Affairs  
College of Veterinary Medicine  
Michigan State University  
784 Wilson Rd F-107  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
UNITED STATES  
funkj@cvm.msu.edu

**Dr Glen Edmunds**

Director Food Safety and Animal Health  
Department of Agriculture  
AUSTRALIA  
Food Exports Branch  
42-44 QANTAS Drive  
Eagle Farm, 4009  
Brisbane, Qld  
AUSTRALIA  
glen.edmunds@agriculture.gov.au  
Phone : +61 7 3246 8740

## OTHER PARTICIPANTS

**Dr Etienne Bonbon**

Representative of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health  
Standards Commission  
e.bonbon@oie.int  
Etienne.bonbon@eeas.europa.eu

**Dr Annamaria Bruno**

Representative of the Codex Secretariat  
Senior Food Standards Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food  
Standards Programme  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00153 Rome  
ITALY  
Phone: (39) 06570 56254  
Annamaria.Bruno@fao.org

**Dr Derek Belton**

Head  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
d.belton@oie.int

**Dr Gillian Mylrea**

Deputy Head  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
g.mylrea@oie.int



Annex XXVIII (contd)

Annex II

**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON SALMONELLA IN PIGS**

**Paris (France), 27–29 August 2014**

---

**Adopted agenda**

Welcome

1. Discussion on the OIE standard setting process and work in animal production food safety and relevant Codex Alimentarius standards.
  2. Development of a new draft Chapter 6.X. on the prevention and control of *Salmonella* in pigs dealing with the management of this pathogen in pigs in order to reduce risks to human health.
  3. Preparation of a report for the Code Commission for consideration at its September 2014 meeting.
-



## Terms of Reference

### **Purpose of the meeting**

To develop a new draft Chapter 6.X. Prevention and control of *Salmonella* in pigs, for Section 6: Veterinary Public Health of the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*, dealing with the management of this pathogen in pigs to reduce risks to human health, taking account of relevant Codex guidelines, and OIE standards.

### **OIE standard setting work in animal production food safety**

The OIE and the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) are two of the three international standard setting organizations recognized under the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement). In the context of the SPS Agreement, the OIE is responsible for setting standards in the domain of animal health (including zoonotic diseases) and the CAC in the domain of food safety.

Since 2002, at the request of its Members, the OIE mandate has included setting standards for animal production food safety, i.e. the management of risks arising at the level of the farm through to primary processing. In 2002, the OIE established a Working Group on Animal Production Food Safety with the aim of improving the coordination and harmonisation of standard setting activities of OIE and CAC. The Secretary of Codex and, on an observer basis, the Chair of Codex, regularly attend the annual meeting of the Working Group. Through this mechanism and through participation in each other's standard setting procedures, the OIE and CAC collaborate closely in the development of standards relevant to the whole food production continuum, taking care to avoid gaps, duplications and contradictions within and between SPS standards.

### ***Salmonella* in pigs**

Salmonellosis is one of the most frequently reported food-borne diseases worldwide and pork meat is considered to be an important source of this food-borne infection.

Since 2010 the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group (APFSWG) has been exploring the need for and feasibility of developing OIE standards on the control of *Salmonella* in food producing animals other than poultry (i.e. pigs, cattle, small ruminants) with the purpose of reducing food-borne illness. Based on a recent literature review requested by the APFSWG, 'A review of the scientific literature on the control of *Salmonella* spp. in food producing animals other than poultry' (Simone Belluco *et al.*, in press) and other publications, the APFSWG noted that a) salmonellosis attributed to cattle and pigs is an important cause of illness in humans, b) effective control measures can be implemented at the farm level and, c) Codex is undertaking work in this area.

They recommended that, should the Codex work proceed, the OIE should develop recommendations for the pre-harvest management and control of *Salmonella* in pigs and cattle to complement the Codex guidelines and ensure a whole food chain approach to *Salmonella* risk management in these species.

At the February 2014 meeting of the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission, they agreed that given that the Codex has commenced new work on guidelines for the Control of nontyphoidal *Salmonella* spp. in pork (and beef) meat, the OIE should commence work in this area to complement the Codex work to ensure that standards cover the farm to fork continuum for this pathogen.

The OIE agreed that work on standard development for *Salmonella* in pigs will be followed by the development of a similar standard for cattle.

Annex XXVIII (contd)Annex III (contd)**Relevant considerations:**

- The OIE has a mandate to develop international standards for animal production food safety, with a primary focus on measures applicable to zoonotic pathogens, for which measures can most effectively be implemented at the animal production level.
- As *Salmonella* in pigs is not an OIE listed disease and the impact on animal health (and direct economic impact) is usually low, this chapter will be part of Section 6: Veterinary Public Health of the *Terrestrial Code*.
- Standards for zoonotic pathogens at the animal production level should take into account:
  - feasible and cost effective means of controlling the pathogen at the animal level;
  - feasible and cost effective measures for animals and animal products that are internationally traded;
  - existing Codex standards and guidelines of the WHO and FAO.
- The *Terrestrial Code* contains general recommendations on veterinary public health and specific recommendations on controlling Salmonellosis in poultry.
- The OIE *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals* (2014) includes a chapter on Salmonellosis (Chapter 2.9.9.) which includes recommendations on diagnostic techniques, vaccines and competitive exclusion.
- The format of the new Chapter 6.X. should follow the style of existing *Terrestrial Code* chapters.

**Relevant documents**

1. A review of the scientific literature on the control of *Salmonella* spp. in food producing animals other than poultry (Simone Belluco *et al.*, in press)
2. *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* Chapter 6.5. Prevention, detection and control of *Salmonella* in poultry
3. *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* Chapter 6.4. Biosecurity procedures in poultry production
4. *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* Chapter 7.3. Transport of animals by land
5. *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* Chapter 7.5. Slaughter of animals
6. FAO/OIE/World Bank Good practices for biosecurity in the pig sector (2011)
7. Draft Codex Guidelines for the Control of Nontyphoidal *Salmonella* spp. in Pork and Beef Meat (under development)
8. Codex *Guidelines for the Control of Campylobacter and Salmonella in Chicken Meat* (CAC/GL 78-2011).



---

**© World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), 2014**

This document has been prepared by specialists convened by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). Pending adoption by the World Assembly of Delegates, the views expressed herein can only be construed as those of these specialists.

All OIE publications are protected by international copyright law. Extracts may be copied, reproduced, translated, adapted or published in journals, documents, books, electronic media and any other medium destined for the public, for information, educational or commercial purposes, provided prior written permission has been granted by the OIE.

The designations and denominations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the OIE concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers and boundaries.

The views expressed in signed articles are solely the responsibility of the authors. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by the OIE in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.