



Organisation Mondiale de la Santé Animale  
World Organisation for Animal Health  
Organización Mundial de Sanidad Animal

Original: English  
September 2009

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

Paris, 7–18 September 2009

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at the OIE Headquarters in Paris from 7 to 18 September 2009.

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

The Code Commission reviewed the documents identified in the agenda, addressing comments that Members had submitted by August 7 2009 and amended texts in the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Terrestrial Code*) where appropriate. The amendments are shown in the usual manner by double underline and ~~strikeout~~ and may be found in the Annexes to the report. In Annexes XI (collection and processing of laboratory rodent and rabbit embryos /ova), XVIII (Anthrax) and XX (foot and mouth disease), the amendments made at this meeting (September 2009) are shown with a coloured background to distinguish them from those made prior to the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session in May 2009.

Members should note that, unless stated otherwise, texts submitted for comment may be proposed for adoption at the 78<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session. Depending on the comments received on each text, the Code Commission will identify the texts proposed for adoption in May 2010 in the report of its February 2010 meeting.

The Code Commission strongly encourages Members to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by submitting comments on this report. It would be very helpful if comments were submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a scientific rationale. Proposed deletions should be indicated in ~~strikeout~~ and proposed additions with double underline. Members **should not use the automatic 'track-change' function** provided by word processing software as such changes are lost in the process of collating Members' submissions into the Code Commission's working documents. Comments on this report must reach OIE Headquarters by **8 January 2010** to be considered at the 8 February 2010 meeting of the Code Commission. Comments should be sent to the International Trade Department at: [trade.dept@oie.int](mailto:trade.dept@oie.int).

## A. MEETING WITH THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

The Code Commission met with Dr Vallat and discussed a number of important issues.

Standards and guidelines of the OIE: In response to Members' questions and to avoid confusion, it was decided that all texts in the *Codes* and *Manuals* would be considered to be 'standards' while texts found outside the *Codes* and *Manuals* (for example, on the OIE internet site) would be considered as 'guidelines' or 'recommendations'.

Delisted diseases: the joint meeting discussed and agreed that all chapters and references to diseases no longer listed by the OIE should be removed from the Code. Relevant information on delisted diseases could be maintained in other locations (e.g. on the OIE internet site) but unless these were updated regularly they could become obsolete. However, Dr Vallat noted that references to delisted diseases could be maintained in the *Manuals* as Members could find this information useful and relevant. The following disease chapters were proposed for deletion (see Annex XXXIII):

- Chapter 11.4. Bovine cysticercosis
- Chapter 11.10. Dermatophilosis
- Chapter 12.4. Epizootic lymphangitis
- Chapter 12.12. Horse mange
- Chapter 12.13. Horse pox
- Chapter 15.2. Atrophic rhinitis of swine
- Chapter 15.6. Teschovirus encephalomyelitis.

On the recognition of country/zone freedom from equine diseases, Dr Vallat noted that an *ad hoc* group under the SCAD would be convened to address the issue of disease freedom on a disease by disease basis. He also indicated that the *ad hoc* Group would start with African horse sickness and could then consider glanders.

On the issue of commodity based trade, Dr Vallat emphasised that this is a priority for the OIE and encouraged the Code Commission to continue working on this issue.

Dr Vallat noted that bee diseases are of increasing concern because of the implications for food production and the environment. He noted that an *ad hoc* group would be convened to review the existing disease chapters to ensure that they address all relevant issues.

The Code Commission examined the Draft 5<sup>th</sup> Strategic Plan and provided comments to the Director General.

The Code Commission acknowledged comments submitted by Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chinese Taipei, the European Union (EU), Japan, Korea (Rep. of), Kenya, Kuwait, New Zealand, Philippines, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, Uganda and the United States of America (USA). The Code Commission also considered comments provided by an industry association.

## B. JOINT MEETING OF THE CODE COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (SCAD) held a joint meeting on 9 September 2009 and discussed several important points. Dr William Karesh (Chair of the OIE Wildlife Working Group) attended this meeting. A summary of these discussions appears below.

## 1. Animal health surveillance

Dr Bruckner, President of the SCAD, explained that the OIE Wildlife Working Group and the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology had been asked to provide advice on the development of an OIE policy on wildlife, including aspects relating to surveillance, treatment of wildlife in the relevant disease chapters, and trade implications of finding infection in wild populations. Dr Karesh commented that there was a need to rethink how the OIE refers to pathogens and diseases, reflecting the fact that some important pathogens readily infect multiple species. Dr Karesh also raised the possibility of developing text in the Code on epizootic haemorrhagic disease (EHD), as this is an important OIE listed disease of wildlife that affects cattle; it should be taken into account in the diagnosis and management of bluetongue.

## 2. Foot and mouth disease

It was confirmed that the SCAD would consider OIE Members' comments on modifications to the four disease questionnaires and provide advice to the Code Commission. On compartmentalisation, Dr Thiermann indicated that the Code Commission did not see a need, at this time, for the SCAD to provide advice for eventual inclusion in the Code on the implementation of compartmentalisation for foot and mouth disease (FMD) nor for other specific diseases. On beef casings, Dr Bruckner stated that the SCAD had received advice from experts that confirmed that the procedures used to render small ruminant and porcine casings safe are also effective for beef casings. In reply to the question of the Philippines for advice on the required coverage of an animal population with FMD vaccine, Dr Bruckner stated that it would be difficult to provide definitive advice to cover all situations but that, as already stated in the *Terrestrial Code* (Article 8.5.44.), as a general rule, at least 80% of the population targeted for vaccination should be vaccinated in order to consider that coverage was adequate.

## 3. Swine vesicular disease

Dr Bruckner indicated that the SCAD would seek advice from an *ad hoc* group and the OIE Wildlife Working Group to review the comments of OIE Members on this chapter and provide advice to the Code Commission. Dr Kahn confirmed that the International Trade Department would then align the format of the revised **swine vesicular disease** chapter with the chapter on classical swine fever as adopted at the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session in May 2009.

## 4. Avian influenza and Newcastle disease

Dr Thiermann indicated that the Code Commission had modified the recommendations on inactivation in these chapters in response to Member comments. Because some of the scientific references lead to different recommendations on time/temperature for inactivation, the SCAD would be asked to provide further advice.

## 5. Classical swine fever

Dr Bruckner indicated that an expert would be asked to review the articles dealing with surveillance for classical swine fever with an approach similar to that taken to avian influenza and Newcastle disease. This would be referred to the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology.

## 6. Other issues:

Anthrax: the Code Commission incorporated comments from an expert and from the SCAD and made appropriate modifications to Chapter 8.1. The Code Commission also requested additional advice from OIE Delegates regarding practical measures used under field conditions to inactivate *B. anthracis* spores in dung, manure and bedding.

Bluetongue: SCAD will continue to seek advice from experts on the points raised by Members on maternal transmission and the use of vaccines and would share with the Code Commission in due course.

Brucellosis: an *ad hoc* group will be convened to provide advice to the OIE, basing its approach on the approach taken to bovine tuberculosis.

African horse sickness: the comment provided by Kenya during the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session regarding the use of vaccine for African horse sickness was forwarded to the OIE Biological Standards Commission (BSC) for advice.

Equine influenza and equine viral arteritis: the International Trade Department had forwarded Member comments to four experts for review and their advice would be taken into account by the Code Commission.

Bee diseases: the Code Commission noted that the SCAD would convene an *ad hoc* group to review bee diseases and related concerns.

Rabies: Dr Knopf advised that an expert had been requested to review the current *Terrestrial Code* chapter and Member comments on rabies and an *ad hoc* group would be convened to draft a new/revised chapter on rabies.

## C. EXAMINATION OF MEMBER COMMENTS AND WORK OF RELEVANT EXPERT GROUPS

### Item 1. Glossary

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU, Japan, Kuwait, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland and the USA.

*Inter alia*, the Code Commission modified the definition of quarantine station in order to clarify that the presence of disease or infection in animals in a quarantine station does not affect the health status of the country or zone. The Code Commission deleted from the Glossary the definitions of ‘uncertainty’ and ‘variability’ as the definition of these terms is readily found in dictionaries of epidemiology.

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

#### *Communication*

In response to Member comments the Code Commission agreed to associate the proposed definitions related to communication with the outline of the draft chapter on communication developed by the *ad hoc* Group. The Code Commission invited Members to provide comments on the outline and definitions and undertook to forward these comments to the *ad hoc* Group to be taken into account in the further development of the chapter.

The outline and definitions are provided in [Annex III](#) for Member comments.

### Item 2. Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments of Australia, the EU and Kuwait, as well as advice of the SCAD and the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology, and made appropriate modifications to several articles, including Article 1.4.3. point 2 (e) ‘case definition’. The Code Commission will propose the inclusion of a definition for ‘wildlife’ once it receives advice from the OIE Wildlife Working Group.

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

### Item 3. Surveillance of arthropod vectors of animal disease (Chapter 1.5.)

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia and the EU.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex V](#) for Member comments.

**Item 4. Status for OIE listed diseases (Chapter 1. 6.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina and New Zealand and made an appropriate modification to Article 1.6.1. Any changes to the disease status questionnaires in response to Member comments would be provided by the SCAD in due course.

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

**Item 5. Import risk analysis (Chapter 2.1. and report of the *ad hoc* Group)**

The Code Commission reviewed a comment from the USA and made a text modification.

The Code Commission noted the report of the OIE *ad hoc* Group on Import Risk Analysis for Animals and Animal Products ([Annex XLI](#)).

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex VII](#) for Member comments.

**Item 6. Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapters 3.1. and 3.2.)****a) Draft revisions to Chapters 3.1. and 3.2.**

The Code Commission reviewed amendments to Chapters 3.1. and 3.2. that had been proposed by the International Trade Department. The Code Commission supported the text amendments, which should help to highlight the importance of veterinary legislation as a key element of veterinary infrastructure and good governance.

The revised Chapters are provided at [Annex VIII](#) for Member comments.

**b) Guidelines on Veterinary Legislation (OIE website)**

The Code Commission noted and encouraged Members to review the “Guidelines on Veterinary Legislation”, which may be found on the OIE website at: [http://www.oie.int/eng/oie/organisation/A\\_Guidelines\\_Vet%20Leg.pdf](http://www.oie.int/eng/oie/organisation/A_Guidelines_Vet%20Leg.pdf).

Dr Kahn informed the Code Commission that the first OIE Global Conference on Veterinary Legislation will be held in Djerba (Tunisia) on 6–8 December 2010. The announcement is available at:

[http://www.oie.int/Eng/A\\_LEG\\_VET2010/ENG\\_first%20announcement.pdf](http://www.oie.int/Eng/A_LEG_VET2010/ENG_first%20announcement.pdf)

**c) PVS Feedback session (9-10 December 2009) and meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on the Evaluation of Veterinary Services (11 December 2009)**

Dr Kahn informed the Code Commission that the OIE was preparing a further revision of the OIE *Tool for the Evaluation of Performance of Veterinary Services* (OIE PVS *Tool*) and that the 11 December meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on the Evaluation of Veterinary Services would be preceded by a two-day seminar on expert experience in the evaluation of Veterinary Services.

**Item 7. Design and implementation of systems for animal identification and traceability (Chapter 4.2.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia. The Code Commission noted that the concept of animal ownership may be very different in developing and developed countries and that the application of Chapter 4.2. needed to be considered in this light. The Code Commission made relevant amendments to the text.

The revised Chapter at [Annex IX](#) is provided for Member comments.

## **Item 8. Zoning and compartmentalisation**

The Code Commission discussed the important concept of compartmentalisation and its incorporation in the *Terrestrial Code* as appropriate. This concept is valuable for disease control as well as for facilitating trade and can contribute to improving food security. The role of the Veterinary Authority in approving the compartment is of critical importance in both cases. Partnership with the private sector is however essential to ensure the correct application of the measures. The biosecurity plan documents the measures and the role of both the Veterinary Authority and the private sector in establishing and maintaining the compartment. If the compartment is being established for the purposes of trade, there must be a negotiation between the veterinary authority of the exporting and the importing country to recognise the correct application of measures. In all cases, the recommendations of the OIE should be followed. However, the OIE will not officially recognise free compartments. At this time the OIE does not propose to provide specific detailed recommendations in the *Terrestrial Code* on the provisions for implementing disease free compartments. However, practical guidance will be provided outside the *Terrestrial Code* via documents published on the OIE internet site.

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

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and advice of the SCAD and the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology. The Code Commission noted that the SCAD had referred the description of measures and functional aspects of the protection zone to the *ad hoc* Group on FMD.

The Code Commission modified the text as appropriate, including the addition of appropriate references to wildlife in Article 4.3.2. and of principles for defining a protection zone to Article 4.3.3. The EU recommendations for controls to provide for auditing of animal movements (Article 4.3.3., former point 5) were not accepted as the Code Commission considered that the important issue was the capacity to audit the history of the animals rather than tracing individual movements. However, the Code Commission reiterated the importance of animal identification and traceability for applying the concept of compartmentalisation.

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

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and advice of the SCAD and amended Article 4.4.7.

The Code Commission noted that these two chapters could usefully be amalgamated to eliminate the duplication of texts and asked the International Trade Department to undertake this work once the content on compartmentalisation and on protection zones had been finalised.

The revised Chapters 4.3. and 4.4. are provided at [Annex X](#) for Member comments.

## **Item 9. Semen and embryo chapters (Chapters 4.5. – 4.8. (inclusive) and Chapter 4.10.)**

Professor Michel Thibier, Chair of the IETS HASSAC Committee, joined the Code Commission for this agenda item. The Code Commission discussed whether it would be useful to develop a new chapter on the collection and processing of equine semen. In the absence of requests from OIE Members, the Code Commission did not propose to undertake this work in the near future.

### **a) Collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen (Chapter 4.5.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments of the EU, extensive comments made by Australia, and the comments made by the USA at the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session.

In accordance with Australia's comments and the advice of Prof. Thibier, the Code Commission renumbered Chapter 4.5. as Chapter 4.6. and made several amendments to the text, including modification of the terms 'quarantine', 'quarantine station' and 'pre-quarantine', the word 'quarantine' being replaced by 'isolation' throughout the chapter.

The Code Commission considered the recommendations made by the USA at the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session regarding testing for *Campylobacter fetus* subsp. *venerealis* and for *Trichomonas fetus* but, in the absence of a structured scientific rationale for the specific number of tests proposed, was not able to make the requested modifications.

The Code Commission decided not to accept the Australian proposal to modify several articles with respect to bluetongue because they were not consistent with the recommendations in Chapter 8.3. (Bluetongue).

As a matter of OIE policy, all references to border disease and Teschovirus encephalomyelitis were deleted from the chapter as these diseases are no longer listed by the OIE.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XI](#) for Member comments.

**b) General hygiene in semen collection and processing centres (Chapter 4.6.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments of Australia.

In accordance with Australia's comments and the advice of Prof. Thibier, the Code Commission renumbered Chapter 4.6. as Chapter 4.5. The Code Commission did not accept the proposal to change the title of this chapter, as the title is appropriate to the contents of the chapter. The Code Commission made appropriate modifications to the text in Articles 4.6.1. and 4.6.2.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XI](#) for Member comments.

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

The Code Commission reviewed comments of the EU, Kuwait and South Africa.

Modifications were made to Articles 4.7.2. and 4.7.4.

In reply to a question from the EU, the Code Commission was advised by Prof. Thibier that the requirement in Article 4.7.5. for washing of no more than 10 embryos in a batch is the recommendation of the IETS Manual because all the studies demonstrating the safety of washed embryos have been conducted on batches of 10 embryos or less.

The Code Commission referred to the IETS the recommendation of South Africa regarding the listing of *Mycobacterium paratuberculosis* (in sheep) under category 3 in Article 4.7.14. Prof. Thibier confirmed that the IETS would consider this at its next meeting in January 2010.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XI](#) for Member comments.

**d) Collection and processing of *in vitro* produced embryos/oocytes from livestock and horses (Chapter 4.8.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments of the EU, Kuwait and Sudan (the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session).

In response to the EU comment on Articles 4.8.3., 4.8.4. and 4.8.5., the Code Commission advised that the risks associated with *in vitro* produced (and micro manipulated) embryos and oocytes are different to the risks associated with *in vivo* produced embryos and oocytes because of the loss of integrity of the *zona pellucida* and there is less scientific evidence for the *in vitro* products, hence the different recommendations.

The Code Commission accepted comments of the EU and of Kuwait and modified Article 4.8.2. and Article 4.8.4. accordingly.

The Code Commission did not accept the recommendation of Sudan to add congenital diseases to Chapter 4.8., as these diseases are outside the scope of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission discussed the comments of the EU on the wording in this chapter 'subject to veterinary restrictions for listed diseases'. The difficulty of determining which diseases on the OIE list should be considered as transmissible via *in vitro* produced embryos/oocytes, as distinct from *in vivo* produced embryos (that are the subject of specific IETS recommendations) makes it difficult to quickly resolve this issue. As an interim measure, the Code Commission decided to qualify the reference to listed diseases by adding the words 'of concern (under study)' and to ask the IETS to provide a proposed listing of the diseases that the OIE should take into account.

The Code Commission also asked the IETS to revise the articles on *in vivo* derived embryos in Chapter 8.3. (Bluetongue), Chapter 11.5. (Campylobacteriosis), Chapter 11.16. (Trichomonosis) and Chapter 14.9. (Scrapie).

The Code Commission modified the text of Article 4.8.5. to clarify that the testing described in this article is considered as supplemental to the procedures outlined elsewhere in the chapter.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XI](#) for Member comments.

**e) Collection and processing of laboratory rodent and rabbit embryos/ova (Chapter 4.10.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments of the EU and Kuwait.

The Code Commission accepted the recommendation of Kuwait on Article 4.10.2. and that of the EU on Article 4.10.5. and made appropriate modifications.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XI](#) for Member comments.

**Item 10. Health certification (Chapters 5.1., 5.2. and 5.10.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and comments from Canada, Norway and the USA forwarded by the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (Aquatic Animals Commission) in March 2009.

Harmonization of the two *Codes* is an important objective. However, the Code Commission noted that the Member comments to the Aquatic Animals Commission had not been submitted to the Terrestrial Code Commission. To facilitate the process of review and harmonization, the Commission encouraged Members to ensure that the comments submitted to the two Commissions are consistent.



In response to a comment from the EU, the Code Commission modified the text to exclude conditions for diseases that are not transmitted by the commodity concerned. The Commission also agreed that only one responsible veterinarian should sign the health certificate to avoid confusion in the importing country. The Code Commission noted that substitutions and other changes to certificates were not acceptable and therefore decided to maintain the text in point 8 of Article 5.2.3.

The Commission did not accept the proposed modification of Chapter 5.10. (Note for guidance on veterinary certificates) because the proposed addition of ‘general principles’ is already covered in Chapters 5.1. and 5.2 and the proposed deletions are normal requirements for border control, zoning, etc. However, it asked the Aquatic Animals Commission to consider introducing modifications to the OIE *Aquatic Animal Health Code (Aquatic Code)* as appropriate.

The revised Chapters are provided at [Annex XII](#) for Member comments.

**Item 11. The control of hazards of animal health and public health importance in animal feed (Chapter 6.3.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia and the EU and modified the text as appropriate, including modification of the definition of ‘feed additive’.

Due to lack of specific information, the Code Commission maintained its position not to cover feed for bees in this chapter. It did not accept the proposed Australian modification of the definition of feed ingredients based on the fact that the text in the *Terrestrial Code* has been substantially harmonized with the Codex Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding (CAC/RCP 54-2004). It did not accept the proposed addition of monitoring to contamination (point 12 of Article 6.3.4.) because this is covered by point 7 (Sampling and analysis) of Article 6.3.4.

The revised Chapters are provided at [Annex XIII](#) for Member comments.

**Item 12. The control of hazards of animal health and public health importance in heat treated pet food (draft proposed new chapter)**

The Code Commission acknowledged the submission of a draft proposed new chapter on pet food and supporting document by the Delegate of the USA.

The Code Commission considered that all animal feed, including pet food, should be covered in Chapter 6.3. and decided that after adoption of the provisions of the proposed new chapter, the text would be included in Chapter 6.3. and the footnotes deleted.

The proposed new Chapters are provided at [Annex XIV](#) for Member comments.

The supporting document is provided at [Annex XLIII](#) for information of Members on the international pet food industry, its practices, and the work in progress.

**Item 13. Salmonellosis**

**a) Report on the Codex Working Group meeting (Brazil 7–12 September 2009)**

In 2007, the Codex Alimentarius Commission agreed that the development of guidelines for the control of *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* in poultry was a priority. Later that year, at its 39<sup>th</sup> session, the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH) agreed on the approach to be taken in the development of draft Guidelines for control of *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* spp. in chicken meat. The 40<sup>th</sup> session of the CCFH requested the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) to provide the necessary scientific advice to ensure that the Guidelines were underpinned with the most robust scientific data. In response the FAO and WHO convened an expert meeting on 4–8 May 2009, in Rome, which the OIE attended.

The Physical Working Group met in Brazil on 7-11 September 2009 to further develop the proposed draft Guidelines for control of *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* in chicken meat. The Working Group reviewed the draft Guidelines taking into account the FAO/WHO Expert meeting report and CAC Member comments.

The Guidelines incorporate a 'production-to-consumption' approach and identify all steps in the food chain where control measures could potentially be applied. The Guidelines are divided into three parts, the first on Good Hygiene Practices (GHPs), the second on hazard based controls and the third on risk based control measures. They include references to relevant OIE standards as the primary source of recommendations regarding the primary production phase and it is noted that the Codex Guidelines are supplementary to relevant OIE standards with regard to control measures during primary production. In addition, the Codex Working Group agreed to use OIE definitions where they exist. The proposed Guidelines include OIE definitions for competitive exclusion, epidemiological unit, establishment and flock. The OIE will continue to participate actively in the drafting and revision of the Guidelines according to the CAC procedures.

**b) Biosecurity procedures in poultry production (revised Chapter 6.4.)**

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Salmonellosis ([Annex XLII](#)), including the revised Chapter 6.4. The Code Commission endorsed the work of the *ad hoc* Group, which had addressed Member comments and had reduced the amount of detail that was previously in this chapter. The resulting text addresses generically hygiene and biosecurity practices. If additional details on frequency and timing of measures are needed by Members, these could be developed and presented as guidelines outside the *Terrestrial Code*. Noting that the OIE had received one round of comments from Members on this text, the Code Commission decided to propose the revised chapter for adoption in May 2010.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XV](#) for Member comments.

**c) Prevention, detection and control of *Salmonella* in poultry (Chapter 6.5.)**

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

The Code Commission reviewed the work of the *ad hoc* Group on Salmonellosis, including the revision of Chapter 6.5. The *ad hoc* Group had addressed Member comments and had also incorporated into Chapter 6.5. the three Articles from Chapter 6.6. (*Salmonella* Enteritidis and *Salmonella* Typhimurium in Poultry) thereby deleting Chapter 6.6.

Bearing in mind that the terminology 'free from at least *S. Enteritidis* and *S. Typhimurium*' was not clear and that concept of freedom from these pathogens has not been defined in the *Terrestrial Code*, the Code Commission modified Article 6.5.5.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XV](#) for Member comments.

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

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

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

**Item 15. Animal welfare**

**a) Use of animals in research and education (new draft chapter) and report of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare (including OIE discussion paper on air transport of laboratory animals)**

The Code Commission considered comments provided by Australia, Canada, Chinese Taipei, the EU, New Zealand, Switzerland and the USA, and from an animal welfare NGO.

The Code Commission acknowledged the work of the *ad hoc* Group and the extensive detailed information in its report (Annex XXXVIII). Noting that the draft chapter had been sent to Members for comment once and that the *ad hoc* Group had substantially addressed the comments provided, the Code Commission considered that the chapter could be proposed for adoption at the 78<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session. This will be decided in light of the Code Commission's consideration of Member comments at its February 2010 meeting. The Code Commission also noted that the list of references provided for Member information would not be included in the chapter when proposed for adoption. To facilitate the analysis of the new draft text, the Commission decided to present two versions of the text, one showing modifications in double underline and strikeout, and a second as clean text.

The revised Chapter is provided at Annex XVII for Member comments.

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

The Code Commission reviewed comments provided by Japan and comments submitted in the previous 12 months by the EU, Canada and the USA and during the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session. The Code Commission recalled that the definition had been adopted at the 76<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session by consensus after lengthy discussion and, given that the comments under consideration could not readily be reconciled, the Code Commission decided that no changes to the definition were warranted.

**c) Stray dog population control (Chapter 7.7.)**

The Code Commission reviewed this chapter, which had been presented as an annex to the report of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG), and, to ensure consistency with the rest of the *Terrestrial Code*, deleted the word 'guidelines' from the title and modified the heading of the table.

The revised Chapter is provided at Annex XVII for Member comments.

**d) Report of the 8th meeting of the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group**

The Code Commission noted the report of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the AWWG (Annex XXXV). In regard to the future work programme of the AWWG, the Code Commission recommended that the AWWG focus its attention in the next year on the development of new chapters on laboratory animal welfare and on the welfare of livestock in the different production systems (starting with beef cattle and broiler chickens, then proceeding to dairy cattle, laying hens and pigs). In this work, the Code Commission encouraged the AWWG to develop texts of similar brevity to those on animal welfare in broiler chicken production and beef cattle production.

The Code Commission recommended that the highest priority for the AWWG is to finish the work on these new standards. The work on wildlife and the ethics of long distance transport should be deferred pending completion of these new standards.

**e) Report of the OIE Electronic Consultation Group on Poultry Welfare**

The Code Commission reviewed the recommendations of the Electronic Consultation Group (Annex XXXIX), which had proposed several amendments to Chapters 7.3., 7.4., 7.5. and 7.6. to address the specific requirements for transporting, killing and slaughtering poultry. The Code Commission acknowledged the thorough work of this group and made a number of modifications to the draft text received from the AWWG. However, the Code Commission expressed its concern that the excessive amount of detail was inappropriate in a standard of this kind. Such detail would be better published as guidelines i.e. outside the *Terrestrial Code*.

The revised Chapters are provided at Annex XVII for Member comments.

**f) Report of the first meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare and Broiler Chicken Production Systems**

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group (Annex XXXVI) and made several modifications to the text of the draft new chapter for clarification and to improve consistency with other *Terrestrial Code* chapters.

The Code Commission noted that the recommendations were limited to broilers in commercial production systems and do not cover broilers in informal production systems (such as backyard and village flocks). This does not mean to say that welfare is unimportant in backyard production systems. Rather, it reflects the difficulties that Veterinary Services face in making interventions in non commercial flocks. No definition has been proposed for backyard flocks but the Code Commission noted that this term has been used for several years (e.g. in the FAO Recommendations on the Prevention, Control and Eradication of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) in Asia, published in September 2004).

The revised Chapter is provided at Annex XVII for Member comments.

**g) Report of the first meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare and Beef Cattle Production Systems**

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group (Annex XXXVII).

The revised Chapter is provided at Annex XVII for Member comments.

The Code Commission commends the brevity of the texts on animal welfare in broiler chicken production and beef cattle production and recommends that these should be models for future concise animal welfare standards.

**Item 16. Other horizontal chapters**

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

**b) Border posts and quarantine stations in the importing country (Chapter 5.6.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Kuwait and South Africa, as well as advice from the SCAD, and modified the definition of quarantine station in the Glossary. The change proposed by Kuwait in Chapter 5.4. had already been adopted at the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session. Since the definition of quarantine station was modified, no modifications were required in Chapter 5.6.

**Item 17. Anthrax (Chapter 8.1.)**

The Code Commission reviewed the comments of Australia, Canada, the EU, Japan, New Zealand and Switzerland, the advice of an expert and comments provided by the SCAD.

On Article 8.1.1. (General Provisions), the Code Commission accepted a recommendation from New Zealand to clarify that the objectives of the recommendations in the chapter encompass animal health, human health and protection of the environment. After discussion with Prof. Thibier the Code Commission also modified the text to clarify that semen and *in vivo* derived cattle embryos collected and handled in accordance with relevant *Terrestrial Code* chapters are considered to be safe commodities.

Complementing this modification, the Code Commission included in the General Provisions a reference to the application of the recommendations in this chapter for international trade in commodities other than those considered to be safe.

On New Zealand's recommendation, the Code Commission modified Article 8.1.6. to reflect that Veterinary Services should not be expected to certify the absence of clinical anthrax in sheep at the time of shearing as there is already certification to this effect for the flock of origin. Moreover, the existing text in points 2 and 3 of Article 8.1.6. is adequate for risk management.

On New Zealand's recommendation, the Code Commission deleted point 3 (c) in Article 8.1.8. and presented the scientific rationale for point 3 (a) i.e. boiling for 60 minutes, as follows: "Table 1 in Spotts Whitney *et al* (2003) cites four different studies which demonstrated the destruction of *Bacillus anthracis* spores through boiling or other moist heat at 100°C for 5, 10 or 17 minutes."

In response to a question from Japan, the Code Commission concluded that the recommendations in Article 8.1.9. are well supported by a published reference [Spotts Whitney *et al* (2003)] and the specifications are less prescriptive and more generally applicable than those specified in the WHO Guidelines.

The Code Commission modified points 1 – 4 (inclusive) of Article 8.1.11. in accordance with a comment from Japan. The Code Commission noted the question raised by Canada on the inactivation of spores in manure, dung and bedding. Given that there is no practical option currently available for the inactivation of anthrax spores in these materials, the Code Commission did not modify Article 8.1.12. and instead requested advice from Delegates as to practical alternatives for the treatment of manure, dung and bedding.

In response to a request from Japan for the background and rationale of the amendments proposed to Articles 8.1.14. and 8.1.15., the Code Commission responded that while the procedures cited are difficult to perform and may not always be totally effective, the recommendations are taken from the best currently available scientific references.

The revised chapter is provided at [Annex XVIII](#) for Member comments. References were left in the text for information of Members but these will be removed when the text is proposed for adoption.

#### **Item 18. Bluetongue (Chapter 8.3.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments of Australia, the EU and South Africa, as well as advice provided by the SCAD and the International Embryo Transfer Society (IETS).

The Code Commission did not accept the EU recommendation on Article 8.3.1., because even if vaccination is performed and could be considered as a measure able to interrupt the transmission of bluetongue virus, the effectiveness of vaccination cannot be assured in the absence of surveillance. The Code Commission did not accept the EU recommendation to add 'in vitro produced embryos and oocytes' as neither the IETS nor the SCAD supported this recommendation. Insufficient scientific studies have been conducted to support the safety of such embryos and there is a small amount of evidence that they may be less safe than *in vivo* derived embryos.

The Code Commission accepted Australia's recommendation to modify the text of point 2 in Article 8.3.3., but did not accept recommendation to modify point 1 of Article 8.3.3., noting that the critical issue of proximity to an infected country is appropriately addressed.

On the issue of changes to the status of a BTV free country/zone due to the importation of bluetongue seropositive animals (Article 8.3.3.), the Code Commission accepted an EU recommendation (supported by the SCAD) to modify text in point 3 (b) of Article 8.3.3. as it considered that this clarified the relevant provisions.

The Code Commission accepted the EU recommendations (supported by SCAD) to modify points 4 and 5 of Article 8.3.8. to make them consistent with the rest of the chapter.

The recommendation of South Africa on Articles 8.3.11. and 8.3.14. were not supported by SCAD and no changes were made to these texts.

The revised chapter is provided at Annex XIX for Member comments.

#### **Item 19. Foot and mouth disease (Chapter 8.5.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina, Chinese Taipei, the EU, Japan, Korea (Rep. of), Kuwait, New Zealand and the USA as well as the Philippines and Uganda (the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session). The Code Commission also received advice from the SCAD.

Noting that camelids are not ruminants, the Code Commission did not accept an EU recommendation to modify the text of Article 8.5.1.

In response to a recommendation from Argentina, the Code Commission modified the text in point 3 (c) of Article 8.5.2. and added new text at point 3 in Article 8.5.3. and at point 4 in Article 8.5.4. and 8.5.5. to strengthen the provisions for protection zones.

The Code Commission agreed with Argentina on the need to modify the Spanish language version of Article 8.5.4. and the International Trade Department agreed to undertake this revision.

The Code Commission discussed the EU comment on Article 8.5.9. and made appropriate modifications to the text for clarification.

The Code Commission accepted a comment from Chinese Taipei on Article 8.5.10. related to the transport of live animals through infected areas and modified the text accordingly but did not accept Chinese Taipei's recommendation on Article 8.5.20., as this modification had not been supported by the SCAD.

In response to the request of Uganda that Article 8.5.39. be extended to include bovine casings, and noting that the SCAD had received advice from an expert confirming that the procedures used to render small ruminant and porcine casings safe are also effective for beef casings, the Code Commission made an appropriate amendment.

In reply to the question of the Philippines for advice on the required coverage of an animal population with FMD vaccine, the SCAD indicated that it would be difficult to provide definitive advice to cover all situations but that, as a general rule, at least 80% of the population targeted for vaccination should be vaccinated in order to consider that vaccine coverage was adequate (as currently stated in Article 8.5.44.).

In response to a comment of Chinese Taipei on Article 8.5.46. point 2(a), the Code Commission sought advice from the BSC and modified the text accordingly to clarify that the NSP is a population test, not a test for individual animals, and that a positive result should be interpreted in terms of the number of positive animals, not the titre of antibody in the individual animal. On Article 8.5.46. point 2(b) and 2(d) the Code Commission modified the text for clarification as recommended by Chinese Taipei.

#### ***Compartmentalisation for FMD***

The Code Commission discussed the comments submitted by the EU, Japan, Korea (Rep. of), New Zealand and the USA regarding compartmentalisation for FMD. Several Members expressed opposition to the application of compartmentalisation to FMD. However, the Code Commission considered that there was still value in continuing to develop this work. The objective of a Member in implementing compartmentalisation may be to aid disease management and control. Notwithstanding the need for bilateral consultations to satisfy trading partners that the compartment is biosecure, the concept could also be of value in facilitating trade.

Dr Vallat has made it clear that the OIE does not intend currently to grant official recognition for FMD (or other disease) free compartments. However, subject to technical feasibility, the Code Commission considered that Members may wish to establish FMD free compartments for the purpose of supporting improvements in animal health status and for facilitating trade.

Noting that the SCAD had supported the concept that a compartment could be established either in an FMD free (with or without vaccination) or in an FMD infected zone, the Code Commission modified Article 8.5.5.bis by deleting 'where vaccination is practised' from the chapeau of this article.

The Code Commission noted that the FMD/FMDV surveillance requirements for a compartment are effectively the same as those for a zone. Accordingly, the Code Commission added text to the effect that surveillance in accordance with Chapters 4.3. and 4.4. should be implemented in the country or zone (as appropriate) in which the compartment is located.

Noting that an expert and the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology had developed a checklist for the implementation of a compartment for avian influenza and Newcastle disease (see [http://www.oie.int/eng/info\\_ev/Other%20Files/En\\_final\\_Compartmentalisation\\_AI\\_ND\\_10\\_05\\_2007.pdf](http://www.oie.int/eng/info_ev/Other%20Files/En_final_Compartmentalisation_AI_ND_10_05_2007.pdf)), the Code Commission considered that it was not necessary at this time to include specific recommendations in the *Terrestrial Code* on the implementation of compartments for FMD but requested that the SCAD consider the development of a checklist for FMD similar to that provided for AI/ND.

The Code Commission also recommended that the checklist for AI/ND be updated, taking into account comments submitted by the EU.

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

#### **Item 20. Paratuberculosis (Chapter 8.10.)**

The Code Commission noted a comment submitted by the EU.

In response to previous requests of Members, the Code Commission discussed with the SCAD the possibility of preparing a support document for guidance of Members. However, in view of the lack of adequate diagnostic tests for paratuberculosis, the Code Commission and the SCAD agreed that this work could not be undertaken in advance of further scientific development.

Noting that the content of Chapter 8.10. had been removed from the *Terrestrial Code*, the Code Commission decided that it could do no further work on paratuberculosis pending the future development of a supporting document.

#### **Item 21. Rabies (Chapter 8.11.)**

The Code Commission reviewed the comments from the EU and referred them to the *ad hoc* Group on Rabies, which will meet in January 2010 to consider replacing the current Chapter 8.10. The Code Commission undertook that, if possible, it would study the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group and the SCAD at its February 2010 meeting.

#### **Item 22. West Nile fever (Chapter 8.16.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and the USA.

The Code Commission accepted the deletion of chicken and turkey chicks under 12 days of age from the list of susceptible species and reorganised the recommendation on importation as appropriate. In making these modifications, the Code Commission took careful note of the following scientific evidence.

“There are only very limited and artificially controlled laboratory studies demonstrating infectivity, but there is absolutely no evidence that this occurs and poses any risk under field conditions. Chickens and turkeys, regardless of age, are a resistant species and as such, artificially laboratory-induced infection should not be used as a basis for imposing trade restrictions. Recommending restrictions on a species (chicks under 12 days old) that have shown not to play any epidemiological role in the transmission of the disease agent is not warranted.

Studies conducted by Swayne *et al.* (Avian Dis. 2000 Oct-Dec; 44(4) 932-7) showed that while turkeys do develop a viraemia, the level of virus is very low – less than what is needed to effectively infect mosquitoes. The data for that study showed that turkeys are not a significant amplifying host for infecting mosquitoes. Similarly, a study conducted by Senne *et al.* (Avian Dis. 2000 Jul-Sep; 44(3) 642-9) showed a lack of significant viraemia needed to infect mosquitoes. Another study by Buckley *et al.* (Virology Journal 2006, Sep; 3:71) failed to isolate either virus or viral RNA from the sera of infected chicks. Furthermore, there is no field evidence which shows that clinical disease develops in chickens or turkeys. Thus, although poultry of any age can become infected with WNV, they do not develop clinical disease, they cannot infect other birds or animals, and they do not act as a reservoir for the virus.”

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XXI](#) for Member comments.

**Item 23. Diseases of bees (Chapters 9.1. – 9.6. [inclusive ])**

Noting that an *ad hoc* Group on Bee Diseases would be convened in January 2010 under the SCAD and the BSC, the Code Commission forwarded Member comments to the experts for review.

**a) Chapters 9.1., 9.2. and 9.3.**

The Code Commission noted comments from the EU.

The Code Commission modified the text in point 3 of Articles 9.1.2. by adding the words ‘honey for human consumption’.

**b) Small hive beetle infestation (Chapter 9.4.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia and the EU.

The Code Commission modified the text in point 2 of Article 9.4.2. by adding the words ‘honey for human consumption’.

**c) Chapters 9.5. and 9.6.**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU.

The Code Commission modified the text in point 2 of Articles 9.5.2. and 9.6.2. by adding the words ‘honey for human consumption’.

The revised Chapters are provided at [Annex XXII](#) for Member comments.

**Item 24. Avian influenza (Chapter 10.4.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments of Australia, the EU and the USA, and SCAD advice.



The Code Commission replaced the word ‘container’ by ‘packaging material’ in all articles relating to eggs (Articles 10.4.10, 11, 12, 13 and 14) as containers are defined in the *Terrestrial Code* and the definition is not appropriate to egg packaging material.

The Code Commission discussed the comments of the EU and New Zealand on Article 10.4.6. regarding the testing of shipments of live birds other than poultry. The Code Commission considered that the final details of the sampling programme need to be agreed between trading partners and cannot be specified in the *Terrestrial Code*. However, in order to provide guidance to Members, the Code Commission modified Article 10.4.6. in line with advice from SCAD.

The Code Commission considered but did not accept the EU suggestion to change Articles 10.4.15. and 10.4.21. because these articles are consistent with the articles describing the procedures for the inactivation of AI viruses.

After considering the comments of the USA, the Code Commission decided to merge Articles 10.4.19. and 10.4.20. as the two articles deal with essentially the same risks and recommend the same approaches to risk management. The essential point is freedom of the country, zone or compartment from HPNAI – which applies equally when the country, zone or compartment is free from NAI.

The Code Commission noted recommendations of the USA on Articles 10.4.22. and 10.4.25. and added a reference to poultry meat meal in both articles and a third processing alternative at point 2 (c) of Article 10.4.25.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XXIII](#) for Member comments.

#### **Item 25. Newcastle disease (Chapter 10.13.)**

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

The Code Commission replaced the word ‘container’ by ‘packaging material’ in all articles relating to eggs (Articles 10.13.8., 9. and 10.) as containers are defined in the *Terrestrial Code* and the definition is not appropriate to egg packaging material.

The Code Commission considered that the approach to management of risks of avian influenza in poultry meat meal should be applied to the management of risks associated with Newcastle disease virus and accordingly modified Article 10.13.16. and Article 10.13.19. by adding poultry meat meal to the scope of these articles, and added a third alternative to the processing parameters in Article 10.13.19.

The Code Commission noted the wide variation in the conclusions of studies on the inactivation of Newcastle disease viruses. However, based on the explanation provided by a Member and an expert, the Code Commission decided to remove ‘under study’ in Articles 10.13.20. and 10.13.21. and accepted the inclusion of poultry meat meal in Article 10.13.19. (feather meal and poultry meat meal).

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

#### **Item 26. Bovine brucellosis (Chapter 8.10.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU.

The Code Commission noted that an OIE *ad hoc* Group on Brucellosis will hold a meeting in November under SCAD to review the chapter and forwarded the submitted comments for consideration of experts.

**Item 27. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.6.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia and the EU and comments submitted by an industry association.

In response to the EU comment, the Code Commission modified Articles 11.6.3. and 11.6.4. to clarify that providing the importation of cattle is done in accordance with Articles 11.6.7., 8. and 9., such importation would not change the status of the importing country.

In response to the comments from an industry association, Dr Thiermann recalled the decision of OIE Delegates at the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session. The Code Commission decided that the articles on gelatine should not be changed.

In response to the EU comment on Article 11.6.14. and the request for the OIE to provide the scientific justification for considering only the distal ileum as specified risk material, the Code Commission noted that no new scientific information has come to light that would warrant changing the decisions based on the supporting document and reported in the Code Commission report of October 2006. The Commission welcomed the submission of relevant new scientific information.

In response to the comment of Australia on Article 11.6.15., Dr Thiermann clarified that the reason for the difference is that Article 11.6.14. applies to raw commodities whereas Article 11.6.15. refers to the production of gelatin, a very rigorous process that has been demonstrated in peer reviewed scientific studies to produce a safe commodity.

In response to the EU comment on Article 11.6.17., the Code Commission noted that the current text makes reference to Article 11.6.15., and thus limits the manufacturing of di-calcium phosphate (DCP) to vertebral columns from cattle under 30 months of age that have passed ante and post mortem inspection. Skulls are excluded. This recommendation is consistent with the current scientific knowledge on BSE and the safety of DCP produced in this manner has been verified by peer reviewed scientific study.

The Code Commission discussed the EU request to modify Article 11.6.20. but made no changes as it considered that the text was sufficiently clear.

In response to EU comments, the Code Commission added text on the assessment of the birth cohort of a case (Article 11.6.23.), to clarify the correct implementation of provisions on the feed ban.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XXV](#) for Member comments.

**Item 28. Tuberculosis of bovines and farmed cervidae****a) Bovine tuberculosis (Chapter 11.7.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Canada (the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session), the EU and South Africa.

The Code Commission accepted the EU proposal to modify the text of Article 11.7.2. for clarification of the meaning. However, the Code Commission did not accept the comment from South Africa regarding the inadequacy of abattoir monitoring for countries that have been free of bovine tuberculosis for at least five years. The Code Commission is not aware of any scientific evidence supporting this proposition. Moreover, the Code Commission is aware of this method being used with success by at least one OIE Member that has eradicated bovine tuberculosis.

The Code Commission accepted a proposal from the EU to modify Article 11.7.3. to clarify that all cattle in the compartment should be included in the certification.

In response to the comment of the Canadian Delegate regarding the consistency of the texts dealing with free compartments and free herds, the Code Commission confirmed that the requirements for a free compartment were intentionally stricter than those for free herds.

**b) Bovine tuberculosis of farmed cervidae (Chapter 11.8.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and accepted a recommendation to make Chapter 11.8 consistent with Chapter 11.7.

The revised Chapters are provided at [Annex XXVI](#) for Member comments.

**Item 29. Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (Chapter 11.9.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU and Kuwait.

The Code Commission discussed an EU comment calling for a definition of domestic cattle. However, rather than addressing this point in Chapter 11.9., the Commission noted that the OIE would have a broader discussion on the definition of the role of wildlife in the epidemiology of several diseases, including the implications for country status and trade. The EU comment should be considered in the context of this broader discussion.

In response to the comment of Kuwait, the Code Commission noted that the OIE *ad hoc* Group on Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia had recommended the removal of semen and embryos from the list of safe commodities and that bovine pleuropneumonia was not currently on any IETS list because insufficient scientific studies have been conducted for the IETS to evaluate the safety of embryos. Therefore, the Code Commission did not accept Kuwait's recommendation.

The revised Chapters are provided at [Annex XXVII](#) for Member comments.

**Item 30. Enzootic bovine leukosis (Chapter 11.11.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from New Zealand.

The Code Commission proposed new text with the conditions for a free compartment, following a structure similar to that adopted in the chapter on bovine tuberculosis. The Code Commission also added text specifying which animals are considered to be susceptible to enzootic bovine leukosis, i.e. domestic cattle (*Bos indicus* and *Bos taurus*) and replaced the word 'animal' with 'cattle' as appropriate throughout the chapter.

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

**Item 31. Infectious bovine rhinotracheitis/infectious pustular vulvovaginitis (Chapter 11.13.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia and agreed with the proposal to make reference to testing according to the OIE *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals* in Article 11.13.7.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XXIX](#) for Member comments.

**Item 32. Equine diseases (Chapters 12.1., 12.7. and 12.10.)**

The Code Commission discussed with Dr Vallat the request of the People's Republic of China (at the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session) for the OIE to consider establishing procedures for the official recognition of Member freedom from certain equine diseases. This matter will be considered by an *ad hoc* Group established under the SCAD. The Code Commission agreed to follow developments on this issue in collaboration with SCAD.

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

The Code Commission referred to the BSC a comment from Kenya regarding the use of vaccine for African horse sickness.

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

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Australia, and the advice of an expert, and modified the text of Article 12.7.6. as appropriate.

**c) Equine viral arteritis (Chapter 12.10.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from the EU, Kuwait and South Africa, and advice of three experts.

The Code Commission did not accept the recommendation of Kuwait on point 3 of Article 12.10.2., because the period described in this point could vary depending on the timing of the first test ('not earlier than 7 days after commencing isolation').

Based on Member comments and expert consultation, several changes were made.

The revised Chapters 12.7. and 12.10. are provided at [Annex XXX](#) for Member comments.

**Item 33. Scrapie (Chapter 14.9.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments of Canada, the EU and New Zealand, as well as comments made by the USA at the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session.

In response to the EU comment, the Code Commission modified Article 14.9.1. (General Provisions) to express more clearly the OIE's position that scrapie does not present a risk to human health. In response to the comment of Canada on the safety of semen, the Code Commission included semen in Article 14.9.1. as a safe commodity. The justification for this decision was provided as follows:

Evidence from epidemiological studies and experimental matings of scrapie-affected rams suggests that scrapie is unlikely to be transmitted by semen (Wrathall 2000, Wang *et al.* 2001, Wrathall *et al.* 2008). Palmer (1959) failed to transmit scrapie by subcutaneous injection into lambs of semen from a clinically affected ram. The lambs were, however, only observed for 30 months post-inoculation and this observation period would now be considered less than ideal.

Bioassays in mice have failed to detect scrapie infectivity in testis, seminal vesicles and semen of affected rams (Hourrigan *et al.* 1979, Hourrigan 1990, Hadlow 1991, Hourrigan and Klingsporn 1996). Hourrigan reported the failure to detect infectivity in semen samples from 21 cases of scrapie (Hourrigan 1990). The study by Hadlow *et al.* (1980) showed that the distribution of scrapie infectivity in goats is essentially the same as in naturally-infected sheep.

Gatti and colleagues were unable to detect PrP<sup>sc</sup> in seminal plasma of rams with scrapie, suggesting that infectivity was absent (Gatti *et al.* 2002). The conclusions of this study have recently been confirmed by an experiment in which semen from infected rams was inoculated into scrapie-susceptible transgenic mice expressing the VRQ allele of the sheep prion gene (Sarradin *et al.* 2008).

The transgenic mouse model used by Sarradin and colleagues (2008) has been shown to be capable of detecting very low levels of infectivity. The study reported by Sarradin and others (2008) demonstrated that scrapie was not transmitted by semen at any time during the incubation period of scrapie in four rams, even from one of the highly susceptible VRQ/VRQ genotype during the clinical stages of the disease.

In reply to the EU question on the justification for the seven-year period stated in Article 14.9.3., the Code Commission pointed out that this recommendation came from the *ad hoc* Group on Scrapie and had been based on twice the average time period for the scrapie agent to be transmitted from one generation of sheep to the next.

The Code Commission did not agree with the Canadian request to permit the introduction of rams and bucks from establishments other than free establishments, although it had been permitted in the 2008 edition of the *Terrestrial Code*. There may be a small risk that rams and bucks, if infected with scrapie, could transmit scrapie via saliva and faeces.

Noting the supportive advice of SCAD on the topic of historical freedom, the Code Commission did not accept the EU proposal to adopt numerical testing targets to establish freedom because to prove the absence of a disease of this nature would require testing of a very large number of animals. The concept of historical freedom has been accepted by the OIE and is appropriate in the case of scrapie. However, the Code Commission modified Article 14.9.15. to strengthen the provisions for the formal programme of targeted surveillance. The Code Commission also deleted from Articles 14.9.14. and 14.9.15. references to demonstrating the presence of susceptible genotypes in the population of sheep in the country because, since the chapter was drafted, there had been significant advances in knowledge on the genetics of scrapie susceptibility and it is highly unlikely that any country would have a small ruminant population without susceptible genotypes.

The EU comment on point 2 a) and b) of Article 14.9.3. was not accepted as the requirement for scrapie to be notifiable is already covered in Article 14.9.3. (point 1).

The Code Commission did not accept the recommendation of the USA (the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session) to target surveillance for scrapie to all cull sheep rather than to sheep with chronic wasting conditions. However, the text in point 2 (b) of Article 14.9.3. was modified to provide that mature sheep found dead on farm should be tested when the numbers of mature culled sheep and goats over 18 months of age were insufficient in the practical situation. In addition, the words 'under study' were removed from this point.

In regard to compartments, the Code Commission considered that there is likely to be commercial interest in this approach and the provisions of Article 14.9.4. should be as clear as possible. With this objective, the Code Commission modified the chapeau and several points in this article.

The Code Commission noted the support of SCAD for the EU comment on Article 14.9.6. and agreed to delete the option for placing imported animals in a quarantine station, given that the OIE is unable to provide specific recommendations on the testing and associated parameters.

The Code Commission did not agree to combine Articles 14.9.11. and 14.9.12. as recommended by SCAD; however, it modified the text of Article 14.9.12. to indicate that listed products should not be traded internationally, consistent with the EU comment.

The revised Chapter is provided at [Annex XXXI](#) for Member comments.

#### **Item 34. Classical swine fever (Chapter 15.3.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments received from Australia and South Africa, comments made by the Delegate of the USA at the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session, and advice of the SCAD.

The Code Commission noted that South Africa's comment on Article 15.3.2. had already been addressed. As stated at the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session, the criterion in point 7 of Article 15.3.2. applies to the determination of status and the text does not need to be repeated in other articles.

The Code Commission accepted the comment of the USA on Article 15.3.3. and made an appropriate modification to the text. The comments of Australia on Article 15.3.22. (procedures for the inactivation of CSF virus in trophies) were referred to the SCAD for advice on the scientific issues raised.

The SCAD confirmed that the articles dealing with surveillance for classical swine fever would be reviewed to ensure consistency with the articles on disease surveillance in Chapter 10.4. (Avian Influenza) and Chapter 10.13. (Newcastle Disease) by the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology.

The revised Chapter is provided at Annex XXXII for Member comments.

**Item 35. Swine vesicular disease (Chapter 15.5.)**

The Code Commission received extensive comments from the EU, Korea (Rep. of), New Zealand and Thailand.

The Code Commission acknowledged Members' requests for advice on surveillance and inactivation procedures for swine vesicular disease virus in swine products, similar to the approach taken in Chapter 15.3. (Classical Swine Fever). The Code Commission is awaiting advice from the SCAD, which will convene an *ad hoc* Group to provide advice on these points. Once the content of the chapter has been agreed, the International Trade Department will align the format of the chapter with that of Chapter 15.3. In the interim, the Code Commission made no changes to Chapter 15.5.

**Item 36. Teschovirus encephalomyelitis (Chapter 15.6.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the EU.

With agreement of the Director General and the SCAD and noting that this disease is no longer listed by the OIE, the Code Commission proposed to delete the chapter and all references to this disease in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The deleted Chapters is provided at Annex XXXIII for Member comments.

### C. OTHER ISSUES

**Item 37. Private standards for sanitary measures and animal welfare**

Dr Sarah Kahn briefed the Code Commission on the current OIE work programme on private standards. The OIE has sent a questionnaire to Members and the replies to the questionnaire will be reviewed by the *ad hoc* Group on Private Standards, which will hold a meeting on 9-10 November 2009.

Dr Kahn indicated that Dr Vallat had attended the General Assembly of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) and had made a presentation on, *inter alia*, private standards. A recording of Dr Vallat's presentation may be found on the CAC website at:

[http://www.codexaudio.net/CAC\\_32/OriginalVersion/Index\\_en.html](http://www.codexaudio.net/CAC_32/OriginalVersion/Index_en.html) (see file at Thursday Part 1, Dr Vallat starts speaking at 7 minutes into the recording).

The *ad hoc* Group has been asked to propose an OIE strategy to help Members to avoid trade problems arising from private standards on sanitary measures and on animal welfare.

The Code Commission noted this update and agreed that it would consider the report of the *ad hoc* Group at the Commission's February 2010 meeting.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is provided at Annex XL or information of Members.

**Item 38. Trade in animal products ('commodities')**

Dr Keith Hamilton (OIE Scientific and Technical Department) briefed the Code Commission on the literature review that has been prepared for the *ad hoc* Group on Trade in Animal Products ("Commodities"), which will hold its next meeting on 15 October 2009.

In the context of its work on safe commodities and to be consistent with the modification of several chapters to highlight the safe commodities, the Code Commission proposed modifications to the chapters on Rift Valley fever and Aujeszky's disease.

The Code Commission noted the update provided by Dr Hamilton and undertook to continue working on this issue as a matter of priority at its February 2010 meeting.

The revised Chapters are provided at [Annex XXXIV](#) for Member comments.

**Item 39. Wildlife disease reporting – update on developments with WAHIS**

The Code Commission received comments from South Africa.

Dr Francesco Berlingieri briefed the Code Commission on the development of WAHIS – Wild, which is a supplement to the existing OIE programme for reporting animal diseases. The Code Commission discussed the implications of this redevelopment and agreed that the topic of wildlife diseases and implications for trade should remain as an important issue on the future work programme of the OIE and of the Code Commission.

**Item 40. Future work programme of the Code Commission**

The Code Commission updated its work programme for 2009–2010, which may be found at [Annex XLIV](#).

**Item 41. Other issues**

The next meeting of the Code Commission is scheduled for 8–12 February 2010. The deadline for comments to be considered by the Code Commission at this meeting is **8 January 2010**.

---

.../Annexes