



Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Original: English  
September 2010

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

Paris, 6–17 September 2010

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at the OIE Headquarters in Paris from 6 to 17 September 2010.

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 6 2010 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 XX (bee diseases), the amendments made at this meeting (September 2010) are shown with a coloured background to distinguish them from those made prior to the 78<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session in May 2010.

Members should note that, unless stated otherwise, texts submitted for comment may be proposed for adoption at the 79<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 2011 in the report of its February 2011 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. In order to be considered at the meetings of the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Education, comments on Annex XXXVI should reach OIE Headquarters by **10 December 2010**. Other comments on this report must reach OIE Headquarters by **7 January 2011** to be considered at the February 2011 meeting of the Code Commission. All comments should be sent to the International Trade Department at: [trade.dept@oie.int](mailto:trade.dept@oie.int).

### A. MEETING OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL WITH THE CODE COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION FOR ANIMAL DISEASES

Dr Vallat, Director General of the OIE, met with the two Commissions for a discussion on the significant elements of the two meetings.

With reference to the work of the *ad hoc* Group on FMD, Dr Vallat asked the two Commissions to work in a coordinated manner on this. Dr Vallat expressed the view that the adopted text on the protection zone and the FMD Chapter was well established. The OIE was organising a second Global Conference on FMD, in collaboration with the FAO. The Conference would be held in 2012. Under the new provisions in the *Terrestrial Code*, non FMD-free Members would be encouraged to present their national FMD control programme to the OIE for endorsement. The OIE endorsement of a national FMD control programme would be a key consideration for donors and should be widely publicised, including at the second Global Conference on FMD, which would also be a pledging meeting. Dr Bruckner indicated that the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (the Scientific Commission) would give to the Code Commission a new draft article dealing with endorsement of national control programmes. On the protection zone, while the definition would not be modified, new text had been proposed dealing with the implementation of protection zones.

Dr Vallat mentioned the OIE Global Rabies Conference, which would take place on 7–9 September 2011 in Seoul, and encouraged both Commissions to progress the review of the rabies chapter.

Dr Vallat also mentioned the OIE Global Conference on Veterinary Legislation and stated that this would provide an important opportunity for strengthening references to OIE standards in the national legislation of OIE Members.

In regard to veterinary drugs and vaccines, Dr Vallat recalled the fact that the OIE had a major influence in the creation of the International Cooperation on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Veterinary Medicinal Products (VICH). The OIE support for VICH was important and this is reflected in the hosting of the VICH Conference at OIE headquarters in June 2010. The membership of VICH was primarily developed countries and at the moment it did not have a globally representative scope. The countries of Latin America, through the Committee of the Americas for the Harmonisation of the Registration and Control of Veterinary Medicines (CAMEVET), have asked the OIE to develop standards on the labelling of veterinary drugs. Noting that this work could fall within the mandate of the Biological Standards Commission, Dr Vallat stated that he would request views from relevant Specialist Commissions on how best to move forward, including the possibility of greater involvement of VICH.

Dr Thiermann reaffirmed that the Code Commission would remove from the *Terrestrial Code* all chapters and references on diseases that have been delisted. Relevant information e.g. on diagnostic procedures would of course be retained in the *OIE Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals* (the *Terrestrial Manual*).

On the listing of diseases, the development of the OIE's work into the domain of wildlife has very significant implications for the OIE classification of diseases and for the structure of the *Terrestrial Code*. The chapter dealing with the disease list should be revised accordingly. The *Terrestrial Code* should be restructured, perhaps based on an alphabetical listing of the disease agents.

Dr Bruckner advised that a document on the wildlife/livestock interface had been drafted by the Wildlife Working Group and the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology would be given to the Code Commission for review.

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

The two Commissions held a meeting to discuss the following key points.

### ***Definition of Wildlife***

The Code Commission explained its proposed modification of the definition drafted by the Wildlife Working Group and the Scientific Commission agreed to the approach outlined.

### ***Infected zone***

Dr Bruckner explained the concerns of the Scientific Commission in regard to the current definition in the Glossary: 'a zone in which a disease has been diagnosed'. Dr Bonbon explained the Code Commission thinking on this problem, which takes into account that not all disease chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* contain specific provisions on infected countries/zones.

Dr Thiermann proposed that a definition of 'undetermined status' could be included, using the text proposed by the Scientific Commission, i.e. 'the absence of the disease under consideration has not been demonstrated based on the requirements specified in the *Terrestrial Code*'.

### ***Case definition of OIE listed diseases***

Dr Bruckner enquired about the Code Commission approach to providing a case definition in each disease chapter. It was agreed that a case definition should be provided in all disease chapters and that this would be done gradually, as disease chapters are updated, including ensuring alignment and harmonisation with the definitions in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

### ***Disease notification and listing***

The two Commissions discussed several points in the report of the recent meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Disease Notification and Listing. Both Commissions expressed concerns about the proposed use of the words ‘potential for international spread’ in place of the existing text ‘has international spread been proven’. This was considered to widen the scope for listing diseases beyond what is considered acceptable.

It was agreed that the title of the chapter should be modified to ‘Criteria for reporting and listing disease’ and that more detailed guidance should be provided on the criteria for reporting emerging diseases and new epidemiological events, particularly when occurring in wildlife. The Code Commission undertook to review the report, which it received earlier in the week, and address the concerns of the Scientific Commission during this review.

### ***Compartmentalisation***

Dr Bruckner advised that the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology had developed a generic checklist on the implementation of a compartment. Dr Thiermann noted that the existing checklist on compartmentalisation for avian influenza and Newcastle disease was well accepted by Members and constituted the key practical reference for countries wishing to apply compartments at the present time. He reiterated that Members had identified the need for a checklist on the specifics of application of a compartment for FMD. The Code Commission undertook to review the draft generic checklist and give feedback to the Scientific Commission.

### ***OIE endorsed national FMD control programme***

Noting the importance of this new OIE initiative, the Code Commission agreed to review the draft text provided by the Scientific Commission.

### ***Principles for defining a protection zone***

Dr Thiermann provided a copy of the Code Commission’s revision of the draft text on establishing protection zones, which had been provided by Scientific Commission. Dr Thiermann explained the revisions to this text. The Scientific Commission noted the revised text provided by the Code Commission and undertook to analyse it in detail.

### ***Commodity trade***

Dr Kahn noted that the last meeting of the *ad hoc* Group occurred in October 2009 and that there was a need to consider further work of the Group.

### ***Rabies***

The Code Commission noted the submission of a revised chapter on rabies and undertook to review this as a matter of priority.

### ***Scrapie***

The two Commissions discussed the issue of ‘atypical’ scrapie in terms of notification requirements and the issue of the host genetic resistance. In response to questions of Members, the Code Commission clarified that ‘classical’ scrapie is reportable to the OIE but that ‘atypical’ scrapie is not reportable (in accordance with the recommendations made by the *ad hoc* Group on Atypical Scrapie and Atypical BSE, which met in November 2007). However, the sharing of scientific information on ‘atypical’ scrapie is encouraged. At this time, the Code Commission considered that more scientific information would be needed to fully address the issues associated with host genotype.

***Labelling of veterinary drugs***

The Scientific Commission proposed that the labelling of veterinary drugs be addressed using a similar approach as used for the OIE Guidelines on Veterinary Legislation.

***Epizootic haemorrhagic disease***

Dr Bruckner proposed that the Scientific Commission draft a chapter on epizootic haemorrhagic disease.

and send it to the Code Commission for consideration.

***Bee diseases***

Dr Thiermann provided an update on the Code Commission's review of the revised chapters on bee diseases, explaining that several modifications had been made to the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group, including removal of the compartmentalisation concept.

***Meeting dates***

The dates for the September 2011 meeting of the two Commissions were discussed. The proposed dates for the Scientific Commission are 29 August to 4 September; the Code Commission agreed to make arrangements to facilitate active liaison between the two Commissions.

**C. EXAMINATION OF MEMBER COMMENTS AND WORK OF RELEVANT EXPERT GROUPS****1. Update on reports of other commissions; harmonisation with the OIE *Aquatic Animal Health Code*; other relevant activities of the OIE**

Dr Thiermann presented an overview of developments within the OIE for information of members.

**2. Revision of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*****Item 1. General comments**

The Code Commission received a comment from the EU.

In response to this comment, the Code Commission stated that references to 'legally binding' in the report of the February 2010 meeting should be understood as the international obligations of the Members of the World Trade Organization under the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement to base their sanitary measures on the standards set out in the *Terrestrial Code*.

**Item 2. Glossary**

The Code Commission received comments from the EU and the Scientific Commission.

***Veterinary Services***

The Code Commission noted that the EU comment (from the General Session held in 2010) had already been addressed by the International Trade Department.

***Antimicrobial agent***

The Code Commission noted a comment from the EU and made a revision to the definition to clarify the text.

### ***Infected zone***

The Code Commission noted a comment from the EU and the two options proposed to amend the definition. The Code Commission accepted the proposal to retain the definition as it stands and to request that the International Trade Department review the text of other chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* and, as appropriate, add the phrase ‘for the purpose of this chapter’.

### ***Veterinary legislation***

The Code Commission proposed a new definition (see Item 7 Veterinary Services).

### ***Wildlife***

The Code Commission noted the recommendations of the Wildlife Working Group but did not see a necessity to define ‘domestic animal’ because the term ‘animal’ is already defined in the *Terrestrial Code* and definitions of the term ‘domestic’ (as applied to animals) are readily found in dictionaries. In addition, the word ‘domestic’ is not needed in the term ‘feral domestic animal’ as ‘feral’ clearly refers to an animal that has at some time been domesticated; therefore the Code Commission proposed to modify this to ‘feral animal’. Finally, the Code Commission proposed to add a fourth definition, i.e.

‘wildlife’ - means any combination of feral animals, captive wild animals and wild animals.

If Members support this proposal, there will be a need to review the *Terrestrial Code* to decide the appropriate use of all defined terms in the *Terrestrial Code* chapters.

### ***Euthanasia***

The Code Commission added to the Glossary the definition of the term ‘euthanasia’ from Chapter 7.8. (Use of Animals in Research and Education). The term *euthanasia* is also used in Chapter 7.7. (Control of Stray Dog Populations). The definitions of euthanasia in Chapters 7.7. and 7.8. were deleted.

Euthanasia means the act of inducing *death* using a method that causes a rapid and irreversible loss of consciousness with minimum pain and distress to the *animal*.

The revised Glossary, which is presented at Annex III, is provided for Member comments.

## **Item 3. Notification of diseases and epidemiological information and Criteria for listing diseases (Chapters 1.1. and 1.2.) – also see Part B**

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

The Code Commission met with Dr Karim Ben Jebara for a short discussion on the findings of the *ad hoc* Group on Notification of Animal Diseases and Pathogenic Agents’, which met on 29 June–1 July 2010. The Code Commission was informed that the *ad hoc* Group had recommended modifications to the decision tree in Chapter 1.2.

On the basis that the *ad hoc* Group recommended and the Scientific Commission supported the delisting of Teschovirus encephalomyelitis, the Code Commission again proposed to delete Chapter 15.5.

The Code Commission accepted recommendations to delist leptospirosis, fowl cholera and Marek’s disease and noted that this would lead to removal of the names of these diseases from Article 1.2.3. and the deletion of Chapters 10.9. and 10.12. in May 2011.

Noting that duck virus enteritis and avian tuberculosis are not listed diseases, the Code Commission proposed to delete Chapters 10.6. and 10.7.

The Code Commission looked forward to receiving a marked up text showing proposed changes to the decision tree in Chapter 1.2. as the basis for proposing modifications to Members.

In response to Members’ comments, the Code Commission proposed to modify Article 1.1.3., on immediate notification, making reference to the relevant provisions in the specific disease chapters.

Re-ordering of disease chapters according to name of the pathogen

In the context of the development of global policies on the interface between human health and animal health, including the role of wild animals, and proposed changes to the OIE requirements for notification of diseases of domestic animals and wildlife, the Code Commission saw a need for reconsideration of the structure of Volume 2 of the *Terrestrial Code*. An appropriate option would be to structure the list of diseases in Article 1.2.3 and Volume 2 according to the scientific name of the disease (e.g. Chapter 11.6. 'Bovine Tuberculosis' to be renamed '*M. bovis* infection'). The Commission asked the International Trade Department to prepare a proposal for consideration at its next meeting.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at Annex IV, are provided for Member comments.

**Item 4. Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.)**

The Code Commission received advice from the Scientific Commission on previous comments from Australia.

The Code Commission noted these comments but did not make any modifications to the chapter (see discussion under Section B). The Code Commission noted the decision at the 78<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session (2010) to delete the definition "case definition" on the basis that the term is explained more clearly in point 2 e) of Article 1.4.3.

**Item 5. Status for OIE listed diseases (Chapter 1.6.)**

The Code Commission received new text on FMD and African horse sickness and questionnaires relevant to both diseases from the Scientific Commission (Note: see specific discussion on FMD and African horse sickness in the relevant items).

On the basis of text changes proposed at the Commission's February 2010 meeting and adopted at the 78<sup>th</sup> General Session in May 2010, no further changes were made to the introductory text (Article 1.6.1.) Changes proposed by the Scientific Commission on each questionnaire may be found in the Item on the relevant disease.

**Item 6. OIE Import Risk Analysis Handbook**

The Code Commission was informed that the revised edition of Volume I of the Handbook on Import Risk Analysis for Animals and Animal Products was close to completion and would be published late in 2010.

**Item 7. Evaluation of Veterinary Services**

The Code Commission received comments from the EU.

**a) Revisions to Chapters 3.1. and 3.2.**

The Code Commission agreed to the EU recommendation to include the words 'or animal welfare' in Article 3.1.1.

In regard to the recommendation, to add a definition of 'veterinary regulations' in Article 3.1.1., the Code Commission decided to include a definition in the Glossary of the term 'veterinary legislation' and delete "and regulation" from "veterinary legislation and regulation". The following definition was proposed:

Veterinary legislation means: laws, regulations and associated legal instruments that pertain to the veterinary domain.

The Code Commission referred to the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group a request from the EU for specific articles on animal welfare to be included in Chapter 3.2.

## b) Global veterinary legislation initiative

Dr Kahn gave an update on the current state of play with the OIE Global Veterinary Legislation initiative. The Code Commission noted the progress of this important initiative. Bearing in mind that the first Global Conference on Veterinary Legislation will take place in Djerba, Tunisia, on 7–9 December 2010, and that this is likely to generate interest on the part of OIE Members to address gaps in national veterinary legislation, the Code Commission considered that it would be appropriate to propose the Legislation Guidelines as a new standard, i.e. to incorporate them into the *Terrestrial Code* as Chapter 3.3.

### Legislation Missions – As at 24 August 2010

Region	Official requests	Missions completed
Africa	16	7
Americas	2	0
Asia/Pacific	3	3
Europe	3	1
Middle-East	4	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>13</b>

Official requests:

Africa (16): *Benin, Burkina Faso, Congo (DR), Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mauritius, Nigeria, Sudan, Togo, Uganda, Zambia*

Americas (2): Bolivia, Honduras

Asia/Pacific (3): *Bhutan, Cambodia, Vietnam*

Europe (3): Armenia, Kazakhstan, *Kyrgyzstan*

Middle-East (4): Afghanistan, *Kuwait, Lebanon, UAE*

*Italics: Completed missions*

The new and revised Chapters, which are presented at Annex V, are provided for Member comments.

#### Item 8. Design and implementation of identification systems to achieve animal traceability (Chapter 4.2.)

The Code Commission received comments from the EU and made some minor modifications in response.

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

#### Item 9. Zoning and compartmentalisation

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

The Code Commission received comments from Brazil, the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology and the Scientific Commission with advice on previous comments from the EU, the Comité Veterinario Permanente del CONOSUR (CVP).

The Code Commission agreed to the comment from the Scientific Commission regarding additional references to the role of susceptible wildlife species and made some appropriate changes to the text. The Code Commission noted and supported a Member's comments on Article 4.3.2.

The Code Commission noted that according to the definition established in the *Terrestrial Code*, the definition of animal identification encompasses both identification at the individual animal or the herd or flock level, hence the modification proposed by a Member in Point 2.a. of Article 4.3.3. was not accepted.

Noting that the goal of the *Terrestrial Code* is to help Members to implement the concept of zone/compartment, the Code Commission modified the title of Article 4.3.3. to read 'Principles for defining and establishing...'.

The Code Commission received new text dealing with the implementation of the protection zone, which had originated from a proposal made by the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology as modified by the Scientific Commission. The Code Commission noted that many points in the new draft text were already specifically covered in Article 4.3.3. The Code Commission carefully reviewed the new draft text and found some useful points that were not in the current text of Article 4.3.3., namely:

- One of the goals of a protection zone is to ensure early detection
- Animals in the protection zone should be clearly distinguishable from other sub populations
- Biosecurity should be increased
- Vector surveillance should be undertaken.

The text of Article 4.3.3. was amended to address these points.

The use of a protection zone is supported strongly by the OIE as this can help countries to control contagious diseases and to minimise trade disruption. However, the *Terrestrial Code* cannot make provisions that curtail the sovereignty of Members to make decisions in response to disease outbreaks in the territories of trading partners. In addition, the Code Commission wished to avoid introducing additional complex and potentially confusing provisions.

The Code Commission accepted a proposal of the Scientific Commission (based on a submission from the CVP) and modified the text on the containment zone accordingly.

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

The Code Commission received comments from Brazil and advice from the Scientific Commission on previous comments from the EU. The Code Commission accepted the comment of Brazil and made the relevant modification. The Code Commission noted the comments of the Scientific Commission and the EU but did not consider that text modifications were required as they would not improve the current version.

#### **c) Update on compartmentalisation projects supported by the OIE**

Dr Thiermann reported that he had undertaken a mission to Thailand to review the compartmentalisation project in that country. The focus of the project is to establish a compartment for broiler rearing establishments, and to appropriately manage the inputs and risks to the health status of this sector.

The Brazilian compartmentalisation project is advancing and Brazil has recently provided feedback to the OIE on the published checklist for avian influenza and Newcastle disease compartments. This information would be provided to the *ad hoc* Group on Epidemiology for information and any action required.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at Annex VII, are provided for Member comments.



**Item 10. Semen and embryos****a) Collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen (Chapter 4.6.)**

The Code Commission removed references to Teschovirus encephalomyelitis (see Item 3).

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

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

The Code Commission received comments from Canada but did not accept the proposed modification because, by convention, ‘should’ is used rather than ‘must’ in the *Terrestrial Code*.

**Item 11. Disposal of dead animals (Chapter 4.12.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Canada, the EU and Japan.

The Code Commission noted that a Member’s comment was no longer relevant as the chapter was adopted in May 2010. Members’ recommendations for the OIE to review data pertaining to Article 4.12.6. were noted and the Code Commission requested the provision of new data that may be relevant to the bio-refining process. A Member’s comment on this point was noted but not supported because it had been adopted on the basis of a peer reviewed scientific study.

**Item 12. Veterinary certificate****a) General obligations related to certification (Chapter 5.1.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Nigeria and Chile.

Members’ comments on Chapter 5.1. were not considered by the Code Commission because specific text amendments, with supporting rationale, were not proposed.

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

The Code Commission received comments from EU and China (the People’s Rep. of ).

The Code Commission accepted the suggestion to replace the word ‘notifiable’ by ‘notifiable diseases’ in Article 5.2.1. paragraph 2, because ‘notifiable diseases’ is defined in the Glossary. The other proposals were not supported by the Code Commission because no rationale was provided for these and therefore the Code Commission was not able to understand the reasoning behind the proposed amendments.

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

**Item 13. Control of hazards of animal health and public health importance in animal feed (Chapter 6.3.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Canada and the OIE Animal Production Food Safety Working Group (APFSWG).

The Code Commission reviewed the comment of a Member and of the APFSWG regarding alignment with Codex definitions but did not agree to make any modifications to the text because it had recently been adopted by the World Assembly.

The Code Commission accepted to add ‘infectious agent’ to the definition of ‘contamination’ for clarification of Article 6.3.3. but did not accept to delete “unwanted”, on the basis that some heavy metals, such as copper, may be beneficial or harmful depending on the chemical concentration. The Code Commission also accepted to make a minor change to point 12 of Article 6.3.4. ‘Contamination’.

Noting the discussion in the *ad hoc* Group on Pet Food, the Code Commission accepted to modify point 8 of Article 6.3.4.

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

#### **Item 14. Control of OIE listed diseases in heat treated, shelf stable pet food – new draft chapter**

The Code Commission received comments from the USA.

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Pet Food, which met on 1–3 September 2010. Dr MacDiarmid, chair of the *ad hoc* Group, outlined the discussion in the *ad hoc* Group meeting and the basis for the recommendations provided to the Code Commission.

The Code Commission had several concerns about Table 1 in the draft text, largely arising from the fact that it draws upon multiple approaches to assuring the safety of pet food. The approaches fall into four categories, i.e.

- pathogens are not relevant to the raw material (e.g. avian influenza in products of porcine or bovine origin);
- the ingredient comprises safe commodities identified in the *Terrestrial Code* (e.g. skeletal muscle that meets the provisions of Article 11.5.1. for BSE);
- the ingredient is obtained from a safe source (e.g. FMD free countries/zones);
- the use of thermal processing to inactivate pathogens that may be present in the ingredient or product, based on current *Terrestrial Code* provisions.

Members of the Code Commission considered that the report of the *ad hoc* Group should be included as an annex to the Code Commission report. In addition, it decided to provide the proposed draft chapter for inclusion in Section 5 of the *Terrestrial Code* (Trade Measures, Import/Export Procedures and Veterinary Certification) as a clean text, on which Members would be asked to comment. The Code Commission amended Article 2 and Table 1 and annotated the table as ‘under study’, with a recommendation that this be revised to provide clear separation between recommendations based on current provisions in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The new Chapter, which is presented at Annex XI, is provided for Member comments. The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached in Annex XXXIII for information of Members.

#### **Item 15. Salmonellosis**

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

The Code Commission received comments from Brazil, China (People’s Rep. of) and from the *ad hoc* Group on Salmonellosis, which met in May 2010. Comments previously provided by South Africa and not adopted at the 78<sup>th</sup> General Session were again reviewed and rejected by the Code Commission on the same grounds.

With respect to Members’ comments on the use of antimicrobials to treat poultry for salmonellosis, the Code Commission recalled that several Members have previously made comments warning against the use of antimicrobials in poultry. The issue has been thoroughly considered and the current text was considered to be appropriate. The OIE standards on prudent use of antimicrobials should also be considered when prescribing antimicrobials for use in poultry.

The Code Commission did not accept an additional sentence in Article 6.5.4. point b) as it considered that it was redundant. The Code Commission amended a few points, including changing ‘and/or’ to ‘or’, based on recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group.

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

The Code Commission reviewed the amendments to the draft text that had been proposed by the *ad hoc* Group at its meeting in May 2010. The text was supported with some minor amendments. The Code Commission wished to remind Members that the purpose of this chapter is to provide guidance to

Members that wish to improve biosecurity at poultry establishments with the goal of improving poultry health and productivity. To highlight this objective, the Code Commission added the phrase ‘and is not specifically related to trade’ to the first sentence of Article 6.4.1.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at Annex XII, are provided for Member comments. The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached in Annex XXXIV for information of Members.

**Item 16. Introduction to the recommendations for controlling antimicrobial resistance (Chapter 6.6.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the EU.

As stated in the last report, all the OIE work on animal production food safety is conducted in active collaboration with the Codex Alimentarius Commission. Thus, there is no need to make a specific statement to this effect in individual articles in the *Terrestrial Code*.

**Item 17. Animal welfare**

**a) Chapters on transport of animals (Chapters 7.3. and 7.4.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, China (People’s Rep. of), the EU, and Korea (Rep. of).

In response to Members’ comments on point 6 e) of Article 7.3.5., the Code Commission noted that the requirement to be able to observe individual animals would not normally apply to poultry and amended the text of Article 7.3.5.7 a) accordingly.

In response to a Member’s question, the Code Commission noted that both long distance and short distance travel is covered in point 3 c) of Article 7.3.7.

The Code Commission noted that a Member’s request for clarification about the need to observe poultry in transit [Point 7 a) Article 7.3.9. ] had already been covered by the modification to the text in point 7a) of Article 7.3.5.

Specific provisions on chickens will be included in Article 7.3.12, dealing with species-specific issues.

**b) Slaughter of animals (Chapter 7.5.)**

The Code Commission received comments from China (People’s Rep. of), Chinese Taipei, the EU, Japan and Korea (Rep. of).

The Code Commission agreed with the need, identified by Members, for inclusion of a text referring to the need for slaughterhouses to implement an animal welfare plan and included new text under point 1 of Article 7.5.2.

Point 1f)viii was changed to point 1g) in Article 7.5.2, reflecting the need to use performance standards generally; not only in relation to the use of goads and other aids.

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member who stated that it was acceptable for poultry with dislocated or broken legs and wings to be immediately shackled for processing, and maintained the original text in point 2 of Article 7.5.2.

The need for a waiting pen at high throughput slaughterhouses (as opposed to all slaughterhouses) was reflected in modified text in point 2 h) of Article 7.5.3.

Several recommendations made by Members were not accepted because the points that they raised were already adequately covered in the text. However, a number of minor text amendments were made to improve clarity.

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

The Code Commission received comments from Brazil, Chinese Taipei and the EU.

The Code Commission requested that the Member which raised it provide a scientific rationale for the proposal to add ‘Ducks and geese do not appear to be resilient to the effects of a mixture of 20% carbon dioxide and 80% nitrogen or argon’ in points 4c) ii and 4d) of Article 7.6.12.

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

The Code Commission received comments from the EU and the *ad hoc* Group on Rabies, as endorsed by the Scientific Commission.

The Code Commission noted a proposal but did not agree to change ‘control’ to ‘management’ (several references within the text) because the goal of the chapter (as reflected in the title of the chapter) is control and the use of ‘control’ rather than ‘management’ had been discussed extensively previously.

The Code Commission modified the preamble, based on the input from the Scientific Commission.

Noting Members’ comments on the definition of euthanasia, the Code Commission proposed to include in the Glossary the definition of euthanasia adopted in Chapter 7.8. (Use of Animals in Research and Education) in the 78<sup>th</sup> General Session and to remove the definition from Article 7.7.2.

With respect to the definition of ‘stray dog’, the Code Commission decided to leave the text unchanged, pending the final decision of OIE Members on the definitions of ‘wildlife’ to be included in the glossary.

The Code Commission modified entries in Table Article 7.7.6. for consistency.

References were removed from Article 7.7.8., in accordance with established practice. Noting that these references are valuable to Members, the Code Commission proposed that the OIE place a copy of Article 7.7.8., complete with updated references, on the OIE web site.

**e) Use of animals in research and education (Chapter 7.8.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Chinese Taipei and the EU.

The Code Commission noted Members’ comments calling for modification of terms such as ‘committee’, ‘local committee’ and ‘ethics committee’ in Chapter 7.8. The Commission noted that the goal of this chapter is to identify an overall framework for correct use of animals, and not to specify the detailed structure to be used. For this reason, the chapter provides for flexibility in selecting elements within the framework. The Commission did not see value in trying to achieve more specificity by qualifying ‘committee’ or other terms used in this chapter.

The Code Commission proposed to delete the definition of ‘euthanasia’ from Article 7.8.1. and include it in the Glossary.

The Code Commission modified the text of point 5 Article 7.8.7 to clarify the distinction between genetically altered and cloned animals.

**f) Report of the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group (June 2010 meeting)**

The Code Commission noted the report of the Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG) and thanked members for their ongoing significant contribution to the OIE’s standard setting work. The Code Commission appreciated the paper ‘Guidance from the AWWG to *ad hoc* Groups on the development of animal welfare standards’ and recommended that, subject to validation by Members, the International Trade Department provide this paper to all *ad hoc* Groups working on animal welfare.

The report of the AWWG is attached in Annex XXXI for information of Members.

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

The Code Commission received comments from Korea (Rep. of).

The Code Commission noted the extensive revision of the draft chapter on animal welfare and broiler chicken production by the *ad hoc* Group and the comments of the AWWG on the draft text. The Commission noted that the AWWG had developed a paper (see point f) above) to guide the work of *ad hoc* Groups in the development of standards for livestock production systems. The Commission invited Members to comment on both the draft text on broilers and the AWWG Guidance paper, in order to consider these comments when drafting standards in the area of livestock production.

The Commission referred a Member's comment on the draft text on broiler chickens to the *ad hoc* Group for consideration at its next meeting.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached in Annex XXXII for information of Members.

**h) Animal welfare and beef production systems**

The Code Commission received comments from Korea (Rep. of).

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group will hold its next meeting early in 2011 and referred the comment to the *ad hoc* Group for consideration.

**i) Proposal to use risk analysis principles in developing animal welfare standards**

The Code Commission noted a submission from an individual in a Member country regarding the use of risk analysis and management principles to support the OIE's work in the development of animal welfare standards. The Code Commission did not recognise the relevance of this approach to the OIE's work and was uncertain to what extent the Delegate had supported the proposal.

**j) Guidelines on the establishment of OIE Regional Animal Welfare Strategies.**

The Code Commission noted the document submitted by the AWWG.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at Annex XIII, are provided for Member comments.

**Item 18. Anthrax (Chapter 8.1.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Brazil, the EU and New Zealand.

The Code Commission agreed to modify Articles 8.1.5. and 8.1.6. Article 8.1.10. was modified to include recommendations on the inactivation by moist heat of *B. anthracis* spores in bone meal and meat-and-bone meal. Modifications were based on scientific studies (Murray, 1931; Spotts Whitney, Beatty *et al.*, 2003). The Commission also modified Article 8.1.11. by adding a reference to the use of gamma irradiation as a means to inactivate *B. anthracis* spores in wool and hair. Scientific references were provided as follows:

T.J. Murray (1931). The thermal death point. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. Vol 48 (5): 457–467.

P. Turnbull P. & O. Cosivi. (2008). Anthrax in humans and animals, 4th Edition, WHO/FAO/OIE.

E.A. Spotts Whitney, M.E. Beatty, T.H. R.J. Taylor, R. Weyant, J. Sobel, M.J. Arduino & D.A. Ashford. (2003). Inactivation of *Bacillus anthracis* spores. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 9 (6), 623–627.

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

**Item 19. Aujeszky's disease (Chapter 8.2.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the EU.

Based on Members' comments, the text of articles relating to disease surveillance was modified to be less prescriptive in terms of the recommendations on surveillance (Article 8.5.6. point b). The Code Commission understood that the 5-km radius was originally based on the expected movements of vectors, such as rodents. The Code Commission modified this recommendation as it considered that the national veterinary services were the best placed to evaluate the radius of the surveillance zone and this point was not amenable to a prescriptive approach.

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

**Item 20. Bluetongue (Chapter 8.3.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia and advice from the Scientific Commission on previous comments from Switzerland.

Based on advice from the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission created a new point 3 c) in Article 8.3.3. and a new point 6 in Article 8.3.8. In addition, the Code Commission included an explanation of the term 'vector protected' in Article 8.3.15. and used this to replace 'vector proof' throughout Chapter 8.3., as was done for Chapter 12.1. (African horse sickness).

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

**Item 21. Foot and mouth disease**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Chinese Taipei and the EU, and the Scientific Commission provided advice on previous comments of the CVP.

**a) Chapter 8.5.**

References throughout the chapter to FMD were checked as to whether 'FMDV' should be added. This modification was made to Article 8.5.5.

The Code Commission developed a new Article 8.5.7. *bis* on the provisions for an OIE endorsed national FMD control programme, based on the text drafted by the Scientific Commission and modified by the Code Commission.

Modifications proposed by the CVP and supported by the Scientific Commission, were adopted in the introduction to Article 8.5.5. and in point 1c).

The Code Commission did not agree to Members' proposals for modifications to the text of point 2 of Article 8.5.8. because it considered that the *Terrestrial Code* already provided an appropriate level of flexibility in the definition of stamping out and the control of disease relating to a containment zone.

With reference to Article 8.5.41., Dr Bruckner informed the Code Commission that the advice that the processes which make small ruminant and porcine casings safe are also effective for beef casings is based on a personal communication to the Scientific Commission by experts (Dr M. Beer and Dr J. Wijnker) of the European Natural Sausage Casings Association.

The Code Commission proposed to merge Articles 8.5.22., 23. and 24. because the risks and conditions are equivalent in these three articles.

**b) Revised FMD questionnaire**

At a Member's suggestion, the Scientific Commission proposed to modify the text of the questionnaire on FMD. The Code Commission provided the revised text to Members for comment.

**c) OIE endorsement of a national FMD control programme**

The Code Commission reviewed the text of revisions to Chapter 8.5. and to the associated questionnaire provided by the Scientific Commission and made several modifications, based on the following key considerations:

- The proposed text addresses the provisions for OIE endorsement of a Member's national FMD control strategy. Within this national strategy the implementation of measures in zones or in the entire national territory may be envisaged. However, the OIE endorsed programme applies throughout the national territory, not solely in a zone.
- Countries requesting OIE approval of their control programme should be encouraged to follow the OIE PVS Pathway.
- The measures implemented under the national programme should be consistent with the provisions in the *Terrestrial Code*, particularly in Chapters 8.5. and 1.1. (Disease reporting).

The draft questionnaire was modified to reflect the revisions made to the draft text and to correct English grammar. Notably, the questionnaire was modified to be consistent with the concept of an OIE endorsed FMD control programme as a national programme, although measures may be implemented at the level of a zone rather than the entire national territory.

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

## **Item 22. Rabies**

### **a) Chapter 8.10. (Rabies)**

The Code Commission reviewed the revised text of Chapter 8.10. drafted by an *ad hoc* Group and agreed by the Scientific Commission.

The entire text was revised for consistency with the approach in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission noted the need for accuracy in naming host species such as dogs, cats and ferrets in light of the new definition of 'wildlife'.

The text was modified to clarify that Chapter 8.10. deals with infection of domestic dogs, cats and ferrets with the species *rabies virus* in the genus *Lyssavirus*.

To facilitate review by Members, the revised chapter was presented as a clean text.

### **b) Model international veterinary certificate for dogs and cats originating from rabies infected countries (Chapter 5.11.)**

The draft certificate for domestic dogs, cats and ferrets was modified to reflect the amendments made to Chapter 8.10.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at Annex XVIII, are provided for Member comments.

## **Item 23. Vesicular stomatitis (Chapter 8.15.)**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from New Zealand received at the previous meeting and modified Article 8.15.6. accordingly.

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

## **Item 24. Diseases of bees (Chapter 4.14 and Chapters 9.1. to 9.6.)**

The *ad hoc* Group on Diseases of Bees reviewed comments submitted previously by Members and reviewed the revised Chapter 4.14. (Hygiene and Disease Security Procedures in Apiaries) and comments on Chapters 9.1. to 9.6. that had been provided by the *ad hoc* Group on Diseases of Bees.

### **a) Hygiene and disease security procedures in apiaries (Chapter 4.14.)**

The Code Commission noted the *ad hoc* Group proposal for new work on *Nosema ceranae* and, as the disease is not currently listed by the OIE, recommended that the status of *N. ceranae* be considered by the *ad hoc* Group on Notification of Animal Diseases and Pathogenic Agents at its next meeting.

The Code Commission considered that the text of Chapter 4.14. should be confined to general recommendations and disease specific recommendations should be relocated to the relevant disease chapter. Accordingly the Code Commission removed the text in point 1a) of Article 4.14.3. and placed it in a new Article 9.6.4. *bis* (varroosis). The text in point 1b) of Article 4.14.3. was retained with an appropriate modification.

It was agreed that the recommendations in Chapter 4.14. should be referenced in Chapters 9.1. to 9.6. inclusive.

In agreement with the *ad hoc* Group on Diseases of Bees, the Code Commission considered that the concept of ‘compartment’ was not applicable to honey bees because bees are free-ranging and therefore it is not possible to implement management controls to prevent them coming into direct contact with bees of a different health status. Therefore the reference to a compartment was removed from all bee disease chapters.

**b) Acarapisosis of honey bees (Chapter 9.1.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the *ad hoc* Group on Diseases of Bees on previous comments from the EU.

‘Extracted honey, pollen, propolis, royal jelly for human consumption and processed beeswax’ were added to the list of safe commodities in Article 9.1.2. and the words ‘honey bee collected’ were removed.

**c) American foulbrood (Chapter 9.2.) and European foulbrood (Chapter 9.3.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the *ad hoc* Group on Diseases of Bees on previous comments from the EU and Canada.

A modification was made to include a reference to Article 4.14.3.

**d) Small hive beetle infestation (*Aethina tumida*) (Chapter 9.4.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the *ad hoc* Group on Diseases of Bees on previous comments from Australia, the EU and Switzerland.

The Code Commission accepted the recommendations and made several modifications to the text, including the addition of a reference to Article 4.14.3.

**e) *Tropilaelaps* infestation of honey bees (Chapter 9.5.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the *ad hoc* Group on Diseases of Bees on previous comments from the EU.

‘Extracted honey, pollen, propolis, royal jelly for human consumption and processed beeswax’ were added to the list of safe commodities in Article 9.5.2. and the words ‘honey bee collected’ were removed.

Article 9.5.1 was modified by replacing ‘7 days’ with ‘21 days’, to be consistent with the *ad hoc* Group’s recommendations to modify this point in Articles 9.5.6., 7. and 8.

The Code Commission accepted Member comments and modified Articles 9.5.6., 9.5.7. and 9.5.8. by replacing ‘7 days’ with ‘21 days’. In addition, point 3 of Article 9.5.8. was modified by adding the phrase ‘recommended by the OIE (under study)’ instead of the proposed reference to ‘chapter X.X’.

**f) Varroosis of honey bees (Chapter 9.6.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the *ad hoc* Group on Diseases of Bees on previous comments from the EU and Switzerland.



Article 9.6.2. was revised to read ‘Extracted honey, pollen, propolis, royal jelly for human consumption and processed beeswax’.

The Code Commission proposed a new Article 9.6.4. *bis*: a Varroa Free Establishment (apiary), containing the recommendation that the *ad hoc* Group had originally proposed in Article 4.14.3. point 1a), because the Code Commission considered that this provision should be included in the specific disease chapter rather than in Chapter 4.14. A reference to the provisions in Article 4.14.3. (Conditions for approval of breeding apiaries for export trade’) was added to Article 9.6.4. *bis* as for other chapters on bee diseases.

Article 9.6.7. and Article 9.6.8. were modified by replacing ‘7 days’ with ‘21 days’, consistent with the *ad hoc* Group’s recommendations.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at Annex XX, are provided for Member comments.

**Item 25. Avian influenza (Chapter 10.4.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Brazil, the EU, and the Scientific Commission.

The Code Commission discussed Members’ comments on additional clarity for disease notification and made minor modifications to the Chapter.

In regard to the inactivation of avian influenza:

- the Code Commission was advised by the author of the cited scientific paper that the correct value in Article 10.4.25 was in fact 870 seconds, not the 256 seconds suggested by Members. The 256 seconds was, according to the author, a typographical error;
- the Code Commission noted that the time cited by a Member with reference to Article 10.4.26. would achieve a 1 log reduction rather than the 7 log reduction achieved elsewhere in the chapter. Therefore, the proposal was not accepted.

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

**Item 26. Newcastle disease (Chapter 10.13.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Brazil, the EU and the USA.

The Code Commission discussed Members’ comments on additional clarity for disease notification. The Code Commission made minor modifications to the Chapter and recommended to add a sentence in Article 1.1.3. referring the reader to the specific recommendations in the relevant disease chapter (see Item 3.)

In response to a question from Members, the Code Commission did not see a need to modify Chapter 10.13. to address the issue of post-vaccination reversion to virulence.

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

**Item 27. Bovine brucellosis (Chapter 11.3.)**

The Code Commission noted that no progress had been made on the review of Chapter 11.3. and that the next meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Brucellosis would be held in 2011.

**Item 28. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.5.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chinese Taipei, the EU, Japan, Korea (Rep. of), New Zealand and the USA.

The Code Commission agreed with comments from Members proposing that changes to the text should not be made in the absence of new, significant scientific information. As no comments presenting new scientific evidence had been submitted, the Code Commission decided not to modify the chapter.

A request for a text modification based on the potential risk of infectivity associated with the bovine intestine was referred to the Scientific Commission for scientific advice. The Code Commission noted that the Scientific Commission referred this question to the *ad hoc* Group on Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy Risk Status Evaluation of Members.

**Item 29. Bovine tuberculosis (Chapter 11.6.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia and Swaziland and an advice from the Scientific Commission on previous comments from Switzerland.

The Code Commission referred to the Scientific Commission a Member's request to address tuberculosis in camelids, noting that this would need to be addressed by the *ad hoc* Group on Diseases of Camelids.

The Member's comment on *M. caprae* was not accepted because Chapter 11.6. deals with *M. bovis* infection. Again, the Code Commission referred this request to the Scientific Commission.

Noting that the Scientific Commission did not accept a Member's comment on Article 11.6.4., no changes were proposed.

**Item 30. Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia**

The Code Commission agreed with a recommendation from the Scientific Commission to include a reference: 'bovine semen, embryos and oocytes to be subject to import control procedures' in the questionnaire on CBPP status in Chapter 1.6.

The revised questionnaire, which is presented at Annex XXIII, is provided for Member comments.

**Item 31. Lumpy skin disease (Chapter 11.12.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, the EU and an expert.

Consistent with the policy of the OIE to incorporate articles dealing with safe commodities, the Code Commission created a new Article, 11.12.1.*bis*, 'safe commodities' and included 'milk and milk products' and 'meat and meat products' in the list of safe commodities, based on the recommendation of the *ad hoc* Group on Trade in Animal Products ('commodities') (report of July 2008 meeting).

The Code Commission agreed to replace 'animals of the bovine species' with 'cattle' in Articles 11.12.2. and 11.12.3. for consistency with Articles 11.12.4. and 5. The Code Commission also modified Articles 11.12.6., 9. and 11.

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

**Item 32. Equine diseases**

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

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Official Disease Status Recognition of African Horse Sickness and supported the proposed new articles, based on the recommendation of the *ad hoc* Group.

The Code Commission discussed the use of "country or zone at risk" and decided to delete all references to 'at risk' in Articles 12.1.5 and 12.1.6. because the mitigation of the risk arising from a neighbouring country or zone is addressed by a new paragraph in Article 12.1.2., similar to that found in Chapter 8.3. (Bluetongue).

The Code Commission reviewed the proposed text in Points a) and b) of Article 12.1.10. 'Protecting animals from culicoides attack'. The Commission deleted proposed text describing 'vector proof' on the basis that 'protection' against vectors is feasible in the setting of a commercial quarantine facility but that 'proofing' against vectors is typically found only in high security laboratories. Such facilities are used for the conduct of experiments with highly pathogenic and contagious agents, not for international trade in animals and animal products (such as semen).

The Code Commission introduced the concept of vector protection, which is also relevant to chapters on other vector borne diseases. The same modification was introduced in Chapter 8.3. (Bluetongue). The Code Commission agreed that relevant text in chapters on other vector borne diseases would be addressed in future.

*Questionnaire on AHS free countries and zones*

The Code Commission reviewed the draft questionnaire for AHS free countries and zones provided by the Scientific Commission, based on the work on an *ad hoc* Group. The International Trade Department undertook to review the references to wildlife (equidae) to ensure that they were used in a manner that was consistent with the new definition of ‘wildlife’ proposed for inclusion in the Glossary. The text is provided as a clean text.

**b) Equine influenza (Chapter 12.6.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia and advice from the Scientific Commission on previous comments from Australia and the EU.

The Code Commission clarified that according to the proposed modified definition of wildlife, feral animals (horses, in this case) are considered as wildlife.

The Code Commission discussed the definition of equine influenza in Article 12.6.1. and agreed that, for the purposes of the *Terrestrial Code*, the disease is defined as a disease of domestic horses, donkeys and mules.

Members’ comments on Article 12.6.4. were accepted and the text modified to include the words ‘*within and*’ between ‘movements of equids’ and ‘into the country’.

In Article 12.6.4. the Code Commission modified the text according to the Scientific Commission recommendation, to include: ‘A country, zone or compartment seeking freedom from EI should apply appropriate movement controls to minimise the risk of introduction of equine influenza virus, in accordance with this chapter’.

**c) Equine viral arteritis (Chapter 12.9.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia and advice from the Scientific Commission on previous comments from Chile and South Africa.

Modifications were made to point 3b) Article 12.9.2., recognising that this provided for harmonisation of the text. On the advice of the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission did not accept other proposals of Members to modify text in Chapter 12.9.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at Annex XXV, are provided for Member comments.

**Item 33. Enzootic abortion of ewes (ovine chlamydiosis) (Chapter 14.5.)**

The Code Commission received comments from New Zealand.

The Code Commission addressed the comment by adopting the description of the disease found in the *Terrestrial Manual* and modifying the title of the chapter in accordance with the discussion in Part A. In addition, Article 14.5.1. was amended accordingly.

The revised Chapters, which are presented at Annex XXVI, are provided for Member comments.

**Item 34. Scrapie (Chapter 14.9.)**

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

A comment from Members questioning the safety of *in vivo* derived embryos was not accepted by the Code Commission because conclusions on the safety of transferred embryos are based on recommendations from the International Embryo Transfer Society which are, in turn, based on peer reviewed studies.

The Code Commission discussed the issue of host genotype and noted the advice of the Scientific Commission ‘Although there is now good scientific evidence on scrapie-resistant genotype selection available (mainly in Europe and North America), the OIE would still need more data and evidence from the rest of the world to enable the development of global standards’. The Code Commission did not, therefore, propose any new text in the *Terrestrial Code*.

Following a Member comment, the Code Commission deleted ‘accredited’ in Point 3 of Article 14.9.4. because ‘free establishment’ is a defined term.

Two Members proposed to reintroduce a point in Article 14.9.8., point 1 regarding the safety of semen. The Code Commission rejected this proposal because it had been discussed and the text on semen removed with support of Delegates at the 78<sup>th</sup> General Session (May 2010). In addition there is no evidence that the proposed risk mitigation measure adds to the safety of semen.

A Member requested that the Code Commission provide the scientific basis for considering that the adrenal gland, pancreas and liver are not safe commodities. The reference was provided, as follows. Hadlow WJ, Kennedy RC, Race RE (1982). Natural infection of Suffolk sheep with scrapie virus. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 146: 657-664.

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

#### **Item 35. Classical swine fever (Chapter 15.2.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia and from the Scientific Commission.

Article 15.2.1. was modified for consistency with the rest of the *Terrestrial Code*.

Article 15.2.13. was modified according to a Member’s comment.

Article 15.2.23. was modified to add references to surveillance relative to a compartment, taking into account that wild pigs should not be present in a free compartment.

Articles 15.2.24. and 15.2.25. were modified according to advice of the Scientific Commission.

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

#### **Item 36. Swine vesicular disease (Chapter 15.4.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the *ad hoc* Group on Swine Vesicular Disease, as supported by the Scientific Commission on previous comments from the EU, Korea (Rep. of), New Zealand and Thailand.

The Code Commission addressed Members’ comments and extensively revised Chapter 15.4., taking care to align the chapter, as appropriate, with Chapter 15.2 (classical swine fever) and other disease chapters (e.g. with respect to definitions, the treatment of findings of infection in wild pigs, and the definition of zones and compartments).

On the basis that the Code Commission was not aware of the existence of international trade in live wild pigs, and consistent with the recommendation of the *ad hoc* Group, supported by the Scientific Commission, Article 15.4.8. was deleted.

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

#### **Item 37. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Communications**

Ms Maria Zampaglione, Head of the Communication Unit, provided an update on the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Communication, which met on 30 June–2 July 2010. The *ad hoc* Group revised definitions, taking into account Member comments, and drafted new text on communication. They recommended that the draft text be included in the *Terrestrial Code* either as a new chapter or as part of an existing chapter. Ms Zampaglione highlighted the importance of institutionalising communication, as a recognised discipline, within Veterinary Services.

The Code Commission noted the report of *ad hoc* Group on Communication and proposed that the new text be included in the *Terrestrial Code* as a new chapter in Section 3. For ease of review, the new text is provided as a clean text except the section on definitions which are shown in double underline/strikeout to show changes following consideration of Member comments.

The new Chapter, which is presented at Annex XXX, is provided for Member comments. The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached in Annex XXXV for information of Members.

### **Item 38. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Education**

Dr Etienne Bonbon, who is a member of the *ad hoc* Group, made some introductory comments on the report of the June 2010 meeting. The main objective of the OIE is to raise awareness on the part of veterinary education establishments (VEE) of the competencies needed by veterinarians, at graduation, to help to ensure that the national veterinary services can meet the OIE quality standards set out in the *Terrestrial Code* Section 3. Dr Kahn informed the Code Commission that some 80% of VEEs in the world do not meet an acceptable standard of veterinary teaching. While the primary objective of the OIE is not to provide guidance to the 20% of VEEs, nonetheless it is important that on day 1 of obtaining the veterinary qualification, all individuals at least have an appreciation/awareness of the national regulatory framework, whether or not they intend to pursue a career in the public sector. The *ad hoc* Group will hold its next meeting on 15–17 December 2010. Dr Kahn explained that Members will be asked to provide their comments on the draft report by 10 December 2010 to facilitate consideration by the *ad hoc* Group. For the moment, the text is not intended for inclusion in the *Terrestrial Code*. Nonetheless, at its February 2011 meeting, the Code Commission will be asked to endorse a text for approval by OIE Delegates at the 79<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session in May 2011. The work of the OIE on veterinary education will also be presented at events held as part of the celebration of Veterinary Year 2011.

The Code Commission endorsed the work of the *ad hoc* Group, in particular the fact that the report addresses competencies rather than the content of the veterinary curriculum. Noting that, in many countries, the Veterinary Services do not have direct or regular communications with the organisations responsible for the education and licensing of veterinarians, the Code Commission strongly encouraged Delegates to make appropriate arrangements for liaison with veterinary Deans, professional veterinary associations, and the veterinary statutory body (as appropriate) in preparing comments on this report.

The Code Commission looked forward to receiving a revised draft document, addressing the comments of OIE Delegates as appropriate, at its next meeting.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached in Annex XXXVI for information of Members.

### **3. Other issues**

#### **Item 39. OIE work programme on standard setting for foodborne pathogens**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Canada and New Zealand on the OIE Paper on Priorities for the Development of Animal Production Food Safety Standards. In accordance with comments of some Members, the Code Commission supported continued collaboration between the OIE, FAO and WHO (and Codex Alimentarius Commission) on standard setting for foodborne pathogens.

Dr Kahn advised that the next step would be a meeting of a new *ad hoc* Group on Parasitic Diseases, which would be asked to update the existing *Terrestrial Code* Chapters on the listed pathogens, *Echinococcus granulosus* and *Trichinella* sp., draft a new chapter on the listed pathogen, *Cysticercus Cellulosae* (*Taenia solium*), and to advise on the possible future need for the OIE to provide advice (outside the *Terrestrial Code*) on the unlisted pathogen, *Cysticercus Bovis* (*Taenia saginata*).

#### **Item 40. Update on the OIE's work on Private standards**

Dr Kahn updated members of the Code Commission on the outcomes of two meetings of the *ad hoc* Group on Private Standards (16 February and 10 September 2010). The Code Commission noted that the Group has provided advice on how to progress Resolution 26 of the 78<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session (May 2010) on the issue of private standards.

The report of the relevant meetings is attached in Annex XXXVII for information of Members.

**Item 41. Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome**

The Code Commission received comments from New Zealand.

Noting that porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS) is the cause of trade problems and that at least one Member has conducted specific import risk analyses on PRRS in pig meat and semen, the Code Commission considered that a chapter should be developed on the disease. This request was passed to the Scientific Commission.

**Item 42. Future work programme of the Code Commission****Naming and ordering of diseases and disease chapters**

In the context of the development of global policies on the interface between human health and animal health, including the role of wild animals, and proposed changes to the OIE requirements for notification of diseases of domestic animals and wildlife, the Code Commission saw a need to modify the list in Article 1.2.3. and restructure Volume 2 of the *Terrestrial Code* accordingly.

An appropriate option would be to restructure the list and Volume 2 according to the scientific name of the pathogen (e.g. Chapter 11.6. 'Bovine Tuberculosis' to be renamed '*M. bovis* infection...'). The International Trade Department undertook to provide a proposal for consideration by the Code Commission at its Spring 2011 meeting.

The Code Commission updated its work programme for 2010–2011, with a table showing each item, annex, chapter numbers and status, and a list of acronyms used in this report, for information of Members (Annex XXXVIII).

**Item 43. Other issues****Proposal to develop a policy on the wildlife-domestic animal interface as a guideline for future standard setting by the OIE**

The Code Commission noted and agreed with the overall approach, except that it considered that the responsibility for developing policy on disease reporting (in domestic and in wild animals) is with the Sanitary Information Department, in liaison with the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission.

To test the proposed approach, the Code Commission invited the Wildlife Working Group and the Scientific Commission to review Chapter 8.5. (FMD) and provide recommendations on any modification of the text that may be appropriate, for consideration of the Code Commission and Members.

**Request for approval of an OIE Collaborating Centre on Animal Welfare (Sweden)**

The Code Commission noted that the AWWG had supported, on technical grounds, the application from Sweden and also noted that the OIE Council was reviewing a draft policy on the approval of new OIE Reference Laboratories and Collaborating Centres. Therefore, the Code Commission took no further action on the proposal from Sweden pending advice of the Council's decision.

The next meeting of the Code Commission is scheduled for 1–10 February 2011.

---

.../Annexes