REPORT OF THE MEETING
OF THE OIE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION FOR ANIMAL DISEASES
Paris, 13–17 February 2017

A meeting of the OIE Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (the Commission) was held at the OIE Headquarters in Paris, France from 13 to 17 February 2017.

Dr Monique Eloit, Director General of the OIE, welcomed the member of the Commission and thanked them for their continual support of the OIE activities. She highlighted the OIE’s commitment and progress made to further develop the Standard Operating Procedures for official status recognition aimed at improving transparency and credibility at all steps of the disease status evaluation process. Dr Eloit emphasised the importance of in-country missions as a tool for monitoring compliance with the requirements of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code) for the maintenance of countries’ officially recognised status.

She also mentioned progress on the development of a new procedure for the election of members of the OIE Specialist Commissions and how the new procedure would allow a wider range of applicants from Member Countries, including experts from OIE Reference Centres.

Dr Matthew Stone, OIE Deputy Director General for International Standards and Science, also welcomed the Commission and highlighted some critical points on the Commission’s agenda that would have an impact on the development of Standards and on the official disease status recognition of some Member Countries.

He highlighted the ongoing work of the OIE to enhance the coordination and communication among the four Specialist Commissions while providing technical support to ease the work of the Commissions. Dr Stone reminded the Commission of its responsibility to contribute to the scientific integrity of the Terrestrial Code and indicated the importance of maintaining a clear separation of the roles of the Commissions. In particular he mentioned the responsibility of the Commission during the risk assessment process while the Terrestrial Animal Health Standard Commission (Code Commission) was responsible for the risk management component of the standard-setting process.

Dr Gideon Brückner, President of the Commission welcomed the Members of the Commission and reminded them of their accountability to guarantee the independence and transparency of the Commission’s decisions. He summarised the most critical aspects in the proposed agenda and outlined the priority issues and the work plan for the week.

1. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of rapporteur

The draft agenda was adopted by the Commission. The meeting was chaired by Dr Gideon Brückner and the OIE secretariat acted as rapporteur. The agenda and list of participants are attached as Annexes 1 and 2, respectively.

2.1. Member Country comments received by January 2017 for consideration of the Commission

The Commission reviewed the science-related comments made by Member Countries on the Terrestrial Code chapters that were circulated for comments after the September 2016 Specialist Commission meetings.

a) Glossary

The Commission concurred with one Member Country that indicated that the Glossary should only define those terms for which the common dictionaries do not provide sufficient clarifications for the correct use of the term in the context of the Terrestrial Code.

The detailed rationale for the Commission’s proposed amendments is attached as Annex 3.

The proposed amendments to the definitions addressing Member Country comments were forwarded to the Code Commission for consideration.

b) Chapter 11.11. on lumpy skin disease (caused by group III virus, type Neethling)

The chapter was circulated for a second round of comments after the September 2016 meeting of the Specialist Commissions with the intention of proposing it for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017. The Commission reviewed and addressed the Member Country comments forwarded by the Code Commission.

The Commission clarified that the case definition of infection with lumpy skin disease (LSD) virus should not be confused with the provisions for freedom from LSD. Countries or zones could only be considered either free or not free in accordance with the provisions of Article 11.11.3 or Article 11.11.3bis. The draft chapter did not consider the possibility of freedom where vaccination is applied.

The Commission pointed out the importance of promoting vaccination to live as a preferred choice for disease control rather than suppressive vaccination (vaccination to kill). References were made to the recommendations of the OIE Global Conference on Vaccination that was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 2004.

The Commission stressed that the recommendations for importation from countries or zones not free from LSD were based on the results of the risk assessment made by the ad hoc Group and by the Commission. As it was the case of all the disease-specific chapters of the Terrestrial Code, the provisions described were considered sufficient to mitigate the risk posed by the importation of live animals and their products from countries or zones not free from LSD.

It was emphasised that Member Countries should not implement any trade restrictions to the importation of live animals or their products from countries that apply vaccination, provided the importation is in compliance with the risk mitigation measures described in the chapter.

The detailed rationale for the Commission’s proposed amendments is attached as Annex 4.

The amended chapter addressing Member Country comments was forwarded to the Code Commission for its consideration.

c) Chapter 8.X. Infection with Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex

A revised version of Chapter 8.X. had been circulated to Member Countries for a third round of comments after the Commissions meeting in September 2016 with the intention of proposing it for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.
The Commission pointed out that only some wildlife species (e.g. wild boars, badgers and possums) had been proven to act as reservoirs. However, the reservoir role of other wildlife species was not sufficiently understood and would need to be further investigated. Based on current knowledge, it was evident that in the majority of occasions, wildlife was infected as a result of spillover from domestic animals but they were not able to maintain the disease.

The Commission also made a remark to indicate the scientific evidence that demonstrated the impact of *M. tuberculosis* in both livestock and wildlife in the different regions.

The detailed rationale for the Commission’s proposed amendments is attached as Annex 5.

The amended chapter addressing Member Country comments was forwarded to the Code Commission for its consideration.

d) Chapter 12.10. Infection with *Burkholderia mallei* (Glanders)

The revised *Terrestrial Code* Chapter 12.10., including the recently amended section on surveillance, was circulated for comment after the September 2016 meeting of the Commission.

The Commission addressed the comments received by the OIE.

The Commission noted that extensive comments on the articles on surveillance were received. It was decided to refer those comments to the OIE experts who drafted the articles for their consideration.

The detailed rationale for the Commission’s proposed amendments is attached as Annex 6.

The amended chapter addressing Member Country comments was forwarded to the Code Commission for its consideration.

e) Chapter 15.1. Infection with African swine fever virus

The revision of this chapter was initiated in 2014. The amended draft chapter was circulated for the third time for Member Country comments with the intention of proposing it for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

The Commission addressed the comments received by the OIE after the Code Commission meeting in September 2016.

The Commission made specific remarks to indicate that all the provisions described in the chapter were based on updated scientific knowledge and on practical experience that had been demonstrated to be effective in a range of epidemiological scenarios in Africa and Europe. The Commission strongly encouraged Member Countries to consult previous Commission and *ad hoc* Group reports for details of the scientific rationale for the proposed amendments.

---

The Presidents of the Biological Standard Commission, of the Code Commission and of this Commission discussed the most appropriate incubation period for African swine fever. While recognising the incubation period may vary due to a variety of factors, such as the infective dose, natural or artificial infection, animal immunity, etc., the three Presidents concurred that a 15-day incubation period, as already adopted by the Member Countries, seemed appropriate for the purpose of the Terrestrial Code.

The detailed rationale for the Commission’s proposed amendments is attached as Annex 7.

The amended chapter addressing Member Country comments was forwarded to the Code Commission for its consideration.

f) Chapter 15.X. Infection with porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus

The drafting of Chapter 15.X. was initiated in 2013. It had been circulated three times for Member Country comment with the intention of proposing it for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

The Commission addressed the comments received by the OIE after the Commission meeting in September 2016.

The Commission reiterated that the distinct classification of susceptible animals for the purpose of the chapter was based on their management systems. This approach was consistent with other pig disease chapters (i.e. African swine fever, classical swine fever). Member Countries are encouraged to consider previous reports of this Commission, and in particular its September 2016 report, when this concept was extensively discussed in the Annex 6 of the report.

The detailed rationale for the Commission’s proposed amendments is attached as Annex 8.

The amended chapter addressing Member Country comments was forwarded to the Code Commission for its consideration.

g) Chapter 4.X. on vaccination

The drafting of Chapter 4.X. was initiated in 2015. The Commission reviewed the Member Country comments on the chapter that was circulated for the first time after its September 2016 meeting.

The Commission pointed out that the purpose of this draft chapter was to provide guidance to Member Countries to successfully implement vaccination programmes in support of disease control. Thus, the recommendations should apply when designing vaccination programmes against both OIE listed and non-listed diseases, which would also include emerging diseases. The recommendations described in this chapter should also be considered when designing both official and non-official disease control programmes.

The Commission stressed that this chapter was not intended to list each and every scenario but to provide guidance to Member Countries on different technical aspects to be considered during the vaccination decision-making process.

The Commission emphasised that, unless specified in the disease-specific chapters, the use of vaccination in response to a threat should not affect the disease status of a country or disrupt trade. However, it was noted that Member Countries having an OIE officially recognised disease free status should duly inform the OIE of any change in their vaccination policy.

The detailed rationale for the Commission’s proposed amendments is attached as Annex 9.

The amended chapter addressing Member Country comments was forwarded to the Code Commission for its consideration.
h) Chapter 4.3. on zoning and compartmentalisation

The Chapter 4.3. on zoning and compartmentalisation was amended during the Code Commission 2016 September meeting.

The Commission concurred with a Member Country proposal to develop a separate chapter to provide clear guidance for the application of zoning as it was the case for the application of compartmentalisation (Terrestrial Code Chapter 4.4). This proposal would also benefit those countries that were in the process of applying for official disease status recognition.

The Commission clarified that the provisions of the Terrestrial Code Chapter 4.3. allowed Member Countries to define more than one zone and to create more than one compartment in their territories. While emphasising that the principle of establishment of a containment zone is to contain all outbreaks, the Commission agreed on the hypothetical possibility of establishing more than one containment zone, provided sufficient justification existed (e.g. different incursions, large geographical areas). The Commission agreed that the concept and operationalisation of multiple containment zones in one single Member Country may need to be further discussed with the Code Commission.

The Commission discussed the need to identify all susceptible animals within a containment zone and the challenge that this may pose in some circumstances (i.e. presence of susceptible wildlife). It was emphasised that the implementation of a containment zone implied a strict control of the movement of the animals and their products. Thus, to implement an effective movement control, individual identification may not always be possible or necessary.

The amended chapter addressing Member Country comments was forwarded to the Code Commission for its consideration.

2.2. Other Considerations

a) Chapter 8.15. Rinderpest

The Commission noted the modifications proposed by the Joint FAO-OIE Rinderpest Advisory Committee (JAC) on the definition of rinderpest virus-containing material included in Article 8.15.2 of the Terrestrial Code.

The Commission reviewed the technical documents provided by the JAC, which were based on comments from a Member Country, and the supporting letter from FAO on the risk assessment of sera. The Commission agreed with the proposal of excluding from the definition sera that have been either heat-treated or shown to be free of rinderpest virus genome sequences by a validated reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assay.

The Commission also considered the JAC’s opinion on whether or not the full genomic material including virus RNA and complementary DNA copies of virus RNA should be maintained in the definition. The Commission acknowledged that, with the current knowledge, it is not possible to obtain infective rinderpest virus from purified RNA. However, the Commission noted that this was feasible for other viruses (i.e. foot and mouth virus and bluetongue virus).

The Commission highlighted the fact that genetic technology is advancing fast and that may have an impact on the efforts for sequestration and destruction of rinderpest virus. The Commission decided that full rinderpest virus genomic material may pose a certain risk and, therefore, should be maintained in the definition of rinderpest virus-containing material provided for in this chapter.

The amended article was forwarded to the Code Commission for its consideration.
b) Chapter 8.X. Infection with *Trypanosoma evansi* (non-equine surra) and Chapter 12.3. Infection with trypanozoon in equids (dourine, equine surra)

The Commission considered the *Terrestrial Code* draft chapter 8.X on infection with *Trypanosoma evansi* (limited to non-equine surra) and the *Terrestrial Code* amended Chapter 12.3. on dourine, which was broadened to include all non-tsetse transmitted trypanosomosis in equids: dourine and equine surra.

The Commission acknowledged the improvements in the structure of the two chapters, as had been requested during its September meeting, but insisted that the terminology and language used should be harmonised with other chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Commission questioned the scientific rationale for claiming freedom in a country or zone in only one particular susceptible species but not in the other susceptible species that share the same pathogens and similar risk factors for transmission. It was agreed that the scope of the chapters should include only domestic and captive wild animals.

The Commission expressed its concerns on the recommendations drafted for the recovery of freedom of a country or zone as described in the draft Chapter 8.X. Considering that *T. evansi* is transmitted by vectors, it would not be sufficient to only test susceptible animals within the affected establishments as was proposed by the *ad hoc* Group but to also investigate animals outside of the affected establishments.

The Commission also made some modifications on the draft chapters to improve their clarity.

The two amended draft chapters were forwarded to the Code Commission for consideration.

3. *Ad hoc and Working Groups*

3.1. Meeting reports for endorsement

a) *Ad hoc Group on the Evaluation of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) Status of Member Countries, 17–20 October 2016*

The Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on the evaluation of applications from Member Countries for the recognition of FMD status recognition.

- **Evaluation of a request from a Member Country for its official recognition as a new FMD free country where vaccination is practised**

  The Commission agreed with the conclusions of the *ad hoc* Group and recommended that the Assembly recognise *Paraguay* as a FMD free country where vaccination is practised.

  The Commission commended the efforts made by Paraguay in taking into consideration the recommendations made by the OIE mission team in April 2016.

- **Evaluation of requests from Member Countries for the status recognition of new FMD free zones where vaccination is not practised**

  The Commission agreed with the conclusions of the *ad hoc* Group and recommended that the Assembly recognise *Zone 3b of Botswana* as a zone free from FMD where vaccination is not practised.

  The Commission also considered the recommendation of the *ad hoc* Group regarding another application for a zone of a Member Country and concluded that it did not meet the requirements to have a recognised FMD free zone where vaccination is not practised. The dossier was referred back to the corresponding Member Country.
Evaluation of requests from Member Countries for the status recognition of new FMD free zones where vaccination is practised

The Commission agreed with the conclusions of the ad hoc Group and recommended that the Assembly recognise the zone of Chinese Taipei as described by the Delegate of Chinese Taipei in documents addressed to the Director General in August 2016 as a FMD free zone where vaccination is practised.

The Commission also considered the recommendation of the ad hoc Group regarding the applications from Kazakhstan and provisionally concluded that the proposed zones – Zone 1 consisting of Almaty region, Zone 2 consisting of East Kazakhstan region, Zone 3 including part of Kyzylorda region, northern part of South Kazakhstan region, northern and central parts of Zhambyl region, Zone 4 including southern part of Kyzylorda region and the south-western part of South Kazakhstan region, and Zone 5 including south-eastern part of South Kazakhstan region and the southern part of Zhambyl region – fulfilled the requirements of the Terrestrial Code. However, the Commission recommended the Director General to mandate a mission to the country, before any final decision be taken, to verify compliance with the provisions of the Terrestrial Code. Pending the outcome of the mission planned in early May 2017, the tentative decision of the Scientific Commission would be confirmed and the five proposed zones of Kazakhstan (as described by the Delegate of Kazakhstan in documents addressed to the Director General in August 2016 as FMD free zones where vaccination is practised) would be proposed for official recognition at 85th General Session in May 2017.

The Commission finally considered the recommendations of the ad hoc Group regarding the applications for three zones of another Member Country and concluded that they did not meet the requirements to have recognised FMD free zones where vaccination is practised. The dossiers were referred back to the corresponding Member Country along with the rationale for the Commission’s position. Suggestions on actions to be taken to comply with the requirements of the Terrestrial Code were provided.

The Commission appreciated the ad hoc Group providing written guidelines on how Member Countries could present their serological survey design and results and proposed that these guidelines be annexed to the questionnaires (online versions) for Member Countries willing to apply for official recognition of FMD status.

The endorsed ad hoc Group report is attached as Annex 10.

b) Ad hoc Group on the Evaluation of Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia (CBPP) Status of Member Countries, 2–3 November 2016

The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report of the ad hoc Group on the evaluation of applications from Member Countries for CBPP status recognition.

The Commission agreed with the conclusions of the ad hoc Group and recommended that the Assembly recognise Brazil and South Africa as CBPP free countries.

In accordance with the established procedures, the Commission member from South Africa withdrew from the meeting during the discussions on South Africa’s dossier by the Commission.

The Commission concurred with the conclusions of the ad hoc Group on another application submitted by a Member Country which did not meet the requirements of the Terrestrial Code. The dossier was referred back to the applicant Member Country providing the rationale for the Commission’s position, as well as suggestions on actions to be taken to comply with the requirements of the Terrestrial Code.

The endorsed report of the ad hoc Group is attached as Annex 11.
c) *Ad hoc Group on the Evaluation of Classical Swine Fever (CSF) Status of Member Countries, 8–10 November 2016*

The Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on the evaluation of the applications from Member Countries for the recognition of CSF status.

The Commission agreed with the conclusions of the *ad hoc* Group to recommend that the Assembly recognise Paraguay as a CSF free country.

The Commission requested additional clarification from Romania during its meeting and also concluded by electronic correspondence that it provisionally fulfilled the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code* but a mission would also be necessary before any final decision be taken. Pending the outcome of the mission planned in May 2017, the tentative decision of the Scientific Commission would be confirmed and Romania would be proposed for official recognition at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

The Commission discussed the application from another country and provisionally concluded that it fulfilled the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*. However, the Commission recommended to the Director General to mandate a mission to the country, before any final decision be taken, to verify compliance with the provisions of the *Terrestrial Code*. Pending the outcome of the mission, the tentative decision of the Scientific Commission would be confirmed and the country would be proposed for official recognition at 86th General Session in May 2018.

The Commission had a physical meeting with a delegation from one of the applicant countries that provided clarification on the uncertainties with regard to its recognition as a CSF free country. However, the Commission was of the opinion that there was not enough evidence proving that the recently implemented measures, essential in demonstrating absence of infection with CSFV in domestic pigs, particularly in the backyard pigs, were effective for the past 12 months in accordance with Point 3 of Article 15.2.3. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Commission therefore concluded that the country did not yet fulfil the requirements of Article 15.2.3. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The dossier was referred back to the applicant Member Country providing the rationale for the Commission’s position and suggestions on actions to be taken to comply with the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Commission concurred with the conclusions of the *ad hoc* Group on another application submitted by a Member Country which did not meet the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*. The dossier was referred back to the applicant Member Country and the rationale for the Commission’s position, as well as suggestions on actions to be taken to comply with the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code* were provided. In accordance with the established procedures, the Commission member originally from this applicant country withdrew from the meeting during the Commission’s discussions on this dossier.

The endorsed report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached as Annex 12.

d) *Ad hoc Group on the Evaluation of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) Risk Status of Member Countries, 22–24 November 2016*

The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on the evaluation of the applications from Member Countries for the recognition of their BSE risk status.

The Commission agreed with the conclusions of the *ad hoc* Group and recommended that the Assembly recognise Poland as having a negligible BSE risk.

The Commission also recommended that the Assembly recognise two zones of the United Kingdom – Northern Ireland and Scotland – as respectively described by the Delegate of the United Kingdom in documents addressed to the Director General in September and October 2016 as zones having negligible BSE risk.
The Commission also considered the recommendation of the ad hoc Group regarding the application of another Member Country and concluded that this Member Country did not meet the requirements of the Terrestrial Code for a BSE negligible risk status. The dossier was referred back to the applicant Member Country explaining the rationale of the Commission’s position and suggestions on actions to be taken to comply with the requirements of the Terrestrial Code.

The Commission also confirmed the decision that was taken by electronic consultation in March 2016, to re-instate the previous “controlled BSE risk” status of France.

Finally, the Commission considered the opinion of the ad hoc Group with regard to the Terrestrial Code chapter and to the questionnaire on BSE and concluded that further steps in convening an ad hoc Group should only be taken after consideration and processing of the draft scientific and technical review on BSE risk (cf. Point 4.5, and Annex 18).

The endorsed report of the ad hoc Group is attached as Annex 13.

e) Ad hoc Group on the Evaluation of African Horse Sickness (AHS) Status of Member Countries, 6–8 December 2016

The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report of the ad hoc Group on the evaluation of the applications from Member Countries for the recognition of their AHS free status.

The Commission considered the recommendation of the ad hoc Group regarding the applications submitted by three Member Countries.

The Commission requested additional information from one of the Member Countries during its meeting and concluded by electronic correspondence that it provisionally fulfilled the requirements of the Terrestrial Code but that a mission would also be necessary before any final decision be taken. Pending the outcome of the mission, the tentative decision of the Scientific Commission would be confirmed and the country would be proposed for official recognition at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

The Commission concluded that the two other applications did not meet the requirements of the Terrestrial Code. The dossiers were referred back to the applicant Member Countries explaining the rationale of the Commission’s position and providing suggestions on actions to be taken to comply with the requirements of the Terrestrial Code.

The Commission also took note of the comments raised by the ad hoc Group on the requirements for retention of the list of countries or zones free from AHS. The Commission agreed that these comments would be considered as part of the discussion under Point 4.3.e) (see below).

The Commission took note of the comments raised by the ad hoc Group on the establishment of equine disease free zones (EDFZ) and stressed that for the establishment of such, it would be the responsibility of the country to identify the list of relevant diseases for which the zone is declared free. If AHS is included in the list of diseases for which the zone is declared free, then the recognition of the AHS free status should be based on an official recognition by the OIE.

The endorsed report of the ad hoc Group is attached as Annex 14.


The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report of the ad hoc Group on the evaluation of the applications from two Member Countries, one for PPR status recognition and one for the endorsement of an official control programme.

The Commission agreed with the conclusions of the ad hoc Group and recommended that the Assembly recognise Botswana as a PPR free country.
The Commission also considered the recommendation of the ad hoc Group regarding the application submitted by the other Member Country which did not meet the requirements of the Terrestrial Code for the endorsement of its official control programme for PPR. The dossier was referred back to the applicant Member Country explaining the rationale of the Commission’s position and suggestions on actions to be taken to comply with the requirements of the Terrestrial Code.

The Commission took note of the points raised by the ad hoc Group on the requirements for retention of the list of countries or zones free from PPR. The Commission agreed that these comments would be considered as part of the discussion under Point 4.3.c) (see below).

The endorsed report of the ad hoc Group is attached as Annex 15.

g) Ad hoc Group on Antimicrobial Resistance, 24–26 January 2017

The Commission considered the report of the ad hoc Group on Antimicrobial Resistance.

The Commission commended the Group and the OIE for the publication of the 2015 “OIE Annual Report on the Use of Antimicrobial Agents in Animals: Better understanding of the Global Situation” and took note of the advancement of the collection of data for the 2016 annual report. The Commission encouraged Member Countries to submit the requested information for the 2016 report.

The Commission considered the updated definitions proposed for therapeutic use and of the new definitions proposed for preventative use and growth promotion that were intended to be included in Chapter 6.8 of the Terrestrial Code for the purpose of monitoring the use of antimicrobial agents in animals.

The Commission suggested to make references to the responsibility of the veterinarian to prescribe antimicrobials and amended the definition of ‘preventive use’ as follows:

**Preventative use:** Administration of an antimicrobial agent targeted to animals at risk for a specific infection(s) or in a specific situation where disease is likely to occur if the drug is not administered, with an appropriate dose and for a limited duration. It should be used on the prescription of a veterinarian or other suitably trained person authorised to prescribe VMP containing antimicrobial agents in accordance with national legislation and under the supervision of a veterinarian.

The Commission also suggested that the ad hoc Group should look into the OIE list of antimicrobial agents of veterinary importance to further specify the classes of antimicrobial agents according to their intended use in animals.

The Commission reviewed the response provided by the ad hoc Group on the technical comments received from the Member Countries related to the proposed amended version of the Chapter 6.7 of the Terrestrial Code.

The amended the chapter addressing Member Country comments and the ad hoc Group report were forwarded to the Code Commission for further consideration.

The Commission was informed of the intention of the OIE to organise a 2nd Global Conference on Antimicrobial Resistance and the Prudent and Responsible use of Antimicrobials in the near future.

The report of the ad hoc Group is attached as Annex 16.

h) Working Group on wildlife, 7–10 November 2016

The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report of the Working Group on Wildlife.
The Commission took note of the information on the emerging and noteworthy wildlife disease occurrences worldwide during the past year. Regarding invasive wasp (*Vespa velutina*) in Europe, the Commission requested a consultation with the OIE experts on bee diseases to have more information on this pest and in particular to ascertain if it fulfils the criteria to be included in the OIE List of diseases.

The Commission requested an opinion from the Members of the Working Group on the high mortality observed in the Saiga antelope population of Mongolia possibly due to infection with peste des petits ruminants.

The Commission also requested feedback from the Working Group on hunter involvement in and progress regarding surveillance of diseases in wildlife.

Regarding the paper developed by the Working Group on “Vaccination of Animals of High Conservation Value”, the Commission thanked the Working Group for drafting this text but expressed the wish to have more time to review this paper as it might have an impact on the official disease status of OIE Member Countries. The Commission proposed to include the review of this paper as an agenda item in their next meeting in September.

The report of the Working Group was endorsed (85 SG/13 GT).

### 3.2. Planned ad hoc Groups

a) *Ad hoc* Group on Rabies: September 2017  
b) *Ad hoc* Group on Alternatives for Surveillance for Demonstration of Freedom from FMD and recovery periods: 14–16 June 2017  
c) *Ad hoc* Group to amend Chapter 1.4. on Animal Health Surveillance: 19–21 June 2017  
d) *Ad hoc* Group on Antimicrobial Resistance: 29–31 August 2017  
e) *Ad hoc* Group on the evaluation of CBPP status: 26–28 September 2017  
f) *Ad hoc* Group on the evaluation of AHS status: 17–19 October 2017  
g) *Ad hoc* Group on the evaluation of BSE risk status: 24–26 October 2017  
h) *Ad hoc* Group on the evaluation of FMD status: 7–9 November 2017  
i) *Ad hoc* Group on the evaluation of CSF status: 21–23 November 2017  
j) *Ad hoc* Group on the evaluation of PPR status: 6–8 December 2017  
k) Working Group on Wildlife: 12–15 December 2017

### 4. Official disease status

#### 4.1. Expert missions to Member Countries requested by the Commission

a) **Potential disease status missions**

The Commission reviewed and prioritised the missions for official recognition and for maintenance of disease status to be performed before its next meeting in September 2017. The prioritisation of the list of missions would be finalised after consultation with the Director General of the OIE.

b) **Other mission of interest: Venezuela (30 January – 3 February 2017)**

The Commission was updated on the main outcomes of a recent OIE mission related to Venezuela’s FMD control activities, with particular focus on its vaccination campaigns. The mission team highlighted the commitment of the country in continuing its activities and efforts for FMD control and making progress in the national official FMD control programme endorsed by the OIE. The Commission also commended the coordination and support provided by the OIE Regional Representation in the regional control and eradication of FMD.
4.2. Update on official disease status

a) Follow-up of some countries having an official endorsed control programme

- Venezuela (FMD)

The Commission took into consideration the information submitted via the annual reconfirmation of Venezuela’s endorsed official control programme and the report of the recent mission (cf. Point 4.1.a)) and agreed to maintain the endorsed official control programme of Venezuela. The Commission made some recommendations to Venezuela for further discussion at its next meeting in September.

b) Cessation of vaccination in a FMD free with vaccination zone

- Peru (FMD)

The Commission took note of the official communication from Peru to the OIE on the cessation of vaccination in the zone free with vaccination to change from FMD free with vaccination status to FMD free without vaccination status. The future application for the new status should be submitted to the OIE within 24 months of the cessation of vaccination, in accordance with Article 8.8.3. of the Terrestrial Code. The current officially recognised FMD free status with vaccination of this zone of Peru will be maintained unchanged until compliance with Article 8.8.2. is approved by the OIE.

4.3. Annual reconfirmations and other official status related issues

a) Comprehensive review of annual reconfirmations (for pre-selected status and all OIE endorsed national official control programmes)

The Commission comprehensively reviewed the annual reconfirmations of the Member Countries that were pre-selected at its last meeting in September 2016. The Commission emphasised that Member Countries with an endorsed control programme must demonstrate progress along the timeline initially submitted to the OIE and should clearly indicate their working plan towards disease control or eradication.

The Commission noted some pending submissions or finalisation of annual reconfirmations of Member Countries’ official status and endorsed control programmes and was not able to review all pre-selected annual reconfirmations at its meeting. While the Commission agreed to follow-up by electronic correspondence for these annual reconfirmations, the Commission underlined the importance of timely submissions (by the end of November each year) of the annual reconfirmations for maintenance of official status and of endorsement of official control programme and agreed that lack of submission by mid-January could lead to the suspension of the official status or to the withdrawal of the endorsement of the official control programme of Member Countries.

b) Report of the annual reconfirmation assessments by the Status Department

The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report prepared by the OIE Status Department on the remaining annual reconfirmations (that were not selected for comprehensive review). The Commission also reviewed the annual reconfirmations for which the Status Department required the Commission’s scientific advice.

The Commission concluded that the annual reconfirmations were compliant with the relevant requirements of relevant Chapter of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised status and made recommendations to some Member Countries regarding their annual reconfirmations for maintenance of disease.

The report of all annual reconfirmations, including those comprehensively reviewed by the Commission and those reviewed by the OIE Status Department and reported to the Commission, is attached as Annex 17.
c) Review of discrepancies between requirements of the disease-specific chapters of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of status

A document was provided to the Commission presenting the discrepancies between the requirements of the Terrestrial Code for the official recognition of AHS, CBPP, CSF, FMD with and without vaccination, and PPR freedom as well as for retention of the list of countries and zones free from these respective diseases. The Commission confirmed the need to harmonise and update the requirements for recognition and maintenance of status. The Commission endorsed the template prepared by the OIE Status Department for the harmonisation of requirements and agreed that the OIE begin to work on this topic. Progress would be evaluated at the September meeting.

With reference to the discussions under the AHS and BSE ad hoc Groups (cf. Points 3.1.a and 3.1.d.), the Commission stressed that the comments made by the ad hoc Groups should be considered when harmonising the requirements for retention under the disease-specific Chapters.

4.4. Disease status recognition procedure

a) Update on the Standard Operating Procedures and internal protocols

The Commission commended the OIE on the good progress made with the Standard Operating Procedures and internal protocols for official status recognition to improve the transparency and credibility at all steps from the initial official recognition of status to its continuous maintenance over time. In particular, the Commission endorsed: the new structure of the procedures for the recognition and the maintenance of disease status and programme endorsement; the need to set up a deadline for the submission of annual reconfirmations with strong incentive to respect it; the criteria to propose that a mission be deployed as well as a check-list on the information to look for during a mission and the methodology being developed for a systematic and homogeneous use of the PVS reports as part of the status recognition process.

b) Update on the amendments and harmonisation of status recognition questionnaires

The Commission reviewed and endorsed the final versions of the questionnaires that were revised by the relevant ad hoc Groups responsible for the evaluation of disease status, harmonised by the OIE Status Department and further reviewed by a member of the Commission (the representative of the Commission to the dedicated ad hoc Group). The questionnaires were forwarded to the Code Commission to be circulated to OIE Member Countries.

4.5. Consideration on the official recognition of BSE risk status

The Commission considered a scientific and technical document assessing the current risk associated with BSE, the OIE Standards for BSE in the Terrestrial Code and the link with the OIE official recognition of risk status for BSE.

The Commission concluded that the Terrestrial Code Chapter on BSE should be revised in detail. The Commission also had in-depth discussion on the relevance of the official recognition for BSE and proposed that the outcome of its discussions be forwarded for consideration by the OIE Council. The Commission would welcome Member Countries’ consideration and comments on this topic to the OIE Status Department (disease.status@oie.int) and proposed that it be mentioned by the President of the Commission during his presentation at the forthcoming General Session.

The scientific and technical document assessing the current risk associated with BSE is attached as Annex 18.
5. FMD and PPR control strategies

5.1. Peste de Petits Ruminants - Global Control Strategy

The Commission was updated on the current status of the PPR Global Control and Eradication Strategy (PPR-GCES). The Commission was informed that the PPR Global Eradication Programme (PPR-GEP) was developed and officially launched on 28 October 2016 (FAO-OIE joint press release) after its endorsement by FAO and OIE. The Commission was informed of the commencement of the work in 2017 to implement a FAO-OIE Joint Resource Mobilization Strategy by exploring interest from public-private partners to support the funding of the PPR-GEP.

The Commission noted that the first round of PPR Regional Roadmap meetings would be finalised with the organisation of the PPR Regional workshop for the Association of Southeast Asian Nations countries in April 2017 in China. The second round would begin by the second PPR Regional roadmap workshop for the Economic Cooperation Organisation countries, scheduled for 28 February to 2 March 2017 in Tajikistan. A meeting of PPR vaccine producers was also planned for April 2017 in Morocco.

The Commission noted the establishment of an OIE Internal Coordination Group with an Action Plan that was developed to support the PPR-GEP. The Commission acknowledged the work of the OIE and FAO assisting the Government of Mongolia, in response to the recent events related to massive PPR outbreaks in wildlife. The Commission was also informed of the OIE coordinative activities related to the Animal Health component of the Regional Sahel Pastoralism Support Project in West and Central Africa, which aims to strengthen the capacities of the national Veterinary Services and support the surveillance and control of priority animal diseases, including PPR. Finally, the Commission took note of the development of the PPR Portal on the OIE’s website as communication tool and for countries to easily access information related to PPR and PPR-GCES online.

5.2. Foot and Mouth Disease Global Control Strategy

The Commission was briefly updated on the latest activities conducted in the framework of the Global FMD Control Strategy and under the umbrella of the Global Framework for the progressive control of Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs). The regions where roadmap meetings took place and where planned in the coming months were listed. With regard to the recent roadmap meeting organised in Sri Lanka for the SAARC countries, it was emphasised that the meeting has been an opportunity to develop collaboration between this region and South East Asia. In addition, the Commission was informed about successful experiences of combined vaccination (FMD – haemorrhagic septicaemia) that were described during this roadmap meeting; this was seen as a good way to motivate farmers to vaccinate against FMD and as a good example of activities under Component 3 of the Global Strategy. The Commission took note that the Roadmap meeting conducted annually in West Eurasia would this year be replaced by an Epidemiology and Laboratory Network meeting to cover the technical topics that were identified as gaps during the preceding roadmap meetings.

Finally the Commission acknowledged that the FAO/OIE guidelines for post-vaccination monitoring had been published and that the GF-TADs FMD Working Group was working on a two-year action plan to structure and organise the activities related to the implementation of the Global Strategy.

6. OIE Collaborating Centres

6.1. Collaborating Centre in Veterinary Epidemiology, Risk Assessment and Public Health

An application from a country in Europe seeking designation as an OIE Collaborating Centre for Veterinary Epidemiology, Risk Assessment and Public Health was evaluated by the Commission. Although the standard of excellence and competence of the applying institution was evident, the Commission noted that the title and some of the described activities overlap with some existing Collaborating Centres in Europe (Veterinary Training, Epidemiology, Food Safety and Animal Welfare [Teramo, Italy], Zoonoses in Europe [FLI, Insel Riems, Germany]), which contravenes the Internal

---


Rules for OIE Collaborating Centres, which limits them to one per topic per region. The Commission proposed that the applicant either propose a new title for the Collaborating Centre and adapt the application, e.g. Risk Analysis and Modelling, for which there is a need since the former Collaborating Centre that covered this topic requested to be delisted, or alternatively, that the applicant consider forming a consortium with one of the other Centres in the region.

7. Liaison with other Specialist Commissions

7.1. Terrestrial Animal Health Standard Commission

Please refer to the report of the joint meeting between the two Commissions attached at Annex 19.

7.2. Biological Standards Commission

The Commission was provided with an update on some pending issues referred to the Biological Standards Commission

a) Equine trypanosomes and non-equine trypanosomoses:

The update of the Terrestrial Manual chapters was put on hold until the proposal to develop Terrestrial Code chapters on Infection with Trypanosoma evansi – non-equine surra and Infection with Trypanozoon in equids (dourine, equine surra) was accepted by the Member Countries.

b) Classical swine fever:

i) Need to update the Terrestrial Manual chapter to include the latest developments in DIVA tests and vaccines

The Biological Standards Commission decided to consult the OIE Reference Laboratory experts to review the latest technological developments regarding DIVA vaccines and validated tests. The Terrestrial Manual Chapter would be updated if necessary.

ii) Move the diagram in the Terrestrial Code Chapter 15.2 use and interpretation of diagnostic tests in surveillance to the Terrestrial Manual

The Commission questioned the necessity of including in the Terrestrial Code diagrams on the use and interpretation of diagnostic tests in surveillance and proposed that they be moved to the Terrestrial Manual. Given that all countries conducting disease control programmes must develop their own decision tree algorithms adapted to their individual situation, the Biological Standards Commission did not see the value of such diagrams in either the Terrestrial Code or the Terrestrial Manual.

c) Draft Terrestrial Code Chapter 4.X. on vaccination

The Commission concurred with the ad hoc Group on Vaccination that had identified the “transmissibility of live-attenuated vaccine strains”, the “purity”, “contamination” and “release and spread of extraneous agents” were important criteria for the choice of vaccine. The Biological Standards Commission felt that these topics were dealt with in Chapter 3.7.2. Minimum requirements for the production and quality control of vaccines and in Chapter 1.1.9. Tests of biological materials for sterility and freedom from contamination of the Terrestrial Manual and thus did not need to be included in the Terrestrial Code draft chapter 4.X.
In response to a question regarding the inclusion in the *Terrestrial Code* chapter on vaccination of the requirement that the vaccine selected for use in a vaccination programme should be subjected to the registration procedure of the country, in agreement with the VICH⁴, the Biological Standards Commission felt that this requirement was already included in the chapter and in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

### 8. Disease specific issues

#### 8.1. Update on the foot-and-mouth disease reference laboratory network and disease global situation

The Commission was updated by Dr Donald King (Pirbright) on the most significant events related to FMD that occurred globally in the past 12 months and that would be included in the 2016 annual report on the activities of the OIE/FAO FMD network.

The Commission noted the spread of FMD virus over long distances out of the well-defined virus pools ecosystem. The Commission acknowledged the importance of sharing FMD virus information and commended the FMD Laboratories Network for their efforts in supporting the FMD Global Control Strategy. Member Countries were urged to remain vigilant to the dynamics of FMD virus strains considered exotic in their regions; to adjust their vaccination strategies aiming at ensuring appropriate protection against newly emerging FMD virus and to share outcomes in achieving protective immunity from vaccination against the relevant field virus strain.

The Commission noted the absence of confirmed cases of FMD serotype C since 2004 and confirmed the intention to present a Resolution in this regard at the 85th General Session in May 2017 (cf Point 10.2.).

#### 8.2. Inactivation of foot and mouth disease virus in milk and cream for human consumption

The Commission acknowledged with thanks the opinion provided by experts from an OIE Reference Laboratory for FMD on the risk assessment of FMDV transmission through international trade of milk powder and butter manufactured for human consumption following an enquiry that was forwarded to the OIE by a Member Country.

The Commission noted that appropriate heat treatment is sufficient to inactivate the virus⁵. However, the procedure to manufacture milk powder and butter for human consumption would need to be well described and kept under control to ensure those commodities are safe for international trade.

The Commission noted the inherent risk of virus spread during the collection, transport and processing of raw milk from infected animals. This risk could extend to a commodity trade risk for processed milk if the handling of raw and processed milk were not well separated. Special attention should be made to avoid aerosols or transmission via the milk collection trucks.

#### 8.3. Follow up on camelds ad hoc Group’s opinion on MERS-CoV⁶ case definition

A draft case definition for MERS-CoV in dromedary camel was presented to the Commission during its September 2016 meeting. Based on the new scientific information, this case definition was finalised and agreed by the OIE ad hoc Group on camelid diseases and MERS-CoV experts. The definition provides information that would help Member Countries to differentiate confirmed and suspected MERS-CoV cases in camels and to report to the OIE in accordance with the emerging disease provisions of Article 1.1.4.

---

⁴ VICH: International Cooperation on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Veterinary Products


⁶ MERS CoV: Middle-East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus
The Commission recommended that the updated case definition be published in the OIE website and that the OIE question and answer document on MERS-CoV should be updated with the latest scientific information to include the new case definition.

8.4. Chronic wasting disease of cervids (CWD): inclusion on the OIE list of diseases

The Commission considered the opinion provided by the Working Group on Wildlife (December 2016), and the EFSA Scientific Opinion published in January 2017. It was also noted that some countries regularly reported the occurrence of the disease in their territories through WAHIS-Wild.

The Commission considered that there were still significant gaps in the understanding of the epidemiology of the disease that may impede the ability of the Commission to make an informed decision. The Commission decided to postpone its decision on whether or not CWD comply with the listing criteria described of Chapter 1.2. of the Terrestrial Code until further scientific information became available.

The Commission encouraged Member Countries to report the occurrence of the disease and other relevant epidemiological information related to CWD through WAHIS-Wild.

8.5. OIE Technical Factsheet on Schmallenberg virus

The Commission took note of the letter received by the OIE in February 2017 indicating the incorrect use of the risk assessment information included in the Schmallenberg factsheet for trade purposes. The factsheet is published in the OIE website.

The Commission stressed that trade restrictions due to the presence of Schmallenberg were not sufficiently justified and made references to previous Commission and ad hoc Group reports when the impact of the Schmallenberg virus was extensively discussed.

The Commission noted that the scientific information included in the factsheet needed to be updated and suggested requesting the OIE to seek expert advice. Meanwhile, the Commission also suggested removing the annex of the current factsheet to avoid misunderstanding among Member Countries.

9. For Commission information

9.1. Update on OFFLU

The Commission was updated on the OIE-FAO network of expertise on animal influenza (OFFLU) activities. A joint Steering and Executive Committee meeting was held in September 2016 to provide strategic direction and operational follow-up on the ongoing technical activities. A significant amount of genetic and antigenic data on zoonotic avian influenza was shared with WHO in the September 2016 Vaccine Composition Meetings. The Influenza A cleavage site document was updated based on the latest analysis and publications of new avian influenza outbreaks; the document is available on the OFFLU website. The Australian Animal Health Laboratory in Geelong has agreed to lead the next annual OFFLU proficiency testing exercise among the OIE-FAO Reference Centres to enable them to detect any avian influenza virus that may be encountered globally. The OFFLU wildlife group undertook regular teleconferences to provide advice and updated situation reports and guidance for H5N8 and other Eurasian H5 clade 2.3.4.4 avian influenza viruses. The OFFLU swine influenza group published a research article on a phylogeny-based global nomenclature system and automated


8 http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Our_scientific_expertise/docs/pdf/A_Schmallenberg_virus.pdf
annotation tool for H1 haemagglutinin genes from swine influenza A viruses. The global swine H1 nomenclature tool was also released on Influenza Research Database website9.

9.2. **Project update: replacement International Standard Bovine Tuberculin**

The Commission was updated on the progress made with the project to develop a replacement international standard bovine tuberculin. Although the OIE had been soliciting financial support from public and private partnerships, the necessary funds have not yet been fully secured. Despite this constraint, the OIE considers this activity to be important and urgent, and so will implement the first phase of the project, and in collaboration with the United Kingdom’s National Institute of Biological Standards and Control (NIBSC), the OIE will contact potential manufacturers to request donations of bulk material that would be evaluated and potentially used to produce the replacement international standard bovine tuberculin. The next steps, which include the selection of the candidate tuberculins, the elaboration of a detailed description of the international collaborative study, the calculation of accurate costing and the development of an updated timeline would be further discussed with the experts.

9.3. **Vaccination trials and DIVA tests for bovine tuberculosis**

The Commission was informed that the United Kingdom was considering the development of a cattle DIVA vaccine and diagnostics as tools for bovine tuberculosis control. It was noted that in some countries (i.e. European Union countries), vaccination against bovine tuberculosis was prohibited due to interference with the tuberculin skin test.

The Commission agreed that if the DIVA vaccine was developed, it may need to be considered for inclusion in the OIE Standards.

9.4. **Upcoming ad hoc Group on biological threat reduction**

The Commission was informed that following the recommendations from the 2015 OIE Global Conference on Biological Threat Reduction, the OIE was convening an *ad hoc* Group on Biological Threat Reduction with the purpose of developing guidelines for the investigation of suspicious biological events resulting from deliberate attacks with biological agents.

The Commission commended the OIE for the initiative and suggested the participation of one of its Members in this *ad hoc* Group.

9.5. **Update on the STAR-IDAZ International Research Consortium**

Since November 2016, the OIE is hosting the Scientific Secretariat for the STAR-IDAZ International Research Consortium (IRC). The first meeting of the IRC Scientific Committee and the IRC Executive Committee meeting took place in Kenya in January 2017.

The Scientific Committee of the Consortium had the mandate to provide guidance on the identification of priority diseases on which working groups should be established, and to provide support to the subject-specific working groups. The aim of the working groups would be to identify research gaps and draft research roadmaps to be used by research funders. The priority diseases included: Brucellosis, PRRS, ASF, bovine TB, and infestation with helminths. The first working group is scheduled for June 2017.

The Commission was informed that the ToR of the working groups and the methodology for the gap analysis were being prepared by the Scientific Secretariat.

9 https://www.fludb.org/brc/influenza_h1clade_search_segment.spg?method=ShowCleanSearch&decorator=influenza
9.6. Veterinary para-professionals

The Commission was briefed on the OIE’s work on veterinary para-professionals (VPPs) that was initiated in response to the recommendations of the 4th OIE Global Conference on Veterinary Education. Pursuant to the plan to develop recommendations for core competencies and guidelines for curricular requirements, the first ad hoc Group meeting held in November 2016 developed a working draft of competencies. It covered three tracks identified as important for VPPs working in the Veterinary Services: animal health field work, veterinary public health field work and laboratory diagnosis. The Commission noted that the meeting report of this ad hoc Group would be appended to the Code Commission February 2017 meeting report.

10. Resolutions for the General Sessions

The Commission identified the Resolutions that would be presented to the Member Countries during the 85th General Session.

10.1. Resolutions related to disease status recognition

The Commission took note of the draft Resolutions on disease status recognition that would be presented at the forthcoming General Session.

10.2. Progressive elimination or sequestration of FMDV serotype C

The Commission endorsed a draft Resolution related to FMD serotype C to be presented at the forthcoming General Session in May 2017.

11. Programme and priorities

The Commission reviewed the working programme for the year, identified the priorities and scheduled the dates for the various ad hoc Group meetings which would be accessible to Member Countries on the OIE website. The programme and priorities of the Commission were also shared with the Code Commission during a joint meeting of the two respective Commissions.

The updated working programme is attached at Annex 20.

12. Adoption of the report

The Commission agreed to circulate the draft report electronically for comments before adoption.

13. Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Scientific Commission is scheduled for 4–8 September 2017.

_______________
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Annex 3

Rationale for the amendments to:
DEFINITIONS OF THE GLOSSARY
provided by the Scientific Commission

Pathogenic agent: When considering the Member Country comments on the proposed definition for “pathogenic agent” and after consulting the Oxford dictionary, the need for inclusion of this term in the Glossary was questioned. The Commission considered the possible ambiguities and inaccuracies that may occur when defining this term for the purpose of the Terrestrial Code (i.e. to include disease-eliciting agents such as prions). It was suggested not to include this term in the Glossary as it was sufficiently explained in common dictionaries.

Containment zone: In response to a Member Country comment, the Commission pointed out that the procedures to continually identify and follow-up suspected cases must be considered when applying and implementing a containment zone. The Commission amended the definitions accordingly.

Disease: The Commission agreed with a Member Country comment on the equipollence of the definitions of “disease” and “infection”. The proposed definition may contradict the classical concepts of epidemiology, whereby disease is described by the manifestation of clinical signs while infection may not always lead to clinical manifestation. The Commission proposed that the current definition be maintained.

Free zone and Zone: In line with the proposed definition for “disease”, the Commission agreed not to delete “infection or infestation” in both definitions as proposed by some Member Countries.

Protection zone: The Commission noted that the defined term “biosecurity” contains a set of measures to reduce the risk of disease introduction. This implies good understanding of the epidemiology of the disease. Therefore, it was not necessary to expand the definition as proposed by a Member Country.

The introduction of biological samples in a country or zone has never been an issue for disease status recognition, provided the introduction of the samples is conducted with the appropriate safety measures. The Commission also considered it unnecessary to include the concept of the animal population (host) in the definition.

Vaccination: While acknowledging that not all vaccinations induce immunity, the Commission was of the opinion that the term should not only refer to the act of administering the vaccine but also to the purpose of the vaccination.
Rationale for the amendments to:
CHAPTER 11.11. ON LUMPY SKIN DISEASE (CAUSED BY GROUP III VIRUS, TYPE NEETHLING)
provided by the Scientific Commission

Article 11.11.1. General Provisions

The Commission added text to indicate that the presence of antibodies is not enough to define a case. It would be necessary to also observe the presence of clinical signs or to determine an epidemiological link to suspect or confirmed cases. Therefore, even in the absence of a DIVA\(^{10}\) vaccine, the presence of antibodies as a consequence of vaccination does not constitute a case.

Article 11.11.3. Country or zone free from LSD

While acknowledging that identification of vaccinated animals is desirable, it is not a requirement considered in other chapters. As a vector-borne disease, vaccination usually implies a high number of animals to be vaccinated, making identification of individual animals unfeasible in many Member Countries. Thus, animal identification should not be a requirement for those Member Countries that apply vaccination.

Article 11.11.3.bis. – Recovery of free status

The Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to delete Point 1.b). In the case of an LSD outbreak, the clinical manifestation is considered highly specific. Thus, a waiting period of 26 months is considered sufficient time to detect the disease by clinical surveillance should LSDV be present, provided clinical surveillance in accordance to Article 11.11.14 is in place.

The Commission also considered the recovery of free status when vaccination is applied, and confirmed that should a country wish to recover free status, vaccination should have ceased. The provisions of this article were amended accordingly.

The Commission considered a Member Country comment to exclude young unvaccinated animals (less than 6 months) from surveillance due to the presence of maternal antibodies. The Commission concurred that these population strata should not be included in the serological surveillance, however the Commission was of the opinion that it was not necessary to specifically mention this as it was already covered by the horizontal Terrestrial Code Chapter 1.4 on surveillance.

Article 11.11.5. Importation of live animals from not free countries

The risk mitigation measures described in this article provide sufficient guarantees to ensure safe trade of animals from not free (or vaccinated) Member Countries. Those animals would need to be tested to ensure the presence of antibodies after vaccination and be placed in a quarantine station for sufficient time to mitigate the potential risk posed by seropositive vaccinated animals. Requesting virus detection would not add value to the already existing provisions for importation of live animals from countries not free from LSD.

\(^{10}\) DIVA: Differentiation of vaccinated from infected animals
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Rationale for the amendments to:

CHAPTER 8.X. INFECTION WITH MYCOBACTERIUM TUBERCULOSIS COMPLEX
provided by the Scientific Commission

Article 8.X.1. General provision

In response to Member Country comments regarding the role of African buffaloes, the Commission pointed out that, in line with the opinion of the ad hoc Group, based on the experience of some African Member Countries, and the scientific literature consulted\textsuperscript{11}, exclusion of African buffalo from the case definition was sufficiently justified for the purpose of this chapter.

Article 8.X.6. Herd free from infection with \textit{M. tuberculosis} complex in bovids or cervids

The Commission referred to previous discussions with the Code Commission and to the opinion of the ad hoc Group on the concept of herd freedom. This concept was extensively and commonly used by Member Countries when applying testing programmes for tuberculosis and brucellosis.

In response to a Member Country comment, the Commission was of the opinion that introducing the concept of compartmentalisation in this article may create unjustified trade restrictions and is not compatible with the common management system for dairy and beef herds. Therefore, it reiterated its previous opinion with regard to the concept of ‘herd freedom’.

The Commission also concurred with the opinion of a Member Country and clarified that it was not always feasible or necessary to conduct active surveillance in wildlife.


Article 12.10.2. Country or zone free from infection with *B. mallei*

As explained in the Commission’s September 2015 report, the 6-month period stated in point 3(b) of this article was directly related to the incubation period. This incubation period was also considered appropriate for the chronic forms of the disease.

In response to a Member Country request to delete the term “germplasm”, the Commission noted that semen and embryos were not considered safe commodities. The importation procedures for germplasm, in accordance with this chapter, should be considered when trading these commodities and when defining a country or zone free from infection with *B. mallei.*
Rationale for the amendments to:

CHAPTER 15.1. INFECTION WITH AFRICAN SWINE FEVER VIRUS
provided by the Scientific Commission

Article 15.1.3. Country or zone free

In response to a Member Country comment on the waiting period for recovery of freedom in the presence of vector ticks, the Commission made reference to its September 2016 report. The presence of vectors would always require a longer waiting period for the recovery of freedom, even when only domestic and captive wild pigs are involved\textsuperscript{12,13}.

\footnotesize

Rationale for the amendments to:

CHAPTER 15.X. INFECTION WITH PORCINE REPRODUCTIVE AND RESPIRATORY SYNDROME VIRUS
provided by the Scientific Commission

Article 15.X.1. – General provisions

In response to a Member Country comment on the case definition, the Commission referred to the report of the ad hoc Group that met in June 2015. It was stated that “the spread of a modified live porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS) vaccine strain from a vaccinated animal to an unvaccinated animal must be considered as an infection”. The Commission confirmed that the isolation of any PRRS virus including vaccine-like virus in a non-vaccinated animal must be considered as a case.

The Commission agreed with a Member Country that indicated that with current serological tests, it was not possible to differentiate pigs naturally infected from those with maternally derived immunity. Therefore, references to maternal antibodies should not be included in this article.

Article 15.X.3 – Country, zone or compartment free from PRRS

The Commission referred the Member Country that commented to the rationale provided in the Commission’s September 2015 report and agreed to maintain the references to the ability to detect the presence of infection with PRRSV even in the absence of clinical signs through surveillance.

The Commission confirmed that the prohibition of vaccination for 12 months would be adequate and that removing all vaccinated animals would not be necessary for the recovery of the free status.

Article 15.X.15. – Additional surveillance requirements for recovery of free status

The Commission disagreed with a Member Country that suggested some additions to clarify that surveillance should target the detection of viral circulation or the presence of antibodies. The Commission considered that this was already included in the surveillance articles and also in the Terrestrial Code Chapter 1.4. on surveillance.

The Commission did not agree with a Member Country proposal to include a specific example of the area to be considered when implementing surveillance activities. Each Member Country should tailor the geographical reference of the surveillance to the epidemiological context.
Article 4.X.2. – Definitions

In response to Member Country comments, the Commission pointed out that all the vaccination programmes aim at preventing the incursion or spread of a disease or infection. However, it was acknowledged that the term “preventive vaccination” was also extensively used. The Commission proposed a separate definition to clearly differentiate emergency vaccination from preventive vaccination.

Emergency vaccination: means a vaccination programme applied in immediate response to an outbreak.

Preventive vaccination: means a vaccination programme in response to an increased risk of introduction of disease, infection or infestation.

Article 4.X.3. – Vaccination programmes

The Commission stressed that the main purpose of vaccination was to reduce the impact of the disease by reducing its incidence, prevalence or the severity of the clinical signs. In response to a Member Country comment, it was proposed to make references to the impact of the disease instead of prevalence or incidence of the disease. The Commission suggested making this modification throughout the chapter.

Article 4.X.5. – Vaccination strategies

When referring to barrier vaccination, the Commission clarified that the vaccination area was not necessarily confined to a protection zone. A note was made to indicate that a protection zone was a concept that may include vaccination but also other disease control measures such as enhanced surveillance, strict biosecurity, movement control, etc.

Article 4.X.6. – Critical elements of a vaccination programme

The Commission disagreed with a Member Country that suggested adding the “virulence of the pathogen” as a critical element of a vaccination programme. The virulence of the pathogen was considered a concept linked to the epidemiology of the disease.

The Commission concurred with a Member Country on the need to clarify the term ‘good governance’ and suggested making references to the relevant chapters on Quality of Veterinary Services of Section 3 of the Terrestrial Code.

The Commission agreed with the proposed addition regarding vector activity as it would be relevant for vaccination against vector-borne diseases.

Considering a Member Country proposal of additional text to Point 7.b), the Commission agreed that this point may need further clarifications but questioned the need to refer specifically to primo-vaccination.

The Commission also considered it relevant to add a reference to the number of vaccinated animals compared with the census of the target animal population as an indicator related to the auditing of the vaccination campaign.
Article 4.X.7. – Choice of vaccine

The Commission agreed with a Member Country comment and suggested including references to the safety for consumers when selecting a vaccine.

The Commission also concurred with the proposal to add the implementation of biosecurity to ensure vaccination teams were not responsible for the transmission of the pathogenic agent.

Article 4.X.8. Logistics of vaccination

While revising the list of factors to be considered when designing the implementation of a vaccination programme, there was agreement on the importance of building capacity among vaccination teams and it was suggested including a point to capture this important element.

Article 4.X.9. – Evaluation and monitoring of a vaccination programme

The Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to make references to non-compliance and the remedial actions implemented.
A meeting of the OIE ad hoc Group on the Evaluation of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) Status of Member Countries (hereafter the Group) was held at the OIE Headquarters from 17 to 20 October 2016.

1. Opening

On behalf of Dr Monique Eloit, Director General of the OIE, Dr Matthew Stone, the OIE Deputy Director General for International Standards and Science, welcomed and thanked the Group for its commitment and the extensive support towards the OIE’s mandates.

Dr Stone acknowledged the work and efforts required in reviewing the dossiers and highlighted that, for the OIE, the official recognition of diseases status was an important activity, while FMD was a flagship.

Dr Stone highlighted the sensitivity and confidentiality of the dossiers received for official recognition and thanked the experts for having signed the forms for undertaking of confidentiality. He also mentioned that if any members of the Group had any conflict of interest in the evaluation of a dossier, the expert should withdraw from the discussions and decision making of the particular application.

Dr Stone also indicated that in line with the 6th Strategic Plan, the OIE was working on a strengthened procedure for the selection of members of the Specialist Commissions; the new procedure would provide an opportunity to update and increase the OIE’s pool of experts that could be called upon to participate in the different Working Groups and ad hoc Groups.

The Group and the OIE welcomed Drs Manuel Sanchez and Ben du Plessis as new members in the Group and thanked the two previous experts for their contribution to the Group.

Dr Laure Weber-Vintzel, Head of the Status Department, introduced Dr Matteo Morini, who recently joined the Status Department to work on the activities related to official disease status recognition.

2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur

The Group was chaired by Dr Manuel Sanchez. Dr David Paton acted as rapporteur, with the support of the OIE Secretariat. The Group endorsed the proposed agenda.

The terms of reference, agenda and list of participants are presented as Appendices I, II and III, respectively.
3. **Evaluation of a request from a Member Country for the status recognition of new FMD free country where vaccination is practised**

**Paraguay**

Paraguay was recognised as having two separate zones free from FMD where vaccination is practised, Zone 1 and Zone 2, in May 2007 and May 2011, respectively. The initial establishment of the two zones was based on the history of the FMD regional situation between 2000 and 2007 and an agreement among countries in the region. Subsequently to an outbreak that occurred on 17 September 2011, in the village of Sargento Loma (department of San Pedro) located in the centre of the country, the status of Zone 1 was suspended on 18 September 2011. In November 2011, the Group reviewed information received from Paraguay following a request of the Scientific Commission in order to monitor and assess the situation in Zone 2.

While strict movement control between the two zones should be in place for the maintenance of two adjacent zones with same status, the *ad hoc* Group found evidence that such movement control was instituted only after the outbreak occurred but not before. The status of Zone 2 was therefore also suspended.

Following Paraguay’s application for recovery, documenting the measures implemented to separate the zones, the FMD free status where vaccination is practised was re-instated on 1 November 2013 for each of its two zones.

In August 2016, the Delegate of Paraguay submitted a letter to the OIE to be officially recognised as a country free from FMD where vaccination is practised, by merging the two FMD free zones (Zones 1 and 2) covering the entire territory of Paraguay. Paraguay considered that the two zones were part of the same system for the production of and trade in FMD susceptible domestic animals and that keeping the two zones separate would be impractical and no longer necessary.

The Group was informed of the outcome of an OIE mission that took place in Paraguay in April 2016 and considered the report and the recommendations made by the mission team.

**Conclusion**

Considering the rationale provided by Paraguay to merge the two zones and the report of the OIE mission that took place in April 2016, the Group recommended that Paraguay be officially recognised as a FMD free country where vaccination is practised.

4. **Evaluation of a request from a Member Country for the status recognition of a new FMD free zone where vaccination is not practised**

a) **Botswana**

Botswana has four FMD free zones where vaccination is not practised officially recognised by the OIE. In August 2016, Botswana submitted an application for the recognition of Zone 3b to be recognised as a zone free from FMD where vaccination is not practised.

The Group requested additional information and received clarification from Botswana.

i. **Animal disease reporting**

The Group considered that Botswana had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting.
ii. **Veterinary Services**

The Group was informed that Botswana had received a PVS evaluation mission in 2010, followed by a Gap Analysis mission in 2011. The PVS report provided additional guarantee that the Veterinary Services were compliant with the requirements for a country having FMD free zones.

iii. **Situation of FMD in the past 12 months**

The Group noted that the last outbreak in Zone 3b occurred in 1981 and was thought to have been due to contact with buffalo; it was followed by a vaccination campaign that ceased in September 2013. The Group was of the opinion that additional information about a buffalo incursion in November 2015 should have been included in the original dossier rather than in response to a question raised by the Group.

iv. **Absence of vaccination and entry of vaccinated animals in the past 12 months**

The Group noted that vaccination ceased in September 2013 after more than 20 years of vaccination using a trivalent inactivated vaccine. Since then, introduction of vaccinated animals has not been allowed into Zone 3b.

v. **Surveillance for FMD and FMDV infection in accordance with Articles 8.8.40. to 8.8.42.**

While acknowledging that active and passive surveillance were in place and the value of clinical surveillance in unvaccinated cattle, the Group received more details on the design of the non-structural protein (NSP) serological survey that followed a buffalo incursion as well as with regard to a document called “Disease Surveillance Programme 2016-2019”.

The Group expressed concern on the follow-up procedure (only based on clinical examination) performed on animals that reacted positively to NSP, particularly in 3% of small ruminants (that are less likely to show clinical signs) which were unvaccinated. The Group strongly recommended that in case of positive results, the follow-up procedure should include clinical inspection, supplementary testing of the animals that tested positive and the in-contact animals, and epidemiological investigation. The Group underlined that it is not acceptable to assume that a level of positive findings, consistent with expected false positive rates of a test, can be discounted.

Further to the Group’s request, Botswana provided satisfactory clarification on the findings related to seropositive small ruminants.

vi. **Regulatory measures for the early detection, prevention and control of FMD**

The Group noted that sufficient regulatory measures in place were described in the dossier for the early detection, prevention and control of FMD, as implemented in other zones already officially recognised as free from FMD. Specific comments can be found under other sections of this report.

vii. **Description of the boundaries of the proposed free zone**

The Group noted that the boundaries of the proposed free zone was well delimited and fenced (cf. section ix.).

viii. **Description of the boundaries and measures of a protection zone, if applicable**

The Group acknowledged that Zone 3b was part of the protection zone protecting the larger FMD free zone without vaccination.
ix. Description of the system for preventing the entry of the virus (into the proposed FMD free zone)

The Group was aware that the fences separating the different zones were very well maintained with teams to look after them and that there were manned gates at crossroads and controls by veterinary officials at entry and exit points along the fences.

The policy recently implemented to destroy stray cattle originating from neighbouring infected countries, was also noted as an additional measure to prevent the potential introduction of FMDV into Botswana.

The Group acknowledged that Zone 3b borders high risk areas due to the presence of buffalo and an infected country and has double fences with a buffalo cable. Considering the role of African buffalo in the FMD epidemiology in the sub-region, the Group requested more information on the detected incursions of buffalo (and other FMD susceptible species) in the zone in the past two years.

In the additional information, Botswana described an incursion of buffalo, in November 2015, and the subsequent follow-up. The Group commended the efficient actions taken (e.g. removal of buffalo and mending the fences) following the buffalo incursion. Furthermore, it appeared to the Group that there was a narrow window of opportunity for mixing with cattle within the two weeks up to the removal of the buffalo. The Group also agreed that the clinical surveillance in place was sufficient in detecting the presence of FMD in the proposed zone, taking into account that the last outbreak in Zone 3b was in 1981 with cessation of vaccination in September 2013.

x. Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.6.

The Group agreed that the format of the dossier was compliant with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.6.

Conclusion

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and the answers from Botswana to the raised questions, as well as based on the prompt reporting records of Botswana to the OIE, the Group considered that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapter 8.8. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.6. of the Terrestrial Code. The Group therefore recommended that the proposed zone 3b of Botswana be recognised as a FMD free zone where vaccination is not practised.

Nevertheless, the Group emphasised that the buffalo incursion highlights the risk to unvaccinated livestock and the need for continuous vigilance to ensure prevention and early detection of buffalo incursions. The Group encouraged Botswana to continue its prompt and detailed reporting to the OIE on the incidence of buffalo incursions and reiterated the importance of adequate follow-up for maintenance of all FMD free zones officially recognised in Botswana.

The Group strongly recommended that the follow-up procedure in future cases of positive results should include clinical inspection, supplementary testing of the animals found seropositive and the in-contact animals, and epidemiological investigation.

b) Other Member Countries requests

The Group assessed one additional request for the recognition of FMD free zone status where vaccination is not practised. The Group concluded that the application did not meet the requirements of the Terrestrial Code and the dossier was referred back to the corresponding Member Country.
5. Evaluation of requests from Member Countries for the status recognition of new FMD free zones where vaccination is practised

a) Kazakhstan

Kazakhstan was recognised as having a zone free from FMD where vaccination is not practised in May 2015 and its national official control programme for FMD was endorsed in May 2016.

In August 2016, Kazakhstan submitted an application for the recognition of five zones – Zone 1 consisting of Almaty region, Zone 2 consisting of East Kazakhstan region, Zone 3 including a part of Kyzylorda region, the northern part of South Kazakhstan region, the northern and central parts of Zhambyl region, Zone 4 including the southern part of Kyzylorda region and the south-western part of South Kazakhstan region, Zone 5 including the south-eastern part of South Kazakhstan region and the southern part of Zhambyl region – free from FMD where vaccination is practised.

Due to the similarities of the five dossiers submitted for the evaluation of the five new zones proposed for recognition of FMD free zonal status, the following report combines the observations for the five zones and only differentiates them when necessary.

In accordance with the established procedures, the participating expert from the United Kingdom expressed a possible conflict of interest and withdrew from the discussions for the conclusions made by the Group on Kazakhstan’s dossier.

The Group requested additional information and received clarification from Kazakhstan.

i. Animal disease reporting

The Group considered that Kazakhstan had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting.

ii. Veterinary Services

The Group acknowledged that the Veterinary Authority had current knowledge of, and authority over, all FMD susceptible animals in the country. The last PVS evaluation mission in Kazakhstan was in 2011. From the information available, the Group concluded that the Veterinary Services had the capacity to prevent and control FMD, should an incursion occur.

iii. Situation of FMD in the past 2 years

The Group noted that the last FMD outbreak within any of the five zones occurred in 2013 in Zone 2 – East Kazakhstan region. According to the dossier, the last outbreaks in the five proposed zones were: in 2013 in Zone 2, in 2012 in Zones 1, 3 and 5, and in 2000 in Zone 4.

iv. Routine vaccination and vaccines

Further to the Group’s request, Kazakhstan provided additional information indicating high levels of vaccination coverage in all five proposed zones. While it was not clear to the Group the difference between numbers of animals planned to be vaccinated versus the total susceptible animals present from the additional information, the Group agreed that the number of vaccinated animals appeared to be high in all five proposed zones. The Group emphasised that the dossier should indicate the percentage of animals actually vaccinated from the total population targeted for vaccination.
The additional information from Kazakhstan stated that the serological threshold used for post-vaccination monitoring was in accordance with the recommendation of the manufacturer of the kits. With regard to the farms and animals on a farm selected for sampling, the Group noted that samples were taken 21 days after vaccination from at least 1% of animals equally from different age and gender groups. However, the selection process of farms and animals was not clarified in the additional information. In the selected animals, the proportion of animals with protective immunity 21 days after vaccination was considered appropriate.

The Group noted with appreciation that the Veterinary Services changed the vaccines in use according to the recommendations of the OIE Reference Laboratory from United Kingdom (the Pirbright Institute); the vaccine currently used is compliant with the OIE Terrestrial Manual, and the strain composition takes account of recently isolated field strains in the region.

v. **Surveillance for FMD and FMDV infection in accordance with Articles 8.8.40. to 8.8.42.**

Further to the Group’s request, Kazakhstan provided more details on the NSP surveillance with maps showing the locations of the randomly selected herds of cattle, small ruminants and pigs and the location of positive reactors in the five proposed zones. Kazakhstan explained that for the NSP serosurveillance the selection of villages, herds in selected villages and animals in selected herds was randomised as well as targeted based on risk (where FMD outbreaks were previously registered, located along the border with an infected country).

The Group considered that sufficient samples were taken from a representative number of herds and with adequate geographical distribution. Nevertheless, the Group emphasised the importance of a survey design that should clearly state which within-herd and between-herd design prevalence was used and details on how the sample size was calculated.

vi. **Regulatory measures for the early detection, prevention and control of FMD**

The Group noted a detailed description of the reporting scheme in case of suspicion or outbreaks. The Group also noted sufficient regulatory measures in place described in the dossier for the early detection, prevention and control of FMD, as implemented in the other zone already officially recognised as free from FMD. Specific comments can be found under other sections of this report.

The Group was informed of a recent simulation exercise performed in Kazakhstan and welcomed the initiative and recommended continuation of such exercises.

vii. **Description of the boundaries of the proposed free zones**

From the additional information provided by Kazakhstan, the Group noted that the delimitation of Zones 3, 4 and 5 were established by legislation on May 2016.

The Group also noted that high numbers of animal movements were taking place from Zone 5 to other zones. Considering the higher risk for FMD incursions in Zone 5, the Group recommended that Zone 5 be considered for heightened surveillance.

The Group recommended that detailed information on the surveillance in the newly recognised zones, and particularly in Zone 5, should be included in the annual reconfirmations to be submitted by Kazakhstan.
viii. **Description of the boundaries and measures of a protection zone, if applicable**

Not applicable.

ix. **Description of the system for preventing the entry of the virus**

The Group noted that individual animal identification and registration was a key method to control movements between the zones. Further to the Group’s request, Kazakhstan provided summary tables of animals moved between the zones. Kazakhstan also provided a summary table with numbers of incidents of non-compliance detected during inspection at zonal border check point and the measures applied in case of detected violations. From this information it appeared that the non-compliant consignments were all destined to the zone recognised free from FMD without vaccination. The Group noted that movement permits were incorrectly issued according to the new administrative situation and therefore the Group recommended training of responsible officials.

Based on the additional information received from Kazakhstan, the Group commended that a system was in place for individual identification for sheep and goats since 2014 and that illegal movements of these animals would be detected.

From the additional information provided by Kazakhstan, the Group noted that importation of FMD susceptible animals was allowed from a part of another country of the Customs Union (surveillance zone without vaccination), not having an officially recognised FMD free status. The Group emphasised that any importation of animals from territories not having an officially recognised FMD free status should be in accordance with Article 8.8.12. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

x. **Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.6.**

The Group agreed that the format of the dossier was compliant with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.6. Among the five separate dossiers submitted by Kazakhstan for official recognition of five different zones free from FMD where vaccination is practised, several parts were identical which were merged into one document by the OIE Status Department to facilitate the evaluation by the Group. The Group recommended for any future applications such presentation of an application should be considered, highlighting the common measures applied to all zones and the particularities of each application with regard to the respective zone.

**Conclusion**

Considering the information submitted in the dossiers and the answers from Kazakhstan to the raised questions, the Group considered that the applications were compliant with the requirements of Chapter 8.8. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Group therefore recommended that the five proposed zones of Kazakhstan be recognised as FMD free zones where vaccination is practised.

The Group re-emphasised that, with reference to section ix of this report, any importation of animals from territories not having an officially recognised FMD free status should be carried out in accordance with Article 8.8.12. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Group suggested that documented evidence of the measures in place regarding these importations as well as detailed information on the surveillance in the newly recognised zones, and particularly in Zone 5 (ref. section v.) be provided in the annual reconfirmations to be submitted by Kazakhstan.

The Group recommended that a mission be conducted to monitor the maintenance of the officially recognised FMD free zones of Kazakhstan in summer 2017.
b) Chinese Taipei

Chinese Taipei has a long history of official FMD freedom recognition: it was first recognised as a FMD free country without vaccination in 1996; it then had its status suspended in March 1997. After introduction of vaccination, the country was recognised free from FMD with vaccination in 2004, but this status was suspended in February 2009.

In August 2016, Chinese Taipei submitted an application for the recognition of a zone free from FMD where vaccination is practised; the proposed free zone covers Taiwan, Penghu and Matsu areas, which refer to the entire Province of Taiwan and Matsu County, but excludes Kinmen County.

The Group requested additional information and received clarification from Chinese Taipei. The Group acknowledged the transparency and clarity of the dossier.

i. Animal disease reporting

The Group considered that Chinese Taipei had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting. The internal and international reporting was well described in the dossier and the country was up to date in terms of reporting to the OIE. With specific regard to FMD, Chinese Taipei had reported to the OIE outbreaks detected through NSP serological surveys without clinical disease or virus isolation.

ii. Veterinary Services

The Group acknowledged that the Veterinary Authority had current knowledge of, and authority over, all FMD susceptible animals in the country and appreciated that training was regularly provided to the Veterinary Services. The Group was informed that no PVS missions had been carried out. However, the Group could conclude from the dossier that the Veterinary Services had the capacity to prevent and control FMD, should an incursion occur.

iii. Situation of FMD in the past 2 years

The Group acknowledged that the last outbreak of FMD in the proposed free zone was resolved in July 2013. FMD cases were reported in May/June 2015 in Kinmen Island which is not part of the proposed free zone.

iv. Routine vaccination and vaccines

The Group noted from the dossier that all cloven-hoofed animals should be vaccinated against FMD; pigs should be vaccinated once between 12 and 14 weeks of age; cattle, goats and deer should be vaccinated twice at 4 and 12 months of age. Chinese Taipei further clarified that after the initial vaccination in animals less than 1 year old, pigs were boosted once every 6 months, and cattle once a year (except in Kinmen, where ruminants were boosted every 6 months).

Detailed figures of the proportion of unvaccinated animals were not available, but evidence of good population immunity was provided. The dossier provided figures of the post vaccination immunity determined by serology, and follow-up actions were in place when low immunity levels were detected.

The Group acknowledged that currently no FMD vaccine was manufactured in Chinese Taipei and that vaccines were imported from Argentina and Russia. The Group commended that the Animal Health Research Institute (AHRI) tested the batches for vaccine potency (> 6 PD50) and noted that information from the OIE Reference Laboratory for FMD (the Pirbright Institute, United Kingdom) was used to decide on vaccine strains.
Following the Group’s request, Chinese Taipei clarified that serotype A and O were the main threats for introduction but provided a rationale for not vaccinating against serotype A. The dossier also described existence of a vaccine reserve and bank which includes serotypes A, O and Asia 1.

The Group acknowledged the rationale for the cut-off level used for Virus Neutralisation Test (VNT) for post-vaccinal monitoring (PVM).

v. Surveillance for FMD and FMDV infection in accordance with Articles 8.8.40. to 8.8.42.

The Group acknowledged that there was a substantial surveillance programme and probably a high level of alertness after a series of FMD outbreaks in the past 20 years; FMD is notifiable with full compensation for index cases and penalties are imposed for failure to report. Nevertheless, all the identified cases in the last three years seemed to have been detected via serological surveys.

In addition to passive surveillance, several serological surveys had been performed every year (including 2015 and 2016), according to a specific study design, which included random surveys and targeted surveys of high risk farms and pig markets.

The Group noted that the Wildlife Rescue Stations of Endemic Species Research Institute examined injured susceptible wild animals for clinical signs of FMD but regretted that these animals were not tested against FMD and would encourage Chinese Taipei to do so.

The Group noted that the samples collected for NSP serological surveillance were also used for post-vaccination monitoring.

The Group noted that Chinese Taipei has a BSL3 laboratory to perform FMD diagnosis which was the only authorised institute to handle live FMDV in Chinese Taipei. The Group noted the laboratories’ participation and results in proficiency testing and would encourage them to participate annually.

vi. Regulatory measures for the early detection, prevention and control of FMD

The Group made note of the risk of feeding swill that is heat treated on the farm even when a licencing system is in operation.

The Group noted from both the dossier and additional information provided and commended the efforts on training farmers and veterinarians to remain vigilant and aware of FMD.

vii. Description of the boundaries of the proposed free zone

The proposed free zone covers Taiwan, Penghu and Matsu areas which refer to the entire Province of Taiwan and Matsu County.

viii. Description of the boundaries and measures of a protection zone, if applicable

Matsu Island was designated as a protection zone, but the Group was not sure how it fulfils this role.
ix. Description of the system for preventing the entry of the virus

Due to consumers’ preference, deboned but not matured fresh beef is introduced from Kinmen into Taiwan which is not in full compliance with 8.8.22. However, the Group noted that additional safeguards have been adopted from Article 8.8.12. (introduction of live animals from an infected area) and taken together with other mitigations in compliance with Article 8.8.22, these measures were considered equivalent to the requirements of the Terrestrial Code.

Fresh deboned pork is also introduced from Kinmen into Taiwan for processing at arrival into meat balls for human consumption. The Group noted the mitigation measures implemented on this meat, including hermetic sealing at origin and channelling to destination where it is heat-treated at 72°C for 30 minutes.

The Group took note of the measures including heat treatment for safe movement of velvet antlers from Kinmen to the rest of Chinese Taipei.

The Group concluded that the applied measures described by Chinese Taipei mitigated the risk of introducing FMDV and considered that the principle of equivalence was met as stated in Chapter 5.3. of the Terrestrial Code.

The Group also noted from the dossier that movement of live animals is banned from Kinmen to the rest of Chinese Taipei but a risk assessment was planned two years after the last outbreak (10 September 2015) to determine whether or not the ban could be lifted. The Group emphasised that measures taken in place of any ban should be in full compliance with Articles 8.8.8. or 8.8.12. of the Terrestrial Code and should be notified to the OIE.

Measures are in place for safeguarding imports of FMD susceptible animals and products from third countries.

x. Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.6.

The Group agreed that the dossier was compliant with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.6.

Conclusion

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and the answers from Chinese Taipei to the raised questions, the Group considered that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapter 8.8. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.6. of the Terrestrial Code. The Group therefore recommended that the proposed zone of Chinese Taipei be recognised as a FMD free zone where vaccination is practised.

c) Other Member Countries requests

The Group assessed additional requests for the recognition of three other FMD free zones status where vaccination is practised. The Group concluded that the applications did not meet the requirements of the Terrestrial Code and the dossiers were referred back to the corresponding Member Country.

6. Update on the Chapter 8.8. on FMD of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code

The Group was informed that an ad hoc Group meeting dedicated to the review of Chapter 8.8. of the Terrestrial Code took place at the OIE in June 2016. The different concepts and the impact of their inclusion in the Terrestrial Code discussed during this meeting were closely being reviewed by the OIE and the Specialist Commissions prior to circulation for Member Countries’ comments.
7. **Other matters**

Based on the experience assessing the applications from Member Countries for official recognition of FMD free status, the Group noted some repetitive shortcomings in the presentations of the applied survey design and results in the dossiers. The Group proposed headings to help Member Countries in presenting this information such as the following:

1) **Objectives of the survey** (e.g. detecting infection, prevalence estimation, population immunity, etc.)

2) **Study design**:
   a. Reference population by species
      i. total number of animals
      ii. definition of an epidemiological unit
      iii. types and description of different epidemiological units
      iv. number of epidemiological units, and where possible location of epidemiological units
   b. Strategy for survey
      i. One stage, two stages
      ii. Stratification and criteria for eligibility (according to age, size of epidemiological unit, etc.)
      iii. Method for sample size calculation, including the level of confidence and precision where relevant
      iv. Design prevalence: between and within epidemiological units (for sample size calculations of epidemiological units and animals)
      v. Details on the selection of epidemiological units and animals (random, convenience, targeted, etc.)
      vi. Types of laboratory tests performed; cut-off used to determine positive results and their sensitivity and specificity (and whether confirmed or assumed)
      vii. Timing of sampling (e.g. in relation to vaccination or disease risk)
      viii. Follow-up of serological findings

3) **Results**
   i. Deviation from original plan
   ii. When, where and how many samples were actually taken
   iii. Tabulated results to show the numbers of epidemiological units, animals sampled and results (indicating whether from preliminary or confirmatory testing); maps showing locations where possible
   iv. Results from follow-up investigation of positive test findings
   v. Additional clinical and epidemiological enquiries, spatial distribution of test findings (in a map to explore clustering) and further sampling and testing.

4) **Conclusion in relation to the objective**

8. **Adoption of report**

The Group reviewed the draft report provided by the rapporteur and agreed to circulate the draft report electronically for comments before the final adoption. Upon circulation, the Group agreed that the report captured the discussions.
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MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION
OF FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE STATUS OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

Terms of Reference

The OIE ad hoc group on foot and mouth disease (FMD) status of Member Countries (the Group) is expected to evaluate the applications for official recognition of FMD free status received from five Member Countries.

This implies that the experts, members of this Group are expected to:

1. Sign off the OIE Undertaking on Confidentiality of information, if not done before.

2. Complete the Declaration of Interests Form in advance of the meeting of the Group and forward it to the OIE at the earliest convenience and at least two weeks before the meeting.

3. Evaluate the applications from Member Countries for official recognition of FMD free status

   a) Before the meeting:
      • read and study in detail all dossiers provided by the OIE;
      • take into account any other information available in the public domain that is considered pertinent for the evaluation of dossiers;
      • summarise the dossiers according to the Terrestrial Animal Health Code requirements, using the form provided by the OIE;
      • draft the questions whenever the analysis of the dossier raises questions which need to be clarified or completed with additional details by the applicant Member Country;
      • send the completed form and the possible questions to the OIE, at least one week before the meeting.

   b) During the meeting:
      • contribute to the discussion with their expertise;
      • withdraw from the discussions and decision making when possible conflict of interest;
      • provide a detailed report in order to recommend, to the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases, the country(ies) or zone(s) to be recognised (or not) as FMD free and to indicate any information gaps or specific areas that should be addressed in the future by the applicant Member Country.

   c) After the meeting:
      • contribute electronically to the finalisation of the report if not achieved during the meeting.
MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION OF FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE STATUS OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

Agenda

1. Opening
2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur
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REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION OF CONTAGIOUS BOVINE PLEUROPNEUMONIA STATUS OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

Paris, 2-3 November 2016

A meeting of the ad hoc Group on the evaluation of contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (CBPP) status of Member Countries (hereafter the Group) was held at the OIE Headquarters from 2 to 3 November 2016.

1. Opening

Dr Monique Eloit, Director General of the OIE, welcomed and thanked the Group for its commitment and extensive support towards the OIE. She acknowledged the huge work done not only during the meeting but also prior to the meeting in reviewing all applications from applicant Member Countries.

Dr Monique Eloit highlighted the sensitivity and confidentiality of the dossiers received for official recognition and thanked the experts for having signed the forms for undertaking of confidentiality. She also mentioned that should any members of the Group feel a possible conflict of interest in the evaluation of a dossier, they should kindly state so and withdraw from discussions on that subject matter.

She also underlined the importance of transparency and scientific credibility of the official disease status recognition procedures and emphasised the value of a detailed report of the evaluations as it was the main channel to communicate the rationale for decisions to the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (Scientific Commission) and to Member Countries. Dr Eloit encouraged the Group to continue providing detailed feedback to all countries, particularly to those countries with a negative output on the identified gaps and points for improvement as well as providing informative recommendations to those countries with positive outcome for further improvement. She clarified that the opinion would be attributed to the Group and not to the individual expert, but in case of disagreement by a minority within the experts of the Group, it should still be duly recorded in the report.

Dr Eloit also indicated that, in line with the 6th Strategic Plan, the OIE was working on a strengthened procedure for the selection of members of the Specialist Commissions; the new procedure would provide an opportunity to update and increase the OIE’s pool of experts that could be called upon to participate in the different ad hoc Groups.

The Group and the OIE welcomed Dr Ahmed El Idrissi as a new member in the Group and thanked the previous experts for their contribution to the Group.

2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur

The Group was chaired by Dr Ahmed El Idrissi. Dr William Amanfu acted as rapporteur, with the support of the OIE Secretariat. The Group endorsed the proposed agenda.

The Terms of Reference of the Group are presented as Appendix I, the agenda is presented as Appendix II and the list of participants is presented as Appendix III.
3. Evaluation of applications from Member Countries for official recognition of CBPP free status

3.1. Brazil

In September 2016, Brazil submitted an application for official recognition of CBPP free country status based on historical grounds.

The Group appreciated the concise, well-structured and good quality dossier provided by Brazil.

a) Animal disease reporting

The Group noted that CBPP was declared as a notifiable disease in Brazil, under relevant legislation, since 1934 when disease control regulations were first legislated. The Group considered that Brazil had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting having regularly submitted the requested reports to the OIE.

b) Veterinary Services

The Group agreed that the Veterinary Services had current knowledge of and authority over, all the livestock population in the country and concluded from the dossier that the Veterinary Services had the capacity to prevent and control CBPP, should an incursion occur. The Group was informed that Brazil had received a Performance of Veterinary Services (PVS) evaluation mission in 2007, followed by a PVS follow-up mission in 2014.

The Group acknowledged and congratulated Brazil for the strategy of financing private veterinarians for their activities in the field to implement animal disease surveillance activities.

c) Situation of CBPP in the past 24 months

The Group noted that CBPP has never been reported in the country neither in domestic nor in wild animals. Therefore, Brazil was eligible for historical freedom from CBPP as described in Article 1.4.6. of the Terrestrial Code.

d) Absence of vaccination and entry of vaccinated animals

The Group acknowledged that CBPP vaccination was prohibited and had never been conducted in Brazil. In addition, neither vaccinated animals nor vaccine, against CBPP agent, have ever been imported into Brazil.

e) Surveillance

The Group agreed that Brazil complied with all the requirements of a historically free country as defined in Article 1.4.6. of the Terrestrial Code and concluded that the surveillance described in the dossier was adequate and appropriate, to the epidemiological situation. No specific serological surveillance for CBPP was in operation but clinical surveillance has been in place for the past ten years during inspections at the field level in livestock operations on farms, livestock fairs and expositions, during vaccination campaigns of other diseases and at ante-mortem and post-mortem inspections in slaughterhouses. Brazil also provided track records of follow-up investigations of suspicions until disease exclusion.

The Group noted that Brazil has a National Network of Agriculture and Livestock Laboratories (LANAGRO) with technical capacities to support prompt isolation and identification of the CBPP agent in case of its introduction in the country. In particular the LANAGRO-MG unit, located in the State of Minas Gerais, is authorised to perform diagnostic tests for Mycoplasma.
The Group mentioned the existence of molecular diagnostic techniques to detect CBPP etiological agent in case of incursion in the country and encouraged Brazil to be ready to rapidly get those diagnostic tools in order to be able to detect by PCR the etiological agent within the country in a reasonable time frame, if needed. Furthermore, the Group acknowledged that Brazil had a formal agreement with an OIE Reference Laboratory for CBPP confirmatory tests.

**f) Regulatory measures for the early detection, prevention and control**

The Group considered that the information provided in the dossier gave evidence to demonstrate that an early detection system and measures to prevent the introduction of CBPP have been in operation in Brazil for the past ten years.

The Group agreed that prevention of CBPP introduction into the country was, since 1934, based on strict regulations for importation of susceptible animals and risk-commodities, reinforced controls at borders with implementation of strict controls on imports, quarantine and laboratory testing. The Group acknowledged that the importation of cattle was permitted only from CBPP free countries and that systematic controls at slaughterhouses within the country were under the supervision of the Veterinary Services. The Group noted that Brazil imported embryos from a CBPP free country under strict sanitary measures to mitigate the risk of introduction of diseases such as CBPP.

Finally, the Group acknowledged that regulatory measures to be applied in case of incursion of CBPP were covered under a legal framework for control and management of zoo-sanitary emergencies. However, the Group recommended that a contingency plan for exotic diseases be developed with the chain of actions specifically targeted to CBPP.

**g) Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.7.**

The Group agreed that the submitted dossier was compliant with the format of the questionnaire in Article 1.6.7.

**Conclusions**

Considering the information submitted in the dossier, the Group concluded that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapters 11.7. and 1.4. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.7. of the Terrestrial Code. The Group therefore recommended that Brazil be recognised as a CBPP free country.

**3.2. South Africa**

In September 2016, South Africa submitted an application for official recognition of CBPP free country status based on historical grounds.

The Group requested additional information and received clarification from South Africa.

**a) Animal disease reporting**

The Group noted that CBPP was declared as a notifiable disease in South Africa under relevant legislation in 1984 and considered that South Africa had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting including regular submission of reports to the OIE.

**b) Veterinary Services**

The Group agreed that the Veterinary Services had current knowledge of and authority over all the CBPP susceptible livestock population in the country. The Group, taking into account the information provided in the dossier, also concluded that the Veterinary Services had the capability to prevent and control CBPP. The Group was informed that South Africa had received a PVS evaluation mission in 2014.
The Group commended the organisation of the awareness campaign described in the dossier. The Group however regretted that a more detailed explanation with regard to the audience targeted, purpose and the topics presented, was not provided.

c) **Situation of CBPP in the past 24 months**

The Group acknowledged that CBPP has been absent from the country since 1924 which is in line with the date of last occurrence reported and recorded in the OIE World Animal Health Information System. Therefore, South Africa was eligible for historical freedom from CBPP as described in Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

d) **Absence of vaccination and entry of vaccinated animals**

The Group noted that vaccination was not carried out during the past ten years in South Africa. Import of susceptible animals was permitted only from countries free from CBPP where vaccination against CBPP was not practised. Therefore, the Group concluded that vaccinated animals were not introduced in South Africa.

e) **Surveillance**

The Group acknowledged that the feedlots system account for an efficient country passive surveillance system.

The Group noted also that from March 2016 a “Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia Surveillance Programme for South Africa”, including passive surveillance and targeted serological surveillance, was implemented to enable early detection, improve awareness on CBPP and to ensure that laboratory capability was maintained. Passive surveillance activities were strengthened, reinforcing the compulsory reporting of any suspicious cases of CBPP and follow-up by serological and/or pathological means, as appropriate.

The Group determined that clinical surveillance on respiratory diseases, including CBPP, was carried out in South Africa for the past 10 years in compliance with Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Group noted that suspected respiratory lesions at slaughterhouses were investigated with CBPP negative results.

The Group challenged the adequacy of the above mentioned targeted serological surveys performed in the high risk areas of the country as presented in the dossier. The Group recommended that, considering that South Africa had been historically free from CBPP, the surveillance should continue to be focused on clinical and abattoir activities in the high risk areas and on the follow-up of suspicions to rule-out the presence of CBPP from differential diagnoses.

The Group agreed that South Africa complied with the requirements of a historically free country as defined in Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

f) **Regulatory measures for the early detection, prevention and control**

The Group noted that South Africa’s international borders are fenced, with regular patrols and maintenance of the fences and that entry of cattle into and out of the country are limited to controlled border posts.

The Group acknowledged that South Africa had regular meetings with its neighboring countries included in the frame of the Southern Africa Development Community to coordinate activities related to animal health, including CBPP.

The Group considered that information provided by South Africa gave assurance on the early detection system and measures to prevent the introduction of CBPP in accordance with Article 11.7.3. and 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*. 
However, with reference to Point 7.3.3. and Appendix E of South Africa’s dossier, the Group considered that the contingency plan should include the chain of actions specifically targeted to CBPP, from the point of detection of clinical suspicion, immediate diagnosis, agent isolation and confirmation using molecular techniques (i.e. PCR), to the point of implementation of control measures. In addition, with reference to Point 4.5. of the questionnaire, the Group regretted that no evidence had been provided on the effective implementation of agent isolation and confirmation using molecular techniques.

g) Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.7.

The Group agreed that the submitted dossier was compliant with the format of the questionnaire in Article 1.6.7.

Conclusions

Considering the information included in the dossier and South Africa’s answers to the questions raised, the Group concluded that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapter 11.7. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.7. of the Terrestrial Code. The Group therefore recommended that South Africa be recognised as a CBPP free country.

The Group recommended that the following information be submitted to the OIE when South Africa reconfirm its CBPP status to the OIE:

- more detailed information on the CBPP awareness programmes with regard to the audience targeted, purpose and the topics presented;
- adjusted contingency plan including the chain of actions specifically targeted to CBPP, from the point of detection of clinical suspicion, immediate diagnosis for agent isolation and confirmation using molecular techniques (i.e. PCR), to the point of implementation of control measures.
- evidence on the implementation of agent isolation and confirmation using molecular techniques (i.e. PCR) and its effectiveness.

3.3. Other Member Country request

The Group assessed one additional request from a Member Country for the recognition of CBPP free country status based on historical grounds. The Group concluded that the Member Country did not meet the requirements of the Terrestrial Code and the dossier was referred back to the corresponding Member Country.

4. Finalisation and adoption of the report

The Group agreed that the report would be circulated for finalisation.

____________________

…/Appendices
Terms of Reference

The OIE ad hoc group on contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (CBPP) status of Member Countries (the Group) is expected to evaluate the applications for official recognition of CBPP free status received from:

- Brazil
- South Africa

This implies that the experts, members of this Group are expected to:

1. Sign off the OIE Undertaking on Confidentiality of information, if not done before.
2. Complete the Declaration of Interests Form in advance of the meeting of the Group and forward it to the OIE as their earliest convenience and at least two weeks before the meeting.
3. Evaluate the applications from Member Countries for official recognition of CBPP free status
   a) Before the meeting:
      - read and study in detail all dossiers provided by the OIE;
      - take into account any other information available in the public domain that is considered pertinent for the evaluation of dossiers;
      - summarise the dossiers according to the Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code) requirements, using the form provided by the OIE;
      - draft the questions whenever the analysis of the dossier raises questions which need to be clarified or completed with additional details by the applicant Member Country;
      - send the completed form and the possible questions to the OIE, at least one week before the meeting.
   b) During the meeting:
      - contribute to the discussion with their expertise;
      - withdraw from the discussions and decision making when possible conflict of interest;
      - provide a detailed report in order to recommend, to the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases, the country(ies) or zone(s) to be recognised (or not) as a CBPP free and to indicate any information gaps or specific areas that should be addressed in the future by the applicant Member Country.
   c) After the meeting:
      - contribute electronically to the finalisation of the report if not achieved during the meeting.
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MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION
OF CLASSICAL SWINE FEVER STATUS OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

Paris, 8 – 10 November 2016

A meeting of the OIE ad hoc Group on the Evaluation of Classical Swine Fever (CSF) Status of Member Countries (hereafter the Group) was held at the OIE Headquarters from 8 to 10 November 2016.

1. Opening

On behalf of Dr Monique Elloit, Director General of the OIE, Dr Matthew Stone, the OIE Deputy Director General for International Standards and Sciences, welcomed the experts of the Group. Dr Stone acknowledged the huge work and efforts required in reviewing the dossiers and thanked the experts of the Group for having submitted their individual assessments in preparation of the meeting.

Dr Stone highlighted the sensitivity and confidentiality of the dossiers received for official recognition and acknowledged that the experts had signed the forms for undertaking of confidentiality. He also mentioned that if any members of the Group had any conflict of interest in the evaluation of a dossier, the expert should withdraw from the discussions and decision making of the particular application.

Dr Stone also indicated that in line with the 6th Strategic Plan, the OIE was working on a strengthened procedure for the selection of members of the Specialist Commissions involving also the OIE Reference Centres; the new procedure would also provide an opportunity to update and increase the OIE’s pool of experts that could be called upon to participate in the different ad hoc Groups.

The Group and the OIE welcomed Dr Mario Eduardo Peña Gonzalez as a new member of the Group and thanked the two previous experts for their contribution to the Group.

Dr Min-Kyung Park, Chargée de mission, introduced Dr Matteo Morini, who recently joined the Status Department to work on the activities related to official disease status recognition.

2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur

The Group was chaired by Dr Trevor Drew. Dr Sophette Gers acted as rapporteur, with the support of the OIE Secretariat. The Group endorsed the proposed agenda.

The Terms of reference, agenda and list of participants are presented as Appendices I, II and III, respectively.

3. Evaluation of applications from Member Countries for official recognition of a CSF free status

1) Paraguay

In October 2015, Paraguay submitted a dossier seeking CSF free country status. The dossier was submitted later than the extended deadline provided. Paraguay was therefore invited and accepted to submit an updated dossier for the Group’s evaluation for the next cycle (for the meeting in November 2016).
In September 2016, Paraguay submitted a dossier for official recognition of its CSF free status.

The Group requested additional information and received clarification from Paraguay.

i. Animal disease reporting

The Group considered that Paraguay had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting and acknowledged that CSF was a notifiable disease in the country since 1921. The Group acknowledged that training of personnel (heads of zonal units, private sector veterinarians and producers) and on-going awareness programmes were in place to encourage reporting of all cases suggestive of CSF.

ii. Veterinary Services

The Group agreed that the Veterinary Services had current knowledge of and authority over all domestic and captive wild pig herds in the country and had current knowledge about the population and habitat of wild and feral pigs in the country.

Further to the Group’s request, Paraguay also confirmed that there were comprehensive records of both family and industrial type farms. In addition, in the case of family type farms, the records were updated three times per year based on regular visits to farms associated with the systematic and compulsory FMD vaccination campaigns in bovine. Paraguay explained that approximately 97% of the total establishments with pigs in the country had ownership of both pigs and cattle.

iii. Situation of CSF in the past 12 months

The Group noted that the last CSF outbreak was in June 1995.

iv. Absence of vaccination in the past 12 months

The Group acknowledged that vaccination against CSF had been prohibited since 2010.

v. Surveillance for CSF and CSFV infection in accordance with Articles 15.2.26. to 15.2.32.

The Group noted the low numbers of reported clinical suspect cases and hence low numbers for follow-up laboratory testing of CSF reported over the last four years.

With regard to serological and virological surveillance in 2015, the Group acknowledged that samples were also collected from feral pigs.

The Group noted that Paraguay based the follow-up confirmation of samples positive on ELISA with PCR. The proper follow-up regime should be in accordance with Article 15.2.32. of the Terrestrial Code, which in the case of Paraguay may require submission of samples to an OIE reference laboratory. The Group noted that samples were sent to the OIE Reference Laboratory for CSF in Canada when virus isolation was deemed necessary.

Further to the Group’s request, Paraguay provided evidence of the satisfactory outcome of laboratory proficiency tests for serology.

With regard to laboratory diagnosis to clear suspect cases, the Group noted that RT-PCR was used for this purpose. The Group therefore recommended that the PCR method be accredited.
vi. **Regulatory measures for the early detection, prevention and control of CSF**

With regard to animal identification and movement control, the Group noted that a high proportion of the pig sector was comprised of familiar type farms, which were not systematically registered. The only available census information of pigs was provided in relation to cattle farms for FMD and while a large number farms owned both cattle and swine, the Group stressed that there are significant differences between cattle and swine sectors.

Upon the Group’s request, Paraguay confirmed that there was no movement of pigs for breeding purposes in the family type establishments and that there was no supervision for slaughter of pigs on the family type farms and therefore no associated surveillance.

The Group acknowledged that coordination activities with neighboring countries and at regional level were in place through regular meetings and a common continental strategy and plan for transboundary animal diseases, including CSF.

The Group also noted that heat treatment of swill was included in Paraguay’s National Legislation (which also applied to family type farms) and was in accordance with Article 15.2.22. of the Terrestrial Code.

vii. **Consideration of wild and feral pigs, if present, in the surveillance programme and biosecurity measure of domestic and captive wild herds**

The Group acknowledged detailed information in the dossier on wild and feral pigs in the country, and noted that they were considered as epidemiologically irrelevant. The Group noted the presence of peccaries in Paraguay (which was not mentioned in the dossier) and suggested, with reference to Fowler (1996)¹ and Terán et al. (2004)², that they should be considered as part of control of any CSF outbreak.

Paraguay confirmed in the additional information that no captive wild pigs were present in the country.

viii. **Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.10.**

The Group agreed that the submitted dossier was compliant with the format of the questionnaire in Article 1.6.10.

**Conclusion**

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and Paraguay’s answers to the questions raised, the Group concluded that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapter 15.2. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.10. of the Terrestrial Code. The Group therefore recommended that Paraguay be recognised as a CSF free country.

The Group recommended that the following information be submitted to the OIE when Paraguay reconfirms its CSF status (also detailed in the relevant sections above):

- Accreditation of the PCR method for CSF diagnosis since it is used as confirmatory test in-country;
- Evidence of enhanced investigative procedures carried out on CSF suspect cases (rather than solely clearing on clinical grounds);

---

- Alignment of the follow-up procedure on positive ELISA results in accordance with Article 15.2.32. of the Terrestrial Code.

2) Romania

In September 2016, Romania submitted a dossier for official recognition of CSF free country status.

In accordance with the established procedures, the participating expert working for the European Commission expressed a possible conflict of interest and withdrew from all discussions of the Group on Romania’s dossier.

The Group requested additional information and received clarification from Romania.

i. Animal disease reporting

The Group considered that Romania had a record of regular animal disease reporting and acknowledged that CSF was a notifiable disease under national legislation.

ii. Veterinary Services

The Group agreed that the Veterinary Services had current knowledge of and authority over, all domestic and captive wild pig herds in the country and had current knowledge about the population and habitat of wild and feral pigs in the country.

The Group acknowledged that it is mandatory for public veterinarians to participate in national training programmes, which includes the implementation of the CSF surveillance programme.

The Group also commended the interaction of National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (NSVFSA) in providing training to official veterinarians and industry groups including simulation exercises and encouraged Romania to continue with these activities.

The Group was informed that a PVS evaluation mission was performed in 2008.

iii. Situation of CSF in the past 12 months

The Group noted that the last CSF outbreak was in 2007.

iv. Absence of vaccination in the past 12 months

The Group noted that CSF vaccination in domestic pigs was ceased in Romania since 2009 while oral vaccination of wild pigs in Romania continued at the border with non-EU countries until the end of 2011.

v. Surveillance for CSF and CSFV infection in accordance with Articles 15.2.26. to 15.2.32.

The Group acknowledged the number of tests carried out during the serological and virological surveillance, as well as the information on CSF suspected cases in the past 12 months, the laboratory test results and follow-up including RT-PCR testing and epidemiological investigations, that was additionally provided by Romania substantiating absence of CSF in the country.

The Group also acknowledged that Romania’s National Reference Laboratories was regularly involved in inter-laboratory ring tests organised by the European Union Reference Laboratory for CSF with satisfactory outcome.
vi. Regulatory measures for the early detection, prevention and control of CSF

The Group noted with concern a statement in Romania’s dossier on the scope of restrictions to be decided and placed at local level in case of a CSF suspicion in high density area of pigs/holding in contradiction with another statement in the dossier confirming these decisions to be made at a national level. In response to the question on this subject, Romania provided an explanation that the inclusion of this statement was an error and that enforcement measures were fully applied on all premises as required by the relevant EU Directive.

Romania provided evidence of strict measures in place to intercept illegal imports at the Eastern border reporting about 5,000 kilogrammes of confiscated pork products, and explained that these control measures have been introduced in response to the increased risk of ASF in the region.

The Group welcomed these measures but recommended that the existing measures concerning illegal imports be extended to points of entry and borders with all countries with undetermined CSF status.

vii. Consideration of wild and feral pigs, if present, in the surveillance programme and biosecurity measure of domestic and captive wild herds

Based on the information provided in the dossier and in Romania’s response to the additional questions raised, the Group acknowledged that Romania had current knowledge of domestic and captive wild pig herds in the country, had current knowledge over the population and habitat of wild pigs and that a national legislation was in place for the notification of CSF in wild pigs in the country.

The Group considered that in general, sufficient information was provided on the surveillance programme for the backyard pig sector considering also that all pigs are identified. Further to the Group’s request, Romania confirmed that sows and boars may be obtained by movement from farms of origin and also that artificial insemination was commonly used, however no clarification was provided concerning the biosecurity measures that were taken in such cases. The Group therefore recommended improvements, particularly in backyard farms, of biosecurity measures, movement control and increased serological surveillance in breeding animals, and requested that evidence be provided on the progress and improvements in this regard when reconfirming its CSF status to the OIE.

viii. Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.10.

The Group agreed that the submitted dossier was compliant with the format of the questionnaire in Article 1.6.10.

Conclusion

Considering the information submitted in the dossier, the Group concluded that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapter 15.2. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.10. of the Terrestrial Code. The Group therefore recommended that Romania be recognised as a CSF free country.

The Group recommended that evidence be submitted to the OIE on the progress and improvements, particularly in backyard farms, of biosecurity measures, movement control and increased serological surveillance in breeding animals when Romania reconfirms its CSF status.

3) Other Member Countries requests

The Group assessed three additional requests from Member Countries for the recognition of CSF free country status. The Group concluded that the Member Countries did not meet the requirements of the Terrestrial Code and the dossiers were referred back to the corresponding Member Country.
4. **Update on the revision of Chapter 15.2. on CSF of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code**

The Group was informed that an *ad hoc* Group had met specifically to review and address the scientific comments received since the last adoption, and to update Chapter 15.2. based on the recommendations made by the Group, but also by the ASF and FMD *ad hoc* Groups for further harmonisation; this Chapter had been reviewed by the Specialist Commissions and circulated for Member Countries’ comments.

5. **Adoption of report**

The *ad hoc* Group reviewed and amended the draft report provided by the rapporteur. The Group agreed that the report would be subject to a short period of circulation to the Group for comments and adoption. Upon circulation, the Group agreed that the report captured the discussions.

---------
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Terms of Reference

The OIE ad hoc group on classical swine fever (CSF) status of Member Countries (the Group) is expected to evaluate the applications for official recognition of CSF free status received from five Member Countries.

This implies that the experts, members of this Group are expected to:

1. Sign off the OIE Undertaking on Confidentiality of information, if not done before.
2. Complete the Declaration of Interests Form in advance of the meeting of the Group and forward it to the OIE at the earliest convenience and at least two weeks before the meeting.
3. Evaluate the applications from Member Countries for official recognition of CSF free status
   a) Before the meeting:
      • read and study in detail all dossiers provided by the OIE;
      • take into account any other information available in the public domain that is considered pertinent for the evaluation of dossiers;
      • summarise the dossiers according to the Terrestrial Animal Health Code requirements, using the form provided by the OIE;
      • draft the questions whenever the analysis of the dossier raises questions which need to be clarified or completed with additional details by the applicant Member Country;
      • send the completed form and the possible questions to the OIE, at least one week before the meeting.
   b) During the meeting:
      • contribute to the discussion with their expertise;
      • withdraw from the discussions and decision making when possible conflict of interest;
      • provide a detailed report in order to recommend, to the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases, the country(ies) or zone(s) to be recognised (or not) as CSF free and to indicate any information gaps or specific areas that should be addressed in the future by the applicant Member Country.
   c) After the meeting:
      • contribute electronically to the finalisation of the report if not achieved during the meeting.
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REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP
ON BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY RISK STATUS EVALUATION
OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

A meeting of the ad hoc Group on Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) Risk Status Evaluation of Member Countries (hereafter the Group) was held at the OIE Headquarters from 22 to 24 November 2016.

1. Opening

On behalf of Dr Monique Eloït, Director General of the OIE, Dr Matthew Stone, the OIE Deputy Director General for International Standards and Science, welcomed and thanked the Group for its commitment and the extensive support towards the OIE mandates. He acknowledged the work and efforts required in reviewing the dossiers and highlighted that the official recognition of disease status was an important activity for the OIE.

Dr Stone highlighted the sensitivity and confidentiality of the dossiers received for official recognition and thanked the experts for having signed the forms for undertaking of confidentiality. He also mentioned that if any members of the Group had any conflict of interest in the evaluation of a dossier, the experts should withdraw from the discussions and decision making of the particular application.

Dr Stone also indicated that in line with the 6th Strategic Plan, the OIE was working on a strengthened procedure for the selection of members of the Specialist Commissions; the new procedure would provide an opportunity to update and increase the OIE’s pool of experts that could be called upon to participate in the different Working Groups and ad hoc Groups.

The Group and the OIE welcomed Drs Ximena Melon, Noel Murray, and Torsten Seuberlich as new members in the Group.

Dr Laure Weber-Vintzel, Head of the Status Department, introduced Dr Anna-Maria Baka who recently joined the Status Department to work on the activities related to official disease status recognition.

2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur

Dr Ximena Melon was appointed Chair and Dr Noel Murray acted as rapporteur with the support of the OIE Secretariat. The Group endorsed the proposed agenda.

The terms of reference, agenda and list of participants are provided as Appendices I, II and III, respectively.

Dr Armando Giovannini could not attend the meeting physically but provided his feedback on the dossiers before the meeting, through electronic correspondence and participated via teleconference during the three days. Dr Lucie Carrouée-Pook could not attend either but was contacted by phone to discuss the points under her particular expertise.

3. Evaluation of applications from Member Countries for official recognition of BSE negligible risk status

3.1. Poland

Poland was recognised as having a controlled risk status for BSE in May 2008.
In October 2016, Poland submitted a dossier seeking a negligible BSE risk status. The Group agreed that the submission mostly conformed to the questionnaire of Article 1.6.5. of the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code)* for Member Countries requesting a formal evaluation of their BSE risk status according to the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Group sought and received additional information and clarification from Poland. Points specifically discussed by the Group are summarised below:

**a) Section 1: Risk Assessment — Article 11.4.2. point 1**

- **Risk assessment for entry of the BSE agent**

  The Group noted that, over the past seven years, Poland imported live cattle only from countries with a recognised BSE risk status. The Group also observed that, consistent with the Regulations of the European Union, only MBM or greaves defined by those Regulations as Category 3 (i.e. low risk material such as material from slaughtered healthy animals that are fit but not intended for human consumption) were imported into Poland.

  Products of bovine origin were imported from countries with an undetermined BSE risk status.

  After discussion of the entry assessment, the Group concluded that the risk that the BSE agent could have entered Poland during the interval covered by the assessment, although very low, was not negligible.

- **Risk of recycling and amplification of the BSE agent**

  The Group acknowledged that Poland applied a mammal-to-ruminant feed ban from 1999 and an extended feed ban to all farm animals since 2003.

  The Group noted that the SRM were removed and destroyed and acknowledged that the definition of SRM was consistent with Article 11.4.14. of the *Terrestrial Code*. In addition, the Group noted that fallen stock and other animal by-products (ABP) were processed at approved rendering plants only.

  The Group considered the parameters of the rendering processes compliant with the requirements of Article 11.4.19. of the *Terrestrial Code*. Rendering processes were carried out under the strict supervision of district veterinary officers.

  Regarding the exposure assessment, the Group concluded that there was a negligible risk of recycling and amplification of the BSE agent if it were present in Poland’s cattle population during the interval covered by the assessment.

- **Appropriate level of control and audit of the feed ban**

  The Group acknowledged that the control and audit of the feed ban relied on inspections and microscopy. The Group considered that the programme provided an appropriate level of inspection oversight and verification through testing indicating that the risk of cross contamination is effectively mitigated.

  The Group noted that the appropriate legislation, control and audit of the proper implementation of the feed ban had been in force for at least eight years and has detected infractions that were appropriately followed-up.

**b) Surveillance according to Articles 11.4.20. - 11.4.22.**

The Group noted that the surveillance undertaken exceeded the minimum requirements of type B surveillance according to Article 11.4.22. on surveillance for BSE in the *Terrestrial Code*. 409,081 surveillance points were collected, compared to the minimum requirement of 150,000 for an adult cattle population of 3,022,021 heads of cattle over two years of age.
c) **Other requirements — Article 11.4.2. points 2–4**

- **Awareness programme**
  
  The Group determined that the awareness programme began in 2000 and met the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*.

- **Compulsory notification and investigation**
  
  The Group noted that BSE was declared a notifiable disease under relevant legislation since 1997 and determined that the system for compulsory notification and investigation met the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*.

- **Laboratory examination**
  
  The Group determined that the arrangements for laboratory examination met the requirements of the *Terrestrial Manual*.

d) **BSE history in the country**

The Group noted that Poland had reported 75 cases of BSE. According to the information provided, the most recent reported birth date for a BSE case was 24 November 2005, and this case was detected in 2012 (11 years have elapsed since the birth of this cow).

The Group noted that another BSE case slaughtered in 2012 was recorded in the passport as being born in 2007, but on a check on dentition, it was estimated as born in 2004. The Group evaluated the information provided and was satisfied with the investigation carried out to confirm the age of this animal. The Group acknowledged that the discrepancy in age was first noticed during the ante mortem inspection and commended Poland for the efficacy of ante mortem inspections as well as for the transparency demonstrated in providing details on this case.

Overall, according to the information provided, all indigenous BSE cases were born more than 11 years preceding the submission of the dossier. Therefore, Poland met the provisions of Article 11.4.3. point 3 b). All cattle which were reared with indigenous BSE cases during their first year of life, and for which subsequent investigations indicated that they had consumed the same potentially contaminated feed during that period, were traced and those remaining alive in the country were completely destroyed.

e) **Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.5.**

The Group agreed that the submitted dossier was mostly compliant with the format of the questionnaire of Article 1.6.5. of the *Terrestrial Code* for Member Countries.

f) **Conclusions**

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and Poland’s answers to the questions raised, the Group concluded that the application was compliant with the requirements of Article 11.4.3. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.5. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Group therefore recommended that Poland be recognised as a ‘negligible BSE risk’ country.

### 3.2. United Kingdom

#### 3.2.1. Considerations on a zoning approach

The United Kingdom was recognised as having a controlled risk status for BSE in May 2008. In September and October 2016, the United Kingdom submitted two dossiers respectively seeking recognition for Northern Ireland and Scotland as negligible BSE risk zones.

Extensive discussions took place on the epidemiology of BSE and how the requirements and definitions of the *Terrestrial Code* for a zoning approach were relevant for that particular disease.
To date, zoning approaches are uncommon for BSE. Only one zone had been recognised with a negligible BSE risk in May 2014, consisting of the People’s Republic of China with the exclusion of Hong Kong and Macau.

With reference to Chapter 4.3 and Glossary of the Terrestrial Code, a zone is “a clearly defined part of a territory containing an animal subpopulation with a distinct health status with respect to a specific disease for which required surveillance, control and biosecurity measures have been applied for the purpose of international trade”. A subpopulation is “a distinct part of a population identifiable in accordance with specific common animal health characteristics”.

The Group discussed the current requirements for movements within the European Union from countries recognised as having a controlled BSE risk status into countries having a negligible BSE risk status. Those requirements were considered similar to those for movements within the United Kingdom.

The Group considered that “control and biosecurity measures” necessary to define and maintain a “subpopulation with a distinct health status” should aim at preventing the occurrence of the specific disease in the zone. Hence, considering the epidemiology of BSE and the ability to control exposure as compared to other communicable diseases, they considered that if the risk of recycling of the BSE agent was demonstrated to be negligible, and if appropriate surveillance and appropriate identification systems to distinguish the subpopulation were proved to be in place, then it should be possible to consider zones for BSE risk status despite a potential risk of entry of the BSE agent.

3.2.2. United Kingdom (zonal BSE negligible risk status for Northern Ireland)

The Group sought and received additional information and clarification from Northern Ireland.

a) Section 1: Risk Assessment — Article 11.4.2. point 1

- Risk assessment for entry of the BSE agent

The Group noted that, over the past seven years, Northern Ireland imported live cattle only from countries with a recognised BSE risk status.

MBM or greaves defined by the Regulations of the European Union as Category 1 (highest risk, principally SRM) and as Category 2 (intermediate risk, includes fallen stock) were introduced into Northern Ireland from Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland for destruction (rendering or incineration).

Material defined by those Regulations as Category 3 (material from slaughtered healthy animals that are fit but not intended for human consumption) were also imported, including from countries with an undetermined BSE risk status, but represent a negligible risk for BSE.

As a result, the Group concluded that the risk that the BSE agent could have entered Northern Ireland during the interval covered by the assessment, although very low, was not negligible.

- Risk of recycling and amplification of the BSE agent

The Group acknowledged that a ruminant-to-ruminant feed ban was introduced in Northern Ireland in 1989 and extended to a mammalian-to-ruminant ban in 1994; followed by a mammalian-to all farmed animal ban in 1996 and finally a ban on animal protein (with a few exceptions) to all farmed animals in 2001.
The Group noted that SRM were removed and destroyed and acknowledged that the definition of SRM was consistent with Article 11.4.14. of the Terrestrial Code. In addition, the Group noted that fallen stock and other animal by-products (ABP) were processed at approved rendering plants only.

The Group observed that all material defined by the Regulations of the European Union as Category 1 and Category 2 were either rendered and incinerated or directly incinerated. The Group pointed out that incineration ensures complete destruction. As a result, the Group determined that the methods employed by Northern Ireland to process that material ensure that infectivity is destroyed.

Regarding the exposure assessment, the Group concluded that there was a negligible risk of recycling and amplification of the BSE agent if it were present in Northern Ireland’s cattle population during the interval covered by the assessment.

- Appropriate level of control and audit of the feed ban
  
  Based on the information provided, the Group considered that the programme of control and audit of the feed ban ensures a high level of inspection, oversight and verification through testing, indicating that the risk of cross contamination has been and continues to be effectively mitigated.

  The Group noted that over the past eight years, a minimal and declining number of infractions were detected in rendering plants. The detected infractions were appropriately followed-up.

  The Group observed that no infractions related to the prohibition of ruminants MBM and greaves was reported in feed mills over the past eight years.

  The Group concluded that the appropriate legislation, control and audit of the proper implementation of the feed ban had been in force for at least eight years.

b) Surveillance according to Articles 11.4.20.-11.4.22.

The Group noted that the surveillance undertaken exceeded the minimum requirements for type B surveillance according to Article 11.4.22. on surveillance for BSE in the Terrestrial Code. 123,601 surveillance points were collected, compared to a minimal requirement of 83,450 for an adult cattle population of more than 750,000 heads of cattle over two years of age.

c) Other requirements — Article 11.4.2. points 2–4

- Awareness programme
  
  The Group determined that the awareness programme began in 1988 and met the requirements of the Terrestrial Code. The Group commended Northern Ireland for its excellent education programme on BSE.

- Compulsory notification and investigation
  
  The Group noted that BSE was declared a notifiable disease under the relevant legislation of 1988 and determined that the system for compulsory notification and investigation met the requirements of the Terrestrial Code.

- Laboratory examination
  
  The Group determined that the arrangements for laboratory examination met the requirements of the Terrestrial Manual.
d) **BSE history in the zone**

The Group noted that Northern Ireland had reported 2,189 cases of BSE. The most recent reported birth date for a BSE case was 10 June 2004, and this case was detected in 2007. Subsequent investigations determined that the affected animal was likely born more than one year before; indeed, when inspected at slaughterhouse with a recorded age of 31 months, the animal was suspected to be older and was therefore sampled for BSE. Subsequent investigations revealed that ear tags of this animal had been replaced on the farm of origin in November 2006 and based on the calcification of the spine processes its age was estimated as greater than 48 months i.e. born in 2003 or earlier. The Group considered that Northern Ireland provided convincing documentary evidence for supporting this conclusion. While the identity of the animal could not be conclusively determined, appropriate risk based measures, taking account of the uncertainty of the animals age, were implemented to ensure that potential members of the same birth cohort could not enter the food chain. The Group commended Northern Ireland for the comprehensive investigation carried out to determine the origin of breakdown in the identification system and the measures subsequently implemented.

The Group determined that all indigenous classical BSE cases were born more than 11 years preceding the submission of the dossier. Therefore, Northern Ireland met the provisions of Article 11.4.3, point 3 b). All cattle that were reared with indigenous BSE cases during their first year of life, and for which subsequent investigations indicated that they had consumed the same potentially contaminated feed during that period, were traced and those remaining alive in the country were completely destroyed.

e) **Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.5.**

The Group agreed that the submitted dossier was mostly compliant with the format of the questionnaire of Article 1.6.5. of the Terrestrial Code for Member Countries.

f) **Conclusions**

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and Northern Ireland’s answers to the questions raised, the Group concluded that the application was compliant with the requirements of Article 11.4.3. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.5. of the Terrestrial Code. The Group therefore recommended that Northern Ireland be recognised as a zone with a ‘negligible BSE risk’.

### 3.2.3. United Kingdom (zonal BSE negligible risk status for Scotland)

The Group agreed that the submission mostly conformed with the questionnaire provided to Member Countries requesting a formal evaluation of their BSE risk status according to the requirements of the Terrestrial Code.

The Group sought and received additional information and clarification from Scotland. Points specifically discussed by the Group are summarised below:

a) **Section 1: Risk Assessment — Article 11.4.2. point 1**

- **Risk assessment for entry of the BSE agent**

According to the information provided, no MBM or greaves (defined by the Regulations of the European Union as Category 1 and Category 2) or feedstuff containing either were introduced into Scotland over the past seven years. Only material defined by those Regulations as Category 3 (from slaughtered healthy animals that are fit but not intended for human consumption) were introduced but represent a negligible risk for BSE.
The Group observed that, over the same period, all live cattle but one were imported from countries with a recognised BSE risk status.

The Group noted that various commodities were introduced into Scotland from elsewhere in Great Britain, from within the European Union and a wide range of third countries. They were all subject to sanitary measures that ensure the likelihood of the BSE agent being introduced is negligible.

Overall, the Group concluded that the risk that the BSE agent could have entered Scotland during the interval covered by the assessment, although very low, was not negligible.

- **Risk of recycling and amplification of the BSE agent**

  The Group observed that all material defined by the Regulations of the European Union as Category 1 and Category 2 were either rendered and incinerated or directly incinerated. The Group pointed out that incineration ensures complete destruction. As a result, the Group determined that the methods employed by Scotland to process that material ensure that infectivity is destroyed.

  The Group acknowledged that a ruminant-to-ruminant feed ban was introduced in Scotland in 1988 and extended to a mammalian-to-ruminant ban in 1994; followed by a mammalian to all farmed animal ban in 1996, and finally a ban on animal protein (with a few exceptions) to all farmed animals in 2001.

  The Group noted that the SRM were removed and destroyed. The Group acknowledged that the definition of SRM was consistent with Article 11.4.14 of the Terrestrial Code. In addition, the Group noted that fallen stock and other ABP were processed at approved rendering plants only.

  Overall, regarding the exposure assessment, the Group concluded that there was a negligible risk of recycling and amplification of the BSE agent if it were present in Scotland’s cattle population during the interval covered by the assessment.

- **Appropriate level of control and audit of the feed ban**

  The Group reviewed the information provided by Scotland on the inspection of feedmills and rendering plants over the period 2008-2015. The Group noted that a minimal number of infractions were detected and observed that these infractions were minor.

  The Group considered that the programme of control and audit of the feedban provided an appropriate level of inspection, oversight and verification through testing indicating that the risk of cross contamination is effectively mitigated.

  The Group concluded that appropriate legislation, control and audit of the proper implementation of the feed ban had been in force for at least eight years.

  **b) Surveillance according to Articles 11.4.20.-11.4.22.**

  The Group noted that the surveillance undertaken exceeded the minimum requirements of type B surveillance according to Article 11.4.22, on surveillance for BSE in the Terrestrial Code. 107,043 surveillance points were collected, compared to a minimal requirement of 83,450 for an adult cattle population of more than 763,072 over two years of age.
c) **Other requirements — Article 11.4.2. points 2–4**

- **Awareness programme**
  The Group determined that the awareness programme began in 1988 and met the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*.

- **Compulsory notification and investigation**
  The Group noted that BSE was declared a notifiable disease under the relevant legislation of 1988 and determined that the system for compulsory notification and investigation met the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*.

- **Laboratory examination**
  While Scotland does not have a laboratory that tests for BSE, all samples collected in Scotland are screened by one of a number of Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA) laboratories that operate across Great Britain. Any inconclusive or positive results are referred to APHA Weybridge, which is the United Kingdom’s Reference laboratory, as well as a European Union and OIE Reference Laboratory. The Group determined that the arrangements for laboratory examination met the requirements of the *Terrestrial Manual*.

d) **BSE history in the zone**

The Group noted that Scotland had reported 8,493 cases of BSE. As clarified by Scotland, the most recent reported birth date for a BSE case was 08 May 2002, and this case was detected in 2007. This means that all indigenous classical BSE cases were born more than 11 years preceding the submission of the dossier. Therefore, Scotland met the provisions of Article 11.4.3. point 3 b). All cattle that were reared with indigenous BSE cases during their first year of life, and for which subsequent investigations indicated that they had consumed the same potentially contaminated feed during that period, were traced and those remaining alive in the country were completely destroyed.

e) **Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.5.**

The Group agreed that the submitted dossier was mostly compliant with the format of the questionnaire of Article 1.6.5. of the *Terrestrial Code* for Member Countries.

f) **Conclusions**

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and Scotland’s answers to the questions raised, the Group concluded that the application was compliant with the requirements of Article 11.4.3. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.5. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Group therefore recommended that Scotland be recognised as a zone with a ‘negligible BSE risk’.

### 3.3. Other Member Countries requests

The Group assessed an additional request from a Member Country for the recognition of its negligible BSE risk status. The Group concluded that the Member Country did not meet the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code* and the dossier was referred back to the Member Country.

### 4. Evaluation of the information provided by a Member Country with regard to the investigations conducted following the identification of a case of classical BSE

- **France**

Following the confirmation of an indigenous case of classical BSE in a five year old bovine (born in March 2011), the “negligible BSE risk” status of France was suspended on 25 March 2016. However, based on preliminary documentation submitted by France, the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases concluded that France fulfilled the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code* to regain its previous “controlled BSE risk” status.
In October 2016, France provided the OIE with the final investigation report on the occurrence of this case, including the manufacture and tracing of cattle feed used on the birth farm. The investigation focussed on the likely period when the affected cow would have consumed potentially contaminated feed (September 2010 – December 2013). It did not identify any risk factors that might have provided an explanation for exposure to the BSE agent. As a result, the origin of this case born many years after the feed ban could not be determined.

All cattle which were born within 12 months preceding or following the birth of the BSE case or which were reared during the first year of their life together with BSE case during its first year of life, as well as all the progeny of the BSE case which were born within two years prior to its death were identified. Among those animals, 57 were still alive and were killed and completely destroyed. Further to the Group’s request, France clarified that this animal was born and raised on the same farm and that other cases of BSE had not been associated with this farm. The Group considered that the investigation was undertaken appropriately.

The Group concluded that France complies with the requirements of the Terrestrial Code for a “controlled BSE risk” status.

The Group noted that cases of classical BSE born after the feed ban were reported in Wales and Ireland in 2015 and in France in 2016. The Group was informed that the European Commission had requested the European Food Safety Agency to provide a scientific opinion on BSE cases born after the total feed ban (2001). This opinion will be delivered by 30 June 2017.

The Group emphasised that the withdrawal of negligible BSE risk status in such circumstances may be disproportionate to the actual level of risk associated with the occurrence of one or a few cases of classical BSE in one or a few animals born after a feed ban, particularly considering the sanitary measures that continue to be implemented.

5. Considerations on Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code on BSE

The current Group was informed of the progress being made in the revision of Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code on BSE by another ad hoc Group. The Group discussed the provisions of the BSE chapter as well as the questionnaire provided to Member Countries requesting a formal evaluation of their BSE risk status (Article 1.6.5. of the Terrestrial Code) and Chapter 2.4.5 of the Terrestrial Manual, as follows:

Surveillance provisions for the categorisation of BSE risk status (Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code)

The current Group discussed the relevance of the surveillance requirements for countries that have had a negligible risk of entry of the BSE agent for at least one incubation period together with a negligible risk of exposure. The Group was of the opinion that for such countries the existing surveillance requirements are likely to not only be disproportionate to the actual level of risk but a significant and unjustifiable roadblock to gaining negligible BSE risk status. The Group explored two options:

- A ‘fast-track’ procedure that would allow those countries to accumulate the required surveillance points over a period shorter than seven years;
- A lesser level of surveillance consisting of testing clinical suspects and fallen stock, without a specific surveillance points target of surveillance.

These options could be referred to the ad hoc Group dedicated to the revision of the BSE chapter at its next meeting for further consideration.

Other considerations on Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code

With regard to Table 1 in Article 11.4.22., the Group noted that surveillance points targets were provided for adult cattle populations greater than one million, equal to one million, between 900,001 and one million, and smaller populations. The Group recommended that the surveillance point target for an adult cattle population of exactly one million be removed (second row of Table 1).
Questionnaire provided to Member Countries wishing to make a formal evaluation of their BSE risk status (Article 1.6.5. of the Terrestrial Code) ("BSE Questionnaire")

The Group observed that it may be difficult for certain countries to provide documented evidence answering all the questions of the BSE Questionnaire with a sufficient level of details. The Group determined that some flexibility may be allowed, as long as the overall resulting outcome of the risk assessment was consistent with the level of BSE risk for which the country applied –provided compliance with Articles 11.4.2. and 11.4.3. of the Terrestrial Code was documented.

The Group reiterated that Tables 5.d, 5.e, 5.f, 5.g were frequently misunderstood and thus inappropriately filled in by applicant countries but noted with appreciation that a revision had already been proposed by a previous ad hoc Group and would be proposed for the Scientific Commission’s endorsement.

Chapter 2.4.5. of the Terrestrial Manual

With regard to Chapter 2.4.5. of the Terrestrial Manual, the Group noted that histopathology is no longer a method of choice. However, for some countries, it may be difficult to implement diagnostic methods other than histological examination. The Group considered that surveillance point values could be adapted to take into consideration the lower sensitivity of this test. However, the sensitivity of histopathology compared to other tests listed in Terrestrial Manual in the different surveillance streams is not well established and needs to be determined. The feasibility of studies to determine the sensitivity of histopathology would need to be determined.

6. Finalisation and adoption of the draft report

The Group reviewed and amended the draft report provided by the rapporteur. The Group agreed that the report reflected the discussions.
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2. Complete the Declaration of Interests Form in advance of the meeting of the Group and forward it to the OIE at the earliest convenience and at least two weeks before the meeting.
3. Evaluate the applications from Member Countries for official recognition of a negligible BSE risk status
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A meeting of the OIE ad hoc Group on the Evaluation of the African horse sickness (AHS) status of Member Countries (hereafter the Group) was held at the OIE Headquarters from 6 to 8 December 2016.

1. Opening

On behalf of Dr Monique Eloit, Director General of the OIE, Dr Jean-Philippe Dop, the OIE Deputy Director General for Institutional Affairs and Regional Activities, welcomed and thanked the Group for its commitment and the extensive support towards the OIE in fulfilling its mandates.

Dr Dop acknowledged the work and efforts required in reviewing the dossiers and highlighted that the official recognition of disease status was an important activity for the OIE.

Dr Dop pointed out that in line with the objectives of the OIE 6th strategic plan, the procedure for the election process of the members of the Specialist Commissions and the appointment of experts to Working Groups and ad hoc Groups were being reviewed. Dr Dop emphasised that the revised procedure for the selection of OIE’s experts aims at enhancing the transparency of the way in which experts are selected and providing an opportunity to update and increase the OIE’s pool of experts that could be called upon to participate in the different Working Groups and ad hoc Groups.

Dr Dop updated the Group on some other activities currently important for the OIE, such as antimicrobial resistance, highly pathogenic avian influenza, as well as the Global Strategy for the Control and Eradication for peste des petits ruminants.

The Group and the OIE welcomed Drs Evan Sergeant and Javier Castillo-Olivares as new members in the Group.

Dr Laure Weber-Vintzel, Head of the Status Department, introduced Dr Matteo Morini who recently joined the Status Department to work on the activities related to official disease status recognition.

Dr Brückner, President of the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases, encouraged the Group to take into consideration countries’ capacities to maintain a free status when assessing the dossiers (e.g. ability to diagnose, report and respond to a disease incursion).

2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur

The Group was chaired by Dr Beverley Parker, and Dr James MacLachlan acted as rapporteur, with the support of the OIE Secretariat. The Group adopted the proposed agenda.

The terms of reference, agenda and list of participants are presented as Appendices I, II and III, respectively.
3. Evaluation of applications from Member Countries for official recognition of AHS free status

The Group assessed three requests from Member Countries for the recognition of AHS free country status. The Group concluded that two of the Member Countries did not meet the requirements of the Terrestrial Code and the dossiers were referred back to the corresponding Member Countries.

At its February 2017, the Scientific Commission provisionally agreed that the third Member Country fulfilled the requirements to be recognised as free from AHS in accordance with Article 12.1.2. of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code (“Terrestrial Code”). However, the Scientific Commission considered that a final and informed decision could only be taken pending an on-site visit to this country. In addition, the Scientific Commission emphasised that a PVS follow-up evaluation would be greatly beneficial to assess the current capacities of the Veterinary Services. The application was therefore put on hold pending the finalisation of the assessment.

In addition, the Group discussed the comments provided by a fourth Member Country on the assessment previously made by the Group when evaluating its application in January 2016. However, in the absence of an updated dossier reporting on the activities conducted since the previous dossier was submitted, and formally applying for the recognition of its AHS free status, the Group was not in position to (re)evaluate this Member Country’s AHS free status.

4. Considerations on Chapter 12.1. on AHS of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code

The Group discussed the provisions of Chapter 12.1. of the Terrestrial Code on AHS. Following a recommendation from the Scientific Commission, the corresponding discussions of the Group were not included in the present report and would be circulated later, once the Scientific Commission would have finalised the harmonisation of the freedom requirements for diseases which status can be officially recognised.

5. Considerations related to AHS free status and equine disease free zones (EDFZ)

The Group discussed whether it should be compulsory to have an AHS officially recognised free status as a precondition for the establishment of an EDFZ. The Group concurred that it should be the responsibility of the country setting the EDFZ to identify the list of relevant diseases for which the zone is declared free with a procedure for self-declaration. If AHS is included in the list of diseases for which the zone is declared free, then the recognition of the AHS free status should be based on an official recognition by the OIE, and on a self-declaration for the other diseases relevant to the EDFZ.

6. Adoption of the report

The Group reviewed and amended the draft report provided by the rapporteur and agreed to circulate the draft report electronically for comments before the final adoption. The Group agreed that the report captured the discussions.
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Terms of reference

The OIE ad hoc group on African horse sickness (AHS) status of Member Countries (the Group) is expected to evaluate the applications for official recognition of AHS free status received from three Member Countries.

This implies that the experts, members of this Group are expected to:

1. Sign off the OIE Undertaking on Confidentiality of information, if not done before.
2. Complete the Declaration of Interests Form in advance of the meeting of the Group and forward it to the OIE at the earliest convenience and at least two weeks before the meeting.
3. Evaluate the applications from Member Countries for official recognition of AHS free status
   a) Before the meeting:
      - read and study in detail all dossiers provided by the OIE;
      - take into account any other information available in the public domain that is considered pertinent for the evaluation of dossiers;
      - summarise the dossiers according to the Terrestrial Animal Health Code requirements, using the form provided by the OIE;
      - draft the questions whenever the analysis of the dossier raises questions which need to be clarified or completed with additional details by the applicant Member Country;
      - send the completed form and the possible questions to the OIE, at least one week before the meeting.
   b) During the meeting:
      - contribute to the discussion with their expertise;
      - withdraw from the discussions and decision making when possible conflict of interest;
      - provide a detailed report in order to recommend, to the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases, the country(ies) or zone(s) to be recognised (or not) as AHS free and to indicate any information gaps or specific areas that should be addressed in the future by the applicant Member Country.
   c) After the meeting:
      - contribute electronically to the finalisation of the report if not achieved during the meeting.
Appendix II

MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON EVALUATION
OF AFRICAN HORSE SICKNESS (AHS) STATUS OF MEMBER COUNTRIES
Paris, 6-8 December 2016

Agenda

1. Opening
2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur
3. Evaluation of applications from Member Countries for official recognition of AHS free status
4. Considerations on Chapter 12.1. on AHS of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code
5. Considerations related to AHS free status and equine disease free zones (EDFZ)
6. Adoption of report
MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON EVALUATION
OF AFRICAN HORSE SICKNESS (AHS) STATUS OF MEMBER COUNTRIES
Paris, 6 – 8 December 2016

List of participants

MEMBERS

Dr Javier Castillo Olivares
The Pirbright Institute
Ash Road, Pirbright, Woking,
GU24 0NF
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: 44 (0)1483 232441 ex 1081
javier.castillo-olivares@pirbright.ac.uk

Dr Alf-Eckbert Füssel
Acting Head of Unit, DG SANTE/G2
European Commission
Rue Froissart 101-367 - B-1040 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel: (32) 2 295 08 70
Fax: (32) 2 295 3144
alf-eckbert.fuessel@ec.europa.eu

Dr James MacLachlan
Department of Pathology, Microbiology and
Immunology
School of Veterinary Medicine
University of California
Davis, California 95616-8739
USA
Tel: (1.530) 754 8125
Fax: (1.530) 752 3349
njmaclachlan@ucdavis.edu

Dr Beverley Parker
Equine Health Fund,
Wits Health Consortium
No 8 Blackwood Avenue, Parktown,
Johannesburg, 2193
SOUTH AFRICA
Tel: (27-82) 578-7044
bevz@agnet.co.za

Dr Evan Sergeant
AusVet Animal Health Services
Orange NSW 2800
AUSTRALIA
Phone: (61) 2 6362 1598
Fax: (61) 7 4688 2699
evan@ausvet.com.au

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

SCAD representative

Dr Gideon Brückner (President)
30 Schoongezicht
1 Scholtz Street
Somerset West 7130
SOUTH AFRICA
Tel: (27) 218 516 444
Mobile : (27) 83 310 2587
gkbruckner@gmail.com

OIE HEADQUARTERS

Dr Jean-Philippe Dop
Deputy Director General
oie@oie.int

Dr Laure Weber-Vintzel
Head
Status Department
l.weber-vintzel@oie.int

Dr Morgane Dominguez
Project officer
Status Department
m.dominguez@oie.int

Dr Matteo Morini
Chargé de mission
Status Department
m.morini@oie.int
A meeting of the OIE ad hoc Group on the Evaluation of the Peste des petits ruminants (PPR) Status of Member Countries (hereafter the Group) was held at the OIE Headquarters from 13 to 14 December 2016.

1. Opening

On behalf of Dr Monique Eloit, Director General of the OIE, Dr Matthew Stone, the OIE Deputy Director General for International Standards and Science, welcomed and thanked the Group for its commitment and support towards the OIE and with particular regard to its important work on official recognition of disease status.

Dr Stone highlighted the sensitivity and confidentiality of the dossiers received for official recognition and thanked the experts for having signed the form for undertaking of confidentiality, as well as for having declared their potential conflict of interest. He mentioned that should any members of the Group feel a possible conflict of interest in the evaluation of a dossier, they should state so and withdraw from discussions on that subject matter.

Dr Stone underlined that the procedures for official disease status recognition engage the OIE scientific credibility and that the OIE committed to increase transparency at all steps of the procedures. He therefore emphasised the value of a detailed report of the evaluations as the main channel to communicate the rationale for decisions to the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (Scientific Commission) and to Member Countries. He also encouraged the Group to continue providing detailed feedback to countries with a negative outcome to support them in identifying the main gaps and points for improvement, as well as providing informative recommendations to those countries with positive outcome for further improvement.

Dr Stone indicated that, in line with the 6th Strategic Plan, the OIE was working on a strengthened procedure for the selection of members of the Specialist Commissions; the new procedure would provide an opportunity to update and increase the OIE’s pool of experts that could be called upon to participate in the different ad hoc Groups. He also referred to the forthcoming work in the next years with regard to the PPR Global Eradication Programme and, together with the Group, welcomed Dr Jean-Jacques Soula, OIE Coordinator of the Joint Global Secretariat for implementation of the Global PPR Control and Eradication Strategy, who participated in the Group’s meeting as an observer.

2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur

The Group was chaired by Dr Henry Wamwayi. Dr Michael Baron acted as rapporteur, with the support of the OIE Secretariat. The Group endorsed the proposed agenda.

The Terms of Reference, the final agenda and the list of participants are presented as Appendix I, II and III.
3. Evaluation of an application from a Member Country for the official recognition of its PPR free status

3.1 Botswana

In August 2016, Botswana submitted an application for the official recognition of its PPR free status based on historical grounds. The Group requested additional information and received clarification from Botswana.

a) Animal disease reporting

The Group considered that Botswana had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting having regularly submitted the requested reports to the OIE. Note was also taken about the transparency demonstrated with regard to FMD control. The Group reviewed the information provided by Botswana to the OIE’s World Animal Health Information System from 2005 to 2016 and acknowledged that PPR was notifiable in the country for at least the past ten years.

b) Veterinary Services

The Group considered the chain of command developed in Botswana from the Veterinary Authority to the field: to facilitate disease control and delivery of veterinary services, Botswana is divided into districts under the supervision of a veterinarian; each district is further subdivided into sub-districts headed by veterinarians; and that sub-districts are composed of extension areas headed by animal health technicians holding diplomas or certificates in animal health.

The Group also appreciated the organisation of regular meetings between farmers and animal health technicians in extension areas. The Group requested and received additional information on the system in place for the identification and registration of domestic small ruminants. A census of the population of small ruminants was conducted every year, and the results were recorded from the Veterinary Services. The Group concluded that the Veterinary Authority had current knowledge of, and authority over, all sheep and goats in the country.

The Group was informed that Botswana had received an OIE Performance of Veterinary Services (PVS) evaluation mission in 2010, followed by a Gap Analysis mission in 2011. The Group considered that the Veterinary Services were compliant with the requirements for a PPR free country.

The Group noted that there were general ongoing awareness programmes in place for animal diseases but no specific programme for PPR. Considering the non-negligible risk of spread of PPR further south and of incursion in Botswana, the Group recommended that Botswana develop awareness programmes dedicated to PPR and intended for all stakeholders.

c) Situation of PPR in the past 24 months

The Group noted that PPR has never been reported in Botswana and that therefore Botswana could be eligible for historical freedom in accordance with Article 1.4.6. of the Terrestrial Code (cf. section f).

d) Absence of vaccination in the past 24 months and no entry of vaccinated animals

The Group acknowledged that vaccination has never been carried out in Botswana. The import of susceptible animals was permitted from neighbouring countries known as historically free from PPR and where vaccination against PPR has never been practised. Therefore, the Group concluded that vaccinated animals were not introduced into Botswana.
e) **Importation of domestic ruminants and their semen, oocytes or embryos - in accordance with relevant articles of Chapter 14.7.**

Small ruminants or their products had only been imported into Botswana from three countries historically free from PPR, two of them officially recognised free by the OIE, and following strict import controls duly documented in the dossier. From the dossier, the Group concluded that import control procedures for animals and animal products in Botswana were in accordance with the requirements of the Terrestrial Code.

f) **Surveillance for PPR and PPR virus infection in accordance with Articles 14.7.27. to 14.7.33. and with Chapter 1.4.**

PPR was never reported in Botswana. In accordance with Article 1.4.6. of the Terrestrial Code, and as Botswana complies with all the requirements 1.a.iii to 1.a.vi) of this article for a period of at least the past 10 years, Botswana is eligible to demonstrate freedom from PPR without an agent-specific surveillance.

The Group acknowledged that active clinical surveillance was carried out as a supplementary measure to the continuous passive surveillance in place for the early detection of the disease, in order to detect a possible incursion from neighbouring infected countries. The Group also commended Botswana for identifying two districts bordering a neighbouring country as high risk areas for PPR and for conducting an annual serological surveillance in small ruminants in those areas.

The Group noted that, in 2015 and 2016, 1100 sheep and goat sera were analysed at the Botswana National Veterinary Laboratory as part of a validation process for a PPR competition ELISA. Out of the 1100 sera, 105 were positive (22 out of 105) or doubtful (77 out of 105). The 105 sera were sent to another laboratory for confirmation and the results were all negative. The Group welcomed the initiative to strengthen the laboratory diagnostic capability and acknowledged the value of these results to substantiate freedom from PPR.

With regard to wildlife, the Group noted that passive surveillance, conducted by the Department of Veterinary Services in conjunction with the Department of Wildlife has not detected any clinical signs in susceptible wildlife. Botswana was encouraged to include serological surveillance of wildlife, where possible, to improve the chances of detecting subclinical infections with PPR virus (PPRV).

The Group concluded that the surveillance described in the dossier was appropriate to the epidemiological situation and complied with the requirements of the Terrestrial Code.

g) **Regulatory measures for the early detection, prevention and control of PPR**

The Group appreciated that Botswana has been participating in joint actions with neighbouring countries for a better cross-border coordination to combat trans-boundary diseases. Botswana contributed to the development of the Southern Africa Development Community regional control strategy for PPR in response to the outbreaks of the disease in two neighbouring countries in the region.

The Group noted the existence of a contingency plan for other diseases, such as foot and mouth disease, which was reviewed in 2015 to respond to current disease situation and policies in the region and that Botswana planned to include PPR. Therefore, the Group recommended that, as a matter of urgency, Botswana finalise the contingency plan for PPR, and share it with the OIE when available.

The Group agreed that the necessary regulatory measures for early detection, prevention and control of PPR were in place.

h) **Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.9.**

The Group noted that Botswana could have provided more details and better explanations to some of the questions in Article 1.6.9. However the Group agreed that the submitted dossier was compliant with the questionnaire.
Conclusion

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and Botswana’s answers to the Group’s questions, the Group concluded that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapter 14.7. and with the questionnaire under Article 1.6.9. of the Terrestrial Code. The Group therefore recommended that Botswana be recognised as a PPR free country.

Recommendations to Botswana:

The Group recommended that:

- Botswana organise and maintain awareness programmes dedicated to PPR and intended for all stakeholders, including the Department of Wildlife and National Parks;
- As a matter of urgency, Botswana finalise the contingency plan for PPR, and share it with the OIE when available;
- Botswana complete the setting up and validation of all necessary diagnostic tests for PPR;
- Botswana include sero-surveillance of wildlife, where possible, to improve the chances of detecting subclinical infections with PPRV.

4. Evaluation of an application from a Member Country for the endorsement of its official control programme for PPR

The Group assessed the request of a Member Country for the endorsement of its official control programme for PPR. The Group concluded that the Member Country had not met the requirements of the Terrestrial Code and the dossier was referred back to the corresponding Member Country.

5. Information on the PPR Global Control and Eradication Strategy

Dr Jean-Jacques Soula, OIE Coordinator of the FAO-OIE joint PPR Secretariat, updated the Group on the implementation of the PPR Global Control and Eradication Strategy1 (PPR-GCES) that was adopted during the International Conference on PPR organised by FAO and OIE in Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire in April 2015, in which more than 70 countries participated. He mentioned the main steps achieved in 2016 regarding the implementation of the PPR-GCES;

- The establishment, in April, of the FAO-OIE joint PPR Secretariat, based in FAO HQ in Rome. The Secretariat comprises the PPR Secretary, the FAO Coordinator and the OIE Coordinator;
- The development of the PPR Global Eradication Programme2 (PPR-GEP), drafted through an inclusive process, including a brainstorming meeting organised in April in Nagarkot (Nepal), the establishment of a drafting committee with FAO, OIE and independent experts, and the organisation of a peer review meeting in July in Rome, with representatives of all stakeholders. After its endorsement by FAO and OIE Management, the PPR-GEP has been officially launched on 28 October (FAO-OIE joint press release3) and presented to the Membership at a side-event organised in Rome on 9 December, during the 155th session of FAO Council;
- The organisation of regional PPR roadmap meetings in eight of the nine regions of infected or at risk countries.

In 2017, the Secretariat would work on the implementation of an FAO-OIE Joint Resource Mobilization Strategy to support the funding of the PPR-GEP (cost estimated to be $996 million for the period 2017-2021); the establishment of PPR-GEP governance, including the PPR Advisory Committee and the PPR Global Research and Expertise Network (PPR-GREN); finalisation of the first round and second round of regional PPR roadmap meetings.

---

The Group discussed the harmonised transboundary epizone approach to PPR eradication as critical to the success of the PPR-GEP and encouraged the PPR Secretariat to promote the collaboration of neighbouring countries by the establishment of coordination mechanisms at national and regional levels.

6. Other matters

Maintenance of a PPR free status (annual reconfirmation)

The Group was reminded the requirements of Chapter 14.7. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of a PPR free status and agreed to further discuss them.

According to Article 14.7.3. of the Terrestrial Code, Point 2 and the last paragraph, countries or zones historically free from PPR are not subject to any requirements in order to be retained on the list of PPR free countries or zones, while other countries or zones have to comply with Point 2b) of the same article. As a consequence, countries or zones free from PPR on historical basis are currently only requested to fill in an annual reconfirmation form for the maintenance of their officially free status, without providing any supportive information, especially with regard to surveillance. This requirement is translated in the annual reconfirmation form of the PPR status of OIE Member Countries by Question 7: “If your country is not historically free from PPR in accordance with Article 1.4.6., is surveillance in operation in accordance with Articles 14.7.27. to 14.7.33.”

The Group therefore recommended that Article 14.7.3. be revised and that subsequently the annual PPR reconfirmation form be adapted to require the provision of evidence of a surveillance programme that could confirm the status of freedom.

7. Adoption of the report

The Group reviewed and amended the draft report provided by the rapporteur. The Group agreed that the report captured the discussions.
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Paris, 13-14 December 2016

Terms of Reference

The OIE ad hoc group on peste des petits ruminants (PPR) status of Member Countries (the Group) is expected to evaluate the applications for official recognition of PPR free status received from:

- Botswana;

The Group is also expected to evaluate the endorsement of official control programme for PPR received from a Member Country.

This implies that the experts, members of this Group are expected to:

1. Sign off the OIE Undertaking on Confidentiality of information, if not done before.
2. Complete the Declaration of Interests Form in advance of the meeting of the Group and forward it to the OIE as their earliest convenience and at least two weeks before the meeting.
3. Evaluate the applications from Member Countries for official recognition of PPR free status and for the endorsement of official control programme for PPR
   a) Before the meeting:
      - read and study in detail all dossiers provided by the OIE;
      - take into account any other information available in the public domain that is considered pertinent for the evaluation of dossiers;
      - summarise the dossiers according to the Terrestrial Animal Health Code requirements, using the form provided by the OIE;
      - draft the questions whenever the analysis of the dossier raises questions which need to be clarified or completed with additional details by the applicant Member Country;
      - send the completed form and the possible questions to the OIE, at least one week before the meeting.
   b) During the meeting:
      - contribute to the discussion with their expertise;
      - withdraw from the discussions and decision making when possible conflict of interest;
      - provide a detailed report in order to recommend, to the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases, the country(ies) or zone(s) to be recognised (or not) as a PPR free and to endorse (or not) an official control programme;
      - indicate any information gaps or specific areas that should be addressed in the future by the applicant Member Country.
   c) After the meeting:
      - contribute electronically to the finalisation of the report if not achieved during the meeting.
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REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE

Paris, 24 – 26 January 2017

1. Opening

The OIE ad hoc Group on Antimicrobial Resistance (hereafter referred to as ‘the Group’) met from 24 to 26 January 2017 at the OIE Headquarters in Paris, France.

Dr Matthew Stone, Deputy Director General of the OIE, welcomed the participants. He addressed the increased global attention on antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and antimicrobial use (AMU), and acknowledged the efforts of the AMR team at the OIE Headquarters in responding to these expectations. Particularly, he highlighted the significant milestone in the release of the first “OIE Annual Report on the Use of Antimicrobial Agents in Animals: Better understanding of the global situation”. Recognising some limitations of the report in this first round, he expressed his confidence in incremental improvements of its analysis capacity over time.

Dr Stone raised the importance of the work of the Group, including the discussion on the development of the formula for measuring animal biomass to be used as a denominator in evaluating AMU trends over time. Evaluation of trends in AMU may be more important within a country or region, rather than comparing between them, to inform and work towards the overarching goal of reducing antibiotic use in animals nationally.

Dr Stone emphasised the importance of ad hoc Groups in the development of standards, an essential role of the OIE. The work of the ad hoc Group on Antimicrobial Resistance meets objectives outlined in the 6th OIE Strategic Plan, which includes aspects of risk management, transparency and trust, and building capacity and sustainability of National Veterinary Services. The work of the Group also fulfils aspects of three broad objectives described in the OIE Strategic plan, particularly that for scientific excellence.

Dr Stone concluded by thanking the Group for its contributions and wished them a successful meeting.

2. Appointment of the chairperson and rapporteur, and adoption of the agenda

The Group elected Dr Herbert Schneider as the chair and Drs Chris Teale and Carolee Carson as rapporteurs.

The adopted Agenda and List of Participants are presented in Appendices I and II of this report, respectively.

3. Roundtable from the participants on any new issues of interest for the Group

The members of the Group shared updates from their regions and respective organisations regarding activities on AMU and AMR.
4. **Overview of the second phase of the collection of data on the use of antimicrobial agents in animals from the OIE Member Countries**

An overview of the second phase of data collected from OIE Member Countries on their use of antimicrobial agents in animals and a preliminary analysis of the results was presented by Dr Delfy Góchez, chargée de mission, Sciences and New technologies Department. The deadline for submitting annual reports had not yet been reached (31 January 2017), therefore it was explained that analysis would later include the additional submissions expected at the deadline.

Based on the preliminary submissions, Dr Góchez reported that while countries were able to submit data for up to four years, the majority of these data pertained to 2014, the year of interest for this phase of data collection.

The preliminary results of the annual reporting also showed that 85 OIE Member Countries had so far replied. There were improvements noted between the second phase of reporting and the first, including the following:

- Eleven Member Countries were new participants in the data collection process.
- Six Member Countries advanced from reporting Baseline Information to reporting amounts of antimicrobial agents in animals (Reporting Options 1, 2 or 3).
- Nine Member Countries advanced from Reporting Option 1 to Reporting Option 2 or 3.

The Group appreciated the preliminary participation level and increased data provided by the OIE Member Countries.

5. **Presentation of the work done on the denominator and work plan for the future**

The Group recommended that the OIE start to convert the spreadsheet format to a database system that could include automated (i.e. direct) data entry and analysis, following final decisions on the information to be included in the denominator.

Dr Lina Awada, Veterinary Epidemiologist for the World Animal Health Information and Analysis Department (WAHIAD) presented on the progress of WAHIAD’s data collection supporting the development of the animal biomass denominator for antimicrobial use data. Dr Awada informed the Group that some Member Countries have started to submit animal population information by the sub-categories of birds and pigs for the year 2015. While the number of countries able to provide these data is currently limited, she expressed a belief that more countries will submit this detailed information after being exposed to this new request, which was initiated only one year ago.

Dr Awada informed that WAHIAD would introduce the full list of animal categories proposed by the Group step by step. She explained that the current World Animal Health Information System (WAHIS) platform is undergoing renovation, whereby the new version will better facilitate data collection and interface with other systems. Dr Awada informed the Group of the opportunity to make additional requests for animal population information by March 2017 to be considered for incorporation into the renovation.

The Group highlighted the need for verification of WAHIS census data, and the WAHIAD team emphasised the work undertaken to clarify inconsistencies detected with the National Focal Points for Animal Disease Notification.

The Group recognised the variability in production cycles and average weights in animals around the world and that data may not be easily available by country or region. The Group agreed that future refinement of the denominator would aim to reduce uncertainty and facilitate detection of trends. Depending on the differences observed, it might be necessary to adapt analysis for short-lived species using regional or sub-regional estimates for production cycles and average animal weights. Regardless of the chosen methodology, the Group emphasised that the approach to the denominator must be simple and transparent. The optimal denominator would be the best estimate of the annual biomass of live animals with its limitations clearly expressed.
The Group discussed whether to apply a live weight at treatment or a live weight at time of slaughter in development of the denominator. The Group acknowledged that the weight at time of treatment is not feasible to collect worldwide, therefore, the Group recommended to use live weight at time of slaughter. The Group acknowledged that weight at time of slaughter may differ significantly between countries depending on whether weights reported were of live animals before slaughter or their final carcass weight. The Group acknowledged that there may be ways of estimating the live weights based on carcass weights, and that average carcass weights and measuring criteria vary widely by region. Ideally, the preference would be to obtain an average live weight by species (and production classes), which may be calculated in the future applying a conversion factor to carcass weight. This conversion factor would need to be developed by species, and likely by region or sub-region.

The Group discussed whether imported and exported animals should be included in the denominator calculation. For simplicity it was decided not to include this at this time, though an explanation of this limitation should be included along with the denominator.

While this denominator is under development, the Group proposed that the OIE should apply a provisional denominator for the second phase of reporting, which would be refined at a later date based on input from OIE Member Countries. This provisional denominator would be generated based on data currently available. Animal production classes included would be those previously proposed by the Group (Appendix III). During the next meeting, the Group plans to conduct an analysis of the production phases for which population data are available to estimate cycle factors and average weights by region.

The following methods for determining the provisional denominator could be used:

- **Cycle factors** (for species with production cycles less than one year): could be determined from the number of live animals (e.g., the number of sows, the number of litters per year, and the number of piglets per litter). These data could be collected from published literature and FAO data.

- **Average live animal weights**: could be extrapolated from FAOSTAT carcass weights with application of a conversion factor.

- **Average live weight of maternal stock** (e.g. cows and sows): would have to be estimated from published literature.

In parallel with this effort and requiring dedicated additional human resources, the Group recommended that the OIE conduct the following:

- **WAHIS-related activities**
  - Check the data on animal population in WAHIS for each country for validity
  - Compare these data with other sources/databases eg. FAOSTAT
  - Compare with historical data within WAHIS
  - Ensure that data provided in WAHIS correspond to the number of animals present at one time in the year

- **Additional activities**
  - Collect information on mean live weight and production cycles (from FAO sources and publications)
  - Work with OIE Sub-regions or OIE regions if clarifications are needed from Member Countries

- **Results expected**
  - For each species and production sub-group (Appendix III): a cycle factor and mean weight by region or sub-region
  - A robust validated denominator
6. Discussion on the future report presenting the results for the second phase of the OIE collection of data on the use of antimicrobial agents in animals

The Group expressed their congratulations on the contents and release of the first *OIE Annual report on the use of antimicrobial agents in animals: Better understanding of the global situation.*

Dr Góchez proposed the following structure for the report of the second phase of data collection:

1. Global Analysis
2. Analysis by OIE Region
   a. Typical situations where Member Countries are not able to provide quantities of antimicrobial classes
   b. Amendments of the data submitted in the first phase
   c. Year of data collection
      - Period of time declared
   d. Animal groups
   e. Food-producing animals species
   f. Quantities of antimicrobial classes reported
      - Calculations
      - Report by OIE Region in mg/kg (using the provisional biomass denominator)

The Group agreed to this structure of the report for the second phase as proposed.

The Group noted that including denominators in the report will provide an opportunity to highlight the value and possibly improve the data collected by WAHIS.

Following the discussion on the report for the second phase of data collection, the Group discussed options for enhancements of the report which could be implemented in the future in a phased approach. The options included further stratifying the data by OIE Regions and Sub-Regions, and refining assessments of trends over time. In parallel, the Group will refine the denominator. It was discussed that, with the support of Member Countries, the coverage of the data (i.e., the number of Member Countries participating within a region) and the accuracy of the data would be improved.

The need to highlight the value of the report to Member Countries was discussed. One example of value for Member Countries is their ability to compare their information to average mg/biomass in their Region, which could serve as impetus to improve a country’s situation with respect to antimicrobial use. The Group mentioned the idea that in the future, the report could be presented as a webinar and during the webinar the OIE could request feedback to determine how the Member Countries are using the data.

7. Review comments from the OIE Member Countries on the proposed updated version of the Chapter 6.7. on “Harmonisation of national antimicrobial resistance surveillance and monitoring programmes”

The Group reviewed the technical comments received from OIE Member Countries relating to the proposed updated version of the Chapter 6.7 of the *Terrestrial Code* on “Harmonisation of national antimicrobial resistance surveillance and monitoring programmes”.

A summary of the Group’s review is given below:

The Group did not support a request to include surveillance and monitoring of feed as an overarching objective of this chapter. The Group considered that feed was rarely addressed in national surveillance programmes and is only one of a number of possible sources of exposure to resistant bacteria for animals. The purpose of the chapter was not to provide a comprehensive list of all possible sources of exposure, but to indicate the types of surveillance and monitoring which might need to be considered, depending on national priorities.
The Group accepted the following proposed changes as they added clarity to the text and were in line with the focus of the chapter:

1. The use of terms ‘surveillance’ and ‘monitoring’ was reviewed throughout the chapter and revised in a manner consistent with the definitions provided in the OIE Glossary of definitions.

2. The sub-article 6.7.3.3. was amended to provide more explanation on the importance of the sample size in antimicrobial resistance surveillance and monitoring programmes and highlight the importance of the Table 1.

3. The third paragraph in the sub-article 6.7.3.5. was deleted due to the duplication of the information in Table 2.

4. In the sub-article 6.7.3.6. iii), “emerging bacteria” was changed for “bacteria which are pathogenic to humans” for more clarity.

5. The term ‘recovery rate’ is used in article 6.7.3. at 9.(d).(x). For clarity, the Group agreed that ‘isolation rate’ was a preferred term, meaning the number of samples yielding the bacterial organism of interest as a proportion of the total number of samples examined for that bacterium. The Group also added for clarity in the sub-article 6.7.3. at 9.(h) the following words underlined: “The bacterial isolation method, antimicrobial susceptibility testing methods, standards and guidelines used should be recorded”.

6. The phrase “proportion of isolates regarded as resistant”, used in article 6.7.3. at 9.(f) in the section on reporting, was amended for clarity to read “The number of isolates regarded as resistant as a proportion of the total number of isolates tested…”

The Group did not support a request to provide a definition of ‘zoonaanthroponosis’ in 6.7.9.6.ii. They noted that the purpose of the chapter is to propose monitoring and surveillance strategies for significant bacterial pathogens that may be present in animal populations. While some of these pathogens are zoonotic, the chapter is not intended to address bacterial origins or routes of exposure. The Group also noted that the examples provided for zooaanthroponotic pathogens were already covered in the chapter in Table 3.

The Group did not support the addition of more examples in Table 3, as the Group emphasised that the table provides a core set of pathogens for surveillance and that other bacteria could be added at the discretion of individual countries. The Group pointed out that Table 3 provides examples of veterinary pathogens which may be included but the table is intentionally not exhaustive.

The Group did not support to change the phrasing of the sub-article 6.7.3.9.g) in introducing quantitative surveillance as the term minimum inhibitory concentrations (MIC) was already mentioned in other points of the sub-article 6.7.3.9. (in particular in the sub article 6.7.3.9.i)).

8. **Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in animals: future work**

In discussion of this item, the Group focused on terminology, particularly on the definition of preventative use of antibiotics as defined in section 9.

The Group noted that other relevant information exists on the prudent use of antimicrobial agents (e.g. the OIE list of antimicrobial agents of veterinary importance) and should be made more visible. The Group agreed that further discussion on this issue was needed at the next meeting.

9. **Discussion on definitions needed regarding the use of antimicrobial agents**

The Group reviewed the definitions proposed in their July 2012 meeting, which were subsequently revised in their August 2015 meeting.

The Group pointed out that the definition of “therapeutic use”, included at the beginning of the chapter 6.8. of the *Terrestrial Code* on “Monitoring of the quantities and usage patterns of antimicrobial agents used in food-producing animals” was not detailed enough to clarify what was expected for reporting in the data collection. Therefore, the Group proposed an updated definition for therapeutic use, defined preventative use, and confirmed the definition for growth promotion.
Therapeutic use: Administration of an antimicrobial agent to animals to prevent, control or treat infection or disease. The Veterinary Medicinal Products (VMP) containing antimicrobial agents should only be used on the prescription of a veterinarian or other suitably trained person authorised to prescribe VMP containing antimicrobial agents in accordance with national legislation and under the supervision of a veterinarian.

Preventative use: Administration of an antimicrobial agent targeted to animals at risk for a specific infection(s) or in a specific situation where disease is likely to occur if the drug is not administered, with an appropriate dose and for a limited duration.

Growth promotion: Use of antimicrobial substances to increase the rate of weight gain and/or the efficiency of feed utilization in animals by other than purely nutritional means. The term does NOT apply to the use of antimicrobial agents for the specific purpose of treating, controlling, or preventing infectious diseases, even when an incidental growth response may be obtained. This definition is in line with the definition developed by Codex Alimentarius in CAC/RCP 61-2005.

10. Next OIE Global Conference on the use of antimicrobial agents and antimicrobial resistance

The Group was informed that a second OIE Global Conference on the Use of Antimicrobial Agents and Antimicrobial Resistance was planned for the end of 2017/2018, at a venue yet to be arranged. The experts of the Group were asked to join the Scientific Committee for the meeting and all participants agreed.

The conference audience will include OIE Delegates and OIE National Focal Points for Veterinary Products, as well as tripartite representatives and other key stakeholders.

11. Next meeting

The Group proposed the following dates for the next meeting: from 29 to 31 August 2017.

12. Adoption of report

The Group adopted the report.

-------------------
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### Appendix III

**List of animal categories or animal species suggested to be included in WAHIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>ANIMAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cattle</strong></td>
<td>Beef cattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy cattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heifers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steers and Bulls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veal calves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffaloes</strong></td>
<td>Adult pigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cervidae</strong></td>
<td>Fatteners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piglets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backyard pigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pigs</strong></td>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broilers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Layers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backyard poultry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other birds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
<td>Sheep and goats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small ruminants</strong></td>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambs and kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equidae</strong></td>
<td>Horses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donkeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camelidae</strong></td>
<td>Hares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hares and Rabbits</strong></td>
<td>Cats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cats and Dogs</strong></td>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fish</strong></td>
<td>(farmed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Molluscs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crustaceans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphibians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As announced by the President of the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (the Commission) in May 2015, the Commission dedicated time during its February 2017 meeting to comprehensively review all annual confirmations provided by Member Countries having an OIE endorsed national official control programme on the progress made, as well as a selection (approximately 10%) of the annual confirmations of Member Countries having an official status. The Commission pre-selected these annual confirmations at its September 2016 meeting on the basis of the technical and administrative considerations such as the following:

- Recent recognition of a disease status for a country (to ensure the maintenance of measures presented in the application);
- Request for a specific follow-up from the relevant ad hoc Group or the Scientific Commission during the initial assessment of the dossier or during the assessment of a previous annual reconfirmation;
- Changes in a country’s epidemiological situation or risk regarding the disease (increased threat in the region requiring the maintenance of a high level of surveillance as crucial, occurrence of BSE cases, etc.);
- Possible problems with the performance of the Veterinary Services endangering the implementation of the endorsed programme or the maintenance of the disease status;
- Follow-up of the recommendations made during a previous mission;
- Feedback from the Regional and Sub-Regional Representations that would justify a close follow-up of the situation; and
- Member Countries may also be randomly selected.

A letter was sent in October 2016 by the OIE Director General to the Delegates of the pre-selected Member Countries informing them that their countries were selected for a comprehensive review of relevant annual confirmations.

In accordance with the Standard Operating Procedures governing the official recognition of disease status, all annual confirmations were screened by the OIE Status Department, and when necessary, additional information was requested in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code. The annual confirmations that had not been selected for this comprehensive review by the Scientific Commission were further assessed by the OIE Status Department and a report was prepared and provided for the Commission’s consideration and endorsement as presented below.

1. Maintenance of the AHS free status

1.1. Annual confirmations comprehensively reviewed by the Commission:

The annual confirmations for AHS free status of Kazakhstan, Morocco, Oman, Philippines and Turkey were selected for comprehensive review by the Commission. Specific comments made by the Commission with regard to countries’ AHS annual confirmations are as follows:

The Commission was not able to review the annual confirmation of Oman at its meeting as it was pending submission.

Morocco: The Commission acknowledged the information on the plan and detailed design of the serological survey conducted in 2016 and would appreciate the results to be submitted with the 2017 annual reconfirmation.
Philippines: The Commission encouraged the Philippines to maintain good levels of awareness programmes and trainings for early detection of AHS as well as PPR (see below) in case of introduction.

Turkey: The Commission took note of the request from Turkey for more guidance on the information to be provided supporting countries’ annual reconfirmations and indicated that the clarification of the requirements for maintenance of status was on the Commission’s work plan.

Conclusion: With the exception of Oman which maintenance of AHS free status is pending submission of its annual reconfirmation, the Commission concluded that the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 12.1. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised AHS free status.

The annual reconfirmation of Oman was finalised and sent to the OIE after the meeting of the Commission. The OIE Status Department informed electronically the Commission that it was compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 12.1. of the Terrestrial Code. The Commission endorsed electronically this conclusion.

1.2. Annual reconfirmations screened by the OIE Status Department

The OIE Status Department reviewed the rest of the annual reconfirmations for AHS free status and reported the outcome of its analysis to the Commission as follows:

The annual reconfirmations for the following countries were reviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algeria</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>Korea (Rep. of)</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Kuwait</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Former Yug. Rep. of Macedonia</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (People’s Rep. of)</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>United States of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OIE Status Department informed the Commission that the annual reconfirmations that were received and assessed were compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 12.1. of the Terrestrial Code.

Conclusion: The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report prepared by the OIE Status Department on the annual reconfirmations for AHS free status.

The Commission concluded that, with the exception of Azerbaijan, Former Yug. Rep. of Macedonia and Kyrgyzstan which maintenance of AHS free status are pending submission of their annual reconfirmations, the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 12.1. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised AHS free status.

The annual reconfirmations of Azerbaijan, Former Yug. Rep. of Macedonia and Kyrgyzstan were finalised and sent to the OIE after the meeting of the Commission. The OIE Status Department informed electronically the Commission that these annual reconfirmations were compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 12.1. of the Terrestrial Code. The Commission endorsed electronically these conclusions.
2. Maintenance of BSE risk status

2.1. Maintenance of the controlled BSE risk status

2.1.1. Annual reconfirmation comprehensively reviewed by the Commission:

The annual reconfirmation of Greece was comprehensively reviewed by the Commission and was considered compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised controlled BSE risk status.

2.1.2. Annual reconfirmations screened by the OIE Status Department

The OIE Status Department reviewed the rest of the annual reconfirmations for controlled BSE risk status and reported the outcome of its analysis to the Commission as follows:

The annual reconfirmations for the following countries were reviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada*</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Taipei*</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France*</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OIE Status Department informed the Commission that the annual reconfirmations that were received and assessed were compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code. However, the OIE Status Department raised the attention of the Commission to the countries marked with an asterisk (*). Their annual reconfirmations were discussed during the Commission’s meeting as follows:

Chinese Taipei: since 2012, the number of samples taken from routine slaughter has continuously decreased to reach the situation where no samples were taken from routine slaughter between 01/11/2015 to 31/10/2016 (the reporting period of the 2016 annual reconfirmation). In response to the Status Department’s question, Chinese Taipei clarified that the surveillance system for BSE, based on Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code, had been in place since 1998: all samples tested until present were negative to BSE and no cases of BSE had been found in the country. Chinese Taipei therefore considered that allocating more resources on increased samples from cattle over 30 months of age sent for casualty slaughter or fallen stock would enhance the surveillance efficacy. Chinese Taipei also mentioned that some samples taken from routine slaughtered cattle with mild lameness or laminitis were wrongly classified as casualty slaughter. They recompiled the data in accordance with Chapter 11.4 of the Terrestrial Code and re-submitted them to the OIE. Nevertheless, this update of the surveillance data of 2016 does not impact the decreasing trend in routine slaughter which still remains.

France: the information on audit, inspections and sampling in rendering plants and feed-mills provided was not presented in the relevant tables of the on-line form for the annual reconfirmation of the BSE risk status (tables 2 and 3), but was provided following the EU legislation (categories 1, 2 and 3). The provided information is however exhaustive.

Canada: Canada does not follow the OIE format for stratification of the sub-populations in Table 5 related to the BSE surveillance data as they use the original BSurvE model. This approach was accepted until now.

Conclusion: The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report prepared by the OIE Status Department on the annual reconfirmations for BSE risk status and reviewed in depth the identified annual reconfirmations.

The Commission concluded that the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised controlled BSE risk status.
2.2. Maintenance of the negligible BSE risk status

2.2.1. Annual reconfirmations comprehensively reviewed by the Commission:

The annual reconfirmations of Brazil, India, Mexico, Namibia and a zone of China (People’s Rep. of) were comprehensively reviewed by the Commission. Specific comments made by the Commission with regard to countries’ annual reconfirmations are as follows:

**Brazil**: Considering the information reported in previous BSE annual reconfirmations of Brazil, the Commission requested that, in its 2017 annual reconfirmation, Brazil reports on the multispecies feed mills in a separate line as prescribed in the tables of the BSE annual reconfirmation form.

**China (People’s Rep. of)** (a zone designated by the Delegate of China in a document addressed to the Director General in November 2013, consisting of the People’s Republic of China with the exclusion of Hong Kong and Macau):

The Commission noted that while samples are taken in feed mills at provincial level, the current regulation does not request that this information be reported at national level. The Commission recommended that the information related to provincial feed mills be also submitted in the annual reconfirmation for 2017.

**Conclusion**: The Commission reviewed the annual reconfirmations of the five above-listed countries and concluded that they were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised negligible BSE risk status.

2.2.2. Annual reconfirmations screened by the OIE Status Department

The OIE Status Department reviewed the rest of the annual reconfirmations for negligible BSE risk status and reported the outcome of its analysis to the Commission as follows:

The annual reconfirmations for the following countries were reviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argentina</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Norway*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Panama*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Iceland*</td>
<td>Paraguay*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Israel*</td>
<td>Peru*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Korea (Rep. of)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Slovakia*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus*</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Luxembourg*</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia*</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>New Zealand*</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OIE Status Department informed the Commission that the annual reconfirmations that were received and assessed were compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code. However, the OIE Status Department raised the attention of the Commission to the countries marked with an asterisk (*). The annual reconfirmations were discussed during the Commission’s meeting as follows:

The majority of the annual reconfirmations that have been identified by the Status Department are in relation with Point 4 of Article 11.4.22. of the Terrestrial Code: Member Countries should sample at least three of the four subpopulations (routine slaughter, fallen stock, casualty slaughter, clinical suspect).
Cyprus: In 2016, Cyprus took samples only from one subpopulation: fallen stock. In 2015 and 2014 samples were taken also from routine slaughter, and in the previous years, also from casualty slaughter. The Commission suggested that sampling continue for the stream on casualty slaughter.

Estonia, Israel, Luxembourg and Norway: In 2016 these countries took samples only from two subpopulations: fallen stock and casualty slaughter (Estonia and Norway), fallen stock and clinical suspect (Luxembourg since 2014) and fallen stock and clinical suspect (Israel). Norway reported that as of first January 2014 the BSE monitoring programme was amended. Sampling of routine slaughtered bovines ended and the age limits for the sampling of emergency slaughtered bovines and fallen stock, were changed from 24 months to 48 months. These changes of the Norwegian monitoring programme for BSE were based on a scientific assessment done by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) in 2013.

Slovakia: In 2016 took samples from three subpopulations: routine slaughter, fallen stock and casualty slaughter. However, only one sample was taken for routine slaughter and the number of samples taken for each stream is constantly decreasing.

The Commission noted the sampling trends of the above-listed European countries. Notwithstanding, the Commission confirmed the maintenance of their risk status while continuing to monitor the surveillance points.

New Zealand: With reference to Table 5 and the historical BSE surveillance data, samples were only taken from two subpopulations: fallen stock and clinical suspects. Samples were not taken from routine and casualty slaughter. In addition, the number of samples annually taken seemed to be pre-established and to perfectly match the minimal target of surveillance points. While recognising the optimisation of the surveillance programme with regard to the surveillance points allocated to each surveillance stream and category of age, this gave the feeling that BSE clinical suspects are tested until the required number of points is reached and not anymore after.

The Commission requested submission of additional information, when reconfirming New Zealand’s status in 2017, on the criteria for clinical surveillance. The Commission stressed that sampling of BSE clinical suspects, when detected, should not be stopped, even after the required number of points is reached.

Iceland: took samples only from two subpopulations in 2016: routine slaughter and fallen stock. In addition, considering the size of the adult cattle population of Iceland (27000 heads), the surveillance points targets should be 2200 points according to the OIE Terrestrial Code. Iceland does not reach the points needed for maintenance. However, until now, the Scientific Commission considered the factors of: the assessed risk, the small size population, the very good health status of Iceland cattle population with regard to BSE and other diseases and the production system. It was concluded that Iceland should remain on the list of countries having a negligible risk for BSE, while asking Iceland to maintain its efforts in terms of awareness and increase sampling.

Paraguay: All feed mills that were inspected had infractions. The detailed description of infractions demonstrates that they were not linked to the level of BSE risk. The Commission appreciated the transparency demonstrated by Paraguay and noted that more precision should be given to the type of infractions that should be reported to the OIE. While considering that countries should focus on infractions that are relevant to BSE, the Commission suggested that the ad hoc Group on BSE propose a clear description on the infractions that countries should report on.

Peru: Peru reported 49 feed mills in total for ruminants and multispecies. These feed mills are registered by SENASA and manufacture only packaged feed that gets distributed to the farms either directly or through retailers and regional mills, not officially authorised by SENASA. In 2016, a random sample of feed mills (4 out of 49) was inspected visually with one infraction.

---

properly documented. Samples are collected only at farm level. Peru justified its decision to sample the farms and not feed mills or regional feed mills due to the possible risk of contaminations as animal feed passes through various intermediaries before reaching the farms. For 2017, Peru has planned to extend inspections with sampling to feed mills and regional feed mills and has initiated a process for official registration of the latter by SENASA.

Conclusion: The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report prepared by the OIE Status Department on the annual reconfirmations for negligible BSE risk status and reviewed in depth the identified annual reconfirmations.

The Commission concluded that, with the exception of Panama which maintenance of BSE risk status is pending finalisation of its annual reconfirmation, the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 11.4. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised negligible BSE risk status.

The annual reconfirmation of Panama was finalised and sent to the OIE after the meeting of the Commission. The OIE Status Department indicated electronically to the Commission that a significant increase in the adult cattle population compared to last year was noted without proportional increase in its BSE surveillance. As a consequence Panama did not reach anymore the BSE surveillance target points. The Commission strongly encouraged that Panama increases its level of BSE surveillance and submit supportive evidence when reconfirming its status in November 2017. The Commission concluded that the BSE status of Panama could be maintained.

3. Maintenance of the CBPP free status

3.1. Annual reconfirmations comprehensively reviewed by the Commission:

The annual reconfirmations for CBPP free status of China (People’s Rep. of) and Swaziland were comprehensively reviewed by the Commission. Specific comments made by the Commission with regard to countries’ CBPP annual reconfirmations are as follows:

China (People’s Rep. of): The Commission noted the extensive information provided by China and appreciated the surveillance conducted in abattoirs and the appropriate follow-up performed upon reported suspicious cases to rule out CBPP.

Swaziland: The Commission commended the concise and good quality report provided by Swaziland.

Conclusion: The Commission reviewed the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries and concluded that they were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 11.7. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised CBPP free status.

3.2. Annual reconfirmations screened by the OIE Status Department

The OIE Status Department reviewed the rest of the annual reconfirmations for CBPP free status and reported the outcome of its analysis to the Commission as follows:

The annual reconfirmations for the following countries were reviewed:

- Argentina
- Australia
- Botswana
- Canada
- France
- India
- Mexico
- Namibia
- New Caledonia
- Portugal
- Singapore
- Switzerland
- United States of America

The OIE Status Department informed the Commission that the annual reconfirmations were compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 11.7. of the Terrestrial Code.

---

2 Namibia: one zone located south to the Veterinary Cordon Fence, designated by the Delegate of Namibia in a document addressed to the Director General in October 2015
Conclusion: The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report prepared by the OIE Status Department on the annual reconfirmations for CBPP free status.

The Commission concluded that the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 11.7. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised CBPP free status.

4. Maintenance of the endorsement of the official control programme for CBPP

The annual reconfirmation of Namibia was comprehensively reviewed by the Commission and was considered compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 11.7. of the Terrestrial Code for an endorsed official control programme for CBPP.

The Commission commended the efforts of Namibia of the progress made on its endorsed official programme for CBPP.

5. Maintenance of the CSF free status

5.1. Annual reconfirmations comprehensively reviewed by the Commission:

The annual reconfirmations for CSF free status of Czech Republic, Italy, Mexico and Poland were comprehensively reviewed by the Commission. Specific comments made by the Commission with regard to countries’ CSF annual reconfirmations are as follows:

Italy: The Commission commended Italy for the comprehensive supportive information provided to reconfirm its CSF free status.

Mexico: The Commission appreciated the information provided and the efforts made to implement the recommendations of last OIE mission conducted in May 2016, in particular with regard to early detection and increased surveillance activities at the borders.

Conclusion: The Commission concluded that the annual reconfirmations of the four above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 15.2. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised CSF free status.

5.2. Annual reconfirmations screened by the OIE Status Department

The OIE Status Department reviewed the rest of the annual reconfirmations for CSF free status and reported the outcome of its analysis to the Commission as follows:

The annual reconfirmations for the following countries were reviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Luxembour</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Brazil: one zone composed of the States of Rio Grande do Sul and Santa Catarina as designated by the Delegate of Brazil in a document addressed to the Director General in September 2014; one zone covering the States of Acre, Bahia, Espírito Santo, Goiás, Mato Grosso, Mato Grosso do Sul, Minas Gerais, Paraná, Rio de Janeiro, Rondônia, São Paulo, Sergipe and Tocantins, Distrito Federal, and the municipalities of Guajará, Boca do Acre, South of the municipality of Canutama and Southwest of the municipality of Lábrea, in the State of Amazonas as designated by the Delegate of Brazil in a document addressed to the Director General in September 2015
The OIE Status Department informed the Commission that the annual reconfirmations were compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 15.2. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

**Conclusion:** The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report prepared by the OIE Status Department on the annual reconfirmations for CSF free status.

The Commission concluded that the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 15.2. of the *Terrestrial Code* for the maintenance of the officially recognised CSF free status.

6. **Maintenance of the FMD free status**

6.1. **Annual reconfirmation comprehensively reviewed by the Commission**

The annual reconfirmations for FMD free status of Albania, Bolivia (two zones), Colombia (without vaccination – one zone designated by the Delegate of Colombia in documents addressed to the Director General in November 1995 and in April 1996 (Area I - Northwest region of Chocó Department); one zone designated by the Delegate of Colombia in documents addressed to the Director General in January 2008 (Archipelago de San Andrés and Providencia); with vaccination – one zone consisting of five merged zones designated by the Delegate of Colombia in documents addressed to the Director General in January 2003, in December 2004 (two zones), in January 2007 and in January 2009), Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Paraguay (two zones) and Ukraine were selected for comprehensive review by the Commission. Specific comments made by the Commission with regard to countries’ FMD annual reconfirmations are as follows:

The Commission was not able to review the annual reconfirmation of Ukraine at its meeting as it was pending submission of required supportive information.

**Albania:** The Commission acknowledged the surveillance in place with particular attention to the early detection system.

**Bolivia (one zone without vaccination** in the Macro-region of the Altiplano designated by the Delegate of Bolivia in documents addressed to the Director General in November 2011; one zone with vaccination consisting of four merged zones covering the regions of Amazonas, Chaco, Chiquitania, Valles and part of Altiplano as designated by the Delegate of Bolivia in documents addressed to the Director General in January 2003 and March 2007, in August 2010, in August 2012 and in October 2013 and February 2014): The Commission appreciated the information provided and the efforts made to implement the recommendations of last OIE mission conducted in April 2016.

**Madagascar:** The Commission commended the efforts made by Madagascar in response to the recent increased risk of FMD in the Region. The Commission recommended that a mission be deployed to support Madagascar in the continuous maintenance of its FMD free status.

**Malaysia** (one zone without vaccination covering the provinces of Sabah and Sarawak as designated by the Delegate of Malaysia in a document addressed to the Director General in December 2003): The Commission noted that amongst the extensive number of animals clinically inspected, no suspicions were detected. The Commission requested more detailed information, on the clinical surveillance (e.g. implementation and criteria for raising suspicion of FMD) and results including differential diagnoses, to be submitted in its 2017 annual reconfirmation.

**Paraguay** (two separate zones with vaccination designated by the Delegate of Paraguay in documents addressed to the Director General in March 2007 and in August 2010): The Commission appreciated the information provided and the efforts made to implement the recommendations of last OIE mission conducted in April 2016. The Commission also noted that Paraguay had applied to become officially recognised as a FMD free country with vaccination by merging the two FMD free zones covering the entire territory of Paraguay.
Russia: The Commission considered the annual reconfirmation of Russia’s reinstated FMD free zone where vaccination is practised status with the exclusion of the containment zone.

Conclusion: With the exception of Ukraine which maintenance of FMD free status is pending finalisation of its annual reconfirmation, the Commission concluded that the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 8.8. of the Terrestrial Code for the maintenance of the officially recognised FMD free status.

The annual reconfirmation of Ukraine was finalised and sent to the OIE after the meeting of the Commission. The OIE Status Department informed electronically the Commission that it was compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 8.8. of the Terrestrial Code. The Commission endorsed electronically this conclusion.

6.2. Annual reconfirmations screened by the OIE Status Department

The OIE Status Department reviewed the rest of the annual reconfirmations for FMD free status and reported the outcome of its analysis to the Commission as follows:

The annual reconfirmations for the following countries were reviewed:

| Australia | Dominican Republic | Italy | Portugal |
| Austria   | El Salvador        | Japan | Romania |
| Belarus   | Estonia            | Latvia| San Marino |
| Belgium   | Finland            | Lesotho| Serbia* |
| Belize    | Former Yug. Rep. of Macedonia | Lithuania | Singapore |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | France | Malta | Slovakia |
| Brunei    | Germany            | Mexico | Slovenia |
| Bulgaria  | Greece*            | Montenegro | Spain |
| Canada    | Guatemala          | Netherlands | Swaziland |
| Chile     | Guyana             | New Caledonia | Sweden |
| Costa Rica| Haiti*            | New Zealand | Switzerland |
| Croatia   | Honduras           | Nicaragua | United Kingdom |
| Cuba      | Hungary            | Norway | United States of America |
| Cyprus    | Iceland            | Panama | Uruguay |
| Czech Republic | Indonesia | Philippines | Vanuatu |
| Denmark   | Ireland            | |

Argentina: Three zones without vaccination
- one zone designated by the Delegate of Argentina in a document addressed to the Director General in January 2007;
- the summer pasture zone in the Province of San Juan as designated by the Delegate of Argentina in a document addressed to the Director General in April 2011;
- Patagonia Norte A as designated by the Delegate of Argentina in a document addressed to the Director General in October 2013;

Two zones with vaccination – two separate zones designated by the Delegate of Argentina in documents addressed to the Director General in March 2007 and October 2013, and in August 2010 and February 2014;

Botswana: Four zones without vaccination designated by the Delegate of Botswana in documents addressed to the Director General in August and November 2014 as follows:
- one zone consisting of Zones 3c (Dukwi), 4b, 5, 6a, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13;
- one zone consisting of Zone 3c (Maitengwe);
- one zone covering Zone 4a;
- one zone covering Zone 6b;

---

4 Excluding Kosovo administered by the United Nations
Brazil:

**One zone without vaccination** – State of Santa Catarina designated by the Delegate of Brazil in a document addressed to the Director General in February 2007;

**Four separate zones with vaccination** designated by the Delegate of Brazil in documents addressed to the Director General as follows:

- one zone covering the territory of State of Rio Grande do Sul (documentation of September 1997);
- one zone consisting of State of Rondônia (documentation of December 2002), State of Acre along with two adjacent municipalities of State of Amazonas (documentation of March 2004) and an extension of this zone into the territory of State of Amazonas (documentation of December 2010);
- one zone consisting of three merged zones: one zone covering the middle southern part of State of Pará (documentation of February 2007), States of Espírito Santo, Minas Gerais, Rio de Janeiro, Sergipe, Distrito Federal, Goiás, Mato Grosso, Paraná, São Paulo, parts of State of Bahia, parts of State of Tocantins (documentation of May 2008), and the zone in State of Mato Grosso do Sul (documentation of July 2008); one zone located in States of Bahia and Tocantins (documentation of December 2010); and one zone covering States of Alagoas, Ceará, Maranhão, Paraíba, Pernambuco, Piauí, Rio Grande do Norte, and the northern region of State of Pará (documentation of October 2013);
- one zone in State of Mato Grosso do Sul (documentation of August 2010);

**Ecuador**: **One zone without vaccination** consisting of the insular territory of the Galapagos, as designated by the Delegate of Ecuador in a document addressed to the Director General in August 2014;

**One zone with vaccination** consisting of the continental Ecuador, as designated by the Delegate of Ecuador in a document addressed to the Director General in August 2014;

**Kazakhstan**: **One zone without vaccination** consisting of the regions of Akmola, Aktobe, Atyrau, West Kazakhstan, Karaganda, Kostanay, Mangystau, Pavlodar and North Kazakhstan, as designated by the Delegate of Kazakhstan in a document addressed to the Director General in August 2014;

**Moldova**: **One zone without vaccination** designated by the Delegate of Moldova in a document addressed to the Director General in July 2008;

**Namibia**: **One zone without vaccination** designated by the Delegate of Namibia in a document addressed to the Director General in February 1997;

**Peru**: **One zone without vaccination** consisting of three merged zones as designated by the Delegate of Peru in documents addressed to the Director General in December 2004, in January 2007 and in August 2012;

**One zone with vaccination** consisting of the regions of Tumbes and parts of Piura and Cajamarca as designated by the Delegate of Peru in a document addressed to the Director General in August 2012;

**South Africa**: **One zone without vaccination** designated by the Delegate of South Africa in documents addressed to the Director General in May 2005 and January 2014.

**Turkey**: **One zone with vaccination** designated by the Delegate of Turkey in a document addressed to the Director General in November 2009.
The OIE Status Department informed the Commission that the annual reconfirmations that were received and assessed were compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 8.8. of the *Terrestrial Code*. However, the OIE Status Department raised the attention of the Commission to the countries marked with an asterisk (*). The annual reconfirmations were discussed during the Commission’s meeting as follows:

**Ecuador (zone with vaccination):** no information was provided on active surveillance; Ecuador mentioned that the serological survey scheduled in 2015-2016 was postponed to 2017. Ecuador revised its surveillance strategy and is using the information obtained from a post vaccination monitoring study implemented in 2015 to target the active surveillance investigations scheduled for 2017. The Commission requested submission of the results of the serological survey, as well as clear objective and design of the survey, in the 2017 annual reconfirmation.

**Greece:** The Commission noted that the information on FMD surveillance and prevention was provided for a part of the country but not for the entire territory. The Commission requested that further information be provided with regard to the whole territory of Greece.

**Haiti:** Whilst this FMD historically free country has never reported clinical suspicions to date, it appears that Haiti does not have an implemented strategy for diagnosis and confirmatory testing.

The Commission requested that a copy of a formal agreement with an OIE Reference Laboratory for FMD or with a laboratory competent for FMD testing, as well as the protocol for collecting and shipping of samples, be provided in the 2017 annual reconfirmation.

**Conclusion:** The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report prepared by the OIE Status Department on the annual reconfirmations for FMD free status and reviewed in depth the identified annual reconfirmations.

With the exception of Belarus, El Salvador, Germany, Guyana, Panama and Portugal which maintenance is pending the submission or finalisation of their annual reconfirmation, the Commission concluded that the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 8.8. of the *Terrestrial Code* for the maintenance of the officially recognised FMD free status.

The annual reconfirmations of Belarus, El Salvador, Germany, Guyana, Panama and Portugal were finalised and sent to the OIE after the meeting of the Commission. The OIE Status Department informed electronically the Commission that these annual reconfirmations that were received and assessed were compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 8.8. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Commission endorsed electronically these conclusions.

7. **Maintenance of the endorsement of the official control programme for FMD**

The annual reconfirmations of **China (People’s Rep. of), India, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Thailand and Venezuela** were comprehensively reviewed by the Commission and were considered compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 8.8. of the *Terrestrial Code* for an endorsed official control programme.

The Commission was not able to review the annual reconfirmation of **Mongolia** at its meeting as it was pending submission of required supportive information.

**China (People’s Rep. of):** The Commission acknowledged the extensive report provided by China on the progress made along the endorsed official control programme. The Commission reiterated that when reporting FMD to the OIE, China should follow the OIE terminology and reminded that an outbreak is related to one or more cases in an epidemiological unit and that a case is not limited to only clinically diseased animals but also includes infected animals with or without clinical signs.

The Commission also highlighted the risk posed by the FMDV strain O/Ind-2001d reported in several countries bordering China and recommended China to maintain its vigilance.
The Commission concluded that China was progressing along its submitted timeline on the implementation of the official control programme.

**India:** The Commission appreciated the information provided and recommended that in its annual reconfirmation for 2017, India provides more information on the vaccination strategy. The Commission considered that India was making progress on the implementation of the official control programme.

**Kazakhstan:** The Commission concluded that Kazakhstan was progressing along the timeline and performance indicators described in its endorsed official control programme. The Commission suggested that the information including the results from laboratories be provided in one of the OIE official languages.

**Morocco:** The Commission requested the results of the NSP serological surveillance (including not only small ruminants but all susceptible species to detect virus circulation) as well as the results of the study on vaccine efficacy conducted in 2016 be also provided in the 2017 annual reconfirmation.

**Namibia:** The Commission commended the efforts of Namibia on the progress made on its endorsed official programme and in providing clear and well-organised supportive information.

**Thailand:** The Commission commended Thailand for the clear report on the progress made, based on pre-established performance indicators.

**Venezuela:** The Commission considered the supportive information provided by Venezuela as well as the report of the OIE mission recently conducted in Venezuela in February 2017. The Commission acknowledged the commitment of Venezuela to continue the FMD-related activities and agreed that the endorsement of the official control programme should be maintained. However, the Commission requested that a clear and detailed table setting the progression with regard to the timeline and performance indicators be provided in advance to and discussed during the forthcoming General Session in May 2017.

With the exception of Mongolia, which annual reconfirmation is pending the submission of the required supportive information and while taking into account the above-mentioned comments and follow-up to be made on pending issues, the Commission considered that the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 8.8. of the Terrestrial Code for an endorsed official control programme for FMD.

The annual reconfirmation of Mongolia was finalised and sent to the OIE after the meeting of the Commission. The OIE Status Department informed electronically the Commission that it compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 8.8. of the Terrestrial Code. The Commission endorsed electronically this conclusion.

8. **Maintenance of the PPR free status**

8.1. **Annual reconfirmations comprehensively reviewed by the Commission:**

The annual reconfirmations for PPR free status of **Chinese Taipei, Italy, Latvia, Myanmar and the Philippines** were comprehensively reviewed by the Commission. Specific comments made by the Commission with regard to countries’ PPR annual reconfirmations are as follows:

**Chinese Taipei:** The Commission appreciated the extensive documentation provided by Chinese Taipei to support the maintenance of its PPR free status.

**Italy:** The Commission commended Italy for the comprehensive supportive information provided to reconfirm its PPR free status.

**Latvia:** The Commission appreciated the supportive information provided related to the surveillance in place.

**The Philippines:** The Commission encouraged the Philippines to maintain good levels of awareness programmes and trainings for early detection of PPR in case of introduction.
**Conclusion:** The Commission reviewed the annual reconfirmations of the five above-listed countries and concluded that they were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 14.7. of the *Terrestrial Code* for the maintenance of the officially recognised PPR free status.

**8.2. Annual reconfirmations screened by the OIE Status Department**

The OIE Status Department reviewed the rest of the annual reconfirmations for PPR free status and reported the outcome of its analysis to the Commission as follows:

The annual reconfirmations for the following countries were reviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argentina</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Norway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Korea (Rep. of)</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OIE Status Department informed the Commission that the annual reconfirmations were compliant with the relevant provisions of Chapter 14.7. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

**Conclusion:** The Commission reviewed and endorsed the report prepared by the OIE Status Department on the annual reconfirmations for PPR free status.

The Commission concluded that the annual reconfirmations of the above-listed countries were compliant with the relevant requirements of Chapter 14.7. of the *Terrestrial Code* for the maintenance of the officially recognised PPR free status.

---

5 Namibia: one zone located south to the Veterinary Cordon Fence, designated by the Delegate of Namibia in a document addressed to the Director General in November 2014
CONSIDERATIONS FROM THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION FOR ANIMAL DISEASES
WITH REGARD TO THE OIE OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF BSE RISK STATUS OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

Purpose
This paper briefly considers the current epidemiological risk associated with BSE, the OIE standards for BSE in the Code, the justification for the OIE official recognition of risk status for BSE, and the risks associated with possible withdrawal of the official recognition procedure for BSE.

Background
Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) was probably present in the cattle population of the United Kingdom since the 1970s or earlier, but it was identified as a probable new transmissible spongiform encephalopathy of cattle at the end of 1986.

In the early 2000’s, atypical prions causing atypical BSE were also identified, as the result of enhanced surveillance for transmissible spongiform encephalopathies. What has been called ‘atypical’ BSE is now believed to occur spontaneously in all cattle populations at a very low rate. Cases of atypical BSE have been reported from 12 countries to the OIE since 2005.

To date, classical BSE has been reported in 25 countries other than the UK, mainly in Europe but also in Canada, Israel, Japan and the United States of America. Two additional countries have only reported atypical BSE: Brazil and Norway.

Animal and public health
It is believed that cattle are contaminated by classical BSE during their first year of life by ingestion of prions through the consumption of products derived from ruminants infected by BSE, such as meat-and-bone meal (MBM). MBM is produced by rendering certain parts of animal carcasses, including farmed small ruminants and cattle that are not suitable, or not used, for human consumption. The incubation period for classical BSE is then estimated to be 2 to 8 years in cattle with an average of five years.

BSE is a zoonosis transmitted to humans by consumption of contaminated bovine tissues and has been causally linked to the variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (Variant CJD) in humans. It has been proven that some tissues of infected animals, so-called Specific Risk Materials (SRM) are most likely to contain and therefore transmit the BSE prion. According to the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code), these tissues include brains, eyes, spinal cord, skull, vertebral column, tonsils and distal ileum.

To prevent human and animal infection, recycling and amplification of the prions, many countries have imposed the removal of those SRM from the human food and the animal feed chains and have banned the use of MBM in ruminant feed (ruminant-to-ruminant feed ban, further reinforced by a mammalian-to-ruminant feed ban).

Global importance
As a result of the measures taken to mitigate the risk of infection, recycling and amplification of the prion, the incidence and global importance of BSE have markedly decreased over the past years.

OIE international standards with regard to BSE
Considering the concerns associated with the emergence of BSE, OIE Member Countries requested the OIE to develop international standards to facilitate trade. A chapter dedicated to BSE was adopted and inserted in the Terrestrial Code in 1992, and, since then, has been continuously revised to provide updated recommendations against new evidence and scientific information available. In 2015, the chapter was modified to exclude atypical BSE for the purpose of official BSE risk status recognition.
The importance of this chapter is linked to the fact that the measures published in it are the result of consensus among the veterinary authorities of OIE Member Countries, and that it constitutes a reference within the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures as an international standard for animal health and zoonoses.

In 2004, BSE was included on the list of diseases for which the OIE officially recognises Member Countries’ status. A first list of countries recognised provisionally free from BSE was published in 2004, and the first list of BSE free countries was published in 2006. Since 2007, countries have been categorised as presenting a negligible or a controlled risk with regard to BSE. This system is still in use.

The requirements for the recognition and maintenance of a BSE negligible risk status are stated in Article 11.4.3. of the Terrestrial Code and can be roughly summarised as follows:

- Negligible risk with regard to the BSE agent for at least 7 years
- Intensive active surveillance (Type B surveillance) over a seven-year period and maintained overtime
- No indigenous case of classical BSE born less than 11 years ago
- Evidence of an effective feed ban for at least 8 years.

Those for the recognition and maintenance of a BSE controlled risk status are described in detail in Article 11.4.4. and summarised as follows:

- At least a controlled risk with regard to the BSE agent
- Intensive active surveillance (Type A surveillance) over a seven-year period and reduced once the status is granted to Type B surveillance (half of type A surveillance) provided continuous surveillance is ensured overtime

Opinion of the SCAD regarding the official recognition of BSE risk status and BSE standards

In September 2016 and February 2017, the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases agreed that consideration should be given to the relevance of the existing procedure for the official recognition of BSE risk status and challenged the current requirements of the Terrestrial Code for the categorisation of BSE risk status.

1) Provisions of the Terrestrial Code for the recognition of negligible and controlled BSE risk status (Chapter 11.4.)

Taking into consideration the double purpose of the official recognition of disease status as well as of the Terrestrial Code: disease control and safe trade facilitation, the following points were discussed and assessed:

a) OIE provisions for active surveillance:

  o have to be continuously met for countries with a negligible risk status despite the fact that the applied control measures (SRM removal, feed ban and rendering parameters) have mitigated the risk of exposure to the BSE agent to a negligible level for more than the average incubation period;
  o have a high cost to achieve and maintain that very few countries which do not have a recognised status to date (i.e. developing and emerging countries) can afford. The high cost prevents those countries from obtaining a BSE risk status even if they are able to demonstrate a negligible risk of entry and/or exposure to the BSE agent for more than the average incubation period;
  o are very demanding for countries with a small cattle population and lead to an intensity of sampling that those countries cannot afford. Here again, that prevents those countries from obtaining a BSE risk status even if they are able to demonstrate a negligible risk of entry and/or exposure to the BSE agent for more than the average incubation period;
  o have been adapted from a model (the BSurvE model) that has been designed during the peak of the epizootic, based on assumptions some of which are known today as being incorrect, and that are now considered outdated;

As a result, the surveillance provisions currently required for the recognition of BSE risk status and for its annual maintenance are considered (i) not proportionate to the risk, (ii) an unjustified trade barrier for less resourced countries.
b) Youngest case of classical BSE be born more than 11 years ago:

- Impact on countries with an already recognised negligible BSE risk status:
  
  The identification of a single case of classical BSE born less than 11 years ago leads to the withdrawal of the negligible risk status and to a suspension of status or to a downgrade to a controlled risk status, until 11 years have elapsed since the date of birth of the case -even if there is no evidence of any breach in the measures mitigating the risk of exposure to the BSE agent. This situation was faced by three countries to date that lost their previously negligible BSE risk status.

- Impact on countries that do not yet have a recognised negligible BSE risk status:
  
  Countries that can demonstrate a negligible risk of exposure of the BSE agent over an incubation period cannot be recognised as having a negligible risk status until 11 years have elapsed since the date of birth of the youngest case. Several countries recognised as having a controlled BSE risk status have been able to demonstrate a negligible risk of exposure to the BSE agent but have had to wait several years (and some are still waiting) to apply and be officially recognised as a negligible risk country. Some countries artificially (i.e. not on the basis of an actual distinct sanitary status) considered a zoning approach to be able to benefit the more advantageous trade conditions required for animals and products from zones recognised as having a negligible BSE risk.

Overall, considering the measures that are continuously applied to mitigate the risk of exposure of the BSE agent, the requirement for the youngest case of classical BSE to be born more than 11 years ago is considered not proportionate to the risk that may be associated with the occurrence of a single case, provided that appropriate investigations have not demonstrated evidence of a breach in the control measures that could have led to an increased risk of exposure.

c) List of commodities that should not be traded:

Two OIE ad hoc Groups of experts convened to differentiate atypical BSE from classical BSE in the Terrestrial Code Chapter were of the opinion that the risk of recycling of the atypical BSE agent should be mitigated by additional requirements to the Terrestrial Code and therefore recommended to increase the list of commodities that should not be traded, including from countries having a negligible risk status. However:

- The prevalence of atypical BSE is estimated to be around 1 in 1 million cattle.
- The Commission reiterates that OIE standards should be risk-based.
- The membership of the OIE ad hoc groups reflect the historical geographical distribution of BSE, countries that have already developed the advanced surveillance and risk mitigation systems to manage BSE and atypical BSE, but this may not properly reflect the real global concern and preparedness to invest in risk management associated with atypical BSE.

As a result, the Commission considered that increasing the list of commodities that should not be traded would not be proportionate to the risk associated with atypical BSE.

d) Basis for the differentiation of controlled and negligible BSE risk status:

The Commission considered the criteria for distinguishing negligible and controlled BSE risk status.

According to Chapter 11.4.4., a country may be recognised as having a negligible risk status and have to implement a type B surveillance, if the following criteria are fulfilled: i) outcome of the risk assessment negligible; ii) evidence of an effective feed ban for at least 8 years; iii) absence of indigenous case of classical BSE born less than 11 years ago. Non-compliance with one of these requirements would prevent a country to be officially recognised as presenting a negligible risk with regard to BSE. The corresponding country may however be recognised as having a controlled BSE risk and would have to conduct a type A surveillance.
The Commission suggested that the duration of implementation of an effective feed ban and the time elapsed since the birth of the youngest indigenous case of classical BSE could be qualitatively taken into consideration in the risk assessment. The occurrence of a BSE case younger than 11 years old would therefore not systematically impact the BSE risk status. The distinction between the controlled and the negligible BSE risk status would therefore rely on the outcome of the risk assessment and the surveillance.

**Conclusion 1:**

As a result of the points listed above, the Commission concluded that Chapter 11.4. of the *Terrestrial Code* on BSE should be revised in depth.

The revision should focus on:
- the relevance of maintaining categorisation of country’s status for trade purposes;
- appropriate requirements for Member Countries’ categorisation, if retained;
- the trade requirements;
- the complete revision of the surveillance system specifications.

2) **Relevance of an official recognition of BSE risk status by the OIE**

The Commission considered the following points:

a) Decrease of prevalence of classical BSE:
   - the prevalence of classical BSE has drastically decreased since the implementation of effective control measures. The prevalence is now estimated to be 1 case in 1 million cattle;
   - the data show that we have reached the tail of the epidemic curve;
   - the prevalence of classical BSE is now close to the prevalence of atypical BSE.

b) Proven effectiveness of control measures implemented:
   - Studies have demonstrated the link between the implementation of the feed ban and the decrease of classical BSE prevalence;
   - These measures are also effective vis-a-vis atypical BSE, which is hypothesised to occur sporadically. Those measures should therefore be maintained over time to prevent the recycling of atypical BSE and the generation of a new epidemic.

c) Evolution of the risk associated with BSE:
   - In the early 90s, the concerns associated with the emergence of BSE and associated public health risks justified giving a high priority to the BSE risk in the context of international trade and the inclusion of BSE in the list of diseases for which the OIE offers official recognition.
   - Nowadays, as a result of the successful implementation of effective control measures, the prevalence of BSE is extremely low, the global sanitary impact associated with BSE is very low, as is the public health risk. The OIE should be devoting its expertise and resources to higher priorities.

d) Consequences of an official status recognition:
   - The purpose of the official recognition by the OIE of disease status is to facilitate international trade. Conversely, the absence of an officially recognised status for a given country may represent a trade barrier. Considering the shortcomings of the current provisions of the *Terrestrial Code* for the recognition of negligible and controlled BSE risk status (as identified above), the system for official recognition of BSE risk status by the OIE may itself represent an unjustified sanitary trade barrier.
e) Scope of an official recognition:

There are no formal criteria to select diseases included in the OIE procedure for official recognition of status. Proposals are made by OIE Delegates and the feasibility studied by the Scientific Commission with the possible support of ad hoc groups. Those proposals are usually initially based on the perceived global importance or global impact of a given disease. Similarly, it should be possible for the Delegates to update the list of selected diseases by removing diseases in light of their decreasing importance.

f) Interests in the official recognition process:

- Countries that have already successfully achieved OIE official recognition of BSE negligible risk status may have an interest in that status continuing to be recognised in a formal system.
- Experts that operate research facilities for BSE or that otherwise benefit from the OIE and their national authorities maintaining BSE as a high priority may also have an interest in continuation of official recognition.

g) Potential for proliferation of national recognition systems and processes:

- Some countries operate existing national systems to recognise BSE risk that sit outside the OIE official recognition system. There is a risk that, if the demand for categorisation of risk status remains, we could see a proliferation of national systems that may be poorly harmonised with OIE standards.

### Conclusion 2

As a result of the points listed above, the Commission recommended that the continuation of the official recognition by the OIE of Member Countries’ BSE risk status be discussed by OIE Delegates. The OIE should explore Member Countries’ opinions and, if relevant and supported, identify the best approach for the discontinuation of the official recognition by the OIE of Member Countries’ BSE risk status.

The Commission clarified that should the OIE World Assembly ask the OIE to discontinue the official recognition of BSE risk status, BSE would still remain an OIE-listed disease and the corresponding chapter in the *Terrestrial Code* would be still regularly updated as deemed appropriate. Categorisation for trade could be based on self-declarations.
A joint meeting of the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (Scientific Commission) and the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (Code Commission) was convened at the OIE Headquarters in Paris on 16 February 2017.

Dr Monique Eloit, the Director General, at the outset, extended her warm welcome to all the members. In her opening remarks she emphasised the significance and importance of the work of the Specialist Commissions and supported greater collaboration and coordination of issues of common interest and concern to better address the needs of the Member Countries. After the opening remarks of the Director General, agenda items were taken up for discussion. The meeting was then chaired by Dr Matthew Stone, Deputy Director General of the OIE.

SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS

1. Issues of mutual interests – *Terrestrial Code*

   a) Horizontal chapters

   i) Chapter 4.3. Zoning and compartmentalisation

      The President of the Code Commission noted that this was a key horizontal chapter of the OIE *Terrestrial Code* as it has an impact on the disease-specific chapters and as such it was the appropriate place to include the new concepts on zoning. In view of the importance of this chapter, it was agreed that a representative of the Scientific Commission would participate in the Code Commission meeting in order to assist with the discussion of some of the critical issues of the chapter.

      The meeting identified certain issues of immediate attention and proposed to look at those issues as a priority during the discussion at the Code Commission. The areas identified were:

      – how to define the protection zone;

      – ways to allow more than one containment zone in a country;

      – new zoning concepts proposed by the *ad hoc* Group on FMD in response to Member Countries’ comments.

   ii) Draft new chapter on management of outbreaks of listed diseases

      It was noted that the new chapter on management of outbreaks of listed disease had already been drafted by the Code Commission.

      The meeting agreed that the two Commissions will work in parallel in developing the new chapter on management of outbreaks of listed diseases taking into account comments of the Member Countries.
iii) Chapter 1.6. Procedure for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE

The Headquarters updated the Commissions on progress towards the revision and harmonisation, when relevant, of the questionnaires for the official recognition of disease status for six diseases (AHS, BSE, CBPP, CSF, FMD, and PPR) and the official control programme for three diseases (CBPP, FMD, PPR) included in Chapter 1.6. It also noted the progress on strengthening of the procedures for self-declaration of disease freedom.

The revised questionnaires have been prepared by the OIE Headquarters, in consultation with each ad hoc Group on disease status and the Scientific Commission, and presented to the Terrestrial Code Commission for further circulation for Member Countries’ comments.

Both Commissions were of the view that these revised questionnaires should be circulated to Member Countries for comment and in addition agreed to seek their views on the removal of the questionnaires from the Terrestrial Code. The questionnaires would then only be available on the OIE website and could be revised and updated as necessary.

iv) Chapter 1.4. Animal Health Surveillance

The OIE Headquarters presented a brief update on on-going preparatory activities towards convening an ad hoc Group on animal health surveillance, tentatively scheduled to be held in June 2017.

The Code Commission asked the OIE Headquarters to provide it with an opportunity to participate in developing the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the ad hoc Group to accurately convey the Member Countries’ specific requests for a revision of the chapter. It was agreed that there was a need for participation of representatives of both Commissions in the planned meeting of the ad hoc Group.

v) Antimicrobial resistance

The Headquarters gave a brief update to the Commissions on the ongoing discussion about the proposed definitions for ‘therapeutic use’, ‘preventative use’ and ‘growth promotion’ proposed by the ad hoc Group on AMR, with a view to update Chapter 6.8.

The Code Commission took note of the report of the ad hoc Group on AMR (January 2017), which had been endorsed by the Scientific Commission and its advice on the Member Countries comments on the proposed amendments of Chapter 6.7. The Code Commission also indicated that the revised Chapter 6.7. and the proposed new definitions related to AMR would be circulated for Member Countries’ comments. The Code Commission also noted that revision of Chapter 6.8. would be included in its work programme with a view to further discussion at its September 2017 meeting.

b) Disease-specific chapters

i) Chapter 8.15. Infection with rinderpest – proposal for revised definition

The Commissions considered the amendments proposed by a Member Country and the FAO-OIE Rinderpest Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) on the definition of rinderpest virus (RPV) containing material in Chapter 8.15. and agreed to circulate the revised definition for Member Countries’ comments with a view to its adoption in 2018.

ii) Chapter 8.X. Infection with Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex

The Scientific Commission noted that it had provided the scientific reference to support the proposed amendments made in the chapter and the Code Commission noted that it anticipated this would go for adoption in 2017.
iii) Chapters on equine and non-equine trypanosomiasis

a) revised Chapter 12.3. on infection with Trypanozoon in equids (dourine, equine surra), and

b) the draft new Chapter 8.X. on infection with Trypanosoma evansi (non-equine surra)

The Scientific Commission explained that since it had identified some inconsistencies between the two draft chapters proposed by an ad hoc Group on equine trypanosomiasis, it decided there was a need to revisit the chapters before forwarding them to the Code Commission for further consideration. The Code Commission noted that in light of its full agenda it would not have an opportunity to review these chapters until its September 2017 meeting.

iv) Chapter 8.8. Infection with foot and mouth disease virus (FMD)

The Scientific Commission advised that the proposed amendments on the FMD chapter had been forwarded to the Code Commission for consideration. It also noted that an ad hoc Group was to be convened in order to explore and develop other tools that may allow the introduction of more flexibility in the waiting periods for recovery of free status.

The Code Commission advised that it would take into consideration the comments provided by the Scientific Commission and the report of the ad hoc Group on FMD held in June 2016. It was agreed that a representative of the Scientific Commission would participate in the 2nd week of the Code Commission in order to facilitate the discussion on several key articles of the chapter.

v) Chapter 12.10. Infection with Burkholderia mallei

The Scientific Commission explained that extensive comments from Member Countries on the amended articles on surveillance were sent to it for advice. It was decided to consult the OIE experts on glanders in order to address these comments and the expert opinion would be considered at its September 2017 meeting.

The Code Commission noted that in light of the need for further expert opinion and that the Biological Standards Commission had proposed a revised Manual chapter on glanders for Member Country comments and possible adoption in 2018, it would make a decision on the next step in revising the chapter in the course of its meeting.

The Chair of the joint meeting drew attention to the fact that the revised chapter on glanders had been proposed for adoption in May 2017 in the Code Commission’s September 2016 meeting report, and requested the Code Commission to give clear explanation in its report on the decision on this chapter in order to avoid unnecessary confusion.

vi) Chapter 11.11. Infection with lumpy skin disease (LSD)

The Scientific Commission explained that it had proposed amendments to the recovery of free status in response to questions arising from comments from a Member Country. The Code Commission noted that it would undertake the review of the revised chapter in the course of its meeting and anticipated that it would be able to propose it for adoption in May 2017.

2. Other business

a) Peste des petits ruminants (PPR) Mongolia – situation

The Code Commission noted that the recent PPR outbreaks in Mongolia have raised concerns and that there was a need to review the epidemiological role of wildlife in this disease.

The Scientific Commission agreed with the need for further scientific evidence to clarify the role of wildlife in the epidemiology of PPR in Mongolia. It however noted that the current provisions on wildlife in the Terrestrial Code are still valid and there is no need for a revision of the chapter at this stage.
b) Updating of Commissions’ work programmes - 5 key priorities per commission for 2017

The Chair invited each Commission to present the 5 key priority issues on their work programmes.

The Scientific Commission highlighted the following key priority areas for 2017:

- revision of waiting period for the recovery of FMD free status;
- revision of Chapter 1.4. on surveillance;
- revision of Chapter 4.3. on zoning and compartmentalisation;
- proposed new concepts in FMD chapter;
- revision of 15 questionnaires in Chapter 1.6.

The Code Commission highlighted the following key priority areas for 2017:

- revision and reorganisation of Chapter 1.6.;
- restructure of Section 4 (especially new chapters on outbreak management and vaccination);
- revision of chapters on veterinary public health (especially on Chapters 6.1. and 6.2.);
- revision of Chapter 10.4. on AI;
- revision of Chapter 15.2. on CSF.

3. Information on recent & upcoming ad hoc Group meetings

The OIE Headquarters noted there were a number of ad hoc Group meetings planned for the coming year and that given budget constraints there may be a need to prioritise them. It also noted that the timing of ad hoc Group meetings impacted on the ability of the Commissions to fully consider these reports, particularly where the ad hoc Group was proposing significant change to chapters in response to Member Countries’ comments.

4. Dates of next meetings

The OIE Headquarters noted that the dates for the September meetings would not allow for a joint meeting; however it was anticipated that this scheduling would allow for greater interaction between the Secretariats of the Commissions and facilitate better exchange of information between the two Commissions.

5. Coordination between the Specialist Commissions

The secretariat updated the Commissions on the progress being made to provide a more harmonised approach to the provision of secretariat functions to the four Commissions including strengthening and clarifying roles and responsibilities of the secretariat, better planning and coordination of agendas.

Noting that the members of Specialist Commissions are in general not Delegates it was agreed to circulate the unofficial reports of both Commissions to Members of the Commissions at the same time as they were uploaded to the Delegate website.

As part of new efforts to improve coordination, the secretariat proposed mechanisms for communication between Commissions in between regular meetings. Two possible scenarios were presented: 1) to create a meeting of the bureaus of the Commissions during the General Session; and 2) to utilise a teleconference with members of the Commissions to follow up on specific topics with the Headquarters between Commission meetings and report back to the respective Commissions.

Both Commissions expressed their full support for the initiative proposed by the secretariat and agreed that there was a need to work more closely between sessions.
## WORK PROGRAMME OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION FOR ANIMAL DISEASES (FEB. 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Progress before Feb 2017 SCAD meeting</th>
<th>Summary of agenda items</th>
<th>SCAD decision Feb 2017</th>
<th>Future action plan</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrestrial Animal Health Code Chapters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glossary</strong></td>
<td>Circulated for comments after Sep 2016 TAHSC meeting</td>
<td>Review Member Country comments on the amended definitions related to zoning and compartmentalisation</td>
<td>Revision of the concepts</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch. 1.4 Animal Health Surveillance</strong></td>
<td>AHG to review the chapter to be convened by the OIE</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Participate in the AHG</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch. 1.6 Procedures for self-declaration and official recognition</strong></td>
<td>The disease-specific questionnaires for official recognition were amended by the responsible AHGs and harmonised by OIE HQ</td>
<td>Questionnaires endorsed</td>
<td>To be circulated for Member Country comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review the procedures for self-declaration</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The procedures for self-declaration to be further reviewed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch. 8.15 Rinderpest</strong></td>
<td>A proposal to amend Article 8.15.1 was requested by Joint rinderpest advisory committee</td>
<td>Review the proposal</td>
<td>Proposed amendments and sent to TAHSC</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch 4.3 zoning and compartmentalisation</strong></td>
<td>Circulated for comments after Sep 2016 TAHSC meeting</td>
<td>Review Member Countries comments</td>
<td>The concept of multiple zones and containment zones was discussed with TAHSC</td>
<td>Follow up ensuring consideration with proposal by the FMD ad hoc Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch. 8.8 Infection with foot and mouth virus</strong></td>
<td>Some new concepts were proposed by the ad hoc Group and SCAD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The proposed modifications were further discussed with TAHSC</td>
<td>Further elaborate the new concepts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in the AHG on review of alternatives for recovery period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch. 8.X Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex</strong></td>
<td>Circulated for third round of comments after Sep 2016 TAHSC meeting</td>
<td>Review Member Countries comments</td>
<td>Proposed amendments and scientific references. Sent to TAHSC</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>Progress before Feb 2017 SCAD meeting</td>
<td>Summary of agenda items</td>
<td>SCAD decision Feb 2017</td>
<td>Future action plan</td>
<td>Priority 1 = top priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch 8.X Trypanosoma evansi (not including surra)</td>
<td>The structure of the amended chapters were revised</td>
<td>Reconsider the amended chapters</td>
<td>Recommend harmonisation and consistency between the two chapters. Proposed amendments and sent to TAHSC</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch 12.3 Dourine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH. 8.13 Infection with rabies virus</td>
<td>An ad hoc Group on rabies was requested to the DG</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Participate in the ad hoc Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 11.11 Lumpy skin disease</td>
<td>Circulated for second round of comments after Sep 2016 TAHSC meeting</td>
<td>Review Member Country Comments on the amended chapter</td>
<td>Proposed amendments and sent to TAHSC</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 11.4 BSE</td>
<td>OIE elaborated technical document assessing the current risk associated with BSE, the standards the link with official recognition of risk.</td>
<td>Consider the technical document.</td>
<td>Chapter 11.4 should be revised in detail Discussion on the official recognition for BSE should be initiated</td>
<td>Annex the document to SCAD report and present it at General Session Plan a dedicated ad hoc Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 11.12 Theileriosis</td>
<td>Ad hoc Group convened</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Revised the amended chapter in September</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 12.10 Glanders</td>
<td>Circulated for comments after the amendments of the article on surveillance</td>
<td>Review Member Country Comments</td>
<td>Consult OIE Glanders experts to address Member countries comments</td>
<td>Review experts’ opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 15.1 African swine fever</td>
<td>Circulated for third round of comments after Sep TAHSC meeting 2016</td>
<td>Review Member Countries Comments</td>
<td>Proposed amendments and sent to TAHSC</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch 15.2 Classical swine fever</td>
<td>Proposed amendments were sent to TAHSC in September 2016</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. X.X Vaccination</td>
<td>Circulated for first round of comments after Sep TAHSC meeting 2016</td>
<td>Review Member Country Comments</td>
<td>Proposed amendments and sent to TAHSC</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. X.X PRRS</td>
<td>Circulated for third round of comments after Sep TAHSC meeting 2016</td>
<td>Review Member Country Comments</td>
<td>Proposed amendments and sent to TAHSC</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equine disease chapters revision</td>
<td>Request harmonisation by HQ</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>Progress before Feb 2017 SCAD meeting</td>
<td>Summary of agenda items</td>
<td>SCAD decision Feb 2017</td>
<td>Future action plan</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc Group (AHG) and Working Group on Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHG on Antimicrobial Resistance</td>
<td>Ad hoc Group convened</td>
<td>Review the ad hoc Group report and consider new proposed definitions</td>
<td>Reviewed or new proposed definitions</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forward report to TAHSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group on Wildlife</td>
<td>The annual meeting took place in November 2016</td>
<td>Review the working group report</td>
<td>Report endorsed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Disease Status Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Member Country dossiers</td>
<td>AHGs evaluation and report</td>
<td>Review the AHG reports</td>
<td>Recommend countries and zones to be recognised in May 2017 (GS85)</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts missions to Member Countries</td>
<td>Field mission conducted</td>
<td></td>
<td>The need of other in-country missions discussed</td>
<td>Consider the deployment of other missions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up of Member Countries with official disease status or with suspended status</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Review the situation and progress made in countries under specific scrutiny</td>
<td>Situation in the listed countries revised</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of annual reconfirmations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Comprehensive review of countries’ annual reconfirmations identified in Sept. 2016</td>
<td>Report of the annual reconfirmation assessments</td>
<td>Follow up with some Member countries that still need to provide additional information for the 2016 annual reconfirmation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation the requirements in the Terrestrial Code</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Review discrepancies between the requirements of the disease-specific Chapters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up the progress made by OIE HQ in Sept. 2017</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work programme of the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases

#### Topics

| Topics                                                                 | Progress before Feb 2017 SCAD meeting | Summary of agenda items                                                                 | SCAD decision Feb 2017          | Future action plan                                      | Priority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of Status recognition procedures</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Update on the Standard Operating Procedures and internal protocols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official recognition of BSE risk status</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Consideration on the official recognition of BSE risk status</td>
<td>Technical document assessing the current risk associated with BSE</td>
<td>Follow up in Sept. 2017</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of PVS Critical Competences relevant for endorsement of official control programme and official status recognition</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Consider the PVS tool during the assessment for the official status recognition</td>
<td>OIE HQ to identify the cc that may be relevant for disease status recognition</td>
<td>Follow up the progress made by OIE HQ</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Liaison with other Commissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissions</th>
<th>Progress before Feb 2017 SCAD meeting</th>
<th>Summary of agenda items</th>
<th>SCAD decision Feb 2017</th>
<th>Future action plan</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAHSC</td>
<td>Ongoing coordination</td>
<td>Discuss issues of common interest</td>
<td>Joint meeting celebrated</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>Ongoing coordination</td>
<td>Update on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i) Equine and non-equine trypanosomoses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Classical Swine Fever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Interpretation of diagnostic test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Ch 4.x Vaccination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Global Control/Eradication Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Progress before Feb 2017 SCAD meeting</th>
<th>Summary of agenda items</th>
<th>SCAD decision Feb 2017</th>
<th>Future action plan</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global eradication of PPR</td>
<td>Ongoing update</td>
<td>Update of the progress made</td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global control of FMD</td>
<td>Ongoing update</td>
<td>Update of the progress made</td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evaluation of applications for OIE Collaborating Centre status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Progress before Feb 2017 SCAD meeting</th>
<th>Summary of agenda items</th>
<th>SCAD decision Feb 2017</th>
<th>Future action plan</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In veterinary epidemiology, risk assessment and public health</td>
<td>Application received by the OIE</td>
<td>Evaluation application</td>
<td>Suggest modification in the content and title of the application</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Follow up of conferences, meeting, mission with impact in the OIE mandate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Progress before Feb 2017 SCAD meeting</th>
<th>Summary of agenda items</th>
<th>SCAD decision Feb 2017</th>
<th>Future action plan</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated on events relevant to the SCAD mandate</td>
<td>Ongoing update</td>
<td>Follow up the events relevant to the SCAD mandate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Disease/infection specific issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Progress before Feb 2017 SCAD meeting</th>
<th>Summary of agenda items</th>
<th>SCAD decision Feb 2017</th>
<th>Future action plan</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FMD</strong></td>
<td>Expert consultation on the inactivation of FMDV in milk and cream</td>
<td>Assess expert opinion</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update on the FMD ref lab network</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urged Member Countries to remain vigilant to new FMDV strains</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration FMDV serotype C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Propose a draft resolution for the progressive elimination or sequestration of FMD serotype C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MERS-CoV</strong></td>
<td>Case definition was drafted by the experts</td>
<td>Revise the case definitions of MERS-CoV infection in camels</td>
<td>Endorse case definition and suggest its publication</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chronic wasting disease of cervids</strong></td>
<td>Consultation with the WG on wildlife, and revision of EFSA scientific opinion</td>
<td>Consideration of the information</td>
<td>Not sufficient information available. Encourage countries to report to the OIE through WAHIS-Wild</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical fact sheet on Schmallenberg virus</strong></td>
<td>Letter received by the OIE indicating the incorrect use of the information provided in the fact sheet</td>
<td>Consideration of the requirements</td>
<td>Trade restrictions due to Schmallenberg are not justified Update the factsheet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replacement of international standard bovine tuberculin</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing activities</td>
<td>Update on the progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rinderpest eradication</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing activities</td>
<td>Update on the elimination of rinderpest virus material activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological threat reduction</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing activities</td>
<td>Update on the activities related to biological threat reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>