



**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION  
OF CLASSICAL SWINE FEVER STATUS OF MEMBERS<sup>1</sup>**  
**Paris, 04 – 06 December 2018**

---

A meeting of the OIE *ad hoc* Group on the Evaluation of Classical swine fever (CSF) Status of Members (hereafter the Group) was held at the OIE Headquarters from 04 to 06 December 2018.

**1. Opening**

Dr Matthew Stone, Deputy Director General for International Standards and Sciences of the OIE, welcomed and thanked the Group for its commitment and its support towards the OIE in fulfilling the mandates given by Members. Dr Stone acknowledged the amount of work before, during and after the *ad hoc* Group meeting in reviewing the dossiers and documenting the Group's assessment in the report.

Dr Stone highlighted the importance of the quality of the report to be scrutinised by Members before adopting the proposed list of countries free from CSF. 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 outcomes for further improvement in maintenance of their CSF free status.

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, as well as the declaration of potential conflict of interests related to the mandate of the Group. The declared interests were reviewed by the OIE and the Group and it was agreed that none represented a potential conflict in the evaluation of CSF status of Members.

Dr Stone mentioned about the current animal health situation of African swine fever (ASF) and how it has reinforced international standards on risk assessment and its management, and implementation of biosecurity measures on the farms, for which are commonly important and similar in parts with CSF.

The experts and the OIE welcomed Drs Sandra Blome and Vitor Gonçalves as new members of the Group.

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

The Group was chaired by Dr Vitor Gonçalves. Dr Trevor Drew 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: This ad hoc Group report reflects the views of its members and may not necessarily reflect the views of the OIE. This report should be read in conjunction with the February 2019 report of the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases because this report provides its considerations and comments. It is available at: <http://www.oie.int/en/international-standard-setting/specialists-commissions-groups/scientific-commission-reports/meetings-reports/>

### 3. Evaluation of requests from Members for the status recognition of CSF free countries

#### a) Latvia

In October 2018, Latvia submitted a dossier for the official recognition of its CSF free status.

The Group requested additional information and received clarification from Latvia.

##### i) *Animal disease reporting*

The Group acknowledged that Latvia had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting and that CSF was a notifiable disease in the country as per legislation.

##### ii) *Veterinary Services*

The Group was informed that Latvia had a CSF expert group consisting of Food and Veterinary Service (FVS) representatives, representatives of the National Reference Laboratory, the State Forest Service, wildlife biologists, the Latvian pig keeper association, the Latvian Hunter association and the Joint Stock Company "Latvia's State Forests".

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

In particular, the Group acknowledged the information on wildlife demographics in Latvia. The Group noted that wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) was the favoured and most abundant large game in Latvia representing nearly 70% of the annually hunted ungulates. The Group noted that the overall population declined considerably over the last four years (after the introduction of African swine fever into Latvia).

Latvia described four types of pig production in the country: large commercial farms with more than 200 pigs, small breeding farms, small fattening farms, and backyard farms with up to ten pigs for self-consumption.

The Group noted that all establishments with farmed animals were registered. Latvia informed that a unique identification number was assigned to each farm and that data on establishments and animals kept were recorded in a national computer database. Pigs were identified with an ear tag or tattoo displaying the unique registration number of the establishment (at the latest, prior to leaving the premises). The FVS was performing annual on spot controls of animal identification, registration and traceability. Latvia informed that these controls were intensified due to the eradication programmes for ASF and CSF.

The Group acknowledged that the main pattern of pig movement was from farm to slaughterhouse. The Group noted that all movements had to be notified 24 hours in advance to an official veterinarian and recorded in the Agricultural data centre database. All animals were subject to ante- and post-mortem inspection at slaughterhouses.

The Group noted that the FVS organised meetings with veterinarians, staff of State Forest Service, hunters and representatives of local municipalities on the CSF situation and necessary eradication measures in the defined infected and risk areas. Furthermore, Latvia informed that the FVS conducted awareness campaigns through press, radio and television and prepared the booklets and leaflets for pig owners/ keepers about both diseases, CSF and ASF.

*iii) Situation of CSF in the past 12 months*

The Group noted that the last outbreak of CSF in domestic pigs occurred in June 2014 and in March 2015 in wild boar.

*iv) Absence of vaccination in the past 12 months*

The Group acknowledged that vaccination of domestic pigs against CSF had ceased in Latvia in 1997, and vaccination against CSF was prohibited since 2004 as per legislation.

The Group noted that the oral vaccination of wild boar with CSF live attenuated vaccine was carried out in an area bordering countries with undetermined CSF status from May 2013 to November 2015. Latvia clarified that the last campaign of oral vaccination in wild boar was in November 2015.

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

The Group noted that passive surveillance was in place for all pig sectors in Latvia.

The Group noted that Latvia designated different areas along the border with neighbouring countries with undetermined CSF status with heightened surveillance, particularly in wild boar.

The Group acknowledged the information on the sampling strategy and results of serological and virological surveillance conducted in domestic pigs in Latvia. In response to the request of the Group, Latvia provided revised and more detailed information on false-positive results obtained on screening tests and details of follow-up actions taken on all suspicious and positive results and on how these findings were interpreted and acted upon to rule-out CSF.

The Group acknowledged that all hunted and wild boar found dead were tested for the presence of CSF antibodies by ELISA and CSFV genome by RT-PCR. The Group noted that additionally to the active surveillance, passive surveillance was in place and involved hunters and gamekeepers who were instructed to report all dead wild boar to the FVS.

The Group noted that laboratory diagnosis of the CSF was carried out at the national Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory and all diagnostic methods used for the laboratory diagnosis of the CSF were accredited standard methods in accordance with ISO/IEC 17025 with an exception of genome sequencing that was not accredited due to lack of samples. The Group acknowledged that the laboratory in Latvia participated regularly in the inter-laboratory proficiency testing organised by the OIE Reference Laboratory in Hannover, Germany. The Group concluded that Latvia had a sufficient level laboratory capability for CSF diagnosis in the country.

*vi) Regulatory measures for the early detection, prevention and control of CSF*

Latvia informed that the FVS performs risk analysis based on the information available on WAHIS and Animal Disease Notification System of the European Union and coordinates prevention measures in close collaboration with neighbouring countries.

From the information provided in the dossier, the Group noted that Latvia implemented the conditions prescribed by the European Union legislation with regard to the importation of pigs and pig products. The Group also noted that documentary, identity and physical checks were performed at the Border Inspection Posts. As part of a physical check, a laboratory test might be carried out in accordance with the national monitoring plans, to verify that the animal product does not contain any residues, contaminants, pathogens or other substances dangerous for animal and public health.

The Group was informed from the additional information received from Latvia that the biosecurity measures were mandatory for all farms, including backyard farms. Latvia also informed that there were continuous education campaigns conducted amongst pig producers to maintain the level of awareness in the country.

In response to the request of the Group, Latvia informed that the slaughter performed on non-commercial pig farms was intended for their own consumption.

Latvia provided a contingency plan with regard to the control of CSF. The Group took note that a general part of the contingency plan was updated at least once in two years whilst the operational manuals on control of specific diseases had to be updated at least every five years and more frequently in the case where there were changes in legislation or specific disease situations.

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

The Group took note that an outdoor housing system for domestic pigs was prohibited in Latvia since 2014, based on the biosecurity requirements described in the national legislation.

viii) *Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.9.1.*

The Group agreed that the submitted dossier was broadly compliant with the format of the questionnaire in Article 1.9.1. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

#### Conclusion

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and the answers from Latvia to the questions raised, the Group considered that the application was generally compliant with the requirements of Chapter 15.2. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.9.1. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Group therefore recommended that Latvia be recognised as a CSF free country.

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

- Documented evidence on implementation of biosecurity at farms, particularly in small scale non-commercial farms. This information could include, but not be limited to, records and number of biosecurity inspections conducted with any detected non-compliance and follow-up actions taken;
- Reporting details of any veterinary investigations carried out, following reports from farmers or veterinarians in the backyard sector – including those where CSF was ruled out on clinical grounds.

#### **b) Uruguay**

In October 2018, Uruguay submitted a dossier for the official recognition of its CSF free status.

The Group requested additional information and received clarification from Uruguay.

i) *Animal disease reporting*

The Group acknowledged that Uruguay had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting and that CSF was a notifiable disease in the country as per legislation.

ii) *Veterinary Services*

The Group acknowledged that the official Veterinary Service of Uruguay consisted of three divisions: the Animal Health Division (DSA), the Animal Industry Division (DIA) and the Veterinary Laboratories Division (DILAVE), and had a network of zonal and local veterinary offices.

The Group noted that the information on pig population was recorded in the National System for Livestock Information (SNIG). The Group took note that there were three types of pig farms in Uruguay (breeding, fattening and farrow-to-finish). Uruguay informed that approximately 90% of pig producers had less than 50 animals and that pig production was concentrated in the south of the country, notably in the departments of Canelones and San Jose that account for 54% of the pig population in Uruguay.

The Group noted the pig demographics of Uruguay and the information on wild boar, feral pigs and their crossbreeds, which are spread throughout the country at a density between 0.52 to 1.17 animals/km<sup>2</sup>. Uruguay provided additional information to describe the method used to estimate the population density. The Group noted that wild boars were introduced in Uruguay in the 1920s for hunting purposes and that, due to intentional release or escapes, they had spread throughout the country. Uruguay informed that keeping wild pigs in captivity had been authorised since 2001. The Group noted that there were two farms of wild boar that were regularly inspected by the Veterinary Service.

From the information provided in the dossier, the Group acknowledged that the collard peccary (*Pecari tajacu*) was the only native mammal from the family *Tayassuidae* in Uruguay and that their population comprised 450 peccaries kept in captivity in 15 parks and zoological gardens in 13 departments of the country. The Group took note that in 2017 the M'Bopicuá Park in Río Negro released 100 peccaries into the wild and that these animals were subsequently monitored by the Veterinary Service.

The Group acknowledged that Uruguay had a group traceability system. Individual pig identification was specifically carried out with pedigree animals and was managed by the Rural Association of Uruguay. Although this was not an official system, records were controlled by the competent authorities. The Group took note that the producers had to make an annual declaration of their herds of cattle, sheep, pigs, horses and goats. The Group noted that all movements of any species of livestock were only permitted in conformity with the Property and Transport Guide, a document indicating the new owner or manager and the locations for the place of departure and arrival, along with descriptions of the categories, animal brandings, transporter, itinerary, etc., thus generating information for group traceability.

The Group noted that all abattoirs were under official veterinary inspection performed by the Veterinary Services. In addition, animal shows, auctions, fairs, and markets were subject to sanitary control by the Veterinary Services.

From the additional information provided by Uruguay, the Group noted that in 2016 and 2017 the awareness activities were targeted at hunters, producers and private practice veterinarians, focusing on animal disease surveillance in wild boar.

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

iii) *Situation of CSF in the past 12 months*

The Group acknowledged that the last CSF outbreak in Uruguay was in November 1991. Therefore, Uruguay was eligible to claim historical freedom from CSF as described in Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

iv) *Absence of vaccination in the past 12 months*

The Group acknowledged that vaccination against CSF had ceased in Uruguay in October 1995 and since then was prohibited as per legislation.

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

The Group acknowledged that Uruguay had passive surveillance in place established for exotic diseases. Since pigs would not have immunity to CSF, detection of suspect cases could be based on clinical signs.

The Group noted from the dossier that CSF would be tentatively diagnosed by clinical observations and post-mortem lesions. The official Veterinary Service periodically undertook clinical inspections of pigs within the framework of activities such as the movement of animals to slaughter, ante-mortem inspection at abattoirs, shows, markets and other sites of animal gathering. The Group appreciated the detailed description provided by Uruguay on how CSF suspicions were followed up to rule-out CSF and reach a final differential diagnosis.

The Group noted that risk-based serological surveillance was conducted in June 2017, targeted at herds that had been positive for PRRS, including establishments that had imported breeding stock either in the form of live animals and/or semen. The sample design assumed a diagnostic test (ELISA) sensitivity of 98.8% and specificity of 99.9%, a 1% herd-prevalence and 3% within-herd prevalence. All samples tested negative. In addition, 92 wild boar samples, obtained from hunting parties, were processed by the Veterinary Services. Uruguay informed that, since 2012, it had carried out structured non-random surveillance in sentinel units, using the framework for foot-and-mouth disease surveillance for those establishments that contain pigs. The country informed that there were 58 establishments involved in the surveillance process, which were visited on an annual basis by the Veterinary Services.

The Group noted that Uruguay had a national reference laboratory for CSF diagnosis in the country, which was accredited to international standards.

vi) *Regulatory measures for early detection, prevention and control of CSF*

The Group acknowledged the good collaboration and coordination on prevention and control of animal health involving different regional organisations and initiatives.

The Group noted that only pigs from officially recognised CSF free countries were allowed into Uruguay. The Group also noted that there was an Import Committee responsible for preparing the requirements for the importation of products of animal origin, establishing details of the sanitary conditions of a general and specific order that must be met in order to allow entry into Uruguay.

The Group noted that 19 permanent official control posts were in place covering the main points of entry into the country for the purpose of zoosanitary and phytosanitary health controls.

From the information provided in the dossier, the Group concluded that when animals or products of animal origin were detected being illegally brought into the country, the Veterinary Authority had the power to permanently confiscate such products and assure their total destruction. The Group took note that there was no detection of illegal entry of pigs in 2016, 2017 and 2018. This permanent control was carried out through the sanitary barriers to prevent passengers and vehicles, by land, sea or air, from bringing animals or plants, their products and by-products into the country, without the corresponding official sanitary certification, as they represent the risk of introducing diseases and pests.

The Group acknowledged that swill feeding, and the removal of waste from the abattoirs that might be used as swill feeding, without prior treatment was prohibited as per legislation. Uruguay also provided additional information on the treatment protocol of swill and oversight to ensure compliance by producers. The Group noted that municipal authorities were responsible for the management of waste and for preventing animals from entering final waste disposal sites.

The Group noted that in case of an emergency, a specific and permanent body for the coordination of public institutions for the comprehensive management of disaster risks in Uruguay, the National Emergency System, comes into operation.

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

The Group noted that medium and large producers used fences and/or perimeter fences to avoid contact with wild pigs. The Group also noted that every farm in Uruguay must have a perimeter fence (there are no communal pastures). From the additional clarification received from Uruguay, the Group was informed that large pig farms had biosecurity plans in place to maintain measures to avoid contact with wild pigs. Uruguay also stated that semi-intensive or extensive farms were concentrated in the south of the country, where there were no forestry areas.

viii) *Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.9.1.*

The Group agreed that the submitted dossier was compliant with the format of the questionnaire in Article 1.9.1. The Group appreciated the well-structured dossier provided by Uruguay and commended the country for the comprehensive answers to the questions raised by the Group.

*Conclusion*

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and the answers received from Uruguay to the questions raised, the Group considered that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapter 15.2., Article 1.4.6. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.9.1. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Group therefore recommended that Uruguay be recognised as a historically CSF free country.

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

- Enhanced disease notification system including the small-scale production sector and provide documented evidence of implementation.

**c) Other requests**

The Group assessed two additional requests from Members for the recognition of CSF free country status. The Group concluded that the Members did not meet the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code* and the dossiers were referred back to the respective applicant Members.

**4. Evaluation of a request from a Member for official recognition of a CSF free zone status**

**a) Ecuador**

In October 2018, Ecuador submitted a dossier for the official recognition of a CSF free zone for the Insular Territory of Galapagos (ITG).

The Group requested additional information and received clarification from Ecuador.

*i) Animal disease reporting*

The Group acknowledged that Ecuador had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting and that CSF was a notifiable disease in the country as per legislation.

*ii) Veterinary Services*

The Group noted that the Veterinary Service of the ITG was under the responsibility of the Biosecurity and Quarantine for Regulation and Control Agency for Galapagos (ABG) created in 2012. The ABG comprised staff working on inspection and quarantine, monitoring, zoosanitary surveillance and phytosanitary surveillance, food safety and the administrative area. The Group noted that the ABG consisted of a Central Office in Santa Cruz, and five insular Operative Technical Offices: three in the ITG (in Isabela, San Cristobal, Floreana) and two in continental Ecuador, in Quito and Guayaquil airports, to coordinate the goods transported from these places.

Ecuador informed that pig production in the ITG was predominantly of small-scale farrow-to-finish herds. The Group acknowledged that the domestic pig population in the ITG was very small, comprising 46 farms and 2432 animals as of 2017. The Island of Santa Cruz holds a large proportion of this population.

The Group noted that animal identification was not implemented in the ITG. However, the ABG conducted periodic animal surveys to determine the size of the animal population; the last census was conducted in 2014 and since then was periodically updated.

The Group noted from the additional information that movement of pigs between the islands of the ITG was prohibited and that pigs were raised for internal consumption in each of the islands of the ITG.

From the information provided in the dossier, the Group concluded that veterinary activities were mainly carried out by veterinarians from the national official services.

*iii) Situation of CSF in the past 12 months*

The Group acknowledged that the last CSF outbreak in the proposed zone of ITG was recorded in 1999.

*iv) Absence of vaccination in the past 12 months*

The Group acknowledged that vaccination against CSF had never been performed in the proposed zone and importation of vaccines against CSF was prohibited as per legislation.

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

The Group noted that in 2014, following the national census of pig population, the activities of the national swine health programme were renewed and included farm supervision, educational communication with producers and technicians and implementation of surveillance activities. Ecuador informed that in 2016 and 2018 serological surveys were conducted to demonstrate the absence of CSF in domestic pigs and feral pigs of the proposed zone. Ecuador informed that the study covered the four islands with pig production, and sampled animals from all registered farms. Ecuador stated that seropositive animals were found in seven out of 45 farms and were resampled and tested by antigen ELISA and resulted negative for CSFV. The Group expressed its concerns with regard to the follow-up testing approach as seropositive animals would not be expected to be positive for antigen. The Group therefore suggested to sample more animals of the same herd to be tested by antibody and antigen ELISA (or preferably RT-PCR) and to follow-up the serology by confirmatory tests, e.g. virus neutralization assays. The Group acknowledged that the complementary investigations on herds with ELISA positive animals should include pathogen detection not only in the reactor animals, but also the in-contact animals and animals which may be epidemiologically linked, in accordance with Article 15.2.28. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Group acknowledged that there was passive surveillance in place. The number of suspicions reported during the past twelve months was low, but the Group considered this was acceptable given the small size of the pig population in the ITG. Nevertheless, the Group strongly encouraged that Ecuador continued strengthening its CSF awareness and monitor the sensitivity of its passive surveillance.

Whilst there was no laboratory for CSF diagnosis in the proposed zone, the Group noted an established protocol for shipment of samples to the national laboratory in continental Ecuador, which was accredited in accordance with ISO 17025: 2017 standards. The Group took note of the ongoing work on the memorandum of understanding for regular inter-laboratory proficiency testing to be done under the Andean Sub-regional Program for the Prevention, Control and Eradication of CSF.

vi) *Regulatory measures for the early detection, prevention and control of CSF*

The Group acknowledged the coordination with neighbouring countries through the Andean Sub-regional CSF Control Strengthening Project.

The Group acknowledged that the introduction of all species of domestic and wild animals including pets from the mainland or from other countries into the proposed zone was restricted. The Group noted that there was no introduction of live animals into the ITG since 1994.

The Group noted that surveillance or quarantine control was carried out in the continental territory of Ecuador, at the airports in Quito and Guayaquil. The Group also noted that inspections were carried out at control points such as airports and ports, both from continental Ecuador (Quito and Guayaquil) and at the destination within the ITG on the inhabited islands. The Group noted that there are currently no regulations managing risks associated with swill feeding of pigs in the ITG, but given the controls on imports considered this was not a critical issue, though it should be addressed.

Ecuador provided a contingency plan for CSF that described all procedures to be followed in case of a CSF outbreak.

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

Ecuador reported that there were no wild pigs in the ITG and that feral pigs were present in three of the four populated islands (Santa Cruz, San Cristobal, and Isabela), with an estimated population of 10,000, of which 75% were in Isabela island. From the information provided by Ecuador and from public online sources, the Group also noted current efforts to eradicate wild and feral pig populations from some islands.

viii) *Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.9.1.*

The Group agreed that the submitted dossier was compliant with the format of the questionnaire in Article 1.9.1. The Group appreciated the concise dossier provided by Ecuador and commended the country for the comprehensive answers to the questions raised by the Group.

*Conclusion*

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and the answers from Ecuador to the questions raised, the Group considered that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapter 15.2. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.9.1. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Group therefore recommended that the proposed zone of the ITG be recognised as free from CSF.

Whilst the Group noted that movement of animals including pigs from continental Ecuador and other countries into the proposed zone was restricted, it strongly reminded that all movement of pigs and their products should continue to comply with Chapter 15.2. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

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

- Improvement of the follow-up investigation of any sero-positive reactors including the laboratory testing, visits and clinical inspections of the farm of origin as well as in-contact animals and animals which may be epidemiologically linked, in accordance with Article 15.2.28. of the *Terrestrial Code*;
- Participation in inter-laboratory proficiency testing for diagnosis of CSF;

- Establishing official regulations or legislation for the inactivation of CSFV in swill in accordance with Article 15.2.22. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

## 5. Other matters

While assessing the Members' applications, the Group noted that some clarity should be brought on the surveillance strategies and recommended a revision of Article 15.2.28. point 2) to provide clearer guidelines on investigations for follow-up and ruling out clinical suspicions.

The Group also suggested to develop the guidance for completing the OIE questionnaire for application for official status recognition in order to improve the clarity and conciseness of the dossiers.

## 6. Adoption of report

The *ad hoc* Group reviewed and amended the draft report. 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.

---

.../Appendices

**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION  
OF CLASSICAL SWINE FEVER STATUS OF MEMBERS  
Paris, 4 – 6 December 2018**

---

**Terms of Reference**

The OIE *ad hoc* group on classical swine fever (CSF) status of Members (the Group) is expected to evaluate the applications for official recognition of CSF free status in accordance with the Standard Operating Procedure for official recognition of disease status.

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

1. Sign off the OIE Undertaking on Confidentiality of information.
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 Members 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;
    - 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.
  - 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 CLASSICAL SWINE FEVER STATUS OF MEMBERS  
Paris, 4 – 6 December 2018**

---

**Agenda**

1. Opening
2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur
3. Evaluation of requests from Members for official recognition of CSF free status
  - Latvia
  - Uruguay
  - Other requests
4. Evaluation of a request from a Member for official recognition of a CSF free zone status
  - Ecuador
5. Other matters
6. Adoption of report

**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION  
OF CLASSICAL SWINE FEVER STATUS OF MEMBERS**

**Paris, 4 – 6 December 2018**

**List of Participants**

**MEMBERS**

---

**Dr Trevor W. Drew**  
Director  
Australian Animal Health Laboratory  
5 Portarlington Road  
Geelong 3220  
Victoria  
AUSTRALIA  
[trevor.drew@csiro.au](mailto:trevor.drew@csiro.au)

**Dr Sandra Blome**  
Friedrich-Loeffler-Institut  
Südufer 10  
17493 Greifswald  
Insel Riems  
GERMANY  
[sandra.blome@fli.de](mailto:sandra.blome@fli.de)

**Dr Vitor S P Goncalves**  
Associate Professor  
EpiPlan – FAV –  
University of Brasilia  
BRAZIL  
[vitorspg@unb.br](mailto:vitorspg@unb.br)

**Mario Eduardo Peña Gonzalez**  
*(invited but could not attend)*  
Director Técnico de Sanidad Animal  
Subgerencia de Protección Animal  
Instituto Agropecuario Colombiano  
Cra 41 N° 17 - 81  
Bogotá D.C.  
COLOMBIA  
[mario.pena@ica.gov.co](mailto:mario.pena@ica.gov.co)

**Dr Francisco Javier Reviriego Gordejo**  
Head of Sector  
Health & Consumers Directorate-General  
DG SANCO/D1  
European Commission  
Rue Froissart 101-3/72  
1040 Brussels  
BELGIUM  
[Francisco.Reviriego-Gordejo@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Francisco.Reviriego-Gordejo@ec.europa.eu)

**Dr Young S. Lyoo**  
*(invited but could not attend)*  
319 College Veterinary Medicine  
Konkuk University  
Seoul 143-701  
[lyoo@konkuk.ac.kr](mailto:lyoo@konkuk.ac.kr)

**REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION**

---

**Dr Silvia Bellini**  
Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale della Lombardia  
e dell'Emilia Romagna "Bruno Ubertini"  
Via Bianchi 9  
25124 Brescia  
ITALY  
[silvia.bellini@izsler.it](mailto:silvia.bellini@izsler.it)

**OIE HEADQUARTERS**

---

**Dr Matthew Stone**  
Deputy Director General  
[oie@oie.int](mailto:oie@oie.int)

**Dr Neo Mapitse**  
Head  
Status Department  
[n.mapitse@oie.int](mailto:n.mapitse@oie.int)

**Dr Min Kyung Park**  
Deputy Head  
Status Department  
[m.park@oie.int](mailto:m.park@oie.int)

**Dr Marija Popovic**  
Chargée de mission  
Status Department  
[m.popovic@oie.int](mailto:m.popovic@oie.int)



**WORLD ORGANISATION FOR ANIMAL HEALTH**  
*Protecting animals, preserving our future*