



Organisation
Mondiale
de la Santé
Animale

World
Organisation
for Animal
Health

Organización
Mundial
de Sanidad
Animal

Original: English
January 2018

**OIE AD HOC GROUP ON KILLING METHODS FOR FARMED REPTILES
FOR THEIR SKINS AND MEAT
ELECTRONIC REVIEW AND TELECONFERENCE¹**

Paris, January 2018

1. Welcome and introduction

The OIE *ad hoc* Group on Killing Methods for Farmed Reptiles for their Skins and Meat (the *ad hoc* Group) conducted a review, electronically, of the draft chapter to consider Member Countries' comments and finalised its review via a teleconference on 25th January 2018.

The electronic work was coordinated by the OIE Headquarters.

The members of the *ad hoc* Group and other participants who participated in the review of the working document are listed at [Annex I](#).

Dr Leopoldo Stuardo, Chargé de mission of the Standards Department, thanked the *ad hoc* Group, on behalf of the Director General, for their commitment to work with the OIE on this important topic.

Dr Stuardo requested that the participants in the teleconference give priority to discussion of the comments on which there were differing points of view, due to time constraints. Dr Slamet Raharjo did not participate in the discussion.

The draft agenda was adopted without modifications. The adopted agenda is at [Annex II](#). Dr Karesh, chair of the *ad hoc* Group, welcomed and thanked the members of the *ad hoc* Group for their dedicated work, and the Member Countries and organisations for sending constructive comments.

2. Review of Member Countries comments on the draft chapter on killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products

The *ad hoc* Group proposed a revised draft Chapter 7.Y. included as [Annex III](#), for consideration by the Code Commission at its February 2018 meeting.

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, Thailand, United States of America (USA), European Union (EU) and International Coalition for Animal Welfare (ICFAW).

During the revision of this chapter and in response to a number of Member Countries' comments, the *ad hoc* Group proposed a number of changes throughout the text to improve grammar, syntax, and clarity.

General comments

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with a Member Country general comment proposal to develop a table that would summarise the different slaughter methods used in reptiles. The *ad hoc* Group noted that some methods which are prohibited in some countries (as indicated in the comment) have been found to be acceptable (and advantageous) and the inclusion of a table would most likely not resolve this concern.

The *ad hoc* Group noted several other Members Countries' comments supported development of this chapter and encouraged the OIE to adopt it at the next General Session in May 2018.

¹ 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 2018 report of the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission because this report provides its considerations and comments. It is available at <http://www.oie.int/en/international-standard-setting/specialists-commissions-groups/code-commission-reports/meetings-reports/>

Article 7.Y.2.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with comments of some Member Countries that it is important to highlight reptiles have characteristics which differ from other animals included in the scope of the *Terrestrial Code* and agreed to insert introductory text, to reflect this in the definitions section.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the suggestion of some Member Countries to replace the word “animal” with “reptile”, when it is not a general statement, to be consistent with the particularities described in the chapter.

The *ad hoc* Group partially agreed with a Member Country comment to be consistent with the definition of unconsciousness. Nevertheless the *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the proposal to include a new sentence at the end of the definition of stunning as the possibility to recover consciousness is mentioned later.

Article 7.Y.3.

With reference to the suggestion of some Member Countries’ comments to include an introductory paragraph under Article 7.Y.3. in order to highlight some specificities of reptiles, the *ad hoc* Group agreed with the suggestion but modify the wording, to include “compared to other animals” rather than to “compared to mammals”, since reptiles also differ from birds, fish, etc.

1. Animal welfare plan

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with a Member Country comment to modify the wording of the first paragraph of the section on the animal welfare plan, for consistency with the proposed change in the definitions section used ‘reptiles’ instead of ‘animals’. This change will be made consistently, as appropriate, throughout the chapter.

In reference to the suggestion of an Organisation to include a sentence to connect the Standard Operating Procedures of the animal welfare plan to the guidelines. The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the suggestion but modified the wording proposed.

2. Competency and training of the personnel

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the comments of Member Countries to add a sentence to highlight the importance of the competencies of the animal handlers in monitoring the effectiveness of the stunning and killing process. Nevertheless, the Group did not agree with the inclusion of the word “care”, as its definition is not clear.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with a Member Country proposal to include a new sentence concerning the risk posed to the personnel as this is covered in Article 7.Y.4. on selection of the killing process.

With reference to a suggestion of an Organisation to add a new sentence at the end of the first paragraph, the *ad hoc* Group did not agree, as the need to use proper handling of reptiles is already addressed in the paragraph. Moreover the *ad hoc* Group emphasised that it was unnecessary to single out any species-specific issues.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the proposal of an Organisation to add a new paragraph after the third paragraph of this article to add reference to the way to transport or move reptiles, as the sentence content is already covered by the second part of the paragraph. However, the *ad hoc* Group included a new paragraph to reflect some Member Countries comments in relation to the need to have personnel that can physically cope with the effort carried out during a work shift so that fatigue does not impair performance of duties.

3. Source of animals

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the proposal from an Organisation to change the word “jurisdiction” to “legislation”, to improve the clarity of the sentence.

Regarding the suggestion of a Member Country to add reference to relevant chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* dealing with transport in the section dealing with the source of the reptiles, the *ad hoc* Group did not agree noting these chapters do not include reptiles in their scope. Nevertheless the *ad hoc* Group agreed with the Member Country that the term “humane” may not be well understood, and agreed to delete it from the text.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the suggestion of some Member Countries to delete or modify the text referring to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and to the use of reptiles captured in the wild. Several species considered in this chapter and covered by CITES are harvested from the wild in large numbers. This may be for local use or consumption or for international trade.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with a Member Country suggestion to add “biosecurity” as an additional aspect to be considered when animals captured in the wild are to be used.

4. Behaviour

The *ad hoc* Group considered the suggestion of some Member Countries and an Organisation for rewording of the bullet point under the section on behaviour, and agreed to incorporate the suggestions in order to improve its readability.

Article 7.Y.4.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the suggestion some Member Countries to add a new sentence at the end of the first paragraph of Article 7.Y.4., as the definitions of stunning and killing in Article 7.Y.2. already covers these aspects. Nevertheless, the *ad hoc* Group agreed to modify the wording for added clarity.

In the second paragraph of this section, an Organisation proposed to insert a new sentence regarding the variables that would not preclude the effective implementation of the chapter. The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with this inclusion as it considered that it would not add value to the existing text. Nevertheless, the *ad hoc* Group agreed to insert the word “killing” in the existing sentence.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed to add a new bullet point on the “species and size of the reptile” to the considerations when choosing the method used in the killing process as it is a helpful addition.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the suggestion of some Members Countries to delete the bullet point on “cost of method”, as the criteria mentioned are not a list of welfare criteria, but factors that influence the choice of the method.

Regarding the first bullet point concerning the expected results of the killing process, the *ad hoc* Group agreed to replace the word “excitement” with “agitation”, as the latter has a more precise meaning in relation to the chapter.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the suggestion of a Member Country to add a new bullet point to this section to highlight the importance of shortening the time between the moment of rendering the reptile insensible and the killing process. Nevertheless, the *ad hoc* Group reworded the sentence to include the word “unconscious” for consistency.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with a proposal to modify the last bullet point of this section as the justification provided was not an accurate statement, as in a clinical setting there are many parameters that are utilised and which have been addressed and included in this document. However, the indication of the use of adjunctive killing method is a valid statement but included further in the chapter.

Article 7.Y.5.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the modifications proposed by an Organisation on the criteria to establish suspicion of consciousness, as for the first proposal, to modify the point on the spontaneous movement is too broad and for the second point, agreed that the response to superficial or deep pain stimuli is not considered to be a measure of pain and consciousness in reptiles.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the proposal of a Member Country to modify the first two bullet points of this section to add clarity. In the same section the *ad hoc* Group agreed with the proposal to add a new bullet point to consider the jaw tone as a criterion to be considered for measuring pain and consciousness in reptiles.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the suggestion of an Organisation to modify the bullet points on the aspects that should be considered in addition to those already mentioned to confirm death on reptiles, as this section regards criteria for confirmation, not actions to be taken. The *ad hoc* Group recommend these criteria to be used to confirm death following any kill step, including brain destruction.

Regarding a Member Country proposal to remove the words “somatic stimuli” in the first bullet point on confirmation of death, the *ad hoc* Group partially agree with the proposal and only deleted the word “somatic”, as stimuli is the action that triggers the response.

The *ad hoc* Group, noting that stimulation to the head relates to brain activity while response in a lower limb may result from a spinal reflex, did not agree with a Member Country comment to modify the first bullet point of this section to add a reference on pain inducing stimuli.

In response to Member Countries proposal to insert specific language for chelonians, in the second bullet point of the section on the additional criteria to determine death, the *ad hoc* Group did not agree as many reptiles are resistant to anoxia not only chelonians.

The *ad hoc* Group thanked a Member Country for highlighting the characteristics of the respiratory and cardiac rate in hypothermic poikilotherms; however, it did not think it necessary to amend the article.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the suggestion of a Member Country to delete the complete section on additional criteria to determine death in reptiles, as this section describes criteria to indicate the death of the reptile. Further, the *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the proposal to add a new sentence in relation to brain destruction, as this is a method rather than an assessment criterion and is described as an important method later in the chapter. Moreover, the scientific reference mentioned in the justification did not support the proposed modification.

In response to a Member Country proposal to add a new sentence at the end of the bullet point regarding cardiac activity, the *ad hoc* Group considered the addition useful to emphasise the variation of the timespan between heartbeats.

Article 7.Y.6.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the suggestion of an Organisation to modify the first paragraph of Article 7.Y.6. on physical restraint to add wording in relation to the control of the movement and the precision of the application.

In the same article the *ad hoc* Group did not agree with a proposal to add a new bullet point on the characteristic of the method of physical restraint to indicate that it should not be used during electrical stunning. The *ad hoc* Group noted that physical restraint can be used effectively to aid electrical stunning taking the necessarily precautions, like using nonconductive material.

The *ad hoc* Group did not accept the suggestion of a Member Country to add the words ‘and effectively’, when referring to the use of the method, as its considered that for every method and procedure described in the chapter its application should be “effective”.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with an Organisation’s proposal to delete the eighth bullet point of this section as the statement clearly says when required, so it is not discarding this possibility, and just making sure it is done safely for the animals.

In response to a Member Country proposal to add a phrase to emphasise that some methods of restraint must not be used, the *ad hoc* Group proposed modified wording, consistent with other OIE chapters.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the deletion of the words “blind animal” proposed by an Organisation but proposed to clarify the sentence by adding the wording “damage or injure the eyes to cause blindness” as it was not intended to mean covering the eyes to prevent vision.

Regarding the suggestion of an Organisation to add a new bullet point on unacceptable practices, the *ad hoc* Group did not agree to include a reference on its use in sensitive body parts, noting that even if it is a common requirement for other species, it is not for reptiles. For example, cloacal reflex, could be used as a reliable indicator to determine the degree of unconsciousness.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with a Member Country suggestion to add vocalisation to the list of animal-based criteria.

Article 7.Y.7.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the suggestion of a Member Country to add a new bullet point referring to the full recovery of consciousness. The *ad hoc* Group indicated that it is only necessary in the case of electrical stunning when used as a capture or restraint method and therefore not in the scope of this document.

With reference to the suggestion of a Member Country to add a new bullet point related to the stunning procedure. The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the addition as it is included in the second bullet point of the section. Nevertheless, the *ad hoc* Group decided to insert the word “immediately” in the last bullet point to improve its clarity.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with comments of some Member Countries that it was important to emphasise even if the equipment used in the stunning process is self-made, it should be well maintained.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the suggestion of an Organisation to add a reference to the necessary requirements to produce unconsciousness in Article 7.Y.5., for clarity.

Article 7.Y.8.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the comments of Member Countries on the need to clarify that in this context it is recommended to apply stunning to the head and amended the sentence to emphasise the appropriate manner to use electrical stunning is through the brain.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree to include a new bullet point suggested by a Member Country to specify the size and condition of the animal to be stunned (only in unrestrained animals); however, they reworded the first paragraph for clarity.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the proposal of an Organisation to add a new bullet point to indicate the position of the device to carry out the stunning procedure. The *ad hoc* Group had already addressed this in the modifications proposed in response to the comment of a Member Country in the first paragraph of this article.

In response to Member Country proposal to delete the sentence recommending that stunning procedures and equipment be submitted for the approval of the competent authorities or the accredited authority, the *ad hoc* Group did not agree. For further clarity and to align the recommendation with Chapter 7.5. *Slaughter of animals*, Article 7.5.7., Stunning methods, point 1 on General considerations, the *ad hoc* Group reworded the sentence.

The *ad hoc* Group did not accept a suggestion of an Organisation to include in recommendations for effective stunning, that minimum electrical parameters should be applied to ensure that the animal remains stunned until its death. The *ad hoc* Group considered that this is a requirement for all the stunning methods presented in this chapter and that special emphasis should not be given only in this paragraph.

The *ad hoc* Group accepted the proposal of a Member Country to better clarify what is meant by “stunning duration” and for this purpose they decided to reword the sentence to clarify that as “stunning duration” is the “length of time of application of the current”.

Regarding an Organisation proposal to delete the bullet point on “minimum stun duration”, the *ad hoc* Group did not agree noting it had already proposed to reword the sentence as mentioned above.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with a Member Country comment regarding the duration of the application of the current; however, they reworded the sentence about “minimum stun duration” for better clarity as mentioned above and following a comment of another Member Country.

In relation to the proposals of Member Countries to include three new bullet points to the recommendations for effective use of stunning methods, the *ad hoc* Group considered that it would be repetitive, as the requirements suggested by the Member Countries are already covered in the general principles of this chapter.

In response to a Member Country suggestion to include a new reference point, stating that the electric stunning method should allow the recovery of consciousness if the animal is not killed, the *ad hoc* Group noted that it was necessary to include methods that do not allow full recovery of consciousness, since the animal may be seriously injured and suffering.

Article 7.Y.9.

The suggestion of a Member Countries to add the word “reliably” was not accepted by the *ad hoc* Group, as the comment was not clear whether it was referring to immediate or rapid death. Furthermore, the occurrence of death is a condition, after the use of a penetrating captive bolt.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree the proposal of a Member Country of the need to mention that the restraint should be humanely applied during the use of captive bolt. The *ad hoc* Group considers that all recommendations in this chapter are referring to humane procedures to ensure animal welfare and that they are not only applicable this paragraph.

In response to a Member Country comment on the need to better specify what the *ad hoc* Group meant by “correct position to apply the captive bolt”, the *ad hoc* Group noted the relevance of the comment, but there was also a need for the chapter not to be too prescriptive. Therefore, they recommended that the OIE Headquarters consider placing this information on the OIE web site as an orientation, in the same place where technical information for Chapters 7.5. and 7.6. is posted.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree the suggestion of an Organisation to replace “type” of animal by “species” when they refer to the equipment and charge of the captive bolt should be chosen accordingly because the word “type” is a more comprehensive term and would cover species, sex, age, etc.

The suggestion of a Member Country and an Organisation to change “and” by “or” when they refer to either “immediate onset of unconsciousness or death” can be used as an animal-based criteria (measurables), was accepted by the *ad hoc* Group as they agreed with the rationale presented.

Article 7.Y.10.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the proposal of a Member Country on the need to include an additional item that mentions that non-penetrative captive bolts are not appropriate in the stunning of large reptiles, as in some types of crocodiles. In the opinion of the experts in the *ad hoc* Group, the ability to stun an animal depends more on the type and fit of the equipment than on the size of the animal, and that when well-adjusted, proper equipment is used effective stunning can be obtained.

In relation to a comment of an Organization recommending that a secondary method should be always used to assure death when using non-penetrative captive bolt; the *ad hoc* Group did not agree as the scientific references provided did not support the changes requested, rather, the references support that captive bolt (penetrating or not) has been shown as an effective method to kill crocodylians and therefore would also be effective for all smaller reptile species.

In response to the suggestion of a Member Country to use “must” instead of “should” in reference to the need to use an additional killing method if death does not occur after the use of a percussive blow, the *ad hoc* Group agreed, as there aren’t any alternatives when the percussive blow is not effective.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the suggestion of a Member Country to delete the word “preferably,” as it considers that procedures described in manufacturer’s recommendation should be followed when available.

Article 7.Y.11.

The *ad hoc* Group did not accept the comment of a Member Country about the use of percussive blow. According to the scientific reference mentioned the AVMA Euthanasia Guidelines 2013 Edition page 78, blunt force trauma to the head can be manually applied. The *ad hoc* Group also consider that a percussive blow is effective for many species and sizes of reptiles except for very large individuals as noted. For the millions of snakes killed for collection of skins and meat, a percussive blow results in immediate destruction of the brain (unconsciousness and death).

With reference to the comment of a Member Country on the need to highlight that percussive blow is applicable for determinate species. The *ad hoc* Group did not agree and reaffirmed that the chapter makes no specific recommendation on which method should be applied on a specific species because it would be impossible due to the large variety of species of reptiles. Nonetheless, the AVMA Euthanasia Guidelines 2013 Edition refers to manually applied blunt force trauma to the head on page 78.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the proposal of an Organisation that a secondary method should always be performed to ensure death, in case of using percussive blow to the head. The *ad hoc* Group commented that a percussive blow to the head is effective for many species and sizes of reptiles.

With reference to the suggestion of a Member Country to add a new sentence emphasising that this method requires specific skills and adequate equipment, the *ad hoc* Group did not agree, as they consider that it is already covered in the general principles of this chapter. In respect of the second suggestion to use the “must” instead of “should” when referring to the need to immediately use an additional killing method, the proposal was accepted by the *ad hoc* Group, as it should always be used to avoid suffering.

As mentioned previously, the *ad hoc* Group did not accept a suggestion of a Member Country to mention in this point that the restraint should be humanely applied in the use of captive bolt. As noted previously all recommendations in this chapter refer to humane procedures to ensure animal welfare and that they are applicable to the whole chapter.

As mentioned previously the *ad hoc* Group did not accept the suggestion of an Organization to replace “type” of animal by “species” when referring to the need for the equipment and charge of the captive bolt to be chosen accordingly. The *ad hoc* Group considered that the word “type” is more comprehensive term and would cover species, sex, age, etc.

The suggestion of a Member Country to add two new bullet points in the recommendations mentioning that the maximum animal live-weight, maximum number of animals stunned/killed per person and day, should considered for effective use of the percussive blow, was not accepted by the *ad hoc* Group. However, the *ad hoc* Group proposed to add a new paragraph in the section on the Competency and training of the personnel to consider the conditions to carry out their duties.

Article 7.Y.12.

With reference to the proposal of a Member Country to highlight that the gunshot method requires skill and poses a risk to humans, the *ad hoc* Group considered it was not necessary to emphasise this point only for this method, as already mentioned in the general considerations, all methods require skilled and competent operators.

As mentioned previously, the *ad hoc* Group did not accept the suggestion of an Organisation to replace “type” of animal by “species” when referring to the equipment and charge of the captive bolt should be chosen accordingly. The *ad hoc* Group considered that the word “type” is more comprehensive term and would cover species, sex, age, etc.

Article 7.Y.13.

Concerning the suggestion of a Member Country to specify that pithing is a killing method. The *ad hoc* Group did not agree, as pithing can be considered as an adjunct method, as sometimes it is used only to ensure brain destruction in a dead animal.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the suggestion of an Organisation to include a new paragraph explaining some features and consequences of using pithing. The *ad hoc* Group considered that the proposals go beyond of the scope of this chapter. The *ad hoc* Group also explained that the chapter was not addressing the technical issues of the type of instrument/tool to be used if it was it would have to be included for all the methods i.e. captive bolt guns, etc. and it could be counterproductive or disadvantageous.

Regarding a Member Country suggestion that clearer instructions with a focus on the outcome should be given rather than a description of the process, the *ad hoc* Group considered that in this case the outcome is destruction of the brain resulting in death, and sometimes it is difficult to assess the outcome and in this case the method should be described as an alternative. The *ad hoc* Group also noted that a minimum of 4-6 rotations, as opposed to simply entering the brain cavity is needed to ensure enough damage is done to the brain. Even in the largest of crocodylians, 4-6 rotations would cause enough damage to the brain; therefore, it would do the same in smaller species.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the comment of a Member Country that the use of the word “must” in the context of this article is more appropriate than “should” as this method is recommended only for unconscious animals.

Article 7.Y.14.

The *ad hoc* Group did not accept the proposal of a Member Country, as decapitation is not a method of death for reptiles as it may not produce unconsciousness or death within an acceptable period. Regarding the second proposal, of the same Member Country, to delete percussive blow as an alternative to ensure the destruction of the brain after decapitation the *ad hoc* Group indicated that a percussive blow can be used to destroy the brain and needs to be included as an option to pithing.

In response to the suggestion of an Organisation to substitute percussive blow by “crushing of the brain” when referring to the methods to be used to assure the destruction of the brain after decapitation the *ad hoc* Group considered that the change did not add clarity to the text and therefore did not change the original text.

Article 7.Y.15.

In relation to some Member Countries proposals to revise the article to emphasise that chemicals should be used carefully because the meat would be consumed. The *ad hoc* Group noted that there are a wide range of variations in chemicals; including type, availability and regulation by countries, which is why it had included in the first paragraph of this article the statement: “The use of these agents for either restraint or killing should be supervised by veterinarians or veterinary paraprofessionals in accordance with the requirements of the Competent Authority.

Regarding the comment of a Member Country that the effect of chemical agents on reptiles could be affected due to variation in animal temperatures, the *ad hoc* Group partially agreed and reworded the sentence to clarify that the use of chemical agents in reptilians varies according to their metabolic rates that could cause a low body temperature.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the suggestion of an Organisation to add a new bullet point to emphasise that chemical agents used should cause rapid unconsciousness and death without causing suffering, as this aspect is considered in the first paragraph of this article.

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the suggestion of an Organisation to add a new bullet point stating that when death does not occur another method should be applied. The *ad hoc* Group considered that this is already covered in the general principles of this chapter.

Article 7.Y.16.

In response to Member Countries comments that exsanguination should not be performed without prior stunning, the *ad hoc* Group reminded Member Countries that this is unacceptable method, and should be used only in dead reptiles.

On the proposal of a Member Country to delete the examples of gases that should not be used to cause unconsciousness and death in reptiles, the *ad hoc* Group did not agree to delete them and reworded the sentence, in order to give more clarity to the example.

The *ad hoc* Group agreed with the suggestion of a Member Country to add “cervical dislocation” as a new bullet point to the unacceptable methods, as the rationale and scientific reference presented supported the proposal.

3. Programme for further work after the teleconference

The *ad hoc* Group was informed that the report of the electronic review and the teleconference, including the amended draft chapter, will be presented to the February 2018 meeting of the Code Commission. The OIE Headquarters will contact the Members of the *ad hoc* Group if additional work is required in the future.

4. Draft a report of the *ad hoc* Group meeting

The *ad hoc* Group agreed to complete their meeting report by January 2018 for submission to the February 2018 meeting of the Code Commission.

5. Other business

There was no other business proposed for discussion.

.../Appendices

Appendix I

**OIE AD HOC GROUP ON KILLING METHODS FOR FARMED REPTILES
FOR THEIR SKINS AND MEAT
ELECTRONIC REVIEW AND TELECONFERENCE
January 2018**

List of participants

MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC GROUP

Dr William B. Karesh
(Chairperson)
Executive Vice-President for Health
and Policy EcoHealth Alliance
460 West 34th St., 17th Floor
New York, NY 10001
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1-212) 380.4463
karesh@ecohealthalliance.org

Dr Leisha Hewitt
Livestock Welfare
PO Box 143
Franklin
Tasmania 7113
AUSTRALIA
leisha.hewitt@gmail.com

Dr Mathias Lörtscher
Head CITES MA Switzerland
Office fédéral de la sécurité alimentaire
et des affaires vétérinaires
Schwarzenburgstrasse 155
3003 BERN
SWITZERLAND
mathias.loertscher@blv.admin.ch

Paolo Martelli
Chief Veterinarian
Ocean Park
HONG KONG
paolo.martelli@oceanpark.com.hk

Dr Christopher Middleton Foggin
Wildlife Veterinarian
Victoria Falls Wildlife Trust
ZIMBABWE
cfoggin@zol.co.zw

Dr Javier G Nevarez
Associate Professor of Zoological
Medicine
School of Veterinary Medicine-Veterinary
Clinical Sciences
Louisiana State University
Skip Bertman Dr, Baton Rouge, LA 70803
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
jnevare@lsu.edu

Dr Clifford Warwick
Consultant Biologist and Medical
Scientist
Riverside House, River Lawn Road
Tonbridge, Kent TN9 1EP UK
UNITED KINGDOM
cliffordwarwick@gmail.com

OIE HEADQUARTERS

Dr Leopoldo Stuardo
Chargé de mission
Standards Department
OIE
E-mail: l.stuardo@oie.int

Dr Patricia Pozzetti
Chargée de mission
Standards Department
OIE
E-mail: p.pozzetti@oie.int

**OIE AD HOC GROUP ON KILLING METHODS FOR FARMED REPTILES
FOR THEIR SKINS AND MEAT
TELECONFERENCE**

January 2018

Adopted agenda

1. Welcome and introduction to the teleconference
 2. Consider Member Countries' comments on draft Chapter 7.Y. 'Killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products' and amend text as appropriate
 3. Programme for further work of the *ad hoc* Group
 4. Draft a report of the *ad hoc* Group electronic review and teleconference
 5. Other business
-

Appendix III

[Note: this Annex has been replaced by Annex 36 to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 12–23 February 2018.]

