



**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION
OF PESTE DES PETITS RUMINANTS STATUS OF MEMBERS¹**
Paris, 7-8 December 2017

A meeting of the OIE *ad hoc* Group on the Evaluation of the Peste des Petits Ruminants (PPR) Status of Members (hereafter the Group) was held at the OIE Headquarters from 7 to 8 December 2017.

1. Opening

Dr Monique Eloit, Director General of the OIE, welcomed the experts of the Group. She acknowledged the huge work and efforts required in reviewing the dossiers and thanked the experts for having submitted their individual assessments of the countries' applications in preparation of the meeting.

Dr Eloit reminded the Group that the OIE and the FAO jointly developed the Global Control and Eradication Strategy (PPR-GCES) of PPR under the Global Framework for the progressive control of Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs), and Dr Jean-Jacques Soula was the OIE Coordinator of the joint PPR Global Secretariat. She finally underlined the Group's contributions to the GCES by providing technical support and sound scientific knowledge and answering to the expectations from the field.

Dr Eloit highlighted the sensitivity and confidentiality of the dossiers received for official recognition and acknowledged that the experts had signed the confidentiality undertakings. She indicated that the information provided within the dossiers belonged to the applicant countries. She also mentioned that if any members of the Group had any conflict of interest in the evaluation of a dossier, the expert(s) should withdraw from the discussions and decision making process of the particular application.

Dr Laure Weber-Vintzel, Head of the Status Department, emphasised the importance of the quality of the public report to be scrutinised by OIE Members before adopting the proposed list of countries free from PPR. She also encouraged the Group to continue providing detailed feedback to support countries receiving a negative outcome in identifying the main gaps and points for improvement, as well as providing informative recommendations to those countries with positive outcomes for further the maintenance of their PPR free status.

The Group and the OIE welcomed Drs Shubh Mahato and Mohamad Hossein Nazem Shirazi as new members of the Group and thanked the four other experts for their contribution to the Group.

Dr Anna-Maria Baka, Chargée de mission of the Status Department, introduced Dr Hernán Oliver Daza, who joined the Status Department to work on the activities related to official disease status recognition.

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 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/>

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

The Group was chaired by Dr Misheck Mulumba. Dr Giancarlo Ferrari 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 applications from OIE Members for the official recognition of their PPR free status

3.1 Madagascar

In October 2017, Madagascar 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 Madagascar.

a) *Animal disease reporting*

The Group considered that Madagascar had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting to the OIE. The Group also acknowledged that PPR was a notifiable disease in the country *as per* legislation since 1998 and that sanctions were envisaged for failure to report PPR cases. The Group appreciated that in 2016 official and private veterinarians had received a series of training on PPR surveillance, control and diagnostics in the framework of a project implemented in collaboration with international partners. Additionally, activities to raise awareness, funded by internal resources, were implemented during 2017 for veterinarians and meat inspectors. However, the Group noted that these activities did not include all relevant stakeholders such as farmers, traders and slaughterhouse workers.

The Group noted that a PPR suspect case was reported in June 2017, followed by epidemiological investigation and laboratory testing that eventually ruled out the occurrence of PPR.

b) *Veterinary Services*

The Group was informed that an OIE Performance of Veterinary Services (PVS) Gap Analysis mission had been conducted in Madagascar in 2013. The mission report was available to OIE partners and therefore was provided to the Group.

The Group noted, from the information provided in the annexes of the dossier, that in Madagascar the Directorate of Veterinary Services was under the Directorate General of Livestock and that there were 22 Regional Agriculture and Livestock Directorates which comprised five services, among which were the Regional Veterinary Services. The Group pointed out that the structure as articulated could potentially cause delays in the implementation of field operations or disbursement of operational budgets, as highlighted also in the above mentioned PVS Gap Analysis mission report. This concern was also reinforced by the fact that, according to the information provided, management of the funds allocated for livestock was not under the direct responsibility of the Directorate of Veterinary Services. The Group advised that in case of emergencies, Veterinary Services should have quick access to funding, for management of the situation.

The Group noted that Madagascar was in the process of implementing the identification of PPR susceptible animals in a pilot area in the southern part of the country (Anosy Region and Androy Region) in collaboration with an international cooperation project. According to the additional information provided, movement controls would be put into force progressively with the implementation of a small ruminant traceability system. The Group appreciated that Madagascar had acknowledged in its dossier the current inadequate control of animal movements and started working to fill the gaps.

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

The Group acknowledged that PPR had never been reported in the country. Therefore, Madagascar was eligible to claim historical freedom from PPR as described in Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code)*.

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

The Group acknowledged that, while there was no legal framework in place prohibiting the use of PPR vaccines, vaccination against PPR had never been carried out in Madagascar under the country's general principle of not vaccinating against diseases that were absent from the country. The Group noted that no vaccinated animals had entered Madagascar, as imports of live animals were prohibited in the country (*cf* section 3.1 e).

e) *Importation of domestic ruminants and their semen, oocytes or embryos - in accordance with relevant articles of Chapter 14.7.*

The Group acknowledged that legislation had been in force since 2001 prohibiting imports of live animals and products of animal origin in Madagascar. Exceptionally, Madagascar allowed the import of small ruminants twice: in 2007, a total of 400 heads were imported from Australia and 15 heads were imported from France in 2010. Madagascar confirmed that the import of fresh meat was forbidden, and that only processed heat treated products were authorised to be imported.

The Group was informed that an OIE expert mission, with regard to foot and mouth disease (FMD), was carried out in Madagascar in 2017 and that the team members of the mission had the opportunity to visit border control facilities and evaluate the implementation of their activities. The Group acknowledged, from the information provided in the report of the above mentioned mission, that the management of imports was considered satisfactory.

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

The Group acknowledged, from the information provided in the annexes of the dossier, that passive surveillance relied on the national epidemiosurveillance network which comprised 154 veterinarians. Among them, 35 veterinarians accredited within the Madagascar Surveillance (MadSUR) network were distributed in specific areas of the country and conducted surveillance and epidemio-vigilance activities on a certain number of diseases, including PPR. This network was financially supported by a project implemented in the framework of a regional partnership and produced epidemiological reports on a monthly basis. The Group commended Madagascar for this initiative and encouraged the Veterinary Services to strengthen MadSUR and to undertake similar initiatives to ensure the expansion of surveillance activities to the rest of the country.

Whilst pathogen-specific surveillance was not mandatory according to Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*, the Group commended Madagascar for the serological surveys since 2016.

The Group noted that PPR diagnostic testing, using antigen capture ELISA, was performed in the National Veterinary Laboratory (LNDV), which was not officially accredited. Madagascar informed the Group that two scientists from LNDV were trained on PPR diagnosis at an OIE Reference Laboratory for PPR in November 2017. The Group also took note that in case of a positive result, samples would be sent to an OIE Reference Laboratory for PPR, under an international partnership framework.

In response to questions raised on the epidemiological investigation of the suspected PPR case, mentioned in paragraph 3.1 a) of this report, Madagascar described the follow-up actions taken to rule out PPR. Even if the follow-up was properly conducted, the Group expected that Madagascar would have sent samples to an OIE Reference Laboratory for PPR, for confirmation.

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

Madagascar developed a PPR National Strategic plan, that was provided as an annex of the dossier. The Group appreciated the development of such a Plan, which included a contingency plan, developed in collaboration with an international partner. The Group also acknowledged that a legal framework was in place regulating imports and designating sentinel sites and entry points. The Group agreed that the regulatory measures for early detection, prevention and emergency control of PPR existed in Madagascar, but noted that, according to the National Strategic Plan, many PPR-related activities in Madagascar would rely on the financial support of regional funds.

h) Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.9.

The Group noted that Madagascar had provided details and answers to some of the questions in Article 1.6.9. in the format of annexes and not within the core dossier. However, the Group agreed that overall the submitted dossier was compliant with the format of the questionnaire in Article 1.6.9.

Conclusion

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and Madagascar'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 Madagascar be recognised as a PPR free country.

Recommendations to Madagascar:

The Group recommended that Madagascar:

- implement the identification, movement control and traceability system of PPR susceptible animals in the whole country;
- organise and maintain awareness and cascade training programmes dedicated to PPR and intended for all stakeholders, including farmers and traders, to increase the sensitivity of the early warning system;
- strengthen laboratory capacity to improve diagnostic capacity;
- establish a legal framework to support the prohibition of vaccination against PPR;
- put in place a system to self-monitor, periodically evaluate and amend, if relevant, the current rapid response mechanism to PPR suspect cases and potential outbreaks.

The Group recommended that information on the above be provided when Madagascar submits its annual reconfirmation in 2018.

3.2 Peru

In October 2017, Peru 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 Peru.

a) Animal disease reporting

The Group considered that Peru had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting and that PPR was included since 2004 in the list of exotic diseases for which notification was compulsory *as per* legislation. The Group also noted that pecuniary penalties were foreseen in case of failure to report suspect cases of notifiable diseases, including PPR.

The Group acknowledged that the National Agrarian Health Service (SENASA) had been implementing a series of annual training sessions targeting all relevant stakeholders. The Group took note that in 2016 a total of 6,885 persons including veterinarians, agricultural technicians, producers, slaughterhouse workers and the general public had received relevant training.

b) Veterinary Services

From the additional clarification, the Group noted that PPR susceptible animals were identified at herd level (lots) and that a Health Certificate for Internal Transit (CSTI), where the number of lot(s) was indicated, was required for their movements. The Group acknowledged that information present in CSTI as well as information on the small ruminant population were registered in the Integrated Animal Health Management System (SIGSA). The Group also appreciated the summary table generated from SIGSA including data on goats provided by Peru for 2017.

The Group agreed that a small ruminant traceability system was in place in Peru and therefore concluded that the Veterinary Services had the knowledge and authority over domestic sheep and goats in the country.

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

The Group acknowledged that PPR had never been reported in the country. Therefore, Peru was eligible to claim historical freedom from PPR as described in Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*. In addition, the Group noted that all Peru's neighbouring countries were officially recognised by the OIE as having a PPR free status and that PPR had never been reported in the whole region of the Americas .

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

While there was no specific regulation in place prohibiting vaccination against PPR, the Group took note that the introduction of any exotic pathogens in Peru was prohibited *as per* legislation. Furthermore, importation of infectious agents or strains for the elaboration of biological products should be authorised by the Competent National Authority exclusively for the purposes determined in the research and experimental design, following a risk analysis. The Group acknowledged that vaccination had never been carried out in Peru.

e) *Importation of domestic ruminants and their semen, oocytes or embryos - in accordance with relevant articles of Chapter 14.7.*

The Group took note of the import requirements for sheep and goats and their products, according to which importations from specific countries were allowed, following an evaluation of their sanitary status. The Group acknowledged that these countries were officially recognised as free from PPR and noted that no small ruminants had been imported in Peru in 2017. The Group concluded that the import requirements were in line with the provisions of Chapter 14.7. 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 had never been reported in Peru. In accordance with Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*, and as Peru had complied with the requirements 1.a.iii to 1.a.vi) of this article for a period of ten years, Peru was eligible to demonstrate freedom from PPR without an agent-specific surveillance. The Group acknowledged that a broad section of stakeholders were involved in the surveillance of animal diseases including PPR, and that a free telephone line was available for reporting suspect cases.

The Group agreed that the surveillance system in place for at least ten years would be able to detect clinical signs in a naïve population, in case of a PPR incursion in the country.

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

The Group took note of the existence and functions of the "Directorate of Animal Health" through the "Sub-Directorates of Risk Analysis and Epidemiological Surveillance, Animal Quarantine, Disease Control and Eradication" as well as the "Centre for Animal Health Diagnosis" to ensure early detection, prevention and control of exotic diseases. Moreover, the Group took note of a "Quarantine Control System" in place, which was intended to prevent the entry of exotic diseases in import shipments or in international transit as well as to ensure the safety of animal products and by-products in export shipments.

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

h) Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.9.

The Group commended the well-structured dossier provided by Peru and agreed that the submitted dossier was compliant with the format of the questionnaire in Article 1.6.9.

Conclusion

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and Peru'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 Peru be recognised as a PPR free country.

Recommendations to Peru:

The Group recommended that Peru maintain awareness activities dedicated to PPR and intended for all stakeholders.

3.2 Uruguay

In October 2017, Uruguay 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 Uruguay.

a) Animal disease reporting

The Group considered that Uruguay had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting and that PPR was included in the list of notifiable diseases *as per* legislation since 1994. The Group took note that the suspected presence of the disease should be notified and agreed that the procedures described in the dossier would lead to a clinical follow-up investigation of suspected cases. The Group acknowledged that penalties were foreseen for failure to report PPR cases. From the additional information provided, the Group appreciated that training programmes and awareness raising campaigns had been implemented both at national and regional level and included all relevant stakeholders, such as official and private veterinarians, veterinary paraprofessionals and producers.

b) Veterinary Services

The Group acknowledged that a legal framework was in place since 1973 regulating the traceability of livestock in Uruguay at herd level, according to which identification of all animals was compulsory. While small ruminants were currently identified at herd level, the Group appreciated that Uruguay planned to integrate them into an individual electronic identification system that would identify the premises, their origin and their movements. The Group appreciated the information on demographics and distribution of sheep and goat holdings as presented in the dossier.

The Group noted from the information provided in the dossier that a PVS follow-up mission had been conducted in Uruguay in 2014 and that the report was made available by the country. The PVS report provided additional guarantees that the Veterinary Services were compliant with the requirements for a country having a PPR free status.

The Group agreed that the Veterinary Services had knowledge and authority over all domestic sheep and goats throughout the country and noted that the legislation regulating the establishment of a Veterinary Statutory Body was pending.

c) Situation of PPR in the past 24 months

The Group acknowledged that PPR had never been reported in the country. Therefore, Uruguay was eligible to claim historical freedom from PPR as described in Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

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

In response to a question, Uruguay informed the Group that legislation was in place prohibiting the possession and manipulation of causative agents of diseases that had never been reported in the country. The Group therefore acknowledged that production and importation of vaccines against PPR were not allowed and that vaccination had never been carried out in Uruguay.

e) *Importation of domestic ruminants and their semen, oocytes or embryos - in accordance with relevant articles of Chapter 14.7.*

The Group noted that imports of live animals or their products were only allowed from countries with an official PPR free status. Some illegal imports of products and by-products of animals susceptible to PPR had been detected and these commodities were destroyed. Furthermore, Uruguay clarified that the countries of origin of these imports were officially recognised as free from PPR and transparently provided a detailed description of the follow-up actions on detection of such imports. No illegal imports of live animals susceptible to PPR had been detected during the past two years.

The Group took note of: i) the 19 fixed official check-points at the main points of entry into Uruguay; ii) the quarantine stations, operating under the control of livestock and agriculture services to control imports.

From the dossier and the additional information provided, the Group concluded that import control procedures for animals and animal products in Uruguay 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 had never been reported in Uruguay. In accordance with Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*, and as Uruguay had complied with the requirements 1.a.iii to 1.a.vi) of this article for a period of at least ten years, Uruguay was eligible to demonstrate freedom from PPR without an agent-specific surveillance.

The Group agreed that the surveillance system in place for at least ten years would be able to detect clinical signs in a naïve population, in case of a PPR incursion in the country.

The Group acknowledged that, as also indicated in the PVS follow-up report, the Veterinary Services had access to and make use of the network of OIE Reference Laboratories for PPR to get a confirmatory diagnosis. The Group commended Uruguay for providing detailed information of the sample shipping procedures to the Reference Laboratories.

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

The Group appreciated that Uruguay had been participating in joint regional actions, as a member of the Permanent Veterinary Committee of the Southern Cone (CVP). The CVP ensures that trade requirements are respected within the region and common interests are protected. The Committee's links with international organisations, such as the OIE, the FAO and their joint Global Framework for Progressive Control of Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs), were acknowledged by the Group.

From the additional information, the Group noted that, in support of the Veterinary Services, Uruguay had established the "National Health Emergency System", a technical organisation integrating all ministries, bodies and institutions related to animal health to quickly respond to exotic disease outbreaks and effectively implement control and eradication activities. Uruguay provided a summary of the activities to be implemented in case of a PPR outbreak, which were included in the PPR action plan.

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

h) Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.6.9.

The Group appreciated the well-structured and comprehensive dossier provided by Uruguay and agreed that the submitted dossier was compliant with the format of the questionnaire in Article 1.6.9.

Conclusion

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and Uruguay'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 Uruguay be recognised as a PPR free country.

Recommendations to Uruguay:

The Group recommended that:

- Uruguay maintains awareness activities dedicated to PPR and intended for all stakeholders, using appropriate communication tools;
- Veterinary Services explore mechanisms to accelerate the enactment of the necessary legislation to facilitate the establishment and operation of a Veterinary Statutory Body.

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

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

5. Information on the implementation of 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 Strategy² (PPR-GCES). He indicated that PPR eradication was directly linked to the global major challenges and to the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations (UN SDGs), with the same timeframe (Achievement by 2030), in particular SDG 1 ("No Poverty"), 2 ("Zero Hunger"), 5 ("Gender Equality") and 8 ("Decent Work and Economic Growth").

Dr Soula projected the newly developed PPR-GCES communication video, available on the FAO and OIE³ websites, and a map showing the current distribution of PPR in the world. He also described in detail the four components of the PPR-GEP.

He summarised the main steps achieved in 2016, as already detailed in the PPR ad hoc Group report annexed to the Scientific Commission report of February 2017⁴ regarding the implementation of the PPR-GCES, and mentioned the main steps achieved in 2017 regarding the implementation of the PPR-GCES, including:

- Finalisation of the first round of PPR regional roadmap meetings (in the nine regions covered by the PPR-GCES) and start of the second round (Central Asia, Middle East and Central Africa);

² <http://www.oie.int/eng/ppr2015/doc/PPR-Global-Strategy-2015-03-28.pdf>

³ <http://www.oie.int/en/animal-health-in-the-world/ppr-portal/>

⁴ http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International_Standard_Setting/docs/pdf/SCAD/A_SCAD_Feb2017.pdf

- Drafting and endorsement of an FAO-OIE Joint Resource Mobilisation and Marketing Strategy to support the implementation of the PPR-GEP (total cost estimated to be \$996 million for the period 2017-2021), through advocacy and fund raising, in order to fill the gaps in PPR eradication projects implemented at country level, and in supporting global and regional coordination;
- Establishment, in June 2017, of the PPR Advisory Committee;
- Editorial support to the PPR National Strategic Plans (PPR-NSP) and Regional strategies drafting processes;
- Second PPR vaccine producers meeting, in Morocco in April 2017;
- Special support to Mongolia (more than 50 million small ruminants), where PPR appeared for the first time in 2016 with spill over into wildlife;

Dr Soula also mentioned the main activities of the OIE on PPR, coordinated by the OIE-PPR Internal Coordination Group:

- OIE-conducted PVS-PPR pilot missions in two countries,
- Support on-going projects with a PPR component (“PRAPS⁵”, covering six countries in the Sahel region in Africa) and
- Activities related to the OIE procedure for the endorsement of national official control programmes for PPR and the official recognition of PPR free status.

The main activities scheduled by the PPR Secretariat in the near future were the following:

- Continuation of the activities (Regional roadmap meetings, vaccine producer workshops, support to countries to draft their PPR-NSP, in conducting socio-economic studies on PPR impact and to apply for the OIE free status);
- Launch of the PPR Global Research and Expertise Network (PPR-GREN) in April 2018 in Vienna

Finally, Dr Soula informed the participants about the organisation of a PPR Ministerial Pledging Conference in Brussels (hosted by the European Commission) during the first semester of 2018. The preparation process for this conference would benefit from the FAO-OIE Resource Mobilization and Marketing Strategy endorsed in 2017 and would use the available communications tools.

The Group discussed the engagement of stakeholders at field level (farmers, producers etc) as critical to the success of the PPR-GEP and encouraged the PPR Secretariat to actively involve farmers representatives in future activities.

6. Other matters

Notification of PPR in wildlife

Following internal OIE discussion, the Group was requested to provide an opinion on whether Chapter 14.7. of the *Terrestrial Code* should be revised to encourage notification of the occurrence of PPR cases in wild animals.

The Group discussed the challenges relative to the available information on the PPR epidemiological situation in wildlife worldwide and expressed its concerns about the possible implications on official status recognition and on trade in case of notification of PPR cases in wild animals. Therefore, the Group expressed the opinion that Chapter 14.7. of the *Terrestrial Code* could include notification of PPR cases in wildlife but that the occurrence of PPR in wildlife should not impact OIE Members’ officially recognised PPR status and requirements for trade.

⁵ PRAPS: Projet régional d’appui au pastoralisme au Sahel

The Group suggested that the OIE encourage the validation in wild animals of the tests used for the serological surveillance of PPR in domestic animals.

7. Adoption of the report

The 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.

.../Appendices

**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION
OF PESTE DES PETITS RUMINANTS STATUS OF MEMBERS
Paris, 7-8 December 2017**

Terms of Reference

The OIE *ad hoc* group on peste des petits ruminants (PPR) status of Member (the Group) is expected to evaluate the applications for official recognition of PPR free status received from three Members and for endorsement of control official programme for PPR received from one Member.

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 Members 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;
 - 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 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.
 - 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 PESTE DES PETITS RUMINANTS STATUS OF MEMBERS
Paris, 7-8 December 2017**

Agenda

1. Opening
 2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur
 3. Evaluation of applications from OIE Members for the official recognition of their peste des petits ruminants (PPR) free status
 - a. Madagascar
 - b. Uruguay
 - c. Peru
 4. Evaluation of an application from an OIE Member for the endorsement of its official control programme for PPR
 5. Information on the implementation of the PPR Global Control and Eradication Strategy
 6. Other matters
 7. Adoption of the report
-

**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION
OF PESTE DES PETITS RUMINANTS STATUS OF MEMBERS
Paris, 7-8 December 2017**

List of Participants

MEMBERS

Dr Giancarlo Ferrari

Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale del
Lazio e della Toscana
Via Appia Nuova 1411
00178 Roma
ITALY
Tel: +39 06 79099389
giancarlo.ferrari@izslt.it
giancarlof57@gmail.com

Dr Geneviève Libeau

Biological Systems Department - CIRAD
AnimalS, health, Territories, Risks,
Ecosystems (ASTRE)
TA 117/E, Campus international de
Baillarguet
34398 Montpellier Cedex 5
FRANCE
Tel: 33 (0)4 67.59 38 50 ou 37 24
Fax: 33 (0)4 67.59.37 50
genevieve.libeau@cirad.fr

Dr Shubh Mahato

Country Director
Heifer International Nepal
Hattiban, Lalitpur 15
NEPAL
Shubh.Mahato@heifer.org

Dr Misheck Mulumba

Agricultural Research Council
Private Bag X05
Onderstepoort 0110
Pretoria
SOUTH AFRICA
Tel: (27-12) 529 9338
Fax: (27-12) 565 46 67
mulumbam@arc.agric.za

Dr Mohamad Hossein Nazem Shirazi

International Laboratory Specialist
Central Veterinary Laboratory
Molecular Diagnostic Department
Tehran
IRAN
nazemshiraz@yahoo.com
Tel: +98 9126084859

Dr Henry Wamwayi

STSD Project Coordinator
AU-IBAR
P.O. Box 30786 – 00100
Nairobi,
KENYA
Tel: +254-20 3674 000
Fax: +254-20 3674 341
henry.wamwayi@au-ibar.org
henry.wamwayi@yahoo.com

OBSERVER

Dr Jean-Jacques Soula

OIE Coordinator, FAO-OIE joint PPR Secretariat
Via delle terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
ITALY
jj.soula@oie.int

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION

Dr. Juan Antonio Montaña Hirose

Subdirector de Constatación de Productos Biológicos
Servicio Nacional de Sanidad, Inocuidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria
Km. 37.5 de la Carretera México-Pachuca
Tecamac, Edo. de México
MEXICO
viro99_1@yahoo.com

OIE HEADQUARTERS

Dr Monique Eloit

Director General
12 rue de Prony
75017 Paris
FRANCE
Tel: (33) 1 44 15 18 88
Fax: (33) 1 42 67 09 87
oie@oie.int

Dr Laure Weber-Vintzel

Head of Status Department
l.weber-vintzel@oie.int

Dr Simona Forcella

Chargée de mission
Status Department
s.forcella@oie.int

Dr Anna-Maria Baka

Chargée de mission
Status Department
am.baka@oie.int

Dr Hernán Oliver Daza

Chargé de mission
Status Department
oh.daza@oie.int