



**MEETING OF THE OIE *AD HOC* GROUP ON THE EVALUATION  
OF PESTE DES PETITS RUMINANTS STATUS OF MEMBERS<sup>1</sup>**

**Paris, 09 – 11 December 2019**

---

A meeting of the OIE *ad hoc* Group on the Evaluation of peste des petits ruminants (PPR) Status of Members (hereafter the Group) was held at the OIE Headquarters from 09 to 11 December 2019.

**1. Opening**

Dr Matthew Stone, Deputy Director General for International Standards and Sciences of the OIE, welcomed the Group. He thanked the experts for their availability and contribution to the work of the OIE and extended his appreciation to their institutes and national governments for allowing their participation in the meeting. 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 sensitivity and confidentiality of the dossiers received for official recognition and thanked the experts for having signed the forms for undertaking of confidentiality. He also mentioned that if any members of the Group had any conflict of interest in the evaluation of a dossier, the expert(s) should withdraw from the discussions and decision making of the particular application.

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 PPR. 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 PPR free status.

Dr Stone mentioned the progress on the implementation of the OIE/FAO PPR Global Control and Eradication Strategy (PPR GCES) and stressed that it continued being a priority for the OIE. He informed the Group that one of the major concerns identified was the implementation of ineffective vaccination in some countries, which was not based on epidemiological assessment. Dr Stone encouraged the Group to consider this issue, especially when evaluating applications for endorsement of official PPR programmes, and make recommendations to the countries, if relevant.

Dr Neo Mapitse, Head of Status Department, introduced Dr Eliana Lima, who joined the Status Department recently to work on the activities related to official disease status recognition.

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

The Group was chaired by Dr Giancarlo Ferrari and Dr Ahmed Al Idrissi 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 2020 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 PPR free countries

#### a) Lesotho

In July 2019, Lesotho submitted a dossier for the official recognition of its PPR free status based on historical grounds.

In accordance with the established procedures, the participating expert working for the African Union-Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR), which supported Lesotho in developing its national PPR strategy, expressed a possible conflict of interest and withdrew from the decision making on Lesotho's dossier.

The Group requested additional information and received clarifications from Lesotho.

#### i) *Animal disease reporting*

The Group acknowledged that Lesotho had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting to the OIE.

The Group noted that PPR was included in the list of notifiable diseases in Lesotho in the Animal Production, Health and Welfare Draft Bill of 2016, which was validated in November 2019 and subsequently forwarded to the parliament for enactment. The Group further noted that penalties were in place for failure to report suspect cases of notifiable diseases.

The Group appreciated that Lesotho had identified the gaps on the system for the early detection of PPR three years ago and started working to address them by aligning its policy with the PPR GCES. In addition to the inclusion of PPR in the list of notifiable diseases, Lesotho initiated awareness campaigns for PPR in 2016 and PPR training workshops targeting official and private veterinarians, as well as livestock field officers. The latter were interacting with farmers on a daily basis at the dip-tank and woolshed level and would refer any disease incident reported by them to the District Veterinary Officer.

Moreover, awareness activities dedicated to farmers were conducted annually at district level and communication tools, such as radio, television, newspapers, magazines, flyers, as well as social media were used for the dissemination of information related to animal diseases. However, it was not clear if these activities were specific to PPR. The Group, therefore, recommended to Lesotho to organise PPR specific trainings for farmers and mohair workers.

The Group concluded that Lesotho had a functional and adequate early warning system in place for PPR that was established less than 10 years ago. Therefore, the Group agreed that Lesotho was not eligible to claim historical freedom from PPR, as described in Article 1.4.6. of the OIE *Animal Health Terrestrial Code (Terrestrial Code)*, even though PPR had never been reported in the country.

#### ii) *Veterinary Services*

The Group noted that the veterinary competent authority of Lesotho was represented by the Directorate of Livestock Services which had the direct responsibility on the Animal Production and the Veterinary Services divisions. The Group further noted that the Veterinary Services division was structured with five sections, namely Veterinary Public Health, Poultry Diseases, Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory, Epidemiology and Data Management, and Theriogenology. The Group considered that Veterinary Services of Lesotho had the mandate to conduct the surveillance, diagnosis and control for animal diseases.

The Group noted that Lesotho had a significant number of technical staff dispatched into 10 veterinary districts, aligned with the 10 administrative districts. Each district was technically supervised by a District Veterinary Officer. The Group further noted that Lesotho had built woolsheds and dip tanks in more than 300 strategic locations across the country, with the regular presence of livestock health technicians.

The Group took note that Lesotho implemented since 2006 a system for registering and marking, allowing to identify animals at group level. The Group noted that movements of animals and their products within the country were regulated through a two permits system, a first permit to be issued for administrative procedure and then a veterinary movement permit to be issued by veterinary authority after undergoing the clinical examination of animals.

The Group concluded that the Veterinary Services had current knowledge of and authority over the livestock population in the country.

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

The Group acknowledged that PPR had never been reported in the country. In addition, the Group considered the fact that Lesotho is enclaved within the border of a country officially recognised by the OIE as having a PPR free status.

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

Whilst there was no specific regulation in place prohibiting vaccination against PPR in Lesotho, the Group noted that importation of PPR vaccines was not allowed into the country.

In response to a question raised by the Group, Lesotho indicated that prohibition of vaccination against PPR would be included in supplementary regulations once the country's status was determined. The Group recommended that Lesotho proceed with establishing the legal basis for prohibiting vaccination against PPR as soon as possible.

The Group acknowledged that vaccination against PPR had never been carried out and no vaccinated animals had entered Lesotho.

v) *Importation of domestic ruminants and their semen, oocytes or embryos is carried out in accordance with relevant articles of Chapter 14.7.*

The Group noted that importation of small ruminants and their products had only been carried out from a country officially recognised as PPR free by the OIE. Moreover, all imported animals would undergo a quarantine or isolation period at their farms and inspection by a District Veterinary Officer upon their arrival.

The Group further noted that Lesotho did not import genetic material from small ruminants.

The Group concluded that import requirements in Lesotho were in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 14.7. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

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

The Group acknowledged that passive surveillance for PPR was in place in Lesotho and that farmers played an important role in disease surveillance, reporting and control. The Group also took note of the chain of command and protocol to be followed, in case of a PPR clinical suspicion.

In addition, sheep and goats were presented at least three times per year at dip tanks and woolsheds, allowing a regular clinical examination of the small ruminant population. The Group acknowledged that the early warning system implemented through the network of the dip tanks and woolsheds would be able to detect PPR clinical suspect cases in a naïve small ruminant population such as Lesotho's.

The Group noted that serological surveillance for PPR had been conducted in 2018 and 2019 countrywide. In 2018, a total of 3192 samples from sheep and goats were collected and sent to an OIE Reference Laboratory for testing for PPR by competitive ELISA (c-ELISA). The Group noted that samples with positive and doubtful results were further analysed using virus neutralisation test (VNT) and were concluded negative for infection with PPR virus. The Group appreciated that clinical examination had been conducted in all animals with positive and doubtful serological results.

While in 2019 Lesotho adopted the same sampling size as in 2018, only 1000 samples were finally sent to an OIE Collaborating Centre, due to a delay in the shipping procedures, and results were pending. However, the Group acknowledged that Lesotho tested the same samples in the country's Central Veterinary Laboratory (CVL) in the frame of their collaboration with international partners, including an internationally recognised laboratory and the results were negative.

With regard to PPR susceptible wild species, the Group noted that only few numbers of them were present in Lesotho, enclosed in Game Parks and Game Lodges and therefore not considered in the serological surveillance.

The Group noted that Lesotho had arrangements in place with an OIE reference laboratory for PPR diagnosis. The Group appreciated that, in addition to these arrangements, Lesotho had started building laboratory capacity for diagnosis of PPR in the CVL, where serological (c-ELISA) and molecular (nucleic acid detection) PPR diagnostics method were performed. To this end, laboratory staff received training on c-ELISA, conventional and real-time PCR as well as on handling and transportation of potentially infected PPR samples. The trainings were conducted in an OIE Reference laboratory and in a laboratory that had benefited from an OIE twinning project for PPR.

From the additional information provided, the Group noted that the CVL participated in 2019 in proficiency tests on diagnosis of PPR by serological and molecular methods, organised by an international recognised laboratory, and the results were satisfactory. In addition, 10% of the samples collected in the frame of the annual serological surveillance would be sent yearly (as of 2019) to an OIE reference laboratory for proficiency testing.

The Group concluded that the surveillance system in Lesotho was in accordance with the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*. However, the Group highlighted that delays in shipping of samples and consequently in laboratory confirmation could compromise the effectiveness of the early warning system. Therefore, the Group recommended that Lesotho develop robust procedures to accelerate the process for obtaining laboratory results from laboratories outside the country. The Group also requested that Lesotho submit to the OIE the final results from the samples sent to the OIE Collaborating Center as soon as they are available.

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

The Group acknowledged that a memorandum of understanding had been signed between Lesotho and its neighbouring country for coordination on issues related to disease control, movements of livestock and livestock products and general sanitary measures.

The Group noted that activities to be carried out in the event of a PPR outbreak were outlined in the PPR Control and Eradication Strategy of Lesotho, which was validated in November 2019. From the additional information provided, the Group further noted that Lesotho was planning, as a next step, to develop a contingency plan specific for PPR and distribute it to all districts of the country. The Group recommended that, as a matter of urgency, Lesotho finalise the contingency plan for PPR, with detailed description of the structures, roles, responsibilities and processes that should be activated in the event of a PPR outbreak at strategic, tactical and operation level, and share it with the OIE when reconfirming its status in November 2020. Once the contingency plan is finalised, Lesotho should organise regular simulation exercise to test its effectiveness.

The Group appreciated that the existing legislation in Lesotho was reviewed in the frame of a national project funded by a regional partner and that financial compensation, in case stamping out was implemented for disease control purposes, had been included in the Draft Bill of 2016.

Overall, the Group agreed that the necessary regulatory measures for early detection, prevention and control of PPR were in place and compliant with the requirement of the *Terrestrial Code*.

viii) *Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.12.1.*

The Group agreed that the Lesotho's dossier was compliant with the questionnaire in Article 1.12.1.

## *Conclusion*

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and the answers received from Lesotho to the questions raised, the Group concluded that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapter 14.7., Article 1.4.6. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.12.1. of the Terrestrial Code. The Group therefore recommended that Lesotho be recognised as a country free from PPR.

The Group recommended that Lesotho maintain the active clinical and/or serological surveillance for PPR in place and submit to the OIE the final results from the samples sent to the OIE Collaborating centre as soon as they are available. In addition, information on the following should be submitted to the OIE when Lesotho reconfirms its PPR status:

- evidence of the enactment by the parliament of the Animal Production, Health and Welfare Draft Bill of 2016, which includes PPR in the list of notifiable diseases in Lesotho;
- evidence of awareness programmes and trainings on PPR for farmers and mohair workers;
- evidence of a legal basis to prohibit vaccination against PPR;
- evidence on measures taken to accelerate shipment of samples to a laboratory outside the country;
- a copy of the contingency plan specific for PPR.

### **b) Russia**

In October 2019, Russia submitted a dossier for the official recognition of its PPR free status based on historical grounds. The Group requested additional information and received clarifications from Russia.

#### *i) Animal disease reporting*

The Group acknowledged that Russia had a record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting and that PPR was a notifiable disease in the country as per legislation since 2008. The Group noted that sanctions were envisaged for failure to report PPR cases.

The Group further noted that an on-going awareness programme, that included PPR, was in place for veterinary professionals and paraprofessionals, and for the general public. Workshops, webinars and advanced training courses on highly contagious animal diseases were organised regularly for the official and private veterinarians and PPR-related communication material was disseminated in livestock markets, farms and slaughterhouses. While the Group acknowledged that there was information on PPR-related issues in the Veterinary Services website, it was recommended that PPR specific training targeting farmers, slaughterhouse workers and other stakeholders should be developed and implemented.

#### *ii) Veterinary Services*

The Group took note of the presence of the Veterinary Services at national, Federal district and regional (Oblast) levels and of the diffuse network of official and private veterinarians as well as veterinary paraprofessionals in place.

The Group appreciated the information on demographics and distribution of the small ruminants population presented in tables and maps by Federal district, farm density and type of farm. Russia described three types of farms in the country, namely commercial, family-operated and backyard. Data on estimations and the geographical distribution of PPR susceptible wild animals were also provided.

The Group noted that all domestic animals in Russia were subject either to individual or group identification through ear-tags, brands or tattoos. An annual livestock census of livestock holdings was carried out at the end of each calendar year, during which all farm animals were recorded under the Federal State Veterinary Communication System.

The Group further noted that a Governmental Information System of the Russian Federation in the Veterinary Field (GIS VetIS ecosystem) was in place for the surveillance and control of commodity marketing and relevant restrictions imposed, that was comprised of 15 integrated tools (e.g., ARGUS, MERCURY, CERBERUS subsystems, etc.). Among them, the automated sub-system MERCURY, regulated by the State Veterinary Surveillance Authority, was used for the electronic certification and traceability of movements of animals and their products. Only animals and their products accompanied by an electronic veterinary document issued through this system could move within the country. The Group appreciated the statistical information on such movements provided in a table.

The Group commended Russia for the comprehensive system in place for animal identification and movement control and acknowledged that the Russian Veterinary Authority had current knowledge of, and authority over, all domestic sheep and goats in the country.

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

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

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

The Group acknowledged that vaccination against PPR had not been carried out in Russia for more than 25 years and was prohibited since 2017 as per legislation. The Group noted that the Federal State Financed Institution “Federal Centre for Animal Health” (FGBI “ARRIAH”) maintained a stock of PPR vaccine for emergency vaccination in case of a PPR outbreak.

v) *Importation of domestic ruminants and their semen, oocytes or embryos is carried out in accordance with relevant articles of Chapter 14.7.*

From the information provided in the dossier and Russia’s response to requests for additional information, the Group noted that, during the past 24 months, live small ruminants and their semen, oocytes or embryos had been imported into Russia only from countries with an official PPR free status.

However, the Group further noted that Russia, as part of a regional economic union, could allow imports from the union’s members, none of which was officially recognised by the OIE as free from PPR. In response to a relevant question, Russia clarified that imports of clinically healthy small ruminants from such countries could be allowed only if the imported animals originated from zones where PPR was absent during the past 36 months. In addition, in such cases, the imported animals would be subjected to quarantine, during which clinical examinations would be conducted, as well as diagnostic testing for notifiable diseases for which the importing country implements prevention or eradication programmes.

The Group highlighted that, should Russia import small ruminants from any countries without an officially recognised PPR free status by the OIE, the requirements of Article 14.7.10. should be followed, according to which animals should be submitted to a diagnostic test for PPRV infection with negative result no more than 21 days prior to shipment.

The Group appreciated that Russia transparently described the illegal movements of small ruminants within and into the country detected in the last 24 months and agreed that the corrective measures applied were satisfactory.

The Group concluded that the import requirements were in line with the provisions of Chapter 14.7 of the *Terrestrial Code*.

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

The Group acknowledged that passive surveillance for PPR had been in place for at least ten years. The Group appreciated the concise information provided on PPR suspicions detected during the past two years, which was indicative of the effectiveness of the early warning system in place. The Group acknowledged that PPR suspect cases were appropriately followed-up, including by laboratory testing using PCR, ELISA and virus neutralisation tests to rule out infection with PPRV and reach a final diagnosis.

The Group further noted that, in addition to passive surveillance, intense serological surveillance had been performed since 2017 in PPR susceptible animals in high-risk areas of Russia, bordering PPR infected countries. The Group acknowledged that wildlife samples from PPR susceptible wild species were also included in the surveillance. While pathogen-specific surveillance was not mandatory according to Article 1.4.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*, the Group appreciated that Russia had identified high-risk areas and commended the country for the serological surveillance in place in these areas. The Group encouraged the Veterinary Services to maintain such vigilance, considering the risk of PPR virus introduction from neighbouring infected countries.

The Group appreciated the information provided on the implementation of the serological surveillance, including its design, diagnostic tests used, results and follow-up of inconclusive results. However, the Group noted the absence of samples with false positive or doubtful status falling within the percentage level expected for the ELISA kit used. It was noted that the specificity claimed (100%) of the test performed was not consistent with the widely available data on the use of such test (99.7%). Considering the large number of samples tested, a proportion of false positives around 0.3% would have been expected. Such a high specificity could indicate use of a cut-off that would affect the diagnostic sensitivity of the test. The Group recommended Russia ensure that the early detection of true positive cases not be compromised by interpretations unduly affecting sensitivity and specificity.

The Group noted that laboratory diagnosis of PPR using commercial and validated diagnostic methods (ELISA, VNT and PCR) was carried out at the FGBI ARRIAH. The Group noted that FGBI ARRIAH was officially accredited according to GOST ISO/IEC 17025-2009 requirements and participated in inter-laboratory comparison tests organised by an OIE Reference Laboratory in 2017 and 2019.

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

The Group noted that simulation exercises for highly contagious animal diseases were organised by the Russian Veterinary Services on a routine basis, to practice their interaction with the Emergency Control Ministry, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and other services for the control, prevention of disease spread and eradication in the event of an outbreak.

The Group acknowledged that a national PPR contingency plan as well as national PPR Surveillance programme were in place. Under these documents, comprehensive regional action plans had been developed for the prevention of PPR occurrence and its spread in the regions.

The Group further noted that Russia, as part of a regional economic union, was following the regional rules for interaction of the union's Members in the field of prevention, diagnosis, containment and eradication of highly contagious animal diseases.

The Group acknowledged the presence of extensive veterinary legislation and sufficient regulatory instruments compliant with the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*, empowering the Russian Veterinary Services to implement all the necessary activities for the prevention, early detection and control of PPR.

viii) *Compliance with the questionnaire in Article 1.12.1.*

The Group agreed that Russia's dossier was compliant with the questionnaire in Article 1.12.1.

*Conclusion*

Considering the information submitted in the dossier and the answers received from Russia to the questions raised, the Group considered that the application was compliant with the requirements of Chapter 14.7., Article 1.4.6. and with the questionnaire in Article 1.12.1. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Group therefore recommended that Russia be recognised as a country free from PPR.

*Recommendations to Russia:*

The Group recommended that Russia (also detailed in the relevant sections above):

- develop and implement PPR specific training targeting farmers, slaughterhouse workers and other stakeholders;
- maintain vigilance in the areas bordering infected countries representing a risk of PPR virus introduction;
- follow the requirements of Article 14.7.10, in case of importation of small ruminants from any countries without an officially recognised PPR free status by the OIE.

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

The Group assessed a request of a Member for the endorsement of its national official control programme for PPR and concluded that the application did not meet the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*. The dossier was referred back to the applicant Member.

**5. Evaluation of an application from a Member for the recovery of its suspended PPR free status**

The Group assessed a request of an OIE Member for the recovery of its suspended PPR free status and considered that the application did not meet the requirements of the *Terrestrial Code*. The dossier was referred back to the applicant Member.

**6. Amendments to Chapter 14.7 and questionnaires under Chapter 1.12. of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code***

**a) Link between PPR virus holding facilities and the procedure for PPR official status recognition**

In response to a request from the Commission, the Group considered a discussion paper proposing to link the documentation of facilities holding PPR virus containing materials (PVCM) with the OIE procedure for official recognition with regard to PPR by including a relevant requirement in Chapter 14.7. and in the questionnaires under Chapter 1.12. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Group welcomed the proposal to request information from Members on PVCM holding facilities as part of their application for official recognition of PPR free status. Developing an inventory of such facilities would facilitate the sequestration and destruction of the PPR virus once the disease was eradicated. However, the Group stressed that, at this early stage of the implementation of the PPR GCES, neither the maintenance of PVCM by countries that have eradicated PPR nor the level of biosecurity measures currently in place should impact the official recognition of PPR free status by OIE.

The Group agreed that the biosecurity criteria to define adequate PVCM facilities should be defined at a later stage.

The Group drafted the definition of PVCM under Article 14.7.1. and the provisions in Article 14.7.3.; submission of this information by Members would be required for the official recognition and maintenance of their PPR free status. In this regard, relevant questions were drafted as part of the questionnaires under Articles 1.12.1. and 1.12.2.

**b) Impact of importing vaccinated animals into a PPR free country or zone**

Article 14.7.10. describes the provisions for importation of animals from infected countries including vaccinated animals. However, in accordance with Article 14.7.3., for a country or zone having an official PPR free status, there should be no vaccinated domestic sheep and goats imported since the cessation of vaccination. Following a Member's comment raising this potential discrepancy, the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission requested the Group to provide its opinion on the impact of the importation of animals vaccinated against PPR on an officially recognised PPR free status.

The Group discussed the aforementioned issue and noted that the definition of PPRV infection under Article 14.7.1. excluded the isolation of PPR vaccine strains from sheep and goats. The Group agreed that there is no scientific evidence that small ruminants vaccinated against PPR pose a risk to a PPR naïve population. Therefore, the Group concluded that the importation of such animals would not represent a risk to officially recognised PPR free countries.

However, the Group highlighted that should such imports occur, the importing country should have a thorough knowledge of the population of these animals as well as good records of their vaccination. Small ruminants vaccinated against PPR should be distinctly identified and their movements should be constantly monitored. In addition, a vaccine and a test that would differentiate vaccinated animals from PPR infected animals (DIVA) should be available to account for any weaknesses in the systems for traceability, and this is not yet the case.

Finally, the Group recalled that PPR had been included in the list of diseases for which the OIE grants an official status, following the decision of the OIE and FAO to embark upon the control of PPR on a global scale and develop a PPR GCES. The Group considered that the introduction of animals vaccinated against PPR into a PPR free country could affect efficient progress towards global eradication of the disease, through potential interference with surveillance activities in the importing countries.

In light of the above, particularly in the absence of a DIVA test and marker vaccines against PPR, as well as the demanding level of surveillance that would be required to ensure the traceability of all vaccinated small ruminants if imported in anything other than low numbers, the Group was of the opinion that the prohibition of imports of sheep and goats vaccinated against PPR by a country or zone having an official PPR free status should be maintained. This position should be reviewed if appropriate vaccine and diagnostic technologies become available.

In Article 14.7.10, the option of applying a vaccination requirement for imports of sheep and goats from countries considered infected with PPR remains relevant, but as a result of Article 14.7.3 should only be used by importing countries that have not received official recognition of freedom, or do not expect to seek such recognition for at least two years.

In summary, there is no discrepancy between these two articles, but their interaction should be fully appreciated, in particular by countries that have achieved or will soon seek official recognition of freedom from PPR.

## **7. Adoption of report**

The 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 PESTE DES PETITS RUMINANTS STATUS OF MEMBERS**

**Paris, 9 – 11 December 2019**

---

**Terms of Reference**

The OIE *ad hoc* group on peste des petits ruminants (PPR) status of Members (the Group) is expected to evaluate the applications for official recognition of PPR free status and for endorsement of official control programme of PPR received from Members 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, if not done before.
2. Complete the Declaration of Interests Form in advance of the meeting of the Group and forward it to the OIE at the earliest convenience and at least two weeks before the meeting.
3. Evaluate the applications from Members for official recognition of PPR free status and for endorsement of official control programmes 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 (Terrestrial Code)* requirements, using the form provided by the OIE;
    - draft the questions whenever the analysis of the dossier raises questions which need to be clarified or completed with additional details by the applicant Member;
    - 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 in case of possible conflict of interest;
    - provide a detailed report in order to recommend, to the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases, i) the country(ies) or zone(s) to be recognised (or not) as PPR free ii) country(ies) to have (or not) the OIE endorsement of national official control programme for PPR, and to indicate any information gaps or specific areas that should be addressed in the future by the applicant Member.
4. Consider and propose amendments to Chapter 14.7 and the questionnaires under Chapter 1.12. of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*. In particular:
  - a) consider the discussion paper proposing to link the documentation of holdings of PPR virus containing materials (PCVM) with the OIE procedure for official recognition with regard to PPR;
  - b) define PCVM in Chapter 14.7.;
  - c) draft provisions in Articles 14.7.3. and 14.7.34. to request information from Members on PPR virus containing material holding facilities as part of their application for official recognition of PPR free status;
  - d) describe the appropriate level of biosecurity in these facilities;
  - e) draft the relevant questions in the PPR questionnaires under Chapter 1.12;
  - f) With reference to point 2.iv. of Article 14.7.3. and point 3.b. of Article 14.7.10. consider the impact of importation of vaccinated animals on official recognition as a country or zone free from PPR.
5. 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, 9 – 11 December 2019**

---

**Agenda**

1. Opening
  2. Adoption of the agenda and appointment of chairperson and rapporteur
  3. Evaluation of applications from Members for official recognition of peste des petits ruminants (PPR) free status
    - Lesotho
    - Russia
  4. Evaluation of an application from a Member for the endorsement of official control programme for PPR
  5. Evaluation of an application from a Member for the recovery of its suspended PPR free status
  6. Amendments to Chapter 14.7 and questionnaires under Chapter 1.12. of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*
  7. Adoption of report
-

**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON THE EVALUATION  
OF PESTE DES PETITS RUMINANTS STATUS OF MEMBERS**

**Paris, 9 – 11 December 2019**

---

**List of Participants**

**MEMBERS**

---

**Dr Abdenacer Bakkouri**

*(invited but could not attend)*  
component manager  
European neighbourhood FMD Risk  
Reduction work programme  
European Commission for the Control of  
Foot-and-Mouth Disease (EuFMD)  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the  
United Nations

**Dr Giancarlo Ferrari**

Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale del  
Lazio e della Toscana  
Via Appia Nuova 1411  
00178 Roma  
ITALY

**Dr Ahmed el Idrissi**

Imb. Bouarfa 9  
Residence Assabah  
CYM 10050 Rabat  
MOROCCO

**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

**Dr Sith Premasithira**

Veterinarian-Senior Professional Level  
Bureau of Disease Control and Veterinary  
Services,  
Department of Livestock Development  
69/1 Phaya Thai Road, Ratchethevi  
Bangkok 10400  
THAILAND

**Dr Henry Wamwayi**

STSD Project Coordinator  
AU-IBAR  
P.O. Box 30786 – 00100  
Nairobi,  
KENYA

**OBSERVER**

---

**Dr Jean-Jacques Soula**

*(invited but could not attend)*  
OIE Coordinator, FAO-OIE joint PPR Secretariat  
Via delle terme di Caracalla  
00153 Rome  
ITALY

**REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION**

---

**Dr Misheck Mulumba**

Agricultural Research Council  
Private Bag X05  
Onderstepoort 0110  
Pretoria  
SOUTH AFRICA

**OIE HEADQUARTERS**

---

**Dr Matthew Stone**

Deputy Director General  
[oiie@oiie.int](mailto:oiie@oiie.int)

**Dr Neo Mapiitse**

Head  
Status Department  
[disease.status@oiie.int](mailto:disease.status@oiie.int)

**Dr Min Kyung Park**

Deputy Head  
Status Department  
[disease.status@oiie.int](mailto:disease.status@oiie.int)

**Dr Anna-Maria Baka**

Chargée de mission  
Status Department  
[disease.status@oiie.int](mailto:disease.status@oiie.int)

**Dr Wael Sakhraoui**

Chargé de mission  
Status Department  
[disease.status@oiie.int](mailto:disease.status@oiie.int)

**Dr Eliana Lima**

Chargée de mission  
Status Department  
[disease.status@oiie.int](mailto:disease.status@oiie.int)

**Dr Charmaine Chng Wenya**

Chargée de mission  
Standards Department  
[standards.dept@oiie.int](mailto:standards.dept@oiie.int)