WORLD ORGANISATION FOR ANIMAL HEALTH
Protecting animals, preserving our future

Original: English
June 2021

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP ON WILDLIFE

Virtual meeting, 15 – 18 June 2021

———

1. Summary

The Working Group on Wildlife (the 'Working Group') met virtually owing to the exceptional circumstances brought about by the pandemic.

To support the OIE's core mission of transparency, the Working Group proposed some actions to improve and simplify the wildlife disease reporting mechanism and to improve the sensitivity of the OIE-WAHIS system. The Working Group also discussed about mechanisms to support Members to manage events affecting wildlife and made recommendations. The tool "Needs Assessment for National Wildlife Health Programs" was presented to the Working Group.

The Working Group was informed and made comments or recommendations on the outcomes from the Technical Item on "Lessons learned from the pandemic: how OIE can support Veterinary Services to achieve One Health Resilience", on the main milestones since the adoption of the OIE Wildlife Health Framework, and on the outcomes of the first meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on reducing risk of disease emergence and spillover through wildlife trade and along the supply chain.

To support the OIE's core mission of Promotion of veterinary services, the Working Group proposed actions to strengthen the wildlife component of the OIE PVS tool, and to improve the functionality of the network of the OIE National Focal Points for Wildlife.

Finally, the Working Group developed a template to guide the members in drafting annual regional reports on new and noteworthy disease events in wildlife.

2. Opening

The Working Group meeting was held by videoconference from 15 to 18 June 2021 and was chaired by Dr William Karesh.

Dr Keith Hamilton, Head of the OIE Preparedness and Resilience Department, welcomed the members, thanking them for their outstanding contribution to the OIE as members of the Group, in particular for their contributions to the 2021 General Session Technical Item and development of the OIE's Wildlife Health Framework, and for the participation of several members in the OIE "*ad hoc* Group on reducing the risk of disease spillover events at markets selling wildlife and along the wildlife supply chain". He also acknowledged the valuable support of Dr Tiggy Grillo (seconded expert to OIE from Wildlife Health Australia) to OIE's wildlife programme and the Australian Department of Agriculture Water and the Environment (DAWE) for its contribution as the first donor to support activities under the Wildlife Health Framework. Drs Uhart and Karesh were thanked for their

contribution as presenters on two General Session videos. It was noted that the two videos (Working Group on Wildlife report and the Technical Item) had the most views of all the videos released for the General Session.

3. Adoption of agenda and designation of rapporteur

Members were appointed as rapporteurs for each session of the meeting. The agenda and the list of participants are provided in Annexes I and II, respectively.

4. Disease intelligence

Drs Paula Caceres and Paolo Tizzani represented the OIE World Animal Health Information and Analysis Department (WAHIAD) during the meeting. Dr Tiggy Grillo represented the OIE Preparedness and Resilience Department.

4.1. Improve and simplify the reporting mechanism to make the reporting of high interest information faster

An update on the development of OIE WAHIS-wild reporting module was provided to the Working Group, mentioning that the development should be finalised in 2022. In the meantime, the Working Group was informed that an alternative strategy for reporting would be to return to the Excel spreadsheets previously used to collect information from the OIE National Focal Points for Wildlife (WFP) on the non-listed diseases of wildlife and to manually introduce the data provided by Members in the old WAHIS system, still accessible to OIE staff. The manual entry of the reports in the old WAHIS system would require WAHIAD resources / staff. The request for reports would be circulated to WFP along with the recently developed Technical Cards for each of the non-listed diseases of wildlife, in addition to documents providing assistance on how to report. Considering the old WAHIS-Wild Public interface was not accessible anymore, there was a need to find an alternative way to publish all the data collected and make them available to Members and other users. The WAHIAD demonstrated a provisional approach to displaying and querying data online that was built using Power BI software (https://powerbi.microsoft.com/en-us/).

As part of the work to improve and simplify reporting mechanisms, the Working Group was informed of the newly developed internal OIE guidance document used by OIE-selected experts to assess if an infectious disease meets the OIE definition of *emerging disease* as described in the Glossary of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code (TAHC). Specifically, the document outlines the quality and type of information necessary and guidance on interpretation of key terms used in the OIE definition of *emerging disease*, both required to determine if an infectious disease should formally be designated as an *emerging disease* on the OIE-WAHIS reference table and Emerging disease registry. Formal recognition of an *emerging disease* would promote ongoing reporting of the disease by OIE Members and flags that the disease might be considered for listing in the future. The Working Group discussed the timelines. It was noted that whilst it might take time for an infectious disease to be formerly assessed by the Specialist Commissions, subject-matter experts, OIE Headquarters, and Members, OIE Members must continue to report *emerging diseases* via Immediate notification through OIE-WAHIS in accordance with the TAHC's Article 1.1.3 and 1.1.4. Members were still encouraged to provide the OIE with animal health information as per the TAHC's Article 1.1.6.

Proposed actions:

- The Working Group agreed that it would be useful to seek voluntary reports for 2019 and 2020 using the Excel spreadsheets, especially as this would be the first opportunity for WFP to report with the assistance of the Technical Cards.

- The Working Group requested to review and provide feedback on the internal OIE "Standard operating procedure for determining if a disease should be considered as *emerging disease*" and the "Guidance for the interpretation of the OIE Terrestrial Code definition of *emerging disease*" (by December 2021).

4.2. Improve system sensitivity

The Working Group was informed about a case study which explored current system sensitivity of OIE-WAHIS by comparing disease information in wildlife reported to OIE-WAHIS with information found in the public domain. The case study was based on reports of tularaemia in wildlife in countries in North America and Europe during the period 2014-2019. First, an analysis using three data sources (OIE-WAHIS, ProMED, Epidemic Intelligence from Open Sources) was conducted. Next, a model was built integrating information from a fourth source (scientific literature collected in PubMed). Using the three-source approach, the predicted number of Tularaemia events was 93 (95% CI 75-114), with an OIE-WAHIS sensitivity of 90%. In the four-source approach, the number of predicted events increased to 120 (95% CI 99-143) and the sensitivity of OIE-WAHIS dropped to 70%. The results indicated a good sensitivity of the OIE-WAHIS system for tuleraemia using the three sources approach, but low sensitivity when including information from scientific literature. This analysis provided a useful approach to assess other disease reported to the OIE (both listed and non-listed) and could be used to identify diseases and regions for which international reporting presents a low sensitivity. To this purpose, WAHIAD had already set an analytical procedure and an R script to assess in a standardized way other listed and non-listed diseases. This could allow evaluation and prioritisation of underreported OIE-listed wildlife diseases on which actions proposed in the Wildlife Health Framework should focus. A manuscript on the tularaemia case study had been drafted for publication.

A review of the current purpose[1] of voluntary reporting of non-OIE listed wildlife diseases was presented to the Working Group. The review explored if the current purpose was clear and being achieved, and whether or not additional achievable and beneficial purposes should be considered. The current and proposed purposes for voluntary reporting were presented against several criteria, including 1) information required to meet the purpose, 2) surveillance tools needed to generate the required information and 3) analysis capability of the information received by the OIE. The Working Group agreed to discuss this further at the next meeting.

In order to further support and encourage OIE Members to submit voluntary reports, a number of resources and activities had been completed or were underway. These include development of Technical cards for each of the non-listed diseases for wildlife, a guidance document on emerging infectious diseases as well as a guidance to assist voluntary reporting (see also item 4.1). In addition, the Working Group discussed how best to explore barriers and needs for voluntary reporting. A survey for WFPs which aimed to explore training requirements, current wildlife surveillance activities and also explore barriers to voluntary reporting had been developed. The Working Group highlighted the need to develop active, two-way, trust-

based relationships / networks with the WFPs and to explore technologies to facilitate reporting and data sharing between systems. The development of WHISPERs was provided as an example(https://whispers.usgs.gov) of technologies to support direct reporting of wildlife disease from national database to OIE-WAHIS. A series of sub-regional meetings had been arranged to discuss wildlife health networks in Asia and the Pacific, which would gather useful perspectives on requirements and formats that might be applicable to other regions. In response to the pandemic and the need to better implement One Health approaches, the collection and sharing of wildlife disease data between different disease reporting systems had been highlighted as of strategic importance by several international groups, including the G20 and G7. This was also a core element of the OIE's Wildlife Health Framework. It would be important for the OIE not to get left behind as other international initiatives gathered pace.

1 "Document new or unexpected occurrences of infectious or non-infectious causes of mortality or morbidity in wildlife" and "Generate knowledge on the presence/absence of infectious or non-infectious agents in wildlife to identify current and potential sanitary risks and trends."

An initial prioritization exercise to evaluate the current non-listed wildlife disease using criteria developed by the Working Group in March 2020 was also presented to the Working Group.

Proposed actions:

- The Working Group agreed to review the purpose of reporting and to revise the non-listed wildlife diseases at the next meeting, drawing upon activities undertaken or to be undertaken by the end of September 2021.

- A manuscript on the Tularaemia case study submitted for publication.

- Survey / engage with WFPs to explore training requirements, current wildlife surveillance activities and also explore barriers to voluntary reporting before WFP training session in September 2021.

5. Mechanisms to support Members to manage events affecting wildlife

In the past 20 years, there were several outbreaks or mortality events affecting wildlife worldwide (e.g. vultures with diclofenac poisoning, amphibians with infection with *Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis* and *Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans*, or Saiga Antelopes with *Pasteurella multocida* serotype B). For these mass mortality events, OIE had not provided technical support for the investigation and response. However, it was felt that the OIE could and should support the response to such events.

The Working Group discussed this situation and concluded that standardized and simple guidance or guidelines on the management of mortality events in wildlife likely already exists and could be repurposed for facilitating investigation, management and reporting by countries.

Proposed actions:

- The Working Group proposed taking stock of the situation and based on this, at their next meeting propose to promote existing guidance or guidelines on the management of mortality events in wildlife, or to develop new ones.
- Once guidance or guidelines are identified, the Working Group suggested setting up an easy and short procedure at the OIE allowing to any OIE Members to have support when there is a mortality event in wildlife.

6. Outcomes from the Technical Item on "Lessons learned from the pandemic: how OIE can support Veterinary Services to achieve One Health Resilience"

The 2021 Technical Item 'Lessons learned from before and during the COVID-19 pandemic; how the OIE can support Veterinary Services to achieve One Health Resilience' and the accompanying Resolution (no.31) were presented to the Working Group. Dr Karesh was thanked for his work in supporting the drafting of the Technical Item, for presenting it to the World Assembly of Delegates and for facilitating the discussion on the accompanying Resolution (no.31). The OIE received comments from numerous countries on the draft Resolution. Members' comments added value and demonstrated strong engagement of the membership on the topics of One Health, Wildlife Health Management, Sustainable Laboratories, and emergency management. The unanimous adoption of Resolution no. 31 signalled a commitment by OIE Members to endorse wildlife health management, One Health, sustainable laboratories, and emergency management as core programmatic work of the OIE. Specifically, the Resolution recommended the better integration of wildlife health management into One Health and animal health strategies; that OIE and OIE Members should work to improve the reporting of wildlife health information to OIE; additional efforts to strengthen multisectoral approaches and systems-based thinking; the endorsement of the Wildlife Health Framework and that OIE should seek funding to operationalize it. It was also noted that sustainable laboratories had a strong link with wildlife health management (surveillance), and that strategies to improve the sustainability of laboratories should also consider support to wildlife disease surveillance.

Recommendations:

- The Working Group stated the need to better consider wildlife health management (surveillance) in the sustainable laboratories programme.

7. OIE Wildlife Health Framework

A summary of the main milestones, since the adoption of the Wildlife Health Framework in December 2020, was presented to the Working Group. The budget, funding status and human resources were also presented, while highlighting that the implementation of the programme was relying on a core group of dedicated staff. Finally, each work package was presented, featuring activities that have been initiated or would be starting in the upcoming months. The focus of these past months has been on fundraising, establishing a costed 5-year workplan, prioritisation of activities, engaging with OIE colleagues from other Departments to get them on board, and starting with quick wins that allow the programme to get rolling.

The Working Group pointed out that activities such as collaboration with CITES, the 'Tripartite', OIE Collaborating Centres, PVS and OIE National Focal Points for Wildlife, i.e., with higher outcome potential, need to be a priority. Indeed, the current prioritisation decision was based on several constraints such as the OIE staff capacity to implement priority activities, the need to build a solid baseline and understand the needs of OIE stakeholders and funding opportunities. The Working Group was reassured that the two objectives were still in sight but no outcome can be presented/delivered just six months after the official start of the programme. Additional discussions revolved around the importance of establishing a network of OIE Collaborating Centres focusing on wildlife to build a community of practice, leverage expertise and resources. Indeed, the OIE is encouraging Collaborating Centres to establish networks, but additional institutional support could help to start the process. Finally, the question of how to engage Focal Points better in supporting the wildlife health framework activities was also discussed. Concerns were also raised about the need to secure additional human resources needed to implement the Wildlife Health Framework.

Recommendations:

- The Working Group proposed to support the OIE in setting the strategic direction on wildlife health and ensuring that the implementation of the wildlife health framework is progressing well;
- The Working Group also indicated the need to develop indicators and metrics to monitor and measure the outcomes of the programme.

8. *Ad hoc* Group on reducing risk of disease emergence and spillover through wildlife trade and along the supply chain

An overview of the purpose and terms of reference for the "*ad hoc* Group on reducing risk of disease emergence and spillover through wildlife trade and along the supply chain" was presented to the Working Group. The participation of several members of the Working Group to the *ad hoc* Group was noted, thus allowing for exchange of expertise and synergies between the two groups.

The Working Group supported the idea that interim guidelines being developed by the *ad hoc* Group include recommended approaches for national or sub-national level risk determination and risk reduction and to utilize a value or supply chain conceptual framework (from source to final destination) on which countries can identify entry points for activities such as identifying various risks and populations at risk, risk monitoring, and risk management options.

9. Options for Wildlife/environmental health capacity/needs assessment tools

No current capacity assessment exists for environmental and wildlife health services, and in many cases, environmental health systems are not formally established with designated functions, sectors and other systematic scope. In response to the current gap, two assessment tool examples have been developed to assist countries in developing national wildlife and environmental health systems capacity:

- Country Assessment for Environmental Health Services: This is intended to support countries in baseline capacity assessment and identification of key gaps, as well as provide orientation and further reading. Its breadth seeks to promote One Health coordination and could be followed up by more in-depth, topical assessment. It builds on existing initiatives promoting environmental resilience, such as the World Bank's Climate Change and Health Diagnostic and Country Environmental Analysis.
- Needs Assessment for National Wildlife Health Programs: This tool provides a pathway for assessing the current state of the national wildlife health program, helps define the future desired state, and identifies the programmatic gaps and needs in functions and capabilities. The tool assesses all aspects of a national wildlife health program, including diagnostic capabilities (pathology, toxicology, microbiology), applied epidemiology (risk assessment, outbreak investigation, surveillance design), health information management (databases, knowledge mobilization, decision support), harmonization and coordination (national-level planning, communication, partner networks, and SOP development), risk communication, applied research, disease management and health promotion (response and interventions), and program management and administration (governance, strategic planning, financial and human resources, workforce development).

The two assessment tools seek to assist countries in prioritizing and tracking capacity development, optimizing use of existing infrastructure. They could potentially be used together, first to examine environment and wildlife scope broadly and then to narrow in on wildlife health system needs and planning. Results could also be used to guide national and international training and investment strategies (and potentially networks to leverage regional laboratory and other expertise and infrastructure). It was noted that there were also opportunities to refine the PVS tools to better collect information on the capacity of National Veterinary Services to play a role in supporting wildlife health management. PVS reports, past surveys to WFPs and information on disease reporting in wildlife may provide useful insights into past and current capacity.

Recommendations and proposed actions:

- Members of the Working Group would provide feedback on these documents by August 15 deadline. The document will then be forwarded to OIE for consideration.

10. Facilitate the transport of wildlife diagnostic specimens

Ms Sofie H. Flensborg (CITES Secretariat) confirmed that the CITES Secretariat was interested in collaborating with the OIE on wildlife trade in the context of the Wildlife Health Framework and on the international movement of diagnostic specimens. She informed the OIE Working Group on Wildlife that the CITES Standing Committee had established a working group on CITES and zoonoses; there had been an enormous interest from international partners in this working group which has over 50 members, including the OIE. The Chair of the CITES working group also will be the chair of the Standing Committee. She highlighted that the guidelines that would be developed by the OIE "*ad hoc* Group on reducing the risk of disease spill-over events at markets selling wildlife and along the wildlife supply chain", could be considered by this CITES working group.

Ms Flensborg presented the guidance on two specific procedures under CITES aimed at facilitating the international exchange of diagnostic specimens of species included in Appendix I or II of CITES: the Simplified procedure and the Scientific exchange exemption. This guidance, which was related to two Resolutions that had been amended at the CITES Conference of the Parties in 2019, had been endorsed by the CITES Standing Committee in May 2021. Ms Flensborg explained the conditions for applying these specific procedures and the advantages they present. The Resolution Conf. 11.15 (Rev. CoP18) containing recommendations on the scientific exchange exemption had been amended at CoP18 *inter alia* to allow for OIE Reference Centres and official reference laboratories to automatically qualify for inclusion in the CITES Register of scientific institutions. Other veterinary diagnostic laboratories could be included in the Register if they meet the standards set out in the Resolution. Exchange of diagnostic samples between two registered institutions would be

exempted from CITES controls under certain conditions. Under the simplified procedures, export and import permits can be partially completed and issued in advance of the trade to expedite trade in case of an emergency.

The Working Group recognised the step forward to facilitate the rapid international transport of diagnostic samples. However, the Working Group highlighted the fact that when there is an outbreak in wildlife, it can be difficult to obtain permits even under the simplified procedures. A diagnostic laboratory, including those that are not OIE Reference Centres, in a potential exporting country should consider applying to the national CITES Management Authority for registration in the CITES Register.

Ms Flensborg noted that the guidance could be updated with inputs from the Wildlife Working Group but further amendments to these specific procedures would need to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties.

Recommendations and proposed actions:

- The Working Group will work on a proposal to further facilitate the exchange of diagnostic samples and will work jointly with the CITES Secretariat.

11. Surveillance of wildlife diseases

11.1. Update on the proposal to assess surveillance of wildlife diseases at the national level

The Working Group was tasked with developing a concept note on ideas for future trainings for OIE National Focal Points for Wildlife (Wildlife Focal Points, WFP). The concept note proposed development of a national wildlife health program needs assessment tool that would assess the current state of the national wildlife health program, define the future desired state, and identify the programmatic gaps and needs in functions and capabilities for wildlife disease surveillance in individual countries. Upon completion of the needs assessment the team would generate a national-level report summarizing the findings and recommended next steps in wildlife health program development. Should further assistance be requested, the team and the OIE Collaborating Centre for Wildlife and Biodiversity would then work with the WFP and in-country partners to co-create training and capacity building activities specifically tailored to the country's needs and level of capability. Pre-developed training modules would be created for key competencies such as outbreak investigation, surveillance, data management, health promotion, etc. The WFP would be the primary point of contact and would assist in inviting key in-country personnel to participate in the needs assessment and follow up training. This approach is consistent with the OIE mandate and would help the organization achieve the goals and objectives in its strategic plan and the Wildlife Health Framework. Sustainably strengthening the in-country wildlife health capacity would also improve the quality of wildlife health surveillance data, enhance reporting of wildlife diseases to the OIE, protect all nations from emerging diseases of wildlife origin, and enhance wildlife conservation and ecosystem resiliency.

This sub-item is linked with the item 9 on Options for wildlife/environmental health capacity/needs assessment tools.

Proposed action:

- The Working Group proposes to circulate this concept note for comments to the relevant Departments at the OIE Headquarters and to review the comments received at its next meeting.

11.2. Update on the potential development of an OIE standard for surveillance and control of wildlife diseases

The Working Group drafted a note for the Terrestrial Animal Health Code Commission proposing to develop a new chapter on surveillance of wildlife diseases.

Proposed actions:

- Once the note has been finalised (by end of June 2021), the Working Group will send it to the Secretariat of the Terrestrial Code Commission.

12. Integrate wildlife health needs into the OIE PVS tool

The Working Group discussed areas in which the current PVS tool (2019) had gaps in reference to wildlife capacities and agreed that there was a need to better assess existing wildlife capacities in OIE Members, even though the exact tools and mechanisms may not yet be defined. It was noted that the PVS tool draws upon the detail in the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* and OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Manual*, and therefore consideration of wildlife in both the Code and the Manual will also be required to better integrate wildlife into the PVS tool. The Working Group also agreed that separate assessments for domestic animals and for wildlife could be more relevant. In this regard, the Working Group highlighted that the current OIE definition of wildlife (Glossary of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*) could be misleading in the assessment process, as captive wild animals, feral animals and free-ranging wild animals are associated with very different health and disease management challenges. These nuances could be relevant both for the assessment tools and for reporting to WAHIS-Wild. Thus, the Working Group discussed proposing a revision of the current OIE definition of wildlife, as stated below in the tables 1, 2a and 2b, presenting crucial differences between feral animals, captive wild animals, and wild animals.

Table 1. Definition proposal in accordance with the 1st Training Manual, with specification of the freedom status for all categories

HUMAN SUPERVISION & CONTROL	PHENOTYPE -> selected by humans?	
	YES = Domestic(ated)	NO = Wild
YES = Captive	**Domestic animals**=livestock (incl. poultry), companion animals	**Captive wild animals**=small game farms, zoo animals, exotic pets
NO = Free-ranging	**Feral animals**=dogs, cats etc. that have escaped from human supervision and established in the natural environment	Free-ranging wild animals (without supervision all year round) = **Wildlife**

Table 2. Surveillance challenges to consider that justify distinction of the four animal types mentioned in Table 1. Two issues purposely not included because they are frequent in free-ranging populations (even if variable and controversial) are feeding and fencing.

Table 2.a. Factors relevant to diagnostic capacities (including laboratory techniques and staff competencies)

Diagnostic capacity	Domestic	Wild
Number of species	Limited, mammals and birds	Large, all taxa, some of which are protected
Validated diagnostic tests	Yes	No
Species conservation concerns potentially hampering rapid sample shipment to competent laboratory (CITES permit needed)	No	Yes (multiple species)
Reference values, knowledge on biology and physiology of host	Yes	Often missing
Need specific training of veterinarians (incl. clinicians, pathologists, microbiologists)	No	Yes (often limited or missing)

Table 2.b. Factors relevant to surveillance, traceability, risk analysis, epidemiology, disease management and animal welfare

Surveillance-related specificity	Captive (close human supervision at least part of the year)	Free-ranging (no human supervision all year round, natural habitat)
Owner	Yes	No (although in practice, it is often the State that acts as owner)
Sector/governmental agency/stakeholders	Veterinary services, owners	Environment, game wardens, rangers, hunters
Identification, traceability, movement control	Yes	No (only possible for individuals captured for research)
Observation of cases	Yes (confinement, limited geographical area)	Difficult (species behavior, environment, large geographical areas)
Potential animal welfare issues	Yes	Uncommon (e.g., translocations, rehabilitation: transport conditions and settings for provisory captivity)
Access to investigation material	Yes, dead and alive (finding carcasses on time for recording mortality and performing analyses is likely)	Difficult, mainly dead. Finding carcasses unlikely unless mass mortality (esp. for small species in forest habitat), no access to samples for population surveys (or disease freedom status documentation) in protected, non-hunted animals

Disease control	Feasible	Very difficult or impossible
Quality of material	Potentially excellent (mild autolysis, clear serum)	Can be very bad (advanced autolysis) due to late, accidental discovery
Knowledge of population size (--> sample size, stratification, randomization) and density	Yes (or at least possible to be determined with a good accuracy level)	No (or only approximate/inaccurate numbers)
Interspecific contacts / interspecific transmission opportunities	Limited, mostly possible to control	Many, not measurable and out of control
Environmental influences	Manageable (captive settings)	Mostly unmanageable (natural environment)
Health focus	Often individual, or both individual and population	Population (rarely individual)
Necessity of specific training of veterinarians (esp. epidemiologists)	No	Yes (training often limited or missing)

It was recognised that explicit inclusion of wildlife health throughout the Code, including specific chapters, will enable PVS to better assess wildlife health management.

Important aspects mentioned in the PVS tool, which likely require a different approach depending on the animal type currently included in the wildlife definition (feral animals, captive wild animals and wild animals) of the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* include, among others:

- Chapter 1 (human, physical and financial resources): competency and education of veterinary staff; identification, traceability and movement control; animal welfare
- Chapter 2 (Technical authority and capability to address current and veterinary issues based on scientific principles): laboratory capacities; risk analysis and epidemiology; disease management (prevention, control and eradication)
- Chapter 3 (sustained interaction with non-government stakeholders): communication; consultation with stakeholders; official representation and international collaboration; and veterinary clinical services.

This item is linked with the item 9 on Options for wildlife/environmental health capacity/needs assessment tools.

Recommendations:

- The Working Group suggested that the OIE PVS team review the gap analysis document prepared by the Working Group to identify possibilities for expansion of the PVS assessment tool to include more information on wildlife health management capabilities and needs, including core competencies, One Health coordination and operationalization, or response to emerging diseases.
- Improving wildlife health capacities is at the core of the OIE Wildlife Health Framework, where assessments of gaps and needs are prominently featured as first step activities towards improving capacities and competencies. The Working Group recommended that OIE clarify expectations as concerns diagnostic capacities and activities for wildlife diseases as listed in chapters 1-3 of the PVS tool as well as for disease reporting to WAHIS-Wild, to evaluate whether expectations are in agreement with the current definition of wildlife, as this will be crucial to develop and implement appropriate assessment and training tools.
- The Working Group recommended revision of the current OIE definitions for wildlife.
- The Working Group suggested that the OIE consider assigning human resources to support coordination of wildlife health assessments and capacity building of Members.

13. Emerging and noteworthy wildlife issues and disease occurrences with relevance to the OIE: reports from members of the Working Group on Wildlife

At the Working Group's meeting in December 2020, it was decided to develop a template to guide the members in drafting annual regional reports on new and noteworthy disease events in wildlife. The Working Group agreed that the purpose of these reports was to bring up noteworthy wildlife health events to the attention of the different members of the Working Group, the OIE and the OIE Members, considering species/biodiversity conservation and public health. The Working Group decided to keep the template as simple as possible and proposed the following information to be included (if available) in the regional reports for each noteworthy disease event:

- disease name / health event followed by pathogen in brackets (or: "infection with pathogen X") or noninfectious cause;
- spatiotemporal frame: geographically limited (local event), small vs. large geographical area, punctual vs. recurring (seasonality if appropriate); or geographically expanding over time (disease spread);
- country(ies)/region(s) where it occurred;
- species involved (followed by latin name in italic in brackets), IUCN Red List status, conservation implications;
- approximate number of affected animals (alive and/or dead as appropriate), information on population size or related numbers (e.g. hunting bag);
- emerging characteristics: new detection in country/region, novel etiology, increased incidence / disease spread, re-emergence;
- zoonotic potential / occurrence of human cases;
- link to trade;
- management measures (prevention, surveillance, control);
- source of information (e.g., scientific reference, governmental report, media report, website, personal communication) to be cited in the text;
- for diseases non-listed by OIE, if appropriate, include a statement (with justification) as to whether the disease should be considered for OIE listing or inclusion as a non-listed wildlife disease.

14. OIE National Focal Points for Wildlife Network (WFPs)

The Working Group developed an updated version of the Terms of Reference for the WFP, in particular in allowing the WFP to be in agencies outside of the "Competent Authority", in including a reference for the work of the WFP in relation to the OIE Wildlife Health Framework, and finally in putting the WFP as a key actor to develop a network at the national level for the surveillance of wildlife diseases and to report the wildlife diseases to the OIE Headquarters through OIE-WAHIS-wild.

Proposed action:

- The Working Group proposed to share the document, for comments, to the relevant OIE Headquarters' departments and OIE regional offices. The comments will be presented at the next meeting of the Working Group.

15. Any other business

In the framework of the Ebo-Sursy project, diagnostic test methods have been developed for the detection of antibodies in humans and non-human primates against Ebola viruses and for the detection of antibodies in bats against Coronaviruses. The Working Group was informed that three scientific papers describing these diagnostic test methods would be sent to it after this meeting to see if these diagnostic tests methods could be included in the relevant disease fact sheets developed for the non-OIE listed disease in wildlife.

16. Date of next meeting

The Working Group proposed the following dates for its next meeting: from Tuesday 7 to Friday 10 December 2021.

17. Adoption of report

The report was adopted by the Working Group.

_____

…/Annexes

Annex I

MEETING OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP ON WILDLIFE

Virtual meeting, 15 – 18 June 2021

———

1. Summary

2. Opening

3. Adoption of agenda and designation of rapporteur

4. Disease intelligence

4.1. Improve and simplify the reporting mechanism to make the reporting of high interest information faster

4.2. Improve system sensitivity

5. Mechanisms to support Members to manage health events in wildlife

6. Outcomes from the Technical Item on "Lessons learned from the pandemic: how OIE can support Veterinary Services to achieve One Health Resilience"

6.1. Recommendations and discussion further the presentation of the Technical Item during the General Session

6.2. Discussion on any impact on the implementation of the Wildlife Health Framework

7. OIE Wildlife Health Framework

7.1. OIE Wildlife Health Framework implementation and costing plan

7.2. Preliminary outputs (e.g. international partnership review, literature review, etc)

8. *Ad hoc* Group on reducing risk of disease emergence and spillover through wildlife trade and along the supply chain

9. Options for Wildlife/environmental health capacity/needs assessment tools

10. Facilitate the transport of wildlife diagnostic specimens

11. Surveillance of wildlife diseases

11.1. Update on the proposal for surveillance of wildlife diseases at the national level

11.2. Update on the potential development of an OIE standard for surveillance and control of wildlife diseases

12. Integrate wildlife health needs into the OIE PVS tool

13. Emerging and noteworthy wildlife issues and disease occurrences with relevance to the OIE: reports from members of the Working Group on Wildlife

14. OIE National Focal Points for Wildlife Network

15. Any other business

16. Date of next meeting

17. Adoption of report

———————

Annex II

MEETING OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP ON WILDLIFE

Paris (France), 15 – 18 June 2021

List of participants

MEMBERS

Dr William B. Karesh (*Chair*)
Executive Vice President for Health and Policy EcoHealth Alliance / Wildlife Trust
520 Eighth Avenue, Suite 1200
New York, NY. 10018
USA

Dr Markus Hofmeyr
Program Officer
Environment Programme
Wildlife Conservation & trade
Oak Philanthropy (UK) Ltd
3rd Floor, 43 Palace Street
London SW1E 5HL
United Kingdom

Dr Rupert Woods
Suite E 34 Suakin Drive
Mosman, NSW 2088
AUSTRALIA

Dr Marcela Uhart
Latin America Program
One Health Institute
School of Veterinary Medicine
University of California, Davis
Los Alerces 3376
Puerto Madryn, Chubut (9120)
ARGENTINA

Dr Jonathan Sleeman
US Geological Survey
US Department of Interior
National Wildlife Health Center
6006 Schroeder Road
Madison, Wisconsin 53711
USA

Prof. Koichi Murata
Department of Wildlife Science
College of Bioresource Sciences
Nihon University
1866 Kameino, Fujisawa
Kanagawa 252-8510
JAPAN

Prof. Marie-Pierre Ryser-Degiorgis
Head of the FIWI Wildlife Group
Centre for Fish and Wildlife Health (FIWI)
Dept. Infectious Diseases and Pathobiology
Vetsuisse Faculty, University of Bern
Postfach, Länggass-Str. 122
CH-3001 Bern
SWITZERLAND

OIE HEADQUARTERS

Dr Keith Hamilton
Head
Preparedness and Resilience Department
oie@oie.int

Dr Tiggy Grillo
Scientific Officer Wildlife Health Programme
Preparedness and Resilience Department
oie@oie.int

Dr François Diaz
Chargé de mission
Preparedness and Resilience Department
oie@oie.int