



Organisation
Mondiale
de la Santé
Animale

World
Organisation
for Animal
Health

Organización
Mundial
de Sanidad
Animal

Original: English
February 2011

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION

Paris, 1–11 February 2011

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at the OIE Headquarters in Paris from 1 to 11 February 2011.

The list of the members of the Code Commission and the agenda adopted are presented in Annex 1.

On behalf of Dr Bernard Vallat, Director General of the OIE, Dr Alejandro Thiermann, President of the Code Commission, welcomed members and thanked them for their ongoing work in support of the OIE.

The Code Commission thanked the following Members for providing written comments: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, Chinese Taipei, the European Union (EU), Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, People's Republic of China, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand and United States of America (USA). Comments were also received from the International Embryo Transfer Society (IETS), two regional organisations – the Comité Veterinario Permanente del CONOSUR (CVP) and the Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA) –, the International Coalition for Farm Animal Welfare (ICFAW) and an industry organisation.

The Code Commission examined various draft texts of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code)* in the light of comments that Members had provided by the requested deadline of 7 January 2011, as well as comments outstanding from the September 2010 Code Commission meeting. It also reviewed the reports of several *ad hoc* Groups, the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group (APFSWG) and the Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG).

The Code Commission's proposals for modification of the *Terrestrial Code* and related matters are presented as Annexes to this report. Amendments made to the *Terrestrial Code* Chapters at the September 2010 meeting, which were circulated to Members in November 2010, are shown as double underlined text and deleted text in ~~strike through~~. Amendments made at the February 2011 meeting, which are also shown in double underline/strike through, are highlighted with a coloured background to distinguish them.

All Member comments were considered by the Code Commission. However, because of the large volume of comments received, the Code Commission could not prepare a detailed explanation of the reasons for accepting or not accepting each individual comment. Members are reminded that if comments are resubmitted without modification or new justification, the Code Commission will not, as a rule, repeat previous explanations for decisions. The Code Commission encourages Members to refer to previous reports when preparing comments on longstanding issues.

The texts presented in Part A of this report are proposed for adoption at the 79th OIE General Session. Chapters provided for Member comment are presented in Part B, together with reports of meetings (Working Groups and *ad hoc* Groups) and related documents.

The Code Commission strongly encourages Members to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by sending comments on this report. Comments should be submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a scientific rationale. Members should **not use the automatic 'track-change' function** provided by word processing software, because suggested text changes may be lost when preparing the working document prior to the Code Commission meeting. Rather, Members should show proposed new text with double underline and proposed text deletions with ~~strike through~~. Members should try to provide a scientific justification should for all proposed changes.

Submission of comments on this report for consideration by the Code Commission in September 2011

Comments should be sent to the International Trade Department at: trade.dept@oie.int by the deadline shown below. To facilitate the work of *ad hoc* Groups meeting in June-August 2011, the Commission set an earlier deadline for the submission of comments on Annexes 30, 31 and 34.

Text	Deadline for comment
Annex 30 (proposed new Chapter 3.3. on Veterinary Legislation)	31 May 2011
Annex 31 (revised Chapters 6.7. and 6.8. on Antimicrobial Resistance)	31 May 2011
Annex 34 (revised Chapters 8.4. and 8.13. on Zoonotic Parasites)	31 May 2011
All other annexes in Part B	6 August 2011

A. MEETING OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL WITH THE OIE TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION FOR ANIMAL DISEASES

Dr Vallat drew the attention of Commission members to the first OIE Global Wildlife Conference, which will be held in Paris in February 2011. This will be the first global forum between OIE and the agencies and public interested in both health and protection of wildlife and the environment.

Dr Vallat also commented on the forthcoming global Conference on Aquatic Animal Health Programmes and Food Security (Panama, 28–30 June 2011) and the OIE Global Conference on Rabies, to take place in Seoul (Republic of Korea) on 7–9 September 2011.

Dr Vallat informed members of the decision to hold a global Conference on FMD in Bangkok (Thailand) in June 2012. This conference will also be a pledging conference. Based on the recommendations to be included in the *Terrestrial Code* on official control programmes for FMD and following decisions from the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (SCAD) and the World Assembly of Delegates, donors will be encouraged to support long term activities of veterinary services in developing countries, where there is a priority to establish national strategic plans for FMD control and eradication. Dr Vallat noted that this work is being undertaken in close collaboration with the FAO, which has the role of supporting countries in the implementation of official control programmes for FMD.

Dr Vallat reminded members that in 2011 the veterinary profession is celebrating its 250 years anniversary. The OIE is involved in several important initiatives relevant to the Vet2011 celebrations.

The second global Conference on Veterinary Education will take place in Lyon on 13–14 May 2011. This conference will feature presentations on the OIE's work on veterinary education. Dr Vallat stated his hope that in May 2011 the World Assembly will adopt a resolution supporting the OIE recommendations on veterinary education, specifically the day 1 competencies of graduates to enable future public and private sector veterinarians to ensure that Veterinary Services can fulfil key OIE objectives.

The final event of Vet 2011 celebrations will be during the World Veterinary Association Congress, which will be held in Capetown (South Africa) on 10–14 October 2011. The OIE will organise a scientific seminar within that congress.

Dr Vallat indicated that he is looking forward to the declaration of World Freedom from Rinderpest at the OIE General Session in May 2011, which will be in principle attended by the FAO Director General. The FAO will also celebrate this important event at the annual meeting of the Committee of Agriculture Ministers in Rome, in June 2011. Dr Vallat indicated that the *Terrestrial Code* chapter on rinderpest would need to be revised to provide for the post-eradication era. In particular, new text would be needed on the management of virus infected samples and vaccine stocks and on contingency plans in the event of an outbreak of rinderpest in the post declaration period.

In terms of the ongoing work programme of the Specialist Commissions, Dr Vallat pointed to FMD and rabies as priority diseases for development of revised texts in the *Terrestrial Code*. On rabies, Dr Vallat noted that the draft revised chapter had been the subject of many Member comments. Although it might be difficult to resolve all the points raised by Members, Dr Vallat encouraged the two Commissions to work together to develop a consensus text for adoption, hopefully, in 2012. Dr Etienne Bonbon raised concerns about the timing of the revision of the rabies chapter in the *Terrestrial Code*, given that the chapter of the OIE *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals* (the *Terrestrial Manual*) on rabies is currently under revision. Dr Vallat indicated that the revision of the Manual chapter on rabies was a complex subject and that the work on the two chapters should be closely coordinated. Dr Vallat asked the two commissions to try to reach consensus as far as possible on recommendations for rabies before the conference in Seoul.

On the official control programme for FMD, Drs Thiermann and Gideon Brückner emphasised the need for explanation of the objectives of this initiative, as some Members have expressed serious concerns about the implications for international trade.

Dr Thiermann praised the greatly improved coordination of Members within regions, with particular reference to Africa and South America and the provision of comprehensive input to the work of the Code Commission.

Disease reporting is a very important and sensitive topic. To improve the framework for updating and modernising texts, Dr Vallat stated that it would be important to improve communication and coordination on the issues of wildlife, disease reporting, food safety and potentially for health certification and labelling. On the definition and treatment of wildlife in the *Terrestrial Code*, Dr Vallat noted that the two Commissions should try to identify a consensus position in time for discussion at the OIE global wildlife conference in February 2011.

On African horse sickness, Dr Brückner indicated that the revised chapter, with the disease freedom questionnaire, is now ready to be forwarded to the Code Commission, but noted that this text was not necessarily for adoption in 2011.

Dr Brückner commented that, given its current work load, the SCAD would need to increase the number or duration of its meetings. Dr Vallat indicated that he could give this request positive consideration. He also indicated that the OIE could provide additional financial and logistical support, including the provision of secretaries or translators, to help the departments to achieve their work. Dr Vallat expressed his keenness for new and revised standards to be adopted promptly, always providing that the established democratic procedures are respected.

Dr Thiermann indicated that several Members had commented on errors in and discrepancies between the Spanish and the English texts of the *Terrestrial Code* and the report of the Code Commission meeting. These Members also requested a more timely release of the Spanish text of the *Terrestrial Code* to facilitate the participation of hispanophone countries. Dr Vallat explained that a professional translator had recently been recruited with the financial support of Spain to examine all Spanish texts and develop a glossary of terms used in the *Terrestrial Code*.

B. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Annex 1 contains the adopted agenda and the list of Code Commission members.

**C. JOINT MEETING OF THE
OIE TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION AND
THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION FOR ANIMAL DISEASES**

1. Rinderpest

The two Commissions held an extensive discussion on the expected declaration in 2011 of the global eradication of rinderpest and the need that would arise for amendment of Chapter 8.12. Bearing in mind that a major modification of the current chapter, and the inclusion of new text would be required to formulate recommendations for the post freedom declaration period, the two Commissions agreed that this should be carefully considered before proposing text for examination by Members. It was agreed that the Code Commission would review the text provided by the SCAD and would develop a proposal for an amended chapter on rinderpest after the May 2011 General Session and for distribution to Members after the Code Commission meeting in September 2011.

2. Foot and mouth disease

Dr Brückner identified a need for care in the development of new text on the ‘OIE endorsed official control programme for FMD’. Dr Thiermann agreed and noted that Members had submitted extensive comments on the proposed amendment of Article 8.5.7 bis. ‘OIE endorsed official control programme for FMD’. Mindful of the voluntary nature of the undertaking, Members questioned whether the implementation of an OIE endorsed official control programme for FMD was considered mandatory for a Member to comply with the provisions of the *Terrestrial Code*. Members also highlighted the fact that the official control programme is meant to be progressive (ie that Members should continue pursuing the pathway towards eradication).

Dr Thiermann pointed out that some Members had proposed that the OIE endorsed official control programme for FMD be addressed in a new, horizontal chapter in the *Terrestrial Code* rather than being incorporated in Chapter 8.5. (FMD).

Dr Bonbon supported the view of Members that countries should not be disadvantaged as a result of not seeking OIE endorsement of an official control programme for FMD as this was a sovereign decision. The provisions in the *Terrestrial Code* (Article 8.5.25.) already distinguish, for trade purposes, between countries that adopt an official control programme and those that do not.

Dr Brückner suggested that the new text be placed in Chapter 8.5. because, for the time being, the text specifically refers to FMD. There was general agreement that the Code Commission would include the text on the OIE recognised official control programme towards the end of the chapter and next to the articles on OIE recognition.

3. Trade in animal products (‘commodities’)

The two Commissions agreed that the concept of the official control programme for FMD would contribute positively towards the strengthening of the competencies of Veterinary Services, thereby facilitating safe trade in animal products (commodities). In addition, the clarification of what is needed to achieve effective immunisation when vaccinating a population could help to promote commodity trade. The two Commissions agreed that there was no need to undertake new work on trade in commodities pending adoption of new text with provisions on the official control programme for FMD.

4. Compartmentalisation

The Code Commission noted the generic, user-friendly checklist for the practical implementation of compartments, which had been provided by the Epidemiology *ad hoc* Group. Noting that SCAD supported this text, the Code Commission undertook to circulate it to Members for information and comment. Dr Thiermann noted that this document was destined to be placed on the OIE internet site rather than for incorporation into the *Terrestrial Code*, as had been done with the Checklist on the Application of Compartmentalisation for avian influenza and Newcastle disease.

On the use of compartmentalisation for the control of bovine tuberculosis, it was agreed to proceed with both concepts, i.e. compartmentalisation and herd freedom.

Dr Thiermann provided a brief progress report on a Member’s compartmentalisation project.

5. Wildlife

Dr Thiermann noted that the Code Commission had decided to withdraw the proposed definition of ‘wildlife’ as this had raised some confusion and concern on the part of Members. Both Commissions agreed that the terms introduced by the OIE Wildlife Working Group (i.e. captive wild animal, feral animal and wild animal) being proposed for adoption should be introduced into the Glossary.

6. Rabies

Dr Brückner and Dr Thiermann agreed that, in light of the volume and diversity of Member comments, the draft revision of Chapter 8.10 would be sent to a new *ad hoc* Group on Rabies for review. Dr Elisabeth Erlacher-Vindel informed the meeting that an additional new *ad hoc* Group on rabies would be convened under the Biological Standards Commission to review the Manual chapter.

7. Zoonotic parasitic diseases

Dr Brückner asked that the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Zoonotic Parasitic Diseases be shared with the SCAD as soon as the Code Commission has reviewed it. Dr Thiermann agreed to this request and further noted that both the OIE and the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) are working on trichinellosis and *Cysticercus bovis*. Dr Thiermann expressed the view that this area of work was appropriate and could serve as model for joint development of common standards by the OIE and CAC.

8. Scrapie

The position of the two Commissions has not changed in regard to an agreement not to include in the *Terrestrial Code* information on pathogen/host genotype interactions and on maintaining the title of Chapter 14.9. as ‘scrapie’ (i.e. not changing it to ‘classical scrapie’, as per the request of the International Embryo Transfer Society).

9. Request for new chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*

The two Commissions were in agreement that no new diseases be considered for inclusion in the list of diseases, and that no work be launched to draft new chapters pending the finalisation of the revised approach to disease listing criteria.

10. Antimicrobial resistance

Dr Elisabeth Erlacher-Vindel advised that an *ad hoc* Group had reviewed and proposed revisions to Chapters 6.8. and 6.9. and that this Group would hold a second meeting after the General Session. Noting that the report of the Group had been endorsed by the SCAD, Dr Thiermann confirmed that the Code Commission would distribute the report to Members with a request for comment.

D. EXAMINATION OF MEMBER COMMENTS AND WORK OF RELEVANT EXPERT GROUPS

1. Update on reports of other commissions; harmonisation with the OIE *Aquatic Animal Health Code*; other relevant activities of the OIE

The Code Commission noted the work of the Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (CCFICS), which is developing a standard on national food safety systems, and urged OIE Members to strive for better coordination with their CAC counterparts at the national level to ensure that the OIE role in setting standards for animal diseases and zoonoses is appropriately recognised in this standard.

2. Revision of the *Terrestrial Code*

Agenda item 1. Categorisation of Part A and B

The Code Commission discussed and agreed on the inclusion of items in Parts A and B of the report.

Agenda item 2. Foreword of the *Terrestrial Code*

The Code Commission noted the revised foreword, which clarifies the aim of the *Terrestrial Code* as being the improvement of animal health and welfare and veterinary public health worldwide, including by describing health measures to be used by veterinary authorities to detect, report and control pathogenic agents, and to prevent their transfer via international trade. Members of the Code Commission undertook to send comments to the OIE subsequent to the meeting.

Agenda item 3. Spanish translation of the *Terrestrial Code*

See discussion under Point A.

Agenda item 4. General comments

The Code Commission agreed with Members who requested that supporting documents (including reports of *ad hoc* Groups) be placed in the public domain before or at the same time as amendments are proposed to the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission noted a Member's comment opposing the proposal for adoption of chapters that are circulated for the first time in the February report, and agreed with the principle stated by the Member. However, emergency situations could occur in the future.

A Member called for the OIE to provide more information in advance of the consultation process and for the criteria for the establishment of a new chapter to be explained. Such criteria should include the feasibility of implementing the proposed chapter. The Code Commission agreed to pay more attention to this point in future but reminded Members that this information was generally provided in the meeting reports of the Code and the Scientific Commission.

Agenda item 5. *Terrestrial Code* Glossary

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Chile, the EU, Norway, Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA) and the International Scientific Working Group of the International Natural Sausage Casing Association (INSCA).

The Code Commission discussed Member comments on the definition of 'wildlife' and decided to remove this definition from the Glossary, based on the consideration that the categories (e.g. 'feral animal, captive wild animal') should be specified whenever they are mentioned in the Code.

Following Members' recommendations, the definition of 'captive wild animal' and 'feral animal' were modified for clarity.

A request to develop a new definition for 'natural casings' was not accepted because this term is not currently used in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The revised Glossary, proposed for adoption, is at Annex 2.

Agenda item 6. Notification and criteria for listing diseases (Chapters 1.1. and 1.2.)

a) Notification of diseases and epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1.)

Comments were received from Canada, the EU, New Zealand and the USA.

The Code Commission accepted Member comments and modified the text of Articles 1.1.1. and 1.1.3. to improve clarity and to heighten awareness of the importance of notification, using WAHIS for reporting.

The revised Chapter 1.1., for adoption, is in Annex 3.

b) Criteria for listing diseases (Chapter 1.2.)

Comments were received from Canada, the EU, Norway and the USA.

The Code Commission noted a Member's support for the proposal to reorganise the *Terrestrial Code* according to the scientific name of pathogens.

The Code Commission noted that some Members had objected to the proposed modification of Article 1.2.1. with respect to the proposed inclusion of the text 'potential for international spread'. Dr MacDiarmid noted that definitions and interpretations of 'potential' are at the source of many disputes on sanitary measures. The inclusion of text in a footnote: '..it may be decided, in limited cases, not to list a disease' was considered to be inappropriate. The Code Commission also considered that the proposed new text in Article 1.2.1. point 1 (v) referring to 'wild animal populations that are an asset *worth protecting* for economic or ecological reasons' and in point 2 : 'possible significant economical (*sic*) impact' was not sufficiently clear.

In a joint meeting with Dr Ben Jebara, the Code Commission proposed modifications to Chapter 1.2., with the exception of the decision tree, which would be modified only after the proposed new text had been adopted.

In response to Member comments, the Code Commission agreed that no new diseases (including chronic wasting disease) should be listed until such time as the revised listing criteria have been considered by Members. However, the decision to delist diseases, where Members generally support delisting of a disease, should not be delayed.

A member's request to retain leptospirosis as a listed disease was not supported but the Code Commission agreed that the OIE consider providing advice on leptospirosis via other routes (e.g. via a document on the OIE website or a technical disease card.)

The revised Chapter 1.2. with modification only to Article 1.2.3., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 3.

The revised Article 1.2.1. is at Annex 29 for Member comments.

Agenda item 7. Veterinary Services

a) Quality and evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapters 3.1. and 3.2.)

Comments were received on both chapters from the EU, Switzerland and South Africa.

In response to Members' comments, the Code Commission deleted point 11 of Article 3.2.14.

A Member's concern about the inclusion of animal welfare in the responsibilities of Veterinary Services was not accepted, given that the OIE World Assembly of Delegates has, since 2005, adopted in the *Terrestrial Code* seven animal welfare standards and that the Veterinary Authority is in most countries the main governmental authority responsible for implementation of these standards.

As discussed under Agenda item 37, the Code Commission endorsed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Education. In view of the general support of Members for the work of the OIE in strengthening the quality of Veterinary Services, including through specifying the minimum competencies of day 1 graduate veterinarians, the Code Commission proposed to include new text in Article 3.2.14, sub-point 2 a (vi) as follows: 'curriculum addressing the minimum competencies of day 1 veterinary graduates to assure the delivery of quality Veterinary Services, as described by the OIE'.

The revised Chapter 3.1., as presented for Member comments after the September 2010 meeting of the Code Commission and the revised Chapter 3.2., proposed for adoption, are in Annex 4.

b) Veterinary legislation (proposed Chapter 3.3.)

Comments were received from Australia, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, Thailand, the USA and an expert.

The Code Commission recalled the resolution adopted by Members at the OIE Global Conference on Veterinary Legislation (December 2010): ‘that the OIE propose the adoption and publication of the current Veterinary Legislation Guidelines as standards in the *Terrestrial Code*’ and the comments of Members regarding the timing of such adoption. Dr Sarah Kahn informed the Code Commission that the OIE would convene an *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Legislation for a first meeting after the General Session in May 2011.

Noting that the numbering of the text was rather complicated, that some text appeared repeatedly (e.g. ‘veterinary legislation should address the following elements’), and that there was an imbalance in the level of detail provided on some subjects (e.g. regulation of veterinary products) and others (e.g. disease control), the Code Commission considered that the draft text was not ready for adoption in May 2011.

The Code Commission encouraged the *ad hoc* Group to take whatever steps are possible to simplify and clarify the text so that it is easier for Members to use.

In light of Member comments the Code Commission made some amendments to the draft Chapter 3.3.

The Code Commission strongly encouraged Members to provide comment on the draft text, in order for the *ad hoc* Group to take this into account in producing a revised text that could be proposed for adoption in 2012.

The new draft Chapter 3.3., for Member comment, is at Annex 30.

Agenda item 8. New chapter on communication (Chapter 3.4.)

Comments were received from the EU and Japan.

The Code Commission reviewed Members’ comments and made some modifications to the draft text, to provide clarification on the objectives and recommendations in the proposed text.

The new Chapter 3.4., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 5.

Agenda Item 9. Design and implementation of identification systems to achieve animal traceability (Chapter 4.2.)

Comments were received from Chile, the EU and Switzerland. Changes proposed by a Member were not accepted because, as previously stated, the OIE convention is to use the term ‘should’ rather than ‘must’ throughout the Code.

The revised Chapter 4.2., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 6.

Agenda item 10. Compartmentalisation (Chapters 4.3. and 4.4.)

a) Zoning and compartmentalisation (Chapter 4.3.)

Comments were received from Chinese Taipei, the EU and Thailand.

Dr MacDiarmid noted, in response to an enquiry about the status of compartmentalisation projects, that an article on the experiences of Thailand would be published in the OIE *Scientific and Technical Review*, Volume 30, Issue 2, August 2011.

b) Application of compartmentalisation (Chapter 4.4.)

A comment was received from the EU supporting the proposed amendment.

c) Generic checklist on the application of compartmentalisation

The Code Commission received a new document “User-friendly, generic checklist on the practical application of Compartmentalisation” and a recommendation from the Epidemiology *ad hoc* Group to modify Article 4.4.7. regarding the procedures for notification to importing countries in the event that the status of the compartment is lost.

The Code Commission modified Article 4.4.7. by replacing the reference to Chapter 1.1. with a reference to Article 5.3.7.

The Code Commission also added sub-point (i) to point 2 of Article 5.3.7. in order to clearly situate the recognition of a compartment as being based on a bilateral agreement between Members.

In the event of detection of the disease for which the compartment was defined, the status of the compartment should be revoked and importing countries that had recognised the compartment informed.

The International Trade Department undertook to review the new checklist in liaison with the two OIE Members that are currently implementing compartments for avian influenza and Newcastle disease.

The revised Chapters 4.3. and 4.4. and the revised Chapter 5.3., proposed for adoption, are at Annex 7.

Agenda item 11. Semen and embryos (Chapters 4.5., 4.6. and 4.7.)

a) General hygiene in semen collection and processing centres (Chapter 4.5.)

Comments were received from Australia.

For the purpose of harmonisation with other articles and following a Member’s comment, the audit interval in Article 4.5.2. point 8, was changed from 6 months to 12 months on the basis that an annual audit would provide a suitable level of oversight and would be consistent with ‘at least once a year’ audits for embryo collection teams (in Articles 4.7.2.7 and 4.8.2.7).

b) Collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen (Chapter 4.6.)

Comments were received from Australia, the EU and Switzerland.

A Member raised concerns about the handling of bluetongue in Chapter 4.6. and some modifications were made to Article 4.6.2. accordingly.

A Member commented on the articles dealing with BVD-MD and ovine epididymitis but the Code Commission made no modifications because it considered that no valid justification was given to support the proposed modification and that the current text was correct.

Article 4.6.3.2. (b) was modified as testing of semen is not, typically, performed before rams enter a semen collection centre and especially not in a pre-entry isolation facility.

c) Collection and processing of *in vivo* derived embryos from livestock and horses (Chapter 4.7.)

Comments were received from the International Embryo Transfer Society (IETS).

Following the recommendation of the IETS the Commission modified Article 4.7.14. to include a reference to equine coital exanthema as a pathogen in category 4.

The revised Chapters 4.5., 4.6. and 4.7., proposed for adoption, are at Annex 8.

Agenda item 12. Certification procedures (Chapter 5.2.)

The revised Chapter 5.2., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 9.

Agenda item 13. Control of OIE listed diseases in heat treated, shelf stable pet food (draft new Chapter 5.X.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, China (P.R. of), Chinese Taipei, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and the USA.

The Code Commission noted the many divergent and incompatible comments received. Some Members objected to the creation of provisions seemingly ‘in parallel’ to the existing recommendations in the *Terrestrial Code*. Others commented on the complexity of the issue if addressed as a Code chapter, given the wide range of ingredients and time/temperature processes used by the global pet food industry. Some noted that the pet food industries themselves have divergent views on the nature of recommendations to be made by the OIE, and the fact that OIE Members in general have not called for this work to be done.

The Code Commission recalled that the rationale for undertaking this work was a request from two pet food industry associations as a result of impediments to global trade in pet food arising from non-scientific and non risk-based trade measures that have been imposed by some countries. Notwithstanding the concerns raised by Members, the Code Commission considered that it might be possible to make specific recommendations on the certification of heat treated pet food for international trade. Chapter 5.10. covers model veterinary certificates for international trade, including model certificates for products of animal origin. The Code Commission requested that the Director General convene a new *ad hoc* Group with the following terms of reference: to review Chapter 5.10. and to make recommendations on new text that should be added, if needed, to provide a predictable and scientific basis for certification of heat treated shelf stable pet food.

Agenda item 14. Control of hazards of animal health and public health importance in animal feed (Chapter 6.3.)

Comments were received from Chile, the EU and the USA.

A Member’s recommendation to define the term ‘undesirable substances’ rather than ‘contamination’ was not accepted because the former term is not used in Chapter 6.3., whereas the latter is. In reply to a Member’s comment about feed for bees, the Code Commission invited the Member to provide information that could be relevant for inclusion in the chapter.

The revised Chapter 6.3., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 11.

Agenda item 15. Salmonellosis (Chapters 6.4. and 6.5.)

a) Biosecurity procedures in poultry production (Chapter 6.4.)

Comments were received from Chinese Taipei, Costa Rica, the EU, New Zealand, Panama, Switzerland, the USA and the Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA).

The Code Commission made several text amendments to improve clarity and completeness.

b) Prevention, detection and control of *Salmonella* in poultry (Chapter 6.5.)

Comments were received from Chile, China (P.R. of), the EU, New Zealand, Switzerland and the USA.

The Code Commission made some minor amendments to the text.

The revised Chapters 6.4. and 6.5., proposed for adoption, are presented at Annex 12.

Agenda item 16. Animal welfare (Chapters 7.1.–7.8.)

a) Transport of animals by land (Chapter 7.3.)

Comments were received from Canada, the EU, Switzerland and the USA.

In response to a Member's comment, the preamble was amended for clarity.

As regards point 8 a) of Article 7.3.5., the Code Commission noted Members' comments on the need to make effort to observe animals during transport, including in the case of poultry, and the text was amended accordingly.

b) Transport of animals by air (Chapter 7.4.)

Comments were received from the EU and the USA.

In response to a Member's comment, it was agreed to add a preamble to this chapter for consistency with other chapters. The preamble will reflect the amendments proposed by the Code Commission, if adopted by OIE Members.

A Member's comment on pallet size was not accepted as the size of pallet is variable.

Several texts were further amended in response to Members' comments.

c) Slaughter of animals (Chapter 7.5.)

Comments were received from Canada, the EU, Switzerland, Thailand, the USA and the Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA).

Article 7.5.4. was reviewed, taking into account the number of comments received from Members. It was agreed to move point 14 into point 6 in order to clearly state that waiting time should be minimised and should not exceed 12 hours.

One Member commented that all slaughterhouses, whether high throughput or not, should have a waiting pen to ensure good animal welfare. The Code Commission did not agree. In some cases small slaughterhouses with a low throughput may not need a waiting pen.

Several requests from Members were not accepted as they were already addressed in the current text or did not significantly improve the text.

A Member's comment on Article 7.5.6. was not accepted as the objective of this table is to summarise the methods and their associated animal welfare concerns, not to rate or recommend individual methods.

d) Killing of animals for disease control purposes (Chapter 7.6.)

Comments were received from Australia, Chinese Taipei, the EU and Switzerland.

Member's comments in regard to the cervical dislocation and decapitation for poultry of Article 7.6.5. were accepted and the table amended accordingly.

Members' comments on Article 7.6.12 and Article 7.6.13 were discussed extensively. The Code Commission decided to maintain the current text except for minor changes to increase clarity as the text has already been reviewed by the Animal Welfare Working Group. However, the Commission undertook to send the scientific references provided by Members to the AWWG for further review. The suggestion of Members to add in Article 7.6.13., after (2) (c) (ii) the sentence "However cessation of vocalisation and convulsing wing flapping sounds can be used to determine the onset of unconsciousness that will in due time lead to death" was not accepted, as point 2c contains a list of the disadvantages of methods and the proposed amendment is not relevant.

The Code Commission accepted a Member's comment on cervical dislocation in Article 7.6.17. as it was considered to be relevant.

e) Stray dog population control (Chapter 7.7.)

Comments were received from the EU and the USA.

Members' comments were generally accepted where these increased clarity. However, a Member's comment on Article 7.7.4., (which had been previously submitted and denied) was not accepted as the Code Commission considers the existing text already addresses the issue raised.

f) Use of animals in research and education (Chapter 7.8.)

Comments were received from the EU, Norway, Switzerland and the USA, and advice was provided by the *ad hoc* Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare.

Members' comments on Article 7.8.4. point 1 were noted and it was agreed to add the word 'minimum' to point c) to ensure that reasonable analysis can be taken into consideration upon review of a project proposal.

The *ad hoc* Group's comment on animal procurement under Article 7.8.7. was accepted to address a Member's concerns about the use of nonhuman primates.

Revised Chapters 7.3., 7.4., 7.5., 7.6., 7.7. and 7.8., proposed for adoption, are at Annex 13.

g) New chapter on broiler chicken production (new Chapter 7.X.)

Comments were received from Chile, the EU, Jamaica, Japan, Korea (Rep. of), New Zealand, Switzerland, USA and the International Coalition for Animal Welfare (ICFAW).

The Code Commission clarified that the term 'backyard flocks' was used in the sense defined by the FAO, under sector 4 production, i.e. 'village and backyard production with minimal biosecurity and birds or products consumed locally' (for more information, see:

<http://www.fao.org/docs/eims/upload/214190/ProductionSystemsCharacteristics.pdf>

The first three sentences of paragraph 2 in Article 7.X.4. (from 'It would be impractical at this time' to 'and genetic selection') were removed from the draft chapter because this is an explanation of the use of criteria or measurables and it is not appropriate to include such explanatory text in the *Terrestrial Code*.

Some Members' comments on Article 7.X.4. paragraph 1 were accepted because these improved the description of mortality.

In Article 7.X.4. Paragraph 2 'Gait', a Member's request to delete the entire paragraph was not accepted because the Code Commission found the explanation to be useful and relevant.

The Code Commission noted a request from a welfare organisation for the inclusion of guidelines of scoring systems (e.g. for gait and for feather condition) in the *Terrestrial Code*. While this type of guidance was not considered to be appropriate for inclusion in the *Terrestrial Code*, the Commission encouraged the OIE to consider making a list of useful references available to Members, via a document on the OIE internet site.

In response to comments of Members and an animal welfare organisation, the Code Commission made a number of amendments to the text.

A Member's proposal to include a measurable relating to the percentage of broilers that is *not* sent to the slaughterhouse was not accepted as such but the Code Commission made an appropriate modification to the text of point 10 in Article 7.X.4. 'Injury rate', to clarify that injuries can occur during production and also during the catching operation.

The Code Commission accepted a recommendation of a Member to add a new point 12 'Animal vocalisation' in Article 7.X.4., based on the scientific reference provided [Jeon, J.H., Yeon, S.C., Ha, J.K., Lee, S. J., and Chang, H.H., 2005. Acoustic analysis for thermal environment-related vocalizations in laying hens. *J. Anim. Sci. & Technol.* 47 (4): 697–702.]

In Article 7.X.5., the Code Commission advised that the terms 'thermal heat index' (THI) can be described as an index that integrates air temperature and relative humidity, which provides an indication of how an animal feels the ambient conditions. The THI is higher when high air temperatures occur with high humidity and lower when they occur with low humidity.

A Member's proposal to include a table with specific optimal temperature ranges was not accepted because OIE policy does not favour the inclusion of quantitative measurables at this time.

Regarding the frequency of checking of the management of the thermal environment, the Code Commission modified Article 7.X.5. point 2.1. to read 'The management system of the thermal environment should be checked at least twice a day', to address a Member's concern about unnecessary entry of farmers into poultry houses.

At the request of an animal welfare organisation, the Code Commission added 'eye condition' to the list of measurables in Article 7.X.5. point 2.2.

In Article 7.X.5. point 2.6., at a Member's request, 'rice husks' was added to the list of appropriate bedding materials. The Code Commission also modified the order of points so that the two points dealing with day old broilers were grouped together.

The Code Commission modified Article 7.X.5. points 2.8., 2.9., 2.11., 2.12. and 2.13. as requested by Members.

The Code Commission noted that an animal welfare organisation and some Members had made several recommendations to put more information and recommendations into the draft text and thanked the organisation for its input. However, in many cases the Code Commission did not agree to include the additional details proposed, because it considered that the comments represented excessive detail and were based on experience drawn mainly from Europe. For example, the organisation proposed to delete the reference to 'performance' from the list of measurables, on the basis that high growth rates can lead to leg problems, etc. This may be correct but it does not change the fact that performance is a useful measure of welfare.

The Code Commission was generally not prepared to quantify measurables because the OIE Members did not generally support the adoption of quantitative measurables in the new chapter at this time.

The Commission noted that Members' positions on the need to specify and quantify measurables vary, with some in favour and some opposed to the inclusion of numeric values. Members have seen the text of the proposed chapter and have had the opportunity to comment on it on two occasions. The policy regarding the inclusion of animal based criteria rather than design criteria, and the arguments for and against the inclusion of quantitative parameters was set out in the report of the Animal Welfare Working Group's June 2010 meeting. The Code Commission considered that the draft text was ready to be proposed for adoption.

The revised Chapter 7.X., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 14.

h) Report of the Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG) June 2010 meeting, including guidance from the AWWG to *ad hoc* Groups on the development of animal welfare standards

Comments were received from Canada, Jamaica, Japan and the USA.

The Code Commission noted the report of the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG), including the work programme, and endorsed it.

The Code Commission did not accept the comments of a Member who referred to the AWWG Discussion paper on the Development of Animal Welfare Guidelines for Production Systems and called for the inclusion of additional points and restructuring of the guidance document. The Code Commission considered that the guidance document was complementary to but separate from the Discussion paper. Both documents are considered to provide valuable guidance to *ad hoc* groups.

The Code Commission accepted a recommendation from a Member to modify a phrase in the guidance document to read: 'In some cases, input-based or resource-based criteria are also acceptable and can supplement outcome-based criteria where there is a good scientific basis for doing so'.

The Code Commission also accepted a Member's recommendation to reorder items for internal consistency.

The revised Guidance document is provided at Annex 32 for Members' information.

Agenda item 17. Anthrax (Chapter 8.1.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China (P.R. of), the EU, Korea (Rep. of), New Zealand and the USA.

The Code Commission made some amendments following Members' comments.

Following Members' comments, the procedures for inactivation of *B. anthracis* spores in animal products were amended in Articles 8.1.10. and 8.1.11. The scientific references supporting these amendments are as follows:

GARCIA R.A. ET AL. (2006). Characteristics of North American meat and bone meal relevant to the development of non-feed applications. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture*. 22: 729–736.

JUNEJA V. K. ET AL. (2010). Thermal inactivation of *Bacillus anthracis* Sterne in irradiated ground beef heated in a water bath or cooked on commercial grills. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*. 11: 123–129.

MONTVILLE ET AL. (2005). Thermal resistance of Spores from Virulent Strains of *Bacillus anthracis* and Potential Surrogates. *Journal of Food Protection*. 68, 11, 2362–2366.

MURRAY T.J. (1931). Thermal death point: II. Spores of *Bacillus anthracis* *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 48 (5): 457–467.

SETLOW P. (2006). Spores of *Bacillus subtilis*: their resistance to and killing by radiation, heat and chemicals. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 101: 514–525.

SPOTTS WHITNEY E.A., BEATTY M.E., TAYLOR T.H., WEYANT R., SOBEL J., ARDUINO M.J. & ASHFORD D.A. (2003). Inactivation of *Bacillus anthracis* spores. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 9(6): 623–627.

In response to a Member's inquiry on the qualifier of articles with subparagraphs, the Code Commission confirmed that "and" is implicit but use of "or" must be made explicit.

After request of a Member, the Code Commission reviewed and updated Chapter 4.13 and transferred the articles on anthrax disinfection procedures from Chapter 8.1., to a new article at the end of Chapter 4.13.

The revised Chapters 4.13. and 8.1., proposed for adoption, are at Annex 15.

Agenda item 18. Aujeszky's disease (Chapter 8.2.)

Comments were received from the EU, Mexico, Thailand and Switzerland.

The Code Commission accepted a Member's comment regarding the necessity to update Article 8.2.1. to make it consistent with the structure of other chapters (e.g. CSF) and better define the disease, the populations concerned and the determination of status.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member's recommendation to specify the radius of the surveillance zone in various articles on the basis that it is the prerogative of the Veterinary Authority to establish the surveillance zone based on knowledge and understanding of the disease epidemiology in the national situation.

The Code Commission agreed with the reasoning of Members and deleted point 3 (b) iii in Article 8.2.3.

The Code Commission rejected a Member's proposal to replace 'Provisionally free country or zone' with 'Country or zone with low prevalence' because the concept of provisional freedom has been adopted by Members. The Member's comment on the phrase 'at a level of confidence not sufficient to meet requirements for freedom' (point 1b) in Article 8.2.4.) was accepted and a modification made to this point and to point 1b) iii) in Article 8.2.3. to address the Member's comment.

As noted by the Member, what constitutes an 'acceptable level of confidence' is not quantified in Chapter 1.4. However, the Code Commission considered that it would not be feasible to provide a quantitative recommendation on a general basis, as the design of surveillance programmes, including the level of confidence sought, varies according to many factors, including disease epidemiology and the objectives of the surveillance programme.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member's recommendation on Article 8.2.12., that pigs in free countries or zones be serologically tested for Aujeszky's disease before donating semen, on the basis that the freedom of the country or zone provided sufficient safeguard.

The revised Chapter 8.2., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 16.

Agenda item 19. Bluetongue (Chapter 8.3.)

Comments were received from Australia, the EU, New Zealand, Norway and the USA.

The Code Commission discussed a Member's proposal to modify Article 8.3.3. point 3 (c), as follows:

'(imported) animals are not vaccinated and a surveillance programme in accordance with Articles 8.3.16. to 8.3.21., has been in place in the source population for a period of at least 60 days immediately prior to dispatch and no evidence of BTV transmission has been detected'.

Although a Member provided a rationale for considering the provisions in point 3 (c) as a valid risk management option, SCAD and the Code Commission did not agree to the proposal because they considered that the Member had not presented a scientific rationale to justify the safety of moving animals of unknown status from an infected country or zone into a free country/zones where *Culicoides* is present. Furthermore, this text was considered to contradict the introductory paragraph of the article that referred to: "importation of vaccinated or seropositive animals from infected countries or zones".

On the same grounds, the Code Commission and the SCAD also rejected the request to maintain a similar text in Article 8.3.8. paragraph 6.

With respect to Chapter 8.3., the Code Commission acknowledged that a Member had repeatedly asserted that not all *Culicoides* species are competent vectors. However, to date, it has not been possible to make a positive response due to the lack of evidence showing that the arguments advanced would be applicable to all countries. The Commission encouraged the Member to provide a supporting document to SCAD for detailed evaluation.

A Member's proposal to modify Article 8.3.5. was accepted because the Code Commission considered that this improved clarity.

Members' comments on Article 8.3.15. were reviewed and some modifications made to the text. The Code Commission recalled that the term 'vector protected' had been adopted rather than 'vector proof' in recognition of the fact that absolute prevention of *Culicoides* entry is unlikely to be achievable. However, systematic use of appropriate gauge mesh and insecticide represents an effective approach to risk management.

The revised Chapter 8.3., for adoption, is at Annex 17.

Agenda item 20. Foot and mouth disease (Chapter 8.5. and Chapter 1.6. – Article 1.6.3. Questionnaire for official status recognition and new Article 1.6.5. *bis* Questionnaire on endorsement of official control programme for FMD)

a) Chapter 8.5.

Comments on Chapter 8.5. were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, Chinese Taipei, the EU, Japan, Korea (Rep. of), Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa, Thailand, USA, the Permanent Veterinary Committee of CONOSUR (CVP) and the International Scientific Working Group of the International Natural Sausage Casings Association (INSCA).

The Code Commission noted the support of some Members for the proposal to include in the *Terrestrial Code* the concept of an OIE endorsed official control programme for foot and mouth disease (FMD) as a voluntary process. Many comments were received on the draft Article 8.5.7.*bis*. The Code Commission decided that the new article would better be co-located with the articles on FMD surveillance. Accordingly, the Code Commission proposed a new draft Article 8.5.47. *bis*.

Noting that the Manual Chapter 2.1.5. (adopted in May 2009) provided extensive detail on the choice of vaccine and use of serological tests in surveillance programmes, the Code Commission did not accept a Member's proposal to add details on FMD vaccines in Articles 8.5.3. and 8.5.5.

In response to a Member's proposal to modify Article 8.5.6., the Code Commission noted that the terms 'official control programme' are already defined in the Glossary and put the term in italics (where this had not already been done).

On Article 8.5.8., the Code Commission did not accept a Member's objection to the proposed modification of point 1 (e) as it felt that the need to quickly establish that the outbreak had been contained was addressed in the proposed text. The comment of a Member and a regional organization to add 'modified stamping out policy' in point 2 was not accepted because, as defined in the Glossary, *stamping out policy* already includes 'modified stamping out policy'.

The Code Commission noted the proposal of a Member to redraft Chapter 8.5. with the objective of improving clarity (correcting the English grammar and simplifying the writing style) and considered that this proposal had merit. However, the Commission considered that the OIE should wait for the adoption of the important new text on the official control programme for FMD before undertaking a large editorial exercise. In addition, the SCAD proposes to review the scientific provisions of Chapter 8.5. Accordingly, the Code Commission decided to revert to the 2010 text for Articles 8.5.22., 8.5.23. and 8.5.24.

At a Member's recommendation, the Code Commission reverted to the 2010 version of the title of Article 8.5.25., to clarify that the reference to 'official control programme' is in the context of the definition of this term in the Glossary. The Code Commission noted that, at the present time, this title does not imply that the control programme has been endorsed by the OIE, as this step remains voluntary. The same rationale applied in relation to Members' comments (which were not accepted) on the title of Article 8.5.28.

Members' comments on Article 8.5.27. were not accepted by the Code Commission on the basis that they should be addressed when the SCAD undertakes a review of the entire chapter.

The Code Commission referred a Member's comment on point 3 of Article 8.5.31. to SCAD for review.

The recommendation of the International Scientific Working Group of the International Natural Sausage Casings Association (INSCA) on Article 8.5.41. was supported by SCAD and the Code Commission, which cited the scientific article which is ‘in press’ and will soon be published in a peer-reviewed journal. The text was amended accordingly.

In response to Members’ comments on Article 8.5.46., the Code Commission noted the advice of SCAD and modified the text accordingly.

The Code Commission drafted a new Article 8.5.47. *bis*, taking into account input from SCAD and the comments provided by Members on the proposed Article 8.5.7. *bis*.

The revised Chapter 8.5., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 18.

b) Chapter 1.6. Status for OIE listed diseases: procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, the EU, Japan, Korea (Rep. of), Mexico, New Zealand, Thailand and the Permanent Veterinary Committee of MERCOSUR (CVP). The Code Commission addressed the comments on the basis of advice from the SCAD and in light of the joint discussion between the two Commissions.

In response to a Member’s comment on Article 1.6.3. point 6., the Code Commission added references to swill feeding in relation to all country classification categories.

The Code Commission noted that Members raised concerns about the fact that OIE endorsement of an official control programme for FMD is not the same as official recognition of disease free status. To address this concern the Code Commission added a new draft Article 1.6.1. *bis* as follows:

OIE Members may request OIE endorsement of their official control programme for FMD. When requesting this endorsement, the Member should submit to the OIE Scientific and Technical Department a dossier providing the information requested (as appropriate).

The Code Commission relocated the questionnaire on OIE endorsement of an official control programme for FMD to a new Article 1.6.5. *bis*.

Proposals of Members to modify various points were adopted or disregarded on the basis of SCAD advice.

The Code Commission recommended that, once Chapter 8.5. had been revised to clarify and simplify the text, attention be given to Chapter 1.6., because the structure of the current text (e.g. the coverage of an entire questionnaire in single articles) contributes to difficulty in reading and understanding the recommendations.

The revised text of Article 1.6.3. (Questionnaire on FMD), Article 1.6.5. (Questionnaire on CBPP) and new Article 1.6.5. *bis* (Questionnaire for OIE endorsed official control programme for FMD), proposed for adoption, are at Annex 19.

The revised text of new Article 1.6.6. (new Questionnaire on African horse sickness), for Member comment, is at Annex 33.

Agenda item 21. Rabies (Chapters 5.11. and 8.10.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, the EU, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Switzerland and the USA on Chapter 8.10.

Comments were received from Canada, the EU and the USA on Chapter 5.11.

The Code Commission and the SCAD agreed with Members that it would be premature to adopt the revised text. The Code Commission therefore proposed that Members' comments be reviewed and new text proposed by a new *ad hoc* expert group, preferably before September (i.e. prior to the Global Rabies Conference in Seoul). The review of the Manual chapter on rabies should be taken into account by the *ad hoc* group when it undertakes this work.

The review should focus in particular on rabies as defined in the *Terrestrial Code*, including canine rabies and livestock rabies transmitted by vampire bats. The *Terrestrial Code* chapter should also address the risks associated with the rabies reservoir in wildlife.

Agenda item 22. Vesicular stomatitis (Chapter 8.15.)

Comments were received from the EU and the USA.

At the recommendation of a Member and in consultation with SCAD, the Code Commission added 'Safe Commodities' to the title of Article 8.15.1. and listed several commodities under this article.

The Code Commission modified Article 8.15.6. in accordance with Members' comments as the modification was considered appropriate.

The revised Chapter 8.15., for adoption, is at Annex 20.

Agenda item 23. Diseases of bees

a) Hygiene and disease security procedures in apiaries (Chapter 4.14.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Canada, the EU, Jamaica, New Zealand, Switzerland and the Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA).

b) Diseases of Apidae (Chapters 9.1.–9.6.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Canada, the EU, Jamaica and New Zealand and Switzerland on Chapter 9.1.

In view of the extensive and diverse comments provided by Members, the Code Commission asked the Director General to convene an *ad hoc* expert group to address comments submitted on all of the bee disease chapters.

Agenda item 24. Avian influenza (Chapter 10.4.)

Comments were received from Canada, the EU, South Africa and the USA.

Members' recommendations to change the text of point 9 in Article 10.4.1. and to modify point 2 in Article 10.4.33. were not accepted, because the text already covered the issue and the proposed modification did not present a significant improvement.

The Code Commission made some minor amendments following Members' recommendations.

The revised Chapter 10.4., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 21.

Agenda item 25. Newcastle disease (Chapter 10.13.)

Comments were received from the EU, Switzerland and the USA and advice was received from an expert.

The Code Commission decided to modify Article 10.13.21., as recommended by a Member, noting that the revised values for thermal inactivation of Newcastle disease virus reflect the up to date scientific evidence, derived from studies that were specifically designed to address sources of uncertainty in earlier studies on thermal inactivation. The scientific evidence is shown in the study by Thomas C., King D.J. and Swayne D.E. *Journal of Food Protection*, Vol. 71, Issue 6, 2008, Page 1214 "Thermal inactivation of avian influenza and Newcastle disease viruses in chicken meat".

The revised Chapter 10.13., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 22.

Agenda item 26. Bovine tuberculosis (Chapter 11.6.)

Comments were received from the EU, Mexico and Switzerland.

On the advice of the SCAD, the Code Commission did not include *M. caprae* in Chapter 11.6.

In response to a Member's recommendation that Article 11.6.2. be modified to make reference to a risk analysis of wildlife, the Code Commission asked SCAD to refer this matter to the OIE Wildlife Working Group.

The Code Commission proposed no modification to Chapter 11.6.

Agenda item 27. Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (Chapter 11.8. and Article 1.6.5.) (Questionnaire on CBPP)

A comment received from the EU on Article 1.6.5. was accepted and the article modified accordingly (see Annex 19).

At the request of the SCAD, the yak (*Bos grunniens*) was added to the list of susceptible animals in Article 11.8.1.

The revised Chapter 11.8., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 23.

Agenda item 28. Lumpy skin disease (Chapter 11.12.)

Comments were received from Australia and the EU.

In response to Members' comments, the Code Commission withdrew the draft article on safe commodities and will forward it to SCAD to request the preparation of articles on milk and meat products.

A Member comment on Article 11.12.2. was not taken into account as point 1 of this Article is not subjected to time; however, for point 4 it was agreed to modify the text for consistency.

Regarding a Member's comment on Article 11.12.4., the Code Commission decided to specify the susceptible species listed in Article 11.12.1. and to modify the chapter accordingly.

The revised Chapter 11.12., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 24.

Agenda item 29. Equine diseases

a) African horse sickness (Chapter 12.1. and revised new Article 1.6.6.)

Comments on Chapter 12.1. were received from Canada, China (P.R. of), the EU, New Zealand, Norway and the USA.

The Code Commission did not accept the recommendation of Members who called for deletion of certain text, including point 4 in Article 12.1.2. and the whole of Article 12.1.3., on the basis that this text had been adopted by the World Assembly of Delegates. Indeed, although the establishment of a seasonally free zone, or a containment zone, for African horse sickness is not a simple undertaking, Members have previously adopted this text on the basis that the establishment of such zones are technically feasible.

Several text modifications were made to improve grammar and clarity.

Comments on Article 1.6.6. were received from Canada, New Zealand and the USA.

The Code Commission made some amendments based on SCAD advice and Members' recommendations to improve clarity or grammar, but based on advice from SCAD, rejected some Members' recommendations.

The revised Chapter 12.1. and the new Article 1.6.6., for Member comments, are at Annex 33.

b) Equine influenza (Chapter 12.6.)

Comments were received from the EU and the USA.

The Code Commission made one amendment based on SCAD advice and Members' recommendations to improve clarity.

c) Equine viral arteritis (Chapter 12.9.)

Comments were received from the EU and the USA.

The Code Commission made some amendments to improve clarity taking into account SCAD advice and Members' recommendations.

The revised Chapters 12.6. and 12.9., proposed for adoption, are at Annex 25.

Item 30. Enzootic abortion of ewes (ovine chlamydiosis) (Chapter 14.5.)

Comments were received from the EU and Switzerland.

Based on SCAD advice and Members' recommendations, the Code Commission made one amendment to improve clarity.

The revised Chapter 14.5., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 26.

Agenda item 31. Scrapie (Chapter 14.9.)

Comments were received from Australia, the EU, New Zealand, Switzerland and the International Embryo Transfer Society (IETS).

The Code Commission did not agree to modify the title of the chapter to 'Classical scrapie' because it considered that a convincing rationale had not been presented to justify this modification and that the current text was clear as to the exclusion of atypical scrapie.

The Code Commission did not accept the arguments of a Member against accepting *in vivo* derived sheep embryos as safe because the IETS had established the safety of *in vivo* derived embryos on the basis of current world wide scientific research on the issue. The Code Commission's position was supported by the conclusions of a recent, peer-reviewed risk analysis, which may be viewed at <http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/files/biosec/consult/import-risk-analysis-scrapie-sheep-goat.pdf>.

No further modifications were made to the draft text proposed in September 2010.

The revised Chapter 14.9., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 27.

Agenda item 32. Classical swine fever (Chapter 15.2.)

Comments were received from Chinese Taipei, the EU, Mexico, New Zealand and the USA. The Code Commission followed SCAD advice relevant to Members' comments on scientific issues.

In response to Members' comments, the Code Commission modified the text of Article 15.2.1. to read 'For the purposes of this chapter, a distinction is made between domestic pig populations on the one hand, and wild pig, including captive wild, and feral pig populations on the other'.

Having made this modification, the Code Commission did not accept Members' recommendations to modify the text of several articles to clarify the treatment of domestic pigs and pigs in captivity in comparison with the treatment of wild pigs, nor did it accept a Member's recommendation to change 'domestic pigs' to 'susceptible animals' in Article 15.2.3. Dr Thiermann noted that the objective of Chapter 15.2. is to recognise and protect the status of domestic pig populations with respect to classical swine fever (CSF). With this goal in mind, the recommendations in the *Terrestrial Code* are based on the definition of CSF as an infection in domestic pigs. The risks associated with wild pig populations are equally associated with free ranging and captive wild pig populations.

Noting that there was a risk of producing recommendations that would make the task of certifying pigs and pig meat exports complicated and difficult, the Code Commission tried to keep the text as simple and clear as possible.

The Code Commission deleted 'and according to Article 15.2.26.' from point 7 of Article 15.2.2. because it considered that this cross reference was redundant.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member's recommendation to add 'since birth or for at least 3 months prior to slaughter' to Article 15.2.12. because the requirement is already covered in the definition of a free country, zone or compartment (Articles 15.2.5. and 6).

The Code Commission did not accept Members' proposals to modify the text of Article 15.2.13. ('the entire consignment of meat') because the consignment may be made up of meat from multiple origins and this text is consistent with that found in other disease chapters. The Commission also noted that the conduct of ante mortem inspection is not feasible in wild pigs.

The Code Commission modified Article 15.2.21. *bis* to include text on the inactivation of CSF virus present in natural casings of pigs, consistent with the modification to Article 8.5.41. (FMD), based on a publication showing that these procedures are sufficient to inactivate CSF virus. [See Wijnker J.J., Depner K.R. & Berends B.R. (2008). Inactivation of classical swine fever virus in porcine casing preserved in salt. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, Volume 128, Issue 2, Pages 411–413.]

In considering Members' comments on Chapter 15.2. overall, the Code Commission agreed with the recommendation of the SCAD that the OIE should continue to develop the OIE policy on the wildlife/livestock interface to clarify the implications of infection in wild animals for disease status and trade, as well as the appropriate recommendations for surveillance and reporting of OIE listed diseases in wildlife. A number of issues raised by Members (e.g. comments on surveillance provisions, in Article 15.2.25.) should be addressed by the SCAD when it reviews the chapter to provide a basis for OIE official recognition of CSF status.

The revised Chapter 15.2., proposed for adoption, is at Annex 28.

Agenda item 33. Swine vesicular disease (Chapter 15.4.)

Comments were received from Canada, China (P.R. of), Chinese Taipei, the EU, Japan, New Zealand and the USA.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member's request to modify point 3 in Article 15.4.1. *bis* (authority over all pigs) because this text has already been adopted by Members elsewhere in the *Terrestrial Code* (e.g. for classical swine fever). A Member's request to include wild pigs in the surveillance of swine vesicular disease (SVD) in Article 15.4.1. *bis* was not accepted because it was not considered to be epidemiologically relevant.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member's request to reinstate the text proposed for deletion in Article 15.4.2. because the proposed text accurately reflects the epidemiology of SVD.

On Article 15.4.4., the Code Commission did not accept any modifications proposed by Members because the text was consistent with articles on containment zones found elsewhere in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission accepted a Member's proposal to modify the text of Article 15.4.5. for improved grammar and clarity.

The Code Commission accepted Members' recommendations to modify the text of Article 15.4.7. and 15.4.8. to reflect that the articles cover the importation of domestic, not wild, pigs. The requirements in point 2 of Article 15.4.8. were also modified to reflect the epidemiology of swine vesicular disease.

The Code Commission referred a Member's request for modification of the conditions for testing boars in Article 14.4.9. and 10., on the grounds that semen should be considered safe, to SCAD for review.

Noting the large number of comments received from Members on remaining articles and the fact that SCAD had not yet provided advice on these, the Code Commission referred the comments on Articles 8.4.11.–19. to SCAD for review. The Code Commission asked the SCAD to specifically focus its further review on Articles 8.4.11.–19. and not to revisit the proposed modifications to Articles 8.4.1.–10.

Agenda item 34. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Zoonotic Parasites

Dr Mylrea recalled the background to this work. Under the auspices of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group, the OIE had developed a discussion paper 'Animal production food safety: priority pathogens for standard setting by the OIE'. The zoonotic parasites *Taenia solium*, *T. saginata*, *Echinococcus granulosus* and *Trichinella spiralis* were identified as pathogens with a very significant impact on human health, particularly in Africa, South America and the Middle East. Echinococcus/hydatidosis, trichinellosis and porcine cysticercosis are OIE listed diseases. The *Terrestrial Code* 2010 contains some recommendations relevant to trade measures in the current Chapters 8.4. Echinococcus/hydatidosis and 8.13. Trichinellosis, but no recommendations on measures at the animal/farm level to avoid human infection with these zoonotic pathogens. The *Terrestrial Code* does not contain any recommendations on porcine cysticercosis.

The OIE *ad hoc* Group on Zoonotic Parasites met for the first time on 5–7 October 2010 and revised the text of *Terrestrial Code* Chapters 8.4. Echinococcus/hydatidosis and 8.13. Trichinellosis to include recommendations on the management of these pathogens in animals in order to avoid risks to human health.

The *ad hoc* Group was also requested to discuss the feasibility of developing guidelines for good on-farm practices to prevent and control important non OIE-listed parasites, such as *T. saginata*, as these parasites, although not always a significant public health concern can result in significant economic losses due to condemnation of affected tissues.

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the first meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Zoonotic Parasites.

The Code Commission noted the *ad hoc* Group's opinion that it was not feasible to establish a trichinella free country or zone and the rationale for this view, as set out in the report of its meeting. The Code Commission considered that, depending on the way the disease was defined in the *Terrestrial Code*, it could be feasible to make provisions for recognition of country or zone freedom.

The Code Commission discussed the location of the revised chapter on trichinellosis and considered that there were arguments for placement of this text in Volume 1 Section 6 'Veterinary Public Health' rather than in Volume 2, primarily based on the fact that the text provides recommendations for control of a pathogen that does not cause disease in animals, in relation to which the primary focus of disease control measures is to assure the safety of products for human consumption.

It is clear that a complete freedom of a country or zone might not be achievable if wild species are included. However, a specific definition of the disease focusing on the main species at risk (e.g. domestic pigs) would help in defining at least zones and populations of lower risk, as has been addressed in other chapters (e.g. on classical swine fever). In combination with risk reduction measures adapted to each situation, this would allow the use in the revised chapter of both risk prevention and reduction (consistent with the philosophy of the *Terrestrial Code* Section 6) to define the trichinella status of defined populations and the measures to be applied to trade. The key consideration is to link the level of biosecurity measures to the status of a population and relevant risk mitigation measures. This should be addressed by the *ad hoc* group at its next meeting, together with Members' comments. The Code Commission noted that the Codex Alimentarius Commission is undertaking new work on trichinellosis and *Cysticercus bovis* and discussed what steps could be taken to ensure that the two international standard setting organisations closely coordinate this work.

The Code Commission recommended that the OIE work closely with the CAC, specifically with the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene, to support the elaboration of parallel complementary standards that address the risk from farm to fork.

Revised Chapters 8.4. and 8.13., for Member comment, are at Annex 34.

Agenda item 35. Report of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group

The Code Commission noted the report of the APFSWG and endorsed the proposed terms of reference for the review of linkages between food safety and animal welfare.

The report of the APFSWG is at Annex 35 for information of Members.

Agenda item 36. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare

The report was noted and endorsed. The Code Commission encouraged the *ad hoc* Group to continue working on the proposed new Article 7.8.10 ‘transport of laboratory animals between institutes’ with a view to circulating a draft text to Members after the next General Session.

The Code Commission noted and supported the proposed priorities identified by the *ad hoc* Group, i.e. recommendations on the training of laboratory animal veterinarians and means to encourage the adoption of scientifically validated, non animal-based methods in regulatory testing.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group, for Member information, is at Annex 36.

Agenda item 37. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Education

The Code Commission endorsed the report of the *ad hoc* Group. In view of the strong support of Members for the work of the OIE in strengthening the quality of Veterinary Services by establishing the PVS Pathway, and the direct relevance of veterinary education to the performance of Veterinary Services, the Code Commission proposed to make direct reference to the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group by including new text in Article 3.2.14, sub-point 2 a (vi), as follows:

‘curriculum addressing the minimum competencies of day 1 veterinary graduates to assure the delivery of quality Veterinary Services, as described by the OIE’

The report of the *ad hoc* Group, for Member information, is at Annex 37.

As shown under Agenda item 7, the revised Chapter 3.2., proposed for adoption, is in Annex 4.

3. Other issues

Agenda item 38. Antimicrobial resistance – review of Chapters 6.7. and 6.8.

The Code Commission reviewed the revised text provided by an *ad hoc* Group and supported by SCAD and made minor modifications. The Code Commission endorsed the removal of reference to farmed fish in Chapter 6.7. and noted that the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission is in the process of developing new text on the topic of antimicrobial resistance in aquatic animals.

The Code Commission strongly encouraged Members to provide timely comment on these revised chapters in view of the importance of this area of work to human and animal health.

The revised Chapters 6.7. and 6.8., for Member comment, are provided at Annex 31.

Agenda item 39. Future work programme of the Code Commission

The revised work program is at Annex 38.

Agenda item 40. Other issues

a) Proposed draft policy on the wildlife-domestic animal interface as a guideline for future standard setting by the OIE (proposal submitted by the SCAD September 2010)

The Code Commission generally endorsed the proposed draft policy and made the following observations. Members should continuously be reminded of the importance of the obligation to notify disease occurrence in wildlife in accordance with the *Terrestrial Code*, not only because of trade. The specific obligations of Members to report disease occurrence in wildlife will vary according to the provisions of each disease chapter. The relevant provisions will need to be spelled out – and this is a task to be addressed by disease specific *ad hoc* Groups reporting to SCAD, with input, as appropriate, from the Wildlife Working Group.

Members should be encouraged to report the presence in wildlife of listed diseases, even if it is not required by the Code. The fact that wildlife may harbour pathogens without obvious signs of disease and act as a reservoir of infection should be highlighted.

In the situation where notification of a disease in wildlife has no impact on trade, this should serve as an incentive to reporting.

The Commission considered that the future work plan of the Wildlife Working Group, as with all OIE working groups, should be prioritised on the basis of requests from Members, OIE headquarters and Specialist Commissions.

b) Review of quarantine measures applicable to non-human primates (Chapters 5.9. and 5.10.)

The Code Commission agreed with text modifications proposed by the Wildlife Working Group and supported by the SCAD.

The revised Chapters 5.9. and 5.10., proposed for adoption, are in Annex 10.

c) Questions from Members on bovine spongiform encephalopathy

The Code Commission received advice from the *ad hoc* Group on Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) and from SCAD in response to a question from Members about the BSE risk associated with bovine intestines. The Commission was informed that, on the basis of current scientific knowledge, no modification to the current provisions on bovine intestine in Chapter 11.5. was warranted. A request submitted by a Member on the BSE questionnaire was not supported by SCAD. Accordingly, the Code Commission proposed no amendments to Chapter 11.5.

d) Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Code Commission is scheduled for 13-22 September 2011.

.../Annexes