



Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Original: English  
February 2012

**REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE  
TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION  
Paris, 14–23 February 2012**

---

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at the OIE Headquarters in Paris from 14 to 23 February 2012.

The members of the Code Commission are listed in Annex I and the agenda adopted is in Annex II.

The Code Commission thanked the following Members for providing written comments: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, the People's Republic of China, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Cuba, the European Union (EU), Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, South Africa, Switzerland, the United States of America (USA) and Uruguay. Comments were also received from the Secretariat of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Secretariat of the Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization (WTO SPS Committee), two regional organisations – African Union – InterAfrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR); the Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA); the International Embryo Transfer Society (IETS), and a non-governmental organisation, the International Coalition for Farm Animal Welfare (ICFAW).

The Code Commission reviewed the documents identified in the agenda, addressing comments that Member Countries had submitted by 13 January 2012 and amended texts in the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Terrestrial Code*) where appropriate. The amendments are shown in the usual manner by double underline and strikethrough and may be found in the Annexes to the report. The amendments made at the February 2012 meeting are highlighted with a coloured background in order to distinguish them from those made at the September 2011 meeting.

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

Member Countries should note that texts in Part A of this report are proposed for adoption at the 80th OIE General Session in May 2012. Texts in Part B are submitted for comment by Member Countries and all comments received will be addressed during the Commission's meeting in September 2012. The reports of meetings (Working Groups and *ad hoc* Groups) are also attached in Part B of this report.

The Commission strongly encourages Member Countries to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by submitting comments on this report. Comments should be submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a scientific rationale. Proposed deletions should be indicated in 'strike through' and proposed additions with 'double underline'. Member Countries should not use the automatic 'track-changes' function provided by word processing software as such changes are lost in the process of collating Member Countries' submissions into the Commission's working documents.

**Comments on this report must reach OIE Headquarters by 2 August 2012 to be considered at the September 2012 meeting of the Commission.**

All comments should be sent to the OIE International Trade Department at: trade.dept@oie.int.

## **A. MEETING BETWEEN THE CODE COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION**

A joint meeting of the Code Commission and Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (the Scientific Commission) took place on Tuesday 14 February 2012. Dr Bernard Vallat, Director General of the OIE, and Dr Karim Ben Jebara, Head of the OIE Sanitary Information Department, attended part of the joint meeting.

The key points discussed are as follows:

### **Restructuring Volume 2 of the *Terrestrial Code***

Dr Sarah Kahn explained that the Code Commission proposes to continue progressively renaming the chapters in Volume 2 of the *Terrestrial Code* to make reference to the pathogen name, that is 'Infection with (disease agent)'. However, in response to comments from Member Countries, the proposal to completely restructure Volume 1 of the *Terrestrial Code* has been reconsidered based on the need to keep the *Terrestrial Code* as 'user friendly' as possible to the Member Countries. It is now proposed to maintain the current structure (that is, diseases of multiple species, diseases of bovidae, etc.). As each disease chapter is updated, provisions on relevant wildlife species will be added as appropriate. If a disease occurs in wild animals, this will not necessarily mean it will be considered as a disease of 'multiple species'. Rather, the inclusion of the chapter under a specific section (for example, bovidae) will reflect the presence of the disease in the species of greatest economic importance.

The meeting discussed the application of this approach in the recent merging of existing chapters on brucellosis into a proposed new Chapter 11.3. Infection with *Brucella abortus*, *B. melitensis* and *B. suis*. Dr Brückner, President of the Scientific Commission, outlined potential problems that had been identified in comments received from Member Countries on the proposed new chapter in which the three *Brucella* species had been addressed in a single chapter. Some Member Countries commented that they had difficulty harmonising this approach with existing disease control programmes and legislation, as well as declarations of disease freedom. It was foreseen that similar problems might be encountered with the planned revision of the chapters on tuberculosis. All agreed on the need to adopt an approach that would maximise Member Countries' ease in using the *Terrestrial Code*. The two Commissions decided to send the revised text, with Member Countries' comments, to a new *ad hoc* group, which could consider drafting three separate revised chapters.

It was agreed that the new approach of making provisions for wildlife in the disease chapters and requiring the reporting of findings in species of epidemiological significance raises complex issues, not least relating to requirements for risk management and disease surveillance, and for making decisions on disease status of countries. The two Commissions will proceed with this approach on a case by case basis.

It had previously been agreed that, following this approach, the two chapters dealing with *M. bovis* infection should be revised and combined into a single chapter. Noting that these texts had recently been updated, the Code Commission considered that there was no urgency to undertake this work. However, Dr Gideon Brückner indicated that a revision of the tuberculosis chapters had been listed as a priority on the Scientific Commission's work programme, once the revision of the chapters on brucellosis had been adopted.

The meeting agreed that the comments of Member Countries on the revised chapter on brucellosis had provided valuable feedback as to the concerns about the new approach.

## Proposed OIE policy on addressing wildlife in the *Terrestrial Code* – discussion paper

Dr Kahn indicated that the Code Commission had received comments from many Member Countries on the proposed policy and that these were broadly supportive of the proposed direction, although there were some questions about how the policy would be applied. Dr De Clercq asked the Code Commission to explain how 'epidemiologically significant' would be defined, given the multiplicity of issues relevant to each disease.

The two Commissions are aware that a group of wildlife experts is currently drafting a book titled '*IUCN Guide to Wildlife Disease Risk Analysis*'. The methodology and terminology used are consistent with those of the OIE and the Scientific Commission indicated the need to make the *Guide* readily available to Members to help with the identification of epidemiological important species and to prioritise relevant wildlife diseases.

Dr Alejandro Thiermann confirmed that the considerations and provisions for each disease would be set out in each individual disease chapter and regularly reviewed based on developments in scientific knowledge. These would then be submitted for comments by Member Countries and eventual adoption in the *Terrestrial Code*. Given the increasing recognition of the importance of wildlife and healthy ecosystems to human wellbeing, the Commissions recommended that, at the 80th General Session (2012), the Director General propose a final OIE policy on wildlife in the standards.

### Disease listing criteria – proposed modification of Chapter 1.2.

Dr Thiermann indicated that the Code Commission had received comments from many Member Countries on the revised text circulated after the Code Commission's meeting of September 2011. These, together with comments of the Scientific Commission, would be addressed and a revised text will be proposed for adoption at the 80<sup>th</sup> General Session. Dr Vallat endorsed the importance of finalising the revised chapter, which had been under review for some time, as it has broad implications for OIE standards. Revision of chapters on certain diseases, such as swine vesicular disease and vesicular stomatitis, was 'on hold' pending adoption of the new disease listing criteria, which would be followed by reassessment to determine whether these diseases continue to be listed.

Dr Ben Jebara informed the meeting that, once the draft chapter had been adopted, the *ad hoc* Group on Notification of Animal Diseases and Pathogenic Agents would be convened prior to the September 2012 Commission meetings to review the list of diseases in the *Terrestrial Code*.

### Chapter 8.5. – Foot and mouth disease

Dr Brückner informed the Code Commission that a fundamental review of the chapter had commenced with the meeting of an *ad hoc* Group in February 2012 and was ongoing. It is hoped that the revised text would be provided to the Code Commission for consideration at its September 2012 meeting. The revision of the chapter will attempt to make it more user-friendly, especially in relation to the application of concepts such as compartmentalisation and recovery of free status. Dr Brückner requested the Code Commission to propose important modifications to the FMD questionnaire (Article 1.6.) for adoption at the 80th General Session. These modifications provide for the endorsement of official national disease control programmes for FMD and their adoption could avoid problems identified in the evaluation of the dossiers received from Member Countries. The Code Commission agreed to address the proposed amendments to the questionnaire as a matter of priority.

The Scientific Commission also proposed to provide latest scientific evidence on virus inactivation in casings. This evidence will comprise recent scientific publications and the outcome of an EFSA meeting in February 2012, in addition to a risk assessment from the International Scientific Working Group of the International Natural Sausage Casings Association provided by the Code Commission.

### **Chapter 8.10. – Rabies**

Dr Vallat highlighted the importance of the revision of Chapter 8.10. in view of the OIE's ongoing collaboration with the WHO and FAO on the global control and prevention of rabies, which is one of the most important zoonotic pathogens in the world. Dr Vallat encouraged the Commissions to finalise their review of Chapter 8.10. and to propose a final text for adoption by Members in May 2012. Dr Thiermann advised that, in the second round of Member Country comment, the Code Commission had again received many, sometimes contradictory, comments on the revised text. Dr Brückner indicated that the Scientific Commission would review the Member Countries' comments and forward its advice to the Code Commission. Both Commissions agreed that a revised chapter would be proposed for adoption in May 2012.

### **Chapter 12.1. – African horse sickness**

Dr Vallat noted the importance of expediting the proposal for official recognition of AHS freedom. Dr Thiermann agreed that the Code Commission would review Member Countries' comments on the revised chapter, and Scientific Commission comments, with a view to proposing revised provisions in Chapters 12.1. (African horse sickness) and 1.6. on Procedures for official recognition for adoption at the 80th General Session.

### **Chapter 15.2. – Classical swine fever (CSF)**

Dr Brückner informed the meeting that the *ad hoc* Group on classical swine fever had completed its review of Chapter 15.2. and that the Scientific Commission would send a revised text with proposed requirements for official recognition for CSF free status, including a questionnaire and surveillance guidelines, to the Code Commission for review. Dr Vallat asked the Code Commission to prioritise its review and to provide a draft for consideration by Member Countries, with a view to potential adoption of the revised text and provisions for official recognition at the 81st General Session (2013). Dr Thiermann confirmed that the Code Commission would examine the draft text as a high priority item when received.

### **Chapter 14.8. – Peste des petits ruminants (PPR)**

Dr Vallat noted the interest of OIE Member Countries in considering the establishment of conditions for recognition of official PPR free status and urged the two Commissions to progress this work as a matter of priority. The Code Commission expressed its concern regarding the current draft text, as it found it to be excessively restrictive in terms of recommendations for trading of commodities and inclusion of host species of low epidemiological significance, such as cattle and camels. Both Commissions agreed to prioritise the review of Member Countries' comments. Dr Brückner advised that the process would be to aim for adoption of the amended Chapter 14.8. followed by approval of the OIE Council for the policy of providing official OIE recognition for PPR status and, finally, the declaration of a global control programme for PPR.

### **Chapter 8.12. – Rinderpest**

Dr Vallat highlighted the priority of progressing work identified in the Resolution on Global Freedom from Rinderpest adopted at the 79<sup>th</sup> General Session. The Code Commission undertook to review Member comments on the revised text of Chapter 8.12., with a view to adoption at the 80<sup>th</sup> General Session. Both Commissions expressed concern at the delay in further action, which is dependent on progress and information to both Commissions, especially on the procedures and guidelines for the sequestration of rinderpest virus from the Joint OIE/FAO Advisory Committee on Rinderpest.

### **Requirements for notification – avian influenza**

Dr Vallat asked the Commissions to consider the need to clarify the reporting provisions for notifiable avian influenza, based on some concerns that had been raised with him. Dr Thiermann advised that the Code Commission had already considered this matter and would propose a simple amendment to Chapter 10.4., which would not change the current provisions but rather would state them more clearly.

### **Schmallenberg virus**

Dr Vallat noted that the OIE has received requests for advice on the risk of spreading this new virus as a consequence of international trade. An expert meeting had been convened and had provided advice on scientific issues, trade related concerns and risk management and a statement would be published this week. Key points to note are that there is no evidence suggesting that this new virus has any zoonotic implication. It is an arboviral disease and animal products such as meat and milk pose no animal or public health risk. Dr Vallat noted that there are still many gaps in the existing scientific knowledge of the disease. This matter would thus be kept under review. Dr Vallat recommended that the *ad hoc* Group meet again before the 80th General Session in May 2012 and agreed that the Scientific Commission would be given time during its presentation to update Member Countries on the disease.

After Dr Vallat left the meeting, due to commitments to other meetings, the two Commissions continued to discuss issues of mutual interest, as follows:

### **Invasive alien species**

Professor Stuart MacDiarmid provided a short update on the results of a meeting at the OIE Headquarters on invasive alien animal species held at the end of 2011. Prof. MacDiarmid noted that he and Dr Brückner attended the meeting, as did the Chair of the OIE Working Group on Wildlife Diseases, representatives of the Secretariats of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the World Trade Organization SPS Committee. The meeting produced a document on draft report 'Guidelines for assessing the risk of non-native animals becoming invasive'. Both Commissions commended this initiative of the OIE in undertaking this work and asked the Director General to take appropriate steps to publish the Guidelines on the OIE website, for guidance of Members.

### **Brainstorming on equine diseases**

Dr Kahn informed the two Commissions about a brainstorming meeting to be held in Paris on 12-14 March on facilitating safe international movement of horses to equine events. The meeting will be attended by several OIE reference experts on equine diseases, as well as representatives of the Federation Equestre Internationale (FEI), with which the OIE has an official agreement. The objective of the meeting is to identify constraints and areas in which the OIE and the FEI might collaborate to review standards or provide advice to Members on this topic in view of the growing international movement of horses to participate in events. The meeting will report to both the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission.

### **OIE policy on official recognition of collaborating centres**

Dr Kahn informed the meeting that an OIE collaborating centre (CC) on multiple topics had applied for recognition as four separate CCs on the topics of animal welfare, food safety, epidemiology and veterinary training. She noted that the Code Commission would consider the proposal relating to animal welfare and food safety (including seeking advice from the relevant OIE Working Groups). Dr Elisabeth Erlacher-Vindel advised that the Scientific Commission would review the proposal relating to epidemiology. The OIE Council's review of policy on CCs would need to be considered in relation to the proposal regarding veterinary training.

It was agreed that the OIE International Trade Department and the OIE Technical and Scientific Department would ensure coordination in the handling of this request.

### **Chapter 8.13. – Infection with *Trichinella* spp.**

Dr Thiermann informed the meeting that the Code Commission had received many Member comments on the revised Chapter 8.13. Dr Etienne Bonbon, who was an observer at the most recent meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on this topic, explained the approach taken to the revision of Chapter 8.13., which now specifically addresses infection with *Trichinella* species in addition to *T. spiralis*. The Scientific Commission noted this information. Dr Thiermann advised that this topic continues to be of high priority for the Code Commission and that it would review Member comments and provide guidance to a review by a new *ad hoc* group.

## Generic checklist on the practical application of compartmentalisation

Dr Brückner advised that the Scientific Commission had considered the comments provided by the Code Commission and would provide a revised text in due course. Dr Brückner discussed the evaluation of sanitary status when the compartment approved for a specific disease experienced an outbreak of another disease. Both Commissions agreed that notification should be carried out in the same way had the outbreak happened anywhere else in the country. However, the Scientific Commission proposed that the sequence of interventions be managed differently in a compartment. The Scientific Commission proposed to decide on disease status after an evaluation of the biosecurity measures in the compartment had been taken. Both Commissions agreed. The Code Commission will check the proposed text so that it aligns with *Terrestrial Code* provisions and refer it back to the OIE Scientific and Technical Department for publishing on the OIE website for information of Member Countries.

Dr Thiermann stated that more specific guidelines on contingency planning are needed in this checklist, as the application of these are critical in the recognition of the status of a compartment by importing countries.

## B. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

### C. EXAMINATION OF MEMBER COUNTRY COMMENTS AND WORK OF RELEVANT EXPERT GROUPS

The Code Commission acknowledged the record number of Member Country comments received on texts circulated after its September 2011 meeting, with a high proportion coming from the Latin American countries and OIRSA. The OIE is committed to continuing to improve the Spanish language edition of the *Terrestrial Code* and so the participation of the Latin American countries in the standard setting process is particularly appreciated. The large number of comments from the African Union-InterAfrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) was also appreciated.

With reference to the many linguistic revisions to the Spanish edition of the *Terrestrial Code* proposed by the Code Commission in response to the comments of Hispanophone Members, it was decided to present these text modifications only in the Spanish version of this report. The Commission noted that it had received a significant number of Member Countries' comments and concerns on certain chapters revised by the *ad hoc* Groups and had to spend considerable time to address these comments. The Commission considered that *ad hoc* Groups should be given clearer guidance when undertaking their reviews. With this in mind, Dr Vallat was asked to invite participation by a member of the Code Commission in the *ad hoc* Groups on classical swine fever, peste des petits ruminants, brucellosis and antimicrobial resistance.

#### Item 1 General comments of OIE Member countries

- a) General comments from Member Countries
- b) OIE standard setting procedures

Lacking time, these two items were carried over to the September 2012 meeting.

#### Item 2 Horizontal issues

- a) Restructuring of the *Terrestrial Code* Volume 2

The approach proposed by the Commission on this issue is detailed in the section 'A meeting between the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission' (above).

- b) Development of the *Terrestrial Code* to address wildlife

The Code Commission received comments from many Member Countries on the proposed policy for addressing wildlife in the *Terrestrial Code*. Most comments were broadly supportive, although some asked questions about how the policy would be applied and how 'epidemiologically significant' would be determined.

The Commission considered that this could only be done on a disease by disease basis, as discussed at the joint meeting of the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission with Dr Vallat.

The Code Commission considered that the proposed policy represents a practical compromise. The objective is to encourage reporting and the collection of relevant information on animal diseases, including in wild animals, by establishing a framework with which Member Countries can comply under real-life conditions. The Commission recognised the need to maintain balance between the various national priorities of Veterinary Services, for which disease surveillance is just one priority, and disease reporting in wildlife a sub-set of this. To encourage transparency, it is important to avoid generating trade bans or other practical problems as side effects of reporting findings in wildlife species which may have little significance for national programmes for animal health and food safety.

In response to Member Countries' requests for explanations of how the policy would be applied in practice, the Code Commission considered that this matter would need to be studied in light of experience. Noting that many *Terrestrial Code* chapters are currently under review, the Commission decided to defer detailed consideration of Members' comments on the proposed wildlife policy until after the 80th General Session. This would allow for consideration of several relevant amendments to the *Terrestrial Code*, and outcomes of the proposed new listing criteria (should they be adopted) to be factored into the discussion.

In the meantime, the Commission encouraged Member Countries to accept the proposed policy as a practical basis on which to proceed.

### **Item 3 Glossary**

Comments were provided by Chile.

On the basis of discussion within the OIE regarding the lack of a definition for the term 'infestation' in the Glossary, even though the term 'disinfestation' is defined, the Code Commission drafted a new definition of 'infestation' and amended the definition of 'disinfestation' as appropriate.

The amended Glossary, proposed for adoption, is attached as Annex III.

### **Item 4 Chapter 1.2. Criteria for the inclusion of diseases and infections on the OIE List**

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Switzerland, the USA and regional organisations (AU-IBAR and OIRSA).

The Commission strengthened the reference to WAHIS by including a reference to this in the revised Article 1.2.1. The phrase 'taking into account the animal health information notified in WAHIS' was removed from Article 1.2.1., subpoint 2, because the information in WAHIS should generally be consulted, not only in seeking to specifically demonstrate disease freedom.

Based on the comments of two Member Countries, supported by the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission deleted the phrase 'excepting the situation where effective prevention and control measures are commonly used'. However, the Commission recommended that when examining the current significance of morbidity or mortality of disease, the availability and common use of effective prevention and control measures be taken into account.

A comment of a Member Country on the criterion for the effect of diseases in wildlife was not supported.

A Member Country's comment on the criterion for emerging diseases was not supported because emerging diseases typically present potentially significant (but initially unclear) risks. This criterion recognises uncertainty. The Commission did not agree that the human illness should be addressed in the manner proposed by the Member Country, as the phrase 'with evidence of zoonotic properties' was considered to cover this point adequately.

A Member Country proposed to include a new point 6; 'The disease has been eradicated globally but is under surveillance for eventual reoccurrence'. The rationale for this modification related to the need to keep rinderpest as a listed disease post-global freedom. However, the Code Commission was confident that under criteria, 1 to 5, rinderpest would continue to be listed and that there was no need to add new text to address this.

In Article 1.2.2., the Code Commission did not accept the recommendations of a Member Country, supported by the Scientific Commission, to add the phrase 'infectious pustular balanopostitis' to the name of the disease 'infectious bovine rhinotracheitis/infectious pustular vulvovaginitis' (IBR/IPV). The Commission acknowledged that while balanopostitis is one of the clinical manifestations of infection with bovine herpesvirus, the common name of the diseases is 'infectious bovine rhinotracheitis/infectious pustular vulvovaginitis' and, therefore, the name is correctly stated in the *Terrestrial Code*.

A Member Country proposed to list respiratory coronavirus. The Code Commission recommended that the Member Country send appropriate information relevant to the disease listing criteria to the *ad hoc* Group on Notification of Animal Diseases and Pathogenic Agents once the revised listing criteria had been adopted.

The Commission agreed with Member Countries' proposals on Article 1.2.2. and added the word 'infestation' where needed to cover diseases caused by screwworm and certain bee parasites.

The revised Chapter 1.2., proposed for adoption, is at Annex V.

The Commission was informed by the OIE Animal Health Information Department that telegram has not been in use as a means of disease notification to the OIE and decided to revise Chapter 1.1., as appropriately.

The revised Chapter 1.1., proposed for adoption, is at Annex IV.

#### **Item 5 Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.)**

The Code Commission thanked Prof. MacDiarmid, who had made an editorial revision of the chapter with the intention of correcting and clarifying the English text. After review, the Commission confirmed that the scientific provisions had not been changed. The Commission removed the reference to 'compartment' from point 1 (a) of Article 1.4.6. 'historically free' as the concept of 'historically free compartment' was not considered to be meaningful, given the disease-specific biosecurity management procedures which must be implemented and documented when designating a compartment.

The revised Chapter 1.4., proposed for adoption, is at Annex VI.

#### **Item 6 Import risk analysis (Chapter 2.1.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, the EU, New Zealand, South Africa and OIRSA. The Code Commission also reviewed the comments provided by the USA on Chapter 2.2. of OIE the *Aquatic Animal Health Code (Aquatic Code)*, which were considered to be relevant to the *Terrestrial Code* Chapter 2.1.

The Code Commission noted that Member Countries had supported the amendment proposed in September 2011. Consistent with the approach agreed in September 2011, the Commission will make the same amendment in other relevant parts of the *Terrestrial Code* as appropriate upon the adoption of this chapter.

The Code Commission also noted several more extensive amendments suggested by a Member Country. However, because the Commission considered that these would not significantly improve the current text and were already well covered by the OIE *Handbook on Import Risk Analysis for Animals and Animal Products*, the Commission did not accept these comments. A proposal to include a new diagram was not accepted because it illustrated a process different from that of the OIE and used some terms not used by the OIE.



The amended chapter, proposed for adoption, is at Annex VII.

## Item 7 Support for Veterinary Services

### a) Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2.)

Comments were received from the EU and Switzerland supporting the modification of the text.

The amended chapter, proposed for adoption, is at Annex VIII.

### b) Communication (Chapter 3.3.)

Comments were received from the EU, Norway and OIRSA. The Commission also reviewed the comments of Australia, Canada, the EU and New Zealand on the new draft Chapter XX of the *Aquatic Code*, which were considered to be relevant to *Terrestrial Code* Chapter 3.3.

The comments of Member Countries on point 2 of Article 3.3.2. were not accepted, because the Commission considered that the current text provides for the integration of veterinary expertise and communication expertise in the veterinary services while giving sufficient flexibility.

Following a Member's comment on point 4 (b) of Article 3.3.4., the Commission deleted 'long-term plan' and clarified the text.

The amended chapter, proposed for adoption, is at Annex IX.

### c) Veterinary legislation (proposed new Chapter 3.4.)

Comments were received from the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, the OIE Animal Production Food Safety Working Group (APFSWG), the Secretariat of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC), the Secretariat of the WTO SPS Committee, and OIRSA.

The Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Legislation, which met in January 2012. The Commission endorsed the work of the *ad hoc* Group and made some comments and modifications to the draft Chapter 3.4., in response to Member Countries' comments, as described below.

In response to a Member Country which opposed the inclusion of this new chapter in the *Terrestrial Code*, the Code Commission stated that the OIE fully appreciates the diverse conditions that exist in OIE Member Countries. However, Member Countries have asked the OIE to provide standards on the fundamental elements to be covered in veterinary legislation. At the request of Member Countries, the OIE is already undertaking missions on veterinary legislation as a follow-up to an initial evaluation mission under the PVS Pathway. Standards on veterinary legislation will be used as the reference point in these missions. These standards can also be used to help Veterinary Services (VS) in developing countries convince governments and donors of the need to modernise legislation and harmonise it with the international standards as a fundamental aspect of VS competency and governance.

In response to a Member Country's comments that it was not the OIE's role to define legal terms, the Code Commission considered that some terms used in the chapter needed to be defined to aid understanding and noted that the phrase in Article 3.4.2. 'for the purpose of this chapter' makes this clear.

On Article 3.4.11. (Veterinary medicines and biologicals), the Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group's recommendation that the *Terrestrial Code* terminology on veterinary medicines and biological products (variously referred to as veterinary products, pharmaceutical products, etc.) should be reviewed for consistency and consideration given to defining key terms. The OIE International Trade Department undertook to report to the Commission's September 2012 meeting on this topic.

Dr Kahn informed the Commission that the OIE had received rather detailed comments from the FAO legal offices (LEGN-AGN) on the draft text after the meeting of the *ad hoc* Group. The Commission asked the *ad hoc* Group to review these comments at its next meeting.

The revised text of the new Chapter 3.4., proposed for adoption, is at Annex X.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is at Annex XXX for information.

## **Item 8 Semen and embryos**

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

The Code Commission reviewed comments from Chile, the EU and Australia.

The recommendation of a Member Country to make new provisions on equine semen was noted and tentatively added to the Commission's work programme. The Commission noted that if this proposal for new work is supported by Member Countries, the Scientific Commission would be asked to convene an *ad hoc* Group on the topic. The Commission also noted that it would be preferable to develop a new chapter on equine semen, in order to avoid introducing further complexity to Chapter 4.6., and in light of the fact that the equine artificial insemination industry may be quite different from that covered in Chapter 4.6.

A Member Country's recommendation to add 'producing semen for international distribution' to Article 4.6.1. was not accepted, because the term 'artificial insemination centres' is defined in the Glossary and the usage in this article is based on the definition.

The entire chapter was modified by deleting 'mucosal disease', as bovine viral diarrhoea is the name of the listed disease given in Chapter 1.2.

Based on the rationale given by Member Countries, the Commission modified the text of Article 4.6.3. to require that animals, but not semen, be tested for maedi-visna and caprine arthritis encephalitis.

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

The Commission reviewed comments from Chile, the EU, the USA and the IETS.

In response to a comment from a Member Country and the IETS, the Commission added equine viral arteritis to the Category 4 diseases in Article 4.7.14., as recommended by the IETS Regulatory Sub-Committee (report dated January 2012).

In response to a request from the IETS Regulatory Sub-Committee to retain the IETS categorisation of diseases and pathogenic agents without modification, the Code Commission modified Article 4.7.14. indicating that the categorisation is based on IETS recommendations and clearly identifying unlisted diseases, as 'not an OIE listed disease'.

The amended Chapters 4.6. and 4.7., proposed for adoption, are at Annex XII.

## **Item 9 OIE procedures relevant to the WTO SPS Agreement (Chapter 5.3.)**

The Commission reviewed the revision of Article 5.3.1. (Obligations of WTO Members) proposed by the *ad hoc* Group on veterinary legislation in response to concerns raised by the Secretariat of the WTO SPS Committee. The Commission noted that the obligation of notification was for WTO Members only, and that not all OIE Member Countries are WTO Members. The Commission revised the proposed text for better alignment with the obligation in the WTO SPS Agreement.

The revised Chapter 5.3., proposed for adoption, is at Annex XIII.

## Item 10 Salmonellosis

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

The Code Commission reviewed this chapter, taking into account comments from the EU and Peru and made some amendments, as appropriate.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's comment to add a reference to the Codex 'Guidelines for the Control of *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* in chicken meat (CAC/GL 78-2011)' in Article 6.4.2.

Following a Member Country's comment, a new sub-point (c) was added to Article 6.4.5., point 2, reading 'All equipment should be cleaned and sanitized before being taken into a poultry house'.

The amended Chapter 6.4., proposed for adoption, is attached at Annex XIV.

- b) Cross reference to Chapter 6.4. in Article 13.2. (Rabbit haemorrhagic disease)

Comments were received from the EU, supporting the proposed amendment.

The amended Chapter 13.2., proposed for adoption, is attached at Annex XV.

## Item 11 Antimicrobial resistance

- a) Harmonisation of national antimicrobial resistance surveillance and monitoring programmes (Chapter 6.7.)

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

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group on Antimicrobial Resistance had reviewed most but not all Member Country comments and provided relevant technical advice on them. The Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group and those Member Countries' comments that had not been addressed by the *ad hoc* Group.

Based on the *ad hoc* Group report and following Member Countries' comments, the Commission modified the text as appropriate.

In response to a Member Country's request for clarification on the inclusion of a table and a reference to a journal article in Article 6.7.3., the Commission deleted the reference, as this was considered to be background information and inappropriate in a *Terrestrial Code* chapter.

The Commission referred to the *ad hoc* Group a Member's request to modify Article 6.7.3., subpoint 6 (a ii).

The revised Chapter 6.7., proposed for adoption, is at Annex XVI.

- b) Monitoring of the quantities of antimicrobials used in animal husbandry (Chapter 6.8.)

Comments were received from Canada, the EU, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland.

The Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on antimicrobial resistance and amended the texts taking the recommendations of *ad hoc* Group into consideration.

The revised Chapter 6.8., proposed for adoption, is at Annex XVII.

- c) Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine (Chapter 6.9.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, the People's Republic of China, Cuba, the EU, Mexico, New Zealand, Switzerland, the USA and AU-IBAR.

The Commission noted the extensive comments received after the *ad hoc* Group meeting in December 2011 and referred these back to the *ad hoc* Group for advice.

- d) Risk assessment for antimicrobial resistance arising from the use of antimicrobials in animals (Chapter 6.10.)

The Commission noted the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Antimicrobial Resistance had revised Chapter 6.10., which had been approved by the Scientific Commission.

The revised Chapter 6.10., for Member Country comment, is attached at Annex XXXI.

#### **Item 12 Zoonoses transmissible from non-human primates (Chapter 6.11.)**

The Code Commission reviewed the revised chapter provided by the Scientific Commission in September 2011, taking into account comments from the *ad hoc* Group on the Welfare of Animals used in research and education, and made some amendments to the text as appropriate.

The revised Chapter 6.11. for adoption is at Annex XVIII.

#### **Item 13 Animal welfare**

- a) Draft new Article 7.1.4. Animal welfare and livestock production systems – guiding principles

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Peru, Switzerland, Uruguay and the USA as well as two regional organisations (AU-IBAR and OIRSA) and a NGO (ICFAW).

In addition to commenting on the new draft Article 7.1.4, the Code Commission noted that several Member Countries had recommended modifications to the established Articles 7.1.1. to 7.1.3.

On Article 7.1.1., the Commission did not agree to change ‘care’ to ‘management’ as this last word is included in ‘husbandry’. Regarding a Member Country’s comment on the addition of the words ‘appropriate and timely’ it was decided to add ‘appropriate’ which includes the concept of timeliness.

On Article 7.1.2, the Commission did not agree with a Member Country’s suggestion to include a reference to the Farm Animal Welfare Committee (FAWC) in point 2 because the concept of the ‘internationally accepted 5 freedoms’ has been in the *Terrestrial Code* for several years and the Commission did not consider it appropriate to now introduce a reference to FAWC.

Following a Member Country’s comment, the Commission replaced the word ‘science’ with ‘research’ in point 5 of Article 7.1.2.

Regarding a Member Country’s comment on the inclusion of the word ‘health’ in point 8 of Article 7.1.2., the Commission did not accept the inclusion and explained that there are two broad sets of performance criteria; namely, those that are based on outcomes for the animal, and those based on the design of the production system, also known as design-based criteria.

Following several Member Countries’ comments, the Commission added ‘should always take into account’ before ‘health and welfare of animals’ in point 1 and deleted the word ‘genetically’.

Following several Member Countries’ comments, the Commission modified point 2 to read ‘so as to minimise the risk of injury and transmission of diseases...’.

Following Member Countries’ comments, point 4 was modified by adding ‘be managed to allow positive social behaviour and minimise injury, distress and chronic fear’ and point 5 was modified to read ‘Air quality, including temperature and humidity, in confined spaces....’.

Following Member Countries' comments, in point 6, the words 'serious or' were removed and 'productivity' introduced in place of 'vigour'.

The Commission noted a recommendation from a NGO but did not accept the proposed inclusion of a new point 6A. While it agreed on the need for production systems to avoid ill-health, pain and injury, it considered that this point was well addressed through the ten points in the draft Article 7.1.4.

Following Member Countries' comments, in point 7, the words 'and controlled' were added after 'prevented' and 'economic constraints' was deleted from point 8.

In point 9, the only modification made was to clarify the 'human-animal relationship'.

Most of the comments submitted by Member Countries were addressed and some were partially addressed in those situations in which opposing recommendations from Members Countries could not be totally reconciled.

The revised Chapter 7.1., proposed for adoption, is at Annex XIX.

b) Animal welfare and beef cattle production systems (draft new Chapter 7.X.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Switzerland, Uruguay, the USA, a regional organisation (OIRSA) and a NGO (ICFAW).

The Commission greatly appreciated the disciplined work of the *ad hoc* Group, which had addressed the multiple and diverse comments of Member Countries and produced a much simpler and clearer text. The Commission considered all Member Countries' comments carefully and made some amendments to the text. In its review, the Commission noted that many Member Countries' comments, if accepted, would have introduced excessive detail into the text. Modifications were made only where the Commission considered that they would improve the text significantly. As most of the comments were minor, in terms of the substance of the draft, the Commission was of the opinion that the draft should be submitted for adoption at the 80th General Session

Following several Member Countries' comments on Article 7.X.2., the Code Commission clarified the scope by replacing the words 'on-farm' by 'welfare' and by deleting the second sentence.

The Commission did not agree with a Member Country's recommendation to include the word 'housing' and a new definition for 'Intensive grazing' as it considered that these modifications were unnecessary.

In response to the comment of a NGO on the need to take resource-based criteria into account, the Commission added a sentence to address this concern.

In order to address several Member Countries' comments with which the Commission agreed, some modifications were made to point 1 of Article 7.X.4., taking care to maintain a clear and simple text.

The Commission did not agree with a Member Country's recommendation to move the paragraph on post-mortem examination to the point on 'Mortality', as it considered that the point was correctly placed.

The Commission did not agree to add 'the presence of endoparasites' to point 6, bullet 1, as suggested by two Member Countries, as the concept of physical observance of endoparasites was not considered to be meaningful.

Several Member Countries recommended deleting 'depression' from the list in point 6 'Physical appearance' as this trait is more accurately described as an attribute of behaviour. The Commission agreed and moved 'depression' to point 1 'Behaviour'.

The Commission modified the terminology used for restraining boxes in Article 7.X.4., point 7, ('Handling responses') and, in accordance with a Member Country's comment, included the word 'slipping' under point 7, bullet 3.

Notwithstanding several Member Countries' comments, the Commission did not agree to remove the word 'percentage' as this was considered to be correct.

Following the comments of several Member Countries on Article 7.X.4., point 8, the Commission amended the text but did not add any new bullets to this point.

Following the recommendations of several Member Countries to modify Article 7.X.5. to improve the language in both Spanish and English, the Commission made appropriate amendments.

The Commission modified and simplified the text in Article 7.X.5., point 1 (b), 'Animal health management' to make it less prescriptive.

Following comments from several Member Countries on Article 7.X.5., point 2, 'Environment', the Commission made appropriate amendments to the text. The Commission did not accept a Member's recommendation to include 'shelter' in this point as it did not consider 'shelter' to be pertinent in extensive farming systems.

In relation to a comment on ammonia, the Commission referred the Member Country to the explanation provided in the *ad hoc* Group's report which was included as Annex XII to the report of the Code Commission's September 2011 meeting.

The Commission did not accept a Member Country's proposal to make reference to the level of haemoglobin under Article 7.X.5., point (e), 'Nutrition', as it considered that such level of detail is too prescriptive.

A Member and a NGO recommended against the use of fully slatted floors and one Member commented that rubber-coated slats were preferable to wood or concrete. The Commission considered this to be an excessive level of detail and referred concerns on this point to the report of the *ad hoc* Group.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Commission modified the text on the mixing of horned and non-horned cattle in Article 7.X.5., point 2 subpoint (g), 'Social environment'.

The Commission did not agree with the comment of a Member Country on the need to include 'outdoor areas' in Article 7.X.5., point 2 sub-point (h), 'Stocking density', as it considered that this was effectively covered in point (f) 'Flooring, bedding, resting surfaces and outdoor areas'.

Following Member Countries' comments on point 3 of Article 7.X.5. 'Management', the Commission agreed to replace the word 'ability' by 'instincts' under point (a) 'Genetic selection', and to replace 'operator' by 'handler' under point (b) 'Reproductive management'.

Regarding a NGO's comment on the use of double muscled animals in point (b) 'Reproductive management', the Commission considered that this issue was already addressed in the text and in the list of identified outcome-based measurables.

Concerning a Member Country's comments on point (c) of Article 7.X.5.3. 'Colostrum', the Commission did not agree to reduce the hours from 24 to 6, as it was not considered achievable by all OIE Members. The Commission also noted that the authority cited for such a change was a document on intensive veal calf production and veal production is specifically excluded from this Chapter. Regarding the modification suggested by a Member Country on the outcome-based measurable for the same point, the Commission decided that a reduction in the weight is indeed a change in weight and therefore decided not to change the text and keep it as already defined in point 4) of Article 7.X.4.

In order to address Member Countries' comments on point (d) 'Weaning' of Article 7.X.5.3., the Commission agreed with the provided rationale, and made minor changes in the text.

Regarding Members' comments suggesting to modify the text of the first paragraph in point e) 'Painful husbandry procedures' of Article 7.X.5.3., the Commission, after a thorough discussion, and taking into account the comments of the *ad hoc* Group on this point, deleted 'Where possible' because it considered that this phrase did not make a useful contribution to the paragraph. The Commission did not accept the recommendation to remove the word 'or' from the last sentence of paragraph one.

In response to several Member Countries' comments on point (e) 'Painful husbandry procedures' of Article 7.X.5.3., the Commission states that this point merely lists examples of painful procedures and that there is no intention to suggest a hierarchy of preferable methods.

The Commission agreed to delete specific names of the method of castration given in the brackets, i.e. 'knife', 'banding or ringing' and 'Burdizzo operation' as suggested by a Member Country leaving the text making only reference to 'and disruption of the spermatic cord'.

The Commission did not agree with a Member Country's recommendation to advance the deadline for castration to six months.

Following a Member Country's comment on point (v) 'Identification', the Commission agreed with the provided rationale but considered that the text should not go into details and should be kept as simple as possible.

Several conflicting comments from Member Countries were received on point (f) 'Handling and inspection', but the Commission decided to leave the text of the first paragraph unchanged. The Commission accepted a recommendation to add a sentence referring to the number of animal handlers to ensure animal health and welfare. On the same point and regarding a Member Country's comment on the inclusion of 'a veterinarian' in paragraph 4, the Commission considered that the last sentence of the paragraph already covers that issue.

The Commission did not agree with Member Countries' comments recommending the addition of text in paragraph 5, as it was considered that even if an animal is experiencing severe and lasting pain, treatment could be an alternative to killing.

The Commission decided not to accept the inclusion of the word 'vocalisation' under the list of outcome-based measurables, as suggested by a Member Country, because it was considered to be already covered in 'behaviour'.

Regarding Member Countries' comments on point (h) 'Emergency plans', the Commission considered that the proposed text did not improve the content; however a few amendments were made to address other Member Countries' concerns.

Following Member Countries' comments on point (i) 'Location, construction and equipment', the Commission made some changes in the title and in the text to better describe certain structures in the three official languages.

Under point (j) 'Humane killing', the Commission decided not to include a new point, as suggested by a Member Country, as it considered that all significant points were already covered.

## **Conclusions**

Based on the support expressed by most Member Countries, the Commission decided to submit the draft chapter for adoption. However, the Commission did not have time to make a detailed review of the many comments submitted by Members on the tables in Article 7.X.5.

The Commission decided to review comments on the tables in September 2012. The Commission decided that the tables would not be included in the chapter because this represents too much detail. Once Members' comments had been reviewed, the tables will be placed on the OIE website for guidance to Member Countries. Noting that this approach breaks with the approach in other chapters in Section 7, the Commission invited Members to advise if they wish to see a similar approach taken to other animal welfare texts.

The Commission agreed with a Member Country's recommendation to improve the structure of the chapter and asked the OIE International Trade Department to propose a new structure presenting the text in short articles and paragraphs once the chapter has been adopted. The OIE International Trade Department will undertake to provide a report to the Commission in September 2012.

The draft new Chapter 7.X., proposed for adoption, is at Annex XX.

- c) Model veterinary certificate for international trade in laboratory animals (Proposed as Chapter 5.13.)

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

The Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to include 'ferrets' in the list of animals included in the scope of this chapter.

The Commission noted a Member Country's comment pointing out the URL given in Boxes 5 and 7 was not functional. The Commission decided to modify the text in these boxes to align with Chapter 5.10.

Regarding the inclusion of 'the name and contact details of the person responsible for each stage of the journey' in Box I.12, the Commission did not agree to include the sentence as suggested, but rather made reference to the 'name and contact detail of an emergency contact person'.

The Commission did not agree to add 'when appropriate' in Box I.20 as suggested by a Member Country as the box makes reference to 'Identification system' not 'individual identification' as mentioned in the rationale provided.

Regarding a Member Country's comment on Box I.17 and point 3 'Part II. Classification of Pathogen Free Status', the Commission did not agree to amend the existing text as it was considered that the current wording was correct.

The draft new Chapter 5.13., proposed for adoption, is at Annex XXI.

- d) Use of animals in research and education (Chapter 7.8)

Comments were provided by Canada, the EU, New Zealand, Switzerland, the USA and a NGO (ICFAW).

Comments were received on the entire chapter but, due to time constraints, the Commission limited its review to the draft new Article 7.8.10. 'Transportation'. The comments received on other articles will be addressed at the Code Commission's meeting in September 2012.

Following Member Countries' comments on the need to make cross references to other chapters in Section 7, the Commission added an appropriate sentence.

In order to address a Member Country's comments on contingency planning, the Commission included a text referring to the nomination of an emergency contact person in Article 7.8.10. and in the related text of Chapter 5.13. (Box 1.12 of the model veterinary certificate).

The Commission did not agree with a statement of a Member Country discouraging the international transport of laboratory animals and instead referred Member Countries to the OIE/IATA discussion paper on the transport of animals used in research and education ([http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Animal\\_Welfare/docs/pdf/Others/IATA/ENG\\_IATA\\_paper\\_2009.pdf](http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Animal_Welfare/docs/pdf/Others/IATA/ENG_IATA_paper_2009.pdf)).

The Commission agreed with a Member Country's proposal to include 'or other competent person' under point 3 (c).



In response to a Member Country's comment on point 4, the Commission added the heading 'Delivery' and moved this paragraph to a new point 6. Also under point 4, sub-point (c), the new sub-point 6 (c) was amended according to a NGO's comment.

The Commission disagreed with a Member Country's request to add a reference to disinfection on arrival as it considered that it was out of the scope of Chapter 7.8., which addresses animal welfare and not disease prevention, consistent with the approach taken in other chapters on animal welfare.

The Commission, as in previous years, received many comments on existing text (Chapters 7.2 to 7.7). The Commission did not have time to consider all comments in detail and considered that the priority was to address the extensive comments on new texts that would be proposed for adoption in May 2012. In addition, at its September 2012 meeting the Commission will consider modifications to the structure of the chapters in Section 7 and the implications of removing tables containing detailed information from the Code - see comments on Chapter 7.X in this report. The Commission decided to hold the comments on Chapters 7.2 to 7.7 for future consideration.

The revised Chapter 7.8., proposed for adoption, is at Annex XXII.

e) Work programme of AWWG

The Commission provided advice on the work programme, as requested by the AWWG. The amended work programme, for information and comment of Member Countries, is at annex XXXII.

#### **Item 14 Aujeszky's disease (Chapter 8.2.)**

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

Following a Member Country's comment, the Commission modified the title of the chapter to 'Infection with Aujeszky's disease virus'.

The Commission did not agree with a Member Country's recommendation to delete references to captive wild pigs from this chapter, as this text had been adopted at the 79th General Session. The Commission did, however, consider the Member Country's comment and amended the text by adding 'which are under direct human supervision or control', in order to clarify the definition of captive wild pigs for the purpose of the *Terrestrial Code*.

Following a Member Countries' comments on the Note attached to Article 8.2.11., the Commission added an introductory text.

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

#### **Item 15 Bluetongue (Chapter 8.3.)**

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

Following a Member Country's comment, the Commission changed the title of the chapter to 'Infection with bluetongue viruses'.

The Commission referred to the Scientific Commission a Member Country's request for a clear case definition, including the definition of epidemiologically significant susceptible species, with reference to the various serotypes and their specific epidemiology.

The Commission did not recognise a need to clarify Article 8.3.1, paragraph 4, as requested by a Member Country, specifically with reference to the word 'adjacent', by adding the phrase 'relevance of ecological or geographical features likely to interrupt the transmission of BTV'. The Commission noted that the *Oxford English Dictionary* states that 'adjacent' means: 'next to or very near to something else; neighbouring; bordering, contiguous; adjoining' and the word is used in this sense in the text.

In reply to a Member Country's comment, the Commission advised that the proposed text under Article 8.3.15., point 1, does not imply a need for facilities that are not involved in international trade to meet these conditions.

The Commission referred a Member Country's comment on Article 8.3.19. to the Scientific Commission for advice.

The Commission referred a Member Country's request for reference to serological surveillance methods and a Member Country's comment on serogroup analysis to the OIE Biological Standards Commission (Laboratories Commission) for advice.

The Commission considered that this chapter should not be further revised until such time as new scientific evidence or trade problems warrant.

## Item 16 Zoonotic parasites

### a) Trichinellosis (Chapter 8.13.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland and the USA, as well as OIRSA.

The Commission agreed with Member Countries which commented on the importance of the OIE working in close collaboration with the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The OIE has participated in meetings of the Codex Working Group on the Proposed Draft Guidelines for Control of Specific Zoonotic Parasites in Meat: *Trichinella spiralis* and *Cysticercus bovis*, which is developing guidelines on the control of these parasites in meat.

Dr Kahn informed the Commission that the OIE continues to work with the CAC Secretariat to encourage the development of complementary standards. At the coming meeting of the Codex Committee on General Principles (CCGP) (2–6 April 2012), the OIE would make a proposal for the OIE and CAC to aim also for 'mutual recognition' of standards. The current work of the OIE on zoonotic parasites and previous work on salmonellosis is entirely consistent with these approaches. In addition to the CAC Secretariat, the joint chairs of the Codex Working Group would be invited to the next meeting of the OIE *ad hoc* Group on Zoonotic Parasites. The Commission endorsed this approach.

In light of several Member Countries' comments and concerns, the Commission advised that the objective of this chapter is to recommend measures to mitigate human health risks arising from *Trichinella* spp., as appropriate to the country and production sector.

The Commission agreed on the need to consider the review of the text very carefully, as the revised Chapter 8.13 will be used as a model for other chapters on zoonotic diseases.

The Commission noted that the disease listed as notifiable is 'trichinellosis'. Therefore, all *Trichinella* species should be considered, as well as the associated risk management measures. The Commission noted that trichinellosis is not contagious and does not cause disease in animals. The management of the human health risk posed by trichinellosis can be largely based on biosecurity and feeding practices on-farm, rather than measures to inactivate the specific agent in meat. Therefore, the inclusion of other species of *Trichinella* in the chapter need not lead to major difficulties in formulating recommendations; the biosecurity management that protects pigs from acquiring infection with *Trichinella spiralis* should also protect them from infection by other *Trichinella* species such as *T. britovi*, etc.

Because of the low sensitivity of available tests, individual testing is not a good tool in low prevalence conditions as has been shown by ample historical data and categorising herds as 'trichinella free' on the sole basis of testing is probably not feasible. However, good biosecurity and management practices could be recommended which would allow herds to be classified as 'negligible risk' and this, taken together with historical data, could ensure negligible risk at herd or zone level. For herds in production systems in which appropriate biosecurity measures could not be applied (for example, backyard and so-called 'free range' production), the risks could be managed after slaughter, using testing or treatment.

The Commission considered that the principal aim of this chapter should be to provide recommendations on the determination and management of risk in domestic pigs and horses.

The Commission sent Member Countries' comments to the *ad hoc* Group for consideration, taking into account the guidance provided above.

b) Echinococcosis/hydatidosis (revised Chapter 8.4.)

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Zoonotic Parasites, noting the extensive comments provided by Member Countries and the significant difference in the lifecycles of these two pathogenic agents. The Commission endorsed the separation of the original text into two separate chapters, i.e.: Chapter 8.4. – Infection with *E. granulosus* and Chapter X.X. – Infection with *E. multilocularis*. The Commission made some text modifications for editorial purposes.

The revised Chapter 8.4. and the proposed draft Chapter X.X. are at Annex XXXIII for Member Country comment.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached as Annex XXXIV for information.

#### Item 17 Foot and mouth disease (FMD)

a) Revision of Chapter 8.5.

Comments were submitted by the EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission noted that further advice would be provided by the Scientific Commission.

b) FMD Questionnaire (Chapter 1.6.)

Following the advice of the Scientific Commission, the Commission made minor amendments to Chapter 1.6.

The revised chapter, for adoption, is at Annex XXIV.

#### Item 18 Rabies

a) Rabies (Chapter 8.10.)

Comments were received from Australia, Chile, the People's Republic of China, Chinese Taipei, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, the USA and two regional organisations (AU-IBAR and OIRSA).

The Code Commission reviewed all comments, taking into account the Scientific Commission's comments on scientific issues raised by Members.

The Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed that a Member who requested access to supporting documents should make reference to comments in the *ad hoc* Group report of April 2011.

A Member Country's recommendation to make reference to birds in Article 8.10.1. was not accepted. While birds may very rarely be infected, this article is prefaced: 'For the purpose of the *Terrestrial Code*'. This means that the key points relevant to the *Terrestrial Code* are covered in this article and inclusion of the reference to birds is not warranted.

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission did not accept a Member Country's recommendation for the word 'species' to be removed from '*Rabies virus* species'. The correct nomenclature is *Rabies virus* according to the International Committee on the Taxonomy of Viruses; see <http://ictvonline.org/virusTaxonomy.asp?version=2009>

Point 3 of Article 8.10.1. was not modified because the Commission considered the text to be clear and did not recognise any conflict with the definition of infective period in the Glossary.

On Article 8.10.2., the Commission carefully reviewed Member Countries' comments. The Commission reiterated its view that in determining the rabies status of a country, the key issue is findings of rabies virus infection in species in the Orders of Carnivora and Chiroptera. Thus, the finding of *Rabies virus* infection in a species other than a one that is a member of these two Orders should not result in the loss of rabies free status of a country.

Following a Member Country's recommendations, the word 'reservoir' was removed from point 5 in this article.

The comment of a regional organisation was accepted and a new point added to Article 1, which states that 'For the purposes of the *Terrestrial Code*... a country that does not fulfil the requirements in Article 2 is considered to be infected with *Rabies virus*'.

Member Countries' comments on the need for permanent identification were not accepted because this is already covered in Article 5.11. (International veterinary certificate for dogs and cats originating from rabies infected countries).

The Commission did not follow a recommendation of the Scientific Commission to delete point 2 ('were permanently identified and their identification number stated in the certificate') because this point was considered to be important and the text to be clear.

Following Member Countries' comments, supported by the Scientific Commission, Article 8.10.5., point 3, was modified to reflect the need for both the use and the production of the vaccine to accord with provisions in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Commission advised that all significant changes in Chapter 8.10. are based on the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group, which are available on the OIE website ([http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International\\_Standard\\_Setting/docs/pdf/SCAD/A\\_SCAD\\_Aug-Sept2011.pdf](http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International_Standard_Setting/docs/pdf/SCAD/A_SCAD_Aug-Sept2011.pdf)).

Following a Member Country's recommendation, point 3 (a) of Article 8.10.6. was modified to improve clarity.

The same change made in Article 8.10.5. was introduced in point 3 (b) of Article 8.10.6.

On Article 8.10.8., the Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments and the Scientific Commission advice regarding clarification of the use of the word 'wildlife' but finally recommended that no changes be made.

The Commission did not accept a Member Country's proposal to add a new clause on vaccination in the certification provisions of Article 8.10.8. as the rabies status of wildlife is unknown; the proposed requirement (separation for six months prior to shipment) was considered by both Commissions to be appropriate.

#### b) Chapter 5.11. (Revised model certificate)

Comments were received from the People's Republic of China, the EU, New Zealand, the USA and OIRSA.

The Code Commission reviewed all comments, taking into account the Scientific Commission comments on scientific issues raised by Members.

Following a Member Country's comment, the title of this chapter was amended by adding 'for international movement of' after Model veterinary certificate, to be consistent with Article 5.12.

Several Member Country comments were not accepted as they were inconsistent with recommendations in Chapter 8.10.

In response to a Member Country which commented that the certifying veterinarian is not always the person who vaccinates or takes blood samples from the animal, the text in points (iv) and (v) were amended to clarify that the certifying veterinarian should have 'seen evidence' relating to the conduct of these procedures. The Commission noted that all amendments made to Chapter 5.11. were consistent with the recommendations in Chapters 5.1. and 5.2.

The revised Chapters 8.10. and 5.11., proposed for adoption, are at Annex XXV.

#### **Item 19 Rinderpest (Chapter 8.12.)**

Comments were received from Australia, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland and two regional organisations (AU-IBAR and OIRSA).

The Commission noted that Member Countries' comments on the revised Chapter 8.12. would be addressed once the two Commissions receive the information awaited from Joint FAO/OIE Advisory Committee on Rinderpest in case of a re-occurrence of rinderpest and on rinderpest virus sequestration.

#### **Item 20 Vesicular stomatitis (Chapter 8.15.)**

Comments were received from Canada, Chile and the EU.

The Code Commission modified the title of the chapter to 'Infection with vesicular stomatitis virus'.

Following a Member Country's recommendation, the Commission deleted 'free zone' from Articles 8.15.8. and 8.15.9.

The Commission referred to the Scientific Commission a Member Country's request for the definition of susceptible species and the proposal to include the concept of zoning in Articles 8.15. 4. to 8.15.7.

The Commission will review the text in its next meeting in September 2012.

#### **Item 21 Review of chapters on bee diseases**

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

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, the People's Republic of China, the EU, Japan, Norway and Switzerland.

Dr Francois Diaz, member of the OIE Scientific and Technical Department, joined the Code Commission for the discussion on bee diseases.

Dr Diaz informed the Commission that, following Member Countries' comments and consistent with the revised title of Chapter 4.14. (Official health control of bee diseases), the *ad hoc* Group had revised and clarified the text. The Commission endorsed the work done by the *ad hoc* Group and made some additional amendments, mainly of an editorial nature.

The revised Chapter 4.14., proposed for adoption, is at Annex XXVI.

##### b) Chapters 9.1. to 9.6. inclusive – Members' comments

The following Member Countries submitted comments:

Chapter 9.1. – Chile, the EU, Japan, New Zealand and OIRSA.

Chapter 9.2. – the EU, Jamaica, New Zealand and Switzerland.

Chapter 9.4. – Australia, Chile, the EU, Japan, Switzerland and OIRSA.

Chapter 9.5. – Chile, the People's Republic of China, the EU, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland and OIRSA.

Chapter 9.6. – Chile, the People's Republic of China, the EU, Norway and Switzerland.

Dr Diaz indicated that there were two key issues that still need to be addressed by the *ad hoc* Group, (1) text modifications that need to be made to reflect the eventual updating of the chapter names (e.g. ‘Infestation of honey bees with *Acarapis woodi*’) and (2) the definition of the commodity ‘honey’. The *ad hoc* Group referred several Member Country comments to the Commission for its review.

Dr Diaz noted that several Member Countries had pointed out the difficulty in achieving disease freedom in the situation where there are wild or feral bee populations. The *ad hoc* Group considered that it would only be possible to address this issue if surveillance could be conducted on the wild and feral populations, and this approach would have to be incorporated into the relevant chapters.

The Commission noted Member Countries’ concerns about the provision in Article 9.5.4. opposing the importation of bees from countries that have established disease freedom as a result of an eradication programme. The Commission emphasised that the *Terrestrial Code* provides criteria by which a Member can assess the disease risks posed by importation; it does not, however, provide predetermined assessments of risk.

Dr Diaz noted that the *ad hoc* Group had reviewed Chapter 5.10. (‘Model veterinary certificates’) and had concluded that no amendment was required as a consequence of the revision of the bee disease chapters.

The Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group would meet again in June or July 2012 and would address scientific aspects of the comments provided by Member Countries. For the purpose of guidance to the *ad hoc* Group, the Commission proposed the following modifications to the chapter names.

Chapter 9.1. Infestation of honey bees with *Acarapis woodi*

Chapter 9.2. Infection of honey bees with *Paenibacillus larvae*

Chapter 9.3. Infection of honey bees with *Melissococcus plutonius*

Chapter 9.4. Infestation with *Aethina tumida*

Chapter 9.5. Infestation of honey bees with *Tropilaelaps* spp.

Chapter 9.6. Infestation of honey bees with *Varroa* spp.

#### **Item 22 Avian influenza (Chapter 10.4.)**

The Code Commission modified the title of Chapter 10.4. to ‘Infection with viruses of notifiable avian influenza’ and clarified the reporting provisions for notifiable avian influenza by repeating text from point 6 of Article 1.2.3. to Chapter 10.4. The Commission emphasised that this does not change the current notification obligations; rather, it states them more clearly.

The amended chapter proposed for adoption is at Annex XXVII.

#### **Item 23 Newcastle disease (Chapter 10.9.)**

The Code Commission reviewed a Member Country’s comment but made no changes to the text.

#### **Item 24 Proposed new chapter on Infection with *B. abortus*, *B. melitensis* and *B. suis***

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, the EU, New Zealand, Japan, South Africa and the USA and from the IETS and OIRSA.

The Code Commission was informed by the Scientific Commission about concerns with the amended chapter, based on the difficulty of Members to understand how the proposed approach could be harmonised with disease control measures and existing legislation and provisions for the declaration of free status.

The proposal to develop a single chapter covering the three *Brucella* species had come from the *ad hoc* group, supported by the Scientific Commission. However, in light of Members' comments and the current advice of the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission referred the revised text and Members' comments to a new *ad hoc* group with a request to re-establish three separate chapters.

#### **Item 25 Lumpy skin disease (Chapter 11.12.)**

Comments were received from Chile, the EU and Switzerland.

The Commission noted Member Countries' comments on the need for more stringent risk reduction measures and import requirements, based on the lack of diagnostic testing methods. The Commission requested that the Laboratories Commission advise on the possibility of improving the recommendations on prescribed tests in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

Following Member Countries' comments, the Commission deleted 'or' between sub-point 2 (b) and point 3 of Article 11.12.5.

The Commission made some modifications of an editorial nature.

In light of the fact that the modifications to the chapter were minimal, the Commission asked the OIE International Trade Department to keep these in a working document. Once the additional information on diagnostic tests is available, the Commission will address the Member Countries' comments on the need for more stringent risk reduction options.

#### **Item 26 Diseases of horses**

##### a) African horse sickness (Chapter 12.1.)

Comments were received from Australia, Chile, the EU, South Africa, Switzerland and OIRSA.

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments, including the Scientific Commission advice on the scientific points raised by Member Countries.

In response to a Member Country's comment on the need to define the word 'adjacent' in Article 12.1.1., the Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that the text is compatible with Chapter 8.3. (Bluetongue). In addition, the Commission noted a definition from the *Oxford English Dictionary*, where adjacent means: 'next to or very near to something else; neighbouring; bordering, contiguous; adjoining.'

Following a Member Country's comment on point 4 (b ii) of Article 12.1.2. and the Scientific Commission's advice, the Commission replaced 'systematic' with 'routine'.

Following a Member Country's comment, the Commission deleted 'should' in point 5 of Article 12.1.2.

The Commission did not agree with a Member Country which called for a definition of 'vector protected establishment', as the relevant definition is in Article 12.1.10.

The Commission did not agree with a Member Country which questioned the efficacy of vaccination in Article 12.1.7., paragraph 3 (d), on the grounds that paragraph 3 (d) does not recommend the use of vaccination alone. Rather it recommends the use of vaccination in conjunction with prolonged isolation in a vector protected establishment.

The revised Chapter 12.1., for adoption, is at Annex XXVIII.

##### b) Questionnaire (Article 1.6.6.bis.)

The Code Commission amended the questionnaire for consistency with the modifications made to Chapter 12.1. and made several amendments for editorial purposes.

The revised texts of Chapter 1.6., proposed for adoption, is attached in Annex XXIV.

c) Chapter 12.6. Equine influenza

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

Following a Member Country's comment, the Commission changed the title of the chapter to 'Infection with equine influenza virus'.

It is anticipated that a Member Country's comment on the use of vaccination for competition horses will be addressed by an OIE brainstorming meeting on safe international movement of horses, which will meet on 12–14 March.

d) Chapter 12.9. Equine viral arteritis

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

The Code Commission noted that some comments would be addressed by the OIE brainstorming meeting on safe international movement of horses, which will meet on 12–14 March.

Following a Member Country's comment, the Commission changed the title of the chapter to 'Infection with equine arteritis virus' and modified the General provisions, to align with the new title.

Following a Member Country's comment on Article 12.9.4, the Commission deleted the word 'animal'.

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

## Item 27 Peste des petits ruminants (Chapter 14.8.)

The Code Commission reviewed the comments submitted by Australia, Canada, the EU, Japan, New Zealand and two regional organisations (AU-IBAR and OIRSA), and received advice from the Scientific Commission on the key concerns raised by Member Countries.

The Commission noted the support of some Member Countries and a regional organisation for the proposed development of an official pathway to global freedom from peste des petits ruminants (PPR).

The Commission noted that the Scientific Commission would seek further advice from the *ad hoc* Group on PPR on the two major concerns raised by Member Countries, namely the definition of epidemiologically significant susceptible species and on the inclusion of meat as a safe commodity for the purpose of trade based on the nature of the virus.

The Commission agreed with a Member Country which raised concerns that the revised chapter, as presented by the *ad hoc* Group, took an overly conservative approach to risk. Risk management had been recommended for a much broader range of species, including cattle, camels, buffalo and wild ruminants, than previously covered. The Commission supported the recommendation of a Member Country which called for the inclusion of 'deboned skeletal muscle meat from animals that passed ante- and post- mortem inspections' as a second point in Article 14.8.2. ('safe commodities'). The Commission urged the Scientific Commission to consider the conclusions of a paper published in the OIE *Scientific and Technical Review* which concluded that 'there is no evidence to suggest that PPR could be introduced through the importation of sheep and goat meat'<sup>1</sup>. The Commission also agreed with a Member Country which recalled the WTO-SPS principle that 'sanitary measures ... should be based on appropriate assessment of risk, not hypothetical possibilities'.

---

<sup>1</sup> MacDiarmid S.C., Thompson E.J. (1997). The potential risk to animal health from imported sheep and goat meat. *Rev. sci. tech., Off. Int. Epiz.*, 16 (1), 45–56.



The Commission did not accept the proposal of a regional organisation to delete the reference to claws in Article 14.8.1., because the term ‘claw’ is routinely used to describe the bovine digit in some countries.

The revised chapter was sent back to the Scientific Commission for further advice on these points.

#### **Item 28 Classical swine fever (Chapter 15.2.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Canada, Chile, the People’s Republic of China, the EU, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland, the USA, AU-IBAR and OIRSA.

The Code Commission reviewed the major revision of Chapter 15.2. and the new questionnaire and surveillance guidelines that had been drafted by the *ad hoc* Group on the official disease status recognition for Classical swine Fever (CSF) and modified by the Scientific Commission.

The aim of this revision had been to meet Member Countries’ requests for the OIE to provide for official recognition of CSF free status based on the principles in the current *Terrestrial Code* chapter, i.e.:

- The recommendations in a single article on CSF free country or zone
- The CSF status of domestic and captive wild pig populations is not affected by infection in wild and feral pig populations.

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group had reported to the Scientific Commission with a proposal for a new approach to the definition of host species and the addition of several articles on free country or zone, which is fundamentally different from the current Chapter 15.2. The Scientific Commission reviewed the report and considered that more discussion and consultation was required. In light of this, rather than reviewing the draft text, the Code Commission encouraged Member Countries to comment on the *ad hoc* Group’s report, which would be provided to them as an annex to the Scientific Commission’s report, with particular attention to the proposed definition of CSF and the multiple categories of ‘free status’.

#### **Item 29 Epizootic haemorrhagic disease (EHD) – new chapter**

The Code Commission began the review of the report of the *ad hoc* Group, including the new draft chapter. However, due to insufficient time at this meeting, the Commission decided to postpone the review of the draft chapter in September 2012.

#### **Item 30 Report of the *ad hoc* Group on veterinary education**

Dr Kahn outlined the productive work of the *ad hoc* Group on veterinary education, which had finalised a document ‘Minimum Competencies expected of Day 1 Veterinary Graduates to assure delivery of high quality National Veterinary Services.’

Dr Kahn explained that OIE Headquarters was in the process of preparing a publication of the Day 1 Competencies, for distribution to Delegates at the 80th General Session.

OIE Headquarters is also producing Guidelines on Twinning for Veterinary Education Establishments, based on the successful Laboratory Twinning Programme.

The Commission noted and endorsed the report of the *ad hoc* Group, including the proposed future work on the core veterinary curriculum.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached as Annex XXXV for information.

#### **Item 31 Animal Production Food Safety Working Group**

The Commission noted and endorsed the report of the Working Group’s November 2011 meeting.

The report of the Working Group is attached as Annex XXXVI for information.

## D. OTHER ISSUES

### Item 32 Update of the Code Commission work programme

The Code Commission updated its work programme, which is attached for Member Countries' information or comment at Annex XXXVII.

### Item 33 Invasive alien species

- a) Guidelines for assessment of the risk of non-native animal species becoming invasive.

The Code Commission noted and endorsed the Guidelines document, which had been produced at a brainstorming meeting convened by the OIE, with participation of representatives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat and the WTO SPS Committee Secretariat.

The Commission thanked Prof. MacDiarmid for his contribution to the development of the Guidelines and supported publication of the document on the OIE website for guidance to Members.

The *Guidelines for assessment of the risk of non-native animal species becoming invasive* are attached as Annex XXXVIII, together with the report of the brainstorming meeting for information.

- b) WTO/STDF seminar on 'Invasive alien species and international trade'

Dr Kahn advised the Commission that the OIE was collaborating with the WTO Standards and Trade Development Facility in the planning of a seminar to be held on 12–13 July 2012, in Geneva, on 'Invasive alien species and international trade'. More information can be obtained at the WTO/STDF website: <http://www.standardsfacility.org/en/TAIAS.htm>

### Item 34 Application from an OIE Collaborating Centre

The Code Commission reviewed the request from an OIE Collaborating Centre (CC) to divide into four separate CCs on animal welfare, food safety, epidemiology and training.

The Commission did not consider it appropriate for OIE CCs to be designated for the sole specialty of 'training', as this should be a function of all OIE CCs. The Commission noted that the Scientific Commission would address the request on epidemiology.

The Commission asked the OIE permanent Working Groups on Animal Welfare and on Animal Production Food Safety to provide advice by the time of the September 2012 meeting on the proposed CCs on animal welfare and food safety respectively.

### Item 35 Generic checklist on the practical application of compartmentalisation

The Commission noted that the Scientific Commission had reviewed and approved the Generic checklist. Due to lack of time, the Commission carried over the review of the Generic checklist to the September meeting. The Commission noted a need to revise Chapter 4.4. in order to further clarify the purpose of a contingency plan and the intent of establishing a baseline animal health report.

The revised Chapter 4.4., proposed for adoption, is at Annex XI.

### Item 36 Dates of next meetings

The next meeting will take place on 3–13 September 2012.

The spring meeting is proposed to take place on 18–28 February 2013.

---

.../Annexes