The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at OIE Headquarters in Paris from 10 to 19 February 2015. The list of participants is attached as Annex I.

The Code Commission thanked the following Member Countries for providing written comments on draft texts circulated after the Commission’s September 2014 meeting: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Chinese Taipei, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), the United States of America (USA), Uruguay, the Member States of the European Union (EU), the African Union–Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of the OIE Delegates of Africa and the Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA) on behalf of the OIE Delegates of Central America. Comments were also received from the International Coalition for Farm Animal Welfare (ICFAW), the International Dairy Federation (IDF), the International Feed Industry Federation (IFIF) and the International Natural Sausage Casing Association (INSCA).

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries’ comments that had been submitted by 9 January 2015 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. In Annexes XII and XVI, amendments made at this meeting are highlighted with a coloured background in order to distinguish them from those made previously. The Code Commission considered all Member Countries’ comments. However, because of the very large volume of work, the Commission was not able to draft a detailed explanation of the reasons for accepting or not every comment received. Member Countries are reminded that comments submitted without a rationale or obvious logic are difficult to evaluate and respond to. Similarly 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. The Commission also draws the attention of Member Countries to those instances where the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (the Scientific Commission) has addressed Member Countries’ comments and proposed amendments. In such cases the rationale for such amendments is described in the Scientific Commission’s report and the Code Commission encourages Member Countries to review this report together with those of the Scientific Commission and ad hoc groups.

Member Countries should note that texts in Part A of this report are proposed for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015. Texts in Part B are submitted for comment. Comments received will be addressed during the Commission’s meeting in September 2015. The reports of meetings (Working Groups and ad hoc Groups) and other related documents are also attached for information in Part B of this report.

The Code Commission again strongly encourages Member Countries to participate in the development of the OIE’s international standards by submitting comments on this report, and prepare to participate in the process of adoption at the General Session. Comments should be submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a structured rationale. Proposed deletions should be indicated in ‘strikethrough’ 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 31st July 2015 to be considered at the September 2015 meeting of the Code Commission. All comments should be sent to the OIE International Trade Department at: trade.dept@oie.int.

A. MEETING WITH THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL

The Code Commission met Dr Brian Evans, Deputy Director General (Animal Health, Veterinary Public Health, International Standards) on 19 February 2015 to review the topics addressed during this meeting, and discuss future work. Dr Thiermann briefly reviewed the work the Code Commission had completed and the prioritisation decisions agreed as it worked through the very full agenda for its meeting. He particularly highlighted the work done in preparing draft documents for adoption on foot-and-mouth-disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, harmonisation of the chapters on vector-borne diseases, African swine fever and high health status horse subpopulations.

Dr Evans thanked the Code Commission members for their support and commitment to achieving OIE objectives, and congratulated them on the quality and quantity of work they produce. He endorsed the prioritisation decisions the Code Commission had taken in conjunction with the Scientific Commission, and observed that more prioritisation across all of the Specialist Commissions is likely to be needed in the future to deal with the continuing growth of subject matter to be addressed. Dr Evans also discussed the OIE goal of better informing and engaging delegates and focal points in the work of the Specialist Commissions, and his work with the Council in support of that. He advised that as part of achieving this goal it is expected that a transparent quality performance assessment framework will be introduced for the newly elected Commissions in 2015.

Finally, Dr Evans gratefully acknowledged the contributions of the retiring members of the Code Commission, particularly the enormous contribution of Dr Thiermann over 21 years, including 15 years as President.

B. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The adopted agenda of the meeting is attached as Annex II.

C. REPORT ON THE JOINT MEETING OF THE CODE COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION (12th February)

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission met on 12th February to discuss issues of mutual interest. The minutes of this joint meeting are attached as Annex III.

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

Item 1 General comments of Member Countries

General comments were received from New Zealand and AU-IBAR.

Under this item the Code Commission noted Member Countries’ endorsement of proposals in the report of the September 2014 meeting. It agreed with a Member Country’s suggestion to review and update the current Code Chapter on lumpy skin disease (Chapter 11.11.) and added this item to the Code Commission’s work programme.

The Code Commission again acknowledged requests from Member Countries to take a systematic approach to reformatting animal welfare chapters into shorter articles more appropriate for Code standards.

Item 2 Horizontal issues

a) User’s guide

Comments were received from Argentina, Canada, EU, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland and AU-IBAR.

In response to a Member Country’s comments, the Code Commission amended the text of point 3 of the introduction to include ‘use of animals’ within the scope of OIE standards (as in the draft chapter on working equids).
In response to Member Countries’ comments, the term ‘stricter’ was replaced with ‘more stringent’, and the term ‘health risks’ with ‘infectious disease risks’ throughout the User’s guide.

In response to a Member Country’s comments seeking reference to the WTO SPS Agreement, the Code Commission reiterated that except for Chapter 5.3., reference to WTO is not appropriate for the Code of the OIE, which is independent of WTO.

Several other points were amended throughout the chapter in response to Member Countries’ comments to improve clarity, and correct grammar and punctuation.

The revised User’s guide is attached as Annex IV to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

b) Harmonisation between the Code and the guidelines for WAHIS

The Code Commission received a document from the World Animal Health Information and Analysis Department, which will be examined at its September 2015 meeting.

Item 3 Glossary

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, EU, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Switzerland, USA, AU-IBAR, OIRSA and INSCA.

The Code Commission revised the definition of listed disease in order to align it with the revised definition of disease.

Following a request from a Member Country considered at its September 2014 meeting, the Code Commission drafted a definition of ‘casings’, taking into account text requested from the International Natural Sausage Casing Association. The proposed definition is provided for Member Countries’ comments.

In response to Member Countries’ comments the Code Commission revised and simplified the proposed definition of ‘safe commodity’, and agreed that criteria for recognition of safe commodities in the disease specific chapters (as provided in the Aquatic Code) should be developed for the Code. This new work item has been added to the Code Commission’s work programme.

In response to Member Countries’ comments on the proposed revised definition of stamping out policy, the Code Commission noted that the glossary definition can only include provisions common to all disease-specific chapters, and that the glossary definition should be refined further as necessary within disease-specific chapters. With that explanation and re-ordering of several phrases to improve syntax, the proposed definition of stamping out policy is again presented for Member Countries’ consideration. The Code Commission will continue to work on the development of recommendations for disease outbreak management.

In response to a Member Country’s comment, the definition of ‘animal health management’ in Chapters 7.9. and 7.10. has been moved to the glossary, according to standard Code protocol. Similarly the definitions of ‘feed’ and ‘feed ingredient’ will be moved to the glossary from Chapter 6.3. and draft Chapter 6.X. when draft Chapter 6.X. is adopted.


The proposed glossary definition for ‘casings’ is attached as Annex XXIV for Member Countries’ comments.
Item 4  Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1.)

The Code Commission reviewed draft amendments proposed by the ad hoc group on notification of animal diseases and pathogenic agents and edited them to align with standard Code format.

The revised Chapter 1.1. is attached as Annex XXV for Member Countries’ comments.

Criteria for the inclusion of diseases, infections and infestations in the OIE list (Chapter 1.2.)

The Code Commission reviewed draft amendments proposed by the ad hoc Group on notification of animal diseases and pathogenic agents and edited them to align with standard Code format. The Code Commission also proposed the list of diseases (current Article 1.2.3.) be a separate chapter to harmonise with the Aquatic Code.

The revised Chapter 1.2. as attached in Annex XXVI for Member Countries’ comments.

The ad hoc group report is also attached as Annex XXXIV for information.

Item 5  Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2.)

Comments were received from Australia, Chile, EU, Japan, Norway, Switzerland, AU-IBAR and the OIE Regional Commission for Africa.

In response to Member Countries’ suggestion to re-order the phrase ‘animal health, animal welfare and veterinary public health’ the Code Commission noted that the order as proposed aligns with established Code protocol and format.

In response to Member Countries’ comments the Code Commission deleted the words ‘animal health’ from the end of the first sentence in Article 3.2.6. point c, and ‘primarily’ from Article 3.2.14. point 6. They also amended Article 3.2.14. point 6 to provide consistent use of the term ‘Institutes’.

In response to Member Countries’ comments the Code Commission also removed the words ‘animal welfare’ from Article 3.2.14. point 7b(i) since animal welfare is not applicable to this clause listing animal products and feedstuffs, and is addressed in point 8b of the same article.

The revised Chapter 3.2. is attached as Annex VI to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

Item 6  Semen and embryos

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

Comments were received from Australia, Chile, EU, Norway and Switzerland.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries’ comments suggesting that this chapter needs a thorough review, and added this item to its work programme.

The Code Commission referred Member Countries’ comments requesting Article 4.6.2. point d(i) be amended to allow for a distinction between vaccinated and infected animals to the Biological Standards Commission to consider amendments to the Terrestrial Manual that would allow such a clause in the Terrestrial Code.

Similarly the Code Commission referred a Member Country’s comment noting inconsistencies in the sampling recommendations for campylobacteriosis between Article 4.6.2. point c, Chapter 11.4. of the Code and Chapter 2.4.5. of the Terrestrial Manual to the Biological Standards for consideration.

In response to a Member Country’s comments on the test requirements for brucellosis in Article 4.6.3. point 2a, the Code Commission amended the text to list brucellosis with no reference to test requirements, and again sought advice from the Biological Standards Commission on appropriate test recommendations for brucellosis in this situation.
In response to a Member Country’s comment, the Code Commission amended Article 4.6.2. point 2 to recognise that brucellosis testing should not be a requirement of pre-entry isolation in countries or zones free from infection with *Brucella* without vaccination.

A Member Country’s question on the justification for listing TGE in Article 4.6.4. point 1d was reserved for consideration in a future wider review of TGE.

Several points throughout the chapter were amended in response to Member Countries’ comments to improve clarity, correct grammar and punctuation, and align with standard *Code* format.

Chapter 4.6. will be re-examined by the Code Commission when comments from the Biological Standards Commission are received.

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

Comments were received from Australia, China, Chile, EU and Switzerland.

No comments were received on the changes proposed in September 2014.

The Code Commission referred a Member Country’s suggestion to include new text addressing animal welfare requirements for embryo collection to the Animal Welfare Working Group for evaluation.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to include international trade requirements in Article 4.7.4. since they are addressed elsewhere in the *Code*.

On advice received from the International Embryo Transfer Society, a Member Country’s suggestion to harmonise Article 4.7.14. with Article 8.3.2. was not accepted and the words ‘except for BTV8 (under study)’ were deleted from Article 8.3.2.

The revised Chapter 4.7. is attached as Annex VII to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

**Item 7 Certification**

a) **General obligations related to certification (Chapter 5.1.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, EU, Japan and Switzerland.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the Code Commission reworded the fourth paragraph of Article 5.1.1. to replace ‘wishes’ with ‘requirements’, and amended Article 5.1.2., points 1, 2, and 4 to align with established *Code* text.

b) **Certification procedures (Chapter 5.2.)**

Comments were received from EU and Switzerland.

All comments received supported the proposed changes to this chapter.

The revised Chapters 5.1. and 5.2. are attached as Annex VIII to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

**Item 8 Prevention, detection and control of *Salmonella* in poultry (Chapter 6.5.)**

Comments were received from Canada, EU, Switzerland and OIRSA.

In response to Member Countries’ comments the Code Commission amended several points throughout the chapter to improve clarity, and correct grammar and punctuation.

In response to a Member Country’s suggestion to replace ‘*antimicrobial agents*’ with ‘antibiotics’, the Code Commission noted that the glossary defined term ‘*antimicrobial agent*’ should be used throughout the *Code*. 
The revised Chapter 6.5. is attached as Annex IX to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

Item 9  Draft new chapter on prevention, detection and control of Salmonella in pigs (Chapter 6.X.)

The Code Commission decided to hold Member Countries’ comments on this chapter for consideration by an ad hoc group which will be reconvened to review the comments on this chapter, along with those anticipated for the new draft chapter on prevention, detection and control of Salmonella in cattle (which is attached to this report for Member Countries’ comments).

Item 10  Report of the meeting of the ad hoc group on prevention, detection and control of Salmonella in cattle (Chapter 6.X.)

The Code Commission reviewed this meeting report and draft chapter. Several points were amended throughout to improve clarity, correct grammar and punctuation, and align with standard Code format.

The Code Commission supported the inclusion of cross references to Codex Alimentarius standards in Article 6.X.3., but noted that the Code should not cross reference draft Codex standards or guidelines that have not yet been adopted.

The new draft Chapter 6.X., together with the report of the ad hoc group, is attached as Annex XXVII for Member Countries’ comments.

Item 11  Animal welfare

a)  Draft new chapter on animal welfare and dairy cattle production systems (Draft Chapter 7.X.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, China, Chinese Taipei, EU, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand, Uruguay, USA, AU-IBAR, OIRSA, ICFAW and IDF.

The Code Commission acknowledged the Member Countries and non-governmental organisations (NGO) participation and contribution of suggestions and comments on this draft chapter. All comments were examined. Unfortunately, many of the comments provided had no supporting rationale, which made them difficult to evaluate. Comments with no supporting rationale or obvious logic were not accepted. Similarly, suggestions previously not accepted were not considered. Member Countries are reminded once again to provide supporting rationale for all changes proposed.

The Code Commission refers Member Countries and NGOs to the ad hoc group report for detailed responses to comments and suggestions received, and reminds Member Countries that bibliographic references included in the draft chapter will be removed when the chapter is adopted.

The Code Commission noted that some of the requests for additional detail to be included in the chapter were overly prescriptive, or could not be accurately assessed and were therefore inappropriate for inclusion. Where contradictory suggestions from different Member Countries were received, the Code Commission applied its judgement to select or develop the most appropriate language.

The Code Commission noted and supported a Member Country’s request for refinement of the structure of current and future animal welfare chapters to ensure shorter articles that are easier for users to search and refer to. This issue has been addressed in the new draft chapter on the welfare of working equids, and will be extended to other chapters.

The Code Commission also suspected a number of Member Countries’ requests for additional wording to duplicate points already covered elsewhere in the chapter to be a symptom of a chapter that is difficult for readers to understand and recall in its entirety.

In response to Member Countries’ question as to whether the scope of the chapter includes commercial dairy buffalo production systems, the Code Commission indicated that at this stage the chapter applies to cattle of the Genus Bos only; and referred the question of how best to deal with the animal welfare of buffalo dairy production systems to the Animal Welfare Working Group.
In response to a Member Country’s comment, the Code Commission replaced the word ‘food’ with ‘feed’ throughout the chapter to clarify that the feed referred to is animal feed rather than human food.

In response to a Member Country’s suggestion that use of the phrase ‘animal health management’ in this chapter (Article 7.X.5. point 2) and Chapters 7.9. and 7.10. warranted a glossary definition of the term, the Code Commission considered the use of these words in each of these chapters to be slightly different and not easily captured in a single glossary definition. As part of the same discussion the Code Commission recognised that the word ‘stockmanship’ in Article 7.X.5. point 2 is poorly defined, and replaced it with ‘animal management practices’.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries’ suggestions that adoption of the proposed new glossary definition of ‘biosecurity’ would make the definition in this chapter redundant, and will amend this chapter accordingly when the glossary definition is adopted.

In response to Member Countries’ and NGOs’ suggestions, the Code Commission made a number of editorial changes throughout the Chapter to make the text more precise, to improve syntax and clarity, and to correct grammar.

The revised Chapter 7.X. is attached as Annex X to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

b) Member Country comments on existing chapters (Chapter 7.10.)

In response to Member Countries’ comments the Code Commission added the words ‘to reduce stress’ to point 2b of Article 7.10.4.

Though the Code Commission requested comment only on Article 7.10.4. point 2b in September 2014, some Member Countries provided additional comments on other parts of the chapter. These will be addressed at a later meeting.

The revised Chapter 7.10. is attached as Annex XI to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

c) Draft new chapter on the welfare of working equids

The Code Commission referred Member Countries’ and NGOs’ comments on this draft chapter to the ad hoc group, and the Animal Welfare Working Group for evaluation and review. The Code Commission expects to consider the reviews of both groups at its September 2015 meeting.

d) Report of the e-conference of the ad hoc group on electrical stunning of chickens in Chapter 7.5., Slaughter of animals

The Code Commission reviewed and edited new text prepared by OIE Headquarters and the ad hoc group to revise Article 7.5.7. point 3b in response to longstanding Member Countries’ concerns.

The revised Chapter 7.5. is attached as Annex XII to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

e) Disaster risk reduction and management in relation to animal health and welfare and veterinary public health

The Code Commission reviewed draft guidelines on disaster risk reduction and management in relation to animal health and welfare and veterinary public health produced by the ad hoc group at its January 2015 meeting. It noted the draft needs editing to ensure glossary-defined terms are used accurately, UK English is used, and the use of slashes is avoided.

The Code Commission noted that these guidelines are intended for publication on the OIE website and in hard copy, but not in the Code.

The draft guidelines and the ad hoc group report are attached as Annex XXVIII for Member Countries’ consideration.
Item 12 Harmonisation of chapters on vector-borne diseases

a) Infection with epizootic hemorrhagic disease virus (Chapter 8.X.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, EU, New Zealand, Mexico, Norway, Switzerland and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission reviewed amendments proposed by the ad hoc group, the Scientific Commission, and an OIE Headquarters group of experts reviewed the alignment of the vector-borne disease Chapters 12.1., 8.3. and 8.X.

The rationale for the changes proposed by the ad hoc group is contained in the ad hoc group report included in the September 2013 Scientific Commission meeting report.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the ad hoc group, Scientific Commission and Code Commission agreed to reinstate the concept of seasonally free zones in this Chapter.

In response to a Member Country’s question, the Code Commission noted that unlike bluetongue, there are no data to indicate that embryos are a safe commodity to be included in Article 8.X.2. with respect to transmission of EHDV.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the Code Commission inserted a new point (1) in Article 8.X.3. to indicate that historical freedom as described in Chapter 1.4. does not apply to infection with EHDV.

The Code Commission added the words ‘importation of animals and their semen, embryos or oocytes is carried out in accordance with this chapter’ to Article 8.X.3. point 2 to align with the other vector-borne disease chapters.

Throughout the chapter, the Code Commission deleted the qualifier ‘known to be competent vectors’ to Culicoides since all species of Culicoides should be considered competent vectors until proven otherwise.

To align with the other vector-borne disease chapters, the Code Commission added a new point (1) to Articles 8.X.5., 8.X.5. bis, and 8.X.6. to specify that the animals exhibited no clinical signs of EHD on the day of shipment.

Similarly, in Articles 8.X.7. point 1, 8.X.8. point 1, 8.X.9. point 1, and 8.X.10. point 1 a new point (a) was added to specify that the donor males or females showed no clinical signs of EHD on the day of collection.

The Code Commission also added new text on requirements for transport by air and transport by land to Article 8.X.11. to align this article with equivalent articles in the other vector-borne disease chapters.

Similarly, in Article 8.X.12., the Code Commission added new text to align this article with the surveillance articles of the other vector-borne disease chapters.

Several other points were amended throughout the chapter in response to Member Countries’ comments to improve clarity, correct grammar and punctuation, and align with standard Code format.

The revised Chapter 8.X. is attached as Annex XIII to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

b) Infection with bluetongue virus (Chapter 8.3.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, EU, New Zealand, Switzerland and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission reviewed amendments proposed by the ad hoc group, the Scientific Commission, and the OIE HQ experts that reviewed the alignment of the vector-borne disease Chapters 12.1., 8.3. and 8.X.
The rationale for the changes proposed by the ad hoc group is included in its report attached to the report of the September 2014 Scientific Commission meeting.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the Code Commission inserted a new point (1) in Article 8.3.3. to indicate that historical freedom as described in Chapter 1.4. does not apply to infection with bluetongue virus.

Throughout the Chapter, the Code Commission deleted the qualifier ‘known to be competent vectors’ to Culicoides since all species of Culicoides should be considered competent vectors until proven otherwise.

To align with the other vector-borne disease chapters, the Code Commission added a new point (1) to Articles 8.3.6., 8.3.7. and 8.3.8. to specify that the animals exhibited no clinical signs of bluetongue on the day of shipment.

Similarly, in Articles 8.3.9. point 1, 8.3.10. point 1, 8.3.11. point 1, and 8.3.12. point 1 a new point (a) was added to specify that the donor males or females showed no clinical signs of bluetongue on the day of collection.

The Code Commission also added new text on requirements for transport by air and transport by land to Article 8.3.13. to align this article with equivalent articles in the other vector-borne disease chapters.

Similarly, in Article 8.3.14., the Code Commission added new text and deleted unnecessary text to align this article with the surveillance articles of the other vector-borne disease chapters.

Several other points throughout the chapter were amended in response to Member Countries’ comments. The Code Commission made several additional changes to improve clarity, correct grammar and punctuation, and align with standard Code format.

The revised Chapter 8.3. is attached as Annex XIV to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

**Item 13 Infection with Taenia solium (Draft Chapter 15.X.)**

Comments were received from Canada, Chile, China, EU, Japan, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland, UAE, USA, and AU-IBAR.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the Code Commission reworded Article 15.X.1. to improve clarity.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion that the requirements in Article 15.X.3. point 2 need not apply to establishments, since the exposure to contaminated food waste is likely to be common to all animals in an establishment. However, in response to a Member Country’s comments the Code Commission did reword the text in this article to improve clarity.

In response to a Member Country’s suggestion, the Code Commission added new text to Article 15.X.4. point 2 to indicate that tongue inspection of live pigs at markets should be carried out in ways that avoid injury and unnecessary suffering.

For the Member Country that requested references to support Article 15.X.6. point 2, the Code Commission is pleased to provide the following text (which was also included in the ad hoc group report):

The ad hoc Group developed an Article 15.X.6. on ‘Procedures for the inactivation of T. solium cysticerci’ based on available literature.

Procedures for the inactivation of T. solium cysticerci in meat of pigs are in line with the regulatory requirements of the European Food Safety Authority (1), USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service (2), and the Public Health Agency of Canada (3), and the WHO/FAO/OIE Guidelines (4). There is also a general international consensus that the temperature/time inactivation requirements appropriate for Taenia saginata cysticerci are also suitable for T. solium cysticerci.


The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to require disposal of all carcases found infected with *T. solium* cysticerci, given the proven efficacy of the heat treatment and freezing options specified in Article 15.X.6.

A Member Country’s suggestion to delete Article 15.x.6. and simply cross reference Codex standard addressing these points could not be accepted since there is not yet an adopted Codex standard addressing these points.

The Code Commission made small editorial changes throughout this chapter to remove unnecessary words and improve syntax and clarity.

The proposed draft Chapter 15.X. is attached as Annex XV to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

When this chapter is adopted, the listing name in Chapter 1.2. will be revised to align with the new chapter.

**Item 14  Foot and mouth disease (Chapters 8.7. and 1.6.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Argentina, China, Canada, Chile, EU, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, South Africa, Thailand, USA and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission commended Member Countries for their constructive comments, and acknowledged the excellent preparatory work done by experts and OIE staff. The rationale for the major revisions to these chapters is contained in the reports of the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* group commissioned to review these chapters. The revised draft chapter received from the Scientific Commission was reviewed and extensively edited by the Code Commission to align with established Code chapter structure and format.

In response to a Member Country’s request to provide an index for the articles in Chapter 8.7. at the beginning of the chapter, the Code Commission considered this could be useful in the online version of the Code providing there are hyperlinks between the index and the relevant chapter article. This suggestion will be considered further after the chapter has been adopted.

The Code Commission agreed to refer Member Countries’ suggestion to hyphenate the spelling of ‘foot-and-mouth’ disease to the Biological Standards Commission for consideration, recognising that such a change would require editorial updating of a very large number of OIE documents.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ suggestion to broaden the scope of the chapter to include all susceptible species, given the recommendations from the *ad hoc* Group and the Scientific Commission to limit the scope of this chapter to epidemiologically significant species.

Similarly, the Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ suggestion to re-order Article 8.7.1. as the proposed order follows the established Code format (e.g. Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus, Infection with Rift Valley fever virus, Infection with Aujeszky’s disease virus etc.).

In response to Member Countries’ requests to reinstate point 2d of Article 8.7.2., the Specialist Commissions noted that this point is now dealt with as point 4e of the same Article in this revised chapter.
In response to Member Countries’ request for additional definitions of “official emergency vaccination” and “systematic vaccination”, the Code Commission considered this request to be part of a broader issue on vaccination to be addressed in the future, probably by development of a specific chapter on vaccination. The Code Commission recommends the Director General establish an *ad hoc* group to address this subject.

In response to Member Countries’ request to reference diagnostic tests and vaccines to the Manual, the Code Commission noted that this point is dealt with in Article 8.7.1. and does not need to be repeated elsewhere through the chapter.

Some Member Countries’ proposed to significantly modify the concept of containment zone by the addition of a protection zone while outbreaks continue in the containment zone. The Code Commission considered that such a significant change should be dealt with under Chapter 4.3. before it is considered in the disease specific chapters. This well formulated proposal could be useful under specific circumstances, but certainly different from those intended in the current containment zone. Furthermore, introduction of such a fundamental change at this late stage in the revision of Chapter 8.7. could be expected to significantly delay adoption of the revised Chapter 8.7.

In response to Member Countries’ suggestions for amendment of the clauses including reference to a ‘standstill’ the Code Commission noted that the Oxford English Dictionary definition of ‘standstill’ is: *a situation or condition in which there is no movement or activity at all*. Using that definition, the Code Commission simplified the language of those clauses in which ‘standstill’ is used.

Several Member Countries’ opposed, for very different reasons, the new text in Article 8.7.7. point 1c that proposed conditions for reducing a six-month waiting period to three months. The Code Commission withdrew these clauses, given the opposition of Member Countries that have recently experienced outbreaks. The Code Commission recommends they be examined further by experts to explore how to address this broad subject including vaccination.

The Code Commission added the words ‘where an official control programme exists’ to the title of Article 8.7.12. to align it with Article 8.7.22.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the Code Commission added the provision for establishments that are quarantine stations to Article 8.7.12. point 4 and Article 8.7.22. point 1c.

In response to a Member Country’s comment, the Code Commission corrected the Spanish version of Article 8.7.37. point 5.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ rationale to replace 12°C with 20°C in Article 8.7.38. given the specific scientific evidence available to support 12°C for inactivation of FMDV (Wieringa-Jelsma et al., Virus inactivation by salt (NaCl) and phosphate-supplemented salt in a 3D collagen matrix model for natural sausage casings. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 2011, 148(2)128-34).

Both the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed to add text to Article 8.7.6. to require application of recovery of the FMD free status of a containment zone within 12 months of its approval; and to introduce a new point 5 to Article 8.7.7. to indicate that if Member Countries do not apply for recovery of status within 24 months of suspension, the provisions of Articles 8.7.2., 8.7.3. or 8.7.4. will apply.

In response to a Member Country’s suggestion, the Code Commission introduced numbered headings to Article 8.7.40. to improve clarity.

The Specialist Commissions agreed with the *ad hoc* group not to accept a Member Countries’ suggestion to replace 30 days with 21 days in the third paragraph of Article 8.7.42., since 30 days cover two incubation periods.

In response to a Member Country’s comment on the inclusion of 12 months in the box between ‘No Vaccination’ and ‘Freedom without vaccination’ in the diagram for an ‘outbreak in a free country or zone without vaccination’ the Specialist Commissions clarified that 12 months is the minimum waiting period after the last case (not the beginning of the outbreak) for a country that has implemented the requirements of Article 8.7.2.
The Code Commission removed unnecessary words and reworded multiple points through multiple articles in response to Member Countries’ comments to improve syntax, clarity, and consistency of presentation with established Code text, structure and format, and correct punctuation.

**Procedures for self declaration and for official recognition by the OIE (Chapter 1.6.)**

Comments were received from Australia, New Zealand, USA and AU-IBAR.

Throughout Articles 1.6.6. and 1.6.11., the Code Commission removed unnecessary words and reworded points in response to Member Countries’ comments to improve clarity, grammar and consistency of presentation with established Code text, structure and format.

To facilitate the examination of this new version, despite the extensive changes, the Code Commission provides the revised chapter also in a clean format.

The revised Chapters 8.7. and 1.6. are attached as Annex XVI to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

**Item 15 Infection with Rift Valley fever virus (Chapter 8.13.)**

Comments were received from EU, South Africa and Switzerland.

In response to a Member Country’s comment that it was uncomfortable with use of the term ‘vector activity’ in the definition of ‘inter-epizootic period’, the Code Commission noted that a low level of vector activity is a key characteristic of the inter-epizootic period.

The revised Chapter 8.12. is attached as Annex XVII to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

**Item 16 Infection with Brucella abortus, B. melitensis and B. suis (Chapter 8.4.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, EU, Switzerland and OIRSA.

In response to a Member Country’s comment, the Code Commission changed all references to ‘testing’ to ‘diagnostic testing’ in the Spanish version only to improve language precision.

In response to a Member Country’s comment, the Code Commission added the words ‘and the semen was collected and processed in accordance with Chapter 4.6.’ to the end of Article 8.4.17. point 2a.

Several points were amended throughout the chapter to align with standard Code format.

The revised Chapter 8.4. is attached as Annex XVIII to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

**Item 17 Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4.)**

Comments were received from Chinese Taipei, EU, Switzerland and OIRSA.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ suggestion to specify frequency of surveillance in Article 10.4.29. point 1, since the frequency of surveillance required is situation dependent.

Similarly, the Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ comment requesting repetition of text already included in Article 10.4.33. point 2 in the first paragraph of the introductory text of the same Article.

The revised Chapter 10.4. is attached as Annex XIX to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

**Item 18 Equine diseases**

a) **Glanders**

Although Member Countries’ comments were received and discussed between the Scientific and Code Commissions, specific advice is still needed from experts and when received it will be discussed by the Code Commission at its September 2015 meeting.
b) **High health status horse subpopulation (Chapter 4.16.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, EU, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, Switzerland and USA.

Both the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission reviewed all Member Countries’ comments. In response to Member Countries’ general comments seeking greater detail and clarification, both Specialist Commissions noted that this chapter was developed as a general principles document intentionally without details to be adopted by the World Assembly of Delegates. The Code Commission recognised that several Member Countries have concerns over this new concept, due to the absence of the biosecurity plan and the OIE guidelines, but these are both under development. These will incorporate the key concepts and principles for establishment and maintenance of a high health status subpopulation. The biosecurity plan will be developed by the private sector partners (FEI and IFHA). Whilst it is possible that some of the details could be incorporated in the Code in the future, for the moment the Code chapter is intended to address the key principles and concepts only.

The Specialist Commissions did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to include region in the opening paragraph of Article 4.16.1. since HHP horses are imported from and into countries rather than regions. However, in response to Member Countries’ comments they amended the chapter to consistently refer to the horse’s ‘country of usual residence’ rather than ‘country of origin’.

In response to a Member Country’s comment, the Code Commission noted that the limitation of certification to periods ‘of not more than 90 days’ is proposed because at some point a relatively short period of time should be specified for the duration of certification of animals moving with the specific certificate.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ comments requesting removal of ‘continual’ from Article 4.16.2. point 3b since continual means ‘happening frequently with intervals between’. In response to Member Countries’ comments, the Code Commission added more text to this point to clarify the expected authorisation process, and noted that the modalities of supervision and compliance would be further defined in the biosecurity guidelines.

A Member Country’s request to strengthen the language of Article 4.16.2. point c was not accepted, as this clause is a recommendation that will be addressed by the private sector when developing the biosecurity plan.

The Code Commission removed ‘region’ from Article 4.16.2. point d because it is a country’s responsibility (rather than a regional responsibility) to determine the maximum period of absence.

The revised Chapter 4.16. is attached as Annex XX to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

c) **Model veterinary certificate for the international movement of not more than 90 days of a high health high performance horse for competition or races**

The Code Commission noted that this certificate was included in Part B of its September 2014 meeting report for Member Countries’ information, and thanked those Member Countries who nevertheless provided comments. The Code Commission reviewed and edited this draft model veterinary certificate for consistent formatting, alignment with the adopted Chapter 4.16., and to take account of Member Countries’ initial comments. In particular references to ‘HHP premises’ were deleted as this term has not been defined anywhere.

In response to Member Countries’ initial comments on the range of diseases included in the draft certificate the Code Commission noted that, at this time, this certificate has been developed for six diseases only. These are OIE listed diseases for which the ad hoc group considered this compartmentalisation is applicable for temporary movement of HHP horses. It is expected that, as with all model certificates, Member Countries’ will be able to include specific diseases in their bilateral certificates depending on their respective situations.

The edited model certificate is attached as Annex XXIX for Member Countries’ comments. An explanatory document which describes underlying principles and mechanism that led to the wording of the model certificate is also attached as Annex XXXIII for information.
Item 19  Infection with African swine fever virus (Chapter 15.1.)

The rationale for the major amendments to this chapter is contained in the reports of the Scientific Commission and the ad hoc group commissioned to review it.

The revised draft chapter received from the Scientific Commission was reviewed and extensively edited by the Code Commission to align with established Code chapter structure and format.

The revised Chapter 15.1. is attached as Annex XXX for Member Countries’ comments.

Item 20  Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.4.)

The rationale for the amendments to this chapter is contained in the ad hoc group report included in the February 2015 Scientific Commission meeting report.

The Code Commission reviewed the draft chapter received from the Scientific Commission but it determined that it is only disease categorisation that must be addressed urgently because of the occurrence of ‘atypical’ BSE. Therefore, it only proposed amendments to prevent a country’s categorisation status being adversely affected by the occurrence of this spontaneously occurring condition.

The Code Commission also noted that the exposure assessment detailed in Article 11.4.2. point 1b should be conducted regardless of the outcome of the entry assessment because of the possibility of recycling ‘atypical’ BSE.

Other amendments proposed by the ad hoc group will be considered by the Code Commission at its September 2015 meeting.

In view of the urgency of these amendments, the revised Chapter 11.4. attached as Annex XXI is to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

Item 21  Report of the meeting of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group

The Code Commission endorsed this report, and will review the terms of reference the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group propose to develop for review of Chapters 6.1. and 6.2. at its September 2015 meeting.

The 2014 Animal Production Food Safety meeting report is attached as Annex XXXI for Member Countries information.

E. OTHER ISSUES

Item 22  Antimicrobial resistance

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

Comments were received from Australia, China, EU, Norway, Switzerland and USA.

The Code Commission reviewed draft amendments proposed by the ad hoc group and Scientific Commission and made further amendments to the chapter to align it with standard Code format.

The ad hoc group meeting report appended to in the February 2015 Scientific Commission meeting report as Annex 15 explains the rationale for its amendments, and also notes those items held over for consideration at the next meeting of the ad hoc group.

The revised Chapter 6.7. is attached as Annex XXII to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.
b) Risk analysis for antimicrobial resistance arising from the use of antimicrobials in animals (Chapter 6.10.)

Comments were received from EU and USA.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the ad hoc group, Scientific Commission and Code Commission agreed to amend the language of the opening paragraph of Article 6.10.1. point 1 to harmonise it with the adopted text of Codex Alimentarius Guidelines GL 77.

The revised Chapter 6.10. is attached as Annex XXIII to be presented for adoption at the 83rd General Session in May 2015.

Item 23 Update of the Code Commission’s work programme

Comments were received from EU and New Zealand.

The Code Commission reviewed and updated its work programme, taking account of Member Countries’ comments within the Code Commission’s scope, and work competed.

The revised work programme is attached as Annex XXXII for Member Countries’ comments.

Item 24 Proposed dates for next meetings

The September 2015 Code Commission meeting is scheduled for September 1–10.