



Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Original: English

February 2016

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

Paris, 8–19 February 2016

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at OIE Headquarters in Paris from 8 to 19 February 2016. The list of participants is attached as [Annex 1](#).

The Code Commission thanked the following Member Countries for providing written comments on draft texts circulated after the Commission's September 2015 meeting: Argentina, Australia, Belize, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Chinese Taipei, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, the United States of America (USA), Uruguay, the Member States of the European Union (EU), the African Union Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of African Member Countries of the OIE. Comments were also received from the International Coalition for Animal Welfare (ICFAW), the International Feed Industry Federation (IFIF) and the International Egg Commission (IEC). Some comments were received too long after the deadline to be considered.

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments that had been submitted on time 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 '~~strike through~~' and may be found in the Annexes to the report. In Annexes 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26 and 37, 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 and documented its responses. However, because of the large volume of work, the Commission was not able to draft a detailed explanation of the reasons for accepting or not each of the comments received and focused its explanations on the major ones.

Furthermore, 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) or an *ad hoc* Group has addressed Member Countries' comments and proposed amendments. In such cases the rationale for such amendments is described in the Scientific Commission's or *ad hoc* Group's report, and the Code Commission encourages Member Countries to review its 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 84th General Session in May 2016. Texts in Part B are submitted for comment. Comments received will be addressed during the Commission's meeting in September 2016. 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 word processor files rather than pdf files because pdf files are difficult to incorporate into the Code Commission's working documents. Comments should be submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a structured rationale. Proposed deletions should be indicated in '~~strike through~~' and proposed additions with 'double underline'. Examples of how this can be done are attached as **Annex 43**. 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 29<sup>th</sup> July 2016** to be considered at the September 2016 meeting of the Code Commission.

All comments on Articles 8.8.4. and 8.8.4bis. must reach OIE Headquarters by **31<sup>st</sup> May 2016**.

All comments should be sent to the OIE International Trade Department at: [trade.dept@oie.int](mailto:trade.dept@oie.int).

### **A. MEETING WITH THE DIRECTOR GENERAL**

The Code Commission met with Dr Monique Eloit, Director General, and Dr Brian Evans, Deputy Director General (Animal Health, Veterinary Public Health, International Standards), on 16 February 2016. Dr Eloit welcomed the Code Commission members and thanked them for their support and commitment to achieving OIE objectives.

Among other matters, Dr Eloit and Dr Evans discussed the implementation of the key objectives of the Sixth Strategic Plan, and how that may impact the work of the Code Commission.

Dr Eloit also noted that the WTO dispute settlement case on implementation of sanitary measures related to African swine fever control provided an opportunity for the OIE to observe how the stakeholders engaged in that case view the OIE procedures for standard development. She explained that key steps to be implemented in the near future, concerning the Code Commission, include:

- the creation of a single department to serve as the Secretariat of all four Specialist Commissions with the aim of facilitating closer collaboration among the Commissions, and easier document sharing through common support services;
- the development of an internal staff training programme to strengthen the skills of this scientific secretariat,
- refurbishment of the OIE website to provide easier access to various technical meeting reports, and improve the transparency of OIE work in general, to enhance Member Countries' participation in standard development.

Dr Eloit also explained the plan to improve the election process for membership of the Specialist Commissions. The aim is to better inform the voting Delegates on the scientific expertise and credentials of candidates standing for election to the Specialist Commissions. In the context of strengthening scientific excellence, Dr Eloit also highlighted the need for closer and stronger relationships with relevant scientific communities, including in new fields of science, and the next generation of scientists.

Dr Evans noted the importance of maintaining discipline in the standard development procedures, including principle of the two-year cycle of standard development, effective coordination of the Specialist Commission work programmes, and participation of Specialist Commission members in relevant *ad hoc* Group meetings.

Dr Etienne Bonbon, on behalf of the Code Commission, thanked Dr Eloit and Dr Evans for their support. He also explained the Code Commission plan to identify future draft chapters to be proposed for adoption in May in the report of the previous September Code Commission's meeting. This extension of notice for standards to be proposed for adoption is designed to give Member Countries and all interested parties more time to consider their content and implementation details ahead of adoption.

## B. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The draft agenda circulated prior to the meeting was discussed, updated, and agreed. The adopted agenda of the meeting is attached as [Annex 2](#).

## C. MEETING WITH THE AQUATIC ANIMAL HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION

The President of the Code Commission met with the President of the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (Aquatic Animals Commission) on several occasions during the week to discuss issues of mutual interest, notably:

- proposed new glossary definitions for OIE standard and OIE guideline;
- proposed revised Chapters 1.1. of the *Aquatic and Terrestrial Codes*;
- proposed revised Chapters 1.2. of the *Aquatic and Terrestrial Codes*;
- proposed restructuring of Section 4 of the *Aquatic and Terrestrial Codes*;
- proposed development of a revised guidance document for *ad hoc* Groups on the application of the listing criteria (Chapter 1.2).

## D. MEETING WITH THE BIOLOGICAL STANDARDS COMMISSION

The President of the Code Commission was invited to meet with the Biological Standards Commission to discuss issues of mutual interest, notably:

- progressive adoption of the convention for naming of OIE listed diseases agreed by the World Assembly of Delegates in both the *Codes* and the *Manuals*;
- update of the Code Commission work programme and coordination of work programmes (e.g. vaccination, lumpy skin disease, BSE, etc.);
- proposed new glossary definitions for OIE standard and OIE guideline;
- diagnostic tests for *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex, including in species other than bovids, i.e. goats and New World camelids, and future revision of the *Manual* chapter on tuberculosis;
- diagnostic tests for ‘classical BSE’ and ‘atypical BSE’ and current revision of the *Manual* chapter on BSE;
- discrepancies between the *Code* and the *Manual* on conditions for collection of semen;
- Member Countries’ concerns about the adequacy of OIE risk management recommendations for the growing production and trade of *in vitro* produced embryos;
- pathogenicity of bluetongue strains, including vaccine strains.

## E. REPORT ON THE JOINT MEETING OF THE CODE COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission met on 11th February to discuss issues of mutual interest. The report of this joint meeting is attached as [Annex 3](#).

## F. EXAMINATION OF MEMBER COUNTRIES' COMMENTS AND WORK OF RELEVANT EXPERT GROUPS

### Item 1 General comments of Member Countries

General comments were received from New Zealand and EU.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's comment that Delegates be notified when the new edition of the *Code* is uploaded onto the OIE website and recommended that Headquarters send a letter to Delegates to notify them of this. The Code Commission also suggested that the Delegates be provided with a list of chapters that had been amended.

In response to Member Countries' comment and after discussion with Headquarters, the Code Commission recommended that each *Code* chapter be footnoted with the date of last adoption of revisions to the chapter (whether small or large) to ensure that readers can more easily find this information. The Code Commission requested that Headquarters implement this request in the next edition (2016) of the *Code*.

### Item 2 Horizontal Issues

#### a) User's guide

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

The Code Commission agreed that although the User's Guide had only been recently adopted and due to the specific nature of this text, it would consider all Member Countries' comments including those received for text that had not been proposed for amendment.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's suggestion to add a new point regarding collaboration between Veterinary Authorities and other Competent Authorities, but considered it should be inserted in Chapter 3.1. rather than the User's guide.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment from Headquarters to amend text in point 1 of Part B to clarify that terms included in the Glossary are those for which the dictionary definition is inadequate for the purposes of the *Code*.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's request to add 'oocytes' to point 6 of Part B because this will be addressed as part of the Code Commission's future work. It also noted that no rationale was provided to support this request.

In response to a Member Country's comment regarding the use of 'bis', the Code Commission reiterated that chapter-numbering changes are implemented after adoption of revised or new chapters, e.g. the proposed Chapter 1.2.bis will be renumbered to Chapter 1.3. once adopted.

The Code Commission proposed a modification of points 1) and 2) of part C of the User's guide, taking into account the proposed structural change in Section 1.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission agreed to amend the sentence in Part C point 3. to clarify that zoning and compartmentalisation should be considered as tools, 'among others', to control diseases and to facilitate safe trade.

The Code Commission did not consider a number of comments submitted by a Member Country because they were without a supporting rationale or obvious logic. The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that a rationale should always be provided to assist the Code Commission in considering comments.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to revert to 'exporting' country or zone in Section C points 4, and 5b because in the framework of the *Code* only 'exporting country' is defined (not 'exporting zone') and it is the country or zone of origin, which is linked to the health status of the animals.

The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country's suggestion to include in Part C point 5c text regarding the language used in certificates because this detail is included in Chapter 5.1. The Code Commission also decided to delete the text 'As stated in Article 5.2.3.' in the same clause as this level of cross-referencing in the User's Guide is not warranted.

In answer to recurring Member Countries' comments seeking clarification of the relationship between the surveillance requirements given in the disease-specific chapters and Chapter 1.4., the Code Commission inserted the following new point 2bis in Section C:

2bis. Freedom from a disease, infection or infestation

Article 1.4.6. provides general principles for declaring a country or a zone free from a disease, infection or infestation. This Article applies when there are no specific requirements in the disease-specific chapter.

In future, the Code Commission will also systematically consider requirements for historical freedom in new chapters and revisions of existing chapters.

The revised User's guide is attached as **Annex 4** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

**b) Glossary**

Comments were received from China, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission noted that some defined terms in the glossary of the *Code* and *Manual* differ. The Code Commission requested Headquarters to review the terms in the glossary of both the *Code* and the *Manual* and prepare a document for the Code Commission to review at its next meeting and discuss with the Biological Standards Commission.

***Acceptable risk***

No comments were received on the proposal to delete this definition.

The definition for 'acceptable risk' will be proposed for deletion at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

***Animals***

Following previous discussions on reptiles in the Code Commission (Sept. 2014) and with Headquarters, Member Countries, concerned stakeholders and the regions, the Code Commission proposes to amend the definition of 'animals' to include reptiles.

The revised definition of ‘animals’ is included in the attached **Annex 5** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

#### ***Appropriate level of protection***

The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country’s request to retain the glossary definition of appropriate level of protection, and reminded Member Countries that this term is used only once in the *Code* (Chapter 5.3.) and therefore does not meet the criteria to be included in the glossary.

The definition of ‘appropriate level of protection’ will be proposed for deletion at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

#### ***Equivalence of sanitary measures***

Since this term is only used in Chapter 5.3. of the *Code*, it does not meet the criteria to be included in the glossary.

The definition of ‘equivalence of sanitary measures’ will be proposed for deletion at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

#### ***Stamping-out policy***

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s request to reinstate the proposed deletion of text in point a) and reminded Member Countries that this text was proposed for deletion because they did not want the definition to be too detailed and prescriptive.

In response to a Member Country’s comment, the Code Commission amended the text of point b) to read ‘the disposal of carcasses and, where relevant, animal products,’ to clarify that animal products that do not present a disease transmission risk need not be destroyed.

The amended definition for ‘stamping-out policy’ is included in **Annex 5** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

#### ***Casings***

The Code Commission noted that this definition defines tissues submitted to a process, rather than a safe commodity *per se*, and that the risk mitigation recommendations in disease-specific chapters should take into account this process. The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries’ comments and having taken advice from experts updated the definition to include oesophagus and to limit treatments to those always applied.

The intended use of casings is as an edible envelope of a foodstuff, being a sausage. To this purpose, bladders are included and, indeed, for some local specialities the oesophagus is used as the edible envelope. The Code Commission was informed that stomachs are an entirely different product in that respect. They are not used as an edible envelope but as an ingredient. In addition, they are produced fresh, do not undergo the indicated processing steps (tissue scraping and defatting that defines a casing) and are subsequently frozen as a means of preservation. The Code Commission thus decided to include only the intestinal tract, bladder and oesophagus as part of the definition of casings and leave stomachs out.

The Code Commission decided to delete the word ‘dried’ because casings are normally salted but not always dried.

The definition of ‘casings’ is included in **Annex 5** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

### ***OIE Standard***

In response to a Member Country's comments, the Code Commission reiterated that both an 'OIE Standard' and an 'OIE Guideline' may include recommendations, and that the definition of an 'OIE Standard' is intended to distinguish standards from guidelines by the General Session process required for adoption of all 'OIE Standards'. It also noted that throughout the English version of the *Code*, where the word 'recommendation' is used the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition applies.

The Code Commission made several amendments to the definition in response to comments from Member Countries, the Scientific Commission, the Biological Standards Commission and the Aquatic Animals Commission to improve clarity, and removed the phrase 'should be used consistently' from the draft definition since recommendations (using the word 'should') do not form part of a definition. It did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to add the phrase 'including through facilitating safe trade' since the existing definition is aligned with the language of the Sixth Strategic Plan, and trade facilitation is addressed in Section 5 of the *Code*.

A discussion took place with the Aquatic Animals Commission on whether a common definition for an 'OIE Standard' and an 'OIE Guideline' across Terrestrial and Aquatic *Codes* and *Manuals* or two different definitions for terrestrial animals and aquatic animals might create conflicts between the different volumes. The issue was forwarded to the OIE Council. In the meantime the two options are presented respectively in the reports of the Aquatic and Code Commissions.

The revised definition for 'OIE Standard' is included in **Annex 23** for Member Countries' comments.

### ***OIE Guideline***

The Code Commission rearranged the text of this definition to follow the structure of the definition used for 'OIE Standard', and made several amendments in response to comments from Member Countries, the Scientific Commission, the Biological Standards Commission and the Aquatic Animals Commission to improve clarity.

The Code Commission acknowledged Member Countries' comments highlighting the need to review the use of these terms throughout the *Code* and align them with the new definitions once adopted.

The revised definition for 'OIE Guideline' is included in **Annex 23** for Member Countries' comments.

### ***Zone/Region, Infected zone, Free zone, Containment zone and Protection zone***

Revisions to the glossary definitions of these terms were discussed with the Scientific and Biological Standards Commissions, and proposed revisions of these definitions are included in **Annex 23** for Member Countries' comments.

#### **c) Convention for naming diseases in the Code**

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission clarified that the new convention for naming a disease is to use the wording 'infection with [pathogenic agent]'. It noted that if the vernacular disease name differs from this format, the Code Commission will decide whether to include the vernacular name in brackets in the title only, e.g. Infection with *Chlamydomphila abortus* (Enzootic abortion of ewes, ovine chlamydiosis). The Code Commission noted that this convention will be implemented with all new chapters and for existing chapters as they come up for review.

The Code Commission also noted that for describing the disease status of a country or zone, if the disease is named after the pathogenic agent name, then the country or zone status will be described as ‘free from infection with [pathogenic agent]’, e.g. free from infection with *Chlamydomphila abortus*, or free from infection with *Brucella* spp. However, if the pathogenic agent is named after the vernacular name of the disease, the country or zone status will be described as ‘free from [disease]’, e.g. free from foot and mouth disease or free from rabies.

The Code Commission noted that it will continue to discuss this naming convention with the Biological Standards Commission to ensure appropriate harmonisation of disease chapter titles in the *Code* and the *Manual*.

**Item 3 Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1.)**

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

In response to comments from Member Countries and the Aquatic Animals Commission, the Code Commission modified the proposed definition of an event and moved it to Article 1.1.2., modified the previous point 3 of Article 1.1.5. to refer to country or zone, and deleted Article 1.1.5. point 2 which becomes redundant with that modification to the previous point 3. (The points of Article 1.1.5. were renumbered accordingly.)

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to delete ‘sufficient’ from Article 1.1.4. point 2b since it considered this qualification usefully highlights the judgement required on the sufficiency of scientific information available to determine whether the emerging disease meets the criteria for listing.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ suggestion to replace Article 1.1.4. point 2a (ii) with ‘no more new cases are occurring’ since that text would be a duplication of point 2a (i).

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ suggestion to add ‘and re-emerging’ to Article 1.1.6. point 1 because ‘re-emerging’ is an unnecessary distinction from ‘emerging’ in this clause.

The Code Commission replaced the reference to ‘WAHID’ with ‘WAHIS’ in Article 1.1.6. to align with the revised OIE description of its World Animal Health Information System. In response to comments from Member Countries and the Aquatic Animals Commission, it also made several minor amendments to correct grammar, spelling and syntax and to harmonise with the *Aquatic Code* throughout the chapter.

The revised Chapter 1.1. is attached as [Annex 6](#) and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

**Item 4 Criteria for the inclusion of diseases, infections and infestations in the OIE list (Chapter 1.2.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Mexico, Switzerland, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission replaced the words ‘the OIE list’ in the first clause of Article 1.2.1. with ‘Chapter 1.2bis.’ to align with the *Aquatic Code*.

It considered a Member Country’s suggestion to add ‘in the *Terrestrial Code*’ to the third paragraph of Article 1.2.1. to be unnecessary additional words, and it did not accept the suggestion of Member Countries to delete ‘normally’ from this paragraph because some listed diseases do not have corresponding chapters.



The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to refer to methods of validation in the final clause of Article 1.2.1.

It did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to replace 'precise' with 'accurate' in Article 1.2.2. point 3 since the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition of 'precise' is more appropriate for case definition.

The Code Commission amended Article 1.2.2. point 3c in response to Member Countries' comments. However it considered Member Countries' suggestions to delete 'any' from threats to the viability of a wildlife population to be inconsistent with the OIE's biodiversity objectives.

In response to comments from Member Countries and the Aquatic Animals Commission, the Code Commission also made several minor amendments to correct grammar, spelling and syntax throughout the chapter.

The revised Chapter 1.2. is attached as **Annex 7** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

#### **Diseases listed by the OIE (Chapter 1.2bis.)**

Comments were received from China, Honduras, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission amended the title of this chapter in response to a Member Country's observation that it should be consistent with the title of Chapter 1.2.

Member Countries' comments on the hyphenation of 'foot-and-mouth disease' were referred to the Biological Standards Commission to ensure that consistent hyphenation or not of this disease name is applied in all OIE documents.

In response to a suggestion from Member Countries, the Code Commission changed the spelling of Crimean Congo hemorrhagic fever to align with that used by the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses and in the *Manual*.

It also accepted Member Countries' argument to retain '(porcine cysticercosis)' after 'Infection with *Taenia solium*' in this chapter and Chapter 15.3. given that the recently adopted *Manual* chapter is titled 'Cysticercosis'.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to separate sheep pox and goat pox into two disease listings because the disease in both species is caused by the same agent.

It also did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to move fowl typhoid to a multispecies listing of *Salmonella* complex, since fowl typhoid is a specific disease and fulfils the listing requirements.

In response to a Member Country's request for greater clarity of 'Infection with influenza A viruses of high pathogenicity in birds other than poultry including wild birds', the Code Commission noted that 'wild birds' means all wild bird species according to the definition of 'wildlife' in the glossary (feral, captive wild and wild), and italicised the word 'poultry' since the glossary definition applies.

The revised draft new Chapter 1.2bis. is attached as **Annex 8** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

#### **Item 5 Prescribed and alternative diagnostic tests for OIE listed diseases (Chapter 1.3.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Chile, New Zealand, Switzerland and EU.

The Code Commission noted that all but one Member Countries' comments supported deletion of Chapter 1.3. given that the content of this chapter is included in the *Manual*.

Chapter 1.3. is attached as **Annex 9** and will be proposed for deletion at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

**Item 6 Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.)**

The Code Commission reviewed Chapter 1.4. for consistency both within the chapter and with the remainder of the *Code*, and discussed the issue with the Scientific Commission.

It amended the title of Article 1.4.6. to ‘Surveillance to demonstrate freedom from a disease, infection or infestation’, and the title Article 1.4.6. point 1 to ‘Requirements to declare a country or a zone free’, deleting ‘without pathogen specific surveillance’ to avoid conflict with Article 1.4.6. point 1b. Corresponding amendments to reflect the change in these titles were made throughout the article, and the numbering of points 1a, 1b and point 2 were aligned.

Amendments to correct grammar and improve syntax were also made throughout the chapter.

The revised Chapter 1.4. is attached as **Annex 24** for Member Countries’ comments.

**Item 7 Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE (Chapter 1.6.)**

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

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries that the reference to Chapter 1.1.3. of the *Manual* systematically included as a proposed amendment in the clauses on Veterinary Services in this chapter in September was incorrect, and that the appropriate cross reference should be to Chapter 1.1. of the *Code*. This error will be addressed in the wider review of Chapter 1.6. that is about to be undertaken by Headquarters, the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission.

To facilitate the review of Chapter 1.6. Headquarters will prepare three options for consideration by the Code Commission at its September 2016 meeting. The three options that will be considered are:

- separate chapters for each disease, all located in Section 1 of the *Code*;
- separate chapters for each disease in a new section of the *Code*;
- a short Chapter 1.6. covering general principles only, and relocation of each questionnaire to its corresponding disease-specific chapter.

**Item 8 Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Article 3.2.14.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Argentina, Japan, Mexico, Switzerland, EU and AU-IBAR.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the Code Commission acknowledged that the proposed new clause ‘animal welfare controls at export and import of animals’ in Article 3.2.14. point 7b (i) could be regarded as inconsistent with Article 3.2.7. However, it considered that the proposed wording of the chapeau text of Article 3.2.14. point 7b (i) allows interpretation of this point to accommodate diverse situations amongst Member Countries, and that the alternatives offered were no better than the current text.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ suggestions to amend currently adopted text in Article 3.2.14., for which comment was not sought, since the suggestions offered no significant improvement on the current text and were not justified by a rationale.

The Article 3.2.14. is attached as **Annex 10** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

## Item 9 Disease prevention and control

### a) Zoning and compartmentalisation (Chapter 4.3.)

The Code Commission reviewed, revised and restructured this chapter, along with the glossary definitions of *zone/region*, *infected zone*, *free zone*, *containment zone*, and *protection zone*. These proposed revisions were further discussed with the Scientific Commission.

The revised Chapter 4.3. is attached as **Annex 25** for Member Countries' comments

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

The Code Commission reviewed the advice of the Biological Standards Commission on this chapter and asked Headquarters to critically review the entire chapter especially for consistency with disease-specific chapters, seek further expert advice, and propose necessary revisions for the Code Commission to consider at its September 2016 meeting.

### c) Collection and processing of in vitro produced embryos/oocytes from livestock and horses (Chapter 4.8.)

Comments were received from Australia and Chile.

The Code Commission noted comments from Member Countries regarding the lack of specific risk management provisions for *in vitro* produced embryos. The Code Commission referred the questions raised to the Biological Standards Commission and Headquarters to inform their approach to future updating of this chapter.

### d) Restructuring of *Terrestrial Code* Section 4 'Disease Prevention and Control'

The Code Commission reviewed the planned restructure of Section 4 of the *Aquatic Code* by the Aquatic Animals Commission. It will reflect on how Section 4 of the *Terrestrial Code* may be also restructured for better logical flow and clarity, and will consider further the best approach to this task at its September meeting.

In parallel with this work, the Code Commission will work on developing a new chapter on outbreak management.

### e) Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Vaccination

The Code Commission reviewed the *ad hoc* Group report, including a skeleton chapter. It commended the work done, discussed the likely outcomes with the Scientific Commission, and will closely follow the ongoing development of this chapter. The Code Commission recommends that the Article structure of this chapter should align with established *Code* format to facilitate future ease of use and cross referencing.

## Item 10 Trade measures

### a) OIE procedures relevant to WTO SPS Agreement (Chapter 5.3.)

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

In response to one Member Country's comment disagreeing with the proposed deletion of the term 'appropriate level of protection,' the Code Commission explained that even without that specific terminology, such a concept is maintained as 'the level of protection it deems appropriate,' notably in Article 5.3.5.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to add further explanation of the SPS Agreement in Article 5.3.1. as such an explanation is unnecessary in an OIE standard.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to replace 'judgement' with 'determination' in the title of Article 5.3.2. and as relevant throughout the chapter to distinguish the process from the final decision.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's suggestion to replace '*hazard*' with '*risk*' in point 2 of Article 5.3.5. and point 1 of Article 5.3.6. in accordance with the glossary definitions.

The Code Commission developed a point 10.bis of Article 5.3.5. to reflect the principle of non-discrimination.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to develop a point 10.ter of Article 5.3.5. to reflect actual practice as a possibility.

In response to Member Countries' suggestions, the Code Commission added a sentence to point 13 of Article 5.3.5. regarding the situation when measures more stringent than OIE standards are applied.

The Code Commission amended point 13 of Article 5.3.5., point 5c of Article 5.3.6. and point 1d (iv) and point 2e (iv) of Article 5.3.7. to refer to OIE guidelines in addition to OIE standards.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to add 'animal health situation of the exporting country' as a factor for consideration in the last paragraph of Article 5.3.6.

The Code Commission took note of information provided by a Member Country about an *ad hoc* consultation procedure recently adopted by the WTO SPS Committee which may assist informal dispute mediation.

The Code Commission deleted point 2 (i) of Article 5.3.7., as it does not pertain to the scope of this article, and notification to the OIE would be more efficient than multiple bilateral information provisions, which may be impractical.

The Code Commission also amended wording in several places throughout the chapter for consistency, improved syntax and correct grammar.

The revised Chapter 5.3. is attached as **Annex 26** for Member Countries' comments.

**b) Draft new chapter on criteria for assessing the safety of commodities (Chapter 2.X.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Argentina, Chile, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland and EU.

The Code Commission discussed the appropriate *Code* Section for this chapter and agreed to place it in Section 2 'Risk Analysis', once it is adopted.

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments and noted that some Member Countries may misunderstand the purpose of this chapter. This chapter is not to provide guidance to Member Countries to assess safety of commodities, but to describe how the lists of safe commodities are developed by *ad hoc* Groups and specialist commissions. The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that a similar approach is taken for 'Chapter 1.2.

Criteria for the inclusion of diseases, infections and infestations in the OIE list'. For this reason, suggestions from one Member Country to significantly redraft the text were not accepted.

The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country's suggestion to simplify the title of the chapter, clarifying that the existing title is appropriate in this context.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to replace the title of Article 2.X.1. with "General provisions".

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries' comments that the word "safety" in this chapter is also applied to human health consideration and amended the first paragraph of Article 2.X.1.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries' comments to replace "products" with "commodity" as far as it relates to the list, as appropriate throughout the chapter, because 'commodity' is what is traded.

In response to Member Countries' suggestions, the Code Commission modified the wording in the second paragraph of Article 2.X.1. to align it with the glossary definition of "safe commodity."

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission replaced the word 'concentration' with 'dose' in point 1 of Article 2.X.2.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to elaborate examples in point 2b of Article 2.X.2.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestions to add a provision concerning precaution to avoid contamination, recalling the purpose of this chapter is limited to the assessment of the commodity's safety.

The revised Chapter 2.X. is attached as [Annex 27](#) for Member Countries' comments.

## **Item 11 Veterinary public health: Antimicrobial resistance**

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

Comments were received from Canada, Switzerland and EU.

The Code Commission acknowledged that detailed comments were provided throughout the chapter, although the changes proposed in its September 2015 meeting report are for Article 6.7.3., point 3 and point 5 only.

Noting also the revision that was made at the meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Antimicrobial resistance in January 2016, the Code Commission decided to review all comments from Member Countries, the report of the *ad hoc* Group and the proposal from the Scientific Commission at the Code Commission's next meeting in September 2016.

**b) Monitoring of the quantities and usage patterns of antimicrobial agents used in food-producing animals (Chapter 6.8.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Japan, Switzerland, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission noted that, although the entire phrase 'therapeutic use of antimicrobial agents' is not present in the chapter, the word 'therapeutic' is present as a 'type of use.' According to the conventions of the *Code*, this is sufficient to define the term.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission replaced 'infectious diseases' with 'infection'.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's proposal to add 'preventing' to the definition of therapeutic use in Article 6.8.1. The Code Commission noted that the Codex Alimentarius Commission clearly differentiates '*Disease Treatment/Therapeutic Use*' from '*Disease Prevention/Prophylactic Use*' (CAC/RCP 61-2005).

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to delete 'controlling' from the definition of therapeutic use in Article 6.8.1. as no rationale was provided.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestions of minor changes in the text which were not sent for comments, as such changes would not significantly improve the text.

The revised Chapter 6.8. is attached as **Annex 11** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

**Item 12 Veterinary public health: Zoonoses and food safety**

**a) Draft new chapter on prevention and control of *Salmonella* in commercial cattle production (Chapter 6.X.)**

**b) Draft new chapter on prevention and control of *Salmonella* in pig production systems (Chapter 6.Y.)**

Dr Gillian Mylrea, Deputy Head, International Trade Department, informed the Code Commission that at the 47th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (held in November 2015) the Committee reviewed the draft Codex Guidelines for the Control of *Salmonella* spp. in Beef and Pork Meat (CX/FH 15/47/5) and agreed to forward the proposed draft Guidelines for adoption at Step 5/8 (with omission of Steps 6/7) by the Codex Alimentarius Commission that will meet in June 2016.

Dr Mylrea noted that although the Codex Guidelines cover the whole farm continuum, the section on primary production, for both pork and beef sections, provides a cross-reference to the draft OIE chapters currently under development for cattle and pigs. For steps where there is a dual role of animal health and food safety, such as lairage, in addition to food safety specific measures there is also a cross reference to the relevant OIE chapters.

The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that they had referred Member Countries' comments on both of the above draft chapters to the *ad hoc* Group on *Salmonella* in pigs and cattle that met in December 2015. The Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group and commended the *ad hoc* Group for its substantial work.

The Commission reviewed the two revised draft chapters and made some minor additional amendments. The Commission noted that the definitions for ‘feed’ and ‘feed ingredient’ would be moved to the Glossary once these chapters are adopted, as they will appear in more than one *Code* chapter.

The Code Commission noted the *ad hoc* Group recommendations and agreed that Chapter 4.13. “General recommendations on disinfection and disinsection” should be revised to address this important topic in more detail. The Commission reminded Member Countries that this item was on its work programme. In addition, the Commission noted that the definitions for ‘disinfection’ and ‘disinfectants’ are not aligned between the *Terrestrial* and *Aquatic Codes* and agreed to discuss this with the Aquatic Animals Commission. The Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group recommendation for the deletion of ‘wood’ bison and agreed to review the use of this term in other relevant chapters in the *Code*.

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group had considered all comments on each chapter submitted by Member Countries and then reviewed both chapters, making further amendments, where required and relevant, to ensure alignment between the two chapters. Hence, many of the amendments and much of the restructuring was to improve readability, provide clarification and improve cross-chapter consistency, where appropriate, rather than changing the intended meaning of the recommendations.

The Code Commission emphasised that given the importance of alignment between the two chapters, Member Countries should consider both chapters together when reviewing them.

The Commission reminds Member Countries to refer to the report of the *ad hoc* Group for explanations of amendments and how Member Countries’ comments were addressed.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group on *Salmonella* in pigs and cattle is attached as **Annex 40** for Member Countries’ information. The amended Chapters 6.X. and 6.Y. are attached as **Annexes 28** and **29** for Member Countries’ comments.

To facilitate the examination of the revised version, due to the extensive changes, the Code Commission provides the revised chapters also in a clean format, which are attached as **Annexes 30** and **31**.

**c) Infection with *Trichinella* spp. (Chapter 8.16.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Canada, Chili, Mexico, New Zealand, Switzerland and EU.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country’s comment to amend the number of designated species of *Trichinella* from eight to nine in Article 8.16.1. noting that this was in line with information published by the International Commission on Trichinellosis and an OIE expert.

In response to Member Countries’ comments regarding the cross reference to the OIE chapter that appears in the Codex Guidelines for the Control of *Trichinella* spp. in meat of suidae (CAC/GL 86-2015), the Commission was informed that Codex is in the process of amending its Guidelines with the correct chapter number reference.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ comment to delete ‘oocytes’ from Article 8.16.2. stating that as in other chapters on parasitic diseases oocytes are listed as safe commodities.

In response to a Member Country that proposed substantial amendments to Article 8.16.4., the Code Commission noted that the proposed amendments did not add any new elements to the article. In addition, since this chapter was adopted in 2013, only amendments of substance would be considered at this time.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's comment to add text in Articles 8.16.8. and 8.16.9. regarding a process to inactivate larvae as it was not aware of any studies that have been undertaken or planned to establish the parameters for the inactivation of *Trichinella* larvae in the meat of equids.

The revised Chapter 8.16. is attached as **Annex 12** and will be presented for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

**d) Infection with *Taenia solium* (Chapter 15.3.)**

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

The Code Commission amended point 5 of Article 15.3.2. and reinstated 'oocytes' since, as in other chapters on parasitic diseases, oocytes are listed as safe commodities.

In response to a Member Country's concern about the possible exposure of pigs to human faeces in an establishment, the Code Commission explained that point 1e of Article 15.3.3. is intended to provide for a specific toilet for people working in the pig establishment to prevent exposure of pigs and their environment to human faeces. While noting that the definition of establishment is not limited to the exact building where pigs are reared, the Code Commission deleted the word "rearing" to avoid any misunderstanding.

After reviewing several Member Countries' comments proposing further significant amendments to the structure and wording of Article 15.3.3., the Code Commission considered that the changes proposed would not substantially improve the current text. It also noted that the last sentence of Article 15.3.3. is a stand-alone paragraph that relates to the entire Article 15.3.3., emphasising that the control of infection in humans is critical to the control of this pathogen in pigs.

The Code Commission did not accept one Member Country's suggestion to refer to a preventive programme for detection and treatment of human tapeworm carriers in point 1 of Article 15.3.3. or another Member Country's comment to refer to provision of human sanitation services in point 2 of Article 15.3.3., noting that recommendations to human health programmes are beyond the scope of the *Code*.

The Code Commission did not accept a suggestion from a Member Country to change 'systemic' to 'generalised' infection in point 2 of Article 15.3.2. as it considered systemic to be a more appropriate term in this context.

In response to a Member Country's comment to reinstate 80°C in place of 60°C in Article 15.3.6., the Commission did not agree and noted that heating to a temperature of 56°C has been shown to inactivate cysticerci (Allen R.W. - 1947, *J. Parasitol.*, 33, 331–338.; Hird D.W. & Pullen M.M. (1979). *J. Food Protec.*, 42 (1), 58–64.). Another publication states that heating pig meat to 45-50°C for 15 to 20 minutes is sufficient to inactivate *C. cellulosae* (Blaha T. (1989) *Applied Veterinary Epidemiology*. Elsevier, Amsterdam).

The revised Chapter 15.3. is attached as **Annex 13** and will be presented for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

**e) Report of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group (including revision of Chapter 6.1)**

Dr Gillian Mylrea informed the Code Commission about activities noted in the report of the November 2015 meeting of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group.

The Code Commission endorsed the report and agreed with the Working Group recommendation that an introductory chapter in Section 6 'Veterinary public health' of the *Code* would be a useful addition to this section and could provide an overview as well as outlining possible future chapters for this section. The Code Commission agreed to add this to its work programme.



The Commission noted the substantial work undertaken by the Working Group to revise Chapter 6.1. 'Role of Veterinary Services in food safety'. The Commission reviewed the amended chapter and made some additional amendments.

The Commission noted that the Working Group had insufficient time to revise Chapter 6.2. 'Control of biological hazards of animal health and public health importance through ante- and post-mortem meat inspection' during its 2015 meeting, and requested that the Working Group undertake this work at its 2016 meeting.

The November 2015 Report of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group is attached in **Annex 41** for Member Countries' information.

Since the revised chapter is significantly different from the current chapter, the proposed revision is provided as clean text. The revised Chapter 6.1. is attached as **Annex 32** for Member Countries' comments.

### **Item 13 Animal welfare**

#### **a) Stunning methods (Chapter 7.5. Article 7.5.7. point 2)**

Comments were received from: Canada, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Switzerland and EU.

The Code Commission noted and supported a request from Member Countries that the diagrams proposed for removal from the chapter be relocated to the OIE website.

The Code Commission considered the rationale for a Member Country's suggestion to replace the word 'checked' with 'verified' in the chapeau text of point 1 insufficient improvement to justify the change.

It did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to add 'restrained' to point 1f, given that restraint is already covered in point 1b.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to delete 'of a manual inspection area' and replace 'cervical dislocation' with 'rapid decapitation' in point 1g, given that the text proposed for amendment is only included as an example, rather than a specific requirement.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission replaced the word 'instrument' with 'device' in the introductory text to the signs of correct stunning (point 2) for consistency within the chapter.

The Code Commission also made several amendments in response to Member Countries' comments to correct grammar and improve syntax throughout the article.

The Code Commission acknowledged receipt of useful comments and proposals from a Member Country on stunning of animals in general which it referred to the Animal Welfare Working Group for consideration.

The revised point 2 of Article 7.5.7. is attached as **Annex 14** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

**b) Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Slaughter of animals: water bath stunning method for poultry (Article 7.5.7. point 3 b)**

The Code Commission endorsed the report of the *ad hoc* Group and the amendments to the proposed text by the Animal Welfare Working Group. The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached as **Annex 42** for Member Countries' information.

The revised point 3 of Article 7.5.7. as amended by the Animal Welfare Working Group is attached as **Annex 33** for Member Countries' comments.

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

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

The Code Commission moved the content of the footnote to this chapter to the relevant place in the table summarising killing methods to clarify the point the footnote refers to.

Given there is currently no reference to foam as a method for killing animals in this chapter, the Code Commission referred a Member Country's suggestion requesting this addition to the Animal Welfare Working Group to consider whether and how this method of killing could be appropriately included in the chapter.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission amended the table entry for poultry to include penetrating and non-penetrating captive bolts as procedures for killing adult poultry.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission amended the text in the table on animal welfare concerns with inappropriate application for penetrating captive bolt followed by pithing and bleeding to be consistent in the table entries for horses, cattle, pigs, poultry and sheep.

The Code Commission referred comments from a Member Country questioning the use of non-penetrating captive bolt and penetrating captive bolt in different species to the Animal Welfare Working Group for advice.

In response to Member Countries' request to add killing of dogs to Chapter 7.6., the Code Commission noted that methods for killing of dogs are included in Chapter 7.7. 'Stray dog population control'.

The Code Commission also made several amendments in response to Member Countries' comments to correct grammar and improve syntax throughout the chapter.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion for editorial change to Article 7.6.14. because the rationale offered was insufficient.

The Code Commission acknowledged receipt of useful comments and proposals from a Member Country on killing of animals for disease control in general, which it referred to the Animal Welfare Working Group for consideration.

The revised articles of Chapter 7.6. are attached as **Annex 15** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

**d) Animal welfare and broiler chicken production systems (Article 7.10.4.)**

Comments were received from Canada, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, New Zealand, Mexico, Norway, Panama, Switzerland and EU.

Recognising the adoption of the glossary definitions for ‘biosecurity’ and ‘animal health management’, the Code Commission deleted the first sentence of points 1a and 1b. The suggestion to replace ‘recommendations in the *Terrestrial Code*’ with ‘OIE standards’ will be revisited when a glossary definition for ‘OIE standard’ is adopted.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion (without supporting rationale) to add ‘waste’ to the list of major routes for disease and pathogen submission.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to add ‘this should be consistent with lighting needs and the age of the bird’ to point 2b because this issue is already addressed in the adopted text for this point.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to amend the adopted text concerning ammonia concentration or choice of broiler strain because both points have been debated extensively and the adopted text was accepted by the majority of Member Countries. However, the Spanish and French translations of choice of genetic strain will be reviewed to ensure they accurately reflect the adopted English text.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country’s suggestions (supported by references) to add ‘behaviour’ to the outcome-based measurables for air quality, and ‘behaviour’ and ‘vocalisation’ to the outcome-based measurables for on farm harvesting. It did not accept the suggestion (without supporting rationale) to add ‘gait’ to the outcome-based measurables for handling and inspection.

The Code Commission did not accept several individual Member Countries’ comments to add examples to the outcome-based measurables for the points in this article, because the descriptions of each outcome-based measurable used in this chapter are included in Article 7.10.3.

In response to a Member Country’s suggestion, the Code Commission added a sentence on humane killing to point o) on emergency plans as provided in the same point of the adopted beef and dairy cattle chapters.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to add more prescriptive text to the period of feed withdrawal recommended in point 2q because there are a number of situational factors to consider in determining this period. It also did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to replace ‘harvesting’ with ‘catching’ because the broader *Oxford English Dictionary* definition of harvesting includes catching and is more appropriate in this article.

The revised Article 7.10.4 is attached as **Annex 16** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

**e) Animal welfare and dairy cattle production systems (Chapter 7.11.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Chile, Costa Rica, Canada, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, EU and ICAEW.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to include a recommendation in Article 7.11.4. point 7 given this Article lists the criteria or measurables used in this chapter, and the point suggested is already addressed in Article 7.11.7. point 13.

In response to Member Countries' request to replace 'animal welfare and health' with 'animal health and welfare' in this chapter, the Code Commission recalled the report of this discussion in September 2015 as follows:

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to refer to 'animal welfare and animal health' in place of 'animal health and welfare' throughout this chapter since welfare is the primary purpose of the chapter and health is part of welfare.

The Code Commission again decided to use 'animal welfare and health' to emphasise that in the animal welfare chapters of the *Code* the recommendations provided are directed first and foremost at animal welfare.

Throughout the chapter, the Code Commission made editorial changes in response to Member Countries' comments to correct grammar and improve syntax.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to duplicate the reference to bedding in Article 7.11.6. point 1b.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' request to amend the requirement in Article 7.11.6. point 5 for at least one space per cow where individual spaces are provided for cows to rest, and drew Member Countries' attention to the supporting explanation to this text provided in the report of the September 2015 Code Commission meeting:

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's repeated comment suggesting the deletion of the need for individual lying spaces since this is a consequence of an outcome based measure requiring that 'all cattle should have sufficient space to lie down at the same time specifically recommended by the AWWG, as noted in the following excerpt from the AWWG report:

'Prof. Fraser noted in relation to a Member Country comment on the rationale to modify the text on space requirements for housed dairy cattle that the recommendation is based on essential housing design. He explained that in this case the need for space to lie could be understood as an outcome measure which directly impacts on animal behaviour.'

To further emphasise this outcome-based measure (and in response to Member Countries' suggestion), the Code Commission included use of lying areas in the examples of outcome-based measurables for point 5 of this article."

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to add 'altered lying time' to the description of outcome-based measurables for Article 7.11.6. point 5, and rearranged the wording of this clause to correct grammar and improve syntax.

Recognising the adoption of the glossary definitions for 'biosecurity' and 'animal health management' the Code Commission amended the headings of Article 7.11.7. point 1a and 1b and deleted the first sentence of point 1a.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission revised the wording of Article 7.11.7. point 9 to emphasise that calves should receive sufficient colostrum to provide adequate passive immunity. In the absence of scientific consensus, the Code Commission decided not to include a specific recommendation on the optimal duration of colostrum feeding.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission amended the second paragraph of Article 7.11.7. point 11 to indicate that individual calf housing is a way to prevent disease in very young calves, but should not be prolonged unnecessarily.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggested amendments to the text of Article 7.11.7. point 13 on painful husbandry procedures that is taken directly from the adopted text in the beef cattle chapter and noted that these procedures are more common in beef cattle than dairy cattle.

The Code Commission did not include additional text on the need for access to an emergency power supply in Article 7.11.6. point 16, given this is already addressed with the cross reference to point 7 of Article 7.11.6.

The revised Chapter 7.11. is attached as **Annex 17** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

**f) Draft new chapter on the welfare of working equids**

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Thailand, Switzerland, USA, EU, AU-IBAR and ICAFW.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission noted that horses and other species used for production of biopharmaceutical products are included in the scope of Chapter 7.8. (Article 7.8.2.), and added this group of horses to those listed outside the scope of the chapter in Article 7.X.2.

Throughout the chapter, the Code Commission made editorial changes in response to Member Countries' comments to remove unnecessary words, correct grammar and punctuation, and improve syntax.

Member Countries' suggestions without a supporting or obvious rationale were not accepted as stated previously.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission decided to use the order 'horses, donkeys and mules' consistently throughout the chapter.

The Code Commission reordered the sentences in the opening paragraph of the introduction in response to Member Countries' suggestion to improve the logical flow of the text. It considered a Member Country's suggestion to add 'gender equity' to the opening sentence to be outside the scope of OIE standards.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission amended the last paragraph of the introduction to more neutral non-judgemental language, and to improve syntax.

The Code Commission considered unnecessary a Member Country's suggestion to expand the last paragraph of the introduction.

In response to Member Countries' comments seeking to add horses used for various specific leisure pursuits to the classes of horse excluded from the scope of this chapter, the Code Commission replaced the words 'leisure riding' with 'leisure activities' in the sentence of exclusions.

The Code Commission expanded Article 7.X.3. point 1 on the responsibilities of the Veterinary Authority in response to comments from a Member Country.

The Code Commission received a wide range of suggestions concerning the reference to the ‘five freedoms’ in Article 7.X.3. point 4 and, after considering them all, decided to include a cross reference to the five freedoms listed in Article 7.1.2. to ensure consistency within the *Terrestrial Code*.

In response to comments, the Code Commission decided the opening paragraph of Article 7.X.4. was unnecessary and deleted it.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to add ‘agitation’ to the list of animal welfare problems included in Article 7.X.4. point 1 because agitation is an indicator rather than a condition.

In response to a Member Country’s request to replace the adjective ‘equine’ with the noun ‘equids’ in the opening sentence of Article 7.X.4. point 1, the Code Commission noted that it is the adjective that is required in this sentence.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the Code Commission added ‘spinal’ to the areas of the body where the various behaviours listed might indicate pain.

In response to a Member Country’s comment, the Code Commission added the qualifier ‘unusual’ to the avoidance of humans that may be a behaviour indicating fear or anxiety.

The Code Commission considered a Member Country’s suggestion to add ‘pacing’ to the locomotive stereotypies to be unnecessary and a source of potential confusion with the normal gait of pacers.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the Code Commission added a sentence on the usefulness of necropsy for determining the cause of death to Article 7.X.4. point 3 (mortality). It also accepted a Member Country’s suggestion to reinstate ‘emaciation’ as one of the attributes of physical appearance that may indicate compromised welfare in Article 7.X.4. point 4.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries’ suggestion to include a recommendation in Article 7.X.4. point 4 given this Article lists the criteria or measurables used in the chapter. It also declined Member Countries’ suggestions to add an unnecessary list of specific types of wounds or injuries, and clinical signs of disease to this point. Similarly, the Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to add ‘abnormal or lack of defaecation’ to this point on body condition and physical appearance.

In response to Member Countries’ comments, the Code Commission added the words ‘or apathetic’ to the indicator of aversive responses to fitting of equipment and loads in Article 7.X.4. point 5.

The Code Commission amended Article 7.X.4. point 7 in response to Member Countries’ comments and moved the text on scoring systems from the indicators to the chapeau text of this article.

The Code Commission expanded the explanatory text of Article 7.X.4. point 8 in response to Member Countries’ comments.

In response to many different comments on Article 7.X.6. point 1, the Code Commission reordered and reworded this point to improve clarity and syntax. It did not accept Member Countries’ suggestions to qualify slaughter, because the chapter on ‘slaughter of animals’ refers to human consumption, and slaughter conducted in accordance with the *Code* is humane.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to add text to this point on protecting horses from predators since this is addressed in Article 7.X.7. point 3.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestions to give more specific parameters on the volume of water working equids need given the very large impact the environment in which equids work has on this requirement.

The Code Commission amended and added to the recommendations to prevent heat stress and provide protection from cold weather in response to Member Countries' suggestions.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestions to add new points to Article 7.X.7. on housing and tethering, and protection from vectors since the suggested points are addressed elsewhere in the chapter.

Recognising the adoption of the glossary definitions for 'biosecurity' and 'animal health management' the Code Commission amended the headings of point Article 7.X.8. points 1 and 2 and deleted the first sentence of both points.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to add 'including insects' to Article 7.X.8. point 1b since insects are included in the glossary definition of vectors.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to add two specific examples in brackets to morbidity in the list of outcome-based measurables for Article 7.X.8. point 2 given the very long list of other examples that might also be considered if the suggested two were added.

The Code Commission did not accept the Member Countries' suggestion to add another paragraph to Article 7.X.9. on painful husbandry procedures, given all the points in the suggested new paragraph are covered more succinctly in the opening sentence of this article.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to delete 'lack of resting periods' from the paragraph describing poor management practices in Article 7.X.9. since the provision of resting periods may not be fully addressed by avoiding an excessive number of working hours.

The Code Commission considered Member Countries' suggestion to add clipping of hair to a non-exhaustive list of poor management practices to be unnecessary detail. Similarly the Code Commission considered a Member Country's suggestion that education strategies should take account of local cultures, a point that can be left implicit in the *Code* as the recommendations will in any case be applied by national Veterinary Services familiar with their own cultural situation.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission revised the text on tethering and hobbling, and added the point that working equids should not be kept confined indoors for long periods.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission deleted the sixth paragraph of Article 7.X.12. since this is addressed in Article 7.X.6. It did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to reorder and rephrase Article 7.X.12. since it considered the alternative offered to be no better than the current text.

The Code Commission considered a Member Country's suggestion to add text requiring the necessary knowledge and skills for persons hoof trimming and shoeing working equids in Article 7.X.13. to be proven as inconsistent with, and beyond the established practice for, recommendations such as this in the *Code*.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to change the measurable 'body condition' to 'foot condition' in this article, since the description of body condition in Article 7.X.4. includes 'feet or limb abnormalities'.

The Code Commission considered a Member Country's suggestion to include a paragraph on carts in Article 7.X.13. to be beyond the scope of this chapter.

The revised Chapter 7.X. is attached as **Annex 18** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

#### **Item 14 Vector-borne diseases**

##### **a) Infection with bluetongue virus (Chapter 8.3.)**

Comments were received from New Zealand, Switzerland, Thailand, USA and EU.

The Code Commission acknowledged Member Countries' comments supporting the work done on this chapter and encouraging its adoption.

In response to a Member Country's comment questioning the validity of seasonal freedom, given the evidence of ongoing climate change, the Code Commission acknowledged the concern but considered that the concept should remain so long as it remains applicable and relevant in at least some Member Countries.

The Code Commission referred Member Countries' questions concerning the exclusion of nonpathogenic serotypes of bluetongue virus and live vaccine strains of bluetongue virus to the Biological Standards Commission for advice.

In response to a comment from Member Countries questioning whether the title of Article 8.3.4. should include 'countries seasonally free from bluetongue', the Code Commission agreed that a zone could be an entire country, but proposed no change to the title at this time.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission made minor amendments to Articles 8.3.14. and 8.3.16. point 4 to improve clarity.

The revised Chapter 8.3. is attached as **Annex 19** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

##### **b) Infection with epizootic hemorrhagic disease virus (Chapter 8.7.)**

Comments were received from New Zealand, Switzerland, Thailand and EU.

In response to a Member Country's comment questioning the validity of seasonal freedom, given the evidence of ongoing climate change, the Code Commission acknowledged the concern but considered that the concept should remain so long as it remains applicable and relevant in at least some Member Countries.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries suggestion to replace 'whole country' with 'entire country' throughout the chapter to be consistent with the other disease chapters.

In response to a comment from Member Countries questioning whether the titles of Articles 8.7.4., 8.7.7., 8.7.9., and 8.7.11. should include countries seasonally free from epizootic hemorrhagic disease, the Code Commission agreed that a zone could be an entire country, but proposed no change to the titles at this time.

The revised Chapter 8.7. is attached as **Annex 20** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

##### **c) Infection with Rift Valley fever virus (Chapter 8.14.)**

Comments were received from New Zealand, Switzerland, Thailand and EU.

The Code Commission acknowledged Member Countries comments supporting the work done on this chapter and encouraging its adoption.



In response to a Member Country's comment questioning the validity of seasonal freedom, given the evidence of ongoing climate change, the Code Commission noted there are no provisions for seasonal freedom in this chapter.

There were no further changes proposed for this chapter.

The revised chapter is attached as **Annex 21** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84th General Session in May 2016.

#### **Item 15 Infection with foot and mouth disease virus (Chapter 8.8.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chinese Taipei, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Switzerland, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission reviewed all comments from Member Countries, advice from the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group, and amended the text accordingly.

Two major issues remain to be addressed by an *ad hoc* Group: movement of vaccinated animals to free zones without vaccination, and waiting periods to regain free status depending on the policy applied. The Code Commission expects to address these at its September meeting.

In the interim, Member Countries' comments are sought on a new article establishing compartments free from FMD with vaccination for consideration at the next meeting of the *ad hoc* Group, and the September meetings of the Scientific and Code Commissions.

The proposed new Article 8.8.4.bis along with the Article 8.8.4. and the relevant extract from the *ad hoc* Group report are attached as **Annex 34** for Member Country comments by **31 May 2016**.

#### **Item 16 Infection with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex (draft new Chapter 8.X.)**

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

The Code Commission reviewed all comments from Member Countries and advice from the Scientific Commission, and amended the text accordingly.

In response to a Member Country's comment that it was unable to locate the *ad hoc* Group report that explains the background to the development of this revised chapter, Headquarters advised that work is underway to make *ad hoc* Group's reports easier to search and find on the OIE website. In the interim the link to the report of the *ad hoc* Group on 'Infection with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex' is: [http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International\\_Standard\\_Setting/docs/pdf/SCAD/A\\_SCAD\\_Sept2014.pdf](http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/International_Standard_Setting/docs/pdf/SCAD/A_SCAD_Sept2014.pdf).

In response to questions from a Member Country on the scope of the revised chapter, the Code Commission advised that the decision to expand the scope of this chapter was approved by the World Assembly of Delegates, and that the purpose of including multiple species of *Mycobacteria* within the scope is to provide risk management measures for all species of the complex for the given host species. The Code Commission recalled that elephants have been found not to be significant in the epidemiology of *M. tuberculosis* complex, and that risk management of tuberculosis of apes is dealt with in Chapter 6.11.

The Code Commission referred Member Countries' requests to update diagnostic methods and ensure appropriate consistency between the Terrestrial *Code* and *Manual* to the Biological Standards Commission. It also noted that the *Manual* aims to include methods for all recognised susceptible host species of a particular agent, whereas the scope of disease-specific chapters of the *Code* is limited to the epidemiologically significant host species.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries' suggestion to replace 'this chapter' with 'the *Terrestrial Code*' in the opening paragraph of Article 8.X.1. and agreed with Member Countries' suggestion to consider development of further specific risk management articles for goats, once expert advice has been received.

After reviewing the *ad hoc* Group report and consultation with the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission concluded it had currently insufficient information to include New World camelids in the list of susceptible species. It asked Headquarters and both the Biological Standards Commission and the Scientific Commission to re-evaluate the significance of infection with *M. tuberculosis* complex in New World camelids along with the available diagnostic and risk management tools to determine whether they should be included in the case definition or not.

The Code Commission considered a Member Country's suggestion to add the words 'or suspicion' to the second definition of the occurrence of infection with *M. tuberculosis* complex in Article 8.X.1. to be unnecessary additional words.

In answer to Member Countries' comment, the Code Commission advised that infection found in the African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*) or other species not included in the list of susceptible species would not impact on the assessment of historical freedom from *M. tuberculosis* complex in bovinds.

In response to Member Countries' comments suggesting that the provisions in Article 8.X.4. are too prescriptive, the Code Commission noted that 'regular testing of all herds has been in place for at least 3 years' is determined by the Veterinary Authority of the Member Country. It does not mean that all herds have to be tested every year for three years, or that all herds should meet the requirements for free herds as described in Article 8.X.6. The Code Commission made minor editorial amendments to Article 8.X.4. in response to a Member Country's comments to improve clarity.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to extend the required period of surveillance in Articles 8.X.4. and 8.X.5. point 2c to five years because the combination of the requirements in points b and c does indeed result in at least five years of surveillance.

Article 8.X.4. point 3 was rearranged in response to a Member Country's suggestions to improve clarity.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestions to replace 'herd' with 'population' in articles for freedom in each animal category because 'herd' as defined in the glossary already addresses this comment.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to replace 'herd' with 'compartment' in Article 8.X.6. because the *ad hoc* Group supported the earlier decision to refer to herd rather than compartment on the grounds that management of a herd is sufficient to assure freedom from infection with *M. tuberculosis* complex with the current conditions, thus ensuring safe trade.

The Code Commission also did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to include provisions for circumstances where human cases of *M. tuberculosis* complex are detected since this is beyond the scope of the chapter, and the possibility of infection from humans is sufficiently accounted for by the species included in the definition of the *M. tuberculosis* complex.

The Code Commission introduced a new point c to Article 8.X.6. based on a Member Country's suggestion to address circumstances where there is a known wildlife reservoir of *M. tuberculosis* complex.

In response to Member Countries' comments requesting articles on herd and country freedom in goats and New World camelids, the Code Commission requested Headquarters to seek information from countries with successful programmes on herd, rather than country, certification of freedom from *M. tuberculosis* complex, which would enable the development of appropriate articles.

In answer to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission changed the period of isolation from 90 days to six months in Article 8.X.7. point c to be consistent with the recommendation for herd freedom. Several editorial amendments were made throughout Article 8.X.7. to correct grammar and improve clarity in response to a Member Country's suggestions. Other suggestions from a Member Country to include additional unnecessary words, or delete words essential to avoid ambiguity, were not accepted.

The Code Commission modified Article 8.X.8. in response to Member Countries' comments by adding the words 'since birth or for at least 6 months prior to shipment' to Article 8.X.8. point 3 (which aligns with the herd freedom requirements). It also added a new point 3b providing for testing of goats to be exported, based on the bovid requirements and field evidence that tuberculin test performance in goats is similar to that in bovids for individual testing.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission made several editorial amendments to Article 8.X.10. to align with amendments made in Articles 8.X.6. and 7.

It did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to add the words 'to be transported directly' to the title of Article 8.X.9. since the title clearly excludes bovids or cervids imported for rearing or breeding, and infection with *M. tuberculosis* complex is not as contagious as diseases such as foot and mouth disease (where the equivalent Article does include that phrase).

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission modified Article 8.X.10. point 2 to reflect the risk management options provided in Article 8.X.7. for breeding animals, and added a cross reference to Article 4.6.2. in Article 8.X.10. point 2a.

The Code Commission aligned Article 8.X.11. point 2b to the corresponding points in Articles 8.X.6. and 8.X.10.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to include a new point addressing semen used for fertilisation in Article 8.X.12. point 1.

It did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to require absence of clinical signs of infection with *M. tuberculosis* complex on the day of collection because of the nonspecific clinical signs of infection with *M. tuberculosis* complex and the very common absence of clinical signs of infection with *M. tuberculosis* complex. For the same reasons, the Code Commission did not accept the suggestion to include a requirement for absence of clinical signs in Article 8.X.13.

Member Countries' observations that compliance with the provisions of Article 8.X.14. point 1 requires that goats are kept in a herd that has been subjected to a testing regime, were referred to the Biological Standards Commission and the Scientific Commission to support further consideration of the development of such a testing regime to demonstrate herd freedom from infection with *M. tuberculosis* complex in goats.

The revised draft Chapter 8.X. is attached as **Annex 35** for Member Countries' comments.

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

Comments were received from the USA and the IEC.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to modify the definition of 'poultry' in point 3 of Article 10.4.1. The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that it has been demonstrated that backyard poultry as well as fighting cocks have major epidemiological significance in some regions. The Code Commission also cautioned that modification of a term defined in the glossary might affect various other parts of the *Code*. Further, the definition of poultry has evolved following extensive debate amongst Member Countries and Specialist Commissions.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to replace 'disinfection' with 'treatment for virus inactivation' in point 1 of Article 10.4.3., noting that 'disinfection' is included in the definition of 'stamping-out policy.' Furthermore, referring to the definition of 'disinfection', the Code Commission reconfirmed that the effect proposed by the Member Country is well covered by 'disinfection.'

#### *Disinfection*

means the application, after thorough cleansing, of procedures intended to destroy the infectious or parasitic agents of animal *diseases*, including *zoonoses*; this applies to premises, *vehicles* and different objects which may have been directly or indirectly contaminated.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to create an additional point in Article 10.4.3. to the effect that isolated detections of avian influenza in certain categories of poultry are not to affect international trade, because backyard poultry are of major epidemiological significance in some regions.

The Code Commission was informed that the result of a scientific study needed to update the table for inactivation of avian influenza virus will be available before its September 2016 meeting. As stated at the meeting of September 2015, the Code Commission will review Chapter 10.4. when such data and substantive conclusions from the generic work on vaccination, zoning and outbreak management become available.

#### **Item 18 Infection with lumpy skin disease virus (Chapter 11.11.)**

The Code Commission reviewed a draft new chapter prepared by an *ad hoc* Group, reviewed by the Scientific Commission and proposed to replace the outdated current chapter. The Code Commission made some amendments and edited it to align with established *Code* style and format.

The proposed new chapter is attached as **Annex 36** for Member Countries' comments.

#### **Item 19 Infection with *Burkholderia mallei* (Glanders) (Chapter 12.10.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, New Zealand, Singapore, Switzerland, South Africa, Uruguay, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission addressed all Member Countries' comments and advice from the Scientific Commission, and amended the text accordingly. However, the experts providing advice on the requirements for surveillance (Article 12.10.8.) and differential diagnosis for the corresponding *Manual* chapter are still working on those tasks.

Given the crucial importance of both points to the chapter as a whole, the Code Commission decided to keep its review of the latest draft of this chapter on hold until that advice is available. It is now expected review of the chapter incorporating the currently outstanding expert advice will be completed in September, and that a revised draft of the chapter will be circulated for Member Countries' comments in the report of the September Code Commission meeting.

#### **Item 20 Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus (Article 14.7.21.)**

Comments were received from Japan.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission corrected a mistake in the chapeau text of Article 14.7.21 in the English version only.

The revised Article 14.7.21. is attached as **Annex 22** and will be proposed for adoption at the 84<sup>th</sup> General Session in May 2016.

**Item 21 Infection with African swine fever virus (Chapter 15.1.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Argentina, Canada, China, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission reviewed all comments from Member Countries and advice from the Scientific Commission, and amended the text accordingly.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion, the Code Commission amended Article 15.1.1. to clarify that the only arthropods known to be capable of transmitting ASFV are ticks of genus *Ornithodoros*.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's comment to differentiate '*captive wild pigs*', as defined in the glossary, from 'domestic pigs' throughout the chapter because captive wild pigs may play a significant role in the epidemiology of ASF. The Code Commission urged Member Countries to refer to the glossary for definitions when words are italicised.

The Code Commission simplified the language of point 2 of the definition of Article 15.1.1., and in response to Member Countries' comments, included reference to clinical signs of a suid from which samples are taken in this point.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission replaced '*outbreak*' with '*case*' in point 3 of Article 15.1.1. considering the definitions of these two terms and the importance of the safeguards provided by this chapter.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission deleted the paragraph warning against the imposition of import bans in response to a notification of infection with ASFV in wild or feral or African wild suids and created a new point 8 in Article 15.1.2. indicating that commodities can be traded safely according to the relevant articles of this chapter. The Code Commission considered that the consequence of a notification of infection with ASFV in wild and feral pigs or African wild suids would be more appropriate to be included in general criteria for determination of the ASF status.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion and noting the importance of feral suids, the Code Commission amended point 4 of Article 15.1.2. to create consistency throughout the chapter.

The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country's suggestion not to apply point 5 of Article 15.1.2. to countries with historically free status. The Code Commission noted that 'appropriate surveillance' does not necessarily mean 'active surveillance' or 'pathogen-specific surveillance'.

In response to a Member Countries' comment, the Code Commission amended the Article numbers referred to in point 5 of Article 15.1.2., noting that Article 15.1.26. is not relevant to the population concerned in point 5.

The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country's suggestion to delete from points 1 and 5 of Article 15.1.2. the word 'appropriate' qualifying surveillance programme, noting that this is to allow flexibility of the surveillance programme depending on the situation. The Code Commission reminded a commenting Member Country that the present tense is used when listing criteria, and not 'should'.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries' comments that the defined term 'risk' is not appropriate in the context and replaced it with 'likelihood' in points 6 and 7 of Article 15.1.2.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission restructured Article 15.1.3. creating three status for historical freedom, freedom in all suids, and freedom in domestic and captive wild pigs.

The Code Commission acknowledged Member Countries' comments seeking specific criteria for a compartment free from ASF in Article 15.1.3.bis, and reviewed the advice from the Scientific Commission that an embedded fence and double fence to ensure no contact with external pig populations would be required and that *Ornithodoros* ticks would be unlikely to move a distance of more than one metre. The Code Commission requested Headquarters to forward this issue to experts to consider if it is possible to draft an Article which suits all situations.

The Code Commission considered unnecessary a suggestion from Member Countries to include a reference to Chapter 4.3. in Article 15.1.3ter. The Code Commission also noted that Chapter 4.3. is currently under revision.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Countries' suggestion to replace the word 'can' with 'may' in the first paragraph of Article 15.1.3ter.

In response to a Member Countries' comment, the Code Commission clarified that a country may self-declare a containment zone for a disease that is not subject to official OIE recognition of disease status.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission amended Article 15.1.4. to clarify that because of the stability of ASFV the three months period does not start until disinfection has been completed.

The Code Commission did not agree with Member Countries' suggestions to limit the situations when sentinel animals are required in point 1 of Article 15.1.4. The Code Commission kept the existing text, considering the stability of ASFV, the possibility of ineffective disinfection and its serious consequences, reminding Member Countries that such a provision is created to facilitate early recovery of free status.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion, the Code Commission added a new point 3 to Article 15.1.5. for precautions to avoid contamination.

In response to Member Countries' comments on the title of Article 15.1.6., the Code Commission explained that in cases where 'country or zone infected with [pathogen]' is not defined in the chapter, 'country or zone not free from' is used to express the disease status of countries or zones that do not comply with the requirements for freedom.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion on point 2 of Article 15.1.6., recalling the opinion of the *ad hoc* Group that tests are not necessary more than once during the quarantine period.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to refer to Chapter 4.4. in point 2a of Article 15.1.6., as such a reference is unnecessary.

The Code Commission did not modify the isolation period of point 2b of Article 15.1.6., noting that the current 30 days is double the incubation period, which is consistent with other chapters and current risk management procedures.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to replace 'donor males' with 'donor boars', noting that the word 'boar' has different meanings between regions. The Code Commission noted again that throughout the *Code* when revising articles dealing with semen or embryos it would consistently use the terms 'donor males' and 'donor females', whatever the species.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission amended point 1a of Article 15.1.9. for consistency with Article 15.1.3.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to test donor males, as such an additional requirement is considered unnecessary in terms of risk mitigation and impractical for pig semen production.

The Code Commission clarified that the publication provided by a Member Country to support its request to reinstate the testing regime in Article 15.1.9. was found to be incorrect and the document cited in the said publication does not exist. After thorough review of the scientific literature and consultation with the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission did not accept the Member Country's comment, as the putative risk of transmission of ASFV through semen could be mitigated by point a and point b of Article 15.1.9.

In response to Member Countries' comments that the IETS classifies ASF as Category 4 for embryo production (Article 4.7.14.), the Code Commission amended point 1a of Article 15.1.9.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission amended Article 15.1.12bis. as follows:

- in point 2a the surveillance requirement was clarified and reinforced;
- point 2b was deleted, since a test at the slaughterhouse alone would not provide the same guarantee as point 2a for meat derived from animals of a herd with unknown disease status;
- point 1 and point 2 were reversed according to the sequence of procedures;
- point 3 was added for precautions to avoid contamination.

In response to Member Countries' concerns and to be consistent with Article 15.1.12., the Code Commission modified Article 15.1.13. to only describe conditions of importation of fresh meat of wild and feral pigs from countries and zones free from ASF in the wild population. The Code Commission also reiterated that, as noted in the User's Guide, the absence of an Article or import conditions on any given commodity does not mean that trade in that commodity cannot be conducted safely, or that Member Countries cannot apply appropriate measures.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion, the Code Commission replaced 'examination centre' with 'examination facility' in point 1 of Article 15.1.13.

The Code Commission replaced 'establishment' with 'facility' in point 1b of Article 15.1.14. to avoid confusion with the defined term '*establishment*'. The same rewording was also made in Article 15.1.16., Article 15.1.17. and Article 15.1.17bis.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission added 'from suids' to the title of Article 15.1.17bis. and replaced 'domestic and *captive wild* pigs' with 'suids' in point 1. The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to replace 'skin' with 'hide', as the former has a more general meaning.

The Code Commission deleted ‘domestic or *captive wild*’ in point 1 of Article 15.1.17ter. as such qualification is unnecessary.

In response to a Member Country’s suggestion, the Code Commission created new point 3 to Article 15.1.18. to accommodate any other equivalent treatment.

In response to a Member Country’s comment with a reference to a supporting scientific paper\*, the Code Commission deleted ‘(under study)’ from the title and amended the word order in the text for consistency in Article 15.1.21ter.

\*Turner, C and Williams, SM (1999). Laboratory-scale inactivation of African swine fever virus and swine vesicular disease virus in pig slurry. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*. Volume 87, Issue 1, pages 148–157.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s request to reinstate the bullet point for the role of semen in Article 15.1.22., for the same reason as explained above.

In response to a Member Countries’ comment, the Code Commission deleted ‘apparently healthy’ from the sixth bullet point of Article 15.1.22. as such words are unnecessary to define a ‘carrier’.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to add ticks to point 1 of Article 15.1.24 as ticks are already listed as a risk factor in the paragraphs following this point.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Countries’ suggestion to change the order of Article 15.1.26. and Article 15.1.27., noting the convention of the *Code* chapters which places the surveillance of vectors after the surveillance of animals.

In response to a Member Countries’ suggestion, the Code Commission amended point 3 of Article 15.1.26. to include a reference to awareness campaigns.

In response to a Member Country’s comment, the Code Commission slightly modified Article 15.1.27. for clarification.

The Code Commission also accepted a Member Country’s suggestion, with a reference to a supporting scientific paper, to add ‘CO<sub>2</sub> flagging’ as a sampling method for vectors in Article 15.1.27.

The revised Chapter 15.1. is attached as **Annex 37** for Member Countries’ comments.

**Item 22 Draft new chapter on infection with porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (Chapter 15.X.)**

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

The Code Commission reviewed all comments from Member Countries and advice from the *ad hoc* Group and the Scientific Commission, and amended the text accordingly. Throughout the chapter amendments were made to simplify the text, improve clarity, and align with established *Code* format.

In response to a Member Country’s comment seeking more information on the description of the disease, the Code Commission noted that this information is included in the corresponding *Manual* chapter updated in May 2015.

The Code Commission acknowledged a Member Country’s comment about the extent of the change in pH in meat during processing, but noted that any putative risk linked with meat coming from infected animals was managed by the removal of lymph nodes of head and viscera.



In response to a Member Country's comment that the scope of the chapter should include all pigs, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that the scope should be confined to domestic and captive wild pigs, because the prevalence of infection with PRRSV in wild pigs is negligible, there is no evidence that PRRSV can be maintained in wild or feral pig populations, and there is no evidence that wild pigs play a role in the epidemiology of the disease. Infection of wild pigs is usually a consequence of a spill over of infection from domestic pigs. It also noted that captive wild pigs are defined by their phenotype rather than their source, and that they are usually reared on farms, which justifies their inclusion in the scope of the chapter.

The Code Commission amended and reordered the definitions of infection with PRRSV in response to Member Countries' comments, advice from the *ad hoc* Group and the Scientific Commission and to align with established *Code* format. In doing so, it also noted:

- the primary cause of PRRS is PRRSV, so notification of detection of the virus is required to apply effective risk management;
- infection with PRRSV includes all PRRSV types and effective risk management of infection cannot be limited to pigs expressing clinical signs;
- Article 15.X.1. provides four options to define infection according to common principles applied throughout the *Code*, whether DIVA tests are available or not;
- when investigating infection in a vaccinated herd, serology is of limited value; other methods of virus detection are needed.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission replaced the last paragraph of Article 15.X.1. with text indicating that commodities from domestic and captive wild pigs (as defined in the glossary) can be traded safely according to the provisions of this chapter, in the event that PRRSV is detected in wild or feral pigs.

In response to a Member Country's comment requesting that this chapter should only be adopted after the corresponding *Manual* chapter has been reviewed, the Code Commission noted that the *Manual* chapter has already been reviewed and was adopted in 2015.

On the basis of the extensive evaluation of the published literature undertaken by the *ad hoc* Group and the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission agreed that there is no scientific justification to remove hides, skins and trophies, meat products (as defined in the glossary), or meat and bone meal from the list of proposed safe commodities. On the same basis the Code Commission added gelatine to the list.

Blood by-products were deleted from the list since they are included in the glossary definition of meat products.

The Code Commission noted that a Member Country's request for a glossary definition of casings has been addressed.

In response to Member Countries' comments, a new point 6 was added to Article 15.X.3. to distinguish the different provisions for inactivated and modified live virus vaccines.

In response to Member Countries' comments and advice from the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission deleted the option of emergency vaccination and added the option of slaughter of infected animals to Article 15.X.4.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion that free status should only be regained six months after a stamping out policy is applied, both the Scientific and Code Commissions agreed that three months is sufficient given that no infected animals remain alive after stamping out.

In response to Member Countries' suggestion that pigs exported from countries, zones or compartments free from PRRS should have been resident in that country, zone or compartment since birth or at least for six months, both the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission noted that any animals imported to a free country, zone or compartment according to the provisions of the *Code* will be free from PRRS, and that three months should be sufficient to detect any non-compliant infected case imported by mistake.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission confirms that in chapters that include a definition of countries or zones infected with the subject disease the phrase 'infected with [pathogenic agent]' is used; in chapters that do not include a definition of countries or zones infected with the subject disease the phrase 'not free from [disease]' is used; and the phrase 'considered infected with [disease]' is being progressively deleted from the *Code*.

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission noted that in the context of pigs imported from countries or zones for slaughter, 'immediate' means transported with no stopover and no holding time prior to slaughter.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to delete Article 15.X.7. because the provisions of the Article deliver effective risk management.

Articles 15.X.8. and 15.X.13. were deleted because wild and feral pigs are not epidemiologically significant, and outside the scope of the chapter. The Code Commission also reiterated that, as noted in the User's guide, the absence of an article on any given commodity does not mean that trade in that commodity cannot be conducted safely, or that Member Countries cannot apply appropriate measures.

Both the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission considered as unnecessary a Member Country's suggestion to add a waiting period to the provisions for donor males for semen exported from countries, zones or compartments free from PRRS.

In response to Member Countries' comments and on the basis of advice from the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission separated the provisions for importation of *in vivo* derived embryos into two articles according to countries, zones or compartments free from PRRS and those not free from PRRS. The Commissions noted that as a Category 3 disease in Chapter 4.7., there is preliminary evidence that the risk of PRRSV transmission in embryos is negligible, but additional *in vitro* and *in vivo* experimental data are required to substantiate this conclusion. If experimental data demonstrate that PRRSV is not transmitted via embryos these articles will be revised or deleted. The serological test provisions included for embryos are aligned with the corresponding requirements for live animals.

Article 15.X.14. was deleted because offal is included in the definition of meat (Article 15.X.12.).

In response to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission added the requirement for investigation of suspected cases of PRRS to Article 15.X.16. point 2.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission added a paragraph to Article 15.X.7. to note the limitations of serology in vaccinated animals in the absence of a test to differentiate infected from vaccinated animals.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the text of Article 15.X.17. point 3 was amended to align with the corresponding text in the *Manual*, and point 4 of this Article was amended to recognise that serology in unvaccinated animals with no maternal antibodies can be useful for detection of infection.

The revised Chapter 15.X. is attached as **Annex 38** for Member Countries' comments.

## G. OTHER ISSUES

### Item 23 Update of the Code Commission's work programme

Comments were received from New Zealand and EU.

The Code Commission reviewed and updated its work programme. Taking note of Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission reiterated its commitment to move forward steadily on planned work.

In response to a Member Country's request, the Code Commission added Crimean Congo hemorrhagic fever to the work programme for further consideration of how to develop a chapter.

Regarding a Member Country's request to add lactose as a safe commodity, the Code Commission agreed to assess the safety of lactose together with other commodities when the relevant disease-specific chapters are revised.

Regarding a Member Country's request to review sometimes repetitive and wordy surveillance articles, the Code Commission agreed and, with the cooperation of the Scientific Commission, will attempt to make them clear and concise. This revision will be done when disease-specific chapters are revised.

The revised work programme is attached as **Annex 39** for Member Countries' comments.

### Item 24 Review of applications for recognition as OIE Collaborating Centres

- a) Renaming of NZ-Australia Collaborating Centre (Animal Welfare Science and Bioethical Analysis);
- b) Renaming of USA Collaborating Centre from "Online Veterinary Education" to "Distance Education Tools for OIE Day-One Veterinary Competencies and Continuing Education";
- c) Application for recognition of Thai Collaborating Centre for Veterinary Public Health Capacity Building (Thailand).

The Code Commission endorsed the proposal to rename the existing OIE Collaborating Centre for Animal Welfare Science and Bioethical Analysis as the "David Bayvel OIE Collaborating Centre for Animal Welfare Science and Bioethical Analysis" in recognition of the late Dr Bayvel's contribution to the expansion of OIE's mandate to include animal welfare.

The Code Commission also noted and supported the proposal to rename a previously endorsed proposal from the USA as the OIE Collaborating Centre for "Distance Education Tools for OIE Day-One Veterinary Competencies and Continuing Education".

Finally the Code Commission reviewed the completed application from Thailand, and confirmed it met the required criteria to establish a Collaborating Centre for Veterinary Public Health Capacity Building.

**Item 25 Dates of next meetings**

The next Code Commission meeting will be held on September 5–16 inclusive, and the scheduled dates for the following meeting are February 13–24 2017.

---