



Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Original: English  
February 2019

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

Paris, 19–28 February 2019

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at OIE Headquarters in Paris from 19 to 28 February 2019. The list of participants is attached as [Annex 1](#).

The Code Commission thanked the following Member Countries for providing comments: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China (People's Republic), Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, the Member States of European Union (EU) and 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 Global Alliance of Pet Food Associations (GAPFA) International Egg Commission (IEC), the International Poultry Council (IPC), the International Coalition for Animal Welfare (ICFAW) and other experts.

The Code Commission reviewed Member Country comments, which were submitted on time and supported by a rationale and amended relevant chapters of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Terrestrial Code*) where appropriate. **The Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.** Due to the large volume of work, the Code 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. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided.

The amendments are presented in the usual manner by 'double underline' and '~~strike through~~' and the chapters are annexed to this report. In Annexes 4 to 18, amendments proposed at this meeting are highlighted with a coloured background to distinguish them from those proposed previously.

The Code Commission encourages Member Countries to refer to previous reports when preparing comments on longstanding issues. The Code Commission also draws the attention of Member Countries to those instances where the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (the Scientific Commission), the Biological Standards Commission, a Working Group or an *ad hoc* Group has addressed specific Member Country comments or questions and proposed answers or amendments. In such cases the rationale is described in the Scientific Commission's, Biological Standards Commission's, Working Group's or *ad hoc* Group's reports and Member Countries are encouraged to review these reports together with the report of the Code Commission. These reports are readily available on the [OIE website](#).

Member Countries should note that texts in **Part A (Annexes 3 to 13)** of this report will be proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019. **Part B (Annexes 14 to 25)** includes some texts that have been circulated for Member Country comments.

All comments on relevant texts in **Part B** must reach OIE Headquarters **by 4 July 2019** for them to be considered at the September 2019 meeting of the Code Commission. Comments received after the due date will not be submitted to the Code Commission for its consideration. In addition, the Code Commission would like to highlight that comments should be submitted through the OIE Delegate of Member Countries or organisations which the OIE has a Cooperative Agreement with.

All comments and related documents should be sent by email to the OIE Standards Department at: [standards.dept@oie.int](mailto:standards.dept@oie.int).

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. Member Countries are also reminded that comments should be submitted as Word files rather than pdf files because pdf files are difficult to incorporate into the working documents of the Code Commission. Comments should be submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a structured rationale or by published scientific references. Proposed deletions should be shown using '~~strikethrough~~' and additions using 'double underline'. Member Countries should not use the automatic 'track-changes' function provided by word processing software as such changes are lost in the process of collating Member Countries submissions into the Code Commission's working documents. Member Countries are also requested **not** to reproduce the full text of a chapter as this makes it easy to miss comments while preparing the working documents.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Part A: Annex No.</b>
1	Welcome and orientation	4	-
2	Performance Management Framework	4	-
3	Adoption of agenda	4	2
4	Cooperation with other Specialist Commissions	4	-
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Texts to be proposed for adoption in May 2019</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Part A: Annex No.</b>
5.1	Glossary Part A ('early warning system' and 'sanitary measure')	5	3
5.2	Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.)	5	4
5.3	Draft new chapter on introduction to recommendations for disease prevention and control (Chapter 4.Z.)	9	5
5.4	The role of the Veterinary Services in food safety systems (Articles 6.2.3. and 6.2.4.)	9	6
5.5	Guiding principles for the use of measures to assess animal welfare (Article 7.1.4.)	11	7
5.6	Animal welfare and pig production systems (Articles 7.13.4. and 7.13.15.)	11	8
5.7	Draft new chapter on killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products (Chapter 7.Y.)	11	9
5.8	Infection with rabies virus (Chapter 8.14.)	14	10
5.9	Infection with <i>Chlamydomphila abortus</i> (Enzootic abortion of ewes, ovine chlamydiosis) (Article 14.4.1.)	15	11
	Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Article 1.3.3.)	15	12
5.10	Infection with African swine fever virus (Articles 15.1.1.-bis, 15.1.2., 15.1.3., 15.1.16., 15.1.22., 15.1.31.)	16	13
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Texts for Member Country comments</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Part B: Annex No.</b>
6.1	Glossary Part B ('epidemiological unit')	17	14
6.2	Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1.)	18	15
6.3	Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE (Chapter 1.6.)	19	16
6.4	Veterinary legislation (Chapter 3.4.)	20	17
6.5	Draft new chapter on official control programmes for listed and emerging diseases (Chapter 4.Y.)	23	18

6.6	Draft new chapter on animal welfare and laying hen production systems (Chapter 7.Z.)	27	-
6.7	Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4.)	27	-
6.8	Infection with classical swine fever virus (Chapter 15.2.)	27	-
7.1	User's Guide	27	19
7.2	Infection with <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> complex (Chapter 8.11.)	28	20
	Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Article 1.3.1.)	28	21
7.3	Infection with Rift Valley fever virus (Chapter 8.15.)	28	22
7.4	Infection with equine influenza (Article 12.6.6.)	29	23
7.5/8.9	Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus (Articles 14.7.3. and 14.7.34.)	29	24
11	Work programme	34	25
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Other topics</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	
8.1	Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.1.) and Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2.)	29	-
8.2	Update on the work on semen and embryos (Chapters 4.5. to 4.9.)	29	-
8.3	Update on the outcomes of the second <i>ad hoc</i> Group meeting on the revision of Chapter 7.5. Slaughter of animals and Chapter 7.6. Killing for disease control purposes	30	-
8.4	Draft Terms of Reference for an <i>ad hoc</i> Group on the revision of Chapter 7.7. Stray dog population control	30	-
8.5	Infection with rinderpest virus (Chapter 8.16.)	30	-
8.6	Outcomes of three <i>ad hoc</i> Group meetings on the revision of BSE chapter (Chapter 11.4.)	30	-
8.7	New/revised articles for the temporary movement of horses	30	-
8.8	Outcomes of <i>ad hoc</i> Group on animal trypanosomoses	31	-
8.9	Harmonisation of <i>Terrestrial Code</i> chapters for diseases with OIE official status recognition	31	-
8.10	Establishment of a Standard Operating Procedure guiding listing decisions for pathogenic agents	31	-
8.11	Consideration of specified dairy products as safe commodities	32	-
8.12	Control of Shiga toxin-producing <i>E. coli</i> (STEC) in food-producing animals	32	-
8.13	Update on standards for pet food	32	-
9.1	Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine (Chapter 6.10.)	32	-
9.2	Update on OIE Curricula Guidelines for Veterinary Paraprofessionals	33	-
10	Applications for OIE Collaborating Centres	33	-
12	Date of next meeting	34	-

## 1. Welcome and orientation

### 1.1. Meeting with the Director General

The Code Commission met with Dr Monique Eloit, the OIE Director General, on 21 February 2019. Dr Eloit welcomed the Code Commission members and thanked them for their support and commitment to achieving OIE objectives.

The Director General updated the Code Commission on the schedule for the General Session in May 2019 and recent changes in the organisation structure of OIE Headquarters and discussed with members of the Code Commission its work programme, and other topics related to the work and performance of the Commission.

## 2. Performance management framework

The Code Commission met with Dr Matthew Stone, the OIE Deputy Director General (DDG) for International Standards and Science, on 19 February 2019. Dr Stone presented the new Performance Management Framework and discussed with Code Commission members the objective of this framework, which is the continuous improvement of the work of all the Specialist Commissions and the OIE Secretariat in order to improve their work for the benefit of the OIE Member Countries. He noted that this process includes regular meetings between Commission members and the DDG, the Presidents and the Director General, and a brief meeting review at the end of each meeting.

## 3. Adoption of agenda

The proposed agenda was discussed, taking into consideration priorities of the work programme and time availability. The adopted agenda of the meeting is attached as [Annex 2](#).

## 4. Cooperation with other Specialist Commissions

### 4.1. Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases

- **Joint meeting**

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission held a Joint meeting on 21 February 2019 chaired by the Director General, Dr Monique Eloit. The meeting provided an opportunity for members of the two Commissions to meet and discuss items of common interest, notably: relevant chapters to be proposed for adoption at the upcoming General Session; the establishment of a formal written Standard Operating Procedure guiding listing decisions for pathogenic agents; a proposed work programme for the harmonisation of requirements for the official recognition and maintenance of disease-free status and endorsement of official control programmes in disease-specific chapters; and the Specialist Commission Presidents' presentations at the General Session.

All members agreed that this meeting provided an excellent mechanism to strengthen collaboration between the two Commissions. It was agreed to hold this meeting annually during the February Commission meetings.

- **Technical working group meeting related to the concept of 'temporary protection zone'**

Following on from the initiative started in September 2018, the Presidents and First Vice Presidents of the Scientific Commission and Code Commission held a technical working group meeting at the margins of the two Commission meetings. The meeting was chaired by the OIE Deputy Director General for International Standards and Science, Dr Matthew Stone.

The main objective of the meeting was to discuss and further develop existing zoning provisions in the *Terrestrial Code* and the OIE procedure for official recognition of disease status, in order to allow and encourage Member Countries to implement enhanced preventive measures to protect their sanitary status in response to an increased risk of disease incursion, while minimising the impact on their status and consequently on trade.

The two Commissions agreed on an approach to be followed and requested OIE Headquarters to present the draft amendments to Chapter 4.3. and disease-specific chapters, where relevant, for consideration at their respective meetings.

#### **4.2. Biological Standards Commission**

The meeting schedule did not allow for a meeting with the President of the Biological Standards Commission. OIE Headquarters provided a brief update on the activities of the Biological Standards Commission from its September 2018 meeting, including the chapters for revision in the *Terrestrial Manual* and other items of interest for the Code Commission. In addition, there was consultation on some of the comments received that was coordinated through the Secretariats.

### **5. Texts to be proposed for adoption at the General Session in May 2019**

#### **5.1. Glossary**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada and Malaysia.

##### **Sanitary measure**

The Code Commission did not agree with comments to include ‘compartment’ in the definition of ‘sanitary measure’ because sanitary measures are taken by a Member Country to protect its territory, i.e. a given geographical area, while a compartment as defined in the Glossary is based on biosecurity management.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to align the definition of ‘sanitary measure’ with the one of the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organisation as the definition in the Glossary of the *Terrestrial Code* is more relevant for its use in animal health than the WTO definition, and the term ‘hazard’ is already defined in the Glossary.

The Glossary definitions for ‘sanitary measure’ and ‘early warning system’ are attached as **Annex 3** and are proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

#### **5.2. Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Georgia, Japan, Malaysia, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Peru, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission considered all comments and made amendments to improve clarity and readability, where relevant. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. In addition, the Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.

In response to a comment proposing a revised structure for the chapter, the Code Commission noted that given this chapter is to be proposed for adoption in May 2019, it would consider this suggestion at a future time.

Amendments were made in the chapter in response to a comment on ensuring consistency in the use of the terms ‘target population’ and ‘study population’.

##### **Article 1.4.1.**

In line with the approach taken in Chapter 1.1., the Code Commission did not agree with a comment suggesting to retain the word ‘disease’ in association with ‘infection or infestation’. The Code Commission explained that as a general principle, and following extensive discussions that accompanied the deletion of its definition from the Glossary, the term ‘disease’ is used throughout the *Terrestrial Code* to refer to general aspects pertaining to the expression, epidemiology and transmission of pathogenic agents with the exception of some defined terms that include the word ‘disease’ (listed disease, notifiable disease, emerging disease). On the other hand, the terms ‘infection’ and ‘infestation’, which are also defined terms, are used in more specific contexts such as cases, incursion, outbreaks, control and eradication. All three terms, i.e. ‘disease’, ‘infection’ and ‘infestation’ can be used when referring to a status, such as ‘freedom from’.

The Code Commission noted that given the significant work involved in making these amendments, the application of this new approach for these terms may not have been applied consistently throughout the *Terrestrial Code*. The Code Commission therefore requested OIE Headquarters to conduct a thorough review on the application of these terms and to provide an update at its September 2019 meeting.

#### **Article 1.4.2.**

In agreement with the advice of the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment proposing to add a definition for ‘surveillance system sensitivity’ and changing the definition for ‘confidence’, as it considered that the current definition of ‘confidence’ captures the concept of surveillance system sensitivity. Moreover, a definition for the term ‘surveillance system sensitivity’ is not necessary given that this term is not used in the chapter.

#### **Article 1.4.3.**

For point 1(b), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add a new indent on ‘disease prevention and control measures’, as it considered that measures such as vaccination or restocking after disinfection could also influence the timing of surveillance.

For point 1(c), in line with the views of the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include more detail under ‘Case definition’ to discriminate between suspicious, probable, confirmed and rejected cases. While recognising that some national control programmes may benefit from the inclusion of such definitions, the Code Commission stressed that the purpose of this point is to define confirmed cases. The Code Commission also agreed with the Scientific Commission that in some disease-specific chapters, the definition of a suspected case may be included when relevant (e.g. rabies and rinderpest).

For point 1(ebis), the Code Commission did not agree with comments to change the title from ‘Diagnostic tests’ to ‘Diagnostic tools’ noting that the text of the point is not limited only to laboratory testing but may also refer to different diagnostic methods that could allow for the detection of a disease. This approach was supported by the Biological Standards Commission which explained that in the *Terrestrial Manual* the term used for laboratory tests is ‘test method’ which is defined as a ‘specified technical procedure for detection of an analyte (synonymous with assay)’.

In response to a comment received on ‘pensive tests’, the Code Commission agreed with the advice of the Biological Standards Commission that the provisions for diagnostic tests covers ‘pensive tests’ and amended the text to improve clarity. Both Commissions emphasised that according to Chapter 1.1.6. ‘Principles and methods of validation of diagnostic assays for infectious diseases’ of the *Terrestrial Manual*, all diagnostic assays (laboratory and field assays) should be validated for the species in which they will be used.

In the second paragraph of point 1(ebis), the Code Commission considered the comments received, in particular the parameters that could have an impact on the conclusions drawn from surveillance, and sought advice from the Biological Standards Commission and Scientific Commission. Based on their advice, the Code Commission proposed modifications to the wording to improve clarity. The Code Commission agreed to delete ‘imperfect’ as there is no such thing as a perfect test. However, the Code Commission did not remove ‘predictive values’ as these are essential parameters.

For point 1(f), a comment was received for the OIE to provide practical guidance on applying sophisticated mathematical or statistical analyses in surveillance, including collection of appropriate field data. The Code Commission, in consultation with the Scientific Commission, agreed that the quality of data is critical for the interpretation of the results from models and any other statistical analysis, and considered this to be covered in point 2(b) on ‘Data collection and management’. The Commissions also noted that this issue was addressed in detail in the following OIE publications: *Guide to Terrestrial Animal Health Surveillance* and *Handbook on Import Risk Analysis for Animals and Animal Products*.

For point 2(a), advice was sought from the Scientific Commission and Biological Standards Commission on a comment received in September 2018 requesting to refer to target species. The Code Commission agreed to replace ‘each species in which they may be used’ with ‘target species’ for clarity. In agreement with the advice from the two other Commissions, the Code Commission did not accept the comment to include reference to expert estimates to support tests where validation data is lacking for non-target species, as it is hard to give an estimation when a test has not been validated in a species. In this case, Member Countries should refer to Chapter 1.1.6. of the *Terrestrial Manual* or other relevant data.

In the first paragraph of point 3, the Code Commission agreed to delete the word ‘significant’ as it considered that the primary role of the auditing would be to identify **any** deviation of procedures from those specified in the design, so that reviews may be conducted and appropriate corrective actions implemented where necessary.

#### **Article 1.4.4.**

For point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to refer to ‘risk’ communication as this article refers to general communication activities, and not only to risk communication that is part of the Glossary definition of risk analysis. This decision was also applied to similar comments received on this point in other parts of this chapter.

For point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘sampling’ before ‘units’, as it considered that sampling is undertaken to select units from the study population, and the resulting units being sampled then become ‘sampling units’. This is in line with the definitions provided in Article 1.4.2.

For point 2(b)(i), after consultation with the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission agreed with the comments to clarify the wording on the objective of sampling. The Commissions’ rationale for this amendment was that **either** probability-based or non-probability-based sampling method may be recommended, depending on the objective of the study. In some cases, samples are deliberately non-representative (e.g. risk-based sampling), and this type of sampling can be more appropriate if the aim is to maximise disease detection. In that case, representativeness is not necessarily required, but could be ensured if risk factors are weighted and underpinned by scientific evidence. If these requirements are met, the results of a non-probability sampling could also be extrapolated to the target population.

For point 2(b)(ii), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to add more detail on the size of the population according to the different alternatives described in the definition for epidemiological unit. The Code Commission considered it was not necessary, as it would depend on the methodology selected and the epidemiological unit being considered.

For point 2(b)(iii), the Code Commission sought the advice of the Scientific Commission on a comment to merge cluster and risk-based sampling. The Scientific Commission did not agree with the comment that cluster sampling is always part of risk-based sampling, explaining that cluster sampling can be used as part of risk-based sampling but can also be used in other contexts. Based on this advice, the Code Commission did not agree to modify the current text.

In the same point, the Code Commission did not agree to remove ‘expert choice’ because it may be relevant in some cases.

Regarding a comment on the term ‘risk’ being featured in both probability-based and non-probability-based sampling methods, in agreement with advice from the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission recalled that risk-based methods can be used in both sampling methods.

The Code Commission did not agree with comments requesting to either delete or to provide further elaboration on the sampling methods in point 2(b)(iii). The Code Commission concurred with the Scientific Commission that it was not within the scope of the *Terrestrial Code* to provide definitions for the different sampling methods, and encouraged Member Countries to refer to relevant epidemiological texts.

For point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace 'risk assessment' with 'scientific evaluation of risk of pathogen entry and establishment' as all the components of risk assessment are useful in establishing risk-based methods for surveillance.

For point 4, the Code Commission agreed to include a new paragraph at the end to address important surveillance data that may be generated from locations other than slaughterhouses/abattoirs, such as rendering plants and hunting places.

For point 6, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include the need for training and awareness of animal keepers on signs of disease that need to be investigated, noting that this is crucial for the early detection of a disease.

In response to a comment regarding the structure and organisation of points under this article, the Code Commission explained that the objective of this article was to highlight topics considered most relevant for the Veterinary Service to develop, while covering under point 8 'Other useful data', other sources of information arising from existing activities that could provide surveillance data.

#### **Article 1.4.5.**

For point 1, the Code Commission replaced 'coverage' with 'access to, and authority over' in response to a comment that the term 'coverage' needed to be clarified.

For point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to modify the text as it considered that training and awareness programmes for various stakeholders involved in the handling of animals from the farm to the slaughterhouse/abattoir are essential for detecting and reporting unusual animal health events.

For point 5, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text to better reflect that epidemiological investigations of **suspected cases** are conducted to confirm cases, and epidemiological investigations of **cases** are carried out to acquire accurate knowledge of the situation.

#### **Article 1.4.6.**

In response to a comment related to the concept of 'disease freedom' provided in the proposed Article 1.4.6., the Code Commission stressed that the proposed text does not imply any change to the current principles for zoning or country freedom already defined in the *Terrestrial Code*.

For point 1, proposed amendments were made by the Code Commission for clarity.

For point 2(a)(iii), following a comment from OIE Headquarters on amendments to ensure harmonisation of relevant provisions across all disease chapters with official recognition, and in agreement with the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission proposed to add new text on the movement of commodities.

For point 2(a)(iv), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to qualify that for some diseases, the presence of infection or infestation in wildlife does not preclude demonstration of freedom if the wildlife are geographically isolated or separated by adequate biosecurity, as this is already covered in the third paragraph of point 1 of this article.

For point 2(a), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include a new indent that no vaccination against the disease had been carried out except for emergency vaccination, as a prerequisite to declare a country or a zone free from an infection or infestation. The Code Commission recalled that a former point on this had been deleted in agreement with the Scientific Commission, as vaccination of animals should be considered a valuable tool to prevent infection or infestation. The impact of vaccination on disease status may be found in Article 4.17.11. and in disease-specific chapters, where relevant. Furthermore, the Code Commission noted that Chapter 4.17. also includes details regarding vaccination and surveillance, and thus no amendments were necessary.



For point 2(b)(i) and 2(b)(iii), advice was sought from the Scientific Commission in response to a comment requesting a rationale for the times prescribed. Both the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission noted that these time references were included when the chapter was first adopted in 2005 and that no new scientific evidence has been provided to date to support modification of the currently accepted timeframes. However, the Code Commission explained that the concept of historical freedom is related to the absence of infection for a sufficient time so that the susceptible population that might have been exposed to the disease would be completely renewed. When the chapter was first adopted, it was agreed that the 25-year period was linked to the lifespan of most domestic susceptible population, and the 10-year waiting period was based on the detection of identifiable clinical or pathological signs which may be masked in the presence of immunity due to vaccination.

For point 2(c), in response to comments pertaining to the length of time for surveillance to be conducted, the Code Commission did not include new text but changed the order of the points listed for clarity. This was also applied to point 3 for consistency.

For former point 4(e) on ‘vaccination against the disease is not applied’ which was previously deleted, the Code Commission agreed with a comment regarding its relevance and proposed to cover this in point 1 of this article by adding a sentence in the first paragraph that reads ‘It should take into account any prevention measures in place such as vaccination in accordance with this chapter and Chapter 4.17.’.

The revised Chapter 1.4. Animal health surveillance is attached as **Annex 4** and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

### **5.3. Draft new chapter on Introduction to recommendations for the prevention and control of transmissible animal diseases (Chapter 4.Z.)**

Comments were received from Australia and AU-IBAR.

#### **Title**

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘transmissible animal diseases’ in the title of this chapter to improve consistency.

#### **Article 4.Z.1.**

The Code Commission agreed with proposed changes that improved clarity of the chapter.

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘should’ with ‘could’. The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that the use of ‘should’ is standard language of the *Terrestrial Code* when referring to recommendations to be implemented, and this does not infer an absolute obligation. ‘Shall’ on the other hand, refers to something compulsory in the *Terrestrial Code* as used in Chapter 1.1.

In the seventh paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to indicate that prerequisites ‘may’ include those listed, noting that all of the outlined prerequisites are required to ensure that prevention and control programmes are effective, including public-private partnerships.

For the first indent, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘sufficient oversight from the Veterinary Authority’ as it considered that this was already addressed in the definition of Veterinary Services.

For the sixth indent, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘relevant’ before Competent Authorities as this was implied.

The revised Chapter 4.Z. Introduction to recommendations for the prevention and control of transmissible animal diseases is attached as **Annex 5** and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

#### **5.4. The role of the Veterinary Services in food safety systems (Articles 6.2.3. and 6.2.4.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, New Zealand and EU.

The Code Commission considered all comments and made amendments to improve clarity and readability, where relevant. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. In addition, the Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.

The Code Commission reiterated that the scope of Chapter 6.2. is on the role of Veterinary Services in food safety and is not intended to prescribe the structure of regulatory controls of food safety systems. The Code Commission acknowledged that the role of Veterinary Services can be very limited or very extensive but in either case, the work of the Veterinary Services should be under the supervision of the Veterinary Authority or other Competent Authority, as noted in point 1 of Article 6.2.4. The Code Commission emphasised that this chain of command is clear and that it is up to each Member Country to organise its Veterinary Services and overall regulatory control over food safety in order to comply with ensuring production of safe food of animal origin. The Code Commission also clarified that the scope is limited to pathogenic agents of animal origin of veterinary public health importance.

The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that revisions to this chapter had been adopted in 2018 and that the Code Commission had only proposed changes to Article 6.2.4. to address a Member Country's concern raised during the General Session discussion prior to adoption. Therefore, comments submitted should have addressed only the proposed amendments and not other text which had been recently adopted. Only one comment on Article 6.2.3. was addressed (see below).

A number of comments emphasised major concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the Glossary definitions of Competent Authority, Veterinary Services and Veterinary Authority as they considered these proposed new definitions to be restrictive, that the changes may impact the accuracy and interpretation of this and other chapters, and that they did not reflect the regulatory controls for food safety in all OIE Member Countries. The Code Commission acknowledged the comments received and agreed to take them into account in the ongoing work to revise these definitions (see Item 6.1.). The Code Commission emphasised that the current Glossary definitions of Competent Authority, Veterinary Services and Veterinary Authority should be referred to for the interpretation of this and other chapters, until changes to the definitions have been agreed and adopted by the World Assembly of Delegates.

The Code Commission referred Member Countries to Item 6.1. Glossary regarding the process for reviewing these definitions.

##### **Article 6.2.3.**

In response to a comment to move 'regularly' before 'assess' in the last sentence of this article, the Code Commission acknowledged that it had missed this comment at its last meeting and modified the text accordingly.

##### **Article 6.2.4.**

The Code Commission did not agree to replace Veterinary Services or Veterinary Authorities with Competent Authority throughout this article noting that the scope of this article is the roles and responsibilities of Veterinary Services in a food safety system and that the purpose of this article is to clarify where Veterinary Services have a precise role, as well as their relation with the Veterinary Authority or Competent Authorities, where relevant. The Code Commission highlighted that the important aspect is that a country should have in place relevant activities to ensure the production of safe food. In addition, the Code Commission agreed that until any amendments to the definitions of Competent Authority, Veterinary Services and Veterinary Authority are adopted, no change to the use or interpretation of these terms should be made.

In the fourth paragraph of point 1, the Code Commission considered comments to add ‘risk analysis’ and ‘advising on mitigation measures’. Whilst the Code Commission agreed that these are part of other food safety-related activities, it did not agree to add these texts as it considered them to be too specific compared to the other examples provided. It also noted that the term ‘such as’ introduces examples and does not imply an exhaustive list.

In the fifth paragraph of point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘for veterinary public health as specified in the *Terrestrial Code* with the given rationale that food safety systems are much wider than those covered in the *Terrestrial Code*. The Code Commission explained that when using the term Veterinary Services, it is within the context of the *Terrestrial Code* and thus it was not necessary to specify this reference.

In the first paragraph of point 2, the Code Commission agreed with comments to clarify what was meant by ‘the first part of the food chain’. Taking into consideration the different ways of structuring regulatory controls over food safety systems among Member Countries, the Code Commission agreed that it was not possible to clearly define this aspect and replaced ‘**the** first (part)’ by ‘**a** (part)’ to allow more flexibility for Member Countries.

In the first paragraph of point 2(a), the Code Commission agreed that the sentence was overly long and split the sentence to improve clarity.

In the second paragraph of point 2(a), the Code Commission explained that the words ‘including feed’ was to emphasise the importance of feed as part of primary production activities. The Code Commission agreed to keep the text as written.

In the first paragraph of point 2(b), the Code Commission agreed to add the adjective ‘animal’ to the term ‘by-products’ for clarity. The Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to consider whether a Glossary definition for this term was necessary.

The revised Articles 6.2.3. and 6.2.4. are attached as **Annex 6** and are proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

#### **5.5. Guiding principles for the use of measures to assess animal welfare (Article 7.1.4.)**

Comments were received from Canada, Japan, Mongolia, Norway, Switzerland and the EU.

The Code Commission considered all comments and made amendments to improve clarity and readability, where relevant. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. In addition, the Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to include the term ‘threshold’ to complement the use of ‘target values’, reflecting minimum acceptable levels and potential optimal values respectively, before corrective interventions are taken.

The revised Article 7.1.4. Guiding principles for the use of measures to assess animal welfare is attached as **Annex 7** and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

#### **5.6. Animal welfare and pig production systems (Articles 7.13.4. and 7.13.15.)**

Comments were received from Chile, Switzerland, Thailand, EU and AU-IBAR.

##### **Article 7.13.15.**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘discharges from nose or eyes’, which was provided as an example of an animal-based measurable for air quality, as it considered that this example is in line with other examples provided in Article 7.13.4. Criteria (or measurables) for the welfare of pigs.

In response to a request for clarification regarding the use of the term ‘culling rate’ as an animal-based measurable, the Code Commission explained that culling rates are used to define the proportion of animals removed from production because of age, health or animal welfare concerns.

Articles 7.13.4. and 7.13.15 are attached as **Annex 8** and are proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

### **5.7. Draft new chapter Killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products (Chapter 7.Y.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, New Caledonia, Norway, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

OIE Headquarters informed the Code Commission that the *ad hoc* Group on Killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products could not meet electronically to review comments received on the draft Chapter 7.Y. circulated in the Code Commission’s September 2018 meeting report. Nevertheless, some members of the *ad hoc* Group provided their individual responses on the comments received and these responses were considered by the Code Commission.

The Code Commission considered all comments and made amendments to improve clarity and readability, where relevant. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. In addition, the Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.

The Code Commission noted that comments received were supportive of the draft chapter.

Although the term ‘animal’ was replaced by ‘reptile’ at its September 2018 meeting, additional amendments were made by the Code Commission after a further review of these terms to ensure consistency.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include a table summarising different stunning and killing methods and associated animal welfare issues, noting that tables are no longer used in the animal welfare chapters. The Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to explore the possibility of including such information in the animal welfare pages on the OIE Website.

In response to some comments requesting improvements in the Spanish and French versions of this draft chapter, the Code Commission proposed amendments to the Spanish and French versions and requested OIE Headquarters to consider these suggestions when preparing the revised draft chapters.

#### **Article 7.Y.3.**

The Code Commission did not agree with comments to replace ‘verifying’ with ‘monitoring’ and reminded Member Countries that as explained in its September 2018 report, ‘verification’ refers to checking an individual reptile, while monitoring suggests on-going confirmation of the process conducted by more specialised staff.

In point 3 on ‘Behavioural consideration for handling, restraining and stunning and killing’, the Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to reword the first sentence to emphasise that reptiles have specific characteristics that should be considered during handling. The Code Commission also amended the article heading accordingly.

In the third indent of point 3, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to complement the information regarding the ability of reptiles to harm handlers, agreeing that reptiles are also capable of causing significant injuries via constriction or blunt trauma.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to add a new indent ‘propensity to regurgitate and choke when restrained inappropriately’ to highlight that taping the jaw of the reptile risks suffocating the animal.

**Article 7.Y.5.**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to modify the first paragraph as it did not consider that the proposal improved readability. However, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add a new indent regarding ‘the extent to which movement of the reptile can be restricted’, which might influence the choice of the killing method.

In the first indent of the third paragraph regarding the expected outcomes of the killing process, the Code Commission agreed to replace the term ‘avoid’ with ‘minimise’ as it was a more appropriate term. ‘Avoid’ could be interpreted as the total absence of welfare problems whereas ‘minimise’ reflects what is achievable in practice.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a new indent in this section to address the stress to neighbouring reptiles but agreed that this could be addressed by making ‘reptile’ plural in the first indent so that this point now addresses all the reptiles in the same enclosure that could be affected by killing.

**Article 7.Y.6.**

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace the term ‘verification’ with ‘monitoring’ noting that this was consistent with its response to a similar comment considered in Article 7.Y.3.

The Code Commission did not agree with comments to add ‘righting reflex’ and ‘response to pinch test’ to the list of criteria regarded as sufficient to establish suspicion of consciousness when stunning reptiles. This decision was based on expert advice that there is insufficient scientific information to consider this a reliable criterion.

For the third and fourth indents, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to specify that the blink or nictitating membrane response to determine death in reptiles can only be used in species where eyelids are present and amended the text accordingly. The Code Commission agreed that this amendment also addressed another comment to specify that snakes are not included in this criteria.

The Code Commission did not agree with comments to modify the last point of this article, firstly because the comment on brain destruction is related to the method to kill the reptile, which is addressed in Article 7.Y.14. on pithing; and secondly, as it is well understood that cardiac activity could be influenced by other physiological and environmental conditions in reptiles, it should not be used as the sole indicator of death.

**Article 7.Y.8.**

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace the term ‘avoid’ with ‘minimise’, for consistency with changes made in Article 7.Y.5.

**Article 7.Y.9.**

In the eighth indent of the second paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘species’ for consistency with similar text used in this chapter.

The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to limit the use of the electrical stunning method to crocodiles less than two metres, noting that scientific literature does not support this proposal. In addition, the Code Commission noted that this method in reptiles could be associated with handling difficulties rather than the effectiveness of the stunning method.

**Article 7.Y.13.**

The Code Commission did not agree with the comment to include a new point indicating that reptiles should be effectively restrained when using the gunshot method, noting that this could be misinterpreted as manual restraint, which is explicitly not recommended when using gunshot as a killing method because of the safety concerns for the personnel involved.

Regarding a comment on including illustrations to depict the accurate shot position when using the gunshot method, the Code Commission stated that illustrations and diagrams have been removed from animal welfare chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*, but could be provided as a guidance document on the OIE website once this chapter is adopted.

#### **Article 7.Y.15.**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include a time limit between stunning and severance of the spinal cord. The Code Commission considered this addition to be unnecessary given that the text indicates that severance of the spinal cord should take place immediately after stunning and only when the reptile is unconscious.

#### **Article 7.Y.16.**

For the second indent, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘dosage’ with ‘dose’, but not the addition of ‘dose rate’.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include age as a factor to consider when using chemical agents and noted that the age of a reptile is correlated with its size and therefore size should be considered when determining the dose of a chemical agent, especially if the desired outcome is the death of the reptile.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include a new indent to emphasise that chemical agents should not be used when the meat is for human consumption. The Code Commission considered that this aspect is already addressed in the first paragraph of this article, where it states that the use of these agents should be ‘in accordance with the requirements of the *Competent Authority*’.

#### **Article 7.Y.17.**

For the ninth indent, the Code Commission agreed with comments to replace the term ‘paralysing’ with ‘neuro-muscular blocking drugs’ noting that the latter is a more accurate term.

The revised new Chapter 7.Y. Killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products is attached as **Annex 9** and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

### **5.8. Infection with rabies virus (Chapter 8.14.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, China (People’s Republic), Chinese Taipei, Japan, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Switzerland, USA and EU.

The Code Commission considered all comments and made amendments to improve clarity and readability, where relevant. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. In addition, the Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.

Regarding a general comment to include recommendations for the control of rabies in wildlife in this chapter, the Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission that the provisions, as written, already captured provisions for disease freedom that are applicable to both domestic and wildlife. In addition, the Code Commission pointed out that the *Terrestrial Manual* includes tools for monitoring vaccination campaigns in wildlife. The Code Commission highlighted that the current global priority is dog-mediated rabies, and therefore additional provisions for wildlife would be looked at in the next revision of the chapter.

#### **Article 8.14.1.**

The Code Commission accepted comments that improved the clarity of this Article.

In the fifth paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete ‘haematophagous’ agreeing that it is not only haematophagous bats that carry the rabies virus.

In the definition of dog-mediated rabies under the second indent, the Code Commission and Scientific Commission did not agree with a comment to specify variants as they did not consider it would improve the definition and may on the contrary restrict the scope of the definition. If the rabies virus strain evolves and becomes adapted to the dog population, even if the variant was originally associated with other species (e.g. bat-associated variants), the new evolved strain should also be considered dog-mediated.

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed that the correct scientific name for dog is '*Canis lupus familiaris*' and therefore replaced the term '*Canis familiaris*'.

#### **Article 8.14.2.**

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to insert a new point on 'record of regular and prompt animal disease reporting' for relevance and consistency with the ongoing harmonisation work of the OIE for diseases with official recognition.

#### **Article 8.14.2.-ter**

As above, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to insert a new point regarding the history of disease reporting under point 1(a).

Although it is already specified in point 1(e) that a country or zone may be considered free from dog-mediated rabies when no case of 'indigenously acquired dog-mediated rabies' has occurred during the past 24 months, for clarity, the Code Commission accepted a comment to insert an indent to point 2 that an imported case confirmed outside a quarantine station does not affect the disease status.

The Code Commission did not agree with a proposal to include 'the presence of rabies virus in cattle transmitted by haematophagous bats and antigenic variants that do not correspond to rabies transmitted by dogs' in point 2, as it considered this unnecessary given the scope of the article (dog-mediated rabies), the definition of dog-mediated rabies, and provisions in point 1.

#### **Article 8.14.5.**

Considering the divergent views between the Code Commission, the Scientific Commission, the OIE *ad hoc* Group for rabies and some of the comments received, the Code Commission proposed to revert to the text in the current version of the *Terrestrial Code* for this article (i.e. provisions in Article 8.14.6. of the current *Terrestrial Code*). In order to inform further discussions on the timeframe for vaccination, testing and shipment of animals, the Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to seek further expert opinion on this issue, in particular the likelihood that animals with positive antibody titres may be incubating the virus and thus pose a risk for importing countries.

In response to a comment regarding the conditions in the model veterinary certificate, the Code Commission confirmed that if this article is significantly revised, Chapter 5.11. on the model international veterinary certificate would need to be updated accordingly.

#### **Article 8.14.6.**

The Code Commission clarified that the rationale for limiting the provisions to members of the Order *Carnivora* and *Chiroptera* was based on the consideration that non-carnivorous mammals are dead-end hosts and play no significant role in the epidemiology of rabies. It considered that the risk for the spread of rabies via these mammals through international trade was low, and a standalone article to address each species or type of susceptible mammals was not warranted. The Code Commission also noted that this did not limit a country from undertaking its own risk analysis and applying relevant measures on the risk posed by these animals.

Nonetheless, in view of the divergent views of the Code Commission, the Scientific Commission, the OIE *ad hoc* Group on rabies and some comments received on this article, the Code Commission proposed to revert to the provisions in Article 8.14.7. of the current *Terrestrial Code* pertaining to the importation of mammals, in order to proceed with the proposal for adoption of the two revised Articles 8.14.8. and 8.14.9. on OIE endorsed official control programme and surveillance respectively.

The Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to seek expert advice on the epidemiological significance and the necessity for risk mitigation measures for susceptible animals not included in the Orders of *Carnivora* and *Chiroptera* for the next revision of this chapter.

**Article 8.14.7.**

Concerning a comment on provisions for wild caught animals for use in laboratories, the Code Commission stated that this would be addressed with the revised Article 8.14.6., as noted above.

**Article 8.14.8.**

For point 2, the Code Commission agreed in principle with a comment to include ‘the capacity of the Competent Authority or Veterinary Authority’ to control dog-mediated rabies, but made an amendment that also recognises the role of other authorities, by replacing ‘capacity of the Veterinary Services’ with ‘its capacity’, which means the capacity of the Member Country as a whole.

In the fourth paragraph, given that the questionnaire for rabies is still under development, the Code Commission removed specific reference to Article 1.6.X.-bis. The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that the application procedure for the endorsement of the national control programme for rabies by the OIE should be developed and adopted as a resolution by the World Assembly of Delegates. It also requested that the details of the questionnaire be reviewed by experts, together with the issues described above regarding the new revised Articles 8.14.5. and 8.14.6.

For the second indent of the last paragraph, in response to a comment on the ‘significant problems’ with the performance of the Veterinary Services, the Code Commission modified the text to include a reference to Section 3 of the *Terrestrial Code* for clarity.

The revised Chapter 8.14. Infection with rabies virus is attached as **Annex 10** and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

**5.9. Infection with *Chlamydophila abortus* (Enzootic abortion of ewes, ovine chlamydiosis) (Article 14.4.1.)**

Comments were received from the EU.

In agreement with the advice from the Biological Standards Commission, the Code Commission changed the name of the pathogenic agent from *Chlamydophila abortus* to *Chlamydia abortus* in Article 14.4.1.

The Code Commission also amended Article 1.3.3. in accordance with this change.

The revised Article 14.4.1. is attached as **Annex 11** and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

The revised Article 1.3.3. is attached as **Annex 12** and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

**5.10. Infection with African swine fever virus (Articles 15.1.1.-bis, 15.1.2., 15.1.3., 15.1.16., 15.1.22., 15.1.31.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, Chinese Taipei, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, New Zealand and EU.

The Code Commission considered all comments and made amendments to improve clarity and readability, where relevant. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. In addition, the Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.



### **Article 15.1.1.-bis**

The Code Commission agreed with comments to use ‘commodities of suids’ instead of ‘pig commodities’ acknowledging that the term ‘pig’ applies only to *Sus scrofa* while the chapter also refers to commodities from other suids. This amendment was made throughout the chapter, where relevant, to ensure consistency.

### **Article 15.1.2.**

In points 1 and 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘pathological lesions’ in addition to clinical signs, noting that pathological lesions are an important consideration if pigs are found dead or examined at slaughter, and play a determinant role for the detection of this disease. This amendment was made throughout the chapter, where relevant.

For point 5, a comment was received on the importance of testing dead animals in surveillance programmes. The Code Commission noted that surveillance in domestic populations is adequately covered in Articles 15.1.27. to 15.1.30. and 15.1.32., but made changes to Article 15.1.31. to strengthen the recommendations for the testing of wild or feral animals found dead, road kills, animals showing abnormal behaviour and hunted animals in surveillance programmes.

In response to a comment requesting the OIE to provide additional technical guidance on implementing appropriate biosecurity to comply with the criteria of Article 15.1.2., notably the effective separation of domestic pig population from wild pig populations, the Code Commission considered that sufficient guidance is provided in Chapter 4.4. on Application on compartmentalisation, in particular Article 4.4.3., and in other horizontal chapters. The Code Commission drew Member Countries’ attention to the OIE/FAO GF-TADs *Handbook on African Swine Fever in wild boar and biosecurity during hunting*<sup>1</sup>, as well as to the GF-TADs *Good practices for biosecurity in the pig sector*<sup>2</sup> and the FAO *Manual on ASF Detection and Diagnosis*<sup>3</sup>. The Code Commission emphasised the importance of Member Countries implementing provisions in the *Terrestrial Code* and other existing documents in order to prevent and control the transmission of this disease.

### **Article 15.1.3.**

For point 3, the Code Commission agreed with comments to revise the wording of the first paragraph to improve consistency with point 7 of Article 15.1.2. The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete the specific reference to point 7 of Article 15.1.2. as it considered that it was important to highlight this point because biosecurity is essential to prevent the spread of African Swine Fever (ASF).

In response to a comment requesting clarification on the proposed deletion of the last paragraph of Article 15.1.3., the Code Commission recalled that the provisions of this paragraph are covered in Article 15.1.1.-bis. The rationale had also been provided in its September 2018 meeting report, where modifications were made to the first paragraph of point 3 to highlight that cases of infection with ASF virus in feral or wild pigs do not preclude freedom in domestic and captive wild pigs and possible safe trade of pig commodities in accordance with the relevant certification and risk mitigation articles of the chapter.

### **Article 15.1.16.**

A few editorial changes were made to Article 15.1.16. for clarity and accuracy.

<sup>1</sup> [http://web.oie.int/RR-Europe/eng/eng/Regprog/docs/docs/GF-TADs%20Handbook\\_ASF\\_WILDBOAR%20version%202018-12-19.pdf](http://web.oie.int/RR-Europe/eng/eng/Regprog/docs/docs/GF-TADs%20Handbook_ASF_WILDBOAR%20version%202018-12-19.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.fao.org/3/i1435e/i1435e00.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.fao.org/3/i7228en/I7228EN.pdf>

### **Article 15.1.22.**

For point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include a reference to other possible validated time-temperature combinations, and modified the text accordingly noting that this was also consistent with other disease-specific chapters (e.g. Chapter 10.4. on Infection with avian influenza viruses).

In response to some comments to request reviewing the minimum curing period for dry cured pig meat, the Code Commission reminded Member Countries that the current text had been adopted after years of discussion in the Code Commission and Scientific Commission and consultations with experts and Member Countries. Since then, the Code Commission has not acknowledged any major trade issues that arose due to the existing provision nor recognised any global epidemiological changes pertaining to this product. More importantly, there is no new scientific evidence that justifies the review of the current provision.

### **Article 15.1.31.**

In Article 15.1.31., amendments were made as per the explanation given above under Article 15.1.2. to strengthen the recommendations for the testing of wild or feral animals found dead, road kills, animals showing abnormal behaviour and hunted animals in surveillance programmes.

The revised Articles 15.1.1.-bis, 15.1.2., 15.1.3., 15.1.16., 15.1.22. and 15.1.31. are attached as **Annex 13** and are proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

## **6. Texts circulated for Member Country comments**

### **6.1. Glossary**

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, India, New Zealand, Switzerland, USA and the EU.

#### **Competent Authority, Veterinary Authority, Veterinary Services**

The Code Commission considered comments received on the proposed amendments to the Glossary definitions for ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Veterinary Authority’ and ‘Veterinary Services’. Taking into consideration the different views expressed by Member Countries, and the importance of these definitions not only in the *Terrestrial Code* but also in the *Aquatic Code* and other OIE activities such as the PVS Pathway, the Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to refer the comments to the *ad hoc* Group on Evaluation of Veterinary Services currently working on revisions of Chapters 3.1. and 3.2. The Code Commission agreed that it would review the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group at its September 2019 meeting.

OIE Headquarters also proposed that the *ad hoc* Group recommendations be considered by the other Specialist Commissions to ensure alignment across all OIE standards.

#### **Captive wild [animal]**

Taking into consideration the different views expressed by Member Countries and the complexity posed by the diversity of species and scenarios covered under this definition, the Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to forward the comments received to the OIE Working Group on Wildlife for its review. The Code Commission was informed that this Working Group will meet in December 2019.

#### **Epidemiological unit**

In response to comments the Code Commission amended the text of ‘epidemiological unit’ to improve clarity.

The revised definition for ‘epidemiological unit’ is attached in **Annex 14** for Member Country comments.

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

Comments were received from the EU.

Regarding the use of the terms ‘disease’ and ‘infection and infestation’, the Code Commission would like to refer to the explanatory text given under Item 5.2., Article 1.4.1.

### **Article 1.1.2.**

For point 3, the Code Commission replaced ‘immediate’ with ‘within 24 hours’ for consistency with Article 1.1.3.

For point 6, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to remove ‘biosecurity’, noting that sanitary measures are not the same as biosecurity. Biosecurity applies at the level of epidemiological units whereas sanitary measures are decided by the Competent Authority and applied to its territory, and as such it is relevant for both biosecurity and sanitary measures to be mentioned.

### **Article 1.1.3.**

In response to a comment as to whether ‘strain’ of the pathogenic agent is the appropriate term to be used for notification versus other terms such as ‘serotype’ and ‘subtype’, and whether establishing a definition for strain would be useful, the Code Commission considered the information provided by the Biological Standards Commission, the Scientific Commission and OIE Headquarters. Given that the specific term (e.g. strain, serotype and subtype) for notification is specified under each disease-specific chapter, the Code Commission concluded that there is no need to refer to all of these terms in Chapter 1.1., the term ‘strain’ being understood here as encompassing all possibilities. Correspondingly, the Code Commission agreed that there was no need to develop a Glossary definition for ‘strain’.

### **Article 1.1.5.**

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission noted that given Article 1.1.5. is related to the notification of the absence of diseases, it therefore has a relationship with the procedures for self-declaration of disease freedom, as well as for the recognition of an official disease status by the OIE. The Code Commission thus proposed to evaluate whether this article was better placed in Chapter 1.6. The Code Commission considered a comment, as well as the advice from the Scientific Commission and OIE Headquarters regarding this proposal and agreed to maintain the proposed deletion of Article 1.1.5. from Chapter 1.1., considering that:

- Points 1 and 2 of Article 1.1.5. refer to country or zone freedom, which is outside the scope of Chapter 1.1.
- Notification of the end of a disease occurrence or spread (i.e. no further cases) is covered by Article 1.1.3. (2) and (3) and Article 1.1.4.

For details regarding the inclusion of the content of Article 1.1.5. in Chapter 1.6. refer to Item 6.3.

The revised Chapter 1.1. Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information is attached as **Annex 15** for Member Countries comments.

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

Comments were received from Australia, India, Malaysia and EU.

The Code Commission considered all comments and made amendments to improve clarity and readability, where relevant. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. In addition, the Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission had agreed with a proposal presented by OIE Headquarters to harmonise the provisions for official recognition and maintenance of disease-free status, and endorsement and maintenance of official control programmes (refer to Item 8.9.). The Code Commission had recommended that provisions common to the five diseases with official recognition of disease-free status be addressed in Chapter 1.6., instead of repeating these provisions in each disease-specific chapter.

The Code Commission considered the proposal from OIE Headquarters that had been endorsed by the Scientific Commission, and agreed to introduce amendments to relevant articles of Chapter 1.6. related to harmonisation.

Additionally, following from the discussion at the September 2018 meeting to move Article 1.1.5. to Chapter 1.6., instead of retaining the current wording in Article 1.1.5., the Code Commission proposed to cover the points via the amendments in Chapter 1.6., noting that most of the content was already addressed in Chapter 1.6., i.e.

- If a self-declaration of disease freedom was made by a Member Country, an outbreak of the disease would suspend the self-declared free status;
- For diseases with official recognition of animal health status, a disease outbreak in the relevant animal population would imply the automatic suspension of the official status;
- If the free status is lost, the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) would require the Member Country to submit a new self-declaration/recovery of free status or application for recovery of official status, before re-publication of its self-declared status or reinstatement of an official status.
- Point 3 of Article 1.1.5. refers to the establishment of free zone(s) and the criteria on which the free status is based, etc. The criteria and procedure are already covered in this draft chapter.

#### **Article 1.6.1.**

The Code Commission agreed with a comment noting that the wording of the second paragraph differed from that in the SOP published on the OIE website and requested OIE Headquarters to amend the SOP to align it with the text used in this article.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to use the word ‘shall’ instead of ‘may’ when referring to the publication of a self-declaration, as they considered it was not an appropriate word because it implies a legal obligation.

As part of the harmonisation work, a new paragraph was added referring to the loss of a self-declared free status in the event of an outbreak in the country, zone or compartment with a self-declared free status.

#### **Article 1.6.2.**

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the title of this article for accuracy and consistency with Article 1.6.1. The Code Commission proposed to use the term ‘animal health status’ as it is defined in the Glossary. The Code Commission also applied the amendment throughout the chapter for consistency.

Taking into consideration the modifications being proposed to Chapter 8.14. Infection with rabies virus (refer to Item 5.8.), the Code Commission agreed to include a new point 2 (d) referring to the possibility for Member Countries to request endorsement of ‘an official control programme for dog-mediated rabies’ from the OIE.

The Code Commission agreed with a proposal from OIE Headquarters to simplify the wording of the paragraph referring to the OIE framework for official recognition to provide a general reference to the resolutions of the World Assembly of Delegates so as to avoid discrepancies when the resolution numbers are updated.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment and amended the wording of the last paragraph to improve clarity.

As part of the harmonisation work, references to Chapters 1.4. and 4.3. were added when relevant, and a new paragraph was added referring to the recognition of zones.

#### **Article 1.6.3.**

As part of the harmonisation work, a new Article 1.6.3. Maintenance of official recognition and endorsement by the OIE was added using the last paragraph of the previous draft Article 1.6.2. and further details on the requirements and processes.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment suggesting editorial changes to the wording of the first paragraph, agreeing that it did not improve the text.

The revised Chapter 1.6. Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE is attached as **Annex 16** for Member Countries comments.

### **6.4. Veterinary legislation (Chapter 3.4.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China (People's Republic), India, Malaysia, Mexico, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission considered all comments and made amendments to improve clarity and readability, where relevant. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. In addition, the Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.

Comments pertaining to the definitions for Competent Authority, Veterinary Authority and Veterinary Services were not addressed, pending further work (see Item 6.1.).

#### **Article 3.4.1.**

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to include 'specific' before legal instruments as it considered this to be unnecessary, noting that fines and sanctions could be considered part of veterinary legislation.

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission accepted a comment to include 'international' before 'standards and instruments' for clarity. The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include 'guidelines and provisions for animal health' noting that guidelines do not have the same legal status as standards and legal instruments.

#### **Article 3.4.2.**

For the definition of 'legal instrument', the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include 'enforceable', as it is already stated in the definition that a legal instrument is a legally binding rule.

For the definition of 'veterinary domain', the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include 'environmental health' as it considered that veterinary public health already included environmental health. Furthermore, the 'One Health approach' is specified in the definition.

The Code Commission did not agree to delete 'veterinary' from 'veterinary public health' as this is a specific term used throughout the *Terrestrial Code*. The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that Chapter 6.1. notes that veterinary public health is a component of public health.

**Article 3.4.3.**

For point 1, the Code Commission agreed with the comment to delete ‘scrupulously’ but modified the sentence to explain the importance of respecting the hierarchy of legislation for effective implementation of veterinary legislation.

For point 2, the Code Commission did not agree to include ‘supranational’ as it considered that in this context, ‘regional’ is taken to mean more than one country and thus encompasses supranational and may include legislation pertaining to more than one country.

For point 4, the Code Commission accepted a comment to include ‘as appropriate’, as it agreed that an impact analysis depending on the situation is not always necessary.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to list the stakeholders involved in the consultative process for the drafting of the legislation as the drafting process typically did not include these other stakeholders. The Code Commission emphasised that the involvement of these stakeholders is important in the development of legislation, and noted that this is already addressed in the second paragraph.

For point 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to reinstate ‘transparent’. It considered this redundant as transparency is covered in point 3 and also implied under point 4.

The Code Commission agreed to include ‘provide legal certainty’ in the text as it improves clarity and is consistent with the title of this point. It did not agree to delete ‘stable’ but instead moved ‘stable’ to the next sentence to retain emphasis that this element is also important.

The Code Commission partially agreed with a comment that legislation should be ‘regularly evaluated and amended as appropriate’ but used the word ‘updated’ instead of ‘amended’ as legislation should be kept up to date, while assuring legal security.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘regularly updated’ with the given rationale that it is not possible to control how regularly legislation is reviewed. The Code Commission noted that this comment may apply if legislation was limited to primary law; however, the definition of legislation in this chapter includes both primary law and regulations, and regulations could be regularly updated by the Veterinary Authority.

**Article 3.4.4.**

For point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘unambiguous’. On the contrary, it considered it essential that the law is unambiguous.

The Code Commission did not agree to include ‘avoid arbitrariness’ at the end of point 2, as the preceding provisions on the drafting of veterinary legislation would have addressed this, including legal certainty.

For point 3, the Code Commission agreed to delete ‘sufficient’ noting that this term is vague and subjective.

For point 4, the Code Commission did not agree to delete ‘duplication’. It recognised that at times duplication is inevitable especially when there is overlapping mandates between different sections of the government, and thus modified the text by adding ‘unnecessary’ in front of ‘duplication’.

For point 5, the Code Commission did not agree to include ‘validity’. Instead it created a new point 8 to take into account the impact of new legislation on pre-existing legislation and regulations when the new legislation comes into effect.

### Article 3.4.5.

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘capacitated’ with ‘have the necessary technical, administrative and infrastructure capacity’ for clarity.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission partially accepted a comment to replace ‘short’ with ‘as short as possible’ and modified the sentence to reflect this.

For point 1(b), the Code Commission agreed to include ‘and in accordance with professional standards’ as it considered this to be an important consideration.

For point 1(c), the Code Commission agreed to include ‘transparency’ as it considered this to be relevant.

For point 1(d)(iii), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘fomites’ under the third and seventh indents. The Code Commission clarified that as ‘commodity’ is a defined term in the Glossary of the *Terrestrial Code*, it agreed to use ‘commodity’ to refer to animals, animal products, by-products and products of animal origin including food. With regard to the terms ‘animal products’, ‘animal by-products’ and ‘products of animal origin’, the Code Commission noted that there are no Glossary definitions for these although they are widely used in the *Terrestrial Code*, with possible different interpretations, and requested OIE Headquarters to work on some draft new definitions (see Item 6.5.).

Regarding a comment to italicise ‘establishment’ in the third and fourth indents, the Code Commission clarified that in this context, establishment does not refer to the term as defined in the Glossary and therefore should not be italicised. To avoid confusion, the Code Commission replaced ‘establishment’ with ‘facility’.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to include additional powers under primary legislation, and thus included ‘establishment of compensation mechanisms’, ‘listing disease for mandatory reporting’ and ‘ordering of disinfection’.

In the last line of point 1, the Code Commission replaced ‘must’ with ‘should’ in accordance with the standard terminology used in the *Terrestrial Code*. It agreed with a comment to include ‘clearly’ before ‘identified’ but not ‘outlined in a limited manner’ as it considered this to be implied the way the text is written.

### Article 3.4.6.

For point 1(d), the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘make secondary legislation or otherwise deal with’ with ‘provide basic principles for or regulate’ so that it is less prescriptive.

For point 1(d)(i), in response to a comment that it is not clear what is meant by various categories of veterinarians, the Code Commission modified the statement to read ‘various specialisations of veterinarians and categories of veterinary paraprofessionals’. This amendment was also applied to other relevant points to ensure consistency. It also agreed to include ‘animal welfare’.

For point 1(d)(iv), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment that the veterinary statutory body does not have the authority to recognise qualifications of veterinarians and paraprofessionals. The Code Commission clarified that it could be the case that the Competent Authority defines the rules for authorisation, but it is the veterinary statutory body that prescribes the conditions for recognising such qualifications in accordance with these rules.

For point 1(d)(vii), the Code Commission acknowledged a comment that the veterinary statutory body is not the authority that identifies exceptional situations such as epizootics under which persons other than veterinarians can undertake activities normally carried out by veterinarians. This would normally reside with the Competent Authority. As such, the Code Commission agreed to modify the sentence to reflect that the veterinary statutory body may ‘define the conditions’ under which this may be carried out, but it is the responsibility of the Competent Authority to decide the situations where this could be allowed.

**Article 3.4.7.**

For point 1(c), the Code Commission agreed with a comment that laboratory testing could be external as well as in-house, and deleted the word ‘in-house’.

For point 2(c), the Code Commission agreed that ‘oversight’ improves the clarity of this sentence and modified the text accordingly.

For point 3, the Code Commission agreed to add ‘including their disposal when applicable’ for completeness and modified the text accordingly.

**Article 3.4.9.**

For the first paragraph, in response to a comment on notifying OIE-listed diseases to the Competent Authority, the Code Commission made amendments to include ‘mandatory reporting’ and clarify that diseases of importance do not only refer to diseases that are present in the country.

In point 2(b)(i), the Code Commission accepted a comment to include ‘activate, implement and coordinate activities’ for clarity.

**Article 3.4.10.**

For point 2, the Code Commission did not accept a comment to include ‘responsibility of the Competent Authority’ noting that there are other actors besides the Competent Authority.

**Article 3.4.11.**

For the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to include ‘within the framework of One Health’ noting that it was already addressed in the definition of veterinary domain.

For point 1(b), the Code Commission agreed to delete ‘laboratory biosafety and biosecurity’ as these terms do not fit under this section.

For point 2, the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘veterinary medicines and biologicals’ with ‘veterinary medicinal products’ for consistency.

For point 3(b)(i), the Code Commission agreed to add ‘veterinary medicinal products incorporated into’ before ‘medicated feeds’ for clarity.

For point 3(b)(iv), the Code Commission did not agree with the comment to add ‘for use in food producing animals’, noting that the withdrawal period by definition relates to the use in food producing animals and thus is already implied.

The Code Commission did not agree to reinstate the deleted point 4 on ‘Quality of veterinary medicine and biologicals’, but agreed to include the element of safety and efficacy in veterinary medical products in the general measures in point 1(b).

For point 5(g), the Code Commission did not agree that ‘reporting on adverse effects to the Competent Authority’ is a repetition of point 4(d), as point 4 concerns the supply chain at the production, storage and wholesale level, while point 5 concerns the supply chain at the retail level.

**Article 3.4.12.**

For point 1(a), the Code Commission agreed to delete ‘veterinary’ in accordance with the wording in Chapter 6.3.

For point 2(b), the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘health identification marks’ with ‘visible marks that indicate the product has been inspected’ to improve clarity.



The revised Chapter 3.4. Veterinary Legislation is attached as **Annex 17** for Member Country comments.

#### **6.5. Draft new chapter on official control programmes for listed and emerging diseases (Chapter 4.Y.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, China (People's Republic), Chinese Taipei, New Caledonia, Switzerland, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission considered all comments and made amendments to improve clarity and readability, where relevant. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. In addition, the Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed to replace the term 'contagious' diseases with 'transmissible' diseases throughout the chapter. The Code Commission also agreed with the Scientific Commission to include 'programmes' in the title for consistency with the text.

The Code Commission considered a comment requesting clarification of the use of the terms 'listed and emerging diseases' and 'notifiable disease' throughout the chapter, and whether 'notifiable disease' would be more appropriate for the title of the chapter. The Code Commission highlighted that the Glossary definitions for 'notification' and 'notifiable diseases' referred to notification at different levels. 'Notification' means the procedure by which the **Veterinary Authority informs the OIE** or the OIE informs the Veterinary Authority, of the occurrence of disease, infection or infestation in accordance with Chapter 1.1., whereas 'notifiable disease' refers to an **internal reporting of a disease to the Veterinary Authority** (within an OIE Member Country) in accordance with national regulations. As this chapter focuses on diseases that are notifiable to the OIE, the Code Commission agreed that the title of the chapter should remain unchanged as 'listed and emerging disease'. However, the Code Commission clarified that when text refers to diseases reportable within a Member Country, the defined term 'notifiable disease' is used.

The Code Commission acknowledged that use of the terms such as 'notify', 'notifiable disease', 'report' and 'reportable disease' in the *Terrestrial Code* may lead to possible misunderstanding and added a review of these terms to its work programme.

In response to comments received on the use of the terms 'animals', 'animal products', 'animal by-products' and 'commodities', the Code Commission amended the text accordingly with the term 'commodity', where relevant, as this is a defined term that includes 'live animals, products of animal origin, animal genetic material, biological products and pathological material'. Notwithstanding this amendment, the Code Commission noted that there is no Glossary definition for products of animal origin, animal products and animal by-products, and requested OIE Headquarters to propose some definitions for these terms that could be considered for inclusion in the Glossary of the *Terrestrial Code* (see Item 6.4.).

#### **Article 4.Y.1.**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission accepted a comment to remove 'including a zoonosis' as it was implicit in the meaning of animal diseases, which may or may not be zoonotic.

The Code Commission accepted a comment to replace 'a new disease' in the parenthesis with 'the first occurrence of a disease' as rapid response would also be relevant in the first occurrence of a disease, whether new or previously recognised.

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace 'developed through' with 'informed by' but did agree to use the term 'based on' for clarity.

In the fifth paragraph, the Code Commission did not accept a comment to add 'from a given population' at the end of the last sentence as it is implicit in that a reduction of the impact of a given disease or eradication of an infection or infestation is from a given population.

In the section regarding the ‘general components of an official control programme’, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission to re-order the points according to the sequence of the articles from 4.Y.2. to 4.Y.12. The Code Commission also agreed with a comment from the Scientific Commission on including a provision on the legal framework and regulatory environment. This has been included as a new point 2 ‘appropriate veterinary legislation’.

For point 3, the Code Commission replaced ‘preparedness and contingency plans’ with ‘emergency preparedness plans and emergency response plans’ for clarity and consistency.

For point 6, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to insert ‘the impact of’ before ‘incidence’ as it considered it unnecessary. However, the Code Commission rephrased the sentence for clarity.

For point 7, the Code Commission included ‘sanitary measures’ for completeness.

For point 8, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘as relevant’ with ‘as appropriate’. The Code Commission also applied this amendment to the other points, where appropriate.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘measures to protect public health’ and inserted a new point 9 on this.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include a new point on ‘exit strategy’ and to delete the entire paragraph on critical components of control programmes for diseases that are not present in the Member Country. The Code Commission agreed that ‘exit strategy’ would not apply in all situations and should therefore not be included in the general list provided. In addition, the Code Commission noted that the intention of this paragraph was to emphasise specific components of control plans important for diseases that are not present in the country and thus this paragraph should be retained. However, the Code Commission recognised that there could be more than one exit strategy and thus inserted ‘options’ after ‘exit strategy’. The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘where relevant’ after exit strategy as it considered it was already implied in the text as written.

#### **Article 4.Y.2.**

For the second indent under point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘additional supporting staff’, but not to remove dedicated staff, which should also be addressed.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘source of financing for communication and awareness campaigns’ and included this in a new indent.

A number of comments were received regarding the new fifth indent of point 2 on sources of financing and compensation policy. The Code Commission agreed that the provisions should not be too prescriptive and agreed to simplify the text accordingly, allowing more latitude for Member Countries to develop relevant compensation policies.

For the second indent under point 3, in response to a comment to replace ‘reporting’ with ‘notification’, the Code Commission clarified that reporting is used when referring to internal reporting within the country, whereas notification, as per the Glossary definition means notifying the OIE.

For the fourth indent, the Code Commission proposed to include ‘forward and backward’ tracing for clarity.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to include procedures for contaminated waste water, manure and other effluents and created a new point on procedures for ‘contaminated or potentially contaminated fodder and effluents such as bedding, litter, manure and waste water’.

**Article 4.Y.3.**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to insert ‘transmissible’ before ‘disease’, but instead agreed to amend the text to ‘emerging disease or a listed disease’ as this is consistent with the title of the chapter and the terminology used in Chapter 1.1. The Code Commission also agreed to include a new point that ‘the Veterinary Authority should define emergencies’ in its official control programmes.

For point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘risk analysis’ with ‘risk ranking’ or ‘risk management tools’, noting that risk analysis as defined in the Glossary includes both risk assessment and risk management.

For point 2, the Code Commission acknowledged a comment but decided to revise the entire paragraph to explain in further detail what emergency preparedness plans should consist of.

**Article 4.Y.4.**

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to insert ‘of a listed or emerging disease’ after ‘strong suspicion’ for consistency with the title.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘local control measures’ with ‘preventative control measures’ because control measures are not always preventative. Instead it proposed to use ‘**pre-emptive** control measures’ for clarity.

**Article 4.Y.5.**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to move Article 4.Y.5. earlier in the chapter explaining that the sequence of Articles 4.Y.2. to 4.Y.10. follows the sequence of the general components of an official control programme as described in Article 4.Y.1.

For point 1, the Code Commission agreed to include ‘fomites’ under backward and forward tracing. The Code Commission explained that fomites could include vehicles, people, clothing, feed and equipment. The same applies for point 3.

In response to a comment requesting clarity on the term ‘management plan’ in the third and fourth paragraphs, the Code Commission amended the text to clarify the meaning.

**Article 4.Y.6.**

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘relevant’ before ‘to the transmission pathways of the pathogenic agents’ noting that the sentence already states that the Veterinary Services should adapt any strategy to the transmission pathway.

In the fifth paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text to ensure consistency and clarity in the terminology used when referring to dead animals and other potentially contaminated commodities and amended the sentence accordingly. This change was applied throughout the chapter.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include the term ‘not appropriate’ in reference to test and cull for highly transmissible diseases. However, the Code Commission proposed an amendment to clarify that this strategy is ‘more suitable’ for less transmissible or slow-spreading diseases.

**Article 4.Y.7.**

As per the rationale given above in the general comments for this chapter, the Code Commission replaced ‘animal products and contaminated materials’ with ‘contaminated commodities and fomites’ for consistency. Thus, it did not accept a comment on including ‘by-products’. However, it accepted a comment to include ‘fomites’ and to include the examples in parenthesis.

**Article 4.Y.8.**

The Code Commission agreed to move the article on ‘Zoning’ (Article 4.Y.10. in the previous draft) to after Article 4.Y.7. on ‘Movement Control’ to follow the logical sequence of the components described in Article 4.Y.1.

For the last sentence of the third paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘clearly defined’ after ‘zones’ noting that this is already in the Glossary definition for zone. However, the Code Commission acknowledged that it is not clear what zones of intensified surveillance or intensified vaccination may mean, and therefore amended the text to explain that these are zones where specific surveillance, vaccination or other activities are conducted.

**Article 4.Y.10.**

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission agreed to insert ‘or antigen’ before ‘banks’ noting that for some diseases antigen banks are more common than vaccine banks.

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission agreed to include differentiation between ‘live vaccine strains from field strains’ as this is possible for some diseases.

In the sixth paragraph, the Code Commission agreed to include that a ‘cost benefit analysis with regard to trade and public health’ should be considered when vaccination is used.

The Code Commission agreed that treatment may be part of an official control programme and thus proposed a new paragraph at the end of this article to address treatment. ‘Treatment’ was also reinstated in the title of this article.

The revised Chapter 4.Y. Official control programmes for listed and emerging diseases is attached as **Annex 18** for Member Country comments.

**6.6. Draft new chapter on animal welfare and laying hen production systems (Chapter 7.Z.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Canada, Chile, China (People’s Republic), Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, New Caledonia, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, USA, EU, AU-IBAR, IEC, ICFAW and experts.

The Code Commission noted the significant number of comments received and that many comments expressed opposing positions with respect to some of the recommendations proposed in the draft chapter. The Code Commission requested that the *ad hoc* Group on animal welfare and laying hen production systems be reconvened to review all comments received and to amend the draft chapter accordingly. The Code Commission was informed that the *ad hoc* Group would be reconvened in April 2019 so that it can consider the *ad hoc* Group’s report at its September 2019 meeting.

The Code Commission recommended that the *ad hoc* Group continue to focus on animal-based measurables based on scientific evidence when revising the draft chapter and ensure that the text is drafted in a manner that is consistent with other animal welfare production system chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*. The Code Commission also requested that the *ad hoc* Group take into account social and economic considerations, as well as impacts on food security when developing the revised text. However, all text should be evidence-based.

**6.7. Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, China (People’s Republic), Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Japan, Malaysia, South Africa, Thailand, USA, EU, AU-IBAR, GAPFA, IPC and experts.

The Code Commission noted the large number of comments that had been submitted. The Code Commission considered all comments and identified those comments that needed further expert advice, and requested that these be referred to the *ad hoc* Group on avian influenza. The Code Commission addressed the other comments and proposed that the amended text be provided to the *ad hoc* Group for information. The Code Commission would review the report of the *ad hoc* Group at its September 2019 meeting.

## 6.8. Infection with classical swine fever virus (Chapter 15.2.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, Chinese Taipei, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, USA and EU.

As explained in Item 8.9. this chapter will be amended to ensure harmonisation of the procedures and requirements for official recognition and maintenance of disease-free status.

Therefore, the Code Commission agreed not to circulate this chapter for Member Country comments until the harmonisation work has been included, in order to avoid Member Countries having to comment on several different versions.

The Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to incorporate the necessary amendments as part of the harmonisation work and to present the amended draft, along with previous amendments for its consideration at its September 2019 meeting.

## 7. New amendments or draft new chapters proposed for Member Country comments

### 7.1. User's Guide

For point 3 of Section B, for consistency with terminology used across the *Terrestrial Code*, the Code Commission replaced 'diagnosis, surveillance and notification of pathogenic agents' with 'diagnosis, surveillance and notification of diseases, infections and infestations'.

Given that Chapter 2.2. on safety of commodities was revised and adopted in 2018, the Code Commission updated the User's Guide to reflect this. Based on a similar reference in the *Aquatic Code*, the Code Commission included a sentence referring to the 'criteria used to assess the safety of commodities' under point 5 of Section C.

The revised User's Guide is attached as [Annex 19](#) for Member Country comments.

### 7.2. Infection with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex (Chapter 8.11.)

The Code Commission reviewed the opinion provided by a panel of experts, and endorsed by the Scientific Commission as to whether *Mycobacterium caprae* and *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* fulfilled the listing criteria in accordance with Chapter 1.2. of the *Terrestrial Code*. The detailed report of the panel of experts and considerations of the Scientific Commission may be found in the report of the September 2018 meeting of the Scientific Commission.

The Code Commission agreed with the conclusion of the Scientific Commission that *M. tuberculosis* did not meet the criteria for inclusion in Article 1.3.1. as an OIE listed disease and proposed to amend Article 1.3.1. and Chapter 8.11. accordingly. Therefore, for the purposes of the *Terrestrial Code*, only *M. bovis* and *M. caprae* should be considered in the case definition.

The Code Commission amended Article 1.3.1. in accordance with this change.

The revised Chapter 8.11. Infection with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex is attached as [Annex 20](#) for Member Country comments.

The revised Article 1.3.1. is attached as [Annex 21](#) for Member Country comments.

### 7.3. Infection with Rift Valley fever virus (Chapter 8.15.)

OIE Headquarters updated the Code Commission with the proposed changes to Chapter 8.15. following the September 2018 meeting, where the Code Commission had requested for alignment between point 6 of Article 8.15.1. with Articles 8.15.4. and 8.15.5., possibly including references to point 1 of Article 1.1.3. on notification and referencing human cases as a consequence of epizootic in Article 8.15.5.

The objective of these amendments is to clarify the obligations of Member Countries to notify when there is an epizootic of Rift Valley fever in an endemic country or zone.

The Code Commission proposed amendments to Articles 8.15.1. and 8.15.5.

#### **Article 8.15.1.**

For point 5, to facilitate reporting, the Code Commission proposed to include new text ‘the transition from inter-epizootic period to epizootic complies with point 1(d) of Article 1.1.3’.

For point 6(b) on the definition of ‘epizootic of RVF’, given that it is highly improbable for human cases to occur in the absence of a number of clinical animal cases<sup>1,2</sup>, the Code Commission proposed to include ‘or the occurrence of indigenous human cases’. The Code Commission also agreed to delete ‘substantially’ as this term is subjective.

#### References

<sup>1</sup> de La Rocque S, Formenty P. (2014) Applying the One Health principles: a trans-sectoral coordination framework for preventing and responding to Rift Valley fever outbreaks. *Rev Sci Tech.* 2014;33(2):555–567

<sup>2</sup> de LaRocque S, Formenty P (2010) Rift Valley fever: Disease ecology and early warning. *Sustainable Management of Animal Production and Health*, eds Odongo N, Garcia M, Viljoen G (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome), pp 327–333

#### **Article 8.15.5.**

The Code Commission agreed to include ‘indigenous human cases of RVF are occurring, even in the absence of detection of animal cases’ to ensure alignment with the proposed amendments in point 6(b) of Article 8.15.1.

The revised Chapter 8.15. Infection with Rift Valley fever virus is attached as **Annex 22** for Member Country comments.

### **7.4. Infection with equine influenza (Article 12.6.6.)**

The Code Commission considered the recommendations provided by the Scientific Commission to amend Article 12.6.6. ‘Recommendations for the importation of domestic equids for unrestricted movement’, in view of the results of a clinical trial on the ‘Evaluation of current equine influenza vaccination protocols prior to shipment’ coordinated by an OIE Reference Laboratory for equine influenza (refer to the Scientific Commission reports of September 2018 and February 2019).

The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission to modify point 3 regarding vaccination requirements, i.e. to define 14 days as the minimum period between vaccination and shipment, and to include a second option of vaccination ‘between 14 and 180 days before shipment, if they are older than four years of age, previously having received at least four doses of the same vaccine at intervals not greater than 180 days’.

The revised Article 12.6.6. is attached as **Annex 23** for Member Country comments.

### **7.5. Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus (Articles 14.7.3. and 14.7.34.)**

Following the work of OIE Headquarters on the harmonisation of requirements for official recognition and maintenance of disease-free status, and for endorsement and maintenance of official control programmes, Chapter 14.7. was identified as the ‘model chapter’ to present the harmonisation work. Articles 14.7.3. and 14.7.34. have been amended accordingly to incorporate the new proposed wording.

For further information, refer to Item 8.9.

The revised Articles 14.7.3. and 14.7.34. are attached as **Annex 24** for Member Country comments.

## 8. Other ongoing topics

### 8.1. Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.1.) and Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2.)

OIE Headquarters provided the Code Commission with an update on the work of the *ad hoc* Group on Evaluation of Veterinary Services, who met in November 2018. The *ad hoc* Group sought guidance from the Code Commission on the proposed restructure of Chapters 3.1. and 3.2. The Code Commission provided guidance and feedback on the *ad hoc* Group's work to date and requested that OIE Headquarters ensure that the revisions of these chapters are focused on providing recommendations for the establishment, maintenance and evaluation of quality Veterinary Services, with the aim of assisting Veterinary Services of Member Countries to meet their objectives of improving terrestrial animal health and welfare and veterinary public health, as well as to establish and maintain confidence in their international veterinary certification.

As these chapters are closely linked to the definitions of Veterinary Services, Veterinary Authority, and Competent Authority, the Code Commission requested that the *ad hoc* Group also review comments received on these definitions (see Item 6.1.).

The Code Commission was informed that the *ad hoc* Group on Evaluation of Veterinary Services will meet in the coming months. The Commission will consider the *ad hoc* Group report at its September 2019 meeting.

### 8.2. Update on the work on semen and embryos (Chapters 4.5. to 4.9.)

OIE Headquarters informed the Code Commission that it had commenced a review of the work needed to improve Chapters 4.5 to 4.9. on semen and embryos and to develop a plan regarding future work. The Code Commission appreciated that progress has been made on this work noting that this is a complicated task and will take time to complete. The Code Commission provided advice as to how to proceed and proposed to commence with work to revise existing chapters on semen.

In addition, the Code Commission noted with pleasure that the International Embryo Technology Society had requested the development of provisions on bovine *in vitro* produced embryos in relation to bovine viral diarrhoea. The Code Commission considered that it was important that the *Terrestrial Code* reflects the latest IETS recommendations and requested that OIE Headquarters prepare some proposed text for inclusion in Chapter 4.8. Collection and processing of oocytes and *in vitro* produced embryos from livestock and horses, for the Code Commission's consideration at its September 2019 meeting.

### 8.3. Update on the outcomes of the second *ad hoc* Group meeting on the revision of Chapter 7.5. Slaughter of animals and Chapter 7.6. Killing for disease control purposes

The Code Commission considered the report of the *ad hoc* Group on the revision of Chapters 7.5. Slaughter of animals and 7.6. Killing for disease control purposes who met from 27–9 November 2018.

The Code Commission agreed with the proposed revised structure and format for the two chapters and the *ad hoc* Group's proposal to develop a draft definition for 'outcome/animal-based measurables'.

The Code Commission also reviewed the *ad hoc* Group's proposed modifications of definitions for slaughter, euthanasia, stunning and death and requested the *ad hoc* Group to review these further to ensure that there will be no impact associated with the use of these terms in other parts of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission requested that the *ad hoc* Group be reconvened to progress this work which the Code Commission will consider at its September 2019 meeting.

#### **8.4. Draft Terms of Reference for an *ad hoc* Group on the revision of Chapter 7.7. Stray dog population control**

The Code Commission agreed with the draft Terms of References for the *ad hoc* Group for the revision of Chapter 7.7. Stray dog population control.

OIE Headquarters informed the Code Commission the *ad hoc* Group is proposed to be convened at the end of 2019. Therefore, the report of the *ad hoc* Group will be considered by the Code Commission at its February 2020 meeting.

#### **8.5. Infection with rinderpest virus (Chapter 8.16.)**

OIE Headquarters informed the Code Commission that as agreed at its September 2018 meeting, this chapter needed to be updated to clarify the definitions of ‘case’ and ‘suspected case’, the reporting obligations of countries where a suspected case is detected and the measures to be taken in case of re-emergence. The Code Commission had accepted the proposal from OIE Headquarters to work on the revision of the chapter, in collaboration with advice from the FAO-OIE Rinderpest Joint Advisory Committee (JAC).

OIE Headquarters provided the Code Commission with a revised draft chapter that included proposals provided by the JAC. The Code Commission reviewed the revised draft chapter and provided comments on some of the proposed revisions and requested OIE Headquarters to ensure that ongoing work on this chapter takes into account these comments.

OIE Headquarters proposed that an *ad hoc* Group be convened to progress this work that will be reviewed by both the Code Commission and Scientific Commission.

#### **8.6. Outcomes of three *ad hoc* Group meetings on the revision of BSE chapter (Chapter 11.4.)**

OIE Headquarters updated the Code Commission on the work of the *ad hoc* Groups on BSE risk assessment and BSE surveillance. The Code Commission was informed that the *ad hoc* Group on BSE risk assessment and surveillance would be meeting in March 2019 to finalise the work on revising Chapter 11.4.

The Code Commission noted that the revision of Chapter 11.4. is considered a high priority by the OIE, and would look forward to reviewing the draft chapter at its September 2019 meeting.

#### **8.7. New/revised articles for the temporary movement of horses**

OIE Headquarters updated the Code Commission on work being conducted in consultation with OIE Reference Laboratory experts to review or develop provisions for the temporary movement of horses for Chapter 12.2. Contagious equine metritis and Chapter 12.7. Equine piroplasmiasis.

The Code Commission provided feedback and guidance, and agreed that these chapters are outdated and not aligned with more recent disease-specific chapters in the *Terrestrial Code* (Chapter 12.2. has not been revised since its first adoption in 1982 and Chapter 12.7. had only a minor amendment made since its adoption in 1982). The Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to evaluate the need for a comprehensive review and revision of these chapters, not just limited to the development of articles for the temporary movement of horses, and added the update of these chapters to its work programme.

#### **8.8. Outcomes of *ad hoc* Group on animal trypanosomoses**

OIE Headquarters updated the Code Commission on the work of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal African Trypanosomoses, including the recommendation and discussion of the *ad hoc* Group to develop a *Terrestrial Code* chapter on Infection with animal trypanosomoses of African origin, in addition to the existing draft chapters 8.X. Infection with *Trypanosoma evansi* (non-equine surra) and Chapter 12.3. Infection with Trypanozoon in equids (dourine, equine surra).

The Code Commission noted the work of the *ad hoc* Group in developing the chapter on Infection with animal trypanosomoses of African origin, which is expected to be presented to the Code Commission at its September 2019 meeting.



### **8.9. Harmonisation of *Terrestrial Code* chapters for diseases with OIE official status recognition**

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission agreed on a proposal presented by OIE Headquarters and endorsed by the Scientific Commission, to harmonise the requirements for official recognition and maintenance of disease-free status, and for endorsement and maintenance of official control programmes. The Code Commission also recommended that common provisions applicable to the five diseases with official recognition of disease-free status, especially regarding procedural aspects, be addressed in the horizontal chapters instead of repeating them in each disease-specific chapter.

The Code Commission agreed that this work requires amendments of Chapters 1.4. and 1.6. which are addressed under other specific items of this report (see Items 5.2. and 6.3.), as well as the revision of the following chapters: 8.8. Infection with foot and mouth disease virus, 11.5. Infection with *Mycoplasma mycoides* subsp. *mycoides* SC (Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia), 12.1. Infection with African horse sickness virus, 14.7. Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus, and 15.2. Infection with classical swine fever virus.

The Code Commission agreed that this harmonisation work should be presented to Member Countries using a ‘model chapter’ so that they could see what is involved in this work. The Code Commission agreed that Chapter 14.7. Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus should be used as the ‘model chapter’ given that it has been recently adopted and there were no ongoing or pending issues since its adoption. The Code Commission, together with the Scientific Commission, will consider Member Country comments on this ‘model’ example before continuing the harmonisation amendments for the other relevant chapters (see Item 7.5.).

The Code Commission considered, and agreed with, the amendments proposed by OIE Headquarters to Articles 14.7.3. and 14.7.34. to include the new proposed wording. The Code Commission highlighted that the modifications introduced in both articles were mainly to align the text to the approach described above.

### **8.10. Establishment of a Standard Operating Procedure guiding listing decisions for pathogenic agents**

The Code Commission was informed that OIE Headquarters will develop an SOP for the listing and delisting of pathogenic agents in Chapter 1.3. of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission considered a guidance document drafted by OIE Headquarters which was endorsed by the Scientific Commission. The document is intended to be used by OIE Headquarters to guide relevant experts in the application of the criteria defined in Article 1.2.2. of the *Terrestrial Code* when undertaking an assessment of a pathogenic agent.

The Code Commission agreed with the proposed approach, but highlighted the need to take into account Article 1.2.1. when deciding whether a disease should be considered for inclusion in Chapter 1.3., not only the assessment against the criteria in Article 1.2.2. Specifically, the second paragraph of Article 1.2.1. which refers to the objective of listing a disease should be considered first, before discussing the specific criteria in Article 1.2.2.

### **8.11. Consideration of specified dairy products as safe commodities**

In response to a Member Country’s request, the Code Commission had previously agreed to consider whether lactose could be considered as a safe commodity, in accordance with Chapter 2.2. Criteria applied by the OIE for assessing the safety of commodities, for inclusion in the relevant disease-specific chapters. The OIE sought technical advice from the International Dairy Federation on the manufacturing processes involved in the production of lactose, in particular whether there was a standard manufacturing process for this product and details of heat treatments used.

The Code Commission considered the information provided and acknowledged that a standardised manufacturing protocol exists that includes various heating and drying steps including pasteurisation.

The Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to collect some additional information in order to determine the best way to define this commodity in the *Terrestrial Code*.

Once the Code Commission has this information, assessments will be undertaken to identify which pathogenic agents would be inactivated by the standardised manufacturing process for lactose and therefore could be considered as a safe commodity in the corresponding disease-specific chapters.

#### **8.12. Control of Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* (STEC) in food-producing animals**

OIE Headquarters updated the Code Commission on past discussions regarding the control of Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* (STEC) in food-producing animals and informed the Code Commission that it had previously agreed to include this item on its work programme in light of new work on STEC that had been proposed by the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Code Commission agreed to keep this item on its work programme and to consider it again at its September 2019 meeting in view of new work on the development of Codex Guidelines for the control of Shiga toxin-producing *E. coli* (STEC) in beef.

#### **8.13. Update on standards for pet food**

OIE Headquarters updated the Code Commission on previous discussions regarding the possible inclusion of provisions for pet food as safe products in the *Terrestrial Code*, noting that this has been a long-standing issue. At its February 2018 meeting, the Code Commission had considered a request from the Global Alliance of Pet Food Associations (GAPFA) to recommence work on the development of provisions for pet food. GAPFA had expressed willingness to provide relevant information on the treatment of ingredients used in the production of pet food that might facilitate this work.

OIE Headquarters informed the Code Commission that the GAPFA has commenced work to gather scientific information that could inform the assessment of pet food products against the criteria for assessing the safety of commodities in accordance with Chapter 2.2., and will provide this information to the OIE once completed.

The Code Commission agreed that it will discuss this further after receiving this scientific information.

### **9. New topics**

#### **9.1. Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine (Chapter 6.10.)**

Comments were received for Chapter 6.10. from the EU.

The Code Commission acknowledged comments requesting a review of Chapter 6.10. Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine and to also consider some proposed amendments given that this chapter has not been significantly reviewed for some time.

The Code Commission noted that Chapter 6.10. had not been circulated for comments but acknowledged that the adoption in 2018 of some revised definitions in Chapter 6.9. Monitoring of the quantities and usage patterns of antimicrobial agents used in food-producing animals could have an impact on Chapter 6.10. The Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to send these comments to an expert group for further guidance. This item has also been added to the Code Commission's work programme.

#### **9.2. Update on OIE Curricula Guidelines for Veterinary Paraprofessionals**

OIE Headquarters updated the Code Commission on the work of the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Paraprofessionals, which was to finalise the OIE Curricula Guidelines for Veterinary Paraprofessionals for publication and dissemination at the May 2019 General Session.

### **10. Applications for OIE Collaborating Centres**

#### Application for OIE Collaborating Centre on Animal Welfare

The Code Commission considered and discussed the information presented by the Biological Standards Commission and a summary prepared by OIE Headquarters on the collaboration of this centre with the OIE.

The Code Commission agreed that it had no objection to this centre being recognised as an OIE Collaborating Centre.

The Code Commission also highlighted that it would be important for the OIE to enlarge its network of expertise in this matter. Additionally, they considered that the expertise of this candidate appears to be complementary to another OIE Collaborating Centre in the same region that is already recognised, and so a collaborative and coordinated approach should be sought.

#### Application for OIE Collaborating Centre for Continuing Education and Veterinary Capacity Building

The Code Commission considered and discussed the information presented by the Biological Standards Commission. One member of the Code Commission abstained from participating in the assessment.

The Code Commission agreed that it had no objection to this centre being recognised as an OIE Collaborating Centre.

The Code Commission highlighted the important role that this centre has been playing by providing training on epidemiology, surveillance and disease control to the Veterinary Services in its region.

### **11. Update of the Code Commission's work programme**

Comments were received from the EU.

The Code Commission acknowledged the comment on updating Chapter 1.3. in tandem with the amendments to Chapter 10.4. on avian influenza, and will consider this at its September 2019 meeting following the meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on avian influenza (see Item 6.7.). In general, the Code Commission will always consider potential changes to Chapter 1.3. when updating listed disease-specific chapters.

With regard to the comment on rabies, *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex, bovine spongiform encephalopathy and Chapter 6.10. on Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine, the updates are referred to in Items 5.9., 7.2., 8.6. and 9.1. respectively.

The following items were added to the work programme:

- Section 5 on trade measures, import/export procedures and veterinary certification, to undertake a holistic review of the existing chapters (especially 5.4. to 5.7.) and for better harmonisation with the *Aquatic Code*
- Definitions for animal products, products of animal origin, animal by-products (see Item 6.5.)
- Chapter 6.10. on Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine (see Item 9.1.)
- Chapter 12.2. Contagious equine metritis and Chapter 12.7. Equine piroplasmiasis (see Item 8.7.)
- Pet food (for certification or safe commodities), replacing a former item on model certificate for pet food (see Item 8.13.).

The order of items under 'Sections 8 to 15' has been revised after re-prioritisation by the Code Commission. Amendments were also made to individual items in the work programme for clarity.

The updated work programme is attached as **Annex 25** for Member Countries information and comments.

### **12. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting will be from 10 to 19 September 2019.

---

.../Annexes

