



Organisation
Mondiale
de la Santé
Animale

World
Organisation
for Animal
Health

Organización
Mundial
de Sanidad
Animal

Original: English

February 2020

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

Paris, 4–13 February 2020

The COVID-19 pandemic has made it necessary to review the arrangements for Members' participation in international meetings, and in particular the 88th General Session of the World Assembly of Delegates of the OIE. In this context, the OIE Council held extraordinary meetings in April and May 2020 and decided, in agreement with the Director General, that the OIE 88th General Session for May 2020 would be postponed until 2021 and that alternative procedures to address key institutional and administrative matters had been proposed.

As a consequence, no new or amended chapters in the Aquatic Animal Health Code, the Terrestrial Animal Health Code, the Manual of Diagnostic Tests for Aquatic Animals or the Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals will be proposed for adoption in 2020. Chapters that were to be proposed for adoption in 2020 will be proposed for adoption in May 2021.

To ensure a consistent approach across all three Specialist Commissions presenting international standards to the World Assembly, the OIE has decided to take the following approach:

1. All relevant texts that were to be proposed for adoption in May 2020 will be circulated in the respective Specialist Commission's February 2020 report noting that adoption has been postponed until May 2021, and that they will be open for one round of comments.
2. Only substantive comments that have not been submitted before will be considered.
3. The deadline for comments for relevant Code Commission Annexes is 3 July 2020.
4. Each Commission will consider such comments at its September 2020 or February 2021 meetings thereby spreading out this work and enabling them to progress other work items.
5. The texts (incorporating any revisions resulting from this process) will be included in the relevant Commission's February 2021 reports, to be proposed for adoption in May 2021.
6. This process does not alter the regular process applying to other chapters being circulated for comments.

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at OIE Headquarters in Paris from 4 to 13 February 2020. The list of participants is attached as **Annex 1**.

The Code Commission thanked the following Members for providing comments: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China (People's Republic of), Chinese Taipei, Costa Rica, Cuba, Japan, Korea (Republic of), Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, New Caledonia, Norway, Panama, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, United States of America (USA), the OIE Americas Region, the Member States of European Union (EU), the African Union Intercontinental Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of African Member Countries of the OIE and the Comité Veterinario Permanente del Cono Sur (CVP) on behalf of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay, the International Coalition for Farm Animal Welfare (ICFAW), the International Egg Commission (IEC), the International Meat Secretariat (IMS) and other experts.

The Code Commission reviewed Member 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 Code Commission wished to note that not all texts proposed by Members to improve clarity were accepted; in these cases it considered the text clear as currently written.

The amendments are presented in the usual manner by 'double underline' and '~~striketrough~~' and the chapters are annexed to this report. In Annexes 4 to 17, and 22, 23 and 26 amendments proposed at this meeting are highlighted with a coloured background to distinguish them from those proposed previously.

The Code Commission encourages Members to refer to previous reports when preparing comments on longstanding issues. The Code Commission also draws the attention of Members 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 have addressed specific Members 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 Members are encouraged to review these reports together with the report of the Code Commission. These reports are readily available on the [OIE website](#).

Members should note that texts in **Part A (Annexes 4 to 15)** of this report, that were to be proposed for adoption in May 2020, will be proposed for adoption in May 2021 and are open for one additional round of comments. The Code Commission noted that the documents that were to be proposed for adoption were the result of a thorough process of analysis of all comments received from members and from experts, taking into account all positions that were duly argued. As these texts have already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously. **Part B (Annexes 16 to 26)** includes texts that are circulated for Member comments only. The reports of meetings of *ad hoc* Groups and other related documents are attached for information in **Part C (Annex 27)**.

All comments on relevant texts in **Part A and Part B** must reach OIE Headquarters **by 3 July 2020** for them to be considered by 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.

The Code Commission again strongly encourages Members to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by submitting comments on this report. Members 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 '~~striketrough~~' and additions using 'double underline'. Members should not use the automatic 'track-changes' function provided by word processing softwares as such changes are lost in the process of collating submissions into the Code Commission's working documents. Members 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.

Table of Contents:

Item No.	Agenda	Page No.	Annex No.
1	Welcome from the Deputy Director General	5	-
2	Meeting with the Director General	5	-
3	Adoption of agenda	5	-
4	Cooperation with other Specialist Commissions	5	-
5.	Code Commission's work programme	Page No.	Annex No.
5.1.	Ongoing priority topics (except texts proposed for comments or adoption)	6	3
5.1.1.	Glossary definitions for 'Competent Authority', 'Veterinary Authority' and 'Veterinary Services'	6	-
5.1.2.	Terminology: animal products, products of animal origin, by-products	7	-
5.1.3.	Listing of diseases (chronic wasting disease) (Chapter 1.3)	7	-
5.1.4.	Control of Shiga toxin-producing <i>E. coli</i> in food-producing animals	7	-
5.1.5.	General hygiene in semen collection and processing centres and collection and processing of bovine, small ruminants and porcine semen (Chapters 4.6 and 4.7)	7	-
5.1.6.	Collection and processing of oocytes and <i>in vitro</i> produced embryos from livestock and horses, to include bovine viral diarrhoea (Revision of Chapter 4.9)	8	-
5.1.7.	Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine (Chapter 6.10)	8	-
5.1.8.	Report of the OIE <i>ad hoc</i> Group for the Revision of Chapter 7.7 Stray dog population control	9	27
5.1.9.	Surra (Draft Chapter 8.X) and Dourine (Revised Chapter 12.3)	10	-
5.1.10.	Rinderpest (Chapter 8.16)	10	-
	Code Commission's work programme (contd)	Page No.	Annex No.
5.1.11.	Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.4) and application for official recognition by the OIE of free status for bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 1.8)	11	-
5.1.12.	Theileriosis (Chapters 11.10 and 14.X)	11	-
5.1.13.	Contagious equine metritis (Chapter 12.2) and Equine piroplasmiasis (Chapter 12.7)	11	-
5.2.	New requests / proposals	12	-
5.2.1.	Infection with <i>Echinococcus granulosus</i> (Chapter 8.5) and Infection with <i>Taenia solium</i> (Porcine cysticercosis) (Chapter 15.4)	12	-

6.	Texts proposed for adoption in May 2021	Page No.	Part A: Annex No.
6.1.	User's Guide	12	4
6.2.	Glossary Part A ('epidemiological unit', 'captive wild [animal]', 'feral [animal]', 'wild [animal]' and 'poultry')	12	5
6.3.	Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1)	14	6
6.4.	Animal health surveillance (Article 1.4.3)	15	7
6.5.	Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE (Chapter 1.6)	15	8
6.6.	Veterinary legislation (Chapter 3.4)	17	9
6.7.	Draft new chapter on official control programmes for listed and emerging diseases (Chapter 4.Y)	19	10
6.8.	Draft new chapter on animal welfare and laying hen production systems (Chapter 7.Z)	21	11
6.9.	Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4)	26	12A&B
	Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Article 1.3.6)	32	13
6.10.	Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus (Articles 14.7.3, 14.7.7, 14.7.24 and 14.7.34)	32	14
6.11.	Infection with classical swine fever virus (Chapter 15.2)	35	15
7.	Texts for comments	Page No.	Part B: Annex No.
7.1.	Glossary Part B ('death', 'distress', 'euthanasia', 'pain', 'slaughter', 'stunning' and 'suffering')	38	16
7.2.	Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Articles 1.3.1, 1.3.2 and 1.3.9)	39	17
7.3.	Quality of Veterinary Services, Evaluation of Veterinary Services, and draft new chapter on Veterinary Services (Chapters 3.1, 3.2, 3.X)	39	18,19,20
7.4.	Zoning and compartmentalisation (Articles 4.4.6 and 4.4.7)	43	21
7.5.	Animal welfare during slaughter (Revised Chapter 7.5)	44	-
7.6.	Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (Chapter 8.Y)	45	22
7.7.	Infection with Rift Valley fever virus (Chapter 8.15)	48	23
7.8.	Chapter 9.4, Infestation with <i>Aethina tumida</i> (small hive beetle), (Article 9.4.5)	51	24
7.9.	Avian mycoplasmosis (<i>Mycoplasma gallisepticum</i>) (Chapter 10.5)	51	25
7.10.	Infection with equine influenza virus (Article 12.6.6)	52	26
	Ad hoc Group reports and other documents for information		Part C: Annex No.
5.1.8	Report of the OIE <i>ad hoc</i> Group for the Revision of Chapter 7.7 Stray dog population control	9	27

1. Welcome from the Deputy Director General

Dr Matthew Stone, Deputy Director General (International Standards and Science), welcomed the Code Commission and thanked the members for taking time from their busy schedules to support the work of the OIE, extending this thanks to their employers and national governments. He provided a briefing on the OIE involvement in the COVID-19 international response led by WHO. Dr Stone noted the draft 7th Strategic Plan had recently been circulated to Delegates, and summarised the revisions to the OIE Headquarters' organigram made in late 2019 as a result of the organisational assessment processes linked to the strategy development. Dr Stone briefed the Commission on initiatives in relation to Good Regulatory Practices, including expectations relating to regulatory stewardship, the completion of the design phase of the OIE Observatory, and the initiation of work on an on-line commenting system for standards development and review. He noted the intention to produce a clear articulation of the OIE Science System, building on work over recent years to more clearly describe process and performance management expectations of Reference Centres, and committed to ongoing engagement with the Specialist Commissions during this work. Finally, he provided an update on the Specialist Performance Management System, focussing on the evaluation phase to be initiated in the second half of 2020 prior to the next elections for Specialist Commissions in 2021. The Code Commission thanked Dr Stone and highlighted the importance of the new commenting tools presented for the future work of the Commission. All members reiterated their full commitment, including for capacity development and informal dispute procedure.

2. Meeting with the Director General

Dr Monique Eloit, the OIE Director General, met with the Code Commission on 10 February 2020 and thanked its members for their support and commitment to achieving OIE objectives. Dr Eloit updated the Code Commission on the work currently being undertaken to develop the 7th Strategic Plan and on key issues of the upcoming 88th General Session to be held in May 2020. She also discussed the work programme of the Code Commission and other topics related to its work and performance.

The Code Commission expressed its satisfaction for the work of the Secretariat and highlighted certain points of priority in the work programme.

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

The opinion of the Scientific Commission was sought for relevant Member comments received. The Code Commission wished to thank the Scientific Commission for this collaborative work. Consideration of the Scientific Commission's inputs is noted under the relevant agenda items.

During the February 2020 meeting, the Bureaus (i.e. the President and two Vice-Presidents) of the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission held a meeting chaired by Dr Matthew Stone. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an occasion where the two Bureaus could be informed about the planning and coordination of relevant topics of common interest and, where necessary, prioritise them and agree on the process to manage these topics. This meeting also allowed for better alignment of relevant items on the work programmes and agendas of both Commissions such as the process and criteria for including diseases into the OIE-listed diseases and the development of disease-specific chapters for all of them, and to review jointly the list of chapters that could be presented for adoption in the next General Session.

4.2. Biological Standards Commission

The Code Commission and the Biological Standards Commission held a Joint meeting on 12 February 2020. The meeting provided an opportunity for members of both Commissions to meet and discuss items of common interest, especially their respective work on disease-specific chapters under revision, including infection with high pathogenicity avian influenza viruses, and other related topics such as the development of case definitions for OIE-listed diseases.

All members agreed that this meeting provided an excellent mechanism to strengthen collaboration between the two Commissions and they agreed to explore future joint meetings should both Commissions meet during the same week.

5. Code Commission's work programme

Comments were received from New Caledonia, Switzerland, the EU, the Comité Veterinario Permanente del Cono Sur (CVP) on behalf of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay, and the OIE Americas Region.

The Code Commission acknowledged a comment to encourage more progress in the development of chapters on Surra and dourine, and explained that this issue was discussed with the Scientific Commission during this meeting period and invited Members to refer to the relevant section of this report (agenda item 5.1.9).

Regarding a query as to whether re-evaluation of risk associated with the importation of honey is planned, the Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to assess the need to work on the provisions regarding honey, including a possibility to create a Glossary definition for 'honey', and report back to the Commission at its next meeting.

The Code Commission acknowledged a comment regarding the implementation of containment zones, and explained that the issue would be addressed while dealing with other items currently in the work programme.

The Commission considered a concept note developed by the OIE Secretariat to propose a methodology to either develop or improve, where needed, the case definitions for listed terrestrial animal diseases, in view of difficulties for Members to notify through WAHIS. The Commission welcomed the initiative and acknowledged the importance of the issue and highlighted that this matter had already been in its work programme for some time. The Commission provided feedback on the proposed approach and requested the OIE Secretariat to propose a plan for action to be considered at its next September 2020 meeting.

The Code Commission updated its work programme and revised the order of items in each Section to reflect the level of prioritisation. The updated work programme is attached as **Annex 3** for Member comments.

The Code Commission noted that in general few comments are submitted on the work programme, which outlines the work areas undertaken by the Commission. The Commission strongly encouraged Members to provide feedback on the proposed topics, as well as their level of prioritisation and possibly make propositions to the Commission.

5.1. Ongoing priority topics (except texts proposed for comments or adoption)

5.1.1. Glossary definitions for 'Competent Authority', 'Veterinary Authority' and 'Veterinary Services'

The OIE Secretariat updated the Code Commission on developments on this topic since its last discussion in September 2019.

Background

Following the request of the Code Commission at its February 2019 meeting, the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Services, who met in July 2019, considered comments received on the proposed amendments of the Glossary definitions for 'Competent Authority', 'Veterinary Authority' and 'Veterinary Services'. The Commission considered the proposed amendments and provided its comments to the OIE Secretariat at its September 2019 meeting.

Update

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that feedback had been received from the Scientific Commission and Biological Standards Commission and that the Aquatic Animals Commission will provide comments at its February 2020 meeting.

The opinions of all the Specialist Commissions will be considered by an internal OIE working Group, and additional advice from the Code Commission and Aquatic Animals Commission would be sought if needed, to ensure alignment of definitions in the *Aquatic* and *Terrestrial Codes*.

The revised definitions, together with the relevant considerations of the other Specialist Commissions, will be presented to the Code Commission at its September 2020 meeting.

5.1.2. Terminology: animal products, products of animal origin, by-products

At its September 2019 meeting the Code Commission briefly discussed the use of the terms ‘commodity’, ‘animal products’, ‘products of animal origin’ and ‘animal by-products’ in the *Terrestrial Code* and the need to clarify the use of these terms and whether to develop definitions for some additional terms.

The Code Commission was informed that a Commission member together with the OIE Secretariat was trying to progress this work and would have more to report at the Commission's September 2020 meeting.

5.1.3. Listing of diseases (chronic wasting disease) (Chapter 1.3)

The Code Commission was informed that there was an error in the Scientific Commission's September 2019 report regarding the reporting of the assessments undertaken by experts for chronic wasting disease and requested that this be reassessed using the new guidance for the interpretation of the listing criteria and asked the OIE Secretariat to facilitate this request.

5.1.4. Control of Shiga toxin-producing *E. coli* (STEC) in food-producing animals

The OIE Secretariat updated the Code Commission on developments on this topic since its last discussion in February 2019.

Background

The Code Commission had agreed to include the ‘control of Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* (STEC) in food-producing animals’ in its work programme in light of new work being undertaken by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH) to develop draft “*Guidelines for the Control of Shiga Toxin-Producing Escherichia coli (STEC) in Beef Meat, Leafy Greens, Raw Milk and Cheese Produced from Raw Milk, and Sprouts*”. The Commission had agreed to consider this item once the FAO/WHO expert meeting to conduct a systematic review of all possible interventions from primary production to the end of processing to control STEC in beef had been published.

Update

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that the FAO/WHO expert meeting was planned for later this year. The Commission requested to be informed when the report was published so that it could decide whether to progress work on this item.

5.1.5. General hygiene in semen collection and processing centres and collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen (Chapters 4.6 and 4.7)

The OIE Secretariat updated the Code Commission on the latest developments on this topic since its last discussion in September 2019.

Background

At its September 2019 meeting, the Code Commission had requested that an *ad hoc* Group be convened to undertake a revision of Chapter 4.6, General hygiene in semen collection and processing centres, and Chapter 4.7, Collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen, as well as provisions in relevant disease-specific chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* and the *Terrestrial Manual*, to resolve inconsistencies among the chapters and ensure that relevant texts reflect the latest scientific evidence and best practices regarding risk mitigation measures in the collection and processing of semen of animals. The *ad hoc* Group will also consider the inclusion of provisions to address equine semen in these chapters.

Update

The Code Commission considered the draft Terms of Reference for the *ad hoc* Group. The OIE Secretariat informed the Commission that the first meeting of this *ad hoc* Group is planned for 2020.

The OIE Secretariat wished to inform Members that the Terms of Reference and the meeting dates, once confirmed, will be uploaded onto the 'OIE calendar of *ad hoc* Groups' on the OIE website at: <https://app.smartsheet.com/b/publish?EQBCT=9e202fcc2c804db5aac7bbe7d55aadb7> .

The Code Commission requested that the OIE Secretariat report back on the progress of this work at its next meeting.

5.1.6. Collection and processing of oocytes and *in vitro* produced embryos from livestock and horses, to include bovine viral diarrhoea (Revision of Chapter 4.9)

The OIE Secretariat updated the Code Commission on the latest developments on this topic since its last discussion in September 2019.

Background

The Code Commission has previously considered amending Chapter 4.9, Collection and processing of oocytes and *in vitro* produced embryos from livestock and horses, to include provisions regarding risk mitigation measures for bovine viral diarrhoea (BVD) based on a proposal submitted by the International Embryo Technology Society (IETS).

The Code Commission, at its September 2019 meeting, requested the OIE Secretariat to seek expert advice regarding the process to demonstrate that the bovine granulosa cells or co-culture cells used for *in vitro* culture were free from BVD virus, in order to develop appropriate risk mitigation measures for BVD free countries or zones.

Update

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that the consultation with IETS was ongoing.

The Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to continue this work and to also consult with relevant OIE Reference Laboratories and report back at its next meeting.

5.1.7. Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine (Chapter 6.10)

At the February 2019 meeting of the Code Commission, comments were submitted requesting a review of Chapter 6.10, Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine, given that this chapter had not been significantly reviewed for some time. The Commission had requested OIE Headquarters to seek advice from the OIE Working Group on Antimicrobial Resistance regarding this request.

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that the Working Group, which met in October 2019, considered the comments and agreed that given the similarity between the text in Chapter 6.10 and that under discussion at the Codex Alimentarius Task Force on Antimicrobial Resistance (TFAMR), it advised that any possible amendments to Chapter 6.10 should not be undertaken until completion of discussions at the TFAMR to avoid duplications and inconsistencies.

The Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to keep it informed regarding progress of the Codex work.

5.1.8. Report of the OIE *ad hoc* Group for the Revision of Chapter 7.7 Stray dog population control

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission agreed to revise Chapter 7.7, Stray dog population control, to ensure it was aligned with the OIE Global Strategy to end human death due to dog mediated rabies by 2030, and requested that an *ad hoc* Group be convened to commence this work.

Update

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that the first meeting of the OIE *ad hoc* Group for the Revision of Chapter 7.7 Stray dog population control was held at the OIE Headquarters on 5–7 November 2019. During the meeting, the *ad hoc* Group reviewed current recommendations that address monitoring and evaluation of stray dog control schemes and responsible dog ownership, and discussed additional recommendations that could support the Global Strategy.

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group, considered its proposals and the following was agreed:

1. To restructure Chapter 7.7, as proposed and to update the text in line with current scientific information; to include in the revision of Chapter 7.7 the practical minimum recommendations for population control measures such as dog catching, housing or restraint.
2. To keep the focus on animal welfare and move the animal and public health recommendations to other relevant chapters; to add cross-references in other relevant chapters, notably animal health related ones.
3. To include information on rabies vaccination strategies in Chapter 8.14; consequently, the *ad hoc* Group was requested to provide a proposal regarding suitable text to be included in Chapter 8.14.
4. To provide further justification for the proposal to change the title and if changed, to expressly include the concept of welfare within it.
5. To further clarify the rationale for the *ad hoc* Group to propose to change the use of ‘Stray dog’ to ‘Free-roaming dog’ in the text and clarify its proposed new definition in the Glossary.

The Code Commission thanked the *ad hoc* Group for its work and requested that it continues its work, taking in consideration its guidance on the *ad hoc* Group’s proposals.

The report of the OIE *ad hoc* Group for the Revision of Chapter 7.7 Stray dog population control is attached as [Annex 27](#) for Members’ information.

5.1.9. Surra (draft Chapter 8.X) and Dourine (revised Chapter 12.3)

Background

In its September 2019 meeting, the Code Commission agreed to amend Article 1.3.1 to add 'Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (*T. vivax*, *T. congolense*, *T. simiae* and *T. brucei*)' to the diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE and circulated a draft new Chapter 8.Y, Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin, for Member comments.

The Code Commission reiterated that the decision agreed by the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission was that three separate chapters on animal trypanosomes with different coverage of trypanosomes species and host animals would be developed. In addition to the development of a new draft Chapter 8.Y, Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin, a draft new Chapter 8.X, Surra, and a revised Chapter 12.3, Dourine, had been proposed and extensively discussed since 2015, in particular their respective scopes. The Code Commission reminded Members that in February 2018 the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission had agreed to put Chapters 8.X and 12.3 on hold in light of the ongoing discussions related to Chapter 8.Y, Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin.

Update

The Code Commission highlighted the complexity of defining the scope of these chapters and agreed with the Scientific Commission that notwithstanding the diagnostic issues, the scope of Chapter 8.X should address surra of multiple species including horses, and that the scope of Chapter 12.3 should remain as dourine of equids.

The Code Commission, together with Scientific Commission, agreed to consider comments received on the new draft Chapter 8.Y, Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin, before progressing work on the other two chapters.

The Code Commission recognised this as a priority issue and will come back to the revision of the pending chapters as soon as comments received on the new Chapter 8.Y show a consensus on the proposed approach.

5.1.10. Rinderpest (Chapter 8.16)

The OIE Secretariat updated the Code Commission on the latest developments on this subject since its discussion in September 2019.

Background

In its September 2019 meeting, the Code Commission agreed on the approach to undertake a thorough review of Chapter 8.16, Rinderpest, and reviewed the Terms of Reference of the *ad hoc* Group.

Update

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that the meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Rinderpest is scheduled for March 2020. The OIE Secretariat wished to inform Members that the Terms of Reference will be uploaded onto the 'OIE calendar of *ad hoc* Groups' on the OIE website at: <https://app.smartsheet.com/b/publish?EQBCT=9e202fcc2c804db5aac7bbe7d55aadb7> .

The Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to report back on the progress of this work at its next meeting.

5.1.11. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.4) and application for official recognition by the OIE of free status for bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 1.8)

Comments were received from Australia, Brazil, Canada, China (People's Republic of), Chinese Taipei, Japan, Korea (Republic of), New Zealand, South Africa, Singapore, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, the EU and the IMS.

Background

In February 2018, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission had agreed on an in-depth review of Chapter 11.4, Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE). The OIE convened two *ad hoc* Groups, one on BSE risk assessment and one on BSE surveillance, which met twice and once, respectively, as well as one joint meeting between July 2018 and March 2019. The Code Commission, at its September 2019 meeting, reviewed the four *ad hoc* Group reports and the opinion of the Scientific Commission regarding the revised draft chapter, and circulated the revised draft chapter for comment.

Update

The Code Commission appreciated the large number of comments that had been submitted. The Commission considered all comments and identified those comments that needed further expert advice, and thanked the OIE Secretariat for having scheduled a joint *ad hoc* Group on BSE risk assessment and BSE surveillance to address these comments together with the draft revised Chapter 1.8. The Commission addressed the other comments and proposed that the amended text and some additional guidance be provided to the *ad hoc* Group in order to inform their future work. The two Commissions will review the report of the *ad hoc* Group once finalised.

5.1.12. Theileriosis (Chapters 11.10 and 14.X)

Due to time constraints the Code Commission was unable to address the following items, and proposed to discuss them at its September 2020 meeting:

- Chapter 11.10, Infection with *Theileria annulata*, *T. orientalis* and *T. parva*, and
- Draft chapter 14.X, Infection with *Theileria lestoquardi*, *T. luwenshuni* and *T. uilenbergi*.

5.1.13. Contagious equine metritis (Chapter 12.2) and Equine piroplasmiasis (Chapter 12.7)

The OIE Secretariat updated the Code Commission on the latest developments on this topic since its last discussion in September 2019.

Background

At its February 2019 meeting, the Code Commission agreed to amend Chapter 12.2, Contagious equine metritis, and Chapter 12.7, Equine piroplasmiasis, to include requirements for the temporary movement of horses. In addition, given that these chapters had not been reviewed for many years the Commission also requested the OIE Secretariat to evaluate the need for a comprehensive revision of these two chapters.

Update

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that electronic consultations with experts had been conducted between September and December 2019 and that the report of the electronic consultations including the draft chapters were provided to the Scientific Commission for review at its February 2020 meeting and that the draft chapters together with Scientific Commission's comments will be presented to the Code Commission for its review in September 2020.

5.2. New requests / proposals

5.2.1. Infection with *Echinococcus granulosus* (Chapter 8.5) and Infection with *Taenia solium* (Porcine cysticercosis) (Chapter 15.4)

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that a request was received from the World Health Organisation (WHO) to update Chapter 8.5, Infection with *Echinococcus granulosus*, and Chapter 15.4, Infection with *Taenia solium* (Porcine cysticercosis), as well as the corresponding chapters in the *Terrestrial Manual*, in view of recent developments in the area of vaccines and vaccination.

The OIE Secretariat reported that the request regarding the *Terrestrial Manual* chapters was to be considered by the Biological Standards Commission at its February 2020 meeting.

The Code Commission acknowledged the request and agreed to wait for the opinion of the Biological Standards Commission before considering the inclusion of these topics in its work programme.

The Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to report back on progress of this work at its next meeting.

6. Texts proposed for adoption in May 2021 (PartA)

6.1. User's Guide

Comments were received from the EU and Switzerland.

Background

Amendments to the User's Guide were circulated to Members in the Code Commission's February and September 2019 meeting reports proposing amendments in point 3 of Section B for consistency with terminology used throughout the *Terrestrial Code*, and in point 5 of Section C to include a reference to Chapter 2.2.

Discussion

In point 3 of Section B, in response to a comment, the Code Commission agreed to remove the reference to 'tests for international trade' noting that tests for international trade have been removed from the *Terrestrial Code* and replaced by cross-references to the *Terrestrial Manual*.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to remove 'diagnosis' noting that the use of this term in the *Terrestrial Code* refers not only to laboratory tests but also to any other methods that could be used to identify the nature of the disease, such as clinical examination.

The Code Commission agreed to replace 'assessment' with 'recognition' to align with the terminology being proposed in the revised version of Chapter 1.6.

The revised points B3 and point C5 of the User's Guide are attached as **Annex 4** for Member comments. The adoption of the revised revised points of the User's Guide has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As these have already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously.

6.2. Glossary Part A ('epidemiological unit', 'captive wild [animal]', 'feral [animal]' and 'wild [animal]')

Glossary definition for 'captive wild [animal]', 'feral [animal]' and 'wild [animal]'

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, USA, the OIE Americas Region, the EU and ICFAW.

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission had proposed a revision to the Glossary definition for ‘captive wild [animal]’ in response to a comment submitted for Chapter 15.1, Infection with African swine fever, that was under revision at that time. Arising from the proposed revision to the definition of ‘captive wild [animal]’, consequent amendments were also proposed to the Glossary definitions of ‘feral [animal]’ and ‘wild [animal]’, that were circulated in the Commission’s September 2019 report.

‘Captive wild [animal]’

The Code Commission recalled that examples were added to the definition of ‘captive wild [animal]’ at its September 2019 meeting in response to requests by Members to provide further elaboration on what was meant by ‘human supervision or control’. At this meeting however, the Code Commission received comments, some of which were from the same Members, either querying the relevance of these examples or requesting to remove them.

In response to these comments and to keep the definition of ‘captive wild [animal]’ concise, the Code Commission proposed to delete the examples of ‘human supervision or control’.

The Code Commission acknowledged that the examples may differ among Members and emphasised that the key difference between captive wild animals and feral and wild animals is that captive wild animals require human supervision and control. For this reason, the Commission did not agree with comments to delete ‘requiring’ before ‘human supervision or control’.

‘Feral [animal]’

The Code Commission did not agree with comments to delete ‘without requiring’ before ‘human supervision or control’ for the same reason given above.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and that can recover some biological patterns typical of its wild ancestors’ after ‘supervision and control’ as it considered this to be too detailed and did not improve the text.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘independently’ after ‘lives’ and ‘direct’ before ‘human supervision or control’, explaining that the objective of these definitions in the *Terrestrial Code* is to highlight the difference in epidemiological significance between these populations and it was not necessary to provide this level of detail.

‘Wild [animal]’

For the same reasons given above, the Code Commission did not agree with comments to delete ‘without requiring’ and to add ‘direct’ before ‘human supervision or control’.

Glossary definition for ‘epidemiological unit’

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

Background

The Code Commission reiterated that a Glossary definition should be concise and yet address essential information. The Commission noted that at its previous meeting some text in the definition for ‘epidemiological unit’ regarding how epidemiological units may be applied in practice had been moved to point 1(d) of Article 1.4.3 in Chapter 1.4, Animal Health Surveillance.

The Code Commission considered comments submitted, as well as advice provided by the Scientific Commission and amended the text to improve clarity.

Glossary definition for 'poultry'

As part of the revision of Chapter 10.4, Infection with avian influenza viruses, the Code Commission acknowledged that the term 'poultry' is used in many other chapters in the *Terrestrial Code* and therefore proposed to remove the definition of 'poultry' from Chapter 10.4 (See Item 6.9) and to amend the Glossary definition for poultry.

The revised Glossary definitions for 'epidemiological unit', 'captive wild [animal]', 'feral [animal]', 'wild [animal]' and 'poultry' are attached as **Annex 5** for Member comments. The adoption of the revised Glossary definitions has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As these have already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously.

6.3. Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1)

Comments were received from Argentina, Cuba, New Caledonia, Switzerland, the EU and AU-IBAR.

Background

Chapter 1.1 was revised by the Code Commission in September 2018 to address inconsistencies in notification by Members through the OIE World Animal Health Information System. Amendments were introduced in points 1, 2 and 3 of Article 1.1.3, and a new point (d) was added to Article 1.1.3. The Commission also reviewed and modified the chapter for consistency with other chapters in the *Code*, and to improve grammar and readability. This chapter has been circulated for comments three times.

Discussion

Title

To better reflect the approach taken for this revised chapter, the Code Commission agreed to amend the title to 'Notification of diseases and provision of epidemiological information'. This is also in alignment with Chapter 1.1 of the *Aquatic Animal Health Code*.

Article 1.1.2

The Code Commission acknowledged a comment requesting that, once the proposed replacement of 'immediate notification within 24 hours' by 'initial notification' in point 3 is adopted, it should also be reflected in WAHIS to avoid confusion, and requested the OIE Secretariat to forward this request to the OIE World Animal Health Information Department (WAHIAD).

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to add the term 'disinfection' before 'biosecurity' as it considered that 'disinfection' is included in the management component for 'biosecurity' as per the Glossary definition.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to reinstate the terms 'infection' and 'infestation' noting that in this sentence the term 'disease' is used in a general manner. The Commission reminded Members that it had provided an explanation for the approach being applied in this chapter for these terms in its September 2019 report.

Article 1.1.3

In point 2, in response to a comment, the Code Commission acknowledged that the information available for the follow up reports might vary according with the evolution and epidemiology of each situation, nevertheless, they considered it necessary to maintain the specific reference to 'weekly reports' to ensure the application of a standard process.

For the same point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘emerging diseases’ after ‘listed diseases’ so that weekly reports be submitted following the initial notification of an emerging disease as it considered this a decision for OIE Headquarters. The notification for emerging diseases is described in Article 1.1.4. The Commission requested OIE Secretariat to seek the advice of the WAHIAD and report back to the Commission if a modification of Article 1.1.4 is deemed necessary.

The revised Chapter 1.1 is attached as **Annex 6** for Member comments. The adoption of the revised chapter has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As the revised chapter has already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously..

6.4. Animal health surveillance (Article 1.4.3)

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

Background

At its September 2019 meeting, as a consequence of the revision of the Glossary definition for ‘epidemiological unit’ the Code Commission amended the text of point 1(d) of Article 1.4.3 in Chapter 1.4, Animal Health Surveillance (see Item 6.2). The revised Article 1.4.3 was circulated for comments in the September 2019 meeting report.

Discussion

For the first paragraph of point 1(d), the Code Commission, together with the Scientific Commission, agreed with a comment to include text that links sampling units to epidemiological units, and amended the text accordingly.

For the second paragraph of point 1(d), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to rephrase the sentence ‘Usually, an *epidemiological unit* is a *herd* or a *flock*.’, as it considered the text was clear as written.

The revised Article 1.4.3 is attached as **Annex 7** for Member comments. The adoption of the revised article has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As the revised article has already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously..

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

Comments were received from Australia, New Caledonia, Switzerland, USA, the EU and AU-IBAR.

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission had agreed, in coordination with the Scientific Commission, to harmonise provisions in disease-specific chapters for official recognition of status (see items 6.9 and 6.10). Common provisions concerning procedures applicable to the diseases with official status recognition would be addressed in Chapter 1.6, Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE, instead of being repeated in each disease-specific chapter.

Discussion

In response to a comment requesting to include an elaboration of the administrative and technical screening processes in Chapter 1.6, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that administrative procedures should not be included in the *Terrestrial Code*. These procedures are defined by the OIE Headquarters and are covered by Standard Operating Procedures which are available on the OIE website at www.oie.int/self-declaration.

Title

The Code Commission deleted ‘an’ before ‘animal health status’ in the title of the chapter for consistency with the grammatically correct heading of Article 1.6.1. This change has also been applied throughout the text.

Article 1.6.1

In response to a comment to replace ‘and’ with ‘and/or’ in the heading of Article 1.6.1, the Code Commission clarified that ‘and’ is more appropriate as both official recognition of animal health status and endorsement of official control programmes are being referred to in the article. The use of ‘and/or’ is not appropriate in the *Terrestrial Code*.

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to use initialisms as the full names of the diseases with their initialisms in parentheses have been provided in point 1.

In point 2(d), in response to a comment on having an official status recognition process for dog-mediated rabies, the Code Commission was of the view that in the goal for the elimination of human deaths from dog-mediated rabies by 2030, the implementation of an official control programme is more crucial than instituting an official status recognition mechanism.

In paragraph 5, the Code Commission did not accept a comment to include ‘along with’ before ‘the endorsement of official control programmes’. The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that the purpose of the sentence is to describe the link to relevant resolutions and is not specific to whether the disease has an official recognition of animal health status or an endorsed official control programme, or both.

In paragraph 6, the Code Commission did not accept a comment to replace ‘or’ with ‘and/or’ as this is not in line with the use of these terms in the *Terrestrial Code*. The Commission proposed to delete ‘based on the provisions of Chapter 1.7 to 1.12’ as this is already covered in paragraph 4.

Article 1.6.2

In the second sentence of paragraph 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to move ‘within 24 months after suspension’ to the beginning of the sentence for clarity.

Article 1.6.3

In the first sentence of paragraph 1, a comment was submitted stating that the Glossary definition of ‘animal health status’ refers to ‘disease’ and not ‘infection’ or ‘infestation’, which is inconsistent with the content in this article that refers to ‘disease, infection or infestation’. The Code Commission will review this inconsistency as part of its ongoing work on how the terms ‘disease’, ‘infection’ and ‘infestation’ have been used in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to rephrase the last sentence of paragraph 1 for clarity.

In the first indent of paragraph 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘in’ with ‘for’ before ‘the entire country’. The Commission clarified that the context refers to the obligation to report notifiable disease in the entire country and thus ‘in’ is a more appropriate preposition. Furthermore, this preposition is used in several chapters in the *Terrestrial Code* and should be retained for consistency.

In the second indent, a comment was submitted to include ‘disease’ after ‘infection or infestation’ as ‘disease’ is also a determinant of ‘animal health status’. The Commission reiterated its previous point that it will continue to review how the terms ‘disease’, ‘infection’ and ‘infestation’ have been used in the *Terrestrial Code* to ensure consistency.

In paragraph 4, in response to a comment requesting for more information on where and how the information on a loss of self-declared free status is made publicly available, the Code Commission noted the explanation provided by the OIE Secretariat that this information is available on the OIE website in the Standard Operating Procedures.

The revised Chapter 1.6, Procedures for official recognition of animal health status, endorsement of an official control programme, and publication of a self-declaration of animal health status, by the OIE is attached as **Annex 8** for Member comments. The adoption of the revised chapter has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As the revised chapter has already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously..

6.6. Veterinary Legislation (Chapter 3.4)

Comments were received from Malaysia, New Caledonia, Switzerland, the EU and AU-IBAR.

Background

A thorough review of Chapter 3.4, Veterinary legislation, was undertaken by the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary legislation in January 2018. The draft revised chapter has been circulated three times for comments.

Discussion

Article 3.4.1

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘international standards and instruments’ with ‘legal standards and instruments available at the international level’ as it considered the original wording to be appropriate language, clear as written, and that the proposed amendments may introduce unnecessary ambiguity.

Article 3.4.2

Regarding the definition of ‘Veterinary domain’, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to reinstate the text ‘consistent with a One Health approach’, reiterating that this was outside the scope of the chapter. The Commission recalled that Chapter 6.1, Introduction to recommendations for veterinary public health, provides further details on veterinary public health taking a ‘One Health’ approach, and therefore considered that the concept of ‘One Health’ was implicit in ‘veterinary public health’. The Commission reminded Members that given that Chapter 6.1 is a horizontal chapter, this concept of the One Health approach applies to other chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*, when relevant.

Article 3.4.3

In the third paragraph of point 2, a comment was submitted to include ‘supranational’ based on the rationale that ‘regional’ could be perceived as legislation of a region or territory which is part of a country, as opposed to legislation pertaining to more than one country. The Code Commission did not agree to this amendment but did consider that the word ‘regional’ could cause confusion in this context and referred to the Oxford dictionary definition of ‘international law’, which refers to a body of rules established by custom or treaty and recognised by nations as binding in their relations with one another. Based on this information, the Commission was of the view that ‘international law’ encompasses regional and supranational laws and thus there was no need to retain the word ‘regional’.

In the first paragraph of point 4, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to make an explicit reference to laboratories or other scientific institutions as it considered this to be covered under ‘other relevant stakeholders’.

In point 5, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘animals’ for completeness. However, it did not agree with a comment to add ‘health status of the country’ after ‘protect’ as it considered this to be implicit, and that the proposed addition would be too restrictive. It also did not agree to delete the phrase ‘against unintended adverse side effects of legal instruments’ as it considered this to be an essential concept regarding the quality of legal drafting. The Commission explained that laws should be crafted carefully so they do not result in unintended abuse or harm to citizens, animals or the environment.

Article 3.4.4

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘authorities’ with ‘powers’ as this point refers to legal powers that are conferred to the responsible entity.

In point 6, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘proportionate and dissuasive’ before ‘penalties and sanctions’ to highlight that penalties and sanctions should be meaningful, to the point, neither too harsh nor too lax, and effective in achieving their objectives.

Article 3.4.5

In the third indent of point 1(d)(iii), the Code Commission did not agree to include ‘where necessary,’ before ‘destruction’ as it considered it unnecessary, given that this section refers to powers of the Competent Authority, which has the discretion on when to exercise these powers. Notwithstanding, for clarity, the Commission separated ‘seizure’ and ‘destruction’ into two separate indented points recognising that these activities may not always be done in conjunction.

In the ninth indent, the Code Commission did not agree to add ‘notification’ given that ‘notification’ is a defined term in the Glossary of the *Terrestrial Code* and could be misunderstood. The Commission recalled that a review of the Glossary definition for ‘notification’ is in the work programme.

The Code Commission did not agree to delete point 1(d)(iv) and reiterated its previous explanation that the article does not prescribe the implementation of any specific compensation budget but recommends that veterinary legislation provide the Competent Authorities with the power to establish compensation mechanisms. It remains up to the country to define compensation mechanisms and sources of funding.

Article 3.4.6

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘if the veterinary legislation does not create a veterinary statutory body’ before ‘veterinary statutory body’ with ‘in the event that a Member Country is yet to have an existing’ with a slight modification for readability, noting that the proposed wording supports and encourages the creation of a veterinary statutory body, rather than leaving it open-ended.

Article 3.4.7

For point 1(c), in response to a comment requesting clarification of ‘recognised’ laboratory, the Code Commission proposed amendments to points 1(b) and 1(c) to draw a clearer distinction between the three types of laboratories listed. Point 1(b) refers to laboratories performing analysis of official samples, which should have specific requirements for approval by the Competent Authority. For clarity, the Commission proposed to replace ‘designated’ with ‘registered’. Point 1(c) refers to other laboratories which are not necessarily approved by the Competent Authority but are still subject to compliance requirements. In addition, the Commission agreed with a comment to delete the examples in point 1(c) agreeing that they were unnecessary and could be unintentionally restrictive.

Article 3.4.8

In point 4(b), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘packaging, labelling’ for completeness, and for consistency with Chapter 6.4, The control of hazards of animal health and public health importance in animal feed.

Article 3.4.10

In point 2, the Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to replace ‘free-roaming domestic ’ before ‘animals’ with ‘abandoned’ for congruency with the content described under this point but retained the term ‘domestic’.

Article 3.4.11

In paragraph 1, the Code Commission proposed to add references to the relevant chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* pertaining to antimicrobial resistance.

In point 1(b), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘distribution’ with ‘wholesale and retail’ for consistency with how these issues are addressed in the article.

In point 4(c), the Code Commission accepted a comment to include ‘good distribution practices’ as it agreed that this should be covered.

In point 5(f), the Code Commission agreed with a comment that ‘a system of surveillance for falsification’ is not well-placed as this activity is not part of advertising. It thus agreed to move this point to 5(g) which describes a system of surveillance.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to separate ‘reporting on adverse effects’ from point 5(g) to a new point 5(h). However, it did not agree with a comment to include ‘pharmacovigilance system’ as it considered this is implied under ‘a system for reporting on adverse effects’. Furthermore, the text of this chapter should not be too detailed.

Article 3.4.12

In point 1(c), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘including (slaughter)’ with ‘and (slaughter)’ for consistency with Chapter 6.2, The role of the Veterinary Services in food safety systems, where slaughter is not identified to be part of primary production.

The revised Chapter 3.4, Veterinary legislation, is attached as **Annex 9** for Member comments. The adoption of the revised chapter has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As the revised chapter has already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously.

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

Comments were received from Australia, Cuba, Malaysia, Switzerland, the EU and AU-IBAR.

Background

The Code Commission added the development of a new chapter on outbreak management to its Work Programme at its February 2016 meeting. The first draft of this new chapter was circulated for Member comments in the Commission’s February 2017 meeting report. Since that time, the Commission has made significant amendments to the text of this chapter having taken into consideration important feedback received from Members during six rounds of comments, as well advice provided by the Scientific Commission to address specific comments.

Discussion

The Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to replace ‘cull’ and ‘culling’ with ‘kill’ and ‘killing’, respectively, throughout this chapter as the ‘killing’ is defined in the Glossary and therefore the meaning is clear. Taking into account the context for the use of the terms ‘cull’ and ‘culling’ in relevant articles, the Commission proposed to replace ‘culling’ with ‘selective *killing*’ as a noun and to replace ‘cull’ with ‘kill’ as a verb. The Commission also requested the OIE Secretariat to ensure these terms are translated appropriately into French and Spanish especially because there is no good counterpart for ‘cull’ in the two languages.

Article 4.Y.1

The Code Commission noted a comment to add a point on communication with relevant stakeholders in the list of general components, and therefore proposed to add a point on awareness programmes using similar wording to that used in other disease-specific chapters.

Article 4.Y.2

In the fifth indent of point 2, in response to a concern that not all countries have the capacity to fund compensation, the Code Commission emphasised that this indent does not prescribe the implementation of any specific compensation mechanisms, but rather it recommends that Veterinary Services explore the sources of finance and develop a compensation policy. Moreover, the Commission stressed that all recommendations in the *Terrestrial Code* are meant to guide Members in the development of their measures, and that the compensation policy is an essential component in disease control efforts like other human and financial resources.

In the fifth indent of point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘if relevant’ as this inclusion could be applied to any points, and that all points would be specific to the disease of concern and the objectives of the control programmes. In the twelfth indent of point 3, the Commission did not agree with a comment to explicitly mention ‘cleaning’ as it considered it is clear enough as written.

Article 4.Y.3

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘on a risk analysis or an evaluation of the actual or likely impact of the disease and’ before ‘on the level of preparedness’ as it considered all these points were covered in the text following this paragraph.

In point 3, the Code Commission considered a comment suggesting alternative wording for the explanation of simulation exercises, and made some minor amendments. The Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘regular’ before ‘organisation of simulation exercises’ as the frequency of the exercises should be decided by the Veterinary Services.

Article 4.Y.5

In the first indent of point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment proposing to add two more points regarding procedures for collection, treatment or safe disposal of contaminated commodities and fomites, noting that these points are already addressed. Nevertheless, the Commission proposed amendment to the text for clarity.

In the chapeau of point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘in premises and/or restricted zones’ before ‘through’ as it did not consider that the proposal improved the existing text, and explained that the indents under this point are not requirements but general considerations.

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission clarified that ‘prevalence control’ means prevention of an increase in prevalence and a reduction in prevalence when possible.

Article 4.Y.6

In the fourth paragraph of point 1, taking into account the advice from the OIE Wildlife Working Group, the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘depopulation’ with ‘selective killing’ in this context for wildlife.

Article 4.Y.10

In the fifth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘cost benefit analysis’ as it considered that aspect well covered in the paragraph that followed. The Commission explained that this sentence is simply describing the expected outcome of vaccination.

The revised new draft Chapter 4.Y, Official control programmes for listed and emerging diseases is attached as **Annex 10** for Member comments. The adoption of the revised new draft chapter has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As the revised new draft chapter has already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously..

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

Comments were received from Australia, Argentina, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Mexico, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, South Africa, USA, EU, AU-IBAR, the OIE Americas Region, ICFAW, IEC, and experts.

Background

This new draft chapter on animal welfare and laying hen production systems is the last chapter to be developed on animal production systems based on the prioritised list developed by former OIE Animal Welfare Working Group. The initial draft chapter was developed by the *ad hoc* Group on Animal welfare and laying hen production systems and has been circulated for comments on three occasions in September 2017, 2018 and 2019.

The Code Commission reiterated that one of the objectives of the revised chapter was to enable the continuous development of country specific animal welfare recommendations and monitoring during implementation.

The Code Commission encouraged Members to refer to its past reports and relevant *ad hoc* Group reports as they include detailed information about previous revisions as well as the rationale for previous amendments. The Commission noted that given some comments submitted were similar to those submitted previously, and that the rationale for such comments was provided in previous reports, the Commission did not repeat these again in this report. The Commission urges Members not to repeat comments that have been made in previous reviews if they are justified by the same argument.

General considerations

A significant number of comments were received, some with opposing positions. The Code Commission considered all comments received, and consulted with the Chair of the *ad hoc* Group during its meeting to seek expert advice on some specific comments.

The Code Commission agreed to focus on reinforcing the outcome-based criteria (or measurables) rather than amending the specific recommendations. They agreed that this would ensure that all Members would be able to implement the chapter irrespective of the level of development of animal welfare measures for laying hens and layer pullets.

The Code Commission did not agree to include additional examples in the description of the criteria or in the recommendations noting that the examples provided are not intended to provide an exhaustive list.

The Code Commission agreed to add the term ‘animal’ before ‘welfare’ throughout the chapter, when appropriate but noted that this was not always needed e.g. when referring to layer pullets and layer hens.

The Code Commission agreed to add the term ‘layer’ before ‘pullets’ and ‘hens’ throughout the chapter for consistency.

The Code Commission revised the use of the term ‘may’ versus ‘can’ and replaced throughout the text as deemed appropriate to ensure consistency.

Since all behaviours were considered, included ‘motivated behaviours’ within the criteria, the Code Commission decided to not qualify behaviours as ‘highly’, ‘strongly’ and ‘complex’ throughout the text to simplify readability noting that these are qualitative terms that are difficult to interpret.

The Code Commission did not agree with the comment to delete the list of outcome-based measurables after each of the recommendations as it considered these to form the basis of the approach taken in the development of other production systems animal welfare chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*.

Title of the chapter

The Code Commission did not agree to add the term ‘commercial’ in the title to be consistent with other animal welfare chapters.

Preamble (previously deleted)

The Code Commission received a number of comments requesting to reinstate text that had been proposed in a previous version but subsequently deleted. The Commission reiterated that the rationale for not including a preamble was described in the Commission’s report of September 2019. The Commission recalled that this text was generic in terms of the framework of the OIE standard-setting process and not specific to this chapter. The Commission recommended that if this kind of statement was included anywhere in the *Code*, the best fit would be in Chapter 7.1., Introduction to the recommendation for animal welfare.

Article 7.Z.2

The Code Commission did not agree to delete the term ‘Commercial’ from this article as this chapter only addresses animal welfare aspects of commercial laying hen production systems. So-called ‘backyard flocks’ are not addressed as there is no capacity to assess the criteria for all backyard flocks. The Commission noted that animal welfare principles are covered in Chapter 7.1, Introduction to the recommendations for animal welfare, for species not addressed in other animal welfare chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission did not agree to amend the definition of ‘Completely outdoor systems’ and explained that what defines the different production system concepts is the confinement and not measures such as the use or not of mechanical environmental control. Whether there is an outdoor area shelter or not, or other measures favouring good animal welfare is a different issue.

Article 7.Z.3

The Code Commission agreed to remove the examples in the first paragraph of this article (e.g. mortality rate), noting that these do not provide clarity (as intended) but rather confuse the reader. The Commission agreed to include the term ‘motivated’ in some of the behavioural criteria to highlight the importance of these behaviours.

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission agreed to add the term ‘in English’ after ‘in alphabetical order’, to clarify that the order is based on English spelling, which would clarify for the reader the order to be used in the corresponding chapters of the French and Spanish editions of the *Terrestrial Code*.

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include the concept of how well beak trimming has been performed as it is not an indication of beak condition.

In point 2(a), the Code Commission did not agree to change the title to ‘Sand bath or bedding material’ as these do not describe a behaviour. It agreed to add the term ‘motivated’ to distinguish this behaviour from behaviours that are reactive. The Commission did not agree with the proposal to delete the term ‘positive affect’ as this is the term used in the scientific reference given [Widowski and Duncan, 2000], which is associated with a positive animal welfare outcome.

In point 2(b), the Code Commission agreed with the proposition to include the words ‘in response to novel objects’ to clarify the example assessing fearfulness of layer pullets and laying hens, but not ‘level of flightiness’.

In point 2(d), the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘ability’ with ‘opportunity’ noting that it reflects better the way foraging behaviour decreases. It also agreed to replace ‘food’ with ‘feed’ which is the proper term for animals.

In point 2(e), the Code Commission did not agree to delete ‘feather’ from the title ‘Injurious feather pecking’ as it agreed feather pecking is the damaging behaviour which can lead to injuries and cannibalism. It agreed to include a text in relation to the possibility to develop secondary infections due to this behaviour.

In point 2(g), the Code Commission agreed to delete the term ‘behavioural’, when talking about social factors, and also agreed to include examples for social and environmental factors that could be indicative of problems in relation to nesting.

In point 2(h), the Code Commission agreed to include an example which could indicate problems with environmental factors that reduce perching behaviour.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree to add ‘health and’ given that the focus of this chapter is on animal welfare nor with the proposal to add ‘management issues that might be associated with’.

In point 5, the Code Commission agreed to delete the complex term ‘of aspect (of the production system)’.

In point 7, the Code Commission agreed to modify the example to ‘e.g. poor flooring leading to foot injury’ to provide further clarification and to move to the appropriate place in the text.

In point 8, the Code Commission did not agree to add the term ‘morbidity’ in the second sentence because we are referring to mortality and culling rates as well as morbidity rates.

In point 9, the Code Commission agreed to delete the term ‘indicators’ after ‘performance’ for clarity noting that it is the performance that is assessed. This is also for consistency with Chapter 7.10, Animal Welfare and broiler chicken production systems. This term was deleted throughout the chapter for consistency.

In point 9(d), the Code Commission agreed to clarify the indicator for the egg production by adding ‘the number, size and weight of eggs per hen housed’.

In point 11, the Code Commission agreed to include the term ‘impacting’, to improve the use of the term animal welfare in the sentence.

Article 7.Z.4

The Code Commission agreed to move the last sentence of the first paragraph of this article to Article 7.Z.15, as Article 7.Z.15 refers specifically to the different thermal environments.

Article 7.Z.5

The Code Commission agreed to add the behaviours ‘dust bathing, nesting and perching’ to the list of outcome-based measurables.

Article 7.Z.6

In the first paragraph of the second sentence, the Code Commission did not agree with the comment to modify the text as the current text allowed flexibility. Similarly, it did not agree to replace the word ‘bird’ with ‘layer pullet’ to ensure consistency within the sentence.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposed change to the order of the measures, noting that the list is in alphabetical order in English (based on the English version). The Commission did not agree to add ‘where applicable’ and ‘where available’ which are vague terms and not relevant in the context of this article.

Article 7.Z.7

The Code Commission did not agree with the comment to add text regarding the expression of locomotory and comfort behaviours in the first paragraph as this is already addressed in the second sentence of the same paragraph. The Commission also did not agree to change the term ‘injuries’ for ‘injurious feather pecking and cannibalism’ as this is implicit in the word ‘injuries’ and also is included in the list of outcome-based criteria.

Article 7.Z.8

The Code Commission agreed to delete the term ‘always’ from the first sentence of the article, as it agreed it did not improve the understanding of what an appropriate diet should be. The Commission also agreed to include ‘and metabolic disorders’, in the list of criteria as it was agreed to use the full title of the criteria, as per Article 7.Z.3, when including them in the list after the recommendations.

Article 7.Z.9

The Code Commission did not agree to delete the terms ‘locomotion of’ because the primary purpose of flooring is to support the locomotion of the animal. Also, it was agreed to include an example to be more precise on which kind of behaviours could positively or negatively be affected.

Article 7.Z.10

The Code Commission did not agree with the comment to add ‘when dust bathing areas are provided, they should have friable and dry substrate’ as it considered this to be too detailed for the chapter.

Article 7.Z.11

The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to delete the first sentence because this is a ‘desirable’ feature. The Commission did not agree with the proposal to add that ‘...substrate should be provided...’ as it considered this to be too prescriptive a statement.

Article 7.Z.12

The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to replace ‘is desirable’ with expanded text as it considered the text as written was clear.

Article 7.Z.14

The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to specify what was meant by ‘...kept in partially housed and completely outdoor systems...’ as it considered that the title of the article provides this information. The Commission clarified that this article is not relevant for systems with no outdoor area and did not agree to reinstate ‘outdoor area should provide shelter and shade for the birds’ due to being implicit.

Article 7.Z.15

The Code Commission agreed to keep the term ‘regularly’ instead of ‘frequently’, noting that it is difficult to define how frequent this should be done. The appropriate frequency should be determined by the animal handlers.

Article 7.Z.17

The Code Commission agreed to include the term ‘is practised’, in order to clarify that rapid changes in lighting is used only when moulting is practised, as described in Article 7.Z.20.

Article 7.Z.19

The Code Commission agreed to modify the second indent by adding ‘associated with’ to clarify that injurious feather pecking is associated with the behavioural phenotype of low propensity to feather pick, and not the genetics.

Article 7.Z.20

The Code Commission did not agree with the comment to add a sentence recommending the use of other management strategies to extend the first laying period, as it considered this to be too restrictive. The Code Commission highlighted that the text as currently written, explicitly mentions the potential risk of this procedure.

Article 7.Z.21

The Code Commission did not agree to move the sentence regarding dubbing and toe trimming to the first paragraph, noting that reordering the text would not provide any additional value and could potentially confuse users.

The Code Commission did not agree to add new text regarding the problems of beak trimming at a mature age, as it considered this addressed in the current text.

The Code Commission did not agree to expand the text regarding the potential of selective breeding for alternative beak profiles and shapes as it considered this too detailed and not currently used broadly.

Article 7.Z.24

The Code Commission did not agree to add a bullet point regarding disease or medical condition as it considered this to be already addressed in the third bullet point, ‘rapid deterioration of a medical condition for which treatment has been unsuccessful’. Similarly, it did not agree with the proposal to include culling as a reason together with euthanasia as this aspect is covered in Article 7.Z.25.

The Code Commission agreed with the principle of several comments regarding the urgency to conduct euthanasia but did not agree to include new text noting that this aspect is included in Chapter 7.6, Killing for disease control purposes.

Article 7.Z.25

The Code Commission did not agree to delete the words ‘for whatever reason’, in the first paragraph, as this article not only applies to end-of lay flock, but also could be applicable to disaster situations. The Commission did not agree to add a reference to Chapter 7.6 noting that this is already included in the fourth paragraph.

Article 7.Z.26.

The Code Commission agreed with the proposal to add ‘evacuation procedures’ in the second sentence at the beginning of the article, as a useful example.

The Code Commission did not agree to add new criteria to the list of outcomes-based measurables as they were not relevant in emergency situations.

Article 7.Z.27

The Code Commission did not agree to add ‘attitude’ to the characteristics of the animal handled as this is included in the ‘handling techniques’ mentioned in the second paragraph.

In relation to the addition of the term ‘humane’ regarding the killing procedures, the Code Commission agreed to wait for the outcomes of discussions on this point after the next meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on the revision of Chapter 7.6, Killing of animals for disease control purposes.

Article 7.Z.28

The Code Commission agreed to include ‘outdoor facilities’ in the first and third paragraphs, to ensure that all the production systems included in the scope are covered by this article.

The Code Commission did not agree to include new criteria in the list of outcome-based measurables, as it considered that they are not in direct relation with the consequences of good or bad management of the inspection or the handling.

The revised new draft Chapter 7.Z, Animal welfare and laying hen production systems, is attached as **Annex 11** for Member comments. The adoption of the revised new draft chapter has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As the revised new draft chapter has already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously..

6.9. Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4) [together with Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Article 1.3.6)]

Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4)

Comments were received from Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Japan, Korea (Republic of), Malaysia, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland, USA, the OIE Americas Region, the EU and AU-IBAR.

Background

A comprehensive review of Chapter 10.4, Infection with avian influenza viruses, was undertaken by the *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza between 2017 and 2019. The draft revised chapter has been circulated for Member comments on two occasions.

General considerations

In response to comments received on the proposal to delist low pathogenicity avian influenza (LPAI) from Chapter 1.3, Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE, the Code Commission considered all these comments together with the previous *ad hoc* Group reports and advice provided by the Chair of the *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza on some specific comments.

The Code Commission extensively discussed the proposed delisting of LPAI and the ensuing consequences for Chapters 1.3 and 10.4. The Commission first noted that the assessment against the listing criteria conducted by the *ad hoc* Group had been correctly conducted and concluded that LPAI, including H5 and H7 subtypes, did not meet the criteria for listing and therefore should be deleted from the Chapter 1.3, while Chapter 10.4 should focus on infection with high pathogenicity avian influenza (HPAI) viruses.

On the other hand, the Commission also noted that at least one specific LPAI virus lineage (the H7N9 Chinese lineage LPAI) did meet the criteria for listing because of its zoonotic impact. After taking into account the scientific evidence available, the appropriate level of risk mitigation measures and coherency in the *Terrestrial Code*, the Code Commission agreed that infection with LPAI viruses having proven natural transmission to humans associated with severe consequences should be listed and notified to the OIE in accordance with Article 1.1.3.

Therefore, the Commission proposed to modify the list of notifiable diseases of OIE in Article 1.3.6, to add ‘high pathogenicity’ between ‘infection with’ and ‘avian influenza virus’, and to include a new indent ‘Infection of domestic and *captive wild* birds with low pathogenicity avian influenza viruses having proven natural transmission to humans associated with severe consequences’.

Title

In line with the approach described above, the Code Commission agreed to maintain the title of Chapter 10.4 as ‘infection with high pathogenicity avian influenza viruses’ noting that whilst the scope of the chapter is HPAI, some recommendations are still addressing LPAI viruses in order to take into account the global issue of avian influenza viruses.

The Code Commission highlighted that many comments made throughout the chapter were addressed by this proposal and the rationale described above in ‘General considerations’ and therefore it would not provide individual responses to each comment in this report.

Article 10.4.1

In point 2(a), the Code Commission noted a comment asking for further clarification of the definition for HPAI and the methods used for the determination of the strain virulence in the *Terrestrial Manual*, and requested the OIE Secretariat to refer this comment to the Biological Standards Commission for its consideration. The Commission also noted that this revised chapter will be aligned with the revised Chapter 3.3.4, Avian influenza (infection with avian influenza viruses), in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

In point 2(c), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to include a specific number of birds kept in a single household as the number would vary greatly depending on the country, culture and economic situation, thus it is not possible to determine such number. The Code Commission did not agree either with a comment to delete the sentence referring to ‘single household’ as susceptibility and transmissibility are different, and the intent was to focus on the epidemiological relevance of the animals, which is negligible if they have no contacts with poultry. The Commission did not agree with a comment suggesting to exclude ‘fighting cocks’ from the definition for poultry as it considered fighting cocks relevant in the spread and control of avian influenza. The Code Commission agreed with amendments proposed by some Members for clarity and alignment with the epidemiology of the disease, and proposed amendments to the text accordingly.

In points 2(c) and 2(d), in response to a comment, the Code Commission acknowledged that the term ‘poultry’ is used in many other chapters in the *Terrestrial Code* and therefore proposed to remove the definition of ‘poultry’ from this chapter and to amend the Glossary definition for poultry.

In point 3, based on the approach described above in ‘General considerations’, the Code Commission amended the text accordingly.

In point 4, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘including live poultry, or on the trade of birds other than poultry’ after ‘*poultry commodities*’ as the Glossary definition for commodities includes live animals and products of animal origin.

In point 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment suggesting to include other hemagglutinin subtypes on the basis that only H5 and H7 subtypes have demonstrated a natural ability to mutate to HPAI through a viable natural process. The Commission also noted that the monitoring considerations included in the chapter were for all subtypes of LPAI viruses.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment that the monitoring of LPAI should be deleted. The Commission highlighted that the Glossary definition for monitoring is defined as ‘the intermittent performance and analysis of routine measurements and observations, aimed at detecting changes in the environment or health status of a population’ and is different from surveillance. In addition, the Commission noted that this was also consistent with the *ad hoc* Group’s view that the monitoring of LPAI may serve several purposes – such as the awareness programmes, which are also requirements for HPAI freedom, as described in Article 10.4.2, and the trade of live birds and hatching eggs as per the relevant articles in this chapter. Moreover, the commonly deployed screening tests and surveys would first detect AI viruses that will be further typed and this gives the possibility to use the data collected to monitor LPAI viruses.

In point 6, in response to a comment requesting to replace ‘Vaccination is an effective complementary control tool ...’ with ‘Vaccination may be an effective complementary control tool’, the Code Commission amended the text accordingly for clarity. The Commission noted a comment saying that the use of vaccination against avian influenza depends on the country’s own control measures and policy, and explained this is already captured as written.

Article 10.4.1bis

At the end of point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment proposing to include ‘or that has been retort-processed’ but requested the OIE Secretariat to examine whether standard ‘retort-processing’ is sufficient to meet the condition described in this point in order to be considered as safe commodities.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘raw cleaned edible birds nest’ to the list of safe commodities as the HPAI virus could be contained in the nests because of feathers and possible faecal contamination. The Commission reminded Members that safe commodities should meet the criteria as described in Chapter 2.2, Criteria applied by the OIE for assessing the safety of commodities. Since ‘cleaned’ is an undefined process it cannot be determined whether the process would be effective at removing or inactivating the HPAI virus.

Article 10.4.2

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘in poultry’ to the title of the article as HPAI is already defined as an infection of poultry in point 2(a) of Article 10.4.1.

The Code Commission acknowledged a comment requesting clarification regarding an awareness programme related to biosecurity and management of avian influenza viruses, and noted that the awareness programme, which depends on the production type or rearing system, should be targeted to all relevant stakeholders. The Commission also highlighted its importance as a requirement for a Member making a self-declaration of freedom from HPAI. In response to this comment the Commission added a separate point regarding the awareness programme for disease reporting for consistency with other disease-specific chapters.

Article 10.4.2bis

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘high pathogenicity’ from the article subheading, noting that the scope of this chapter is HPAI. The Commission considered that this response would address the same comment repeatedly made throughout the articles on trade of commodities of poultry.

Article 10.4.2ter

The Code Commission did not agree with comments requesting to explicitly indicate that more than one containment zone can be established, noting that the current text does not prohibit the establishment of more than one containment zone. In addition, the Commission noted that this article is about how a Member can establish a containment zone effectively. The Commission reiterated that there is a possibility to have more than one containment zone as long as each containment zone includes all epidemiologically linked outbreaks, as described in Chapter 4.4, Zoning and compartmentalisation.

Article 10.4.2quater

The Code Commission noted comments asking for further clarification regarding exactly when the counting of the waiting period starts and amended the text for clarity and for consistency with the wording used in other disease-specific chapters.

Article 10.4.3

In response to a comment seeking clarification on point 3 and saying that any requirement should only apply to H5 or H7 subtypes, the Code Commission reiterated that there is a risk of transmission of Influenza A viruses of all subtypes through international trade of live birds, which the *ad hoc* Group had also recognised. The Commission agreed that Members need to take precautions in order to decrease the global circulation of the viruses that could facilitate their recombination. The Commission clarified that the proposed text was not meant to require pre-movement testing but that the establishment of origin should be included in the monitoring described in Article 10.4.22ter. The Commission considered that the proposed text is actually less stringent than the current provisions in Chapter 10.4 in terms of testing requirements but wider in the coverage of virus types. Therefore, the Code Commission did not propose any amendments to the text. The Commission noted that similar comments were made throughout the articles on trade of commodities and considered its response would address these other repeated comments.

The Code Commission did not agree with comments to add ‘and meet the surveillance requirements in accordance to Article 10.4.22 point 2 of this chapter’ at the end of last paragraph noting that it is already covered in point 2 of Article 10.4.22, i.e. that all vaccinated flocks should be tested to demonstrate freedom from HPAI. The Commission considered that this response would address the same comment repeatedly made throughout the articles on trade of commodities of poultry including hatching eggs. The Code Commission also noted a comment stating that the vaccination requirements may not always prevent the export of the virus and therefore there should still be a minimum period since vaccination to allow for seroconversion. The Commission considered that this concern is adequately addressed by point 2 of Article 10.4.22 and did not propose any amendment to the text.

Article 10.4.4

In point 2, in response to a comment asking for the scientific rationale to change the isolation period from 21 days (the incubation period for avian influenza in the existing chapter) to 28 days (two flock-level incubation periods proposed in the draft revised chapter), the Code Commission recalled that the *ad hoc* Group had provided a thorough analysis and rationale as to why the current chapter provided the 21-day incubation period, and that it had proposed the 28-day isolation period to ensure an appropriate safety margin. The Commission also noted that birds other than poultry may not show clinical signs, thus 28-day period would provide a safety margin in such cases.

In point 3, the Code Commission noted a comment querying whether 14 days is enough for antibodies to become detectable, and recalled that the *ad hoc* Group had proposed to retain 14 days as per the current chapter, which is now the same as one flock-level incubation period. The Commission also agreed with the *ad hoc* Group that the inclusion of ‘serological or virological’ was not necessary, as appropriate tests would need to be determined in accordance with the *Terrestrial Manual* depending on the purpose and other factors such as species, test available and type of management system.

The Code Commission did not agree with comments to add ‘and meet the surveillance requirements in accordance with Article 10.4.22 point 2 of this chapter’ at the end of last paragraph, as Article 10.4.4 is for live birds other than poultry and Article 10.4.22 is only about poultry. The Commission also noted these birds should be isolated and tested in accordance with points 2 and 3 of this article, which is more stringent than point 2 of Article 10.4.22, thus there would be no need to reference that point. The Commission considered that this response would address the same comment repeatedly made throughout the articles on trade of commodities of birds other than poultry including hatching eggs.

Article 10.4.6

In point 1, in response to a comment stating that clinical signs of the disease will not likely manifest in day old live birds thus it is more appropriate to sample the day-old live birds and test for the infection, the Commission noted that it is not practical to test day-old chicks and that testing of parent flocks provides sufficient knowledge of the status of the birds, and that inspection of day-old chicks would detect any mortalities that can be followed up by the testing. The Commission also emphasised that this point is a standard language as a generic condition for clinical observation of chicks to confirm they look healthy, and that all points from 1 to 4 should collectively make the risk to be negligible.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment suggesting to require testing of eggshell surfaces using statistically appropriate samples, as the measurable metric for lack of contamination with AI viruses in a hatchery has not been validated as to the appropriate sampling type and the numbers needed to generate an appropriate level of confidence, according to the *ad hoc* Group.

Article 10.4.13

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘with favourable results’ with ‘have been found free of any signs suggestive of avian influenza’, noting that ‘favourable results’ means all types of clinical signs and signs of particular diseases may not always be observed therefore it is more practical to be generic rather than focusing on the specific disease. The Commission also highlighted that ‘with favourable results’ is standard wording used throughout the *Terrestrial Code*.

Article 10.4.15

In point 1, the Code Commission acknowledged a concern expressed by Members that both requirements may not be necessary in this point and proposed amendments to the text.

Article 10.4.16

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting the reinstatement of ‘washed and steam-dried at 100 °C for 30 minutes’, as the deletion of this treatment from this article was a consequence of adding ‘washed and steam-dried feathers and down from poultry and other birds’ in the list of safe commodities in Article 10.4.1bis.

On the same point, the Code Commission noted a comment saying that ‘fumigation with formalin’ is not permitted in some Member Countries and if no other Members use it, this treatment should be deleted from the article. The Commission proposed not to delete this point as the formaldehyde fumigation is effective and efficient as an inactivation treatment. Nevertheless, the Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to investigate the appropriateness of retaining this treatment in the *Terrestrial Code* taking into account the impact on public health and the environment.

Article 10.4.17bis

In response to a concern of some Members that the inclusion of ‘scientific specimens’ in the article subheading and that the conditions required in this article may prevent the exchange of samples containing active virus between laboratories, the Code Commission proposed to amend ‘scientific’ to ‘collection’ in the subheading.

Article 10.4.20

In response to a comment claiming that there are contradictions between the subheading of this article and the inclusion of a monitoring system for LPAI in the text of this article, the Code Commission reaffirmed that this is not a contradiction nor an inconsistency, and encouraged Members to refer to the relevant reports of the *ad hoc* Group and the responses given in the relevant Commission reports which provide the justification to include recommendations for monitoring of LPAI in this chapter. Furthermore, the Commission highlighted that sampling and testing used for HPAI surveillance and diagnosis, both serological and virological, may also be used for the monitoring of LPAI.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to request moving the requirements regarding LPAI to a separate section of this chapter, noting that this article provides basic principles for surveillance for avian influenza including a monitoring of LPAI.

The Code Commission amended the text in line with the approach described above under ‘General considerations’.

Article 10.4.21

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment saying that expectations from surveillance are not clear, especially in point 2(b) of this article and that provisions in Article 10.4.22 do not seem to be aligned in terms of the required type of surveillance or tests. The Commission highlighted that depending on species, production type and the risk relating to wild birds etc., Members may need to do more than clinical inspections and adjust the surveillance design, including sampling strategy, to address the risk appropriately.

In point 2(a), regarding a comment questioning if the intent of the last sentence was to take samples and submit them to a laboratory for appropriate tests only when the suspicion cannot be ruled out by other means, the Code Commission clarified that the suspicion of AI can never be resolved by epidemiological and clinical investigation alone and that further testing should be performed. It nevertheless proposed amendments to the text for clarity.

Article 10.4.22

In response to comments that the current text is still ambiguous, too long and too academic, the Code Commission proposed some amendments to the text in point 1 for improved clarity and readability, as well as consistency with the approach described above under ‘General considerations’ and in answer to a comment on Article 10.4.22ter.

In point 2, the Code Commission noted a comment stating that the purpose of sentinel birds is unclear, and it moved the sentence providing for the possible use of sentinel birds to the end of the second paragraph for clarity. The Commission did not agree with a comment saying that there is no need to perform virological and serological tests in all vaccinated flocks, but amended the text so that it does not indicate which testing should be performed to demonstrate the absence of infection.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment saying that virological testing and the use of sentinel poultry should be done to ensure the absence of virus circulation in all vaccinated flocks, as the objective here is to detect infections with field virus in vaccinated populations. The Commission noted that this can be done by virological or serological surveillance in vaccinated birds, or with the use of sentinel birds, while noting that the use of sentinel birds has the added advantage of detecting HPAI based on clinical signs and mortality. The Commission also added that there are different types of vaccines that may require different types of tests to detect infections, and that the use of sentinel birds is not compulsory.

Furthermore, the Code Commission proposed to delete ‘every six months or at shorter intervals’ to clarify that minimum testing intervals should be determined based on risk.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment proposing to reference the relevant paragraph of the corresponding chapter of the *Terrestrial Manual*, as chapters in the *Terrestrial Manual* are often revised and keeping the generic text without specific reference avoids the inclusion of incorrect references and the need for regular updates of such references in this chapter.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete the specific reference to DIVA approaches in the corresponding chapter of the *Terrestrial Manual* noting that DIVA approaches may need to be further elaborated in the *Terrestrial Manual*. The Commission also noted that this point is about requirements for freedom with vaccination and the specificities around the DIVA approaches could be beyond the scope of this chapter.

Article 10.4.22bis

The Code Commission noted a comment querying what ‘investigated’ would mean in the first paragraph, and proposed an amendment to the text for clarity.

In the second paragraph, following a comment asking what activities would be included in active surveillance vs. passive surveillance, the Code Commission proposed an amendment to the text for clarity.

Article 10.4.22ter

In response to comments saying that the monitoring of LPAI should be exclusively limited to the LPAI viruses of H5 and H7 subtypes, the Code Commission reiterated the rationale previously stated and emphasised that any HPAI surveillance system would include sampling and testing that could support LPAI monitoring with minimal additional resources. The typing of detected viruses should be used for management purposes.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment stating that the inclusion of ‘awareness and reporting’ in the last sentence of the first paragraph is prescriptive and does not relate to HPAI, and proposed an amendment to the text accordingly.

The Code Commission acknowledged a comment proposing to include ‘birds other than poultry’ in the scope of LPAI monitoring but did not agree to do this noting that the inclusion of ‘birds other than poultry’ would cause significant and unnecessary financial and logistical challenges to many Members with unknown effectiveness. The Commission, however, explicitly included this type of birds in the scope of HPAI surveillance for freedom declaration and amended the text in point 1 of Article 10.4.22.

The Code Commission noted a comment proposing to add a sentence underlining the usefulness of LPAI monitoring or the early warning system for HPAI, and proposed an amendment of the text accordingly.

Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Article 1.3.6)

Comments were received from Argentina.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment that low pathogenic avian influenza of H5 and H7 subtypes should be maintained as an OIE-listed disease and referred the reader to the rationale provided in the section above for Chapter 10.4.

In line with the approach described in the section above for Chapter 10.4, the Code Commission proposed to add ‘Infection of domestic and captive wild birds with low pathogenicity avian influenza viruses having proven natural transmission to humans associated with severe consequences’ to Article 1.3.6.

Following the approach to naming diseases being applied in the *Terrestrial Code*, i.e. Infection of [animal] with [pathogenic agent], the Commission also proposed to amend the disease name for avian influenza in birds other than poultry including wild birds to read ‘Infection of birds other than *poultry*, including wild birds, with influenza A viruses of high pathogenicity’ for consistency with the new proposed listing.

The revised Chapter 10.4, Infection with high pathogenicity avian influenza viruses, attached as [Annex 12A](#) (clean version) and [Annex 12B](#) (track-changed version), the revised Glossary definition for ‘poultry’ attached as part of [Annex 5](#) and the revised Article 1.3.6 attached as [Annex 13](#) are presented for Member comments. The adoption of these has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As these texts have already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously..

6.10. Infection with Peste des petits ruminants virus (Articles 14.7.3, 14.7.7, 14.7.24 and 14.7.34)

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

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission had agreed to harmonise the requirements for official recognition and maintenance of free status, and endorsement and maintenance of official control programmes in disease-specific chapters with official recognition (excluding Chapter 11.4, Bovine spongiform encephalopathy).

In February 2019, the Code Commission agreed to use Chapter 14.7, Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus (PPR), as the ‘model chapter’ to present relevant amendments. At this meeting, the Commission reviewed comments received on the proposed amendments to Chapter 14.7 and also applied changes pertaining to harmonisation, when relevant to Chapter 15.2, Infection with classical swine fever (see Item 6.10). The remaining chapters will be amended progressively.

Recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group on the Evaluation of peste des petits ruminants status of Members

The OIE Secretariat updated the Code Commission on several proposals made by the *ad hoc* Group on the Evaluation of peste des petits ruminants status of Members who met in December 2019.

The *ad hoc* Group had proposed to link the documentation of facilities holding PPR virus containing materials (PVCMM) with the OIE procedure for official recognition and had drafted some additional text for Article 14.7.1 to define peste des petits ruminants virus-containing material. The Code Commission was of the view that the proposed text would be better placed in the *Terrestrial Manual* and requested the OIE Secretariat to consult with the Biological Standards Commission on this point.

The *ad hoc* Group also proposed to include text in Article 14.7.3 on the submission of information on PVCMM holding facilities as part of the application for official recognition of free status by Members. The Code Commission acknowledged that the development of an inventory of such facilities would facilitate the sequestration and destruction of the PPR virus once the disease was eradicated. However, the Commission was of the view that the submission of such information concerns official status recognition and is not an epidemiological requirement for country or zone to be considered free of PPR. In addition, from a harmonisation perspective, there is no equivalent requirement in the disease-specific chapter of other diseases with official status recognition. The Code Commission recommended that the OIE Secretariat consider other ways of addressing this proposal outside of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission recalled that at its meeting of September 2019, it had discussed a comment seeking clarification on whether the importation of vaccinated animals results in a loss of free status, given that point 3(b) of Article 14.7.10 recommends that animals imported from countries or zones considered infected should be vaccinated against PPR. The Commission noted the opinion of the *ad hoc* Group that there was no scientific evidence that small ruminants vaccinated against PPR would pose a risk to a naïve population. However, the Commission also considered the position of the *ad hoc* Group that in the absence of marker vaccines or a test to differentiate infected from vaccinated animals (DIVA) and the demanding level of surveillance that would be required to ensure the traceability of all vaccinated animals, the prohibition of imports of vaccinated sheep and goats by a country or zone having an official PPR free status should be maintained. In light of the above, the Commission concluded that notwithstanding the apparent inconsistency between point 6 of Article 14.7.3 and point 3(b) of Article 14.7.10 as a result of risk-related considerations, the management of the status of the country or zone and the difficulties in demonstrating freedom when there is no DIVA strategy justifies the prohibition on the importation of vaccinated animals by countries or zones recognised as officially free.

The *ad hoc* Group report on the Evaluation of peste des petits ruminants status of Members is appended to the February 2020 report of the Scientific Commission for Member information.

Discussion

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include text regarding a functional separation of the domestic population from the feral population in Chapter 14.7. The Commission recalled that the first paragraph of Article 14.7.1 states that ‘only domestic sheep and goats play a significant epidemiological role’ and since the occurrence of PPR in wild ruminants does not affect the status of the domestic population, there is no need to specify a functional separation between the domestic and wild ruminant populations.

Article 14.7.3

In the first sentence, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘have been complied with’ with ‘compliant with’ as this is not consistent with the language used across the *Terrestrial Code*.

In addition, the use of the present perfect tense stresses that the country or zone has been assessed and shown to have continuously fulfilled the necessary requirements during the period.

In point 3(a), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to specify in parenthesis ‘point 2’ after ‘Article 1.4.6’ as it considered this reference to be too specific. Furthermore, this reference is already covered in the first sentence of this article.

In point 4, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘the infection’ with ‘PPRV’ as the intention of this point is to prevent the introduction of infection, not prevent the introduction of the pathogenic agent, which it considered may take place, for example through the importation of biological specimens. The Commission further clarified that prevention of infection does not refer to just infected animals and would also apply to other commodities able to transmit the infection.

In point 6, the Code Commission deleted ‘[under study]’ after considering the opinions of the *ad hoc* Group on the Evaluation of peste des petits ruminants status of Members (see above explanation).

In the first sentence of paragraph 3, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘compliance with’ before ‘all points above’ to improve clarity.

In the same paragraph, the Code Commission, together with the Scientific Commission, did not agree with comments requesting to replace ‘1) to 4)’ with ‘1) to 6)’ as documented evidence for points 5 and 6 would be difficult to provide and are unlikely to change on an annual basis.

Article 14.7.7

In the first sentence of paragraph 1, the Code Commission replaced ‘restored’ with ‘recovered’ for consistency with Chapter 15.2, Infection with classical swine fever.

In the last sentence, the Code Commission replaced ‘The country or *zone* will regain PPR free status’ with ‘The PPR free status of the country or *zone* will be reinstated’, as the term ‘reinstated’ better emphasises that this is an official status recognition process.

Article 14.7.34

Regarding a comment stating that there is inadequate transparency in how the OIE endorses official control programmes, the Code Commission noted the explanation by the OIE Secretariat that the Standard Operating Procedures are published on the OIE website at <https://www.oie.int/en/animal-health-in-the-world/official-disease-status/official-recognition-policy-and-procedures/>.

In response to a comment that there may be difficulties complying with the requirements listed in this article, the Code Commission noted the clarification provided by the OIE Secretariat that no changes had been proposed with regard to the provisions on annual reconfirmation of countries with an OIE endorsed official control programme for PPR. These countries must inform the OIE on an annual basis of the progress on the implementation of the official control programme based on the initially submitted programme that was endorsed.

In point 1(b), the Code Commission agreed with comment to delete ‘livestock’ as ‘sheep and goats’ is mentioned in the same sentence.

In point 3(b), the Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, agreed with a comment to include the identification of vaccinated animals, but reworded the proposal. The Code Commission proposed to include a reference to Chapter 4.18, Vaccination, in point 3(a) and included a new point 3(b)(v) on ‘strategy to identify vaccinated animals’.

In response to a comment stating that point 7 is redundant in view of point 8, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that performance indicators are to assess the control measures to be implemented. Although this may be a component of point 8, the Code Commission proposed to retain the text for clarity.

Articles 14.7.3, 14.7.7, 14.7.24 and 14.7.34 are attached as **Annex 14** for Member comments. The adoption of these revised articles has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As these have already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously..

6.11. Infection with classical swine fever virus (Chapter 15.2)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, New Caledonia, USA, Switzerland, the OIE Americas Region and the EU.

Background

The revision of Chapter 15.2, Infection with classical swine fever virus, was undertaken in response to comments submitted by Members, experts, the *ad hoc* Group on Classical swine fever, and to ensure relevant alignment with the recent amendments to Chapter 15.1, Infection with African swine fever virus (ASF), adopted in 2019, as well as with other chapters on diseases for which the OIE grants official recognition of animal health status. The draft revised Chapter 15.2 was last circulated for comments in the Code Commission's September 2019 report.

In response to a comment regarding the removal of the previous Article 15.2.9, Importation of wild and feral pigs, and Article 15.2.15, Importation of fresh meat of wild and feral pigs, the Code Commission reiterated the rationale presented in its September 2019 report, i.e. that given the broad diversity of possible circumstances associated with wild and feral pigs, it was not possible to recommend precise and effective mitigation measures to be included in the *Terrestrial Code* for this disease that would apply to all possible situations. The Commission recalled that this does not preclude countries from conducting a risk analysis in accordance with the *Terrestrial Code*, to identify appropriate sanitary measures if needed.

Discussion

Article 15.2.1

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to amend the text to improve clarity and explained that the current wording takes into account different possible epidemiological links, not only the relation with suspected or confirmed cases and that there is value in maintaining the detail in the proposed text, as in other similar articles.

In point 3, in response to a comment requesting to replace 'three months' by '90 days' to improve preciseness and clarity, the Code Commission did not agree to amend the text because the proposed text follows the approach used in the recently adopted Chapter 15.1, Infection with African swine fever virus. The same rationale is relevant for similar comments received for other articles.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to reinstate the sentence 'A Member Country should not impose bans on the trade in commodities of domestic and captive wild pigs in response to a notification of infection with CSFV in wild and feral pigs', noting that new proposed text in the last sentence of Article 15.2.1bis addresses this point in the same way it was done for Chapter 15.1.

Article 15.2.2

In point 3, the Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, did not agree with a comment to delete the full point, as it considered that knowledge about the situation regarding the infection in wild and feral pigs was needed in order to determine the most appropriate mitigation measures, noting that a case in the wild and feral pig populations would not impact the CSF status if adequate measures were in place before detection of the case.

In point 7, in response to a comment, the Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, amended the text to specify that the separation of the domestic and captive wild pig populations from the wild and feral pig populations, should be required only when justified by the risk of the spread of the disease from wild and feral to domestic pig populations.

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘In case a containment zone has been established’ at the beginning of the paragraph, as it considered it unnecessary given that it is already defined by the title and the scope of the article.

Article 15.2.3bis

A new article defining a ‘Country or zone infected with CSFV’ was added for consistency with other chapters.

Article 15.2.5

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to delete ‘the disinfection of the last establishment’ throughout the article. The Commission considered that, although the definition of stamping out already includes the cleaning and disinfection of establishments, it is more precise to refer to the ‘completion of the disinfection’. For consistency, similar amendments were made in other relevant chapters revised during this meeting.

The Code Commission amended the last paragraph of the article for consistency with other chapters.

Article 15.2.5bis

In point 1, the Code Commission added ‘movement for’ before ‘for slaughter’, for clarity and consistency with other chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*.

In points 4 and 5, in response to a comment, the Code Commission agreed to amend the text to specify that the transport and slaughter of pigs should be done under biosecure conditions. In response to another comment, the Commission amended the text of point 4 for clarity.

Article 15.2.5ter (deleted)

In response to comments and in agreement with the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission agreed to delete the previously proposed Article 15.2.5ter, ‘Direct transfer of pigs within a country from a containment zone to a free zone for slaughter, as it considered that, as per the new definition for ‘Country or zone infected with CSFV’ added to Article 15.2.3bis and the definition of containment zone in Chapter 4.4., a containment zone is an infected zone, and therefore the provisions for movement of animals for slaughter from a containment zone would be covered by Article 15.2.5bis.

Articles 15.2.7 and 15.2.9

The Code Commission amended the title of these articles in view of the inclusion of the new definition for ‘countries or zones infected with CSF’ added to Article 15.2.3bis.

Article 15.2.10

In point 2, in response to a comment, the Code Commission agreed to amend the text from ‘fertilise the oocytes’ to ‘the semen used to inseminate the donors’, noting that this article refers indeed to *in vivo* derived embryos, not to *in vitro* produced embryos.

Article 15.2.11

The Code Commission amended the title of this article in view of the inclusion of the new definition for ‘countries or zones infected with CSF’ added to Article 15.2.3bis.

In point 1(a), in response to a comment requesting to harmonise the surveillance requirements listed in Articles 15.2.11 and 15.2.9, the Code Commission noted that this had been addressed by the amendments proposed in Article 15.2.9. The Code Commission amended the text for clarity.

In point 2, in response to a comment, the Code Commission agreed to amend the text from ‘fertilise the oocytes’ to ‘the semen used to inseminate the donors’, noting that this article refers to *in vivo* derived embryos, not to *in vitro* produced embryos.

Article 15.2.12bis

The Code Commission amended the title of this article in view of the inclusion of the new definition for ‘countries or zones infected with CSF’ added to Article 15.2.3bis.

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with the comment to replace ‘Veterinary Services’ by ‘Veterinary Authority’ for consistency with other chapters.

In point 4(b), the Commission amended the text for clarity.

Article 15.2.13

In point 1(b), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace the word ‘facility’ by ‘slaughterhouse/abattoir’, since the article relates to meat products and not meat. The Commission explained that this change (from ‘establishment’ to ‘facility’) was introduced in September 2019 for consistency with the Glossary definitions to avoid misinterpretation of the term ‘establishment’.

Article 15.2.18

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to amend the text to improve clarity as considered it was consistent with similar articles in the *Terrestrial Code*. In the same point, the Commission agreed to include a new item (b) referring to ‘any equivalent heat treatment which has been demonstrated to inactivate CSFV in meat’ for consistency with other chapters.

Article 15.2.19ter

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to modify the treatment time to 60 minutes, agreeing that this would not be consistent with point 1 of this article.

The Code Commission also noted that the term ‘swill’ needs to be defined, recalling that this was discussed in its September 2019 meeting and decided to include it in its work programme. The Code Commission agreed to request the OIE Secretariat to include this task within the ongoing work to prepare Guidelines on compartmentalisation for African Swine Fever, that would involve expert consultation. The Commission requested that the OIE Secretariat report back on the progress of this work at its next meeting.

Article 15.2.23

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text to refer to ‘domestic and captive wild pig population’ for consistency within the chapter.

Previous Article 15.2.32 (deleted)

In response to a comment requesting to maintain Article 15.2.32 as it included useful information, the Code Commission reiterated that it had agreed previously to remove this kind of information, e.g. charts from the *Terrestrial Code*, as this format was not easy to update nor adapted to the *Terrestrial Code*. Nevertheless, the Commission acknowledged that this information could be useful for Members and requested the OIE Secretariat to explore ways to make this information available outside of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The revised Chapter 15.2, Infection with classical swine fever virus, is attached as **Annex 15** for Member comments. The adoption of the revised chapter has been postponed until the 89th General Session in May 2021. As the revised chapter has already undergone extensive consultation, Members are requested to only submit comments to address substantive issues that have not been considered previously..

7. Texts for comments (Part B)

7.1. Glossary Part B ('death', 'distress', 'euthanasia', 'slaughter', 'stunning' and 'suffering')

Death

The Code Commission agreed with the proposal to remove the second sentence of the definition as it considered it may be misinterpreted. Consequently, it proposed to delete the definition as a whole, noting that the meaning in the context of the *Terrestrial Code* is similar to that of a Dictionary definition.

Distress

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to consider including text that an animal that cannot escape or avoid a negative stimulus will be also suffering, as it considered that the proposed addition was describing a situation and not describing what distress was, thus did not add clarity to the text.

Euthanasia

The Code Commission noted that the revised definition clarifies the difference between killing and euthanasia but should not include how as this aspect is addressed in the text of relevant animal welfare chapters, when relevant. The Commission agreed to add 'of an animal' to be more specific. The Commission did not agree with adding 'when it is in the interest of animal welfare' as it considered this to narrow down meaning. The Commission agreed to add 'method with the least pain and suffering possible' for consistency with the proposed changes made in the definition of 'Stunning'.

Slaughter

The Code Commission did not agree to add 'and animal consumption' at the end of the sentence, as the definition notes the primary consumer are humans but animal consumption or other uses associated with slaughter are not excluded.

The Code Commission did not agree to include the humane aspect in the definition, noting that the purpose of the definition is to define the action, i.e. to kill, rather than how this should be done. This aspect is addressed in the text of relevant animal welfare chapters. The Commission did not agree with the proposal to add 'by bleeding', as it deemed it unnecessary to specify in the definition the actual cause of death. The Commission agreed to change the term 'animals' to its singular form to be more specific and consistent with the agreed change to the definition of 'Euthanasia'.

Stunning

The Code Commission agreed to replace 'and other type of suffering' with 'pain and suffering' to be more specific but did not agree to include 'distress' and 'fear' noting that these are behavioural responses that occur before stunning rather than a physical reaction during stunning. In addition, these responses may be induced by actions other than stunning.

The Code Commission did not agree to add 'when used before killing' because the purpose of the definition is not to define at which point in a sequence of actions stunning should be done but rather to define what stunning is. How stunning is conducted is described in the text of relevant chapters.

The Code Commission agreed that the proposal to add the text 'without unnecessary pain' may confuse the reader. The Commission noted that as any type of pain should be minimised and agreed that this is already considered in the proposed text.

Suffering

The Code Commission agreed to include 'physical or mental state' to be more specific but did not agree to add 'that the animal cannot escape' as it considered this to be implicit. It agreed to replace 'important' with 'essential' to strengthen the definition.

The revised definitions on ‘distress’, ‘euthanasia’, ‘pain’, ‘slaughter’, ‘stunning’ and ‘suffering’ are attached as **Annex 16** for Member comments.

7.2. Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Articles 1.3.1, 1.3.2 and 1.3.9)

Comments were received from Switzerland, USA and the EU.

The Code Commission did not agree with comments to replace ‘and’ with ‘and/or’ in some disease names that includes more than one causative pathogenic agent, as ‘and’ here does not mean infection with all included pathogen species at the same time, but means that the disease name includes infection with each of those pathogen species. The Commission clarified that all species of pathogenic agent included in such listed disease names are notifiable.

Infection with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex

The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission’s proposal described in its September 2019 report to reconsider the listing or delisting of *M. tuberculosis* at its September 2020 meeting. Based on this proposal, the Code Commission withdrew its proposal to amend the name of this disease, and invited Members to provide new scientific evidence to the OIE regarding the possibility and impact of transmission of *M. tuberculosis* from animals to humans or other animals.

Infection with *Mycoplasma mycoides* subsp. *Mycoides* SC (Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia)

The Code Commission noted a comment to replace ‘SC’ with ‘small colony’. Taking into account that the corresponding chapter in the *Terrestrial Manual* is currently under revision, the Code Commission agreed to propose an amendment to the name once the corresponding chapter in the *Terrestrial Manual* has been adopted.

Infection of dromedary camels with Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus

After considering a comment and advice of the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission proposed to change ‘Infection of dromedary camels with Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus’ to ‘Infection of dromedary camels with Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus’, using lower-case characters, which is also in line with the notation used by the World Health Organization.

The Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, did not agree with a comment that ‘Infection of dromedary camels with Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus’ should not be listed until a disease-specific chapter with a clear case definition is developed, noting that such case definition should be drafted. The Code Commission recalled that not only the assessment for the listing had been conducted and this disease was considered to meet the criteria for listing, but also that a corresponding chapter in the *Terrestrial Manual* would be presented for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2021, which will help Member Countries for their notification of cases. The Commission noted that the issue of lack of disease-specific chapters for the OIE-listed diseases is being well recognised by the Specialist Commissions and the work to resolve this issue is in progress.

The revised Articles 1.3.1, 1.3.2 and 1.3.9, Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE, are attached as **Annex 17** for Member comments.

7.3. Quality of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.1), Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2) and new draft Chapter 3.X

Background

The new draft Chapter 3.X and revised Chapters 3.1, Quality of Veterinary Services, and 3.2, Evaluation of Veterinary Services, were circulated for the first time in the Code Commission’s September 2019 report. Chapters 3.1 and 3.2 had been revised to reflect the contemporary activities and responsibilities of the Veterinary Services and to better align with other chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*. An *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Services was convened in July 2019 to revise these chapters. The *ad hoc* Group also proposed a new Chapter 3.X as an introductory chapter for Section 3 of the *Terrestrial Code*.

Quality of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.1)

Comments were received from Chinese Taipei, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Singapore, Switzerland, the EU and AU-IBAR.

General comments

In response to a comment that it was not possible to comment on the proposed changes to Chapter 3.1 until the review of the Glossary definitions for ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Veterinary Authority’ and ‘Veterinary Services’ is completed, the Code Commission clarified that until the work on revising these definitions is finalised, the definitions in the Glossary are to be used. The Commission noted that the chapter will be updated, if necessary, once revised definitions have been adopted (see Item 5.1.1).

In response to a comment that certain elements in the current text of Chapters 3.1 and 3.2 have been omitted, the Code Commission noted that as no specific details had been provided it was difficult to identify the elements being referred to. The Commission reminded Members that the rationale for revising Chapters 3.1 and 3.2 was because these chapters have not been reviewed for a long time and that some of the content in the existing chapters was out of date, no longer reflected the broadened scope of the activity of Veterinary Services such as antimicrobial resistance and biothreats, or was not what might be appropriately regarded as standards.

Article 3.1.2

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘knowledge’ in the subheading as it considered knowledge to be inherent in sound professional judgement.

In point 6, the Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to include ‘social science’ to highlight the different scientific fields that should be considered. However, it did not agree with the second part of the comment to replace ‘and’ with ‘or’ after ‘epidemiology’ given that the use of the term ‘such as’ in the preceding part of the sentence implies that the list is not exhaustive.

In the same point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘research and development’ as they did not consider this to be a scientific ‘field’ and would be out of place in the list. Furthermore, research and development is inherent in the fields of risk analysis, epidemiology, economics and social science.

Article 3.1.3

In the last sentence of the first paragraph, in consideration of a comment to include ‘commercial’ and ‘hierarchical’ before ‘influences’ the Code Commission considered that it would be clearer to include this under ‘other non-scientific influences’ which would address all potential non-scientific influences.

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘science’ with ‘new scientific evidence’ for clarity.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘inspection’ with ‘control’ as it considered ‘inspection’ to be a clearer term. ‘Control’ implies compliance activities such as in official control programmes and could be confusing if used here.

In point 4, the Code Commission did not accept a comment to replace ‘or’ with ‘including’ as it did not agree that government policies could be in the form of programmes. The Commission noted that programmes are operational activities, although they may be based on policies.

In point 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘knowledge’ as it considered that knowledge is a type of information.

In point 6, the Code Commission accepted a comment to include ‘policies’ with the rationale that data from information management systems can be a source for policy evaluation.

In point 7, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘within the Veterinary Authority’ after ‘effective internal coordination’. The Commission did not agree that ‘field levels’ imply state or provincial level authorities. The Commission explained that ‘field level’ does not necessarily refer to the administrative levels within the country but encompasses operations in the field such as the management of borders or farms. Notwithstanding, the Commission also noted that this point covers the chain of command down to decentralised governments, where they exist.

In point 9, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to remove ‘pre’ before ‘consultation’ as consultation with stakeholders should be carried out at all times during the policy development.

Article 3.1.4

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘education’ with ‘professional development’ as it considered that the term ‘continuing education’ is used in other parts of the *Terrestrial Code*, OIE Guidelines on Veterinary Education and the OIE PVS Tool, so understood by Members. A similar comment for point 5 was not accepted for the same reason.

In point 6, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘as appropriate’ to the end of the point as it considered this to be addressed by the word ‘adequately’. Furthermore, the Glossary definition for ‘veterinary paraprofessional’ states that these persons are ‘under the responsibility and direction of a veterinarian’.

In point 7, the Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to replace ‘education’ with ‘professional development’. The Commission proposed to replace ‘education’ with ‘professional development, including continuing education programmes’ as it recognised that continuing education is a means of achieving professional development.

Article 3.1.5

In paragraph 2, the Code Commission accepted a comment to add ‘relevant to their role’ after ‘educational and professional standards’, and to add ‘other veterinary tasks as appropriate’ to the end of the first sentence, as it agreed that the scope of Veterinary Services is broader than veterinary clinical services.

In point 1(b), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘day-1 competencies’ in parenthesis as this point is intended to be generic.

In point 3, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to move ‘quality’ to the first part of the sentence for conciseness.

Article 3.1.6

In the last sentence of paragraph 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘and’ with ‘including’ to reflect that programmes are a subset of policies, for the same reason as given above in Article 3.1.3.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘non-government (stakeholder representatives)’ noting that this article refers to engagement with non-government stakeholder representatives. The Commission noted that engagement with government agencies is covered in points 7 and 8 of Article 3.1.3.

Article 3.1.7

In point 1, the Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to include ‘data analysis technologies’ as it agreed with the given rationale that modern surveillance systems are starting to make use of new information and data analysis technologies. However, the Commission did not agree to include the examples of ‘big-data’ or ‘artificial intelligence’ as the use of these technologies is not widespread across Member Countries.

In point 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘specific for the country’ after ‘priority diseases’ as it considered this to be implicit as written. With regard to the comment requesting criteria to identify priority diseases, the Commission noted that this goes beyond the OIE mandate. National Veterinary Services may develop their own national or sub-national disease priorities as appropriate, considering the OIE listed diseases.

In point 8, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘livestock’ with ‘animals’.

Article 3.1.8

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘auditing’ noting that this is an official activity carried out by Competent Authorities.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘auditing’ because the point specifically refers to ante- and post-mortem inspection activities, not its oversight via auditing.

In point 4, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘based on chemical hazard analysis’ after ‘residue monitoring programme’ as it considered that the sentence was intended to be general to highlight the range of residue risks.

In point 6, the Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to indicate that sanctions should be ‘proportional and dissuasive’ but did not agree to add the word ‘proportional’ before ‘procedures’.

Article 3.1.10

In paragraph 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘protection’ with ‘effectiveness’ as it considered this to be a more appropriate term.

In the same paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘freedom’ with ‘animal health status’ for consistency with Chapter 1.6.

Article 3.1.11

In the first sentence, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘and’ with ‘including’ to reflect that programmes are a subset of policies, for the same reason as given above in Article 3.1.3.

The revised Chapter 3.1, Quality of Veterinary Services, is attached as **Annex 18** for Member comments.

Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2)

Comments were received from Chinese Taipei, Switzerland, the EU and AU-IBAR.

Discussion

Article 3.2.2

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘competence, history of’ after ‘verify’ and ‘of integrity’ after ‘enhance reputation’ as it did not consider that the proposal enhanced the existing text.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘with the key components and operating principles’ after ‘demonstrate compliance’ as it considered this to be unnecessary and the demonstration of compliance should apply to the whole chapter.

In point 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘as part of risk analysis in international trade’ to the end of the sentence. The Commission explained that this is a general statement not only addressing risk analysis. Furthermore, the link to risk analysis is covered in Chapter 2.1, Import risk analysis.

In the last sentence, the Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to include ‘on a non-discriminatory basis’ but proposed to incorporate this in Article 3.2.4.

Article 3.2.3

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include the sentence ‘The competent authorities should consider the principle of independence when carrying out self-evaluations and may appoint independent bodies to carry out such evaluations on their behalf’. The Commission considered the proposal to be too detailed for a general statement and noted that the principles for evaluation are covered in Article 3.2.1.

In point 3, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘regions’ to the list of examples of sub-national levels.

Article 3.2.4

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘in a non-discriminatory manner’ to incorporate the concept of non-discrimination with respect to the evaluation of Veterinary Services.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘its objective’ with ‘the objectives of the evaluation’ as it considered this to be implicit.

In the same point, the Code Commission did not accept a comment to replace ‘or’ with ‘and/or’ as in this instance, ‘or’ includes the concept of ‘and’, as written conventionally in the *Terrestrial Code*.

In point 5, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to consider financing for the cost of evaluation and proposed to replace ‘requirements of confidentiality’ with ‘financing and confidentiality requirements’.

In point 8, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘and provide the opportunity for the evaluated country to clarify or respond to the findings before the production of the final evaluation report’ to the end of sentence, with the rationale that the country under evaluation should have the opportunity to respond formally to the findings of the evaluating country.

The revised Chapter 3.2, Evaluation of Veterinary Services, is attached as **Annex 19** for Member comments.

Draft new Chapter 3.X Introduction to recommendations on Veterinary Services

No comments were received for Chapter 3.X.

The new draft Chapter 3.X, Introduction to recommendations on Veterinary Services, is attached as **Annex 20** for Member comments.

7.4. Zoning and compartmentalisation (Articles 4.4.6 and 4.4.7)

Background

The Code Commission recalled that during the last revision of Chapter 4.4, Zoning and compartmentalisation, adopted in 2018, some Members had requested clarification on the proposal to include new text in Article 4.4.6 on the concept of ‘temporary protection zone’. At that time, in consultation with the Scientific Commission, it was agreed to not address these comments, but to discuss further how to manage, clarify and incorporate this concept into the *Terrestrial Code*. Both Commissions have discussed this concept over several dedicated meetings and have agreed on critical aspects of its implementation, the implications on animal health status, and the amendments required for its inclusion in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The proposed revision aims at improving the practical function of the ‘protection zone’ as a risk management strategy to minimise the impact that a disease introduction would have on the entire country or zone when an increased risk is considered to be temporary. The Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, proposed to amend Article 4.4.6 to include clear provisions that could apply for all diseases (rather than creating or defining a new concept of ‘temporary protection zone’). The Commissions also proposed that if further specific provisions are required concerning a specific infection or infestation, they will be addressed in the relevant disease-specific chapter.

Both Commissions also agreed to amend the use of the term ‘protection zone’ included in the current description of ‘containment zone’ in Article 4.4.7, in order to avoid confusion between this term and the new proposed description of a protection zone in Article 4.4.6.

A document presenting the background and explanation for this revision as discussed between the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission is presented as **Annex 24** in the February 2020 report of the Scientific Commission.

Proposed amendments

Article 4.4.6

The Code Commission amended the first paragraph of Article 4.4.6 to specify that a protection zone can be established as a temporary measure in response to an increased risk of disease, and that based on the results of a risk assessment more than one protection zone may be established.

After this paragraph, a new sentence was added to highlight the surveillance requirements in line with Chapter 1.4.

In the previous fourth paragraph, a reference to Articles 4.4.2 and 4.4.3 was introduced to avoid repeating principles already covered in Chapter 4. The text of this paragraph was also amended to ensure that the content of the previously numbered requirements (1 to 6) were addressed, and the numbered requirements (1 to 6) were deleted.

The last paragraph of the current text was replaced by new text stating that unless otherwise specified in the relevant disease-specific chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*, if the animal health status of a protection zone changes due to the occurrence of a case or the implementation of vaccination, the animal health status of the rest of the country or zone would not be affected.

The Code Commission also added a new paragraph regarding some specificities for the implementation of this concept for diseases for which the OIE grants official recognition of animal health status, including its temporality condition. Further details on the practical impact for the official status recognition procedures can be found in the Scientific Commission’s February 2020 report.

Additionally, since the use of the term ‘protection zone’ in point 4(b) and point 7 of Article 4.4.7 would not be in line with the new definition of Protection Zone, the Code Commission revised the text of point 4(b) and point 7 of Article 4.4.7 for consistency.

The revised Articles 4.4.6 and 4.4.7 are attached as **Annex 21** for Member comments.

7.5. Animal welfare during slaughter (Revised Chapter 7.5)

Comments were received from Australia, Argentina, China (People’s Republic of), Japan, Mexico, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, USA, the EU and the International Coalition for Animal Welfare (ICFAW).

Background

The OIE *ad hoc* Group on the Revision of Chapter 7.5, Slaughter of animals, and Chapter 7.6, Killing of animals for disease control purposes, has met three times (April 2018, November 2018, and June 2019) to progress work on a comprehensive review of Chapters 7.5 and 7.6. The objective of this review is to resolve inconsistencies in the methods used in the slaughter of animals and the killing of animals for disease control purposes; to propose amendments to ensure that the text reflects current scientific knowledge; and to review the structure of both chapters. At its September 2019 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed the work of the *ad hoc* Group and agreed to seek Member comments on the new proposed structure of Chapter 7.5, Animal welfare during slaughter.

Discussion

General comments

The Code Commission noted that Member comments were supportive of the approach taken by the *ad hoc* Group.

In response to a comment concerned that some important information currently present in the chapter, e.g. the tables, may be lost in this revision, the Code Commission reminded Members that figures and tables not to be included in the revised chapters will be published on the OIE Website as has been done for the figures showing the recommended positions to perform different stunning methods that were removed from Chapters 7.5 and 7.6 when it was revised in 2016.

The Code Commission requested that the *ad hoc* Group be reconvened to continue its work to finalise development of the revised draft Chapter 7.5, Animal Welfare during slaughter, to include the recommendations on animals arriving in crates and containers, also taking into account some guidance provided by the Commission.

The Code Commission also requested the *ad hoc* Group to discuss the implications on the use of the term ‘hazard’ in the chapter and whether there is a need to amend the current definition of the Glossary to include animal welfare considerations.

The Code Commission noted a comment regarding the translation of the term ‘killing’ in Spanish and requested that the *ad hoc* Group consider whether there is a better translation for ‘killing’ in both Spanish and French taking into consideration the use of this term throughout the Spanish and French editions of the *Terrestrial Code*, and the use of this term in the definition for ‘stamping-out’.

7.6. Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (Chapter 8.Y)

Comments were received from Australia, China (People’s Republic of), New Zealand, Switzerland, USA, and the EU.

Background

In February 2019, the Code Commission considered the assessments undertaken by the *ad hoc* Group on Animal trypanosomes of African origin that had been endorsed by the Scientific Commission. The *ad hoc* Group had conducted assessments for the most relevant species of trypanosomes of African origin against the criteria for the inclusion of diseases, infections and infestations in the OIE list as described in Chapter 1.2 of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Code Commission had proposed to amend Article 1.3.1 (of Chapter 1.3, Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE) to include ‘Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (*T. vivax*, *T. congolense*, *T. simiae* and *T. brucei*)’ and to delete ‘Trypanosomosis (tsetse-transmitted)’ from Article 1.3.2.

Also at its February 2019 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed the new draft Chapter 8.Y, Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin, that had been developed by the *ad hoc* Group, and circulated it for comments.

Discussion

Article 8.Y.1

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text of the third sentence for clarity.

In the same point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘wildlife including’ before ‘non-human primates’, as it considered this reference would be unprecise and unclear. The Commission agreed with other proposed amendments to improve the clarity of the text.

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text to include ‘although not always evident using routine testing methods’ to improve clarity.

In points 7 and 8, the Code Commission agreed to remove the reference to ‘in susceptible animals’, as it considered it was unnecessary given that the general definitions in this article address this point.

Article 8.Y.2

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘in accordance with Chapter 2.2’. The Commission recalled that this was standard text used throughout the *Terrestrial Code* for articles on safe commodities.

The Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, considered that although transmission of infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin had occurred in carnivores as a result of feeding on infected dead animals, it agreed that based on available evidence, the risk of transmission via meat derived from animals slaughtered in a slaughterhouse and subjected to ante- and post-mortem inspections (this being a non-specific standardised risk mitigation process), is negligible. Consequently, the Commission proposed to include a new commodity, point 5, ‘meat from animals that have been slaughtered in a slaughterhouse/abattoir and have been subjected to ante-and post-mortem inspections with favourable results’ to the list of safe commodities and to delete Articles 8.Y.11 and 8.Y.12.

The Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, agreed with Member comments that, based on the available evidence, the risk of transmission of infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin via semen from clinically healthy donors and embryos is negligible. Consequently, the Commission proposed to include new commodities, point 8 ‘semen collected and processed in accordance with Chapter 4.6’ and point 9 ‘embryos’ to the list of safe commodities and to delete Articles 8.Y.7 to 8.Y.10.

Article 8.Y.3

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text for consistency with the definition of commodities.

In point 3(b)(ii) the Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete ‘compartment’, noting that this article only refers to ‘Country or zone free’.

Article 8.Y.4

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete the whole article. Although the Commission acknowledged the difficulties of implementing compartmentalisation for vector-borne diseases, the Commission agreed there was value in keeping this article to indicate that although difficult compartmentalisation was a possible disease control strategy. The Commission agreed that it was not possible to provide detailed recommendations that would fit all country situations and reminded Members that the provisions provided in Chapters 4.4 and 4.5 should be used, including for bilateral recognition of the compartment.

Article 8.Y.6

In the title, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘compartment’, noting that as the article refers to recommendations for the importation of susceptible species, all options of risk mitigation measures or strategies should be included. This same rationale was applied to similar comments in other articles.

In the title, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to remove the subheading ‘For susceptible species’ and include ‘of susceptible animals’ within the title for consistency.

Previous Article 8.Y.7 (deleted)

As discussed under Article 8.Y.2, the Code Commission proposed to list ‘semen collected and processed in accordance with Chapter 4.6’ as a safe commodity and consequently proposed the deletion of Article 8.Y.7.

Previous Article 8.Y.8 (deleted)

As discussed under Article 8.Y.2, the Code Commission proposed to list ‘semen collected and processed in accordance with Chapter 4.6’ as a safe commodity and consequently proposed the deletion of Article 8.Y.8.

Previous Article 8.Y.9 (deleted)

As discussed under Article 8.Y.2, the Code Commission proposed to list ‘embryos’ as a safe commodity and consequently proposed the deletion of Article 8.Y.9.

Previous Article 8.Y.10 (deleted)

As discussed under Article 8.Y.2, the Code Commission proposed to list ‘embryos’ as a safe commodity and consequently proposed the deletion of Article 8.Y.10.

Previous Article 8.Y.11 (deleted)

As discussed under Article 8.Y.2, the Code Commission proposed to list ‘meat that have been slaughtered in a slaughterhouse and have been subjected to ante-and post-mortem inspections with favourable results’ as a safe commodity and consequently proposed the deletion of Article 8.Y.11.

Previous Article 8.Y.12 (deleted)

As discussed under Article 8.Y.2, the Code Commission proposed to list ‘meat from animals that have been slaughtered in a *slaughterhouse/abattoir* and have been subjected to ante-and post-mortem inspections with favourable results’ as a safe commodity and consequently proposed the deletion of Article 8.Y.12.

Article 8.Y.8 (Previous Article 8.Y.14)

In point 2(a) the Code Commission agreed to delete the reference to ‘compartment’, as it was not relevant to this article.

In point 2(b) the Code Commission agreed with a comment and amended the text in line with Chapter 1.4, Animal health surveillance.

In this same point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a new point stating that ‘the identification of any trypanosomes of the subgenuses *Duttonella*, *Nannomonas* and *Trypanozoon* in susceptible animals should be reported to the OIE as an infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin’. The Commission explained that, although it might be difficult to differentiate the species of trypanosomes causing an infection, Members must notify OIE listed diseases in accordance with Chapter 1.1 by using the diagnostic methods available.

Article 8.Y.9 (Previous Article 8.Y.15)

In point 2(c), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘serological’ and add ‘on appropriate tests, such as serological or molecular methods’ at the end of the sentence. Taking into consideration the advice of the Biological Standards Commission, the Commission explained that molecular methods are used for confirmation following an initial screening identification by serology and that molecular techniques are further developed in point 3).

In point 4(d), the Code Commission, considering the advice of the Scientific Commission and the Biological Standards Commission, agreed with a comment and amended the wording of points 4(d), 4(d)(i) and 4(d)(ii) for clarity.

In point 6, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text for clarity and added a reference to Chapter 1.5, Surveillance for arthropod vectors of animal diseases.

Article 8.Y.10 (Previous Article 8.Y.16)

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed to add ‘established in accordance with Article 4.4.7’ after ‘containment zone’, given that no specific provisions are included in this disease-specific chapter regarding containment zones.

The draft new Chapter 8.Y, Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin, is attached as **Annex 2** for Member comments.

7.7. Infection with Rift Valley fever virus (Chapter 8.15)

Comments were received from China (People’s Republic of), Switzerland, USA and the EU.

Background

Proposed amendments to Chapter 8.15 were first circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2019 report to clarify the obligations of Members to notify when there is an epizootic of Rift Valley fever (RVF) in an endemic country or zone. This chapter has been circulated twice for Member comments.

Discussion

General comments

In response to a comment to include the name of the commodity, for example ‘susceptible animals’ in the title of the trade related articles instead of as subheadings, the Code Commission agreed to apply this for consistency throughout this chapter, where relevant. The Commission noted that this practice has not been applied consistently throughout the disease-specific chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* and will standardise this progressively as the chapters are being revised.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete the word attacks in ‘vector attacks’ throughout the text as it considered that the key emphasis was to protect against ‘vector attacks’, given that the presence of vectors may be ubiquitous.

Article 8.15.1

In point 2(a), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘occurs’ with ‘is occurring’ to indicate that the epizootic is ongoing.

In point 2(b), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘geographic’ before ‘distribution’ as distribution in this context is not limited to geographical (spatial) distribution but could also refer to host distribution.

In points 4(b) and 4(c), the Code Commission proposed to add ‘including in a human’ after ‘case of RVF’ to oblige the notification of cases in animals when there are no virus isolations and only findings of RVF antigen or ribonucleic acid or seropositivity, without an epidemiological link to an animal case, but when cases in humans make it highly likely that there is active infection in animals.

In point 5, the Code Commission agreed with a comment from the Scientific Commission to include the incubation period of RVF to facilitate the establishment of appropriate risk mitigation measures by Members. Considering that sufficient information exists on the incubation period for RVF (refer to technical disease card available at https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Animal_Health_in_the_World/docs/pdf/Disease_cards/RIFT_VALLEY_FEVER.pdf), the Code Commission proposed to add ‘and the incubation period shall be seven days’ to point 5.

In point 6, the Code Commission accepted a comment to include ‘and other’ before environmental conditions as climatic conditions are considered environmental conditions.

Article 8.15.4

In the first sentence, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘comply with’ with ‘meet the requirements’, for consistency with the term used in Article 8.15.3.

Article 8.15.5

In the first sentence, the Code Commission did not agree to replace ‘measures’ with ‘options’ as the term ‘include’ already implies that all the measures listed are not mandatory.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘any equivalent measures that protect against any attacks by vectors’ to the end of the point. The Commission clarified that the list contains possible risk management measures that Members may employ to protect against vector attacks and Members have the discretion to use any of these measures.

Article 8.15.6

In point 2(b), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete ‘during transportation to the place of shipment’ for clarity.

Article 8.15.7

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘compatible with’ after ‘clinical sign’ in Article 8.15.7 and throughout the text as it considered this to be unnecessary. Furthermore, this would not be consistent with the rest of the *Terrestrial Code*.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘at least’ before ‘one of the following conditions’ as it is sufficient to have just one of the two conditions met.

In point 2(b), the Code Commission did not accept a comment to replace ‘or’ with ‘and/or’, for consistency, as in this instance ‘or’ includes the concept of ‘and’.

In point 3(a), the Code Commission agreed to delete ‘during transportation to the place of shipment’ for clarity, as with the amendment to point 2(b) in Article 8.15.6.

Article 8.15.8

In the title of the article, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘period’ after epizootic as ‘epizootic’ is used as a noun in this context and not as an adjective. The Commission highlighted that this is different from ‘inter-epizootic period’ where ‘inter-epizootic’ is used as an adjective.

In point 4, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘AND’ after the semicolon for consistency with the other articles in this chapter.

Article 8.15.9

In the title of this article, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘infected’ after ‘countries or zones’ with ‘affected’ as this would be inconsistent with the rest of the *Terrestrial Code*. This rationale applies to the rest of the text where the Member had provided the same comment.

In point 2(b), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘to the appropriate neutralising antibodies’ after ‘seropositive’ as it considered this too detailed for the *Terrestrial Code*. Such information can be found in Chapter 3.1.18, Rift Valley fever (Infection with Rift Valley fever virus), of the *Terrestrial Manual*. Nonetheless, the Commission proposed amendments to this point for consistency with the wording across the *Terrestrial Code* and replaced ‘demonstrated to be seropositive’ with ‘subjected to a serological test’ and added ‘with positive result’ at the end of the point.

In point 2(c), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘within 14 days of semen or embryo collection’ with ‘at a 14-day interval with negative results and completed within 7-10 days prior to the day of semen or embryo collection’. The Commission did not agree with the rationale provided by the Member that it is imperative to confirm a negative RVFV status of the donor animals prior to collection. While it agreed with the Scientific Commission that the collection of semen from an RVF infected animal could pose a risk to the human handler, the Code Commission explained that provisions for personnel performing such activities are covered in Chapter 4.6, General hygiene in semen collection and processing centres. The Commission clarified that the rationale for requiring paired seronegative samples is to ensure the detection of animals that might have become infected on the day of semen or embryo collection. For consistency with the wording used in the *Terrestrial Code*, the Commission proposed the following text ‘were subjected to a serological test on two occasions with negative results on the day of collection and 14 days after collection’.

Article 8.15.10

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘the following’ after ‘the entire consignment of meat comes from’ as it considered this to be unnecessary.

In point 1(c), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘submitted to maturation’ with ‘matured’ as this proposal was not consistent with the usage of this term in the rest of the *Terrestrial Code*.

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment that ‘products’ may be interpreted to exclude fresh meat, and thus replaced ‘products’ with ‘meat’ for clarity. Consequently, the Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘as applicable (see Article 8.15.10bis below)’ after ‘meat’ as it considered this point to have been addressed.

Article 8.15.10bis

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘meat’ with ‘susceptible animals’ and explained that as per the Glossary definition for ‘meat products’, meat products are derived from meat and thus it would be more appropriate to refer to ‘meat’.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘complies with’ with ‘are managed in compliance with provisions listed in’ as it did not consider that the proposal improved the existing text.

Article 8.15.11

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘subjected to pasteurisation’ with ‘pasteurised’ as the proposal was not consistent with the use of this term in the rest of the *Terrestrial Code*. Furthermore, ‘pasteurisation’ is a Codex-defined term widely understood by Members.

Article 8.15.12

The Code Commission reiterated to the OIE Secretariat that further guidance on surveillance would be beneficial for Members, in particular surveillance during the inter-epizootic period in order to facilitate an early warning system indicating the start of an epizootic period.

The revised Chapter 8.15, Infection with Rift Valley fever virus, is attached as **Annex 23** for Member comments.

7.8. Infestation with *Aethina tumida* (small hive beetle) (Article 9.4.5)

Background

At its September 2019 meeting, the Code Commission received a comment to modify points 2 and 3 of Article 9.4.5 concerning the timing of inspection prior to export and area freedom from the occurrence of *Aethina tumida*, and requested the OIE Secretariat to consult experts on the proposal.

At this meeting, the Code Commission considered the comment together with the advice provided by two OIE Reference Laboratory experts and thanked them for their contributions.

Discussion

Article 9.4.5

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree to replace ‘immediately prior to dispatch’ with ‘in the 72 hours prior to the packing of the bees for export’ as inspecting colonies immediately prior to dispatch ensures that no observable adult or larvae of *A. tumida* are present in the hive. Inspecting the hive 72 hours after packaging leaves sufficient time for one or several adults of *A. tumida* to enter the hive unobserved. However, the Commission proposed to replace ‘immediately prior to dispatch’ with ‘on the day of packing’ for clarity.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree to delete this point and invited the Member to submit a more comprehensive rationale to justify the deletion. The Commission agreed with the OIE Reference Laboratory experts that the absence of detection of *A. tumida* in an area was an important risk mitigation measure. However, considering the comment from one of the OIE Reference Laboratory experts that 100 km might be excessive, the Commission proposed to replace ‘100 km’ with ‘50 km’, which in conjunction with other measures, is currently used as an effective import risk mitigation measure by some Members.

Revised Article 9.4.5 is attached as **Annex 24** for Member comments.

7.9. Avian mycoplasmosis (*Mycoplasma gallisepticum*) (Chapter 10.5)

Background

In view of the proposed amendments to Chapter 3.3.5, Avian mycoplasmosis (*Mycoplasma gallisepticum*, *M. synoviae*), of the *Terrestrial Manual* to include a new table for available test methods and their purpose, the Code Commission, as per its work programme, commenced the work to review Chapter 10.5, Avian mycoplasmosis (*Mycoplasma gallisepticum*). The Commission thanked the OIE Reference Laboratory expert who provided comments.

Discussion

Article 10.5.2

In point 3, the Code Commission considered the comments of the expert, and proposed amendments to include provisions for an ‘agent identification test’ and ‘serological test’. The Commission highlighted that the *Terrestrial Code* should not duplicate information in the *Terrestrial Manual* on diagnostic tests to be performed and reminded Members to refer to the *Terrestrial Manual* for standards on diagnostic tests.

Article 10.5.3

In point 3, in considering comments from the expert, the Code Commission proposed to replace ‘a diagnostic test’ with ‘agent identification test’.

The Code Commission highlighted that this circulation signalled the beginning of the review of Chapter 10.5. The chapter would be further improved for consistency with the other disease-specific chapters in the *Terrestrial Code* as the Commission progressed with the review.

The revised Chapter 10.5, Avian mycoplasmosis (*Mycoplasma gallisepticum*), is attached as **Annex 25** for Member comments.

7.10. Infection with equine influenza virus (Article 12.6.6)

Comments were received from China (People's Republic of), Switzerland and the EU.

Background

At the Code Commission's February 2019 meeting, it had proposed amendments to Article 12.6.6 based on the results of a clinical trial coordinated by an OIE Reference Laboratory for equine influenza. The revised article has been circulated twice for Member comments.

Discussion

Article 12.6.6

In point 2, a comment requested replacing 'on the day of shipment' with 'within 24 hours prior to shipment' as shipment may be carried out on the calendar day following the day when the clinical examination is performed. The Code Commission did not agree to specify '24 hours' as it considered this to be implied.

In points 3(a) and 3(b), the Code Commission, in consultation with the Scientific Commission, did not agree with a comment to replace '14 and 90 days' with '21 and 90 days'. The Code Commission did not accept the rationale provided by the Member that this is the protocol followed by bilateral agreements and that horses should not receive vaccinations during the pre-export isolation period. The Commission explained that there is no contraindication against vaccinating animals during the pre-isolation period and highlighted that the vaccination protocol was based on a study that the horses seroconverted within 14 days after being vaccinated. The Commission added that it would be up to Members to negotiate their own bilateral agreements if in disagreement with the *Terrestrial Code*, based on an import risk analysis.

In point 3(b), a comment was submitted to delete this point as the scientific basis for this vaccination protocol has not yet been published. The Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission and the Biological Standards Commission, noted that the basis for this recommendation was in the final 2018 technical report from the OIE Reference Laboratory for equine influenza that evaluated equine influenza vaccination protocols prior to shipment. The information supporting the proposed changes are covered in this report, although not yet publicly available. Given the validity of the findings, the Commission did not agree to delete point 3(b).

In the same point, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace 'previously' with 'up to the date of this pre-shipment vaccination' for clarity. The Commission did not agree to add 'consecutive' before 'four doses' as it considered that it was implicit and did not improve the existing text.

In the last sentence, a comment was submitted to add 'first sample collected' before 'four to six days after' and 'second sample collected within' before 'four days of shipment'. The Code Commission did not agree to specify 'first sample' and 'second sample' as it considered this to be implied. However, it replaced 'prior to' with 'within' to clarify that the second collection should take place during the four days before shipment.

The revised Article 12.6.6 is attached as **Annex 26** for Member comments.

8. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held from 1–10 September 2020.

.../Annexes