



Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Original: English

February 2017

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

Paris, 13–24 February 2017

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at OIE Headquarters in Paris from 13–24 February 2017. The list of participants is attached as **Annex 1**.

The Code Commission thanked the following Member Countries for providing written comments on draft texts circulated after the Commission's September 2016 meeting: Argentina, Australia, Belize, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, the United Kingdom, the United States of America (USA), and Uruguay, the Member States of the European Union (EU) and the African Union Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of African Member Countries of the OIE. Comments were also received from the OIE PRRS Reference Laboratory (Poland), the European Forum of Farm Animal Breeders (EFFAB), International Dairy Federation (IDF) and the International Coalition for Animal Welfare (ICFAW). Some comments were received too long after the deadline to be considered.

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments that had been submitted on time and amended texts in the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Terrestrial Code*) where appropriate. The amendments are shown in the usual manner by 'double underline' and '~~strike through~~' and may be found in the Annexes to the report. In Annexes 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22bis, 24, 26, 27, 29 and 30, amendments made at this meeting are highlighted with a coloured background in order to distinguish them from those made previously. The Code Commission considered all Member Countries' comments that were supported by a rationale and documented its responses. However, because of 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.

Furthermore, Member Countries are reminded that comments submitted without a rationale or obvious logic are not examined by the Code Commission as they are difficult to evaluate and respond to. Similarly if comments are resubmitted without modification or new justification, the Code Commission will not, as a rule, repeat previous explanations for decisions. The Code Commission encourages Member Countries to refer to previous reports when preparing comments on longstanding issues. The Code Commission also draws the attention of Member Countries to those instances where the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (the Scientific Commission), the Biological Standards Commission, a Working Group or an *ad hoc* Group has addressed specific Member Countries 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 the Code Commission encourages Member Countries to review its report together with those of the Scientific Commission, Biological Standards Commission, Working Groups and *ad hoc* Groups.

Member Countries should note that texts in Part A of this report are proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017. Texts in Part B are submitted for comments. The reports of meetings (Working Group and *ad hoc* Groups) and other related documents are attached for information in Part C. The questionnaires related to official recognition of disease status have been reviewed and revised and are attached for comment in Part D. Part E (**Annex 51**) contains editorial amendments that will be made in the 2017 edition of the *Terrestrial Code*. This will be circulated separately during April 2017. The corrections are provided to Member Countries for information.

Comments on Parts B & D of the report must reach OIE Headquarters **by 12 July 2017** in order for them to be considered at the September 2017 meeting of the Code Commission. Comments received after the due date will not be submitted to the Code Commission for its consideration.

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

The Code Commission again strongly encourages Member Countries to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by submitting comments on this report, and prepare to participate in the process of adoption at the General Session. Comments should be submitted as Word files rather than pdf files because pdf files are difficult to incorporate into the Code Commission's working documents. Comments should be submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a structured rationale. Proposed deletions should be indicated in '~~strikethrough~~' and proposed additions with 'double underline'. Examples of how this can be done are attached as **Annex 41**. Member Countries should not use the automatic 'track-changes' function provided by word processing software as such changes are lost in the process of collating Member Countries' submissions into the Code Commission's working documents. Member Countries are also requested **not** to reproduce the full text of a chapter as this makes it easy to miss comments while preparing the working documents.

### **Item 1 MEETING WITH THE DIRECTOR GENERAL**

The Code Commission met with Dr Monique Eloit, Director General, and Dr Matthew Stone, Deputy Director General (International Standards and Science), on 13 February 2017. Dr Eloit welcomed the Code Commission members and thanked them for their support and commitment to achieving OIE objectives.

Among other matters, Dr Eloit and Dr Stone discussed the forthcoming session of the Council and the proposals that it will consider in relation to the new procedure for the election of experts and the provisional budget, in particular noting the increased costs of supporting the standards setting functions of the OIE (convening of *ad hoc* Groups and field missions to support status recognition). The Director General also expressed her appreciation for the willingness of the members to work closely with the Secretariat to improve the functioning and efficiency of the Specialist Commissions. Dr Stone also noted the efforts of the Headquarters to improve the efficiency across all of the Specialist Commissions through enhanced coordination systems that would provide stronger direction and support to their work programmes, improve internal communication, and strengthen understanding of roles and responsibilities in particular between the risk assessment functions of the Scientific Commission and the risk management functions of the Code Commission.

Dr Etienne Bonbon, on behalf of the Code Commission, thanked Dr Eloit and Dr Stone for their support. Dr Bonbon also noted that the Code Commission welcomed the improved transparency in the process for elections as it was important to have the best expertise to support the standards development process. Dr Bonbon noted that the Code Commission had already had a discussion on its work programme, priorities and management of the meetings heavy agenda. Dr Bonbon highlighted one of the difficulties in managing such an extensive work programme was the access to the *ad hoc* Group reports, and in particular when they were proposing new or revised chapters. He noted that the view of the Code Commission was that these reports should be reviewed by the relevant Headquarters Secretariat in order to identify issues relevant to the Code Commission so that these issues could be shared with the members of the Code Commission and added to its work programme according to priorities. In response the Director General agreed that it was important for OIE Headquarters to decide what is relevant to each Commission in order to better align the work programmes and priorities and that this could be managed through better coordination by OIE Headquarters.

### **Item 2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

The draft agenda circulated prior to the meeting was discussed, updated, and agreed. The adopted agenda of the meeting is attached as **Annex 2**.

### **Item 3 COOPERATION WITH OTHER SPECIALIST COMMISSIONS**

#### **a) Meeting with the President of the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission**

The President of the Code Commission met with the President of the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (Aquatic Animals Commission) during the week when both Commissions were meeting. The Presidents discussed issues of mutual interest in the *Terrestrial* and *Aquatic Codes*, notably:

- alignment of Glossary terms, in particular the definition for zoning and the ongoing review of definitions used in the *Terrestrial Code*;

- proposed revisions to Chapter 1.2. in the *Aquatic Code* (criteria for listing); and the proposed development of a guidance document on the application of the criteria for listing an OIE disease.

The Aquatic Animals Commission agreed that this meeting was important in facilitating harmonisation of relevant chapters in the two *Codes* when under review by the respective Commissions.

#### **b) Meeting with the Presidents of the Biological Standards Commission and the Scientific Commission**

The President of the Code Commission met with the Biological Standards Commission and the President of the Scientific Commission on 10 February 2017 to discuss and highlight several issues of mutual interest, notably:

- Chapter 12.10. ‘Infection with *Burkholderia mallei*’ (glanders) in regards to comments from a Member Country on diagnostic testing for both *B. mallei* and *B. pseudomallei* (the pathogenic agent for melioidosis). The President of the Biological Standards Commission indicated that from a diagnostic perspective the two diseases are very difficult to distinguish both in terms of clinical signs and serological assays (see Item 4.14.);
- Chapter 8.X. ‘*Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex’ in regards to comments from a Member Country on the implications for trade of including pathogenic agent that can also be found in humans (see Item 4.11.);
- Chapter 15.X. draft new chapter on infection with porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus in regards to Member Countries comments relating to the implication of including vaccine strains in the case definition (see Item 4.16.); and
- Chapter 15.1. ‘Infection with African swine fever virus in relation to the proposal to amend the incubation period. The Presidents agreed to keep 15 days even though the *Manual* states ‘The incubation period in nature is usually 4–19 days’. This is because 19 days is an extreme, exceptional value and is not considered to be a useful reference value. The Biological Standards Commission will ask reference laboratories to look at the question in more detail (see Item 4.15.).

#### **c) Report on the Joint Meeting of the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission and the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases**

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission met on 16 February to discuss issues of mutual interest. The report of this joint meeting is attached as **Annex 3**.

### **Item 4 TEXTS PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION AT THE GENERAL SESSION IN MAY 2017**

**Table 1. Lists of texts proposed for adoption at 85th General Session**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Annexes in Part A</b>	<b>Chapters/Articles</b>	<b>Title</b>
4.1	4	-	Glossary A, A' and A"
4.2	5	1.2.1.	Criteria for the inclusion of diseases, infections and infestations in the OIE list
4.3	6	1.3.	Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (the Preamble)
4.4	7	2.X.	Draft new chapter on criteria applied by the OIE for assessing the safety of commodities
4.5	8	4.16.3.	High health status horse subpopulation
4.6	9	5.3.	OIE procedures relevant to the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures on the World Trade Organization

Item	Annexes in Part A	Chapters/Articles	Title
4.7	10	6.X.	Draft new chapter on prevention and control of <i>Salmonella</i> in bovines
4.8	11	6.Y.	Draft new chapter on prevention and control of <i>Salmonella</i> in pigs
4.9	12	7.11.6.	Animal welfare and dairy cattle production systems
4.10	13	7.12.	Welfare of working equids
4.11	14	8.X.	Infection with <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> complex
4.12	15	10.4.25.	Infection with avian influenza viruses
4.13	16	11.11.	Infection with lumpy skin disease
4.15	17	15.1.	Infection with African swine fever virus
4.16	18	15.X.	Draft new chapter on Infection with porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus
4.17	19	4.11.4.	Somatic cell nuclear transfer in production livestock and horses
4.18	20	2.1.	Import risk analysis

#### Item 4.1. Glossary Part A, A' and A''

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Belize, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Norway and EU.

#### Glossary Part A – Amendments

At its meeting in September 2016, the Code Commission proposed revised definitions for several terms in the Glossary. In examining and responding to Member Countries comments the Code Commission made the following amendments or observations:

*Animal Health Status*: the term *compartment* was added for consistency with amendments made to other *Terrestrial Code* chapters.

*Captive Wild [animal]*: the Code Commission noted that there was an error in the text of the report of its last meeting; the word in square brackets should have been *animal* and not *species*.

*Notification*: the Code Commission considered that the inclusion of relevant health information is part of the procedure detailed in Chapter 1.1. and therefore does not need to be included in the definition. Furthermore, in respect to a Member Country comment on the inclusion of *infection* or *infestation*, it noted that this is related to the ongoing work on the definition for *disease*, which could not be addressed at this time.

*Pathogenic Agent*: in examining a number of Member Countries comments and considering the opinion of the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission was of the opinion that the proposal to define the term 'pathogenic agent' appeared to be confusing in the context of the *Terrestrial Code* because not all pathogenic agents are "organisms" (for example BSE and scrapie). In order to reconcile these issues the Code Commission proposed not to add a new definition for pathogenic agent but rather considered that common dictionary definitions are sufficient. However, it noted that there was a need to ensure the term was used consistently throughout the *Code* (see **Item 7.4**).

Consequently, the Code Commission requested that in preparing the 2017 edition of the *Terrestrial Code* the OIE Headquarters replace, where relevant, similar terms currently used in the *Terrestrial Code* with ‘pathogenic agent’, as well as other terms that are used inconsistently, namely: *slaughterhouse/abattoir*, *herd* or *flock*, ‘oocytes’ instead of ‘ova’, ‘oocytes and embryos’ instead of ‘embryos and oocytes’ (see **Item 7.4.**).

The revised definitions are attached in **Annex 4** (Glossary **Part A**) and are proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

#### **Glossary Part A’– Deletions**

In response to a Member Country comment proposing to retain the definition for *zoonosis* the Code Commission did not consider that it was necessary to retain this as the term is well defined in dictionaries and text books.

The proposed deleted definitions are attached in **Annex 4** (Glossary **Part A’**) and are proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

#### **Glossary Part A'' Amendments to definitions of a purely editorial nature and provided for Member Countries’ information**

At its meeting in September 2016, the Code Commission noted numerous editorial mistakes in the Glossary and proposed editorial changes that do not introduce any changes in the meaning but provide consistency and remove inaccuracies. In examining supportive Member Countries comments the Code Commission noted that the changes proposed by it were editorial and that there was no rationale for proposing other changes at this time. Another Member Country proposed to amend the definition for *Animal Identification System* to *Animal Traceability System*, but the Code Commission did not agree to amend because the term “animal traceability system” is not used in the *Terrestrial Code*, and the term *Animal Identification System* fits correctly where it is used in the *Terrestrial Code*.

These amendments are attached in **Annex 4** (Glossary **Part A''**) for Member Countries' information and will be reflected in the 2017 edition of the *Code*.

#### **Item 4.2. Criteria for the inclusion of diseases, infections and infestations in the OIE list (Article 1.2.1.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Switzerland and EU.

The Code Commission noted that unless a new definition of ‘disease’ is adopted or the definition is removed from the Glossary, it was not relevant to make any changes to the criteria as proposed by Member Countries. However, once a decision is made, the whole *Terrestrial Code* will be reviewed to identify where there is a need to modify the term ‘diseases, infections and infestations’.

The revised Article 1.2.1. is attached as **Annex 5** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

#### **Item 4.3. Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (the Preamble of Chapter 1.3.)**

Comments were received from Switzerland and EU.

Noting the comments received were in support of the revised preamble, the Code Commission made no further changes.

The revised preamble to Chapter 1.3. is attached as **Annex 6** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

#### **Item 4.4. Draft new Chapter on criteria applied by the OIE for assessing the safety of commodities (Chapter 2.X.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Switzerland, USA, EU, AU-IBAR and IDF.

In examining Member Countries comments on the two articles in this chapter the Code Commission made minor editorial changes. It considered that the text of the chapter will provide clear guidance to OIE experts to assist them in assessing the safety of commodities and that no further clarification was required.

The draft new Chapter 2.X. is attached as **Annex 7** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

**Item 4.5. High health status horse subpopulation (Article 4.16.3.)**

Comments were received from Switzerland and EU.

The Code Commission noted the comments in support of the adoption of this article and made no further changes. However, it noted that the chapters on horse diseases may need further revision in light of lessons learnt from the Olympic Games and other international events, and requested that OIE Headquarters provide feedback on the benefits or problems in relation to the use of the principle of high health, high performance (HHP) horse subpopulation.

The revised Article 4.16.3. is attached as **Annex 8** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

**Item 4.6. OIE procedures relevant to the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization (Chapter 5.3.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Belize, Canada, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Switzerland and EU.

In respect of a Member Country proposal to amend the wording in Article 5.3.1. to exactly mirror the wording in the WTO SPS Agreement, the Code Commission wished to draw the attention of Member Countries to the *User Guide* which gives detailed explanation on the relationship between this chapter and the WTO SPS Agreement. Furthermore, it considered that the text as it is currently worded is appropriate to the *Terrestrial Code*.

In examining a Member Country proposal to replace ‘live animals and animal products’ with ‘commodities’, the Code Commission was of the view that the *Terrestrial Code* should represent the intent of the WTO SPS Agreement and the language used (animal health), so did not make the proposed change. In response to another Member Country proposal to add the term ‘processing systems and export systems’ it was agreed that the inclusion of ‘processing systems’ added clarity. However it considered that the term ‘export systems’ is covered in the animal health management system.

The Code Commission noted with regard to a proposal from a Member Country to include ‘infection and infestation’ after the word ‘diseases’ in Article 5.3.2. that current work on the Glossary to either modify or remove the definition of ‘disease’ may address this in the future.

In response to Member Countries comments on Article 5.3.3., the Code Commission made minor editorial changes by including the wording ‘in its territory’ to clarify that an importing country’s animal and human health can be protected. The Code Commission did not support a proposal to change ‘assured’ to ‘satisfied’ because the exporting country should demonstrate that its measures meet the level of protection required by the importing country.

In respect of a Member Country comment on the first paragraph of Article 5.3.4., to replace the word ‘judgement’ with ‘determination’, the Code Commission noted in its February and September 2016 meeting reports that this issue had been thoroughly discussed and that in respect of equivalence, the ‘judgement’ is a decision based on the process of ‘determination’. Therefore the Code Commission did not accept this proposal at that part of the text dealing with the decision.

The Code Commission did not support a Member Country proposal to include reference to ‘the country status’ in point 3) of Article 5.3.5, as ‘country status’ is not a sanitary measure. In response to a proposal to replace ‘should’ with ‘shall’, the Code Commission reminds Member Countries that except in the cases either referring to the obligation of disease notification or referring to the incubation period of specific disease, the language used in the *Terrestrial Code* for recommendations is always ‘should’.

In response to a Member Country proposal to delete reference to ‘informally’ from Article 5.3.6., the Code Commission explained that the intent of the article is to provide guidance to Member Countries on the steps to be taken in the determination of equivalence, which provides for either a formal agreement between the importing and exporting country in the form of a high level treaty, or a more informal agreement such as the exchange of letters, and therefore it did not accept the proposed change.

In considering comments from Member Countries on Article 5.3.8., the Code Commission agreed in principle with the proposal to change the title of the OIE informal procedure for dispute mediation, to align it with the text. However it noted that the procedure is the responsibility of OIE Headquarters, and as the procedure is currently under review it would not be appropriate for the Code Commission to make the change at this time. OIE Headquarters will consider the proposal to change ‘informal’ to ‘voluntary’ in its review of the process.

The revised Chapter 5.3. is attached as **Annex 9** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

**Item 4.7. Draft new Chapter on prevention and control of Salmonella in bovines (Chapter 6.X.)**

**Item 4.8. Draft new Chapter on prevention and control of Salmonella in pigs (Chapter 6.Y.)**

Comments on Chapter 6.X. were received from Australia, Canada, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, EU, AU-IBAR and IDF.

Comments on Chapter 6.Y. were received from Australia, Canada, Belize, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Japan, Nigeria, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission noted that the two Chapters, 6.X. and 6.Y., had been developed to ensure alignment, when relevant, and appreciated that many Member Countries submitted the same comments for both chapters to ensure further alignment.

In response to Member Countries comments, the Code Commission noted the following points that were relevant to both chapters.

The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country comment regarding the use of the term ‘wildlife’ throughout the chapter and noted that the use of the term ‘wildlife’ or ‘birds’ or ‘rodents’ takes into consideration the context. For example, sometimes the defined term ‘wildlife’ is too broad for the context and so only ‘wild birds’ was used. Also, on some occasions rodents were listed along with other wildlife in order to emphasise the importance of the rodents. The Code Commission also reminded Member Countries that an editorial amendment has been proposed to the glossary definitions of ‘captive wild animal’, ‘feral animal’ and ‘wild animal’ with the word ‘animal’ being replaced with ‘[animal]’, to show more clearly the possible use of the terms in the context of different diseases affecting different species. Should this be adopted terms such as ‘wild birds’ would appear in italics.

In response to a Member Country comment regarding the implication of these chapters for international trade, the Code Commission reiterated that these chapters are intended to provide guidance for the prevention and control of *Salmonella* (which is not an OIE listed disease) and are not intended to be used to elaborate conditions for trade. The Code Commission also noted that these draft chapters are similar in status to the recently adopted Codex Guidelines for the Control of Non-typhoidal *Salmonella* spp. in Beef and Pork Meat (CAC/GL 87-2016).

The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that, as noted in its February 2016 report, “the definitions for ‘feed’ and ‘feed ingredient’ would be moved to the Glossary once these chapters are adopted, as they will appear in more than one *Terrestrial Code* chapter.”

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country comment to reword the first sentence in Articles 6.X.4. and 6.Y.4. because it considered it to be clear as currently written.

The Code Commission agreed to change ‘manure’ to ‘faecal waste’ in both chapters to ensure consistency, noting that faecal waste is used because the term manure is too restrictive, based on the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition of manure as ‘animal dung used for fertilising land’.

The Code Commission agreed to amend the point in Articles 6.X.4. and 6.Y.4. that mentions good farming practices and hazard analysis and critical control points (HACCP) to clarify that it may not always be possible to implement HACCP at the primary production level.

The Code Commission agreed to amend the first sentence of Articles 6.X.5. and 6.Y.5. to emphasise the importance of biosecurity in the prevention and control of *Salmonella*.

The Code Commission agreed to add a new point 4) *bis* to Articles 6.X.5. and 6.Y.5. for the prevention of contamination of feed and water, including water for irrigation. It also agreed to add ‘water supply’ into point 5) of these articles.

The Code Commission did not agree to include ‘equipment’ in point 9) of Articles 6.X.5. and 6.Y.5. noting that it is addressed in point 12).

The Code Commission agreed to include ‘domestic animals’ in point 8) of Articles 6.X.5. and 6.Y.5. noting the potential role of domestic animals in the contamination of feed.

The Code Commission agreed to delete the example in point 5) of Articles 6.X.7. and 6.Y.7. agreeing that it was up to the Veterinary Services or stakeholders to determine the most suitable period for isolation of newly introduced animals. The Code Commission noted that the December 2015 report of the *ad hoc* Group on *Salmonella* in pigs and cattle provided references supporting four weeks as the most appropriate time period for separation.

In point 2) of Articles 6.X.9. and 6.Y.9. the Code Commission agreed to move ‘where practicable’ so it is relevant to the text regarding ‘access of animals, birds, rodents and wildlife’ noting that feed should always be handled in a hygienic manner.

In point 5) of Articles 6.X.11. and 6.Y.11. the Code Commission reminded Member Countries that the inclusion of clinical enteric salmonellosis during the last iteration was to highlight the risk of developing antimicrobial resistance when treating salmonellosis. It was agreed that the treatment of any clinical salmonellosis with antimicrobial agents should be done in accordance with Chapter 6.9. and thus the word ‘enteric’ could be deleted.

The Code Commission agreed to add a reference to Chapter 4.13. in Articles 6.X.12 and 6.Y.12. whilst acknowledging that Chapter 4.13. needs revision to address disinfection in more detail. The Code Commission agreed to include the revision of Chapter 4.13. in its work programme.

For reasons of consistency the word ‘serotypes’ was used instead of ‘types’ where relevant throughout the text.

The following comments are specific to Chapter 6.X. Draft new Chapter on prevention and control of *Salmonella* in bovines.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country comment concerning the inconsistent use of the term ‘cattle’ in the *Terrestrial Code* noting that in some chapters this term is not defined at all or sometimes is defined but with a varying list of species, and sometimes the *Code* uses the term ‘bovid’ rather than cattle.

The Code Commission agreed that in light of the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition for the noun ‘bovine’ which is ‘an animal of the cattle group, which also includes buffaloes and bison’ it would replace the term ‘cattle’ with ‘bovine(s)’ and specify in Article 6.X.3. which species are included in the use of the term ‘bovine’. The Code Commission agreed to gradually amend all relevant chapters of the *Code* in this manner as they are reviewed.

The Code Commission noted that the definition for ‘semi-intensive systems’ was deleted because this term is not used in the chapter.

The Code Commission did not agree to amend point 4) of Article 6.X.4. to include milk and meat as this was already addressed in points 1) and 2) of this article.

The Code Commission did not agree to delete 'biosecurity' from the last paragraph in Article 6.X.6. as it considered that some biosecurity measures were applicable in extensive bovine production systems.

As stated in the Code Commission's September 2016 meeting report the Code Commission did not agree to align text in Article 6.X.7. with that in Article 6.Y.7. regarding the introduction of bovines as a risk factor for introducing *Salmonella* because it was not considered relevant to this article that applies to intensive and extensive bovine production systems, which differ significantly from pig production systems.

The Code Commission agreed to delete the text referring to 'washing of live animals to reduce contamination of meat at slaughter' in Article 6.X.12. because there is lack of consistent evidence regarding the efficacy of washing dirty hides (Reference: FAO/WHO. 2016. Interventions for the control of non-typhoidal *Salmonella* spp. in beef and pork: Meeting report and systematic review. Microbiological Risk Assessment Series No. 30. Rome. 276 pp).

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country comment to include text regarding use of artificial insemination or embryo transfer to minimise introduction of *Salmonella* in Article 6.X.16. noting that this is already addressed in point 3) of Article 6.X.7.

The following comments are specific to Chapter 6.Y. Draft new Chapter on prevention and control of *Salmonella* in pigs.

The Code Commission did not agree to amend the definition for 'commercial pig production systems' to include marketing of products because this is not in the remit of the OIE.

The Code Commission did not agree to change 'will' to 'may' in point 2) of Article 6.Y.4. noting that the text as read is factual and accurate, i.e. when one limits the source of contamination one will reduce the likelihood of infection.

The Code Commission agreed to add a new sentence in Article 6.Y.5. for reasons of consistency with the corresponding Article 6.X.5. in order to stress the importance of applying a biosecurity plan.

The Code Commission did not agree to amend text in Article 6.Y.7. to emphasise that the introduction of pigs into a herd is the most important factor because it considered that the current wording is correct as written and implies that it is an important factor in all herds but qualifies its importance between low, moderate and high prevalence herds.

The Code Commission did not agree to the deletion of the reference to pre- or probiotics, requested to ensure consistency between chapters, noting that there is more evidence supporting the efficacy of these in pigs.

The Code Commission did not agree to delete the second sentence in Article 6.Y.9. regarding the importance of feed as sources of *Salmonella* in low prevalence situations, noting that whilst these measures are important in all regions they are especially important in low prevalence regions, and that the text as written qualifies this point.

The Code Commission did not agree to reinstate the article on stress, nor to add a new point on stress in Article 6.Y.11., noting that stress is already addressed in other articles in the chapter.

Whilst the Code Commission noted the proposal to include a new article to address post-weaning preventive measures, the Code Commission referred this comment to OIE Headquarters requesting an expert opinion and report back to the Code Commission.

The draft new Chapter 6.X. is attached as **Annex 10** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

The draft new Chapter 6.Y. is attached as **Annex 11** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

**Item 4.9. Animal welfare and dairy cattle production systems (Article 7.11.6.)**

Comments were received from Japan, Switzerland, USA, the EU, AU-IBAR, ICFAW and IDF.

The Code Commission considered Member Countries comments on the revised point 5) of Article 7.11.6. and noted several Member Countries were supportive of the proposed text. Noting that the chapter was adopted relatively recently (May 2015), the Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters consider the comments made on other text during the next revision of the chapter.

The Code Commission did not accept the Member Countries suggestions to modify its proposal, as the new wording would not improve clarity. It also insisted that the currently proposed text, even if it is considered as a design-based criterion, is only conditioned to the primary choice of the design of resting spaces and has a clear beneficial impact on the welfare of dairy cattle. Therefore the Code Commission decided to leave the existing proposal as it is.

The revised Article 7.11.6. is attached as **Annex 12** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

**Item 4.10. Welfare of working equids (Chapter 7.12.)**

Comments were received from Canada, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, EU and ICFAW.

The Code Commission noted comments in support of the revised text and reviewed several Member Countries comments on Article 7.12.2., and did not agree to expand the scope of the chapter to include ‘equine-assisted therapy’ or ‘hippotherapy’ as this is considered to be a subset of leisure activities and as such, is excluded from the chapter.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country suggestion to delete the text that excludes equids used in research or for the production of biopharmaceuticals and equids kept solely for the production of meat, as the former are addressed in Chapter 7.8., while the latter are not considered working equids.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country suggestion to replace the words ‘five freedoms’ with ‘five domains’, because the use of ‘five freedoms’ is consistent with Article 7.1.2.

In response to a Member Country comment on the last bullet point under behaviour indicating stress in Article 7.12.4., the Code Commission replaced the word ‘and’ by ‘or’ to improve clarity of the text. In the same bullet point, the Code Commission did not accept the suggestion to insert the word ‘irregular’ as a qualifier for defaecation as the word ‘abnormal’ in the beginning of the sentence is sufficient to convey the intent of the text.

In response to a Member Country comment to add ‘sub-optimal body condition score’ as an example of an attribute of physical appearance that may indicate compromised welfare, the Code Commission did not accept the suggestion because ‘‘emaciation’’ is sufficient in conveying the intent of the text; that is, any abnormal thinness caused by lack of nutrition or by disease. The Code Commission also noted that a single harmonised body condition scoring system does not exist, so the chapter will not give specific recommendations relating to body condition scores.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country proposal to remove the fifth paragraph of Article 7.12.9. as the text was a consensus from expert opinion. The Code Commission further explained that it is not possible to define precisely the meaning of ‘‘long period’’ because variables such as temperature influence the length of time.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country comment in the first paragraph of Article 7.12.11. to replace ‘‘should be discouraged’’ with ‘‘is unacceptable’’, to maintain the consistency with other chapters, to give recommendation to Member Countries through positive actions while avoiding value judgements.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country comment to remove a text that limits the working hours of working equids to six hours per day in Article 7.12.12. Although this recommendation is a management-based measure, it is supported by expert opinion of an *ad hoc* Group. The Code Commission also expressed that limiting the working hours has a positive effect on the welfare of working equids, and indicated that it is not possible to compare working equids with dairy cows, since lactation is not considered a ‘working activity’ (neither is standing still); it is a physiologic response that cannot be controlled. The Code Commission further commented that more scientific arguments are needed to support the deletion of the text.

The Code Commission accepted the suggestion of a Member Country, with modifications, of the first paragraph of Article 7.12.13., and added a sentence to highlight the importance of removing dirt and any debris before fitting a harness to avoid wounds.

The revised Chapter 7.12. is attached as **Annex 13** and will be proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

**Item 4.11. Draft new Chapter on infection with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex (Chapter 8.X.)**

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

In considering the general comments received from two Member Countries (one in support and the other opposed), the Code Commission reminded Member Countries that this chapter had been under discussion for many years including the lengthy discussion and debate on the inclusion of New World camelids and that several opportunities had been provided for Member Countries to comment. Therefore, the Code Commission was surprised to note that a Member Country was still questioning the scientific rationale for the inclusion of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* in this chapter. The Code Commission further noted that in regards to the question of the scientific rationale, the Scientific Commission had provided a list of peer-reviewed papers demonstrating the impact of *M. tuberculosis* in livestock and wildlife and that the inclusion of *M. bovis*, *M. caprae* and *M. tuberculosis* in the chapter was intended to manage the human and animal health risks associated with the disease.

- Alexander KA, Pleydell E, Williams MC, Lane EP, Nyange JF, Michel AL, *et al.* Mycobacterium tuberculosis: An Emerging Disease of Free-Ranging Wildlife. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
- Romero B, Rodríguez S, Bezos J, Díaz R, Copano MF, Merediz I, *et al.* Humans as Source of Mycobacterium tuberculosis Infection in Cattle, Spain. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
- Fetene T, Kebede N, Alem G. Tuberculosis infection in animal and human populations in three districts of western Gojam, Ethiopia. *Zoonoses Public Health*. 2011;58:47–53. PubMed doi:10.1111/j.1863-2378.2009.01265.x.
- Chen Y, Chao Y, Deng Q, Liu T, Xiang J, Chen J, Potential challenges to the Stop TB Plan for humans in China; cattle maintain *M. bovis* and *M. tuberculosis*. *Tuberculosis (Edinb)*. 2009;89:95–100. DOI PubMed
- Prasad HK, Singhal A, Mishra A, Shah NP, Katoch VM, Thakral SS, Bovine tuberculosis in India: potential basis for zoonosis. *Tuberculosis (Edinb)*. 2005;85:421–8. DOI PubMed

In response to the same Member Country question regarding freedom from infection from all the prescribed species of *M. tuberculosis* complex the Code Commission noted that a case of tuberculosis is defined if the pathogenic agent is isolated from an animal sample, but not humans. The Code Commission further noted that the possibility of reverse zoonosis cannot be dismissed in order to protect the animals. Furthermore, in respect of the same Member Country’s view that African buffaloes (*Syncerus caffer*) were excluded from the chapter, the Code Commission recalled former discussion on wildlife. While in many countries wildlife can be a reservoir for the disease as is noted in Article 8.X.1. they are not included in the case definition, rather only included in the risk assessment for herd freedom. Furthermore, the *ad hoc* Group as well as the Scientific Commission considered that African buffaloes do not play a role in maintaining the disease. They are usually infected as spill over from domestic animals rather than the other way around. The same Member Country also questioned the rationale for the use of ‘herd free’ instead of the use of compartmentalisation to help address ‘safe trade’. The Code Commission noted that the concept of herd freedom was extensively discussed (between it and the Scientific Commission) and widely and successfully implemented for both tuberculosis and brucellosis as well as others, and in their opinion referring only to free compartment will lead to unjustified trade restrictions.

The Code Commission noted that in line with changes being made to other *Code* chapters, the use of the term ‘cattle’ would be reviewed and replaced where appropriate with ‘bovines’.

The Code Commission addressed specific comments in each of the articles as follows:

Article 8.X.1.: in response to a proposal to expand the species of New World camelids, the Code Commission reconfirmed that the inclusion of the species was limited to those for which there is a published source supporting their epidemiological role, and further clarified the sentence by deleting ‘domestic’, as this is stated in the chapeau of the article.

The Code Commission made a minor amendment to Articles 8.X.4. and 8.X.5. to clarify that measures should be periodically reassessed.

In Article 8.X.6., the Code Commission changed ‘evidence’ to ‘occurrence’ for clarity and consistency with other chapters and added the word ‘known’ to the term wildlife reservoirs in point 2 c) to make it clear that this point applies to known reservoirs such as badgers, possums and some wild cervids.

In considering a comment in relation to the validity and reliability of intradermal testing in goats on Article 8.X.8., the Code Commission noted previous discussion on this issue during its February 2016 meeting. It decided to add a new point 3 b) providing for testing of goats to be exported. The proposed measures are based on the requirements for bovines and on field evidence that tuberculin test performance in goats is similar to that in bovines for individual testing. The following rationale supported the inclusion of the provision.

A study of tuberculosis in goats in New Zealand considered the sensitivity of the tuberculin test to be 80%, certainly better than merely examining for clinical signs.

- Sanson R.L. (1998). Tuberculosis in goats. *Surveillance*. Vol.15, No.2; 7–8.

A review article in the OIE’s *Scientific and Technical Review* reports sensitivity of the tuberculin test in goats to be 100%, 38%, >95% and 87% in various studies. The same article cites sensitivity of the Bovigam test in goats as 100%, 83.7% and 87.2%. These sensitivities are, with one exception, adequate for most purposes and so a testing requirement should be introduced into this article.

- Cousins D.V., Florisson N. (2005). A review of tests available for use in the diagnosis of tuberculosis in non-bovine species. *Rev. sci. tech. Off. int. Epiz.*, 24 (3), 1039–1059.

In responding to a Member Country proposal to delete Article 8.X.14. the Code Commission agreed that there was not enough information to recommend tuberculosis risk management measures suitable for 180 Member Countries for the importation of milk and milk products from goats. In order to study this issue more fully the Code Commission requires more information on the management of tuberculosis in goats, including protocols for herd freedom. Consequently, the Code Commission urges Member Countries to provide information to OIE Headquarters on their national tuberculosis control programmes for goats, as the Code Commission is aware that several Member Countries have protocols for certifying herd freedom.

The draft new Chapter 8.X. is attached as **Annex 14** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

#### **Item 4.12. Infection with avian influenza viruses (Article 10.4.25.)**

Comments were received from Switzerland and EU.

The Code Commission noted Member Countries comments in support of the adoption of the revised article.

In considering the adoption of this revised article the Code Commission extensively discussed the need for further revision of this chapter to take account of the differences among Member Countries in terms of notification to the OIE, the differing needs when responding to either LPAI or HPAI outbreaks and when recovering free status, the impacts of unjustified barriers to trade being implemented by some Member Countries, and the need to include articles on safe commodities and the need to expand those on surveillance.

The Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to provide it with expert advice on the following aspects:

- a) Disease and case definitions;
- b) Appropriate sanitary measures including trade requirements and safe commodities;
- c) Outbreak management of LPAI and HPAI;
- d) Recovery of free status; and
- e) Surveillance.

The Code Commission included the revision of Chapter 10.4. on its work programme, as a priority area for new work, with a view to discussion of the expert advice requested above, at its September 2017 meeting.

The revised Article 10.4.25. is attached as **Annex 15** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

#### **Item 4.13. Infection with lumpy skin disease (Chapter 11.11.)**

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

The Code Commission noted a Member Country comment in support of the proposed chapter, in particular the modifications proposed in Article 11.11.3. *bis* regarding recovery of free status in the case of preventive vaccination. In responding to the general comment of another Member Country that the draft chapter was not sufficiently developed to consider adoption, the Code Commission noted that the current chapter is outdated and of no significant use to countries dealing with lumpy skin disease and that these countries consider the need for this revised chapter is a matter of urgency and, therefore, any additional questions about vaccination and inactivation could be dealt with after the chapter is adopted. In addition it was also suggested that the same Member Country review in more depth the report of the *ad hoc* Group as there seemed to be some misinterpretation of the report.

In line with a more general comment by Member Countries on the use of the term ‘cattle’ throughout the *Code* the Code Commission replaced it with ‘bovine’ or ‘bovines’, as appropriate throughout the chapter. For clarity and consistency with changes made to other chapters, ‘evidence’ was replaced with ‘occurrence’ where relevant throughout the chapter.

In Article 11.11.3. in response to a Member Country comment and in agreement with the advice from the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission added ‘For at least three years vaccination has been prohibited in’ at the beginning of point 2) and ‘For at least two years vaccination has been prohibited’ in point 3).

In examining a Member Country comments on Article 11.11.3. *bis*, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission did not agree with the deletion of point 1 b). However, they agreed there was a need to address the possibility of emergency vaccination, and the Code Commission added ‘the slaughter or killing of the last case, or after the last vaccination if emergency vaccination has been used, whichever occurred last,’ and deleted ‘a stamping-out policy has been applied’ in both points a) and b). In response to the same Member Country proposal that vaccination be prohibited and vaccinated animals be permanently identified and removed from the population, the Code Commission considered that prohibition of vaccination could not be included in this article as this was a prerequisite condition for free status, and further noted that identification is covered in Article 11.11.14. In regards to the proposal to delete point 2) the Code Commission considered that the point was clear and that it was implicit that if vaccination is used the status of the country would change and would not be free.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to add a maximum period to point 3), in Article 11.11.5. and added ‘one year’ for clarity.

In response to another Member Country proposal to delete Article 11.11.5. neither the Code Commission nor the Scientific Commission supported the proposal and considered that the article provides sufficient risk mitigation measures to ensure trade of animals from infected countries is safe. In respect of point 5), the Code Commission included the provision of testing during quarantine in order to encourage safe trade. In response to the same Member Country proposal for the OIE to develop a protocol based around sequential PCR testing the Code Commission noted that the *Terrestrial Manual* provides sufficient guidance in this regard.

In response to a Member Country proposal to increase the residency period for donor males and donor females from 28 to 180 days, in point b) of Article 11.11.6., point b) of Article 11.11.7. and point b) of Article 11.11.8., the Code Commission considered this was unnecessary as the recommendations in these articles are for importation from countries or zones free from LSD and any animal would have been imported in compliance with the relevant import conditions (Article 11.11.4. or Article 11.11.5.). In response to another Member Country proposal to replace ‘regularly’ with ‘annually’ in point c) of Article 11.11.7. and point c) of Article 11.11.8. the Code Commission considered that the manufacturer’s instructions should be sufficient.

In examining a Member Country comment in respect of the periods relative to testing, the Code Commission amended point c) iii) of Article 11.11.7. to 28 days and 21 days respectively, and in point iv) changed 14 days to 28 days. This was to clarify the different testing periods relative to the incubation period (28 days) or the time necessary for seroconversion (21 days).

In response to a Member Country questioning the scientific evidence supporting the control measures for the importation of milk and milk products in Article 11.11.10., the Code Commission replied that milk *per se* is considered a low risk material. The Code Commission also relies on the advice of experts who have pointed out that there is no reason to assume that LSDV would not be inactivated by pasteurisation that has been shown to be effective against closely related viruses, and many other viruses. This deductive assessment is supported by decades of empirical observation on the safety of milk and milk products with respect to LSD.

The Code Commission moved Article 11.11.11. to before Article 11.11.14. to improve the flow of the chapter and for consistency with other chapters. In response to a Member Country comment it added a new point 3) in Articles 11.11.12. and 11.11.13., to read ‘the necessary precautions were taken after processing to avoid contact of the commodities with any potential source of LSDV.’

In response to a Member Country comment proposing the revision of Article 11.11.14. on surveillance regarding vaccination, serology and subclinical disease, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission considered the current surveillance articles are sufficient to support Member Countries’ surveillance strategies. The Code Commission made some amendments to the article which may address the Member Country concerns and added a new sentence at the end of point 3) to address other Member Countries comments regarding the possible interference of maternal antibodies.

The draft revised Chapter 11.11. is attached as **Annex 16** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

#### **Item 4.14. Infection with *Burkholderia mallei* (glanders) (Chapter 12.10.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, Singapore, Switzerland, USA and EU.

The Code Commission noted that the Biological Standards Commission had undertaken a revision of the *Terrestrial Manual* Chapter 2.5.11. Glanders, in order to include provisions in relation to melioidosis. The *Manual* chapter will be circulated for Member Countries’ comments and proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

In order to inform its discussion in September 2017, the Code Commission asked OIE Headquarters to provide a more detailed expert analysis and consideration of Member Countries comments, advice received from the Scientific Commission and the new *Manual* chapter. The results of the expert analysis should be provided to the Code Commission by the end of June 2017, in order to allow it to fully consider the advice in preparation for its meeting in September 2017.

#### **Item 4.15. Infection with African swine fever virus (Chapter 15.1.)**

Comments were received from Belize, Canada, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Korea, New Zealand, Nigeria, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, USA and EU.

The Code Commission considered Member Countries comments and scientific advice provided by the Scientific Commission and made further revisions to this chapter.

The Code Commission made editorial changes throughout the chapter to replace ‘housed’ with ‘captive’ and deleted ‘farmed free range’ and replaced it with ‘free ranging’.

In responding to a general comment from a Member Country that measures apparently based on the draft revised chapter had not proven successful in a region recently affected by ASF, the Code Commission noted that the measures implemented were not exactly similar to those proposed in the revised chapter, and agreed with the advice from the Scientific Commission that measures appropriate from a scientific and technical perspective should still be implemented fully by all relevant stakeholders of Member Countries in order to be effective.

In examining Member Countries comments on this chapter, in particular repeated requests from a Member Country to exclude *captive wild pigs*, the Code Commission reiterated its previous explanations on this point and draws the attention of the Member Country to its September 2016 report in which the following explanation was provided.

*The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission, in that captive wild pigs do not play the same role as wild and feral pigs in the epidemiology of the disease. They are rather comparable to domestic pigs, because, by definition, they are under human control and supervision, can have contact with domestic pigs and their meat is more widely traded. That is why they are considered jointly with domestic pigs in terms of risk assessment and management.*

In other words captive wild pigs are included with domestic pigs not because they are at increased risk of being exposed to ASF but because the animals and their products pose a greater risk of disseminating the disease.

A Member Country proposed the inclusion of ‘wild boars’ in Article 15.1.1.; this was seen as unnecessary, as by definition, wild pig includes wild boars.

For clarity and consistency with other disease-specific chapters, the Code Commission included the words ‘the occurrence’ before ‘infection’ in the definition of the disease. Further amendments were made to point 2) to include reference to ‘pathological lesions’ after ‘showing clinical signs’ and to delete ‘whether or not clinical signs or pathological lesions consistent with ASF are present’ at the end of the paragraph as this is contradictory and unnecessary. In response to Member Countries comments regarding the proposed change to the incubation period (15 to 19 days), the issue was discussed with the Scientific Commission and the Biological Standards Commission and it was agreed to retain the original incubation period of 15 days as it is consistent both with the *Terrestrial Manual* and scientific evidence.

In examining Member Countries comments on the general criteria for the determination of the ASF status of a country, zone or compartment (Article 15.1.2.), the Code Commission made the following observations:

- Point 1) clearly articulates the investigation in relation to pigs showing clinical signs;
- Point 2) allows for situations where organisations, other than the Veterinary Authority, such as hunting associations, might have awareness programmes;

- Points 5) and 6), as in point 2) above, noted that others besides the Veterinary Authority can play a role in surveillance (hunters, etc.); and
- Point 7), agreed to rearrange the point to clarify that the action taken is stated first, followed by the conditions, and identifying roles and responsibilities as the biosecurity is a key aspect of the chapter.

In response to a Member Country request to delete the paragraph related to commodities that can be safely traded, the Code Commission reminded Member Countries that the purpose of the *Code* is to provide recommendations and guidelines in order to facilitate safe trade and therefore did not propose to delete this point.

The Code Commission agreed with the advice provided by the Scientific Commission, in relation to a Member Country comment to remove reference to surveillance and *Ornithodoros* ticks, in Article 15.1.3. in that *Ornithodoros* ticks remain infectious for their entire life, thus surveillance needs to be longer if ticks are involved.

In Article 15.1.3. *ter*, the Code Commission made minor editorial amendments for clarity.

In response to a Member Country requesting the rationale for removing acaricide treatment from Article 15.1.4., the rationale was explained in the September 2014 Scientific Commission meeting report referring to the *ad hoc* Group conclusions: ‘The Group (convened in April 2014) suggested removing the reference to ticks and acaricide treatment since this was considered ineffective.’ The Code Commission reminds Member Countries that the reports of its meetings should always be read in conjunction with the report of *ad hoc* Groups and, where relevant, of the Scientific Commission, as it is not always possible to include specific comments on every proposal.

In responding to a Member Country proposal to include Veterinary Authority to clarify that it is the Veterinary Authorities’ responsibility to carry out the action of *stamping out*, the Code Commission considered it was unnecessary as it is implicit.

In responding to a Member Country comment on Article 15.1.5. that there was a need to clarify what is meant by ‘necessary precautions’, the Code Commission added ‘until the shipment’ at the end of point 3) and considered that there was no need for a list of examples.

In response to an editorial change to point b) of Article 15.1.9. proposed by a Member Country, the Code Commission noted that the text was consistent with other *Code* chapters and with the articles in this chapter in relation to the collection of embryos.

Several Member Countries proposed the inclusion of a new point c) referencing the need to retain the provision for serological testing; in response the Code Commission restated the rationale for its decision in September 2016.

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

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

Furthermore, while it has been widely assumed that ASFV would be likely to be transmitted in porcine semen, there is no peer-reviewed evidence to support this. Some authors have suggested that ASFV can be found in boar semen and even transmitted to recipient sows. However, the only evidence for this provided in any of these sources appears to be a personal communication by D.H. Schlafer in 1984 published in a conference proceedings. This alleged observation has never been published in any peer-reviewed paper and is not supported by any epidemiological data on ASF spread.

The Code Commission made an editorial change to point 2) of Article 15.1.10 for consistency with articles in other disease chapters, the point now reads ‘the semen used to fertilise the oocytes complied with the conditions referred to in Articles 15.1.7. or 15.1.8., as relevant.’

In considering a Member Country comment on Article 15.1.13., the Code Commission reiterated its decision from September 2016 in that ‘*In response to Member Countries’ concerns and to be consistent with Article 15.1.12., the Code Commission modified Article 15.1.13. to only describe conditions of importation of fresh meat of wild and feral pigs from countries and zones free from ASF in the wild population. The Code Commission also reiterated that, as noted in the User’s Guide, the absence of an article or import conditions on any given commodity does not mean that trade in that commodity cannot be conducted safely, or that Member Countries cannot apply appropriate measures.*’

In response to a proposal from a Member Country to delete point 2) of Article 15.1.17. (reinstated), in not accepting this proposal, the Code Commission noted that the rationale provided was not strong enough to support the proposal and that, as Article 15.1.21.ter provides procedures for the inactivation of ASFV in skins and trophies, an importing country that does not wish to accept these types of products can do so based on its own risk assessment. The same Member Country also proposed deletion of similar points in Article 15.1.17. bis and Article 15.1.17. ter, which was not accepted either.

A Member Country requested the scientific information on which the provisions for procedures for inactivation of ASFV were based. The Code Commission notes that the provisions of these articles have been under discussion for several years, some of which has included review of scientific articles by *ad hoc* Groups on both ASF and CSF as well as the Scientific Commission. The provisions are based on the best available scientific evidence and informed by common effective practices that have been used by Member Countries for many years.

The Code Commission provided the following references to supporting scientific papers:

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

Wieringa-Jelsma, Tinka, et al. ‘Virus inactivation by salt (NaCl) and phosphate supplemented salt in a 3D collagen matrix model for natural sausage casings.’ *International journal of food microbiology* 148.2 (2011): 128-134

[http://www.cfsph.iastate.edu/Factsheets/pdfs/african\\_swine\\_fever.pdf](http://www.cfsph.iastate.edu/Factsheets/pdfs/african_swine_fever.pdf)

[http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Animal\\_Health\\_in\\_the\\_World/docs/pdf/Disease\\_cards/AFRICAN\\_SWINE\\_FEVER.pdf](http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Animal_Health_in_the_World/docs/pdf/Disease_cards/AFRICAN_SWINE_FEVER.pdf)

The Code Commission made minor editorial changes to the abovementioned articles for clarity and to align them with other disease chapters of the *Code*.

The Code Commission agreed to change ‘Competent Authority’ to ‘Veterinary Authority’ in Article 15.1.27. as it agrees with the Member Country that animal disease control programmes should be under the control of the Veterinary Authority.

The draft revised Chapter 15.1. is attached as **Annex 17** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

**Item 4.16. Draft new Chapter on infection with porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (Chapter 15.X.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Chile, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, USA, the EU and the OIE PRRS Reference Laboratory (Poland).

The Code Commission made several changes to the chapter including throughout the chapter where appropriate, changing the word ‘outbreak’ to ‘case’ for consistency with other disease chapters. Furthermore, in relation to requests from a Member Country to exclude *captive wild pigs*, the Code Commission reiterated its previous explanations on this point and draws the attention of the Member Country to its September 2016 report in which the following explanation was provided.

*The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to delete ‘captive wild pig’ from the definition of the PRRS in the General provision, noting that ‘captive wild pig’ is, by definition, under direct human supervision or control and as such may play a role comparable to domestic pigs.*

In other words captive wild pigs are included with domestic pigs not because they are at increased risk of being exposed to PRRS but because they pose a greater risk of themselves or their products disseminating the disease.

The Code Commission amended the wording in the preamble to point 1) to read ‘The following defines the occurrence of *infection* with PRRSV’, this for clarity and consistency with amendments proposed to other disease chapters in the *Code*.

In order to address an issue raised by Member Countries, the Code Commission amended point 1) to read ‘PRRSV, excluding vaccine strains, has been isolated from samples from a domestic or wild pig’. Consequently, amendments were also made to point 3) to address the issue of isolation of a live PRRS vaccine strain. In examining the Member Countries comments on point 3) it was confirmed that the isolation of any PRRS virus including vaccine-like virus in an unvaccinated animal is considered a case.

In respect to the strong opposition to the inclusion of ‘maternally-derived immunity’ the Code Commission agreed that it is impossible to discriminate between maternally-derived immunity and naturally-acquired immunity and therefore for clarity amended point 4) by adding ‘unless they are demonstrated to be’ and deleted ‘or maternally-derived immunity’.

The Code Commission examined numerous lengthy and irreconcilable Member Countries comments on whether or not meat was a safe commodity and whether or not it should be included in Article 15.X.2. In order to resolve this, the Code Commission further noted that formerly proposed Article 15.X.12. provided recommendations for the importation of fresh meat of domestic and captive wild pigs with ante- and post-mortem inspection and reinstated an Article 15.X.12. into the chapter (see below) and deleted reference to meat in Article 15.X.2. In addition, as the definition of meat includes blood, and meat has now been deleted from this article, it was considered appropriate to reinstate a reference to ‘blood products’ (point 5) as it was not clear what is meant by ‘blood by-products’.

Editorial changes were made to Article 15.X.3. in response to a number of inconsistencies with other chapters, and in order to address some Member Countries comments. One Member Country proposed to insert a reference to ‘capable of detecting the presence of *infection* with PRRSV even in the absence of clinical signs’ at the end of point 3), however the Code Commission considered it more appropriate to include the reference in Article 15.X.13. on surveillance (see below).

In response to a Member Country comment in regards to the use of inactivated and modified live vaccines, the Code Commission agreed with the advice provided by the Scientific Commission that immunity after vaccination lasts an average of nine months and that existing point 5) and point 6) provide sufficient guidance.

In responding to a Member Country proposal to change the term Veterinary Authority to Veterinary Services in Article 15.X.4. (and other following articles) the Code Commission considered the proposal was redundant as it is implicit that the Veterinary Services are responsible for the actions identified in this chapter.

In examining a Member Country proposal to include a reference to the need for laboratory results to corroborate clinical signs in point 1) of Article 15.X.5., the Code Commission did not consider the rationale provided was sufficient to support the proposal.

The Code Commission made minor amendments to the points in Article 15.X.6., to address Member Countries comments. However, it did not accept the rationale to delete point 1) as isolation alone with no information on the herd of origin is not considered an appropriate risk management option, nor did it consider there was a justification to include testing in the herd of origin. The inclusion of ‘28 days’ (twice the incubation period) in point 4) was considered appropriate to clarify the time for isolation for animals prior to entry into an artificial insemination centre.

In examining a Member Country proposal for Article 15.X.7., the Code Commission considered that the need for testing is redundant as the animals are for slaughter and ‘appropriate biosecurity’ during transport is sufficient. It also noted that this point is consistent with other chapters.

In response to a proposal to add additional sampling of males in Article 15.X.8, the Code Commission noted that the animals are in a free country or zone and therefore testing would be unnecessary.

The Code Commission examined Member Countries comments and proposed amendments to the text, in Article 15.X.9., for clarity, in particular, noting that (i) testing cannot be done on the same day as semen collection, (ii) serological testing may not be the best technique in the case of herd testing for donor males. With regards to a proposal from a Member Country to include further testing, it noted that the requirements should be the same as for live animals and therefore did not include additional requirements. In its discussion on this article the Code Commission also referred Member Countries to the relevant article of the *Terrestrial Manual* Chapter 2.8.6.

In considering a Member Country comment on Article 15.X.11. the Code Commission considered the safety of embryos is addressed through the requirements included in point b) and further cited a recent scientific article on the safety of embryos, which Member Countries are encouraged to consider.

Haijing Zhao, Guangyuan Zhao, Wenjun Wang. “Susceptibility of porcine preimplantation embryos to viruses associated with reproductive failure”  
[Theriogenology 86(7) (2016) 1631e1636]  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0093691X16302588>

The Code Commission reinstated an Article 15.X.12. for the importation of pig meat, requiring certification that the meat comes from animals that passed ante- and post-mortem inspection with favourable results (see above point on Article 15.X.2.)

In regards to Article 15.X.13. Introduction to surveillance, the Code Commission made minor amendments to clarify that surveillance should be capable of detecting PRRSV in the absence of clinical signs and did not agree with a proposal from a Member Country to include reference to virus circulation as it was covered in the current text.

In response to a request from a Member Country to include examples in Article 15.X.15. the Code Commission considered that the inclusion of examples for the establishment of proximities around outbreaks, in the case of PRRSV, was not appropriate, and that Member Countries should choose the most appropriate options particular to their circumstances.

The proposed draft new Chapter 15.X. is attached as **Annex 18** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

#### **Item 4.17. Somatic cell nuclear transfer in production livestock and horses (Article 4.11.4.)**

Comments were received from Switzerland and EU.

In view of the comments received in support of the proposed revised Article, the Code Commission made no changes and noted that this limited change could be adopted at the upcoming General Session.

The revised Article 4.11.4. is attached as **Annex 19** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

#### Item 4.18. Import risk analysis (Chapter 2.1.)

The Code Commission noted in its review of the Glossary that ‘transparency’ appears in one chapter only, Chapter 2.1. Its placement in the Glossary arose because originally risk analysis was covered in two chapters. These were later merged into a single chapter, but ‘transparency’ remained in the Glossary. Noting this, the Code Commission removed the italics from the word ‘transparency’ in Article 2.1.1.

The Code Commission consequently revised point 4) of Article 2.1.3., inserting the sentence defining transparency that was deleted from the Glossary, to read:

Consistency in *risk assessment* methods should be encouraged and transparency is essential in order to ensure fairness and rationality, consistency in decision making and ease of understanding by all the interested parties. Transparency means the comprehensive documentation of all data, information, assumptions, methods, results, discussion and conclusions used in the risk analysis.

Since this proposed new text is in fact only a movement from the Glossary to the chapter, the revised Article 2.1.3. is attached as **Annex 20** and is proposed for adoption at the 85th General Session in May 2017.

#### Item 5 TEXTS CIRCULATED FOR MEMBER COUNTRIES’ COMMENTS

**Table 2. Lists of texts circulated for Member Countries’ comments**

Item	Annexes in Part A	Chapters/Articles	Title
5.1	21	-	Glossary B
5.2	22	4.3.	Zoning and compartmentalisation (clean text)
5.2	22 bis	4.3.	Zoning and compartmentalisation (marked up text)
5.3	23	4.X.	Draft new Chapter on vaccination
5.4	24	4.8.	Collection and processing of oocytes and <i>in vitro</i> derived embryos from livestock and horses
5.6	25	6.1.	The role of the Veterinary Services in food safety (clean text)
5.6	25 bis	6.1.	The role of the Veterinary Services in food safety (marked up text)
5.7a)	-	-	Definitions (‘therapeutic use’, ‘preventive use’, ‘growth promotion’) as proposed by the <i>ad hoc</i> Group on Antimicrobial Resistance
5.7b)	26	6.7.	Harmonisation of national antimicrobial resistance surveillance and monitoring programmes
5.8	27	7.1.X.	Draft new article on guiding principles on the use of animal based measures
5.9	28	7.X.	The draft new Chapter on animal welfare and pig production systems
5.10	29	8.3.	Infection with bluetongue virus
5.11	30	8.8.	Infection with foot and mouth disease virus
7.3	37	-	Work programme

#### Item 5.1. Glossary Part B

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, Nigeria, Norway, Singapore, EU and AU-IBAR.

In examining Member Countries comments on the proposed revised definitions, the Code Commission made a number of changes to the proposed definitions, which are presented for further comment in the corresponding Annex. In light of the discussion on the proposed definition of disease (see last paragraph below), the terms ‘infection and infestation’ were reinstated.

*Animal Welfare* – In examining the proposal of the AWWG (see Item 6.9.) to modify the definition, the Code Commission considered that ‘General Considerations’ was more appropriate sub-heading than ‘Introduction’. It also noted that it would be more clear and succinct if only the first paragraph of the modified text was used as the definition for animal welfare in the Glossary of the *Code*. The definition now reads ‘*Animal welfare* means the state of well-being of an animal in relation to the condition in which it lives’.

*Containment Zone* – In light of its discussion on Chapter 4.3., the Code Commission replaced the word ‘outbreaks’ with ‘cases’, included ‘sanitary’ after ‘biosecurity’. In response to a Member Country proposal to include reference to ‘where disease investigation is being carried out to establish suspicion or confirm an outbreak’, the Code Commission considered that this was an activity that would be carried out and was not appropriate to include in a definition.

*Free Zone* – Deleted ‘disease’ and reinstated ‘infection and infestation’.

*Infected Zone* – Replaced ‘diagnosed’ with ‘confirmed’ and reordered the wording to improve readability.

*Protection Zone* – In response to numerous Member Countries comments, the Code Commission proposed a new text, in order to add clarity to what a protection zone is as articulated in Article 4.3.6.

*Zone* – For clarity added ‘animal’ before ‘health status’ and included ‘defined by the Veterinary Authority’.

*Compartment* – Accepted proposals from a Member Country to include ‘animal’ before ‘health status’ and to clarify that the control measures would be applied ‘in a country or zone’.

*Vaccination* – Noting the objective of vaccination as described in the proposed new Chapter 4.X., and for clarity and consistency with other *Code* chapters, the Code Commission replaced ‘of a vaccine comprising antigens appropriate to the’ with ‘with the intention of’ and replaced ‘disease to be controlled’ with ‘pathogenic agent’. It did not agree with a proposal to include reference to ‘national legislation’ as this was addressed in the chapter.

The Code Commission considered the numerous Member Countries comments in regards to the definition of *disease*. The majority of these comments did not support the proposed change to the definition, the Code Commission noting this was linked to its proposal on a definition of pathogenic agent. As the current definition brings confusion about the understanding of the term *disease*, *infection* or *infestation* the Code Commission considered that the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition is appropriate for the purposes of the *Code*, as is also the case for ‘pathogenic agent’, and therefore proposed to delete the term ‘disease’ from the Glossary. This will result in consequential changes to the *Code* where the term ‘disease’ will need to be unitalicised, replaced by ‘infection and infestation’ or changed to exactly what is meant, i.e. clinical or pathological signs. It further noted that this would not affect the definition of ‘listed disease’ or ‘emerging disease’ and would bring further clarity to the use of the terms *infection* and *infestation*.

The revised definitions are attached in **Annex 21** and are proposed for Member Countries ‘comments.

### **Item 5.2. Zoning and compartmentalisation (Chapter 4.3.)**

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

The Code Commission noted a general comment from Member Countries and agreed to consider whether there was a need to develop a separate chapter on the application of zoning as is the case for compartmentalisation and has included this in its work programme for further consideration. For consistency throughout the chapter the Code Commission changed ‘distinct’ to ‘specific’, replaced ‘animals’ and ‘animal products’ with ‘commodities’ and ‘herd/flock’ with ‘herd or flock’ as appropriate.

In examining several Member Countries comments on Article 4.3.1. the Code Commission made the following observations and where appropriate made minor amendments:

- Included the term ‘or prevention’, to clarify that establishing or maintaining a subpopulation with a specific health status could be for the purpose of disease prevention, disease control or international trade;
- Clarified that the use of a compartment was also a tool to control the disease in a country or zone;
- Did not consider there was a need to add further clarification to the text of the third paragraph, as this article is a general one and it is obvious that a country may have more than one zone or compartment;
- Included reference to ‘facilitate disease control and the continuation of trade’.

In considering Member Countries comments on Article 4.3.2. the Code Commission made several amendments including changing ‘distinct’ to ‘specific’ for consistency with other chapters, added text to clarify the cooperation between industry and the *Veterinary Services* and to clarify the reference to the principles and criteria in Chapters 3.1. and 3.2.

It did not agree with the proposal of a Member Country to reorder a sentence relating to ‘assessment of resources needed and available’ as in its view reordering the words changed the intent of the sentence. The purpose of the assessment is to determine the resources needed and if they are available to establish and maintain the zone or compartment. In response to a comment from the same Member Country the Code Commission noted that ‘*sanitary measures*’, a defined term that includes e.g. vaccination and import and export measures, are not a subset of ‘*biosecurity*’ and did not agree to delete ‘*sanitary measures*’.

In response to a proposal to include ‘audit’ with ‘inspections’ the Code Commission did not agree as audit is covered in the second sentence.

The Code Commission agreed with a proposal from a Member Country to include reference to ‘in consultation with the *Veterinary Services*, if appropriate’ in the paragraph relating to industry responsibilities and agreed to change ‘animals’ to ‘commodities’ for consistency as commodities include animals and animal products.

In considering Member Countries comments on Article 4.3.3. the Code Commission replaced ‘industry’ with ‘operators’, changed ‘animals’ to ‘commodities’ but did not agree with a proposal to include ‘with trading partners when requested’. In response to two Member Countries comments on the last paragraph in this article, one proposing to delete the paragraph and the other to delete the last sentence, the Code Commission noted that this paragraph was a key part of the article and to delete it, or the last sentence, would be to limit everything that is in the *Code*. The intent of this chapter is to provide the ability for countries to establish different types of zones but to list every example of a type of zone is not feasible. This sentence provides the necessary flexibility to allow Member Countries to protect their health status, to control diseases and to facilitate trade.

In examining Member Countries comments in relation to Article 4.3.4, the Code Commission noted a number of comments opposed to the deletion of ‘infection or infestation’ that was linked to the proposal on the definition of *disease*, which was as yet unresolved. Thus it agreed to reinstate the terms ‘infection or infestation’ in this chapter.

In response to a proposal to delete the second last sentence in this article, the Code Commission did not agree with the rationale and noted that the text was consistent with other *Code* chapters such as those on brucellosis, classical swine fever and tuberculosis. The Code Commission amended the last sentence to include ‘principles determined for its definition and establishment are respected’.

The Code Commission did not support a proposal to move Article 4.3.5. Infected Zone to follow Article 4.3.6. Protection Zone as it did not agree with the rationale and considered the current proposed order more logical. In line with changes made in other disease chapters, the Code Commission also replaced ‘diagnosed’ with ‘confirmed’ and reordered the sentence to clarify that there may also be areas of the country that are apparently free from the disease but that status may not have been formally confirmed.

In considering comments from Member Countries in relation to the first paragraph in Article 4.3.6. the Code Commission reworded the first sentence to clarify that a protection zone can be established to prevent the introduction of a pathogenic agent from adjacent countries or zones to an animal population. It also included the term ‘commodities’ in point 5) for consistency with other articles.

The Code Commission in agreement with the advice of a member of the Scientific Commission clarified whether or not measures implemented in a *protection zone* established in a *free* country or *zone* would affect the status of the rest of the *free* country or *zone* and added a new paragraph at the end of the article to further clarify this.

In response to a number of Member Countries comments the Code Commission made several amendments, including some of an editorial nature, to Article 4.3.7. as follows:

- added ‘epidemiologically-linked’ to the first paragraph to clarify that it is possible to have more than one *containment zone* provided the *outbreaks* in different containment zones are not epidemiologically-linked;
- added ‘infestation’ to point 2);
- replaced ‘clear’ with ‘animal’ before ‘identification’ in point 4), but did not agree to include ‘and registered’. Moreover, while recognising that strict animal movement control should be in place, individual specific identification may be desirable but not always feasible and the method used should be decided by the Member Countries;
- replaced ‘evidence’ with ‘occurrence’ to be consistent with the disease chapters where it states ‘A case is defined as an occurrence of, etc.’;
- in point 6 b) added ‘for at least two incubation periods’ for consistency with point a) and in agreement with the advice from a member of the Scientific Commission;
- amended the third last paragraph by adding ‘Once the containment zone has been established’ and ‘regain free status’ rather than the free status being reinstated; and
- amended the final paragraph to reference the relevant disease-specific chapters or, if there are none, Article 1.4.6.

In examining Member Countries comments on Article 4.3.8. the Code Commission acknowledged that while the OIE has procedures for official recognition of the status for six listed diseases (Chapter 1.6.), for others, Member Countries may recognise each other’s status through bilateral agreements or processes. In the final paragraph of this article the Code Commission added ‘in accordance with Chapter 5.3.’ and replaced ‘certifies’ with ‘demonstrates’ for clarity.

The draft revised Chapter 4.3. is attached as **Annex 22** and is proposed for Member Countries’ comments.

### **Item 5.3. Draft new Chapter on vaccination (Chapter 4.X.)**

Comments were received from Australia,, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, USA, EU, AU-IBAR and IDF.

The Code Commission noted the comments of a large number of Member Countries in support of this draft new chapter. In responding to a proposal to include more focus on animal welfare as an argument in favour of vaccination, the Code Commission noted animal welfare was covered in Article 4.X.1. Throughout the chapter the Code Commission also changed the word ‘non-vaccinated’ to ‘unvaccinated’ as this is the correct term in English.

In examining Member Countries comments on this draft new chapter, the Code Commission made a number of changes to Article 4.X.1. In response to a Member Country proposal to change ‘pathogenic’ to ‘causative’ it has been explained previously that in order to improve the consistency of language in the *Code* a decision was taken to use the term ‘pathogenic agent’ in the future. The Code Commission rearranged the words ‘control and prevent’ and amended ‘prevent’ to ‘prevention’ for improved logic and in the context of the description of vaccination. In response to Member Countries comments it also amended the reference to the relevant general and specific recommendations of the *Terrestrial Manual* rather than just Chapter 1.1.8. The Code Commission did not support a proposal to include reference to the reduction of the development of antimicrobial resistance in the introduction as it was already covered indirectly by reduction of the use of antimicrobial agents in animals. In response to a proposal to add reference to cost benefit analysis, it noted that this was covered in Article 4.X.4.

In response to an organisation’s proposal to include reference to vaccination for diseases not under official control programmes, the Code Commission added a sentence to the end of the paragraph with the objective to highlight that the recommendations in this chapter could be used for any diseases for which vaccines exist.

In examining Member Countries comments on Article 4.X.2. Definitions, the Code Commission made a minor editorial change to ‘purpose’ and in response to Member Countries comments made the following observations:

- noting that vaccination is either to respond to an increased risk or to outbreaks, it did not support a proposal to amend the definition of ‘emergency vaccination’ or to include a new definition of ‘preventive vaccination’;
- for clarity it expanded on the text in Article 4.X.3.;
- in respect of Member Countries comments in comparing the definitions to those used in the Manual on WAHIS notification procedures it noted that the Manual on WAHIS notification procedures should be consistent with the *Code* and this would be done by OIE Headquarters once the chapter was adopted;
- noted that a vaccination strategy is part of the overall vaccination programme and thus there was no need for a new definition; and
- did not agree with a proposal to amend the definition of ‘population immunity’ to include ‘herd immunity’ as epidemiologists consider that immunity does not apply only to herds, there can be many types of epidemiological units.

The Code Commission considered several proposals to amend Article 4.X.3. including one to limit the scope to ‘official’ control programmes; it considered this was unnecessary as it was now addressed in Article 4.X.1, and Article 4.X.3. also deals with control programmes under the Veterinary Authority. For further clarity it added reference to the need to take into account the disease, ‘its impact and zoonotic potential’ to the first paragraph.

In response to Member Countries comments on point 1), the Code Commission added reference to ‘prevalence and impact’, included ‘prevention’ and ‘control’ and ‘prevent the introduction of a pathogenic agent from an infected adjacent country or zone’ to further clarify that the objective of a vaccination programme includes the need to take preventive measures. It made a further amendment to the final paragraph of this article in order to clarify that vaccination programmes should be ‘integrated with other’ ongoing animal health related activities.

In examining Member Countries comments on Article 4.X.4. the Code Commission made the following amendments and observations with regards to the considerations when launching a vaccination programme:

Point 1) – included a new point 1) ‘the epidemiology of the disease’;

Point 1) *bis* – added ‘by means other than vaccination’ for clarity;

Points 2) and 3) – deleted reference to ‘increased’ as it was not considered to be a necessary part of the criteria;

Point 3) *bis* – added reference to ‘the zoonotic potential of the disease’ as the potential impact on humans is an important consideration;

Point 4) – reworded the point to clarify the need to consider the extent of potential exposure of the animal population;

Point 5) – deleted reference to ‘an insufficient’ in reference to the level of population immunity;

Point 7) – included ‘programme’ for clarity;

Point 8) – amended the text to add clarity to the type of resources that need to be considered, particularly in regards to human resources as these may be already dedicated to other control measures in the event of a disease outbreak; and

Point 9) – amended the text regarding the need for an appropriate cost-benefit analysis.

In examining Member Countries comments on Article 4.X.5, in relation to vaccination strategies the Code Commission made minor amendments to the article and noted the following:

**Blanket vaccination** – this term is used to mean all animals at risk, as opposed to targeted vaccination. Further, in response to a question concerning the use of the terms ‘area’ and ‘zone’, the Code Commission noted that the term ‘area’ is used only in the geographical sense while ‘zone’ is used in the sense defined in the *Code*.

**Ring vaccination** – for clarity deleted the word ‘primarily’ and replaced ‘establishment’ with ‘location’ and ‘boundary’ with ‘limit’.

**Barrier vaccination** – in response to a proposal to include mention of ‘protection zone’ the Code Commission in agreement with the Scientific Commission noted that there are other measures of control (i.e. enhanced surveillance, movement control) implemented in a protection zone. The Code Commission also considered that there was no need to include examples in the definition.

**Targeted vaccination** – in examining Member Countries comments on this definition, the Code Commission noted that the criteria to define the subpopulation could be very broad and that the reasons for targeted vaccination can be numerous (e.g. in response to disease, epidemiology of the disease, exposure, importing country requirements) and therefore deleted the wording ‘defined by a greater likelihood of exposure and severity of the consequences.’

In consideration of the logical flow of the chapter the Code Commission rearranged Articles 4.X.6 and 4.X.7. Article 4.X.6 is now ‘choice of vaccine’ and made minor amendments to include the need for consideration of ‘marketing authorisation’, a term used in other chapters of the *Code*, a new point to address the ‘ability to be monitored for vaccine-induced antibodies’ and safety for the ‘users and consumers’ as well as the environment.

Article 4.X.7. was changed to read ‘Other critical elements of a vaccination programme’. In responding to Member Countries comments on old Article 4.X.6. the Code Commission:

- Included a new point 1), to address the need for a legal basis for undertaking a vaccination programme, as well as the need to consider compensation for farmers and possible side effects;
- Vaccination coverage – amended the second sentence to read ‘The vaccination programme should define the minimum vaccination coverage necessary to achieve a sufficient population immunity to fulfil the objectives of the programme.’ It also included reference to the ‘efficacy of the vaccine’ for clarity in the last sentence and in response to Member Countries comments proposing the inclusion of ‘virulence of the pathogen’ the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission did not agree as they considered this was already covered in the epidemiology of the disease;
- Stakeholder involvement – changed ‘government agencies’ to ‘governmental organisations’ for consistency with other *Code* chapters;

- Timing of vaccination programmes – added the words ‘necessary to attain or maintain’ in order to clarify that the objective of the vaccination campaign could also be to maintain population immunity;
- Auditing of the vaccination campaigns – for clarity changed ‘actors’ to ‘participants’ and deleted ‘involved’; added a new point b) *bis* ‘number of animals vaccinated compared to census figures for the relevant animal population’ as it was considered a useful indicator. However, the Code Commission in agreement with the Scientific Commission did not agree to add ‘taking into account the primary course of vaccinations if more than one is required’ to the existing point b) as it was considered unnecessary. In response to a proposal to include reference to ‘serological post vaccination monitoring’ the Code Commission in agreement with the Scientific Commission noted that post vaccination monitoring is covered in Article 4.X.9.

In examining Member Countries comments on Article 4.X.8. the Code Commission noted the need to address the legal aspects of a vaccination programme and included it as a new point under Article 4.X.7. The Code Commission made further amendments to this article as follows:

- Procurement of vaccines – Point 1) Replaced ‘registration procedure’ with ‘marketing authorisation’; made a correction to the name of the VICH; did not support the view that ‘procurement’ should be replaced by ‘availability’ ;
- Implementation of the vaccination programme – added ‘establishment of’ before ‘standard operating procedure’ for clarity. *In response to a Member Country comment regarding disposal of waste, added a new point e) bis) ‘determine the disposition of partially used or unused containers of vaccine’. In order to address the need for appropriate biosecurity measures by vaccinators added a new point e) ter) but did not agree with the need to include reference to appropriate training for vaccinators, as the list is to identify what should be included in a SOP, which would be used by trained vaccinators. In order to avoid confusion in point i) deleted the term ‘vaccination site’ as this is generally understood to mean the injection site on the animal rather than the location where vaccination takes place.*

In considering Member Countries comments on Article 4.X.9., the Code Commission noted that the guidelines on foot and mouth disease vaccination and post-vaccination monitoring published jointly by the FAO and OIE provided excellent guidance. However, it was not an appropriate reference to include in an adopted standard. To further clarify the need for periodical evaluation and monitoring during the campaign it amended the preamble to the article and included a new paragraph at the end to highlight that if the objectives and targets of the vaccination programme were not achieved, this should be identified and addressed.

In response to a Member Country comment the Code Commission replaced ‘adverse reaction’ with ‘side effects’ in point 3) and in response to several Member Countries comments in relation to reduction of incidence, prevalence or clinical signs, it amended point 4) to include ‘or impact of the disease’.

In responding to Member Countries comments on Article 4.X.10., the Code Commission replaced ‘sufficient’ with ‘more appropriate’ in point 3), to clarify that alternative methods may actually be more efficient rather than merely sufficient and noted that cost-benefit analysis was covered in Article 4.X.4. However, it agreed that a revised cost-benefit analysis could provide useful information for a decision on whether or not to continue with the vaccination programme and included a new point 6).

In response to Member Countries comments that the first sentence of Article 4.X.11. was too general and that while it may be true that for some diseases vaccination may be an alternative to stamping-out, it is not applicable to all diseases, the Code Commission inserted ‘several’ after ‘eradicate’ in the first sentence.

In response to a Member Country proposal to delete the last sentence of paragraph 3, the Code Commission noted that this was in fact a key element in the chapter, in that, unless specified in disease-specific chapters, the use of systematic (preventive) or emergency vaccination in response to a threat should not *per se* affect the disease status or disrupt trade. It also noted that Member Countries having an officially recognised disease free status should inform the OIE of any change in the vaccination policy. To address the Member Countries concerns the Code Commission amended the first sentence of the third paragraph of the article to replace ‘a change’ with ‘in the absence of cases and an increase’.

The draft new Chapter 4.X. is attached as **Annex 23** for Member Countries' comments.

**Item 5.4. Collection and processing of oocytes and *in vitro* produced embryos from livestock and horses (Chapter 4.8.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Singapore, Switzerland and EU.

The Code Commission noted the comments of a Member Country supporting the proposed changes. It also noted that some others were not supported by scientific rationale and that in order to reconcile some of these comments it would require additional scientific expertise and in cases where Member Countries referred to other bodies such as International Embryo Transfert Society (IETS) that it is not appropriate to just include these references without some analysis of the material to be referenced.

The following observations were made in respect of Member Countries comments on the chapter;

Article 4.8.2. – In response to a proposal to insert the word ‘audit’ as a more rigorous aspect inspection, the Code Commission noted that audit is encompassed in the meaning of a regular inspection carried out by an Official Veterinarian.

Article 4.8.3. – Noted in terms of practicality it is easier to protect laboratories from rodents and insects rather than keep them completely free. Agreed in principle to a proposal from Member Countries to include reference to the need for a laminar flow facility in which to handle or process the oocytes and embryos, but as there was no proposed text the Code Commission did not consider this further and invites the Member Countries to provide a specific text for its consideration at its September 2017 meeting.

In response to the same Member Countries proposal to add a reference to the IETS manual and a question as to whether the list of diseases for donor animals should be reviewed in point 2) of Article 4.8.4., the Code Commission requested the OIE Headquarters to provide scientific advice in regards to these two proposals. In addition, the Code Commission also invited Member Countries to provide information on diseases that can be transmitted through semen and embryos.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries proposal to insert ‘slicing techniques’ in the text of Article 4.8.4 concerning the recovery of oocytes so as to complete the list of methods that are available for collection.

In response to the same Member Countries comments to insert reference to ‘a pool of at least three washes of the washing medium used for the oocytes or the embryos’ in Article 4.8.5., the Code Commission noted that there was a need for a supporting scientific rationale before it could consider this inclusion. The Member Countries are invited to provide supporting rationale for such an inclusion. It also noted that in regard to the same Member Countries general comment on this article, relating to the inclusion of validated tests in the *Terrestrial Manual*, it would request OIE Headquarters to refer the proposal to the Biological Standards Commission.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country comment to insert new text ‘and be collected and processed in accordance with Chapter 4.5.’ for clarity.

The Code Commission also accepted a proposal from the same Member Country to insert new text ‘or semen for fertilisation of oocytes’ in Article 4.8.6., recognising the role of the health status of donors from which semen is collected.

The revised Draft Chapter 8.3. is attached as **Annex 24** for Member Countries' comments.

**Item 5.5. Report of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group**

OIE Headquarters informed the Code Commission of the activities noted in the report of the December 2016 meeting of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group (Working Group). The Code Commission endorsed the report.

The Code Commission agreed with the Working Group recommendation to use the word ‘foodborne’ in this chapter given that this is the internationally accepted format rather than ‘food-borne’. The Code Commission agreed that once this chapter is adopted, this format will be applied throughout the *Code* to ensure consistency.

The Code Commission noted the Working Group recommendation to consider reviewing the definitions for Veterinary Services and Competent Authority used in the glossary to better reflect the role that these entities play in food safety. The Code Commission agreed to consider this recommendation as part of future work that will consider a broader review of these definitions.

The Code Commission noted that the Working Group had discussed the control of Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* (STEC) and had reiterated that it is an important pathogen in bovines and potentially other species for both public health and trade reasons. The Code Commission agreed to add this to its work programme and to monitor outcomes of relevant work underway by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the FAO/WHO expert group, and to consider undertaking relevant work when Codex undertakes new work.

The Code Commission noted the substantial work undertaken by the Working Group to revise Chapter 6.1. ‘Role of Veterinary Services in food safety’ (see **Item 5.6.**).

The Code Commission reviewed the draft Terms of Reference for the development of a revised draft Chapter 6.2. ‘Control of biological hazards of animal health and public health importance through ante- and post-mortem meat inspection’ developed by the Working Group and requested that OIE Headquarters proceed with convening an expert group to undertake this work.

The report of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group is attached as **Annex 38** for Member Countries’ information.

#### **Item 5.6. The role of the Veterinary Services in food safety (Chapter 6.1.)**

OIE Headquarters noted that the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group (Working Group), at its December 2016 meeting, had considered the extensive number of Member Countries comments received on this chapter following circulation of a revised chapter in the Code Commission’s February 2016 report.

The Code Commission was informed that the Working Group had considered all Member Countries comments and made a significant number of changes to improve the readability and refocus the text on the role of Veterinary Services, as opposed to the function of a food safety system. It also made amendments to better distinguish between the role of the Competent Authority and Veterinary Services to address the concern that in some countries the role and responsibilities of the Veterinary Service along the food chain differ depending on the role of the Competent Authority.

The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that the rationale for the changes made by the Working Group are presented in the Working Group’s December 2016 meeting report which is presented in **Annex 38**.

The Code Commission reviewed the amended chapter and made some additional amendments of an editorial nature.

The revised Chapter 6.1. is presented as clean text and showing track changes in **Annex 25** and **Annex 25bis**, respectively, for Member Countries’ comments. Member Countries are requested to use the clean version as the basis for their comments.

## Item 5.7. Antimicrobial resistance

### a) Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Antimicrobial Resistance (January 2017)

OIE Headquarters presented the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Antimicrobial Resistance which met in January 2017. The Code Commission thanked OIE Headquarters for providing an update on this important work and noted that in addition to reviewing Member Countries comments on Chapter 6.7., the *ad hoc* Group had also proposed amendments to Chapter 6.8., which was not currently on the Code Commission's work programme.

The Code Commission took note of the advancement of the collection of data for the 2016 annual report and the revised definition proposed for 'therapeutic use' and of new definitions proposed for 'preventative use' and 'growth promotion' that were intended to be included in Chapter 6.8. of the *Terrestrial Code*. It also noted that the definition of 'growth promotion' was in line with the definition used by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

Member Countries' are invited to comment on the following definitions as proposed by the *ad hoc* Group:

**Therapeutic use:** Administration of an antimicrobial agent to animals to prevent, control or treat infection or disease. The Veterinary Medicinal Products (VMP) containing antimicrobial agents should only be used on the prescription of a veterinarian or other suitably trained person authorised to prescribe VMP containing antimicrobial agents in accordance with national legislation and under the supervision of a veterinarian.

**Preventative use:** Administration of an antimicrobial agent targeted to animals at risk for a specific infection(s) or in a specific situation where disease is likely to occur if the drug is not administered, with an appropriate dose and for a limited duration. The Veterinary Medicinal Products (VMP) containing antimicrobial agents should only be used on the prescription of a veterinarian or other suitably trained person authorised to prescribe VMP containing antimicrobial agents in accordance with national legislation and under the supervision of a veterinarian.

**Growth promotion:** Use of antimicrobial substances to increase the rate of weight gain and/or the efficiency of feed utilization in animals by other than purely nutritional means. The term does NOT apply to the use of antimicrobial agents for the specific purpose of treating, controlling, or preventing infectious diseases, even when an incidental growth response may be obtained. This definition is in line with the definition developed by Codex Alimentarius in CAC/RCP 61-2005.

Noting that it is important to make a distinction between preventive use and use for growth promotion, the Code Commission agreed it would include revision of Chapter 6.8 on its work programme. Comments from Member Countries will be considered in the context of this review.

The Code Commission noted that the OIE planned to organise a second Global conference on antimicrobial resistance and the prudent and responsible use of antimicrobials in the near future.

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

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

The Code Commission noted the support of a Member Country for the proposed changes in this chapter; it also noted in regards to another Member Country comment that the OIE would continue to work closely with the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other relevant international bodies in regards to antimicrobial resistance in order to avoid any contradictions, gaps or duplications.

In examining Member Countries comments on Chapter 6.7. the Code Commission also took into account responses provided by the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group (mentioned above). In this regard, wherever 'surveillance' or 'monitoring' in relation to programmes is mentioned in the chapter, the text has been revised so it reads 'surveillance and monitoring'.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries comments that Article 6.7.3. was too long and amended the layout of the chapter in order to improve readability.

Article 6.7.1. – In response to a Member Country proposal to include reference to ‘in their feed’ in the objectives, the Code Commission noted that surveillance is in animals and food and at this stage of the chapter there is no value to add feed, as it is only one of many routes of exposure and not a specific objective of the surveillance of antimicrobial resistance in animals. However, in response to a proposal by Member Countries, the Code Commission considered it appropriate to insert a new text ‘sampling and testing of feed ingredients or feed’ as a component of national antimicrobial resistance monitoring and surveillance programmes in Article 6.7.3., and another new text ‘feed samples should preferably be taken at the feed mill and animal’ in Article 6.7.5.

Article 6.7.2. – The Code Commission deleted reference to ‘targeted’ as it was considered unnecessary as ‘active surveillance and monitoring’ conveyed the same meaning. In response to a Member Country comment that the OIE should be more assertive in encouraging cooperation it amended the last sentence of the chapeau of this article by deleting ‘should be encouraged’ and inserting ‘The OIE encourages’ at the beginning of the sentence which now reads ‘The OIE encourages cooperation between all Member Countries conducting antimicrobial resistance surveillance.’

Article 6.7.4. Sampling – In response to Member Countries comments on the introductory text to Table 1, the Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group proposals to address these comments and added two new paragraphs:

‘The sample should avoid bias and provide a representative sample whilst taking into account the expected prevalence of the resistance phenotype and the desired level of precision and confidence.’

‘The sample size calculation in Table 1 is based on independent samples. If there is any clustering at the *establishment* or animal level, the sample size should be adjusted accordingly.’

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries suggestion to insert text ‘Resource allocation should be guided by production volume and the prevalence of resistant bacteria’ as it acknowledged that a population of food producing animals can contribute significantly to production without showing crucial prevalence of resistant bacteria.

Regarding products of animal origin intended for human consumption, the Code Commission agreed with the same Member Countries suggestion and the rationale provided, and inserted ‘produced locally or imported’ so that both locally and imported products can be considered in surveillance and monitoring programmes. In response to a comment from the same Member Countries on the type of samples to be collected it agreed to include ‘representative of the batch’ at the beginning of point 5) for clarity. However in the same point it did not agree with a proposal to include ‘should be representative of the herd, flock or population to be tested’ as it noted that faecal samples are commonly collected at the slaughterhouse/abattoir and to include this point would complicate the sampling process and was adequately covered in the article concerning sampling strategy.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country comment to delete a paragraph contained in Article 6.7.4. under the heading ‘Type of sample to be collected’, as the content of the paragraph has already been captured in Table 2.

Article 6.7.5. – The section ‘Bacterial isolates’ was changed to ‘Bacteria subject to surveillance and monitoring’ for clarity and reformatted to assist with readability. In examining Member Countries comments on this section the Code Commission made the following amendments:

- replaced ‘guide veterinarians in prescribing treatments’ with ‘provide data to inform their decisions’;
- included a reference to ‘good agricultural practice’ in the point regarding ‘existence of quality assurance programmes’.

The Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group that it was not appropriate or necessary to include additional pathogens in Table 3. The table is not intended to be an exhaustive list, but to provide a core set of pathogens for surveillance and others can be added by individual countries.

A Member Country commented that zoonanthroponosis, or reverse zoonosis, should be included in Article 6.7.5. The Code Commission and the *ad hoc* Group considered the inclusion unnecessary as zoonanthroponotic bacterial agents, irrespective of the direction of transmission, have already been covered by the current chapter.

In response to two Member Countries comments on bacterial recovery rate in Article 6.7.8., the Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group to replace the word ‘recovery’ with ‘isolation’, and inserted the wording ‘bacterial isolation methods’ in a following point of the same article.

In response to a Member Country request to clarify point 6) in Article 6.7.8., the Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group to insert a new text ‘The number of isolates regarded as resistant should be reported as a proportion of the number of isolates tested’ for clarity.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country comment to modify point 7) to include the quantitative aspect of antimicrobial resistance surveillance as it has already been mentioned in other points of Article 6.7.8., particularly point 9).

The revised Draft Chapter 6.7. is attached as **Annex 26** for Member Countries’ comments.

**Item 5.8. Draft new article on guiding principles on the use of animal based measures (Article 7.1.X.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Norway, USA, EU, ICFAW and IDF.

The Code Commission agreed with the comment of Member Countries to modify the title of the new Article 7.1.X. to reflect that measures, other than animals-based measures, are also mentioned in the article.

The Code Commission did not accept several Member Countries comments to make reference to resources and management practices in point 1) of the article as they are already addressed in point 5) of the article.

The Code Commission agreed in principle with a Member Country proposal to add ‘five freedoms’ in the text. However as the ‘five freedoms’ are described in Article 7.1.2. of the *Code*, it inserted a reference to that article.

The Code Commission agreed with an organisation’s proposal to add new text to point 2), relating to the use of a combination of approaches to assess the welfare of animals. However, it considered it more appropriate to insert the new text in point 3) to improve its clarity.

In response to some Member Countries comments to insert new text relating to equivalent animal-based measures, the Code Commission did not agree as it would allow the use of animal-based measures that are not recommended in OIE animal welfare standards in the *Code*.

The Code Commission did not agree with a modification to point 5) proposed by several Member Countries and an organisation as the rationale did not support the modification. In the same point, it did not support the deletion of the entire point as the modified title of Article 7.1.X. now reflects the need for measures other than animal-based measures.

The new Article 7.1.X. Guiding principles for the use of measures to assess animal welfare of the Chapter 7.1. is attached as **Annex 27** for Member Countries’ comment.

**Item 5.9. Report of the *ad hoc* Group and the draft new Chapter on animal welfare and pig production systems (Chapter 7.X.)**

Comments from Australia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, EU, AU-IBAR, and ICFAW.

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare and Pig Production Systems extensively reviewed draft Chapter 7.X., at its second meeting in January 2017. In examining the text the Code Commission made some additional modifications to the draft chapter. The Code Commission invited Member Countries to review the report of the *ad hoc* Group for more extensive responses to Member Countries' comments.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached as **Annex 39** for Member Countries' information.

In the first paragraph of Article 7.X.1. the Code Commission accepted the inclusion of the scientific name of pigs proposed by a Member Country. However, the Code Commission decided to remove the subspecies 'domesticus' and insert the word 'domestic' in Article 7.X.2. to make clear that the chapter refers to domestic pigs but not *captive wild pigs* as defined in the *Code*.

The Code Commission further discussed the rationale for excluding *captive wild pigs* in the chapter despite their important role in the epidemiology of pig diseases. However, noting that this chapter is intended to give recommendations for the animal welfare of pigs in production systems, it noted that it had insufficient information on the way in which *captive wild pigs* are managed to draft criteria and recommendations.

For more clarity in the text, the word 'however' was removed from the Article 7.X.2. and the word 'domestic' was added to this article.

To improve clarity of point 2) in Article 7.X.4., the Code Commission removed the word 'risk' from the text because 'risk', as defined in the *Code*, has a meaning different from the intent of this chapter.

The Code Commission modified point 5) of the Article 7.X.4. to replace the word 'performance' by 'efficiency' as the latter is more appropriate to describe reproduction issues.

For more clarity the Code Commission transferred the last sentence of point 7) of the Article 7.X.4. to the end of article 7.X.7., prior to the criteria.

The second paragraph of Article 7.X.8. was amended for clarity, and the word 'animals' was replaced by 'pigs'. The word 'increasing' was deleted as it has already been addressed by the word 'abnormal' in the text.

To maintain consistency with other *Code* chapters on animal welfare, in the title of Article 7.X.9., the Code Commission replaced the word 'watering' with 'water provision', and removed the words 'of the animals'.

The Code Commission edited the penultimate paragraph of Article 7.X.9. to provide clarity and consistency by replacing the word 'palatable' with 'drinkable', and removing the wording 'that does not inhibit drinking and'.

In Article 7.X.10. the Code Commission deleted the word 'innate' to maintain consistency with the other chapters, as well as the word 'very' as this adjective is inappropriate in standards.

The Code Commission in Article 7.X.12. (formerly 7.X.6.) in response to a Member Country comment and considering that pigs are social animals that prefer living in groups, deleted the wording 'housing systems where' and replaced it with 'should preferably be housed' in order to maintain consistency with other chapters.

In the fourth paragraph of Article 7.X.13. the Code Commission removed the words 'high level of' as it considered that 'high level' was already addressed by the word 'abnormal'.

The wording ‘or pastures’ was added in the sixth paragraph of Article 7.X.14. in recognition that an outdoor system may include both paddocks and pastures and the words have different meanings in different countries.

In the second paragraph of Article 7.X.20., the words ‘an average’, ‘at the age’ and ‘recommended’ were deleted for consistency with other chapters.

In order to maintain consistency with other *Code* chapters on animal welfare, the Code Commission replaced the word ‘bowel’ with ‘gut’, and the word ‘reduced’ with the word ‘less’ before diarrhoea. The word ‘preventive’ was deleted, and the word ‘agents’ was added after ‘antimicrobial’ because ‘antimicrobial agent’ is a defined term.

For clarity, the Code Commission accepted a proposal to modify the fifth paragraph of Article 7.X.20. replacing ‘as well as a proper dietary provisions’ by ‘and appropriate diet’.

The Code Commission revised point 1) of Article 7.X.24. on Biosecurity and prevention as follows, for clarity and to group the activities more appropriately:

- first point added ‘especially from different sources’;
- disagreed with a proposal to include ‘semen’ in the point relating to feed and bedding so included it as a new point 2) in place of ‘young animals coming from different sources’, which it considered was already covered in point 1);
- included ‘vehicles’ in the point relating to equipment, tools and facilities;
- included ‘air’ in the point relating to water and deleted ‘supply’;
- reordered the point relating to waste, as waste includes manure, garbage and disposal of dead animals.

The revised Draft Chapter 7.X. is attached as [Annex 28](#) for Member Countries’ comments.

#### **Item 5.10. Infection with bluetongue virus (Chapter 8.3.)**

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

The Code Commission noted that this chapter had been adopted with the intention of further examining the case definition, and that the Member Countries comments on the proposed revisions were mainly editorial rather than technical and one was in support of the proposed revised chapter.

Article 8.3.1. – In examining Member Countries comments the Code Commission agreed in principle with a proposal to amend point 3), and inserted ‘a live BTV’ to clarify the link with point 2) and point 4). However, it did not support the inclusion of reference to ‘virulent revertant or reassortant’. It also inserted new text ‘showing clinical signs consistent with bluetongue, or epidemiologically linked to a suspected or confirmed case’, acknowledging the additional circumstances where antigen or RNA may be detected.

Article 8.3.4. – The Code Commission noted Member Countries comments on this article and that there was no principle against a country being seasonally free, so amended the sub-heading to include ‘country or’ and amended the first paragraph to reflect the inclusion of this principle.

Regarding the recommendations on the presentation of an international veterinary certificate in various articles throughout the chapter, the word ‘and’ has been inserted after the clause ‘showed no clinical sign of bluetongue on the day of shipment [or collection]’ to convey the intended recommendations.

Article 8.3.9. – In response to Member Countries comment in support of deleting points c) and d), the Code Commission did not consider it was necessary to add further text to clarify that conditions in Article 8.3.9. apply only during the seasonally free period.

Article 8.3.11. – The Code Commission made changes to this article to make it consistent with proposals already included in Article 8.3.9.

The revised Draft Chapter 8.3. is attached as [Annex 29](#) for Member Countries’ comments.

### Item 5.11. Infection with foot and mouth disease virus (Chapter 8.8.)

Comments on the report of the February 2016 meeting of the Code Commission were received from Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chinese Taipei, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Switzerland, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission noted that it had considered this chapter at its February 2016 meeting and since that time the Scientific Commission and an *ad hoc* Group had also reviewed the chapter, including Member Countries comments. It further noted that during its September 2016 meeting it had reviewed the proposals from the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group, and that it had been apparent at that time that there was still a large amount of work to be done on this chapter, and that it would continue to review this chapter before its February 2017 meeting. At this meeting the Code Commission noted the three outstanding issues that it needed to work on were the case definition, protection zone and the introduction of vaccinated animals. Further editorial amendments would also need to be made to align this chapter with other disease-specific chapters that have been reviewed at this meeting.

Member Countries are requested to consider the reports of the meetings mentioned above in analysing this revised chapter as this report will only explain the rationale for the inclusion of new articles or new text.

Article 8.8.1. point 6) – The Code Commission included a new sentence to clarify that the transmission of FMDV from African buffaloes to domestic livestock is rare.

Article 8.8.2. point e) – The Code Commission included reference to Articles 8.8.9. *bis*, 8.8.11. and 8.8.11. *bis* which address the recommendations for the direct transfer and importation of both vaccinated and unvaccinated animals and addressed the introduction of animals for slaughter by adding a new text ‘Any animals introduced for *slaughter* were subjected to ante- and post-mortem inspections in accordance with Chapter 6.2. with favourable results. For ruminants the head, including the pharynx, tongue and associated lymph nodes, is either destroyed or treated in accordance with Article 8.8.31’.

In order to address the concerns of many Member Countries and the proposals of the *ad hoc* Group in regards to an incursion of potentially infected African buffaloes, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group that there was a need to address the consequences of a small group of potentially infected wild African buffaloes entering a country or zone free from FMD and included a new paragraph which reads ‘A country or zone free from FMD may maintain its free status despite an incursion of potentially infected African buffaloes provided that the surveillance programme substantiates the absence of transmission of FMDV.’

Article 8.8.3. – The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group to include new text to address the introduction of vaccination in a country or zone free from FMD where vaccination was not previously practised, changing status to ‘free from FMD where vaccination is practised’ and the possibility to define a protection zone where vaccination is practised. It also made the proposed amendments to include ‘two years’ and ‘12 months’ to improve clarity and to align with proposed changes to the questionnaires in Chapter 1.6.

Article 8.8.4. – Amended the title to read ‘Compartment free from FMD where vaccination is not practised’ in light of the inclusion of a new Article 8.8.4. *bis* ‘Compartment free from FMD where vaccination is practised’.

Article 8.8.4. *bis*. – In response to Member Countries comments, the Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group, that there was a need to include provisions for a compartment where vaccination is practised given that stricter provisions for surveillance and biosecurity would be in place.

Article 8.8.6. – The Code Commission agreed with a proposal by the Scientific Commission to reorder the wording in the first paragraph for clarity, and included the word ‘previously’ for further clarity. It made the same amendments to the first paragraph of Article 8.8.7. and included additional wording to point 1 c) to address Member Countries comments to provide provisions shortening the recovery period in some specific situations. In response to a proposal from the same Member Countries, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group not to include provisions to allow recovery of freedom with vaccination after three months in the situation where no additional round of vaccination (emergency vaccination) is carried out.

Article 8.8.9. *bis* – The Code Commission agreed to the proposal of the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group to include a new article to allow inter-zone movements of animals for direct slaughter without the need for testing and made some editorial changes to the text proposed for clarity. The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to add a new Article 8.8.9. *ter*, as there was no rationale for introducing provisions on importation of unvaccinated animals from a free country or zone for slaughter into a free country or zone.

Article 8.8.10. – The Code Commission reworded the title of this article for clarity and included a new point 4) ‘if previously vaccinated, comply with point 4) of Article 8.8.11.’

Article 8.8.11. – The Code Commission considered the proposal from the *ad hoc* Group for alternate text for this article but it considered it more appropriate to split the proposal and added a new Article 8.8.11. *bis* to include recommendations for vaccinated animals destined for slaughter. The Code Commission made several amendments to Article 8.8.11. and included a new point 4) to include provision for testing of vaccinated animals as it did not agree with the *ad hoc* Group proposal to include measures linked to the status of an importing country on a health certificate, this being contrary to the principles of the *Code*.

Article 8.8.12. – The Code Commission considered the proposal from the *ad hoc* Group to include text recommending the prohibition of feeding of swill to exported domestic ruminants and pigs. However, noting that there are provisions in the chapter relating to the inactivation of FMDV in swill (new Article 8.8.31. *bis*) and that it was not appropriate for the *Code* to impose this on Member Countries, it added a new point 2) ‘pigs have not been fed with swill not complying with Article 8.8.31. *bis*.’ It accepted a proposal to include reference to ‘official control programme’ and inserted this at the beginning of point 4) (formerly point 3)).

In response to a Member Country comment on testing after semen collection in Articles 8.8.15. and 8.8.16., the Code Commission considered that the question of an upper time limit should be addressed and requested that OIE Headquarters consult with relevant experts in order to address these questions so that it might reconsider this issue at its September 2017 meeting.

In considering the recommendations in Articles 8.8.20. to 8.8.23. (including a new Article 8.8.22. *bis*), the Code Commission noted that there were no recommendations applicable to importation of game meat or small ruminants from infected countries or zones. It requested that OIE Headquarters look at the possibility of developing these recommendations in order to address what it considers to be a significant gap in this chapter.

Article 8.8.22. – The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group to split point c) into two points. However, it did not agree with a Member Country that the point as written was open to ambiguity and considered that with the proposed change of layout it was clear. In response to the same Member Country comment it agreed to include ‘FMD-susceptible’ before ‘animals’ in point d) for clarity.

Article 8.8.22. *bis* – The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to include a new article to include ‘recommendations for importation from countries or zones infected with FMDV, where an official control programme exists’ for fresh meat of domestic pigs. It made several amendments to the proposed article for consistency and clarity.

Article 8.8.26. – The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of a Member Country to include a new point 2) ‘the necessary precautions were taken after processing to avoid contact of the products with any potential sources of FMDV.’

Articles 8.8.26. to 8.8.28. – As proposed by the *ad hoc* Group, the Code Commission included ‘zones’ in the title of these articles for consistency and improved clarity.

Article 8.8.31. *bis* – For consistency with other chapters and to address the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to include provisions related to swill, the Code Commission added a new article based on the same provisions contained in other disease-specific chapters.

Article 8.8.39. – In response to a Member Country comment, the Code Commission agreed with the proposal to amend the last point under 7) to read ‘an increase in the incidence or extension of distribution of FMD that cannot be addressed by the programme’, and agreed with the *ad hoc* Group that is not possible to list all of the problems that may have an impact on FMD control.

Article 8.8.40. – In response to a Member Country comment the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group that sampling should be representative rather than selective and that there was no strong rationale for including additional text.

Article 8.8.42. – In response to a Member Country comment the Code Commission made several amendments to this article to improve the clarity.

In regards to the diagrams in Figures 1 to 3, the Code Commission requested that the Biological Standards Commission be asked to consider their inclusion in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

The revised Draft Chapter 8.8. is attached as **Annex 30** for Member Countries' comments.

#### **Item 5.12. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.4.)**

The Code Commission recalled that it had reviewed Member Countries comments on the revised chapter circulated for comment in its February 2015 meeting report, and on the chapter adopted in May 2015, at its September 2015 meeting. At that time it had requested OIE Headquarters to convene an *ad hoc* group (different from the one for status recognition) to specifically address these Member Countries comments and recommend appropriate updates to the BSE Chapters in the *Manual* and the *Code*.

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) which met 23 to 25 August 2016 and noted that there were still some outstanding issues that should be addressed, such as surveillance, risk assessment and specified risk materials. In particular, it noted that this chapter was subject to ongoing discussion within the Scientific Commission in relation with official recognition of disease status, and so it would be premature to commence its own revision at this meeting. However, the chapter will remain on its work programme for discussion in September 2017.

### **Item 6 NEW AMENDMENTS OR DRAFT NEW CHAPTERS PROPOSED FOR THE *TERRESTRIAL CODE***

**Table 3. Lists of new texts proposed for the *Terrestrial Code***

<b>Item</b>	<b>Annexes in Part B/D</b>	<b>Chapters/Articles</b>	<b>Title</b>
6.1	42	1.6.	Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE (revised questionnaires)
6.2	31	6.Z.	Draft new Chapter on introduction to recommendations for veterinary public health
6.3	32	4.Y.	Draft new Chapter on management of outbreaks of listed diseases
6.5	33	8.4.	Infection with <i>Brucella abortus</i> , <i>B. melitensis</i> and <i>B. suis</i>
6.6	34	8.15.2.	Infection with rinderpest virus
6.7	35	15.2.	Infection with classical swine fever virus
6.9	36	7.1.1.	Introduction to the recommendations for animal welfare

#### **Item 6.1. Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE (Chapter 1.6.)**

The questionnaires related to official recognition of disease status have been reviewed and revised by OIE Headquarters and the Scientific Commission. In view of time constraints and the large volume of questionnaires and the number of proposed changes, the Code Commission was unable to undertake a thorough review during its February 2017 meeting, but considered that these questionnaires could nevertheless be proposed for Member Countries' comments.

It also noted that in light of ongoing work to strengthen the procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition, it was essential to propose amendments to Chapter 1.6. and requested OIE Headquarters to undertake the necessary review as soon as possible.

The Code Commission finally noted that the questionnaires would have to be revised on a more regular basis and that in view of the time it would take for their adoption it might be more appropriate for them to be removed from the *Code* and maintained by OIE Headquarters (e.g. accessible on the OIE website), so they could be revised by OIE Headquarters and the Scientific Commission on a more regular basis. Member Countries are invited to provide their views on the possibility of taking the questionnaires out of the *Code* in the frame of a thorough review of the chapter.

The revised questionnaires are included as **Annexes 42–50** for Member Countries' comments.

**Item 6.2. Draft new Chapter on introduction to recommendations for veterinary public health (Chapter 6.Z.)**

In considering its previous discussions on chapters in Section 6, Veterinary Public Health, the Code Commission identified a need to address the introduction to the recommendations in this section, and drafted an introductory chapter.

The proposed draft new Chapter 6.Z. is attached as **Annex 31** for Member Countries' comments.

**Item 6.3. Draft new Chapter on management of outbreaks of listed diseases (Chapter 4.Y.)**

The Code Commission recalled that this proposed new chapter had been on its work programme since February 2016.

The Code Commission drafted a new Chapter 4.Y., based on the guiding document on the OIE website that had been elaborated by the Scientific Commission, and on the guide to Good Emergency Management Practises published by the FAO.

The Code Commission recognised that the draft document was technically sound and noted the current structure which included short succinct articles was a good basis for guidance.

The proposed draft new Chapter 4.Y. is attached as **Annex 32** for Member Countries' comments.

**Item 6.4. Draft new Chapter on the slaughter and killing of farmed reptiles for their skins and meat (Chapter 7.X.)**

The Code Commission congratulated the *ad hoc* Group on its work and noted that this *ad hoc* Group had been conducted electronically. While good progress has been made on the chapter, it considered there is a need for further work before the draft new chapter is ready to be submitted to Member Countries for comment.

In view of time constraints, the Code Commission did not examine the chapter in detail but requested OIE Headquarters to review it and provide a revised version for its meeting in September 2017. In revising the chapter, the following points need to be addressed:

- 1) The structure of the draft new chapter should align with the latest animal welfare chapters of the *Code*, for example, Chapter 7.5. The draft new chapter should be arranged in the following order: general considerations, outcome-based measurables or criteria, and recommendations with more detailed points.
- 2) Content in the draft new chapter such as definition of terms, reference to the *Code* glossary terms, and duplicated points should be reviewed for consistency.
- 3) Where advantages are contrasted with disadvantages in several articles listing stunning or killing methods, they should rather be addressed as recommendations, showing linkages to general considerations and outcome-based measures, and to how animal welfare risks are mitigated.

- 4) The Code Commission recommended not using tables and encouraged the *ad hoc* Group to present the same content in the format of recommendations.

**Item 6.5. Infection with *Brucella abortus*, *B. melitensis* and *B. suis* (Chapter 8.4.)**

Comments were received from Korea.

In response to a question seeking clarification as to the scientific rationale for the exclusion of castrated males from the testing in Article 8.4.10., the Code Commission noted that the amendment had been made to correct an inconsistency in the testing regime and to better align it with point 3 b) of Article 8.4.13. The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that ‘castrated males’ do not play any real role in the epidemiology of brucellosis. They further confirmed that ‘castrated males’ should be excluded from the testing regime in Chapter 8.4. It can also be inferred from the report of the December 2013 meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on *Brucella* in that ‘castrated males’, by definition, do not belong to the category of sexually mature animals.

The Code Commission made also a minor editorial amendment to the article.

The revised Article 8.4.10. is attached as [Annex 33](#) for Member Countries’ comments.

**Item 6.6. Infection with rinderpest virus (Article 8.15.2.)**

Comments were received from the UK and the FAO-OIE Rinderpest Joint Advisory Committee (JAC).

Two proposals to review the definition of rinderpest virus containing material were referred by OIE Headquarters to the Scientific Commission.

In considering the proposals, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that sera that has been subjected to an appropriate heat treatment or that has shown to be free from rinderpest virus genome sequences should be excluded from the definition. It also agreed that that full length genomic material should be considered as a potential risk and thus be included in the definition.

In respect of the proposal to delete ‘clinical’ from ‘clinical material’ the Code Commission replaced it with ‘pathological material’ which is already defined in the Glossary and is considered more appropriate in this context. Additional editorial amendments were made to correct grammar, improve syntax and for consistency with the standard *Code* format.

The revised Article 8.15.2. is attached as [Annex 34](#) for Member Countries’ comments.

**Item 6.7. Infection with classical swine fever virus (Chapter 15.2.)**

The Code Commission noted that Chapter 15.2. had been last adopted after revision in May 2013, when the procedure for official recognition was expanded to include CSF. It also noted that an *ad hoc* Group had met in July 2016, to address the scientific comments received since the last adoption, and to update the chapter based on the recommendations made by a previous CSF *ad hoc* Group, and also on the African swine fever (ASF) and FMD *ad hoc* Groups for further harmonisation. However, in noting this progress the Code Commission did not consider the current structure of many of the proposals of the *ad hoc* Group were in line with other *Code* chapters and made a large number of structural changes to the proposals in relation to the chapter including, where appropriate, amending subheadings of articles for consistency with other chapters.

The Code Commission also made a number of changes to align the chapter with other disease-specific chapters that it had worked on during this meeting.

In response to a general comment from a Member Country to include additional provisions for importation of skins and trophies other than from domestic and captive wild pigs, the Code Commission noted that point 2) of Article 15.2.21 would apply.

Article 15.2.1. – In examining Member Countries comments and the *ad hoc* Group proposals on this article, the Code Commission considered that the logical flow was for the description (moved from the end of the article) of the chapter to come before the case definition and rearranged the wording in the case definition for consistency and readability. It included the words ‘the occurrence of’ for clarity in the chapeau to the third paragraph and included the amended proposal from the *ad hoc* Group.

Article 15.2.2. – Considering this article relates to criteria, the Code Commission amended the text for clarity and consistency.

Article 15.2.3. – The Code Commission discussed a Member Country comment made during the adoption of the revised chapter at the 81st General Session in May 2013 regarding historical freedom. The Code Commission noted that historical freedom is mentioned in Chapter 1.4. and so applies by default. In 2013, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed that historical freedom would not need to be mentioned specifically in every disease-specific chapter. This approach will be harmonised in the relevant chapters (AHS and PPR) in the future. The Code Commission also amended the title of the article for clarity and reworded the second last paragraph to improve readability.

Article 15.2.4. – The Code Commission also amended the title of the article for clarity, reworded the paragraph to improve readability and deleted reference to ‘management system’ after the word ‘biosecurity’ for consistency as the definition of biosecurity includes management.

Article 15.2.5. – The Code Commission also amended the title of the article for clarity and included a reference in the penultimate paragraph to Article 15.2.3.

Article 15.2.6. – In considering the *ad hoc* Group proposal on this article, the Code Commission did not agree with the inclusion of a reference to Article 15.2.4. as this article relates to recovery of status for a previously free country or zone, whereas Article 15.2.4. relates to a compartment free from CSF.

Article 15.2.6. *bis* – The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to include a new article on direct transfer of pigs within a country from an infected zone to a free zone for slaughter. In considering the proposal the Code Commission made several amendments for consistency with other chapters and to clarify the requirement for ante- and post-mortem inspection in accordance with Chapter 6.2.

Article 15.2.6. *ter* – The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to include a new article on the direct transfer of pigs within a country from a containment zone to a free zone for slaughter. In considering the proposal the Code Commission made several amendments for consistency with other chapters and to clarify the requirement for ante- and post-mortem inspection in accordance with Chapter 6.2.

Article 15.2.7. and Article 15.2.8. were amended for clarity and consistency with other chapters.

Article 15.2.9. – In considering the provision in point 2) regarding the period of quarantine, the Code Commission noted that for clarity the word ‘isolation’ should replace ‘kept’ to make it clearer that the pigs should be isolated in a quarantine station, and amended the period from 40 to 28 days, and included ‘on a sample collected’ to clarify that the serological test should be performed on a sample collected at least 21 days after entry to the quarantine station, in accordance with the recommendation of the *ad hoc* Group.

Article 15.2.10. – Minor editorial amendments for clarity and consistency with other chapter including reference to ‘donor males’ rather than ‘donor animals’ and reference to ‘in accordance’ rather than ‘in conformity’.

Article 15.2.11. – The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to include a provision for an establishment with the addition of a surveillance requirement of at least 12 months point a) and a new point c i) since transmission of CSFV via semen is scientifically proven. It also made editorial amendments for clarity and consistency with other chapter including reference to ‘donor males’ rather than ‘donor animals’ and reference to ‘in accordance’ rather than ‘in conformity’.

Article 15.2.12. – The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to amend the article to align the requirements for donor females in accordance with the amended draft chapter on ASF.

Article 15.2.13. – The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to amend the article to align it with Article 15.2.11. and made additional amendments for clarity and consistency, including removing the reference to ‘since birth’ as donor females need to be at least three months of age anyway.

Article 15.2.14. – The Code Commission made minor amendments to the article in accordance with the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group.

Article 15.2.14. *bis* – The Code Commission considered the rationale of the *ad hoc* Group, that the concept of CSF free compartments allowed trade of fresh meat from infected countries, while compartmentalisation would not be applicable for the importation of fresh meat from wild and feral pig from infected countries. Whilst it agreed in principle to include a new article with provisions for fresh meat from domestic pigs it did not consider the article was consistent with other chapters which had articles on safe commodities. It made several amendments to the chapter to strengthen the controls which should be in place such as transport directly to an approved slaughterhouse/abattoir without coming into contact during transport or slaughter with other pigs which do not fulfil the required conditions for export.

Article 15.2.15. – The Code Commission noted that the inclusion of the new Article 15.2.14. *bis*, as proposed by the *ad hoc* Group addressed the concerns raised by a Member Country in relation to this article and the absence of an article on fresh meat from infected countries.

Article 15.2.16. – The title of the article was amended to ‘Recommendations for the importation of meat products of pigs’ as it was in agreement with the *ad hoc* Group, that the intended use of the meat products was irrelevant since the objective is to mitigate the risk posed by the products regardless of their intended use.

Article 15.2.17. – The Code Commission considered that this article relating to importation of other pig products did not logically sit before the articles on bristles, litter and manure and skins and trophies, there was also some question as to what ‘other’ products it referred to so it was moved and became Article 15.2.21. *bis*.

Article 15.2.18. – This article was considered to be a duplication of Article 15.2.17. so it was deleted.

Articles 15.2.19. to 15.2.21. – The Code Commission made minor editorial amendments to ensure consistency with other *Code* chapters.

Article 15.2.23. – In considering the inclusion of the different styles of hams in this article, the Code Commission noted that they would be covered by dry cured pig meat and such specificity was unnecessary and so deleted points 3 a) and b).

Article 15.2.24. – In response to Member Countries comments on the procedure for the inactivation of CSFV in casings, the Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group had studied an EFSA opinion that the effectiveness of phosphate supplemented dry salt was superior to dry salt alone for a number of viruses. The *ad hoc* Group also noted that Wijnker *et al.* (2008) had demonstrated that it is possible eliminate CSFV from porcine sausage casings by treating them with phosphate supplemented salt and storing them for 30 days at temperatures over 4 °C. Wieringa-Jelsma *et al.* (2011) demonstrated that a combined treatment using phosphate supplemented salt and storage at 20 °C or higher for a period of 30 days is effective to inactivate CSFV. The Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group not to include dry salt as the only inactivation method.

Article 15.2.25. *bis* – The Code Commission noted that the Scientific Commission had reviewed scientific literature compiled by OIE Headquarters and concluded that boiling was currently the only method with enough scientific justification that would inactivate CSFV in bristles. The *ad hoc* Group also agreed that boiling bristles in water for at least 30 minutes would inactivate CSFV. The *ad hoc* Group could not find scientific evidence supporting other inactivation treatments such as the use of 0.5% formalin as suggested by some Member Countries.

Article 15.2.25. *ter* – The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group provided the following references to support the proposal to include the procedures for the inactivation of CSFV in litter and manure from pigs and accepted its inclusion.

- *Anette Bøtner and Graham J. Belsham. - Virus survival in slurry: Analysis of the stability of foot-and-mouth disease, classical swine fever, bovine viral diarrhoea and swine influenza viruses Volume 157, Issues 1–2, 25 May 2012, Pages 41–49.*
- *Eefke Weesendorp, Arjan Stegeman and Willie L.A. Loeffen. - Survival of classical swine fever virus at various temperatures in faeces and urine derived from experimentally infected pigs. Volume 132, Issues 3–4, 10 December 2008, Pages 249–259.*
- *Factors affecting the infectivity of tissues from pigs with classical swine fever: Thermal inactivation rates and oral infectious dose Lucie Cowan a,c, Felicity J. Haines a, Helen E. Everett a, Bentley Crudgington a, Helen L. Johns a, Derek Clifford b, Trevor W. Drew a, Helen R. Crooke a.*

Article 15.2.27. – The Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group proposals to include a new point c) appropriate laboratory testing capability for CSF diagnosis, and a new paragraph that gives further guidance on the need to review surveillance strategies. However, they did not support a Member Country proposal to delete the second paragraph of point 2 a) as it was important as part of a contingency plan for personnel involved in surveillance to be able to call on outside expertise if required. In regards to this point the Code Commission also reworded the sentence for clarity.

Article 15.2.28. – In considering the *ad hoc* Group proposals the Code Commission agreed to amendments it had proposed to this article and noted some of the Member Country comments on this article related to Spanish translation and these would be referred to OIE Headquarters. In point 4) the Code Commission included reference to ‘in a herd’ in the second paragraph, merged paragraphs three and four and did not support the proposal of a Member Country to delete ‘and the requirements for statistical validity’ in this article as it agreed with the *ad hoc* Group that survey design should not be compromised when using sera collected for other purposes.

Article 15.2.31. – In responding to a Member Country comment on this article the Code Commission and *ad hoc* Group did not agree with replacing ‘surveillance’ with ‘monitoring’ as the term surveillance is more appropriate as monitoring can imply that no further action is taken. In examining the Member Countries comments, and considering opinions of the *ad hoc* Group and the Scientific Commission in relation to Article 15.2.32., which includes complex diagrams, the Code Commission requested that OIE Headquarters ask the Biological Standards Commission to consider how these might be included in the *Terrestrial Manual* in the future.

The revised draft Chapter 15.2. is attached at [Annex 35](#) for Member Countries’ comments.

#### **Item 6.8. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare and Laying Hens Production Systems**

The Code Commission congratulated the *ad hoc* Group on its work. However, it considered that further work is still needed to better align the text with other animal welfare chapters and for consistency before the chapter can be circulated for Member Countries’ comments. In this regard, the Code Commission noted that the format (i.e. alphabetical order) used in the newly developed chapter, specifically in articles that describe the ‘Criteria or measurables for welfare of pullets or hens’ and recommendations could create confusion for some members.

The Code Commission requested that OIE Headquarter revise this chapter with input from the members of the Code Commission in order to present a revised chapter for the next meeting in September 2017.

### **Item 6.9. Proposed amendment of OIE definition of ‘animal welfare’ by the Animal Welfare Working Group**

The OIE Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG), at an informal meeting during the 4th Global OIE Conference on Animal Welfare held in Guadalajara Mexico the 6–8 December 2016, discussed the need to update the current definition of ‘animal welfare’ in the *Code*.

The Code Commission agreed in principle with the rationale provided by the AWWG that there was a need to update the current definition to take into account updated terminology that is widely accepted in animal welfare science.

In examining the proposal of the AWWG the Code Commission considered that ‘General Considerations’ was more appropriate sub-heading than ‘Introduction’. It also noted that it would be more clear and succinct if only the first paragraph of the modified text was used as the definition for animal welfare in the Glossary of the *Code*. In order to improve readability it also separated the article into three paragraphs. The Code Commission agreed to delete the words ‘coping with’ as the phrase ‘coping with the conditions in which it lives’ implies that it might only be applicable to animals dealing with negative situations. However, it is widely accepted that animal welfare considerations are not limited solely to coping with negative situations. In response to the proposal to include ‘refers to animal’s quality of life’ the Code Commission noted that this subjective wording might have different interpretations for some Member Countries and could not be included in an OIE standard. In order to address these issues, the definition was amended to read ‘Animal welfare means the state of well-being of an animal in relation to the condition in which it lives.’

The Code Commission modified the new second paragraph in agreement with the proposal of the AWWG to delete the term ‘innate’ in relation to behaviour, as the latest scientific information has invalidated the implications that behaviour could either be innate or acquired and rearranged the wording to add clarity.

The revised Article 7.1.1. of the Chapter 7.1. is attached as **Annex 36** for Member Countries’ comment.

## **Item 7 OTHER ISSUES**

### **Item 7.1. Report of an *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Paraprofessionals**

OIE Headquarters provided an overview of the OIE’s work on veterinary paraprofessionals (VPPs) in response to the OIE Sixth Strategic Plan and a recommendation of the Fourth OIE Global Conference on Veterinary Education. The Code Commission was informed that pursuant to the plan to develop recommendations for core competencies and guidelines of curricular requirements, the first *ad hoc* Group meeting held in November 2016 developed a working draft of competencies. It covered three themes identified as important for VPPs working in the veterinary services, animal health field work, and veterinary public health field work and laboratory diagnosis.

The *ad hoc* Group, taking into account the wide variation among existing training programmes, considered that the recommendations for competencies should be structured as three levels: basic, intermediate and advanced. The *ad hoc* Group will work to develop further substance to the working draft of competencies so that the draft recommendations for core competencies can be presented to the Code Commission at its September 2017 meeting. The work on developing guidelines for curricula requirements will follow.

OIE Headquarters also noted that, as with the ‘OIE Recommendations on the Competencies of graduating veterinarians (‘Day 1 graduates’) to assure National Veterinary Services of quality’ (OIE Day 1 Competencies) and ‘OIE Guidelines on Veterinary Education Core Curriculum,’ the documents to be developed for VPPs would not be part of the OIE standards but rather guidance for Member Countries. Nonetheless, any suggestions and advice from the Member Countries and the Code Commission would be highly appreciated for this ongoing work.

The Code Commission acknowledged the importance of this new initiative of the OIE and noted that there is no plan to change the current definition of ‘veterinary paraprofessional.’ Reflecting the discussion at the time of the development of the Day 1 Competencies, some members of the Code Commission commented that recommendations of competencies with different levels might be difficult for some Member Countries to apply.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached as **Annex 40** for Member Countries' information.

**Item 7.2. General comments of Member Countries on the texts circulated after the Code Commission's September 2016 meeting**

Comments were received from Switzerland and EU.

The Code Commission considered general comments and reflected them in its work programme and in the relevant agenda items.

**Item 7.3. Update of the Code Commission's work programme**

The Code Commission made the following observations with regards to its work programme and simplified its format:

- The date of first adoption and last revision of each chapter will appear in the 2017 *Terrestrial Code*;
- OIE Headquarters will review the User's Guide for consistency with the User's Guide to the *Aquatic Code*;
- Noted there had been no progress on the revision of Chapter 1.4. 'Animal health surveillance', to which Member countries have already sent comments, notably on Article 1.4.6. and the need of an article on early warning system, and requested OIE Headquarters to provide an update for its September 2017 meeting;
- Noted that increasingly *ad hoc* groups were proposing changes to chapters that often were not on the Code Commission's work programme and requested that, to enable better management of its agenda, OIE Headquarters (i) consider the priority modifications to chapters already identified in the Code Commission's work programme; (ii) review *ad hoc* group reports and provide timely advice to the Code Commission so that these could be adequately included in its work programme;
- Noted that several items still required additional follow-up by OIE Headquarters (notably Chapters 7.5. and 7.6. for which a need for thorough review was identified).

The updated work programme is attached as **Annex 37** for Member Countries' information and comments.

**Item 7.4. Editorial corrections for the 2017 edition of the *Terrestrial Code* including proposed replacement of similar terms currently used in the *Code* with 'pathogenic agent'**

During its September 2016 meeting and in reviewing the Glossary, the Code Commission noted that throughout the *Code* many different terms are used for the same concept such as pathogen, aetiological agent, causative agent, etc. At the request of the Code Commission, and under its guidance, the OIE Headquarters has undertaken a review of the use of these terms throughout the *Code* (see **Item 4.1.**).

During this review, a number of other editorial inconsistencies were identified:

- slaughterhouse to be replaced by slaughterhouse/abattoir;
- herd/flock to be replaced by herd or flock;
- ova to be replaced by oocytes;
- embryos/oocytes the forward slash will be replaced by either 'and' or 'or'
- the order of the terms 'embryos' and 'oocytes' will reversed to show oocytes before embryos.

A table indicating where the corrections have been made in the updated *Code* will be circulated as **Annex 51** during April 2017. As the changes are purely editorial Member Countries' comments are not sought on these proposed changes. The corrections are provided to Member Countries for information.

**Item 7.5. Date of next meetings**

The Code Commission agreed that the dates for its next meetings would be 18–29 September 2017 and, tentatively, 19 February to 2 March 2018.

---

Annexe/...