



Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Original: English

September 2014

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

Paris, 9–18 September 2014

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at the OIE Headquarters in Paris from 9 to 18 September, 2014. The list of participants is attached as Annex I.

The Code Commission thanked the following Member Countries for providing written comments on draft texts circulated after the Commission's February meeting: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, Chile, China, Chinese Taipei, Ecuador, Guatemala, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, the United States of America (USA), Uruguay, the Member States of the European Union (EU), the African Union–Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of OIE Delegates of Africa. Comments were also received from the International Coalition for Farm Animal Welfare (ICFAW) and International Dairy Federation (IDF).

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments that had been submitted by 8 August 2014 and amended texts in the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Terrestrial Code*) where appropriate. The amendments are shown in the usual manner by 'double underline' and '~~strikethrough~~' and may be found in the Annexes to the report. In Annexes XII and XVI, amendments made at the September 2014 meeting are highlighted with a coloured background in order to distinguish them from those made previously. The Code Commission considered all Member Countries' comments. However, because of the very large volume of work, the Commission was not able to draft a detailed explanation of the reasons for accepting or not every comment received. Member Countries are reminded that if comments are resubmitted without modification or new justification, the Commission will not, as a rule, repeat previous explanations for decisions. The Commission encourages Member Countries to refer to previous reports when preparing comments on longstanding issues. The Commission also draws the attention of Member Countries to those instances where the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (the Scientific Commission) has addressed Member Countries' comments and proposed amendments. In such cases the rationale for such amendments is described in the Scientific Commission's report and the Code Commission encourages Member Countries to review this report together with those of the Scientific Commission and *ad hoc* groups.

Member Countries should note that texts in Part A of this report are presented for comment, and that all comments received will be addressed during the Commission's meeting in February 2015. The reports of meetings (Working Groups and *ad hoc* Groups) and other related documents are attached for information in Part B of this report.

The Code Commission again strongly encourages Member Countries to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by submitting comments on this report, and prepare to participate in the process of adoption at the General Session. Comments should be submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a structured rationale. Proposed deletions should be indicated in '~~strikethrough~~' and proposed additions with 'double underline'. Member Countries should not use the automatic 'track-changes' function provided by word processing software as such changes are lost in the process of collating Member Countries' submissions into the Commission's working documents.

Comments on this report must reach OIE Headquarters **by 9th January 2015** to be considered at the February 2015 meeting of the Code Commission. All comments should be sent to the OIE International Trade Department at: [trade.dept@oie.int](mailto:trade.dept@oie.int).

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

The Code Commission met Dr Bernard Vallat, Director General of the OIE, and Dr Brian Evans, Deputy Director General (Animal Health, Veterinary Public Health, International Standards) on 10 September 2014 to discuss key topics on the current meeting agenda, and future work requests.

Dr Vallat welcomed the Code Commission members and thanked them for their support and commitment to achieving OIE objectives.

Key topics on the current agenda that were discussed included the removal of references to “appropriate level of protection” from the Code, except in Chapter 5.3. which directly refers to the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization (WTO), from where this term originates, review of the OIE disease listing criteria, and development of a definition for safe commodities to highlight inappropriate use of unwarranted sanitary measures for OIE listed diseases. The Code Commission also expressed its commitment to give highest priority to the completion of the draft revised chapter on FMD, followed by the chapter on *Brucella*, animal welfare and dairy cattle production systems, glanders and high health status horse subpopulation. Requests for new work, which were discussed included a review of the current Code chapter on theileriosis, and requests to develop animal health and welfare standards for reptiles.

Dr Evans discussed the work he is leading with the OIE Council to improve Delegates’ knowledge of the competencies and commitments expected from members of the Specialist Commissions, ahead of the next elections in May 2015.

#### **B. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

The adopted agenda of the meeting is attached as [Annex II](#).

#### **C. REPORT ON THE JOINT MEETING OF THE CODE COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION (16th September)**

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission met on 16th September to discuss issues of mutual interest. The minutes of this joint meeting are attached as [Annex III](#).

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

##### **Item 1. General comments of Member Countries**

General comments were received from Australia, Bangladesh, Japan, New Zealand and South Africa.

Under this item, the Code Commission noted Member Countries’ endorsement of the proposals in the report of the February 2014 meeting.

They discussed the italicisation of the word “animal” throughout the Code, and agreed that italics should only be used when the term is being used according to the full meaning of the glossary definition, that is “mammal, bird or bee”.

The Code Commission endorsed Member Countries’ comments requesting that the two-year cycle of new standard development should be followed whenever possible. In circumstances where urgency is required, this will be noted in the relevant Code Commission report, along with an explanation for the urgency. For regular updates of the Code Member Countries should have at least two opportunities for comments.

In response to a Member Country’s request for consistency between chapters, the Code Commission noted that this is an ongoing process. Given that all changes must be adopted by the World Assembly of Delegates, consequential changes for consistency may only be proposed after the text initiating those consequential changes has been adopted by the World Assembly.

In response to a Member Country's comment on the evolution of the meaning of country freedom throughout the Code, the Code Commission noted that the drivers of this evolution are Member Countries' suggestions and direction, rather than primarily from the Code Commission itself.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's comment that the Wildlife Working Group should continue to examine the epidemiological role of wildlife in relevant chapters to the extent possible. It also noted that the rationale for the many approaches to all Code Chapter standards is contained in the relevant *ad hoc* group reports, and recommended Member Countries refer back to those reports whenever they wish to understand the rationale behind the text of any Code Chapter.

A Member Country's request for examination of the implications of a recently published study demonstrating subclinical infection with African horse sickness virus in vaccinated horses was referred to the Scientific Commission.

In response to an expert's comments highlighting the challenges of managing East Coast fever and the emergence of the Ikeda strain of *Theileria orientalis* in Oceania, the Code Commission requested the Director General to convene an *ad hoc* group including experts from Africa and Oceania to review the current Code chapter on theileriosis.

## **Item 2. Horizontal issues**

### **a) User's guide**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, EU, New Zealand, South Africa, and AU-IBAR.

In response to discussion at the 82nd General Session and Member Country comment, the Code Commission further modified text proposed for the User's guide on how the absence of OIE disease-specific recommendations should be interpreted.

In response to a Member Country's comments seeking reference to the WTO SPS Agreement, the Code Commission noted that reference to WTO is not appropriate in the User's Guide for the OIE *Terrestrial Code*, which is independent of WTO.

The Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to reword Section B point 7 to improve clarity.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission developed a definition of "safe commodity". Once this definition is adopted, the Code Commission will ensure the use of this term throughout the Code as chapters are reviewed or new ones are drafted.

The Code Commission made additional changes to improve harmonisation between the *Terrestrial* and *Aquatic Animal Health Codes* where appropriate.

The revised User's guide is attached as Annex IV for Member Countries' comments.

### **b) General obligations related to certification (Chapter 5.1.)**

Comments were received from EU, Japan and South Africa.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission amended Article 5.1.2. points 1 and 2 to avoid use of the term 'appropriate level of protection' in the Code except when directly referring to the SPS Agreement, and to replace the phrase with 'stricter'.

The revised Chapter 5.1. is attached as Annex V for Member Countries' comments.

## **Item 3 Glossary**

Comments were received from EU and New Zealand.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to revise the definition of *disease* to include "infestation".

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission amended the definition of *stamping-out policy* to improve clarity, include relevant *Terrestrial Code* cross references, and incorporate reference to the term "*modified stamping out*". If adopted, some consequential changes in the Code will follow, and some may require more reflection the way these terms are used with respect to contingency plans and outbreak management.

The Code Commission discussed a Member Country's suggestion to include a definition of natural "casings" in the glossary, and agreed to postpone discussion on this subject until February when further information from relevant stakeholders and experts is expected to be available.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion, the Code Commission developed a definition of "biosecurity" for use throughout the Code.

The Code Commission reviewed the use of the defined term "*hazard identification*", and observed use of this term is inconsistent within the Code. Further, it concluded that the current definition of hazard identification adds little to the existing definition of *hazard* and could therefore be deleted from the glossary. Moreover several definitions relating to risk analysis were modified in order to give them broader application, while Chapter 2.1. will remain as strictly dealing with imports.

The Code Commission agreed that the qualification "within the territory of an importing country" in the definition of *risk assessment*, is unnecessary, and deleted those words to allow more generic use of the term *risk assessment* (e.g. in reference to development of antimicrobial resistance).

As discussed under item 2a, the Code Commission developed a definition for "safe commodity" for Member Countries' consideration as follows:

means a *commodity* which in the form normally traded is considered safe for trade with respect to a *listed disease, infection or infestation*, without the need for specific *risk mitigation measures* against the *listed disease, infection or infestation* and regardless of status of the country or *zone* of origin for that *disease, infection or infestation*.

The revised Glossary is attached as [Annex VI](#) for Member Countries comments.

#### **Item 4 Criteria for listing diseases (Chapter 1.2.)**

Comments were received from Argentina and Japan.

The Code Commission recalled that the decision to delist swine vesicular disease and vesicular stomatitis was proposed by the Code Commission in 2012 after an *ad hoc* group had evaluated these disease against the criteria for listing in Article 1.2.2. However, they were retained "under study" in 2013 to provide Member Countries another chance to develop a rationale for retention of these diseases on the OIE list according to the criteria in Article 1.2.2. Finally the two diseases were delisted in 2014 as no adequate rationale for retention was received.

In response to a Member Country's request for listing of Schmallenberg virus, the Code Commission recalled that the OIE had already convened an *ad hoc* group to evaluate Schmallenberg virus against the disease listing criteria. This *ad hoc* group concluded that Schmallenberg virus does not meet the listing criteria, and that if Schmallenberg virus were to be listed all viruses of the Simbu group should also be listed. (See *ad hoc* group meeting report included in the February 2014 report of the Scientific Commission.) The Code Commission also disagreed with a Member Country's assertion that serologic response alone is a factor to be considered in the assessment of morbidity.

#### **Item 5 Import risk analysis (Chapter 2.1.)**

Comments were received from Australia, EU and Japan.

In response to Member Countries' request for further explanation of the changes made and adopted during the 82nd General Session, the Code Commission explained that the changes adopted were designed to remove text that is not directly pertinent to an import risk analysis, and remove reference to "appropriate level of protection" from the principles and components of risk management as this term had already been included in Chapter 5.3.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to expand the chapter title as it considered this unnecessary and noted that the current title accurately reflects the content of this chapter.

**Item 6 Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2.)**

The Code Commission reviewed recommendations from the Animal Welfare Working Group to appropriately reference animal welfare in a number of places in this chapter (as proposed at the February 2014 meeting of the Code Commission).

The revised Chapter 3.2. is attached as Annex VII for Member Countries comments.

**Item 7 Semen and embryos**

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

At the request of the OIE Headquarters, the Code Commission reviewed and refined the cross references to relevant articles in the new chapter on Infection with *Brucella abortus*, *B. melitensis* and *B.suis* in Chapter 4.6.

The revised Chapter 4.6. is attached as Annex VIII for Member Countries comments.

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

Comments were received from EU.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission deleted the word "listed" from the introductory text of Article 4.7.14., since not all the diseases and pathogenic agents referred to are OIE listed diseases. The Code Commission also agreed with Member Countries' suggestion to align the names of diseases in this chapter to the nomenclature used in Chapter 1.2. Where the reference is made to a pathogenic agent that is not one of a *listed disease* the agent name remains.

The Code Commission harmonised the use of the terms embryo, oocyte and ova throughout this chapter on the recommendation of an expert. The expert advised that reference should be made to embryos only in the context of the *Terrestrial Code* except in the case there is particular reason for otherwise, since no scientific data available on oocyte-pathogen interaction. Similar revision of other chapters will be made as needed when they are next reviewed.

The revised Chapter 4.7. is attached as Annex IX for Member Countries' comments.

**Item 8 Certification procedures (Chapter 5.2.)**

Comments were received from EU.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestions to replace the word "documentation" with "exchange of data" in the introductory clause of Article 5.2.4. point 1, to amend the reference for guidance on electronic certification in Article 5.2.4. point 1b, and to introduce a new point 1c on secure methods of electronic data exchange.

The revised Chapter 5.2. is attached as Annex X for Member Countries' comments.

**Item 9 Prevention detection and control of *Salmonella* in poultry (Chapter 6.5.)**

Comments were received from EU.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to add new text to Article 6.5.5. point 3 on protecting treated feed from recontamination.

The Code Commission also accepted Member Countries' suggestion to change Article 6.5.8. point 5 from "new and clean containers" to "new or clean containers" to recognise the practice of reusing containers.

The revised chapter is appended as Annex XI for Member Countries' comments.

## **Item 10 Antimicrobial resistance**

### **a) Responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine (Chapter 6.9.)**

Comments were received from USA.

The Code Commission did not accept the requests to change Article 6.9.3. point 10b, Article 6.9.5. point 1, Article 6.9.7. point 2b, and Article 6.9.8. point 1 because the suggested changes are counter to the intent of the chapter.

### **b) Risk assessment for antimicrobial resistance arising from the use of antimicrobial agents in animals (Chapter 6.10.)**

Comments were received from EU and USA.

The Code Commission requested that the Director General seek expert advice on a Member Country's suggestion to revert to the original text proposed for Article 6.10.1. point 1, rather than accept the alternative language (kept under study) proposed by Member Countries during the 82<sup>nd</sup> General Session.

## **Item 11 Animal welfare**

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

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Ecuador, EU, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Uruguay, USA, AU-IBAR, ICFAW and IDF.

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

The Code Commission refers Member Countries and NGOs to the *ad hoc* group report for detailed responses to comments and suggestions received, and reminds Member Countries that bibliographic references included in the draft chapter will be removed when the chapter is adopted and, therefore, proposed addition references were not accepted.

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

The Code Commission noted and supported a Member Country's request for refinement of the structure of current and future animal welfare chapters to ensure shorter articles that are easier for users to search and refer to.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion that cattle kept in extensive pastoral systems should be excluded from the chapter, and noted that the *ad hoc* group had carefully structured the draft chapter to include all commercial dairy production systems.

The Code Commission noted a Member Country's request to restructure this draft chapter by subdivide lengthy articles, along with the adopted chapters on animal welfare in beef and broiler production systems, and referred this to OIE Headquarters for consideration.

The Code Commission noted a number of NGO and Member Countries requests for additional criteria (or measurables) and specific examples in the indicative lists of examples given for each indicator. In general these requests were declined since the indicators do not have global applicability and are expected to be used and adapted according to the different situations in which dairy cattle are managed. Similarly the examples of parameters that could be measured for each indicator are provided for illustrative purposes only. It is not practical to provide an exhaustive list of examples for each indicator.

Several Member Countries suggested culling rates could be subsumed under mortality rates, but both the *ad hoc* group and the Code Commission are clear that culling rates are different from mortality rates. Culling rates in dairy herds are in general much higher than in beef herds, and high culling rates are often an indicator of animal welfare problems.

Several Member Countries also questioned the link between lighting and locomotory behaviours. Both the *ad hoc* group and the Code Commission are clear that suboptimal lighting often results in abnormal locomotory behaviours in the form of baulking and inadvertent stumbling into unseen fixed objects.

In response to a Member Country's request to align the text of this chapter on identification in Article 7.X.5. point 2m (iii) with the text on the same subject in Chapter 7.9., the Code Commission considered it would be more appropriate to align the relevant text in Chapter 7.9. with the text in this chapter, once adopted.

Similarly, in response to a Member Country's request to delete Article 7.X.5. point p on disaster management and leave this subject to be addressed by whatever means the *ad hoc* Group on Disaster Management proposes, the Code Commission considered that the current text proposed for this chapter should be retained, and reviewed when the *ad hoc* Group on Disaster Management have completed its work.

Throughout the chapter the Code Commission also made a number of editorial changes to make the text more concise, to improve syntax and clarity, and to correct grammar. Several corrections limited to the Spanish version were also required.

The revised Chapter 7.X. is attached as [Annex XII](#) for Member Countries' comments.

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

At the request of the Code Commission the Animal Welfare Working Group revised point 2b of Article 7.10.4. on lighting to take account of a Member Country's and NGO's comments.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's request to reduce the threshold of acceptable ammonia concentration in Article 7.10.4. point 2c in the absence of sufficient supporting evidence.

The revised Chapter 7.10. is attached as [Annex XIII](#) for Member Countries' comments.

**c) Report of the meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management in Relation to Animal Health and Welfare and Veterinary Public Health**

The Code Commission reviewed and endorsed the report of the *ad hoc* group meeting held on 15–17 April 2014. The Code Commission noted that though having developed a draft guideline document on disaster management and risk reduction in relation to animal health and welfare and veterinary public health, the *ad hoc* group considered that more work needs to be done before circulating the draft document for Member Countries' comments.

The report of the meeting of the *ad hoc* group is attached as [Annex XXV](#) for Member Country information.

**d) Report of the meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Welfare of Working Equids**

The Code Commission noted the report of the *ad hoc* group meeting held on 17–19 June 2014.

The Code Commission reviewed the draft Chapter 7.X. developed by the *ad hoc* Group on Welfare of Working Equids and edited it to align with established Code presentation and format.

Noting a Member Country's request to refine the structure of animal welfare chapters to ensure shorter articles that are easier for users to search and refer to, the Code Commission split the recommendations into articles topic by topic.

The Code Commission also reviewed the draft amendments in Chapters 3.4. (Veterinary legislation) and 7.1. (Introduction to the Recommendations for Animal Welfare), which the *ad hoc* group proposed in association with the newly developed draft chapter on animal welfare of working equids.

The proposed draft Chapter 7.X. together with revised Chapters 3.4. and 7.1. is attached as Annex XIV for Member Countries' comments.

The report of the meeting of the *ad hoc* group is attached as Annex XXVI for Member Countries' information.

**e) Report of the meeting of the Working Group on Animal welfare**

The Code Commission reviewed and endorsed the report of the Working Group meeting held on 24–26 June 2014.

The report of the Working Group is attached as Annex XXVII for Member Countries' information.

**Item 12 Infection with *Taenia solium* (Draft Chapter X.X.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Chinese Taipei, EU, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, USA, and AU-IBAR on behalf of the OIE Delegates of Africa.

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

In response to a Member Country's comment the Code Commission revised the term "human carrier" to "human tapeworm carrier" in Articles X.X.1. and X.X.3.

The Code Commission also accepted a Member Country's proposal to add text to Article X.X.1. to further clarify that humans are susceptible to infection with *T. solium* eggs from human faeces, and that *T. solium* is a zoonotic parasitic infection of pigs.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to replace "hygiene" with "manufacturing practices" in Article X.X.1., as it considered this too restrictive.

The Code Commission did not accept either a Member Country's suggestion that the whole Article X.X.3. point 2b should be considered within the purview of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

In response to Member Countries' suggestions the Code Commission inserted a new point to Article X.X.5. point 3 to recognise that many countries, zones or compartments are demonstrably free from *T. solium*.

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission corrected the temperature for heat inactivation in point 1 of Article X.X.6. to 80°C based on the WHO/FAO/OIE Guidelines for the surveillance, prevention and control of taeniosis/cysticercosis [http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/43291/1/9290446560\\_eng.pdf?ua=1](http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/43291/1/9290446560_eng.pdf?ua=1)).

The proposed draft Chapter X.X. is attached as Annex XV for Member Countries' comments.

**Item 13 Foot and mouth disease (Chapters 8.7. and 1.6.)**

An unprecedented number of comments were received from Member Countries on this draft chapter. To adequately address these comments two *ad hoc* group meetings, several internal OIE working sessions and several reviews by the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission were required since the last circulation of the revised chapter.

The rationale for the major revisions to these chapters is contained in the reports of the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* group commissioned to review these chapters. The revised draft chapter received from the Scientific Commission was reviewed and extensively edited by the Code Commission to align with established Code chapter structure and format.

Member Countries requested the consistent use of numerals for time periods given throughout the Code. The Code Commission has adopted the convention that numbers from one to nine will be presented in words, while numbers from 10 onwards will be presented as numerals.

The Code Commission supported Member Countries' suggestion to move some sections on surveillance to the *Manual*, and referred this matter to the Biological Standards Commission to address.

In response to a Member Country's request for additional definitions of "emergency vaccination", and "systematic vaccination", the Code Commission considered this request to be part of a broader issue on vaccination to be addressed in the future, probably by development of a specific chapter on vaccination.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' request to replace "post mortem" with "post slaughter" as inconsistent with standard Code usage.

The Code Commission accepted in principle a Member Country's suggestion to revert to the previous definition of FMD virus infection, and made further minor amendments to the definition to improve clarity.

The Code Commission reworded multiple points in Articles 8.7.2., 8.7.3., 8.7.4., 8.7.5., and 8.7.6. in response to comments received from a number of Member Countries.

The Code Commission revised Article 8.7.4. and deleted the option of compartment free with vaccination because FMD vaccination within a compartment would be incompatible with the biosecurity requirements to establish a FMD free compartment.

In response to a Member Country's question the Code Commission noted that the OIE does not grant official disease status for compartments, which is why they are not included in Article 1.6.1., and confirmed that a protection zone is not a necessary requirement around a containment zone.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to include specific reference to historical freedom in Article 8.7.40. on the grounds that historical freedom for FMD is adequately dealt with in Article 1.4.6., which applies horizontally to all diseases unless specified otherwise in the disease-specific chapters.

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

The revised Chapters 8.7. and 1.6. are attached as Annex XVI for Member Countries' comments.

#### **Item 14 Infection with Rift valley fever virus (Chapter 8.13.)**

Comments were received from EU.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission reworded point 6c of Article 8.13.1. that previously referred to "low level virus activity" to improve clarity.

Member Countries' request for additional non-specified text on protection from vector attack in Article 8.13.6. was not accepted as the *ad hoc* group advised that the additional measures are not practically applicable in this case.

The revised Chapter 8.12. is attached as Annex XVII for Member Countries' comments.

#### **Item 15. Infection with *Brucella abortus*, *B. melitensis* and *B. suis* (Chapter 8.4.)**

Comments were received from Australia, EU and USA.

In response to a Member Country's concern on the implications of the single chapter for three species on country health status recognition, the Code Commission noted that the articles in this chapter identify the requirements for freedom by host population, rather than as previously by *Brucella* species.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to replace the words "identified in" with "isolated from" in Article 8.4.1. point 5a.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to remove "in animals" from Article 8.4.3. point 1, because the notification obligation applies to all the species listed in Article 8.4.1. to enable recognition of freedom in specific categories of animals.

In response to a Member Country's comment the Code Commission clarified that historical freedom can be claimed in an animal category when there is no history of infection of that animal category with any of the three listed species of *Brucella*.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion for replacing Article 8.4.4. point 1d with an alternate point in Article 8.4.4. point 2 as unnecessary change.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to include *Brucella* species names in the headings of Articles 8.4.4., 8.4.5., 8.4.6. and 8.4.7., as that incorrectly assumes that the host range of each *Brucella* species is restricted to the single host species specified in each of those articles. As the *ad hoc* group stated in their report, experts question whether these three species are, indeed, distinct species.

In response to a Member Country's request for advice on how Member Countries could demonstrate freedom from infections with *Brucella* in pigs in compartments, zones and countries the Code Commission recalled the *ad hoc* group advice that surveillance tools are not yet adequate to demonstrate zone freedom from *Brucella* in pigs. Furthermore as stated in the User's Guide, this does not preclude the possibility for a Member Country to substantiate a claim of freedom.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country's suggestion to insert the word "and" between Article 8.4.13. points 3 b and c.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's request to make a new point 5 in Article 8.4.13., since the text proposed is already covered (as for example in Article 8.4.4. point 3).

A Member Country's request for updating cross references between Chapter 8.4. and Chapters 4.6., 4.7., 4.8. and 4.9. has been addressed in the 2014 edition of the Code and further modifications were proposed to these chapters (see item seven).

The revised Chapter 8.4. is attached as Annex XVIII for Member Countries' comments.

#### **Item 16 Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4.)**

Comments were received from New Zealand.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to amend Article 10.4.29. so that it aligns surveillance recommendations with the less prescriptive text used for the similar point in Article 10.9.24. point 1 (Infection with Newcastle disease virus).

The revised Chapter 10.4. is attached as Annex XIX for Member Countries' comments.

#### **Item 17 Equine diseases**

##### **a) Glanders (Chapter 12.10.)**

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

The draft article on restricted movements proposed by the *ad hoc* group was removed, as this topic will be addressed when the biosecurity protocols for equine diseases in high health status horse subpopulations are developed.

Since the proposed new chapter is significantly different from the current chapter, the proposed revision is provided as clean text. The revised Chapter 12.10. is attached as Annex XX for Member Countries' comments.

##### **b) High health status horse subpopulation (Chapter 4.16.)**

Comments were received from Australia and EU.

In response to comments from Member Countries at the 82<sup>nd</sup> General Session, the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* group, the Code Commission developed a definition of a high health status (HHS) horse subpopulation, and revised the definition of a high health high performance (HHP) horse developed by the *ad hoc* group and added both these definitions to Article 4.16.1.

The Code Commission also added new text to Article 4.16.2. point 3a that foresees the future adoption of a model of international veterinary certificate for HHP horses.

In response to Member Countries' suggestions the Code Commission replaced the words "not included" with "excluded from" in the final clause of Article 4.16.1.

Similarly in response to Member Countries' suggestions it made several wording changes in Articles 4.16.2. and 4.16.3. to improve clarity.

The Code Commission noted Member Countries suggested text for a new point e in Article 4.16.2. point 3 and retained this comment for future consideration. In doing so, the Code Commission draws Member Countries attention to the model Veterinary Certificate included as Appendix IV of the Report of the meeting of the OIE *ad hoc* Group on International Horse Movement for Equestrian Sport. Member Countries are strongly encouraged to read this *ad hoc* group meeting report and all attached annexes for full explanation of the ongoing development of this chapter, and to provide comments.

The revised Chapter 4.16. and the report of the *ad hoc* group are attached as Annex XXI and Annex XXII for Member Countries' comments.

#### **Item 18. Infection with porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (Chapter 15.X.)**

The Code Commission examined the draft chapter and is waiting for further expert advice before proceeding.

#### **Item 19 Report of the meeting of the ad hoc Group on Salmonellosis in Pigs**

The Code Commission reviewed the draft chapter prepared by the *ad hoc* group. The Code Commission revised the article structure to align with established Code format, and made minor edits to improve clarity.

The Code Commission noted that the draft chapter prepared by the *ad hoc* group closely followed the structure of the existing *Terrestrial Code* chapter on prevention and control of salmonellosis in poultry (Chapter 6.5). However, recalling that a Member Country suggested shorter articles in Section 7 of the *Terrestrial Code* that are easier for users to search and refer to, the Code Commission split the recommendations for prevention and control measures into articles topic by topic.

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* group had used the following document in developing the draft chapter and had brought this valuable resource to the attention of Member Countries.

*FAO/OIE/World Bank. 2010. Good practices for biosecurity in the pig sector – Issues and options in developing and transition countries. FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No. 169. Rome, FAO*

The draft Chapter 6.X. is attached as Annex XXIII for Member Countries' comments. The report of the meeting of *ad hoc* group is attached as Annex XXVIII for Member Countries' information.

### **E. OTHER ISSUES**

#### **Item 20 Update of the Code Commission work programme**

Comments were received from EU and New Zealand.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries' suggestions that the OIE should take on development of standards for reptile animal health, public health and welfare. However for such work to be undertaken resources beyond those currently available will be required.

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

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

#### **Item 21 Review of applications for recognition as an OIE Collaborating Centre**

The Code Commission endorsed the application from the State Scientific-Research Control Institute of Veterinary Medical Products & Feed Additives, Lviv, Ukraine for recognition as an OIE Collaborating Centre for safety of bee products.

**Item 22 Other issues****a) Proposed dates for next meetings**

The 2015 Code Commission meetings are scheduled for February 10–19, and September 8–17.

**b) Prescribed and alternative diagnostic tests for OIE listed diseases (Chapter 1.3.)**

In response to the request from the Biological Standards Commission the Code Commission agreed the approach regarding the progressive shift from a list of prescribed and alternative tests towards “fit for purpose” tests described within each *Manual* chapter.

---

.../Annexes