



Organisation
Mondiale
de la Santé
Animale

World
Organisation
for Animal
Health

Organización
Mundial
de Sanidad
Animal

Original: English

September 2015

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

Paris, 31 August–10 September 2015

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at OIE Headquarters in Paris from 31 August to 10 September 2015. The list of participants is attached as [Annex 1](#).

The Code Commission thanked the previous Commission members for their great contribution during their term of office. Particular thank was given to Dr Alejandro Thiermann for his 15-year presidency.

The Code Commission thanked the following Member Countries for providing written comments on draft texts circulated after the Commission's February 2015 meeting: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Chinese Taipei, Japan, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), the United States of America (USA), Uruguay, the Member States of the European Union (EU), the African Union Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of African Member Countries of the OIE. Comments were also received from the International Coalition for Animal Welfare (ICFAW), the International Feed Industry Federation (IFIF), the European Natural Sausage Casings Association (ENSCA) and the International Natural Sausage Casings Association (INSCA).

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 '~~striketrough~~' and may be found in the Annexes to the report. In Annexes 5, 6, 7 and 27, amendments made at this meeting are highlighted with a coloured background in order to distinguish them from those made previously. The Code Commission considered all Member Countries' comments and documented its responses. However, because of the very large volume of work, the Commission was not able to draft a detailed explanation of the reasons for accepting or not each of the comments received.

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

Member Countries should note that texts in Part A of this report are submitted for comment. Comments received by the deadline will be addressed during the Commission's meeting in February 2016. The reports of meetings (Working Groups and *ad hoc* Groups) and other related documents are also attached for information in Part B of this report.

The Code Commission again strongly encourages Member Countries to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by submitting comments on this report, and prepare to participate in the process of adoption at the General Session. Comments should be submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a structured rationale. Proposed deletions should be indicated in '~~striketrough~~' 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 8th January 2016** to be considered at the February 2016 meeting of the Code Commission. All comments should be sent to the OIE International Trade Department at: trade.dept@oie.int.

A. MEETING WITH THE DEPUTY DIRECTORS GENERAL

The Code Commission met Dr Monique Eloit, Deputy Director General (Administration, Management, Human Resources and Regional Activities) and Director General Elect, and Dr Brian Evans, Deputy Director General (Animal Health, Veterinary Public Health, International Standards) on 31 August 2015. The Deputy Directors General welcomed the newly elected Commission and discussed their expectations of the Commission over their three-year term of office.

Dr Evans highlighted the resolution adopted at the 83rd General Session to establish a performance evaluation framework for the Specialist Commissions which will provide feedback to Member Countries on the performance of each of the Specialist Commissions via the Council. He also recalled the strong request from Delegates for congruence, coherence and effective sequencing of work between the Specialist Commissions which should be taken into account in the scheduling of meetings, Specialist Commission representation on *ad hoc* Groups and reviews and improvements to Specialist Commission procedures.

Dr Evans highlighted Delegates commitment to maintaining the two-year cycle of standard development, and that requests for standard development or amendment in one year should be considered in exceptional circumstances only or for minor updates.

Dr Eloit endorsed Dr Evans comments, and outlined her commitment as the Director General Elect. Dr Eloit highlighted the importance of adapting the organisation and its various bodies to the developments of our time, in order to meet the expectations of Member Countries for the effective implementation of the Sixth Strategic Plan adopted by the World Assembly of Delegates in May 2015.

Dr Eloit noted that to put the Sixth Strategic Plan into effect and to safeguard the credibility of the Organisation (for example when we are accountable to WTO) we must strengthen our excellence by increasing our reliance on science and improving the transparency of our work.

Three major themes will be considered:

- 1) The composition of the Specialist Commissions and of the *ad hoc* Groups. Procedures for selecting experts will be revised in order to:
 - a) Enlarge the pool of experts, considering the various scientific domains of expertise,
 - b) Establish a coherent and accountable selection procedure for experts to be elected,
 - c) Prepare for the future by encouraging participation of young scientists.
- 2) Improvement in work coordination among the Specialist Commissions, in particular between the Code and the Scientific Commissions, and of course the terrestrial and aquatic animal sectors: it is important that the inclusion of a subject on a Specialist Commission agenda (as well as the decision to create an *ad hoc* Group and define its terms of reference) be based primarily on the nature of the issue, rather than the OIE organisational chart.
- 3) Optimisation of human resources to strengthen the skills of the Headquarters secretariats that support the Specialist Commissions, to provide better support for the work of the Specialist Commissions, and consequently make more efficient use of Specialist Commission members' time.

Code Commission members expressed their enthusiasm and commitment to realise these goals, and clarified how they may be achieved with several specific examples. They agreed that beyond standard drafting, the role of the Code Commission was also to give advice on the interpretation and implementation of standards.

Finally Dr Eloit and Dr Evans thanked the Commission members for their commitment, promised their support, and wished the Commission every success throughout their newly elected term of office.

MEETING WITH THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

The Code Commission met with the Director General on 8 September, 2015. Dr Vallat congratulated the Commission members on their election and on behalf of the Member Countries wished them a successful three-year term. He highlighted the importance of good communication and flexibility of approach between the Specialist Commissions to ensure alignment between the *Codes* and the *Manuals*, and between the *Aquatic* and *Terrestrial Animal Health Codes*.

Dr Vallat reminded Commission members about the flexible approach that OIE has to the nomination of experts to *ad hoc* Groups, and that he would welcome their nominations of experts to be considered for participation in *ad hoc* Groups on subjects of particular interest to the Code Commission.

Dr Vallat highlighted the pressures from multiple quarters for updates to the standards on ASF and glanders, a new model certificate for elite competition horses, and glossary definitions for OIE standards and guidelines.

Finally, Dr Vallat reminded the Commission members that the primary objective of OIE standards is effective disease control.

The Commission Members again expressed their enthusiasm and commitment to the Code Commission, and the President briefly updated Dr Vallat on progress with respect to the key issues identified.

B. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The draft agenda circulated prior to the meeting was discussed, and several new agenda items were added. The adopted agenda of the meeting is attached as [Annex 2](#).

C. INFORMATION FOR NEW CODE COMMISSION MEMBERS

A compilation of information for new Code Commission members was reviewed and discussed. The Code Commission members agreed this was a helpful introductory document, and that there would be value in updating it as and when necessary to provide an on-going single source reference on the role of the Commission, and how it operates.

D. MEETING WITH THE BIOLOGICAL STANDARDS COMMISSION (1st September)

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

- the progressive adoption of the convention for naming of OIE listed diseases agreed by the World Assembly of Delegates in both the *Codes* and the *Manuals*;
- update of the Code Commission work programme;
- proposed deletion of Chapter 1.3.;
- deletion of text in the *Code* that is duplicated in the *Manual* (e.g. testing methods for non-human primates); and
- proposed new glossary definitions for OIE standards, OIE guidelines, vaccination, vaccination programme, emergency vaccination and routine vaccination.

E. REPORT ON THE JOINT MEETING OF THE CODE COMMISSION AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION (8th September)

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission met on 8th September to discuss issues of mutual interest. The minutes of this joint meeting are attached as [Annex 3](#).

The President of the Code Commission was also invited to meet with the Scientific Commission on 10th September in order to discuss the outcome of the meetings and the work programme.

F. EXAMINATION OF MEMBER COUNTRY COMMENTS AND WORK OF RELEVANT EXPERT GROUPS

Item 1 General comments of Member Countries

General comments were received from New Zealand.

In answer to a Member Country's comment, the Code Commission asked OIE Headquarters to make *ad hoc* Group reports more easily accessible.

Item 2 User's guide

Comments were received from Australia and EU.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion to change 'is' to 'are' in the final sentence of section B point 7 the Code Commission noted that 'is' is correct for the singular 'range'.

In anticipation of the proposed transfer of the OIE List to a new chapter, and at Member Countries' suggestion, the Code Commission included reference to Chapter 1.2 bis in the second paragraph of Section C point 2.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to add the words 'unless based on risk analysis' to the end of the third paragraph of Section C point 4, since this point is already included in the first paragraph of Section C point 4. However the Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to revise the language in this paragraph on safe commodities taking account of the recently adopted glossary definition of '*safe commodity*'. The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to delete 'or zone' from the first sentence on safe commodities but amended the text to read 'or zone of origin'.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to change 'because of' to 'owing to' given they are synonymous.

The language in point 5b of Section C was amended to align with the amendments made to the third paragraph of point 4 of Section C.

After discussion within Headquarters, the Code Commission added the following new text at the beginning of Section C point 3 Prevention and Control to clarify expectations for the establishment of free zones and compartments: "Chapters 4.3. and 4.4. describe the measures which should be implemented to establish zones and compartments. Zoning and compartmentalisation should be used to control diseases and to facilitate safe trade."

For the same reason the Code Commission introduced new text specifically referencing zones and compartments to the second paragraph of Section C point 5.

The revised User's guide is attached as Annex 4 for Member Countries' comments.

Item 3 Glossary

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

Having simplified the definition of *stamping-out policy* the Code Commission supported a Member Country's general comment to work on the development of a new standard for management of disease outbreaks, and requests that the Director General convene an *ad hoc* Group to advance this work.

Acceptable risk

Since this term is not used in the *Code*, the Code Commission proposes it be deleted from the glossary.

Appropriate level of protection

Since this term is used only in one chapter of the *Code*, the Code Commission proposes it be deleted from the glossary.

Casings

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments and communications from INSCA and ENSCA (Community Guide to Good Practice for Hygiene and the application of the HACCP principles in the production of natural sausage casings, 2014) and on that basis revised the definition of *casings* to give more precision to the definition of organs and treatments commonly used in the production of casings. The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestions to include occasionally-traded tissues as beyond the scope of the proposed new definition and not congruent with industry practices.

Safe commodity

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to delete the words 'or zone' from the safe commodity definition since recognition of safe commodities is made irrespective of the maintenance of the specific animal health status of zones. No change is proposed to the current glossary definition of *safe commodity*.

Stamping-out policy

In response to Member Countries' comments, the Code Commission simplified and clarified the definition of *stamping-out policy* by deleting from point (a) the words "this includes all susceptible animals, vaccinated or unvaccinated, on infected establishments" and rewording point (b) to read 'The destruction of carcasses and animal products, as relevant by rendering....'.

Infection and infestation

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to delete the definition of *infestation* and align the definition of *infection* with that used in the *Aquatic Animal Health Code*. The Code Commission considers it is important to retain the distinction between infection for internal parasites, and infestation for external parasites in the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* for diseases where a parasite does not live within the animal, such as small hive beetle.

OIE Standards and OIE Guidelines

Further to the discussion on this subject at the joint meeting between the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission in February 2015, and in support of the suggestion from the Director General to develop a definition of *OIE Standards* the Code Commission developed new definitions for *OIE Standards* and *OIE Guidelines*, jointly with the Biological Standards and Scientific Commissions.

Once these definitions are adopted the use of these terms throughout the *Code* will be reviewed and aligned with the adopted definitions.

Vaccination, Vaccination Programme, Emergency Vaccination and Routine Vaccination

Following the discussion on vaccination at the February 2015 Code Commission meeting, the work the Biological Standards Commission has undertaken on vaccine banks, and a request from OIE Headquarters, the Code Commission developed a modified definition for *vaccination* and new draft definitions for *vaccination programme*, *emergency vaccination*, and *routine vaccination*, which were referred to the Biological Standards Commission and the Scientific Commission for review. These draft definitions have then been forwarded to OIE Headquarters to be included in the documents for the *ad hoc* Group on vaccination. The Code Commission expects to review comments on these draft definitions from these Groups at its February 2016 meeting, and then circulate them for Member Countries' comments.

Transmission

The Code Commission discussed the relevance of adding a definition of transmission to the glossary, and concluded it is unnecessary. It confirmed that transmission means the transfer of a pathogenic agent from one animal to another.

The revised and new glossary definitions are attached as [Annex 5](#) for Member Countries' comments.

Item 4 Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1.)

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

In response to a Member Country's comments on the alignment of Chapters 1.1. of the *Terrestrial* and *Aquatic Animal Health Codes* the Code Commission noted:

- the Oxford English Dictionary definition of aetiological agent is sufficient,
- criteria for listing diseases have been aligned in both *Codes*,
- the distinction between infection and infestation is relevant in the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*.

To facilitate precise notification of disease events by Member Countries, the Code Commission refined a draft Headquarters definition of 'event' proposed for inclusion in Chapter 1.1. of the *Code*.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to cross reference Article 1.1.4. point 2b to Chapter 1.2. for clarity.

The Code Commission added a new point 3 to Article 1.1.4. in response to a Member Country's suggestion for clarification of the need for a final report for emerging diseases, and removed unnecessary words from point 2 of Article 1.1.3. to align with this point.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to replace *Veterinary Authority* with *Competent Authority* in Article 1.1.5. point 1 since the authority responsible for OIE notification is the Veterinary Authority. It also did not accept the suggestion to add 'compartment' to this article since compartments cease to exist once infection occurs in them.

In response to a Member Country's comment the Code Commission removed unnecessary words and simplified the language of Article 1.1.5. point 2 to improve clarity.

Having proposed a definition of *event* for use in Chapter 1.1., the Code Commission revised the wording of Article 1.1.6. to avoid use of the word 'events' in this article in a manner that is inconsistent with the proposed new definition.

The revised Chapter 1.1. is attached as [Annex 6](#) for Member Countries' comments.

Item 5 Criteria for the inclusion of diseases, infections and infestations in the OIE list (Chapter 1.2.)

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

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's proposal to revise the order of the criteria since it believes the logic of putting the 'and' criteria before the 'or' criteria significantly improves the readability and comprehension of the complete list of criteria. Similarly the Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to retain the explanatory notes previously used in the *Aquatic Animal Health Code* since it considers these notes are better included in the Terms of Reference for *ad hoc* Groups convened to apply the listing criteria rather than in the *Code* chapter texts.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggestion to replace 'reliable means of detection' with 'scientifically proven method of detection' in Article 1.2.2. point 3 since reliability is the primary requirement of the criterion.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission revised the wording of Article 1.2.2. point 4c to improve clarity. It did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to delete reference to production losses since these are important in a range of situations where wildlife contribute directly to income.

The revised Chapter 1.2. is attached in [Annex 7](#) for Member Countries' comments.

Diseases Listed by the OIE (Chapter 1.2.bis)

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission re-numbered the articles in this draft chapter to align with established *Code* format.

The Code Commission also updated listing names to align with the names of recently adopted chapters, and where necessary corrected the spelling of listed diseases to align with that used by the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses. (While the OIE uses UK English, the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses uses US English). Providing these spelling changes are accepted, consequential changes will subsequently be made throughout the relevant chapters of the *Code* and the *Manual*.

The revised draft new Chapter 1.2.bis is attached in [Annex 7](#) for Member Countries' comments.

Item 6 Prescribed and alternative diagnostic tests for OIE listed diseases (Chapter 1.3.)

With systematic referencing to the *Manual* in the disease-specific chapters of the *Code* and the explanation of the use of the various tests in the *Manual*, and after discussion with the Biological Standards Commission, the Code Commission considers Chapter 1.3. is now redundant and proposes to delete it from the *Code*.

The proposed deletion of Chapter 1.3. is attached as [Annex 8](#) for Member Countries' comments.

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

In response to Headquarters' comments the Code Commission agreed to correct several reference errors throughout this chapter to the correct chapter reference of the *Manual*.

The Code Commission considered that the questionnaires for each disease in this chapter should be independent chapters, and decided to include this issue in its work programme.

The relevant parts of the revised Chapter 1.6. are attached in [Annex 9](#) for Member Countries' comments.

Item 8 Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2.)

Comments were received from EU.

In response to Member Countries' comment the Code Commission added a new clause to Article 3.2.14. point 7b to include animal welfare inspections at the export and import of animals.

The relevant part of the revised Chapter 3.2. is attached as [Annex 10](#) for Member Countries' comments, and the report of the *ad hoc* Group meeting on evaluation of Veterinary Services in April 2015 is attached as [Annex 30](#) for Member Countries' information.

Item 9 High health status horse subpopulation (Chapter 4.16.) and Model veterinary certificate

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

After a thorough review of all Member Countries' comments, a number of which expressed concerns over the discrepancies between some requirements of the certificate and the current *Code* chapters and the fact that the certificate as proposed is no longer a "model" but rather a "fit-for-purpose" document, the Code Commission together with the Scientific Commission proposed that, at this stage and for the time being, the document "Model veterinary certificate for the international movement of not more than 90 days of a high health high performance horse for competition or races" be included in the "Handbook for the management of HHP horses", which has three parts, "Principles", "Biosecurity" and "Certification".

Member Countries are invited to refer to the report of the Scientific Commission meeting in order to consider jointly the Handbook and a revised version of the certificate, which takes into account Member Countries' comments.

Item 10 OIE procedures relevant to the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures on the World Trade Organization (Chapter 5.3.)

Supporting a suggestion of the Director General, the Code Commission updated and revised Chapter 5.3. to take into account comments of recent WTO DSB panels and to remove unnecessarily discursive text, and further edited the chapter to align with established *Code* format.

The revised Chapter 5.3. is attached as Annex 11 for Member Countries' comments.

Item 11 Veterinary Public Health: Antimicrobial resistance

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

Comments were received from Australia.

In response to a Member Country's comments the Code Commission deleted repetitive sentences from Article 6.7.3., points 3 and 5.

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

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group meeting to set up a global database on the use of antimicrobial agents in animals held in August 2015 and, as a consequence, proposed to add a definition of 'therapeutic use of antimicrobial agents' for use in Chapter 6.8. based on the adopted text in Chapter 6.6.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached to the report of the Scientific Commission. The amended Chapters 6.7. and 6.8. are attached as Annexes 12 and 13 for Member Countries' comments.

Item 12 Veterinary Public Health: Zoonoses and Food Safety

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

b) Draft new chapter on prevention and control of Salmonella in pig herds (Chapter 6.X.)

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments on both of the above draft chapters prior to be referred to the *ad hoc* Group scheduled to be convened in December 2015. The Code Commission expects to review the *ad hoc* Group report at its February 2016 meeting, and will then circulate the revised chapters for Member Countries' comments in the February 2016 meeting report.

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

In response to advice from Headquarters the Code Commission updated the cross references to the Codex text so that they now refer to the recently adopted Codex Guidelines for the control of *Trichinella* spp. in meat of Suidae (CAC/GL 86-2015).

The Code Commission also amended the language of the definition in paragraph 5 of Article 8.16.1. to align with the chapter title.

The revised Chapter 8.16. is attached as Annex 14 for Member Countries' comments.

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

Comments were received from Australia, EU and USA.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission amended the language of the first paragraph of Article 15.3.1. to more clearly define infection with *T. solium*.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission also added a new point d to Article 15.3.3. and additional words to the previous point d (now point e) to provide additional detail for avoiding transmission of *T. solium* eggs from humans to pigs.

Based on common practices of post-mortem inspection in several Member Countries, the Code Commission also proposed new less prescriptive wording that can be more practically implemented for Article 15.3.3. point 2b.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission also expanded the scope of the last sentence of Article 15.3.3.

Following consultation with the *ad hoc* Group and an expert, the treatment temperature in Article 15.3.6. was amended to 60⁰C. The Code Commission recommends that the WHO / FAO / OIE Guidelines for the Surveillance, Prevention and Control of Taeniosis / Cysticercosis (available at <http://www.oie.int/doc/ged/D11245.PDF>) be revised to reflect this current practice and advice.

The revised Chapter 15.3. is attached as Annex 15 for Member Countries' comments.

e) Terms of reference for the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group

The Code Commission reviewed the terms of reference drafted for the scheduled revision of Chapters 6.1. and 6.2. by the APFSWG at its next meeting. The APFSWG is expected to propose amendments where needed or to determine the necessity of further expert advice.

Item 13 Animal welfare

a) Slaughter of animals (Chapter 7.5.)

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

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments on Article 7.5.7. point 3b (electrical stunning of birds using a water bath) and decided to wait for the report of the *ad hoc* Group scheduled to meet in October 2015 before considering this point further.

The Code Commission supported the Animal Welfare Working Group recommendation to delete all figures and photos in Article 7.5.7., given that they are more appropriately included in a handbook than the *Code*, and the range of minor variations of these recommendations available in the literature, with no consensus on a single figure for the species included.

The Code Commission moved texts describing the signs of correct stunning and a captive bolt under 'figure 5' in Article 7.5.7. point 5 to point 2 of the same article to improve readability.

The revised part of Chapter 7.5. is attached as Annex 16 for Member Countries' comments.

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

The Code Commission supported the addition of equids to the table in Article 7.6.5., and appropriate cross referencing to equids in Articles 7.6.6., 7.6.7. and 7.6.15., as recommended by the *ad hoc* Group on working equids.

The Code Commission also supported the Animal Welfare Working Group's recommendation to delete 'figures 1-4' in Article 7.6.8. point 2f, "figure 5" in Article 7.6.10. and the pictures included at the end of Article 7.6.13., for the same reasons proposed for the deletion of figures from Chapter 7.5.

The Code Commission also deleted the '/' and the term 'and/or' throughout the chapter and replaced each with 'and' or 'or' as appropriate.

The revised parts of Chapter 7.6. are attached as [Annex 17](#) for Member Countries' comments.

c) Animal welfare and broiler chicken production systems (Chapter 7.10.)

Comments were received from China and EU.

The Code Commission decided to forward a Member Country's ethological comments on Articles 7.10.3. and 7.10.4. to the Animal Welfare Working Group for review.

In response to Member Countries' suggestion the Code Commission revised Point 2k of Article 7.10.4., to more accurately incorporate the considerations included in this point. The Code Commission noted, however, that unlike in other species production systems, genetic selection is not directly applied in broiler chicken production, but rather in the source genetic stock lines.

The amended Article 7.10.4. is attached as [Annex 18](#) for Member Countries' comments.

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

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

In response to Member Countries' general comments the Code Commission noted that the OIE chapters on animal welfare and production systems are all based on a range of measurables that may be selected and recorded according to what is appropriate for the type of herd.

The Code Commission amended the text on 'mortality and culling rates' and 'changes in body weight, body condition and milk yield' in Article 7.11.4. in response to a Member Country's suggestions to improve syntax.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to change the title of Article 7.11.5., to 'Recommendations' to align with Chapter 7.9. and make it clearer.

The Code Commission divided the previous Article 7.11.5., into 3 separate Articles (7.11.5., 7.11.6., and 7.11.7.) to align with the well-received format proposed in the draft chapter on the welfare of working equids.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion the Code Commission deleted the unnecessary word 'relevant' from the new Article 7.11.5.

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

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to delete 'wet coat' from point 3 of Article 7.11.6. on air quality since 'wet coat' can be an indicator of poor air quality due to high humidity.

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

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

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

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion for more prescriptive and subjective language on tethering.

At Member Countries' suggestion the Code Commission included 'emergency killing of animals according to Chapter 7.6.' in point 7 of Article 7.11.6.

In new Article 7.11.7. point 1b the Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to replace 'hooves and claws' with 'feet', which includes them.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' suggested qualification that vaccinations and other treatments (point 1b of Article 7.11.7.) should only be carried out if they will improve animal health or welfare, since treatment outcomes cannot be guaranteed, and the current qualification of veterinary or other expert advice ensures use of vaccinations and other treatments is evidence based. However the text was aligned with Article 7.10.4. point 1b (broiler production).

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to further qualify the provisions for movement of non-ambulatory cattle, and added 'as quickly as possible', as used in Chapter 7.6.

The Code Commission revised the colostrum feeding recommendations taking account of Member Countries' suggestions and the provisions in Chapter 7.9. on this subject, and current knowledge and practices.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to delete the requirement for a dry navel before transport since this is a very commonly accepted indicator of fitness for travel that is also included in Chapters 7.2. and 7.3.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to add new text on early separation before bonding is established, since that is already included in point 10 of this article.

In response to a Member Country's suggestion the Code Commission added text to point 11 of Article 7.11.7. to recognise the health benefits of individual calf housing facilities for very young calves.

The Code Commission amended point 13 on painful husbandry procedures in response to Member Countries' comments and to align with Chapter 7.9.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to delete the statement that selection of polled cattle is preferable to dehorning because this is widely practised.

The revised Chapter 7.11. is attached as [Annex 19](#) for Member Countries' comments.

e) Draft new chapter on the welfare of working equids

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

The *ad hoc* Group revised the draft chapter taking into account all comments received. Its meeting report explaining the rationale for their revision is appended to this report as [Annex 31](#).

The Code Commission reviewed the *ad hoc* Group's revision, and edited it further to align with established *Code* chapter structure and format.

The revised chapter is attached as [Annex 20](#) for Member Countries' comments.

f) Report of the Animal Welfare Working Group

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the June 2015 meeting of the Animal Welfare Working Group, which is attached as [Annex 32](#) for Member Countries' information.

g) Disaster risk reduction and management in relation to animal health and welfare and veterinary public health

Comments were received from EU and ICFAW.

The Code Commission reviewed the draft guidelines on disaster risk reduction and management in relation to animal health and welfare and veterinary public health. It commended and endorsed the work of the *ad hoc* Group, and proposed improvements to the text taking into account all comments received.

The Code Commission noted that these guidelines are intended for publication on the OIE website and in hard copy, but not in the *Code*.

The draft guidelines is attached as [Annex 33](#) for Member Countries' information.

h) Collaborating Centre Twinning Proposal on animal welfare between Italy and South Africa

Headquarters presented an application for twinning on animal welfare between The Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale dell'Abruzzo e del Molise "G.Caporale" and the University of Pretoria Faculty of Veterinary Science to the Code Commission.

The Commission agreed the project subject matter was relevant and timely with significant potential to assist the implementation of OIE animal welfare standards in the African region.

Item 14 Harmonisation of chapters on vector-borne diseases

a) Infection with bluetongue virus (Chapter 8.3.)

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

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

Comments were received from Australia and EU.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission reviewed and edited these chapters for consistency between each of them and with established *Code* format.

The Code Commission noted the Member Countries' proposal to exclude "non-pathogenic serotypes" of BTV from Chapter 8.3. and sought advice from the Biological Standards Commission.

The revised Chapters 8.3., 8.7., and 8.14. are attached as [Annexes 21, 22 and 23](#) for Member Countries' comments.

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

Comments were received from Australia and USA.

The Code Commission did not accept Member Countries' comments seeking a revision of this chapter to make distinct provisions for the three named species of *Brucellae*. The reason for combining the previous three *Brucella* chapters into one is found in the report of an *ad hoc* Group which met in July 2011. Its report is attached to the August-September 2011 meeting of the Scientific Commission and the relevant section is quoted below:

“Following an in depth discussion on this issue and options available for brucellosis, the Group expressed some concerns about the implications of such new approach for brucellosis. Some pros and cons of having separate chapters for *Brucella abortus*, *Brucella melitensis* and *Brucella suis* versus combining all *Brucellae* into one Terrestrial Code chapter were debated. One of the main arguments for addressing the three *Brucella* species together in one chapter was that the three *Brucella* species of concern (*B. abortus*, *B. melitensis* and *B. suis*) were genetically so homologous that they could be considered as a single bacteria species. The taxonomy reflected more the history of the control of the disease than the molecular biology (genetics) of the agent. In some countries, *B. abortus* was the only species infecting cattle. On the contrary, in most countries, where several animal species are in contact, *B. melitensis* and sometimes *B. suis* were frequently isolated from and causing disease in several species, including cattle. In addition, in many countries two or three of these *Brucella* species could co-exist in the same animal species, particularly in cattle. In light of these facts, *B. melitensis* or *B. suis* represented sometimes the most important species causing brucellosis in cattle. Moreover, control and eradication programmes (including those officially recommended by international organisations) were essentially based on serological testing which did not differentiate between the three *Brucella* species in cause. Furthermore, all of these three *Brucella* species were causing Brucellosis infection in humans.”

The Code Commission noted a Member Country's suggestion to develop an article in this chapter for feral and wild pigs, and game meat, and recommends that these subjects are addressed next time the chapter is reviewed. Additional suggestions for minor editorial improvements will be addressed at the time of the next review.

In response to Member Countries' request for provisions for country freedom from infection with *B. abortus*, *B. melitensis*, and *B. suis* in pigs, the Code Commission recalled that the *ad hoc* Group found it impossible to provide conditions for country freedom in pigs. The following text is extracted from their report:

“General provisions of *Brucella* freedom should apply by category of animals, i.e. to all five categories, while provisions requiring serological testing could not be applied to porcines. The diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of serological tests in porcines were not considered suitable in the context of the *Terrestrial Code*.”

The Code Commission concluded that drafting of country and zone freedom requirements for pigs must await development of reliable diagnostic tests.

Item 16 Infection with foot and mouth disease virus (Chapter 8.8.)

Comments were received from AU-IBAR, Australia, China and Japan.

The Code Commission referred a Member Country's comment on available NSP tests to the Biological Standards Commission for consideration.

In response to Member Countries' request for consideration of development of provisions for compartments free from FMD with vaccination, the Code Commission noted that the available risk management options are insufficient to maintain compartments free from FMD with vaccination. Both the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agree that greater assurance that vaccines effectively prevent infection would be needed to make this a viable option.

In order to align with language in other chapters recently adopted, the Code Commission agreed to use the phrases ‘transmission of FMDV’ instead of ‘FMDV transmission’ and ‘country, zone or compartment free from FMD’ instead of ‘FMD free country, zone or compartment’ throughout the chapter. (Chapter 1.6 will be updated accordingly when this format is adopted in Chapter 8.8.)

The Code Commission removed unnecessary words, corrected punctuation, and reworded multiple points through multiple articles in response to Member Countries’ comments to improve syntax, clarity, and consistency of presentation with established Code text, structure and format.

In Article 8.8.1. point 3b the Code Commission accepted a Member Country’s suggestion to remove the unnecessary word ‘viral’.

Point 4 of Articles 8.8.2. and 8.8.3. was reworded and simplified in response to a Member Country’s comments.

Member Countries’ proposal to revise point 6 and the last paragraph of Article 8.8.6. was considered, by the Code Commission together with some Member Countries’ general comments. However, because of the generic implications of such a change for multiple chapters it considered that the generic work planned or already underway on vaccination, zoning and managing outbreaks is likely to be relevant to this issue and inform future updates of this article.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to refer to evidence of ‘transmission or infection’ rather than ‘infection’ in Article 8.8.7., because of the established principle that in a country where vaccination is not practised demonstration of absence of infection is required, and in a country where vaccination is practised demonstration of absence of virus transmission is required.

The Code Commission made editorial changes to correct syntax in Articles 8.8.8. and 8.8.9.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country’s suggestion to amend Article 8.8.15. point 1c(i) and similar clauses in Articles 8.8.16. and 8.8.19., to improve readability (and align with Article 8.8.22.).

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country’s suggestion to amend Article 8.8.16. point 1b and the similar clause in Article 8.8.22., to improve readability.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to add ‘where an official control programme exists’ to the titles of Articles 8.8.16., 8.8.20., 8.8.23., 8.8.26., 8.8.27., 8.8.28. and 8.8.30., because the risk mitigation provisions in those articles are sufficient for safe trade in the absence of an official control programme.

In Article 8.8.21., the Code Commission accepted a Member Country’s suggestion to remove unnecessary words. However they did not accept Member Countries’ suggestions to replace ‘...inspections with favourable results’ with ‘inspections with no evidence of FMD’ in this article, or elsewhere, because the phrase ‘...inspections with favourable results’ is an established Code format used with ante and post mortem inspection throughout the Code that in this chapter clearly means the absence of signs of FMD.

In answer to a comment from Member Countries suggesting specific surveillance recommendations be included in Article 8.8.22., the Code Commission noted that surveillance recommendations for FMD are included in Articles 8.8.40., 8.8.41., and 8.8.42., and can be applied in this specific situation too.

In Article 8.8.32., the Code Commission clarified that recommendations 1, 4 and 5 are for wool only.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country’s suggestion to change the minimum time for HTST to 17 seconds in Article 8.8.35. point 2, because the most recent scientific data validates the current minimum time recommendation of 15 seconds.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country’s proposal to use ‘wildlife’ consistently in Article 8.8.37.

The Code Commission also accepted a Member Country’s proposal to rephrase point 5 of Article 8.8.39., and to simplify the wording of the third paragraph of Article 8.8.40. point 2.

In the first paragraph of Article 8.8.41., the Code Commission replaced Veterinary Authority with Veterinary Services which is the relevant term in this case.

The Code Commission also made minor amendments to Article 8.8.42. in response to Member Countries' suggestions to improve syntax and readability.

The revised Chapter 8.8. is attached as [Annex 24](#) for Member Countries' comments.

Item 17 Infection with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex (draft new Chapter 8.X.)

The rationale for this new chapter is contained in the reports of the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group commissioned to develop it.

The revised draft chapter received from the Scientific Commission was reviewed and amended by the Code Commission, and edited to align with established *Code* chapter structure and format.

The draft Chapter 8.X. is attached as [Annex 25](#) for Member Countries' comments.

Item 18 Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4.)

Comments were received from Australia, EU and USA, including recommendations from the International Conference on Avian Influenza and Trade held in Baltimore (Maryland) in June 2015.

In response to a Member Countries' request for an *ad hoc* Group to be convened to update this chapter, the Code Commission noted the generic work planned or underway on vaccination, zoning and outbreak management, which is expected to address the key recommendations and requests from the International Conference on Avian Influenza relevant to the *Code*.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to merge Articles 10.4.16. and 10.4.17., as they consider merging those two articles would be likely to make the provisions for each of the two circumstances covered more difficult to understand.

The Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to check the reference material provided to support updating the table for inactivation of avian influenza viruses in dried egg white in Article 10.4.25. In the interests of improving the efficiency of maintaining and updating the *Code*, this information along with several other minor comments will be held until substantive conclusions from the generic work on vaccination, zoning and outbreak management are available to propose an update of this chapter for Member Countries' comments.

In the meantime the Code Commission calls on all countries to apply the provisions of the existing chapter, especially the recommendations for country, zone, or compartment free status recognition and the specific trade provisions to minimise trade disruption associated with outbreaks of avian influenza.

Item 19 Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.4.)

Comments were received from Argentina, EU, Japan and USA.

The Code Commission reviewed Member Countries' comments on the revised chapter circulated for comment in the February 2015 meeting report, and on the chapter adopted in May 2015. It decided to recommend to OIE that an *ad hoc* Group be convened to specifically address these Member Country comments and those comments not yet addressed in the November 2014 *ad hoc* Group meeting report, and recommend appropriate updates to the BSE chapters in the *Manual* (e.g. differential diagnostic tests) and the *Code* (e.g. case definitions).

Item 20 Infection with *Burkholderia mallei* (Glanders) (Chapter 12.10.)

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

In response to a Member Country's suggestion to include provisions for historical freedom, the Code Commission noted that the provisions for historical freedom of Chapter 1.4., apply to all disease-specific chapters unless otherwise specified. In the case of Chapter 12.10., the provisions given in Chapter 1.4. apply.

The Code Commission acknowledged a Member Country's concern about the difficulty of applying movement controls effectively to establish and maintain zones free from infection with *B. mallei*, but nevertheless considered the zoning option should be retained for those countries that are able to effectively apply the conditions given.

Throughout the chapter the Code Commission applied the standard *Code* format of 'country or zone free from infection with *B. mallei*.'

The Code Commission re-phrased the opening paragraph of Article 12.10.1., in response to Member Countries' suggestions to improve sentence structure and clarity.

In response to a Member Country's question on the need for an epidemiological link or a cause for suspicion to confirm infection with *B. mallei*, the Code Commission noted that the link could be as simple as the health status of the previous countries of residence of the animal concerned.

On the basis of Member Country comments the Code Commission aligned the definition of free country or zone in Article 12.10.2. with the standard *Code* format and re-introduced the surveillance requirement for 12 months (twice the incubation period) to point b of this article.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries' comments that Article 12.10.2. lacks clear criteria on surveillance to define a country or zone free from infection with *B. mallei*, and recommends that OIE Headquarters seek expert advice to address the surveillance requirements in Articles 12.10.2. and 12.10.8., to demonstrate country or zone freedom from infection with *B. mallei*.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestions to amend Article 12.10.3. to correct grammar and syntax and remove ambiguity. The Code Commission also modified point 3 on *stamping-out policy* to align with the proposed new glossary definition. Neither the Scientific Commission nor the Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to extend the surveillance period in Article 12.10.3. beyond that required in Article 12.10.2.

On the basis of a Member Country's suggestion and advice from the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission amended point 4 and deleted point 5 of Article 12.10.3.

The Code Commission also amended Articles 12.10.4. and 12.10.5., on the basis of Member Countries' suggestions to improve clarity and align with standard *Code* format.

The Code Commission reviewed the literature on the risk of transmission of *B. mallei* via semen and embryos and concluded that most of the sanitary measures proposed for Articles 12.10.6. and 12.10.7. should be deleted based on the following rationale:

Most of the sanitary measures recommended in Article 12.10.6., and Article 12.10.7., should be deleted as there is insufficient scientific basis to require such restrictions on either embryos or semen. The *ad hoc* Group report that supports the inclusion of these articles in the *Code* cites a single publication to justify the application of these measures, namely Khan *et al.* (2013) Glanders in animals: A review on epidemiology, clinical presentation, diagnosis and countermeasures. *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases*, 60, 204-221. The *ad hoc* Group report summarises this review as stating that a large percentage of infected equines had orchitis and therefore concluded that "it cannot be stated with any certainty that semen cannot transmit *B. mallei* infection", and this same argument (orchitis) is used to justify the imposition of measures for the international trade in equine embryos.

The epidemiology section of the Khan *et al.* review paper cited makes no reference to the transmission of *B. mallei* through equine germplasm although it does cite Saqib (2009) as describing 31/69 horses with glanders as having orchitis. Saqib (2009) is a PhD thesis from the University of Faisalabad, Pakistan. The literature review of that thesis describes transmission of *B. mallei* by ingestion or inhalation but makes no reference to venereal transmission (pp 20-21). Although the thesis does describe orchitis in a number of horses with glanders, the section of the thesis (pp 93-94) suggests that this is actually the cutaneous form of glanders and is associated with contaminated bedding.

The OIE's *Handbook on Import Risk Analysis for Animals and Animal Products* states that "It is not acceptable to simply conclude that, because there is significant uncertainty, measures will be based on a precautionary approach. The rationale for selecting measures must be made apparent". In this case, there is no evidence to suggest that *B. mallei* is likely to be transmitted through the international trade in equine germplasm and the precautionary approach adopted by the inclusion of these articles is inconsistent with OIE guidance.

The Code Commission inserted a new clause cross referencing Chapter 1.4. at the beginning of Article 12.10.8. and amended the second clause of this article to a Member Country's suggestions to improve clarity.

The revised Chapter 12.10. is attached as Annex 26 for Member Countries' comments.

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

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

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country's suggestion to include African *wild* suid species as a subset within the description of suids for this chapter under the general provisions of Article 15.1.1. Whenever the term 'suids' is used in the chapter, the description of species included in Article 15.1.1. applies.

The Code Commission noted Member Countries' suggestion that wild and feral pigs should be included in the ASF disease status determination of a country, zone or compartment. However, the Code Commission considered that when the domestic and captive wild populations can be effectively separated from the wild population and, when present, from the vector, it is possible to establish free status in the domestic and captive wild populations. Indeed several countries continue to successfully maintain superior health status of their domestic and captive wild pig populations despite infection being present in feral and wild pig populations.

The Code Commission accepted a number of Member Countries' suggestions to amend Article 15.1.1. to improve clarity and delete unnecessary words. The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to place captive wild pigs with *wild* and *feral* pigs in this article because captive wild pigs are kept under human control to produce meat or be released for hunting and thus can play a more significant epidemiological role. The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to delete 'biological' from the description of *vectors* or add the qualifier 'of the infection' to *vectors* since 'biological' usefully clarifies that *Ornithodoros* ticks are biological rather than mechanical vectors of ASF, and infection is included in the glossary definition of *vectors*. The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion that detection of specific antibodies to ASFV is sufficient on its own to define infection with ASF, since due to possible false positives, there is a need for an epidemiological link or a cause for suspicion to substantiate a case.

The Code Commission amended several points in Article 15.1.2., in response to Member Countries' comments to align with established *Code* format and improve clarity. It introduced new language to point 7 of Article 15.1.2. to take into consideration the effectiveness of biosecurity measures in the presence of arthropod vectors. The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to include language on the powers of the Veterinary Authority in point 4 of Article 15.1.2., since they are included in Chapter 3.2.

In response to a Member Country's comment the Code Commission deleted 'historically' from Article 15.1.3., since point 1 of Article 1.4.6 applies and includes two distinct situations where freedom may be recognised without pathogen specific surveillance. In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission amended Article 15.1.3. to remove unnecessary words, improve clarity and align with established *Code* format.

In response to Member Countries' comments regarding the time references to gain free status, the Code Commission decided to revert to the previous version of Article 15.1.3. point 2a, which takes better into account the actual epidemiology of ASF.

The Code Commission amended Article 15.1.3.ter in response to Member Countries' suggestions including the addition of specific reference to African wild suids, and *Ornithodoros* ticks to the second paragraph of this article.

The Code Commission amended Article 15.1.4., in response to Member Countries' comments and to align with established *Code* format. In response to Member Countries suggestion it also included the time period recommended for use of sentinel pigs, taking into account the environmental survival of the virus and the incubation period of the disease.

In response to a Member Country's comment the Code Commission changed the words in the titles of Articles 15.1.6., 15.1.9., 15.1.11. and 15.1.12.bis 'considered infected with ASF' to 'countries or zones not free from ASF', for clarity.

In answer to a Member Country comment questioning the inclusion of point 2a of Article 15.1.6., the Code Commission noted that the possibility of exporting from a free compartment in a country or zone not free from disease warrants its inclusion.

The Code Commissions did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to replace 'three months' with '90 days' throughout this chapter, since 'three months' is the standard *Code* format for this period.

The Code Commission noted Member Countries' comment suggesting the possibility of exporting live animals from an infected country or zone also be considered in the CSF chapter, and will address this point in the next revision of the CSF chapter.

The Code Commission agreed to the deletion of point c from Articles 15.1.9. and 15.1.11., based on the following rationale provided by a Member Country:

"Some authors have suggested that ASFV can be found in boar semen and even transmitted to recipient sows (Thacker *et al.*, 1984; Wittmann, 1989; Guérin and Pozzi, 2005). However, the only evidence for this provided in any of these sources appears to be a personal communication by D.H. Schlafer in 1984. More recently, Maes *et al.* (2008) stated that there is no published evidence to support this hypothesis.

While it has been widely assumed that ASFV is likely to be transmitted in porcine semen, there is no published evidence to support this. If there is no evidence to support the imposition of sanitary measures for ASFV in porcine semen, they should be discontinued.

The OIE's *Handbook on Import Risk Analysis for Animals and Animal Products* states that "It is not acceptable to simply conclude that, because there is significant uncertainty, measures will be based on a precautionary approach. The rationale for selecting measures must be made apparent". In this case, there is no evidence to suggest that ASFV is likely to be transmitted through the international trade in porcine semen and the precautionary approach adopted by the inclusion of these articles is inconsistent with OIE guidance.

Guérin B. and Pozzi N. (2005). Viruses in boar semen: detection and clinical as well as epidemiological consequences regarding disease transmission by artificial insemination. *Theriogenology*, 63, 556–572.

Maes D., Nauwynck H., Rijsselaere T., Mateusen B., Vyt P., de Kruif A. & Van Soom A. (2008). Diseases in swine transmitted by artificial insemination: An overview. *Theriogenology*, 70, 1337–45.

Thacker B., Larsen R., Joo H.S. & Leman A. (1984). Swine diseases transmissible with artificial insemination. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 185, 511–6.

Wittmann G. (1989). Die bedeutung viraler erkrankungen beim schwein für die besamung und den embryotransfer (Significance of viral diseases in pigs during artificial insemination and embryo transfer). *Tierärztliche Umschau*, 44, 580–6."

In response to a Member Country's suggestion, the Code Commission revised point 1a of Article 15.1.11. to refer to an establishment according to normal *Code* format, rather than a compartment, which is covered elsewhere.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries' suggestion to add the words 'or introduced' to Article 15.1.12., to allow for animals moving between zones in a country as well as imported animals.

The Code Commission amended point 2 of Article 15.1.12., point 1 of Article 15.1.12.bis and point 1 of Article 15.1.13. to the standard generic *Code* format of 'with favourable results' for the required outcome of ante and post mortem inspections.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to include the words 'approved by the Veterinary Authority for export purposes' to point 2 of Article 15.1.2., since this is covered with the reference to Chapter 6.2.

The Code Commission amended the language in the requirements of Article 15.1.12.bis taking into account Member Countries' suggestions and established *Code* format.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member Country's suggestion to limit the scope of Article 15.1.13. to countries or zones free from ASF because this article is intended to apply to all countries regardless of their ASF status.

The Code Commission amended Articles 15.1.13. and 15.1.14. in response to Member Country's comments and to align with amendments made to similar provisions in previous articles, and standard *Code* format.

The Code Commission amended the title of Article 15.1.15. and moved it to become Article 15.1.17.ter so that the new title is congruent with previous articles in the chapter. Minor amendments were made within the article to align with standard *Code* format.

In response to a Member Country's new proposals for inactivation of ASFV the Code Commission reinstated separate articles for bristles from pigs and for litter and manure from pigs, and introduced new Articles 15.1.21.bis and ter with some recommendations being still 'under study'.

In response to a Member Country's request for information on inactivation of ASFV in swill the Code Commission advised that the provisions of Article 15.1.18. were informed by the common effective practices applied for many years in Member Countries where ASF is endemic.

The Code Commission made minor amendments to Articles 15.1.20. and 15.1.21., in response to a Member Country's comments to align with standard *Code* format.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission deleted repetitive text from the first two paragraphs of Article 15.1.22. and deleted 'the role of semen in transmission of ASFV' from the list of specific characteristics at the end of this article to align with the proposed revision of Article 15.1.9.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission amended point 1b of Article 15.1.23. and added a new point c to specifically include laboratory testing capability in this point 1. In point 2a of the same article the Code Commission addressed Member Countries' comments by replacing 'early warning system' with the glossary defined term '*early detection system*', included reference to the private sector and changed 'information programmes' to 'awareness programmes'.

In response to Member Countries' comments the Code Commission broadened the population referred to in Article 15.1.24. to 'domestic, *wild* and *feral* suids', and as a consequence deleted the second paragraph of this article. The virological surveillance provisions in point 3 and the serological surveillance provisions in point 4 of this article were amended in response to Member Countries' suggestions to improve clarity.

The title of Article 15.1.25. was amended to align with standard *Code* format and minor amendments were made to the article in response to Member Countries' suggestions to improve syntax and clarity.

In response to a Member Countries' suggestions the Code Commission broadened the scope of Article 15.1.26., replaced 'pigs' with 'suids' where relevant throughout the article, replaced 'should' with 'may' in point 3 and made minor amendments to improve syntax.

On the basis of Member Country suggestions the Code Commission also removed unnecessary words from Article 15.1.27. and added new text to improve clarity

The revised Chapter 15.1. is attached as [Annex 27](#) for Member Countries' comments.

Item 22 Draft new chapter on criteria for assessing the safety of commodities (Chapter X.X.)

Following Member Countries' comments on the glossary definition of *safe commodity* adopted in 2015, the Code Commission developed a draft chapter on the criteria to be used for assessing the safety of commodities.

The new draft Chapter X.X. is attached as [Annex 28](#) for Member Countries' comments.

G. OTHER ISSUES

Item 23 Update of the Code Commission's work programme

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

The revised work programme is attached as [Annex 29](#) for Member Countries' comments.

Item 24 Review of applications for recognition as OIE Collaborating Centres

- a) Online veterinary education products (USA)
- b) Infectious reproductive diseases (France)
- c) Capacity building in veterinary services (Thailand)

The Code Commission reviewed three applications for recognition as Collaborating Centres, and commended Headquarters for its work in preparing summary reviews of the applications.

The Code Commission supports the applications for 'Online veterinary education products' from the USA and 'Infectious reproductive diseases' from France. It noted that these applications were available for consideration at the February 2015 Code Commission meeting, but there had been insufficient time available to review them then.

With respect to another application, the Code Commission recommends that OIE Headquarters seek further information from the applicant with the aim of presenting a completed dossier for Code Commission review at its February 2016 meeting.

Item 25 Ad hoc Group on veterinary education report

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group meeting on veterinary education held in July 2015. The main focus of the meeting was the forthcoming fourth OIE Global Conference on Veterinary Education to be held Bangkok in June 2016. The potential for further work on continuing education is also noted. Headquarters staff updated the Commission on progress with developing the programme for the 2016 conference.

This *ad hoc* Group meeting report is attached as [Annex 34](#) for Member Countries' information.

Item 26 Proposed dates for next meetings

The 2016 Code Commission meetings are scheduled for February 8–19, and September 5–16 inclusive.

.../Annexes