



Organisation
Mondiale
de la Santé
Animale

World
Organisation
for Animal
Health

Organización
Mundial
de Sanidad
Animal

Original: English
September 2019

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

Paris, 10–19 September 2019

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at OIE Headquarters in Paris from 10 to 19 September 2019. The list of participants is attached as **Annex 1**.

The Code Commission thanked the following Members for providing comments: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China (People's Republic), Chinese Taipei, Japan, Korea (Republic), Mexico, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, the Member States of European Union (EU), the African Union Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of African Member Countries of the OIE and the Comité Veterinario Permanente del Cono Sur (CVP) on behalf of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay.

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments, which were submitted on time and supported by a rationale and amended relevant chapters of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Terrestrial Code*) where appropriate. **The Code Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were difficult to interpret.** Due to the large volume of work, the Code Commission was not able to draft a detailed explanation of the reasons for accepting or not each of the comments received and focused its explanations on the major ones. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. The Code Commission wished to note that not all texts proposed by Members to improve clarity were accepted; in these cases it considered the text clear as currently written.

The amendments are presented in the usual manner by 'double underline' and '~~striketrough~~' and the chapters are annexed to this report. In Annexes **4** to **28** amendments proposed at this meeting are highlighted with a coloured background to distinguish them from those proposed previously.

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

Members should note that texts in **Part A (Annexes 4 to 17)** of this report are circulated for Member comments and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020. **Part B (Annexes 3, 18 to 28)** includes texts that are circulated for Members comments only. The reports of meetings of *ad hoc* Groups and other related documents are attached for information in **Part C**.

All comments on relevant texts in **Part A** and **Part B** must reach OIE Headquarters **by 20 December 2019** for them to be considered at the February 2020 meeting of the Code Commission. Comments received after the due date will not be submitted to the Code Commission for its consideration. In addition, the Code Commission would like to highlight that comments should be submitted through the OIE Delegate of Member Countries or organisations which the OIE has a Cooperative Agreement with.

All comments and related documents should be sent by email to the OIE Standards Department at: **standards.dept@oie.int**.

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

Table of Contents:

Item No.	Agenda	Page No.	Annex No.
1	Welcome from the Deputy Director General	4	-
2	Meeting with the Director General	4	-
3	Adoption of agenda	4	2 (Part A)
4	Cooperation with other Specialist Commissions	4	-
5	Code Commission's Work Programme	5	3 (Part B)
6.	Texts proposed for adoption in May 2020	Page No.	Part A: Annex No.
6.1.	User's Guide	6	4
6.2.	Glossary Part A ('epidemiological unit')	6	5
	Animal Health Surveillance (Article 1.4.3)	6	6
6.3.	Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1)	6	7
6.4.	Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE (Chapter 1.6)	7	8
6.5.	Veterinary legislation (Chapter 3.4)	9	9
6.6.	Draft new chapter on official control programmes for listed and emerging diseases (Chapter 4.Y)	13	10
6.7.	Draft new chapter on animal welfare and laying hen production systems (Chapter 7.Z)	17	11,12
6.8.	Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4)	18	13,14
	Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Article 1.3.6)	18	15
6.9.	Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus (Articles 14.7.3, 14.7.7, 14.7.24 and 14.7.34)	22	16
6.10.	Infection with classical swine fever virus (Chapter 15.2)	24	17

7.	Texts for comments	Page No.	Part B: Annex No.
7.1.	Glossary Part B ('captive wild [animal]', 'feral [animal]', 'wild [animal]' 'slaughter', 'euthanasia', 'stunning', 'death', 'distress', 'pain' and 'suffering')	28	18
7.2.	Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Articles 1.3.1 and 1.3.9)	29	19
7.3.	Quality of Veterinary Services, Evaluation of Veterinary Services, and draft new chapter on Veterinary Services (Chapters 3.1, 3.2, 3.X)	29	20,21,22
7.4.	Slaughter of animals (Chapter 7.5)	30	23
7.5.	Draft new chapter on infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (Chapter 8.Y)	31	24
7.6.	Infection with Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex (Chapter 8.11)	32	-
7.7.	Infection with Rift Valley fever virus (Chapter 8.15)	32	25
7.8.	Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.4)	34	26,27
7.9.	Infection with equine influenza (Article 12.6.6)	37	28
8.	Other topics for information	Page No.	Annex No.
8.1.	Glossary definitions for 'Competent Authority', 'Veterinary Authority' and 'Veterinary Services'	38	-
8.2.	General hygiene in semen collection and processing centres and collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen (Chapters 4.6 and 4.7)	38	-
8.3.	Revision of collection and processing of oocytes and <i>in vitro</i> produced embryos from livestock and horses (Chapter 4.9) to include bovine viral diarrhea	38	-
8.4.	Infection with rinderpest virus (Chapter 8.16)	39	-
8.5.	Contagious equine metritis and equine piroplasmiasis (Chapters 12.2 and 12.7)	39	-
8.6.	Harmonisation of <i>Terrestrial Code</i> chapters for diseases with OIE official status recognition	39	-
8.7.	The Scientific Commission's recommendation on the evaluation of pathogenic agents against the listing criteria	39	-
9.	Date of next meeting	40	-
	Ad hoc Group reports and other documents for information		Part C: Annex No.
6.7.	Report of the meeting of the OIE <i>ad hoc</i> Group on animal welfare and laying hen production systems, 2–4 April 2019	-	29
6.8.	Report of the meeting of the OIE <i>ad hoc</i> Group on avian influenza, 11–13 June 2019	-	30
7.3.	Report of the meeting of the OIE <i>ad hoc</i> Group on Veterinary Services, 3–5 July 2019	-	31
7.4.	Report of the meeting of the OIE <i>ad hoc</i> Group on the revision of Chapter 7.5 Slaughter of animals and Chapter 7.6 Killing of animals for disease control purposes, 25–27 June 2019	-	32
7.8.	Chapter 1.8 Application for official recognition by the OIE of risk status for bovine spongiform encephalopathy	-	33,34
	Summary of changes proposed by <i>ad hoc</i> Groups on BSE		35

1. Welcome from the Deputy Director General

Dr Matthew Stone, OIE Deputy Director General for International Standards and Science, welcomed the members of the Commission and thanked them, their institutions and their governments for making their expertise and time available to support the OIE's work.

Dr Stone provided the Commission with a brief overview of the development of the draft 7th Strategic Plan, noting its focus on scientific expertise and the use of multidisciplinary evidence in standard setting and capacity building; ensuring the OIE is a good partner, and targets collaborations for impact, including in multilateral fora related to UN's Sustainable Development Goals; improving monitoring and evaluation to demonstrate performance across our strategies, programmes and projects; and the development of internal data management, stewardship and governance practices that support the ongoing digital transformation of the OIE. He also provided a brief update on the culmination of the design phase of the OIE Observatory project; the OIE-WAHIS development project; and the ongoing work on the OIE Reference Centre system.

Dr Stone noted that the OIE's continuous improvement approach to ensuring good coordination across all the Specialist Commissions through the internal mechanism of the Common Secretariat is maturing and demonstrating its benefits. The recent focus had been on identifying and supporting discussions between Commissions on common issues. He finished his opening remarks by reassuring members that the OIE's performance management system for Specialist Commissions was providing very useful feedback, and all parties could now appreciate the process was important to optimise the performance and transparency of the elected Commissions and the OIE Secretariat working in partnership.

2. Meeting with the Director General

Dr Monique Eloit, the OIE Director General, met with the Code Commission met on 16 September 2019 and thanked its members for their support and commitment to achieving OIE objectives. Dr Eloit updated the Code Commission on the work currently being undertaken to develop the 7th Strategic Plan. She also discussed the work programme of the Code Commission and other topics related to its work and performance.

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

3. Adoption of agenda

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

4. Cooperation with other Specialist Commissions

4.1. Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases

The opinion of the Scientific Commission was requested and coordinated through the OIE Secretariat for relevant comments received on draft chapters circulated in February 2019. The Code Commission wished to thank the Scientific Commission for this collaborative work as well as its advice on a number of other topics identified in the February 2019 meeting report. Consideration of the Scientific Commission's inputs is noted under the relevant agenda items.

During the September 2019 meeting, two side meetings were held:

- **Meeting of the Bureaus of the Code Commission and Scientific Commission**

The Bureaus (i.e. the President and two Vice-Presidents) of the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission held a meeting chaired by Dr Matthew Stone. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an occasion where the two Bureaus could be informed about the planning and coordination of relevant topics of common interest and, where necessary, prioritise them and agree on the process to manage these topics. This meeting also allowed for better alignment of the work programme and agenda of both the Code Commission and Scientific Commission.

- **Technical working group meeting related to the concept of ‘protection zone’**

The Presidents and First Vice-Presidents of the Code Commission and Scientific Commission held a third technical working group meeting chaired by Dr Matthew Stone. Previous meetings had been held in September 2018 and February 2019.

The aim of these discussions was to agree on a mechanism that would allow Members to implement enhanced preventive measures to protect their animal health status in response to an increased risk of disease incursion, while minimising the impact on their status and consequently on trade.

Possible amendments to existing provisions in Chapter 4.4 of the *Terrestrial Code* were discussed, in particular those related to a protection zone, and participants agreed on the principles to apply for these amendments. The potential impact on the OIE procedure for official recognition of disease status was also noted, mainly in relation to the maintenance of ‘freedom’ from disease in the rest of the country or zone when an outbreak occurs within the protection zone.

The OIE Secretariat was requested to prepare draft amendments to Chapter 4.4 based on the outcome of the discussions, to be considered by both Commissions in February 2020.

The outcome of discussions and the respective amendments to Chapter 4.4 will impact on some disease-specific chapters under revision, such as Chapter 8.8 Infection with foot and mouth disease virus.

4.2. Biological Standards Commission

The OIE Secretariat to the Biological Standards Commission provided a brief update to the Code Commission on relevant activities of the Biological Standards Commission, including chapters in the *Terrestrial Manual* that are being revised as well as other items of interest. A similar report was presented by the OIE Secretariat to the Code Commission to the Biological Standards Commission on relevant activities of the Code Commission. Both Commissions agreed that this new item on information sharing was very useful and helped to strengthen the linkages between the two Commissions.

The Code Commission also sought the advice of the Biological Standards Commission on some of the comments received on draft chapters circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2019 meeting report. The Code Commission wished to thank the Biological Standards Commission for its support.

5. Code Commission’s work programme

The Code Commission updated its work programme and revised the order of items under ‘Sections 8 to 15’ to reflect the level of prioritisation.

Under the point 4 of the section on Glossary, the Code Commission briefly discussed the use of the terms ‘commodities’, ‘animal products’, ‘products of animal origin’ and ‘animal by-products’ in the *Terrestrial Code* based on a discussion paper prepared by a Commission member. The Code Commission acknowledged the importance of clarifying the use of these terms and whether to develop definitions for some terms. It agreed to continue this work out of session and to discuss further at its next meeting.

The Code Commission received a request to review Chapter 9.4 Infestation with *Aethina Tumida* (Small hive beetle) with regard to the timing of inspection prior to export, and included this item to its work programme. The Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat seek expert advice on the proposal in order to prioritise this request.

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

The updated work programme is attached as **Annex 3** for Member comments.

6. Texts proposed for adoption in May 2020

6.1. User's Guide

Comments were received from the EU.

Background

Amendments to the User's Guide were circulated to Members in the Code Commission's February 2019 meeting report proposing to replace 'pathogenic agents' with 'diseases, infections and infestations' under point 3 of Section B for consistency with terminology used throughout the *Terrestrial Code*, and to include a reference to Chapter 2.2 on the safety of commodities under point 5 of Section C.

In response to a comment asking why Glossary terms were not italicised in the User's Guide, the Code Commission explained that this is because the Glossary appears after the User's Guide.

The User's Guide is attached as **Annex 4** for Member comments and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

6.2. Glossary Part A ('epidemiological unit')

Comments were received from Argentina, USA and the EU.

The Code Commission considered comments received and highlighted that the last four sentences in the definition were provided to describe how epidemiological units may be applied in practice and were not intended to be exhaustive. The Code Commission agreed that these sentences are useful and therefore proposed that this text be moved to point 1(d) of Article 1.4.3 in Chapter 1.4 Animal Health Surveillance. Although Annex 6 presents the whole point 1 of Article 1.4.3 for ease of reference, Member comments are sought specifically for point 1(d) where the proposed amendments are being made.

The Code Commission also noted that the definition for 'epidemiological unit' as described in the first sentence is similar to the definition for 'epidemiological unit' that can be found in reference texts. In agreement with advice from the Scientific Commission, however, the Code Commission considered it appropriate to keep this part as a Glossary definition for the *Terrestrial Code* due to recognised reliance by many Members on the definition.

The Glossary definition for 'epidemiological unit' is attached as **Annex 5** for Member comments, and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

The revised Article 1.4.3 is attached as **Annex 6** for Member comments, and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

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

Comments were received from Australia, Chile, New Zealand, Singapore, USA and the EU.

General comments

The Code Commission noted the comments received on the use of the terms 'disease', 'infection' and 'infestation', and clarified that these terms are used throughout the *Terrestrial Code* as follows:

- 'Disease' is used when referring to general aspects pertaining to the expression, epidemiology and transmission of pathogenic agents. (The Code Commission reiterated that 'disease' is no longer a defined term in the *Terrestrial Code*. In some Glossary definitions such as 'listed disease', 'notifiable disease' and 'emerging disease', the word disease is italicised as it is part of these defined terms.)

- ‘Infection’ and ‘infestation’, as defined in the Glossary, are used in more specific contexts such as cases, outbreaks, incursions, surveillance, control, eradication and free status.
- All terms ‘disease’, ‘infection’ and ‘infestation’ may be used in the context of describing spread.

The Code Commission noted in agreement with the Scientific Commission that as they apply this approach throughout the *Terrestrial Code*, if they find exceptions they will provide a rationale when they propose a change.

Article 1.1.2

In response to comments regarding the addition of ‘within 24 hours’ in point 3, the Code Commission reminded Members that this amendment had been made to ensure consistency with Article 1.1.3. In order to address these comments, the Code Commission agreed with one of the comments to replace ‘immediate’ with ‘initial’ and delete ‘within 24 hours’ noting that the sentence describes the events in the time span beginning from initial notification through to the final report.

Given some of the confusion over the use of the term disease, the Code Commission agreed to replace the terms ‘disease, infection or infestation’ by ‘listed disease and emerging disease’, noting that this article refers to notification of listed and emerging diseases.

Article 1.1.4

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to specify that notification for an emerging disease should be made ‘within 24 hours’ because of the difficulties involved in defining within 24 hours, whether the event meets the definition of an emerging disease.

The revised Chapter 1.1 Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information is attached as [Annex 7](#) for Member comments, and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

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

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

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission had agreed, in coordination with the Scientific Commission to harmonise provisions in disease-specific chapters for official recognition of status (see Item 8.6). Common provisions concerning procedures applicable to the diseases with official status recognition would be addressed in Chapter 1.6 instead of being repeated in each disease-specific chapter.

General comment

In response to a comment on standardising the use of the singular form of the term ‘Member Country’, the Code Commission agreed and applied this throughout the text, where relevant.

Title

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to change the order of the three types of status in the title of Chapter 1.6 and amended the title to ‘Procedures for official recognition of an animal health status, endorsement of an official control programme, and publication of a self-declaration of animal health status, by the OIE’.

The order of the articles in the chapter were also re-ordered to reflect this sequence. In the Annex, Members should note that the re-ordered text is reflected by the change in the Article numbers.

To ensure consistency with the title, the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘disease freedom’ by ‘animal health status’ throughout the text.

Article 1.6.1 (Article 1.6.2 in the previous draft)

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to amend the title of this article to include ‘official’ before the words ‘animal health status’ and agreed to keep it as ‘official recognition of animal health status’ in accordance with the title of the chapter. The Code Commission also noted the comment from OIE Secretariat that when the draft chapter has been adopted, all relevant OIE documents including the Standard Operating Procedure will be harmonised.

Regarding comments questioning the purpose of an official control programme for dog-mediated rabies when there is no official animal health status recognised for rabies, the Code Commission noted that as described in Article 8.14.11, the purpose of an OIE endorsed official control programme is for Members to progressively improve their dog-mediated rabies situation. The Commission highlighted that the endorsement of official control programmes does not necessarily have a link with the procedure for official disease status; the procedure to self-declare freedom from dog-mediated rabies is available. The Commission also emphasised that this mechanism is a useful tool to support and contribute to the Global Strategic Plan for Dog-mediated Human Rabies Elimination. For point 1(e), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to harmonise the wording with terminology used in Chapter 8.8 and replaced ‘with or without vaccination’ with ‘where vaccination is either practised or not practised’.

In response to comments requesting to include a reference to the rabies questionnaire in paragraph 4, the Code Commission clarified that until the questionnaire has been published, a reference cannot be included.

In paragraph 7, the Code Commission agreed to insert ‘geographical’ before ‘boundaries’ for clarity, and correspondingly deleted the terms ‘describing the geographical boundaries of the zone’ at the end of the sentence. The Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘susceptible animals and their products’ in the last sentence with ‘commodities’ for consistency with other chapters.

In paragraph 8, in response to a comment that there is no official recognition of animal health status for dog-mediated rabies, the Code Commission proposed amendments to address the possibility of self-declaration for dog-mediated rabies.

Article 1.6.2 (Article 1.6.3 in the previous draft)

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to specify ‘list’ in the first sentence and amended the sentence accordingly. For consistency with the terms used in Chapter 1.1, the Code Commission replaced the word ‘reported’ with ‘notified’.

In the last indent, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘or distribution’ noting that this is an important piece of evidence for the withdrawal of endorsement of an official control programme.

Article 1.6.3 (Article 1.6.1 in the previous draft)

In the first indent and second indent of the first sentence of Article 1.6.3, the Code Commission proposed to include ‘infection or infestation’, in line with the agreed approach for these terms (see Item 6.3).

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘disease-free’ before ‘status’ in this article as it considered the freedom status is being referred to in the text as written. Furthermore, the addition of ‘disease’ may be confusing as freedom refers to freedom from infection or infestation.

In the last sentence of the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to amend the text to ‘publish the self-declaration to provide information to OIE Member Countries’ as it considered the current wording described the procedure more accurately.

The Code Commission noted a comment requesting clarity on the ‘Procedure for the application for the publication by the OIE of a self-declaration of disease freedom’ (SOP), in particular whether Article 1.4.6 or the disease-specific chapter should be referred to for historical freedom. The Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission clarified that in the absence of specific requirements or unless otherwise specified in the disease-specific chapter for freedom from a particular disease, compliance with the relevant horizontal chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* should be applied. The requirements of a disease-specific chapter provide the framework for interpretation of compliance by adding specificity to requirements in a horizontal chapter. Notwithstanding, the Commission noted that OIE Secretariat will update the SOP to clarify the guidance regarding self-declarations on the basis of historical freedom.

In the third indent, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘surveillance and early warning system’ with ‘surveillance, including an early warning system’ agreeing that this was in line with Chapter 1.4 where an early warning system is a component of surveillance.

Regarding a comment seeking clarification on the objective of ‘administrative and technical screening’, the Code Commission noted the explanation provided by the OIE Secretariat that administrative screening entails checking that the structure of the self-declaration dossier is in accordance with the SOP, whilst technical screening involves the assessment of the dossier to ensure that sufficient information on the provisions of the specific disease or relevant horizontal chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* has been provided and is consistent with the information reported by the Members to OIE WAHIS.

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission and Scientific Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘except when otherwise provided for in the listed disease specific chapter’ at the start of the first sentence, as the occurrence of an outbreak does not automatically change the status of a country or zone for certain diseases, depending on provisions in the disease-specific chapter.

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add more detail on the recovery of a lost self-declared free status by aligning the text with Article 4.4.7 and to make reference to Article 1.4.6, noting that when a self-declared free status is lost, the procedure is to submit a new self-declaration in accordance with the procedures described in this article.

The revised Chapter 1.6 Procedures for official recognition of an animal health status, endorsement of an official control programme, and publication of a self-declaration of animal health status, by the OIE is attached as **Annex 8** for Member comments and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

6.5. Veterinary legislation (Chapter 3.4)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, China (People’s Republic), Chile, Chinese Taipei, New Zealand, Singapore, USA, the EU, AU-IBAR, and CVP.

Background

A full review of Chapter 3.4 Veterinary legislation was undertaken by the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary legislation in January 2018. A draft revised chapter has been circulated for Member comments on two occasions, September 2018 and February 2019.

General comments

In response to a comment, the Code Commission reviewed the use of the terms ‘establishment’, ‘facility’, and ‘premise’ throughout the chapter and amended the text to ensure consistency. The Commission recalled that ‘establishment’ is a defined term in the Glossary referring only to the premises in which animals are kept.

Article 3.4.2

Regarding the definition for the ‘veterinary domain’, the Code Commission did not agree with comments requesting to replace ‘veterinary public health’ with ‘public health’ and reiterated the need to refer to ‘veterinary public health’ because not all components of public health pertain to the veterinary domain. The Commission emphasised that this definition refers only to the ‘veterinary’ aspects of the public health sector. In response to a comment to include a definition for ‘veterinary public health’ in the Glossary, the Commission recalled that Chapter 6.1 Introduction to recommendations for veterinary public health provides further details on veterinary public health, taking a ‘one health’ approach, and therefore considered there was no need to add a new specific definition.

Article 3.4.3

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘as soon as possible’ with ‘without delay’ noting that the process to develop legislation may encounter unavoidable delays.

In point 4, in response to a comment, the Commission amended the text to ensure that it covered the inclusion of all relevant stakeholders in the consultative processes related to veterinary legislation.

In point 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to add ‘as much as possible’ concerning the protection of citizens, as it considered it unnecessary. However, the Commission did agree with a comment to amend the text to address the protection of the environment.

Article 3.4.4

The Code Commission agreed to include a new point 7 to ensure that the collection, use of, and disclosure of the information is appropriately covered under veterinary legislation.

In point 8, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘regulations’ with ‘secondary legislation’ agreeing that depending on the legal system, the terms for legal instruments and their meaning could vary significantly.

Article 3.4.5

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment proposing to replace ‘that is effective, as short as possible, and with all responsibilities clearly defined’ by ‘that is effective, efficient and with all responsibilities clearly defined’, as it considered that this change would change the meaning, and highlighted that it was important to have as few steps as possible in the chain of command.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add the phrase ‘including clarifying the role of each Competent Authority’ to reflect the importance of avoiding overlapping roles and regulatory gaps.

In point 1(b), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘good faith’ as it considered it necessary to specify that actions were not from dishonest or insincere intention. The Commission also noted this was a well understood dictionary term.

In point 1(d)(i), the Code Commission agreed to amend the term ‘vehicles’ to ‘vehicles/vessels’ for alignment with the Glossary definition. This amendment was made throughout the chapter.

In point 1(d)(iii), in response to a comment as to whether the inclusion of ‘establishment of compensation mechanisms’ created an obligation to Members, the Commission emphasised that this article does not prescribe the implementation of any specific compensation mechanisms, but it recommends that veterinary legislation should provide the Veterinary Authority with the power to establish compensation mechanisms. On the same point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete the list of sanitary measures explaining that the list does not have to be exhaustive and provides useful guidance for Members.

In point 2, in response to a comment regarding the use of the term ‘delegation’, the Code Commission recognised the possibility that different countries use different terminology in their legislation, but considered that the term ‘delegation’ was the most appropriate term to use when referring to the power of a Competent Authority to entrust others to conduct, on its behalf, a task for which it had the primary responsibility.

Article 3.4.6

In points 1(d)(i), (ii) and (iii), the Code Commission agreed with a comment that these points covered all veterinarians and therefore amended the text to refer to the ‘various professional categories of veterinarians (e.g. specialisations)’.

In point 1(d)(vi), the Code Commission agreed with a comment that it was important to ensure that procedural fairness is facilitated in situations relating to veterinarian conduct and competence, and amended the text accordingly.

In point 1(d)(vii), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete this point noting that in some cases it was not the responsibility of the veterinary statutory body to regulate which persons other than veterinarians could undertake activities that are normally carried out by veterinarians. The Commission referred readers to the rationale that was provided in its February 2019 meeting report for this point and reminded Members that the text had been modified to reflect that the veterinary statutory body may define the conditions, but it is the responsibility of the Competent Authority to decide the situations where this could be allowed.

Article 3.4.7

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to add ‘reporting’ after ‘obligations’ as it considered reporting was part of obligations.

In point 1(c), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘testing’ with ‘analyses’, noting that ‘testing’ was in line with the relevant terms used in the *Terrestrial Manual* for ‘Testing methods’ and ‘tests’.

In point 1(c), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘animal health, veterinary public health’ after ‘for the purposes of’, as it considered that points (a), (b) and (c) clearly define three different types of laboratories.

Article 3.4.8

In point 2(b), the Code Commission did not agree with comments to add ‘cleaning and’ before ‘disinfection’ because this is already addressed by the Glossary definition for ‘disinfection’.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘animal welfare and ethical consideration’, noting that animal welfare is addressed in Article 3.4.10.

The Code Commission agreed to add a new point 4(a) for alignment with point 5(a).

In point 4(b), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text to include other biological, chemical or physical risks.

In point 5(d), the Code Commission agreed with a comment that the meaning of this point was unclear, and deleted the point, noting that the animal owner’s compliance with rules was not specific to this point.

Article 3.4.9

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to recommend that legislation should provide for the listing and mandatory reporting of all OIE listed diseases within the country. The Commission emphasised that mandatory reporting within a country should be in accordance with each country’s situation, and some of the OIE listed diseases may not be relevant. Nevertheless, the Commission amended the text to clarify that veterinary legislation should provide powers for the Veterinary Authority to access information needed to comply with its obligation to notify all listed diseases to the OIE.

In point 2(b)(ii), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include the phrase ‘including the capacity to destroy livestock and declare quarantine areas’, noting that this was already addressed in Article 3.4.5.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a request to add a new point (d) on the provision of the storage for materials for disease prevention and control, noting that this was included in ‘logistic organisation’ in point 2(b)(i).

Article 3.4.10

In the second paragraph of point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include the words ‘cruelty or’ before ‘neglect’. The Commission also agreed to remove ‘animal keepers’ because ‘cruelty’ or ‘neglect’ could be related to a variety of actors.

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘domestic’ in the subheading to clarify that this clause was not intended for wildlife.

Article 3.4.11

In point 1(b), the Code Commission agreed with a comment requesting to take into consideration the disposal of veterinary medicinal products and amended the text accordingly.

In response to a comment requesting to clarify if veterinary medicinal products would include veterinary biologics used for research purposes, the Code Commission clarified that this was covered by the Glossary definition for ‘*veterinary medicinal product*’ i.e. ‘any product with approved claims to having a prophylactic, therapeutic or diagnostic effect or to alter physiological functions when administered or applied to an animal’.

In point 2(b), in response to a comment, the Code Commission clarified that this point does not pertain to proteins contained in a vaccine which do not allow for differentiation between exposure and vaccinal reaction but rather this point refers to substances that could be intentionally added to the formulation.

In point 3, the Code Commission clarified that point 3(b)(i) referred to all types veterinary medicinal products incorporated into feed, while point 3(b)(ii) referred to all products prepared by authorised veterinarians or authorised pharmacists, irrespective of their use. The Commission agreed with a comment proposing to include a new point (v) regarding restrictions of use of veterinary medicinal products for food-producing animals.

In point 4(c), the Code Commission did not agree to add a reference to distribution, noting that it was already addressed in point 1(b) and 5(a).

In point 5(b), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘appropriate labelling’ agreeing that labelling is critical for the effective use of veterinary medicinal products.

In points 5(f) and 5(g), in response to comments the Code Commission amended the texts to include a reference to a system of surveillance of falsification and a system of surveillance of the quality of veterinary medicinal products marketed.

Article 3.4.12

In point 2(b), in response to a comment the Code Commission clarified that the ‘visible marks’ referred to visual proof on the products, showing that the product complied with health standards in a broader sense, and not only to ante and post-mortem inspection. The Code Commission also noted that the use of visible marks would apply not only to meat but also to other animal products such as milk and honey, for example.

In the last paragraph of point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add more detail, as it considered that the means to prevent the operator from producing and distributing withdrawn products in the future was implicit in the existing text.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with adding a new point on the ‘the recognition of quality assurance systems’ noting that this was out of the scope of the chapter.

The Code Commission noted a comment highlighting the importance of the public-private partnerships (PPP) but did not agree to include a new article as it considered that in Article 3.4.5 point 2 Delegation of powers by the Competent Authority the current text addresses the provision of the necessary basis within the legislation to make these partnerships possible.

The revised Chapter 3.4 Veterinary legislation attached as **Annex 9** for Member comments and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

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

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

Background

The first draft of this new chapter was circulated for Member comments in the Code Commission’s February 2017 meeting report. Since that time, the Commission has made significant amendments to the content of this chapter having taken into consideration the important feedback received from Members during five rounds of comments. During the development of this new draft chapter the Code Commission has also consulted with the Scientific Commission to address specific comments and text. The latest version was circulated in the Commission’s February 2019 meeting report.

General comments

In response to a comment requesting to clarify the difference between official control programme and disease contingency plan, the Code Commission reiterated that official control programmes, as defined in the Glossary of the *Terrestrial Code* ‘means a programme which is approved, and managed or supervised by the Veterinary Authority of a Member Country for the purposes of controlling a vector, pathogenic agent or disease by specific measures applied throughout that Member Country, or within a zone or compartment of that Member Country’ whereas disease contingency plans are developed only for emergencies and are part of the official control programme as described in point 3 of Article 4.Y.1. The Code Commission also noted a comment regarding consistency in the use of the terms ‘listed disease’ and ‘emerging disease’, and reviewed the usage of these terms throughout the chapter to ensure the correct use for each specific situation.

The Code Commission clarified that this chapter addressed official control programmes in general, whether or not they are endorsed by the OIE.

In response to a comment that the Glossary term ‘commodity’ was not used in a consistent manner in this chapter, the Code Commission reviewed the text to ensure its consistent use.

Title

The Code Commission did not agree with a suggestion to add ‘Recommendations on’ at the beginning of the title of the chapter as it is not in line with the current convention for chapter titles used in the *Terrestrial Code*, except for introductory chapters. The Code Commission noted that all chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* contain recommendations thus it is not necessary to highlight this in the title.

Article 4.Y.1

The Code Commission agreed with a comment requesting to change the order of the first three paragraphs to provide a more logical flow, and amended the text accordingly.

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to move ‘including zoonosis’ in the first sentence to the second sentence for consistency with point 1 of Article 4.Y.2.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a proposal to delete the entire paragraph because its content focused on management of outbreaks of listed diseases, which was the initial title of the chapter, as it was of the view that the paragraph was still relevant to this chapter, despite the change in focus of the chapter.

The Code Commission did not agree to a comment requesting to include ‘or Veterinary Services’ after ‘Veterinary Authority’ noting that Veterinary Services are under the overall control and direction of the Veterinary Authority, in accordance with the current Glossary definitions. The Code Commission did not agree with a suggestion to add ‘undertake a risk assessment and’ before ‘implement control measures’ agreeing that the text should not be too prescriptive in this general introductory article. Furthermore, risk analysis, including risk assessment, is addressed in point 1 of Article 4.Y.3.

In the fifth paragraph, the Code Commission noted a comment that there were still inconsistencies regarding the use of the terms ‘disease’, ‘infection’ and ‘infestation’ in this chapter. The Commission did not agree with a suggestion to reinstate ‘disease’ after ‘the eradication of a given’ as this was not in line with the agreed approach for the use of these terms (see Item 6.3).

For point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘appropriate’ with ‘relevant’, as it considered that ‘appropriate’ is a better fit for the intent of this point.

For point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘as appropriate’ after ‘emergency preparedness plans and emergency response plans’, as official control programmes should include plans for emergencies and endemic diseases since the epidemiological situation may evolve in a way that is not manageable with routine activities.

For point 4, in response to a comment suggesting to add ‘infection and infestation’ after ‘surveillance of the relevant disease’, the Code Commission amended the text to read ‘surveillance of the relevant infection or infestation’ as to align with the agreed approach for the use of these terms (see Item 6.3).

For point 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘in accordance with Chapter 1.1’ at the end as this point noting that this point is about internal reporting within countries and is different from disease notification to the OIE, which is addressed in Chapter 1.1.

For point 6, in response to a comment to include ‘infection and infestation’ after ‘cases of the relevant disease’, the Code Commission amended the text to read ‘cases of the relevant infection or infestation’ to align with the agreed approach for the use of these terms (see Item 6.3).

For point 7, in response to a comment to add ‘infection and infestation’ after ‘spread of the relevant disease’, the Code Commission amended the text to read ‘spread of the relevant infection or infestation’ to align with the agreed approach for the use of these terms (see Item 6.3).

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘including’ with ‘and’ explaining that movement control is a part of sanitary measures.

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission, in response to comments, included a separate sentence to highlight the importance of evaluation of the programmes at the beginning of the paragraph while emphasising that plans can be tested before the implementation of programme components but the programmes can only be evaluated afterwards.

Article 4.Y.2

For the first indent under point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘with the possibility of obliging owners to assist’ as it considered this statement to be clear as written and noted that in this sentence ‘assist’ means help and participate.

For the fifth indent under point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘as part of disease control efforts’ at the end, as it considered this point to be implicit in the current draft.

For the fourth indent under point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘animals in contact and potentially infected or contaminated’ before ‘commodities and fomites’ for consistency with Article 4.Y.5, as it considered the current text to be clear as written and noted this point was a general consideration.

For the fifth indent under point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to cross-reference Chapter 4.4 noting that Article 4.Y.8 specifically addresses zoning and refers to Chapter 4.4.

For the sixth indent under point 3, in response to a suggestion to add ‘and samples collected from fomites if relevant’ at the end for completeness, the Code Commission addressed this by deleting ‘animal’ to clarify that samples may be taken from not just animals.

For the tenth indent under point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘products of animal origin’ with ‘commodities and fomites’, as this text is about commodities and fomites is addressed in the next indented text.

For the thirteenth indent under point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘for countries that have established mechanisms for compensation,’ at the beginning in order to take into account some Members may not be able to comply with the provisions for compensation. Indeed, the Code Commission stressed that all recommendations in the *Terrestrial Code* are meant to guide Members in the development of their measures, that compensation mechanisms are an essential component in disease control efforts like other human and financial resources and that this statement is about establishing those mechanisms for compensation.

Article 4.Y.3

For the first paragraph, the Code Commission considered a comment questioning whether there should be an official control programme against all diseases that meet the criteria in the first sentence, and clarified that this was not the case and amended the text accordingly. The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to insert ‘according to an evaluation of the actual or likely impact of the disease or risk analysis’ in the first sentence, as it considered it implicit that such an evaluation is performed by Veterinary Authorities.

In point 2(b), the Code Commission considered that since the article was about emergencies, it was logical to refer to an emergency in the text, rather than to the occurrence of a listed or emerging disease.

For point 3, following advice from the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary emergencies, the Code Commission proposed to add a sentence defining simulation exercises. The Code Commission also agreed with a comment that simulation exercises within a country should be encouraged, and amended the text accordingly.

Article 4.Y.4

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘and’ with ‘or’ in the text ‘Chapter 1.4 and listed disease-specific chapters’ noting that all chapters were relevant, i.e. Chapter 1.4 provides general recommendations for animal health surveillance and disease-specific chapters complement these recommendations or add specific requirements for each disease, as appropriate.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘detect suspected cases and either rule them out or confirm them’ with ‘confirm cases’, explaining that surveillance first detects suspected cases. The Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘full sanitary measures’ with ‘the approved control programme’ noting that implementation of full sanitary measures is critical in the control of the disease and this is worth highlighting.

Article 4.Y.5

For point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and surveillance’ after ‘tracing forward and backward’, noting that an epidemiological investigation is part of surveillance (as described in Chapter 1.4) and inclusion of ‘surveillance’ in this sentence could lead to confusion. The Commission also noted that post-control surveillance was addressed in Article 4.Y.12.

For the first indent under point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace 'dead animals' with 'carcasses' explaining that carcasses were not in line with the terminology used in Chapter 4.13 Disposal of dead animals. The Commission agreed with a comment to add some examples of fomites and amended the text accordingly.

For point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a suggestion to insert a new indent on zoning, explaining that as zoning is not a measure *per se*, but rather a framework for the implementation of measures. For the third indent, the Code Commission agreed with a comment that the activities listed are not limited to animals that are at-risk of being infected and amended the text accordingly.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission considered a comment seeking clarification on 'partial control' and replaced this term by 'prevalence control'. The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete the examples in the third sentence of the paragraph as although examples are not usually given in the *Terrestrial Code*, in this case the Commission considered it may be useful for Members to have some examples to refer to with regard to choice of strategy. The Commission amended the text regarding compensation for clarity.

Article 4.Y.6

In the first paragraph, in response to a comment to replace 'remain contaminated' with 'continue to contaminate the environment, the Code Commission addressed this concern by amending the text to read 'remain infective'.

In the fourth paragraph of point 1, the Code Commission considered a comment questioning whether depopulation is the same as killing in the context of wildlife. The Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat seek advice from the Working Group on Wildlife as to which term is the most appropriate in this context to be discussed at the Code Commission meeting of February 2020.

In the fifth paragraph of point 1, the Code Commission considered a comment requesting to delete 'rendering plant' on grounds that slaughtering of animals should not be undertaken at a rendering plant. The Commission did not agree explaining that depending on the country or in specific situations killing or slaughter of animals may take place at rendering plants.

In the last paragraph of point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include text that notes that when disinfection is not practical, alternate means of elimination of the causal pathogenic agent such as extended fallowing periods or composting should be permitted.

Article 4.Y.8

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to add 'biosecurity and communication' after 'surveillance' for completeness.

Article 4.Y.9

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace 'unwanted animals' with 'animals that are capable of transmitting the disease', explaining that the proposed term could be confusing and mean 'susceptible animals', while 'unwanted animals' may include more than only those capable of transmitting the disease, e.g. any animals from outside the premises, and this would be a decision made by the owner or operator of the premises.

Article 4.Y.10

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a sentence regarding animal identification and animal traceability, explaining that this was addressed in point 3 of Article 4.Y.2.

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include a sentence regarding a vaccination-to-kill strategy and differentiating infected and vaccinated animals, as it considered this to be too detailed to be included in this article. The Commission reminded Members that Chapter 4.18 addresses vaccination.

Article 4.Y.11

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘before, during and after outbreaks’ with ‘at all times’, explaining that it wanted to highlight the different stages of intervention on outbreaks.

Article 4.Y.13

In response to a suggestion to include a sentence highlighting the importance of feedback, the Code Commission amended the text accordingly. However, the Commission did not accept the proposal to include ‘feedback’ in the title of this article.

The revised Chapter 4.Y Official control programmes for listed and emerging diseases is attached as **Annex 10** for Member comments and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2019.

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

Background

This new draft chapter was elaborated by the *ad hoc* Group on Animal welfare and laying hen production systems in 2016. The draft chapter has been circulated for comments on two occasions in September 2017 and September 2018.

The OIE Secretariat recalled that a significant number of comments had been received on the draft chapter circulated in the Code Commission’s September 2018 report and that the Commission, at its February 2019 meeting, had requested that the *ad hoc* Group on animal welfare and laying hen production systems be reconvened to consider all comments and to amend the draft chapter accordingly.

The Code Commission considered the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal welfare and laying hen production systems which met in April 2019 and thanked the *ad hoc* Group for its work noting that they had to consider a very large number of comments often expressing opposing positions with respect to some of the recommendations proposed in the draft chapter.

The Code Commission confirmed that the *ad hoc* Group had considered all comments received and reminded Members that the *ad hoc* Group report provided responses to comments received and proposed amendments to the draft chapter and therefore should be read in conjunction with this report.

The Code Commission highlighted that the revised chapter allowed for the continuous development of country specific animal welfare recommendations and monitoring for implementation. The Commission noted the *ad hoc* Group’s comment that the role of ethics in animal welfare cannot be summarised easily and in a manner that encompasses the belief systems of all Members and because of this the amended text focused, as much as possible, on the scientific basis for the recommendations presented in the chapter.

The Code Commission considered the *ad hoc* Group report and reviewed the draft chapter and made some minor changes of an editorial nature as well as the following amendments.

Preamble

The Code Commission did not agree with the *ad hoc* Group proposal to include a preamble to consider the social, economic and cultural diversity of OIE Members when developing country-specific recommendations. The Commission considered that this text was generic in terms of the framework of the OIE standard-setting process and not specific to this chapter.

Article 7.Z.3

In point 2(d), the Code Commission deleted the last sentence regarding the reduction of incidence of feather pecking when there are opportunities to forage, given that this wording corresponds to the recommendations section.

In point 2(d), the Code Commission moved the scientific references provided to justify that the provision of foraging and other materials reduces the incidence of injurious feather pecking and cannibalism to Article 7.Z.19. The Code Commission also replaced the word ‘activity’ by ‘behaviour’ in the subtitle, to align this measurable with other behavioural ones such as fear, feeding and drinking or locomotory and comfort.

Articles 7.Z.3, 7.Z.4, 7.Z.5, 7.Z.12 and 7.Z.13

In the third paragraph of Article 7.Z.4, the Code Commission modified the text to highlight that it is also possible to include other criteria or measurables, such as design or management-based measurable criteria, when appropriate.

In Articles 7.Z.3 and 7.Z.7, the Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group and highlighted that the lists of bullet points in these articles alphabetically ordered and were not a ranking of the listed factors.

Regarding point 2(g), (h) and (i) of Article 7.Z.3, and Articles 7.Z.5, 7.Z.12 and 7.Z.13, the Code Commission deleted the word ‘highly’ when referring to a behavioural aspect, as it considered this to be subjective and without a clear metric.

Article 7.Z.24

The Code Commission modified the text to be consistent with the use of the term ‘euthanasia’ throughout this article and deleted the use of the term ‘humane killing’. The Code Commission also reviewed and modified the first bullet point of the list of reasons in which euthanasia is required to make it clear that euthanasia is part of the disaster management. The Code Commission also deleted the last bullet point noting that this point is included in the previous bullet points.

Order for articles

The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to reorder the articles to provide a more logical structure and fluidity to the chapter. The proposal is presented in Annex IV of the Report of the *ad hoc* Group meeting of April 2019. However, to avoid complicating readability of the revised draft chapter, the Code Commission requested that the reordering of articles be undertaken in February 2020.

The revised new draft Chapter 7.Z Animal welfare and laying hen production systems is attached as [Annex 11](#) (clean version) and [Annex 12](#) (track-changed version) for Member comments and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal welfare and laying hen production systems is attached as [Annex 29](#) for Member information.

6.8. Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4)

Background

At the Code Commission’s February 2017 meeting, it agreed to undertake a major revision of Chapter 10.4 Infection with avian influenza viruses. The *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza met in December 2017 and June 2018 to undertake a comprehensive review and draft a revised chapter which was circulated for comments in the Code Commission’s September 2018 meeting report.

At its February 2019 meeting, the Commission considered all comments received on the draft chapter and referred comments of a technical nature to the *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza which met in June 2019. The *ad hoc* Group was also tasked with the assessment of H5 and H7 low pathogenicity avian influenza against the listing criteria in Chapter 1.2 of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group, including the assessment of H5 and H7 low pathogenicity avian influenza against the listing criteria, as well as the revised draft chapter. The Code Commission commended the comprehensive work of the *ad hoc* Group.

The Code Commission noted that the Scientific Commission had agreed, at its September 2019 meeting, with the *ad hoc* Group’s recommendation that, taking into account the caveats observed by the experts, H5 and H7 low pathogenicity avian influenza does not meet the criteria for the inclusion in the OIE listed diseases.

The Code Commission agreed with most of the amendments proposed by the *ad hoc* Group and made some additional amendments to improve clarity and alignment with other chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* and the *Terrestrial Manual*, where relevant.

The following text includes the Code Commission's rationale for comments that it addressed at its February 2019 meeting, as well as the rationales for additional amendments proposed at its September 2019 meeting, including one to address the comment from the Scientific Commission.

Article 10.4.1

In point 2(c), the Code Commission noted comments on the rationale for the proposed wording on single households being excluded from the definition of poultry. The Commission explained that although susceptible, birds kept in a single household and that are not traded or exchanged are of negligible epidemiological significance.

In response to a comment requesting the alignment of the definitions for 'poultry' used in this chapter and the one in the Glossary, the Code Commission noted that the definition for 'poultry' as described in point 2(c) of this article is for the purposes of the *Terrestrial Code*, thus once adopted, the Glossary definition will be amended accordingly and be applied throughout the *Terrestrial Code*.

In response to another comment on the definition of poultry requesting to explicitly include 'breeding flocks producing offspring raised for restocking supplies of game', the Code Commission clarified that those birds were included in the current wording 'all birds used for restocking supplies of game' and there was no need to amend the text.

In point 4, the Code Commission agreed with a comment that the Glossary definition of 'commodity' covers live animals and changed the text accordingly. This change was applied throughout this chapter to ensure consistency.

Article 10.4.1bis

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete the article on safe commodities noting that the listed commodities are produced using standardised industry protocols that have been evaluated and considered to meet the criteria in Chapter 2.2 by the *ad hoc* Group and the Code Commission. The Code Commission reminded Members that the definition of safe commodity, as per the Glossary, means 'a commodity that can be traded without the need for risk mitigation measures specifically directed against a particular listed disease, infection or infestation and regardless of the status of the country or zone of origin for that disease, infection or infestation'.

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment regarding the notation for F_0 value and changed from '3.00' to '3' for consistency with other disease-specific chapters. The Code Commission did not agree to a comment to include 'or pet food containing poultry' after 'heat-treated poultry meat', but included poultry meat products, which can include pet food.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include 'containing poultry' after 'extruded dry pet food' but addressed this issue by deleting 'poultry-based' for consistency because it considered there would be no misunderstanding as written now.

In point 4, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a treatment time and temperature requirement given that feathers and down are produced using standardised industry protocols and these products had been included following scientific advice provided by the *ad hoc* Group (See the report of the meeting of the OIE *ad hoc* Group on avian influenza, Paris (France), 25–27 June 2018).

Article 10.4.2

For the first indent, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to change from 'viruses' to 'virus' to maintain consistency with the title of this chapter and noted that HPAI may be caused by different viruses.

Article 10.4.2ter

The Code Commission did not agree with comments to clarify the possibility of the concurrent establishment of more than one containment zone. The Code Commission noted that if the outbreaks are not related, establishment of more than one containment zone is possible and this is sufficiently explained by ‘a containment zone, which includes all epidemiologically linked outbreaks may be established...’ in Article 4.4.7.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to claim that a slight deviation from Article 4.4.7 exists in this article as it could not find any deviation. The Commission noted that this article only adds some specifications regarding the surveillance programme in addition to the provisions in Article 4.4.7.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a sentence about removal of commodities from containment zone as it is already covered in point 3 of Article 4.4.7.

Article 10.4.2quater

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘with high pathogenicity avian influenza virus’ after ‘infection’ for clarity.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘(i.e. two flock-level incubation periods)’ after ‘28 days’ to explain the basis for the waiting period. This change was applied throughout this chapter to ensure consistency.

In response to comments regarding the start of counting 28 days, the Code Commission reminded Members that this was in line with the Glossary definition for ‘stamping-out policy’. With regard to the timeline for surveillance, the Commission clarified that Members should decide when to start the surveillance and that the surveillance could begin prior to the completion of ‘stamping-out policy’ (i.e. completion of the disinfection mentioned in point (c) of the definition), but this would not change the period of 28 days that begins after the stamping-out policy. The Code Commission noted that this would be considered whenever a relevant chapter is revised.

Article 10.4.3

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to italicise the word ‘poultry’ in the subtitle because it is a convention of the *Terrestrial Code* not to italicise defined terms in the title and subtitle of the chapter.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment that poultry traded internationally are usually alive, however sometimes the word ‘poultry’ is used for meat, therefore the Code Commission considered that ‘live poultry’ should be used for clarity throughout this chapter.

In point 2, the Code Commission noted a comment that the current wording ‘originated from’ may allow for commodities to originate in a free country and then move thorough an infected country, but considered that this issue can be adequately addressed by an appropriate international veterinary certificate. Furthermore, the Code Commission clarified that ‘originate’ in this context not only means where the animals were born but also where they come from.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a new point ‘the necessary precautions were taken to avoid contact of the commodity with any source of high pathogenicity avian influenza virus’, as it considered that this was already addressed in the provisions for importation from free countries or zones.

Article 10.4.4

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete ‘infection with a virus which would be considered’ and ‘in poultry’ in point 1 as this was not consistent with the new definition of the disease, and modified the text accordingly. This change was applied throughout the chapter to ensure consistency.

In points 2 and 3, the Code Commission modified the text for clarity.

Article 10.4.10

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to start point 3 with ‘a statistically valid sample of donor birds were tested ...’ as each donor bird should be tested because there is no flock of origin for this type of birds.

Article 10.4.11

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to move the previous articles on eggs for human consumption and egg products, respectively, to after the previous article on semen of birds and changed accordingly to respect the logical order of the chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*.

Article 10.4.15

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘post treatment’ after ‘avoid’ in point 3 noting that a ‘commodity’ in this case refers to the final goods traded and it is implicit that the commodity is well handled post treatment.

Article 10.4.17

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘not listed in Article 10.4.1bis’ to the title and amended it accordingly. The Commission did not agree with a comment to insert ‘AND’ between points 1 and 2 noting that this is not the convention used in the *Terrestrial Code*. The convention is to put ‘AND’ only when there is an ‘OR’.

Article 10.4.17bis

Taking into account that the draft chapter includes Article 10.4.19bis ‘Procedures for the inactivation of high pathogenicity avian influenza viruses in scientific specimens and in skins and trophies’, the Code Commission proposed to add trade provisions for these commodities in a new Article 10.4.17bis ‘Recommendations for the importation of scientific specimens, skins and trophies of birds other than poultry’.

Article 10.4.19bis

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment that virus inactivation procedures in this and other articles should cover all types of avian influenza viruses instead of only those of high pathogenicity, noting that the proposed chapter is focused on the risk management of HPAI, even if low pathogenicity avian influenza viruses are monitored.

Article 10.4.20

The Code Commission agreed to move specific text on monitoring of low pathogenicity influenza virus in poultry to Article 10.4.22ter which specifically addresses this activity, while keeping in this article the justification for the recommendation of a monitoring system to be in place.

Article 10.4.22

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘viruses’ with ‘virus’ in point 1 as there are a variety of HPAI viruses. The Code Commission also requested that the OIE Secretariat check that use of this term throughout the chapter is consistent.

The Code Commission considered a comment from the Scientific Commission that based on the opinion of the *ad hoc* Group that ‘the absence of the disease and infection could be effectively demonstrated, even after vaccination if adequate surveillance is in place’, there could be a need for surveillance articles to take into consideration the use of a differentiating infected from vaccinated animals (DIVA) approach.

The Code Commission considered the relevant text of Chapter 3.3.4 Avian influenza in the *Terrestrial Manual* and amended the text in point 2 of Article 10.4.22 to include a reference to the DIVA test to address this comment.

The revised Chapter 10.4 Infection with high pathogenicity avian influenza viruses is attached as **Annex 13** (clean version) and **Annex 14** (track-changed version) for Member comments and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

The revised Article 1.3.6 is attached as **Annex 15** for Member comments and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza (June 2019) is attached as **Annex 30** for Member information.

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

Comments were received from Australia, China (People's Republic), Chinese Taipei, New Zealand, Thailand, USA, the EU and AU-IBAR.

Background

The Code Commission, at its February 2019 meeting, agreed to use Chapter 14.7 Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus (PPR) as the 'model chapter' to present amendments regarding harmonisation of requirements for official recognition and maintenance of freedom status to be applied across the five disease-specific chapters with official recognition of status (see Item 8.6). As part of this work, the Code Commission circulated Articles 14.7.3 and 14.7.34 for comment in its February 2019 report.

General comments

The Code Commission did not agree with comments requesting to include a reference to Chapter 1.12 Application for official recognition by the OIE of free status for peste des petits ruminants in Articles 14.7.3 and 14.7.34 given that these articles outline the conditions required for official recognition and maintenance of animal health status and therefore should not include procedural information.

The Code Commission encouraged Members to read these articles in conjunction with Chapter 1.6 and Chapter 14.7 when providing comments.

Article 14.7.3

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include 'in all domestic sheep and goats' as it considered this to be unnecessary given that Article 14.7.1 includes a definition for PPR as an infection of domestic sheep and goats with PPRV. For the same reason, the Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, did not accept a comment to specify whether 'wildlife' was included in point 2.

In point 3(a), the Code Commission agreed to replace 'Chapter 1.4' with 'Article 1.4.6' as the latter is a more precise reference.

The Code Commission introduced a new point 4 to reiterate point 2(a)(iii) of Article 1.4.6 given that this is a requirement to demonstrate and maintain freedom from PPRV. This amendment also addressed a comment to include an additional point that the 'importation of domestic ruminants and their semen, oocytes or embryos is carried out in accordance with this chapter'.

Under point 6 (previous point 5), the Code Commission discussed a comment seeking clarification on whether the importation of vaccinated animals results in a loss of PPR-free status, given that point 3(b) of Article 14.7.10 recommends that animals imported from countries or zones considered infected should be vaccinated against PPR. Whilst noting that alternative provisions to vaccination are available in Article 14.7.10, the Code Commission acknowledged this discrepancy and requested the OIE Secretariat to seek expert opinion on the impact of importing vaccinated animals on status recognition.

The Code Commission included a new paragraph (second paragraph) stating that ‘the country or the zone will be included in the list of countries or zones free from PPR in accordance with Chapter 1.6’. This is to ensure alignment with other disease-specific chapters with official status recognition (see Items 6.10 and 8.6), and would address comments requesting elaboration on what the list refers to.

In response to a comment on the last paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission to distinguish notification obligations from documented evidence to be submitted for annual reconfirmation and modified the text accordingly. The Commission also deleted the reference to point 4(d) of Article 1.4.6 as this is already included in point 3.

Article 14.7.7

The Code Commission proposed amendments to the structure of Article 14.7.7 as part of the harmonisation work.

Article 14.7.24

The Code Commission agreed with a comment that the reference to Chapter 8.8 is incorrect and proposed to delete this reference and to add the text of relevant provisions from Articles 8.8.32 and 8.8.34.

Article 14.7.34

In point 2(b), the Code Commission together with the Scientific Commission accepted a comment to replace ‘diagnosis’ with ‘diagnostic testing’.

In point 3, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to rename the subheading as ‘vaccination’, and to split the previous point 3(a) into two parts, now 3(a) and 3(b) for clarity.

In point 3(b)(vi), the Code Commission in agreement with the Scientific Commission, agreed with a comment to remove ‘if relevant’ noting that vaccines used should always be compliant with the *Terrestrial Manual* for an official control programme to be endorsed. The Code Commission deleted ‘proposed timeline for the transition to the’ given that there is no official PPR free status where vaccination is practised.

The Code Commission together with the Scientific Commission, did not agree with a comment to delete point 5 on an emergency preparedness plan and emergency response plan given that this is not the same as measures to prevent the introduction of and rapid detection of the pathogenic agent included in point 4.

In response to a comment asking whether the actual emergency preparedness and response plans need to be submitted for the endorsement of an official control programme, the Code Commission noted the clarification from the OIE Secretariat that provision of evidence that such plans exist, for example a summary of these plans would be considered sufficient.

In point 6, in response to a comment questioning what is meant by ‘defined work plan’, the Code Commission agreed that ‘defined’ was an ambiguous term and proposed to delete it. The Code Commission reiterated that the work plan should address all control activities for PPR with the objective of achieving an official recognition of PPR free status in at least one zone in the country.

In point 8, in response to a comment asking what is meant by ‘assessment of evolution’, the Code Commission proposed to replace ‘assessment of the evolution and implementation’ with ‘monitoring, evaluation and review’ noting that this was aligned with wording in draft Chapter 4.Y.

To ensure consistency with Article 14.7.3, the Code Commission proposed a new paragraph stating that ‘the country will be included in the list of countries having an OIE endorsed official control programme for PPR in accordance with Chapter 1.6’. This is also to ensure alignment with other disease-specific chapters with official status recognition (see Items 6.10 and 8.6) and addresses comments requesting elaboration on what the list mentioned in the last paragraph refers to.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to reinstate the paragraph on withdrawal of endorsement of the official control programme noting that these provisions have been moved to the revised draft Chapter 1.6 as part of the harmonisation work (see Item 8.6).

Articles 14.7.3, 14.7.7, 14.7.24 and 14.7.34 are attached as **Annex 16** for Member comments and are proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

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

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

Background

The revision to Chapter 15.2 Infection with classical swine fever virus was undertaken in response to comments submitted by Members, experts, the *ad hoc* Group on Classical swine fever, as well as to ensure alignment with the most recent amendments to Chapter 15.1 Infection with African swine fever virus (ASF) adopted in 2019. The draft revised Chapter 15.2 was last circulated for comments in the Code Commission's September 2018 report.

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

General comments

The Code Commission did not agree with a general comment that the terms 'suid' and 'pig' are inconsistently used in this chapter and the chapter on ASF as the case definitions for both chapters are different and these two terms are used appropriately in each chapter. In the CSF chapter, CSF is defined as an infection in pigs only while for ASF, infection is also defined in African wild suids, which are not pigs.

Additional changes have been proposed to this chapter as part of harmonisation with other disease-specific chapters with official status recognition, under Articles 15.2.2, 15.2.3 and 15.2.6 (see Item 8.6).

Article 15.2.1

The Code Commission agreed with a comment requesting to match the first indent of this article with the same statement in the chapter on ASF for consistency, and changed the text accordingly.

The Code Commission did not agree with the Scientific Commission to delete the sentence 'Pigs exposed to CSFV prenatally may not show clinical signs at birth and be persistently infected throughout life' as it considered these points relevant to the epidemiology of CSF and the interpretation of the text in this chapter. However, for clarity, the Code Commission moved the sentence 'Pigs exposed to CSFV postnatally have an *infective period* of up to three months' up, and made it a separate paragraph from the statement on incubation period.

Article 15.2.1bis

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete the last sentence of this article as the sentence provides the better guidance and understanding for Members.

Previous Article 15.2.2 (deleted)

The Code Commission agreed to delete the previous Article 15.2.2 as part of harmonisation with other disease-specific chapters with official status recognition, and to move the relevant contents of this article to Article 15.2.3 which was renumbered 15.2.2 (subsequent articles were also renumbered accordingly).

Article 15.2.2

Amendments have been made to the text as part of harmonisation mentioned under General Comments.

For point 5, the Code Commission agreed with a comment that ‘pigs and’ should be deleted and modified the associated text to indicate that the importation or movements of commodities into a country or zone have been carried out in accordance with this chapter, without specifying the type of commodities and specific articles to refer to.

For point 7, the Code Commission also agreed with comments requesting the better alignment between this chapter and the chapter on ASF and changed the texts accordingly.

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission proposed to amend the reference to the points in this article so that documented evidence should be resubmitted annually for ‘points 1) to 5)’, thereby addressing comments on the incorrectly cited points.

Article 15.2.3

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete the second sentence of this article to align with the chapter on ASF.

Article 15.2.4

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘previously’ to the title for clarity and consistency with the first sentence of this article.

The Code Commission made further amendments to the text for clarity and consistency with Article 4.4.7.

In the last sentence of the fourth paragraph, in response to a comment to include a specific mention that the provisions did not apply to safe commodities in Article 15.2.1bis, the Code Commission explained that Article 15.2.1bis already states that Veterinary Authorities should not require any CSF-related conditions for safe commodities, therefore it is redundant to add a specific exclusion for safe commodities in this paragraph. Nonetheless, the Code Commission deleted this last sentence to avoid duplication with Article 4.4.7.

Article 15.2.5

For points 1, 2 and 3, the Code Commission agreed as part of the work of harmonisation to replace ‘the disposal of the last case’ with ‘the disinfection of the last affected establishment’ and modified the text accordingly.

Article 15.2.5bis

The Code Commission noted a comment asking the reason why the provisions in this article and Article 15.2.5ter were added to this draft chapter but not to the chapter on ASF. The Commission clarified that the *ad hoc* Group had proposed the inclusion of these articles to facilitate the OIE official recognition of disease status, which does not apply to ASF.

For points 1 through 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to restructure these points for clarity as it considered the current structure is adequately clear.

For point 4, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘Veterinary Services’ with ‘Veterinary Authority’ for alignment with Chapter 8.8. The Commission noted a comment suggesting to add a sentence on minimising the risk of virus spread during the transport and proposing adding ‘under biosecure conditions’ to the first sentence.

For point 5, the Code Commission noted a comment proposing to add a sentence on precautions to prevent the cross-contamination, but considered it is unnecessary to include such a sentence in this point.

For point 6, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘under the supervision of the Veterinary Authority’ at the beginning as it is implicit.

In response to a comment requesting to delete this article and Article 15.2.5ter on the basis that the current draft articles recommend that the meat be eventually treated in accordance with Article 15.2.18 on the inactivation of the CSFV, the Code Commission considered the advice from the Scientific Commission. The Scientific Commission had advised that these two articles not only address the inactivation of the virus in meat, but also related to the safe transport of commodities in a free zone. The Code Commission added that the conditions in 15.2.5bis and 15.2.5ter are to provide the possibility for slaughter to take place in free zones. As the conditions in these articles are less stringent than the importation of live animals, meat or meat products from countries or zones not free from CSF, some additional measures have been included to minimise the risk of transmission or contamination.

Article 15.2.6

For point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment that the phrase ‘unless there are means, validated in accordance with Chapter 3.8.3 of the *Terrestrial Manual*, of distinguishing between vaccinated and infected pigs.’ should be deleted, with the provided rationale that vaccinated animals can represent a significant risk. The Commission stated that this is not the case if any reactor can be demonstrated to not be infected with CSFV and other relevant conditions have been met.

Article 15.2.7

For point 3, in response to the same comment made to Article 15.2.6, the Code Commission did not agree as per the same rationale.

Previous Article 15.2.9 (deleted)

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to reinstate this article on recommendations for the importation of wild and feral pigs as, while recognising the importance of a risk presented by countries where CSF is present in their wild and feral pig populations, fit for all mitigation measures cannot be drafted, and such importations should not be covered by the *Terrestrial Code*, but should be agreed between countries on a bilateral basis. The Commission stressed that in the absence of a specific recommendation in the *Terrestrial Code*, a country can take necessary measures in accordance with the WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures Agreement via bilateral trade agreements.

Article 15.2.9

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘prior to the collection’ at the end of point 1(a) as it considered it was obvious and did not improve clarity.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘caused’ with ‘elicited’ in point 1(c)(iii) for consistency with Article 15.2.13.

In response to a comment requesting to delete points 1(c)(ii) and 1(c)(iii) altogether, the Code Commission reiterated its justification previously made for Article 15.2.7 above that the recommendation in this article was a set of requirements ensuring risk mitigation.

Article 15.2.11

The Code Commission agreed with a comment proposing to add point 2 of the Article 15.2.10 to this article as it considered that the provision is also relevant to this article.

Article 15.2.12bis

In response to comments querying whether or not ‘official control programme’ in this article refers to an OIE endorsed official control programme, the Code Commission concurred with the Scientific Commission that OIE does not endorse official control programmes for CSF and the term used here means an official control programme as defined in the Glossary.

For point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘comes’ with ‘derives’ and changed the text accordingly.

Previous Article 15.2.15 (deleted)

The Code Commission agreed with a comment that this article on recommendations for the importation of fresh meat of wild and feral pigs should be deleted entirely, based on the same justification as the decision to delete previous Article 15.2.9 on recommendations for the importation of wild and feral pigs.

Article 15.2.13

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment proposing to delete ‘, 15.2.12bis’ from point 1(b)(ii) as Article 15.2.12bis was not about just ‘endemic countries or zones’ as said in the comment but about ‘countries or zones not free from CSF, where an official control programme exists’ and effective risk mitigation measures are possible in such countries and zones.

Article 15.2.15

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment that this article should be deleted due to a high risk of dissemination of CSFV relating to litter and manure as it considered litter and manure can be traded as long as the appropriate risk mitigation measures are in place.

Article 15.2.16bis

The Code Commission agreed with a comment proposing to change the text in point 2 for consistency with other articles and modified the text accordingly.

Article 15.2.17

In response to a comment querying discrepancies regarding heat treatment requirements for some commodities and swill, the Code Commission reiterated its view expressed at its report of February 2018 that this article was built upon long-standing practice and field experience that showed the inactivation of virus in swill, and was used to successfully control the disease. The Commission in agreement with the Scientific Commission considered that meat and swill cannot be compared because their water/fat content is very different and the diverse material that can be present in swill could potentially protect the virus, hence the thermal inactivation procedure for swill should be more stringent than that for meat. The Commission also noted that the term ‘swill’ is not defined in the Glossary, although in this context, purely vegetal swill is not of concern. The main transmission pathway is kitchen swill and all swill containing meat or meat products.

Furthermore, the Code Commission took this opportunity to encourage the scientific community to continue the relevant research on this important issue of thermal inactivation processes in different commodities and field environments, which would also help with the future development of a new chapter on biosecurity.

Article 15.2.18

In response to some comments to request reviewing the minimum curing period for dry cured pig meat, the Code Commission noted that the proposed changes aimed to align with Chapter 15.1 on African swine fever since the same conditions applied for both diseases. The Commission reminded Members that the current text of Article 15.1.23 had been adopted after years of discussion in the Code Commission and Scientific Commission and consultations with Members. Since then, the Code Commission has not acknowledged any major trade issues that arouse due to the existing provision nor recognised any global epidemiological changes pertaining to this product. More importantly, there is no new scientific evidence that justifies the review of the current provision.

Article 15.2.19

In response to a comment seeking clarity on the procedures for the inactivation of CSFV in casings in pigs, the Code Commission proposed some changes to the text.

Article 15.2.19ter

The Code Commission added the point 3 to be consistent with other disease-specific chapters.

In response to the same comment as made in Article 15.2.15 requesting the deletion of this article, the Code Commission highlighted that these inactivation procedures had been effective in the field and in the absence of scientific evidence to the contrary the recommendations were valid.

Article 15.2.22

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘live pigs or products’ with ‘pig commodities other than those listed in Article 15.2.1bis’ as this is a general statement and does not need to be specific.

Article 15.2.23

For point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to clarify the populations to be covered by surveillance and amended the text accordingly. The Commission however did not agree with a comment to replace ‘survey design’ with ‘design of the randomised survey’ in the second last paragraph as this should be consistent with Chapter 1.4. The Commission did not agree with a comment to include ‘false negative’ in the first sentence of the last paragraph as this paragraph specifically deals with false positive reactions found in CSF surveillance.

For point 4, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting to modify the text in the second paragraph as it considered the current wording is clear enough.

The revised Chapter 15.2 Infection with classical swine fever virus is attached as [Annex 17](#) for Member comments and is proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2020.

7. Texts for comments

7.1. Glossary Part B (‘captive wild [animal]’, ‘feral [animal]’, ‘wild [animal]’, ‘slaughter’, ‘euthanasia’, ‘stunning’, ‘death’, ‘pain’, ‘distress’ and ‘suffering’)

‘Captive wild [animal]’, ‘feral [animal]’, and ‘wild [animal]’

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

Background

The Code Commission recalled that at its September 2018 meeting it proposed a revision to the Glossary definition for ‘captive wild [animal]’ in response to a comment submitted for Chapter 15.1 Infection with African swine fever that was under revision at that time. At its February 2019 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed the comments received and recognised the different views expressed by Members and the complexity posed by the diversity of species and scenarios covered under this definition. The Code Commission requested comments from the OIE Working Group on Wildlife (Working Group) for its review. The Working Group conducted an electronic consultation during the summer of 2019 to address this request, and the Commission thanked the Working Group for its contribution.

Definitions

The Code Commission agreed with the Working Group proposal to delete ‘population management’, ‘regular contacts’ and ‘harvesting’ from the examples. The Commission agreed with some comments that stated that these examples created confusion and replaced ‘feeding’ with ‘regular feeding’ to clarify that this does not include ‘occasional’ feeding for luring and hunting animals. The Commission also concurred with the Working Group’s suggestion to include ‘protection from predators’ as another example and to delete ‘direct’ before ‘human supervision’ for clarity.

The Working Group did not agree with a comment to delete ‘a phenotype’ from the definition for captive wild [animal] on the grounds that not all domestic animals are phenotypically manipulated by humans, such as llamas and alpacas as it considered that a phenotype is an easily observable trait that distinguishes domesticated animals from their wild conspecifics. Furthermore, both llamas and alpacas were domesticated from their wild guanaco and vicuña conspecifics by humans, changing their phenotypes, and neither exist naturally in the wild. The Code Commission concurred with the Working Group’s opinion.

In response to a comment that pets should not be emphasised since all pets do not fall into this category, the Working Group agreed that the current definition as written does not imply that all pets are captive wild animals. The Code Commission concurred and did not amend the text regarding this point.

The Code Commission also agreed with the Working Group’s recommendation to make minor amendments to the Glossary definitions for ‘feral [animal]’ and ‘wild [animal]’ for alignment with the proposed definition for ‘captive wild [animal]’.

The revised Glossary definitions for ‘captive wild [animal]’, ‘feral [animal]’ and ‘wild [animal]’ are attached as **Annex 18** for Member comments.

Furthermore, the Code Commission proposed new or revised Glossary definitions for ‘slaughter’, ‘euthanasia’, ‘stunning’, ‘death’, ‘distress’, ‘pain’ and ‘suffering’ which arose from the ongoing revision of Chapter 7.5 Slaughter of animals (see Item 7.4).

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

Comments were received from Australia, USA and the EU.

The OIE Secretariat reminded the Code Commission that Article 1.3.1 had been circulated for comments in the Commission’s February 2019 report as a consequence of the proposal to delist *M. tuberculosis* in Chapter 8.11 (see Item 7.6).

Regarding comments on the lack of alignment in the species-categorisation in Chapter 1.3 vis a vis the species-categorisation in Volume II of the *Terrestrial Code*, after consultation with the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to look into the rationale behind the discrepancies in the categorisation and to report back to the Commission.

In addition, the Code Commission proposed further amendments to Articles 1.3.1, 1.3.2 and 1.3.9 based on the assessments of a number of pathogenic agents against the listing criteria (see Items 7.5 and 8.7).

The revised Articles 1.3.1, 1.3.2 and 1.3.9 are attached as **Annex 19** for Member comments.

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

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that as recommended at its February 2019 meeting, the Director General agreed to convene a new *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Services to continue the work to revise Chapters 3.1 and 3.2 noting that although this work was linked to the PVS Tool, it required a broader profile and competencies in its membership. The Group met in July 2019 to draft revised Chapters 3.1 and 3.2. They were also requested to consider comments received on the proposed revised Glossary definitions for ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Veterinary Authority’ and ‘Veterinary Services’.

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group and wished to acknowledge the excellent work undertaken to develop these draft chapters. The Commission agreed with the proposed new structure for Chapters 3.1 and 3.2. The Commission agreed with the proposal to change the title of Chapter 3.1 to ‘Quality of Veterinary Services’ noting that this better reflected the content of the chapter.

The Code Commission also agreed with the *ad hoc* Group’s proposal for a new Chapter 3.X. Introduction to recommendations for Veterinary Services to be included as an introductory chapter to Section 3. In addition, the Commission agreed to change the title of Section 3 to ‘Veterinary Services’ to better reflect the chapters in this section. This amendment will be made once the new chapter is adopted. The Commission noted this was consistent with the approach taken in other sections of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Commission amended draft Chapters 3.1 and 3.2, and the new Chapter 3.X, for clarity and alignment with other chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The revised Chapters 3.1 and 3.2, and the new Chapter 3.X are attached as **Annexes 20, 21** and **22** for Member comments.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Services is attached as **Annex 31** for Member information.

7.4. Slaughter of animals (Chapter 7.5)

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that the *ad hoc* Group on Chapter 7.5 Slaughter of animals and Chapter 7.6 Killing of animals for disease control purposes had met for the fourth time in June 2019 to progress its work on the revision of Chapter 7.5. The *ad hoc* Group made significant progress on this revision and will start work on the revision of Chapter 7.6 once this work is completed.

The Code Commission thanked the *ad hoc* Group for its ongoing work acknowledging the significant work that the revision of these two chapters represented.

The Code Commission considered the *ad hoc* Group report and reviewed the draft chapter and made some minor changes of an editorial nature. As noted in its February 2019 meeting report, the Code Commission, agreed with the proposed new title for Chapter 7.5 ‘Animal welfare during slaughter’ and the new proposed structure.

The Code Commission agreed with the proposal to limit the scope of the revision of Chapter 7.5 to cattle, buffalo, bison, sheep, goats, horses, pigs, rabbits and poultry and not include camelids, deer or ratites given that there is not enough scientific information to develop robust recommendations for the slaughter of these species.

In Article 7.5.18, the Code Commission considered that it was important to maintain some existing text from the current chapter concerning the transportation of pregnant animals to the slaughterhouse.

Even though the draft chapter was not yet complete and still needed articles to address the welfare of animals arriving in containers to the slaughterhouse, the Code Commission agreed to annex the revised draft chapter and requested Members to provide their views as to whether the new proposed structure is appropriate as well as comments on the draft text.

Given the very extensive amount of amendments to this chapter, the Code Commission agreed to only provide this draft revised chapter as clean text.

Definitions related to this revision

Definitions for ‘slaughter’, ‘euthanasia’, ‘stunning’ and ‘death’

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that as agreed at its February 2019 meeting, the *ad hoc* Group continued its work to amend the existing definitions for *slaughter*, *euthanasia*, *stunning* and *death* to ensure that they are harmonised with their use in the proposed new Chapter 7.5 as well as ensuring consistency with other uses of these defined terms throughout the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission reviewed the proposed amendments and made the following additional amendments for (i) ‘slaughter’ - to include the concept of a product that is primarily suitable for human consumption; (ii) ‘euthanasia’ - to simplify the definition so it can be used in different contexts, such as on-farm or in a natural disaster setting; (iii) ‘stunning’ - to focus on the outcomes rather the specific methods; (iv) ‘death’ - added some aspect in relation to the indicators to confirm the permanent loss of vital function.

Defined terms for ‘distress’, ‘pain’ and ‘suffering’

The Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group proposal to move the definitions for pain, suffering and distress from Chapter 7.8 Use of animals in research and education to the Glossary of the *Terrestrial Code* given that these terms are extensively used throughout the *Terrestrial Code* and not only in other chapters of Section 7 Animal Welfare.

The Code Commission made some editorial amendments to these three definitions.

The revised proposed definitions for ‘slaughter’, ‘euthanasia’, ‘stunning’, ‘death’, ‘distress’, ‘pain’ and ‘suffering’ are provided in the Glossary attached as **Annex 18** for Member comments.

The revised version of Chapter 7.5 Animal welfare during slaughter (free-moving animals) is attached as **Annex 23** for Member comments.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group on the revision of Chapter 7.5 Slaughter of animals and 7.6 Killing for disease control purposes is attached as **Annex 32** for Member information.

7.5. Draft new chapter on infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (Chapter 8.Y)

Following requests from Members, the OIE Director General convened an *ad hoc* Group that met in March 2018 and January 2019 to evaluate the most relevant species of trypanosomes of African origin against the criteria for the inclusion of diseases, infections and infestations in the OIE list as described in Chapter 1.2 of the *Terrestrial Code* and to draft a new chapter for animal African trypanosomoses.

The Code Commission considered both reports of the *ad hoc* Group, which had been endorsed by the Scientific Commission in February 2019.

The Code Commission reviewed the assessments conducted for the relevant species of trypanosomes of African origin against the criteria in Chapter 1.2 and agreed with the Scientific Commission to propose the inclusion of *T. vivax*, *T. congolense*, *T. simiae* and *T. brucei* in Chapter 1.3 Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE. Consequently, the Code Commission amended Chapter 1.3 to include these in the OIE list, as ‘Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (*T. vivax*, *T. congolense*, *T. simiae* and *T. brucei*)’ within the category of multiple species in Article 1.3.1, and to delete the current ‘Trypanosomosis (tsetse-transmitted)’ from Article 1.3.2 (see Item 7.2).

The Code Commission noted that the definition of Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin in Chapter 8.Y explicitly excluded *T. evansi* and *T. equiperdum* that are dealt with in other chapters and listed elsewhere in Chapter 1.3. Thus, it did not consider necessary to repeat this exclusion in the name of the listed disease in Article 1.3.1.

The Code Commission reviewed the draft new Chapter 8.Y Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin and made some additional amendments to improve clarity and alignment with other chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission concurred with the opinion of the Scientific Commission, as presented in their February 2019 report, that an article on importation of live susceptible animals from infected countries or zones should not be included in the draft chapter given that, currently there is insufficient scientific information to define effective sanitary measures. However, the Code Commission emphasised that, if sanitary measures are applied to prevent the spread of the disease through international trade of live animals, they should be supported by a risk analysis in accordance with Chapter 2.1. The Code Commission amended the draft new chapter to reflect this principle.

The reports of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal African trypanosomoses can be found as Annex 14 to the [Scientific Commission report of February 2019](#).

The draft new Chapter 8.Y Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin is attached as **Annex 24** for Member Country comments.

7.6. Infection with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex (Chapter 8.11)

Comments were received from China (People's Republic), Chile, New Caledonia, South Africa and the EU.

In light of comments requesting to reinstate *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* as part of the *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that available scientific evidence may have led to contradictory opinions on the possibility of transmission of *M. tuberculosis* from animals to humans or animals to animals and therefore agreed to defer the delisting until new scientific information is available.

The Code Commission addressed other comments received and will keep these on hold pending resolution on the above.

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

Comments received from Australia, China (People's Republic), Chile, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa, USA, the EU and AU-IBAR.

Background

Proposed amendments to Chapter 8.15 were first circulated in the Code Commission's February 2019 meeting report to clarify the obligations of Members to notify when there is an epizootic of Rift Valley fever (RVF) in an endemic country or zone. This amendment was in response to the observation that human cases are often notified to the World Health Organisation without corresponding notifications of animal cases to the OIE despite epidemiological knowledge that the occurrence of indigenous human cases would imply virus circulation in the animal population.

General comments

In response to a comment that Chapter 8.15 focused only on notification from endemic countries and not the first occurrence of RVF in a free country, the Code Commission reaffirmed that in accordance with Chapter 1.1, Members must notify the first occurrence of RVF as with other listed diseases to the OIE. However, considering the epidemiological characteristics of RVF and the difficulties associated with achieving freedom from infection, this chapter emphasises the requirement to notify the transition from an inter-epizootic to an epizootic period.

Article 8.15.1

The Code Commission proposed to move the definitions 'for the purposes of this chapter' (previously in point 6) to point 2 to ensure alignment with other disease-specific chapters.

In point 2(a), the Code Commission replaced the defined term 'area' with 'epizootic area' for improved readability of Articles 8.15.7, 8.15.8, 8.15.9 where the term 'epizootic area' is used.

In point 2(b), the Code Commission noted comments that disagreed with the inclusion of indigenous human cases as a definition of an epizootic of RVF. The Code Commission concurred with the Scientific Commission that human cases of RVF are usually preceded by or at least accompanied by cases in animals. However, the Code Commission was of the view that the notification of indigenous human cases does not fall within the scope of the *Terrestrial Code*. Therefore, the Code Commission removed 'occurrence of indigenous human cases' in the definition of 'epizootic of RVF'.

Notwithstanding, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that further guidance on surveillance, especially during the inter-epizootic period, was required in Article 8.15.13 in order to facilitate an early warning system indicating the start of an epizootic period. The detection of indigenous human cases could serve as a trigger in an early warning system and the Veterinary Authorities are encouraged to take appropriate actions to detect animal cases.

Under the same point, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission's proposed changes to improve the definition of 'epizootic of RVF' and modified the definition to 'sudden and unexpected change in the distribution or increase in incidence of, or morbidity or mortality of RVF', in line with point 1(d) of Article 1.1.3.

In point 2(c), the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission's proposed changes to the definition of 'inter-epizootic period' and modified the definition to 'a period with low levels of vector activity and low rates of RVFV transmission'. This also addressed a comment that the definition of inter-epizootic was not scientific.

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed with a comment that it was inappropriate to consider dromedary camels as 'ruminants' in this chapter and made changes throughout the text to refer to 'susceptible animals' instead of ruminants. In point 2(d), 'susceptible animal' has been defined as ruminants and dromedary camels for the purpose of the chapter.

Regarding a comment questioning the exclusion of New World Camelids, the Code Commission explained that in the absence of evidence on the contrary, only dromedary camels are of epidemiological significance in the transmission of RVF.

In the last sentence of point 6, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include compliance with Articles 8.15.9 to 8.15.12 for importations in the event of transition from an inter-epizootic to epizootic period, as when the animal health status changes, it is understood that Members should observe the relevant trade provisions corresponding to that status. The Commission explained that notification was highlighted because the transition to an epizootic of RVF is a significant epidemiological event that should be shared with other countries, despite the disease being endemic, in order to take risk mitigation measures relevant to the new situation.

In response to a comment that disagreed with the requirement to notify a transition from an inter-epizootic to epizootic period because all outbreaks should be immediately notified, the Code Commission explained that cases could also occur during the inter-epizootic periods which would not correspond to point 1(d) of Article 1.1.3 and consequently such cases are not usually notified to the OIE.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete point 7 on the general description of the historical, temporal and spatial distribution of RVF agreeing that such a description does not normally feature in other disease-specific chapters.

Article 8.15.3

In point 2(a), in response to a comment that a minimum of ten years seemed excessive to demonstrate freedom, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that the ten-year time period referred to the duration of the inter-epizootic period, which is highly variable and could last several years.

In point 2(b), in response to a comment asking why the animal health status of a country or zone should depend on the absence of indigenous human cases, the Code Commission explained that the epidemiology of RVF is such that when there is an indigenous human case it implies virus circulation in the animal population. In response to a comment that reference to human cases was not mentioned in other disease-specific chapters, the Commission gave the example of Article 8.14.2 of Chapter 8.14 Infection with rabies virus where it is stated that 'an imported human case of rabies does not affect the free status', implying that an indigenous case would.

Article 8.15.4

The Code Commission agreed with a comment that the definition of a country or zone infected with RVF virus (RVFV) during the inter-epizootic period may be unclear. Given that relevant definitions are already outlined in point 2 of Article 8.15.1, the Code Commission simplified this article to refer to ‘country or zone infected with RVFV’. In line with this amendment, the Code Commission deleted the previous Article 8.15.5 on country or zone infected with RVFV during an epizootic as it is not needed.

Article 8.15.5

In the first sentence, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘potential insecticide resistance’ but not ‘bionomics’ as local ecology is already addressed.

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to include ‘vehicles’ and ‘insecticides’. The Commission also included ‘vessels’ for completeness.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘en route’ with ‘on the way’ as it considered the meaning to be clear as written.

Article 8.15.7

In point 2(a), the Code Commission deleted ‘modified live virus vaccine’, in response to a comment asking why this was specifically mentioned in this article and not in other articles. Indeed, the Code Commission agreed that the types of vaccines are recommended in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

In point 3, given that ‘epizootic area’ has been defined in point 2(a) of Article 8.15.1, ‘area experiencing an epizootic’ was replaced with ‘epizootic area’. This was applied throughout the chapter, where relevant.

Article 8.15.8

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘sign’ with ‘clinical signs’ for consistency with other disease-specific chapters. This was applied throughout the chapter, where relevant.

Article 8.15.9

The Code Commission did not accept a comment to delete point 2(b) as it did not agree with the rationale provided and clarified that this point refers to the seropositivity of donors, which confers safety to the semen or embryos.

Article 8.15.10

The Code Commission noted that despite the title for this article i.e. ‘fresh meat and meat products’, the provisions only refer to meat. Therefore, the title was amended to delete ‘meat products’, and a new Article 8.15.10bis was proposed to address meat products.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not accept a comment to add ‘findings not consistent with RVFV infection’, noting that findings in *ante* and *post-mortem* inspections may not be disease-specific.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to include a new point 4 that necessary precautions were taken to avoid contact of the products with any potential source of RVFV, for consistency with other disease-specific chapters.

The revised Chapter 8.15 Infection with Rift Valley fever virus is attached as [Annex 25](#) for Member comments.

7.8. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.4)**Background**

In February 2018, The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission had agreed on an in-depth review of Chapter 11.4 Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), in particular regarding the provisions for categorisation of official BSE risk status and the corresponding surveillance. The OIE convened two *ad hoc* Groups on BSE risk assessment and surveillance, respectively, and a total of four meetings have been held (from July 2018 to March 2019).

The Code Commission reviewed the reports of the four *ad hoc* Groups on BSE risk assessment and surveillance that met between July 2018 and March 2019, and the opinion of the Scientific Commission regarding the revised draft chapter.

The Code Commission made some additional amendments to improve clarity and ensure alignment with other chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*, where relevant. Where amendments were of an editorial nature no explanatory text has been provided.

The rationale for significant amendments made by the Code Commission are described in the following text.

Article 11.4.1

The Code Commission agreed with a proposal from the *ad hoc* Group to include a new definition for ‘protein meal’, which will replace the terms ‘meat-and-bone meal (MBM)’ and ‘greaves’. The Code Commission stated that once the chapter is adopted it will review the use of terms MBM and greaves in other disease-specific chapters and consider deleting these terms and replacing them with ‘protein meal’, where relevant.

Article 11.4.1bis

The Code Commission reviewed recommendations of the *ad hoc* Groups as to whether gelatin and collagen prepared from bones could meet the criteria for safe commodities in accordance with Article 2.2.2. Given that point (2)(a) of the current Article 11.4.15 was considered unjustifiable and that point (2)(b) describes industrial practices that are not specifically directed against BSE, the Code Commission agreed to include ‘gelatin and collagen’ in Article 11.4.1bis and to delete the draft article on recommendations for importation of gelatin and collagen prepared from bones and intended for food or feed, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals including biologicals, or medical devices.

Similarly, the Code Commission reviewed recommendations of the *ad hoc* Groups as to whether tallow derivatives can be considered safe commodities and concluded that tallow derivatives complied with the criteria in Article 2.2.2. Therefore, the Code Commission added ‘tallow derivatives’ to point 6 of Article 11.4.1bis and deleted the draft article on recommendations on importation of tallow derivatives intended for food, feed, fertilisers, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals including biologicals, or medical devices.

The Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Groups and Scientific Commission that deboned skeletal meat, as well as blood and blood products, as defined in points 1(g) and 1(h) of current article 11.4.1, do not comply with the criteria in Chapter 2.2 to be considered as safe commodities because they include process conditions specifically directed to address BSE risks. Therefore, the Code Commission proposed their removal from the list of safe commodities, and the drafting of new articles on recommendations for trade of these products.

Article 11.4.3

The Code Commission noted that the conditions to be met to be considered of negligible BSE risk were the same as the ones for controlled BSE risk, and the only difference was whether all conditions have been met for at least 8 years. Taking this into account, the Code Commission proposed modifications to the conditions to ensure that they are applicable to both BSE risk status.

The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission on the need to include the required information for the retention on the list of countries or zones posing a negligible risk for BSE, and amended the text to be in line with disease-specific chapters with official status recognition.

Article 11.4.3bis

The Code Commission separated out the relevant provisions regarding the recovery of negligible BSE risk from Article 11.4.3 and introduced a new Article 11.4.3bis to include these provisions. The Code Commission also highlighted that the current maximum 2-year period given to regain negligible BSE risk status as described in the relevant Standard Operating Procedures should be modified to a 1-year period to align with the conditions for annual re-confirmation of status.

Article 11.4.4

The Code Commission amended the text in the last two paragraphs for alignment with the amendments it made to Article 11.4.3, and for consistency with disease-specific chapters with official status recognition.

Articles 11.4.6 to 11.4.11

In Article 11.4.6 the Code Commission deleted the proposed condition ‘the cattle selected for export were born in the country, zone or compartment during the period when the likelihood of the BSE agents being recycled in the cattle population has been demonstrated to be negligible’ explaining that the negligible BSE risk should have been determined for the whole cattle population in accordance with Article 11.4.3 thus ‘the cattle selected for export came from a country, zone or compartment posing a negligible BSE risk’ is sufficient. This principle was applied to other relevant draft articles and the text was amended accordingly.

For Articles 11.4.6 to 11.4.11, taking into consideration that the change in BSE risk status (from negligible to controlled to undetermined risk) should correspond to a gradation in risk mitigation measures that are proportionate to the BSE risk posed by live animals or animal products, the Code Commission revised the provisions accordingly.

Article 11.4.14

The Code Commission agreed that the draft chapter should consider two populations in countries or zones with a controlled BSE risk. The first would be cattle populations consisting of animals that were born during the period when the likelihood of the BSE agents being recycled in the cattle population has been demonstrated to be negligible, and the second would be cattle populations consisting of animals that were not born during this time period. The Code Commission stressed that the risk posed by these two populations are different and should be distinguished. Therefore, the Commission added a paragraph at the end of this article to clarify that the provisions do not apply to the first cattle population aforementioned.

Article 11.4.18

The Code Commission agreed that BSE surveillance should include the reporting of animals with clinical signs suggestive of BSE and amended the text accordingly.

Consequential amendments to Chapter 1.8

In view of the linkages between Chapter 11.4 Bovine spongiform encephalopathy and Chapter 1.8 Application for official recognition by the OIE of risk status for bovine spongiform encephalopathy, the Code Commission requested the Status Department to prepare an amended version of Chapter 1.8 that aligns with the amendments being proposed in the revised draft Chapter 11.4.

Given that the revised draft Chapter 11.4 will be circulated for the first time in this meeting report and that further changes are expected, and that Chapter 1.8 always reflects provisions provided in Chapter 11.4, the Code Commission requested that the revised draft Chapter 1.8 be provided for Member information only (not for comments) so Members can see the consequential amendments. Once the revised draft Chapter 11.4 is closer to final version the revised Chapter 1.8 will be circulated for comment.

Therefore, Chapter 1.8 is attached as **Annex 33** (clean version) and **Annex 34** (track-changed version) for Member information.

The revised Chapter 11.4 Bovine spongiform encephalopathy is attached as **Annex 26** (clean version) and **Annex 27** (track-changed version) for Member comments.

A document summarising the rationale for the changes proposed by the *ad hoc* Groups during four meetings is attached as **Annex 35** for Member information.

7.9. Infection with equine influenza (Article 12.6.6)

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

At the Code Commission's February 2019 meeting it had proposed amendments to Article 12.6.6 'Recommendations for the importation of domestic equids for unrestricted movement' arising from the results of a clinical trial coordinated by an OIE Reference Laboratory for equine influenza. The revised article was circulated for comment in its February 2019 meeting report.

Article 12.6.6

In response to a comment requesting to add a new point that the domestic equids were tested with negative results on two occasions during the pre-export isolation period by use of the validated type A influenza pan-reactive assay targeting the matrix gene, the Code Commission considered the advice provided by the Biological Standards Commission to accept this addition. The Code Commission did not agree to include a new point that would create a requirement for all countries, but agreed to include the provision in the last paragraph, so that it would only be applicable to countries that are free from equine influenza or undertaking an eradication programme.

For point 3, the Code Commission in agreement with the Biological Standards Commission, concurred with a comment to state that vaccines used are effective against the virus lineages that are in circulation, and amended the text accordingly.

In point 3(a), the Code Commission considered a comment whether it should be stated that in young horses or horses that are undergoing the vaccination for the first time, the booster should be considered valid only if it was a booster to complete a primary course as in some cases different vaccines are used from the first dose. The Code Commission agreed with the advice of the Biological Standards Commission that receiving a mix of equine influenza vaccines during the primary vaccination schedule does not have a detrimental impact on the antibody response that correlates with the protection^{1,2}. In line with this, the Code Commission deleted the words 'the same' from point (3)(b), which addressed a comment from another Member claiming that it is uncommon for horses to receive the same influenza vaccine repeatedly.

References

- ¹ Dilai M, Piro M, El Harrak M, Fougerolle S, Dehhaoui M, Dikrallah A, Legrand L, Paillot R, Fassi Fihri O: Impact of Mixed Equine Influenza Vaccination on Correlate of Protection in Horses. *Vaccines* (Basel). 2018 Oct 4;6(4)
- ² Ryan M, Gildea S, Walsh C, Cullinane A: The impact of different equine influenza vaccine products and other factors on equine influenza antibody levels in Thoroughbred racehorses. *Equine Vet J*. 2015 Nov;47(6):662-6

In point 3(b), in response to a comment to replace '180 days' with '201 days' on the grounds that equine federations may exercise some flexibility around the 6-month interval, the Code Commission noted the opinion of the Biological Standards Commission that there is no published data to support this change. Therefore, the Code Commission agreed to maintain 180 days and to review the figure again should new supporting evidence be published.

In this respect, the Code Commission was informed that a scientific publication on work done by the Irish Equine Center, the OIE Reference Laboratory for equine influenza, is underway and will be published in a peer-reviewed journal. The Commission will review this paper once published.

The revised Article 12.6.6 is attached as **Annex 28** for Member comments.

8. Other topics for information

8.1. Glossary definitions for ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Veterinary Authority’ and ‘Veterinary Services’

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

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that the opinion of all the Specialist Commissions will be sought on the proposed amendments to these definitions which will be considered by an internal OIE group, including a representative from each Commission. This group will ensure that any cross-Commission issues are addressed, and any consequences of these amendments on other OIE work can be considered before presenting draft revised definitions to the Specialist Commissions at their February 2020 meetings.

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

The Code Commission reviewed a discussion paper that had been developed by the OIE Secretariat following the request from the Code Commission in February 2019, which outlined current issues of gaps and inconsistencies in the *Terrestrial Code* pertaining to sanitary measures applicable to the collection and processing of semen of animals, in particular Chapter 4.6 General hygiene in semen collection and processing centres and Chapter 4.7 Collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen and provisions in some disease-specific chapters, with the objective of defining future work to improve the chapters concerned.

The Commission noted the issues and discussed possible approaches for the revision of these chapters considering the complexity of some matters. The Commission agreed that Chapter 4.6 should provide overarching general guidance for hygienic production of semen without any cross-references to disease-specific chapters and that Chapter 4.7 should provide provisions for ensuring animals entering the artificial insemination centre are free of relevant OIE listed diseases, including equine diseases, and to remove cross-references to disease-specific chapters.

The Code Commission requested that an *ad hoc* Group be convened to undertake a revision of Chapter 4.6 and would work with the Secretariat to develop the Terms of Reference. In parallel, noting that the proposed approach for a revised Chapter 4.7 would require significant work, the Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to explore the availability of internationally recognised information on safe processing or production of semen and testing protocols for semen production in order to scope the work required and to report back to the Commission at its next meeting.

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

The Code Commission, at its February 2019 meeting, requested the OIE Secretariat to prepare a draft text for the Commission’s review to amend Chapter 4.9. Collection and processing of oocytes and *in vitro* produced embryos from livestock and horses to include provisions regarding risk mitigation measures for bovine viral diarrhoea (BVD) for *in vitro* produced embryos based on the proposal from the International Embryo Technology Society (IETS).

The Commission wished to thank the IETS for its proposal and the detailed supporting rationale. However, the Code Commission considered that further information was needed regarding the process to demonstrate that the bovine granulosa cells or co-culture cells used for *in vitro* culture were free from BVD virus in order to develop appropriate risk mitigation measures regardless of disease status of a country or zone (as there is no provision in the *Terrestrial Code* for BVD free countries or zones). Therefore, the Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to seek expert advice on this point before amending Chapter 4.9.

8.4. Infection with rinderpest virus (Chapter 8.16)

The Code Commission reviewed a discussion paper developed by the OIE Secretariat on a proposed approach to the revision of Chapter 8.16 Infection with rinderpest virus. It agreed with the proposal to undertake a thorough review of the chapter and provided comments on the Terms of Reference of the *ad hoc* Group. The Code Commission also requested that a member from each of the Specialist Commissions (Code Commission, Scientific Commission and Biological Standards Commission) and an expert from the FAO working on the dossier for the Global Rinderpest Action Plan be invited to participate in the *ad hoc* Group meeting.

8.5. Contagious equine metritis and equine piroplasmiasis (Chapters 12.2 and 12.7)

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

The OIE Secretariat reported that two electronic consultations with subject matter experts were held to undertake a comprehensive review of both chapters.

The Code Commission was informed that the revised draft chapters will be provided to the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission for their February 2020 meetings.

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

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission agreed with the proposal presented by the OIE Secretariat and endorsed by the Scientific Commission, to harmonise the requirements for official recognition and maintenance of free status, and endorsement and maintenance of official control programmes in Chapters 8.8 Infection with foot and mouth disease virus, 11.5 Infection with *Mycoplasma mycoides* subsp. *mycoides* SC (Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia), 12.1 Infection with African horse sickness virus, 14.7 Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus, and 15.2 Infection with classical swine fever virus.

The Code Commission also agreed that common provisions applicable to the five diseases with official recognition of status, in particular those regarding procedural aspects, be addressed in Chapter 1.6 instead of repeating them in each disease-specific chapter.

In February 2019, proposed amendments for harmonisation were introduced into Chapter 14.7 as a 'model chapter' and Member comments were received and addressed (see Item 6.9). During this September meeting, the Code Commission continued the work of harmonisation by applying relevant amendments to Chapter 15.2 (see Item 6.10). Both Chapters 14.7 and 15.2 will be proposed for adoption in 2020. The remaining chapters will be amended progressively.

8.7. The Scientific Commission's recommendation on the evaluation of pathogenic agents against the listing criteria

The Code Commission considered the Scientific Commission's conclusion on the assessments of pathogenic agents against the listing criteria together with the assessments undertaken by *ad hoc* Groups or subject experts for (a) Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV), (b) Animal trypanosomes of African origin, (c) Porcine epidemic diarrhoea, (d) Chronic wasting disease and (e) *Theileria lestoquardi*, *T. luwenshuni*, *T. uilenbergi* and *T. orientalis* (Ikeda and Chitose). The Commission noted that this information had been included in the February 2019 report of the Scientific Commission.

In line with the assessments, the Code Commission proposed the following amendments to Chapter 1.3 (see Item 7.2):

- Article 1.3.1 to add ‘Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (*T. vivax*, *T. congolense*, *T. simiae* and *T. brucei*)’ (see Item 7.5); and
- Article 1.3.9 to add ‘Infection of dromedary camels with Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus’.

The Code Commission concurred with the listing of *Theileria lestoquardi*, *T. luwenshuni*, *T. uilenbergi* and *T. orientalis* (*Ikeda* and *Chitose*). Nevertheless, taking into consideration that this assessment is linked to previous work of the Code Commission on related disease-specific chapters (refer to its February 2018 meeting report), it will not propose changes to Chapter 1.3 until it reassesses previous work and circulates the corresponding chapters for comments.

The Code Commission reminded Members that each time a new disease is listed, there should be a corresponding new disease-specific chapter. However, for MERS-CoV, the Code Commission concurred with the Scientific Commission that there was a need to better understand the transmission dynamics in animal populations and mechanisms of zoonotic transmission to humans before recommending risk mitigation measures in the *Terrestrial Code*. The report of the *ad hoc* Group on MERS-CoV may be found as Annex 3 to the [Biological Standard Commission report of February 2019](#). The Commission was also pleased to note that a draft chapter for the *Terrestrial Manual* is being drafted.

Regarding the assessment for chronic wasting disease (CWD), the Code Commission reviewed the Scientific Commission’s assessment and the subject experts’ assessment for CWD, as well as the justification provided. The Code Commission noted that there was not a consensus of opinion between the 2 subject experts for criteria 2 and 4b and that the Scientific Commission did not recommend the listing of CWD. The Code Commission also noted that in the October 2018 report of the OIE *ad hoc* Group on Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy Risk Status Evaluation of Members, the *ad hoc* Group had noted that the impact of CWD on wild cervid populations was significant. Considering the divergence of opinions, the Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat seek further clarification from the Scientific Commission on its recommendation.

9. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held from 4–13 February 2020.

.../Annexes