



Organisation  
Mondiale  
de la Santé  
Animale

World  
Organisation  
for Animal  
Health

Organización  
Mundial  
de Sanidad  
Animal

Original: English

September 2018

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

Paris, 11–20 September 2018

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at OIE Headquarters in Paris from 11 to 20 September 2018. The list of participants is attached as [Annex 1](#).

The Code Commission thanked the following Member Countries for providing comments: Argentina, Australia, Canada, China (People's Republic), Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Costa Rica, Fiji, Guatemala, Japan, Malaysia, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, Americas, the Member States of European Union (EU) and the African Union Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of African Member Countries of the OIE. Comments were also received from the Voice of Europe's Poultry Meat Sector (AVEC), European Live Poultry and Hatching Egg Association (ELPHA), the European Serum Product Association (ESPA), the International Coalition for Animal Welfare (ICFAW), International Egg Commission (IEC) and International Poultry Council (IPC). The Code Commission referred comments regarding translation to the OIE Headquarters.

The Code Commission reviewed Member Country comments, which were submitted on time and supported by a rationale, including some comments made by Member Countries during the 86th General Session in May 2018, and amended relevant chapters of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Terrestrial Code*) where appropriate. The amendments are presented in the usual manner by 'double underline' and '~~strike through~~' and the chapters are annexed to this report. In Annexes [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 17](#), amendments proposed at this meeting are highlighted with a coloured background to distinguish them from those proposed previously.

The Code Commission considered all Member Country comments supported by a rationale and documented its responses. However, because of the large volume of work, the Code Commission was not able to draft a detailed explanation of the reasons for accepting or not each of the comments received and focused its explanations on the major ones.

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

Member Countries should note that texts in [Part A](#) of this report are submitted for comments and will be proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019. Texts in [Part B](#) are submitted for comments only. Comments on [Parts A and B](#) of the report must reach OIE Headquarters **by 14 January 2019** for them to be considered at the February 2019 meeting of the Code Commission. Comments received after the due date will not be submitted to the Code Commission for its consideration. The reports of meetings of *ad hoc Groups* and other related documents are attached for information in [Part C](#).

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

The Code Commission again strongly encourages Member Countries to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by submitting comments on this report. Member Countries 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 '~~strike through~~' and additions using 'double underline'. Member Countries should not use the automatic 'track-changes' function provided by word processing software as such changes are lost in the process of collating Member Countries submissions into the Code Commission's working documents. Member Countries are also requested **not** to reproduce the full text of a chapter as this makes it easy to miss comments while preparing the working documents.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Texts proposed for adoption in May 2019</b>	<b>Part A: Annex No.</b>
3.c)	Infection with <i>Chlamydophila abortus</i> (Enzootic abortion of ewes, ovine chlamydiosis) (Chapter 14.4.)	3
4.3	The role of the Veterinary Services in food safety systems (Chaper 6.2.)	4
4.4	Guiding principles for the use of measures to assess animal welfare (Article 7.1.4.)	5
4.5	Animal welfare and pig production systems (Chapter 7.13.)	6
5.1	Glossary Part A ('Early warning system' and 'sanitary measure')	7
5.2	Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.)	8
5.5	Draft new chapter on introduction to recommendations for disease prevention and control (Chapter 4.Z.)	9
5.7	Draft new chapter on killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products (Chapter 7.Y)	10
5.8	Infection with rabies virus (Chapter 8.14.)	11
5.10	Infection with African swine fever virus (Articles 15.1.1bis., 15.1.2., 15.1.3., and 15.1.22.)	12
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Texts for Member Countries comments</b>	<b>Part B: Annex No.</b>
4.3/ 5.10/ 7.1.g)	Glossary Part B ('Competent Authority', 'Veterinary Authority', 'Veterinary Services', 'captive wild [animal]', and 'epidemiological unit')	13
5.3	Procedures for self declaration and for official recognition by the OIE (Chapter 1.6.)	14
5.4	Draft new chapter on official control of listed and emerging diseases (Chapter 4.Y.)	15
5.6	Draft new chapter on animal welfare and laying hen production systems (Chapter 7.Z.)	16
5.11	Infection with classical swine fever virus (Chapter 15.2.)	17
6.2	Veterinary legislation (Chapter 3.4.)	18
6.4	Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4.)	19
7.1.b)	Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1.)	20
7.1	Work programme	21

Item No.	Texts for Member Countries information	Part C: Annex No.
5.6	Report of the <i>ad hoc Group</i> on Animal welfare and laying hen production systems (March 2018)	22
5.7	Report of the <i>ad hoc Group</i> on Killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products (August 2018)	23
6.2	Report of the <i>ad hoc Group</i> on Veterinary legislation (January 2018)	24
6.4	Report of the <i>ad hoc Group</i> on Avian influenza (June 2018)	25

## 1. Welcome and orientation

### 1.1 Meeting with the Director General

The Code Commission met with Dr Monique Eloit, Director General, on 11 September 2018. Dr Eloit welcomed the Code Commission members and congratulated them on their election or re-election and thanked them for their commitment to the work of this Commission.

The Director General noted that new members bring a diverse range of expertise and experience to what is an important contribution to the standards setting function of the OIE. The Director General acknowledged the Member Countries' requests and high expectations for the OIE standard setting process. Noting the resource and financial constraints faced by the OIE to support *ad hoc Group* meetings, the Director General asked the Code Commission for its active consideration of these constraints in considering its work programme. The Director General drew the attention of the Code Commission members to the framework for the evaluation of the performance of Specialist Commissions which would be introduced at its meeting in 2019 February. Finally the Director General highlighted the importance of good coordination among the Specialist Commissions and their Secretariats and noted the high expectations for the Common Secretariat for which the Standards Department takes a leading role.

The President of the Code Commission thanked the Director General and the Headquarters for the support for the Code Commission's work.

### 1.2 Induction to the Code Commission work

Noting that this was the first meeting of the newly elected Specialist Commissions it was agreed that the opening session of all Specialist Commission meetings would be dedicated to a half-day 'Induction session'.

The purpose of these sessions, for new and previously elected members, was to start to get to know each other, to better understand how the work of each of the Commission's fits into the mission of the OIE and to clarify the roles of Commission members and OIE Secretariat and other staff. There was general agreement that this new initiative was very valuable for all concerned and will assist in ensuring the success of the work of each Commission. The OIE will continue to explore other novel ways of supporting the Commissions in their work.

## 2. Adoption of the agenda

The Agenda was adopted, noting that it would not consider the *ad hoc Group* report on BSE as additional meetings were planned to continue revising the relevant chapter of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Code Commission also noted that Chapter 8.8. on Foot and mouth disease would be reviewed once the issue of the new concept of zoning (temporary protection zone) is addressed in the horizontal chapter on zoning and compartmentalisation (see Agenda Item 3. a.). The adopted agenda of the meeting is attached as **Annex 2**.

### 3. Cooperation with other Specialist Commissions

#### a) Technical working group meeting with the Presidents and Vice Presidents of the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission related to the concept of ‘temporary protection zone’

The Presidents and First Vice Presidents of the Scientific Commission and Code Commission held a technical working group meeting in the margins of the two Commission meetings to discuss the concept of a temporary protection zone that was first circulated for Member Countries comments after the Specialist Commissions meeting in September 2017. The meeting was chaired by the OIE Deputy Director General for International Standards and Science, Dr Matthew Stone.

The main objective of the meeting was to consider the Member Countries comments received after circulating the draft concept, to explore its links with currently existing concepts of the *Terrestrial Code* (i.e. protection zone, containment zone) and to agree on the best approach to further develop and communicate the new concept to the Member Countries.

The strategic drivers of the temporary protection/preventive zone, the relevance for its inclusion in the horizontal chapter (i.e. Chapter 4.3. on Zoning and compartmentalisation) and whether it should be applicable to all diseases or to only those diseases for which the OIE recognises an official status, were extensively discussed.

It was agreed that the OIE Headquarters would draft a discussion paper, based mainly on the current concept of “protection zone”, exploring the application and impact of the concept related to different diseases. This paper would be reviewed by both Commissions during the February 2019 meetings.

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

The President of the Code Commission met with the President of the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (Aquatic Animals Commission) to discuss issues of mutual interest in the *Aquatic and Terrestrial Codes*, notably:

- proposed amendments to Chapter 1.1. *Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information*, in order to better align this Chapter in both Codes;
- progress regarding proposed new and revised chapters in Section 4 of the Codes; and
- the development of a guidance document on the application of the criteria for listing an OIE disease.

#### c) Consultation with the Biological Standards Commission

The meeting schedule did not allow for a meeting with the President of the Biological Standards Commission. However, there was consultation on some items of work that was coordinated through the Secretariats. In agreement with the advice from the Biological Standards Commission, the Code Commission agreed to the updated taxonomy of the pathogenic agent *Chlamydia abortus*, where it is referred to in Chapter 14.4., including the title and also noted that Article 1.3.3. should be updated accordingly if the modification is adopted during the General Session in May 2019.

The revised title and Article 14.4.1. are attached as **Annex 3** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

### 4. Examination of Member Countries’ comments at the 86th General Session

#### 4.1. Zoning and compartmentalisation (Chapter 4.3.)

The following Member Countries made comments at the 86th General Session: Argentina and Thailand.

In response to a Member Country comments on the definition of ‘compartment’ used in this chapter, specifically in reference to the need to reflect more explicitly the status of the compartment, the Code Commission asked the OIE Headquarters to closely look at the implications in the recently adopted Chapter 4.3. and the possibility of revising Chapter 4.4. on Application of compartmentalisation. It also requested the OIE Headquarters to seek advice from the Scientific Commission about the Member Country comments.

In further response to the same Member Country comment, the Code Commission clarified that, in Article 4.4.7., the free status of a compartment could be suspended if there was a significant breach in biosecurity even in the absence of outbreaks. In this case, the disease free status of the compartment could only be reinstated by applying measures necessary to re-establish the original biosecurity level.

In response to a Member Country request to provide more guidance on activities to be undertaken in each type of zone, the Code Commission agreed to develop a new chapter on the application of zoning and added this to its work programme.

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to delete the words ‘and vector surveillance’ after ‘specific surveillance’ in Article 4.3.4., as it is not compulsory to conduct ‘past or ongoing specific surveillance’ or ‘vector surveillance’. The words ‘may require’ indicate this clearly. The Code Commission further noted that the provisions on “vector surveillance” should remain considering the important epidemiological role of vectors for some diseases.

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country request to add a new sentence 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 response to a Member Country proposal to delete the last new paragraph related to the event of an occurrence of a case of the infection or infestation for which the containment zone was established in Article 4.3.7., the Code Commission disagreed and reaffirmed the importance of this text to clarify the concept of a containment zone and its advantages for the rest of the country.

#### **4.2. Vaccination (Chapter 4.17.)**

The following Member Countries made comments at the 86th General Session: the EU.

In reviewing Member Countries comments made during the 86th General Session suggesting that in their view the definition of ‘population immunity’ is not correct, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission disagreed. The Code Commission noted that ‘population immunity’ is the measure of immunity in the target population immunised at a specific time and the current definition in this chapter is appropriate. The Code Commission also noted that the ‘population immunity’ is not an absolute term and it reflects a given level of immunity, even if it is not sufficient to prevent the spread of the disease.

#### **4.3. The role of Veterinary Services in food safety systems (Chapter 6.2.)**

The following Member Countries made comments at the 86th General Session: New Zealand on behalf of the Quads and the European Union.

In response to a Member Country comment that Article 6.2.4. was confusing with respect to the role of the Veterinary Services and the Competent Authority in food safety and veterinary public health, the Code Commission reviewed this article. The Code Commission tried to address any inconsistencies in the text but noted that without the provision of alternative text by the Member Country it was difficult to address their concerns. The Code Commission requested that any further Member Countries comments include the submission of alternative text and a rationale to assist the Code Commission to fully understand their concerns. The Code Commission agreed to make the following amendments in Article 6.2.4.:

In point 1. *Roles and responsibilities of Veterinary Services*, the Code Commission agreed to replace the words ‘Veterinary Services’ with ‘Veterinary Authorities or other Competent Authorities’ in the third paragraph for clarity as it is the Veterinary Authority or Competent Authority, that should retain overall responsibility for the delivery and performance of any activities delegated to third party providers.

In point 2. c) *Assurance schemes and certification of food of animal origin for international trade*, The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country comment that the use of the term ‘Competent Authority’ was incorrect and proposed to replace this term with ‘responsible agencies’ which is consistent with the use of the term in Article 6.2.1.

In response to a Member Country comment, the Code Commission revised the definitions for ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Veterinary Authority’ and ‘Veterinary Services’ to better reflect the roles that these entities play in veterinary public health.

The Code Commission made amendments to the definition of ‘Competent Authority’ to make a clear differentiation with the definition of ‘Veterinary Authority’.

The Code Commission also added the words ‘the OIE Delegate’ in the definition of ‘Veterinary Authority’, as it is true that in accordance with the OIE Rules, the Veterinary Authority should be under the OIE Delegate’s responsibilities or at least the OIE Delegate should be part of the Veterinary Authority.

Other comments did not improve the clarity of the text and were not accepted by the Code Commission.

The revised Article 6.2.4. is attached as **Annex 4** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

The revised Glossary definitions for ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Veterinary Authority’ and ‘Veterinary Services’ are attached as **Annex 13** for Member Country comments.

#### **4.4. Guiding principles for the use of measures to assess animal welfare (Article 7.1.4.)**

The following Member Countries made comments at the 86th General Session: Japan and Paraguay on behalf of the 30 OIE Members of the Americas and the European Union.

Some Member Countries commented on point 3) noting the importance of not excluding other entities, universities and research institutions from the collection of relevant data to establish the threshold to meet animal-based measures as they considered that deletion of the phrase ‘and other relevant bodies’ would result in the loss of a valuable source of data. The Code Commission did not agree to reinstate the reference to ‘other relevant bodies’ and clarified that the Competent Authority is the entity responsible for officially collecting data, and also clarified that the data provided to the Competent Authority can come from different sources such as universities or research institutions, which is expressed in the proposed text as ‘all **relevant** data should be collected’. However, the Code Commission agreed to reinsert the sentence and move it from the end of point 3), in the version proposed for adoption during the 86th General Session, to the end of point 5), as a new sentence, for improved readability.

The revised Article 7.1.4. is attached as **Annex 5** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

#### **4.5. Animal welfare and pig production systems (Chapter 7.13.)**

The following Member Countries made comments at the 86th General Session: Chad, on behalf of the 54 Members of the African Union and the OIE African Region, Germany on behalf of the 28 Member States of the EU and USA on behalf of the 30 OIE Members of the Americas.

##### **Article 7.13.1.**

Regarding Member Countries request to replace ‘mental’ state with ‘behaviour’ in the definition of ‘environmental enrichment’, due to the difficulties to define the ‘mental state’ in an animal, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal, as both terms are not interchangeable. The term ‘behaviour’ refers in this chapter to a response to a given situation and a ‘mental state’ is a condition at a particular time. They also recalled that the term ‘mental state’ is consistent with the recently revised definition of animal welfare.

##### **Article 7.13.4.**

The Code Commission agreed with the comment of Member Countries to include the word ‘other’ in the second paragraph of the section on behaviour as they agreed this addition would help to differentiate behaviours associated with poor animal welfare from behaviours indicating good animal welfare.

**Article 7.13.9.**

The Code Commission did not agree with the rationale given by Member Countries to delete the third bullet point on the provision of feed and water saying that this point was more relevant to Article 7.13.10. on the environmental enrichment aspects. The Code Commission recalled that its position was in agreement with the rationale provided by the *ad hoc Group* on Animal welfare and pig production systems in its January 2018 report. The *ad hoc Group* indicated that the provision of specific forage and foraging behaviour are related to the improvement of nutritional aspects and not to environmental aspects.

The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal of Member Countries to add a new sentence concerning the early mixing after servicing of sows and gilts as this management procedure is not supported by any scientific literature. The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that the *ad hoc Group* had noted this in its report of January 2018.

**Article 7.13.13.**

The Code Commission did not agree with the comments of some Member Countries to promote the use of group housing systems in point 1) as this aspect is already mentioned in the last paragraph of Article 7.13.12. on housing. The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to add a new sentence about the period in which sows and gilts should be kept in stalls after service as it is too prescriptive.

**Article 7.13.15.**

The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal of Member Countries to keep the animal-based criteria for excessive soiling and tear staining. However, they agreed to modify the list of criteria to include ‘discharges from nose or eyes’, being an animal-based measurable, as examples of physical appearance aspects to be considered when assessing animal welfare in relation to air quality conditions.

The revised Articles 7.13.4. and 7.13.15. of Chapter 7.13. is attached as **Annex 6** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

**4.6. Infection with *Burkholderia mallei* (Glanders) (Chapter 12.10.)**

The following Member Countries made comments at the 86th General Session: Argentina.

The Code Commission disagreed with a proposal from a Member Country to only use the term ‘equid’ rather than ‘equine’ throughout this chapter and noted that in accordance with the past discussion at the Code Commission meetings about the terms used for animal species, the respective use of these terms is correct in the chapter, where ‘equid’ is a noun and ‘equine’ is an adjective.

**5. Texts circulated for Member Countries’ comments at the September 2017 and February 2018 meetings****5.1. Glossary**

Comments were received from New Zealand and Switzerland.

The Code Commission considered Member Country comments and proposed the following amendments and observations on proposed changes to the Glossary.

**Early warning system**

The Code Commission disagreed with comments from a Member Country requesting the inclusion of more detailed information in the definition and agreed with the Scientific Commission to keep the definition short, as should be the case in the Glossary, while the details are found in the relevant chapters. In response to the same Member Country proposal to reinstate the word ‘identification’, the Code Commission disagreed as ‘identification’ of the pathogenic agent is a further step after detection that can take some time, while ‘Early warning system’ is meant for rapid response. The Code Commission disagreed with the same Member Country proposal to delete the word ‘communication’ as it did not consider this to be a synonym of reporting. Communication has a wider meaning and could be done by authorities or relevant stakeholders to the public. Finally, the Code Commission noted that as the definition of ‘Early detection system’ would be replaced with ‘Early warning system’ in the Glossary, the current definition of ‘Early detection system’ should appear as ‘~~striethrough~~’ and requested the OIE Headquarters to make a necessary amendment on the Glossary.

## Sanitary measure

The Code Commission noted comments received in support of the proposed definition.

The revised Glossary is attached as **Annex 7** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

### 5.2. Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China (People's Republic), Colombia, Japan, Malaysia, New Caledonia, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

In response to a Member Country comment regarding some inconsistencies in the use of the term 'disease', the Code Commission noted that the definition of the term 'disease' was deleted from the Glossary at the 86th General Session in May 2018. The Code Commission reiterated that the term 'disease' would not disappear from the *Terrestrial Code* but rather will be used as a general term, not a defined term. As a consequence, the term now appears not in italics. The Code Commission noted that it would seek consistency in the use of the term 'disease' throughout the *Terrestrial Code*, including the User's Guide with assistance from the OIE Headquarters, in order to make any necessary amendments for clarity.

#### Article 1.4.1.

In point 1), the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed not to accept a proposal from a Member Country to add the words 'or presence of a zoonotic pathogen' after '*infection* or *infestation*', as the definition of 'infection' already includes the presence of a pathogenic agent in animals or humans.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries comments to reinstate the previous wording 'to facilitate the control of infection or infestation'. The Code Commission also agreed to amend the sentence related to the type of surveillance to include the words 'objectives of the surveillance' after 'depends on' agreeing that it also depends on the surveillance objectives. The Code Commission also made editorial amendments to improve the clarity.

In point 2), in response to a Member Country comment to add the words 'be harvested, hunted, traded and' after 'they can', the Code Commission disagreed as surveillance for wildlife is considered in the *Terrestrial Code* because of their potential roles in affecting animals and humans.

In point 3) *b*), the Code Commission agreed with a Member Country comment to add the words 'population demographic data' before 'animal production data', as it is important for the analysis of surveillance data.

#### Article 1.4.2.

In 'sampling unit', the Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country comment to add a new sentence about minimum unit of observation, as it is already included in the definition of 'sample' above. In response to another Member Country comments proposing editorial changes, the Code Commission agreed to delete the third sentence because 'sampling frame' is not used in the *Terrestrial Code*.

#### Article 1.4.3.

In point 1) *a*), the Code Commission partially agreed with the proposal to delete the last text added in the February 2018 and added the word 'stated' at the end of the last sentence. In response to a proposal of several Member Countries to replace the word 'disease' with 'infection or infestation' as this would be a more appropriate term than 'disease', the Code Commission disagreed and reaffirmed that when the *Terrestrial Code* is referring to the epidemiology it is in a general sense regarding the disease and not related to the control of a specific infection or infestation.

In point 1) *b*), the Code Commission amended the first sentence to add the words ‘and frequency’ after ‘duration’ and deleted the last sentence in point 1) *b*) as this is included in the above. In response to a proposal of a Member Country to add the word ‘environmental condition’ after ‘climate’, the Code Commission agreed to add the words ‘environmental factors, including’ in the last indent.

In point 1) *c*), in response to a Member Country comment to add the common name to the taxonomy, the Code Commission disagreed as it does not add value.

In point 1) *e*), the Code Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to delete the last text of this point.

In point 1) *ebis*), in response to a Member Country request for clarification and the proposal to add the definition of ‘test’, the Code Commission added the word ‘laboratory’ before ‘tests’ in the last sentence to highlight the fact that the *Terrestrial Manual* deals with laboratory tests.

In point 1) *f*), the Code Commission amended the text in response to a Member Country proposal to replace the words ‘should only be carried out when’ with ‘may be carried out only when’. The Code Commission highlighted that statistical analysis cannot be carried out without good quality data.

In point 1) *g*), the Code Commission disagreed with Member Countries proposals to include the words ‘coverage and’ before ‘representativeness’ in this point as the representativeness in this chapter includes the species of animals and the ways they are distributed.

In point 2) *a*), the Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to make editorial changes as it did not improve the clarity. In response to another Member Country proposal to make reference to target species, the Code Commission requested OIE Headquarters to seek opinions from the Biological Standards Commission and the Scientific Commission on the proposal.

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to make changes in relation to pooled samples as it does not add further clarity.

In point 2) *b*), the Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to add data validation as it confirmed that data management includes data validation and there is no need to specify it explicitly. The Code Commission also disagreed with a Member Country proposal to delete the words ‘particularly for data involving *wildlife*’ as the survey of wildlife often requires the involvement of other Competent Authorities and hence needed to be noted.

In point 3), in response to a Member Country proposal to change the subtitle to ‘Surveillance evaluation’, the Code Commission disagreed because the content of the paragraph is about quality assurance approach.

#### **Article 1.4.4.**

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to make editorial changes in the paragraph 1 as it agreed with the *ad hoc Group* on Surveillance that this is more understandable.

In point 2) *b*) *i*) *Objective*, in response to a Member Country comment on the application of risk factor, the Code Commission proposed editorial changes to add the words ‘probability-based’ in the second sentence and considered the proposals from the Scientific Commission to make necessary changes to add ‘Those weights should be underpinned by relevant scientific evidence and should’. In response to Member Countries comments to avoid misunderstandings as non-probability-based sampling is by definition not representative of the target population, the Code Commission added ‘can be considered as’ as non-probability-based sampling may not be representative of the target population and deleted the following sentence to improve the clarity.

In point 2) *b*) *iii*) *Sample selection*, in response to a Member Country comment to add the word ‘risk’ in probability-based sampling methods, the Code Commission agreed and added the words ‘risk-based sampling’.

In point 3), the Code Commission made editorial amendments in response to Member Country comments on risk-based methods and deleted the words ‘(e.g. large economic losses or trade restrictions)’ as it is important to keep all aspects of risk assessment in this point, including consequence, but not to give specific examples. In response to a Member Country comment on justification for surveillance techniques, the Code Commission disagreed as the objective of surveillance deals with the consequence of disease not only the presence of disease related to declaration of the disease free status.

In point 4), Member Countries proposed to replace the words ‘Competent Authority’ with ‘Veterinary Authority’ for consistency, but the Code Commission disagreed, as an authority other than the Veterinary Authority could be the responsible authority in the slaughterhouse.

In point 5), in response to Member Country comments on the last sentence on ‘sentinel units’, the Code Commission amended the point for clarity. The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed to accept Member Countries proposals to insert ‘or re-emergence’.

In point 7), in response to a proposal of a Member Country to delete the last sentence on software, the Code Commission agreed to delete it as the sentence is about data management, which is not relevant to the syndromic surveillance, but move it in point 2) b) of Article 1.4.3.

In point 8) b), the Code Commission noted the proposal of a Member Country to make reference to laboratory investigation records and added ‘in particular for retrospective studies’ to improve clarity. In response to Member Countries proposals to include a new sentence on valid analysis of data, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed to add the words ‘quality control and quality assurance systems, including’. The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country comment on the list of specimen surveillance, as it did not add clarity to the text and was too prescriptive.

In response to Member Countries proposals to include published data and grey literature in point 8) g) Additional supporting data, the Code Commission noted that all the data listed in this point can come from published data or grey literature but it is not necessary to articulate in the *Terrestrial Code*. However, the Code Commission amended the subtitle of point 8) to read ‘Other useful data’ to improve the clarity.

#### **Article 1.4.5.**

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to move the definition of ‘early warning systems’ to the Glossary as the parts of early warning systems that have been moved to the surveillance chapter are the recommendations which are not stated in the Glossary and it is more appropriate to have the detailed information in the surveillance chapter.

The Code Commission disagreed with Member Countries proposals to move the second paragraph of draft Article 4.Y.4. on Surveillance and early warning systems to this chapter, as some parts of this article are not relevant to early **warning** systems but early **action**. However, the Code Commission agreed to move the sentence on the case confirmation from draft Article 4.Y.4. to this chapter.

In point 1), the Code Commission did not accept the comment of a Member Country to reference ‘representative coverage’, as representative coverage is relevant to statistical sampling while the point here is about the presence, tools and actions of *Veterinary Services* to understand the sanitary situation of the animal population.

In point 4), the Code Commission disagreed with the proposal of a Member Country to include the words ‘unusual animal health incidents including’, as this is already included in point 3) above. The Code Commission accepted the proposal of a Member Country to include the words ‘veterinarians and other’.

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission disagreed with a Member Country comment on deleting point 4), as notifiable diseases and emerging diseases are compulsory to report to the OIE. However, the Code Commission accepted the proposal of several Member Countries to delete all the indents in point 4) and amended the text to add ‘including the description of the findings’.

In point 5), the Code Commission accepted the proposal of Member Countries to delete all the indents as the list is not exhaustive and can be considered to be too prescriptive. However, the Code Commission noted that it is an important aspect in early warning systems and added the words ‘in order to confirm the case and to acquire accurate knowledge of the situation for further action:’.

In point 7), the Code Commission disagreed with the proposal of a Member Country to amend ‘a national chain of command’ as the national chain of command is under the supervision of the *Veterinary Authority* which covers the *Veterinary Services* including private sectors.

The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of Member Countries to move the second last sentence to the first paragraph of this article and deleted the last sentence as it is already covered in Chapter 1.1.

#### **Article 1.4.6.**

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission disagreed with the proposal of a Member Country to add a paragraph to provide clarity regarding the two types of freedom (self-declaration and official recognition by the OIE), as this is referred in Chapter 1.6. and this chapter deals with surveillance to demonstrate absence of disease regardless of the procedures.

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to retain the subtitle, as it considered the revised subtitle logically fits with the structure of this article.

In response to the proposal of a Member Country to replace the word ‘present’ with the words ‘detected by scientific methods’ to improve clarity, the Code Commission disagreed and noted that if the agent is detected the country is not free and the sentence is to demonstrate statistical freedom that is based upon the presumed level of prevalence.

The Code Commission disagreed with Member Countries proposals to insert the words ‘where applicable’ after ‘as indicated’ as it is implicit in the relevant chapters.

In point 2) *a) iii)*, the Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to retain the proposed deleted text to ensure clarity, as this point concerns all types of susceptible animals.

In point 2) *a) iv)*, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to reinstate this point, as unless otherwise specified in the relevant listed disease-specific chapters, vaccination of animals does not affect the status of the country or zone and should not disrupt trade. The Code Commission disagreed with the same Member Country proposal to reinstate some points as disease reporting is already covered in other points.

In point 2) *a) v)*, the Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to add a point on the wildlife because this is already covered in the relevant disease-specific chapters.

In point 2) *b) Historical freedom*, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission’s request to add new points regarding claiming historical freedom.

In point 2) *b) iii)*, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission disagreed with the proposal of a Member Country to replace ‘25 years’ with ‘10 years’, as the provision in point 2) *b) iii)* depends only on the detection of occurrence of a disease, while the provision under point 2) *b) i)* is more stringent and requires much more efforts for a country to gather evidence to claim freedom.

In point 2) *c) ii)*, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission disagreed with the proposal of a Member Country to add text on a minimum frequency, as it is already included in Article 1.4.3. In response to the editorial proposal from Member Countries to improve the clarity of this point, the Code Commission deleted “if exists” as “relevant chapter” is enough to explain that some chapters include pathogen-specific surveillance and others do not.

In point 3) *b)*, the Code Commission disagreed with the proposal of several Member Countries to improve clarity, as it is already included in Article 1.4.3. The Code Commission agreed on other editorial proposals from Member Countries to improve the clarity of this point.

In point 4), in response to a Member Country proposal to add the word ‘compartment’ after ‘a country or zone’, the Code Commission disagreed as this is about the maintenance of freedom for a country or zone that has achieved freedom, and for a compartment Chapter 4.4. on Application of compartmentalisation could be used. The Code Commission also disagreed with a Member Country proposal to retain the proposed deleted text to ensure clarity, as this point concerns all types of susceptible animals.

The revised Chapter 1.4. is attached as **Annex 8** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

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

Comments were received from Australia, China (People’s Republic), Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, EU and AU-IBAR.

In response to several Member Countries comments on the standard operating procedure (SOP) for self-declaration, the Code Commission noted that it should be discussed with the Scientific Commission because the OIE’s SOP for submission of a self-declaration of disease freedom is not a part of the *Terrestrial Code*, but a **procedure** related to the work of the Scientific Commission and the OIE Headquarters. The Code Commission also noted that Article 1.1.5. is related to the notification of the absence of diseases, and therefore has a relationship to the procedure regarding disease free country or zone (see Agenda Item 7.1.b.), and it proposed to consider whether the article should be moved to Chapter 1.6. in its next meeting in February 2019.

#### **Article 1.6.1.**

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to include a reference to Article 1.4.6. on Surveillance for freedom from an infection or infestation in the first sentence, as this chapter is about the procedure for self-declaration and not the conditions to be met by Member Countries.

In response to editorial amendments from several Member Countries in paragraph 2, the Code Commission disagreed, as they do not add clarity to the text. The Code Commission clarified that the term ‘relevant chapter’ means not only the listed-disease chapters but all relevant chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*.

In response to Member Countries comments on footnotes of specific URLs in the *Terrestrial Code*, the Code Commission requested that the OIE Headquarters include a hyperlink only in the OIE web version once it is adopted.

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to replace the word ‘disease’ with ‘infection/infestation’ because the use of disease here means any disease and includes diseases that are not listed or do not have a specific chapter in the *Terrestrial Code*.

In response to a Member Country proposal to add text for specific surveillance the Code Commission did not agree because the surveillance referred to is not specific and it could be any general surveillance.

The Code Commission agreed to delete the words ‘of freedom from’ after ‘self-declarations’ because the status are not only for freedom and accepted comments to replace ‘1.6.1bis.’ with ‘1.6.2.’.

#### **Article 1.6.2.**

In response to several Member Countries comments to add the words ‘and endorsement’ after ‘Official recognition’ and other editorial changes, the Code Commission amended the article for clarity.

In response to Member Countries proposals to remove the reference to risk status of BSE, the Code Commission noted that BSE chapter is now being revised by the OIE taking into account all Member Countries comments.

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries comments regarding possible discrepancies between the wording in points *a), c), d), e)* and *f)* and the new chapters 1.7., 1.9., 1.10., 1.11. and 1.12., and noted that the Code Commission along with the OIE Headquarters will look at the possible discrepancies to ensure alignment with the *Terrestrial Code* convention for naming diseases.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country comment to add the words ‘of status’ after ‘official recognition’.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries comments to reinstate the parentheses after the chapter numbers for clarity and readability.

The Code Commission also accepted editorial comments on the last paragraph.

The revised Chapter 1.6. is attached as **Annex 14** for Member Country comments.

#### **5.4. Draft new chapter on official control of listed and emerging diseases (Chapter 4.Y.)**

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China (People’s Republic), Colombia, Malaysia, New Caledonia, Singapore, Switzerland, Thailand, EU and AU-IBAR.

##### **Title**

The Code Commission continued to use official control in the title, but it proposed to address concerns from a Member Country by adding new text on the purpose of the chapter in Article 4.Y.1.

In response to a Member Country proposal to make a reference to ‘official control programme’, the Code Commission disagreed as ‘official control programme’ is a defined term in the Glossary and “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.”

##### **Article 4.Y.1.**

In paragraph 1, in response to a Member Country proposal to replace ‘listed’ with ‘notifiable’, the Code Commission disagreed, as the sentence is to specify that this chapter could be used for diseases other than listed diseases. In response to the same Member Country proposal to replace the words ‘the likely impact of the disease’ with ‘cost-effective risk reduction’, the Code Commission disagreed as cost effectiveness is already covered in the paragraph 4.

The Code Commission did not accept a proposal from a Member Country to add the words ‘and/or eradication’ after ‘long-term control’, as this is not the objective of this chapter and not relevant to this point. However, the Code Commission made amendments for clarity and consistency.

In paragraph 2, the Code Commission accepted a Member Country proposal to make an editorial change.

The Code Commission also added a new sentence on the purposes of the chapter as “Although this chapter focuses primarily on *listed* and *emerging diseases*, the recommendations may also be used by the *Veterinary Authorities* for any *notifiable diseases* or diseases against which they have established *official control programmes*.” to make it clear that the chapter could be used for any notifiable diseases.

In paragraph 4, the Code Commission accepted a proposal from a Member Country to replace the word ‘They’ with ‘*Official control programmes*’ for clarity. The Code Commission also agreed to add the word ‘preferably’ and delete ‘when possible’, and add ‘should’ in the last sentence, for clarity.

In paragraph 6, the Code Commission proposed amendments to the paragraph to add the list of the components of an official control programme addressing the comments of a Member Country and the Scientific Commission. The Code Commission added the words ‘critical...for diseases that are not present in the Member Country are measures to prevent the introduction’ for better understanding and clarity and deleted the last sentence as it is already covered in the added list.

**Article 4.Y.2.**

In point 2), the Code Commission accepted a Member Country proposal to replace the word ‘power’ with ‘authority’.

The Code Commission considered a Member Country suggestion to add ‘hiring additional technical and professional staff if necessary’ after ‘epidemiological enquiries’ and agreed to include a new point on ‘sources of financing for dedicated supportive staff’.

In regard to the concerns raised by several Member Countries on the added words ‘or for losses incurred due to movement restrictions’, the Code Commission clarified in the text that these losses were not incurred due to international trade but as a result of movement restrictions imposed by the control programme. The Code Commission emphasised that not to give a compensation to affected farmers could be used as an excuse for an illegal movement of commodities.

In point 3), the Code Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to make a reference to ‘assess risks and prioritize actions’ and replaced the word ‘identify’ with ‘assess’.

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to add the words ‘and/or animal products’ after ‘testing of animal’, as samples could be any parts taken from the animals.

The Code Commission proposed amendments to the second last indent to replace the words ‘compulsory emergency’ with ‘implementation of’ and add ‘programme’ after ‘vaccination’, in order to address the concerns that this chapter is for all kind of situations not only for emergencies.

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to add new point related to a good communication protocol, as this is too specific to an emergency situation.

The Code Commission made amendments on the last indent to take into account comments of Member Countries and the Scientific Commission.

**Article 4.Y.3.**

The Code Commission made amendments to the subtitle to read ‘Emergency preparedness’ and paragraph 1, as this article is describing the emergency situation and there is a need to mention the occurrence of a disease that is not present in the country or zone or sudden increase of a disease that is present.

In point 1), the Code Commission disagreed with Member Countries proposals to make a reference to prioritisation, as this is already covered in the paragraph.

In point 3), the Code Commission agreed with the proposal of a Member Country to include the words ‘and other relevant agencies’ after ‘neighbouring countries’.

**Article 4.Y.4.**

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries proposal to amend the subtitle to read ‘Surveillance and early warning systems’ for consistency with draft Article 1.4.5. and revised the paragraph to add the words ‘are an integral component of emergency preparedness’ after ‘Early warning systems’.

In response to Member Countries proposal to move some of the information contained in the paragraph to Article 1.4.5., the Code Commission agreed that the first three sentences from the new text to be moved to point 5) of Article 1.4.5.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries proposal to add the words ‘at least’ before ‘the implementation’ and made additional amendment to improve clarity.

**Article 4.Y.5.**

The Code Commission made amendments to the subtitle to read ‘General considerations for outbreak management’ for clarity.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to add a new point as point 1) on epidemiological investigation.

The Code Commission made an amendment to include the word ‘commodities’ after ‘animal’.

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to add a new point related to surveillance and tracing, as it agreed with the Scientific Commission’s opinion that this is not relevant and surveillance and tracing is not meant to stop the spread of infection.

The Code Commission agreed with a proposal of a Member Country to include the words ‘control of vectors’ as a new point.

#### **Article 4.Y.6.**

The Code Commission thanked Member Countries who submitted a proposal for a definition of animal products. In response to a clarification request from a Member Country, considering the below definition of ‘commodity’ in the Glossary, the Code Commission proposed to replace the words ‘animal products’ with ‘other commodities’ in the subtitle for clarity.

##### **COMMODITY**

means live animals, products of animal origin, animal genetic material, biological products and pathological material.

The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of a Member Country to make a reference to vectors, as it can cause indirect infection. In response to other Member Country proposal to include people themselves as a fomite, the Code Commission agreed, as this was relevant to this article. The Code Commission proposed to delete the words ‘active’ and ‘effectively’ taking another comment from the same Member Country into account.

The Code Commission accepted a Member Country proposal to replace the word ‘infection’ with ‘transmission of pathogenic agents’, as this was relevant to cause indirect infection.

In response to Member Countries proposal to replace the words ‘contagious disease(s)’ with ‘infectious disease(s)’ consistently throughout the chapter, the Code Commission proposed to use the word ‘transmissible’ instead of ‘contagious’ as it could encompass both meanings of ‘contagious’ and ‘infectious’. The Code Commission also requested the OIE Headquarters to seek an opinion from the Scientific Commission as to whether it agreed with the proposed change.

The Code Commission accepted Member Countries proposals to include ‘of animals’ after ‘culling’ and replace ‘their products’ with ‘other commodities’ for clarity.

In point 1) *Stamping-out policy*, the Code Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to delete the words ‘include all establishment of’ before ‘a defined *zone*’, as to allow the inclusion of wildlife as well as farmed populations. The Code Commission also agreed with another Member Country proposal to include a new sentence “Depopulation and carcass disposal can be applied to *wildlife* within a defined *zone*, based on the assessment of associated *risks*.” as the paragraph 4.

In response to a Member Country request for clarification on transportation of animals, the Code Commission confirmed that the words ‘slaughtered animals’ means that the animals are slaughtered in an approved and dedicated slaughterhouse.

In point 2) *Test and cull*, the Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to amend the title to include ‘selective killing and disposal’ as these words mean partial stamping-out in the OIE World Animal Health Information System (WAHIS) and are not relevant to this point.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to make a reference to the change of design strategy as the disease prevalence changes.

#### **Article 4.Y.7.**

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to add the word ‘or disinsection’ after ‘*vectors*’, as the protection of vectors does include possible disinsection.

**Article 4.Y.8.**

In response to Member Countries proposal to add text on disinsection, the Code Commission agreed and proposed amendments to add a new sentence “Disinfection and disinsection should be applied in accordance with Chapter 4.13”. Meanwhile, the Code Commission noted that Chapter 4.13. needed to address disinsection and agreed to include this item into its work programme.

**Article 4.Y.9.**

The Code Commission proposed amendments to replace the word ‘produced’ with ‘induced’ in response to Member Countries comments and to improve clarity. In response to the same Member Countries proposal to replace the word ‘strategies’ with ‘strategy’, the Code Commission agreed for correct grammar.

The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of Member Countries to include a reference that the vaccination is to be used to reduce clinical signs or economic losses in this article.

The Code Commission made other amendments for clarity and consistency with Chapter 4.17.

**Article 4.Y.10.**

The Code Commission made an amendment in the first paragraph, for clarity.

**Article 4.Y.11.**

The Code Commission made amendments on the subtitle to read ‘Communication’ and in the second sentence, for clarity.

**Article 4.Y.12.**

The Code Commission made minor editorial amendments to improve the clarity of this article.

The revised draft Chapter 4.Y. is attached as **Annex 15** for Member Country comments.

**5.5. Draft new chapter on introduction to recommendations for disease prevention and control (Chapter 4.Z.)**

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, China (People’s Republic), Japan, South Africa, Switzerland, EU and AU-IBAR.

In response to Member Countries requests for clarification on the reason for not including non-infectious diseases in the first sentence, the Code Commission amended the text to replace the word ‘infectious’ with ‘transmissible’ for clarity and consistency with the title.

In paragraph 6, the Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country comment to add reference to ‘cost effective risk reduction’ as this is already covered in the definition of ‘risk analysis’ which includes cost and economic factors.

In response to several Member Countries comments on the indents, the Code Commission updated and amended the text for clarity and completeness.

In response to Member Countries comments to add the words ‘sufficiently competent’ before ‘veterinarians and veterinary paraprofessionals’, the Code Commission disagreed as the meaning of competency is already included in the definition of veterinarians.

In response to a Member Country comment to propose the inclusion of media in the indents, the Code Commission disagreed as it was already covered in the effective awareness.

The Code Commission disagreed with a Member Country proposal to include ‘capacity to set clear objectives and targets’ in the indents, as it was too specific and the Code Commission meant it to be broader and more general to the topics.

In response to Member Countries comments to add the words ‘neighbouring countries or’ before ‘regional cooperation’, the Code Commission disagreed as neighbouring country is included in regional countries.

The revised draft Chapter 4.Z. is attached as **Annex 9** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

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

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China (People’s Republic), Costa Rica, Guatemala, Japan, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, Thailand, USA, EU, AU-IBAR, ICFAW and IEC.

The Code Commission considered the report of the *ad hoc Group* on Animal welfare and laying hen production systems which met from 6 to 8 March 2018. The Code Commission focused its attention on reviewing the content of the draft articles, noting that it would undertake a more thorough review of the structure of the chapter once the text is finalised.

The Code Commission highlighted that the *ad hoc Group* had considered all Member Country comments and that the report provides detailed justifications for the proposed amendments to the draft chapter. Therefore, the report of the Code Commission will only note proposals that differed from the *ad hoc Group*. Consequently, the Code Commission emphasised the importance of reading the *ad hoc Group* report in conjunction with this report in order to understand the rationale for amendments made. The Code Commission also made some minor amendments throughout the chapter to improve grammar and clarity. The Code Commission requested that comments regarding issues of translation in the Spanish version be addressed by OIE Headquarters.

### **Article 7.Z.1.**

The Code Commission excluded breeding hens from the definition for ‘laying hen’ to clarify which bird categories this chapter covers.

### **Article 7.Z.2.**

The Code Commission added a new sentence in the first paragraph to highlight that only commercial laying hen production systems are included in the scope of this chapter; pullets and hens kept in backyards are not addressed in this chapter.

### **Article 7.Z.3.**

Terminology used in this chapter such as ‘criteria’ and ‘measurable’, ‘laying hen’ and ‘hen’, and ‘good welfare’ and ‘positive state of welfare’ were amended, where relevant, to ensure alignment with other animal welfare chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*.

In point 7) *Mortality, culling and morbidity rates*, the Code Commission deleted the word ‘recorded’ from this point as they considered that this article addresses criteria (or measurable) and indicators should be included in the recommendations article.

In point 8) *Performance, d) and e)* were edited by the Code Commission to provide examples as to how egg production quality and downgrades can be measured.

In point 9) *Plumage condition*, the Code Commission added the word ‘injurious’ to feather pecking to ensure consistency with other articles as feather pecking behaviour can also be considered as a normal behaviour in some circumstances.

In point 10) *Water and feed consumption*, the Code Commission deleted references to signs and symptoms as it considered these to be indicators that are addressed in Article 7.Z.8. as animal-based measurable.

### **Article 7.Z.7.**

The Code Commission reinstated the item ‘production system’ as it considered that the type of production system is a factor that can influence space allowance.

**Article 7.Z.8.**

The Code Commission deleted the word ‘aggression’ as an animal-based measurable, as aggression is considered as a behaviour and as such is not a measurable factor.

The list of criteria was amended to ensure harmonisation with other animal welfare chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*.

**Articles 7.Z.12. and 7.Z.13.**

The Code Commission made some editorial changes in the first paragraph to ensure consistency with the terminology used in other animal welfare chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*.

**Article 7.Z.15.**

The Code Commission deleted the recommendation from the first paragraph that ‘thermal environment parameters’ should be consulted in management guidelines provided by breeder companies as they considered this information was not appropriate for the chapter.

**Article 7.Z.17.**

The Code Commission reworded the fourth paragraph for consistency with the terminology used in other chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*.

**Article 7.Z.20.**

The Code Commission agreed that induced moulting can lead to animal welfare problems, and highlighted this by adding a sentence in the first paragraph.

**Article 7.Z.21.**

This article was reviewed by the Code Commission to harmonise the terminology used in other *Terrestrial Code* chapters.

**Article 7.Z.24.**

The Code Commission added a new sentence to emphasise the need to humanely kill injured or sick pullets or hens, as soon as possible and in accordance with Chapter 7.6.

**Article 7.Z.25.**

With respect to using the mortality rate as an animal-based measure during depopulation or arrival at destination, the Code Commission agreed to exclude any mention of the stage at which it should be carried out, as this criterion could also be measured in other situations.

**Article 7.Z.26.**

The Code Commission edited the first paragraph to improve its readability.

**Article 7.Z.29.**

The Code Commission highlighted that production systems should be designed and maintained to prevent access by predators and wild birds.

Finally, regarding the proposal of the *ad hoc Group* to reorder the articles of the chapter to have a more fluid structure, the Code Commission decided to postpone this discussion until their next meeting.

The revised new Chapter 7.Z. is attached as **Annex 16** for Member Country comments.

The report of the *ad hoc Group* is attached as **Annex 22** for Member Countries information.

### 5.7. Draft new chapter on killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products (Chapter 7.Y.)

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, China (People's Republic), New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, USA, EU, AU-IBAR and ICFAW.

The Code Commission commended the work of the *ad hoc Group* on Killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products which was conducted electronically during August 2018. Given that the *ad hoc Group* report provides detailed justifications for the proposed amendments to this chapter, this report will only note proposals made by the Code Commission that differed from the proposals of the *ad hoc Group*. Consequently, the Code Commission highlighted the importance of reading the *ad hoc Group* report in conjunction with this report in order to understand the rationale for amendments made.

The Code Commission also made amendments throughout the chapter to improve grammar and clarity and requested that comments regarding issues of translation in the Spanish version be addressed by OIE Headquarters.

#### Article 7.Y.3.

In point 2) *Competency and training of the personnel*, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal that animal handlers should be responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of the stunning process as they considered this activity should be conducted by more specialised staff. The Commission amended the text accordingly.

The Code Commission did not agree with amendments to the third bullet point related to the behavioural aspects to be taken into account when handling, restraining, stunning and killing reptiles and amended the text to improve readability.

#### Article 7.Y.7.

The Code Commission did not agree with the *ad hoc Group* proposal to add a new bullet point regarding unacceptable practices during restraint as they considered that this addition did not improve clarity.

#### Article 7.Y.9.

Regarding recommendations for the effective use of electrical stunning, the Code Commission agreed to modify the fifth bullet point to include some aspects that may vary the length of time of application of the current for a correct stunning procedure.

The revised new Chapter 7.Y. is attached as [Annex 10](#) for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

The report of the *ad hoc Group* is attached as [Annex 23](#) for Member Country information.

### 5.8. Infection with rabies virus (Chapter 8.14.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China (People's Republic), Chinese Taipei, Japan, New Caledonia, New Zealand, EU, AU-IBAR and ICFAW.

In response to a Member Country comment on the naming of the rabies virus, the Code Commission disagreed and noted that the term lyssavirus is not a common name. It noted that the explanation had been already given in the report of the *ad hoc Group* on Rabies.

#### Extract of the report of November 2017 *ad hoc Group* on rabies

“The Group noted that the current internationally accepted taxonomic name that refers to the former classical rabies virus, genotype 1, is “Rabies lyssavirus” (ICTV, 2015). The Group also emphasised the role of Rabies lyssavirus as responsible for the vast majority animal and human rabies cases. The Group pointed out that lyssavirus species other than Rabies lyssavirus may also cause the disease, but have more restricted geographical distribution and host range, and that public health consequences are limited.

The Group consulted an expert from the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses, and concluded that the common name of the pathogenic agent, formerly named as “classical rabies virus, genotype 1”, should be maintained as “rabies virus” throughout the chapter.

The Group discussed the need to include other Lyssavirus species in the case definition. The public and animal health impact of other Lyssavirus species and the notification implications were discussed. The conclusion was that for the purposes of the *Terrestrial Code*, a rabies case should remain as any animal infected with rabies virus only.”

The Code Commission understood in principle but disagreed with a Member Country comment on the possible misunderstanding on the necessity of post-exposure vaccination in humans. It noted that the comment is more related to public health issues and not relevant in the chapter.

#### **Article 8.14.1.**

The Code Commission disagreed with Member Countries proposal to add “group of” before “diseases” in the first sentence. The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission not to accept this proposal, as it is well accepted in international rabies community that rabies is indeed not a group of diseases but a unique disease, even if caused by different viruses.

In response to Member Countries comments on replacing the second sentence of the first paragraph with a new sentence taken from the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses stating that bats are the principal reservoir hosts for most lyssaviruses, while agreeing in general sense, the Code Commission disagreed noting that in many regions carnivore populations are considered to play the role of reservoir. However, the Code Commission replaced the word ‘Members’ with ‘Populations’ in the beginning of the second sentence to improve clarity.

In response to a proposal of Member Country to add the words ‘is present in many countries and territories’ and delete ‘found worldwide’, the Code Commission partially agreed to replace the word ‘worldwide’ with ‘in most parts of the world’. In response to a Member Country proposal to add the word ‘infected’, the Code Commission disagreed noting that it is implicit.

The Code Commission agreed to Member Countries proposal to add the words ‘the taxonomic prototype species in the Lyssavirus genus’ for more clarity in the beginning of the second paragraph.

In regard to other lyssavirus species in the third paragraph, the Code Commission agreed to make editorial changes. To be clear about other lyssavirus, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission and proposed to relocate the seventh paragraph of this article to paragraph 4 and made further editorial changes for clarity and readability.

In response to Member Countries comment related to the incubation period, the Code Commission made it clear that the incubation period depends on viruses, hosts and sites of entry and made editorial changes.

In response to a Member Country request to delete the sentence related to the infective period and to add a new sentence on description of clinical symptoms, the Code Commission disagreed noting that the description of infective period is important to certification and clinical symptoms can be referenced in the *Terrestrial Manual*. In the English version only, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission to replace ‘through’ with ‘last until’ following Member Countries question on the meaning of ‘and through death’.

In the English version only, the Code Commission agreed to delete the word ‘the’ before the ‘rabies virus’ in the first indent of eighth paragraph. In regard to the second indent about the need to define ‘dog population’, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission to add ‘(*Canis familiaris*)’ and made changes to clarify the definition of ‘dog-mediated rabies’.

In response to Member Countries comment on the term of epidemiological studies, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission and noted that there is no need to provide further details. The objective of an epidemiological study is to provide evidence of the virus circulation in dog population and it is maintained in dog population independent from other species.

### **Article 8.14.2.**

In point 1) *b*) and *c*), the Code Commission disagreed with Member Countries proposal to address animals not showing clinical signs in a free country or zone and to merge both points or move point *b*). The Code Commission noted that point 1) *b*) is for compulsory reporting of clinical signs and point 1) *c*) deals with the investigation of suspected cases.

In point 1) *c*), the Code Commission disagreed with Member Countries proposals to make editorial changes as it did not improve the clarity of the text.

In point 1) *d*), the Code Commission agreed with a Member Country comment to add the words ‘infection with’ and ‘virus’. In response to a request for clarification from another Member Country, the Code Commission clarified that other relevant recommendations for the prevention of rabies can be found in Sections 4, 5 and 7 of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission reinstated point 5) to state “if an imported case is confirmed outside a quarantine station, epidemiological investigations have ruled out the possibility of secondary cases” to address the possibility of the issue of imported cases in relation to the maintenance of free status.

In response to Member Countries comments, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission to make a reference to the meaning of preventive vaccination in Chapter 4.17.

In point 2), the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission to delete ‘at risk’ as it does not add any value to this provision.

In point 3), the Code Commission amended the text to improve its clarity.

### **Article 8.14.2ter**

In point 1) *a*), the Code Commission added the words ‘in the entire country’ after ‘notifiable disease’ to improve clarity and for consistency with other disease-specific chapters.

In point 1) *b*), in response to Member Countries comments on adding wildlife in the reporting of animals and need to specify the target animals subject to each sub-paragraphs *a*) and *d*), the Code Commission disagreed as the animals include all animals and the text is meant to assess the status of the dog population not other populations. The Code Commission agreed to delete ‘control’ as it is not part of the surveillance programme to prove the freedom from dog-mediated rabies. The Code Commission also agreed to unitalicise the term ‘early warning system’ as the definition is not yet adopted in the Glossary.

In point 1) *c*), the Code Commission agreed with Member Countries proposal to make editorial changes. In response to another Member Country comments to make a reference to Article 8.14.9., the Code Commission agreed to replace it with ‘including Articles 8.14.4. to 8.14.7.’.

In point 1) *e*), the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission to add the word ‘dog population control programme has been implemented and maintained’.

In point 2), in response to Member Countries comments to add the words ‘except stray dogs’ after ‘wildlife’, the Code Commission partially agreed to replace the word ‘wildlife’ with ‘wild animals’ in order not to exclude feral dogs from dog-mediated rabies.

### **Article 8.14.4.**

The Code Commission agreed with Member Countries comments to add the words ‘or zone’ at the end of the first sentence of point 2) *a*).

**Article 8.14.5.**

The Code Commission accepted comments of a Member Country to improve the clarity of point 3) *a*). It did not accept a proposal of Member Countries to replace ‘one month’ with ‘six months’ in the same point. The Code Commission clarified that animals can be protected by vaccination and if animals show antibody titres of at least 0.5 IU/ml they are safe to trade. The Code Commission added the words ‘not more than 12 months prior to shipment’ after ‘vaccinated or revaccinated’ and added the words ‘after the last vaccination’ after ‘12 months’.

In response to comments from an organisation to replace ‘six months’ with ‘four months’, the Code Commission disagreed as the incubation period is already defined in the chapter.

**Article 8.14.6.**

In response to many Member Countries comments to amend the article, the Code Commission took the Scientific Commission’s opinion into account and proposed to keep only import requirements for other members of the order Carnivora and members of the order Chiroptera and not to recommend vaccination in trade because there is no known protocol for vaccination nor validated serological tests for species other than dogs. The Code Commission also proposed to replace the words ‘susceptible animals’ with the words ‘members of the order Carnivora and of the members of the order Chiroptera’ in the subtitle. The Code Commission proposed to delete the points 2) *b*) and 3) and add the words ‘separation from susceptible animals was maintained and where’ in point 2).

**Article 8.14.7.**

In response to a Member Country question on the deletion of the words ‘of rabies’, the Code Commission noted that a case is defined in the chapter and it is implicit.

In response to Member Countries comments to add the word ‘susceptible’ before ‘laboratory animals’ as only certain species of laboratory animals are susceptible to rabies, the Code Commission agreed with them. In response to the same Member Countries comments on the reference to the specific chapters of the *Terrestrial Manual*, the Code Commission agreed and made the respective amendment.

**Article 8.14.8.**

In response to Member Countries comments on the need to have a new chapter with a relevant questionnaire in Section 1 of the *Terrestrial Code*, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission and it confirmed that such a chapter with the questionnaire would be developed before the adoption of this revised chapter, and a reference of it would be included in this article.

In point 1), in response to a Member Country comments to add new text regarding the requirement of having specific legislation, the Code Commission agreed that it is necessary to add legislation requirement for the Member Country and added the words ‘(including relevant legislation)’ after ‘documented evidence’ in point 2) and also added the words ‘dog-mediated rabies is a notifiable disease and that’ in point 3) *c*).

In point 2), the Code Commission disagreed with Member Countries comments on the nature of the OIE PVS Pathway as the tool is well known as voluntary and the sentence is already using ‘may be’.

In point 3), the Code Commission agreed with Member Countries comments to delete the words ‘or zone’ to avoid confusion.

In point 4) *c*), in response to Member Countries comments on reference to Chapter 7.7. on Stray dog population control, the Code Commission agreed to amend the text.

In point 6) *a*), the Code Commission agreed with a Member Country comment that the *Terrestrial Manual* deals with vaccine rather than vaccination and added the words ‘the vaccines are produced’ after ‘compulsory and’.

In point 6) *b*), in response to Member Countries comments on clarification for vaccination, the Code Commission referred the Member Countries to the new Chapter 4.17. on Vaccination. In response to an organisation comments on the need to add the movement of dogs, the Code Commission disagreed because the control of movements of dogs is covered in other articles.

#### **Article 8.14.9.**

The Code Commission modified the subtitle to read ‘Surveillance’, taking into account the specific nature of the description contained in the article.

In point 1), the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission to add the words ‘shows any change in behaviour followed by death within 10 days or that’ in the second paragraph to improve clarity.

In point 2) *b*), in response to Member Countries comments to include reference to animals that may be found dead, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission to add new sentence at the end of first paragraph ‘Animals (especially carnivores and bats) found dead are recognised as an important source of information for rabies *surveillance* and should be part of the clinical *surveillance*’.

In point 2), in response to a Member Country comment to add the words ‘governmental legislation’, the Code Commission disagreed because legislation is already addressed in the previous article.

In point 2) *e*), in response to Member Countries comments to move the last sentence to the official control programme, the Code Commission agreed and developed the new Article 8.14.10. on Cooperation with other Competent Authorities to include this text.

The revised Chapter 8.14. is attached as **Annex 11** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

### **5.9. Infection with lumpy skin disease virus (Chapter 11.9.)**

The Code Commission reviewed advice provided by OIE reference laboratories for lumpy skin disease (LSD) on whether lactose could be included as a safe commodity in this chapter. The Code Commission considered there was still insufficient scientific evidence to include lactose as a safe commodity and requested the OIE Headquarters to seek further information from the relevant industries on the standardised treatment process in order to verify if the treatment inactivates LSD virus. The point was added to the Code Commission work programme.

### **5.10. Infection with African swine fever virus (Articles 15.1.1bis., 15.1.2., 15.1.3., 15.1.22.)**

Comments were received from Australia, China (People’s Republic), Colombia, Japan, Switzerland, USA and EU.

The Code Commission recalled that at the General Session in May 2017 the revised chapter was adopted with two countries opposing adoption. The comments of the Member Countries had been taken into account at the September 2017 and the February 2018 meetings, and in response to the proposed changes several Member Countries submitted additional comments.

In response to a Member Country comments to develop a new definition of ‘direct human supervision or control’ to make specific reference to presence or freedom in *wild* vs domestic pigs, the Code Commission considered the comments from the Scientific Commission and proposed a revised Glossary definition of ‘captive wild [animal]’ to add ‘i.e. population management, regular contacts or handling, feeding, harvesting and *slaughter*,’ after ‘under direct human supervision or control’.

#### **Article 15.1.1bis.**

In regard to the request to replace the words ‘F0 value of 3.00 or more’ with ‘F0 value of 8 or more’ in canned meat, the Code Commission, after reviewing the documents from the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex) relating to the canning/sterilization of meat products (<http://www.fao.org/docrep/010/ai407e/AI407E22.htm>), noted that Codex defines F-value 3 as “121 °C for 3 minutes” and suggested that it could be detrimental for the quality of certain canned goods if they are treated above F-value 4. The Code Commission reconfirmed that the normal process of F value 3 would among others mitigate the ASFV risk and be used in normal industrial process. Thus the Code Commission amended the safe commodity to reflect the wording of ‘F-value of 3 or above’ used in Codex.

**Article 15.1.2.**

In point 3), in response to a request of a Member Country to include the words ‘and *feral*’ after ‘*captive wild*’, the Code Commission disagreed as the Veterinary Services have no authority over feral pigs as defined in the Glossary definition of ‘feral [animals]’.

**Article 15.1.3.**

In point 1), the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission did not accept a Member Country proposal to add the words ‘or equivalent measures as determined by risk analysis’ after ‘15.1.20.’, as equivalence was covered in Chapter 5.3. on OIE procedures relevant to the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization of the *Terrestrial Code*. However, the Code Commission amended the text to improve the clarity of the sentence.

In point 2), the Code Commission did not accept a Member Country comment to replace the number of years with the number of months as it was not in line with the convention used in the *Terrestrial Code* and would result in inconsistency across the *Terrestrial Code*.

In point 2) c), the Code Commission disagreed with a proposal to add the words ‘Pigs and’ as the definition of ‘commodity’ includes live animals and other products.

In point 3) c), the Code Commission deleted the words ‘Pigs and’ before ‘pig *commodities*’ in accordance with the definition of ‘commodity’.

In response to a request of several Member Countries to delete the proposed text in Article 15.1.3., the Code Commission agreed as the sentence refers to the trade conditions and not the disease free status. However, the Code Commission added the words ‘including *cases of infection with ASFV in feral or wild pigs*’ after ‘1) or 2) above’ and ‘especially point 7)’ after ‘Article 15.1.2.’ in the paragraph 1 to clarify that a country or zone may under certain conditions be free in domestic and captive wild pigs while having cases in wild pigs, and as such the specific trade requirements for countries or zones free from ASF in domestic and captive wild pigs should be applied, guaranteeing safe trade.

The revised Articles 15.1.1bis, 15.1.2., 15.1.3. and 15.1.22. are attached as **Annex 12** for Member Country comments and are proposed for adoption at the 87th General Session in May 2019.

The revised definition of ‘captive wild’ is attached as **Annex 13** for Member Country comments.

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

The Code Commission noted the ongoing work by the Scientific Commission and the OIE Headquarters on the harmonisation of the provisions for the official recognition and maintenance of disease free status in the *Terrestrial Code* and that this chapter had been revised by the Code Commission in September 2017 but not circulated for Member Country comments.

For the effective management of time, the Code Commission made some amendments that would not be directly subjected to the scope of the ongoing harmonisation work. In particular, the following point was confirmed in this meeting.

**Article 15.2.3.**

In response to the questions posed by a Member Country in regards to their general concern that the chapter gave no consideration to the different health status of different countries based on the presence or absence of infection with classical swine fever virus (CSFV) in their wild/feral pig populations, the Code Commission noted that the Scientific Commission had disapproved to add the provision for three types of free status (historical freedom, freedom in all pigs and freedom in domestic and captive wild pigs) in the CSF chapter. The Code Commission agreed to maintain the current text.

The revised Chapter 15.2. is attached as [Annex 17](#) for Member Country comments.

## 6. New amendments or draft new chapters proposed for the *Terrestrial Code*

### 6.1. Harmonisation of the *Terrestrial Code* chapters on diseases with official status recognition by the OIE

The OIE Headquarters explained to the Code Commission that there are a number of inconsistencies across the chapters on five diseases with official recognition by the OIE in the *Terrestrial Code* and that significant work had been undertaken on proposals to harmonise the requirements for the initial recognition and maintenance of official status.

The Code Commission thanked the OIE Headquarters for its work and noted that it was aware there are some discrepancies in these chapters, but this was mainly due to the differences of timing in updating each chapter and different interests in some chapters such as FMD.

The Code Commission also noted that the disease-specific chapters should only deal with the criteria for the free status and how to demonstrate it, while procedural matters should be included elsewhere. The Code Commission thus requested the OIE Headquarters include all procedural issues in Chapter 1.6. or chapters on disease-specific questionnaires. It also requested that the ongoing revision of the CSF chapter be used to propose amendments related to the maintenance criteria for free status. This should be presented for consideration at its February 2019 meeting.

### 6.2. Veterinary legislation (Chapter 3.4.)

The OIE Headquarters advised the Code Commission that the *ad hoc Group* on Veterinary legislation met from 23 to 25 January 2018. The OIE Headquarters noted that the *ad hoc Group* proposed the revision of Chapter 3.4. on Veterinary legislation to include the OIE biological threat strategy and address some deficiencies and the lack of clarity found in the chapter.

The Code Commission considered the proposed amendments to Chapter 3.4. that the *ad hoc Group* identified and discussed some suggestions on how to address these issues and broadly endorsed the report of the *ad hoc Group*.

The Code Commission reviewed the revised chapter and modified it for consistency with the *Terrestrial Code*, for clarity and to improve grammar and readability.

The revised Chapter 3.4. is attached as [Annex 18](#) for Member Countries comments.

The report of the *ad hoc Group* is attached as [Annex 24](#) for Member Countries information.

### 6.3. Collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen (Chapter 4.6.)

Comments were received from Canada.

The Code Commission noted that there was a longstanding problem for Member Countries to decide on the application of the appropriate conditions between Chapter 4.6. on Collection and processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen and the disease-specific chapters. With these inconsistencies in mind, the Code Commission considered the comments from a Member Country to seek OIE's advice on which chapter the country should follow for the importation of both fresh and frozen porcine semen between Chapter 4.6. and a disease-specific chapter such as Chapter 15.5. on Transmissible gastroenteritis.

In this respect, the Code Commission agreed that strong inconsistencies exist between Chapter 4.6. and some disease-specific chapters. It also noted the revision of Chapter 4.6. was on the work programme of the Code Commission, and the revision of Chapter 4.5 on General hygiene in semen collection and processing centres was also necessary for updates.

The Code Commission requested the OIE Headquarters to seek advice from experts from the relevant OIE reference centres and industry who have expertise on semen collection to revise both Chapters 4.5. and 4.6. together. The Code Commission also emphasised that the current chapters did not cover horse semen and this should be considered in the revised chapters.

#### **6.4. Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4.) including review of the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza (June 2018)**

Comments were received from Australia, Brazil, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, Thailand, USA, EU, AU-IBAR, IPC and AVEC & ELPHA.

The Code Commission thanked the *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza for its work to revise Chapter 10.4. on Infection with avian influenza viruses.

The Code Commission reviewed the revised chapter presented by the *ad hoc* Group and made editorial amendments for consistency and to improve the clarity of the text.

The Code Commission noted there was no scientific evidence to substantiate the current three-month recovery period and considered reducing this period to at least 28 days. The Code Commission requested that the OIE Headquarters seek advice from experts on the surveillance requirements to support reducing the minimum recovery period to less than three months. It also discussed the need to consider whether low pathogenicity avian influenza meets the criteria for listing in Chapter 1.3. and requested that the OIE Headquarters seek expert advice in this regard.

The Biological Standards Commission did not support the movement of the diagnostic diagrams in Article 10.4.33. to the *Terrestrial Manual*. Therefore the Code Commission requested the OIE Headquarters to consider putting the diagrams on the OIE website.

The revised Chapter 10.4. is attached as **Annex 19** for Member Country comments.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached as **Annex 25** for Member Countries information.

## **7. Other issues**

### **7.1. Update of the Code Commission's work programme**

Comments were received from Australia and EU in 86th General Session.

In response to comments from Member Countries pertaining to the Code Commission's work programme, the Code Commission noted the listing of Porcine epidemic diarrhoea virus (PEDV) was already included in its work programme and the disease would be assessed against the criteria for listing by experts. Acknowledging that this is an ongoing work, the Code Commission expected that the results of the assessment would be available soon for its review.

The following items were presented by the OIE Headquarters, with consequences for the Code Commission's work programme.

#### **a) Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.1.) and Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2.)**

The OIE Headquarters advised the Code Commission that the *ad hoc* Group on Evaluation of Veterinary Services met from 28 to 31 May 2018 to revise the OIE PVS Tool, and the group had recommended to revise Chapters 3.1. and 3.2 to utilise the return of experiences on the PVS Pathway. The *ad hoc* Group will meet again in November 2018 and the report will be available to the Code Commission for its review in February 2019.

The OIE Headquarters explained that the *ad hoc* Group had developed two new critical competencies for the PVS Tool, to address antimicrobial resistance and veterinary clinical services.

The Code Commission agreed with the report of the *ad hoc* Group and requested the OIE Headquarters to share the Terms of References for the next Group for its review. It also discussed with the OIE Headquarters the definitions of 'Competent Authority', 'Veterinary Authority', 'Veterinary Services' and proposed amendments for clarity and consistencies.

The Code Commission thanked the OIE Headquarters for the update and expressed appreciation for the *ad hoc Group's* work, which it considers will assist many Member Countries to improve Veterinary Services where the PVS Tool plays an important role.

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

The OIE Headquarters explained that there are many inconsistencies when a Member Country reports a case to the OIE using Chapter 1.1. This is especially evident when a final report is submitted to declare an 'event' closed, the confusion appears to be as a result of inappropriate usage of the word 'outbreak' in point 1) *b)* of Article 1.1.3. The OIE Headquarters also noted that there was a need to provide a definition of 'strain' in the *Terrestrial Code*, as many different meanings are used by Member Countries depending on the diseases.

The Code Commission agreed and proposed to make amendments in points 1), 2) and 3) of Article 1.1.3. to improve clarity and readability. Regarding the definition of 'new strain', the Code Commission agreed with the Biological Standards Commission and the Aquatic Animals Commission that it did not see a need for a definition as it depends on the interpretation of strain and it would relate to a phenotypic change corresponding to a genotypic change that can be diagnosed consistently.

The Code Commission also accepted the comments from the OIE Headquarters to add a new point *d)* of Article 1.1.3. in order to provide a clear reason to notify the recurrence of an eradicated strain of a *listed disease* when there is an ongoing event of the same disease.

The Code Commission reviewed the revised chapter and modified it for consistency with the *Terrestrial Code*, for clarity and to improve grammar and readability.

The Code Commission noted that Article 1.1.5. is not related to the notification but to the disease free country or zone and it proposed to delete the article as it should be better placed in Chapter 1.6. (see Agenda Item 5.3.)

The revised Chapter 1.1. is attached as **Annex 20** for Member Country comments.

**c) Infection with Rift Valley fever virus (Chapter 8.15.)**

The OIE Headquarters informed the Code Commission that during recent increases in human cases of Rift Valley fever (RVF) in eastern African countries, countries did not submit immediate notifications because of some inconsistencies or gaps found between the RVF chapter and point 1) *b)* of Article 1.1.3.

The Code Commission agreed that there are difficulties of notification regarding Chapter 8.15., especially when the situation evolves from an inter-epizootic to an epizootic period. The Code Commission requested the OIE Headquarters better align points 6) *b)* and *c)* of Article 8.15.1. with Articles 8.15.4. and 8.15.5., possibly including references to point 1) *b)* of Article 1.1.3. and including the text in Article 8.15.5. by referencing human cases as a consequence of epizootic. The Code Commission requested the OIE Headquarters present a draft revised text in its February 2019 meeting.

**d) Stray dog population control (Chapter 7.7.)**

The OIE Headquarters noted that as part of the global rabies eradication strategy, there have been discussions within the OIE on the need to update Chapter 7.7. on Stray dog population control to improve responsible dog ownership, monitoring and evaluation of stray dog control schemes. The Code Commission considered the request and with the understanding that rabies control is a priority area of work for the OIE, it proposed to add the revision of the chapter to its work programme and requested the OIE Headquarters seek expert advice in order to progress with revision of the chapter. The Code Commission emphasised that the chapter is not only for animal welfare issue but also for the disease control purpose such as rabies and echinococcosis and requested the OIE Headquarters that these aspects be considered while selecting the experts for the revision of the chapter.

**e) Infection with rinderpest virus (Chapter 8.16.)**

The OIE Headquarters advised the Code Commission that during the two regional rinderpest tabletop exercises to test the Global Rinderpest Action Plan (November 2017 and March 2018) and the stakeholder conference (March 2018), concerns were expressed about the provisions of the chapter that were not inclusive of countries that do not wish to slaughter vaccinated animals as a means to recover freedom, after rinderpest re-emergence. It was also noted that, in the event of a re-emergence of the disease, for trade purposes the chapter reverts to the trade requirements in the 2010 edition of the *Terrestrial Code* and reinstate them to the current version, should the provisions for recovery of freedom not be complied within the stipulated timeframe.

The Code Commission agreed with the comments from some Member Countries on the need to update the chapter, and accepted the proposal from the OIE Headquarters to work on the revision of the chapter, in collaboration with the OIE Headquarters, under the advice of the FAO-OIE Rinderpest Joint Advisory Committee (JAC). The OIE Headquarters was advised to discuss this issue at the next JAC meeting and submit the outcome of the discussion for review of the Scientific Commission on its next meeting in February 2019.

The Code Commission also requested that the revision work include clarification on the definitions of ‘case’ and ‘suspected case’ and the reporting obligations of countries where a suspected case is detected.

**f) Request for international trade standards for animal serum products used in cell culture media**

The Code Commission thanked a Member Country for submitting its national practice and agreed with the Biological Standards Commission that Member Countries should use the *Terrestrial Manual*, especially Chapter 1.1.9. for international trade of animal serum products used in cell culture media.

**g) Action arising from February 2018 meeting (definition of “epidemiological unit”)**

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed with Member Countries proposals to amend the Glossary definition for epidemiological unit to include the possibility that an epidemiological unit can consist of only one animal, as it can often be the case for equids, and it proposed to add the words ‘or, in some circumstances, to a single animal’ after ‘animal handling facility’.

The revised Glossary definition for epidemiological unit is attached as **Annex 13** for Member Country comments.

**h) Revision of Chapter 7.5. Slaughter of animals and Chapter 7.6. Killing for disease control purposes**

The Code Commission considered the report of the *ad hoc Group* on the revision of Chapters 7.5. on Slaughter of animals and 7.6. on Killing for disease control purposes which met from 3 to 4 April 2018.

The Code Commission agreed with the modified Terms of Reference and the proposal to restructure the articles, and to review some text and some definitions. The Code Commission requested that the *ad hoc Group* be reconvened to progress this work which will be considered by the Code Commission at its February 2019 meeting.

**i) Report of the meeting of the *ad hoc Group* on Animal African trypanosomoses (March 2018)**

The Code Commission reviewed the report of the *ad hoc Group* on Animal African trypanosomoses noting the work of the *ad hoc Group* is ongoing (listing of different species of trypanosomoses and development of the surveillance articles), including to give advice on the pending revision of Chapter 12.3. on Dourine and on the draft new chapter on infection with Trypanozoon (surra). The Code Commission agreed to keep the item in the work programme, but to postpone further discussion until the report of the next *ad hoc Group* on Animal African trypanosomoses and the opinion of the Scientific Commission were available.

#### **j) OIE list of notifiable diseases**

The Code Commission discussed once more the need for clarification following comments made by some Member Countries on some listed diseases in revision and on some diseases not listed. It reiterated its request to the Headquarters to seek relevant expertise. The item remains in the Code Commission's work programme.

The Code Commission updated its work programme taking into account the items above, the priorities discussed at the previous General Session, the work of the other Specialist Commissions, and proposals from the OIE Headquarters and Member Country comments. Consequently, the following new items were included in the work programme.

- Revision of definitions of 'Competent Authority', 'Veterinary Authority', 'Veterinary Services', 'Captive wild' and 'epidemiological unit' (see Agenda Item 4.3., 5.10. and 7.1.g.)
- Harmonisation of articles of official status recognition by the OIE (see Agenda Item 6.1.)
- Revision of Chapter 1.1. (see Agenda Item 7.1.b.)
- Revision of Chapters 3.1. and 3.2. (see Agenda Item 7.1.a.)
- Revision of Chapter 3.4. (see Agenda Item 6.2.)
- Revision of Chapter 4.5. (together with Chapter 4.6.) (see Agenda Item 6.3.)
- Revision of Chapter 8.15. (see Agenda Item 7.1.c.)
- Revision of Chapter 8.16. (see Agenda Item 7.1.e.)
- Revision of safe commodities list to include lactose (see Agenda Item 5.9.).

The updated work programme is attached as **Annex 21** for Member Countries information and comments.

#### **7.2. Date of next meetings**

The Code Commission agreed that the date for its next meeting would be 18 to 28 February 2019 in order to facilitate a joint meeting with the Biological Standards Commission and the Scientific Commission in preparation for the 87th General Session of the World Assembly of OIE Delegates.

The Code Commission also discussed the dates for future meetings and asked the Secretariat to schedule them as far as possible on the second and third weeks of September and of February.

---

.../Annexes