



Organisation
Mondiale
de la Santé
Animale

World
Organisation
for Animal
Health

Organización
Mundial
de Sanidad
Animal

Original: English

September 2017

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

Paris, 18–29 September 2017

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) met at OIE Headquarters in Paris from 18–29 September 2017. The list of participants is attached as [Annex 1](#).

The Code Commission thanked the following Member Countries for providing comments: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Japan, Mexico, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Switzerland, South Africa, Taipei China, Thailand, USA, 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 Global Alliance of Pet Food Associations (GAPFA), International Coalition for Animal Welfare (ICFAW) and the International Poultry Council (IPC).

The Code Commission reviewed Member Country comments, which were submitted on time and supported by a rationale, and amended relevant chapters of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Terrestrial Code*) where appropriate. The amendments are presented in the usual manner by ‘double underline’ and ‘~~strikethrough~~’ and the chapters are annexed to this report. In Annexes [8](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [14](#), [15](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#) and [23](#), 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 proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018. Texts in [Part B](#) are submitted for comments. The reports of meetings of *ad hoc* Groups and other related documents are attached for information in [Part C](#).

Comments on [Parts A](#) and [B](#) of the report must reach OIE Headquarters **by 9 January 2018** for them to be considered at the February 2018 meeting of the Code Commission. Comments received after the due date will not be submitted to the Code Commission for its consideration.

Member Countries’ attention is drawn to the one page questionnaire on Veterinary Paraprofessionals Competency in [Annex 36](#) and are requested to provide their responses to the OIE Headquarters **by 9 January 2018**.

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

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

Item No.	Texts for Member Countries' comments and proposed for adoption in May 2018	Part A: Annex No.
4.1	User's guide	Annex 3
4.2	Criteria applied by the OIE for assessing the safety of commodities (Chapter 2.2.)	Annex 4
4.3	Prevention and control of <i>Salmonella</i> in commercial pig production systems (Chapter 6.13.)	Annex 5
4.7	Infection with lumpy skin disease virus (Articles 11.9.4., 11.9.5., 11.9.6. and 11.9.15.)	Annex 6
4.8	Infection with African swine fever virus (Articles 15.1.1bis., 15.1.2., and 15.1.22.)	Annex 7
5.1	Glossary	Annex 8
5.1'	Proposed deletion of Glossary definition of 'transparency' and consequential changes to chapter on import risk analysis (Articles 2.1.1 and 2.1.3.)	Annex 9
5.4	Zoning and compartmentalisation (Chapter 4.3.)	Annex 10
5.5	Collection and processing of <i>in vitro</i> produced embryos from livestock and horses (Chapter 4.8.)	Annex 11
5.6	New chapter on vaccination (Chapter 4.X.)	Annex 12
5.8	New chapter on introduction to recommendations for veterinary public health (Chapter 6.X.)	Annex 13
5.9	The role of the Veterinary Services in food safety systems (Chapter 6.1.)	Annex 14
5.10	Harmonisation of national antimicrobial resistance surveillance and monitoring programmes (Chapter 6.7.)	Annex 15
5.11	Monitoring of the quantities and usage patterns of antimicrobial agents used in food-producing animals (Articles 6.8.1. and 6.8.1bis.)	Annex 16
5.12	Introduction to the recommendations for animal welfare (Article 7.1.1.)	Annex 17
5.12'	New article on guiding principles for the use of measures to assess animal welfare (Article 7.1.X.)	Annex 18
5.13	Animal welfare and pig production systems (Chapter 7.X.)	Annex 19
5.14	Infection with bluetongue virus (Chapter 8.3.)	Annex 20
5.15	Infection with <i>Brucella abortus</i> , <i>B. melitensis</i> and <i>B. suis</i> (Article 8.4.10.)	Annex 21
5.17	Infection with rinderpest virus (Article 8.15.2.)	Annex 22
5.18	Infection with <i>Burkholderia mallei</i> (Glanders) (Chapter 12.10.)	Annex 23

Item No.	Texts for Member Countries' comments	Part B: Annex No.
5.2	Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.) (including proposed new definition of 'early warning system')	Annex 24
5.7	New chapter on management of outbreaks of listed diseases (Chapter 4.Y.)	Annex 25
6.1	New chapter on introduction to recommendations for disease prevention and control (Chapter 4.Z.)	Annex 26
6.2	New chapter on the killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products (Chapter 7.Y.)	Annex 27
6.3	New chapter on animal welfare and laying hen production systems (Chapter 7.Z)	Annex 28
6.4	New chapter on infection with <i>Trypanosoma evansi</i> (non equine surra) (Chapter 8.X.)	Annex 29
6.5	Draft revised chapter on infection with <i>Trypanozoon</i> in equids (Chapter 12.3.)	Annex 30
6.6	Chapter 11.12. on infection with <i>Theileria annulata</i> , <i>T. orientalis</i> and <i>T. parva</i> (<i>bovidae</i>)	Annex 31
6.6'	New chapter on infection with <i>Theileria lestoquardi</i> , <i>T. luwenshuni</i> and <i>T. uilenbergi</i> (small ruminants) (Chapter 14.X.)	Annex 32
7.2	Work programme	Annex 33
7.4.1	Questionnaire on Veterinary paraprofessionals competency	Annex 36
Item No.	Texts for Member Countries' information	Part C: Annex No.
5.13	Report of the <i>ad hoc</i> Group on Animal Welfare and Pig Production Systems (August 2017)	Annex 34
6.5	Report of the <i>ad hoc</i> Group on Equine Trypanosomoses (June 2016)	Annex 35
7.4.1	Report of the <i>ad hoc</i> Group on Veterinary Paraprofessionals (August 2017)	Annex 36
6.2.	Report of the <i>ad hoc</i> Group on Killing Methods for Reptiles Commercially Processed for their Skins, Meat and Other Products	Annex 37
6.3.	Report of the <i>ad hoc</i> Group on Animal Welfare and Laying Hens Production Systems	Annex 38

1. Meeting with the Director General

The Code Commission met with Dr Monique Eloit, Director General, on 25 September 2017. Dr Eloit welcomed the Code Commission members and thanked them for their support and commitment to achieving OIE objectives.

The Director General noted the procedure for nomination for election to the OIE Specialist Commissions and that the Evaluation Guide and the composition of the Evaluation Committee had been provided to the Council for its endorsement. The Director General also noted the ongoing work to develop standard operating procedures for the disease status recognition process and the revision of the related questionnaires.

The Director General also informed the Code Commission that the Standards Department had several new staff who would be working specifically on the Observatory on the implementation of standards project and while the project was still in the design phase, it would be useful in the future to gather feedback from the Members of the Code Commission on issues related to the implementation of OIE standards by OIE Member Countries. In response, the President noted that the Code Commission was also making efforts to improve the guidance provided in its reports, along with rationale supporting its proposed changes to chapters and that it would look forward to being engaged in further discussion on the Observatory.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The adopted agenda of the meeting is attached as Annex 2.

3. Cooperation with other Specialist Commissions

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

The President of the Code Commission met with the President of the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (Aquatic Animals Commission). The Presidents discussed issues of mutual interest in the *Terrestrial* and *Aquatic Codes* to facilitate harmonisation of relevant chapters in the two *Codes* when under review by the respective Commissions.

Issues discussed included:

- Harmonisation of the User's Guides for the *Terrestrial* and *Aquatic Codes*, where appropriate.
- Development of draft Guidelines for the application of listing criteria.
- Proposed changes to the Glossary for definitions of 'biosecurity' and 'biosecurity plan' in the *Aquatic Code*, which are necessary for the new draft chapter on Biosecurity in Aquaculture Establishments in Section 4. The Code Commission expressed an interest in this work and the new chapter on biosecurity, noting that it would add this to its work programme.
- The President of the Code Commission noted that it was continuing with the proposed deletion of the definition of disease from the Glossary, but will retain the definitions for listed disease, emerging disease and notifiable disease.
- Revision to Chapter 1.4. on surveillance in both *Codes*.
- Concerning the chapters on zoning and compartmentalisation, the President of the Aquatic Animals Commission noted its plan to develop a new chapter on the application of zoning. The President of the Code Commission noted that the general chapter of the *Terrestrial Code* on zoning and compartmentalisation was in the process of revision and would need first to be adopted before going further.
- Concerning the Code Commissions' proposed new chapter on management of outbreaks of listed diseases, the President of the Aquatic Animals Commission noted its plans for a different approach, which will include the development of two new chapters, one on emergency disease preparedness and one on outbreak disease management.

b) Consultation with the Presidents of the Biological Standards Commission and the Scientific Commission

The meeting schedule did not allow for joint meetings with either the Biological or Scientific Commissions. However, there was consultation on several key items of work that was coordinated through the Secretariats.

The Scientific Commission provided advice to the Code Commission in response to Member Country comments on several chapters under consideration at this meeting, including both horizontal and listed disease-specific chapters. It also provided suggestions for proposed amendments on its own initiative.

The Biological Commission provided advice to the Code Commission in response to Member Country comments and in response to specific questions.

4. Examination of Member Country comments at the 85th General Session

4.1. User's guide

The following Member Country made comments at the 85th General Session: Thailand .

During the adoption of the two new chapters on *Salmonella*, a Member Country requested that a sentence be added to the purpose and scope of both Chapters 6.12. and 6.13. that would read: ‘This chapter is not intended to be used to elaborate conditions for trade’. In response, the President noted that the issue would better be addressed in the User’s Guide.

The Code Commission confirmed that these chapters are not intended to provide recommendations on trade measures but on the way Veterinary Services could eliminate or control food safety hazards. In response to the concerns of that Member Country, the Code Commission amended the paragraph relating to Chapter 6.4. in Section C point 4 of the User’s guide to clarify that the chapters in Section 6 provide ‘recommendations for some specific on-farm prevention and control plans for the unlisted foodborne pathogen *Salmonella* as part of the Veterinary Services mission to avoid, eliminate or control food safety hazards in animal production’.

At the request of the OIE Headquarters, the Code Commission added a new sentence to the introduction of the User’s guide to indicate that all chapters now include the dates of first adoption and last revision. This will assist Member Countries to ensure that they use the latest version of the chapters when implementing them. In regards to the date of adoption and date of revision, the OIE Headquarters noted it had made every effort to ensure the accuracy of the information based on its historical records.

The revised User’s guide is attached as [Annex 3](#) for comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

4.2. Criteria applied by the OIE for assessing the safety of commodities (Chapter 2.2.)

The following Member Countries made comments at the 85th General Session: the United States on behalf of the OIE Members of the Region of the Americas, Australia and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission considered Member Countries comments on the text adopted in May 2017, especially about the inconsistency between Articles 2.2.1. and 2.2.2., the reference to GMP, and proposed amendments to Article 2.2.1.

In response to Member Countries comments on the use of the term ‘should’ throughout this chapter, the Code Commission recalled that the intent of the chapter is to describe criteria and the way in which these criteria are to be applied when drafting lists of safe commodities rather than recommendations on treatments. The Code Commission modified the fourth paragraph of Article 2.2.1. to clarify that its intention is to indicate that this is a prerequisite to applying the criteria mentioned in Article 2.2.2. The Code Commission also modified Article 2.2.2. to include some recommendations for those who use this chapter and, finally, a clear cross reference between Articles 2.2.1. and 2.2.2 was made. In conclusion, the Code Commission noted that the chapter on how to apply the criteria is directed at *ad hoc* Groups and the Specialist Commissions.

The revised Chapter 2.2. is attached as [Annex 4](#) for comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

4.3. Prevention and control of *Salmonella* in commercial pig production systems (Chapter 6.13.)

The following Member Countries made comments at the 85th General Session: Australia, Costa Rica on behalf of OIE Members of the Americas, Thailand and USA.

In examining a Member Country comment made during the 85th General Session indicating that infection with *Salmonella* in pigs is not an OIE listed disease, the Code Commission recalled that this is a public health issue and noted that these concerns had been addressed by the modification it proposed to the User’s guide (see above).

In reference to Member Country’s requests to clarify the use of the term “commercial” specifically to exclude backyard and family pigs in the chapter, the Code Commission reiterated its view that narrowing the scope of this chapter would have consequences for other chapters related to pigs and that it was not appropriate. The Code Commission noted that the aim of this chapter is to solve problems in the production and commercialisation of meat for consumption. For the purposes of the chapter, the term ‘commercial pig production systems’ is intended to mean production of pigs and pig meat that are put on the market. Therefore, the Code Commission proposed to amend the definition as follows: ‘means those systems in which the purpose of the operation includes some or all of the following: breeding, rearing and management of pigs for the production of commercially traded pigs or pig meat.’ The scope would hence be positively limited to the products that are commercially traded.

The revised Chapter 6.13. is attached as **Annex 5** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

4.4. Welfare of working equids (Chapter 7.12.)

The following Member Countries made comments at the 85th General Session: Uruguay on behalf of the OIE Members of the Region of the Americas, Thailand and EU.

The Code Commission considered Member Country comments that were sent before, and expressed at, the General Session and the reiteration of a comment from the USA on Article 7.12.12.

In response to a Member Country's repeated request to include horses used in hippotherapy in the scope of this chapter, the Code Commission reiterated its previous advice that this category of animals is similar to horses that are used in leisure activities and sport and as such is out of the scope of the chapter. Working equids are those that are used primarily in traction and transportation, e.g. horse drawn carts and carriages.

In relation to a proposal from Member Countries to add 'sweating' to the indicators of heat stress, the Code Commission noted that 'sweating' per se is not an indicator. In regards to the reference provided by those Member Countries to support their proposal, it noted the reference cited was insufficient to enable it to verify the applicability of it. However, the Code Commission considered that excessive sweating could be an indicator of heat stress and proposed to add a criterion 'excessive sweating'.

The Code Commission discussed the comment made on behalf of the Americas during the 85th General Session to consider the deletion of an input-based measure on the recommendation on the maximum working hours for working equids. The Code Commission recalled that the President of the Code Commission had requested the Delegates of that Region to provide information to support this proposal, but as such information had not been submitted it could not make any modification to the article. The Code Commission requested the Headquarters to contact the Member Countries and request that they provide relevant scientific information to support their proposal. It also encouraged the Headquarters to look for relevant scientific information so the issue could be considered further at its next meeting.

The article will be reconsidered by the Code Commission in light of new information when it is provided.

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

The following Member Country made comments at the 85th General Session: Australia.

In examining the Member Country comment challenging the scientific expertise and assessment in reference to the epidemiological link for animal-to-human or animal-to-animal transmission of *M. tuberculosis* infection, the Code Commission noted that establishing the public health burden of *M. tuberculosis* is obvious even if it is difficult to prove the actual transmission between animals and humans. It is completely reasonable to assume that whenever cattle are found to be a reservoir in a country where humans are infected at the same time, assumptions are made that there is a link and it is appropriate to control the disease in animals.

However, the Code Commission considered that more analysis and discussion is needed with the Scientific and Biological Commissions on whether *M. tuberculosis* and *M. caprae* should be included in the OIE listed diseases. In this regard, the Code Commission requested the OIE Headquarters to seek expert advice in order to assess the two pathogenic agents (*M. caprae* and *M. tuberculosis*) against the OIE criteria for listing. The Code Commission noted that it is important that the scientific references used be cited when this assessment is undertaken and the information should be available for the Code, Scientific and Biological Commissions to consider at their meetings in February 2018.

In response to a former Member Country comment on herd freedom and surveillance in goats and camelids, the Code Commission agreed that existing scientific information shows that it would be possible to formulate a practicable system for determining herd or flock freedom. This would need a testing regime to be included in the *Terrestrial Manual*, but the Biological Standards Commission had indicated previously that there was currently not enough information available to do this. However, the Code Commission noted that there is a need for joint discussion on the complexity of the issue and that literature previously provided by a Member Country showed that the sensitivity and specificity of testing in goats and camelids is no worse than in cattle. The Code Commission urged the Headquarters to work with the Biological Standards Commission on the revision of the chapter of the *Manual* on tuberculosis and the possible inclusion of tests on camelids and goats so that surveillance and testing could be addressed in the Code.

The following scientific information was provided to the Code Commission:

- legislation supporting Argentina's National Plan for Eradication of Bovine Tuberculosis (Resolución SENASA 128/2012):
<http://servicios.infoleg.gob.ar/infolegInternet/anexos/195000-199999/195314/texact.htm>
- A study of tuberculosis in goats in New Zealand considered the sensitivity of the tuberculin test to be 80%. Sanson R.L. (1998). Tuberculosis in goats. *Surveillance*. Vol.15, No.2; 7–8.
- A review article in the OIE's *Scientific and Technical Review* reports sensitivity of the tuberculin test in goats to be 100%, 38%, >95% and 87% in various studies. The same article cites sensitivity of the Bovigam test in goats as 100%, 83.7% and 87.2%. These sensitivities are, with one exception, adequate for most purposes.
- Cousins D.V., Florisson N. (2005). A review of tests available for use in the diagnosis of tuberculosis in non-bovine species. *Rev. sci. tech. Off. int. Epiz.*, 24 (3), 1039–1059.

4.6. Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4.)

The following Member Countries made comments at the 85th General Session or submitted written comments to the OIE: Australia, Latvia on behalf of the OIE Members of the European Region, France on behalf of the EU, Thailand on behalf of ASEAN, and the International Poultry Council (IPC).

The Code Commission noted in the report of its February 2017 meeting that there is a need for further revision of this chapter to take into account the following:

- differences among Member Countries in terms of notification to the OIE,
- differing needs when responding to either low pathogenic AI (LPAI) or highly pathogenic AI (HPAI) outbreaks and when recovering free status,
- impacts of unjustified barriers to trade being implemented by some Member Countries, and
- need to include articles on safe commodities and to expand those on surveillance.

OIE Headquarters introduced the discussion paper that it had prepared in response to the request from the Code Commission at its February 2017 meeting. The paper noted that the AI chapter had been comprehensively revised and adopted by the World Assembly in May 2005. This revision was proposed in order to provide clear notification criteria, as well as definitions for free status, conditions for status recovery, and commodity-specific risk-based mitigating measures, which would provide safety when trading and encouraging transparent reporting. This new text was aimed at encouraging rapid and transparent reporting of AI by Member Countries, as well as giving clear recommendations on how to avoid unjustified trade disruptions resulting from these reports.

After considering concerns about problems in trade raised by Member Countries at the General Session in May 2017 and in correspondence, the paper notes that there are strong indications that this chapter has been ineffective in fulfilling its objectives in terms of disease control and resumption or continuation of trade. In addition, the chapter is unclear about the difference between health measures for low and highly pathogenic AI viruses and lacks sufficient detail to guide

Member Countries in the implementation of zoning and compartmentalisation. To date, the disease continues to affect large parts of the world with high impacts, while the number of trade issues related to AI outbreaks remains relatively high compared to other diseases of concern. These issues appear to be related to non-implementation of existing OIE standards by some Member Countries, either because of disregard for their obligations or difficulties in abiding by standards that cannot be adapted easily to their situation.

In this regard, the Code Commission has received several requests from Member Countries to update the AI chapter to ensure that the requirements are still relevant to the most recent scientific findings. This revision is more important in today's environment because many countries worldwide are experiencing unprecedented HPAI events, which threaten animal health, public health, food security, agricultural productivity, farming community livelihoods and global trade, and the number of circulating subtypes are continually increasing.

The Code Commission thanked the OIE Headquarters for the paper and the high priority that had been given to this issue. It broadly agreed with the definition of the problems outlined in the discussion paper. The Code Commission focussed its discussion on the draft Terms of Reference for the proposed *ad hoc* Group and on its management and membership.

Given the breadth of the issues to be discussed, observers from the Code, Scientific and Biological Standards Commissions should be included in the *ad hoc* Group. Membership of the group needs to include a balance of representation to cover the broad range of issues including risk managers (e.g. CVO), reference laboratory, OFFLU, industry and the Working Group on Wildlife. OIE Headquarters noted that it would aim to hold the first meeting before the end of the year so that the report could be considered by the Specialist Commissions in February 2018.

The Code Commission reviewed the draft Terms of Reference of the *ad hoc* Group and made several comments and proposals for further consideration by the OIE Headquarters.

The Code Commission further noted that a key point for the *ad hoc* Group was the need to review the virus dynamics of AI introduction via wild birds with respect to critical number of wild birds and presence of water bodies required for AI virus amplification. In addition, the *ad hoc* Group needs to propose effective biosecurity measures to be implemented by poultry farmers to prevent the introduction of AI virus from wild birds into poultry. The Code Commission stressed that another important task to be carried out by the *ad hoc* Group is to propose risk-mitigating measures for trading some commodities safely from countries or zones not free from AI.

OIE Headquarters noted that in line with its efforts to provide greater transparency to the work of *ad hoc* Groups it was intending to put Terms of Reference for these groups on its website along with the reports. The Terms of Reference for the revision of the chapter on avian influenza, together with the revised discussion paper will be put on its website in October 2017.

4.7. Infection with lumpy skin disease virus (Chapter 11.9.)

The following Member Countries made comments at the 85th General Session: EU.

The President of the Code Commission reminded the Delegates that this chapter had been adopted as a matter of urgency because of the crisis in Europe and the Middle East. Member Countries had raised a question concerning the inclusion of 'which are not a consequence of vaccination' in the definition of a case. The Code Commission agreed with the explanation provided by the Scientific Commission that currently it is not possible to differentiate vaccine-induced antibodies from those induced by natural infection. Furthermore, the presence of antibodies does not ensure complete protection. Consequently, the case definition was not modified.

In relation to the comment of a Member Country on inconsistencies between point 2) of Article 11.9.3. and Article 11.9.15., the Code Commission proposed to modify the text in Article 11.9.15. on the General principles of surveillance, to increase the clarity of the chapter with respect to clinical signs.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to modify Article 11.9.4. and proposed some additional modifications to improve the clarity of the text.

The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of a Member Country to delete the term ‘domestic’ throughout the chapter, as both *Bos indicus* and *Bos taurus* are domestic animals. In response to Member Countries noting that Article 11.9.5. did not explicitly exclude the importation of seropositive animals from a free country or zone, the Code Commission clarified that while there is prohibition on vaccination in a free country or zone, there is no prohibition on the importation of vaccinated animals into that free country. Article 11.9.6. states that when imported from an infected country, animals should be vaccinated.

The revised Articles 11.9.4., 11.9.5., 11.9.6. and 11.9.15. are attached as **Annex 6** for Member Country comments and are proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

4.8. Infection with African swine fever virus (Chapter 15.1.)

The following Member Countries made comments at the 85th General Session or submitted written comments to the OIE: Australia, China, Korea and USA.

The Code Commission considered the Member Country comments proposing a change to the definition of ‘domestic pigs’ (i.e. ‘excluding backyard farms and family pig farms for own use’) in Article 15.1.2. The Code Commission did not agree with the rationale for excluding backyard and family pigs from the case definition because not only there is no clear distinction between the different types of production but also backyard operations play a significant role in the epidemiology of the disease. Backyard farms are a significant pathway for the infection of larger units. Indeed, backyard and family-farmed pigs and their products are commercialized locally and present a high risk to other domestic populations. That is one of the reasons why the chapter allows for the distinction of status of free compartments, which should be protected from the rest of the pigs by appropriate biosecurity. Regarding ‘captive wild pigs’, the Code Commission noted that in some regions, some wild pigs are kept and fed for the production of meat and should be considered ‘captive wild’ in accordance with the glossary definition. In that case, they should be considered together with domestic pig populations because of the risk they represent. In other regions, some wild pigs may be kept in large parks or ranches but are not fed or under direct human supervision and cannot be considered ‘captive wild’ in accordance with the glossary definition, but rather ‘wild pigs’.

The President of the Code Commission recalled the discussion during the 85th General Session, in which Member Countries proposed to delete the last paragraph of Article 15.1.2. on safe trade of pig commodities despite the notification of cases in wildlife. The Code Commission agreed to delete the paragraph, since it is one of the purposes of the chapter that pig commodities can be safely traded from countries complying with the relevant provisions of the Code, even if they notify an infection with ASFV in wild or feral pigs or African wild suids.

Furthermore, the Code Commission proposed a new Article 15.1.1bis. on safe commodities, including canned meat and gelatine. In considering the inclusion of canned meat in the new article, the Code Commission referred to the Codex definition of canned food (CX/RCP-23/1979 Code of hygienic practice for low and acidified low acid canned foods), which means commercially sterile food in hermetically sealed containers. The Code Commission also considered these amendments responded to the question of another Member Country concerning the title of the point on safe commodities in other chapters.

The revised Articles 15.1.1bis., 15.1.2. and 15.1.22. are attached as **Annex 7** for Member Country comments and are proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

5. Texts circulated for Member Country comments at the February 2017 Code Commission meeting

5.1. Glossary

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

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

Compartment – In line with the proposal to remove the term “disease” from the Glossary, the words “*infection* and *infestation*” were included in the definition. The Code Commission considered it was not necessary to include “defined by the Veterinary Authority” after the words “animal subpopulation” as it is the responsibility of industry to define the *subpopulation* while the *Veterinary Authority* approves its status. It did not agree with a proposal to delete the words “for the purpose of international trade or disease prevention and control in a country or zone”, as, in fact, this was included at the request of Member Countries in order to convey the intention that compartments were not only for trade but also for disease prevention and control.

Containment zone – In response to a request to replace ‘movement control, biosecurity and sanitary measures’ with the term ‘biocontainment measures’ the Code Commission did not consider that it was appropriate or necessary to replace defined terms with ‘biocontainment measures’ which was used in a different context and is not defined in the *Code* or *Manual*.

Disease – In considering Member Country comments, the Code Commission agreed that the consequential changes as a result of the deletion of the definition of *disease* required throughout the *Code* will be extensive. It noted that it would make relevant changes as it reviews chapters and, where appropriate, either the term ‘infection and infestation’ would replace ‘disease’ or the term ‘disease’ would be retained and unitalicised. It agreed that consideration should be given to harmonising the *Aquatic Code* at the same time, and noted that the Presidents of the two Commissions had been discussing this for some time and that OIE Headquarters would look at how to manage this once the decision was taken to delete the definition. It further noted that the word ‘disease’ would not disappear from the *Code* entirely, and references to disease-specific chapters would be replaced with *listed disease*-specific chapters and that the definitions of *notifiable disease* and *emerging disease* would remain. In response to a proposal to include the term *infestation* within the definition of *infection*, it did not agree with the rationale provided as there are *Code* chapters that referred only to ‘*infestation* with’, and the distinction is still relevant (see Item 5.2.).

Free zone – The Code Commission did not consider it was necessary to include ‘defined by the veterinary authority’, since it is already included in the definition of zone.

Infected zone – The Code Commission included the words ‘defined as such’ in order to avoid confusion with provisions to determine the health status of a *zone* in other relevant chapters of the *Code*, especially some listed disease-specific chapters.

Protection zone – The Code Commission noted that in the report of its February 2017 meeting (Annex 21) two definitions for protection zone had mistakenly been included; the second option presented was the proposed amended definition. The Code Commission agreed to change ‘adjacent’ to ‘neighbouring’ as it more accurately reflects how the *Code* deals with *protection zones* and their wider application. In response to a proposal to replace ‘pathogenic agent’ with ‘*infection* and *infestation*’ the Code Commission disagreed as ‘the entry’ refers to the entry of a pathogenic agent. With respect to a proposal to replace *biosecurity* with ‘biocontainment’, the Code Commission considered that it was not appropriate or necessary to replace defined terms that are relevant and well understood. Further, with respect to the request to include ‘free’ before ‘zone’, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that this was not appropriate, as ‘*protection zone*’ does not, by definition, necessarily mean be free.

Vaccination – The Code Commission agreed to replace ‘several’ with ‘more’ for consistency with the definition of *compartment* and because ‘one or more’ is more appropriate, as ‘several’ means two or more.

Zone/region – The Code Commission noted that the proposal to delete the words ‘population of’ and to only refer to ‘animal subpopulations’ changed the intent of the *Code* in that a *zone*, which is based on geographical data, could include a whole animal population in a country or only a subpopulation.

Transparency – The Code Commission noted there were no comments on the proposed deletion of the definition of ‘transparency’ in the glossary, and that relevant content of this definition would be included in Chapter 2.1. (see below).

The revised definitions are attached in **Annex 8** for Member Country comments and are proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

NB: With respect to new or revised definitions being proposed because of a new or revised chapter, these definitions will be included with the chapter in the relevant annex. This will assist Member Countries in their review of the chapters and preparation of their comments.

Revision of Article 2.1.1. (Consequence of the deletion of the definition of “transparency”)

At its February 2017 meeting, the Code Commission noted in its review of the Glossary that “transparency” appears in one chapter only, Chapter 2.1. Its placement in the Glossary arose because originally risk analysis was addressed in two chapters. These were later merged into a single chapter, but “transparency” remained in the Glossary. Noting this, the Code Commission removed the italics from the word “transparency” in Article 2.1.1., and consequently revised point 4) of Article 2.1.3., inserting the sentence defining transparency that was deleted from the Glossary, to read:

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

During this meeting, the Code Commission re-examined the proposal and considered that the amendments proposed to Article 2.1.3. were clear and there was no need for further amendment. It recalled that it had included the first sentence only because the meaning of the second sentence is clearly conveyed in the rest of the article.

The revised Articles 2.1.1. and 2.1.3. are attached in **Annex 9** for Member Country comments and are proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

5.2. Animal health surveillance (Chapter 1.4.) and review of the *ad hoc* Group report (June 2017)

The Code Commission commended the *ad hoc* Group for its work on revising the chapter. Regarding the *ad hoc* Group proposal to revise the definition of ‘infection’ to include ‘infestation’, the Code Commission did not agree as not only this would involve a large body of work to update all the related chapters, but also the International Epidemiological Association¹ dictionary contained separate definitions for these terms. The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to replace the term ‘early detection system’ with ‘early warning system’ (Article 1.4.8.) and amended the definition in the Glossary accordingly. For consistency with the approach taken in other chapters the term ‘disease’ was replaced with ‘*infection* and *infestation*’ where appropriate, the term ‘disease-specific chapters’ was revised to read ‘*listed* disease-specific chapters’ and ‘non-infected’ was changed to ‘uninfected’ as this is correct English.

The Code Commission proceeded to review the chapter article by article and proposed the following amendments:

Article 1.4.3. Surveillance systems

Point 1 b) – The Code Commission included timing in the subheading for clarity, added a new sentence and bullets on the factors to be taken into consideration when determining the timing and duration of surveillance. As it is not only the epidemiology of the disease which determines the surveillance activities but it is also important to identify how and when samples should be taken, and the frequency of collection when designing the system.

¹ <http://irea.ir/files/site1/pages/dictionary.pdf>

Point 1 d) – Epidemiological units – The *ad hoc* Group considered the definition provided in the Glossary, which considers only a group of animals as epidemiological units. Whilst the Group agreed that, most often, epidemiological units consist of a group of animals, it pointed out that, in some circumstances, epidemiological units may consist of individual animals (one animal holding, wildlife, etc.). The Code Commission considered the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group, which was supported by the Scientific Commission, and agreed to consider the possibility of revising the definition at its February 2018 meeting.

Article 1.4.4. Surveillance methods – The Code Commission proposed several editorial amendments to this article to improve the clarity and to ensure consistency with other chapters of the *Code*, including the deletion of the term ‘animal identification system’, as traceability goes beyond the definition used in the Glossary, and replacing ‘likelihood and consequence of disease’ with ‘risk of introduction of the *infection*’, since ‘risk’ is the result of the likelihood and consequences of a hazard.

Article 1.4.5. Considerations in survey design – The Code Commission proposed amendments to clarify the language and to better define the considerations in the design of surveys.

Article 1.4.6. Surveillance to demonstrate freedom from a disease or infection – The Code Commission included a new point to address requirements to declare a compartment free from infection or infestation and proposed changes to improve clarity and for consistency with the Glossary and other chapters of the *Code*.

Since the proposed revised chapter is significantly different from the current chapter, the proposed revision is provided as clean text.

The draft revised Chapter 1.4. and draft revised definition of ‘early warning system’ are attached as **Annex 24** and are proposed for Member Country comments.

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

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

The OIE Headquarters advised the Code Commission that the Scientific Commission had considered and addressed the Member Country comments on the questionnaires related to official recognition at its recent meeting. However, although all Member Countries comments had been addressed by the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission, after having reviewed one of them, considered that they still required some significant editing to improve the context and add clarity to the language. Given the size of this task, and taking into consideration the comments from Member Countries at the General Session, the Code Commission decided it was not possible to review all the questionnaires thoroughly at this meeting. The OIE Headquarters proposed that it would undertake further work between now and the Scientific and Code Commissions’ meetings of February 2018, with the assistance of Professor MacDiarmid. The Code Commission could then circulate them for further Member Country comments after its February meeting with the possibility of proposing them for adoption in May 2018. The Code Commission also requested that the OIE prepare the questionnaires as a separate chapter for each disease because, in its opinion, Chapter 1.6. should only cover the procedures and that this would facilitate any future revisions of the questionnaires in a more efficient and effective manner.

5.4. Zoning and compartmentalisation (Chapter 4.3.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Chile, Mexico, New Caledonia, New Zealand, South Africa and EU.

The Code Commission noted the general comment of a Member Country in support of the chapter and the expanded concept of a containment zone. In regards to another Member Country comment in relation to the definitions of ‘free zone’, ‘infected zone’ and ‘protection zone’ in the chapter, it noted these terms in the chapter and in the Glossary would be aligned and adopted at the same time. With respect to the use of ‘disease, infection and infestation’, ‘cases’ and ‘outbreaks’, the Code Commission noted it would make appropriate amendments to harmonise their use throughout the *Code*.

Article 4.3.1. Introduction

In response to a Member Country comment on paragraph 8 and proposals to make the text clearer, the Code Commission considered that there was no need to include reference to zones being defined on a geographical basis as this was adequately covered in the rest of the chapter. It proposed minor amendments to improve the readability.

Article 4.3.2. General considerations

In responding to Member Country comments, the Code Commission proposed to add reference to movement control and official control programmes in the first paragraph and where appropriate vaccination, treatment and protection against vectors in the fourth paragraph. In response to a Member Country comment on the last paragraph on certification, the Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission that certification may not always be required, although some form of paperwork would generally be required, so proposed to add 'when necessary' to clarify this point. It also added reference to vaccination in the list of systems to be audited.

Article 4.3.3. Principles for defining and establishing a zone or compartment

In responding to Member Countries comments on the legal boundaries in point)1, the Code Commission disagreed with a proposal to replace 'legal' with 'administrative' as this was inconsistent with the language used in other parts of the *Code* and that in its view 'administrative boundaries' would be covered by 'legal boundaries'. In response to the same Member Countries comments on point 4) on the need to include the concept of movement controls, the Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission that individual animal identification is not compulsory and that movement control is already included in the text (as well as in point 3)). The Code Commission amended the point by deleting 'animal' and inserting 'commodities' for consistency with the first sentence and because the definition of commodity in the Glossary includes live animals. In responding to a proposal to include records of cleansing and disinfection in point 5) the Code Commission noted this was covered by 'and any other criteria' so was considered unnecessary and reminded the Member Countries that 'cleaning' is covered in the definition of 'disinfection'.

The Code Commission proposed other editorial amendments for consistency with other chapters in the *Code* including deleting 'disease' where it appears before 'risk' as disease is included in the definition of risk in the Glossary.

Article 4.3.4. Free zone

The Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission in response to a Member Country proposal to include vector surveillance in the second paragraph. The Commissions agreed that the presence of competent vector is a factor to take into consideration in surveillance and that the absence of the competent vector may be evidence of the absence of the transmission of the disease.

Article 4.3.5. Infected zone

The Code Commission noted the opinion of the Scientific Commission about the definition of infected zone and noted it had proposed amendments to the definition in the Glossary, which were also included in this article. The Code Commission made other editorial amendments for consistency with other chapters in the *Code* including deleting 'disease' and replacing it with 'infection or infestation' as appropriate.

Article 4.3.6. Protection zone

The Code Commission considered the comments of Member Countries and clarified that because of an oversight there were two proposals of definition included in the Glossary in its February 2017 report and that the first proposal for the definition should not have been included. It disagreed with a comment stating that the establishment of a protection zone does not guarantee that the introduction of the pathogenic agent is prevented. In response to a request to delete the second ‘vehicles’ before ‘for transportation’ in point 4), the Code Commission noted that the definition of *vehicles/vessels* contained in the Glossary specifically referenced live animals and did not include commodities, and it amended the point to read ‘used for transport’ to clarify the intent of this point. The Code Commission further noted that any time the status of the protection zone changes, the status should be determined in accordance with the relevant listed disease-specific chapters.

The Code Commission considered the proposal from the Scientific Commission to include provisions in the *Code* to enable countries to establish a temporary preventive zone, as a containment zone, in response to a sudden increased risk. The two main purposes are to avoid trade barriers for those countries that may decide to implement vaccination to manage that risk, while retaining their status as free countries or zones and to protect the status of the rest of the free country or zone in case of introduction of a pathogenic agent. The Code Commission had a broad discussion, including with the OIE Headquarters Status Department, on the concept of « temporary preventive » zone and agreed on the need to include the concept within the article on protection zone. It considered this could be addressed by inserting new paragraphs at the end of the article. The new paragraphs provide for the establishment of a temporary *protection zone* in the event of an emergency, such as a sudden increased *risk* to a free country or *zone*. A paragraph was included in order to clarify that in such a situation, measures implemented in a *protection zone* established within a free country or *zone* will not affect the status of the rest of the free country or *zone*. However, some of the measures, such as *vaccination*, may make it necessary to distinguish the status of the *protection zone* from the rest of the country or *zone*.

The Code Commission noted that, by definition, temporary implied for a limited period of time. Therefore, it included a paragraph to clarify that a temporary protection zone should be established for a defined period, and that at the end of that period either it has to be permanently distinguished from the rest of the country or zone or it has to be disestablished.

It also wanted to ensure that Member Countries were clear in their understanding of the consequences of a case of an infection or infestation being detected in the temporary *protection zone*. It added a further paragraph to clarify that providing the zone was established at least two incubation periods before the occurrence this would not affect the status of the rest of the country or zone. It further clarified, without it being needed in the article, that should a case occur before two incubation periods have elapsed since the establishment of the zone, the status of the country or zone would be suspended until that zone becomes a containment zone.

Article 4.3.7. Containment zone

In examining Member Country comments on this article, the Code Commission noted, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, that if sufficiently justified, it may be possible to have more than one containment zone provided that the outbreaks in different containment zones are not epidemiologically linked. Hence, the Code Commission reiterated its February 2017 report explanation that there is a need for a reference to ‘all epidemiologically linked’ outbreaks being in one containment zone. The Code Commission further agreed with the comment that it may not always be possible to identify the definitive epidemiological link and for it to be the main criteria in defining the number of containment zones. The design of the containment zone or zones depends on the Veterinary Services’ strategy to manage outbreaks while facilitating safe trade. The containment zones for diseases with official status must be recognised by the Scientific Commission, and countries should provide the OIE with evidence to justify the establishment and the maintenance of the zone. For other diseases, countries should provide evidence to their trading partners.

The Code Commission considered Member Country comments on periods needed for the effective establishment of a containment zone, and noted that listed disease-specific chapters refer to two incubation periods. It agreed with the Scientific Commission that point b) of this article allows countries to recover free status outside of the containment zone promptly despite continuous outbreaks in the containment zone. In this situation a country should demonstrate that the protection zone around the containment zone remains free despite the event that triggered the creation of the containment zone. Two incubation periods would be needed to ensure time for appropriate implementation of measures, such as movement control between the zone where outbreaks are occurring and the protection zone, are effective. The Code Commission also modified the point to clarify that the period begun from the disposal of the last detected case.

Article 4.3.8. Bilateral recognition by trading countries:

In examining Member Country comments on this article, the Code Commission noted that editorial amendments proposed to align the text with the SPS Agreement were unnecessary and reiterated its previous advice that the *Code* does not paraphrase articles of the SPS Agreement. It further noted that in respect to the need to demonstrate that an importing country's requirements were being met, this was also not appropriate as the chapter was about the implementation of zoning and compartmentalisation and not meeting importing country requirements.

The Code Commission, in concluding its examination of this chapter, noted that its adoption in May 2018 would allow completion of work on listed disease-specific chapters that are dependent on the acceptance by Member Countries of the concepts outlined in this chapter.

The revised draft Chapter 4.3. is attached as **Annex 10** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

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

Comments were received from Chile, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Switzerland, USA and EU.

The Code Commission noted comments in support of the proposed revised chapter. In examining Member Country comments, it proposed the following amendments to the chapter.

Article 4.8.3. Conditions applicable to the processing laboratories

The Code Commission added a new point to include the need for laboratories to use appropriate facilities to handle and process embryos for export. The justification for the inclusion of the additional requirements was provided by the OIE Collaborating Centre (and references provided by the Member Country) and in line with the recommendations in the *Manual of the International Embryo Transfer Society (IETS)*.

Article 4.8.4. Conditions applicable to donor animals

The Code Commission agreed with a proposal to replace 'Veterinary Authority' with 'Veterinary Services' for consistency with the rest of the chapter. It noted the concerns expressed about the batch collection and agreed this should be addressed in future revisions of the chapter.

The Code Commission noted that it had requested advice from the OIE Collaborating Centre on whether the list of diseases for donor animals should be reviewed in point 2 of this article. In response, the OIE Collaborating Centre expressed the opinion that the individual status of the donor, whenever it can be ascertained, should take priority over the status of the herd or flock of origin. The Code Commission expressed its appreciation for the advice provided by the Collaborating Centre, noting in particular that the specialised expertise provided in the Manual of the IETS should be the reference for this chapter. It further noted the cross reference with Article 4.7.4. at the beginning of the article, which provides conditions for donors. This point will be discussed again in the February meeting when looking at the issue of the batch collection.

Article 4.8.5. Optional tests and treatments

In response to Member Countries comments, and in accordance with the scientific justification provided in chapter 5 of the Manual of the IETS, the Code Commission added a new point 4) to read ‘a pool of the last three washes from the 10 washes performed on the embryos.’ The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to include reference to ‘in the case of livestock’ in point 1) cross-referencing to Chapters 4.5. and 4.6. as the words ‘as appropriate’ were clear enough to avoid any confusion as to which species were included.

Article 4.8.7. Conditions applicable to the storage and transport of oocytes and embryos

In considering a Member Country comment on point 2) b), the Code Commission agreed there was a need for further clarity and amended the point to indicate that the liquid nitrogen should not have been used previously in order to avoid cross contamination of the oocytes and embryos during storage.

The revised draft Chapter 4.8. is attached as **Annex 11** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

5.6. New chapter on vaccination (Chapter 4.X.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China, Japan, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Singapore, Switzerland, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission noted that the comments of Member Countries indicated there was a lot of support for the content of the chapter. In addition to this chapter on vaccination programmes, a Member Country recommended the development of recommendations for the approval of veterinary medicines, such as vaccines to ensure they are effective and safe to use in a disease control programme. In response to this question, the Biological Standards Commission advised that the recommendations in the *Terrestrial Manual* cover diagnostics and vaccines but not veterinary medicines. Chapter 1.1.8. of the *Terrestrial Manual* gives comprehensive guidelines on the manufacture of vaccines, and Chapter 3.7.2. gives minimum requirements for the production and quality control of vaccines. While the Biological Standards Commission recognises that this does not cover the scope of veterinary medicines, its mandate does not include approval of these products. It further noted that the question of expanding the mandate of the Biological Standards Commission is one for Member Countries. On the other hand, the Code Commission noted that there are OIE standards on the use of veterinary antimicrobials in the *Terrestrial Code* (Chapters 6.7. to 6.10.) and the *Aquatic Code* (6.1. to 6.5.), and there are OIE standards on the organisation of the control of veterinary medicines in Chapters 3.2. and 3.4. (Article 3.4.11.). Moreover, the OIE has an agreement with the VICH, referenced in Chapter 6.9.: ‘Member Countries are encouraged to apply the existing guidelines established by the International Cooperation on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Veterinary Medicinal Products (VICH).’

In response to a proposal from the same Member Country to replace the phrase ‘marketing authorisation’ with ‘relevant approvals’ throughout the chapter, the Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the Biological Standards Commission to refer to ‘relevant regulatory approvals’ because some countries may not use the term ‘marketing authorisation’ when approving vaccines according to national legislation. The term ‘marketing authorisation’ has been replaced with ‘relevant regulatory approvals’ throughout the chapter.

The Code Commission reviewed the draft chapter and in response to Member Country comments proposed some additional amendments.

Article 4.X.1. Objective and introduction

In response to a Member Country proposal to only reference vaccination carried out as part of an official control programme, the Code Commission did not agree to narrow the scope, as the objective is to provide guidance for all types of vaccination control programmes, not just those under official control. Further, in respect to the proposal by the same Member Country to include reference to infestations, the Code Commission noted that vaccination against infestations is not yet available. In response to another proposal to replace ‘implementation’ with ‘use’ the Code Commission made the proposed change as the guidance is broader than implementation. In point 4), ‘and quality control’ was added for clarity.

Article 4.X.2. Definitions

Vaccination programme

The Code Commission agreed with a proposal to include ‘prevention or’ to harmonise the text with Article 4.X.1. and to clarify that the definition of vaccination programme includes both disease prevention and control.

Emergency vaccination

While recognising that a clear timeline for vaccination is desirable, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that it was not always possible to estimate the time to end an emergency vaccination programme and therefore did not accept the proposal to include ‘with a defined start and end date’ in the definition.

In response to a proposal from a Member Country to include a new definition of vaccination campaign, the Code Commission concurred with the view of the Scientific Commission and the *ad hoc* Group that had extensively discussed the terminology at its first meeting. The *ad hoc* Group considered the draft definition and emphasised that the vaccination programme should involve a structured plan to apply vaccines with the specific purpose of disease control or eradication. The *ad hoc* Group did not consider it necessary to provide a definition for ‘vaccination campaign’ as it is considered part of a vaccination programme.

Article 4.X.3. Vaccination programmes

The Code Commission replaced disease with *infection* where appropriate throughout the chapter.

In the chapeau, in response to a Member Country comment, the Code Commission proposed adding a new point to clarify the need for close collaboration with other public health authorities when developing vaccination programmes against zoonoses.

Point 1) – The Code Commission proposed to replace ‘adjacent’ with ‘neighbouring’ as the term was more appropriate to the intent of the chapter and also more generally throughout the *Code*. In regards to the sentence ‘prevent the introduction of a pathogenic agent from an infected adjacent country or zone,’ and a proposal from a Member Country to delete this reference, the Code Commission disagreed in principle with the rationale that vaccination by itself does not prevent the introduction of an infection. If successful, vaccination can indeed prevent introduction, with PPR being a good example of vaccination preventing infection.

Point 2 a) – The Code Commission proposed deleting ‘disease’ for consistency with editorial amendments being proposed to other chapters.

Point 2 b) – In response to a Member Country proposal to include reference to emergency vaccination that is applied to boost immunity, the Code Commission agreed that this is the case and proposed replacing ‘is applied’ with ‘revaccination’ as it was a more appropriate term in this context.

Point 2 *d*) – In response to a Member Country comment, the Code Commission amended the point to read ‘introduction of a pathogenic agent or emergence of a disease’ for clarity, as the introduction of a pathogenic agent and emergence of disease are different concepts.

Article 4.X.4. Launching a vaccination programme

Point 3) – In response to the same Member Country comment on point 2 *b*), the Code Commission proposed to add reference to the introduction of a pathogenic agent and emergence of disease, for clarity and consistency with point 2 *d*).

In response to a Member Country comment on the inclusion of reference to the need for an animal identification system to differentiate vaccinated from unvaccinated subpopulations, the Code Commission agreed to include a new point 7) bis.

Point 8) – The Code Commission considered the proposal of a Member Country to add a new point on the safety and efficacy of available vaccines and reworded point 8) by deleting ‘an appropriate’ and replacing it with ‘safe and effective’ and placing the reference to ‘availability of human, financial, and material resources’ into a new point 8) bis.

Article 4.X.5. Vaccination strategies

Ring vaccination – In response to a Member Country comment that the inclusion of how to conduct the process of ring vaccination was too prescriptive, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that the strategy to follow when implementing ring vaccination could vary depending on the circumstances and deleted the last sentence.

Barrier vaccination – The Code Commission replaced ‘disease’ with ‘infection’ for consistency.

Article 4.X.6. Choice of vaccine

In responding to a proposal to include reference to the availability of diagnostic tests to monitor for vaccine-induced antibodies, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission disagreed with the Member Country and considered that the point was not relevant, as the availability of a diagnostic test does not influence the availability or cost of the vaccine and, in any case, this was covered in point *b*) biological characteristics. The Code Commission also proposed to change ‘antibodies’ to ‘immunity’.

In response to a Member Country comment on the need to include reference to ‘stability in ambient conditions’ under point 2), the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission noted this was covered by thermostability under point *b*) biological characteristics.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country on the need to include specific reference to ‘age of animals’ in point *b*) biological characteristics – ‘suitability of vaccine formulation for species in the target population’, as the age of the animal could be an important factor in determining the appropriate dose depending on the formulation of the vaccine.

In response to a request to include ‘target species’, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission both agreed that this was adequately covered in point *c*) side effects, and that there was no justification to include it in point *b*) biological characteristics.

Point *c*) side effects, in responding to a Member Country comment proposing the addition of three new points to cover reversion to virulence, risk of vaccine pressure selecting new resistant strains of the disease agent, and risk of vaccination masking future outbreaks, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that reversion to virulence is covered by the added text and that the other two points are more related to the vaccination programme, and not directly linked to the vaccine characteristics. To address the Member Country concerns, the Code Commission proposed to amend the point on transmission of live strains by splitting it and creating a new point on reversion of attenuated strains to virulence.

Article 4.X.7. Other critical elements of a vaccination programme

Legal basis – The Code Commission noted in response to a question from a Member Country that the adverse effects referred to were those experienced by the animals, rather than humans. The Code Commission considered that the inclusion of a specific reference to ‘accidental damage caused by vaccination’ was unnecessary, as this would be covered by ‘adverse effects’. In regards to other Member Country comments about the legal basis for the vaccination programme, the Code Commission revised the text to take these into account and for clarity.

Stakeholder involvement – In response to Member Country comments on the need for clarity in what is meant by good governance by the Veterinary Services, the Code Commission reworded the text to show that it is the responsibility of the Veterinary Services to demonstrate good governance of the *vaccination* programme.

Timing of vaccination campaigns

The Code Commission proposed several editorial amendments to this point to address a Member Country comment in relation to a need for a definition of vaccination campaign and other Member Country comments in relation to storage facilities and animal identification systems.

Auditing of vaccination campaigns

The Code Commission proposed several editorial amendments to this point to address Member Country comments in relation to the need to increase the flexibility in the way audit is applied and the timing and duration of the campaign.

Article 4.X.8. Logistics of vaccination

For consistency, the Code Commission replaced ‘marketing authorisation’ with ‘relevant regulatory approval’ and in response to Member Country comments added a new point 1) bis Procurement of equipment and consumables, to cover the procurement of all necessary equipment and consumables which are also an important part of the logistics of vaccination. Subsequently it also added reference to other consumables such as ampoules, vials and bottles under ‘disposition’.

In response to a Member Country comment on the need to ensure the safety and welfare of vaccination teams, the Code Commission considered this was already covered in point g); however, for clarity it added a point g) bis specifically referencing safety of the vaccination teams distinct from the safety and welfare of the animals.

Point 5 on animal identification – The Code Commission agreed with a proposal to replace ‘carried out’ with ‘implemented’ as it was clearer.

Article 4.X.9. Evaluation and monitoring of a vaccination programme

In examining Member Country comments on this article, the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that monitoring and evaluation should not only be applied to systematic vaccination but also to emergency vaccination, that the term ‘side effects’ was broad and includes adverse reactions and that the reduction of clinical signs is covered by ‘reduction of the impact’ covered in point 4).

Article 4.X.10. Exit strategy of a vaccination programme

In considering Member Country comments, the Code Commission proposed several editorial amendments for consistency with changes proposed to previous articles including adding reference to ‘*pathogenic agent*’.

Article 4.X.11. Impact on disease status and management of vaccinated animals

In response to a Member Country comment proposing to include reference to ‘absence of cases needing to be accurately demonstrated through documented surveillance’ the Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that this is a default requirement in the listed disease-specific chapters of the *Code* and that surveillance in accordance with Chapter 1.4. should be implemented. Therefore, including a reference here would be a duplication of that guidance.

The revised draft Chapter 4.X. is attached as **Annex 12** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

5.7. New chapter on management of outbreaks of listed diseases (Chapter 4.Y)

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

The Code Commission expressed disappointment that developing Member Countries had not commented on the draft chapter. It also expressed concern that this lack of comment could be interpreted to mean that developing Member Countries do not see this draft chapter as being relevant to them. The Code Commission calls on all Member Countries to review and comment on this draft chapter, meant to provide general guidance relevant to any OIE Member Country.

In examining comments from Member Countries and the advice from the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission had a general discussion on whether the scope of the chapter should be restricted to management of listed diseases under official control by the *Veterinary Services*. Noting the *Code* deals with emerging and listed diseases except in some circumstances, the Code Commission revised the title of the chapter to ‘Official Control of Emerging and Listed Diseases’. This change was proposed to emphasise that the recommendations apply to official control programmes and are not intended to impose anything on countries that do not have such programmes. The Code Commission noted that the new title reflected defined terms in the Glossary, which will facilitate its implementation.

The Code Commission analysed all Member Countries comments and introduced several modifications to the draft text to improve its clarity and consistency and to reflect the new title and scope of the draft chapter and with other chapters of the *Code*.

Article 4.Y.1. Introduction

The Code Commission considered a Member Country comment on the reference to the results of risk analysis. It agreed to its deletion, noting it is more appropriate to reference this elsewhere in the article and so included it in the fourth paragraph. In response to other Member Country comments, the text of the article was modified to clarify the scope and to highlight that the measures can vary from a rapid response to a new hazard to management of outbreaks to long-term control of an endemic infection or infestation in accordance with the likely impact of the disease. The article was also modified to include the need for responses to be adapted according to the epidemiology of the disease, the need for cooperation with other relevant stakeholders and authorities, and the need for plans to include an exit strategy.

Article 4.Y.2. Legal framework and regulatory environment

The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to delete reference to veterinary legislation in point 2) but included ‘or other relevant legal framework’ to address the different approaches that may apply in some countries, such as coordination with other authorities, that may not be addressed in veterinary legislation.

In examining a Member Country proposal to modify point 3) to include policy and regulations the Code Commission agreed that it adds clarity and confirms the variety of approaches used by different countries through both regulatory and non-regulatory approaches.

The Code Commission also modified the second bullet point under point 3) by separating it into two bullet points for clarity.

The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal of a Member Country to replace ‘disinsection’ by ‘disinfestation’, as the first is broader and its use in this article is consistent with concepts included in Chapter 4.13.

Article 4.Y.3. Preparedness

In examining a Member Country proposal to modify the third paragraph of point 1), on risk analysis, the Code Commission partially agreed with the proposal and amended the paragraph for clarity and to highlight the need to review the risk analysis in light of new scientific evidence.

Article 4.Y.4. Early detection system (Surveillance and early warning systems)

The Code Commission had an extensive discussion on the use of the term ‘early warning system’ and noted the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group on surveillance that the term ‘early detection system’ be replaced with ‘early warning system’ in the revised Chapter 1.4. on surveillance. To take into account the change to ‘early warning system’ the Code Commission amended the title of the article to ‘Surveillance and early warning systems’ and agreed to use ‘early warning system’ throughout the chapter.

Taking into consideration the revised chapter on surveillance (Chapter 1.4) the Code Commission deleted points 2) to 6) of the article as these concepts are more appropriately addressed in the surveillance chapter. The deletion simplifies the article and will allow for the inclusion of these concepts in Chapter 1.4.

Article 4.Y.5. General considerations when managing an outbreak

The Code Commission modified the first paragraph to specify and clarify that it applies to diseases subject to an official control programme. In response to Member Country proposal to change ‘disinsection’ to ‘disinfestation’ the Code Commission did not agree with the rationale provided and clarified that the point addresses the need for disinfection and, if relevant, disinsection.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country comment to address the control of movement of people and agreed it is an important factor to be considered to stop the spread of infection and added a new indent in point 2).

The Code Commission agreed in principle with the general comment of a Member Country that there was a need to add a reference to ‘incident command system’ and included the need for close coordination through intersectoral mechanisms, such as an incident command system, in a new paragraph.

Article 4.Y.6. Culling and disposal

In response to Member Country proposals to modify the first paragraph to correct the overly definitive expression that animals always are the greatest source of infection, and to highlight the risk of pathogenic agents surviving in the environment, the Code Commission amended the paragraph accordingly to address both issues and to add clarity to the text.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country comment that employing and adapting strategies is equally applicable to killing and disposal of animals and animal products as it is to culling and so modified the second paragraph accordingly.

The Code Commission amended the title of point 1) Stamping-out by adding ‘policy’ for clarity. In response to Member Country comments the Code Commission reordered and amended the paragraphs for a more logical flow and to clarify that the application of a stamping-out policy should take into consideration an assessment of the associated risks, particularly when it is to be applied to animals present on an affected establishment.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country to include eggs in the list of commodities to be destroyed or processed to inactivate the pathogenic agent.

The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed with a Member Country comment that the design of a test and cull strategy is dependent on the performance characteristics of the diagnostic tests available. The Code Commission modified point 2) by including a new sentence on the application of different test and cull strategies based on the epidemiology of the infection or infestation and that the design of the strategy should take into account the specificity and sensitivity of diagnostic tests.

Article 4.Y.7. Movement control

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country on the need for movement restrictions on animal products as well as animals, people and vehicles. In regards to the erection of physical barriers, the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘should’ with ‘may’ as it is not always necessary to put up physical barriers to restrict movement. The Code Commission also amended the paragraph to include the need to review measures on the basis of a risk assessment.

Article 4.Y.8. Biosecurity

In examining Member Country comments, the Code Commission agreed with proposals to modify paragraphs one and two to include the potential for anything to act as a fomite, in the first one, and to indicate that the use of disinfection is not always part of the management of all infections or infestations in the second one.

Article 4.Y.10. Zoning

The Code Commission proposed editorial amendments including reference to ‘slaughter’ and to clarify the use of zones in response to outbreaks of emerging or listed diseases.

Article 4.Y.12. Specific post-control surveillance

The Code Commission proposed minor editorial amendments for consistency with the rest of the chapter.

The revised new Chapter 4.Y. and the proposed definition of ‘early warning system’ are attached as **Annex 25** for Member Country comments.

5.8. New chapter on introduction to recommendations for veterinary public health (Chapter 6.X.)

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

Article 6.X.1.

The Code Commission considered Member Country comments on the introductory paragraph and amended it for consistency with the WHO definition of veterinary public health² and proposed minor editorial amendments for clarity.

In response to other Member Country comments on the rest of the chapter, the Code Commission proposed minor editorial amendments and included references to improvement of animal welfare, contributions to biomedical research, food security and the need for veterinary education to take into account the role of *Veterinary Services* in public health at national, regional and global level in the development of veterinary public health capabilities.

The revised draft Chapter 6.X. is attached as **Annex 13** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

² http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/42460/1/WHO_TRS_907.pdf Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Veterinary Public Health as “a component of public health activities devoted to the application of professional veterinary skills, knowledge and resources to the protection and improvement of human health.”

5.9. The role of the Veterinary Services in food safety systems (Chapter 6.1.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Switzerland, USA and EU.

The Code Commission examined the particularly large number of Member Country comments on this chapter and made the following amendments.

Article 6.1.1. – The Code Commission agreed with several proposals to change ‘actors’ to ‘personnel’ as the term was more readily understood at the international level and included reference to ‘foodborne’ and ‘hygiene’ to clarify the training of veterinarians in relation to food safety. For further clarity, the Code Commission merged the first and second paragraphs.

Article 6.1.3. Point 1) – The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to include ‘storage’ in the list at the end of the first paragraph for completeness. It also partially agreed with a proposal to include ‘hazards and associated risks’ but did not agree to include ‘competent authorities, which comprise’ as it considered that the definition in the Glossary was sufficient and that in the case of a food safety incident Veterinary Services were often not the only competent authority involved. It also agreed to reinstate a sentence highlighting the effectiveness of control of hazards throughout the food chain.

Point 1) – The Code Commission agreed with a proposal to change ‘risk assessment’ to ‘risk analysis’. It agreed to reinstate the proposed deletion of ‘prevention, detection and control of foodborne hazards’ and included an example at the end of the paragraph to highlight the role in ‘providing information on the occurrence of *infections* on the farm prior to dispatch of animals for slaughter may allow more targeted, risk-based inspection at the *slaughterhouse/abattoir*.’ In response to a Member Country comment that the inclusion of responsibilities for consumers seemed a bit strong, the Code Commission noted that consumers have a role to play in that it is their responsibility to follow storage and preparation instructions in order to ensure food safety.

Point 3) – The Code Commission disagreed with the need to include ‘relevant’ before ‘Competent Authorities’ as countries may have multiple competent authorities when it comes to food safety and, in general, a food business operator will only be required to inform a single competent authority.

Point 4) – The Code Commission did not agree with Member Country proposals to amend this point as it considered it is clear that preventive actions may be part of the corrective action plan. The Code Commission agreed in part with a proposal to include reference to the use of ‘third party providers to implement controls’ and added a new paragraph to address this proposal, noting that this aligned with Codex guidelines.

Article 6.1.4. – The Code Commission made several proposed changes to this article to address Member Country comments, in particular in point 3), to clarify that Veterinary Services play a key role in the investigation of and response to foodborne disease outbreaks which may be attributable to or involve animal products.

The revised draft Chapter 6.1. is attached as **Annex 14a** (in track changes) and **Annex 14b** (clean) respectively for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

5.10. Harmonisation of national antimicrobial resistance surveillance and monitoring programmes (Chapter 6.7.) and review of the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Antimicrobial Resistance (August 2017)

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

The OIE *ad hoc* Group on Antimicrobial Resistance met from 29 to 31 August 2017. The tasks of the *ad hoc* Group included revision of Member Country comments received on Chapter 6.7. Harmonisation of national antimicrobial resistance surveillance and monitoring programmes and on

the proposed definitions for possible inclusion in Chapter 6.8. of the *Terrestrial Code*: therapeutic use, preventative use and growth promotion.

The Code Commission considered the advice provided by the *ad hoc* Group on Member Country proposals and thanked it for its work. In reviewing the chapter, the Code Commission proposed the following amendments:

Article 6.7.2. – In response to a Member Country comment that the chapter was about surveillance and monitoring, the Code Commission added ‘monitoring’ where appropriate for consistency.

Article 6.7.3. Point 1) – In response to a Member Country comment on the inclusion of ‘trends’, the Code Commission noted that surveillance of antimicrobial resistance and monitoring the trends in prevalence was more appropriate language and amended the first paragraph accordingly. In response to the same Member Country comment that animal feed and the environment should not be considered critical to animal health and safety, the Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the *ad hoc* Group that feed is one of a number of possible sources of resistant bacteria and the purpose of the chapter is not to provide a comprehensive list of sources which might be monitored, but to provide an indication of those types of monitoring which might be appropriate to the national situation. The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the Scientific Commission to delete animal feed and environment and to add a sentence at the end of the paragraph to indicate these should be considered according to national priorities.

Point 3) – In response to a Member Country comment noting the definitions of herds and flocks are identical in the Glossary, the Code Commission noted that this was the case but that the terms were applied differently according to Member Countries and, for this reason, it was necessary to include both terms in the *Code*.

Point 4) – In response to a Member Country proposal to add ‘where available’ the Code Commission noted that the introduction to this paragraph contains the term ‘may include’ which already implies that inclusion of this item is optional.

Point 6) – In response to a Member Country proposal to delete this point, the Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group that the purpose of the chapter was not to provide a comprehensive list of all possible sources of exposure, but to indicate the types of surveillance and monitoring which may be considered depending on national priorities. In response to another Member Country proposal to delete ‘feed ingredients’, as the word ‘feed’ covers feed ingredients, the Code Commission did not agree, but instead noted it would consider whether there was a need to include a definition of feed ingredient in the Glossary because in Chapter 6.3. the definitions of feed and feed ingredients are different.

Article 6.7.4. – The Code Commission proposed several amendments to take into consideration Member Country comments, except in response to a proposal to amend the title of Table 1; it agreed with the *ad hoc* Group that the proposed changes did not reflect the content of Table 1. The Code Commission also noted that the *ad hoc* Group agreed to add additional rows to Table 1 to cover lower expected prevalence of 1% and 5%. However, as the *ad hoc* Group did not offer specific figures to include in the table, the Code Commission was unable to make the proposed change and invited the *ad hoc* Group to address this oversight at its next meeting.

Table 2. – The Code Commission noted the opinion of the *ad hoc* Group and revised the order of the points in the paragraphs preceding the table. In response to a proposal to include ‘animal origin’ before ‘food’ in point c), the Code Commission did not consider this was necessary as it was clear that it applied to food of animal origin. In response to another Member Country comment proposing to add ‘While it is difficult to collect’ in point 4) the Code Commission disagreed with the proposal as it was unnecessary and inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the *Code*.

In regards to a Member Country comment on the outputs for carcass and food products, the Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group that the outputs for ‘abattoir’ and ‘processing’ and ‘packing’ could be clearer and amended the outputs of each to read ‘prevalence of resistant bacteria after carcass dressing (processing), representative of the hygiene of the process and the contamination during slaughter (processing and handling)’.

Article 6.7.5. – The Code Commission considered the comment of a Member Country and a proposal from the *ad hoc* Group and amended point *iv*) accordingly.

Table 3. – The *ad hoc* Group considered a Member Country proposal to add *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* under the poultry pathogens listed in the Table but did not support this. The Code Commission noted however that Table 3 focuses on animal pathogens and because *Salmonella* is relevant in cattle, pigs as well as poultry, it included *Salmonella* spp. as an enteric pathogen for poultry.

In response to a Member Country comment on point *a*) *Salmonella*, the Code Commission noted the proposal of the *ad hoc* Group to address this comment, inserted the revised text, and reordered the wording for consistency with previous amendments. In response to another Member Country comment on the low prevalence of *Salmonella*, the Code Commission considered this comment had been addressed by the amendments proposed. In response to a Member Country proposal to replace ‘phage typing’ with ‘genetic based tests’ the *ad hoc* Group proposed alternate wording which the Code Commission largely accepted.

The revised draft Chapter 6.7. is attached as **Annex 15** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

5.11. Definitions for inclusion in Chapter 6.8. Monitoring of the quantities and usage patterns of antimicrobial agents used in food-producing animals and review of the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Antimicrobial Resistance (August 2017)

Comments were received from Australia, Japan, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Singapore, USA, EU and the International Poultry Council.

The Code Commission recalled that proposed definitions of ‘therapeutic use’, ‘preventative use’ and ‘growth promotion’ had been circulated in its last report for Member Country comments at the request of the Director General of the OIE. The Member Country comments received were reviewed by the *ad hoc* Group on Antimicrobial Resistance at its meeting in August 2017. The *ad hoc* Group proposed further amendments to the definitions in order to reconcile the many Member Country comments and presented revised definitions for consideration of the Code Commission.

These revised definitions included additional definitions of ‘treatment’, ‘control’ and ‘prevention’ in order to clarify the definition of therapeutic use. While the Code Commission appreciated the work of the *ad hoc* Group, it considered that the definitions as presented were overly duplicative and that the structure of the text did not fit within the *Code*. The Code Commission revised the structure and content of the definitions to take into account Member Country comments and to improve clarity.

In revising the definitions, the Code Commission noted that the inclusion of the text ‘The Veterinary Medicinal Products (VMP) containing antimicrobial agents should only be used on the prescription of a veterinarian or other suitably trained person authorised to prescribe VMP containing antimicrobial agents in accordance with national legislation and under the supervision of a veterinarian’, whilst important, was not appropriate in this chapter about monitoring usage, and was already covered in Chapter 6.9. on responsible and prudent use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine.

The Code Commission considered the structure of Article 6.1.8. and agreed with the proposal presented by the OIE Headquarters to have separate articles for purpose and definitions. The Code Commission revised the purpose for clarity and amended the definitions in the proposed new article 6.8.1.bis.

In reviewing Member Country comments, the Code Commission noted the opinion of the *ad hoc* Group on a proposal to include a new definition of medically important antimicrobial drugs, and shared the opinion that the concept relates to human health and lies within the remit of WHO and was not appropriate or necessary to include in this chapter. The Code Commission considered that in reviewing the definitions it had followed the rationale of the *ad hoc* Group, reduced duplication and improved the clarity of the text and that the definitions now provided a clear distinction between therapeutic and nontherapeutic use.

The draft revised Article 6.8.1. and new Article 6.8.1.bis (including the definitions) are attached at **Annex 16** for Member Country comments and are proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

5.12. Introduction to the recommendations for animal welfare (Chapter 7.1.) (including proposed amendment of definition of ‘animal welfare’ and a new article on guiding principles for the use of animal-based measures)

Definition

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

The Code Commission recalled that the proposal to modify the definition of animal welfare was developed by the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG) during the 4th Global Conference on Animal Welfare (December 2016). The Code Commission considered that the modification would provide a more precise definition in the Glossary and that the descriptive text fits more appropriately in Chapter 7.1. Introduction to the recommendations for animal welfare, and in particular in Article 7.1.1. on General principles.

In examining comments from Member Countries and an organisation proposing to retain the current definition, the Code Commission did not agree, because the details of the factors involved in the animal welfare concept are retained in the modified Article 7.1.1.

The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of some Member Countries to replace ‘well-being’ with ‘physical and psychological state’, as the latter is an integral part of the concept of ‘well-being’ and will allow a better translation in French and Spanish.

The revised definition of animal welfare is attached as **Annex 17**, and is proposed for Member Country comments.

Chapter 7.1. Article 7.1.1. General considerations

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, USA, EU, AU-IBAR and ICAFW.

The Code Commission took note of the general comments of Member Countries and reiterated its response to comments on the definition. The Code Commission also pointed out that ‘*animal welfare*’ is used throughout the *Code*, not just in Section 7.

In response to a comment from a Member Country and an organisation to keep the title of the article as ‘Definition’, the Code Commission did not agree as this article not only deals with the definition of animal welfare but also with some general consideration regarding good animal welfare and how to promote it.

In response to a Member Country proposal to amend the first and second paragraphs of the article, the Code Commission modified these in order to be consistent with the proposed new definition in the Glossary.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to delete the parenthesis around ‘as indicated by scientific evidence’, as the following articles, in particular Articles 7.1.2. and 7.1.3., provide sufficient information to support the statement.

The Code Commission agreed partially with some Member Country proposal to add more descriptive elements to achieve good animal welfare and included the term ‘enjoy’, in its legal meaning, to emphasise the need for some required conditions to achieve good animal welfare. The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country to add text in relation to the state of the animals, as in this paragraph the intention is to include the recommendation to allow the animals to develop good animal welfare.

The Code Commission noted and thanked a Member Country for its comment on Article 7.1.3. Nevertheless, the Code Commission would like to have agreement on the current modifications before reviewing and revising the remaining articles in this chapter.

The revised Article 7.1.1. is attached as **Annex 17** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

New article on guiding principles for the use of measures to assess animal welfare (Article 7.1.X.)

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

The Code Commission considered the Member Countries comments and edited the first item to emphasise that animal welfare should be evaluated using positive outcome-based criteria while, nevertheless, recognising the necessity of having some specific recommendations on conditions.

Considering that some comments of the Member Countries were contradictory, the Code Commission developed a new proposal to clarify the meaning of the first sentence of Article 7.1.X.

The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country proposal to use the term ‘five domains’ instead of ‘five freedoms’ as the latter is still part of the guiding principles for animal welfare, and are mentioned in Article 7.1.2. However, the Code Commission commented that it could be considered further in the next review of the chapter.

The Code Commission did not agree with Member Country comments and decided to keep ‘criteria’ in point 2), as the rationale was not clear enough to support the proposed change.

In examining Member Country comments on point 2), the Code Commission did not agree to delete the word ‘ideally’ as this means ‘preferably’ while not excluding other possibilities. However, the Code commission changed the sentence to ‘ideally comprising animal-based measures’ according to the suggestion of another Member Country, to improve clarity. In this point, the Code Commission’s intention was to keep the emphasis that the main recommendation of the OIE is to base the assessment of animal welfare on animal-based criteria, and not only on the measures applied. Finally, the Code Commission accepted the comment of a Member Country to use ‘criteria’ with ‘or measurables’ between brackets to harmonise the terminology with other chapters.

The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country comment on point 4) that users should establish targets and thresholds, or with the rationale that the OIE should not establish them, as in some cases it is necessary to provide the guidance on targets on the thresholds. The Code Commission did not agree with a Member Country suggestion to replace ‘In addition’ with ‘When compared’ as the meanings are different. However, considering these comments, and to improve the logic and clarity, the Code Commission opted to place point 4) before point 3) and consequently renumbered the points.

The Code Commission agreed partially with a Member Country comment on point 4) that proposed replacing ‘Competent Authorities’ with ‘other relevant bodies’. However, the Code Commission decided to keep both for clarity.

The Code Commission agreed with a proposal of some Member Countries and an organisation to include a sentence explaining what should be done in case of a failure in the measurements of the outcomes. However, for clarity, it emphasised that however the outcome is measured, if it is unsatisfactory, the user should consider what might be changed, including management of resources, to improve the outcome in the future. The Code Commission proposed to add the sentence as a new bullet point 6).

The new Article 7.1.X. is attached as **Annex 18** and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

5.13. Animal welfare and pig production systems (Chapter 7.X.) and review of the report of the *ad hoc* Group (August 2017)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China, Japan, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Mexico, Switzerland, USA, EU and ICFAW.

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare and Pig Production Systems met at OIE Headquarters from 29–31 August 2017 in order to review Member Country comments on the revised draft Chapter 7.X. The Code Commission commended the *ad hoc* Group for its revised draft chapter. It invited Member Countries to review the report of the *ad hoc* Group for more extensive responses to Member Country comments.

The Code Commission reviewed the draft chapter together with the Member Country comments and proposed some modifications in addition to those proposed by the *ad hoc* Group, to ensure consistency with other chapters and where appropriate address comments it considered required more detailed revision. The rationale for specific proposals is given below.

Article 7.X.1. – In respect to the definition of ‘pig production systems’, the Code Commission modified the article to take into consideration the revised definition for commercial systems used in Chapter 6.13. on prevention and control of *Salmonella* in commercial pig production systems and to align the other definitions with proposed changes to the definition of animal welfare. The Code Commission agreed with the modifications proposed by the *ad hoc* Group to address Member Country comments on the use of ‘biological functioning’ as it considered the use of ‘physical and psychological’ was more appropriate and in line with the revised definition of animal welfare.

Article 7.X.4. – For clarity, the Code Commission deleted references to ‘health’ proposed for inclusion by the *ad hoc* Group in a number of points, as it did not consider this was relevant. The Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group not to include a table proposed by a Member Country, noting that the information was designed to be used at the national level to show the relationship between animal-based measures and normal and abnormal behaviours.

Point 9) – The Code Commission disagreed with the *ad hoc* Group’s decision to include ‘sunburn’ as a type of skin discoloration as it was considered too specific. In the same point, the Code Commission inserted the words ‘painful or potentially painful’ to indicate that not all the procedures used in the management of pigs are painful and agreed to reinstate the reference to ‘human safety’.

The Code Commission did not accept a recommendation by the *ad hoc* Group to include a definition of the term ‘suffering’ in the Glossary because it considered this was unnecessary as the definition in the Oxford English Dictionary is sufficiently clear.

Article 7.X.5. – The Code Commission disagreed with the addition of the last sentence in the third paragraph, as all the recommendations included in this chapter are intended to ameliorate the animal welfare of the pigs, and therefore proposed to delete it.

For consistency with the wording of the proposed new Article 7.1.X., ‘outcome-based criteria’ was replaced by ‘animal-based criteria’ throughout the draft chapter.

Article 7.X.8. – The Code Commission considered the recommendations in the article relating to painful procedures and proposed to delete the reference to the use of anaesthesia or analgesia from the second paragraph, as this was adequately covered in the general recommendations. In regards to the proposal by an organisation to include recommendations related to tail docking, the Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group that there is broad general agreement that tail docking should be avoided and this was adequately covered in the existing text.

Article 7.X.9. – The Code Commission added reference to ‘emaciation’ in the animal-based criteria and deleted reference to ‘in piglets’ as it was unnecessary and proposed to reinstate reference to ‘pigs should be fed a diet with sufficient fibrous feedstuffs’ as this was an important consideration.

Article 7.X.13. – The Code Commission agreed with the comprehensive rationale provided by the *ad hoc* Group in relation to the proposal by some Member Countries and an organisation for the use of ‘stalls and crates’. The *ad hoc* Group noted as follows:

‘In relation to Member Countries recommendation to discourage the use of stalls and crates, the *ad hoc* Group did not agree to add the proposed new paragraph, as loose housing for pregnant sows is already included in Article 7.X12. Furthermore, the group did not find enough convincing scientific evidence that the mortality rate of live born piglets could be kept as low as in crate farrowing and lactation systems. Until this problem is solved, the group did not consider it appropriate to recommend loose housing systems for farrowing sows and gilts.

The *ad hoc* Group recognised that large comparative studies in Europe (Weber et al., 2007; Kilbride et al., 2012) show that crushing is higher in loose pens and mortality due to other causes (e.g. stillborn) was higher in farrowing crates.

While the group however, did acknowledge the evidence that piglets reared in farrowing crates may be deprived of some benefits relating to social development (e.g., piglets reared in loose farrowing and lactation systems show more play behaviour and less injurious behaviour, such as nibbling, sucking or chewing another piglet (Oostindjer et al., 2011; Singh et al., 2017)), higher live-born piglet mortality in loose farrowing and lactation systems (e.g., Weber et al., 2007; Kilbride et al., 2012; Cronin et al., 2014) is a serious concern. Since the majority of pre-weaning piglet mortalities occur within the first 2–3 days postpartum and are mainly caused by crushing, Johnson and Marchant-Forde (2009) concluded that farrowing crates can safeguard piglet survival and welfare during nest occupation in the farrowing phase, especially limiting early pre-weaning mortality.’

Article 7.X.14. – The Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group not to accept the proposal by a Member Country to include text to support phasing out of fully slatted floor systems, as it did not consider the scientific references provided sufficient evidence to differentiate between partially and fully slatted floors in terms of foot and leg injuries and the ability to provide enrichment. The *ad hoc* Group could not find other references that could support the phasing out of fully slatted floors.

Article 7.X.16. – In response to a Member Country comment relating to cold stress, the Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group’s position not to include the phrase ‘skin discoloration of more than 10% of the skin’ after ‘piloerection’, as the *ad hoc* Group could not find support for this in the ‘Welfare Quality Assessment Protocol for Pigs, 2009’, where other parameters such as huddling or shivering are used for the assessment of cold stress.

Article 7.X.18. – The Code Commission agreed with the proposed deletion of the paragraph which provided a recommendation on the minimum intensity of light, as the *ad hoc* Group could not find enough supportive evidence. Nevertheless, the Code Commission indicated that Member Countries should carefully consider the recommendation on the adequate photoperiod suitable for pigs and also the necessary light intensity to conduct inspections. The Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group on a Member Country proposal to add a new article related to Regulatory Assessment Procedures, but considered the addition was out of the scope, even if it was considered relevant and was not only relevant to animal welfare but also to animal health standards. Nevertheless, the Code Commission agreed with the recommendation of the *ad hoc* Group that the OIE Headquarters should consider this proposal further in the next revision of the chapter.

Article 7.X.19. – The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group had proposed new text in order to resolve conflicting Member Country comments and that it had also proposed to delete the second paragraph of this article for consistency with the previous articles on housing and space allowance, as it was agreed not to recommend specific housing or farrowing systems because the current literature is not conclusive.

The Code Commission broadly agreed with the proposals made by the *ad hoc* Group to address Member Country comments on the remaining articles and commended the *ad hoc* Group for its thorough review of the chapter and in addressing Member Country comments.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached as **Annex 34** for Member Countries' information.

The new Chapter 7.X. is attached as **Annex 19** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

5.14 Infection with bluetongue virus (Chapter 8.3.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa, Switzerland, Taipei China, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

In examining Member Country comments on the revised chapter, the Code Commission proposed a number of editorial amendments for consistency with amendments to the Glossary and for consistency with other chapters of the *Code*.

The Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission on a Member Country proposal to include recommendations for the declaration of seasonal vector-free period and should criteria be developed they should be included in Chapter 1.5. Surveillance for arthropod vectors. The Code Commission noted this should be discussed further between the two Commissions.

Article 8.3.1. General provisions

In response to a general proposal by a Member Country to amend the first paragraph to include reference to other susceptible herbivores of epidemiological significance, the Code Commission noted that the case definition is restricted to some relevant species for purposes of notification but surveillance can cover more species. For this reason in Article 8.3.16. (and not Articles 8.3.14. or 8.3.15.) there is reference to species relevant 'within the country or zone'. The Code Commission further noted it would examine this together with the Scientific Commission a future meeting.

In response to Member Countries comments on point 3) on inclusion of 'virulent, revertant or reassortant', the Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission that the presence of a virus in unvaccinated animals is considered an infection as per the case definition, whether or not the virus is a vaccine strain that has reverted to virulence or reassorted, therefore there was no need to amend this point. The Code Commission noted that it is indeed possible that an infection with clinical signs could result from a live BTV vaccine.

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country that the terms 'detected' and 'identified' were used inconsistently in the chapter and proposed changes throughout in order to correct this.

Article 8.3.2. Safe commodities

In response to a Member Country proposal to delete point 5), and another Member Country comment on the categorisation of embryos as a risk of transmission, the Code Commission did not agree with the rationale provided, and noted that the authority for the *Code* when considering the safety of embryos is the expertise of the IETS and its Manual and the recommendations in this article are in line with that advice.

Article 8.3.4. Country or zone seasonally free from bluetongue

The Code Commission agreed with a Member Country proposal to include a cross reference to surveillance in accordance with Articles 8.3.14. to 8.3.17. The Code Commission also drew the Member Countries' attention to the report of its February 2017 meeting with regards to the use of 'seasonally free' as referring to the season as being free and proposed no further changes.

Article 8.3.6. Recommendations for importation from countries or zones free from bluetongue

In responding to Member Country comments, the Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission and merged several points under point 5), and proposed editorial changes for clarity. It agreed with the proposal of a Member Country to delete point *a*) and reminded another Member Country that the definition of *vaccinated* in the Glossary means 'were subject to vaccination'.

Article 8.3.7. Recommendations for importation from zones seasonally free from bluetongue (added country to the subheading)

The Code Commission examined Member Country comments and amended the article for consistency with Article 8.3.6. and included reference to Article 8.3.13., point 2). In response to a proposal to amend point 6), the Code Commission noted that, by definition, a seasonally free zone is within an infected country. It further noted other Member Country comments had either been addressed in the amendments to the previous article or rationale provided against previous articles for not accepting them.

Article 8.3.8. Recommendations for importation from countries or zones infected with BTV

The Code Commission amended point 5) for consistency with the two previous articles and in response to a Member Country comment included reference to Article 8.3.8. in points 2), 3) and 4). The Code Commission did not agree with the same Member Country proposal to amend point 5) to include reference to 'vaccination with a vaccine approved by the exporting country' (see definition in the Glossary). In response to a proposal to include 'a protective level of antibodies' in point 6), the Code Commission noted the opinion of the Biological Standards Commission that a protective level of antibodies for BTV has not been established but the detection of antibodies to a particular serotype is indicative of infection with that serotype. Animals thus exposed may be considered protected against that serotype.

Article 8.3.9. Recommendations for importation from countries or zones free or seasonally free from bluetongue

The Code Commission considered Member Country comments and proposed minor changes to this article adding reference to 'country' where appropriate. The Code Commission also noted it should examine the option of exporting semen from vaccinated animals in a future revision of the chapter and requested the OIE Headquarters to seek expert advice as to whether it was appropriate to include the same conditions for importation of semen as was applicable to the importation of live animals.

Article 8.3.10. Recommendations for importation from countries or zones infected with BTV

In response to a proposal from a Member Country to include 'were protected from attacks from *Culicoides*', the Code Commission considered it was unnecessary in point *b*) as the recommendation included the requirement the animals be kept in a vector-protected establishment and this was considered sufficient. The same applies to Article 8.3.12.

Article 8.3.11. Recommendations for importation from countries or zones seasonally free from bluetongue

The Code Commission noted with respect to proposed alternate text for *in vivo*-derived embryos that this was already covered in Article 8.3.2. and did not need to be repeated.

Article 8.3.12. Recommendations for importation from countries or zones infected with BTV

To improve clarity, the Code Commission included reference to Articles 8.3.13. and 8.3.10., as proposed by a Member Country.

Article 8.3.16. Surveillance strategies

In response to a Member Country proposal to include reference to camelids and other susceptible herbivores, the Code Commission did not agree as the case definition provided adequate clarity with reference to camelids. In responding to another Member Country suggestion to add ‘using all of the five strategies below’, the Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission that it may not always be appropriate to use all five strategies. Depending on the epidemiological situation, it is up to Member Countries to decide on the most suitable strategy.

In response to the same Member Country comment on point 5), vector surveillance relating to over-winter and seasonal freedom and that more specific recommendations on criteria for the definition of the Seasonal Vector Free Period (SVFP) should be included in the article, the Scientific Commission and the Code Commission agreed that new scientific evidence related to over-winter and seasonal freedom could be taken into account in a future revision of the chapter and that SVFP should be considered for inclusion in Chapter 1.5. surveillance for arthropod vectors.

The revised draft Chapter 8.3. is attached as **Annex 20** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

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

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

The Code Commission considered Member Country comments on the exclusion of castrated males from testing and, for clarity, a slight modification was proposed; namely adding ‘i.e.’. The Code Commission noted that the wording ‘except castrated males’ takes into account the fact that castrated males are not sexually mature.

The revised Article 8.4.10. is attached as **Annex 21** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

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

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, China, Japan, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, Taipei China, Thailand, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission noted that the comments from Member Countries had been reviewed by the Scientific Commission. However, in light of the proposed changes to Chapter 4.3. zoning and compartmentalisation and specifically with regards to the concept of a temporary preventive *protection zone*, the Code Commission decided it would wait until its February 2018 meeting to review this chapter, with the possibility of including the concept of temporary preventive *protection zone* to address problems in maintaining FMD free status, and its implications for international trade.

5.17. Infection with rinderpest virus (Article 8.15.2.)

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

The Code Commission examined Member Country comments on the proposed revised article and in response to comments on diagnostic material encoding live virus, it agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission that the term may not be sufficiently clear and, at the suggestion of the Biological Standards Commission, clarified the term to read ‘laboratory-generated material containing live virus’.

Point 2) – In response to the same Member Country comment concerning the reference ‘either as plasmids or incorporated into other recombinant viruses,’ the Code Commission sought the advice of the Scientific and Biological Standards Commissions. Having confirmed that this is not effective at the present time, the Code Commission decided to keep the reference (deleting ‘other’) as a precaution, because of the likelihood of future developments.

In response to another Member Country comment concerning the time and temperature reference, the Code Commission amended this to read ‘to at least 56°C for at least two hours’ for clarity. Other Member Country comments were difficult to reconcile, as the countries did not provide sufficient rationale to support their proposals.

Point 3) – The Scientific Commission proposed to amend the point to address a Member Country question on whether it was intended that the point left room to vaccinate animals with recombinant DNA sequences or antigens derived from recombinant RP sequences. The Code Commission agreed with the proposal of the Scientific Commission to amend the point to clarify that the intention is to ban any form of vaccination against rinderpest.

The revised Article 8.15.1. is attached as [Annex 22](#) for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

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

No new comments were received as the chapter was initially proposed (in September 2016) for comments and adoption at the General Session in May 2017. However, at its February 2017 meeting the Code Commission decided not to put it forward for adoption until the chapter on glanders in the *Terrestrial Manual* had been reviewed. Further, it was waiting advice from experts on surveillance. The Code Commission noted that the review of the chapter in the *Manual* has now been completed and also that the Biological Standards Commission and Scientific Commission, as well as other experts, had encouraged Member Countries to use the same antigen when testing to avoid disputes over test results.

The Code Commission replaced the term ‘glanders’ with *infection with B. mallei* throughout the chapter for consistency with other recently adopted listed disease-specific chapters and proposed other editorial changes to reflect changes or proposed changes to Glossary definitions.

Article 12.10.1. General provisions

In examining Member Country comments, the Code Commission agreed with a proposal to include goats in the first paragraph, but noted that this had no consequence for the case definition and that the infection was not notifiable in goats. In regards to the same Member Country proposal to change ‘significant’ to ‘rare’, it agreed this was appropriate.

Article 12.10.2. Country or zone free from infection with *B. mallei*

Point 3) – In response to a Member Country proposal to maintain the previous proposal for a 12 month period of surveillance, the Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission that two incubation periods is the approach generally followed in the *Code*. The Code Commission further noted that for a disease where clinical signs are not obvious and there are difficulties in surveillance and reliability of tests, 12 months was appropriate.

Point 4) – In response to the same Member Country proposal to delete reference to ‘and their germplasm’, the Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission that germplasm may not, *per se*, be a safe commodity and retained it. The Code Commission further noted that there was a need to continue to work on semen and embryos in this chapter.

Article 12.10.3. Recovery of free status

The Code Commission noted, in response to Member Country comments on a proposal to change ‘standstill’ to ‘prohibition’, the Oxford English Dictionary definition of standstill, namely ‘a situation or condition in which there is no movement or activity at all’, was appropriate as the intent of this point was to stop all movement or activity. With regards to references to ‘infected establishments’, the Code Commission recalled previous discussions on the use of this term and noted it was not the establishment that became infected; rather the establishment was affected when infected animals were detected. Therefore, it amended the term to read ‘affected establishments’ for clarity and consistency with other chapters. The Code Commission reinstated ‘12 months’ for the same reason as given in point 3) and deleted the word ‘increased’ as it was superfluous. In respect to its decision to reinstate the 12 months, the Code Commission further noted that the incubation period of this disease is variable and horses often travelled long distances on frequent occasions and therefore the period for surveillance had to err on the side of caution.

Article 12.10.4. Recommendations for importation of equids from countries or zones free from infection with *B. mallei*

In response to a Member Country proposal to clarify the intent of this article, the Code Commission amended point 2 *b*) to make it clear that if the animals have been imported into a free country from a country not free and then re-exported, the previous importation must be in accordance with Article 12.10.5.

Article 12.10.5. Recommendations for importation of equids from countries or zones not free from infection with *B. mallei*

In response to a Member Country comment on the time during which the samples should be taken, the Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission that the samples should be taken between 21 to 30 days apart and amended the text accordingly. In response to another Member Country on consistency with other chapters, the Code Commission added ‘tests for infection with *B. mallei*’.

Article 12.10.6. Recommendations for the importation of equine semen

In response to Member Country comments, the Code Commission considered an opinion of the Scientific Commission. However, after reviewing the literature referred to in the Scientific Commission’s September 2016 report, it concluded that the risk is related to the collection of semen from animals with cutaneous lesions rather than to the semen itself and proposed to add text to point *b*) to address this issue. It further clarified that the recommendations related to the day of collection and amended the article for clarity. The Code Commission did not delete references to Articles 4.6.5. to 4.6.7. as, although Chapter 4.6. is applicable to processing of bovine, small ruminant and porcine semen only, Articles 4.6.5 to 4.6.7. could be applied to all types of semen. However, the Code Commission noted the request of the Member Country to consider this in a future review of Chapter 4.6.

Article 12.10.7. Recommendations for the importation of *in vivo*-derived equine embryos

The Code Commission agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission on a request from a Member Country to delete point 1 *a*) and *b*) and point 3), that there was still a risk of infection during collection and therefore retained the recommendations.

Article 12.10.8. General principles for surveillance

The Code Commission reminded Member Countries that the recommendations in this section reflected what was in practice already being done by many countries and that it was no more prescriptive than necessary. The Code Commission proposed editorial amendments to harmonise the text with Chapter 1.4. on surveillance and to address Member Country comments.

Article 12.10.9. Surveillance strategies

In examining Member Country comments on this article, the Code Commission noted that a large portion of the text was redundant as it paraphrased language from epidemiology textbooks and was therefore unnecessary. In addressing Member Country comments, the Code Commission took into account advice from the Scientific Commission to clarify questions on serologically positive and malleinisation and included a reference to animal identification and harmonised the text with other chapters.

The Code Commission acknowledged that there is a need for more information on surveillance but that it was difficult to be more precise because of the nature of this disease. It also requested the OIE Headquarters to request the Biological Standards Commission to consider recommending a single antigen only in the *Manual*, as this would assist Member Countries to avoid trade disputes over test results.

The revised Chapter 12.10. is attached as **Annex 23** for Member Country comments and is proposed for adoption at the 86th General Session in May 2018.

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

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, Switzerland, Taipei China, USA, EU and AU-IBAR.

In examining Member Country comments, the Code Commission considered the advice provided by the Scientific Commission and proposed substantial changes to the chapter to address inconsistencies and to harmonise the chapter with the recently adopted Chapter 15.1. Infection with African swine fever virus. Considering the number of changes proposed to the chapter, the Code Commission requested the OIE Headquarters refer the revised text back to the Scientific Commission for further consideration at its February 2018 meeting. The Code Commission also noted the need for the revised chapter to be discussed at a proposed joint meeting between the two Commissions in February 2018.

The revised Chapter 15.2. is not attached to this report but will be circulated again for Member Country comments after the February 2018 meetings of the Code and Scientific Commissions.

6. New amendments or new chapters proposed for inclusion in the *Terrestrial Code*

6.1. Draft introductory chapter Section 4 4.Z. Introduction to recommendations for disease prevention and control

The Code Commission recalled that the chapters in this section describe the measures and tools that should be used to assist Member Countries manage and control animal diseases. It also recalled that, as was the case with some other sections of the *Code*, this section lacked an introductory chapter. The Code Commission thus drafted one. It finally proposed to change the title of Section 4 to reflect its content.

The draft new Chapter 4.Z. is attached at **Annex 26** for Member Country comments.

6.2. New chapter on the killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products (Chapter 7.Y.) and review of the report of the *ad hoc* Group (August 2017)

The Code Commission considered the report of the *ad hoc* Group that met at OIE Headquarters in August 2017, and commended it on its work, in particular that it had taken into account the Code Commission's request to restructure the chapter and to harmonise it with other animal welfare chapters in the *Code*.

The Code Commission noted the proposed modification to the title, to include 'other products', to better align with the scope of the chapter but did not agree with the proposal to include 'commercial' in the title, as it considered that this would cause confusion. The Code Commission proposed to amend the title to 'Killing of reptiles for their skins, meat and other products' for clarity.

In examining the rest of the articles of the draft chapter, the Code Commission proposed some modifications to add clarity and for consistency with the other animal welfare chapters of the *Code*, notably Chapter 7.1. The Code Commission invited Member Countries to review the report of the *ad hoc* Group for more details on the development of this draft.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached as [Annex 37](#) for Member Countries' information. The new Chapter 7.Y. is attached as [Annex 27](#) for Member Country comments.

6.3. New chapter on animal welfare and laying hen production systems (Chapter 7.X) and review of the report of the *ad hoc* Group (November 2016)

The Code Commission recalled that it had reviewed the report of the *ad hoc* Group that met in Paris in November 2016, at its February 2017 meeting. The Code Commission had requested that the draft chapter proposed by the *ad hoc* Group should be restructured specifically to arrange the articles and bullets in a logical order, as used in other chapters. The OIE Headquarters had undertaken the restructuring of the document and conducted further electronic consultations with members of the *ad hoc* Group and the Code Commission in order to refine the text.

The Code Commission reviewed the restructured draft chapter and modified it accordingly for accuracy, clarity and consistency.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group is attached as [Annex 38](#) for Member Countries' information. The proposed new Chapter 7.X. is attached as [Annex 28](#) for Member Country comments.

6.4. New Chapter on infection with *Trypanosoma evansi* (non-equine surra) (Chapter 8.X.) and review of the report of the *ad hoc* Group on equine trypanosomoses (June 2016)

The Code Commission recalled that an *ad hoc* Group on equine trypanosomoses had met in Paris from 14 to 16 June 2016. The *ad hoc* Group noted that both dourine and surra were listed diseases. However, recommendations for trade in live susceptible animals and their products were currently only provided in Chapter 12.3. Infection with trypanozoon in equids (dourine). Member Countries had expressed a need for trade standards applicable to non-equine surra and in response to this request the *ad hoc* Group developed a draft new chapter that was reviewed by the Scientific Commission before being forwarded to the Code Commission for consideration.

The Code Commission revised the chapter provided by the *ad hoc* Group, included hair in the list of safe commodities, included appropriate cross-references to Chapter 12.3. and agreed with the opinion of the Scientific Commission that the recommendations in Article 8.X.4. on recovery of free status proposed by the *ad hoc* Group were not applicable in the context of this chapter but were only applicable to Chapter 12.3. and amended the article accordingly.

The proposed new Chapter 8.X. is attached as [Annex 29](#) for Member Country comments.

6.5. Draft revised Chapter on infection with *Trypanozoon* in equids (Chapter 12.3.) and review of the report of the *ad hoc* Group on equine trypanosomoses (June 2016)

The Code Commission recalled that an *ad hoc* Group on equine trypanosomoses had met in Paris from 14 to 16 June 2016 to revise the current *Code* Chapter 12.3. on dourine to encompass all infections with *Trypanozoon* in equids. The Code Commission revised the chapter provided by the *ad hoc* Group, which had also been reviewed by the Scientific Commission, and proposed editorial changes for consistency with other listed disease-specific chapters in the *Code*.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group on equine trypanosomoses is attached at [Annex 35](#) for information.

The proposed draft revised Chapter 12.3. is attached as [Annex 30](#) for Member Country comments

6.6. New Chapter on Theileriosis and review of the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Theileriosis (February 2017)

The Code Commission thanked the *ad hoc* Group for its work on the revision of Chapter 11.12. infection with *Theileria* spp. in ruminants. In discussing the outcomes of the *ad hoc* Group, the Code Commission noted the expansion of the range of host species covered in the chapter. Whilst the *ad hoc* Group had agreed that small ruminant *theileriosis* should be covered by the same chapter, and that only certain species of pathogenic agent met the criteria for listing, the Code Commission considered this would be problematic in the future, as this was the first time that notification requirement differs by pathogen species and by host species within a single chapter. In order to prevent problems in the future, the Code Commission decided it was more appropriate to have two separate chapters.

The two chapters are presented as draft revised Chapter 11.12. Infection with *Theileria annulata*, *T. orientalis* and *T. parva* (bovidae) and new Chapter 14.X. Infection with *Theileria lestoquardi*, *T. luwenshuni* and *T. uilenbergi* (small ruminants).

a) Draft revised Chapter on Infection with *Theileria annulata*, *T. orientalis* and *T. parva* (bovidae) (Chapter 11.12.)

In line with its decision to amend the scope of the chapter to cover only bovidae, the Code Commission deleted references to sheep and goats and any corresponding recommendations. It proposed further editorial modifications for consistency with other chapters of the Code.

The Code Commission also noted that the *ad hoc* Group had reviewed the list of susceptible species and acknowledged that, while camels and some wild ruminants could be infected with *Theileria* spp., they are not considered to play a significant role in the epidemiology of the disease as related to trade. The Code Commission agreed with the decision to include bovines and water buffaloes in the case definition, and included wild ruminants as susceptible animals and included them in the article relating to recommendations for the importation of trophies.

The proposed draft revised Chapter 11.12. is attached as [Annex 31](#) for Member Country comments

b) New Chapter 14.X. Infection with *Theileria lestoquardi*, *T. luwenshuni* and *T. uilenbergi* (small ruminants)

In line with its decision to amend the scope of the chapter to cover only small ruminants (sheep and goats) the Code Commission deleted references to bovines and water buffalo and any corresponding recommendations. It proposed further editorial modifications for consistency with other chapters of the Code.

The proposed new Chapter 14.X. is attached as [Annex 32](#) for Member Country comments

7. Other issues

7.1. General comments of Member Countries on the texts circulated after the Code Commission's February 2017 meeting

Comments were received from the EU and AU-IBAR.

The Code Commission considered general comments and, where appropriate, reflected them in its work programme and in the relevant agenda items. In regards to specific comments relating to the questionnaires for official recognition by the OIE (Chapter 1.6.) and the burden this large volume of annexes had placed on Member Countries, it noted it had taken these concerns into account during its discussion of the specific agenda item (see Item 5.3.). The Code Commission did however note that when there is a thorough revision of a chapter, which included structural and text changes it would provide clean text in order to facilitate thorough review of the complete text by the Member Countries, as well as to facilitate its own work when reconciling the comments with the revised chapter. This was the case with Chapter 1.6.

In response to another Member Country comment on the use of the term ‘bovid’ in the Code, the Code Commission noted that it would use ‘bovine’ throughout to replace ‘cattle’ and ‘bovid’ as relevant chapters are reviewed, and at which time it would need to consider which species were covered by the term ‘bovine’ as this will vary depending on the purpose of the chapter and the epidemiology of the disease.

7.2. Update of the Code Commission’s work programme

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

- New chapter on Tsetse transmitted trypanosomiases
- New chapter on biosecurity
- Revision of Chapters 5.4. to 5.7. (discussion see below)
- Revision Chapter 5.10. to include a model certificate for pet food (discussion see below)
- Revision of Chapter 7.7 on stray dog population control (pending the outcomes of a proposed ad hoc Group on rabies).

Chapter 1.3. Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE: assessment of chronic wasting disease (CWD) and West Nile fever (WNF) against the criteria for listing disease

The Code Commission noted that the Scientific Commission considered that there were still significant gaps in the understanding of the epidemiology of CWD that may impede the ability to make an informed decision. However, the Code Commission noted the EFSA opinion and epidemiological information previously provided by a Member Country and requested OIE Headquarters ask the relevant Collaborating Centre to assess CWD against the listing criteria of Chapter 1.2. of the *Terrestrial Code* and provide advice back to the Specialist Commissions on what, if any, gaps there are in the scientific evidence, and if not to advise on its listing or not.

In regards to listing of WNF, the Code Commission, considering the fact that horses are dead-end hosts, questioned whether it was appropriate for the disease to remain listed in Section 8, multiple species disease category or be moved to Section 10 aves disease category. Consequently, the Code Commission requested that the OIE Headquarters gathered expert advice, not necessarily from specialists in the disease, to decide on where to place it in the *Code*, or to delist WNF based on the listing criteria.

New work on quarantine stations – proposal from Brazil

In response to a request from a Member Country on the need for guidance for Member countries on the establishment and management of quarantine stations, the Code Commission noted the chapters in Section 5 of the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* already express some recommendations in relation to the import and quarantine of animals and the measures that are applicable on arrival. Nevertheless, the Code Commission acknowledged that the chapters in this section are old and may not be adequate to support countries in managing the risk of the introduction of disease through the importation of live animals. It noted the interaction between these chapters with recommendations in the disease specific chapters in Volume II of the *Code*, which are constantly evolving through updates endorsed by the World Assembly. Periodic review of the horizontal chapters of Volume I is important to ensure ongoing alignment and coherence between Volumes I and II of the *Code*.

In order to respond more adequately to the concerns raised, the Code Commission included review of these chapters on its work programme and requested the OIE to consider establishing an *ad hoc* Group to revise Section 5, specifically Chapters 5.4. to 5.7. The *ad hoc* Group Terms of Reference should include: providing recommendations relating to control at border (not just with neighbouring countries), especially for the importation of live animals; considering whether there is a need for additional detailed guidance on the use of quarantine stations (both at departure in the exporting country or at arrival in the importing country); and align the chapters with the relevant listed disease-specific chapters as necessary.

Request to restart work on a standard for pet food – proposal from Global Alliance of Pet Food Associations (GAPFA),

The Code Commission considered a request from an organisation, with which the OIE has a cooperation agreement, to restart work on the development of an international standard for pet food. The organisation expressed its continued interest in facilitating the development of consensus-based guidance for the global pet food industry, to better support the health and wellbeing of pets and to help the eradication of disease from foodborne pathogens.

The Code Commission noted that previous attempts had been halted due to a lack of consensus and that a draft chapter could not be progressed due to a lack of support by Member Countries and the industries' reluctance to provide detailed information on manufacturing processes to inactivate certain pathogens. In considering this request the Code Commission noted that the problem is not specifically about the safety of pet food, but rather a lack of recognition that heat treatment can inactivate pathogens of concern and that in order to avoid the contentious issues encountered last time the development of a model certificate for pet food should be explored. This work would require input from the industry and a willingness from them to provide detailed scientific evidence on specific heat treatments. A model certificate could then be developed in Section 5 of the *Code*, and modifications could be proposed in the relevant listed disease-specific chapters.

In light of the Code Commission's full work programme and noting the OIE budget constraints with regards to the establishment of *ad hoc* Groups, it requested the OIE Headquarters to write to the organisation and seek its views on the possible development of a model certificate for pet food in international trade, such a certificate could include recommendations on minimum treatment required for inactivation of pathogens of concern.

The Code Commission added this item to its work programme but noted it was a relatively low priority.

The updated work programme is attached as [Annex 33](#) for Member Countries' information and comments.

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

The Code Commission noted the Member Country comments in relation to the editorial amendments proposed to the 2017 Edition of the *Code*, and the OIE Headquarters advised that the comments related to typographical errors had all been resolved in the 2017 Edition before it was published. The Code Commission requested the OIE Headquarters analyse the remaining issues and make proposals for addressing them at its February 2018 meeting in preparation for the publication of the 2018 edition.

7.4. Other Business

7.4.1. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Paraprofessionals

The OIE *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Paraprofessionals met from 31 July to 2 August 2017 at the OIE Headquarters in Paris, France.

OIE Headquarters provided the background to the work of the current *ad hoc* Group, recalling the activity of a previous *ad hoc* Group on the role of private veterinarians and veterinary paraprofessionals (VPPs) in the provision of animal health services, which was convened in 2003 and led to adoption of changes in the *Code* on Veterinary Services with regard to the role of VPPs, including a definition of VPPs being included in the Glossary in 2004. The later work of the *ad hoc* Group on veterinary education was also noted with regard to the development of competencies of graduating veterinarians, as well as a core curriculum for the training of veterinarians and that this work had served as a model for the creation and activities of the current *ad hoc* Group on VPPs.

The Code Commission welcomed the work of the current *ad hoc* Group which is divided into two parts – first the development of expected competencies for VPPs working in three tracks, namely laboratory diagnosis, animal health and veterinary public health, followed by the development of core curricula for the three tracks. The OIE noted that the competencies are identified as basic or advanced, indicating that basic competencies would be covered in a core curriculum but advanced competencies would require additional training.

The Code Commission thanked the OIE for the update on the work of the *ad hoc* Group and the OIE for its support to this work. It further noted that at this stage the work of the *ad hoc* Group did not imply any revision of the *Code* was required at this time. However, in order to seek the views of Member Countries on the draft Veterinary Paraprofessionals Competency document, it agreed to append the report of the *ad hoc* Group as an annex to its report and to invite Member Countries to submit their comments to the OIE Headquarters, including their responses to the one page questionnaire that accompanies the Competency Document.

The report of the *ad hoc* Group and questionnaire are attached as **Annex 36** for Member Countries' comments. Responses to the questionnaire should reach the OIE Headquarters no later than 9 January 2018.

7.4.2. Invasive hornet (*Vespa velutina*)

OIE Headquarters introduced a scientific review of *Vespa velutina nigrithorax*, the aim of this paper being to provide an assessment of *Vespa velutina nigrithorax* against the OIE criteria for listing a disease, infection or infestation. The Scientific Commission proposed that the Code Commission consider the inclusion of *Vespa velutina nigrithorax* in the OIE List of diseases, as was done with *Aethina tumida* (small hive beetle).

The Code Commission noted the concerns and the issues raised in the paper. However, it was of the opinion that *Vespa velutina nigrithorax* is an invasive species, rather than a disease or a parasite of animals. Therefore, the issue was considered to be outside the mandate of the *Code*. The Code Commission also noted that at the national level this type of issue was not in the remit of the Veterinary Services but more likely to be within the competence of a national environment authority. The Code Commission further recalled that listing of diseases was a way to provide guidance to Member Countries for the control of those diseases, and considered that since the hornet was quite widespread and that control measures had not proven to be successful anywhere, although in one country the bees had adapted and developed some resistance, it should not even be a candidate for listing.

However, the Code Commission agreed there was a need for further research involving both veterinary services and environmental agencies. It recommended that the OIE should continue to work on this issue unless the Member Countries indicated that this was outside the mandate of the OIE.

7.4.3. International Transfer and laboratory containment of animal pathogens (Chapter 5.8.)

An *ad hoc* Group was held from 17 to 19 July 2017 on transport of biological materials. The *ad hoc* Group identified the need to update the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* Chapter 5.8 entitled "International transfer and laboratory containment of animal pathogens", especially with respect to the international requirements for transfer of animal pathogens due to CITES and the Nagoya Protocol.

The Code Commission noted the recommendation from the *ad hoc* Group, but did not consider that it was necessary to include a revision of the chapter to include reference to a need for a CITES permit to accompany pathogens from animals. Specifically in relation to the inclusion of biodiversity issues in the work programmes of the Specialist Commissions, this should only apply if it is clearly linked to animal health or wildlife. In this regard, the Code Commission was of the view that the OIE Headquarters should seek an exemption from the Nagoya Protocol in order to avoid future requests of this nature.

7.5. Date of next meetings

The Code Commission agreed that the dates for its next meetings would be tentatively, **12–23 February 2018** in order to facilitate a joint meeting with the Scientific Commission in preparation for the 86th General Session of the World Assembly of OIE Delegates.

.../Annexes