PROCEDURES USED BY THE OIE TO SET STANDARDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE, WITH A FOCUS ON THE TERRESTRIAL AND AQUATIC ANIMAL HEALTH CODES

1. Introduction

This paper provides an overview of the procedures used by the OIE to set standards and recommendations for international trade, with a focus on the Terrestrial and Aquatic Animal Health Codes (the Codes). The texts in these publications are developed and revised using an established procedure. There is only one pathway for adoption of OIE standards, i.e. approval by the World Assembly of Delegates (World Assembly) meeting annually at the OIE General Session.

The World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures recognises the OIE standards as fundamental references for animal health and zoonotic diseases. Application and use of the standards by WTO Members is important to facilitate safe international trade in animals and their products.

The OIE procedures provide a basis for rapidity, responsiveness, scientific rigour and transparency in the setting of standards. Important features of the standard-setting procedures are outlined in this paper.

Contact: trade.dept@oie.int

2. OIE standards and recommendations for international trade

2.1. The OIE publications

The publications that are commonly referred to, collectively, as the OIE standards are:

- the Terrestrial Animal Health Code (the Terrestrial Code)
- the Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals (the Terrestrial Manual)
- the Aquatic Animal Health Code (the Aquatic Code)

2.2. International trade in animals and their products

The Terrestrial Code and the Aquatic Code contain science-based recommendations for disease reporting, prevention and control and for assuring safe international trade in terrestrial animals (mammals, birds and bees) and aquatic animals (amphibians, fish, crustaceans and molluscs) and their products. The Codes detail the sanitary measures for animal diseases, including zoonoses, which should be used by the Veterinary Services and other Competent Authorities of importing and exporting countries. Correctly applied, these measures prevent the introduction and spread, via animals and their products, of agents that are pathogenic for animals and/or humans.
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2.3. Diagnostic tools and vaccines

The Terrestrial Manual and the Aquatic Manual contain OIE international standards on quality management in testing laboratories, principles of validation and quality control of diagnostic assays, and diagnostic testing methods for specific diseases including official tests listed in the Terrestrial and Aquatic Codes. The Terrestrial Manual also provides generic and specific guidance on vaccine quality. In addition to the Manual, the OIE publishes a list of approved Standard Sera (reagents) produced by OIE Reference Laboratories, validates and certifies commercially-available diagnostic assays, and publishes a list of the tests certified ‘fit for purpose’ in the OIE Register of Diagnostic Tests. Assessment of diagnostic tools for terrestrial animals is carried out under the auspices of the OIE Biological Standards Commission (Laboratories Commission). For aquatic animals, assessment of diagnostic tools is the responsibility of the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (Aquatic Animals Commission).

2.4. Official disease status of OIE Member Countries

The OIE recognises the official disease status of Member Countries for foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy and contagious bovine pleuropneumonia. The currently recognised official disease status for the specified diseases is published on the OIE website at: http://www.oie.int/en/animal-health-in-the-world/official-disease-status/.

3. The Procedures for the Elaboration of the OIE Terrestrial and Aquatic Animal Health Codes

3.1. General considerations

The procedures for developing and updating the Terrestrial Code and the Aquatic Code are responsive, transparent and rapid. Importantly, they provide a basis for continuous improvement to standards as new scientific information comes to light, and for ‘fast track’ adoption of new standards when Member Countries need to address important new risks to human and animal health on an urgent basis.

Each one of the 178 OIE Member Countries has an equal voice in the development and adoption of standards and each Member Country has a responsibility to engage with the OIE in this important work.

Specialist Commissions play a central role in the OIE standard setting procedures. They comprise six members (normally), elected by the World Assembly for a three year mandate, in compliance with the terms of reference established in the OIE Organic Texts, which provide for scientific excellence and geographic balance.

Recommendations on new standards and on significant revisions of existing standards are developed by small groups of independent experts (ad hoc Groups), which report to a Specialist Commission. Reporting may be direct to the Specialist Commission or, depending on the topic, via a permanent OIE Working Group, which in turn reports to Specialist Commissions. Membership of Working Groups is proposed by the Director General and is endorsed by the World Assembly. All draft texts are reviewed by the relevant Specialist Commission, then provided to OIE Member Countries for comment. All comments submitted by Member Countries are reviewed by the Specialist Commissions, who may deal with comments directly or may send them to the ad hoc Group and/or Working Group for consideration and advice, as appropriate. The reports of ad hoc Groups submitted to Specialist Commissions, as well as the Commission’s review of Member Country comments are documented in the meeting report of the Specialist Commission, which is sent to Member Countries after each meeting and is also placed on the OIE website. In March of each year, as part of the meeting report of the Specialist Commissions that have met by February, all texts proposed for adoption at the General Session (held in May) are sent to Member Countries for consideration prior to presentation to the World Assembly in May for adoption. Twice yearly, following distribution of Specialist Commission reports, OIE Member Countries have the opportunity (normally during a 60 day period) to submit written comments. Although there is no provision for written comments to be presented to the General Session, there is opportunity to make oral statements and to request clarification of texts before adoption.
The normal cycle for the adoption of new texts in the Codes is two years, meaning that the development of a new text is the subject of consultation with OIE Member Countries on two to four occasions during that period. In the case of emergency situations warranting a more rapid procedure, standards may be developed within a shorter period. Less significant modifications to existing texts may also be undertaken in a one year period, if Member Countries agree to the proposed modifications.

There is only one pathway for the adoption of OIE standards, i.e. approval by the World Assembly, meeting annually at the OIE General Session. Revisions to the Codes are adopted via resolutions. In almost all cases, standards are adopted by consensus. In a small minority of cases, where it is not possible to achieve consensus, standards have been adopted after a vote. Voting is normally done by a show of hands and a two-thirds majority is sufficient for the adoption of a standard. More than half the Delegates representing Member Countries must be present in order to have a quorum for the adoption of standards.

Each OIE Member Country has an equal voice in the adoption of standards. Partner organisations may attend technical sessions of the General Session in an observer capacity but they do not have the right to participate in the adoption of standards. Discussion and decisions of the World Assembly on the adoption of standards are recorded in a report presented for adoption at the end of the General Session. This report is provided to Delegates and is placed on the OIE website accessible to the public.

Additional information on the OIE Organic Rules, General Rules, structure and organisation may be found on the OIE website at http://www.oie.int/about-us/key-texts/basic-texts/.

Detailed information on the work of the Specialist Commissions and Working Groups may be found on the OIE website at http://www.oie.int/en/international-standard-setting/overview/.

3.2. The work programme for setting standards

Requests for the development of a new standard or the revision of an existing standard come to the OIE from various sources. Proposals from OIE Delegates are given highest priority, particularly if several OIE Member Countries support the request. Proposals from international and regional organisations that have official agreements with the OIE are also given priority. Requests from other organisations, be they scientific, industry or non-governmental organisations (NGO), are also considered but generally as a lower priority. A Specialist Commission may propose new work to be undertaken by itself or by another Specialist Commission. Proposals for developing new or revised standards are identified in the work programmes of the Specialist Commissions and permanent working groups, which are submitted to OIE Delegates for information annually at the General Session.

The OIE Strategic Plan sets out the priorities, strategies and overall direction of the OIE’s work programme, including for standard setting. It is developed under the direct supervision of the Director-General in consultation with the OIE Council (the Board) and submitted by him to the World Assembly for approval once every five years. The current OIE Strategic Plan (2011–2016) was adopted in May 2010.

The five Regional Commissions (Asia, Far East and Oceania; Americas; Europe; Africa and Middle-East) provide important input to the strategic planning process and to identifying priorities for standard setting. The Recommendations adopted by Regional Commissions, and those voted at OIE Global Conferences, often identify a need for the OIE to develop standards relevant to matters of strategic importance. These recommendations are presented to the World Assembly for endorsement at each General Session.
The work programmes of the Specialist Commissions are established within the overall framework of the OIE Strategic Plan. Proposals received by these Commissions are evaluated in terms of:

i) the likely extent of Members’ support, as evidenced from comments relevant to the request; and

ii) the availability of scientific information needed to develop a standard.

In the case of the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (Code Commission), the opinions of the Scientific Commission on Animal Diseases (Scientific Commission) and the Laboratories Commission are critical in determining whether there is sufficient scientific information to support the development of a new or revised standard. In effect, the absence of key information, notably on disease aetiology or diagnostic methods, prevents the development of a new standard. The Code Commission and the Scientific Commission regularly hold a one-day joint meeting to discuss matters of common interest and harmonise work programmes on the development of standards. Communications between Specialist Commissions are documented in their meeting reports.

The reports of the Code and Aquatic Animals Commissions, along with their work programmes, are adopted annually by the World Assembly. In the period between General Sessions, opportunities are also provided for comment.

3.3. Role of OIE headquarters

OIE headquarters staff are responsible to ensure that the Terrestrial and Aquatic Codes are kept up to date on an ongoing basis. Non-significant revisions, including modifications to ensure consistency of chapters within the Codes, and harmonisation between the Aquatic Code and the Terrestrial Code are undertaken by the OIE International Trade Department in liaison with the responsible Commission. When a proposal is made to develop a new standard or to significantly revise an existing standard, the Director General of the OIE decides how the work will be managed, with reference to the terms of reference of the four OIE Specialist Commissions and the human resources at OIE headquarters.

The Director General of the OIE decides the terms of reference and membership of ad hoc Groups convened to prepare draft texts on specific topics. In taking this decision, he takes into account any opinions of relevant Specialist Commissions and the comments of OIE Members as appropriate. OIE Member Countries are informed of these matters at the annual General Session. Ad hoc Groups may address specific diseases or ‘horizontal issues’ (relating to diseases in general; or to cross cutting themes). When convening Working Groups (of which the membership is endorsed by the World Assembly) and ad hoc Groups, the Director General seeks experts with internationally recognised knowledge of the topic and to obtain the broadest regional representation. As a priority he draws upon the experts within the global network of more than 250 OIE Reference Centres worldwide.

The Director General may request that a ‘supporting document’ be drafted by an expert, usually an official from an OIE Reference Centre. Supporting documents contain the latest scientific information relevant to the topic, e.g. relating to infective period, host distribution, transmission mechanisms, diagnostic methods, treatment and control. They are a valuable resource for ad hoc Groups and Working Groups and key scientific references for OIE Member Countries.

The Director General forwards the reports of Working Groups and ad hoc Groups to relevant Specialist Commissions for further consideration.

Each ad hoc Group, Working Group and Specialist Commission receives logistic and secretariat support from staff at OIE headquarters. To facilitate consistency in the drafting of texts intended for adoption in the Codes and Manuals, Groups may consult a guidance document prepared by OIE headquarters. All experts and members of ad hoc Groups, Working Groups and Specialist Commissions must sign a declaration attesting to confidentiality and to the absence of conflict of interest.
According to the OIE Staff Regulations approved by the World Assembly, all headquarters staff are obliged to be impartial and to respect the confidentiality of information provided by Members.

3.4. Role of OIE Specialist Commissions

- The Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission is responsible for the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*.

- The Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission is responsible for the *Aquatic Animal Health Code* and the *Manual of Diagnostic Tests for Aquatic Animals*.

- The Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases is responsible for drafting texts for eventual inclusion in the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* and for the recognition of Member Countries’ official disease status.

- The Biological Standards Commission is responsible for the *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals* and for the approval of standard sera and the certification of diagnostic assays.

Specialist Commissions play a key role in the OIE standard setting procedures. Commissions normally have six members, who are elected by the World Assembly on the basis of excellence and geographical balance. Regional Commissions propose candidates and the World Assembly elects the members of Specialist Commissions for a three year term. The general functioning of Specialist Commissions is described in the Basic Texts of the OIE (http://www.oie.int/about-us/key-texts/basic-texts/specialist-commissions/) and is not, therefore, described in detail in this paper. However, some aspects that are relevant to standard setting are described below.

The Specialist Commissions meet twice each year. At their bi-annual meetings, the Specialist Commissions examine submissions made by OIE Member Countries and submissions from other sources, and the reports of relevant Working Groups and *ad hoc* Groups that have held meetings in the preceding semester. The Code Commission also considers submissions from the Scientific Commission on draft texts for possible inclusion in the *Terrestrial Code*. The two Commissions responsible for the *Codes* regularly consult on the harmonisation of horizontal aspects.

The Commissions determine how to incorporate scientific recommendations into the new or revised standard. While submissions from OIE Member Countries and OIE Reference Centres are of greatest importance, Commissions also consider scientific information from other sources, including OIE partner organisations and both private sector and non-governmental organisations, in order to ensure that the proposed standards are based on comprehensive and up-to-date scientific information.

Each Specialist Commission compiles a meeting report that includes, as annexed documents, the reports of all Working Groups and *ad hoc* Groups considered by the Commission. The meeting report also explains how the various submissions were addressed. OIE Member Countries and others submitting comments are encouraged to provide a scientific rationale for their comments, to facilitate analysis by Specialist Commissions.

On a twice yearly basis, OIE Member Countries are invited to comment on the recommendations in the reports of Specialist Commissions. Organisations with which the OIE has formal agreements may also be invited to provide advice, depending on the relevant areas of expertise.

Thus, the ‘two-year standard setting cycle’ may afford as many as four opportunities for comment. All Commission reports, in English, French and Spanish, are placed on the OIE website: (see http://www.oie.int/international-standard-setting/specialists-commissions-groups/ ).
In reviewing draft new or revised standards in the Terrestrial and Aquatic Codes, the relevant Commissions consider the extent to which OIE Member Countries support the recommendations and the rationale provided, particularly in the case of criticisms of a draft text. If, after at least two rounds of comment, there is widespread support for the proposed new or revised standard, the relevant Commissions may decide to submit the chapter for adoption at the following OIE General Session. If, however, significant concern is expressed or if Member Country comments suggest a need for further technical work, the relevant Commissions may re-examine the issue. If scientific or technical questions outside its expertise are raised, the Commissions will normally ask the Working Group or the relevant ad hoc Group to re-examine the issues and provide advice to the the relevant Commissions. Another round of consultation with OIE Member Countries will then be undertaken.

In reviewing draft new or revised standards in the Terrestrial and Aquatic Manuals, the Laboratories Commission and the Aquatic Animals Commission rely on the preparatory work done by one or more OIE Experts or an ad hoc Group. When Commissions consider that after one round of comments a draft standard is ready for adoption, they submit the draft standard to the World Assembly. Thus, OIE Member Countries have the opportunity to comment on at least two occasions before final adoption. As of September 2011, the structure and organisation of the OIE Manuals was under review.

3.5. Role of OIE Working Groups

The OIE currently has three ‘permanent’ Working Groups, which are responsible for the general management and oversight of the OIE work programme in three thematic areas:

The Animal Welfare Working Group reports to the Code or Aquatic Animals Commissions, as relevant to the topic.

The Animal Production Food Safety Working Group reports to the Code or Aquatic Animals Commissions, as relevant to the topic.


OIE Working Groups play an important role in setting standards in the three thematic areas. The work programme of each Working Group is presented to the relevant Specialist Commission and, via the report of the Commissions, to the World Assembly for information and comment annually.

To assist in addressing new themes and significant developments, Working Groups may take responsibility for drafting discussion papers and strategy papers to establish key principles and directions for the OIE to follow in standard setting. In all cases, these papers, along with the recommendations of Specialist Commissions, are provided to OIE Member Countries for information and comment. Once endorsed, Working Group papers can provide a framework and key principles for OIE standard setting.

Members of Specialist Commissions may participate in Working Groups as observers to facilitate communication between these Working Groups and the relevant Commission. However, a member of a Specialist Commission may not chair a Working Group.

In addition to being circulated with the reports of Specialist Commissions, Working Group reports, after approval by the relevant Commission, are put on dedicated pages on the OIE website along with other information relevant to the theme (e.g. http://www.oie.int/animal-welfare/animal-welfare-key-themes/). The terms of reference and membership of OIE Working Groups are included on these thematic website pages. The members of the Working Groups are nominated by the Director General of the OIE and endorsed by the World Assembly annually at the General Session. In addition to representation from the five OIE regions, relevant public and private sector partners of the OIE may participate in Working Groups.
3.6. Role of OIE \textit{ad hoc} Groups

As described above, the initial drafting of a new standard and any significant revision of an existing standard is normally undertaken by a group of experts specifically convened to an \textit{ad hoc} Group tasked with the work in question. OIE \textit{ad hoc} Groups normally comprise up to six scientists with internationally recognised expertise in a disease or topic. OIE Reference Centres (comprising Reference Laboratories and Collaborating Centres) are a common source of experts but participants are also drawn from academia, industry organisations, NGOs and OIE partner organisations. OIE Member Countries and organisations having an official agreement with the OIE also submit lists of experts for various topics, which are held on file at OIE headquarters.

OIE \textit{ad hoc} Groups may meet once or several times. A few \textit{ad hoc} Groups, especially those tasked with the evaluation of disease status, meet regularly, once or twice a year, depending on the number of applications received from OIE Member Countries. The composition and terms of reference may change from one meeting to another if needed. In addition to preparing a first draft text for consideration by the relevant Specialist Commission, they may be re-convened to advise Specialist Commissions on submissions and on draft texts submitted by Member Countries.

The members of \textit{ad hoc} Groups are nominated on the basis of excellence and geographical balance by the Director General, who takes into account any recommendations that OIE Member Countries may have provided, in addition to ensuring that participants are drawn from all five OIE regions, to the extent that this is practicable. Members of Specialist Commissions and Working Groups may participate as observers in \textit{ad hoc} Groups to facilitate communication between these Groups and the relevant Commission. However, a member of a Specialist Commission may not chair an \textit{ad hoc} Group.

The terms of reference of \textit{ad hoc} Groups are decided by the Director General, taking into account the requests of Members, the opinion and advice of relevant Specialist Commissions and, as appropriate, Working Groups.

Reports of \textit{ad hoc} Groups, including draft standards, reflect a consensual position of all members of the Group. Where scientific uncertainty leads to differences of opinion on the appropriate means to manage risk, options to address uncertainties are fully documented in the Group’s report.

The membership and terms of reference of \textit{ad hoc} Groups are included in their reports, which are provided to OIE Member Countries with the report of the Specialist Commissions to which the Groups report, through the Director General.

3.7. Role of OIE Experts and OIE Reference Centres

The OIE calls upon the expertise of renowned scientists in the development and significant revision of standards. The major source of OIE experts is the OIE-designated Reference Centres, comprising Reference Laboratories and Collaborating Centres, which number more than 250 institutes globally. Each OIE Reference Laboratory has an OIE-designated Expert whose competence on a specific pathogen/disease is recognised internationally. Collaborating Centres of the OIE offer experts in specific fields. The OIE also calls on institutes other than OIE Reference Centres as necessary.

The experts serving as members of the OIE Specialist Commissions, Working Groups and \textit{ad hoc} Groups act in their personal capacity as independent scientists, not as representatives of a country or an organisation, to serve the overall interest of the OIE and its Member Countries. Upon appointment, they are required to sign a Confidentiality Undertaking and submit a declaration of interest, in accordance with the relevant rules of the OIE, to ensure proper management of transparency and potential conflict of interest and to assure the impartiality, objectivity and scientific integrity of the OIE’s work. The same requirements apply to all experts, regardless of the specific mission or task. The rules governing confidentiality and conflict of interest are set out by the Director General in conformity with the provisions in the Basic Texts and as agreed with the OIE Council (the elected Board of the OIE).
The experts from OIE Reference Centres are requested to respect confidentiality of information and refrain from engaging in any work that might compromise or generate conflict with the mandate of OIE Reference Centre, including in relation to standard setting.

Recognising the need to improve the geographic distribution of Reference Centres in the world, the OIE is implementing a laboratory twinning programme, with the specific objective of strengthening the capacity of developing countries to contribute to the OIE standard setting process.

3.8. Role of OIE Member Countries and Delegates

Participation in the process of development and adoption of OIE standards is a responsibility of each OIE Member Country, as defined in the OIE Organic Rules. This activity is coordinated through the national Delegate, who is, in most cases, the Head of the national Veterinary Services. The OIE encourages national Delegates to nominate, under their authority, focal points on seven topics (disease notification; animal welfare; animal production food safety; veterinary products; wildlife; aquatic animals; and communications) to help the Delegate to meet his/her responsibilities, particularly in relation to standard setting. The OIE undertakes capacity building to support Delegates and nominated focal points, including by the regular conduct of seminars on the OIE and its standard setting procedures.

Experts, industry groups and organisations wishing to participate in the process of standards development may send submissions direct to the OIE but they are strongly encouraged to provide their input through a relevant national Delegate.

OIE Delegates are informed of new or revised draft standards and are consulted at different steps of development, as mentioned above. Their comments are the key inputs to future OIE standards. They elect members of Specialist Commissions (as well as members of the Council and members of Regional Commissions) and they endorse, on an annual basis, the membership of OIE permanent Working Groups.

The Member Countries also contribute to OIE standard setting through financial and other support of OIE Reference Centres located in their territory, most of which are government institutes.

4. Conclusions

As outlined above, the OIE procedures provide a basis for rapidity, responsiveness, scientific rigour and transparency in the development of standards. Key aspects relating to transparency are as follows:

– Standards are drafted by independent experts drawn from different OIE regions and selected on the basis of scientific excellence and geographical balance. Mechanisms are in place to ensure the neutrality and scientific integrity of experts appointed to work with the OIE.

– All reports of ad hoc Groups are reviewed by Specialist Commissions, comprising elected members, and, as appropriate, by Working Groups. These reviews particularly consider the risk management options proposed.

– Reports of Specialist Commissions, Working Groups and ad hoc Groups are made available to Members and the public via publication on the OIE website.

– OIE Member Countries have scheduled opportunities to comment on draft standards.
– Member Country comments are reviewed by the Specialist Commissions, which advise Delegates of their analysis and decisions on these comments by report on the OIE website.

– All standards are adopted by the World Assembly, usually by consensus or, in rare cases, by a two thirds majority vote.

– Each one of the 178 OIE Member Countries has an equal voice in the development and adoption of standards and each has a responsibility to engage with the OIE in this important work.
DEVELOPMENT OF THE OIE TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL HEALTH CODE TO ADDRESS WILDLIFE

Summary

The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) has, since its foundation in 1924, encouraged Members to report listed diseases. Although the legal obligation for reporting has never distinguished between domestic and wild animal host species, the provisions in the OIE Terrestrial and Aquatic Animal Health Codes have generally focused on animals kept for food production and other human use. However, in view of the importance of emerging diseases, many of which are zoonotic, more attention must be paid to reporting listed diseases in wildlife in future.

It is proposed to develop new provisions, starting in the Terrestrial Animal Health Codes (Terrestrial Code), to address wildlife along the following lines. Disease notification obligations will continue to be stated in Chapter 1.1. For each listed disease, the notification and surveillance provisions applicable to wildlife species and trade implications, as appropriate, will be set out in the disease specific chapters. Such provisions will be applied with priority to those wildlife species identified as epidemiologically significant and each chapter will describe the specific obligations with respect to disease occurrence in those wildlife host species and the impact on domestic animal populations and zoonotic risks.

Background

The founding Members defined three main objectives when they created the OIE: to promote and co-ordinate scientific research; to provide Governments with the means of supervising the enforcement of relevant international agreements; and for the OIE to function as a disease intelligence node. Collecting animal health data and distributing it to all OIE Members was deemed to be one of the main activities of the OIE with effect from its founding 1924.

As stated in the Organic Statutes of the OIE, all listed diseases must be notified to the OIE. However, Chapter 1.1. in the Terrestrial Code details Members’ obligations for notifying OIE-listed diseases, without specifying the host species in which the disease is detected. Chapter 1.1. also calls up relevant information (e.g. the case definition and, in some cases, detailed recommendations on disease surveillance) in specific disease chapters elsewhere in the Code. The specific disease chapters have, to date, focused mainly on food producing animals.

A national animal health information system cannot be fully effective if it focuses only on the situation in domestic animals. In view of the importance of emerging diseases, many of which are zoonotic, attention must also be paid to wildlife, including wild animals kept as pets and in zoos. Collecting information from all these sources is essential to provide a system that tracks the animal health situation worldwide.

Proposed development of the OIE Terrestrial Code

In the next five years, the Terrestrial Code will be modified as follows:

Each disease chapter will be renamed as: Infection (or Infestation) with ‘pathogen’.

Disease chapters may be named according to single or multiple species (e.g. Infection with Mycobacterium bovis; Infection with Brucella abortus, B. Suis and B. melitensis) or according to families or genera (e.g. Infection with Trichinella spp.).

Each disease chapter will contain a case definition and a listing of epidemiologically significant susceptible species, including wildlife. Where applicable, chapters will contain recommendations on surveillance in domestic and wild animals. Each chapter will contain an explanation of the implications of the disease being present in wild animals for:
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1. the disease or infection status of the country/zone; and
2. export of animals and products.

An article on ‘safe commodities’ will be included in disease chapters, when relevant.

Guiding principles to address wildlife in the Terrestrial Code

1. Infection in wild animals plays a significant epidemiological role

   Certain wild species are known or strongly suspected to serve as reservoirs for the pathogen. Transmission of the pathogen between wildlife and domestic animals occurs naturally.
   
   - The OIE will cover specified, epidemiologically significant wildlife species in its recommendations.
   - Surveillance of these specified wildlife species will be required in the event that the country wishes to establish an official disease free status (when relevant) or to make a credible self-declaration of disease freedom in a country or zone, as specified in the relevant Terrestrial Code chapter.
   - Findings of infection/disease in these specified wildlife species should be reported to the OIE as specified in Chapter 1.1. of the Terrestrial Code.
   - Recommended trade measures will reflect the status of the pathogen in domestic animals and in these specified wildlife species, as appropriate to the circumstances.

2. Infection in wild animals does not play a significant epidemiological role.

   Although wildlife species may be known or shown to be susceptible to infection, transmission from wild animals to domestic animals does not present a significant risk pathway under real-life conditions. It is feasible to prevent the infection or control the disease by implementing measures in domestic animals, without needing to manage risks presented by wildlife populations. A wildlife reservoir does not play a meaningful epidemiological role.
   
   - The OIE will not include wildlife species in its recommendations and the status of the country or zones can be established without surveillance of wildlife.
   - The OIE may encourage Members to conduct monitoring and to report their findings to the OIE for scientific purposes as appropriate
   - Recommended trade measures will be based on the risk posed by the pathogen in domestic animals and their products.

3. Infection in wild animals does not play a significant epidemiological role but may present a significant risk to human health.

   Transmission from wild animals to domestic animals either does not occur or does not present a significant factor in the epidemiology of the disease in animals. However, the transmission of the pathogen from wild animals to humans may present a significant human health risk.
   
   - The OIE does not include wildlife species in its recommendations and the status of the country or zones can be established without surveillance of wildlife.
   - The OIE may recommend specific surveillance of wildlife species, e.g. for assessing risks to human health.
• Findings in wildlife should be reported as appropriate.

• Recommended trade measures are based on the animal health and public health risks presented by the pathogen in traded animals and their products, as appropriate to the circumstances.

Note on vector borne diseases

For vector borne diseases, determining the distribution of the vector may be the most important priority of surveillance. Specific surveillance of wildlife may be deemed as a much lower priority than surveillance of domestic animals and the main vector species. Nonetheless, the principles identified above still apply.
REPORT OF THE MEETING
OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON VETERINARY LEGISLATION
Paris, 5–7 July 2011

1. Welcome, adoption of the agenda and introductory remarks

Dr David Sherman, Chair of the ad hoc Group on Veterinary Legislation (ad hoc Group), opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. He noted in particular the great achievement of Dr Martial Petitclerc in drafting the Guidelines on veterinary legislation and associated material in the Manual for experts and thanked all participants for agreeing to support the OIE in this important work.

The list of participants and the adopted agenda are given at Annexes I and II.

Dr Sarah Kahn, Head of Trade Department of the OIE, presented the Terms of Reference (see Annex III) of the meeting, which are to prepare draft text on veterinary legislation for consideration by the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) with a view to proposing the adoption of a new chapter on Veterinary Legislation (draft Chapter 3.4.) in the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code). Dr Kahn stressed that the Guidelines on veterinary legislation had been on the OIE website for some time and that these provide a good basis for drafting new text for adoption in the Terrestrial Code. However, OIE Members would review the draft text very carefully, because of the different status of ‘guidelines’ and the Terrestrial Code. Incorporating text from a ‘guidelines’ document into the Terrestrial Code gives the text greater importance and legal weight. It would be important for the ad hoc Group to address all Member comments provided to date and, wherever possible, to amend the draft text in line with these comments. Where the ad hoc Group considered that a Member’s recommendations could not be adopted (e.g. in the situation where several Members made opposing recommendations), the Group should provide a clear explanation of the reasons for partial acceptance or rejection of a recommendation.

Dr Sherman reiterated the importance of preparing a text that is clear and unambiguous. To this end, he recommended simplifying and shortening the text previously submitted by the Code Commission. By removing duplication and ensuring coherence in all parts of the text, the ad hoc Group could ensure that questions and comments reflecting lack of understanding of the text by Members would be largely addressed.

Dr Alejandro Thiermann, President of the Code Commission, recommended that the ad hoc Group not spend too much time trying to reply to the comments of OIE Members who argued against the adoption of a draft text on veterinary legislation, on the basis that the members of the ad hoc Group were selected for their technical knowledge and experience in conducting missions to Member Countries and not necessarily for their detailed understanding of OIE policies in general. The question of whether the OIE should adopt a text on veterinary legislation in the Terrestrial Code and related policy issues would be more appropriately addressed by the Code Commission. However, Dr Thiermann assured members of the ad hoc Group that the Code Commission would take careful note of all their recommendations, whether these related to technical issues or policy matters. To help the Code Commission in its work, he recommended that the text include a clear statement of the role and significance of veterinary legislation and a limited number of definitions of terms with which OIE Members may be unfamiliar.
2. Explanatory comments on the background to the OIE Veterinary Legislation Support Programme

Dr Thiermann explained how the Code Commission would address the report of the ad hoc Group. The draft text prepared by the Group would be reviewed by the Code Commission at its September meeting and circulated to the OIE Members towards the end of 2011. The third round of Members’ comments would be reviewed by the Code Commission at its February 2012 meeting. Depending on the nature and extent of comments, the Code Commission may propose the text for adoption at the General Session (GS) in May 2012.

Dr Kahn noted that the report of the current meeting, together with any annexed documents, should be finalised by mid-August at the latest to meet the Code Commission deadline. She advised that the ad hoc Group might be reconvened in mid-January, or later in 2012, depending on the feedback from the Code Commission and OIE Members.

Dr Kahn also stated that if the ad hoc Group made extensive modifications to the draft text, it would be preferable to provide a ‘clean’ version of the document for the next round of Member comment. Notwithstanding this, the International Trade Department would maintain a record of all modifications made to the text, which would be provided to OIE Members on request.

3. Review of OIE Member comments on proposed text

Dr Sherman noted that the draft text on veterinary legislation, which was based on the OIE Guidelines on Veterinary Legislation, was a good starting point for the ad hoc Group’s work. However, he noted that OIE Members had raised several concerns, including that the text included redundancy, ambiguity and overly prescriptive recommendations. Dr Sherman noted that OIE Members have already had two occasions for comment, i.e. after the meetings of the Code Commission in September 2010 and February 2011. Dr Sherman emphasised the need to revise the text to make it clearer and more ‘user-friendly’, to address these comments.

Dr Sherman also noted that, depending on the modifications made and eventually adopted to the draft text, it would be advisable to revise the current Terrestrial Code Chapters 3.1. and 3.2. (specifically, Article 3.1.2. point 6, Article 3.2.7. and Article 3.2.14. point 6) to eliminate duplication.

After discussion on the structure, scope and objective of Chapters 3.1. and 3.2. and the draft Chapter 3.4., the ad hoc Group recommended that the Code Commission reconsider Chapters 3.1. and 3.2. in future, if/when Members agree to adopt Chapter 3.4. (see Annex IV).

[Note: this annex has been replaced by Annex V to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 13–22 September 2011.]

It was also noted that the elements removed from the text proposed for adoption as Chapter 3.4. should be maintained in some other document – either in the Guidelines (if this document is kept) or in the Manual for Experts of the Veterinary Legislation Support Programme, because more detailed guidance than the points included in the Terrestrial Code would be needed to ensure harmonised approaches to veterinary legislation identification missions.

3.1. General comments of OIE Members

In response to Member comments, it was agreed to include ‘Introduction’ and ‘Objectives’ as a new Article 3.4.1. With the objective of responding to Members who raised concerns about the clarity of the text, it was agreed that key terms should be explained. The inclusion of a new Article 3.4.2. ‘definitions for the purpose of the chapter’ was also considered valuable. The ad hoc Group agreed that the terms shown in Table 1 may warrant explanation or definition as there was unlikely to be a common understanding of these terms on the part of veterinary services. The ad hoc Group developed the texts in column 2 based on the original text, written in French, in column 1.
### Table 1: Terms requiring explanation or definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Législation vétérinaire : ensemble des normes juridiques spécifiques (législation primaire et secondaire) au domaine vétérinaire et nécessaire à sa gouvernance.</td>
<td>Veterinary legislation: the collection of specific legal instruments (primary and secondary legislation) required for the governance of the veterinary domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Législation primaire : normes juridiques émanant du pouvoir législatif.</td>
<td>Primary legislation: legal instruments issued by the legislature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Législation secondaire : normes juridiques émanant du pouvoir exécutif et correspondant au domaine réglementaire.</td>
<td>Secondary legislation: legal instruments issued by the executive and relating to the regulated domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norme juridique : règle de droit en tant que concept, quelle qu’en soit la nature ou le statut, émanant d’une autorité investie d’un pouvoir et ayant force de loi.</td>
<td>Legal instrument: legally binding rule that is issued by a body with the required legal authority to issue the instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualité de la législation : caractère d’une législation techniquement pertinente, acceptable par la société, techniquement, financièrement et administrativement soutenable, effectivement appliquée et assurant la sécurité juridique.</td>
<td>Legislative quality: the technical relevance, acceptability to society, sustainability in technical, financial and administrative terms and effective implementation of laws. Good legislative quality provides legal certainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiérarchie des normes juridiques : classement des normes juridiques découlant des prescriptions de la loi fondamentale du pays et selon lequel une norme quelconque est strictement conforme aux normes de rang supérieur.</td>
<td>Hierarchy of legal instruments: ranking of the legal instruments arising from the prescriptions of the fundamental law (e.g. the constitution) of a country. Respect for the hierarchy means that each legal instrument must comply with higher order legal instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sécurité juridique : situation dans laquelle les citoyens sont protégés contre les effets secondaires négatifs des normes juridiques, en particulier les incohérences ou la complexité de la législation, ou de son changement trop fréquent (insécurité juridique).</td>
<td>Legal certainty: situation in which citizens are protected against any adverse side effects of legal instruments. The situation of legal uncertainty could arise when legislative instruments are not coherent, are overly complex or change frequently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domaine vétérinaire</td>
<td>Veterinary domain: all the activities that are directly or indirectly related to animals, their products and by-products, which help to protect, maintain and improve the health and welfare of humans, including via the protection of animal health and welfare, and food safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ad hoc Group agreed that appropriate references should be made to standards of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC), given that the ‘veterinary domain’ addressed by veterinary legislation within the OIE framework includes aspects such as food safety, veterinary medicines and biological products, and animal production, which are the subject of CAC standards and that the CAC is a sister standard setting organisation under the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization. This decision enabled the ad hoc Group to address a comment from a Member on the need for consultation and collaboration with other international organisations and the importance of avoiding duplication/contradiction with other existing standards.
The ad hoc Group could not decide if references to the standards of other international organisations should be included and therefore asked the Code Commission to advise if this was necessary or appropriate.

3.2. General principles (new Article 3.4.3.)

To improve clarity and to streamline the articles on general characteristics of veterinary legislation, the general principles were regrouped and reworded.

It was decided that the terms ‘primary legislation’ and ‘secondary legislation’ should be defined.

A Member’s recommendation to include ‘the general public’ in relation to the responsibilities of Competent Authorities for communication and documentation was addressed by amendments in the appropriate part of the text.

Point 5 of the old Article 3.4.5. ‘Delegation of Power’ was rephrased and moved to the section on General principles, following a Member’s suggestion.

3.3. Drafting of veterinary legislation (new Article 3.4.4.)

The title of this article was modified following a Member’s comment.

To improve clarity and simplify the text, this article was restructured by moving all elements relating to the competent authority, e.g. powers, intervention by inspectors, delegation of powers and obligations, to a new Article 3.4.5. (Matters relating to the Competent Authority) together with relevant points from other parts of the text.

Following Member comments, the draft text relating to objectives and penalties was modified to avoid provisions that were considered to be too prescriptive.

A Member’s comment regarding contradiction between English and Spanish texts was addressed by amending the text.

In response to Member’s comments the draft text relating to Financing was modified to make it less prescriptive.

3.4. Matters relating to the competent authority (new Article 3.4.5.)

Noting that provisions relating to the Competent Authority were found in several different articles, the ad hoc Group decided to consolidate all provisions relevant to the Competent Authority (including powers, interventions, obligations and delegation of powers) into a new article, with appropriate modification.

Following a Member comment, the word ‘official’ was used instead of ‘inspector’.

The ad hoc Group discussed the fact that the powers of Competent Authorities potentially impact on individual rights, which are protected under the fundamental texts of most countries. It was agreed that the powers of Competent Authorities should be defined in primary legislation to ensure that the rights and responsibilities of competent authorities are dealt with at the appropriate level in the legal hierarchy.

The provisions for delegation of powers of the Competent Authorities were clarified.

3.5. Veterinary professionals and veterinary para-professionals (new Article 3.4.6.)

The term ‘veterinary para-professional’ was used throughout, for consistency with the Terrestrial Code glossary.
In response to a Member’s comment, the *ad hoc* Group deleted the point ‘define the professional responsibilities of veterinarians and persons working under their control’ as this was deemed to duplicate other provisions in the text.

Several text amendments were made to improve clarity.

### 3.6. Laboratories in the veterinary domain (new Article 3.4.7.)

The term ‘veterinary field’ in the title was replaced by ‘veterinary domain’ for clarity.

In response to a Member’s comment, the term ‘the Competent Authority’ was used in lieu of ‘the State’.

Following a Member’s comment, point c) was amended to highlight the difference between b) and c). However, a recommendation to delete the entire article was not accepted as even where laboratories and reagents are controlled on the basis of contracts between a private entity and the competent authority, a legal basis for such contracts is needed. The *ad hoc* Group had no disagreement with the fact that Competent Authorities may delegate their authority to other entities as appropriate.

### 3.7. Health provisions relating to animal production (new Article 3.4.8.)

In response to Member comments, the text was simplified by making reference to relevant articles in the *Terrestrial Code* and some amendments were made to improve clarity.

### 3.8. Animal diseases (new Article 3.4.9.)

The *ad hoc* Group added text to reply to the concerns expressed by a Member on the intended scope of ‘listed diseases’.

In response to a Member’s recommendation to add ‘biosecurity measures’ in the list, point a) was amended.

The text was further revised to eliminate redundancy and overly prescriptive provisions.

### 3.9. Animal welfare (new Article 3.4.10.)

The text was simplified by making appropriate references to relevant *Terrestrial Code* chapters.

### 3.10. Veterinary medicines and biologicals (new Article 3.4.11.)

Noting that the term ‘veterinary products’ is not defined in the *Terrestrial Code* and that some experts had found that countries confused the topic of this article with ‘animal by-products’, the term ‘veterinary medicines and biologicals’ was adopted, consistent with the terminology used in the OIE PVS Tool.

Introductory text was added to clarify the objective of this article. The old text on ‘Objectives’ was deleted in this article and in the following one, for consistency with other articles on technical aspects of veterinary legislation.

Titles of points 5 and 6 were amended to clarify the demarcation of the production and retail phases.

Noting that provisions for recall would fall under the manufacturer’s responsibility, a provision on reporting was added to point 6.

The text was amended to improve clarity.

### 3.11. Human food production chain (new Article 3.4.12.)

The title was amended following a Member’s comment.
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A Member’s recommendation to add ‘animal feed’ in this article was not accepted as this article was specific to the human food chain, and animal feed was addressed elsewhere in the text.

The text was amended to improve clarity.

3.12. Import/export procedures and veterinary certification (new Article 3.4.13.)

The title was amended and the text simplified by including appropriate references to relevant chapters in the Terrestrial Code.

Due to the extensive revision of the text of the draft Chapter 3.4., the ad hoc Group decided to submit a clean text to the Code Commission and to ask the International Trade Department to keep a record of all modifications in case of requests from OIE Members.

4. Discussion with the Director General

The ad hoc Group met with Dr Vallat, OIE Director General, on 7th July. Dr Vallat stated that the establishment of standards for veterinary legislation was within the mandate of the OIE because legislation is an essential part of the veterinary services infrastructure and good quality legislation is needed by OIE Members in order to implement the international standards on animal health. Furthermore, the OIE standards are recognised under the WTO SPS Agreement. Dr Vallat emphasised the importance of informing Members of the technical requirements to be addressed in veterinary legislation via a standard in the Code. The means taken to address these requirements in legislation would vary according to the political, cultural, economic and religious environment of Members, with lack of resources particularly important to developing country Members and countries with ‘in transition’ economies. He advised that Members would benefit from the adoption of a standard on veterinary legislation as it would help to clarify the role and authority of the veterinary services and the need for infrastructure and resources to allow them to deliver effective animal health programmes.

Dr Sherman briefed Dr Vallat on the work undertaken by the ad hoc Group. He commended the excellent work of Dr Petitclerc in writing the Guidelines on veterinary legislation and associated material in the Manual for experts. He indicated that the ad hoc Group had been able to positively address nearly all Members’ comments while preserving the broad intent of the Guidelines. He also noted that the ad hoc Group had produced a significantly shorter text for consideration by Members.

Dr Sherman asked Dr Vallat if the ad hoc Group should hold another meeting before the General Session in May 2012. Dr Thiermann advised that the revised draft Chapter (now 3.4.), together with the ad hoc Group meeting report, would be reviewed by the Code Commission at its meeting on 12–23 September 2011 and, with additional comments from the Commission, provided to Members for comment. He indicated the possibility of requesting to reconvene the ad hoc Group before or after the General Session, depending on the feedback received from Members. Dr Vallat agreed to this possibility.

Dr Thiermann asked Dr Sherman for advice on 1) the future need to maintain the Guidelines on the OIE website and 2) the ad hoc Group’s recommendation on any necessary modification of Chapters 3.1. and 3.2. in future, once Chapter 3.4. had been adopted.

Dr Sherman advised that the new text had been extensively redrafted and there was potential for confusion if the Guidelines were retained on the website in their current form if/when Chapter 3.4. had been adopted. To avoid problems, he considered that it might be preferable to maintain detailed information in the Manual for Veterinary Legislation and to remove the current Guidelines from the OIE internet site. He suggested that the ‘public communication’ function of the Guidelines could be fulfilled by putting the Questionnaire on the website; this would also facilitate preparation by OIE Members requesting Veterinary Identification missions. The text of the Questionnaire would need to be revised for consistency with Chapter 3.4. if and when adopted.
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Dr Sherman recommended that the Code Commission review several articles in Chapters 3.1. and 3.2., particularly Article 3.2.14., once the new Chapter 3.4. had been adopted, to eliminate any potential duplication or conflict. The review could be facilitated by including specific reference to the new Chapter 3.4. in Chapters 3.1. and 3.2.

Dr Ahmed El-Idrissi recommended the inclusion of specific references to the standards of the CAC, particularly in Articles 3.4.11. (Veterinary medicines and biologicals) and 3.4.12. (Human food chain) and asked Dr Vallat if the Codex Secretariat would be given an opportunity to review the draft Chapter 3.4. Dr Vallat replied that the OIE had an official agreement with the Codex and that the CAC Secretariat would be encouraged to submit comments to the OIE. He also asked about the possibility of including the Law Development Service (LEGN) of FAO in the review process of the draft of the new chapter 3.4 for comments and inputs as appropriate. Dr Vallat has no objection to this but insisted on the coordination of FAO inputs through a focal point.

5. Date of next meeting

If a meeting should be required prior to the May 2012 General Session, 17–19 January was identified as the most appropriate date.
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Adopted agenda

Day 1 (Tue 5 July 2011) 9:00-17:00
- Welcome, adoption of the agenda, and introductory remarks
- Explanatory comments on the background to the OIE Veterinary Legislation Support Programme
- Review of OIE Member comments received on proposed text for the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*.

Day 2 (Wed 6 July 2011) 9:00-17:00
- Review of OIE Member comments received on proposed text for the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*
- Drafting of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* chapter on veterinary legislation.

Day 3 (Thu 7 July 2011) 9:00-17:00
- Discussion with the OIE Director General
- Date of next meeting
- Closing of the meeting.
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Terms of Reference

Considering:

- that veterinary legislation is a key component of efficient veterinary services;
- that many countries, especially developing countries and countries with ‘in transition’ economies, do not have up to date veterinary legislation and are not, therefore, well placed to meet current and future challenges and societal expectations;
- that the OIE has created a global Veterinary Legislation Strengthening Programme, as one of the components in the OIE PVS Pathway, which provides an opportunity for OIE Members that wish to modernise their legislation to obtain advice from the OIE and, through a PVS Gap Analysis, encourage governments and donors to invest in the infrastructure of the Veterinary Services, including veterinary legislation;
- that the OIE is working to support Members by the development of the PVS Pathway and training certified experts to conduct missions at the request of Members;
- the recommendations of the first OIE Global Conference on Veterinary Legislation (7–9 December 2011, Djerba, Tunisia), notably the proposal to adopt the OIE Guidelines on Veterinary Legislation in the Terrestrial Code.

The ad hoc Group is asked to:

- prepare a draft text for inclusion in the Terrestrial Code, based on the current OIE Guidelines on Veterinary Legislation, with appropriate modification to address the relevant comments of OIE Members and of the Code Commission;
- consider if it is necessary to retain a guidance document on Veterinary Legislation on the OIE website once the new text has been adopted in the Terrestrial Code and, if so, to draft this document;

and if time permits:

- review the OIE Veterinary Legislation Manual and make any recommendations considered necessary to make it more useful tool for the conduct of veterinary legislation missions.
DISCUSSION PAPER: ELECTRONIC VETERINARY CERTIFICATES
FOR THE TRANSPORT OF RESEARCH ANIMALS

Purpose

The purpose of this discussion paper is to assist the OIE in encouraging the use of electronic veterinary certificates as a natural progression of the current OIE Model Certificate. The proposal is to use electronic veterinary certificates for the transport of research animals as a pilot for wider adoption. The benefits of this approach will be to promote the welfare of research animals during transportation by reducing the likelihood of errors and impediments associated with hard copy documentation and thereby to maintain progress in advancing human and animal health. At the same time, potential challenges associated with electronic certification will be identified and addressed within this relatively well defined field.

Background

The establishment of the OIE Laboratory Animal Welfare ad hoc Group (LAWAHG) in 2007 provided the foundation for leadership by the OIE in setting standards for the use of animals in research and education. The serious problems currently impacting the domestic and international transport of research animals have been raised during discussions between the LAWAHG and international laboratory animal science organisations such as the International Council for Laboratory Animal Science (ICLAS) and the International Association of Colleges of Laboratory Animal Medicine (IACLAM) as well as the International Air Transport Association (IATA). This has resulted in a strong recommendation that the OIE should lend its support to addressing this problem.

For a number of reasons, research animals may need to be transported between research institutions as well as from commercial animal breeders to research institutions. Over the last two decades there have been increasing numbers of genetically defined animals (almost exclusively rodents) bred in small colonies in research institutes and universities that have unique genotypes and phenotypes that have been produced through tailored genetic alteration. These colonies increasingly have become a unique resource of research animals, both nationally and internationally, for use in important collaborative international research studies or as small commercial enterprises. Unlike large commercial producers, any given research institution may have relatively small numbers of animals that need to be transported, however, in the aggregate, these can represent a substantial number of journeys and constitute a critically important element in the success of high quality, internationally recognised, research.

A relatively small number of species are routinely used in research with rats, mice, amphibians and fish representing by far the greatest number – about 97% in the UK. Other species, including guinea pigs, gerbils, hamsters, rabbits, cats, dogs, pigs and nonhuman primates (consisting of only a few species) are also essential but used in relatively small numbers. All these species are of critical importance in a broad range of research fields including regulatory testing, particularly the final approval of human medicinal products, and in fundamental biomedical and veterinary research. However, the particular physiological vulnerability and microbiological status of some of these animals leads to the potential for significant impact on their health and welfare if there are avoidable delays on their journey, even if those delays are quite minimal.

A major impediment to the transportation of these animals is associated with errors in the preparing and handling of hard copies of the relevant documentation. The expansion of the use of an electronic system for constructing required documents for national and international transport of animals for research would help to reduce document errors and consequent delays with individual shipments. At the present time, a single shipment of research animals may require as many as 39 separate documents although most journeys require fewer documents.

Reference to UK National Statistics 2010 just published.
Discussion

There is clear direction in animal transportation to go paperless. An electronic veterinary certificate for animal shipment would allow paperless transfer of information that would interface with other electronic documents. Furthermore, the use of an electronic system for veterinary certificates would eliminate many errors that result in difficulties in transportation of animals and refusal of carriage. When document errors occur and shipments are delayed, carriers often must absorb the liability for holding the animals under appropriate conditions until the problem can be resolved. This inevitably makes them less inclined to accept animal shipments in the future. Eliminating some of these document-related transportation issues associated with the shipment of research animals is therefore likely to remove some of the pressures to restrict carriage of these animals. An electronic format would allow documents to be sent by the consignor for review by the border post authority prior to shipment. This would thus catch errors that might halt or delay shipment and importation. Of course, it would not imply pre-approval of the shipment, or waiving of the right to refuse entry of the shipment, based upon the condition of the animals on arrival.

Electronic veterinary certificates would further allow for the easy insertion of tailored text to accommodate specific requirements of importing countries. Hence, it would facilitate timely resolution of disputes in wording of the certificates between importing and exporting countries, and this could be achieved prior to shipping. This would avoid potential delays, possibly of several days, during transit. It would also improve relationships with the carriers and custom brokers who have to deal with the consequences of such errors. Electronic certificates would also address the issue of lost documents during transport and would decrease errors in transfer of information to other documents (e.g. air waybill) and databases (e.g. TRACES).

An electronic certificate would allow access by multiple parties (veterinary authority, shipper/forwarder, consignee, border post personnel, and carriers) that have a legitimate need for this information. The use of an identifying certificate number would assist this access and is already an OIE recommendation. This would allow retrieval and printing of the certificate if needed or to fill out other required documents (e.g. TRACES).

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. Given the multiple external pressures impeding the transport of research animals and the critical need for this transport, to support both medical and veterinary research, the OIE should strongly encourage the use of electronic veterinary certificates for the transport of laboratory animals on a pilot basis.

2. The Model Veterinary Certificate for Research Animals should incorporate relevant components of the existing OIE Model Veterinary Certificate for live animals, plus the following elements (Annex 1):

   A. Statement of any special medical needs or provisions to travel in order to ensure welfare during carriage

   B. Categorisation of the microbial status based upon the IATA classification scheme:

      a. Conventional

      b. Specific Pathogen Free (SPF):

         i. Conditioned SPF

         ii. Barrier Raised SPF.
3. Based upon evaluation of this pilot with research animals, the OIE should consider recommending the use of electronic veterinary certification more widely and, if appropriate, undertaking the development of appropriate standards for electronic certification systems.

4. In order to facilitate more general application of electronic veterinary certificates, the OIE should maintain a regularly updated list of countries that accept veterinary certification in electronic format and make this accessible to official veterinarians responsible for completing the certificates.

5. Going forward, the system could be refined to assist in journey planning (See Article 7.8.10 on Transport) and provide worksheets to guide shippers through required steps and considerations prior to submitting animals for shipment. This, coupled with training, would decrease the error rate in shipments and enhance the welfare of research animals initially, and ultimately of all animals being transported.
Introduction

Islam is a comprehensive religion guiding the lives of its followers through sets of rules governing the personal, social and public aspects through the verses of the Holy Qur’an and Hadiths, the compilation of the traditions of Prophet Mohammed (pbuh), the two main documents which serve as guidelines.

In Islam, the law is a privileged means of access to the sacred. For most Muslims, Islamic normativity (fiqh or shari’a) is an essential part of being a Muslim. The demand for and production of authoritative rulings is one form of social expression of normative Islam.

The relevance of animal welfare under Islam

Islam provides considerable support for the importance of animal welfare. There is a rich tradition of the Prophet Mohammad’s (pbuh) concern for animals to be found in the Hadith and Sunna and Islam provides considerable support for the importance of animal welfare.

The Qur’an is explicit, with regard to using animals for human purposes. A closer look at the teachings of the Qur’an and tradition reveals teachings of kindness and concern for animals. Nonetheless, the Qur’an, clearly supports the use of animals, including for food.

For example:

- And cattle He has created for you (men); from them ye derive warmth and numerous benefits, and of their (meat) ye eat. Surrah An-Nahl 16:5

- And they carry your heavy loads to lands that ye could not (otherwise) reach except with souls distressed: for your Lord is indeed Most Kind, Most Merciful. Surrah An-Nahl 16:7

- And (He has created) horses, mules, and donkeys, for you to ride and as an adornment; And he has created other things of which ye have no knowledge. Surrah An-Nahl 16:8

- We have made animals subject to you, that ye may be grateful. Surrah Al Haj 22:36

- There is not a moving (living) creature on earth, nor a bird that flies with its two wings, but are communities like you. We have neglected nothing in the Book, then unto their Lord they (all) shall be gathered. Surrah Al-Anam 6:38

- Seest thou not that it is Allah Whose praise all beings in the heavens and on earth do celebrate, and the birds (of the air) with wings outspread? Each one knows its own (mode of) prayer and praise, and Allah knows well all that they do. Surrah An-Noor 24:41

We now have a view of animals that shows them not merely as resources, but as creatures dependent on God (Allah) organized into social groups and, most importantly, engaged in the active worship of Allah.

Animals are seen to have their own lives and purpose, valuable to themselves and to Allah above and beyond any material value they may provide to humanity.
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The Qur’an is not the only Islamic source for messages of kindness towards animals. There is a rich tradition of the Prophet Mohammed’s (pbuh) concern for animals to be found in the Hadith and Sunna. For example, the Prophet Muhammad (pbuh):

- Condemned the beating of animals and forbade striking, branding, or marking them on the face.
- He cursed and chastised those who mistreat animals and gave praise to those who showed kindness;
- He also instituted radical changes against the practice of cutting off the tails and humps of living animals for food.

One Hadith quotes Muhammad (pbuh) as saying:

*A good deed done to an animal is as meritorious as a good deed done to a human being, while an act of cruelty to an animal is as bad as an act of cruelty to a human being*

Prophet Muhammad (pbuh) was especially vocal in his disapproval of the cruel practices of notching and slitting of ears of animals and the practice of putting painful rings around the necks of camels.

Below are just a few well-known examples from the hadith (traditions):

- “There is a reward (ajr) for helping any living creature.” (Bukhari and Muslim)
- “It is a great sin for man to imprison those animals which are in his power.” (Muslim)
- “The worst of shepherds is the ungentle, who causes the beasts to crush or bruise one another.” (Muslim)
- You will not have secure faith until you love one another and have mercy on those who live upon the earth.” (Bukhari, Muslim, and Abu Dawud)
- “Fear God in these mute animals, and ride them when they are fit to be ridden, and let them go free when … they [need to] rest.” (Abu Dawud)
- “There is no man who kills a sparrow or anything beyond that, without its deserving it, but God will ask him about it.” (Ahmad and al-Nasai)
- The grievous things are: shirk (polytheism); disobedience to parents; the killing of breathing beings …” (Bukhari and Muslim)
- “May god curse anyone who maims animals.” (ibn al-Athir)
- “Whoever is kind to the creatures of God is kind to himself.”

**Islam and rules concerning the slaughter of animals**

The humane slaughter of animals is strongly supported in the Islamic tradition. For example, Sahih Muslim (Book 21, Chapter 11, Number 4810) records Mohammad (pbuh) saying:

‘Verily Allah has enjoined goodness to everything; so when you kill, kill in a good way and when you slaughter, slaughter in a good way. So every one of you should sharpen his knife, and let the slaughtered animal die comfortably.’
Prophet Muhammad (pbuh) has also said:

When one of you slaughters, let him complete it, “meaning that one should sharpen the knife well and feed, water, and soothe the animal before killing it”.

He also said “Do you intend inflicting death on the animal twice - once by sharpening the knife within its sight, and once by cutting its throat?”

Islam has also laid down Other Rules for humane slaughter, including that:

1. Animals should have a preslaughter rest, and be well fed and well looked after at the point of slaughter.
2. The animals must be alive or deemed to be alive at the time of slaughter.
3. Slaughter must be performed by a Muslim (who is of sound mind, mature, and fully understands the Islamic procedure and conditions for slaughtering of animals).
4. Animals that are slaughtered should be securely restrained, particularly the head and neck, before cutting the throat.
5. Operator competence is of great importance in order to carry out satisfactory Halal slaughter.
6. Slaughtering tools and other implements used must be for the slaughter of Halal animals only.
7. The knife must be razor sharp and without blemishes and damage. For animals with normal necks, the act of slaughter must begin with an incision on the animal’s neck just before the glottis, and for animals with long necks such as chicken, turkeys, ostriches, camels etc., the incision must be before the glottis.
8. The animal's trachea and oesophagus must be severed. The spinal cord should not be cut and the head not severed completely so as to induce immediate and massive haemorrhage. In certain mazhab (school of thought), uttering the phrase “bismillah” immediately before the slaughter is compulsory. In others, such utterance is highly encouraged.
9. Slaughtering must be done once only. The slaughtering implement must not be lifted off the animal during slaughtering. Any lifting is construed as one act of slaughter. Multiple acts of slaughter on one animal are prohibited.
10. Slaughter the animal in such a way that its life departs quickly and it is not left to suffer.
11. Bleeding must be spontaneous and complete.
12. Animals should not be shackled and hoisted before bleeding.
13. Hoisting should be done only after the animal has lost consciousness. Restraining equipment should be comfortable for the animal.
14. Further preparation and dressing of the carcass must be delayed until all signs of life and cerebral reflex have disappeared.

Shackling and hoisting conscious animals seems to violate both the humane intent of Islamic slaughter law, and Prophet Muhammad’s (pbuh) comments on the process of slaughter.
Eating meat produced using cruel methods violates the Prophet Muhammad’s (pbuh) general precept to cause animals no pain before their slaughter, as well as more specific injunctions regarding the treatment of food animals. Indeed, if animals have been subjected to cruelty in transport and slaughter, or to general cruelty, meat from them is considered by Islam as impure and unlawful to eat (Haram). The flesh of animals killed by cruel methods (Al-Muthiah) is carrion (Al-Mujaththamah). Even if these animals have been slaughtered in the strictest Islamic manner, if cruelties were otherwise inflicted on them, their flesh is still forbidden (Haram) food.

Oh, ye messengers! Eat of the good things {tayyibat} and do righteous deeds. Surely, I know what you do.” (Qur’an 23:51).

Oh believers! Eat what We have provided for you of lawful and good things, and give thanks for Allah’s favour, if it is He whom you serve. (Qur’an 2:172; 16:114).

The word 'Tayyib', translated as 'good', 'pure', 'wholesome', etc. and means pure both in the physical and the moral sense.

In summary, the main counsel of Islam for the slaughter of animals for food is to do it in the least painful manner. All the Islamic laws on the treatment of animals, including the method of slaughter, are based on compassion, fellow-feeling and benevolence.

What is prevalent today?

Many current practices are not in accordance with the above teachings and may result in great cruelty to animals.

Handling of animals before and during transport is often cruel. Some animals are marched on foot for several days. During such transport animals may lose weight and may be beaten unnecessarily. Many animals are not fed and watered en route. Animals – young and old, big or small – may be tied in twos and fours in order to reduce the number of animal minders or personnel on the trail. Such tying results in injury and fatigue to the animals. Some animals are beaten and forced to move quickly in order to reach markets and abattoirs on time. Those that fall down may be whipped to force them to rise.

Similarly, needless suffering is inflicted on animals that are transported three or four days together in overcrowded, ill-ventilated, trucks, especially in hot, humid weather.

Harsh conditions also occur at slaughter plants. Animals may be held in primitive facilities without shade, and animals may be restrained by short tethers. At the point of slaughter, animals are often struck and beaten to make them enter the slaughter facilities.

What needs to be done?

Many Muslims and Islamic religious leaders are not aware of the cruelty that is routinely inflicted on animals during transport, pre-slaughter and at slaughter in many Islamic countries. There is an urgent need to sensitise all Muslims to the teachings on animal welfare in the Quran and the Hadiths. This approach is bound to be more effective in influencing the majority of Muslims in the livestock trade especially the slaughter man in treating animals more humanely. This needs to be done by intervention at the highest level by Religious bodies and organisations, which could be most effective in giving rulings (fatwas) on this issue.

Progress might be achieved by taking the following measures.

1. A campaign is needed to apprise religious leaders of the current cruelty which occurs during transport and slaughter, for example by slides and videos. This should be done by competent and knowledgeable individuals who are also aware of the Islamic principles of animal welfare, preferably by Muslims in order to give authenticity to their claims.
2. The creation of animal welfare legislation, including animal transport and slaughter, according to the OIE standards and Islamic principles.

3. Government officials in charge of livestock, especially at abattoirs, should be sensitised to the concepts of animal welfare and how these relate to Islamic principles.

4. Abattoirs should be equipped with the facilities required for the good application of animal welfare standards, including unloading facilities, slaughtering boxes, and well-trained personnel to implement correct Halal slaughter.

5. The OIE animal welfare standards, especially those dealing with land transport and slaughter of animals for human consumption which were adopted in 2005 by OIE Members, need to be more strictly implemented by governments.

6. The inclusion of animal welfare as a subject in the veterinary curriculum should be encouraged, including by making available a model syllabus such as that used in the veterinary schools of India.

The OIE welcomes the opportunity to enter into dialogue with governments and religious authorities with the objective of improving animal welfare in all countries of the world.
REPORT OF THE TENTH MEETING OF THE OIE ANIMAL WELFARE WORKING GROUP

Paris (France), 21–23 June 2011

On behalf of Dr Bernard Vallat, OIE Director General, Dr Sarah Kahn welcomed members and participants to the meeting of the Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG). She made reference to discussions at the World Assembly of Delegates, held in May 2011, as background to present the strategic priorities for the OIE and the issues to be considered by the Working Group at this meeting. The list of participants and the agenda are attached as Appendices I and II.

Dr Sarah Kahn briefly discussed the following priority issues:

- Standards for livestock production systems including state of play with ad hoc Groups on broiler chickens and beef cattle
- How to help and encourage Members in the implementation of standards
- Review of linkages between animal welfare, food safety and food security
- Future work on standards for the welfare of working animals
- The 3rd OIE Global Conference on Animal Welfare.

With respect to the challenge the OIE faces to encourage Members to adopt standards dealing with livestock production systems, Dr David Wilkins invited members to consider the history of the Council of Europe that uses the term ‘recommendation’, not ‘standard’. He mentioned that countries that have signed and ratified the Convention are not obliged to put the recommendations into law; for example they can implement the recommendations via the use of Codes of Practice. Representatives of countries were voting participants, while industry and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) attended as observers. Dr Wilkins undertook the task to circulate a copy of the document “The European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming purposes”, plus relevant guiding principles developed by the Council of Europe and International Coalition for Farm Animal Welfare (ICFAW). However, Mr Luc Mirabito underlined that there were also several issues in the Council of Europe and some recommendations were never adopted, despite many years of discussions.

Prof. Hassan Aidaros commented that the pace of introduction of new standards must be acceptable for all the OIE Members, not only for the wealthier countries. There is a risk that too rapid progress will lead to disconnection of a majority of Members. He agreed with Dr Sarah Kahn that there was a need to put more emphasis on helping countries to implement the standards, including by providing seminars to raise awareness and train focal points in the veterinary services.

Dr David Bayvel agreed that it is a key role of the Working Group to ensure that the work of the OIE addresses the need to help and encourage Members to implement standards, as appropriate to their national circumstances.
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Meeting with the OIE Director General

On the third day of the meeting Dr Vallat, OIE Director General, joined the Working Group to discuss some key points from the Working Group meeting, as set out below. Note: these points should be read in conjunction with the entire meeting report.

a. OIE Collaborating Centres – new rules, with particular reference to animal welfare needs

Prof. Fraser raised the concerns of the Working Group regarding the situation with the new OIE policy on Collaborating Centres, notably the decision to approve one Collaborating Centre per region or, exceptionally, per sub-region. He noted that animal welfare is not a single uniform subject. In fact, there are many specific aspects within ‘animal welfare’, such as laboratory animals; the humane management of stray dogs; transport, intensive and extensive livestock production systems and livestock slaughter procedures. Prof. Fraser concluded that institutes with specialised expertise in these various aspects could provide valuable support to the OIE.

Dr Vallat agreed that the Working Group should submit a proposal to the OIE, including details of the type of specialisations that could be envisaged within the overall subject of animal welfare. In addition, the new rules for Reference Centres would be discussed by the elected Commissions and by the OIE Council at its next meeting (20 September 2011).

b. Definition of the role of FAO vis-a-vis the standard setting role of the OIE in animal welfare endorsed at Director General level

Dr Bayvel recalled that, at the 79th General Session, Dr Vallat had commented on the future definition of roles and responsibilities of the FAO in regard to animal welfare, and invited him to update the Working Group on progress and next steps. Dr Vallat replied that the definition of roles and responsibilities of OIE and FAO had been clearly addressed in a chart and a Vade Mecum on animal health in 2008. This agreement does not deal with roles and responsibilities for animal welfare. Subsequently, FAO had started to work on animal welfare, without agreement with the OIE. Dr Vallat stated that the OIE Council had recommended discussing this matter with the incoming Director General of FAO at an early opportunity.

c. Teaching animal welfare as part of the OIE recommendations on veterinary education

Dr Sira Abdul Rahman commended the OIE Initiative on Veterinary Education and asked the Director General to take steps to ensure that the subject of animal welfare be considered as a key competence of day 1 veterinary graduates and that some relevant teaching should be included in the core curriculum.

Dr Vallat briefly outlined the activities of the ad hoc Group on Veterinary Education and stated that he would ask the Chair, Dr Ron Dehaven, to carefully consider the Working Group’s comments and recommendations at the time of its next meeting (2–4 August 2011). He also noted that animal welfare was already on the list of key contents of the basic core curriculum but that more details on the teaching priorities within animal welfare may be needed.

d. Problems with the slaughter of cattle exported from Australia to Indonesia

Dr Vallat commented that humane slaughter is a very important issue and that welfare problems related to the slaughter of cattle are not limited to Indonesia; it is fundamental to encourage the implementation of this and other OIE animal welfare standards by Members.

In order for the OIE to help improve situations of this kind, the key step is for the OIE Delegate to request OIE involvement. For example, the OIE voluntary mediation procedures could be requested by both parties to a disagreement relating to international trade.

Dr Vallat indicated that, with the agreement of the Delegate of Indonesia, the OIE would be prepared to organise a dialogue with religious leaders to raise awareness of the OIE standards for cattle slaughter, to facilitate understanding of the rationale for these standards and of how their use can help to prevent cruel treatment of animals, which he understood to be consistent with religious considerations. Dr Vallat welcomed an offer from Prof Aidaros and Dr Rahman to prepare a document as a resource to facilitate discussion of the issue of religious slaughter, at the request of OIE Members.
e. **OIE Regional animal welfare strategies**

Dr Marosi Molomo thanked Dr Vallat for the OIE’s valuable initiative to call for nomination of Animal Welfare Focal Points by national OIE Delegates, and to provide training seminars, the most recent of which took place in Ethiopia in 9–11 November 2010. Dr Molomo expressed her support for the proposal to develop an OIE sub-regional animal welfare strategy in the South African Development Community (SADC), which comprises 15 countries. Some work has already been done, with the production of a concept note and the conduct of a baseline study looking at the current ‘state of play’ with animal welfare in the SADC members. She considered that this provided a good starting point and that there are good prospects to follow up on this. Dr Molomo, as Delegate for Lesotho, also participates in the SADC Livestock Technical Committee, which has been supportive of the idea of a sub-regional strategy.

Dr Vallat replied that the OIE supported Regional Strategies as a basis to implement the OIE global standards and pointed out that this should be the objective. In contrast, the development of new standards at the regional level is not supported. He advised that national Delegates of many developing countries do not recognise animal welfare as an immediate priority; clearly, poverty reduction and food security can present more urgent concerns in some countries.

Dr Vallat advised that OIE policy is that Delegates, as veterinarians and heads of the veterinary services, have a responsibility for the implementation of the OIE animal welfare standards and cannot ignore them. The OIE must work to convince Delegates to address this responsibility, but it must be done in a progressive manner.

Dr Vallat noted that the Middle East region, which imports many live animals, has benefited from the commitment of Australia to invest in raising awareness and strengthening infrastructure, including through the provision of financial support for the development of a regional strategy and the organisation of workshops.

With respect to the Middle East, Prof Aidaros indicated that a workshop was held recently in Bahrain to address the issue of animal welfare and praised the focal point seminar held in Lebanon in 23–25 November 2010.

The AWWG agreed to support the inclusion of a one hour session on animal welfare at all OIE Regional Commission meetings, to ensure that the issue remains on Delegates’ agendas.

f. **Follow up to the OIE Global Conference on Wildlife**

Dr Wilkins asked Dr Vallat to outline the OIE’s intended follow up to this conference. Dr Vallat indicated that one important action was for the OIE to enter into formal agreements with wildlife conservation organisations, with the objective of strengthening compliance with international standards for international trade in wildlife, such as the CITES requirements. He also indicated that the OIE, in collaboration with partners, would take steps to address practices such as illegal capture and trade of endangered wildlife species.

Dr Wilkins expressed concern that the Conference had not taken into account all the expertise available from Animal Welfare NGOs. Dr Vallat recognised that animal welfare was important particularly in the area of capturing wildlife and detaining them. The OIE rationale for addressing these issues is based in priority on the need to prevent risks associated with emerging diseases and to support the conservation of biodiversity.

g. **Collaboration between the European Commission and the OIE**

Dr Andrea Gavinelli confirmed the continuing European Union (EU) Commission support for the OIE’s standard setting work and for the implementation of the OIE animal welfare standards. Importantly, the EU Council Regulation 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing foresees that the OIE standards on the slaughter of animals should be taken into account when equivalency with EU requirements under this Regulation needs to be established for the purpose of imports.
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Dr Gavinelli stated that he looked forward to receiving more information on the planned 3rd Global Conference on Animal Welfare in Malaysia and suggested that, amongst other sources and based on the agreement of the EU Member States, the EU contribution to the OIE Animal Health and Welfare Fund could provide support for this conference.

1. **Working Group 9th meeting report and agreed actions; informal meeting at General Session; teleconferences**

Dr Bayvel commented that the approach taken to progress the agreed annual work programme, i.e. regular teleconferences; a side-meeting during the General Session; and electronic exchange of a list of agreed actions, has been very effective.

Dr Wilkins provided an update on the progress of rabies control in Bali (Indonesia) where the provision of rabies vaccine by the Australian Government and the on-going commitment of World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), working in collaboration with Indonesian authorities, have given satisfactory results in Bali to date.

Dr Bayvel drew attention to the activities of the EU Food and Veterinary Office, which has conducted fact finding visits to countries exporting to the EU within the context of the EU Council Regulation 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing (see reference paragraph g.)

Dr Bayvel also mentioned that, following the recommendations of the 78th General Session, held in May 2010, the OIE is on its way to sign an agreement with the Global Food Safety Initiative (www.mygfsi.com) and is continuing discussions with GlobalGap (www.globalgap.org).

2. **OIE 79th General Session 2011 outcomes**

The adopted Resolutions on animal welfare, food safety, veterinary education and the contribution of veterinary controls to food security were noted.

Dr Bayvel mentioned that Dr Barry O’Neil, previous President of the OIE and present OIE Delegate for New Zealand, was awarded the Gold Medal during the 79th General Session.

Dr Bayvel commented on the advice provided by Dr Vallat at the General Session on steps that would be taken to define the respective roles and responsibilities of the OIE and FAO in animal welfare. Working Group members agreed that further information on this would be most welcome.

With reference to the discussion at the General Session on the draft Chapter 7.9. (welfare in broiler chicken production systems), Members discussed the various positions of OIE Members on the draft text, notably in relation to the inclusion of specific measurables. Considering that it had not been possible to reconcile the positions of OIE Members to provide for adoption of the draft chapter, it was agreed that the Working Group would give priority to developing a draft text on General Principles for animal welfare and livestock production systems. This would be based on a draft document prepared by OIE Headquarters, with consideration to documents produced by the ICFAW among others.

The timing of presentation of the draft *Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code)* texts on broiler chickens and beef cattle was also discussed and it was agreed to continue progressing these according to the established (typo) OIE standard setting procedures.
Copies of the 10th edition of the OIE Tool for the Evaluation of Performance of Veterinary Services (2010) were circulated for information of members and the inclusion of a competence on animal welfare was noted and endorsed.

Dr Molomo asked for some guidance on how to increase the engagement of OIE Members in the OIE’s standard setting work programme for animal welfare. Dr Alejandro Thiermann noted that the African region had been much more effective in its inputs to the OIE, notably through better coordination, facilitated by the OIE Regional and sub-Regional Representations and Regional Economic Communities, especially AU-IBAR. Sarah Kahn noted that much capacity building in the realm of SPS standard setting takes place under the WTO framework but that this does not address animal welfare. She noted that African countries may find the proposed future work on animal welfare standards for working animals more directly relevant, as compared with some OIE standards adopted to date.

Prof. David Fraser commented that animal welfare standards should be seen in the light of optimising animal production. The basis for the EU provisions on animal welfare is that they represent good animal health and production.

3. Work of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission

Prof. Neville Gregory raised a question regarding Chapter 7.2., as to whether the standard on transport of farmed fish covers the transport of wild caught fish to production sites for farming. Prof. Gregory indicated that there is a growing practice of catching wild fish and relocating them to farms where they are grown for slaughter. Examples include cod ranching (NE coast of North America), tuna caught in the north Atlantic and transferred to farms in the Mediterranean Sea, and tuna caught in the south Pacific and transferred to cages off the southern coast of Australia.

Prof. Gregory also asked if the recommendations in Chapter 7.2. are adequate to cover these translocation practices. He indicated that it could be considered as the most stressful situation for fish and that the methods used are different (e.g. towing in cages) and present different hazards.

The Working Group agreed to refer this question to the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (Aquatic Animals Commission) for consideration.

4. Veterinary education

Dr Sarah Kahn provided an overview of the OIE activities in relation to veterinary education and drew members’ attention to key documents, including the report of the OIE ad hoc Group on Veterinary Education (published as an annex to the report of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (Code Commission)’s February 2011 meeting); Resolution 34 of the 79th General Session on Veterinary Education; the recommendations of the 2nd Global Conference on Veterinary Education (held in Lyon, 13–14 May 2011) and the Declaration of the OIE Conference on the Role of Veterinary Statutory Bodies (held in Bamako [Mali], 14–15 April).

The Working Group made recommendations on the text dealing with animal welfare in the ‘Day 1 competencies’ (i.e. Items 2.4. and 2.9.).

The Working Group recommended: 1) change title of section 2.4. (delete ‘regulation of’) for consistency with the titles of other sections and 2) add a reference that supports the role of veterinarians in advising on ethical issues in the use of animals in contemporary society e.g. add an additional point under item 2.9.4. ‘to be able to provide leadership to society on ethical considerations involved in the use, or treatment, of animals by humans.'
5. Animals used in research and education

Dr Bayvel summarised current work of the OIE ad hoc Laboratory Animal Welfare Group. He indicated that, since the adoption of Chapter 7.8., the Group has focused on the following issues: drafting new articles on air transport of animals used in research and education; veterinary training in laboratory animal medicine; regulatory testing/collaboration with the International Cooperation on Harmonization of Technical Requirements for Registration of Veterinary Medicinal Products (VICH) and the relationship with the Institute for Laboratory Animal Research (ILAR).

Dr Bayvel also mentioned the paper written by the ad hoc Group and coordinated by Dr Bayne on Veterinary Training. This will be published in the ILAR online Journal prior to the World Veterinary Association Conference in Cape Town. As the result of a meeting with Dr Vallat, and at his instigation, ILAR is considering submitting an application to be recognised as an OIE Collaborating Centre.

Regarding air transport, Dr Bayvel indicated that Dr Touisi from International Air Transport Association (IATA) and Dr White for Charles River have been invited to the next ad hoc Group meeting in July, and that Dr White would give a Seminar to OIE staff.

It is anticipated that the July meeting would be the last physical meeting of the ad hoc Group for the time being. Members would however continue to provide specialist advice to the OIE on laboratory animal welfare issues.

6. OIE ad hoc Group on Animal Welfare and Beef Cattle Production Systems.

Dr Mariela Varas presented the report of the ad hoc Group’s meeting 8–10 June 2011. The primary task of the Group was to address the comments made by OIE Members before and during the 79th General Session.

Prof. Gregory made several comments on the draft chapter (7.X.X.), as follows:

- The references to ‘tongue rolling’ on pages 25 and 27 should be clarified.
- On p. 30, the reference to ‘high’ tetanus risk should be replaced by ‘higher’ tetanus risk.

Regarding the references to castration, disbudding and dehorning, Prof. Gregory had some concerns about the inclusion of the phrase ‘a veterinarian should be consulted on how to control pain’ as he considered that veterinarians would not always be well placed to deal with this recommendation.

It was also agreed that, where possible, recommendations on analgesia should be included in the ‘key animal welfare requirements’ column. For chemical castration, members of the Working Group were not aware of any information on how to effectively reduce pain, and recommended that words to this effect be included in the column on ‘key animal welfare requirements’.


Dr Ferrara mentioned that the EU Commission had requested EFSA to provide a Scientific Opinion on the use of welfare indicators for dairy cows that should be adopted by the end of 2011. She also mentioned that the EFSA Panel on Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW) launched an online public consultation on its draft Guidance on risk assessment for animal welfare (www.efsa.europa.eu/en/consultations/call/ahaw110504.htm).
Dr Sarah Kahn gave an update on the OIE commissioned literature review on ‘Linkages between Food Safety and Animal Welfare’ - see discussion under ‘Other Business’ in this report. She indicated that this review was compiled by Dr Allison Small, on behalf of the NZ-AUS CC, and that it does not cover food security as yet. However, the issue of food security would be addressed in a subsequent draft.


Dr Bayvel reported on the availability of the 2011 revision of a 2008 Australian publication on wildlife welfare and indicated that the humane control of vertebrate pests is an important topic in Australia and New Zealand.

Copies of the Australian publication will be supplied to the OIE Headquarters.

The Working Group discussed the recent OIE Conference on Wildlife, including the resolutions of that conference.

9. Report of the OIE ad hoc Group on Climate Change

The Working Group discussed the report of the 27–28 April 2010 meeting. It was agreed to continue to monitor the issues associated with climate change.

10. Joint Session with Collaborating Centres

The Collaborating Centres representatives made a brief summary of their activities during 2010, as also indicated in their annual reports available at the OIE website www.oie.int/en/our-scientific-expertise/collaborating-centres/annual-reports/. It was agreed to include a link to the Collaborating Centres annual reports under the OIE Animal Welfare web page. The list of participants to this joint session is given at Appendix III.

All Centres mentioned they would be pleased to be involved in the 3rd Global Conference on Animal Welfare in 2012 and to provide any assistance required. Ms Alessandrini proposed to have a joint presentation of the Collaborating Centres during this conference.

At Dr Bayvel’s request, Ms Alessandrini also provided an update on the Callisto project proposal (Companion animals multisectorial interprofessional interdisciplinary strategic think tank on zoonoses) as an example of cooperation and funding from the EU. The aim of the project is to identify knowledge and technology gaps in the management of the most important zoonoses transmitted by companion animals as well as to propose targeted actions that contribute to reduce the risk for infectious disease outbreaks associated with the keeping of companion animals in humans and food producing animals.

Dr Gallo mentioned the 2nd Meeting of Researchers that will be held in April 2012. It was agreed to invite one Member of the Working Group.

Dr Johnson, who attended the Working Group meeting personally, also commented on the NZ-AUS Collaborating Centre activities and confirmed that being an OIE Collaborating Centre has been very fruitful for the five Groups that form the NZ-AUS Collaborating Centre.

Dr Bayvel mentioned that the NZ-AUS Collaborating Centre has been supporting the OIE with the literature review on AW and FS, in both financial and human terms.

It was confirmed that all Collaborating Centres could provide services in all regions, regardless of their region of origin.

Regarding the Better Training for Safer Food (BTSF) initiative and apart from the EU-based seminars, Dr Gavinelli underlined that the workshops organised outside the EU are meant to be held mainly in countries which trade with the EU. In response, Dr Rahman suggested that it could be a good strategy for the EU to consider training for future trading partners such as India or China.
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It was agreed that Dr Mariela Varas and Ms Alessandrini would discuss further website opportunities to exchange information between the three CCs.

At the subsequent follow-up meeting, held in conjunction with the Human Society Association “Centenary International Conference”, the following additional actions were agreed:

Collaborating Centres will advise each other of proposed attendance at international conferences, which might provide an opportunity for face to face meetings.

The proposed AWWG amendments to the OIE Rules on Collaborating Centres will be provided, for information, to the three existing Centres after consideration by the OIE Council.

Collaborating Centres will advise each other of twinning applications being considered.

11. Other business

- **Future work of ad hoc Groups on Animal Welfare and Livestock Production Systems**

The Working Group had a discussion on the way forward with these standards. It was agreed to draft a chapter on Guiding Principles for animal welfare in livestock production systems, to be provided to the Code Commission meeting in September 2011. This work will involve Prof. Fraser and Drs Wilkins, Rahman, Mirabito and Guyonnet, with Prof. Fraser taking the lead.

It was noted that the first meeting of the ad hoc Group on Welfare in Dairy Cattle Production Systems would be postponed until further notice, to allow for a clearer understanding of OIE Members’ expectations, including on the broiler and beef cattle chapters.

- **Third Global Conference on Animal Welfare**

The chosen theme for the conference will be: *Implementing the OIE standards – addressing regional perspectives*. It was agreed that Dr Bayvel, Dr Wilkins and Dr Mariela Varas would provide a draft Concept Note for 31 July 2011. Dr Gavinelli commented on the need to focus on regional issues to develop synergies amongst OIE Members.

- **OIE Regional Animal Welfare Strategy: update on the situation of each Region**

Dr Bayvel mentioned that the Regional Animal Welfare Strategy (RAWS) in the Asia, Far East and Oceania (AFEO) is well advanced and that the RAWS-Coordination Group held its first meeting in April. He indicated that it was agreed to hold the second meeting of the Coordination Group back to back with the Animal Welfare Focal Point seminar that is planned for November 2011 in Tokyo.

Dr Molomo commented on the proposal to develop an animal welfare sub-regional strategy in the SADC region, which includes 15 Member Countries. The Concept Note has been circulated and will be submitted to the SADC meeting in September for endorsement and then to the OIE Regional Commission in the next General Session.

Prof. Aidaros stated that, during the Focal Point seminar for the Middle East, which was held in Lebanon in November 2010, it was agreed to draft a concept note on a regional strategy. It was agreed that Dr Mariela Varas and Prof Aidaros would contact the Regional Representation for an update on this matter.

Regarding the situation in the Americas, Dr Mariela Varas mentioned that a Concept Note has been circulated and will be submitted to the Regional Commission in due course.

Dr Gavinelli mentioned the EC is willing to support a strategy at European level and that he looks forward to attending the Animal Welfare Focal Point seminar planned for March 2012 in Kiev.

The Working Group encouraged all OIE Regions to continue to give priority to strategy development.
• Animal welfare standards for reptiles

The AWWG noted correspondence between OIE Headquarters and the Delegate of Switzerland. Unfortunately, due to other priorities, the AWWG was not in a position to further consider this matter.

• FAO electronic consultation on dog population management

Dr Mariela Varas mentioned that FAO held an Electronic Consultation on Dog Population Management (DPM) options with special emphasis on animal welfare and health, on 13 September–12 November 2010. The objectives were to review the current state of knowledge on DPM options and practices and to analyse the current state of implementation of the OIE standards on stray dog population control. FAO then held a meeting in March, along with WSPA and the IZC (Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale dell'Abruzzo e del Molise ‘G. Caporale’ di Teramo), where the objective was to raise key points to deal with DPM and perhaps to provide guidance on how to implement the relevant OIE standard. It was acknowledged that many of the points identified are covered in the Terrestrial Code Chapter 7.7. (stray dog population control). The FAO report is likely to be released in November 2011.

• FAO electronic consultation – working animals; future OIE standard on working animals

Drs Mariela Varas, Rahman and Gavinelli attended the meeting held by FAO and The Brooke following the electronic consultation on the Role, Impact and Welfare of Working Animals. They mentioned some of the recommendations of the meeting, which will include recommending that the OIE draft a standard on the welfare of working animals.

The Working Group acknowledged this statement, and it was decided to wait for FAO’s report. An ad hoc group on working animals may be anticipated to start working in the second semester 2012.

• Literature review of animal welfare and food safety

The Working Group gratefully acknowledged the work of Dr A. Small, commissioned by the NZ-AUS CC.

Mr Mirabito commented that he had some problems with the structure of the report. He suggested to better formalise the analysis by, for example, including a cross-table with the different criteria for animal welfare and food safety; and also adding information on where data are lacking, as well as where data exist. A review by members of his organisation could also be helpful as he's not, himself, specialist of food safety.

Dr Vincent Guyonnet advised that he was aware of additional references on poultry welfare and food safety, e.g. housing and shell quality, and that he would provide these.

Prof. Fraser stated that he did not agree with the approach to the review. Specifically, he considered that the concept of animal welfare used in the review should be more closely aligned with the OIE definition of animal welfare. Animal health and animal welfare interact/overlap much more closely than as presented in the diagram shown in the paper. Prof. Fraser suggested that the paper be retitled, e.g. ‘The impact of animal health and welfare on the transmission of foodborne pathogens and zoonotic diseases’.

Prof. Gregory recommended that additional issues be covered in the paper, i.e.:

- Use of post mortem inspection criteria for assessing animal welfare
- Effect of pre-slaughter stress on meat pH and survival of pathogens such as FMD
- Significance of trauma and bruising for microbial survival
- Importance of zoonoses that can be transmitted by meat that have an animal welfare impact.
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Dr Rahman recommended that the paper deal with the issue of consumption of non-traditional animal products (e.g. bush meat) and risk of transmission of zoonotic diseases via this route.

The International Trade Department of the OIE will provide the draft report, together with the AWWG comments, to the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group, at its meeting in November 2011.

- **Animal welfare risk assessment – teleconference with Dr A. Sheridan**

Dr Sheridan introduced his paper with the comment that animal welfare is a human construct, it is not objective. Risk communication is critical. EFSA deals with risk assessment but does not provide a practical and pragmatic approach to help resolve problems in the context of animal trade across borders. Dr Sheridan therefore conducted a ‘road test’ on how the *Terrestrial Code* chapter on slaughter fits with Australian abattoir procedures.

Dr Sheridan explained that he visited an Australian abattoir and made a hazard assessment, based on the *Terrestrial Code* chapter, to see if this was consistent with the expectations of the Australian public for animal welfare. Charts included in the paper provided to the OIE show the risks with both uncontrolled and controlled hazards. He recommended that the topic be addressed by the OIE, using the ad hoc group methodology.

Dr Wilkins questioned what interaction there would be between the proposed ad hoc group and the Regional Strategy in Asia, Far East and Oceania (AFEO), as for the moment, there are no comparable regional strategies in other regions. Dr Sheridan agreed that the proposed approach should be generally applicable, not restricted to the AFEO region.

Prof. Fraser commented on the use of risk assessment to determine compliance with animal welfare standards at slaughter plants and stated that a similar approach had been undertaken in Canada. He recommended that this approach be studied and standardised, with the objective of making it more user-friendly. He also considered that the development of peer reviewed scientific literature would be necessary to support general acceptance by OIE Members. Dr Sheridan replied that he recognised the need to produce scientific papers supporting the approach and planned to present the proposed work to the Australian Centre of Excellence on Risk Assessment in future.

Dr Rahman encouraged Dr Sheridan to consider the slaughter of working animals within the scope of the paper, especially given the involvement of developing countries in the Regional Strategy for the AFEO region.

Dr Bayvel invited Dr Sheridan to explain how his proposal fits with the work of EFSA on animal welfare risk assessment. Dr Sheridan explained that his work was rather different, as he saw a need to work with stakeholder groups, with a view to establishing an ‘acceptable’ approach to the treatment of animals and that this was best established by working with stakeholders, rather than using a ‘top down’ approach or an entirely ‘science based’ approach, as done by EFSA.

Prof. Gregory commented that Dr Sheridan’s proposal is commendable as a research goal, noting that the need to develop systems for risk assessment that are aimed at applying the OIE animal welfare standards is recognised.

The Working Group did not support adoption of Dr Sheridan’s proposal because there was insufficient clarity about the goals and practical outcomes of the analytical approach. When asked about how the practical example on slaughter would be developed, it appeared from Dr Sheridan’s reply that it would mainly address risk identification. However, the Working Group considered that the risks associated with livestock slaughter has already been well identified in the OIE standard on livestock slaughter, which has already been included in the *Terrestrial Code* for several years.
Noting that Dr Sheridan’s proposal aimed to address the expectations of stakeholders on livestock welfare at the time of slaughter, the Working Group questioned if risk analysis was the most appropriate technique to use. As a technique, risk analysis was valuable in identifying risks and how to manage them but it may be less valuable in addressing the expectations of stakeholders. Additionally, risk communication with stakeholders is dependent on the cultural context and situation and it does not seem to be appropriate to address both this topic and the identification of hazards and evaluation of risk management options in the same project, as the latter topic mainly relies on approaches based on scientific and technical risk assessment.

Prof. Fraser stated that he would be pleased to see scientific publications that could be used as a basis for standard development in the future.

- **Fifth Pan Commonwealth Veterinary Association Conference (CVA) /Ghana Report**

Dr Bayvel reported that the conference was a very successful event with internationally recognized speakers and strong OIE involvement. Dr Gavinelli agreed with Dr Bayvel and stated that feedback should be used to support more cooperation and assistance in Africa. Dr Rahman was congratulated on being elected to the position of CVA President.

- **Global Fund**

Contributions from OIE Member Countries to the World Fund were mentioned, as well as the contribution from the EC for Global conferences.

- **Collaborating Centres applications (Mexico/Sweden)**

The Working Group acknowledged the reply sent by the OIE to these applications. It was agreed that Drs Fraser and Bayvel would work on a new document to be provided to the OIE Council at its meeting in October 2011, as mentioned above (see ‘Meeting with the Director General’).

- **Technical Item 2013**

It was agreed to consider proposing Wildlife Management and Trade as a Technical Item for the OIE 81st General Session in 2013 and that Dr Wilkins would prepare a presentation on this subject for the next AWWG meeting.

- **Disaster management**

Dr Wilkins made a presentation on WSPA’s involvement in disaster relief and management and provided the Working Group with a detailed picture of the work in Haiti following the massive earthquake in early 2010.

The Working Group acknowledged the need to provide guidelines on this matter. Dr Susanne Munstermann, OIE Scientific and Technical Department, reported that the OIE awaited the outcomes of the FAO electronic consultation and an upcoming meeting on this subject to define how to intervene. She also drew the attention of members to the very useful Guidelines published by LEGS (Livestock emergency guidelines and standards).

Dr Bayvel also referred to the Marjan Institute as another potential partner in this area.

- **Emerging and Strategic Issues: Reducing suffering in fisheries – report from Fishcount.org.uk**

The Working Group noted this excellent report and referred it to the OIE Aquatic Animals Commission and relevant FAO contact person for review.

- **Avian influenza stamping out systems**

Dr Mariela Varas referred to the extensive documentation received by OIE headquarters on this subject. It was agreed that Dr Varas will liaise with Prof. Gregory to finalize correspondence of this issue.
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- **Animal welfare and trade: other issues**

  Dr Gavinelli referred to the ongoing discussions with OIE to hold a second Animal Welfare and Trade Colloquium, as a follow-up to the meeting held in Brussels in 2009.

  Dr Bayvel summarised the current situation regarding the export of Australian cattle to Indonesia. The OIE has received letters from Animals Australia and ICFAW regarding potential cruel treatment of cattle at abattoirs in Indonesia.

  Prof. Gregory presented some details of the problem, stating that the problems shown in the DVD had been filmed in small slaughterhouses, mostly slaughtering small numbers of cattle (2–3 head), using Halal techniques. In Java and Sumatra, there are some 4,000 slaughter premises. The animals exported from Australia go to feedlots, from which they are purchased in very small numbers and slaughtered in small abattoirs. Dr Rahman commented that this situation applies in many developing countries. Slaughterhouses are small and controls over food safety and animal welfare generally fall short of international standards.

  The Working Group discussed steps that the OIE could take to help to improve this situation. Members considered that the OIE could make a valuable contribution by establishing a dialogue with religious leaders to raise awareness of the OIE standards for humane slaughter.

  Prof. Aidaros proposed that he and Dr Rahman develop a paper setting out some of the key recommendations of the Koran in respect of animal welfare. Dr Sarah Kahn asked Dr El–Saleh (intern from Saudi Arabia, temporarily located at the OIE) to collaborate in this work.

  Dr Gavinelli proposed to make OIE Members aware of the outcomes of the EU-funded research project Diarel, which aims to facilitate dialogue between religious authorities and stakeholders (http://www.diafre.eu/welcome).

- **Request from Thailand for modification of the OIE standards for poultry stunning and slaughter**

  Prof. Gregory summarised information provided by Thailand arising from discussion held at the first meeting of the RAWS AFEO Coordination Group held in Bangkok in April.

  Thailand has requested reconsideration of the OIE standards for electrical stunning of poultry when slaughtering according to religious requirements (i.e. where the stunning should not be lethal). The OIE standard does not address the issue of applying a stun without killing the animal; therefore it is open to the operator to choose a method that provides satisfactory results. The submission from Thailand outlined the efforts made to find a method that satisfies requirements for animal welfare, religious slaughter and meat quality.

  The Working Group appreciated the Thai submission. Members noted that there is provision in Chapter 7.5, for stunning using a lower current than that recommended in the tables in Article 7.5.7. point 3 (b). However, this may be seen as conflicting with the title of the tables, which refer to ‘minimum current’. The Working Group asked Prof. Gregory, in collaboration with other experts in poultry slaughter, to advise if it would be appropriate to make provision for the use of lower currents in combination with 200–400 Hz frequency. If so, this point could be added to the table on ‘minimum current for stunning poultry when using high frequencies’ in Article 7.5.7 point 3 (b).

12. **Work programme 2012**

Members reviewed the current work programme with the view to updating it for 2012. It was agreed that Dr Mariela Varas and Dr Bayvel would circulate the draft proposed 2012 Work Programme by 1 November 2011.

All Members were encouraged to give careful attention to the draft work programme to ensure that it includes all key initiatives and regional priorities.
13. Dates of next meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting would be held on 26–28 June 2012.

A Working Group teleconference will be scheduled in early January to provide input to the winter meetings of the Code and Aquatic Animals Commissions.
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Adopted agenda

Introduction and priorities / Dr Kahn

Introduction of participants and welcome to Dr Guyonnet / Dr Bayvel

Administrative arrangements / Dr Kahn

23 June 2011 - 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm: Joint Session with Representatives of OIE Animal Welfare Collaborating Centres

1. Working Group 9th Meeting Report, agreed Actions, Informal Meeting at GS & Teleconferences

2. OIE General Session 2011 Outcomes
   - General Session Report/ Resolutions
   - Resolution on Animal Welfare
   - Other Issues Raised: adoption of Chapter 7.9 on Animal Welfare and Broiler Chicken Production Systems
   - PVS

3. Work of the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission

4. Report of the ad hoc Group on Veterinary Education and 2nd Global conference on Veterinary Education 13–14 May 2011 – Feedback from Dr Kahn

5. Report and on-going work of the ad hoc Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare
   - Air Transport: New article
   - Veterinary Training
   - Regulatory Testing: collaboration with VICH


9. Report of the ad hoc Group on Climate Change

10. Joint session with Collaborating Centres
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11. **Other Business**

- Future work of *ad hoc* Groups on Animal Welfare and Livestock Production Systems
- 3rd Global Conference on Animal Welfare – planning
- OIE Regional Animal Welfare Strategy: update on the situation of each Region
- RAWS/AFEQ Coordination Group report
- OIE Technical Mission to Korea (Rep. of)
- Animal Welfare standards for reptiles (Dr. Wyss’ email)
- Future OIE work on Working Animals
- Animal Welfare and Food Safety/ Food Security - Literature review
- Animal Welfare Risk assessment (Dr Sheridan’s paper/possible teleconference)
- Ghana report
- Global fund
- Collaborating Centres applications (Mexico/Sweden)
- Annual Reports of Collaborating Centres (Italy, Chile/Uruguay, NZ/Australia)
- Twinning opportunities
- Animal Welfare Focal Point Seminars
- ILAR – report on the meeting between Dr Vallat and Drs Joubert/MacArthur Clark.
- Technical Item for 2012
- OIE *ad hoc* group on Disaster Relief and Management
- Disaster Management presentation (Dr Wilkins)
- Emerging and Strategic Issues: “Reducing suffering in fisheries” report from Fishcount.org.uk
- PVS
- Compact Europe
- Intra OIE communications
- Request from Thailand for modification of the OIE standards for poultry stunning and slaughter
- Animal welfare and Trade: diverse issues

12. **Work programme 2011**

13. **Meeting report**

14. **Next Meeting**
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The OIE ad hoc Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare (the ad hoc Group) met at the OIE Headquarters on 5-7 July 2011. Dr David Bayvel chaired the meeting.

The members of the ad hoc Group and other participants at the meeting are listed at Appendix I. The adopted Agenda is provided as Appendix II and a Glossary in Appendix III.

Meeting with Dr Bernard Vallat, Director General of the OIE

Dr Vallat participated in the ad hoc Group meeting on Thursday 7 July 2011 to discuss some key points, as set out below. Note: these points should be read in conjunction with the entire meeting report.

Dr Bayvel welcomed Dr Vallat and thanked him for his support. He indicated that, in order to fulfil expectations of OIE Members and other key stakeholders, the ad hoc Group Members will continue to be available “virtually” if the OIE requires their assistance, after this final meeting.

Dr Vallat thanked the members for being “electronically available” and mentioned that the OIE could reactivate a physical meeting in the future when needed.

Dr Bayne mentioned the plan for an “International Plan for the Production of Non-human Primates and their Use in Research and Testing” (International Primate Plan; IPP) that is currently being developed under the leadership of the Institute for Laboratory Animal Research (ILAR) of The National Academies in the US. This plan will serve to guide the development of a web-based resource for the international community to coordinate efforts in the breeding, use, characterisation and conservation of NHPs.

Dr Bayne stated that the ad hoc Group believed that the issue of sourcing of nonhuman primates (e.g., F2 generation) in Chapter 7.8 should be modified in accordance with the IPP, once completed. Dr Vallat supported this statement.

Dr Bayne then commented on the OIE/ILAR/IACLAM joint Article on Veterinary Training and indicated it would be published in the ILAR online Journal in September 2011. She also mentioned the on-going work of the ad hoc Group on Veterinary Education and the document on Day 1 competencies. Dr Bayne emphasized the need to include basic knowledge on the role, importance and welfare of animals used in research and education, as well as to include Chapter 7.8 in the PVS Tool.

Dr Vallat stated that, in the basic core curriculum for veterinarians, there is a competition between different topics and that many of them required further specialisation. He also mentioned that the ad hoc Group could propose to include sensitisation to the subject of laboratory animal medicine in the core curriculum.

In addition, Dr MacArthur Clark pointed out that chapter 7.8 could provide that basic core, as well as an introduction to ethical considerations.
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On another topic, Dr Demers mentioned the Eighth World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences, to be held in Montréal on 21-25 August 2011. He advised that a presentation on the Role of the OIE will be given by Dr Kurosawa. Dr Demers also mentioned the WC9 that will be held in Prague in 2014 and indicated that the OIE will be asked to participate.

Dr Vallat acknowledged the information provided and thanked Dr Demers for his contributions.

Dr MacArthur Clark then commented on the status of the possible application by ILAR to be an OIE Collaborating Centre (CC), mentioning that, along with Dr Bayne, she would continue developing the proposal with ILAR.

Dr Vallat pointed out the new OIE Policy adopted in May during the General Session limits the number of CC within a region, to avoid contradictions and duplications, but he also remarked that this policy refers to a particular topic. He recommended that this new policy be carefully considered, when defining the scope of the application.

Regarding animal welfare in other areas, Prof Souilem mentioned the 3S concept that is being used for farm animals. 3S means “supprimer, soulager, substituer” in French and eliminate (suffering), relieve (pain), and replace (animals) in English.

Dr Kurosawa then referred to the Animal Welfare Focal Point Seminar that will be held in Tokyo in early December 2011 and commented on his interest to be involved in the workshop. Dr Vallat asked the secretariat to note this for the planning and took the opportunity to invite Dr Kurosawa to the new OIE Regional Office’s inauguration at the University of Tokyo in September the 10th 2011.

To close the round table, Dr White summarised the discussion and work done by the ad hoc Group on the Transport and Model Health Certificate for animals used in research and education. Dr Vallat supported this work and appreciated the commitment of the attendees and thanked them for their hard work.

Finally, Dr Bayvel thanked Dr Vallat for his ongoing support for the work of the ad hoc Group.

1. Feedback from the Chair on the Report of the Fourth Meeting of the OIE ad hoc Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare

Dr Bayvel reviewed the report of the Fourth Meeting of the OIE ad hoc Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare and noted that some specifics issues discussed with Dr Vallat have not been addressed. It was decided to provide a document about raising OIE Delegates’ awareness on Laboratory animal welfare issues and encouraging them to liaise with competent authorities where the Veterinary Services are not responsible for the legislation covering the use of animals in research and teaching. He also mentioned that Dr Barry O’Neil received the OIE Gold Medal during the last General Session.

Dr Bayvel noted the importance of providing training to OIE Focal Points and mentioned the commitment of the EC in providing funding to support these initiatives. He explained that Focal Point seminars are programmed every two years in each region and mentioned that he attended the Focal Point Seminar in AFEO region that was held in Bangkok in April 2010.

Dr Varas mentioned that Focal Points are nominated by the Delegate and, as of today, there are Focal Points nominated in eight topics: animal disease notification, wildlife, veterinary products, food safety, aquatic animals, animal welfare and communication.

Dr Bayvel mentioned the first Coordination Group meeting of the Regional Animal Welfare Strategy (RAWS) for Asia, Far East and Oceania (AFEO) that was held in April 2011 and indicated the second meeting would take place in Tokyo in November 2011. It was agreed to recommend the OIE to invite Dr Kurosawa as a speaker for that Seminar. He also added that this Regional Strategy has served as a model for other OIE regions.
Dr Bayvel indicated the dates for the Third Global Conference on Animal Welfare, which is programmed for 5-9 November 2012 in Malaysia. He mentioned a Concept Note would be prepared and that the finalised programme should be completed by November 2011.

Regarding the World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences, Dr Demers confirmed its ninth meeting will be held in Prague in 2014. OIE’s involvement would be defined after the 8th Congress later this year.

As requested by AHG Members, Dr Varas explained that the conduct of an evaluation of Veterinary Services (VS) using the OIE PVS Tool is the basis for OIE Member countries to follow the OIE PVS Pathway, a global programme for strengthening VS compliance with OIE quality standards in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code - Chapters 3.1. and 3.2.).

2. Feedback from the Chair on the Report of the Tenth Meeting of the Animal Welfare Working Group and update from the 78th General Session

The ad hoc Group acknowledged the report of the tenth Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG) meeting.

Dr Bayvel noted that a teleconference meeting with the Animal Welfare Collaborating Centres (CCs) was held, and listed the attendees at that meeting. He mentioned that this experience would be repeated, if possible, at the next AWWG meeting to be held at OIE Headquarters in June 2012. Dr Bayvel also provided details of AWWG Membership and Industry observers. He emphasized the international representation of the group.

Dr Bayvel updated the group regarding the on-going literature review on the relation between Animal Welfare and Food Safety that has been done by Dr A. Small from the NZ-AUS CC (CSIRO) at the request of the OIE.

Dr Bayvel then mentioned the new OIE policy for Reference Centres (comprising OIE Reference Laboratories and OIE Collaborating Centres) and explained that the AWWG will provide a document to the OIE Council meeting in September on the need to address the full range of animal welfare subject areas.

Continuing with the AWWG report, Dr Bayvel mentioned that the draft new chapter on Broiler Chicken Production Systems was not adopted at the General Session and that the AWWG had agreed to draft a set of general principles on animal welfare and livestock production systems. This work will be done by an AWWG subcommittee, led by Professor Fraser.

The ad hoc Group supported the idea of providing some general principles on animal welfare and livestock production systems. Dr Bayne also indicated that the AVMA website included guidelines for broilers.

Dr Bayvel commented on two further OIE work areas: 1. Disaster Management and 2. Working Animals; and confirmed that this work will draw on related FAO e-consultations.

3. Review of Code Commission and Member comments on Chapter 7.8: Use of Animals in Research and Education

The ad hoc Group discussed and responded to comments provided by Switzerland and Member States of the European Union and modified the text that had been reviewed by the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (Code Commission) at its February meeting.

The ad hoc Group also noted that the AWWG had made no specific comments and had supported the text.
The ad hoc Group determined to revise the statement in Item 1 by deleting the word “generally,” but not inserting the word “strongly” so that the statement would read: “The use of wild caught nonhuman primates is discouraged…” With regard to the proposed language that “only purpose-bred animals should be used in line with the ultimate goal of shifting towards the use of second or higher generation purpose bred (F2+) animals”, the group was of the opinion that such a statement is premature in the light of the planned International Primate Plan (IPP) being led by ILAR and funded, in part, by the EC through EUPRIM Net.

The IPP will address the following issues:

1. current absence of a global overview and prioritisation of nonhuman primate resources; 2. poor sharing of information regarding the care and use of primates; and 3. issues surrounding the transport, welfare and conservation of nonhuman primates (NHP).

The IPP will provide a detailed characterisation of NHPs (behaviours, genetics, health profile, etc.), establish a sustainable international informatics network, and describe guidelines for the appropriate care and use of NHP. The ad hoc Group therefore felt that changes to the Chapter regarding the issue of F2 primates would be premature at this time and would be better informed by the results of the objective analysis that will be conducted by the international panel that will draft the IPP. Therefore, the ad hoc Group decided to defer modifying this portion of the Chapter with the recommendation that this topic be reconsidered in the future, subsequent to the publication of the IPP.

The ad hoc Group agreed with the EU position that the word ‘minimum’ should be deleted. The ad hoc Group supported the view of the Code Commission that the number of animals should always be minimised compatible with achieving the scientific outcome and the principles of the Three Rs. However, inclusion of the word minimum here would not achieve that objective (e.g., if a suitable alternative became available it may be that no animals should be used and this would be less than the minimum quoted) and would also place no limit on the maximum number of animals which may be used. The intention of this section in the Chapter is simply to establish an estimate of the number of animals that might be used and to ensure this is considered in the project proposal review.

Regarding acidification of drinking water, one Member requested to indicate a pH ≤ 2.4, but the ad hoc Group considers that it even if this level produces bacteriostatic conditions, is not necessarily bacteriocidal or virucidal. Since mineral acids have little buffering capacity they are rapidly neutralized by animal saliva causing a rise in pH and loss of effectiveness. Autoclaving is but one of many possible water treatments that can produce bacterial and viral free water. Other processes used singly or in combination include but are not limited to ozonation, UV light, reverse osmosis, chlorination/ halogenation and ultrafiltration. These methods are generally more adaptable to large volume treatment than autoclaving and can be used to maintain axenic and define flora animals. The proposed statement does not take into account alternative water treatments and does not consider the context of application. It is therefore not recommended for inclusion.

Chapter 7.8, including proposed text changes by the ad hoc Group, is at Appendix IV.

[Note: this annex has been replaced by Annex X to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 13–22 September 2011.]

4. Model veterinary certificate for international trade in laboratory animals

Transport of animals used in research and education was discussed, taking as a basis the IATA/OIE Discussion Paper available on the OIE internet site at: (http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Animal_Welfare/docs/pdf/Others/IATA/ENG_IATA_paper_2009.pdf). The ad hoc Group decided to work on a Model veterinary certificate for animals used in research and education, based on Terrestrial Code Article 5.10.2. Given the specific nature of the international trade in animals for use in research, the ad hoc Group considered that the development of a more specific model certificate was warranted.
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Dr White mentioned that an electronic format Model veterinary certificate for research animals would allow for the possibility of documents to be sent by the consignor for review by the border post authority prior to shipment. This would thus catch errors that might halt or delay shipment and importation. It would also help to resolve disputes in wording concerning importing country required assurance statements that are required to be included on the certificate before the animals enter into carriage. Of course pre-review of the certificate would not imply pre-approval of the shipment, or waiving of the right to refuse entry of the shipment, based upon the condition of the animals on arrival nor would it preclude attaching paper copies of the electronic certificate to the shipment if required. He added that an electronic MHC could allow access by multiple parties that have a legitimate need for it (Shipper/forwarder, consignee, border post personnel, and carriers) avoiding shipping document transposition errors, resolving issues associated with loss of paper copies of certificates during shipping, and for carriers being able to pre-plan availability for special temperature controlled space on aircraft or vehicles. The use of an identifying certificate number would assist this access and is already an OIE recommendation. This would allow retrieval and printing of the certificate if needed or to fill out other required documents (e.g., TRACES).

Dr White also stated that a Model veterinary certificate for research animals would facilitate trade and help to safeguard animal welfare as it would contain specific information on microbiological classification of the animals, could indicate needs for care during transport (if required as a result of adverse events/ or delays) as well as Border Post Officials that may need to utilise special precautions to maintain the animals’ microbial status as part of the inspection process. It would also assist carriers in verifying that the appropriate shipping container to meet animal needs and correct labelling had been used. Dr White suggested that the following attestations could be provided in a Model veterinary certificate: 1) a statement of clinical fitness to travel - either as a stand-alone item or as a guidance note on the certificate - indicating that endorsement of fitness to travel at the time of issuance would be a consequence of signing the certificate; 2) description of special veterinary needs or provisions to travel, if needed, at the time of issuance of the certificate; 3) a microbiological health classification. It was agreed to draft a Model veterinary certificate for submission to the Code Commission (see Appendix V).

[Note: this annex has been replaced by Annex XI to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 13–22 September 2011.]

The ad hoc Group also developed a Discussion paper on “Electronic veterinary certificates for the transport of research animals” as a means to promote the welfare of research animals during transportation, specifically by preventing errors in paper documentation, and associated problems and delays (see Appendix VI).

5. Update on the on-going work

- Article on Veterinary Training in Laboratory Animal Medicine (authored in collaboration with ILAR & IACLAM)

Dr Bayne mentioned that the Article will be published in the ILAR online journal of September 2011. Prof Souilem asked to include a paragraph on the difficulties faced by developing countries. It was agreed to finalise the document by the end of July.

Dr Bayvel commented that this was intended to be a World Veterinary Year Initiative and that it would be valuable to use the OIE/IACLAM/ILAR networks to promote it.

- Article on Air transport of laboratory animals

The Article was updated and finalised for its submission to the Code Commission at its meeting in September and can be found in Appendix VII.

[Note: this annex has been replaced by Annex X to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 13–22 September 2011.]
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- **Regulatory Testing and the adoption of alternatives to animal use**

  Dr MacArthur Clark commented on the meeting held in April with Drs Joubert, Erlacher-Vindel, Munstermann and Varas, and outlined the role of VICH. She indicated which countries are involved in this organisation and explained OIE’s concern related to a broader view that would include all 178 Members and focus on harmonization of opportunities amongst all OIE Members.

  The ad hoc Group acknowledged one Member’s comment on the Guiding Principle of the Discussion Paper on “Animals used in regulatory testing”. To address this comment, it was agreed to add two new paragraphs to the Discussion Paper under the heading “Discussion” (Appendix VIII).

- **Relationship of OIE with ILAR**

  Dr MacArthur Clark provided an update on the status of ILAR’s possible application to be an OIE Collaborating Centre. It was understood that this application would need the support of the USDA and discussions to date were noted.

6. **Other Business**

- **Directive 2010/63/EU on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes**

  Dr MacArthur Clark summarised progress on the transposition of Directive 2010/63/EU in all EU Member States. The text of the Directive had been finalised in September 2010 and entered into force in November 2010. This means all Member States must have completed their transposition into national legislation by November 2012 and implementation must have taken place by 1 January 2013. Failure to do so will incur significant fines.

  In March 2011, the Commission had arranged the first of a series of six monthly meetings of Member State representatives in Brussels. These were intended to support harmonisation of implementation. In addition, a number of Expert Working Groups would be arranged by the Commission to consider specific issues. These were being prioritised with consideration of statistics being given top priority at present. The Statistical Expert Group was meeting in Brussels this week (7th and 8th July) for the second time to agree terminology for statistical collection of data.

  Other topics for which Expert Groups would be established include classification of severity (which relates to retrospective reporting of animal use); content of non-technical summaries and other aspects of transparency/confidentiality; and standards for education and training, including promotion of free movement of personnel across Europe. Work on these topics will need to be well progressed by January 2013. In addition, consideration of the necessary feasibility studies for non-human primate (NHP) supplies will follow and a proposal for the conduct of these studies has already been provided to the Commission by a consortium representing European academia, industry and laboratory animal veterinarians.

  The UK recently launched its public consultation on transposition of the Directive (see: http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/about-us/consultations/transposition-protection-animals/) with a closing date of 5 September 2011. The timetable for legislation following this consultation was very tight but Dr MacArthur Clark was confident it could be achieved. Many EU Member States would be making very significant changes to their current regulations compared to the UK, where current practice already largely reflected the Directive.

- **Eighth World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences (WC8)**

  Dr Demers confirmed that Montréal, Canada and the CCAC will host the Eighth World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences from August 21 to August 25, 2011 (www.wc8.ccac.ca). He mentioned he was given the opportunity to be co-chairing a session on animal use protocol review with participants from all parts of the world. A round table discussion will be held to discuss the importance of training for animal users. A common core component of an animal user training program will be discussed.
A third session will be highlighting the work done by ICLAS on Harmonization of Guidelines, the role played by OIE on animal welfare, and finally the work done by ICLAS to update the 1985 CIOMS Guiding Principles for the use of animals in Biomedical science.

Amongst other topics to be discussed are: Safety Testing, Validation and Risk Assessment. Public Policy, Alternatives and Animal Ethics

All parties involved in animal use for research, teaching and testing should attend this important meeting

- **International Organization for Standardization (ISO)**
  The ad hoc Group noted that the OIE has signed a formal agreement with the ISO.

- **Veterinary education**
  The ad hoc Group noted that the OIE ad hoc Group on Veterinary Education will meet again in early August 2011. The document on Day 1 Competencies was discussed and it was understood that all veterinarians should understand the relation between the animals used in research and the vaccines and drugs that are essential for animal treatment, not to mention medical research.

  It was decided to provide feedback and ensure report exchanges with the ad hoc Group on Veterinary Education

- **Brazil Conference : Feedback from Dr Rivera**
  Dr Rivera commented on the very successful 2010 Congress in Goiania, Brazil. She mentioned that ad hoc Group Members will be invited to the next meeting in 2012, and some to be part of the Scientific Committee.

- **International Society of Camelids Research and Development (ISOCARD)**
  Prof Souilem mentioned the 3rd Conference of the International Society of Camelid Research and Development to be held from 29th January to 1st February 2012 in Muscat, Sultanate of Oman.

- **Institute for Laboratory Animal Research (ILAR) update**
  Dr. Bayne brought the group up to date on the status of the publication and implementation of ILAR’s 8th edition of the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. Two primary organizations that use the Guide in their oversight of animal care and use programs are: 1) the Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare/National Institutes of Health and 2) the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International (AAALAC International). OLAW underwent a 90 day public comment period on their adoption of the Guide (i.e., not on the content of the Guide), and is currently considering the many comments received. Based on the tenor of those comments and the estimated financial impact of some of the new recommendations in the Guide, it is conceivable that OLAW will be obliged to undergo a “rule making” process (i.e., undergo a formal process of seeking public feedback on the actual content of the Guide) which would delay OLAW’s adopting and implementation of the new Guide and result in OLAW continuing to refer to the 1996 Guide in the meantime. In contrast, AAALAC International has conducted an in-depth analysis of the 2011 Guide by its 51-member Council on Accreditation. That review process resulted in the identification of 121 items for particular notice by, or clarification for, AAALAC’s constituents. Subsequently, AAALAC has developed 16 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and six Position Statements which emphasize a performance approach rather than engineering standards. Thus, AAALAC will proceed with implementing the new Guide internationally, independent of OLAW’s timeline.
Annex XXXIV (contd)

- **Council For International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS) Guiding Principles**
  
  Dr Demers reported on recent activities in relation to the ICLAS revision of the 1985 CIOMS International Guiding Principles (Appendix IX).

  Following the Fourth ICLAS meeting on Harmonization held in USA, in 2008 and the Fifth ICLAS Meeting on Harmonization held, Finland (FELASA) on June, 2010, the draft document describing the CIOMS Guiding principles was refined and starting May 2011, this document has been revised through a large consultation with the national and international organizations, scientific societies and interested parties (NIH). The process was a great success and has been completed on 1 July 2011. The ICLAS ad hoc group, which includes Dr. Bayne, will next meet in Geneva during the fall of 2011 to complete the work. The publication of the final CIOMS document is expected for 2012.

  Dr MacArthur Clark mentioned that systematic review is not always undertaken and that lessons learnt are a useful tool.

- **ICLAS General Assembly and the election of a new ICLAS Governing Board 2011-2015**

  Dr Demers mentioned that on 12-13 June 2011, the XV ICLAS General Assembly was held in conjunction with the Third ICLAS East Mediterranean Regional Meeting. This important scientific meeting has been organized in collaboration with the Laboratory Animal Science Association (LASA) Turkey and was held in Istanbul.

  The composition of the new ICLAS Executive Board for the next 4 years is represented by:

  President: Dr Patri Vergara, Spain,

  Vice-President: Dr Naoko Kagiyama, Japan

  Secretary General Dr Harry Rozmiarek, USA

  ICLAS Treasurer Dr Guy Devroey, Belgium

  Dr Demers also mentioned that Prof Souilem was re-elected and that Dr Rivera was elected as a member of the ICLAS Governing Board.

  The ad hoc Group congratulated Drs Souilem and Rivera on these important appointments and also Dr Demers on his outstanding contribution to ICLAS over a period of 11 years.

7. **Emerging/Strategic Issues**

- **Biotechnology research and Globalization of research**
  
  Ad hoc Group members agreed to monitor developments of relevance to OIE and to bring key items to the attention of OIE HQ.

- **Veterinary legislation**

  It was agreed to share the report of the ad hoc Group on Veterinary Legislation, once available, as well as the recommendations of the First OIE Global Conference on Veterinary Legislation, held in Djerba in December 2010.

- **OIE Global Fund**

  Contributions from OIE Member Countries to the World Fund were mentioned, as well as the contribution from the EC which is particularly valuable in supporting OIE Global conferences.
• **OIE PVS Tool**

At the request of *ad hoc* Group Members, Dr Varas explained the PVS Pathway and a copy of the OIE PVS Tool was provided for information. Noting that *Terrestrial Code* Chapters 7.7 and 7.8 are not addressed in the PVS Tool, it was agreed to ask the OIE, through the Terrestrial Code, to include Chapter 7.8 in the PVS Tool Chapter II Technical Authority and Capability, section II.14 Animal Welfare.

8. **Review and finalise report of meeting**

The *ad hoc* Group completed the text for Article 7.8.10 and the discussion papers on veterinary training, electronic veterinary certificate and animal use in regulatory testing.

Dr Bayvel closed the meeting by paying tribute to the quality of the contributions and teamwork shown by *ad hoc* group members during the five meetings held to date. He also made specific mention of the quality of the support provided by OIE HQ staff, over the same period, and the particularly valuable contribution made by Dr White at this particular meeting. He concluded by looking forward to the group continuing to work on a “virtual” basis.

Annex XXXIV (contd)
Meaning of the OIE Ad Hoc Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare

Paris, 5-7 July 2011

List of participants

Members of the Ad Hoc Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Address/Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr David Bayvel (Chair)</td>
<td>Director MAF New Zealand</td>
<td>Dr David Bayvel (Chair) Director Animal Welfare MAF New Zealand Pastoral House 25 The Terrace Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel.: 644-498 0368 Fax: 644-498 9888 <a href="mailto:david.bayvel@maf.govt.nz">david.bayvel@maf.govt.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Kathryn Bayne</td>
<td>Global Director AAALAC International</td>
<td>Dr Kathryn Bayne Global Director AAALAC International 5283 Corporate Drive Suite 203 Frederick, MD 21703 UNITED STATES Tel.: 301.696.9626 Fax: 301.696.9627 <a href="mailto:kbayne@aaalac.org">kbayne@aaalac.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Gilles Demers</td>
<td>President ICLAS</td>
<td>Dr Gilles Demers President ICLAS 365 Maricourt, St-Hilaire QC CANADA J3H 4W1 Tel.: 450.467.4221 Fax: 450.467.6308 <a href="mailto:gdemers@ccac.ca">gdemers@ccac.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Tsutomu Miki Kurosawa</td>
<td>The Institute of Experimental Animal Sciences, Osaka University Medical School 2-2, Yamadaoka, Suita-shi, Osaka JAPAN Tel: 81.6.6879.3170 Fax: 81.6.6879-3171 <a href="mailto:kurosawa@iexas.med.osaka-u.ac.jp">kurosawa@iexas.med.osaka-u.ac.jp</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Christophe Joubert</td>
<td>CEA – BEBA</td>
<td>Dr Christophe Joubert CEA – BEBA 92265 Fontenay aux Roses Cedex FRANCE Tel: 33 – 1- 46 54 84 17 Fax: <a href="mailto:christophe.joubert@cea.fr">christophe.joubert@cea.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Judy Mac Arthur Clark</td>
<td>Chief Inspector Animals Scientific Procedures Inspectorate 4th Floor Seacole, 2 Marsham Street, London SW1P 4DF, UK UNITED KINGDOM Tel: +44 (20) 7035 0751. Mobile: +44 (7500) 089323 or (7961) 255976 <a href="mailto:judy.macarthurclark@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk">judy.macarthurclark@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:judymacarthurclark@gmail.com">judymacarthurclark@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Souilem Ouajdi</td>
<td>National School of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>Prof. Souilem Ouajdi National School of Veterinary Medicine Service of Physiology and Therapeutics 2020 ENMV Sidi Thabet University of Sidi Thabet TUNISIA Tel.: 97087745-9708745 Fax: 71552441-71552444 <a href="mailto:souilem.ouajdi@topnet.tn">souilem.ouajdi@topnet.tn</a> <a href="mailto:labanimal2004@yahoo.fr">labanimal2004@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ekaterina Rivera</td>
<td>Director, Central Laboratory Animal Facility</td>
<td>Dr Ekaterina Rivera Director, Central Laboratory Animal Facility Biological Science Institute Federal University of Goiás Rua R-16 Quadra 14 Lote 09/Itaitiaia Goiania /Goiás CEP 74690410 BRAZIL Tel.: 55 62.3205.1845 Fax: 55 62.3521.1490 <a href="mailto:e.rivera@uol.com.br">e.rivera@uol.com.br</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex XXXIV (contd)

Appendix I (contd)

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Dr Alejandro Thiermann (Apologies)
President of the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission
OIE
12, rue de Prony
75017 Paris
FRANCE
Tel.: 33-(0)1 44 15 18 69
Fax: 33-(0)1 42 67 09 87
a.thiermann@oie.int

Dr William White
Charles River Laboratories
251 Ballardvale Street
Wilmington MA 01887
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
William.White@crl.com

Dr Meriem Touisi (Apologies)
Air France CARGO
General Manager for Official Affairs
Service DZ-CA
12, rue du Tarteret
95704 Roissy CDG Cedex
FRANCE
meriem.touisi@airfrance.fr

OIE HEADQUARTERS

Dr Bernard Vallat
Director General
OIE
12, rue de Prony
75017 Paris
FRANCE
Tel: 33-(0)1 44 15 18 88
Fax: 33-(0)1 42 67 09 87
oie@oie.int

Dr Sarah Kahn
Head
International Trade Department
OIE
s.kahn@oie.int

Dr Mariela Varas
Chargée de mission
International Trade Department
OIE
m.varas@oie.int

Dr Leonardo Vinco
International Trade Department
OIE
l.vinco@oie.int
MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON LABORATORY ANIMAL WELFARE

Paris, 5–7 July 2011

Agenda

Welcome and introduction – Dr David Bayvel

Objectives of the meeting – Dr David Bayvel

1. Comments from the Chair on the Report of the Fourth Meeting of the OIE ad hoc Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare

2. Feedback from the Chair on the report of the Tenth meeting of the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group and 79th OIE General Session

3. Review of Members’ and Code Commission’s comments on Chapter 7.8: Use of Animals in Research and Education

4. Model health certificate for animal transport: in collaboration with Dr. White and Dr. Touisi

5. Update on the on-going work:
   - Article on Veterinary Training in Laboratory Animal Medicine (authored in collaboration with ILAR & IACLAM)
   - Article on Air transport of laboratory animals (Drs White/Touisi)
   - Regulatory Testing and the adoption of alternatives to animal use (Dr Suzanne Munstermann, OIE lead on VICH)
   - Relationship of OIE with ILAR: feedback from meeting with Dr Vallat and consideration of Collaborating Centre in relevant subject

6. Other Business
   - Update on the OIE agreement with ISO
   - Feedback from the World Conference on Veterinary Education
   - Any other business proposed/documents provided
   - PVS
   - “Goiania 2”
   - EC Directive

7. Review and finalise report of meeting
GLOSSARY

3Rs  Replacement, Reduction, and Refinement
AAALAC Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International
AAAVMC American Association of Veterinary Medical Colleges
ACAW American College of Animal Welfare
AFEO Asia, Far East and Oceania
AVMA American Veterinary Medical Association
AWWG Animal Welfare Working Group
BSE Bovine spongiform encephalopathy
CCs OIE Collaborating Centres
CIOMS Council For International Organizations Of Medical Sciences
EC European Commission
ECLAM European College of Laboratory Animal Medicine
EMA European Medicines Agency
FDA Food and Drug Administration
IACLAM International Association of Colleges of Laboratory Animal Medicine
IATA International Air Transport Association
ICH International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirement for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use
ICLAM International Committee for Insurance Medicine
ICLAS International Council for Laboratory Animal Science
IFAH International Federation for Animal Health
ILAR Institute for Laboratory Animal Research
INRA Institut Nationale de la Recherche Agronomique
IPP International Primate Plan
ISO International Organization for Standardization
OLAW Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare
PETA People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
RAWS Regional Animal Welfare Strategy
VICH International Cooperation on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Veterinary Products
DISCUSSION PAPER: ELECTRONIC VETERINARY CERTIFICATES
FOR THE TRANSPORT OF RESEARCH ANIMALS

Purpose

The purpose of this discussion paper is to assist the OIE in encouraging the use of electronic veterinary certificates as a natural progression of the current OIE Model Certificate. The proposal is to use electronic veterinary certificates for the transport of research animals as a pilot for wider adoption. The benefits of this approach will be to promote the welfare of research animals during transportation by reducing the likelihood of errors and impediments associated with hard copy documentation and thereby to maintain progress in advancing human and animal health. At the same time, potential challenges associated with electronic certification will be identified and addressed within this relatively well defined field.

Background

The establishment of the OIE Laboratory Animal Welfare ad hoc Group (LAWAHG) in 2007 provided the foundation for leadership by the OIE in setting standards for the use of animals in research and education. The serious problems currently impacting the domestic and international transport of research animals have been raised during discussions between the LAWAHG and international laboratory animal science organisations such as the International Council for Laboratory Animal Science (ICLAS) and the International Association of Colleges of Laboratory Animal Medicine (IACLMAM) as well as the International Air Transport Association (IATA). This has resulted in a strong recommendation that the OIE should lend its support to addressing this problem.

For a number of reasons, research animals may need to be transported between research institutions as well as from commercial animal breeders to research institutions. Over the last two decades there have been increasing numbers of genetically defined animals (almost exclusively rodents) bred in small colonies in research institutes and universities that have unique genotypes and phenotypes that have been produced through tailored genetic alteration. These colonies increasingly have become a unique resource of research animals, both nationally and internationally, for use in important collaborative international research studies or as small commercial enterprises. Unlike large commercial producers, any given research institution may have relatively small numbers of animals that need to be transported. However, in the aggregate, these can represent a substantial number of journeys and constitute a critically important element in the success of high quality, internationally recognised, research.

A relatively small number of species are routinely used in research with rats, mice, amphibians and fish representing by far the greatest number – about 97% in the UK. Other species, including guinea pigs, gerbils, hamsters, rabbits, cats, dogs, pigs and nonhuman primates (consisting of only a few species) are also essential but used in relatively small numbers. All these species are of critical importance in a broad range of research fields including regulatory testing, particularly the final approval of human medicinal products, and in fundamental biomedical and veterinary research. However, the particular physiological vulnerability and microbiological status of some of these animals leads to the potential for significant impact on their health and welfare if there are avoidable delays on their journey, even if those delays are quite minimal.

A major impediment to the transportation of these animals is associated with errors in the preparing and handling of hard copies of the relevant documentation. The expansion of the use of an electronic system for constructing required documents for national and international transport of animals for research would help to reduce document errors and consequent delays with individual shipments. At the present time, a single shipment of research animals may require as many as 39 separate documents although most journeys require fewer documents.

2 Reference to UK National Statistics 2010 just published.
Discussion

There is clear direction in animal transportation to go paperless. An electronic veterinary certificate for animal shipment would allow paperless transfer of information that would interface with other electronic documents. Furthermore, the use of an electronic system for veterinary certificates would eliminate many errors that result in difficulties in transportation of animals and refusal of carriage. When document errors occur and shipments are delayed, carriers often must absorb the liability for holding the animals under appropriate conditions until the problem can be resolved. This inevitably makes them less inclined to accept animal shipments in the future. Eliminating some of these document-related transportation issues associated with the shipment of research animals is therefore likely to remove some of the pressures to restrict carriage of these animals. An electronic format would allow documents to be sent by the consignor for review by the border post authority prior to shipment. This would thus catch errors that might halt or delay shipment and importation. Of course, it would not imply pre-approval of the shipment, or waiving of the right to refuse entry of the shipment, based upon the condition of the animals on arrival.

Electronic veterinary certificates would further allow for the easy insertion of tailored text to accommodate specific requirements of importing countries. Hence, it would facilitate timely resolution of disputes in wording of the certificates between importing and exporting countries, and this could be achieved prior to shipping. This would avoid potential delays, possibly of several days, during transit. It would also improve relationships with the carriers and custom brokers who have to deal with the consequences of such errors. Electronic certificates would also address the issue of lost documents during transport and would decrease errors in transfer of information to other documents (e.g., air waybill) and databases (e.g., TRACES).

An electronic certificate would allow access by multiple parties (veterinary authority, shipper/forwarder, consignee, border post personnel, and carriers) that have a legitimate need for this information. The use of an identifying certificate number would assist this access and is already an OIE recommendation. This would allow retrieval and printing of the certificate if needed or to fill out other required documents (e.g., TRACES).

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. Given the multiple external pressures impeding the transport of research animals and the critical need for this transport, to support both medical and veterinary research, the OIE should strongly encourage the use of electronic veterinary certificates for the transport of laboratory animals on a pilot basis.

2. The Model Veterinary Certificate for Research Animals should incorporate relevant components of the existing OIE Model Veterinary Certificate for live animals, plus the following elements (Annex 1):
   
   A. Statement of any special medical needs or provisions to travel in order to ensure welfare during carriage
   
   B. Categorisation of the microbial status based upon the IATA classification scheme:

   i. Conventional
   ii. Specific Pathogen Free (SPF):

   a. Conditioned SPF
   b. Barrier Raised SPF

3. Based upon evaluation of this pilot with research animals, the OIE should consider recommending the use of electronic veterinary certification more widely and, if appropriate, undertaking the development of appropriate standards for electronic certification systems.

4. In order to facilitate more general application of electronic veterinary certificates, the OIE should maintain a regularly updated list of countries that accept veterinary certification in electronic format and make this accessible to official veterinarians responsible for completing the certificates.
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5. Going forward, the system could be refined to assist in journey planning (See Article 7.8.10 on Transport) and provide worksheets to guide shippers through required steps and considerations prior to submitting animals for shipment. This, coupled with training, would decrease the error rate in shipments and enhance the welfare of research animals initially, and ultimately of all animals being transported.
DISCUSSION PAPER
OIE AD HOC GROUP ON LABORATORY ANIMAL WELFARE – ANIMAL USED IN REGULATORY TESTING
A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO ENCOURAGING INTERNATIONAL ADOPTION OF SCIENTIFICALLY VALIDATED NON-ANIMAL ALTERNATIVES

Purpose

The purpose of this discussion paper is to assist the OIE Laboratory Animal Welfare ad hoc Group in formulating a possible strategic approach to encouraging and facilitating (at an international level) the replacement of live animal use in regulatory testing, where scientifically validated, non-animal tests exist.

This paper is a revised version of an earlier paper, of 26 July 2009, discussed at LAWAHG 3 and a further revision dated 28 December 2010 following discussion at LAWAHG4. This draft reflects both discussion at those meetings and subsequent discussions on 27 April 2011 involving OIE staff responsible for co-ordination with VICH (Dr Elizabeth Erlacher-Vindel and Dr Susanne Munstermann, OIE-VICH focal point since April 2011). The paper also takes note of recent developments in the subject area, including the outcome of General Session 78.

Background

Laboratory animals are used for regulatory testing to assess the safety, efficacy and/or potential adverse health effects of new chemicals and products such as vaccines, medicines, food additives, pesticides and industrial chemicals. These regulatory tests are required by law in most countries, and companies performing these tests have to comply with the regulatory protocols.

At the May 2010 General Session of the World Assembly of Delegates, OIE members adopted for inclusion in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code, as Chapter 7.8, “The use of animals in Research and Education”. This text is considered to underpin Guiding Principles relevant to the use of animals in regulatory testing detailed in Appendix 1. Likewise, it is considered that relevant OIE definitions are included in existing OIE documents, with the exception of those included in Appendix 2.

The original discussion paper “Issues and options regarding a future international role for the OIE in laboratory animal welfare” identified “facilitating the regulatory acceptance and adoption of internationally-validated, non-animal test methods” as a possible priority area for OIE focus.

As for laboratory animal welfare in general, the unique benefit of OIE involvement was seen to be the scientific and policy credibility provided by an internationally recognised inter-governmental body dedicated to animal health and welfare issues and representing 178 members.

In this same discussion paper, the important role played by VICH and its relationship with the OIE was highlighted. The factors which influenced the establishment of VICH in 1996, under the auspices of the OIE, were emphasised i.e.

- The drive to reduce the number of animals used in regulatory testing of veterinary products by eliminating the need for duplication of tests in each VICH region.

- The International drive to harmonise regulatory standards and minimise their impact on trade.
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Discussion

- Considerable research investment has been made in non-animal test methods over the last two decades, by both the private and public sectors, with a number of significant achievements.

- Validation bodies have been established in both Europe (ECVAM) and North America and the “European Partnership on Alternative Approaches to Animal Testing” is an important component of the EU animal welfare action plan.

- Individual Governments (e.g., Canada in 2001) and NGOs (e.g., RSPCA and UK NC3Rs) have taken a particular interest in this policy area, from both a scientific and regulatory perspective, and the subject continues to be an important programme item at World Congresses on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences.

- Regulatory acceptance, however, continues to be perceived to be hampered by a conservative regulatory approach, with liability and litigation risks considered to be influencing attitudes of regulatory bodies and individual decision matters.

- A number of regulatory bodies have, however, taken a leadership position and confirmed formal policies promoting the use of validated non-animal tests.

- For transnational companies supplying a significant number of international markets, it is important that non-animal tests are acceptable in all markets, if changes to testing requirements are to be introduced.

- Selected relevant developments, since LAWAHG 3, include progress with acceptance of non-animal regulatory tests for shellfish biotoxin testing at EU and international levels – a significant example of success in gaining acceptance of non-animal tests by regulators. Also the EC’s proposal to establish a Reference Laboratory, at European level, to continue the work so far carried out by ECVAM.

- An area in need of further attention as a high priority is the replacement of the LD50 test where this is still used for batch potency and product stability testing of biologicals such as tetanus and diphtheria vaccines and botulimum toxin.

The OIE LAWAHG chair and secretariat has held valuable initial discussions with VICH on this issue in 2008 and 2009 but, to date, has had no contact with the human health equivalent, ICH.

Recommendations

The key decision for the OIE is whether it wishes to take an inter-governmental leadership position in encouraging regulatory acceptance of scientifically-validated, non-animal alternatives utilising its unique relationship with 178 Governments and the VICH.

It is recognised that the significant majority of animals used in regulatory testing are for products destined for human use and therefore under the auspices of ICH. Nevertheless, it is proposed that the preferred strategic approach is to initially work through the existing OIE relationship with VICH (in association with the OIE-VICH focal point) and to consider establishing a similar relationship with ICH in due course depending on progress made with VICH.

It is recommended that:

i) The OIE continues dialogue with VICH through its focal point of contact, and with expert technical advice from the LAWAHG and others, to identify opportunities for both organisations to encourage international regulatory acceptance of scientifically-validated alternative test requirements in relation to veterinary product testing.
ii) The OIE continues dialogue with VICH through its focal point of contact, supported by the LAWAHG and others, to promote the development of harmonised standards for testing veterinary products in countries which are not currently members of VICH (the Outreach Initiative). This can be expected to lead to a reduction in overall animal use (application of the Three Rs) by avoiding unnecessary tests and duplication of tests.

iii) The OIE raises awareness during relevant OIE activities, such as training sessions for Veterinary Products Focal points and other appropriate meetings, about available alternative laboratory test methods for the registration of veterinary products which implement the principles of the Three Rs. Such alternative methods are those that do not require the use of laboratory animals (Replacement), or that use fewer animals for comparable levels of information (Reduction) or, where animals must be used, involve methods that prevent, alleviate or minimise pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm and/or otherwise enhance welfare for the animals used (Refinement).

iv) The LAWAHG provides support to the OIE-VICH focal point to raise the issue of alternatives and implementation of the Three Rs at relevant VICH meetings (including the planned meeting in Tokyo later this year to which representatives of non-VICH countries in each OIE region have been invited) with a view to identifying specific opportunities and agreeing appropriate short and medium term actions and initiatives.

v) Following progress made with VICH, the OIE initiates dialogue with ICH at the appropriate time to identify opportunities for both organisations to encourage international regulatory acceptance of scientifically-validated alternative test requirements in relation to human medical product testing.
INTERNATIONAL GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following Principles should be used by the international scientific community to guide the responsible use of vertebrate animals in scientific and/or educational activities.

1. The advancement of scientific knowledge is important for the improvement of human and animal health and welfare, conserving the environment, and the good of society. Animals serve a vital role in these scientific activities and animal welfare is integral to achieving scientific and educational goals. Decisions regarding the welfare, care, and use of animals should be guided by scientific knowledge and professional judgment, reflect ethical and societal values, and consider the potential benefits and the impact on the well-being of the animals involved.

2. The use of animals for scientific and/or educational purposes is a privilege that carries with it a moral obligation and ethical responsibility for institutions and individuals to ensure the welfare of these animals to the greatest extent possible. This is best achieved in an institution with a culture of care and conscience in which they willingly, deliberately, and consistently act in an ethical, humane and compliant way. Individuals working with animals have an obligation to demonstrate respect for animals, to be responsible and accountable for their decisions and actions pertaining to animal welfare, care and use, and to ensure that the highest standards of scientific integrity prevail.

3. Animals should only be used when necessary and only when their use is scientifically and ethically justified. The tenets of the Three Rs – Replacement, Reduction and Refinement – should be incorporated in the design and conduct of scientific and/or educational activities that involve animals. Scientifically sound results and avoidance of unnecessary duplication of animal-based research are achieved through study and understanding of the scientific literature and proper experimental design. When no alternative methods, such as mathematical models, computer simulation, in vitro biological systems, and other non-animal approaches, are available to replace the use of live animals, the minimum number of animals should be used to achieve the scientific or educational goals, and the animal’s experience of pain and distress should be avoided or minimized. Cost and convenience must not take precedence over these tenets.

4. The animals selected for the research or educational purpose should be suitable for the purpose, of an appropriate species and genetic background, and of a nutritional, microbiological, and general health status to ensure scientific validity and reproducibility. The physiological, immunological, and behavioral characteristics of the animal also should be appropriate to the planned use.

5. The health and welfare of animals should be primary considerations in decisions regarding the program of veterinary medical care, animal production, transportation, husbandry and management, housing, restraint, and final disposition of animals. Measures should be taken to ensure that the animals’ environment and management are appropriate for the species, contribute to the animals’ well-being and do not result in unnecessary use of animals by adversely affecting the scientific or educational outcomes through the introduction of confounding variables.

6. The welfare, care, and use of animals should be under the supervision of a veterinarian, scientist, or other person trained and experienced in the health, welfare, and proper handling and use of the species being maintained or studied. The individual or team responsible for animal care should be involved in the development and maintenance of all aspects of the program. If the program is directed by a scientist, veterinary care should be available as necessary.
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7. Investigators should assume that procedures that would cause pain in human beings cause pain in other animals, unless there is evidence to the contrary. Thus it is a moral imperative to minimize stress, distress, discomfort, and pain in animals, consistent with sound scientific practice. Taking into account the research and educational goals, more than momentary or minimal pain and/or distress in animals should be managed and mitigated with refinement of experimental techniques and/or appropriate sedation, analgesia, anesthesia, and/or non-pharmacological therapies developed in consultation with a qualified veterinarian. Surgical or other painful procedures should not be performed on unanesthetized animals paralyzed by chemical agents.

8. Endpoints and timely interventions should be established for both humane and experimental reasons. Humane endpoints and/or interventions should be established before animal use begins, should be assessed throughout the course of the study, and should be applied as early as possible to avoid, eliminate, or minimize unnecessary and/or unintended pain and/or distress. Animals that would otherwise suffer severe or chronic pain, distress, or discomfort that cannot be relieved and is not part of the experimental design, should be euthanized using a procedure appropriate for the species and condition of the animal.

9. It is the responsibility of the institution to ensure that personnel responsible for the welfare, care, and use of animals are appropriately qualified through relevant training and experience for the procedures they perform. Adequate opportunities should be provided for on-the-job training and continuing education in the humane and responsible treatment of animals.

10. A system of animal use oversight that verifies commitment to these Principles should be implemented in each country, varying from country to country according to cultural, economic, religious, and social factors. This system should include a mechanism for authorization (such as licensing or registering of institutions, scientist, and/or projects) and oversight which may be assessed at the institutional, regional, and/or national level. The oversight framework should encompass both ethical review of animal use as well as considerations related to animal welfare and care. It should promote a risk-benefit analysis for animal use, balancing the benefits derived from the research and/or educational activity with the potential for pain and/or distress experienced by the animal.
The OIE ad hoc Group on beef cattle production systems (the ad hoc Group) met at OIE Headquarters from 8 to 10 June 2011.

Welcome and introduction

Dr Fisher welcomed the participants and thanked them for their attendance. The members of the ad hoc Group and other participants at the meeting are listed at Appendix I. The Agenda was revised and adopted as indicated in Appendix II.

Dr Kahn welcomed the ad hoc Group Members on behalf of Dr Bernard Vallat, and acknowledged the challenge facing the OIE to respond to so many Member comments.

Dr Pelgrim and Dr Varas introduced the relevant outcomes of the 79th General Session, which was held in May 2011. The ad hoc Group noted that Chapter 7.X. on the Welfare on Broiler Chicken Production Systems was not supported for adoption because of a fundamental disagreement between OIE Members in regard to the treatment of animal welfare measurables, with some Members recommending more specificity and some recommending more general approaches.

Dr Fisher mentioned the variability of production systems and the difficulties in making recommendations that would be relevant and applicable to all local specificities in one chapter.

Dr Thiermann confirmed that Members’ comments are sometimes conflicting. He explained the need to have a well-defined scope and objectives, and advised to use a table where this could be useful to summarise existing procedures rather than seeming to recommend particular ones, as done in Article 7.5.8. of Chapter 7.5. on the Slaughter of Animals.

Dr Thiermann advised that the OIE might ask the Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG) to draft a new text, setting out Guiding Principles on animal welfare standards for livestock production systems, which could be proposed to OIE Members for adoption as a first step. Following this, Members could be asked to adopt chapters addressing specific livestock production systems.

Dr Fisher recognized that two types of comment had been provided to the ad hoc Group. On one hand, there were specific comments by OIE Members and one organisation on draft Chapter 7.X. on the Welfare on Beef Cattle Production Systems (Appendix III). On the other hand, there were general comments from the AWWG on the approach to the development of the draft chapter.

[Note: this annex has been replaced by Annex XIII to the report of the meeting of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 13–22 September 2011.]

1. Feedback from the Animal Welfare Working Group and from the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission

The AWWG provided the OIE ad hoc Groups with Guidance on animal welfare standards (Appendix IV) as well as some specific questions for this ad hoc Group to address. It was agreed to take this guidance into account in the revision of the chapter.
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Regarding the request of the AWWG to give guidance on situations with multiple stressors, the ad hoc Group added a paragraph under the section on animal handling to address this.

The AWWG also asked the ad hoc Group to address the issue of caesarean section and dystocia. These topics were addressed in general terms in the sections ‘Genetic Selection’ and ‘Reproductive management’.

The ad hoc Group considered whether it would be possible to provide guidance on the ‘serving capacity test’ and on ‘gait scoring’ to record lameness, with reference to double muscled cattle, but decided that these issues were too specific and that the gait score should not be mentioned in the chapter.

The ad hoc Group added some general recommendations on the marketing of unweaned calves.

The AWWG requested the ad hoc Group to include recommendations on genotypes susceptible to heat stress in international transport. The ad hoc Group noted that recommendations on this subject are found elsewhere in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code).

The AWWG requested the ad hoc Group to include recommendations on humane killing in relation to religious slaughter. The ad hoc Group determined that such a question would potentially involve several Code chapters and therefore referred it back to the AWWG as the more relevant body to consider the question, to assure consistency throughout the Terrestrial Code.

2. Draft Chapter 7.X. on Animal Welfare and Beef Cattle Production Systems

The comments received from many OIE Members and from one organisation on the draft chapter on Animal Welfare and Beef Cattle Production Systems were addressed by the ad hoc Group.

Several comments that proposed a better wording or structure were accepted thereby improving clarity.

One Member considered that the chapter was dominated by considerations relevant to intensive/indoor production systems. The ad hoc Group took note of the comment. However the ad hoc Group stressed that in many occasions animal welfare in these production systems depends more on management, resulting in more guidelines.

One Member commented that articles in this chapter were too long, which complicated the commenting process. The ad hoc Group considered that the layout of this chapter is in line with the other chapters in the Terrestrial Code.

Some comments were provided without a rationale, and therefore, unless clearly providing an improvement, were not accepted.

Article 7.X.2. Scope

To address the comments of several Members, the wording of the scope of the chapter was changed slightly to highlight the fact that veal calf production is not within the scope of this document and to improve the wording. It was noted that veal calf production would be addressed in another chapter. One Member requested to include slaughter in the scope. The ad hoc Group considered that the Terrestrial Code chapters on the slaughter of animals and on the killing of animals for disease control purposes well covered the specifics of humane slaughter and killing.

Article 7.X.3. Commercial beef cattle production systems

Following the comments of several Members, the wording of paragraph 7.X.3. was improved.
Article 7.X.4. Criteria or measurable for the welfare of beef cattle

Several Members questioned the criteria used in the chapter. The ad hoc Group decided to add the descriptions already provided in the report of the first meeting, to address their concern. New scientific references were therefore added to this report to support the updated information.

One Member requested to add ‘stress physiology measures’ to the chapter. The ad hoc Group discussed this point and concluded that these measures are not commonly used in normal production circumstances, in beef cattle production systems, but are more relevant in a research context.

Two Members asked for the deletion of the measurable ‘survivability’. The ad hoc Group agreed that survivability is already addressed in the mortality rate and deleted this measurable.

The ad hoc Group also decide to delete the measurable ‘post mortem pathology’ because this item is already covered by mortality and morbidity rate, and covered in the additional descriptive text included for these measurables.

Article 7.X.5. Recommendations

Many Members commented on the list of measurables given at the end of each article containing recommendations. The ad hoc Group added a paragraph to explain that these lists contain the most relevant outcome-based measurables derived from section 7.X.4. However this list is not exhaustive, and therefore does not exclude the use of other measures where appropriate.

Article 7.X.5.1.a) Biosecurity and disease prevention

Following Members’ comments, the definition of biosecurity was improved.

One Member requested to specifically name wildlife in the list of ‘other animals’. The ad hoc Group considered that this addition was not necessary because “animal” as defined in the glossary of the Terrestrial Code is a mammal, bird or a bee. This definition includes domestic animals as well as wildlife.

Article 7.X.5.1.b) Animal Health Management

Following Members’ and one organisation’s comments the definition of animal health management was improved.

In paragraph 7.X.5.1.b, ‘Animal Health Management’, several Members commented on the prescription and administration of Veterinary Medicines. To address all comments the ad hoc Group considered that vaccinations and other treatments administered to cattle should be undertaken by people skilled in the procedures and on the basis of veterinary or other expert advice.

Many comments were received on the handling of downer cattle. The ad hoc Group added a few paragraphs to address the on-farm handling of downer cattle. Some of these comments relate to transport and here the ad hoc Group made a reference to Article 7.3.7. of the Terrestrial Code.

Article 7.X.5.2.a) Thermal environment

One organisation requested that the chapter specify a ‘thermo-neutrality zone’ for beef cattle. The ad hoc Group discussed this point and concluded that such recommendations could not be made in view of the number of breeds and production systems globally.

Several Members and one organisation commented on the ‘Thermal Heat Index’, some requesting more explanation, others proposing to delete this index because it is not validated in beef cattle production for all breeds and production environments. The ad hoc Group agreed with the latter and therefore removed the thermal heat index.
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Article 7.X.5.2.b) Lighting

One organisation proposed to change ‘sufficient lighting’ to ‘appropriate lighting’. The ad hoc Group considered that the current wording ‘sufficient lighting’ was more accurate.

Article 7.X.5.2.c) Air quality

The ad hoc Group agreed with one Member that there is sufficient scientific basis to recommend that ammonia levels should not exceed 25 ppm in paragraph 7.X.5.2.c. and made this modification.

Article 7.X.5.2.d) Acoustic environment

Following the comments of some Members the title of this paragraph was changed to ‘noise’.

One Member suggested adding a separate article on visual environment. The ad hoc Group agreed that this topic should be addressed and accordingly modified Article 7.X.5.3f) ‘Handling and Inspection’.

Article 7.X.5.2.e) Nutrition

In point 2.e of Article 7.X.5., one Member did not consider straw as an adequate feed/roughage and proposed to delete it. The ad hoc Group did not agree as, in certain circumstances, straw can be used as roughage as part of a diet that also contains other feeds.

One Member proposed to use the body condition score (BCS) in this paragraph. The ad hoc Group agreed and added a recommendation containing the BCS.

Article 7.X.5.2.f) Flooring, bedding, resting surfaces (litter quality)

One Member commented that rubber-coated slats should be preferred over wood or concrete. The ad hoc Group did not agree and considered that there was no scientific evidence that supports such a recommendation.

Several Members commented that the term ankle is not a defined anatomical term. One organisation considered that ankle deep mud is excessive. The ad hoc Group addressed these comments and proposed another wording.

One organisation considered that the use of fully slatted floors should be avoided. The ad hoc Group did not agree and considered that there was insufficient scientific evidence to support such a recommendation.

Article 7.X.5.2.g) Social environment

One organisation and one Member commented that the term ‘buller animal’ needed clarification. The ad hoc Group agreed and changed this wording.

The ad hoc Group agreed with some Members that horned and dehorned cattle should not be kept in the same group where this constitutes a welfare risk and modified the text accordingly.

Article 7.X.5.2.h) Stocking density

The wording in the paragraph was improved following the comments of Members.
Article 7.X.5.2.i) Outdoor areas

This paragraph had been included in an attempt to follow the sequence of the draft chapter on animal welfare in broiler production systems. One organisation recommended specifying that beef cattle should always have access to outdoor areas. Some members proposed to delete the whole paragraph. The ad hoc Group considered that there was not enough scientific evidence to recommend permanent access to outdoor areas and followed the recommendation of Members to delete this paragraph.

Article 7.X.5.2.j) Protection from predators

Addressing some Members’ comments the ad hoc Group changed the wording of this article slightly.

Article 7.X.5.3. Management

To address Members’ comments the ad hoc Group decided to add two paragraphs entitled: ‘reproductive management’ and ‘colostrum’ to this section.

Article 7.X.5.3.a) Genetic selection

In this article only small changes in wording were made. One Member proposed to add ‘fertility’ to the list of traits beneficial to animal health and welfare. The ad hoc Group did not agree. The list in this article focuses on animal welfare. Fertility per se is considered critical for beef cattle production, not for animal welfare.

Article 7.X.5.3.b) Weaning

One organisation recommended to add ‘fence line separation’ and ‘two step weaning’ as preferred weaning strategies. The ad hoc Group decided against this recommendation because globally there are many weaning strategies and little scientific evidence to enable making a recommendation on particular practices as preferred strategies in all production systems.

Article 7.X.5.3.c) Painful husbandry procedures

One organisation requested to recommend anaesthesia and analgesia in all cases when performing painful procedures in animals, as well as the presence or supervision of a veterinarian. The ad hoc Group discussed this proposal at length and came to the conclusion that such a recommendation would be impossible to implement in many parts of the world. However the ad hoc Group added text to convey the importance of using anaesthesia and analgesia for pain relief.

One Member requested to strongly encourage the use of selection of polled cattle. The ad hoc Group agreed and modified the text to address this comment.

Article 7.X.5.3.e i) Castration

A table was added to the chapter to address Members’ comments (also in Appendix V). The rationale for this inclusion as provided by the ad hoc Group is as follows:

Castration is considered an essential husbandry procedure in order to:

1. reduce sexual and aggressive behaviours;
2. minimise risk of physical injury to other animals and handlers;
3. prevent indiscriminate mating when both sexes are mixed in feedlot or at pasture.
Castration is performed on calves because it reduces management problems associated with aggressive and sexual behaviour of bulls. The production of beef from castrated male cattle is still preferred in Ireland, United Kingdom (UK), United States of America (USA), Australia and New Zealand. Castration is a husbandry procedure, which can cause pain and discomfort and if done incorrectly may result in subsequent health problems. In Ireland, use of anaesthesia is required for surgical/Burdizzo castration of cattle over six months of age (Protection of Animals [Amendment] Act 1965 [S.I. 10 of 1965]; Oireachtas, 1965). In contrast, castration of calves without use of anaesthesia must be performed before they reach two months of age in the UK (Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966; DEFRA, 2003). In Ireland and the UK, rubber ring castration (or use of other devices for constricting the flow of blood to the scrotum) without use of anaesthesia can only be performed in calves less than seven days of age (Oireachtas [Ireland], 1965; DEFRA [UK], 2003). Where the administration of anaesthesia is required for castration, the procedure must be performed either by a veterinarian or under veterinary supervision.

Castration of male cattle has been shown to elicit physiological stress by increasing plasma cortisol concentrations, inflammatory reactions, pain associated behaviour, suppression of immune function and a reduction in performance (Robertson, 1966; Robertson et al., 1979; Robertson et al., 1994; Molony et al., 1995; Fisher et al., 1997; Fisher et al., 2001; Murata, 1997; Earley and Crowe, 2002; Pang et al., 2006; 2208; 2009a; 2009b; 2011; Ting et al., 2003a; 2003b; 2004; 2005; 2010; Coetzee et al., 2010). Burdizzo castration has been shown to be less stressful for bull calves of age of 5 to 6 months than surgical castration (Fisher et al., 1997) and when it is correctly applied the method causes the least stress (Robertson et al., 1994; Fisher et al., 1997) and complications compared with surgical or rubber ring castration (Kent et al., 1996; Molony et al., 1995). The routine practice of castration of calves without use of analgesia or anaesthesia should occur before 2 months of age in order to minimise the physiological stress (cortisol), inflammatory reactions (acute-phase proteins, scrotal swelling and surface skin temperature), and by inference the pain associated with Burdizzo castration (Ting et al., 2005; Ting et al., 2010). It is possible that younger two-month-old calves have less well-developed genital organs and the associated nerve types (e.g. A delta versus C-nociceptors), densities, and distribution of these nerves along the scrotum may be different compared with more mature animals. This difference might have given rise to the diminished cortisol response to castration (Ting et al., 2005; 2010). However, this postulate remains to be investigated. Furthermore, it would be interesting to examine whether stimulation of different nerve types during castration would give rise to differences in terms of physiological (cortisol) and behavioural stress responses to castration. Cottrell and Molony (1995) suggested that this phenomenon could be examined by selective denervation of the scrotum to determine the individual contributions of the nerves and to isolate the effects of the pain sensation itself from tissue inflammation.

In all countries where the administration of anaesthesia is required for castration, the procedure must be done either by a veterinarian or under veterinary supervision. Attempts to alleviate the undesirable effects of castration with analgesia have been achieved with varying degrees of success. The use of butorphanol and xylazine failed to alter the blood cortisol response, and reduction in performance of calves following castration (Faulkner et al., 1992) whereas the provision of local anaesthesia was found to be ineffective in diminishing cortisol response beyond the initial 1.5 h after castration of calves (Fisher et al., 1996). The administration of lidocaine local anaesthesia (LA) for castration (Jones, 1997) is a standard procedure employed by veterinary practitioners. However, LA is not effective in reducing the overall stress (cortisol) response associated with castration (Fisher et al., 1997). The use of caudal epidural (i.e. intercoccygeal administration of xylazine) anaesthesia (EPI) has been described by Caulkett et al. (1993) as a suitable method for inducing analgesia for the castration of mature bulls. They reported that adequate sedation was achieved in 97.4% of animals, and good surgical analgesia was achieved in 80.5% of animals, with no animals displaying a poor level of analgesia. Local anaesthetic causes increased scrotal swelling when used in conjunction with Burdizzo castration (Fisher et al., 1997). The degree of analgesia (as defined by the suppressive effect on integrated cortisol response) induced by the epidural anaesthesia was demonstrated to be no better than local anesthetic for castration (Ting et al., 2003b). The duration of anaesthesia following the regional infiltration of lignocaine without an added vasoconstrictive agent is approximately 1 h. Ketoprofen (K), a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID), was reported to be superior to lidocaine local anaesthesia with ketoprofen in suppressing the overall plasma cortisol elevation associated with castration (Earley and Crowe, 2002). Recent studies showed (see Pang et al., 2009a; 2009b) that banding or Burdizzo castration does not induce a general systemic inflammation and does not significantly affect peripheral leukocyte inflammatory cytokine gene expression in 5.5 month old calves. This latest study showed that systemic inflammatory markers are not altered by Burdizzo or banding castration in 5.5 month old calves compared with intact controls (Pang et al., 2011). The findings reported that Banding or Burdizzo castration did not have any major effect on peripheral leukocyte inflammatory cytokine gene expression; Banding castration caused a greater proinflammatory cytokine gene expression reaction than Burdizzo castration and carprofen administration can affect IL-6 gene expression levels in BURD castrated animals (Pang et al., 2011).
All methods of castration caused acute pain irrespective of age, and Burdizzo castration produced the least pain, but the effect was more pronounced in younger calves (Robertson et al., 1994). The acute (first 3 h) and chronic (over 48 days [d]) component of pain produced by four different methods of castration using rubber rings, Burdizzo, surgery, or combined Burdizzo and rubber ring castration was investigated by Molony et al. (1995) in one week-old Ayshire calves. In agreement with the previous study, calves castrated by rubber rings showed significantly greater active behaviours than either by surgical or Burdizzo castration, but the latter two methods produced greater statue standing posture.

Mixed results have been reported for animals castrated at younger ages. King et al. (1991) found no effect of either surgical or Burdizzo castration on the liveweight or daily gain of 76 day-old calves (118 kg) compared with bulls over a three-month period post castration. In contrast, Fenton et al. (1958) found no difference in either surgical, Burdizzo, or banding castration procedures in 7 week-old (47.6 kg) calves in terms of liveweight gain five weeks post castration, but the control calves had greater liveweight gains than castrates. However, the authors (Fenton et al., 1958) reported a significant retardation of growth for the banding group on the 28th day post castration due to chronic pain and sepsis (based on visual assessment and palpation of the scrotum) proximal to the ring. This is supported by the findings of Molony et al. (1995), which showed trends for lower 36-d growth rates in banding, and combined banding plus Burdizzo castrated week-old calves compared with intact, surgical or Burdizzo castrated calves. Surgical castration acutely reduced the ADG during the period from d –1 to 7, but had no effect on dry matter intakes (DMI) until 20 d post castration (Ting et al., 2003a). Ting et al. (2003b) found no difference in DMI between Burdizzo castrates and control bulls during the 36-d of the study. From d –1 to 7, the ADG were reduced in Burdizzo castrates compared with intact bulls, and overall, the ADG from d –1 to 35 was higher in controls than in Burdizzo castrates (Ting et al., 2003b).

Mullen (1964) reported that the effects of surgical versus Burdizzo castration procedure on growth depended on the initial weight of the calves. Calves castrated by either method between 102 to 152 kg body weights did not differ in weight changes over 24 weeks. In contrast, calves surgically castrated between 76 to 102 kg body weights suffered less severe weight loss than by Burdizzo method (Mullen, 1964). However, the comparisons among the effects of different castration methods on growth are contradictory. This may be in part due to the age of the animals employed and the level of performance achieved, taking into account the relative statistical impact of the castration effect on growth and the different stages of growth in these animals. A number of studies have shown that there is no advantage in delaying castration of bulls from birth up to 17 months of age in terms of liveweight, growth rate, or carcass weight at slaughter (Worrell et al., 1987; Bagley et al., 1989; Parrassin et al., 1999; Keane, 1999; Knight et al., 1999a,b).

The age at surgical castration (7 to 17 months) of post-pubertal bulls had no effect on either live-weight or carcass weight when the animals were slaughtered at the same age of 22 months (Keane, 1999). Split castration (one testicle at 6 months and the other at 13 months) had no effect on slaughter or carcass weight at 24 months compared with complete castration at either 6 or 13 months. In older animals, greater than 12-months old, there is no difference between the performance of Banding and Burdizzo castrates during the period 15 to 84 days post-castration (Pang et al. 2006).

**Article 7.X.5.3.e ii) Dehorning (disbudding)**

A table was added to the chapter to address Members’ comments (also in Appendix VI). The rationale for this modification, as provided by the ad hoc Group, is as follows:

Several options are used to prevent horn growth (disbudding) including heat cauterization and chemical cauterization (caustic paste). Heat and chemical cauterization are often the methods of choice for younger calves (2 to 8 weeks of age; when horn buds are 5 to 10 mm long). When horns become longer and a disbudding iron is not effective, they are removed by amputation (dehorning; Weaver, 1986). Hot-iron disbudding is done by applying a device, electric or butane-gas heated to over 600°C, over the horn bud destroying the growing tissue at its base. This method is performed when horn-buds are evident by palpation which usually occurs at an age of 2–8 weeks.
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Hot-iron disbudding causes severe pain-related distress that is demonstrated by significant plasma cortisol rise (Boandl et al., 1989; Morisse et al., 1995; Graf and Senn, 1999; Stilwell et al., 2010) and behavioural changes (Faulkner and Weary, 2000; Stafford et al., 2000; 2003; Stafford and Mellor, 2005; Vickers et al., 2005; Doherty et al., 2007). Local anaesthesia (cornual nerve blocking) has been shown to delay the pain responses for at least 2 h (Graf and Senn, 1999; Vickers et al., 2005; Doherty et al., 2007). All these studies show that applying the hot-iron with no anaesthesia causes pain so that significant physical restraint is necessary to carry out the procedure. In a large survey in the USA, anaesthetics were used by only 12.4% of dairy owners and analgesics by 1.8% (Fulwider et al., 2008).

Currently the legislation concerning dehorning of cattle requires that once calves are over 2 weeks of age dehorning may only be performed in association with local anaesthesia. Dehorning or disbudding of horned cattle is a mandatory requirement in many countries to reduce the risk of injuries to humans or other animals (Marshall, 1977; Vowles, 1976). There is considerable variation both between breeds and within breeds between individuals in the age at which disbudding becomes impossible and amputation (dehorning) becomes the necessary method. Dehorning of older cattle is carried out by various methods and includes: 1) dehorning scoop that consists of two interlocking semicircular blades attached to handles that amputate the horn close to the underlying bone; 2) Guillotine shears; 3) saw – where the horn is cut close to the skull bone using a tenon saw; 4) foetotomy wire – where the horn is cut close to the skull bones by repeated sawing with a foetotomy wire; 5) cryosurgery (Bengtsson et al., 1996) – however this method was unreliable (60% effective at best) and too difficult to implement in practice and has not been published on since.

The cortisol responses of male Friesian calves (5 to 6 months of age) to amputation dehorning by each of the first 4 methods listed were similar, suggesting that the degree of distress and pain caused by the different methods of dehorning are similar (Sylvester et al., 1998a). With scoop dehorning which may cause either shallow or deep impact on the underlying bone and surrounding skin, the depth of the wound did not affect the cortisol response (McMeekan et al., 1997).

When dehorning cattle, lignocaine local anaesthetic (LA) was somewhat effective at reducing cortisol rises and adverse behaviours during cauterery or caustic paste disbudding for a period of 1.5 to 2 h (Morisse et al., 1995; Petrie et al., 1996; Graf and Senn, 1999; Grondahl-Neilsen et al., 1999) in young calves (4–8 weeks). Although it produced no benefit when used in conjunction with xylazine sedative (Vickers et al., 2005) in 1 to 5 week old calves. When ketoprofen (3 mg/kg BW orally in milk 2 h pre, 2 h post and 7 h post dehorning) was used in conjunction with xylazine sedative and lignocaine LA an effective 24 h period of pain alleviation was achieved (Faulkner and Weary, 2000).

In the case of the more severe amputation dehorning (scoop) in older calves, local anaesthesia (Lignocaine or Bupivacaine) was only partially effective at alleviating pain for a period of 2 to 4 hours, respectively (Petrie et al., 1996; Sylvester et al., 1998b; McMeekan et al., 1998a,b). When these two anaesthetic agents were administered sequentially (Lignocaine at –15 min relative to horn amputation, and bupivicaine 2 h post amputation) a 5 h period of pain alleviation was achieved (Sutherland et al., 2002a,b). However, prolonging the local anaesthesia effectively only deferred the rise in cortisol without completely preventing it (McMeekan et al., 1998b; Sutherland et al., 2002a,b). Use of the non-steroidal anti-inflammatory (NSAID), ketoprofen, administered 15 to 20 min before de-horning had little effect on peak cortisol, but ensured a rapid reduction in cortisol to pre-treatment baseline concentrations (McMeekan et al., 1998b). However, when phenylbutazone (a NSAID) was used, it failed to prevent the inflammation-related cortisol response, suggesting that as in other species it is mainly anti-inflammatory rather than analgesic (Chambers et al., 2002). In the calf dehorning model the combined use of pre-emptive ketoprofen and lignocaine together virtually eliminated the cortisol response to dehorning (McMeekan et al., 1998b; Sutherland et al., 2002b). Indeed the behaviour of calves receiving this combined ketoprofen and local anaesthesia was similar to that of controls over the acute and chronic period following dehorning (McMeekan et al., 1999). However where ketoprofen was used in conjunction with longer acting local anaesthetics (bupivacaine; 4h; or lignocaine followed by bupivacaine; 5 h) there was a significant cortisol response once the local anaesthesia wore off (Sutherland et al., 2002b). Similarly the use of ketoprofen in combination with local anaesthesia during scoop amputation dehorning was effective at maintaining low cortisol up to 8 hours post dehorning (Stafford et al., 2003). In the same study Stafford et al. (2003) clearly demonstrated that xylazine sedation, or xylazine sedation with local anaesthesia (lignocaine) were effective at alleviating pain for only 2 or 3 h, respectively. Heat cauterization of the amputation wound in association with local anaesthesia was also very effective (Sutherland, 1998a). Unfortunately there is a complete absence of literature available on other methods of amputation dehorning (foetotomy wire, saw, guillotine crange) and alleviation of the associated pain. Stilwell et al. (2009) reported that caustic paste (Sodium hydroxide) disbudding causes distress for at least 3 h and that local anaesthesia
is effective in controlling pain for the first hour but discomfort returns after the nerve blocking subsides. Sodium hydroxide, which is commonly used for calf disbudding, is a very strong (pH 14) and corrosive alkali. Nerve blocking may not be completely effective after chemical tissue damage due to caustic paste. Regional anaesthesia, together with a non-steroidal-anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID), was shown to reduce plasma cortisol in calves disbudded using caustic paste.

In conclusion, for disbudding (cautery or caustic) of horns in young calves the use of ketoprofen along with local anaesthesia is beneficial; however it needs to be examined both in the presence and absence of local anaesthetic. For horn amputation (scoop) the most effective option of achieving pain relief appears to be lignocaine LA in conjunction with Ketoprofen NSAID (McMeekan et al., 1998b; Stafford et al., 2003). Unfortunately Ketoprofen is one of the more expensive NSAIDs available, and further work is required to determine if any cheaper alternatives are effective. The recommended methods for dehorning of calves are by scoop dehorners, gouging knife or heat cautery, as soon as the horn buds are detectable. The method of choice must be able to remove all horn-growing tissue in one action with minimal damage to adjacent tissues.

Article 7.X.5.3.e iii) Spaying

A table was added to the chapter to address Members’ comments (also in Appendix VII). The rationale for this modification, as provided by the ad hoc Group, is as follows:

Different approaches to spaying of cattle are used. In flank spaying, a small incision is made of all layers of the left paralumbar abdominal wall. The ovaries are manipulated manually and removed with a specially shaped instrument with a concealed cutting surface, or with long-handed spaying scissors. Typically, only the skin is sutured on closure. The ‘Willis’ dropped ovary technique involves a per-rectal manipulation of the spaying tool which is inserted into the abdominal cavity via a small puncture made by the tip of the instrument in the vaginal wall. The spaying tool is a flattened rod with a keyhole shaped opening that conceals a sharp cutting surface. Each ovary is manipulated in turn and severed with the instrument, and then drops into the abdominal cavity and involutes. Less commonly than either the flank or Willis methods, ovaries can be removed by the per-vaginal ‘passage’ method. This involves a more sizeable per-vaginal incision near the cervix to allow manual manipulation of the ovaries which are then removed. To obviate the producer use of spaying, research is aimed at developing non-surgical methods of fertility control in female cattle, particularly using immunocontraceptive approaches. If effective, such methods would result in improved animal welfare compared with surgical spaying.

In studies on spaying, Habermahl (1993) reported that the Willis technique resulted in a post-procedure mortality rate of 0 to 0.26%. The subsequent introduction of the Willis technique to extensive conditions in northern Australia was initially reported to result in a post-procedure mortality rate of 2 to 5%, but some of this was thought due to operator inexperience in the specifics of the technique (Jubb et al., 2003). Later research indicated a post-procedure mortality rate of 1.5% for the Willis technique compared with 2.5% for the flank method (McCosker et al., 2010). This research also indicated that both methods produced behavioural changes indicative of discomfort for a 6-hour observation period following and reduced weight gain over 42 days, but the flank method resulted in greater morbidity. A subsequent study also showed reduced weight gains following spaying by both methods over 21 days, and with similar, increased plasma cortisol concentrations as a measure of the physiological stress response (Petherick et al., 2011). The flank method produced a more prolonged and increased (compared with control animals) inflammatory response as measured by blood concentrations of the acute phase protein haptoglobin (Petherick et al., 2011). There has not been published research specifically examining different approaches for analgesia and anaesthesia for spaying of cattle. However, it is thought that comprehensive pain management, especially for the flank method with its increased inflammatory response, would require a combination of initial local anaesthesia and systemic analgesia such as provided through some non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (Stafford and Mellor, 2009).

Article 7.X.5.3.e v) Identification

A table was added to the chapter to address Members’ comments (also in Appendix VIII). The rationale for this modification, as provided by the ad hoc Group, is as follows:
Many different methods for the identification of beef cattle are used, and this section focuses on the major methods and/or those with a potential impact on animal welfare. Generally, individual identification of beef cattle can permit enhancements of their management and welfare, such as facilitating individual treatment and management, particularly for animals whose health or wellbeing has been assessed to be at risk. For reporting on this section, rather than rewriting an existing review, we refer to a recent FAO report released for consultation purposes, which was co-written by one of the ad hoc groups, and which reviews the different methods of beef cattle identification in considerable detail.

**Article 7.X.5.3.d) Handling and inspection**

Several Members commented on the use of electro immobilisation and requested that the ad hoc Group specifically recommend against its use. The ad hoc Group agreed to include text to the effect that electro immobilisation should not be used.

Following the request of a Member a paragraph was added to this article to address the visual environment.

**Article 7.X.5.3.e) Personnel training**

A Member asked to add text to the effect that documented evidence should be provided to ensure the competence of caretakers. The ad hoc Group did not agree that this was generally necessary.

**Article 7.X.5.3.f) Emergency plans**

Some Members and one organisation commented on this article. The ad hoc Group considered that these comments had already been addressed elsewhere.

**Article 7.X.5.3.g) Location, construction and equipment of farms**

Some Members recommended to discourage the use of husbandry systems which require permanent tethering. The ad hoc Group did not agree to this proposal.

**Article 7.X.5.3.h) On-farm harvesting**

Following Members’ comments, the ad hoc Group decided to delete this article because the item was already covered in section 7 of the Terrestrial Code.

**Article 7.X.5.3.i) Humane killing**

Some comments were received on this article. Comments on sick and non-ambulatory animals were addressed in Article 7.X.5.1.b) ‘Animal Health Management’.

3. **Programme for further work after this meeting**

In relation to the Guidance document, it was agreed to provide the AWWG with some examples of Performance Target measurables.

**Revised list of scientific references**
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GUIDANCE FROM THE ANIMAL WELFARE WORKING GROUP TO AD HOC GROUPS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANIMAL WELFARE STANDARDS

When ‘welfare codes’ were first developed in the 1970s and 1980s, they tended to contain truisms such as, ‘Animals should have adequate space’ and ‘Noise levels should not be excessive’. Although such statements can be useful to identify important variables in the course of providing more specific advice, they do not provide any implementable information or any means of determining whether a given practice or facility is in compliance. In contrast, an OIE animal welfare standard should contain recommendations that can be implemented, and criteria that can be used to tell whether a given practice or facility is in compliance with the standard.

Outcome-based or animal-based criteria should be used where possible because they are generally related most directly to animal welfare, and because they can be applied to a wide range of production systems. Such criteria can be qualitative (all animals should be able to lie down at the same time without lying on top of each other) or quantitative (no more than 1% of animals should be dead on arrival).

In some cases, input-based or resource-based criteria may be possible, for example if welfare is likely to be reduced by a certain factor in a wide range of systems. Again these can be qualitative (no animal should be hoisted while conscious) or quantitative (ammonia level in the air should not exceed 25 ppm).

In other cases, ‘conditional’ criteria can be used. These generally specify what actions should be taken under certain conditions. These can include both qualitative and quantitative elements, as in: (1) If more that 2% of birds arrive at the slaughter plant with broken wings, catching crews should be re-trained to catch birds in ways that are less likely to cause injuries. (2) In months where hot weather is expected, stocking density should be reduced so that birds have enough space to perform wing-stretching unimpeded.

For certain variables, it is possible to identify ‘critical levels’ beyond which welfare is expected to be affected. Such levels are normally determined by scientific research. For example, welfare in many species is noticeably affected if ammonia levels in the air exceed 25 ppm.

For other variables (percent lame, percent dead during transport) there are no critical levels but it may be possible to set or recommend ‘performance targets’. In the case of performance targets, an ad hoc committee may be able to agree that a certain level of performance should be achieved broadly, for example, that no more than 3% of animals should fall while being moved in a slaughter facility. In other cases, there may be so much variation between breeds or locations that a standard merely identifies variables that should be used to assess performance, and calls for national or breed-specific targets to be set. In such cases it is helpful to provide examples of performance targets from other standards that are broadly applicable under different conditions.

June 25, 2010
## Castration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Specific method</th>
<th>Key animal welfare requirements</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burdizzo method</td>
<td>This procedure requires the male calf to be restrained as the Burdizzo device is placed on the scrotum above the testicles and is closed to crush and disrupt the spermatic cord. Each spermatic cord is crushed separately. This action severs the blood supply to the testicles causing them to degenerate.</td>
<td>High level of operator competency, competent operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>This method shuts off the blood supply to the testicle and causes the testicle to be reabsorbed if properly done (bloodless and no open wound). The Burdizzo procedure requires certain skill to use properly and may result in only partial castration depending on competency of the operator. Post-castration discomfort or pain from the use of the Burdizzo is comparable with other castration methods. Cannot visually confirm if procedure has been successful. A veterinarian should be consulted on how to control pain during such procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber ring method</td>
<td>Small rubber rings are used for calves less than one month of age (rubber ring castration), and for older calves heavy wall latex bands are used along with a grommet to securely fasten the mechanically tightened bands at the appropriate tension. After several weeks, the testicles and scrotum degenerate and slough from the body.</td>
<td>High level of operator competency, competent operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>Post-castration discomfort may be prolonged by this method compared with other castration methods. A veterinarian should be consulted on how to control pain during such procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banding method</td>
<td>A fast, easy and effective non-surgical method of castrating large animals.</td>
<td>High level of operator competency, competent operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>Post-castration discomfort may be prolonged by this method compared with other castration methods. High tetanus risk. A veterinarian should be consulted on how to control pain during such procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Castration (contd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Specific method</th>
<th>Key animal welfare requirements</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Surgical method            | Removal of the testicles using sharp cutting instruments and emasculators involves opening the scrotum and removing the testicles by severing them from the spermatic cords. | High level of operator competency, competent operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; accuracy. | Risk of haemorrhage is greater after surgical castration.  
Post-castration discomfort is normally not as long as it is when elastrators are used.  
Potential complications associated with castration include haemorrhage, excessive swelling or oedema, infection, poor wound healing, and failure.  
A veterinarian should be consulted on how to control pain during such procedures. |
| Chemical castration        | Chemical castration includes injection of sclerosing or toxic agents (e.g. 88% lactic acid) into the testicular parenchyma to cause irreparable damage and loss of function. | High level of operator competency, competent operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; accuracy. | Studies have reported that 25% of the chemically castrated calves had scrotal necrosis caused by the high pressure of injection and drug leakage from the testes.  
A veterinarian should be consulted on how to control pain during such procedures. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Specific method</th>
<th>Key animal welfare requirements</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disbudding (thermo-cautery)</td>
<td>Hot-iron disbudding is performed by applying the hot-iron device, electric or butane-gas heated to over 600°C, over the horn bud destroying the growing tissue at its base. This method is performed when horn-buds are evident by palpation which usually occurs at an age of 2–8 weeks.</td>
<td>High level of operator competency, competent operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>The different methods of horn removal can be ranked on the basis of the acute stress (cortisol) and behavioural responses and the production effects. Methods that elicit less struggling during the procedure and lower overall distress responses are preferred. A veterinarian should be consulted on how to control pain during such procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caustic paste</td>
<td>Paste disbudding is caused by the chemical burn of underlying tissue. The active ingredient used for disbudding is usually sodium hydroxide or calcium hydroxide. These strong alkalis cause liquefactive necrosis, resulting in saponification of fats and denaturation of proteins, which allows deeper penetration of the chemical. With caustic burns, tissue damage continues to increase as long as the active chemical is in contact with the tissue.</td>
<td>High level of operator competency, competent operation, restraint; accuracy. The evidence indicates that caustic paste disbudding causes distress for at least 3 h and that local anaesthesia is efficient in controlling pain for the first hour but discomfort returns after the nerve blocking subsides.</td>
<td>A veterinarian should be consulted on how to control pain during such procedures. Inert lying is a sign of distress in young calves after caustic paste disbudding. Caustic dehorning chemicals should only be used with care. They can spread into the eyes if the skin gets wet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dehorning/disbudding (contd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Specific method</th>
<th>Key animal welfare requirements</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dehorning methods</td>
<td>Dehorning of older cattle is carried out by various methods and includes:</td>
<td>High level of operator competency, competent operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>There is a complete absence of literature available on other methods of amputation dehorning (foetotomy wire, saw, guillotine crange) and alleviation of the associated pain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Scoop dehorning</td>
<td>1. Scoop dehorning consists of two interlocking semicircular blades attached to handles that amputate the horn close to the underlying bone. Scoop dehorning which may cause either shallow or deep impact on the underlying bone and surrounding skin.</td>
<td>The cortisol responses of male Friesian calves (5 to 6 mo of age) to amputation dehorning by each of the first 4 methods listed were similar, suggesting that the degree of distress and pain caused by the different methods of dehorning are similar.</td>
<td>A veterinarian should be consulted on how to control pain during such procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Guillotine shears</td>
<td>2. Guillotine shears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Foetotomy</td>
<td>4. Foetotomy wire – where the horn is cut close to the skull bones by repeated sawing with a foetotomy wire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cryosurgery</td>
<td>5. Cryosurgery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipping of the horn</td>
<td>Removal of the non-sensitive tip of the horn.</td>
<td>High level of operator competency, competent operation, restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>A veterinarian should be consulted on how to control pain during such procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaying</td>
<td>Specific method</td>
<td>Key animal welfare requirements</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovarian removal by flank incision</td>
<td>High level of operator competency, hygienic operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>Produces a longer-lasting inflammatory response than per vagina method. Mortality rates in studies shown as comparable or slightly higher than per vagina method. Administration of local anaesthetic where applied may produce less complications than epidural block for per vagina method. Applicable to different stages of pregnancy, but results in abortion if gestation is less than 4.5 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Willis’ dropped ovary technique (per vagina approach)</td>
<td>High level of operator competency, hygienic operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>Produces a shorter-lasting inflammatory response than flank incision, but a comparable stress and behavioural response. Mortality rates in studies shown as comparable or slightly lower than flank method. Epidural administration of local anaesthetic where applied may produce la greater risk of complications than local or regional block for flank method. Applicable only for non-pregnant, or early pregnancy (&lt; 4 months). Results in abortion if pregnant animal is thus spayed. Greater risk of leaving ovarian tissue intact if operator not fully experienced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovarian removal by vaginal incision</td>
<td>High level of operator competency, hygienic operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>Similar method to Willis technique, but requires larger vaginal incision and manual manipulation removal of the ovaries. Tissue trauma is likely to be greater.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Specific method</th>
<th>Key animal welfare requirements</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ear tagging    | Insertion of ear tag with visible identification marks | Hygienic operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; moderate level of operator competency. | Ear tagging when performed well causes little distress additional to any effects of handling and restraint.  
 Poor equipment or low operator competency can increase the risk of retention failure, requiring animals to undergo additional procedures.  
 Visible ear tags make identification easier from a distance, potentially reducing the need for handling, but the increased tag size can increase the risk of it being caught on fences and other objects, leading to tearing of the ear pinna and tag loss. |
| Tattooing      | Ear tattooing                                       | Hygienic operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; moderate level of operator competency. | Ear tattooing when performed well is permanent and causes little distress additional to any effects of handling and restraint.  
 Because the tattoo can only be read at close quarters, animals may need to be restrained for subsequent identification checks, or the tattoo may be need to be supplemented by an additional form of identification, requiring an additional procedure. |
| Insertion of radio frequency identification device |                        | Hygienic operation and maintenance of equipment; restraint; moderate level of operator competency. | Insertion of radio frequency identification device when performed well causes little distress additional to any effects of handling and restraint.  
 Poor equipment or low operator competency can increase the risk of retention failure, requiring animals to undergo additional procedures.  
 The risk of retention failure is lower in RFID-only tags because they are smaller, but tag reading requires specialized equipment at a short distance (< 1m). |
### Identification (contd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Specific method</th>
<th>Key animal welfare requirements</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ear notching</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hygienic operation and</td>
<td>Ear notching results in a slightly larger area of tissue damage than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance of equipment;</td>
<td>tagging or tattooing and therefore can cause more discomfort or pain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>restraint; moderate to high level of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>operator competency.</td>
<td>Has the advantage of being permanent if applied correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ear notching may be more suitable for herd identification, as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>number of variations available is less than for other identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsequent hair growth or ear trauma can obscure the identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>notch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of infection or parasite infestations (miasis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding</td>
<td>Freeze branding</td>
<td>High level of operator</td>
<td>Thermal injury and subsequent inflammatory response has the potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>competency, hygienic operation</td>
<td>to cause a moderate degree of discomfort and pain, and a good result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and maintenance of equipment;</td>
<td>is highly dependent on operator competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>Freeze branding may be less effective on white or light coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coloured cattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results in a permanent brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>when applied appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires specialized equipment and can be expensive and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>time-consuming than other methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot iron branding</td>
<td>High level of operator</td>
<td>Thermal injury and subsequent inflammatory response caused by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>competency, hygienic operation</td>
<td>heated iron contact has the potential to cause a significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and maintenance of equipment;</td>
<td>degree of discomfort and pain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>restraint; accuracy.</td>
<td>A good identification marking is highly dependent on operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaving the brand in contact with the skin for longer than the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimum time necessary can cause thermal injury to subcutaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>structures and severe tissue trauma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hot-iron branding is permanent, and in some environments may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>currently be the only practical means of individual animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>identification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of infection or parasite infestations (miasis).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON ZOONOTIC PARASITES

Paris, 30 August–1 September 2011

The OIE ad hoc Group on Zoonotic Parasites (the ad hoc Group) met at OIE Headquarters in Paris on 30 August–1 September 2011.

The members of the ad hoc Group and other participants are listed at Annex I. The Agenda adopted is at Annex II.

Dr Sarah Kahn, on behalf of Dr Bernard Vallat, Director General of the OIE, welcomed members to the second meeting of the ad hoc Group. She welcomed two additional members, i.e. Dr Annamaria Bruno, from the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) secretariat, and Dr Etienne Bonbon, European Commission (DG SANCO) and vice-President of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (Code Commission).

Dr Bruno outlined the CAC process for initiating new work and the proposal for new work on the development of guidelines for the control of specific parasites: Trichinella spiralis and Cysticercus bovis, which was approved by the CAC in July 2011. The CAC recommended that the work be risk-based (a risk profile had been developed and a risk assessment was not necessary) and that the work of OIE be monitored to ensure that there is no duplication of work.

A CAC physical Working Group (pWG), established by the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH) met in Ireland on 14–15 July 2011 to develop a first draft document. The pWG recommended broadening the scope of the guidelines to all Trichinella species infecting pigs (Suidae); the document cross-references Chapter 8.13. of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code) (in the section on control measures at farm level) and the OIE Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals (Terrestrial Manual) (in the section on testing). The pWG agreed to wait for the development of the OIE work in trichinellosis with respect to the conditions for official recognition of Trichinella-free herds/compartments and negligible risk for countries in order to cross reference to these provisions and use them as a reference point for developing a risk-based approach to the implementation of post-harvest control measures.

The draft CAC document (CX/FH 11/43/6) has been circulated for comments and will be considered by the 43rd session of the CCFH (meeting to be held in Miami, United States of America, 5–9 December 2011).

Dr Bonbon outlined that trichinellosis is both a public health problem and a trade problem. The EU supports work by both the OIE and the CAC in setting standards to address these problems.
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Dr Bonbon outlined the work of the EU on trichinellosis, including rules on the status of source countries/zones, and rules on trade in meat from susceptible species. He indicated that the EU had adopted a decision and that two countries (Denmark and Belgium) had already been declared as negligible risk for trichinellosis. He noted that the absence of wild boar in Denmark simplifies the epidemiological situation, but foxes had nevertheless to be tested.

**Agenda item 2: addressing Member comments on Chapter 8.13. Trichinellosis**

**General considerations**

The *ad hoc* Group noted the general comments made by Canada, the EU, New Zealand, Norway and the United States of America.

Regarding New Zealand’s recommendation to use the term ‘infestation’ throughout the chapter, Dr Murrell noted that by scientific convention, external parasites are considered to be ‘infestations’, whereas internal parasites such as *Trichinella* are considered to be ‘infections’. Further, infection also applies to metazoan parasites that multiply within the host, which is the case for *Trichinella*. The *ad hoc* Group noted that the term ‘infestation’ is used in the draft Codex document but nonetheless was unanimous in its view that ‘infection’ was the correct term to use.

The *ad hoc* Group accepted the US recommendation to replace ‘farm’ with ‘herd’ throughout the text. In addition, the word ‘equine’ was replaced by ‘equid’ throughout the text.

In response to the comments of New Zealand supporting the use of the antibody ELISA as an alternative to the meat digestion test, the *ad hoc* Group noted the limitations of the serological testing methods currently available and that there is no internationally standardised serological test validated for use at the individual animal level. To monitor *Trichinella* infections in pig herds, the method and/or the antigen production, and/or reference sera will need to be standardized by the international body ISO (International Organization for Standardization). In the *OIE Terrestrial Manual*, the ELISA test is considered appropriate for use in herd surveillance but is not accepted in relation to testing individual pigs. As stated in the *Manual*, there is a critical need for an international bank of reference sera to provide a common standard for *Trichinella* serological assays. Noting that the International Commission on Trichinellosis (ICT) is trying to address this need, the *ad hoc* Group encouraged the OIE to take whatever steps may be possible to support the ICT in this endeavour.

The recommendation of New Zealand was accepted throughout the chapter in relation to surveillance and epidemiological investigation at the herd level but it was not accepted in relation to testing individual animals (e.g. for the importation of pigs into a free country).

In view that the OIE is amending the titles of disease chapters in the *Terrestrial Code* Volume 2, the *ad hoc* Group modified the title of the chapter to ‘Infection with *Trichinella* spp.’ This modification was considered necessary to clarify that species additional to *Trichinella spiralis* are within the scope of the chapter.

In response to a comment from the EU, the *ad hoc* Group noted the *Terrestrial Code* Glossary definition of ‘wild’, and asked the OIE International Trade Department to add ‘and feral’ where needed in the text, to reflect that the recommendations cover both wild and feral pigs and equids.
In response to a comment from Dr Bruno, the ad hoc Group agreed that the OIE text should take full account of the current CAC work on *Trichinella*. The draft text currently contains a reference to the CAC Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat (CAC/RCP 58-2005) that will be modified as appropriate when the CAC work on *Trichinella* is finalised. Noting that the Codex pWG has not to date included horse meat in the scope of its work, whereas the international trade in horse meat is significant and the OIE is addressing trade measures for horse meat, the ad hoc Group recommended that the CAC consider addressing horse meat in its future work. The Group also considered that the issue of meat testing for the purpose of assuring food safety should be the subject of CAC recommendations. Once the CAC document has been adopted an appropriate cross reference on meat testing methods will be included in Chapter 8.13.

The ad hoc Group did not consider that there was an urgent need to develop specific provisions for the use of compartmentalisation, particularly as the revised chapter now includes provisions for country and zone of negligible risk, as well as provisions for free herds.

**Revision of articles**

On Article 8.13.1, in response to the EU comment, the ad hoc Group replaced the word ‘cosmopolitan’ with ‘widely distributed’. The Group also accepted a recommendation from New Zealand and modified Article 8.13.1. accordingly. The spelling of the word ‘inapparent’ was retained as this was considered to be correct. The Group did not agree to incorporate the word ‘normally’ as this modification was not considered necessary (trichinellosis is virtually always clinically inapparent in animals).

With respect to the EU comment on the use of curing to inactivate *Trichinella* in meat, Dr Murrell indicated that the USA Code of Federal Regulations specifies a relevant method for curing meat, which is supported by scientific publications (9CFR318.10 Chapter 3, part 318, Section 318.3.). In addition, Dr Gajadhar noted that the Terrestrial Manual makes reference to the use of curing to inactivate *Trichinella* species.

The ad hoc Group considered the comments of the EU and the USA and made several modifications to the text, including moving all the text that had previously appeared in Article 8.13.2. to Article 8.13.1.

The ad hoc Group noted and accepted a recommendation from New Zealand to include a new article dealing with commodities considered to be safe for trade. This is consistent with the established approach to disease chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*, which normally address ‘safe commodities’ in Article 2. In addition to hides, skins, bristles, semen, embryos, oocytes, milk and milk products, the Group included a reference to ‘swine meat and meat products processed according to the recommendations in CX/FH 11/43/6’. This reference was put in ‘square brackets’ to reflect the fact that the CAC’s work on trichinellosis is ongoing.

The ad hoc Group discussed the comments of the EU, New Zealand, Canada and the USA on Article 8.13.3. and made appropriate modifications to the text.

The ad hoc Group discussed at some length an EU recommendation to make provision for piglets less than five weeks of age to have access to the outdoor environment but did not agree that pigs of this age could safely be exposed to an environment of unknown risk status for *Trichinella* spp. Determination of the risk presented by the external environment depends on knowledge of both the wildlife species present and, importantly, the *Trichinella* species present and their infectivity for pigs.

The ad hoc Group considered the recommendations of the EU, Norway and Canada on the need to establish requirements for declaring a country, zone or compartment as free or as ‘negligible risk’ (the latter term proposed by the EU). Taking as a model the recently revised *Terrestrial Code* Chapter 15.2. (Classical swine fever), the Group developed two new articles, i.e. Article 8.13.4. ‘Determination of the status of *Trichinella* infection in domestic pigs for a country, zone or herd’ and Article 8.13.5. ‘Country or zone with a negligible risk of *Trichinella* infection in domestic pigs’.
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Article 8.13.4. sets out the prerequisites for determining the *Trichinella* infection status of countries, zones and herds. The *ad hoc* Group considered that reporting of *Trichinella* infection in all animals (domestic and wildlife) was a prerequisite requirement in order to establish the status of a country, zone or herd. Wild animals may be infected with a wide range of *Trichinella* spp. However, for domestic pigs, *T. spiralis* is the most significant source of infection. A point dealing with identification and traceability of domestic pigs was included in this Article.

All members agreed that communication between Veterinary Services (VS) and Public Health Agencies (PHA) is needed as part of the system of surveillance for *Trichinella*, as cases of infection in humans are an important indicator of the presence of the infection in domestic pigs. The *ad hoc* Group noted that this point is well covered in the Codex working document. A new point was added to draft Article 8.13.4. to reflect the importance of communication between the VS and PHA.

The recommendation of New Zealand on provisions for the introduction of live pigs was addressed as a new point in both Articles 8.13.5. and 8.13.6.

The *ad hoc* Group carefully considered the proposal of the EU setting out the conditions for countries and zones to be considered ‘negligible risk’ for *Trichinella* spp. The Group agreed with the proposal for all prerequisite conditions to have been in place for at least two years, based on the fact that a period less than two years is insufficient to collect sufficient surveillance information.

There was an extensive discussion on the design of surveillance programmes to support country or zone freedom. The *ad hoc* Group noted two key papers that are relevant to this discussion, i.e., Alban et al., ‘Towards a standardised surveillance for *Trichinella* in the European Union’ (Preventive Veterinary Medicine, Volume 99, Issues 2-4, 1 May 2011, Pages 148–160) and Prattley et al., ‘An Assessment of the *Trichinella* Status of the United Kingdom and Recommendations on Future Surveillance’ (Report to the Food Standards Agency, 20 August 2010).

The *ad hoc* Group did not agree with the EU proposal to establish a numerical value for the sample size and specific confidence level as a basis to determine that a country or zone presents negligible risk. The surveillance strategy and design of the surveillance programme depends on the prevailing epidemiological circumstances in and around the country or zone (which can vary from country to country), and must be planned, selected and implemented accordingly to demonstrate the absence of *Trichinella* in pig populations; the Veterinary Authority in each country must choose the strategy and options for doing this. In the absence of specific scientific studies presented in support of the EU proposal the Group was not of the view that specific sample numbers should be specified. In addition, the Group noted the paper of Prattley et al., which argued for alternative, simpler and less costly, approaches to national surveillance. In this paper, evidence from surveillance of slaughter age pigs, culled breeding pigs, horses and foxes was integrated in a ‘surveillance portfolio’, in order to demonstrate negligible risk of *Trichinella* being present in domestic pigs.

There was some discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of ‘negligible risk’ and ‘country freedom’, including the issue of whether the term ‘negligible risk’ applies to the domestic pig population, the whole country, or the health risks to the human population arising from the animal health status. It was agreed that the term ‘negligible risk’ applies to the domestic pig population.

The *ad hoc* Group also accepted a recommendation from the EU to the effect that if a herd is located in a country or zone of negligible risk, points 2 and 3 in the original Article 8.13.6. do not apply and only one visit needs be made, as recommended by Norway. The Group did not understand the comment made by the USA in respect of ‘testing pigs at points of concentration (i.e. slaughter plants)’, as the text already reflects the current approach to testing, which uses the digestion method on meat samples collected at slaughter houses.
In light of the revision of the first five articles, the *ad hoc* Group restructured Article 8.13.6, and thereby addressed comments from the EU, Canada and New Zealand, excepting that the comment of New Zealand on the use of antibody ELISA was not accepted for the reasons set out above.

Noting that the Codex has not to date included horse meat in the scope of its work and that the OIE is not undertaking any work on the topic of time/temperature parameters to inactivate larvae in horse meat, the *ad hoc* Group deleted the original Article 8.13.10.

In response to the evident interest of Members in guidance on surveillance, a new Article 8.13.11. was developed on surveillance for *Trichinella*.

The revised Chapter 8.13. is presented in Annex III. Due to the extensive modification and restructuring of the previous draft text, the International Trade Department decided to present this text as a clean document (i.e. without track changes), which should be read with the detailed report of the *ad hoc* Group for an explanation of the work done.

[Note: this annex has been replaced by Annex XVII to the report of OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission which was held on 13–22 September 2011.]

**Agenda item 3: address Member comments on Chapter 8.4. Echinococcus/hydatidosis**

Due to lack of time the *ad hoc* Group did not address Member comments on the draft Chapter 8.4. *Echinococcus*/hydatidosis. It was agreed that a meeting would be held, if possible, in December 2011 to carry out this review.

**Agenda item 4: draft a new chapter on porcine cysticercosis**

Due to lack of time, the *ad hoc* Group did not start any new work on porcine cysticercosis. It was agreed that this topic could be addressed at a future meeting.
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Adopted agenda

Welcome

1. Update on relevant Codex work.

2. Consider Member comments on draft Chapter 8.13. Trichinellosis and amend text as appropriate.

3. Consider Member comments on draft Chapter 8.4. Echinococcus/hydatidosis and amend text as appropriate.

4. If time allows, draft a new chapter on porcine cysticercosis, dealing with the management of these pathogens in animals in order to manage risks to human health.

5. Any other business
REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON VETERINARY EDUCATION

Paris, 2–4 August 2011

The meeting of the OIE ad hoc Group on Veterinary Education (the ad hoc Group) was held at the OIE Headquarters in Paris (France) from 2 to 4 of August 2011. A list of participants to the meeting may be found at Annex I and the adopted agenda at Annex II.

Dr Ron DeHaven asked all members to briefly present themselves and to make a short update on their activities relevant to the work of the ad hoc Group for the benefit of all members.

Several members had attended the Second Global Conference on Veterinary Education at Lyon (France) from 13 to 15 May 2011. Drs DeHaven and Timothy Ogilvie both commended the organisation of this conference, which was an excellent event within the overall framework of Vet2011, celebrating 250 years of the veterinary profession.

Dr Tjeerd Jorna presented an overview of the work of the World Veterinary Association (WVA), in the context of Vet2011, including the final event – the WVA Conference, which will be held in Cape Town (South Africa) in October 2011, at which time Dr Jorna will conclude his term as President of the WVA. He commented that the WVA has produced a Policy Paper on Veterinary Education and noted that several other organisations are working on similar statements. Dr Jorna advised that some planning was underway by the WVA for a global conference of veterinary statutory bodies, which would be done in collaboration with the OIE in 2012. He also commented on the WVA planning for a 3rd global conference on veterinary education to be held in 2013 in Asia. This will also be done in collaboration with the OIE.

Dr Alejandro Thiermann, President of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (Code Commission), was invited to the opening discussions in order to provide comments and advice on how strengthen the reference to the importance of veterinary education in the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code), taking into account comments received from Members and Academic institutions. He also suggested that the ad hoc Group re-examine the list day 1 competencies and consider separating essential day 1 competencies from those that could be addressed post-graduation.

Noting that the OIE had received comments from several Members on the subject of the education of veterinarians in aquatic animal health, Dr DeHaven recommended that the Group’s report be provided to both the Code Commission and the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (Aquatic Animals Commission).
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Meeting with Dr Vallat, Director General

Dr Bernard Vallat held a short introductory meeting with the ad hoc Group.

Reflecting on the 79th OIE General Session, Dr Vallat stated that there is a strong consensus on the part of OIE Members to work on improving veterinary education globally. This objective is strongly supported by all countries. The celebration of Vet 2011 has given this work a good momentum, enabling the OIE with its partners, notably WVA, to raise awareness of this important work and secure support of Member Countries and international organisations. The work of the ad hoc Group is key to the OIE global initiative on improving veterinary education.

Dr Vallat noted that the recommendations of the ad hoc Group had been well received by the World Assembly of Delegates in May 2011. He advised that the objective is to have guidelines supported by the World Assembly. It is important to make appropriate reference to this work in the Terrestrial Code but not necessary for the guidelines to be incorporated in the Terrestrial Code. Some Members have expressed concerns about the proposed role of the OIE but it is clear that the OIE has no plan or intention to enforce standards for veterinary education in countries or regions.

Dr Vallat advised members of the ad hoc Group that there are now new and important challenges, such as the topic of aquatic animal health and production. The OIE held a first Global Conference on the contribution of aquatic animal health programmes to global food security in June 2011. Resolutions made at the conference recognised the key role of aquatic animal production to meet the growing global demand for food and that aquatic animal health programmes must be strengthened. Veterinarians are not currently the leading profession in aquatic animal health. This subject should be addressed by the ad hoc Group.

Animal welfare is also an important issue, now and in future. Given the links between animal health and animal welfare, the veterinary profession is well placed to take a leadership role and the OIE is taking steps to encourage a proactive approach to animal welfare by Veterinary Services. Dr Vallat asked the ad hoc Group to ensure that the “Day 1 competencies” document provide a basis for the profession to take a leading role in improving animal welfare.

Dr Vallat informed the ad hoc Group that the OIE, at the request of some Members, is launching an initiative for twinning between veterinary education establishments, based on the successful model established for veterinary laboratory twinning. The Group’s recommendations on day 1 competencies would be a central element in defining the objectives of twinning programmes on veterinary education. Dr Sarah Kahn undertook to provide a progress report on this item at the next meeting of the ad hoc Group.

1. Discussion on the May 2011 General Session

Dr DeHaven drew to the attention of members the discussion on Terrestrial Code Chapters 3.1. and 3.2. at the General Session held in May 2011. He noted that animal welfare has been the subject of discussion, both as to the definitions of ‘animal welfare’ and the appropriate references to include in the Terrestrial Code.

Dr Jorna commented that animal welfare is now addressed in veterinary education to a much greater extent than was previously the case.

Dr DeHaven commented that the subjects to be addressed in the Day 1 competencies should include not only basic knowledge of relevant animal welfare but also the capacity to advocate for humane treatment of animals, whether these are livestock, companion animals, or animals used in veterinary or medical research. The veterinary profession should be a leading advocate for animal welfare.
Dr DeHaven drew members’ attention to the recommendation made by several OIE Members for the Group to address aquatic animal health in the Day 1 competencies. He noted that aquatic animal production would make an increasingly important contribution in future to the production of high quality protein and to food security in developing countries. While it may be beyond the scope of the Group to make specific recommendations on Aquatic Animal Health competencies, at least the topic of aquatic animal health should be mentioned in the Day 1 competencies document.

Dr DeHaven considered that the need for linkages between veterinary education establishments and regulatory veterinary medicine should be more clearly stated in the competencies document, ideally in the Executive Summary.

Dr Ogilvie identified a possible need for inclusion of a glossary of terms. It was agreed that where terms are defined in the Terrestrial Code glossary, the same definitions are used in this document. For terms that are not defined in the Terrestrial Code, the Group may need to develop definitions. The ad hoc Group decided to repeat some definitions for the sake of clarity, as the document should be clear on a ‘stand alone’ basis, for the reader who does not have a good knowledge of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Codes.

Dr DeHaven also noted the comment made by the Delegate for China (People’s Republic) at the General Session and agreed that the ad hoc Group should address the topic of continuing education at this meeting.

The ad hoc Group made several modifications to the text to address the concern expressed by some Members that the OIE had made too many recommendations and/or had included too much detail in its recommendations.

Dr Etienne Bonbon suggested that the recommendations on Day 1 competencies needed to be revised to highlight the distinction between Day 1 basic competencies and advanced competencies. This view was generally agreed.

Dr Sarah Kahn indicated that the main discussion at the General Session, reflecting Members’ concerns, had concerned the proposal to include a reference in the Terrestrial Code [Article 3.2.14. sub-point 2 a (vi)] to the Day 1 competencies elaborated by the ad hoc Group. The OIE’s approach to this work falls within the scope of the OIE PVS Pathway, a global initiative to improve good governance of Veterinary Services. The legal base for the OIE PVS Tool for the Evaluation of Veterinary Services (the OIE PVS Tool) is the Terrestrial Code. Dr Kahn explained that this was the basis for the Code Commission’s proposal to add the reference in the Terrestrial Code to the Day 1 competencies. Resolution 34, which was finally adopted at the General Session, reflected a compromise to provide for continuation of the work of the OIE on Day 1 competencies, leaving the way open for appropriate references to be included in the Terrestrial Code. Dr Sarah Kahn indicated that the OIE would consider the best way to present the Day 1 competencies – perhaps a publication (in the form of a booklet) could be placed on the internet, available for downloading, as a means to help disseminate the information.

Dr DeHaven summarised his view that it is the Group’s job to produce the best document possible, and that the Code Commission, in collaboration with the OIE Headquarters, should decide on the manner of presenting recommendations to National Delegates.

Dr Pierre Lekeux outlined the concerns of many academic staff, as follows: the veterinary graduate of today is under pressure to become competent on a tremendous number of topics. New topics are continually being added to the veterinary curriculum, but no topics are being removed. Day 1 veterinary graduates cannot be experts on all topics. Rather, they should have fundamental skills and knowledge and, importantly, an understanding and capacity to access appropriate and up to date sources of information. Group members generally agreed with this perspective.
The ad hoc Group noted the valuable contributions to this meeting, including the Draft Report of the American Veterinary Medical Colleges (AAVMC) Board ‘Roadmap for Veterinary Medical Education in the 21st Century: Responsive, Collaborative, Flexible’ (draft 31 October 2010) and the document provided by Prof. A.S. Mweene, on behalf of the Deans of veterinary establishments of southern and eastern Africa.

2. Addressing Members comments - Revise document ‘Minimum competencies expected of Day 1 Veterinary Graduates to assure the delivery of high quality national veterinary services

The ad hoc Group worked through the Minimum competencies document (Annex III), modifying it as appropriate to address the written comments submitted by Members. Comments were received from Switzerland, the United States of America and the European Union. The ad hoc Group also considered comments from the Code and Aquatic Animals Commissions, the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group and the ad hoc Group on the Welfare of Laboratory Animals, as well as comments made by Members at the General Session in May.

Distinction between basic and advanced competencies

Definitions were added to clarify the distinction between basic and advanced competencies. Day 1 veterinary graduates should have a mastery of all basic competencies and should have received an introduction to the advanced competencies. Basic competencies comprise general and specific competencies, the latter being directly related to the OIE mandate. For the advanced competencies, veterinary graduates need further education, via on the job training or specific post graduate training courses. The ad hoc Group modified the entire document to make this clear.

The ad hoc Group also included definitions for key terms used in the document, including ‘Day 1 veterinary graduate’ and ‘competencies’, the latter term including ‘basic competencies’ and ‘advanced competencies’. It was agreed that inclusion of a definition of ‘veterinary products’ in the Terrestrial Code Glossary may be valuable.

A sentence was added to the introduction to highlight that, given the expanding scientific knowledge base and demands on the veterinary profession, it is essential that veterinarians be capable of accessing appropriate information sources.

Under ‘Scope’, the ad hoc Group added text to highlight the need for close collaboration between veterinary education establishments, national veterinary services and veterinary statutory bodies to ensure that veterinary education meets the needs of the country and, as appropriate, the region.

The ad hoc Group drafted new text on the importance of aquatic animal production to global food security and the need to ensure that Day 1 veterinarians possess relevant competencies, as appropriate to the importance of the aquaculture sector in the country or region.

The ad hoc Group considered that the need expressed by a Member for greater clarity regarding the role of veterinarians had already been addressed in paragraph 3, which states that veterinarians in the private sector and in government make a contribution towards achieving the goals of the national veterinary services.

The list containing the competencies (i.e. knowledge, skills, attitude and aptitude) was reordered to reflect a more logical sequence.
In response to Members’ comments, the ad hoc Group agreed that the disciplines taught under ‘basic veterinary sciences’ would normally include subjects such as anatomy, physiology, biochemistry and pharmacology. The disciplines taught under clinical veterinary sciences would normally include subjects such as pathology, clinical medicine and surgery. However, the ad hoc Group did not wish to list the relevant disciplines because 1) it would not be possible in the time given to make a complete listing; 2) this could be seen as a prescriptive approach that would not be appropriate to all OIE Members, and 3) it is not the mandate of the Group to advise on the general teaching of veterinarians. Instead, the Group added two sentences, as follows ‘Basic veterinary sciences are normally taught early in the curriculum and are prerequisite to clinical studies’ and ‘clinical veterinary sciences provide the competencies necessary to diagnose, treat and prevent animal diseases.’

The ad hoc Group decided that, according to the definitions proposed, the competencies relating to 1) animal identification and traceability; 2) animal welfare; and 3) food hygiene and safety should be included under ‘specific competencies’, because these subjects are specifically addressed in the OIE Terrestrial and Aquatic Codes. Accordingly, the ad hoc Group modified the ‘general competencies’ so that it covered only three sub-points – i.e. basic veterinary sciences, clinical veterinary sciences, and animal production.

The ad hoc Group also re-ordered the ‘specific competencies’ along more logical lines, as follows:

- epidemiology;
- transboundary animal diseases;
- zoonoses;
- emerging and re-emerging diseases;
- disease prevention and control;
- food hygiene and safety;
- veterinary products;
- animal welfare;
- veterinary legislation and ethics;
- certification procedures;
- communication skills.

The ad hoc Group discussed the issue of selection of undergraduates. Although a topic of major importance, the Group considered that it is beyond its scope to make any recommendations.

Throughout the document, phrases such as ‘as defined by the ad hoc Group’ were removed, to ensure a presentation consistent with OIE recommendations, rather than a record of the discussion of the ad hoc Group. The document was extensively modified, including re-ordering of many points, meaning that it was not feasible to show all modifications in the manner used for Codes texts. Noting that this document is not intended for adoption as a Terrestrial Code text and in light of the technical challenge, the ad hoc Group decided to present the document as a clean text. The Trade Department undertook to keep a record of all text changes, to facilitate any review that may be needed in future.

Critical skills needed by senior level veterinarians in the Veterinary Authority

The ad hoc Group expanded the list of topics and included some additional detail to the document drafted at the December 2010 meeting.

3. Future work

The ad hoc Group had a discussion with Dr A. Thiermann, President of the Code Commission, on the appropriate modifications to be considered to the Terrestrial Code relative to the day 1 competencies. Options discussed included the drafting of a new chapter for the Terrestrial Code or the addition of text to Terrestrial Code Chapter 3.2. Dr Thiermann and the ad hoc Group felt that the day 1 competencies document should not be included in total in the Terrestrial Code but that it could be valuable to include new text capturing the key points of that document. The Group agreed to develop a short text capturing the key points and to provide that to the Code Commission but considered that the decision on placement of this text, and any appropriate modifications to other parts of Chapters 3.1. and 3.2., would be the purview of the Code Commission.
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Next steps will be to consider comments of the Aquatic Animals and Code Commissions (meetings in September and October, respectively), the OIE Animal Production Food Safety Working Group (meeting in November), and OIE Members’ comments submitted to the OIE in the second semester of 2011.

4. Dates for next meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting would take place on 11–13 January 2012. Members agreed to inform the OIE International Trade Department of their availability.
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MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON VETERINARY EDUCATION
Paris, 2–4 August 2011

Adopted agenda

Day 1 (2 August 2011) Morning
- Welcome, adoption of the agenda, and introductory remarks
- Discussion with the OIE Director General
- Revise AHG’s work product: Minimum Competencies Expected of Day 1 Veterinary Graduates to Assure Delivery of High-Quality National Veterinary Services, taking into account comments from the OIE Code Commission, Members, and 79th General Session

Day 1 (2 August 2011) Afternoon
- Complete revisions to Minimum Competencies document
- Begin review and refinement of draft of critical skills needed by senior level veterinarians employed by the Veterinary Authority (“Senior Skills”) developed during the December 2010 AHG meeting

Day 2 (3 August 2011) Morning
- Complete review and refinement of “Senior Skills” document
- Begin review, refinement, and potential combination of the two continuing education (CE) draft documents (“CE Delivery” and “NVS CE for Private Practitioners”) developed during the December 2010 AHG meeting

Day 2 (3 August 2011) Afternoon
- Complete review and refinement of the CE documents
- Discuss and potentially develop recommendations to Code Commission regarding adoption of all AHG work products
  - Any changes to Code language needed?
  - Is a specific recommendation to OIE General Session delegates needed for adoption of Minimum Competencies document and other work products as guidance documents or as components of the PVS tools?

Day 3 (4 August 2011) Morning and Afternoon
- Review work completed during third meeting of the AHG and make any necessary final changes
- Finalize recommendations to the Code Commission
- Discussion of next steps
  - Code Commission to review in September 2011; sent thereafter to OIE Members as annex to the Code Commission Report; potential for Member comment to be considered by the Code Commission in January 2012
  - Need for a fourth meeting to review the Code Commission and OIE Member comments?
- Closing remarks
MINIMUM COMPETENCIES EXPECTED OF DAY 1 VETERINARY GRADUATES TO ASSURE DELIVERY OF HIGH-QUALITY NATIONAL VETERINARY SERVICES

Background

Veterinarians in every nation are responsible for the delivery of National Veterinary Services – that is, services provided under the legislative framework and the auspices of the governmental authority of a given country to implement animal health to assure the health and wellbeing of animals, people and ecosystems. The term “Veterinary Services” refers to the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code (Terrestrial Code) definition, which includes both public and private components of the veterinary profession involved in the promotion of animal and public health as well as animal welfare.

National Veterinary Services should be able to meet standards adopted by each country, but should also be able to comply with appropriate international standards and recommendations, particularly those in the OIE’s Terrestrial Code. In delivering National Veterinary Services, veterinarians serve as an integral partner in the One Health effort – a collaboration of multiple disciplines working locally, nationally, and globally, to address critical challenges and attain optimal health for people, animals and the environment (www.onehealthcommission.org).

Although only some veterinarians will focus their careers on the delivery of National Veterinary Services, all veterinarians, regardless of their professional area of practice after graduation, are responsible for promoting animal health, animal welfare and veterinary public health. Many will frequently act as sub-contractors for National Veterinary Services and in many instances opt for career changes into National Veterinary Services. As such, veterinary education is a cornerstone to assure that the Day 1 veterinary graduate not only has received a level of education and training that ensures sound overall competencies, but also has the required knowledge, skills, attitudes and aptitudes to understand and be able to perform entry-level national veterinary service tasks that relate to the security and promotion of animal and public health. In addition, basic education that includes instruction in the minimum competencies will establish a basis on which those veterinarians seeking national veterinary service careers can build expertise through on-the-job training and quality postgraduate continuing education.

Scope

Taking into account the vast societal, economic, and political differences among OIE Member Countries, including the different existing Veterinary Education Establishments accreditation schemes, this document sets forth the competencies necessary for the Day 1 veterinary graduate to be adequately prepared to participate in National Veterinary Services at the entry-level.

While the minimum competencies outlined in this document are those relevant to the delivery of National Veterinary Services, no attempt is made to dictate in which specific course or during which educational year each competency should be taught. Indeed, it may be that many of the following competencies cross course boundaries and can be integrated across the curriculum in multiple courses. The document does not suggest how many credit hours of educational contact are required to teach each competency, as this might vary depending on the needs and resources of each country. Close collaboration between veterinary education establishments, national veterinary services and veterinary statutory bodies is encouraged in order to ensure the provision of veterinary education appropriate to the needs of each country. Education in the following minimum competencies during the course of each veterinary school’s curriculum will prepare the Day 1 veterinary graduate to promote global veterinary public health and provide an excellent base for advanced training and education for those veterinarians wishing to pursue a career in both public and private components of National Veterinary Services. Given the expanding scientific knowledge base and increasing demands on the veterinary profession, it is essential that graduates be competent in locating, accessing and using appropriate information sources.
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It is important to note that veterinary education includes not only undergraduate education but also postgraduate continuing education and on-the-job training. The authorities should bear in mind the importance of life-long learning to ensure the various competencies of veterinary graduates.

Animal production, in particular the growing sector of aquaculture, is key to satisfy the growing global demand for food. Aquatic animal health programmes need to be strengthened and, to this end, the involvement of veterinarians with competence in aquatic animal health should be promoted and assured. Competencies in this document cover both terrestrial and aquatic animals. However, the aquaculture sector is not of equal importance to all countries. Therefore, veterinary education establishments should address competence in aquatic animal health as appropriate to the importance of the aquaculture sector in the country or region.

Definitions

- Competencies means:
  - Knowledge: cognitive abilities, meaning mental skills
  - Skills: ability to perform specific tasks
  - Attitude: affective abilities, meaning feelings and emotions, and
  - Aptitude: a student’s natural ability, talent, or capacity for learning.

- Basic competencies
  means the minimum knowledge, skills, attitudes and aptitudes required for a veterinarian to be licenced by a Veterinary Statutory Body. This comprises general competencies, as well as specific competencies that directly relate to the OIE mandate.

- Advanced competencies
  means the minimum knowledge, skills, attitudes and aptitudes required for a veterinarian to work within the Veterinary Authority.

- Day 1 veterinary graduate
  means a veterinarian who has just graduated from a Veterinary Education Establishment.

Competencies

The Day 1 veterinary graduate should have basic competencies and should have received an introduction to advanced competencies.

1. Basic competencies

1.1. General competencies

1.1.1. Basic veterinary sciences, which are normally taught early in the curriculum and are prerequisite to clinical studies.

1.1.2. Clinical veterinary sciences, which provide the competencies necessary to diagnose, treat and prevent animal diseases.

1.1.3. Animal production, which includes health management and economics of animal production.
1.2. Specific competencies

1.2.1. Epidemiology

Epidemiology is the study of factors affecting the health and illness of populations, and serves as the foundation and logic of interventions made in the interest of veterinary public health and preventive medicine.

Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.1.1. know and understand the general principles of descriptive epidemiology, its application to disease control and the ability to access and use appropriate information sources;

1.2.1.2. understand and participate appropriately in an epidemiological inquiry in case of occurrence of a reportable disease, including collection, handling, and transport of appropriate specimens or samples.

1.2.2. Transboundary animal diseases

Transboundary animal diseases (TADs) are epizootic diseases that are highly contagious or transmissible and have the potential to spread very rapidly irrespective of national borders. TADs agents may or may not be zoonotic, but regardless of zoonotic potential, the highly contagious nature of these diseases invariably impacts global economy, global trade and global public health. Examples of TADs include highly pathogenic avian influenza, rinderpest, classical swine fever and foot and mouth disease.

Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.2.1. identify the clinical signs, clinical course, transmission potential (including vectors), and pathogens associated with TADs;

1.2.2.2. describe the current global distribution of TADs or know where to find up-to-date distribution information;

1.2.2.3. use or explain the collection and handling of samples and the rationale for the use of appropriate diagnostic and therapeutic tools to prevent and combat TADs and pathogens;

1.2.2.4. understand regulatory implications of TADs and their pathogens (eg, the Official Veterinarian who should be contacted if an TAD pathogen is identified or suspected) and know where to find relevant up-to-date information.

1.2.3. Zoonoses (including food borne diseases)

Zoonoses are diseases or infections that are naturally transmissible from animals or their products to humans. Many food borne pathogens are zoonotic and most emerging human pathogens have an animal (livestock or wildlife) origin. As such, zoonoses have major implications for human health and trade in animals and animal products.
Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.3.1. identify the clinical signs, clinical course, transmission potential, and pathogen associated with common zoonotic and food borne diseases;

1.2.3.2. use or explain the use of current diagnostic and therapeutic tools for common zoonotic and food borne diseases;

1.2.3.3. understand the implications of common zoonotic and food borne diseases for human health (e.g., how does the disease spread from animals to humans) and know where to find up-to-date information;

1.2.3.4. understand regulatory implications (e.g., the Official Veterinarian who should be contacted if a zoonotic pathogen is identified or suspected) of common zoonotic and food borne diseases and pathogens and know where to find up-to-date and reliable information.

1.2.4. Emerging and re-emerging diseases

An emerging disease is a new infection resulting from the evolution or change of an existing pathogenic agent, a known infection spreading to a new geographic area or population, or a previously unrecognized pathogenic agent or disease diagnosed for the first time. A ‘re-emerging disease’ is a resurgence in a defined time period and location, of a disease considered to have been eradicated or controlled in the past. Both emerging and re-emerging diseases have significant impacts on animal (naïve populations) and/or public health.

Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.4.1. define “emerging disease” and “re-emerging disease” and provide contemporary examples;

1.2.4.2. detect suspicious signs and report them to the relevant veterinary authority;

1.2.4.3. understand the reasons or hypotheses to explain the emergence and re-emergence of diseases;

1.2.4.4. know where to find up-to-date and reliable information regarding emerging and re-emerging diseases.

1.2.5. Disease prevention and control programmes

Disease prevention and control programmes, whether or not approved, managed or supervised by the veterinary authority, include movement controls, vaccination and treatment. Disease prevention and control programmes will be specific to each country or region and should comply with applicable OIE standards, as appropriate.
Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.5.1. describe established programs for the prevention and/or control of common zoonotic or contagious diseases or emerging/re-emerging diseases, to include animal identification and traceability and oversight by the relevant veterinary authority;

1.2.5.2. understand and participate in the implementation of contingency plans to control transboundary diseases, including humanely killing animals;

1.2.5.3. understand and participate in regular or emergency vaccination campaigns, as well as in regular test-and-cull/treat programmes;

1.2.5.4. explain the concept of “early detection system,” which is defined as a system, under the control of the veterinary services, for the timely detection and identification of an incursion or emergence of diseases/infections in a country, zone or compartment;

1.2.5.5. know which diseases of animals (including companion animals) require compulsory notification by the veterinarian to the veterinary authority in order to mitigate disease transmission;

1.2.5.6. know where to find up-to-date and reliable information regarding specific disease prevention and control measures, including rapid response mechanisms.

1.2.6. Food hygiene

Food hygiene means all conditions and measures necessary to ensure the safety and suitability of food of animal origin.

Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.6.1. understand and explain on-farm food safety practices;

1.2.6.2. participate in slaughter inspection: this includes ante mortem, post mortem and humane slaughter;

1.2.6.3. understand and explain the integration between animal health controls and veterinary public health: the role of veterinarians in conjunction with physicians, public health practitioners, and risk analysts to ensure safe food.

1.2.7. Veterinary products

‘Veterinary products’ means drugs, insecticides/acaricides, vaccines, and biological products used or presented as suitable for use to prevent, treat, control, or eradicate animal pests or diseases; or to be given to animals to establish a veterinary diagnosis; or to restore, correct or modify organic functions in an animal or group of animals.
Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.7.1. use common veterinary products in the appropriate manner;

1.2.7.2. explain and utilize the concept of drug withdrawal time as a means to prevent drug residues in products of animal origin meant for human consumption, and know how to find up-to-date and reliable information regarding specific withdrawal times;

1.2.7.3. understand common mechanisms leading to development of antimicrobial resistance in common pathogens;

1.2.7.4. know where to find and how to interpret up-to-date and reliable information regarding the link between use of antimicrobials in food animals and development of antimicrobial resistance in pathogens of human importance;

1.2.7.5. know the appropriate use of drugs and biologicals to ensure the safety of the food chain and the environment (e.g., proper disposal of biological waste).

1.2.8. Animal welfare

Animal welfare means how an animal is coping with the conditions in which it lives. An animal is in a good state of welfare if (as indicated by scientific evidence) it is healthy, comfortable, well nourished, safe, able to express innate behaviour, and if it is not suffering from unpleasant states such as pain, fear, and distress. Good animal welfare requires disease prevention and veterinary treatment, appropriate shelter (when relevant), management, nutrition, humane handling, and humane slaughter/killing. Animal welfare refers to the state of the animal; the treatment that an animal receives is covered by other terms such as animal care, animal husbandry, and humane treatment. Veterinarians should be the leading advocates for the welfare of all animals, recognizing the key contribution that animals make to human society through food production, companionship, biomedical research and education.

Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.8.1. explain animal welfare and the related responsibilities of owners, handlers, veterinarians and others responsible for the care of animals;

1.2.8.2. identify animal welfare problems and participate in corrective actions;

1.2.8.3. know where to find up-to-date and reliable information regarding local, national and international animal welfare regulations/standards in order to describe humane methods for:

- animal production;
- transport;
- slaughter for human consumption and killing for disease control purposes.
1.2.9. Veterinary legislation and ethics

Veterinary legislation is an essential element of the national infrastructure that enables veterinary authorities to carry out their key functions, including surveillance, early detection and control of animal diseases and zoonoses, animal production food safety and certification of animals and animal products for export. Furthermore, Veterinary Education Establishments’ should teach ethics and value issues to promote high standards of conduct and maintain the integrity of the profession.

Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.9.1. have a general knowledge of the fundamentals of national veterinary legislation and of specific rules and regulations governing the veterinary profession at the local, provincial, national, and regional level (in some countries this information may be delivered to the graduates by the Veterinary Statutory Body after graduation);

1.2.9.2. know where to find up-to-date and reliable information regarding veterinary legislation and the rules and regulations governing the veterinary profession in his/her own state, province, region and/or country;

1.2.9.3. understand and apply high standards of veterinary medical ethics in carrying out day-to-day duties;

1.2.9.4. provide leadership to society on ethical considerations involved in the use and care of animals by humans.

1.2.10. General certification procedures

Certification means an official document, completed by an authorised veterinarian, for purposes of verifying the health or sanitary status of animals and animal products, respectively, most often prior to transport.

Veterinarians are responsible to certify the health status of an animal or herd in private practice or as an element of official certification.

Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.10.1. examine and monitor an animal or a group of animals with a view to certifying freedom from specified diseases or conditions according to established procedures;

1.2.10.2. fill out, sign and provide health certificates according to the national rules.

1.2.11. Communication skills

Effective communication skills are as important to success in veterinary medicine as are technical skills. In general, communication entails the exchange of information between various individual, institutional and public audiences for purposes of informing, guiding and motivating action. The application of the science and technique of communication involves modulating messages according to situations, objectives and target audiences.
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Specific learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate being able to:

1.2.11.1. communicate technical information in a way that the general public can understand;

1.2.11.2. communicate effectively with fellow health professionals to exchange scientific and technical information and practical experience.

2. **Introduction to advanced competencies**

Mastery of these advanced competencies is not expected of Day 1 veterinary graduates. However, they should have a general awareness and appreciation of the following topics.

2.1. **Organisation of veterinary services**

Veterinary Services means the governmental and non-governmental organisations that implement animal health and welfare measures and other standards and recommendations in the OIE Terrestrial Code and the Aquatic Animal Health Code in the territory. The Veterinary Services are under the overall control and direction of the Veterinary Authority. An objective in the delivery of national veterinary services is to bring a country, territory, or region in line with international standards in terms of legislation, structure, organisation, resources, capacities, and the role of the private sector and paraprofessionals.

Learning objectives include the Day 1 veterinary graduate having a general awareness of and appreciation for:

2.1.1. the delivery of national veterinary services as a global public good;

2.1.2. how veterinary services are organized within his/her own country/region (e.g., central and local levels, epidemiological networks);

2.1.3. the function and authority of the national veterinary service within his/her own country/region;

2.1.4. how his/her country’s national veterinary service agencies interact with veterinary services in other countries and international partners;

2.1.5. the relationship between private and public sector veterinarians in delivery of national veterinary services within his/her own country;

2.1.6. the essential need to evaluate the quality of veterinary services as provided for in the OIE PVS Pathway;

2.1.7. where to find up-to-date and reliable information should deeper knowledge be needed or desired.

Other learning objectives include understanding the following definitions:

2.1.8. **Veterinary Authority:** The governmental authority of a country, territory, or region that comprises veterinarians, other professionals, and paraprofessionals and with the responsibility and competence for ensuring or supervising the implementation of animal health and welfare measures, international veterinary certification, international standards and recommendations such as those in the OIE Terrestrial Code, and other relevant legislation related to animal and public health and animal welfare. The Veterinary Authority typically accredits or approves private-sector organisations, veterinarians, and veterinary paraprofessionals to deliver veterinary service functions.
2.1.9. Veterinary Statutory Body means an autonomous authority (typically at the national level) that regulates veterinarians and veterinary para-professionals.

2.2. Inspection and certification procedures

Inspection means examination and evaluation of animals and animal products by an authorized veterinarian prior to completing a certificate to document the health or sanitary status, respectively. Certification means an official document, completed by an authorised veterinarian, for purposes of verifying the health status of animals and safety of animal products.

Learning objectives include the Day 1 veterinary graduate having a general awareness of and appreciation for:

2.2.1. the processes used to assess the health status of animals and safety of animal products for the purpose of transport / export;

2.2.2. the process of ante and post mortem risk-based inspection of animals, and of the inspection of animal products;

2.2.3. the drafting of health certificates.

2.3. Management of contagious disease

Prevention and control of contagious diseases, whether or not approved, managed or supervised by the veterinary authority, include movement controls, vaccination and treatment. Disease prevention and control programmes will be specific to each country or region and should comply with applicable OIE standards, as appropriate.

Learning objectives include the Day 1 veterinary graduate having a general awareness of and appreciation for:

2.3.1. the management of samples and the use of appropriate diagnostic and therapeutic tools;

2.3.2. tracing the source and spread of a disease;

2.3.3. monitoring and conducting initial surveillance of diseases, to include communication of epidemiological information to other public health practitioners;

2.3.4. the methods to:

- identify and trace animals;
- control movement of animals, animal products, equipment, and people;
- quarantine infected and at-risk premises/areas;
- humanely kill infected or exposed animals;
- dispose of infected carcasses in an appropriate manner;
- disinfect or destroy contaminated materials.
2.4. Food hygiene

Food hygiene means all conditions and measures necessary to ensure the safety and suitability of food of animal origin.

Learning objectives include the Day 1 veterinary graduate having a general awareness of and appreciation for:

2.4.1. the performance of slaughter inspection including ante mortem, post mortem, humane slaughter and hygienic dressing;

2.4.2. residue testing programmes;

2.4.3. the traceability of animal products;

2.4.4. sanitation at food processing plants, proper storage of processed animal products, in-home food storage and preparation safety, and health and cleanliness of all humans involved in the food chain from farm to fork.

2.5. Application of risk analysis

Risk means the likelihood of the occurrence and likely magnitude of the biological and economic consequences of an adverse event or effect to animal or human health. The process of risk analysis involves hazard identification, risk assessment, risk management, and risk communication. The importation of animals and animal products involves a degree of risk to the importing country. Risk analysis as applied to importation provides the importing country with an objective and defensible method of assessing the disease risks associated with the importation of animals, animal products, animal genetic material, feedstuffs, biological products and pathological material using, particularly as a basis, relevant existing OIE standards.

Learning objectives include the Day 1 veterinary graduate having a general awareness of and appreciation for:

2.5.1. how risk analysis can be applied to assessment of animal disease related risks and residues of veterinary drugs, including importation of animals and animal products and other related veterinary services activities;

2.5.2. how risk analysis can be used to ensure veterinary services adequately protect animal and human health;

2.5.3. where to find up-to-date and reliable information should deeper knowledge be needed or desired (e.g. the OIE Handbook on Import Risk Analysis);

2.5.4. the following risk analysis concepts:

- hazard identification: the process of identifying pathogenic agents which could potentially be introduced in the commodity (e.g., food of animal origin);
- risk assessment: evaluation of the likelihood and the biological and economic consequences of entry, establishment, and spread of a hazard within a territory;
risk management: the process of identifying, selecting, and implementing measures that can be applied to reduce the level of risk;

risk communication: the interactive transmission and exchange of information and opinions throughout the risk analysis process concerning risk; risk-related factors; and risk perceptions among risk assessors, risk managers, risk communicators, the general public, and other interested parties (e.g., stakeholders).

2.6. **Research**

Research means testing a hypothesis by appropriately designing and implementing a protocol, analysing the data, drawing conclusions and publishing the results.

Learning objectives include the Day 1 veterinary graduate having a general awareness of and appreciation for how translational and interdisciplinary research is essential to advance veterinary knowledge in the areas relevant to delivery of National Veterinary Services (e.g., zoonoses, transboundary diseases, (re-)emerging diseases, epidemiology, animal welfare, veterinary drugs and biologicals) so that future generations are better equipped to assure the health of animals, the public, and the ecosystem.

2.7. **International trade framework**

The framework on which regulations governing safe international trade in animals and animal products relies on the interaction and cooperation among several organisations as well as on the latest scientific advances so as to improve animal health world-wide and to promote and preserve the safety of the international trade in animals and animal products.

Learning objectives include the Day 1 veterinary graduate having a general awareness of and appreciation for:

2.7.1. the World Trade Organisation (WTO) Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (i.e., SPS Agreement);

2.7.2. the role and responsibilities of the WTO standard setting organisations such as the OIE and the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) in developing science-based current regulations governing international trade in animals and animal products;

2.7.3. current international regulations, that govern the safe trade of animals and animal products;

2.7.4. the potential implications of transboundary diseases, including zoonoses, on international trade, e.g., does presence of a disease in one country potentially impede international trade of the affected animal species and its products, and knowing where to find up-to-date and reliable information regarding these implications. the process leading to certification of commodity quality and wholesomeness as it relates to sanitary matters for export;

2.7.5. the import control mechanisms and certification processes related to protection of the health of animals, the public, and the ecosystem in the importing country.
2.8. Administration and management

Administration can be defined as the universal process of organising people and resources efficiently so as to direct activities toward common goals and objectives, with management comprising planning, organising, staffing, leading or directing, and controlling an organisation or effort for the purpose of accomplishing a goal. In the broadest sense, administration consists of the performance or management of business or organisational operations and, thus, the making or implementing of major decisions, whereas management is the act of getting people together to accomplish desired goals and objectives.

Learning objectives for this competency include the Day 1 veterinary graduate having a general awareness of and appreciation for:

2.8.1. best practices in administration and management;

2.8.2. the importance of excellent interpersonal communication skills, to include self-knowledge and knowledge of others;

2.8.3. the importance of effective communication (public awareness and advocacy);

2.8.4. where to find up-to-date and reliable information should detailed knowledge be needed or desired;

2.8.5. the need to have proficiency in at least one of the official languages of the OIE.
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