

PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF OIE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES ON COMPARTMENTALISATION

Alejandro B. Thiermann

President of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission¹

Original: English

***Summary:** The presentation will discuss the implementation of compartmentalisation, including current biosecurity measures to guarantee the safety of sub-populations and their products, even when notifiable diseases are present in the country or zone.*

The specific criteria and conditions for compartmentalisation are described in the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code.

Compartmentalisation requires a competent and credible Veterinary Service, as well as a strong partnership between the private and public sector.

This approach is being applied particularly in industrialized poultry and pig operations.

While it is a higher demand on the Veterinary Service, it provides assurances to the well developed production sector of continued operation, even when wildlife or artisan operations maybe infected or at risk from infection with notifiable diseases.

While the concept of compartmentalisation has been clearly described through principles and guidelines, and adopted and published in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code, it has been difficult to date to fully implement compartments in the field and to achieve formal recognition of such a concept by trading partners.

The presentation will also describe and analyse the responses received from countries to the questionnaire prepared by the OIE on the current state of implementation of the concept of compartmentalisation within the European Region.

Key words: compartmentalisation – Europe – Terrestrial Animal Health Code – Aquatic Animal Health Code

¹ Dr Alejandro B. Thiermann, Advisor to the Director General, World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), 12 rue de Prony, F-75017 Paris, France

1. Introduction

One of the main objectives of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) has been to develop international standards for the prevention and control of significant animal diseases, including zoonoses; as well as to the facilitation of international trade.

Historically, the main emphasis of these standards has been on the determination of country freedom of disease and on how to regain such freedom, when lost, in order to facilitate trade. A good example of such an approach has been the chapter on foot and mouth disease in the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (hereafter referred to as the *Terrestrial Code*). However, through time we have learned that safe trade is not just limited to countries declared free of relevant diseases. It is also true that at times, emphasis on country freedom created a false sense of security, particularly in cases where a country may have been able to reach such disease freedom, but this was difficult to maintain due to risks from neighbouring infected countries.

Therefore, this rather simplistic approach of focusing strictly on country freedom had to be complemented. The OIE also encourages that this disease freedom concept be considered beyond national borders, and be extended at a regional level. Countries are encouraged to work towards disease eradication at regional level and with an aim at global eradication, whenever possible. As a matter of fact, the most successful disease eradication campaigns today are approached regionally.

2. Compartmentalisation: a new way forward through OIE standards

In addition to disease eradication efforts, the OIE seeks the most updated scientific information in order to develop commodity specific recommendations as part of the overall recommendations in the *Code*. Even, in cases where a disease may be present in a country or zone, the trade of animals and their products may pose no risk if the proper risk mitigating conditions are met.

While the ultimate goal is the global eradication of diseases of importance, the OIE addresses the management of risk at all levels. The recommendation on safe trade must take several factors into account. The status of country is certainly of great importance; however, while total freedom may not always be attainable, the true health status of the country or zone is essential before other safety measures can be considered.

Even if the true health status of a country or zone within that country, cannot be ascertained, and even in cases where it is known that total disease freedom does not exist, risk mitigating measures recommended by the OIE can be applied in order to guarantee that the disease does not occur in a certain animal sub-population and that the commodity to be traded can be rendered safe. Being able to determine and maintain the disease freedom in a sub-population becomes a valuable element in the formula for safe trading.

Nevertheless this OIE approach, based on the safety of specific commodities being traded, as well as on the ability to define and maintain disease free sub-populations through the establishment of zones and compartments should not interfere with the obligations of OIE Members regarding disease notification and implementation of disease prevention and control measures in the entire territory.

Depending on the epidemiology of a disease and in the hosts preference and modes of transmission of the pathogen, it is at times difficult to guarantee the absence of such pathogen from an entire territory. However, it is possible, through adequate biosecurity measures and intense surveillance, to demonstrate the disease freedom in a selected and well isolated sub-population.

Traditionally, countries have separated segments of their animal populations on the basis of geography. Taking advantages of natural ecological borders, they have established zones containing animal sub-populations with a different health status. They have separated these from others by rivers, deserts, mountains, or in other cases, using political borders between provinces or states. The safety of these zones has been guaranteed by strict animal movement control, and intense disease surveillance.

This zoning approach has proven successful in guaranteeing the separation of animal sub-populations with different health status for diseases like foot and mouth disease, bovine brucellosis, bovine tuberculosis, etc. Efficient and credible Veterinary Services with an adequate surveillance system remain the essential elements in the establishment and maintenance of these health conditions.

However, there are diseases and certain situations where zoning alone is not sufficient to guarantee the freedom of disease in a certain animal sub-population. Particularly, in cases, where the disease is present in wildlife, or where the disease is carried by migratory birds, zoning does not always prove to be sufficient to guarantee the status of the sub-population.

In certain situations it is only through strict biosecurity measures that we can manage to separate and preserve the disease freedom in a specific animal sub-population. Historically successful eradication programs for bovine brucellosis and bovine tuberculosis relied heavily on the use of biosecurity measures for the separation of herds. The OIE has further elaborated this biosecurity approach into what today is known as the concept of 'compartmentalisation', which with its principles and guidelines has been incorporated into the *Code*.

Compartmentalisation is the procedure by which animal sub-populations presenting different health statuses can be separated from each other through strict biosecurity measures.

The Veterinary Services of a country wishing to establish compartments within its territory should be able to clearly define the animal sub-population intended to be compartmentalised, as well as provide proof of the required surveillance system and the identification and traceability of live animals, as described in the *Code*.

3. Compartmentalisation: a matter for true partnership

In the specific case of compartmentalisation, for it to be effective and credible, several essential factors need to be taken into account. This concept, above all, requires a strong partnership between the private and public sector, even more so than was required in the case of zoning. In compartmentalisation, it is the industry's responsibilities to manage the application and monitoring the efficacy of biosecurity measures, quality assurance schemes, conducting animal identification and traceability, documenting audits and corrective actions, conducting surveillance within and outside the compartment(s), demonstrate rapid reporting and maintenance of records in a readily accessible form, and in accordance with a strict protocol established jointly with the Veterinary Services.

While the surveillance and testing is conducted primarily by the private sector, the Veterinary Service must audit the certification of movement, conduct periodic inspections of facilities, and verify implementation of biosecurity measures, records and surveillance procedures. The Veterinary Service must also conduct or audit surveillance, reporting and laboratory diagnostic examinations. The final authority for all official certification still rests solely in the hands of the Veterinary Authority.

A series of principles should be applied when establishing a compartment. The factors defining a compartment should be approved by the Veterinary Authority on the basis of relevant criteria identified in the Biosecurity Plan, and should be made public through official channels.

The Biosecurity Plan should describe the details of the partnership between the relevant industry and the Veterinary Authority, including their respective responsibilities. The plan, taking into consideration the epidemiology of the diseases of concern and all related risk factors, it should describe the routine operating procedures to provide clear evidence that the surveillance conducted, the live animal identification and traceability system, and the management practices are adequate to meet the criteria for the compartment.

The animals within a compartment must be identified in such a way that their history can be audited. Depending on the system of production, this identification may be done at a herd, flock, or individual level. Animal movement in and out of the compartment must be well controlled and documented.

The establishment of compartments and the accompanying biosecurity plans should be shared by the Veterinary Authority of the exporting country with interested trading partners to seek their approval prior to agreeing on the certification requirements for that trade. Ideally, these agreements on the soundness of the compartments should be established at a time when there are no disease outbreaks, and should then be respected by the importing country in the event of disease outbreaks outside the compartments. Meeting the obligation of rapid and transparent reporting of any changes in the disease situation in the exporting country should ensure the continuation of trade from the free compartments.

The OIE has developed a set of guidelines for the application of compartmentalisation. These guidelines outline the requirements needed to be identified by the Veterinary Authority in order to demonstrate the separation of a compartment from potential sources of infection.

The guidelines also identify specific surveillance requirements to be conducted inside and outside the compartments. Other important factors include the demonstration of the necessary diagnostic capabilities, the ability for emergency response and rapid notification, and the strict supervision and control of all compartments. The Veterinary Authority must be able to demonstrate that these factors have all been addressed, while also identifying whose responsibility it is to conduct each of the activities.

As a practical tool, the OIE has developed a 'check list' to be used by the Veterinary Service and the industry when first establishing a compartment and developing the biosecurity plan.

4. Practical applications: a new challenge and opportunity for OIE Members

While the concept of compartmentalisation has been clearly described through principles and guidelines, and adopted and published in the Code, it has been difficult to date to fully implement compartments in the field and to achieve formal recognition of such a concept by trading partners.

The difficulty in the official acceptance of compartments relates to several factors. One of them, and possibly the most critical, is the need for a robust and credible partnership between the relevant private sector and the Veterinary Authorities. Never before has the credibility of this partnership been so important, as most of the implementation of biosecurity measures and surveillance and testing are to be conducted by the industry rather than the Veterinary Service. The role of the Veterinary Service has shifted from actual implementers to auditors and certifiers.

The need for trusting relationships is not limited to the public/private partnership at a national level, but is also critical between the Veterinary Authorities of trading partners. The credibility of a competent Veterinary Service is most important, when needing to demonstrate that the Veterinary Service is fully aware and confident of the information provided by the industry, when signing the relevant veterinary certificates. Therefore, the demonstration of reliable and credible veterinary governance is essential.

Currently, several countries are considering the practical implementation of compartments, and some are even establishing compartments among their poultry and/or swine industries.

At the moment, there are several efforts underway to establish compartments within the poultry sector. Some countries are limiting their initial approach to the poultry genetics sector. While it is important to consider the establishment of compartments in all sectors of the industry, this particular sector that has historically been completely isolated and already operating under extreme biosecurity conditions.

More ambitious initiatives are being undertaken by countries with a strong poultry industry and with a robust export market. As a result of the recent avian influenza crisis, these countries, whether been affected, or considering the potential effect of an avian influenza incursion, are implementing a compartment framework for the more industrialised sectors of the poultry industry and with a special attention to avian influenza and Newcastle disease.

The OIE has offered to provide technical assistance to countries in their efforts to implement compartmentalisation. More specifically, the OIE has obtained a grant from the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) to provide technical advice to Thailand and Brazil in the preparation of a grant proposal that would help fund a major pilot project between these governments and their poultry industry.

The OIE envisions that the broad implementation of compartmentalisation beginning with the industrial poultry and pig sectors as well as the acceptance by trading partners, will be the best insurance to the industry, as well as serving as an animal and public health guarantee in case of animal diseases incursions.

With the sound application of these modern procedures, safe trade should be expanded and the production further protected, while significant diseases are being controlled while not always totally eradicated.

5. State of implementation of the 'compartmentalisation' concept in the European region

This situational picture is based on the analysis of responses received from European countries to the questionnaire prepared by the OIE. From 52 Member Countries of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe, the OIE has received answer to the questionnaire from 16 individual countries (non EU¹ Members) and a common answer from the European Commission which consolidated all answers from EU Member Countries, bringing this to a total of 43 responses.

In order to have an updated inventory of the status of implementation efforts within the Europe region of the OIE, Members were asked to respond to several questions.

1 EU: European Union

5.1. Implementation of the concept of 'compartmentalisation'

- The Veterinary Services of 12 non EU member countries (out of 16 = 75%) plus the common answer from the EC (on behalf of all EU member countries) have considered the implementation of compartmentalisation within their territory.
- 6 out of these 12 EU non member countries and all EU member countries have responded affirmatively to having introduced the concept of compartmentalisation in their national legislation.
- Regarding the industries that are being considered by those countries for implementing the concept of compartmentalisation, 9 countries are considering it for poultry, 4 for porcine, 3 for bovine, 2 for equine and 2 for aquaculture. The EU member countries common answer indicates that they are considering poultry as the first candidate, porcine as the second and all other species later. The EU members have also indicated that they are already applying the concept to aquaculture, but that the application of the concept is different than the one in the *Terrestrial Code*.
- From the countries that have not yet considered the implementation of compartments (4), the following industries are willing to be considered: poultry in 4 countries; porcine in 3; bovine in 2 and equine in 1 country.

The specific diseases identified for which the compartmentalisation concept is being applied are the following:

- Highly pathogenic avian influenza, in 7 non EU countries and in EU countries;
- Newcastle disease, in 5 non EU countries and in EU countries;
- Other diseases currently considered by few countries are: foot and mouth disease, African swine fever, salmonellosis, brucellosis, tuberculosis, equine influenza, equine infectious arteritis, Gumboro, and rinderpest.

Regarding the main objective identified by countries for the implementation of compartmentalisation (even in those countries that have not yet implemented compartments but would do it) is as follows:

- Only 'market access' for 4 non EU members and for EU members;
- Only 'prevention and control of diseases' for only 1 non EU member country;
- Both ('market access' and 'prevention and control of diseases') for 10 non EU member countries.
- EU member countries have identified market access as their main objective for the implementation of compartmentalisation.

Regarding the identification of the stage of implementation of the process, countries responded differently, and some provided more than one answer:

- 5 non EU member countries have not started with the process of implementation yet;
- 1 non EU member country is in the early consultation with stakeholders;
- 3 non EU member countries are in the early faces of the implementation;
- 2 non EU member countries are developing a bio-security plan with the industry;
- 4 non EU member countries are implementing compartmentalisation within at least one industry sector;
- Some EU members have responded as being in the early stages of consultation with stakeholders; while few have developed a biosecurity plan with the industry and are ready for its implementation; but at the EC level the stage is currently in the early phases of the implementation;

- Some countries have expressed that they are not considering the implementation of compartmentalisation for the following reasons:
 - 4 non EU member countries for lack of infrastructure or economic resources;
 - 4 non EU member countries for legislation problems;
 - 1 non EU member country for lack of awareness of the concept, at both the official level and the private sector;
 - 1 non EU member country for lack of commercial incentives or export opportunities;
 - 1 non EU member country for lack of private sector capacities;
 - 2 non EU member countries for small size of its territory.

Lack of cooperation between the official and private sector or lack of public sector capacities were not identified by any country as limiting factors in the implementation of compartmentalisation.

Evaluation of Veterinary Services with the OIE-PVS Tool

Rationale: The OIE-PVS evaluation allows assessing compliance of Veterinary Services with OIE international standards on quality. Appropriate implementation of Compartmentalisation can be only achieved with good governance of Veterinary Services, including a close cooperation between public and private sector.

On the evaluation of the Veterinary Service using the PVS tool, the following countries responded as having been evaluated or having requested the PVS evaluation by the OIE: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Turkey, and Ukraine. Rumania is the only EU member country that has been evaluated with the PVS. Georgia and Israel have expressed their interest in having the PVS evaluation, through the questionnaire, although they have not yet requested the PVS evaluation officially from the OIE.

5.2. Relationship between public and private sectors

- Just 2, out of 16, non EU member countries have responded as having legal agreements or contracts with the private sector allowing them to perform specific duties related to compartmentalisation;
- 10 countries (out of 16) EU non member countries have expressed that they do not have such agreements and 4 EU non member countries, as well as EU members consider doing it soon.

Those countries that have agreement and those who would have one, have delegated (or would delegate), the following activities to the private sector, under the control of the Veterinary Authority:

- 6 EU non member countries, the implementation of the Biosecurity plan;
- 4 non EU member countries, the Epidemiosurveillance;
- 4 non EU member countries, the Disease Diagnostics;
- The EU indicated that it would delegate to the private sector the implementation of the biosecurity plan, and partly the Epidemiosurveillance and the Disease Diagnostics.

5.3. Definition of the compartment

5.3.1. Elements to be considered in a compartment

Table 1 gives the components of the production system which are, or would be included by non EU member countries within a compartment, followed by the number of countries which are considering each component.

Table 1.– Components to be considered in a compartment and number of countries considering each component

For poultry production	Hatcheries	10
	Reproduction farm	10
	Fattening farm	8
	Feed mills	2
	Vehicles	3
	Services suppliers	3
	Slaughterhouses	4
For pig production	Reproduction farm	4
	Fattening farm	4
	Feed mills	1
	Vehicles	1
	Services suppliers	1
	Slaughterhouses	2
	Semen production	2
For bovine production	Reproduction farm	5
	Fattening farm	3
	Feed mills	1
	Vehicles	2
	Services suppliers	2
	Slaughterhouses	3
	Semen and embryo production	1
For other species	Equines: Semen production	1
	Aquaculture: Hatcheries and smolt production	1

- Serbia and Kazakhstan would include all components in all species.
- The EU expressed that a compartment should eventually include all the components mentioned above, but this would depend on the disease, its epidemiology, the risk factors and the details of the biosecurity plan.

These figures show clearly that the idea (and implementation) of compartments it is (would be) broader referred to intensive productions, and currently more focused in components related to reproduction.

5.3.2. How does the existing compartment meet the OIE definition?

The following are individual country statements expressing how they would comply with the OIE definition when establishing compartments:

- Through the implementation of biosecurity measures, surveillance, and control of diseases;
- Currently a partial compliance;
- Through demonstration and preservation of sanitary status and biosecurity measures;
- Meeting OIE definition, identifying the need to include definition in the OIE *Aquatic Animal Health Code*;
- Through disease control and biosecurity measures.

The EU definition will meet the OIE definition.

5.3.3. Existence of documentation of factors critical to the compartment

Just 7, out of 16 non EU member countries have a database for registering some, but not all relevant compartment related activities. The EU members have a database for registering all relevant information.

The following is a list of statements made by countries on the information, related to compartments which would be registered:

- Address of the farms;
- Description of production system;
- Persons responsible;
- Main functional links between different components of the compartment;
- All relevant information that should / could be recorded;
- Animal identification and movements; sanitary events; exportations; veterinary measures; alert systems; traceability of samples;
- Name, address, type and object of activities;
- All commercial poultry holdings are registered.

5.4. Biosecurity

5.4.1. Elements of the biosecurity plan that define and underscore the functional boundary of the compartment

- 9 non EU member countries have indicated of having (or intention to have) physical separation for the compartments, but none of them have clearly described or mentioned the elements of an integrated biosecurity plan, including the implementation of risk assessment. The measures identified by countries are as follows:
 - Veterinary and sanitary rules, legal requirements for the premises and territories included within the compartments. Fencing and disinfection measures;
 - Disinfection and isolation measures.
 - Production flows and processes.
 - Access control.
 - Incoming material control and processing;
 - Specific facilities and requirements for introduction of animals (isolation facilities), material and personnel;
 - Provision of showers and vestuaries;
 - Hygiene rules for personnel;
 - Strict restriction of entrance of people to the premises;
 - deratisation and disinfection of premises;
 - Identification of sources of animals (either import or self-production);
 - Physical isolation, construction characteristics and maintenance of buildings;
 - Separation and isolation of feed store and veterinary products;
 - Prohibition for staff to keep the same animal species;
 - Special animal health programmes;
 - Closed production system for pigs (fattening and slaughtering within the same establishment);
 - Closed production system for hatcheries (egg production and packaging within the same establishment (?));
 - Facilities and procedures for controlling access of machinery, vehicles and equipment (including washing and disinfection);
 - Storage and disposal of carcasses and waste;
 - Ventilation of premises with net frames;
 - Big industrialised poultry farm implement HACCP plan.

- The EU Member countries indicated that all steps mentioned in the rationale for physical separation and the biosecurity plan should be covered, taking into account the disease concerned, and the 7 steps of the HACCP plan.
- Just 5 of the 16 non EU member countries indicated that they have conducted a risk assessment for the compartments.
- From these countries, two countries up-date their risk assessments every six months, two do it annually, and the other one does not indicate to update such a risk assessment.
- EU member states do not report having done risk assessment of the compartments except for a few member states which have pilot projects, without specific frequency so far.

5.4.2. Response of Member Countries as to how identification and traceability is being addressed

- 10 out of the 16 non EU member countries have indicated some, not very well described procedures related to the animal identification and traceability system of:
 - Legislation for movements of animals, including issuing of a veterinary certificate, and also subject to compulsory veterinary and sanitary controls and surveillance;
 - All animal movements into and out of the compartment should be certified by the Veterinary Authority and recorded at the compartment level;
- 1 non EU member country reported that an individual identification and registration system for pigs is planned for 2009-2010;
- 1 non EU member country indicated that there are already procedures in place which are easily adaptable to compartments;
- 1 non EU member country indicated that for bovines there is a full traceability; for ovine and porcine there is an identification and registration, with individual tags; and for poultry a registration of holdings; they also plan the introduction of movement control for small ruminants and porcines;
- 1 non EU member country indicated that for big poultry enterprises there is identification by compartments, age group, product source, and the animal movements are well documented;
- 1 non EU member country indicated that all animals, except for poultry, are subject to individual records entered in the registration book, within the townships or rural administration districts. Each animal is identified with an ear tag or with a chip containing an individual code which is registered in the registration book. In case of the animal movements, the individual animal identification is noted in the veterinary certificate, thus given sufficient assurance of the animal's traceability;
- The EU indicated that the Veterinary Authority will only verify movements between approved compartments but will not certify them. It is the responsibility of the compartment manager to set up a traceability system and maintain and control it.

5.5. Supervision and control of the compartment

When asked to describe the auditing procedures, including legislation and formal agreements, the responses were very vague:

- 5 non EU member countries and the EU responded that they do as per the Rationale;
- Other answers from non EU member countries included:
 - Periodical inspections by Veterinary inspectors of all enterprises (production, processing, transportation and sale) of animal products; including animal breeding and reproduction. Controls twice a year “by law”, but other controls could do it anytime for assessing compliance with veterinary and sanitary standards;
 - Another reported that it is done according to national legislation and in line with the *Code*;
 - Monitoring by the competent services of the European Commission within the framework of Stabilisation and Association Agreement and EU criteria for accession. Reliable certification that assures constant official supervision that fulfill all requirements.
 - Compartments will be under the control of the Veterinary Authority. Audit of compartments would be done as part of routine auditing procedures.
 - Permanent control and surveillance by the State Veterinary Authority, under the law.

5.6. Description of the surveillance programme

- 14 out of the 16 non EU member countries indicated that their surveillance programme is in compliance with the guidelines of the OIE *Code*. The main diseases that are being (or would be) considered by those countries under a permanent surveillance programme within the established compartment(s) are the following:
 - avian influenza: 10 countries;
 - Newcastle disease: 7 countries;
 - foot and mouth disease: 7 countries;
 - bovine brucellosis: 5 countries;
 - tuberculosis, African swine fever, classical swine fever, leukosis, anthrax, rabies: 3 countries.
- The EU also reported that their surveillance programme complies with the OIE Guidelines, and for the time being they are considering to include avian influenza and Newcastle disease, as well as possible other avian diseases such as salmonellae, under a permanent surveillance programme within the compartments.

These responses indicate that most of the countries are considering specific surveillance programmes for avian compartments.

5.7. Diagnostic capabilities

- Most of the non EU member countries (14 out of 16) expressed that the sample testing from the compartments by their laboratories are in compliance with OIE standards. From the other 2 countries, 1 responded that some of its laboratories are compliant with OIE standards, while the other is not compliant.
- The EU responded that their laboratories (which are or would be testing samples from the compartments) are compliant with OIE standards.
- 9 out of the 16 non EU member countries have formal agreement between the national reference laboratory and laboratories conducting testing to support compartmentalisation.
- The EU member states have established such formal agreement between laboratories.

5.8. Emergency response, control, and notification capability

In response to having emergency response, control, and notification capability:

- All non EU member countries, as well as EU members, responded as having an effective emergency response to a disease outbreak, both at national level as well as within the compartment;
- 15 out of the 16 non EU member countries, as well as the EU members have responded as having the legal requirements and established procedures for compulsory notification of disease occurrences.

In response to awareness and training programmes, both at the level of the compartment and the country:

- 12 out of the 16 non EU member countries, as well as the EU members have responded as having awareness and training programmes, both at the level of the compartment and the country.

5.9. Bilateral recognition of the compartment

- 5 out of the 16 non EU member countries responded that their trading partners recognise their compartments when importing from them;
- 4 out of the 16 non EU member countries responded that they recognise compartments when importing animals and products from third countries;
- 1 non EU member country responded that it recognises but unofficially, the compartments from exporting countries;
- The EU does not recognise compartments and its trading partners have not recognised compartments from EU members.

5.10. OIE International standards

In response to having made the industry aware and discussed on the following documents:

- 8 non EU members responded 'yes', and 8 responded 'no', to the OIE *Terrestrial Code* chapter on zoning and compartmentalisation (1.3.5);
- 9 non EU members responded 'yes', and 7 responded 'no', to the *Terrestrial Code* chapters on the quality and evaluation of veterinary services (1.3.3 and 1.3.4), and the associated PVS tool;
- 10 non EU members responded 'yes', and 6 responded 'no', to the *Terrestrial Code* appendices on 'general guidelines for animal health surveillance' (3.8.1);
- 12 non EU members responded 'yes', and 4 responded 'no', to the *Terrestrial Code* appendix on the general principles for the identification and traceability of live animals (3.5.1);
- 4 non EU members responded 'yes', and 12 responded 'no', to the OIE *Scientific and Technical Review* article on the concept of compartmentalisation;
- 8 non EU members responded 'yes', and 8 responded 'no', to the *Terrestrial Code* appendix on general guidelines on the application of compartmentalisation;
- 9 non EU members responded 'yes', and 7 responded 'no', to the OIE checklist on the practical application of compartmentalisation for avian influenza and Newcastle disease in poultry;
- The EU responded it made the industry aware and discussed all the documents above except for one who responded it did not do that with *Terrestrial Code* chapters on the quality and evaluation of veterinary services (1.3.3 and 1.3.4), and the associated PVS tool.

In response to the necessity for the OIE to continue its work on developing standards and guidelines for the application of compartmentalisation, both as for prevention and control of diseases, as well as for safe trade:

- All countries (both EU members and non members) considered it necessary that the OIE continue its work on developing standards and guidelines for the application of compartmentalisation, both as for prevention and control of diseases, as well as for safe trade.
- Just one country expressed its partial agreement, stating that currently it is more important to use the time and resources on how to implement the existing *Code* texts

As to how they would like to the OIE to continue:

- 7 non EU member countries responded: at national level;
- 5 non EU member countries responded: at regional level;
- 1 non EU member country, as well as all EU members responded: at global level.

When asked to describe briefly, they responded:

- By harmonising the implementation of standards on compartmentalisation between neighbouring countries and encouraging mutual recognition;
- By continuing to develop standards;
- By the standardisation of requirements for every compartmentalisation step for different sectors of animal production
- By assisting countries on practical implementation of compartmentalisation;
- By developing standards for compartmentalisation that address aspects beyond trade;
- By developing compartmentalisation standards for trade; as well as for prevention and control of diseases, but without downgrading current recommendations for disease control nor jeopardising or replacing the authority of Veterinary Services;
- By improving and promoting standards and guidelines based on practical international experiences).