

77 SG/12/CS1 B

Original: English  
March 2009

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

**Paris, 2–6 March 2009**

---

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Code Commission) met at the OIE Headquarters in Paris on 2–6 March 2009.

The members of the Code Commission are listed in [Annex I](#) and the agenda adopted is in [Annex II](#).

On behalf of Dr Bernard Vallat, Director General of the OIE, Dr Alex Thiermann, President of the Code Commission, welcomed members and thanked them for their ongoing work in support of the OIE.

Dr Thiermann shared with the Code Commission members his appreciation for the excellent work of the International Trade Department in incorporating Member comments, even those received after the deadline and just before the meeting. He also indicated that several Members had expressed dissatisfaction over the quality and late distribution of the Spanish and French version of the October 2008 Code Commission report and advised that the OIE is doing as much as possible to address these concerns.

Dr Thiermann also noted the heavy workload for this meeting, in part due to the fact that Members had provided extensive comments on several Chapters. Dr Thiermann was pleased to note that several Members had provided comments for the first time and welcomed Members' increased participation in the standard-setting work of the OIE.

Dr Thiermann reminded the Code Commission that they should focus on the texts to be proposed for adoption at the General Session in May 2009 in the event that they were unable to deal with all agenda items in the time available for the meeting.

The Code Commission thanked the following Members for providing written comments: Argentina, Australia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Chinese Taipei, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the European Union (EU), Guatemala, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand and the United States of America (USA). Comments were also received from the International Embryo Transfer Society (IETS), three regional organisations - the Comité Veterinario Permanente del CONOSUR (CVP), Comité Interamericano de Sanidad Avícola (CISA) and Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA), the International Federation of Horseracing Authorities (IFHA) and some industry organisations.

The Code Commission strongly encourages Members to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by sending comments on this report. The Code Commission reiterates that it would be very helpful if comments were submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a scientific rationale. Members are requested **not to use the automatic 'track-change' function** provided by word processing software in preparation of their comments. The Commission also reminded Members that they should follow the established convention in recommending modification of text in the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (hereinafter referred to as the *Terrestrial Code*), i.e. propose new text (shown as double underline) and propose text deletions (shown as ~~strike through~~) and provide a scientific justification for all changes proposed.

The Code Commission examined various draft texts of the *Terrestrial Code* in the light of comments received from Members, as well as comments outstanding from the previous Code Commission meeting. It also reviewed advice received from the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (hereinafter referred to as the Scientific Commission), the Biological Standards Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Laboratories Commission), the reports of several *ad hoc* Groups and of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group (APFSWG).

The outcome of the Code Commission's work is presented as Annexes to this report. Amendments made to the *Terrestrial Code* Chapters and circulated to Members before the October 2008 meeting are shown as double underlined text, with deleted text in ~~strikeout~~. Amendments made at this meeting (March 2009) are shown in the same manner, with a coloured background to distinguish the two groups of amendments.

All Member comments were considered by the Code Commission. However, because of the very large volume of work, the Code Commission was not able to prepare a detailed explanation of the reasons for accepting or not accepting each proposal received. Members are reminded that if comments are resubmitted without modification or new justification the Code Commission will not, as a rule, repeat previous advice. The Code Commission encourages Members to refer to previous reports when preparing comments on longstanding issues

The texts presented in Part A of this report are proposed for adoption at the 77<sup>th</sup> OIE General Session. The texts presented in Part B are provided to Members for comment. Relevant reports of meetings (working groups and *ad hoc* Groups) are presented in Part C for Members' information.

Comments on this report must reach OIE Headquarters by **7 August 2008** in order to be considered at the next meeting of the Code Commission in September 2009. However, in order to meet the deadlines for meeting of the *ad-hoc* Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare, comments on Annex XXXIV (Chapter 7.X Use of animals in research, testing or teaching) should reach the OIE Headquarters by **24 July 2008**. Comments should be sent to the International Trade Department at: [trade.dept@oie.int](mailto:trade.dept@oie.int).

## A. MEETING WITH THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

Dr Vallat, Director General of the OIE, joined the Code Commission on the final day of the meeting. Dr Vallat outlined work under way on the Fifth OIE Strategic Plan (2011-2015), which will address among others the following important global themes, 'One World-One Health', good governance of veterinary services, control of zoonotic diseases and food safety.

Dr Vallat indicated that the management of diseases in wildlife is a priority for the future. Surveillance and notification of diseases in wildlife is important and the OIE will encourage Members to strengthen these aspects, starting with the establishment of national focal points for wildlife. The welfare of wildlife (including the harvest of some species) could also be addressed.

Dr Vallat indicated that, for animal welfare standards, the current priority is to draft standards for laboratory animals, including standards for the transport of non human primates. The latter issue will be addressed in the field of air transportation in collaboration with the International Air Transport Association (IATA). Dr Vallat took particular note of the recommendation of the Code Commission to prioritise the development of animal welfare standards for the production of both broiler chickens and beef cattle production.

Dr Vallat discussed the problems encountered with translation of the *Terrestrial Code* texts into French and Spanish. In some cases, the problems relate to regional differences in language. The OIE continues to work hard to resolve these linguistic issues.

Dr Vallat commended the Code Commission on the finalisation of the draft Chapter on the control of stray dog populations and agreed that it should be proposed for adoption by the OIE International Committee in May 2009. Dr Vallat noted that the use of oral rabies vaccine is a control method that is of growing importance and requested that this be addressed in the proposed review of the Chapter on rabies, which he considered to be a priority.

In regard to the OIE procedures for recognition of official disease status, Dr Vallat agreed with the Code Commission to develop a specific Chapter, which would include the current four disease questionnaires and explanatory text. Dr Vallat agreed with the Code Commission that the OIE should not undertake to provide official recognition for compartments free of foot and mouth disease (FMD). Dr Vallat also informed the Code Commission that Members have called upon the OIE to provide official recognition of freedom from certain equine diseases. This matter will be discussed in the framework of the fifth Strategic Plan..

On bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), Dr Thiermann advised Dr Vallat that some Members continued to oppose the Code Commission's proposal to update the *Terrestrial Code* in regard to the deletion of the 30 month age restriction for boneless skeletal muscle meat and the recommendations on the safe production of gelatine. However, no new scientific rationale had been provided by Members and the Code Commission referred Members to the rationale proposed for the deletion of the 30 month restriction that was outlined in the report of the Code Commission's October 2008 meeting. The Code Commission therefore considered that the text modifications drafted at its October 2008 meeting should be proposed for adoption at the General Session in May 2009. Dr Vallat confirmed that he agreed with this procedure.

## **B. UPDATE ON REPORTS OF OTHER COMMISSIONS AND OTHER RELEVANT ACTIVITIES OF THE OIE**

Dr Thiermann provided update on the activities of the OIE and Dr Sarah Kahn, Head of International Trade Department, updated the Code Commission on the OIE work on trade in animal products ('commodities'). Working in collaboration with experts from the United Kingdom, the OIE has commissioned a review of existing research findings, risks, modern pathogen inactivation methods and processing techniques to support the further development of standards for international trade in animal products. Dr Kahn explained that the terms of reference for the study had been drafted in a broad manner, to provide for a complete review of existing scientific knowledge and understanding of current beef processing techniques. The study would also address sheep and pig meat, in relation to FMD. The need for additional research (especially as relevant to FMD and sheep or pig meat) would also be addressed.

The terms of reference of the study are:

- Define what is meant by 'deboned beef' in the context of the review for FMD risk, including species, type of tissue, anatomical origin, relevant processing techniques and maturation/ageing. Describe the viability and survival of FMD viruses in deboned beef from infected animals and how post mortem changes affect this, particularly in relation to the sanitary safety – for trade – of deboned beef. This should account for all known relevant factors and the range of FMD serotypes.
- Review existing scientific literature and experimental research findings that provide evidence about the sanitary safety – relating to FMD – of exporting deboned beef from FMD affected animals and countries, zones or compartments.

- Review historical evidence provided by experience of exporting deboned beef from FMD affected countries, zones or compartments.
- Assess whether International Codex and OIE Standard slaughtering and processing protocols and technologies would affect the validity of prior research findings or historical evidence relating to the sanitary safety of deboned beef in relation to FMD.
- Assess the sanitary risk – in relation to FMD – posed by exporting deboned beef from FMD affected countries, zones or compartments whilst implementing existing slaughter and processing technologies (in developed and least developed countries).
- Where appropriate apply the same methodology to specific mutton and pork primary meat products (bone in and deboned mutton products and pork meat) and advise on the need for further research for the same sanitary guarantees related to these products.

The *ad hoc* Group on Trade in Animal Products ('Commodities') will meet (physical meeting or teleconference) in August to consider the findings of this review and will provide advice, including recommendations on additional standards for trade in animal products, to the Code Commission for consideration at its September 2009 meeting if possible.

The Code Commission noted that the 2008 edition of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (hereinafter referred to as the *Terrestrial Code*) was totally restructured in comparison with previous editions. The word "guidelines" had in all cases been removed from texts that were previously included as annexes and the corresponding texts included in relevant disease Chapters, reflecting the fact that all parts of the *Terrestrial Code* have the same legal standing.

## C. TEXTS SUBMITTED FOR ADOPTION

### 1. Glossary

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Australia, Canada, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, South Africa, the USA, and three regional organisations (the CVP, the CISA and the OIRSA).

At the request of Members, the Code Commission proposed some amendments to the glossary, including a new definition for '*vector*'.

The Code Commission considered Member comments on the definition of *veterinary para-professional* but decided not to amend the proposed definition, which includes the word 'registered' rather than 'authorized' by the *veterinary statutory body*, in view of the fact that this body registers veterinary para-professionals, while the Veterinary Authority authorizes them.

Other definitions in the Glossary that were modified include: '*early detection system*', '*monitoring*', '*risk assessment*' and '*vaccination*'.

In response to Member comments on the definitions relevant to communication, the Code Commission provides two separate annexes on glossary. The revised texts presented at [Annex III](#) of this report are for adoption. The new texts on communication presented at [Annex XXXIII](#) in Part B of this report are for Member comment, i.e. not for adoption.

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

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, the Dominican Republic, the EU, El Salvador, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, South Africa and Switzerland, Thailand, the USA, two regional organisations (the CISA and the OIRSA) and the Scientific Commission.

The Code Commission noted that the definitions of ‘early detection system’ and ‘surveillance’ were deleted from this draft Chapter as these are already defined in the Glossary. The Code Commission also noted that these two definitions in the glossary had been modified, based on Member comments (see Annex III - Glossary).

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments on the proposed definition of ‘wildlife’ and recommended its deletion. The Code Commission requested that the OIE Wildlife Working Group (WWG) develop a new definition, taking into account, for example, the fact that animals in game parks are owned and fenced in but should still be considered as wildlife.

Some Articles were modified as proposed by the WWG, to address the significance of wildlife health and in light of the role wildlife can play in the epidemiology of diseases of humans and domestic animals.

In response to Member comments and in light of the current contents of the Glossary, the Code Commission made some modifications to the definitions in this Chapter but in reply to a Member’s request to define the term “Outbreak definition”, the Code Commission noted that ‘outbreak’ is defined in the *Terrestrial Code* as ‘one or more cases’ and that no further definition was needed.

In response to Member comments, new text on self-declaration was added in Article 1.4.6.

The revised text is presented at Annex IV of this report for adoption.

### **3. Horizontal chapters**

#### **a) Import risk analysis (Chapter 2.2.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Panama, the USA, and two regional organisations (the CISA and the OIRSA)

Dr Kahn updated the Code Commission on the *ad hoc* Group that has been convened to review the OIE *Handbook on Risk Analysis*. The Group will hold its first meeting in August 2009 and a report will be provided to the Code Commission at its September 2009 meeting.

The Code Commission examined Chapter 2.1. (General Provisions) and Chapter 2.2. (Import Risk Analysis) and decided to merge these two Chapters, noting that Article 1 of Chapter 2.1. served as a better introduction to Chapter 2.2.

#### **b) Animal health measures applicable before and at departure (Chapter 5.4.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, Panama and two regional organisations (the CISA and the OIRSA)

Articles 5.4.1. and 5.4.5. were modified in light of Member comments.

#### **c) Border posts and quarantine stations in the importing country (Chapter 5.6.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the EU and Switzerland.

The Code Commission modified Chapter 5.6. as appropriate.

The revised texts are presented at Annex V of this report for adoption.

#### **4. Design and implementation of systems to achieve animal traceability (Chapter 4.2.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Canada, the EU, Mexico and New Zealand.

The definition of 'reporting' and Article 4.2.3. were modified, based on Member comments.

The revised text is presented at [Annex VI](#) of this report for adoption.

#### **5. Zoning and compartmentalisation (Chapters 4.3. and 4.4.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Canada, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Thailand, the USA and two regional organisations (the CISA and the OIRSA).

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments and modified the text as appropriate.

The revised texts are presented at [Annex VII](#) of this report for adoption.

#### **6. Vector surveillance (new draft Chapter)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, the EU, New Zealand, Switzerland and the Scientific Commission.

In response to Member comments, the Code Commission made some amendments to the draft text and referred some comments back to the Scientific Commission for consideration.

The revised text is presented at [Annex VIII](#) of this report for adoption.

#### **7. Semen and embryos (Chapters 4.5., 4.6., 4.7., 4.8., 4.9., 4.10. and 4.11.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, South Africa, Switzerland, a regional organization (the OIRSA) and the IETS.

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments and modified the text as appropriate.

The revised texts are presented at [Annex IX](#) of this report for adoption.

#### **8. Somatic cell nuclear transfer in production livestock and horses (Chapter 4.12.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, Panama, a regional organization (the OIRSA) and the IETS.

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments and modified the text as appropriate.

The revised text is presented at [Annex X](#) of this report for adoption.

#### **9. Model certificates (Chapters 5.1. and 5.2.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, the EU, New Zealand and Switzerland.

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments and modified the text as appropriate.

The revised texts are presented at [Annex XI](#) of this report for adoption.

## 10. The role of the veterinary services in food safety (Chapter 6.1.)

The Code Commission received comments from Canada, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, Panama, two regional organizations (the OIRSA and the CISA).

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments and modified the text as appropriate.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XII](#) of this report for adoption.

## 11. Salmonellosis

### a) Prevention, detection and control of *Salmonella* in poultry (new draft Chapter)

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Guatemala, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, South Africa, the USA, and two regional organisations (the OIRSA and the CISA). The comments received for the previous meeting were also discussed.

The Code Commission noted the extensive and detailed comments provided by Members on the revised new Chapter and commended the work of the *ad hoc* Group on Salmonellosis, which had addressed these comments in a comprehensive manner. In reply to Member requests for clarification of the status of the Chapter on salmonellosis, the Code Commission advised that for salmonellosis (and for other production diseases), the OIE's goal was to establish standards for effective surveillance and management at the farm level, to support the management of production and flock (or herd) status with the objective of reducing the incidence of food borne diseases. The Code Commission further noted that country freedom from salmonellosis is not a feasible goal for many Members in the short term. However, all Members have a keen interest in ensuring that international trade does not pose risks to animal or human health. Implementation of the standards in the *Terrestrial Code* is the best way to achieve these objectives.

The Code Commission agreed with the *ad hoc* Group's recommendation to remove details on sampling methodology from the draft Chapter and to update the applicable Chapter in the OIE *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals* (hereinafter referred to as the *Terrestrial Manual*) to include details on sampling methodology for *Salmonella* prevention and control. The Code Commission recommended that the Laboratories Commission consider this recommendation.

The Code Commission also agreed to adopt the same definition of poultry as used in Chapter 10.4. (avian influenza) and Chapter 10.13. (Newcastle disease). Once this Chapter is adopted, the definition will be moved to the Glossary.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XIII](#) of this report for adoption. For ease of reference, the Annex was provided as a clean text but a marked up version of this text may be found in the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Salmonellosis (see [Annex XI](#)).

### b) Hygiene and biosecurity procedures in poultry production (Chapter 6.3.)

The Code Commission received comments from the EU.

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group on Salmonellosis had not reviewed Member comments on Chapter 6.3. at its recent meeting due to lack of time. However, it made a preliminary assessment of the work that would need to be done to address these comments. The Code Commission supported the *ad hoc* Group's recommendation that Articles 6.3.6. and 6.3.7., which currently include significant detail on the use of disinfectants, be amended to address general hygiene principles only. If Members were to seek more detailed information, the inclusion of this information in the *Terrestrial Manual* should be considered.

The Code Commission recommended that the Director General reconvene the *ad hoc* Group to consider Member comments and to revise Chapter 6.3.

## 12. Recommendations on antimicrobial resistance (new introductory text)

The Code Commission received comments from the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Norway, Panama and two regional organisations (the OIRSA and the CISA).

Dr Kahn advised the Code Commission that the APFSWG had in fact considered the new chapeau text (although this fact was not recorded in the Group's report) and that there were no objections to the new text.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XIV](#) of this report for adoption.

## 13. Animal welfare

### a) Stray dog population control (new draft Chapter)

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Canada, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, South Africa, the USA, a regional organisation (the OIRSA) and the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG).

The Code Commission was pleased to note the extensive comments provided by Members but noted that some Members were revisiting topics that had been thoroughly discussed at previous meetings of the *ad hoc* Group of the AWWG and of the Code Commission.

Noting that several Members had commented on Table 1 ('List of Methods for the Euthanasia of Dogs'), the Code Commission clarified that the purpose of this table is to list all methods that are currently available and that there was no intention to establish a system for approving, disapproving, or ranking methods for euthanasia. Given that the socioeconomic, cultural and religious circumstances vary widely amongst OIE Members, the OIE should provide information on methods that could be used in different circumstances. When choosing the most appropriate method to use, Members should take into account the points included in Table 1 and make a choice that is appropriate to their national situation. Some Members recommended the addition of new information on chemical methods for euthanasia. The Code Commission referred these comments to the AWWG for consideration at its next meeting in July 2009.

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments on the draft Chapter in detail and made a number of amendments to the text. The Code Commission considered that this text has now been thoroughly discussed and that it is ready for adoption.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XV](#) of this report for adoption.

### b) Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare

The Code Commission commended the report of the *ad hoc* Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare, including the proposed draft Chapter on 'The Use of Animals in Research, Testing and Teaching'. The report contains a useful and extensive list of references for the information of Members when reviewing the text. However, in accordance with normal practice, the list of references would not be included in the text when proposed for adoption in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission invited Members to comment on the report of the *ad hoc* Group, in particular on the proposed draft Code Chapter on 'The Use of Animals in Research, Testing and Teaching'.

The new text is presented at [Annex XXXIV](#) in Part B of this report for Member comment.

### c) Other issues

#### Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare and Livestock Production Systems

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Australia, Japan and a regional organisation (the CVP) reflecting the recommendations of the First OIE Inter American Meeting on Animal Welfare, held in Panama on 19-20 August 2008.

The Code Commission endorsed the recommendation of some Members that beef production be given higher priority than dairy production in regard to the development of animal welfare standards for livestock production systems. Providing that the OIE has the resources to address two topics simultaneously, the Code Commission agreed that animal welfare standards for the production of broiler chickens should also be addressed.

#### **Comments of the OIE Wildlife Working Group**

The Code Commission noted that the WWG recommended the development of animal welfare standards in regard to the transport of wildlife and asked the AWWG to consider this matter when updating their workplan.

#### **Electronic Consultation: *ad hoc* Group on Poultry Welfare**

Dr Kahn updated the Code Commission on the work that is being undertaken to update the existing OIE standards having a relation with poultry welfare. An electronic consultation is under way and recommendations will be provided to the AWWG and to the Code Commission for consideration at its next meeting in September 2009.

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> OIE Global Conference on Animal Welfare**

Dr Kahn and Dr Stuardo informed the Code Commission about the outcomes of the 2nd OIE Global Conference on Animal Welfare, which was held in Cairo in October 2008. The resolutions and other documentation relevant to the conference are available on the OIE Website. The conference proceedings should be finalised later this year.

### **14. Bluetongue (Chapter 8.3.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Canada, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, Norway, Panama, South Africa, Switzerland, a regional organisation (the OIRSA), the WWG, the Scientific Commission and the Laboratories Commission.

The Code Commission was unable to resolve Members' differences regarding several aspects in this Chapter. Dr Thiermann informed members of the Code Commission that the Director General was convening an *ad hoc* Group to review Member comments on bluetongue, with particular reference to the use of attenuated live and inactivated vaccines, the infective period for bluetongue, and the waiting periods specified in the *Terrestrial Code*, in view of the latest scientific information. This meeting will take place on 14 April 2009 and Dr Thiermann will attend on behalf of the Code Commission.

In response to Member comments about the global range of bluetongue virus, the Code Commission reinstated the existing text that makes reference to the northern and southern global distribution and the status of adjacent countries and zones. The Code Commission considered that this text is still correct and addresses the issues raised by countries outside Europe.

The Code Commission developed a new Article on commodities considered safe for the purpose of international trade.

In response to the comments of Members and of the Laboratories Commission on references to quarantine stations in Article 8.3.7., the Code Commission modified the text accordingly.

The recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group on the Chapter will be circulated to the Code Commission electronically. Once approved by the Members of the Code Commission, the modified Chapter 8.3. will be circulated in the week of 27 April for consideration by OIE Members with a view to adoption at the General Session.

### **15. Foot and mouth disease (Chapter 8.5.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Thailand, two regional organisations (the OIRSA and the CVP), the WWG and the Scientific Commission.

In responding to Member comments, the Code Commission noted that the proposed protection zone incorporates the concepts that were previously included in the buffer zone and surveillance zone. Rather than the emphasis being on specified minimum distances, as was previously the case when implementing buffer or surveillance zones, the concept of the protection zone in the *Terrestrial Code* was based on a combination of elements (including geographic factors and official programmes, including measures for disease surveillance and control) that were used to protect a population from one of lower FMD status.

The Code Commission reminded Members that the rationale for developing the concept of a *protection zone* had previously been provided by an expert and reprinted this advice for ease of reference.

*A country free from a disease (with or without vaccination) either throughout the country or in a part of the country (a free zone) has the right to take appropriate biosecurity measures to prevent the entry and spread of the relevant pathogen. The country may apply the measures in respect of a country of a different health status (whether that country is contiguous or not) or in respect of a zone of a different health status within its territory.*

*The objectives of these measures are to:*

1. *prevent the entry of the pathogen into the free country/zone;*
2. *facilitate early detection if the pathogen gains entry;*
3. *help the veterinary services to respond quickly and to minimise the spread of the pathogen if it gains entry.*

*To meet the first objective, the following measures are relevant:*

- o conditions for the import of commodities to prevent the entry of the pathogen from a country /zone of lower health status (whether contiguous or not);*
- o animal movement controls, which may include the exclusion of animals susceptible to the disease in question, in a defined area near the border of the free country/zone. Note: this would apply in the case where there is a contiguous country/zone of lower health status;*
- o reliance on existing physical or geographical barriers. Note: this would apply in the case where there is a contiguous country/zone of lower health status;*
- o implementation of legal and/or administrative procedures (such as border check points).*

*The most important activity to address the second objective is increased and/or targeted surveillance near the border of the free country/zone.*

*To help address the third objective, vaccination could be applied at and/or near the border or throughout the country if the country is free with vaccination.*

*In the case of a free zone within a country, the national veterinary services are responsible for the implementation and monitoring of these measures as part of the country's management and justification of the free zone. These activities are essential to convince trading partners that the free zone is being effectively maintained.*

*In the case of a free country that has an agreement with a contiguous country/trading partner of lower health status, the relevant measures could be applied by the veterinary services of the partner i.e. outside the free country. The country that is disease free (or contains the free zone) would be expected to monitor effective application of the measures by its partner.*

*In the case of a free country that has not established an agreement with a contiguous country/trading partner of lower health status, the relevant measures should be applied by the national veterinary services at the national borders and, as appropriate, within the country. The application of measures such as import restrictions and border check points is a key component of national disease control and eradication programmes and is required to justify claims of disease freedom. These measures are also important to support international trade in animals and animal products.*

The Code Commission also reviewed the text on the *containment zone* and further clarified that the size of the *containment zone* should be large enough to contain the outbreak but small enough to minimise adverse effects on trade.

In response to Member comments, the Code Commission explained that the exclusion of *Camelus dromedarius* from the provisions in Chapter 8.5. was based on the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group on Camelidae Diseases, which met on 8-10 July 2008. The *ad hoc* Group's report was provided as an annex to the Report of the Laboratories Commission (September 2008).

The Code Commission reviewed a report provided by the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Secretariat to the 18th Conference of the OIE Regional Commission for Africa, N'Djamena, Chad, 22 – 26 February 2009. This report identifies the need for the OIE to develop standards that facilitate trade from African countries, notwithstanding the current situation with FMD viruses in buffalo. Specifically, the SADC countries are calling for the incorporation of the concepts of compartmentalisation and safe commodities into Chapter 8.5.

Noting that no Members had commented on the OIE Official Disease Status Questionnaire, which had been circulated with the report of the October 2008 meeting of the Code Commission, it was decided that after adoption the questionnaires would be published in a new Chapter of the *Terrestrial Code* (Chapter 1.5.) dealing with the OIE procedures for official recognition and self declaration of disease free status.

The revised Chapter 8.5. and new Chapter 1.5. containing the questionnaires are presented at [Annex XVI](#) and [Annex XXXII](#) of this report for adoption.

### **Compartmentalisation for FMD**

The Code Commission recognised the importance of including the compartmentalisation concept in Chapter 8.5., as has already been done for other diseases, including classical swine fever and avian influenza.

At the request of Members, the Code Commission developed a new Article (8.5.5. bis) setting out the requirements for a compartment 'free from FMD' where vaccination is not carried out. The Code Commission discussed at length whether provisions could be developed for a compartment 'free from FMD' where vaccination is carried out. While the OIE has established provisions for the implementation of a compartment that is free with vaccination for classical swine fever, this approach is not considered to be appropriate for FMD at this time. The Code Commission felt strongly that the establishment of a FMD free compartment should be based on the strict implementation of an effective biosecurity plan. If the health status of the population inside the compartment is not able to be maintained without the use of vaccine, this could imply that the biosecurity plan is not sufficiently effective. Nonetheless, the Code Commission agreed that in future it may be possible to re-examine this question and to propose conditions for a compartment that is 'FMD free with vaccination'.

The Code Commission also considered whether the OIE should provide official recognition for FMD free compartments, in the same way that FMD free countries and FMD free zones may be officially recognised. As compartmentalisation is still a new concept, the Code Commission is not in favour of the OIE considering official recognition of FMD free compartments at this time. The Code Commission noted the work underway with two Members to implement compartments that are free for avian influenza and Newcastle disease in the poultry sector and decided that until the practical implementation of this concept has been studied in detail, the OIE should not proceed to grant official recognition of FMD free compartments.

The introduction of the compartmentalisation concept necessitated consequent modifications to Articles 8.5.5.bis, 8.5.8., 8.5.10., 8.5.13., 8.5.14., 8.5.17., 8.5.18., 8.5.19., 8.5.20., 8.5.21., 8.5.22. and 8.5.25.

The revised text containing the inclusion of compartmentalisation in Chapter 8.5. is presented at [Annex XXXV](#) in Part B of this report for Member comment.

#### **16. Leptospirosis (Chapter 8.8.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia and New Zealand.

Based on the repeated request of Members, the Code Commission decided to delete Chapter 8.8., which comprised a title but no text. The rationale provided by Members included:

‘Leptospirosis is distributed globally; it is improbable that any country can, with any credibility, claim to be free from the disease. Further, it is unlikely that any country has an official control programme for leptospirosis. Current serological tests and culture techniques are not able, with any degree of confidence, to demonstrate that an animal is free from leptospirosis. Antibiotic treatment to clear renal carriage of leptospire is not consistently successful and has not been validated in all the species subject to international trade. Retention of this empty Chapter, with the words ‘under study’ gives the false impression that the OIE is able to formulate meaningful measures to manage the disease.’

The text proposing the deletion of this Chapter is presented at [Annex XVII](#) of this report for adoption.

#### **17. Paratuberculosis (Chapter 8.10.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the EU and Japan.

The Code Commission noted that the OIE is developing a supporting document addressing the diagnosis and management of paratuberculosis. Once this document is available, the Code Commission will consider whether text in the *Terrestrial Code* should be developed.

#### **18. Rabies (Chapter 8.11.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Canada, the EU, New Zealand and Switzerland.

The Code Commission was in agreement with the comments of Members and recommended that the Director General convene an *ad hoc* Group on rabies to update the Chapter, which was drafted several years ago and is not consistent with more recently drafted disease Chapters. The *ad hoc* Group should consider recommendations from two regional rabies conferences (‘First International Conference on Rabies in Europe’, 15-18 June 2005, Kiev, Ukraine and ‘Towards the Elimination of Rabies in Eurasia’, 27-30 May 2007, Paris, France) and provide advice on issues raised by Members, including on the possible closer alignment of OIE and World Health Organization recommendations and the classification of rabies status in light of the presence of susceptible hosts (including wildlife) and of lyssaviruses in the territory of a Member. It was also recommended that, in this disease Chapter, the OIE should clarify which types of infection are relevant for the determination of rabies free status of a country. The use of oral vaccines in dogs is of growing importance as a control method to be used in future and this should be considered by the *ad hoc* Group and advice provided to the Code Commission and to the Laboratories Commission as appropriate.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XVIII](#) of this report for adoption.

#### **19. Rinderpest (Chapter 8.13.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Japan, Mexico, Panama and a regional organisation (the OIRSA).

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments and made a number of modifications to Chapter 8.13.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XIX](#) of this report for adoption.

## 20. Bee diseases (Chapters 9.1., 9.2., 9.3., 9.4., 9.5. and 9.6.)

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Canada, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Switzerland and a regional organisation (the OIRSA).

The Code Commission considered the comments of Members and made some amendments.

The revised texts are presented at Annex XX of this report for adoption.

## 21. Avian influenza (Chapter 10.4.)

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Chile, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Guatemala, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, South Africa, the USA, two regional organisations (the CISA and the OIRSA) and the WWG.

The Code Commission noted that some Members again raised concerns about the notification of LPAI and HPAI to the OIE and the definition of poultry in Chapter 10.4. Once again, the Code Commission points out that the definition and reporting requirements have been carefully and specifically drafted to encourage Members to report HPAI in all avian species and sectors and to avoid unjustified trade bans in response to notifications of HPAI in birds other than poultry, which do not pose a risk to international trade in poultry products. The Code Commission saw no need to modify the current provisions on reporting or on the definition of poultry but modified the text of Point 4 of Article 10.4.1. for further clarification.

The Code Commission considered the comments of Members and made several consequent amendments, including on the conduct of laboratory investigations in response to serological findings of infection; on the sanitization of the surface of eggs and the packaging of eggs moving in international trade and on the use of vaccination in compliance with relevant provisions in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

Article 10.4.23. was modified to reflect the minimum time/temperature requirements for virus inactivation in products of poultry origin intended for use in animal feeding (etc.). The Code Commission was unable to extrapolate from the inactivation procedures used for feather meal to other poultry products, as requested by Members. The Code Commission requested that Members assist by providing descriptions of the commodities for which they require recommendations, the standard industry practices used to produce them, and relevant supporting scientific information.

In reply to requests for finalisation of Article 10.4.24. (Recommendations for the Importation of Feathers and Down), the Code Commission decided to ask Members to provide additional information.

In regard to Member comments on the Articles dealing with surveillance for avian influenza, the Code Commission decided to refer these to experts for advice. The Code Commission also recommended that the drafting of these Articles be shortened and simplified where possible, taking the format of the text on surveillance for Newcastle disease as a model.

The revised text is presented at Annex XXI of this report for adoption.

## 22. Newcastle disease (Chapter 10.13.)

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Australia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Switzerland, the USA, two regional organisations (the CISA and the OIRSA) and the WWG.

The Code Commission discussed in detail the comments of Members on the inactivation procedures for NDV. The Code Commission was unable to extrapolate from the inactivation procedures used for feather meal to apply to other poultry products, as requested by Members. The Code Commission requested that Members assist by providing descriptions of the commodities for which they require recommendations, the standard industry practices used to produce them, and relevant supporting scientific information. The recommendations of a Member regarding time/temperature parameters for the inactivation of NDV were referred to the OIE Scientific and Technical Department with a request to provide specific advice on the recommendations that should be included in Chapter 10.13.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XXII](#) of this report for adoption.

### **23. Bovine brucellosis (Chapter 11.3.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina.

The Code Commission noted that the *ad hoc* Group on Brucellosis had not held a meeting since the October 2008 meeting of the Code Commission. The Code Commission requested that the OIE International Trade Department continue to follow progress on this issue and provide an update at the next Commission meeting, in September 2009.

### **24. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.6.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Canada, Chile, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, the USA, two regional organisations (the CVP and the OIRSA) and an industry organisation.

The Code Commission questioned the rationale provided by certain Members opposing the removal of the 30 months age limitation for deboned muscle meat for countries in the 'undetermined BSE risk' category.

The Code Commission noted that it had already expressed a view that the safety of this commodity relies on the application of all other measures specifically identified for the country category and pertaining to the commodity. The Code Commission could not understand the position of Members that opposed this change on the grounds that the application of measures in a country of 'undetermined BSE risk' status could not be trusted, while accepting that the same measures would be fully applied in a country of 'controlled BSE risk' status where BSE is known to have occurred.

Further, while it may have been reasonable to adopt such a restriction as a risk reduction measure at the height of the public panic over BSE in the late 1990, it is now ineffective and an unwarranted restriction.

An expert informed the Code Commission that there has been a single published report of possible BSE infectivity in cattle muscle meat. This finding was in an animal showing clinical signs of BSE. Such an animal would be condemned as unfit for human consumption in any country. The Code Commission considered that the 30 month age restriction was unwarranted and could be deleted without exposing consumers anywhere to additional risk. Attempting to justify restrictions on muscle meat because of findings of abnormal PrP in muscle cells of laboratory animals inoculated with laboratory strains of TSEs is unscientific. It is well-documented that different TSE agents behave differently in different animal models. There is only one valid model for judging the distribution of BSE infectivity in cattle, and that is BSE in that species.

The Code Commission was unable to find a scientific justification to retain this text and therefore submitted it for adoption at the 77<sup>th</sup> General Session.

Similarly, the Code Commission did not understand and could not accept the arguments of Members that opposed the use of vertebral column from countries in the 'undetermined BSE risk' category for the manufacturing of gelatin, on the grounds that this material was unsafe. The Code Commission noted that it had already provided scientific justification demonstrating that the manufacturing process for gelatin is in itself sufficiently stringent to render the gelatin safe. If Members insisted that vertebral column from countries in the 'undetermined BSE risk' category (where all other measures have been applied) were unsafe for the manufacturing of gelatin, the Code Commission would find it impossible to support a text suggesting that vertebral columns from countries in the 'controlled BSE risk' category would be safe. The Code Commission, in view of the comments from some Members supporting this change, and failing to understand the justification presented for opposing this change, submitted the text for adoption at the 77<sup>th</sup> General Session.

The Code Commission referred to the OIE Scientific and Technical Department the request of Members that they be allowed to submit their annual update for the purpose of the official OIE classification of their BSE risk status in January or February of each year.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XXIII](#) of this report for adoption.

## 25. Bovine tuberculosis

### a) Bovine tuberculosis (Chapter 11.7.)

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, the EU, Switzerland, New Zealand, South Africa, the USA, the WWG and two OIE specialist Commissions (Scientific Commission and Laboratories Commission).

The Code Commission accepted Members' recommendations to revise the nomenclature in Article 11.7.1. by adding the word 'complex' after '*Mycobacterium bovis* (*M. bovis*)'.

The Code Commission noted the questions raised by the WWG on the role of wildlife and asked the OIE Scientific and Technical Department to make arrangements for the production of specific text for inclusion in the *Terrestrial Code* and a supporting scientific rationale.

Changes proposed by Members to modify the frequency of testing in Subpoints (i) and (ii), Point 1c) of Article 11.7.3. and to Point 4. of Article 11.7.5. were endorsed by the Laboratories Commission and accepted by the Code Commission. However, changes proposed by Members to Subpoint (iii) and (iv), Point 1c) of Article 11.7.3. on the test frequency and annual percentage of herds confirmed as infected were not supported by the Laboratories Commission and were not accepted by the Code Commission.

Members raised concerns about the deletion of Article 11.7.4. but the Code Commission explained that this Article had become obsolete as a result of the introduction of the compartmentalisation concept, whereby one or more herds can qualify for classification as a free compartment.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member's request to add the word 'immediate' in the title of Article 11.7.6. on the importation of cattle (etc.) for slaughter, as the provisions in this Article already describe the conditions and do not relate to high risk animals for immediate slaughter.

### b) Bovine tuberculosis of farmed cervidae (new draft Chapter)

The Code Commission received comments from the EU, New Zealand, Switzerland and the USA.

After careful review of Member comments and in light of the advice received from the Laboratories Commission on Chapter 11.7. and on the draft Chapter on bovine tuberculosis of farmed cervidae, the Code Commission modified this draft Chapter to make it consistent with Chapter 11.7. as revised (see above).

The Code Commission accepted a Member's comment to delete text on artificial insemination centres in Article 6.1.point b because this text did not reflect the commercial reality of the farmed cervid industry in most countries.

The Code Commission did not accept a Member's proposal to create a new Article on the importation of milk and milk products as it was not aware that any OIE Member has a commercial dairy industry based on cervidae.

The revised texts are presented at [Annex XXIV](#) of this report for adoption.

## 26. Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (Chapter 11.8.)

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Canada, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, Panama, Switzerland, a regional organisation (the OIRSA) and the Scientific Commission.

The Code Commission noted advice from the *ad hoc* Group on CBPP that the inclusion of the yak as a susceptible species awaits confirmation from a Member.

In response to Member comments, the Code Commission modified Article 11.8.1. to exclude semen, *in vitro* derived cattle embryos and lungs from the list of commodities considered safe for international trade and created new Articles dealing with cattle semen (Article 11.8.7. bis/tris) and embryos (Article 11.8.7. quads/quints).

The revised text is presented at [Annex XXV](#) of this report for adoption.

## 27. Equine diseases

### a) African horse sickness (Chapter 12.1.)

The Code Commission received comments from the Dominican Republic, the EU, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, Switzerland, the USA, a regional organisation (the OIRSA) and the IFHA.

Following advice received from the OIE Scientific and Technical Department, the Code Commission did not accept a request from a Member to modify Article 12.1.2.

In light of Member comments the Code Commission agreed that the Articles dealing with clinical surveillance for AHS should be revised.

### b) Equine influenza (Chapter 12.7.)

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, the EU, New Zealand and the IFHA.

Noting support from the Laboratories Commission, the Code Commission accepted a Member's comment to amend Articles 12.7.3. and 12.7.6.

### c) Equine rhinopneumonitis (Chapter 12.9.)

The Code Commission received comments from the EU, Japan, the USA and the IFHA.

To address the repeated comments of a Member and the IFHA and in light of advice from the Laboratories Commission, the Code Commission added a sentence clarifying that the application of measures for international trade purposes is relevant only to the abortigenic and paralytic forms of EHV-1 infection, not to EHV-4 infection, and modified Article 12.9.2. accordingly.

### d) Equine viral arteritis (Chapter 12.10.)

The Code Commission received comments from the Dominican Republic, the EU, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, South Africa, the USA, a regional organisation (the OIRSA) and the IFHA.

In response to Members' requests and taking account of advice from the Laboratories Commission, some changes were made to the Articles dealing with vaccination and to Article 12.10.2.

In regard to some additional points on vaccination raised by Members and the IFHA, the Code Commission requested additional advice from the Laboratories Commission.

The revised texts are presented at [Annex XXVI](#) of this report for adoption.

## 28. Scrapie (Chapter 14.9.)

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Australia, Canada, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, South Africa, the USA, two regional organisations (the OIRSA and the CVP) and the IETS.

The Code Commission noted that a Member had, once again, proposed that atypical scrapie is a contagious disease and that the *Terrestrial Code* should reflect this. The Code Commission restated its position, that although atypical scrapie can be transmitted experimentally by intracerebral inoculation, the scientific and epidemiological evidence strongly indicates that the disease is not contagious. ('Contagious' meaning transmissible by contact.)

In atypical scrapie, neither infectivity nor PrP-sc [which is different from the PrP-sc of classical scrapie] is found in any tissues of the lymphoreticular system. Atypical scrapie infectivity and/or PrP-sc has not been found in any tissue except CNS.

In response to Member comments and in light of advice of the IETS, the Code Commission removed sheep and goat semen from the list of safe commodities in Article 14.9.1. and made some consequent amendments elsewhere in this Chapter, including reinstating Article 14.9.8. A Member's proposal to include sheep and goat embryos on the list of safe commodities was not accepted, based on the advice of the IETS which recommended that the OIE await the results of current scientific studies on the question of scrapie transmission via sheep embryos.

The term 'small ruminants' was replaced by 'sheep and goats' throughout Chapter 14.9.

The Code Commission discussed the proposal of some Members to remove the option of historical freedom from scrapie (Article 14.9.14.). On the basis of a review of the relevant provisions of this Article and, noting that there is no public health risk from scrapie (as there is from BSE), the Code Commission determined that the provisions were sound and should not be modified.

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments on the requirements for surveillance and on the establishment of scrapie free compartments (Article 14.9.2.) and modified the text as appropriate.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XXVII](#) of this report for adoption.

## 29. African swine fever and classical swine fever

### a) Classical swine fever (Chapter 15.3.)

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Canada, Chile, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Guatemala, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, South Africa, Switzerland, the USA, a regional organisation (the OIRSA), the WWG and the Scientific Commission.

The Code Commission noted Member comments calling for a revision of the incubation period and, after consulting the current OIE disease card, which states that the incubation period of CSF is 2-14 days, modified Article 15.3.1. accordingly.

In response to a Member's comment about the undesirability of importing pigs with vaccine derived antibodies, the Code Commission clarified that Members could address this concern as part of their import regulations.

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments on Article 15.3.12., regarding a minimum period of 6 months to be respected before importing fresh pig meat from a country or zone after recovery of CSF free status. The Code Commission had already clarified this point and considered that no further changes were required.

To provide clarification on the importation of skins and trophies, the Code Commission developed a new Article separating these from the importation of animal products, basing the new Article on the relevant Article in Chapter 8.5. (FMD), and thus simplified the text of Article 15.3.14.

In response to a Member seeking clarification on the inactivation of CSFV in pig meat products, as set out in Article 15.3.19., the Code Commission confirmed that the *ad hoc* Group on Trade in Animal Products ('commodities') is reviewing scientific information relevant to viral inactivation in meat products, starting with FMD, and would provide advice to the OIE in due course.

The Code Commission accepted Members' recommendations regarding the deletion of the concept of 'historical freedom' from Articles 15.3.23. and made some consequent changes to the Articles on surveillance for CSF. The Code Commission considered that the Articles dealing with surveillance for CSF should be further reviewed by an expert once the revised Chapter had been adopted, to take account of the changes under discussion.

The Code Commission modified several Articles in Chapter 15.3.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XXVIII](#) of this report for adoption.

**b) African swine fever (Chapter 15.1.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the EU.

The Code Commission recognised that it would be necessary to update Chapter 15.1. (African swine fever) for consistency with Chapter 15.3. once the revisions to the latter had been adopted by the OIE International Committee.

**30. West Nile fever (new draft Chapter)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, Canada, Chinese Taipei, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, the EU, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, South Africa, Switzerland, the USA, two regional organisations (the CISA and the OIRSA) and the IFHA.

In reviewing Member comments the Code Commission noted that several of the comments had been submitted previously. In response to Members seeking clarification on whether the OIE recommends the imposition of trade measures on horses, the Code Commission recalled that, in the text, horses are described as a 'dead end host' and that Article 8.x.x.2. states 'Members should not impose trade restrictions on dead-end hosts such as horses'. For clarification, the Code Commission added the words 'other than horses' to the titles of Articles 8.x.x.5. and 8.x.x.6. and to the text of Article 8.x.x.7.

In regard to Members' requests for the OIE to modify the list of species that are susceptible to West Nile fever (WNF) and/or to describe chickens and turkeys less than 12 days of age as 'non susceptible hosts', the Code Commission placed the words 'under study' after 'chicken and turkey chicks less than 12 days old' in Article 8.x.x.1. To resolve this matter, the Code Commission requested that Members provide scientific information supporting this request to the OIE for expert review. In response to a Member's request, the Code Commission provided the scientific clarification on the susceptibility of day old chicks to WNF mentioned in the Commission's October 2008 report: 'Even though there is a low likelihood of commercially raised day old poultry being exposed to infection, studies show that they are susceptible to infection and they cannot, therefore, be included on the list of safe commodities.'

The Code Commission strongly recommended that Members adopt this Chapter as the text has been very thoroughly discussed.

The revised text is presented at Annex XXIX of this report for adoption.

**31. Control of hazards of animal health and public health importance in animal feed (new draft Chapter)**

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Australia, Chinese Taipei, the EU, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland and the USA.

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments and made a number of modifications to the text. The Code Commission considered that the draft Chapter had been thoroughly reviewed and discussed and that it was ready for adoption.

The revised text is presented at Annex XXX of this report for adoption.

**32. Trade in animal products ('commodities')**

In addition to the update in Section B of this report, the Code Commission reviewed Member comments on Chapters circulated previously for comment.

**a) Rift Valley fever (Chapter 8.12.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Argentina, Australia, Canada and the EU.

The Code Commission modified the text on commodities that are considered safe for international trade to harmonize Chapter 8.12. with other disease Chapters.

**b) Bovine cysticercosis (Chapter 11.4.)**

The Code Commission received comments from the EU and New Zealand.

In response to a Member's comment, the Code Commission revised Article 11.4.2. because the current text refers to a Codex Alimentarius Code of Practice for ante-mortem and post-mortem judgement which is obsolete and was superseded in 2005. The reference to "moderate infestation" was deleted because it is undefined.

**c) Teschovirus encephalomyelitis (Chapter 15.6.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Canada and the EU.

The Code Commission recognised that recommendations on major commodities are already in the *Terrestrial Code* and decided to delete the Article on trade in animal products. In the light of available scientific information, the Code Commission is willing to add such an Article in future.

A Member proposed to delete Chapter 15.6. because Teschovirus encephalomyelitis is not an OIE listed disease. The Code Commission considered that the Chapter should be retained for the moment, but in future, this information may be presented in the form of a disease card, pending further development.

The revised text is presented at [Annex XXXI](#) of this report for adoption.

**33. Official disease status questionnaires**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia, the EU, Guatemala, Japan and New Zealand.

The Code Commission considered that, in view of Members' support and in the absence of significant concerns, the four official disease status questionnaires should be included in the *Terrestrial Code* as part of a new Chapter addressing the OIE procedures for the official recognition of the disease status of Members for FMD, BSE, CBPP and rinderpest.

The Code Commission requested that the International Trade Department develop a short introductory text as a chapeau to the questionnaires.

The questionnaires, with no amendments, were submitted for adoption.

The new Chapter 1.5. is presented at [Annex XXXII](#) of this report for adoption.

**34. Infectious bursal disease (Chapter 10.11.)**

A comment was received from New Zealand.

The Code Commission reviewed Member comments and determined that until new scientific information was provided, there was no need to consider changes to this Chapter.

**D. TEXTS NOT FOR ADOPTION / FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION****35. Anthrax (Chapter 8.1.)**

The Code Commission received comments from Australia and the EU.

The Code Commission considered a revised text of this Chapter, which had been drafted by an expert who incorporated published scientific information on the inactivation of the agent, advice from other experts, and Member comments. References were left in the text for information of Members but these will be removed when the text is proposed for adoption.

The revised text is presented at Annex XXXVI in Part B of this report for Member comment.

### **36. Swine vesicular disease (Chapter 15.5.)**

The Code Commission noted that the report of the Scientific Commission (September 2008) contained the following statement: ‘The draft Chapter and surveillance guidelines will be reconsidered during the February 2009 meeting pending the final recommendations of the revised Chapter on CSF.’ At the request of the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission is providing the revised Chapter on swine vesicular disease to Members for comment prior to further review and harmonisation with the format of the Chapter on classical swine fever. The Code Commission reminded Members that in the 2007 edition of the *Terrestrial Code*, swine vesicular disease was identified as Chapter 2.6.5. but in the 2008 edition this Chapter was renumbered as Chapter 15.5.

The revised text provided by Scientific Commission is presented at Annex XXXVII in Part B of this report for Member comment.

## **E. OTHER ISSUES**

### **37. Applications for OIE Collaborating Centers**

The Code Commission acknowledged three applications for new Collaborating Centres as follows. The Code Commission endorsed these submissions and recommended that the International Trade Department forward the applications according to the normal OIE procedure.

- a) OIE Collaborating Centre for Food Safety - Research Centre for Food Safety, Graduate School of Agricultural and Life Sciences, University of Tokyo, Japan
- b) OIE Collaborating Centre for Animal Welfare Research Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile  
This centre will work jointly with the Animal Welfare group at the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Montevideo, Uruguay.
- c) OIE Collaborating Centre for Animal Welfare Science and Bioethical Analysis MAF Biosecurity New Zealand Wellington, NEW ZEALAND

This Centre will incorporate and replace the current OIE Collaborating Centre for Animal Welfare Science and Bioethical Analysis (Asia/Pacific), and will include participation from the following institutions:

- i) Animal Welfare Science and Bioethics Centre (AWSBC), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand;
- ii) Animal Behaviour and Welfare Research Centre, AgResearch Ruakura, Hamilton, New Zealand;
- iii) The Animal Welfare Science Centre, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia;
- iv) The Centre for Animal Welfare and Ethics, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Queensland, Australia;
- v) The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), Division of Livestock Industries, St Lucia, Queensland, Australia.

### 38. Wildlife disease reporting

A comment was received from South Africa.

Dr Karim Ben Jebara, Head of the OIE Animal Health Information Department, joined the Code Commission for discussion on this item. In response to the Member's comment, Dr Ben Jebara advised that the objective of the questionnaire on wildlife disease notification for the collection of 2008 data is to align this activity with the WAHIS reporting system and to help countries to prepare for the use in future of the WAHIS-Wild web application. It is envisaged that most of the information on OIE listed diseases will come from WAHIS. Wildlife focal points would only have to complete the questionnaire for wild animals if needed and to process information on wildlife diseases that are not OIE listed diseases.

As mentioned in the questionnaire, only one template should be used for each disease/infection reported, either by month or for the whole six month period. While the Excel questionnaire cannot be as user friendly as an online notification system, the OIE has made efforts to make it as user friendly as possible. The occurrence codes may vary from country to country. It is possible for countries that have significant wildlife populations (such as South Africa) to have many diseases in wildlife in one or more zones, in which case the occurrence code +() should be used. Wildlife focal points (not national Delegates) should play a major role in their countries in collecting information from the various stakeholders, including conservation agencies and NGOs, to prepare and provide this, via the national Delegate, to the OIE.

The objective of integrating WAHIS with the wildlife disease notification system is to avoid duplicating reporting through the WAHIS System. The new questionnaire to collect data for 2008, in which the OIE requested data on listed diseases in wildlife, may give the impression of duplication because the two systems have not yet been completely integrated. However, this problem will be corrected when WAHIS and WAHIS - Wild are integrated in early 2010, when it will be time to collect data for 2009.

### 39. The Rights and Obligations of OIE Members in relation to International Trade and Disputes

The Code Commission noted that the OIE has developed a text for guidance of Members in regard to their rights and obligations in relation to international trade and disputes. This text is currently not intended for inclusion in the *Terrestrial Code* but is to be placed on the OIE Internet site.

The text is attached in Annex XXXVIII for information of Members.

### 40. Report of the Working Group and *ad hoc* Groups

The Code Commission endorsed the reports of the APFSWG, the *ad hoc* Group on Salmonellosis and the *ad hoc* Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare.

These reports are attached in Annexes XXXIX to XLI for information of Members.

### 41. Future work programme of the Code Commission

The Code Commission made no changes to the work programme, which it will review at its next meeting. The Code Commission asked the International Trade Department to prepare an updated work programme and to circulate it to the members of the Commission for detailed discussion at the September 2009 meeting.

### 42. Others

The next meeting of the Commission is scheduled for 7-18 September 2009.

---

.../Annexes

