



Organisation Mondiale de la Santé Animale

World Organisation for Animal Health

Organización Mundial de Sanidad Animal

Original: English  
October 2006

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

Paris, 2-13 October 2006

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (hereafter referred to as the Terrestrial Code Commission) met at the OIE Headquarters in Paris from 2 to 13 October 2006.

The members of the Terrestrial Code Commission are listed in Appendix I. The agenda adopted is given in Appendix II.

The Terrestrial Code Commission examined various OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (hereinafter referred to as the *Terrestrial Code*) texts in response to Member Countries' comments received by the end of August, as well as outstanding comments from the previous meeting and the General Session. During this meeting, the Terrestrial Code Commission again experienced difficulty in examining some of the comments because of the lack of explicit rationale.

The outcome of the Terrestrial Code Commission's work is presented as appendices to this report. Amendments made to existing chapters and previously circulated drafts are shown as double underlined text, with deleted text in strikeout.

Member Countries should note that, unless stated otherwise, all texts submitted for comment in this report (Part A) may be proposed for adoption at the 75<sup>th</sup> General Session. Depending on the nature of the comments received on each text, the Terrestrial Code Commission will indicate in its March 2007 meeting report whether a particular text will be proposed for adoption or held for further work.

The Terrestrial Code Commission strongly encourages Member Countries to participate in the development of the OIE's international standards by sending comments on this report. The Terrestrial Code Commission reiterates that it would be very helpful if comments were submitted as specific proposed text changes, supported by a scientific rationale.

Comments on this report need to reach the OIE Headquarters by **10 February 2007** in order to be considered at the next meeting of the Terrestrial Code Commission in March 2007. Comments should be sent to the International Trade Department at: [trade.dept@oie.int](mailto:trade.dept@oie.int).

The Director General, Dr B. Vallat, welcomed the members and thanked them for their willingness to participate in this important work. He noted the need of further close communication and cooperation among Specialist Commissions, in particular between the Terrestrial Code Commission and the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (hereafter referred to as the Scientific Commission) for developing and revising chapters and appendices of the *Terrestrial Code*, and between the Terrestrial Code Commission and Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Aquatic Animals Commission) for harmonisation of the two Codes.

Dr Vallat briefed the Terrestrial Code Commission on the recent meeting he held with Presidents of Specialist Commissions and the directors of Scientific and Technical Department and the International Trade Department. The purpose of that meeting was to review the terms of reference of the Commissions and to improve coordination between Commissions and Departments. Arrangements were made to improve the exchange of information including documents.

The Terrestrial Code Commission had detailed discussions with Dr Vallat on: BSE Chapter and Appendix on BSE risk assessment; the future of draft guidelines of traceability; the review of the *Performance, Vision and Strategy [PVS] Instrument* and the development of indicators and manual for evaluators; the terms of reference for the *ad hoc* Group on certification; the definition of animal handler as recommended by the Working Group on Animal Welfare; the urgently needed review of the Chapter on rinderpest; the review of the Chapter on zoning and compartmentalisation; and modification of the Chapter on avian influenza.

The Terrestrial Code Commission thanked the following Member Countries for providing written comments: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, the European Union (EU), Japan, New Zealand, South Africa, Sudan, Switzerland, Taipei China and the United States of America (USA).

#### **A. TEXTS WHICH ARE SUBMITTED FOR MEMBER COUNTRY COMMENT**

##### **1. General definitions (Chapter 1.1.1.)**

After considering many Member Countries' concerns about the definition of "animal handler", including the proposed requirement for certification of competency, the Terrestrial Code Commission modified the text in the general definitions. An explanation for this decision may be found under Item 19 Animal Welfare below.

Comments received from countries on the definitions of "slaughter" and "stunning" will be forwarded to the Working Group on Animal Welfare for further examination.

Noting that there are two different definitions for "surveillance", one in Chapter 1.1.1. and the other in Appendix 3.8.1., the Terrestrial Code Commission decided to seek advice from the Scientific Commission, for a single definition of surveillance, including examination of the closely-related definition of "monitoring".

The Terrestrial Code Commission reviewed the definitions adopted for 'veterinary services', 'veterinary authority' and 'veterinary administration' and the usage of these terms in the *Terrestrial Code*. The Terrestrial Code Commission agreed that, in principle, definitions for the terms 'competent authority', 'veterinary authority' and 'veterinary services' should be clarified and steps taken to ensure that these terms are used consistently throughout the *Terrestrial Code*. The Terrestrial Code Commission proposes to eliminate the term 'veterinary administration' and instead use one of the other terms (as appropriate). Only after the definitions have been finalised can the use of the various terms throughout the *Terrestrial Code* be reviewed and modified as appropriate.

The revised chapter, which is presented at Appendix III, is circulated among Member Countries for comment.

## 2. Evaluation of Veterinary Services

- a) **Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 1.3.3.)**
- b) ***Performance, Vision and Strategy Instrument***

The Terrestrial Code Commission discussed with Dr Vallat the future development of the *Performance, Vision and Strategy* [PVS] *Instrument* and next steps in the development of a Handbook and Indicators for conducting evaluations. The Terrestrial Code Commission noted the work under way and the planned meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on the Evaluation of Veterinary Services, which will take place from 31 October to 2 November. The Terrestrial Code Commission anticipates reviewing the work of the *ad hoc* Group at its March meeting. The PVS Instrument, the Handbook and the Indicators will not form part of the *Terrestrial Code*. Rather, they will be published by the OIE as an official tool for use in the evaluation of Veterinary Services, in accordance with Chapters 1.3.3. and 1.3.4.

## 3. Zoning and compartmentalisation

The Terrestrial Code Commission has requested that the Scientific Commission evaluate the incorporation of the concept of compartmentalisation into specific disease chapters where applicable.

- a) **Zoning and compartmentalisation (Chapter 1.3.5.)**

An expert was asked to review the chapter and incorporate Member Countries' comments, taking into account the input from the Scientific Commission's concept paper published in the OIE *Bulletin* (No. 2006 – 2). On the basis of further discussion, the Terrestrial Code Commission drafted the revision of Chapter 1.3.5. shown in Appendix IV. The draft chapter is circulated among Member Countries for comment.

- b) **Practical guidelines on compartmentalisation for avian influenza**

Experts have been commissioned to develop practical guidelines on the application of the compartmentalisation concept to avian influenza. There is a possibility of applying these guidelines simultaneously to Newcastle disease. The Terrestrial Code Commission examined an early draft text and provided feedback to the experts to assist in this work. The Terrestrial Code Commission expects to produce a draft for circulation as part of the March 2007 report.

## 4. International transfer of pathogens (Chapter 1.4.5.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission considered comments received from Member Countries. Reassurance was sought that material removed from the revised chapter would be retained in the *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals* (hereinafter referred to as the *Terrestrial Manual*). This was endorsed by the Biological Standards Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Laboratories Commission) at its 13-15 September meeting. A new edition of the *Terrestrial Manual* will be developed in 2007. Chapter 1.4.5. will not be removed from the *Terrestrial Code*. The amendments in the *Terrestrial Code* will be harmonised with amendments in the *Terrestrial Manual* and will be made at the same time.

## 5. Rabies (Chapter 2.2.5.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission followed advice from the Laboratories Commission and updated this chapter in relation to the use of recombinant vaccines in a live virus vector.

The revised chapter, which is presented at Appendix V, is circulated among Member Countries for comment.

## 6. Paratuberculosis (Chapter 2.2.6)

The Terrestrial Code Commission had decided at its March meeting that it could not proceed with revision of the Paratuberculosis Chapter without consulting the Biological Standards Commission on diagnostic methods.

The Biological Standards Commission has undertaken to consult experts for advice on diagnostic methods. Once this information is received and assessed, the Biological Standards Commission will make recommendation to the Terrestrial Code Commission.

The Terrestrial Code Commission considered that there would be merit in forwarding to such experts the text circulated among Member Countries as Appendix XXXVII to the meeting report of September 2005 together with the comments subsequently received from Member Countries.

## 7. Foot and mouth disease

### a) Foot and mouth disease (Chapter 2.2.10.)

The comments received from Member Countries on the chapter were submitted to the Scientific Commission for consideration. Recommendations from the Scientific Commission were incorporated by the Terrestrial Code Commission.

As requested in Resolution No. XXX of the 74<sup>th</sup> General Session, an *ad hoc* Group was convened to consider the establishment of a procedure to expedite the recovery of status in the event of a limited outbreak in a previously FMD free country or zone. The recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group were endorsed by the Scientific Commission and the new article 2.2.10.6.(bis) and a definition for a containment zone were submitted to the Terrestrial Code Commission for consideration. The recommendations were adapted for inclusion in the chapter.

Suggested changes to the chapter, which are at Appendix VI, are circulated among Member Countries for comment.

### b) Guidelines for surveillance of foot and mouth disease (Appendix 3.8.4.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission has requested that the Scientific Commission evaluate the feasibility of incorporating the concept of compartmentalisation into the FMD surveillance appendix (Appendix 3.8.4.).

## 8. Bluetongue

The Terrestrial Code Commission reviewed comments received from Member Countries and the recommendations from the Scientific Commission. The discussion by an emergency *ad hoc* Group on bluetongue held immediately after the meeting of the Terrestrial Code Commission was also taken into consideration. The texts of the Chapter and of the Appendix on surveillance were modified accordingly. These texts, which are presented at Appendices VII and VIII, are circulated among Member Countries for comment.

### a) Bluetongue (Chapter 2.2.13.)

Considering recent outbreaks in Europe and the understanding that bluetongue is increasing its geographical distribution in this region, the Terrestrial Code Commission modified the northern latitude boundary in Articles 2.2.13.1. and 2.2.13.2.

Article 5 was deleted as per the Scientific Commission's recommendation. The Terrestrial Code Commission considers that the risks associated with importation from a bluetongue infected country are adequately addressed in the commodity articles.

The request to reassess the possibility of allowing importation of semen/embryos/oocytes from vaccinated donors was considered by the Terrestrial Code Commission. It was determined that this is already covered by relevant articles in the chapter.

**b) Bluetongue surveillance guidelines**

Comments received from Member Countries on the first draft of the guidelines on surveillance for bluetongue were reviewed by the Scientific Commission and appropriate changes to the text were made. The Terrestrial Code Commission noted the incorporation of the concept of compartmentalisation in these surveillance guidelines and questioned how this could be applied, in practice, to anything more than an individual holding, such as artificial insemination centres and quarantine stations. The principle of vector free premises is already well established in the *Terrestrial Code* without the need to consider the application of compartmentalisation. The Terrestrial Code Commission will further consider incorporating the concept of compartmentalisation in the bluetongue chapter in light of future comments from Member Countries.

**9. Bovine brucellosis (Chapter 2.3.1.)**

Significant comments were received from several Member Countries. The comments were reviewed by the Scientific Commission, which determined that the complex technical nature of the comments required consultation and that an *ad hoc* Group would be convened in February 2007.

**10. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy**

**a) Risk assessment recommendations (Appendix 3.8.5.)**

Among a substantial number of comments suggesting modifications and better linkage to Chapter 2.3.13., the Terrestrial Code Commission recognised it should first address a comment from New Zealand requesting clarification of the purpose of this Appendix in relation to a set of guidelines titled "BSE Questionnaire for country status recognition" prepared by the Scientific Commission. The OIE has agreed to conduct procedures to recognise the BSE status of Member Countries. In view of this, the Terrestrial Code Commission was of the opinion that Appendix 3.8.5. on factors to consider in conducting BSE risk assessment should be incorporated, without further review by the Terrestrial Code Commission, into the documents used for the official OIE categorisation of Member Countries.

Once such guidelines become available to Member Countries on the OIE website or otherwise, the Terrestrial Code Commission will propose to Member Countries that current Appendix 3.8.5. be dropped from the *Terrestrial Code*. It was agreed that any detailed and very prescriptive documents should not be part of the *Terrestrial Code*.

**b) Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 2.3.13.)**

Some Member Countries requested clarification of the term "imported" appearing in Article 2.3.13.2. point a) Release assessment. The Terrestrial Code Commission was of the view that this should be addressed in Chapter 1.3.5. as it is a general consideration in implementation of zone and compartment.

The Terrestrial Code Commission examined outstanding concerns raised by the EU and Japan regarding the risk of potentially infected animals present in the age cohorts born before the risk management measures were enforced. As a result, Articles 2.3.13.6., 2.3.13.7. and 2.3.13.12. were modified.

The Terrestrial Code Commission was informed by the EU that an article from French scientists (D. Calavas, V. Supervie, E. Morignat, D. Costagliola & C. Ducrot) has been accepted for publication in the *Journal on Risk Analysis* and will be published very soon. This document will provide the scientific rationale for changes made to the compliance period (i.e. the period of 7 years from the reporting of the case changed to 11 years from the birth of the case - Article 2.3.13.3. paragraph 3 b).

A Member Country requested to exclude the transverse processes of the thoracic and lumbar vertebrae and the wings of the sacrum from the definition of the vertebral column in point 2 of Article 2.3.13.13. The Terrestrial Code Commission did not adopt this recommendation because it doubted if the proposed definitions would be universally practicable or enforceable.

The Terrestrial Code Commission examined comments from a Member Country regarding the safety of gelatine irrespective of the origin of source material due to the safety of the production process. Based on the supporting document and a risk assessment recently published by the New Zealand Food Safety Authority (NZFSA, 2005, Wellington) and entitled "Officials' Review of New Zealand's BSE Country-Categorisation Measure" (<http://www.nzfsa.govt.nz/imported-food/bse-categorisation/report/index.htm>), the Terrestrial Code Commission decided to revise Article 2.3.13.14. to allow all cattle bones to be used as a source material for the production of gelatine, provided the cattle have passed ante-mortem and post-mortem inspections.

The revised chapter, which is presented at Appendix IX, is circulated among Member Countries for comment.

**c) Surveillance for bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Appendix 3.8.4.)**

The Terrestrial Code Commission examined comments received from Member Countries on this Appendix. Noting that some questions remain on the usage of the full BSUrVE model instead of Appendix 3.8.4., the Terrestrial Code Commission reiterated its intention as follows: Appendix 3.8.4. was developed using a modified version of the BSUrVE model so that it would be easily applicable to any Member Country. However, the Terrestrial Code Commission does not see any problem in a Member Country choosing to use the full BSUrVE model to estimate its BSE presence/prevalence. The reason why Appendix 3.8.4. does not make any reference to the BSUrVE model as an alternative method is that the concept of equivalence underpins all chapters of the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Terrestrial Code Commission did not adopt country recommendations to modify descriptions of cattle sub-populations, as those used in the Appendix are consistent with commonly used terminology. The Terrestrial Code Commission did not adopt a request to expand Table 1 (Appendix 3.8.4.) to provide a more detailed breakdown of cattle sub-populations because it considered that additional detail and complexity would not be helpful. Member Countries wishing to apply a more expanded version for BSE surveillance can use the BSUrVE model.

**d) Supporting document**

The Terrestrial Code Commission received a fully revised supporting document on BSE prepared by a group of experts. The document was commissioned to provide supporting scientific evidence for recent changes made to the chapter on BSE. All Commission members expressed their sincere appreciation to the experts who contributed to the drafting of the report.

The supporting document, which is presented at Appendix XXVIII, is circulated among Member Countries for information.

**11. Equine influenza (Chapter 2.5.5.)**

The Terrestrial Code Commission reviewed country comments on the draft chapter, which was circulated as part of its meeting report in March 2006. The chapter was revised taking these comments into consideration. Most significantly, the chapter was modified to be consistent with the format and the purpose of the *Terrestrial Code*. Articles were modified to meet the requirements for safe trade, rather than identifying the status of importing country.

Submissions suggesting all trade in horses would require excessive quarantine period, including when imported into countries not free of disease, are not justified. Consistent with the approach of the *Terrestrial Code*, only countries or zones that are free or have adopted official control for the disease should require the application of measures recommended in the chapter. Countries that are not free and do not have a control programme should only require measures equivalent to those applied within the country.

The Terrestrial Code Commission received an enquiry about the scientific basis for recommending that no measures be applied in regard to trade in equine semen and embryos (see Article 2.5.5.5. in the working draft). The Terrestrial Code Commission sought additional advice from experts and will revisit this issue at its March meeting. In the meantime, this article is placed 'under study'.

In response to an enquiry about the scientific rationale for adopting a period of 30 days (see Article 2.5.5.10.) as opposed to 21 days (used elsewhere in the draft chapter), the Terrestrial Code Commission requested clarification from the members of the *ad hoc* Group on Equine Influenza. In the absence of definitive advice on this point, the Terrestrial Code Commission decided to adopt a period of 21 days throughout the chapter.

The revised chapter, which is presented at Appendix X, is circulated among Member Countries for comment.

## 12. Equine diseases (other than equine influenza)

- a) Equine infectious anaemia (Chapter 2.5.4.)
- b) Equine piroplasmiasis (Chapter 2.5.6.)
- c) Equine rhinopneumonitis (Chapter 2.5.7.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission examined further comments received on Chapters 2.5.4., 2.5.6. and 2.5.7. As for equine infectious anaemia, country comments on point 3 of Article 2.5.4.2. were accepted to cover equines imported on a temporary basis. As for equine piroplasmiasis, point 3 of Article 2.5.6.2. was modified to give clear guidance. In response to Member Country requests, "equine herpes virus infection" was adopted in Article 2.5.7.2. and added to the chapter title in parentheses. The reference to equine rhinopneumonitis cannot be deleted as this is the name used in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

The revised chapters, which are presented at Appendix XI, XII and XIII, are circulated among Member Countries for comment.

### d) Glanders (Chapter 2.5.8.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission examined newly-received comments on glanders in addition to those received for its March meeting. Recognising the use of surveillance programmes, Article 2.5.8.2. was modified based on a comment from Member Countries. Point 3 of Article 2.5.8.3. was deleted, as testing is considered unnecessary for equines from glanders free countries. Point 3 of Article 2.5.8.4. was modified from 15 to 30 days based on a proposal from a Member Country for reasons of practicality in line with other disease test periods. Article 2.5.8.5. was deleted, as the Terrestrial Code Commission agreed with Member Countries' concerns about exemption from testing for equines, even for immediate slaughter, taking into account the zoonotic potential of *B. malleus*.

The revised chapter, which is presented at Appendix XIV, is circulated among Member Countries for comment. In this Appendix, modifications made during this meeting on the text from the September 2005 report are indicated with a coloured background to distinguish the two groups of proposal.

### e) Equine viral arteritis (Chapter 2.5.10.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission examined comments received from Member Countries and made appropriate changes.

The main change in Article 2.5.10.2. relates to young horses with maternal antibodies. Articles 2.5.10.4. and 2.5.10.5. relating to fresh and frozen semen were combined.

The revised chapter, which is presented at Appendix XV, is circulated among Member Countries for comment. In this Appendix, modifications made during this meeting on the text from the September 2005 report are indicated with a coloured background to distinguish the two groups of proposal.

### 13. Classical swine fever (Chapter 2.6.7.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission reviewed Chapter 2.6.7., which was largely restructured and adopted in last General Session, and recognised that certain articles may still need revision. To avoid possible confusion between point 2 of Article 2.6.7.3. and Article 2.6.7.5., titles of sub-article in Article 2.6.7.3. were modified to clarify that this article concerns the initial attainment of free status, while the word “previously” was inserted in Article 2.6.7.5. to clarify that this article concerns recovery of free status. In light of Member Countries’ comments, the title of Article 2.6.7.4. was modified to clarify the difference between Articles 2.6.7.3. and 2.6.7.4. (being with/without infection in the wild pig population). Point 2 of Article 2.6.7.4. was modified to clarify the intent of these articles.

As for Member Countries’ comments about harmonising time periods that animals must be kept in free countries/zones or compartments to obtain free status (30 days per Article 2.6.7.5.; 3 months per Article 2.6.7.7. and subsequent articles), the Terrestrial Code Commission decided to seek advice from the Scientific Commission.

Suggested changes to the chapter, which are presented at Appendix XVI, are circulated among Member Countries for comment.

### 14. Avian influenza

#### a) Avian influenza (Chapter 2.7.12.)

Although few comments were received on this revised chapter from Member Countries, the Terrestrial Code Commission noted that the Central Bureau has been receiving many inquiries, from Member Countries and industry representatives, about the health status of particular countries following occurrences of HPNAI infection in various birds including wild birds and zoo birds. The Terrestrial Commission therefore clarified the definition of poultry (see point 2 of Article 2.7.12.1).

Considering the ongoing difficulty of Member Countries in applying the measures in the *Terrestrial Code*, which has resulted in trade bans being imposed following the reporting of any findings, including reports in birds other than poultry, a new point 4 clarifying the obligations of countries was added to Article 2.7.12.1.

The Terrestrial Code Commission also provided a clarification in regard to the detection of antibodies in the absence of virus. Further investigation should be conducted to identify the source of the antibodies. This should not be considered as an occurrence of infection if further investigation fails to isolate the virus or to detect viral RNA.

Suggested changes to the chapter, which are presented at Appendix XVII, are circulated among Member Countries for comment.

#### b) Guidelines for the surveillance of avian influenza (Appendices 3.8.9.)

After reviewing countries’ comments, the Terrestrial Code Commission revised the title of Article 3.8.9.5. to clarify that it refers to countries declaring that they have regained freedom.

Suggested changes to the Appendix, which are presented at Appendix XVIII, are circulated among Member Countries for comment.

#### c) Guidelines for the inactivation of avian influenza virus (Appendix 3.6.5.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission reviewed a research paper titled “Thermal Inactivation of H5N1 High Pathogenicity Avian Influenza Virus in Chicken Meat” published by Drs C. Thomas and D. Swayne (Research report to the USDA, 2006 April 25), which was sent by a Member Country for the purpose of reconsidering the conditions stipulated in Article 3.6.5.2. The Commission used this paper as a basis to modify the recommendations on the thermal inactivation of avian influenza virus in poultry meat. Article 3.6.5.1. was modified based on a communication from Dr Swayne regarding his review of his research findings on egg products.

Suggested changes to the Appendix, which are presented at Appendix XIX, are circulated among Member Countries for comment.



#### 15. Bovine and small ruminant semen (Appendix 3.2.1.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission examined comments received from Member Countries on the Appendix. A comment on point 2 a) in Article 3.2.1.5. recommending to remove the requirement for a serological test in the case of animals from brucellosis free countries was not adopted, as the current definition of 'free country' does not assume that all animals are free of infection.

A suggestion on Article 3.2.1.5 point 3 to use RT-PCR as a suitable testing method was forwarded to the Laboratories Commission for review. An inquiry on the possibility of transmission of border disease via semen was forwarded to an expert for advice.

#### 16. Animal identification and traceability

The Terrestrial Code Commission noted the report of the third meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on Identification and Traceability of Live Animals, which is at [Appendix XXV](#) for Member Countries' information.

##### a) General principles for animal identification and traceability (Appendix 3.5.1.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission addressed the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Group and of the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group in revising the principles. The revised Appendix, which is presented at [Appendix XX](#), is circulated among Member Countries for comment.

##### b) Guidelines for animal identification and traceability

The Terrestrial Code Commission noted the progress made by the *ad hoc* Group on the guidelines for animal identification and traceability. It noted questions from Member Countries about the intended future status of the guidelines and the need to retain a focus on outcomes rather than to develop prescriptive guidance based on system design elements. The Terrestrial Code Commission clarified that the guidelines were intended as an Appendix to the *Terrestrial Code* and that the guidelines would indeed set out principles and general approaches rather than prescribing specific standards. The comments of Member Countries and the Terrestrial Code Commission will be sent back to the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group to consider at its November 2006 meeting.

#### 17. Disposal of dead animals (Appendix 3.6.6.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission reviewed detailed recommendations received from a Member Country on Appendix 3.6.6. The Terrestrial Code Commission considered that these recommendations enhanced the newly-developed guidelines.

Suggested changes to the Appendix, which are presented at [Appendix XXI](#), are circulated among Member Countries for comment.

#### 18. Ante-mortem and post-mortem inspections (Appendix 3.10.1.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission addressed the comments received on Appendix 3.10.1. and considered that no immediate amendments were necessary since the text already addressed these issues. It forwarded to the Animal Production Food Safety Working Group the comments raised by Delegates at the 74<sup>th</sup> General Session.

#### 19. *Ad hoc* Group on the Revision of the OIE Model Certificates

The Terrestrial Code Commission reviewed the report of the electronic meeting of the *ad hoc* Group on the revision of the OIE model certificates which is at [Appendix XXVI](#) for the information of Member Countries. The Terrestrial Code Commission noted the recommendation from the recent OIE Regional Conference for Europe concerning methods to combat fraudulent certification in international trade and recommended that this be considered by the *ad hoc* Group in its work.

The Terrestrial Code Commission reviewed the terms of reference for updating the current texts on certification in the *Terrestrial Code* and recommended that the *ad hoc* Group, with membership as proposed, be convened to do this work.

## 20. Animal welfare

After considering many Member Countries' concerns about the definition of "animal handler", including the proposed requirement of certification of competency, the Terrestrial Code Commission modified the text in the general definitions. The Terrestrial Code Commission supported the principle that animal handlers should be experienced and knowledgeable and that Veterinary Services should have a role in ensuring that competent people work as animal handlers, but considered that it is the responsibility of Member Countries to determine how the competence of animal handlers should be demonstrated. Also, the Terrestrial Code Commission was of the view that formal certification systems for animal handlers may not be practical or feasible for many Member Countries at this time. Consequently, the recommendation by the Working Group on Animal Welfare for the certification of competence of animal handlers was not adopted. The modified definition adopted by the Terrestrial Code Commission appears in General Definitions (Chapter 1.1.1.) and, to facilitate consultation with Member Countries, in the relevant Guidelines. Once adopted the definition would be removed from the Guidelines.

### a) Guidelines for the transport of animals by sea and land (Appendices 3.7.2. and 3.7.3.)

The Terrestrial Code Commission examined the comments of countries and the work done by the Animal Welfare Working Group to refine the draft guidelines for the transport of animals by sea and land including substantial modification to the presentation. The Terrestrial Code Commission noted a recommendation from a Member Country to develop more specific guidance on the transport of poultry and agreed that such work could be undertaken in future. However, this would depend on the priority afforded to other tasks currently before the OIE and the availability of resources to carry out the high priority work items.

The revised Appendices, which are presented at Appendices XXII and XXIII, are circulated among Member Countries for comment.

### b) Report of the OIE Working Group on Animal Welfare

The Terrestrial Code Commission noted the report of the Working Group on Animal Welfare, including some outstanding work in the guidelines on animal slaughter and killing for disease control purposes. The Terrestrial Code Commission endorsed the priorities identified by the Working Group including on the development of guidelines on the humane management of stray dogs, the use of laboratory animals in research and on animal production, housing and management. The report of the fifth meeting of the Working Group on Animal Welfare is presented at Appendix XXVII for information.

## 21. Revision of the structure of the *Terrestrial Code*

The Terrestrial Code Commission agreed to a recommendation from the International Trade Department that, based on the quantity of material and technical considerations, the printed version of the *Terrestrial Code* should be divided into two separate volumes. The International Trade Department recommended that one volume contain horizontal chapters (i.e. all of Part 1 plus some information from Parts 3 and 4, including guidelines on animal welfare). The International Trade Department recommended that the second volume contain specific disease chapters together with appendices relevant to specific diseases (including guidelines on surveillance, inactivation of specified pathogens, risk analysis for specified diseases). A table showing the proposed distribution of current *Terrestrial Code* chapters and appendices in the proposed new format appears in Appendix XXIX for the information of Member Countries.

## 22. Meeting with the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission

The Terrestrial Code Commission held a short meeting with the Aquatic Animals Commission to discuss issues of mutual interest, including: the future structure of the *Terrestrial Code* (the need to divide the *Terrestrial Code* into two volumes and the possibility of combining horizontal chapters of the *Terrestrial* and *Aquatic Codes*), harmonisation of terms and horizontal themes, animal welfare recommendations and exchange of information, including documents.

## 23. Future Work Programme

The Terrestrial Code Commission expressed its satisfaction with the proposal by the Scientific Commission to convene an *ad hoc* Group to review new scientific information and experience of managing rinderpest in the field in order to update the chapter. The Terrestrial Code Commission considered this information to be of urgent priority to modify the OIE pathway to eradicate this disease. On receipt of the report of the Scientific Commission, the Terrestrial Code Commission anticipates being able to review the chapter at its March meeting.

The Terrestrial Code Commission reviewed progress on the work programme agreed at its September 2005 meeting, including comments received from Member Countries on the work programme.

The Terrestrial Code Commission discussed the repeated request from Member Countries to establish a *Terrestrial Code* chapter on the small hive beetle. A draft chapter and supporting documents are currently with the Scientific Commission awaiting review. The Terrestrial Code Commission agreed to expedite work on this request as soon as it receives advice from the Scientific Commission.

A Member Country suggested that, further to planned work on the inactivation of *B. anthracis*, the OIE should develop guidelines on methods for the inactivation of agents of important zoonotic diseases, such as toxoplasmosis, brucellosis and leptospirosis. The Terrestrial Code Commission referred this request to the Working Group on Animal Production Food Safety.

Some other Member Countries' comments that related to disease reporting arrangements were referred to the Information Department.

The updated work programme is shown in Appendix XXIV for the comments of Member Countries.

## 24. Others

The next meeting of the Terrestrial Code Commission is scheduled for 12 to 16 March 2007.

## B. REPORTS OF WORKING GROUPS AND *AD HOC* GROUPS

The following reports are presented to Member Countries for information:

- *Ad hoc* Group on Identification and Traceability of Live Animals (Appendix XXV)
- *Ad hoc* Group on the Revision of the OIE Model Certificates (Appendix XXVI)
- Animal Welfare Working Group (Appendix XXVII)

### C. OTHER DOCUMENTS

The following documents are presented to Member Countries for information:

- Supporting document of the *Terrestrial Code* Chapter on BSE (edition 2006) (Appendix XXVIII)
  - Plan of the division of the *Terrestrial Code* into two volumes (Appendix XXIX)
- 

.../Appendices

Appendix I**MEETING OF THE OIE TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL  
HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION***Paris, 2-13 October 2006***List of Participants****MEMBERS OF THE CODE COMMISSION****Dr A. Thiermann**

*President*  
US Mission to the OECD  
19, rue de Franqueville  
75016  
FRANCE  
Tel.: 33-(0)1 44 15 18 69  
E-mail: [a.thiermann@oie.int](mailto:a.thiermann@oie.int)

**Dr W.-A. Valder**

*Vice President*  
Specialist in Public Veterinary Services  
Graue Burgstr. 79  
D-53332 Bornheim  
GERMANY  
Tel.: (49)-(0)-2227-5850  
E-mail: [wolf-arno.valder@freenet.de](mailto:wolf-arno.valder@freenet.de)

**Prof. S.C. MacDiarmid**

*Secretary General*  
Principal International Adviser,  
Risk Analysis, International Coordination and  
Adjunct Professor in Veterinary Biosecurity  
(Massey University)  
Biosecurity New Zealand  
P.O. Box 2526  
Wellington  
NEW ZEALAND  
Tel.: (64-4) 894-0420  
Fax: (64-4) 894-0731  
E-mail: [Stuart.MacDiarmid@maf.govt.nz](mailto:Stuart.MacDiarmid@maf.govt.nz)

**Dr S.K. Hargreaves**

Principal Director of Livestock  
and Veterinary Services  
Ministry of Agriculture  
PO Box CY66  
Causeway Harare  
ZIMBABWE  
Tel.: (263-4) 791 355/722 358  
Fax: (263-4) 791 516  
E-mail: [skhargreaves@zol.co.zw](mailto:skhargreaves@zol.co.zw)

**Prof. A.M. Hassan**

Veterinary Expert  
Federal Ministry of Animal Resources  
and Fisheries  
Khartoum  
SUDAN  
Tel.: (249)912 163 979  
Fax: (249) 83 475 996  
E-mail: [ahmedhassan32@hotmail.com](mailto:ahmedhassan32@hotmail.com)  
[hescobusiness@yahoo.com](mailto:hescobusiness@yahoo.com)

**Dr J. Caetano**

Director of Animal Programme  
Secretaria de Defesa Agropecuaria  
Ministerio da Agricultura, Pecuaria e  
Abastecimento  
Espl. dos Ministerios  
Bloco D – Anexo B 4-ANDAR  
70.043-900 Brasília DF  
BRAZIL  
Tel.: (55-61)3218 2314 / 3218 2315  
E-mail: [jcaetano@agricultura.gov.br](mailto:jcaetano@agricultura.gov.br)

**OIE HEADQUARTERS****Dr B. Vallat**

Director General  
12, rue de Prony  
75017 Paris  
FRANCE  
Tel.: 33 (0)1 44 15 18 88  
Fax: 33 (0)1 42 67 09 87  
E-mail: [oie@oie.int](mailto:oie@oie.int)

**Dr S. Kahn**

Head  
International Trade Department  
Tel.: 33 (0)1 44.15.18.80  
E-mail: [s.kahn@oie.int](mailto:s.kahn@oie.int)

**Dr T. Ishibashi**

Chargée de mission  
International Trade Department  
Tel.: 33 (0)1 44.15.18.92  
E-mail: [t.ishibashi@oie.int](mailto:t.ishibashi@oie.int)

**Dr W. Droppers**

Chargé de mission  
Tel.: 33 (0)1 44 15 18 68  
E-mail: [w.droppers@oie.int](mailto:w.droppers@oie.int)

**Dr F. Berlingieri**

Deputy Head  
International Trade Department  
Tel.: 33 (0)1 44 15 18 90  
E-mail: [f.berlingieri@oie.int](mailto:f.berlingieri@oie.int)

**Dr L. Stuardo**

Chargé de mission  
International Trade Department  
Tel.: 33 (0)1 44 15 18 72  
E-mail: [l.stuardo@oie.int](mailto:l.stuardo@oie.int)



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

*Paris, 2-13 October 2006*

---

**Adopted agenda**

**A. EXAMINATION OF MEMBER COUNTRIES' COMMENTS AND  
WORK OF RELEVANT EXPERT GROUPS**

- Item 1**    **General definitions (Chapter 1.1.1.)**
- Item 2**    **Evaluation of Veterinary Services**
  - a)    **Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 1.3.3.)**
  - b)    ***Performance, Vision and Strategy Instrument***
- Item 3**    **Zoning and Compartmentalisation**
  - a)    **Zoning and compartmentalisation (Chapter 1.3.5.)**
  - b)    **Practical biosecurity guidelines for avian influenza**
- Item 4**    **International transfer of pathogens (Chapter 1.4.5.)**
- Item 5**    **Rabies (Chapter 2.2.5.)**
- Item 6**    **Paratuberculosis (Chapter 2.2.6.)**
- Item 7**    **Foot and mouth disease**
  - a)    **Foot and mouth disease (Chapter 2.2.10.)**
  - b)    **Guidelines for surveillance of foot and mouth disease (Appendix 3.8.4.)**
- Item 8**    **Bluetongue**
  - a)    **Bluetongue (Chapter 2.2.13.)**
  - b)    **Bluetongue surveillance**
- Item 9**    **Bovine brucellosis (Chapter 2.3.1.)**
- Item 10**   **Bovine spongiform encephalopathy**
  - a)    **Risk assessment recommendations (Appendix 3.8.5.)**
  - b)    **BSE (Chapter 2.3.13.)**

Appendix II (contd)

- c) Surveillance for BSE (Appendix 3.8.4.)
  - d) Supporting document
- Item 11 Equine influenza (Chapter 2.5.5.)
- Item 12 Equine diseases (other than equine influenza)
  - a) Equine infectious anaemia (Chapter 2.5.4.)
  - b) Equine piroplasmiasis (Chapter 2.5.6.)
  - c) Equine rhinopneumonitis (Chapter 2.5.7.)
  - d) Glanders (Chapter 2.5.8.)
  - e) Equine viral arteritis (Chapter 2.5.10.)
- Item 13 Classical swine fever (Chapter 2.6.7.)
- Item 14 Avian influenza
  - a) Avian influenza (Chapter 2.7.12.)
  - b) Guidelines for the surveillance of avian influenza (Appendix 3.8.9.)
  - c) Guidelines for the inactivation of avian influenza virus (Appendix 3.6.5.)
- Item 15 Bovine and small ruminant semen (Appendix 3.2.1.)
- Item 16 Animal identification and traceability
  - a) Animal identification and traceability (Appendix 3.5.1.)
  - b) Guidelines for traceability
  - c) Animal identification and traceability *ad hoc* Group work
- Item 17 Disposal of dead animals (Appendix 3.6.6.)
- Item 18 Ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection (Appendix 3.10.1.)
- Item 19 Ad hoc Group on the revision of the OIE Model Certificate
- Item 20 Animal welfare
  - a) Guidelines for the transport of animals by sea and land
  - b) Report of the OIE Working Group on Animal Welfare



**B. OTHER ISSUES**

- Item 21** Revision of the structure of the Terrestrial Code
  - Item 22** Meeting with the OIE Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission
  - Item 23** Future work programme
  - Item 24** Others
-



## CHAPTER 2.3.13.

## BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY

## Article 2.3.13.1.

The recommendations in this Chapter are intended to manage the human and animal health risks associated with the presence of the bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) agent in cattle (*Bos taurus* and *B. indicus*) only.

1. When authorising import or transit of the following *commodities* and any products made from these *commodities* and containing no other tissues from cattle, *Veterinary Administrations* should not require any BSE related conditions, regardless of the BSE risk status of the cattle population of the *exporting country, zone or compartment*.
  - a) *milk and milk products*;
  - b) semen and *in vivo* derived cattle embryos collected and handled in accordance with the recommendations of the International Embryo Transfer Society;
  - c) hides and skins;
  - d) gelatine and collagen prepared exclusively from hides and skins;
  - e) protein-free tallow (maximum level of insoluble impurities of 0.15% in weight) and derivatives made from this tallow;
  - f) dicalcium phosphate (with no trace of protein or fat);
  - g) deboned skeletal muscle meat (excluding mechanically separated meat) from cattle 30 months of age or less, which were not subjected to a stunning process prior to slaughter, with a device injecting compressed air or gas into the cranial cavity or to a pithing process, and which passed ante-mortem and post-mortem inspections and which has been prepared in a manner to avoid contamination with tissues listed in Article 2.3.13.13.;
  - h) blood and blood by-products, from cattle which were not subjected to a stunning process, prior to slaughter, with a device injecting compressed air or gas into the cranial cavity, or to a pithing process.
2. When authorising import or transit of other *commodities* listed in this Chapter, *Veterinary Administrations* should require the conditions prescribed in this Chapter relevant to the BSE risk status of the cattle population of the *exporting country, zone or compartment*.

Standards for diagnostic tests are described in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

## Article 2.3.13.2.

The BSE risk status of the cattle population of a country, *zone or compartment* should be determined on the basis of the following criteria:

## Appendix IX (contd)

1. the outcome of a *risk assessment*, based on Section 1.3., identifying all potential factors for BSE occurrence and their historic perspective. Countries should review the risk assessment annually to determine whether the situation has changed.

- a) Release assessment

Release assessment consists of assessing, through consideration of the following, the likelihood that the BSE agent has either been introduced into the country, *zone* or *compartment* via *commodities* potentially contaminated with it, or is already present in the country, *zone* or *compartment*.

- i) the presence or absence of the BSE agent in the indigenous ruminant population of the country, *zone* or *compartment* and, if present, evidence regarding its prevalence;
- ii) production of *meat-and-bone meal* or *greaves* from the indigenous ruminant population;
- iii) imported *meat-and-bone meal* or *greaves*;
- iv) imported cattle, sheep and goats;
- v) imported animal feed and feed ingredients;
- vi) imported products of ruminant origin for human consumption, which may have contained tissues listed in Article 2.3.13.13. and may have been fed to cattle;
- vii) imported products of ruminant origin intended for *in vivo* use in cattle.

The results of any epidemiological investigation into the disposition of the *commodities* identified above should be taken into account in carrying out the assessment.

- b) Exposure assessment

If the release assessment identifies a *risk* factor, an exposure assessment should be conducted, consisting of assessing the likelihood of cattle being exposed to the BSE agent, through a consideration of the following:

- i) recycling and amplification of the BSE agent through consumption by cattle of *meat-and-bone meal* or *greaves* of ruminant origin, or other feed or feed ingredients contaminated with these;
  - ii) the use of ruminant carcasses (including from fallen stock), by-products and *slaughterhouse* waste, the parameters of the rendering processes and the methods of animal feed manufacture;
  - iii) the feeding or not of ruminants with *meat-and-bone meal* and *greaves* derived from ruminants, including measures to prevent cross-contamination of animal feed;
  - iv) the level of surveillance for BSE conducted on the cattle population up to that time and the results of that surveillance;
2. on-going awareness programme for veterinarians, farmers, and workers involved in transportation, marketing and slaughter of cattle to encourage reporting of all *cases* showing clinical signs consistent with BSE in target sub-populations as defined in Appendix 3.8.4.;

## Appendix IX (contd)

3. the compulsory notification and investigation of all cattle showing clinical signs consistent with BSE;
4. the examination in an *approved laboratory* of brain or other tissues collected within the framework of the aforementioned surveillance and monitoring system.

When the *risk assessment* demonstrates negligible risk, the country should conduct Type B surveillance in accordance with Appendix 3.8.4.

When the *risk assessment* fails to demonstrate negligible risk, the country should conduct Type A surveillance in accordance with Appendix 3.8.4.

## Article 2.3.13.3.

**Negligible BSE risk**

*Commodities* from the cattle population of a country, *zone* or *compartment* pose a negligible risk of transmitting the BSE agent if the following conditions are met:

1. a *risk assessment*, as described in point 1 of Article 2.3.13.2., has been conducted in order to identify the historical and existing risk factors, and the country has demonstrated that appropriate specific measures have been taken for the relevant period of time defined below to manage each identified risk;
2. the country has demonstrated that Type B surveillance in accordance with Appendix 3.8.4. is in place and the relevant points target, in accordance with Table 1, has been met;
3. EITHER:
  - a) there has been no *case* of BSE or, if there has been a *case*, every *case* of BSE has been demonstrated to have been imported and has been completely destroyed, and
    - i) the criteria in points 2 to 4 of Article 2.3.13.2. have been complied with for at least 7 years; and
    - ii) it has been demonstrated through an appropriate level of control and audit that for at least 8 years neither *meat-and-bone meal* nor *greaves* derived from ruminants has been fed to ruminants;

OR

- b) if there has been an indigenous *case*, every indigenous *case* was born more than 11 years ago; and
  - i) the criteria in points 2 to 4 of Article 2.3.13.2. have been complied with for at least 7 years; and
  - ii) it has been demonstrated through an appropriate level of control and audit that for at least 8 years neither *meat-and-bone meal* nor *greaves* derived from ruminants has been fed to ruminants; and
  - iii) all BSE cases, as well as:
    - all cattle which, during their first year of life, were reared with the BSE *cases* during their first year of life, and which investigation showed consumed the same potentially contaminated feed during that period, or

## Appendix IX (contd)

- if the results of the investigation are inconclusive, all cattle born in the same herd as, and within 12 months of the birth of, the BSE cases,
- if alive in the country, *zone* or *compartment*, are permanently identified, and their movements controlled, and, when slaughtered or at death, are completely destroyed.

## Article 2.3.13.4.

**Controlled BSE risk**

*Commodities* from the cattle population of a country, *zone* or *compartment* pose a controlled risk of transmitting the BSE agent if the following conditions are met:

1. a *risk assessment*, as described in point 1 of Article 2.3.13.2., has been conducted in order to identify the historical and existing risk factors, and the country has demonstrated that appropriate measures are being taken to manage all identified risks, but these measures have not been taken for the relevant period of time;
2. the country has demonstrated that Type A surveillance in accordance with Appendix 3.8.4. has been carried out and the relevant points target, in accordance with Table 1, has been met; Type B surveillance may replace Type A surveillance once the relevant points target is met;
3. EITHER:
  - a) there has been no *case* of BSE or, if there has been a *case*, every *case* of BSE has been demonstrated to have been imported and has been completely destroyed, the criteria in points 2 to 4 of Article 2.3.13.2. are complied with, and it can be demonstrated through an appropriate level of control and audit that neither *meat-and-bone meal* nor *greaves* derived from ruminants has been fed to ruminants, but at least one of the following two conditions applies:
    - i) the criteria in points 2 to 4 of Article 2.3.13.2. have not been complied with for 7 years;
    - ii) it cannot be demonstrated that controls over the feeding of *meat-and-bone meal* or *greaves* derived from ruminants to ruminants have been in place for 8 years;

OR

- b) there has been an indigenous *case* of BSE, the criteria in points 2 to 4 of Article 2.3.13.2. are complied with, and it can be demonstrated through an appropriate level of control and audit that neither *meat-and-bone meal* nor *greaves* derived from ruminants has been fed to ruminants, but at least one of the following two conditions applies:
  - i) the criteria in points 2 to 4 of Article 2.3.13.2. have not been complied with for 7 years;
  - ii) it cannot be demonstrated that controls over the feeding of *meat-and-bone meal* and *greaves* derived from ruminants to ruminants have been in place for 8 years;

AND

- iii) all BSE cases, as well as:
  - all cattle which, during their first year of life, were reared with the BSE cases during their first year of life, and which investigation showed consumed the same potentially contaminated feed during that period, or

## Appendix IX (contd)

- if the results of the investigation are inconclusive, all cattle born in the same herd as, and within 12 months of the birth of, the BSE cases,
- if alive in the country, *zone* or *compartment*, are permanently identified, and their movements controlled, and, when slaughtered or at death, are completely destroyed.

## Article 2.3.13.5.

**Undetermined BSE risk**

The cattle population of a country, *zone* or *compartment* poses an undetermined BSE risk if it cannot be demonstrated that it meets the requirements of another category.

## Article 2.3.13.6.

When importing from a country, *zone* or *compartment* posing a negligible BSE risk, *Veterinary Administrations* should require:

for all commodities from cattle not listed in point 1 of Article 2.3.13.1.

the presentation of an *international veterinary certificate* attesting that the country, *zone* or *compartment* complies with the conditions in Article 2.3.13.3.

Article 2.3.13.6.a

When importing from a country, *zone* or *compartment* posing a negligible BSE risk, *Veterinary Administrations* should require:

for cattle selected for export

the presentation of an *international veterinary certificate* attesting that the animals:

1. are identified by a permanent identification system enabling them to be traced back to the dam and herd of origin, and are not exposed cattle as described in point 3) b) iii) of Article 2.3.13.3.;
2. were born after the date from which the ban on the feeding of ruminants with *meat-and-bone meal* and *greaves* derived from ruminants had been effectively enforced.

## Article 2.3.13.7.

When importing from a country, *zone* or *compartment* posing a controlled BSE risk, *Veterinary Administrations* should require:

for cattle

the presentation of an *international veterinary certificate* attesting that:

1. the country, *zone* or *compartment* complies with the conditions referred to in Article 2.3.13.4.;
2. cattle selected for export are identified by a permanent identification system enabling them to be traced back to the dam and herd of origin, and are not exposed cattle as described in point 3b)iii) of Article 2.3.13.4.;