

AQUATIC ANIMAL HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION

SEPTEMBER 2012 REPORT

CHAPTER 1.2.

**CRITERIA FOR LISTING
AQUATIC ANIMAL DISEASES**

Article 1.2.1.

Introduction

This chapter describes the criteria for listing *diseases* in Chapter 1.3 of the *Aquatic Code*. The objective of listing is to support Members' efforts to prevent the transboundary spread of important *diseases of aquatic animals* through transparent and consistent reporting.

For the *diseases* listed in accordance with Article 1.2.2., the corresponding disease-specific chapters in the *Aquatic Code* provide standards for safe international trade in *aquatic animals* and their products.

The purpose of listing *diseases* in accordance with Article 1.2.3. is to collect epidemiological information to improve understanding of an *emerging disease*. This information is collected to enable later consideration of listing of the *disease* in accordance with Article 1.2.2. *Diseases* listed in accordance with Article 1.2.3. do not have a corresponding disease-specific chapter in the *Aquatic Code*.

The requirements for notification of *listed diseases* are detailed in Chapter 1.1.

Article ~~1.2.1~~-1.2.2.

Criteria for listing an aquatic animal disease

Diseases proposed for listing should meet the relevant criteria as set out in A. Consequences, B. Spread and C. Diagnosis. Therefore, to be listed, a *disease* should have the following characteristics: 1 or 2 or 3; and 4 or 5; and 6; and 7; and 8. Such proposals should be accompanied by a *case definition* for the *disease* under consideration.

No.		Criteria for listing	Explanatory notes
A. Consequences			
1.		The disease has been shown to cause significant production losses at a national or multinational (zonal or regional) level.	There is a general pattern that the disease will lead to losses in susceptible species, and that morbidity or mortality are related primarily to the infectious agent and not management or environmental factors. (Morbidity includes, for example, loss of production due to spawning failure.) The direct economic impact of the disease is linked to its morbidity, mortality and effect on product quality.
2.	Or	The disease has been shown to or scientific evidence indicates that it is likely to cause significant morbidity or mortality in wild aquatic animal populations.	Wild aquatic animal populations can be populations that are commercially harvested (wild fisheries) and hence are an economic asset. However, the asset could be ecological or environmental in nature, for example, if the population consists of an endangered species of aquatic animal or an aquatic animal potentially endangered by the disease.
3.	Or	The agent is of public health concern.	

No.		Criteria for listing	Explanatory notes
And B. Spread			
4.		Infectious aetiology of the disease is proven.	
5.	Or	An infectious agent is strongly associated with the disease, but the aetiology is not yet known.	Infectious diseases of unknown aetiology can have equally high-risk implications as those diseases where the infectious aetiology is proven. Whilst disease occurrence data are gathered, research should be conducted to elucidate the aetiology of the disease and the results be made available within a reasonable period of time.
6.	And	Likelihood of international spread, including via live animals, their products or fomites.	International trade in aquatic animal species susceptible to the disease exists or is likely to develop and, under international trading practices, the entry and establishment of the disease is likely.
7.	And	Several countries or countries with zones may be declared free of the disease based on the general surveillance principles outlined in Chapter 1.4. of the <i>Aquatic Code</i> .	Free countries/zones could still be protected. Listing of diseases that are ubiquitous or extremely widespread would render notification unfeasible. However, individual countries that run a control programme on such a disease can propose its listing provided they have undertaken a scientific evaluation to support their request. Examples may be the protection of broodstock from widespread diseases, or the protection of the last remaining free zones from a widespread disease.
And C. Diagnosis			
8.		A repeatable and robust means of detection/diagnosis exists.	A diagnostic test should be widely available and preferably has undergone a formal standardisation and validation process using routine field samples (See <i>Aquatic Manual</i> .) or a robust case definition is available to clearly identify cases and allow them to be distinguished from other pathologies.

Article ~~1.2.2~~-1.2.3.

Criteria for listing an emerging aquatic animal disease

An ~~newly recognised~~ **emerging** disease or a ~~known disease~~ behaving differently may be proposed for listing if it meets the criteria 1 or 2, and 3 or 4. Such proposals should be accompanied by a *case definition* for the disease under consideration.

No.	Criteria for listing	Explanatory notes
1.	Infectious aetiology of the disease is proven.	
Or		
2.	An infectious agent is strongly associated with the disease, but the aetiology is not yet known.	Infectious diseases of unknown aetiology can have equally high-risk implications as those diseases where the infectious aetiology is proven. Whilst disease occurrence data are gathered, research should be conducted to elucidate the aetiology of the disease and the results be made available within a reasonable period of time.
And		
3.	The agent is of public health concern.	

No.	Criteria for listing	Explanatory notes
Or		
4.	Significant spread in naive populations of wild or cultured aquatic animals.	The disease has exhibited significant morbidity, mortality or production losses at a zone, compartment or country level. 'Naive' means animals previously unexposed either to a new disease or a new form of a known disease.

— Text deleted