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**PART A - Texts to be proposed for adoption in May 2021**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) held its meeting electronically from 2 to 11 February 2021. The list of participants is attached as **Annex 1**.

Considering the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic the 88th Annual General Session of the World Assembly of Delegates will be held virtually from Monday 24 to Friday 28 May 2021. During the 88th General Session new and revised chapters of the OIE International standards (the *Aquatic Animal Health Code*, the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*, the *Manual of Diagnostic Tests for Aquatic Animals* and the *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals*) will be proposed for adoption.

To facilitate this process, the **February 2021 meeting report of the Code Commission will be distributed in two parts**: **Part A** (herewith) provides information about the new and revised texts for the *Terrestrial Code* that will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session; and **Part B** (to be published in April 2021) will provide information about other topics discussed at the Commission’s February 2021 meeting including texts circulated for comments and information.

In preparation of the virtual 88th General Session, the OIE will organise a series of information webinars to ensure that Members are well aware of the background and key aspects of the standards being presented for adoption. Attendance to these webinars will be by invitation only. Please note that Delegates will soon receive detailed information about the virtual 88th General Session, and in particular the process for commenting and adoption of standards shortly.

The Code Commission thanked the following Members for providing comments: Argentina, Australia, Armenia, Belize, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China (People’s Republic of), Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Japan, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Switzerland, Thailand, the United Kingdom (UK), the United States of America (USA), Zimbabwe, Members of the OIE Americas region, the Member States of European Union (EU), the African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of African Members of the OIE. The Code Commission also thanked the following organisations for providing comments: the International Coalition for Farm Animal Welfare (ICFAW), the International Egg Commission (IEC), the World Renderers Organization (WRO), as well as various experts of the OIE scientific network.

The Code Commission reviewed the Member comments that were submitted on time and supported by a rationale, and amended relevant texts, as appropriate. **The Commission did not consider comments where a rationale had not been provided or that were unclear and difficult to interpret.** Due to the large volume of work, the Commission was not able to draft a detailed explanation for the reasons for accepting or not each of the comments received, and focused its explanations on the major comments. Where amendments were of an editorial nature, no explanatory text has been provided. The Commission wished to note that not all texts proposed by Members to improve clarity were accepted; in these cases, it considered the text clear as currently written.

The amendments are presented in the usual manner by ‘double underline’ and ‘~~strikethrough~~’, and are annexed to this report. In **Annexes 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 21** amendments proposed at this meeting are highlighted with a coloured background to distinguish them from those proposed previously.

The Code Commission encourages Members to refer to previous reports considering longstanding issues. The Commission also draws the attention of Members to those instances where the Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases (the Scientific Commission), the Biological Standards Commission, a Working Group or an *ad hoc*Group have addressed specific comments or questions and proposed answers or amendments. In such cases the rationale is described in the Scientific Commission’s, Biological Standards Commission’s, Working Group’s or *ad hoc*Group’s reports and Members are encouraged to review these reports together with the report of the Code Commission. These reports are readily available on the [OIE website](http://www.oie.int/en/standard-setting/specialists-commissions-working-ad-hoc-groups/).
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1. Welcome from the Deputy Director General

OIE Deputy Director General, International Standards and Science, Dr Matthew Stone welcomed members of the Code Commission, noting that this was the last meeting in the three-year term, a term during which excellent productive output has been maintained despite significant challenges. He acknowledged that the OIE had drawn heavily on the Specialist Commissions as it responded to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the response has always been in the spirit of goodwill, innovation and scientific excellence. Dr Stone thanked all members for their contributions during the term, including the forthcoming meeting, and extended this appreciation to the members’ employing institutions and national governments. Dr Stone briefed the members on the ongoing design process for a full-virtual OIE General Session. He summarised the ongoing work on the OIE standards development and review system, including Standard Operating Procedures development and planning for digital tools. Finally, he provided an overview of the OIE’s continuing support to the COVID-19 pandemic response, including *ad hoc* groups, the development and implementation of the OIE Wildlife Health Management Framework and the compilation of services under the OIE Supporting Veterinary Services Resilience paper.

The members of the Code Commission thanked the Deputy Director General for the excellent support provided by the OIE Secretariat throughout these three years and especially acknowledged the improved coordination of the OIE Headquarters’ teams involved as well as the strong collaboration between the OIE Specialist Commissions.

**2. Meeting with the Director General**

Dr Monique Eloit, the OIE Director General, met the Code Commission on 8 February 2021 and commended the Commission’s work during this three-year term and thanked its members for their support and commitment to achieving OIE objectives. She recognised the Commission’s efforts and adaptability to develop new ways of working to sustain the OIE standards setting process despite the challenges imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. Dr Eloit provided an update on progress in the implementation of the 7th OIE Strategic Plan and highlighted that this plan represents a milestone in the history of OIE, not only due to the technical challenges it implies by promoting new priorities such as aquatic animal health and wildlife health but also because it entails major structural changes towards digital transformation and data management. The Director General recognised that these transformations demand significant resources and will also impact the way the Commission and its Secretariat undertake some of their work. Dr Eloit acknowledged the work already being done by the Commission and the OIE Secretariat to strengthen the discussions and communication with Members regarding their work programme and highlighted that prioritisation of its work programme would be critical during this coming period given the likely constraints on resourcing. Dr Eloit expressed her belief that the new tools and processes developed by the organisation will also support the Commission, and therefore OIE Members, to develop more efficient ways of working, especially in standard setting.

The Code Commission thanked Dr Eloit for making time to meet with its members and commended the excellent work of the Secretariat for meeting preparations and its work during the meeting especially given the challenges of a virtual meeting.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The proposed agenda was discussed, taking into consideration the priorities of the work programme and time availability. The adopted agenda of the meeting is attached as **Annex 2**.

4. Texts proposed for adoption in May 2021

The Code Commission considered comments received on the following new and revised texts previously circulated for Member comments and its responses are presented below.

4.1. User’s Guide

Comments were received from Switzerland, the USA and the EU on the annex circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report.

Background

Amendments to the User’s Guide were last circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report proposing amendments in point 3 of Section B for consistency with terminology used throughout the *Terrestrial Code*, and in point 5 of Section C to include a reference to Chapter 2.2. This text has been circulated three times for comments. At its September 2020 meeting, the Commission reviewed comments received and agreed to defer its discussion until its February 2021 meeting.

Discussion

In point 3 of Section B, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a reference to surveillance for animal health and arthropod vectors of animal disease in the second sentence. The Commission agreed that the first sentence of this point 3 already addresses this point of surveillance and that there was no need for a detailed and exhaustive list. Moreover, the Commission also noted that the second sentence of this point 3 only aimed at highlighting some specific procedures.

In point 5 of Section C, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to amend the text of the second paragraph to reflect all titles of Chapters 5.1 to 5.3, as it considered again that the text was intended to provide a guide for users rather than detailed information. However, the Commission added the word ‘general’ before ‘obligations and ethical responsibilities of importing and exporting countries’ to better stress this approach. With the same rationale, the Commission did not agree with a comment to add references to other chapters in the third paragraph.

Revised point 3 of Section B and point 5 of Section C of the User’s Guide are presented as **Annex 3**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.2. Glossary Part A (‘epidemiological unit’, ‘captive wild [animal]’, ‘feral [animal]’, ‘poultry’ and ‘wild [animal]’)

**a) ‘Captive wild [animal]’, ‘feral [animal]’, and ‘wild [animal]’**

Comments were received from Belize, Colombia, Switzerland and the USA on the annex circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report.

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission had proposed a revision to the Glossary definitions for ‘captive wild [animal]’ in response to a comment submitted for Chapter 15.1, Infection with African swine fever, which was under revision at that time. Arising from the proposed revision of ‘captive wild [animal]’, consequent amendments were also proposed to the definitions of ‘feral [animal]’ and ‘wild [animal]’ and were circulated for the first time in the Commission’s September 2019 report. The amended definition for ‘captive wild [animal]’ has been circulated three times for comments, and the amended definition for ‘feral [animal]’ and wild [animal]’), twice.

At its September 2020 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed comments received and agreed to defer its discussion until its February 2021 meeting.

Discussion

*‘Captive wild [animal]’*

The Code Commission noted that no further comments were received regarding the proposed amendments.

*‘Feral [animal]’*

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete ‘now’ from the amended text given that the meaning of the definition is not dependent on a time reference, but on the reference to ‘an animal of a domesticated species’ in contrast to an ‘animal that has a phenotype not significantly affected by human selection’ as used for the definition of wild animals.

*‘Wild [animal]’*

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘phenotype unaffected by human selection’ with ‘phenotype not significantly affected by human selection’ for consistency with the definition of captive wild [animal]. The Commission did not consider that this change improved the definition and explained that the text had been proposed by the OIE Wildlife Working Group’s experts.

**b) ‘Epidemiological unit’**

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, in response to comments and in agreement with the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission agreed to amend the Glossary definition for ‘epidemiological unit’ to include the possibility that an epidemiological unit can consist of only one animal. The amended definition for ‘epidemiological unit’ has been circulated four times for comments, the last time in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report.

At its September 2020 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed comments received and agreed to defer its discussion until its February 2021 meeting.

Discussion

No comments were received on the amended Glossary definition for ‘epidemiological unit’.

**c) ‘Poultry’**

Comments were received from China (People’s Republic of), Singapore, the UK, the USA and the EU on the annex circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report. An additional comment was received from New Zealand for the Commission’s February 2021 meeting.

Background

In its February 2020 report, as part of the revision of Chapter 10.4, Infection with avian influenza viruses, the Code Commission acknowledged that the term ‘poultry’ is used in many other chapters in the *Terrestrial Code* and therefore proposed to remove the definition of ‘poultry’ from Chapter 10.4 (see Item 4.14) and to amend the Glossary definition for poultry. The amended text had been previously circulated for comments as part of the revised Chapter 10.4. A proposed modification to the Glossary definition for poultry was circulated for comments in the Commission’s February 2020 report.

The Code Commission considered comments received at its September 2020 meeting as part of the discussion of Chapter 10.4, Infection with avian influenza viruses. The Commission’s responses to these comments can be found under Item 6.7 of the September 2020 meeting report. At this meeting, the Commission addressed one additional comment that was received.

Discussion

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘domestic’ before ‘birds’ to align with Chapter 10.4. The Commission noted that this point had been discussed in its September 2020 report, where it replaced ‘poultry’ with ‘domestic’ in point 4 of Chapter 10.4. The Commission noted that it had previously agreed with the *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza, and the Scientific Commission, that birds of wild origin but reared in captivity for commercial purposes should be considered poultry based on the epidemiological risk of spreading avian influenza. Furthermore, the Commission explained that as the term ‘poultry’ is used in many other chapters and is not limited to Chapter 10.4, the definition needs to address all uses in the *Terrestrial Code*.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘current’ before ‘direct or indirect contact’. Although it agreed with the comment that ex-commercial poultry that gets rehomed as backyard poultry for home consumption should be excluded from the definition, the Commission noted that the text is worded in the present tense, i.e. ‘have no direct or indirect contact’, and thus considered that it was unnecessary to be more specific by adding ‘current’.

Revised Glossary definitions for ‘epidemiological unit’, ‘captive wild [animal]’, ‘feral [animal]’, ‘wild [animal]’ and ‘poultry’ are presented as **Annex 4**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.3. Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information (Chapter 1.1)

Comments were received from Australia, Switzerland and the EU on the annex circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report.

Background

Chapter 1.1 was revised by the Code Commission in September 2018 to address inconsistencies in notification by Members through the OIE World Animal Health Information System. Amendments were introduced in points 1, 2 and 3 of Article 1.1.3, and a new point (d) was added to Article 1.1.3. The Commission also reviewed and modified the chapter to ensure consistency with other relevant chapters in the *Terrestrial* *Code*, and to improve grammar and readability. This chapter has been circulated for comments four times, the last time in February 2020. At its September 2020 meeting, the Commission reviewed comments received and agreed to defer its discussion until its February 2021 meeting.

Discussion

**General comments**

The Code Commission acknowledged a comment noting the need to ensure that OIE WAHIS procedures are updated to ensure alignment with any relevant changes, once adopted, in this chapter. The Commission confirmed that OIE Headquarters has mechanisms to ensure that all relevant modifications of the Codes are incorporated into OIE WAHIS processes at the beginning of the year following adoption.

**Article 1.1.4**

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to amend the text to reinforce the importance of notification of emerging diseases as soon as sufficient information is available, as it considered that the current text was clear. The Commission reminded Members that transparent, clear, and timely notification is a compulsory duty of OIE Members.

The Code Commission considered the feedback from the OIE World Animal Health Information and Analysis Department (WAHIAD) on a comment discussed in its February 2020 meeting related to the frequency of reporting follow-up reports for emerging diseases. The Commission noted that this comment should be considered in the context of Article 1.1.4 (rather than 1.1.3), and recognised that the information on emerging diseases would not necessarily evolve every week, hence a follow-up report is not necessarily needed to be sent every week. Therefore, the Commission agreed not to modify the current wording that provides adequate flexibility by encouraging reporting at any frequency needed.

Revised Chapter 1.1, Notification of diseases, infections and infestations, and provision of epidemiological information, is presented as **Annex 5**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.4. Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Articles 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6 and 1.3.9)

**a) Articles 1.3.1, 1.3.2, and 1.3.9**

Comments were received from New Caledonia, Switzerland, the EU and the AU-IBAR.

Background

At its September 2019 meeting, in the context of the discussion of new Chapter 8.Y, Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin, the Code Commission agreed to amend Article 1.3.1 to include ‘Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (*T. vivax*, *T. congolense*, *T. simiae* and *T. brucei*)’, and to delete the current ‘Trypanosomosis (tsetse-transmitted)’ from Article 1.3.2. This decision was based on the assessment done by a dedicated *ad hoc* Group, which had been endorsed by the Scientific Commission in February 2019. At the same meeting, in agreement with the Scientific Commission’s conclusion on the assessments of pathogenic agents against the listing criteria, the Code Commission agreed to amend Article 1.3.9 to add ‘Infection of dromedary camels with Middle east respiratory syndrome coronavirus’. The amended articles have been circulated three times for comments.

Discussion

**Article 1.3.1**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘infection’ with ‘infestation’ at the fifth indent as the use of the term ‘infection’ for an internal blood parasite was consistent with the Glossary definition of infection and in line with the experts’ discussion.

The Commission noted a comment received on proposed new Chapter 8.Y, Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin, proposing to replace ‘animal trypanosomes of African origin’ by ‘specific animal salivarian trypanosomes’ in the name of the listed disease. However, the Commission did not agree to introduce any modifications to the disease name at this time and invited Members to refer to Item 4.12 of this report for its rationale.

No comments were received on revised Articles 1.3.2 and 1.3.9.

**b) Article 1.3.6**

Background

The revised Article 1.3.6 was first circulated for comments in the Code Commission’s September 2019 report, in line with proposed changes made to Chapter 10.4. The revised article was to be proposed for adoption at the May 2020 General Session. However, due to the postponement of the 88th General Session, the revised text was circulated for an additional round of comments in the February 2020 report of the Commission. The Commission considered and discussed comments received at its September 2020 meeting. No further comments were received on revised Article 1.3.6 at the February 2021 meeting.

Revised Articles 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.6 and 1.3.9 are presented as **Annex** **6**, and are proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

**4.5. Animal health surveillance (Article 1.4.3)**

Comments were received from Switzerland and the EU on the annex circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report.

Background

At its September 2019 meeting, as a consequence of the revision of the Glossary definition for ‘epidemiological unit’ the Code Commission amended the text of point 1(d) of Article 1.4.3 in Chapter 1.4, Animal Health Surveillance. The revised Article 1.4.3 was circulated twice for comments, the last time in its February 2020 meeting report. At its September 2020 meeting, the Commission reviewed comments received and agreed to defer its discussion until its February 2021 meeting.

Discussion

The Code Commission noted general comments supporting the proposed changes and that no specific comments were received.

Revised Article 1.4.3 is presented as **Annex 7**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.6. Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE (Chapter 1.6)

Comments were received from Switzerland and the EU on the annex circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report.

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission had agreed, in coordination with the Scientific Commission, to harmonise provisions in disease-specific chapters for official recognition of status. Common provisions concerning procedures applicable to the diseases for which the OIE grants official recognition of status would be addressed in Chapter 1.6, Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE, instead of being repeated in relevant disease-specific chapters. The revised Chapter 1.6 was circulated five times for comments, the last time in its February 2020 meeting report. At its September 2020 meeting, the Commission reviewed comments received and agreed to defer its discussion until its February 2021 meeting.

Discussion

**Article 1.6.2**

In the second paragraph, in response to a request from the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission agreed to amend the text referring to the time limit for Members to apply for the recovery of a previously recognised animal health status to accommodate the need for flexibility in the OIE procedures for some diseases. The Commission did not agree to include a reference to the OIE Standard operating procedures (SOP) for status recognition in this article because SOP is based on existing standards and not the other way around.

Revised Chapter 1.6, Procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE, is presented as **Annex 8**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.7. Quality of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.1), Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2), and new chapter on Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.X)

Background

Chapters 3.1, Quality of Veterinary Services, and 3.2, Evaluation of Veterinary Services, had been revised to reflect the contemporary activities and responsibilities of the Veterinary Services and to better align with other chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*. An *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Services was convened in July 2019 to revise these chapters. The *ad hoc* Group also proposed a new Chapter 3.X, Veterinary Services, as an introductory chapter for Section 3 of the *Terrestrial Code*. The new Chapter 3.X and revised Chapters 3.1 and 3.2 have been circulated three times for comments, the last time in the Code Commission’s September 2020 report.

**General comments**

In response to a comment that Chapters 3.X and 3.1 should not be adopted until the Glossary definitions for ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Veterinary Authority’ and ‘Veterinary Services’ are finalised, the Code Commission reiterated its previous response that until the work on revising these definitions is completed, the current definitions in the Glossary are to be used. The Commission noted that these chapters will be reviewed and updated, if necessary, once work on revising these definitions has been completed (refer to Part B of this report).

The Code Commission agreed with comments requesting to develop a definition of ‘One Health’ in order for Members to have a shared understanding of all that One Health encompasses. The Commission acknowledged that One Health is not only the domain of the OIE and therefore requested OIE Headquarters to consider the possibility of developing a definition of ‘One Health’ in collaboration with the Tripartite and other relevant partners.

**a) New chapter on Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.X)**

Comments were received from Australia, Singapore, Switzerland, the USA, Zimbabwe, the EU and the Members of the OIE Americas Region.

Discussion

**Article 3.X.1**

In the first sentence, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and ecosystem’ after ‘wildlife’, as it considered that the scope of ecosystem is more far-reaching than animals. Furthermore, ‘environmental protection’ is covered in the latter part of the sentence.

In the second paragraph, regarding a comment to add ‘as applicable’ after ‘veterinary domain’ and to delete ‘as they see fit’ because this term would imply that Members could disregard OIE standards, the Code Commission clarified that with the exception of notification of a listed disease, infection or infestation, OIE standards are not mandatory. Nonetheless the Commission proposed to replace ‘as they see fit’ with ‘as they consider appropriate’ for consistency with the language used in the *Terrestrial Code*.

In paragraph 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘national, regional and’ before ‘international veterinary certificates’ as it considered this to be too detailed, and it is a defined term. The Commission explained that the OIE standards on certification are intended for international veterinary certificates, although they can be used for national and subnational purposes.

**b) Quality of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.1)**

Comments were received from Australia, Colombia, New Caledonia, Singapore, Switzerland, the UK, the USA, Zimbabwe, the EU, the Members of the OIE Americas Region and the AU-IBAR.

Discussion

**Article 3.1.2**

In point 7, the Code Commission agreed with a comment that ‘One Health approach’ is not defined, and thus proposed to add ‘collaboratively, including via’ before ‘One Health approach’ to improve clarity.

**Article 3.1.3**

In the first sentence of the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘economics and social science’ before ‘principles’, for consistency with point 6 of Article 3.1.2, but did not agree to add ‘sound’ before ‘risk analysis’ as it considered this to be implicit. For the same reason, the Commission proposed to delete ‘sound’ before ‘epidemiological’.

In the second paragraph, a comment requested to replace ‘governmental authorities’ with the original text ‘Competent Authorities’ as it considered that authorities at the provincial level do not fall under ‘governmental’. The Code Commission did not agree and clarified that ‘governmental’ was not synonymous with ‘national’ and could also cover provincial authorities.

In the same paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘activities’ after coordination as it considered the statement to be clear as written. Furthermore, coordination is not limited to activities, but would also include strategies and approaches.

In point 3, the Code Commission agreed with a comment that the outcome of risk analysis should be used to justify resource requirements to policy makers, and made changes accordingly.

In point 6, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘performance’ after ‘policies’, noting that this is different from the scope of Article 3.1.3 which is on policy and management.

In point 8, the Code Commission agreed with comments to add ‘other relevant governmental authorities’. The Commission did not agree to add ‘non-governmental authorities’ as it considered this was addressed by the term ‘stakeholders’.

In point 9, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘relevant’ before ‘stakeholders’ as it considered this to be implied. Further information on stakeholders is also provided in Article 3.1.6.

**Article 3.1.4**

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘and sufficient’ after ‘qualified’.

In point 4, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘and regular’ after ‘sufficient’.

**Article 3.1.5**

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a new point on public sector professionals, including the chief veterinary officer. The Commission clarified that public sector veterinary professionals are addressed by the reference to ‘governmental authorities’ in the opening paragraph, and by the reference to ‘official tasks’ in the second paragraph.

In the same point, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘and extension’ before ‘services’, and to add ‘awareness of and’ before ‘access to’.

**Article 3.1.6**

In the first sentence, the Code Commission did not agree to add ‘ecologists’ as it considered this to be potentially confusing and to be already covered under ‘researchers’.

**Article 3.1.7**

In the first sentence, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘detect’ after ‘prevent’. However, it did not agree to add ‘disease sources’ after ‘trace’ as the act of tracing is for animal movements. For clarity, the Commission proposed to replace ‘and should be’ with ‘including through being’.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and timely’ after ‘effectively’ as it considered timeliness to be part of effectiveness.

**Article 3.1.8**

The Code Commission noted a comment supporting the additions made to the first two paragraphs.

In the first sentence of the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘primary production stages of the farm to table food continuum’, as it considered this to be too prescriptive. Furthermore, it commented that the roles and responsibilities of the Veterinary Services and human health authorities in the continuum vary between Members.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include ante-mortem and post-mortem inspections for ‘on-farm slaughter when authorised’, noting that few countries implement post-mortem inspections for on-farm slaughter, which is mainly for personal consumption.

**Article 3.1.9**

In point 1(b), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘and appropriate safe disposal’ after ‘administration’.

**c) Evaluation of Veterinary Services (Chapter 3.2)**

Comments were received from Australia, Switzerland, the EU and the AU-IBAR.

Discussion

The Code Commission noted comments that supported the proposed changes to this chapter.

**Article 3.2.3**

In point 2, regarding a comment seeking clarification on the principle of independence, the Code Commission clarified that the objective was to maximise the objectivity and reliability of the self-evaluation, and this could be done through different approaches, including with the use of independent evaluators.

**Article 3.2.4**

In point 6, the Code Commission noted a comment that the correct article reference should be Article 3.1.2 and not Article 3.2.2, and made the change accordingly.

Revised Chapters 3.1 and 3.2 and new Chapter 3.X are presented as **Annexes 9, 10 and 11**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.8. Veterinary legislation (Chapter 3.4)

Comments were received from Australia, Chinese Taipei, Switzerland, the UK and the EU on the annex circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report.

Background

A thorough review of Chapter 3.4, Veterinary legislation, was undertaken by the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary legislation in January 2018. The revised chapter has been circulated four times for comments. At its September 2020 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed comments received and agreed to defer its discussion until its February 2021 meeting.

Discussion

**Article 3.4.2**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to retain the reference to ‘One Health’ under the definition of ‘Veterinary Domain’. While the Commission agreed that veterinary public health should contribute to One Health, it noted that this is an article on definitions, and thus the definition should focus on activities under the ‘Veterinary Domain’, and not how the activities should be conducted.

**Article 3.4.5**

In the ninth indent of point 1(d), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘listing disease for’ with ‘request of’, and to add ‘of listed disease’ after ‘mandatory reporting’. It clarified that this point is about designating a list of diseases that are reportable within the country.

**Article 3.4.11**

In point 3(d), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘suspending, withdrawing’ after ‘granting’.

Revised Chapter 3.4, Veterinary legislation, is presented as **Annex 12**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.9. New chapter on official control programmes for listed and emerging diseases (Chapter 4.Y)

Comments were received from Australia, China (People’s Republic of), Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Switzerland, the USA and the EU on the annex circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report.

Background

The Code Commission added the development of a new chapter on outbreak management to its work programme at its February 2016 meeting. The new chapter was circulated for comments the first time in the Commission’s February 2017 meeting report. Since that time, the Code Commission has made significant amendments to the text having taken into consideration important feedback received from Members as well as advice provided by the Scientific Commission to address specific comments. The revised chapter has been circulated seven times for comments. At its September 2020 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed comments received and agreed to defer its discussion until its February 2021 meeting.

Discussion

**General comments**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to limit this new chapter’s application to diseases for which the OIE grants official recognition of status. The Commission noted that official control programmes are not limited to these diseases, but in the context of the *Terrestrial Code,* cover any programme approved, managed, or supervised by the Veterinary Authority to control a pathogenic agent or disease by specific measures applied throughout the country, or within a zone or compartment of that country. The Commission reminded that this chapter was drafted following the request of Members, and while noting its complementarity with other horizontal chapters in the *Terrestrial Code*, it is aimed at filling some specific gaps that exist in the current *Terrestrial Code*.

**Article 4.Y.1**

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘to be prepared, developed and’ before ‘implemented’, to improve clarity and consistency with the purpose of the chapter as stated in the previous paragraph.

In the sixth paragraph as well as the list of points that follows this paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘infection or infestation’ with ‘disease’. The Commission referred Members to the convention explained in its September 2019 meeting report regarding the use of these terms, and considered that in this context, the use of the terms’ infection or infestation’ was more appropriate. Following this rationale, the Commission agreed to amend the text to ensure alignment with the use of ‘infection or infestation’ elsewhere in this article.

In the seventh paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment that the phrase ‘exit strategy options’ was not clear and agreed to replace it with ‘options for revising or ending them’.

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘from both epizootic or enzootic situations’ to better reflect that the term ‘outbreaks’ referred to the occurrence of one or more cases in an epidemiological unit, in either of those epidemiological contexts. The Commission also agreed to replace ‘trained’ with ‘proficient’ as that is the real objective, not the training itself.

**Article 4.Y.2**

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘disease’ after ‘listed’, as it considered that, although it would be grammatically correct, the convention was to use the full terms as defined in the Glossary.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘sources of finance’ with ‘financial resources’ in several indents, as it considered that the original text was clear and the intention of this point was to focus on the sources, not on the resources.

In the second indent of point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to remove ‘case’ after suspected, as it considered that the repetition was necessary to precisely indicate that there are different procedures for both ‘suspected cases’ and ‘confirmed cases’.

In the tenth indent of point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘products of animal origin’ with ‘products of either animal or non-animal origin’, as the non-animal origin products are covered as fomites in the following points.

**Article 4.Y.3**

In the first paragraph of point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to improve clarity and replaced ‘to what extent’ with ‘the level of preparedness needed’.

In the third paragraph of point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘pathogenic agents’ with ‘pathogens’ and noted that ‘pathogenic agent’ is the term used in the *Terrestrial Code*, after many exchanges with Members when dealing with the revision of the Glossary of terms.

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the wording of some indents to improve clarity.

In points 2(a), (b), (c) and (d), the Code Commission amended the wording to use consistent terminology.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to expand the text to include other workshops and seminars and considered that although correct, it was too detailed and did not add any significant value to the chapter.

**Article 4.Y.5**

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘management and’ before ‘coordination’, as it considered that the focus for this text was on coordination and not management.

**Article 4.Y.6**

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and, for emerging diseases, in accordance with available scientific information’ at the end of the sixth paragraph, as considered this was implicit.

**Article 4.Y.7**

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text, to better reflect that movement restrictions should be based on risk analysis, as movements of negligible risk are critical for business continuity during an outbreak.

**Article 4.Y.9**

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to provide further details regarding disinfection processes, noting that such details should be addressed in Chapter 4.14, General recommendations on disinfection and disinfection. The Commission noted that the revision of Chapter 4.14 is included in the Commission’s work programme (refer to Part B of this report).

**Article 4.Y.10**

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘increase the herd immunity for and’ before ‘decrease the shedding’ to better reflect the benefits derived from vaccination.

In the fifth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add more details regarding identification of vaccinated animals, to avoid being too prescriptive, and noted that such details are already provided in Chapter 4.18, Vaccination.

**Article 4.Y.11**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add new text to highlight the importance of communication with Competent Authorities of trading partners to control transboundary animal diseases. The Commission also added a reference to neighbouring countries for the same reason.

New Chapter 4.Y, Official control programmes for listed and emerging diseases, is presented as **Annex 13**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.10. Zoning and compartmentalisation (Articles 4.4.6 and 4.4.7)

Comments were received from Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, the USA, the EU and the AU-IBAR.

Background

During the last revision of Chapter 4.4, Zoning and compartmentalisation, that was adopted in 2018, some Members had proposed to include new text in Article 4.4.6 on the concept of ‘temporary protection zone’ to minimise the impact that a disease introduction would have on the entire country or zone. At that time, the Code Commission, in consultation with the Scientific Commission, agreed to not address these requests but rather to discuss further how to manage, clarify and incorporate this concept into the *Terrestrial Code*. Since that time, both Commissions have discussed this concept over several dedicated meetings and have agreed on critical aspects of its implementation, the implications on animal health status, and the amendments required for Articles 4.4.6 and 4.4.7. As a result of the exchanges and discussions between the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission it was considered that a better approach would be to modify the current ‘protection zone’ by including provisions for its establishment as a temporary measure, rather than incorporating a new concept ‘temporary protection zone’.

The proposed revised texts for Articles 4.4.6 and 4.4.7 were circulated twice for comments, the last time in the Code Commission’s September 2020 report.

Discussion

**Article 4.4.6**

In response to a comment, the Code Commission agreed to include, in the second paragraph, a limit of 24 months for a protection zone that would be established as a temporary measure, regardless of the official recognition of animal health status by the OIE. The Commission recognised that once a protection zone is established temporarily within a free country or zone in response to an increased

risk of disease, it should be lifted as soon as the risk is mitigated. If a disease incursion occurs, it would either become a containment zone or a normal infected zone. If the protection zone cannot be lifted because the risk is continuing, then the protection zone cannot be considered temporary anymore, and a more permanent arrangement should be foreseen. Accordingly, the Commission also agreed to delete the second indent in the ninth paragraph of Article 4.4.6 as it considered this to be redundant given the change proposed in the second paragraph.

In the sixth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with an editorial comment to revise the wording for clarity, as it considered that it implied modifying the sense of the original text.

**Article 4.4.7**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to revise the wording of point 4(b). The Commission emphasised that the text in this point is clear as written, as it refers to the role of the ‘outer zone’ in separating the ‘inner zone’ from the rest of the country or zone. The Commission also noted that the word ‘zone’ being used in italics refers to the defined term in the Glossary, and implies compliance with all specific provisions provided elsewhere in the *Terrestrial Code* (e.g. Chapter 4.4, Chapter 1.4).

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include a new point (c) referring to the need to establish similar measures within neighbouring countries when a containment zone is bordering on the territory of another country. The Commission agreed that the epidemiological situation in the neighbouring country should be taken into consideration and cross border coordination would undoubtedly improve the efficiency of the measures in the national territory. Nonetheless, as countries cannot implement measures outside of their national territories, this cannot be considered mandatory. Nevertheless, all provisions related to border control and surveillance should be effectively implemented. The Commission also noted that for these cases, the proposed change for Article 4.4.6 provides a suitable approach for dealing with this situation.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to amend the text specifying that a containment zone is considered effectively established when the conditions described in the article and the relevant disease-specific chapters have been applied and documented evidence is submitted and accepted by the OIE. The Commission explained that this was already addressed in the chapeau of point 4 and point 6 of this article.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to revise point 7 to improve clarity. The Commission emphasised that if a case occurs in a containment zone (as described in point 4(a) or in the ‘outer zone’ of a containment zone, as described in point 4(b)), the country or zone that was free will lose its status. The Commission noted that the borders of an established containment zone cannot be further modified.

The Code Commission considered a request from the Scientific Commission to introduce new amendments in Article 4.4.7 regarding the temporality of containment zones. The Code Commission noted that this topic was out of the scope of the current revision and decided not to address it at this stage, given that the amended text was to be proposed for adoption in May 2021. The Code Commission agreed to further discuss this with the Scientific Commission.

Revised Articles 4.4.6 and 4.4.7 are presented as **Annex 14**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.11. New chapter on animal welfare and laying hen production systems (Chapter 7.Z)

Comments were received from: Australia, Canada, Chile, China (People’s Rep. of), Dominican Republic, Colombia, New Caledonia, Norway, Peru, Switzerland, the USA, the UK, Zimbabwe, the EU, the AU-IBAR, the IEC and the ICFAW.

Background

The new Chapter 7.Z, Animal welfare and laying hen production systems, was the last chapter to be developed on animal production systems based on the prioritised list developed by the former OIE Animal Welfare Working Group. The draft chapter was developed by the *ad hoc* Group on Animal welfare and laying hen production systems in 2016 and was considered by the Code Commission at its February 2017 meeting. The proposed new chapter was circulated four times for comments, the last time in the Code Commission’s September 2020 report.

Discussion

**General comments**

The Code Commission noted that despite having considered comments and having made relevant amendments that reflect scientific evidence, Members continue to hold opposing views for a number of articles including recommendations on Dust bathing, Article 7.Z.10; Foraging Areas, Article 7.Z.11; Nesting areas, Article 7.Z.12; and Perches, Article 7.Z.13. The Commission reiterated that as the scope of this chapter is for all types of production, it did not agree with several comments that were considered too limiting in scope. For the same reason, it also did not agree with comments to replace ‘is desirable’ with ‘should’ throughout the chapter.

The Code Commission noted that there has been a tremendous amount of work done to develop this important chapter; it is based on sound science, and it is well balanced between different and opposing views in terms of implementation. It will provide, to OIE Members, a new welfare standard for laying hen production systems that takes into consideration the diversity of production systems around the world. The Commission noted that no new comments of substance had been received during this round of comment. The Commission agreed that delaying the adoption of this new chapter would prevent Members from having access to an animal welfare standard for laying hen production systems and therefore may delay the implementation of improvements in such production systems.

The Secretariat also presented to the Code Commission a proposal to respond to a pending Member comment from the September 2020 meeting about the use of the terms ‘outcome-based measurables’ versus ‘outcome-based measures’. The Commission decided not to discuss the proposal in this meeting, but rather include it in its work programme, as the potential changes and impact go beyond this chapter.

The Code Commission reminded Members to use the official Commission translation of the reports to have a correct understanding of the text when submitting their comments. The use of the official translation will ensure better alignment of the three linguistic versions. The Commission requested that this be addressed and presented in the corresponding Annexes in its Spanish and French reports.

The Code Commission considered all comments received with justification and amended the text accordingly.

**Article 7.Z.1**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment proposing to add ‘intended for human consumption or for meat meal’ to the definition of ‘End-of-lay hens’ because the purpose (or what is done with these hens) is not relevant for this definition.

**Article 7.Z.2**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to replace the term ‘birds’ with ‘chicks’ because ‘day-old bird’ is a defined term in the glossary.

The Code Commission agreed with the comment to add the term ‘layer’ in front of ‘pullet’ and reviewed the use of this term throughout the chapter and amended the text accordingly, thereby addressing similar comments made in other articles.

The Code Commission did not agree with the comment to remove the term ‘laying’ between ‘laying pullets’ and ‘laying hens’ because they considered these as two different types of production animals and so they should be identified accordingly.

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment that proposed new text caveating that the recommendations may not be applicable for different systems. The Commission noted that the text already considered different systems with the use of the term ‘or’. Similarly, it did not agree with a comment to specify ‘in cages or cage-free’ in completely housed systems because the text is flexible enough to allow for either options, and the text should apply to any types of systems.

**Article 7.Z.3**

In the penultimate sentence of the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with the comment to add ‘production systems’ but it decided to do so between the terms’ different’ and ‘situations’.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to replace ‘depopulation’ with ‘depletion’ because the latter has a different meaning. Moreover, the term ‘depopulation’ is used in other chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* to express the same objective as intended in this chapter.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to add the term ‘health’ in front of ‘monitoring’ because by definition, ‘monitoring’ aims at detecting change in health status.

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to remove or change ‘in alphabetical order in English’ because it was important to inform the reader how the terms are ordered i.e. alphabetically rather than by importance, priority or categories. The Commission understands that the order is not alphabetical in the Spanish and French versions, but it is equally important for readers to know why the terms are presented in this order.

In point 2, first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to add text to caveat that some behaviours may not apply to different housing systems. The Commission noted that the performance of certain behaviours is dependent on the production system and therefore not all outcome-based measurables presented are suitable for every system.

In point 2, first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to split the third sentence because it considered the two parts (separated with ‘and’) to be linked where the second part is a consequence of the first part.

In point 2(a), the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to remove ‘is a motivated behaviour’, because it needs to be stated that these behaviours are innate and animals are compelled to perform them even in the absence of any specific stimuli. Also, this wording emphasises the fact that when some of these behaviours are performed, good animal welfare is achieved. The Commission noted that this term is used consistently throughout this chapter. This response applies to the same comment made in points 2(d), 2(g) and 2(h).

In point 7, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add the term ‘equipment,’ before ‘environment conditions’ because injuries can be a consequence of ‘equipment’.

**Article 7.Z.4**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to remove the seemingly repeated terms ‘management practices’ because ‘environmental management practices’ are distinct from ‘animal management practices’ and do not mean the same as ‘environmental and animal management practices’.

In the last sentence of the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with the proposal to remove the term ‘serious’ due to the subjective meaning of the term. It also replaced the second term ‘problems’ with ‘issues’ to improve readability.

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to add ‘may apply’ at the end of the first sentence because the sentence is clear as written.

**Article 7.Z.5**

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal from various Members to add ‘include’, ‘may include’ or ‘suggested’ to the outcome-based measurables throughout the chapter. The Commission noted the importance of ensuring alignment with the use of these terms in other chapters. The Commission reiterated the importance of reading the chapter as a whole, for example, Article 7.Z.3 explains that the list of measurables presented is not exhaustive, and its use should be adapted to different production systems and situations.

**Article 7.Z.6**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with the proposal to replace ‘birds’ with ‘layer pullets’ in the last sentence but removed the terms ‘layer pullets’ from the beginning of that sentence to avoid unnecessary repetition.

**Article 7.Z.7**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to merge the first sentence with the second by adding ‘if possible’ and deleting ‘is desirable’. Also, it did not agree with the comment suggesting to replace ‘is desirable’ with ‘should be provided’. The Commission noted that those two opposite comments have been addressed by the *ad hoc* Group and previous discussion in the Commission. The *ad hoc* Group as well as the Commission considered that *the recommendation in this chapter should be applicable to all production systems considered in the scope of the chapter* (see *ad hoc* Group report attached to September 2019 Code Commission report) and thus the current text *allowed for the continuous development of country specific animal welfare recommendations and monitoring for implementation* (see September 2019 Code Commission report). On the same grounds, the Commission did not take similar comments made in Articles 7.Z.9, 7.Z.10, 7.Z.11, 7.Z.12, and 7.Z.13.

The Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to add ‘flock or group size’ to the list of factors to consider when determining space allowance because space allowance is not dependent on the group size, but rather on an individual animal basis. The group size is dependent on the space allowance, but not the other way around.

**Article 7.Z.8**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission considered a comment and added ‘production system’ as it agreed it was a factor to consider to ensure appropriate nutrition.

**Article 7.Z.9**

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to delete ‘dust bathing’ and ‘foraging behaviour’ and noted that the list of outcome-based measurables is presented for guidance and should be used in accordance with the type of production system. Similarly, the Commission did not agree with the proposal to add ‘appropriate for the type of housing and management’ because it considered that it is implicit, i.e. that these factors should be considered when choosing the outcome-based measurable.

**Article 7.Z.12**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to replace ‘areas’ with ‘boxes’, as the term ‘areas’ is more generic and includes ‘nest boxes’.

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to add ‘under relevant management system’ in the first sentence because it considered that the term ‘desirable’ implies it is recommended when appropriate. The Commission did not agree with a similar comment made in Article 7.Z.13.

**Article 7.Z.13**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the deletion of ‘all’ in the second sentence because it considered that perches should be provided to all birds that can use them and not just by a limited number of birds.

**Article 7.Z.14**

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to remove ‘standing’ in front of ‘water’ because the issue comes from the accumulation of water or water that is standing rather than water itself.

**Article 7.Z.15**

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to change ‘be’ for ‘are’ or ‘can be’ because the use of ‘be’ is grammatically correct.

**Article 7.Z.16**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission considered the comment to add ‘housing’, to the ‘type or systems’, and agreed to add the term ‘design and equipment’ after ‘housing’ to be more specific as to the possible causes that can affect the air quality.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to change the ammonia concentration ‘25 ppm’ to ‘10 ppm’ and reiterated that 10 ppm, as stated in the reference provided, is the concentration that is detectable by humans and 25 ppm corresponds to the level where tissue damage is detected in birds.

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to remove the sentence on ‘dust levels should be kept to a minimum’ because this is based on a recommendation in the reference provided, which shows evidence of a clear synergy between ammonia and dust impairing pulmonary function.

**Article 7.Z.19**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the addition of ‘prophylactic’ and ‘therapeutic’ partial beak removal as it considered that the list of management methods provided is not exhaustive and should not be too prescriptive.

The Code Commission did not agree to add ‘implementing beak treatment at day-of-age in the hatchery’ to the bulleted list, because ‘partial beak removal’ is already considered as a final course of action if management methods are unsuccessful. The Commission did not agree to remove the management method ‘providing nesting areas during lay’ because this addition was based on the scientific evidence that nesting areas do alleviate feather pecking, per reference provided to the Commission.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to add ‘layer pullet and laying hens’ at the beginning of the sentence as it considered that the article clearly refers layer pullets and layer hens.

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to replace ‘euthanised’ with ‘salvaged’ because the concept of ‘salvaged’ was covered under ‘treated’. ‘Treated’ does not imply that the bird must return to the flock.

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to replace ‘partial beak removal’ with ‘beak trimming’ because it considered that both terms refer to the same management method and ‘partial beak removal’ is easier to translate into French and Spanish. The Commission did not agree with a similar comment made in Article 7.Z.21.

**Article 7.Z.21**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission removed the term ‘therapeutic’ in front of ‘partial beak removal’ to be consistent with Article 7.Z.19.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to add ‘shape’ to ‘beak’ in the outcome-based measurables because it considered that ‘beak condition’ includes ‘beak shape’.

**Article 7.Z.22**

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to add ‘and infestation’ after ‘prevention of diseases’ because ‘diseases’ in this context include infestations.

In the fifth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to add a caveat explaining when a bird should be transferred to the hospital area because it considered this to be self-explanatory.

**Article 7.Z.24**

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with the proposal to add ‘impossibility or physical inability to access food or water’ as a reason for euthanasia because it considered that the proposed reason would be a consequence of other reasons already listed and not a reason in itself.

**Article 7.Z.25**

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with the proposal to delete the second sentence noting that it was out of context.

**Article 7.Z.26**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to remove ‘evacuation procedures’ because it considered that the terms ‘where relevant’ written before made it clear that an ‘evacuation procedure’ was not compulsory.

**Article 7.Z.29**

The Code Commission did not agree to add ‘and wild birds’ to the title ‘Protection from predators’ of this article because it considered that this article is not meant to say ‘protect from wild birds’ but simply ‘prevent access to wild birds’ as a general biosecurity measure mentioned in the first paragraph.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree to add ‘predation rate’ to the list of ‘outcome-based measurables’ as it considered it was not a criterium as defined in Article 7.Z.3, but rather it could be considered as cause of mortality, which is already included in the list.

New Chapter 7.Z, Animal welfare and laying hen production systems, is presented as **Annex 15**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.12. New chapter on infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (Chapter 8.Y)

Comments were received from Australia, Switzerland, Thailand, Zimbabwe, the EU and the AU-IBAR.

Background

At its September 2019 meeting, the Code Commission agreed to amend Article 1.3.1 to add ‘Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin (*T. vivax, T. congolense, T. simiae* and *T. brucei*)’ to the diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE and circulated a new Chapter 8.Y, Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin, for comments. The Code Commission together with the Scientific Commission had agreed that three separate chapters on animal trypanosomes would be developed to address the different coverage of trypanosomes species and host animals, and that a new Chapter 8.Y would be the first to be developed.

The draft chapter was developed by an *ad hoc* Group and the proposed new chapter was circulated for comments on three occasions, the last time in the Code Commission’s September 2020 report.

Discussion

**General comments**

The Code Commission noted a comment seeking clarification on the use of terms ‘competent vectors’ and ‘competent tick vectors’ in the *Terrestrial Code* and requesting the inclusion of genera or species of competent vectors in all relevant chapters. In response the Commission considered that the term ‘competent’ referred to a vector’s capability to transmit the disease and found no added value on further defining these terms for the purpose of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Commission also explained that it was not always possible to provide a detailed list of competent vectors for every disease and that such a list could even vary according to the region. The Commission highlighted that the detailed provisions for surveillance for arthropod vectors is provided in Chapter 1.5.

**Title**

The Code Commission considered a comment to change the term ‘animal trypanosomes of African origin’ to ‘specific animal salivarian trypanosomes’ in the title and across the whole chapter. In line with the opinion of the Scientific Commission, the Code Commission agreed with the rationale for that change, that Article 8.Y.1.4 defines the range of trypanosomes targeted in the chapter and that creating disease names that have geographical indicators of little or no scientific value should be avoided. Nevertheless the Code Commission noted that the current title was proposed after thorough expert consultation and had already undergone three rounds of comments. However, the Commission agreed to review this again in the future, noting that it would also require harmonisation with the *Terrestrial Manual* as well as with the use of the disease name by the World Health Organisation (WHO).

**Article 8.Y.1**

At its September 2020 meeting, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘cyclically transmitted by tsetse flies’ to the definition of animal Trypanosomes of African origin in points 1 and 4, based on previous discussions of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal trypanosomes of African origin. The Code Commission noted that the Scientific Commission’s September 2020 report provided a rationale to support this decision.

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘cattle’ with ‘animal’, noting that the chapter refers to many species and not only to cattle.

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘could exist’ with ‘may occur’ to avoid ambiguity but did not agree to delete the reference to ‘routine testing methods’ as it considered it was relevant for this to be highlighted in the context of these general provisions. The Commission highlighted that specific recommendations for diagnostic techniques are provided in the *Terrestrial Manual*.

**Article 8.Y.3**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete point 3(c). Nevertheless, the Commission agreed with the rationale that the absence of competent vectors should not be the only basis on which a country can declare freedom from a disease and noted that this was in line with Article 1.5.1. The Commission noted that compliance with points 1 and 2 of this article is also required, and agreed to amend point 3 to specify that the absence of cases for at least the past two years would always apply, and that it should be complemented either with specific surveillance, in accordance with the relevant articles of this chapter, or with the absence of competent vectors.

**Article 8.Y.7**

In the fifth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete the recommendation for wildlife to be considered in the surveillance system. The Commission recognised the challenges of implementing surveillance programmes in wildlife but agreed that the text was clear as presented and that it does not imply a mandatory requirement to establish dedicated wildlife surveillance programmes, but rather it recommends to consider wildlife, for example to address surveillance targeting ‘at risk’ domestic populations that could be in contact with wildlife.

**Article 8.Y.8**

In point 2(a), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text to also include stakeholders who are neither owners nor keepers but have regular contact with susceptible animals, noting that this is particularly relevant for wildlife.

Translation changes were included in the Spanish version of the chapter to better align with the versions in French and English.

New Chapter 8.Y, Infection with animal trypanosomes of African origin, is presented as **Annex 16**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.13. Infestation with Aethina tumida (Small hive beetle) (Article 9.4.5)

Comments were received from Switzerland, the EU and the AU-IBAR.

Background

At its February 2020 meeting, the Code Commission agreed to amend Article 9.4.5 in response to a comment concerning the timing of inspection prior to export and the area freedom from the occurrence of infestation with *Aethina tumida*. The revised article has been circulated for comments on two occasions, the last time in the Code Commission’s September 2020 report. The Commission consulted OIE Reference Laboratory experts for advice to support its discussions during this revision.

Discussion

**Article 9.4.5**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to revert to a 100 km radius. The Commission noted that the rationale for changing this to 50 km had been noted in its September 2020 report. The Commission reiterated that this decision was not only based on empirical evidence from a single country and that this is not an isolated measure, but rather one of a number of measures presented in this chapter that together ensures the commodity can be traded safely.

The Code Commission also noted references presented by Members and considered that they supported the chosen radius. One publication stated that maximum recorded foraging range of bees (euglossine bees) is 24 km (Janzen, 1971), 50 km being twice that distance; another noted that a smaller radius might allow for more intensive surveillance and, hence, increase the likelihood of detecting infested apiaries within the surveillance zone, and could also make controls on movements within the zone more feasible (EFSA Journal 2015;13(12):4328, 77 pp) The Commission considered this specifically relevant for a surveillance zone aiming at detecting a potential incursion of the pathogenic agent from infected areas, making the certification more reliable.

Revised Article 9.4.5 is presented as **Annex 17**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.14. Infection with avian influenza viruses (Chapter 10.4)

Comments were received from Argentina, Canada, China (People’s Republic of), Japan, Switzerland, Thailand, and the EU.

Background

A comprehensive review of Chapter 10.4, Infection with avian influenza viruses, was undertaken by the *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza between 2017 and 2019. A revised chapter was to be proposed for adoption at the May 2020 General Session. However, due to the postponement of the 88th General Session and to the fact that other related texts had been concomitantly sent for comments (Glossary definition of poultry and OIE list of diseases), the revised text was circulated for an additional round of comments in the February 2020 report of the Code Commission. At its September 2020 meeting, the Commission considered comments received on the revised chapter together with those on the revised Glossary definition for ‘poultry’ and the revised Article 1.3.6, and circulated Chapter 10.4 for another round of comments. The revised Chapter 10.4, Infection with avian influenza viruses, has been circulated for comments on four occasions.

Discussion

**General comments**

The Code Commission wished to highlight that comments received on Chapter 10.4 were not of a substantial nature and some explicitly supported the proposed amendments. The Commission thanked Members for their engagement in the revision of this chapter and acknowledged the valuable contributions received throughout the review process that assisted the Commission to develop a version that addressed Members concerns.

In response to a comment requesting that H5 and H7 low pathogenicity avian influenza (LPAI) viruses should be notified to the OIE because they mutate easily and usually cause infection, the Code Commission reminded Members that this issue had been addressed by the *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza at its last meeting and had been extensively discussed during previous meetings of the Commission. The Commission encouraged Members to thoroughly review previous relevant Commission reports. The Commission also considered the advice provided by the Chair of the *ad hoc* Group on Avian influenza for this meeting, and reiterated that LPAI viruses are a heterogeneous group that are lineage specific, and literature does not support that all H5 and H7 LPAI viruses quickly and easily mutate to high pathogenicity avian influenza (HPAI) viruses. The vast majority of H5 and H7 LPAI strains do not mutate to HPAI viruses. Some H5 and H7 lineages have a propensity to mutate to HPAI and thus a monitoring programme as proposed in the revised chapter would identify such viruses allowing Members to take actions to mitigate risks. The Commission reminded Members that the current Chapter 10.4, which does not appropriately manage the different risks posed by LPAI and HPAI, while not having resulted in an improvement of the global epidemiological situation, has resulted in severe negative trade impacts for both LPAI and HPAI notification, and this has led to disproportions in notification and trade restrictions based predominantly on H5 and H7 LPAI reported from Members with intense surveillance programmes, and therefore biased against those with the most sophisticated active surveillance programmes capable of detecting LPAI infections.

The Code Commission disagreed with a comment that notification of specific LPAI subtypes with zoonotic potential as emerging disease was inappropriate. The Commission noted another comment supporting the approach in the revised chapter and agreed that once a Member identifies and notifies to the OIE the occurrence of a specific LPAI subtype with zoonotic potential as an emerging disease in accordance with Article 1.1.4, further occurrence of that specific LPAI subtype in other Member Countries would also need to be notified as an emerging disease. Based on the data gathered through these initial notifications, the subtype could then be assessed as to whether it would fit the listed disease, infection and infestation as per indent 10 of Article 1.3.6, and subsequent notification as per Article 1.1.3. The Commission agreed that this would require good coordination and emphasised that

the OIE Headquarters should develop the mechanisms within the OIE World Animal Health Information System (OIE WAHIS) to facilitate this. While the Commission agreed with the Member that important animal health information should be provided to the OIE through OIE WAHIS in accordance with Article 1.1.6, it did not agree that WAHIS is the main platform for the exchange of scientific data on avian influenza viruses other than official notifications. The Commission noted that other platforms exist, such as the OIE/FAO Network of Expertise on Animal Influenza (OFFLU), for OIE Reference Laboratories and avian influenza experts to share scientific information, and in this way allow the identification and tracking of potentially zoonotic LPAI subtypes.

**Article 10.4.1**

In point 4, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘domestic’ with ‘all domestic birds including poultry’, noting that it was clear as written, and domestic birds would encompass more than just those included in the definition of poultry.

**Article 10.4.20**

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to invert the point and to begin the sentence with ‘it is not possible to predict which H5 and H7 low pathogenicity avian influenza viruses will mutate into high pathogenicity avian influenza viruses and when these mutations will occur’ as it considered that this would have the same meaning as currently written without providing any additional value.

In point 2, the Code Commission proposed to replace ‘in order to fulfil notification obligations of’ with ‘is notifiable as’ for consistency with the wording in point 3. In the same point, the Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘Article 1.1.4’ with ‘Article 1.1.3. 1d’. The Commission clarified that low pathogenicity avian influenza viruses in poultry *per se* is a known pathogen but not a listed disease, hence it would fit point (a) of the Glossary definition of ‘emerging disease’.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘Article 1.1.3’ with ‘Article 1.1.4’ and clarified that as per the proposed revised Article 1.3.6 (see Item 4.4), ‘infection of domestic or captive wild birds with low pathogenicity avian influenza viruses that have been proven to be transmitted naturally to humans with severe consequences’ would become a listed disease, and thus, once these changes are adopted, would have to be notified in accordance with Article 1.1.3.

Revised Chapter 10.4, Infection with avian influenza viruses,is presented as **Annex 18**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.15. Avian mycoplasmosis (Mycoplasma gallisepticum) (Chapter 10.5)

Comments were received from Switzerland and the EU.

Background

At its February 2020 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed Chapter 10.5, Avian mycoplasmosis *(Mycoplasma gallisepticum),* to align it with proposed amendments to Chapter 3.3.5, Avian mycoplasmosis *(Mycoplasma gallisepticum, M. synoviae)*, of the *Terrestrial Manual*. The Commission consulted OIE Reference Laboratory experts for advice to support its discussion during this revision. The revised Chapter 10.5, Infection with avian mycoplasmosis, has been circulated twice for comments.

Discussion

**Article 10.5.3**

In point 3, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text to clarify that both a serological test and an agent identification test should be performed at the end of the quarantine period. The Commission acknowledged that this was in line with the expert advice discussed in its February 2021 meeting. Therefore, the Commission proposed to delete the word “respectively” for clarity.

Revised Chapter 10.5, Avian mycoplasmosis *(Mycoplasma gallisepticum),* is presented as **Annex 19**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.16. Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus (Articles 14.7.3, 14.7.7, 14.7.24 and 14.7.34)

Comments were received from China (People’s Republic of), Switzerland and the EU on the annex circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report.

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission had agreed to harmonise the provisions for official recognition and maintenance of free status, and endorsement and maintenance of official control programmes in disease-specific chapters with official recognition of status (excluding Chapter 11.4, Bovine spongiform encephalopathy).

In February 2019, the Code Commission agreed to use Chapter 14.7, Infection with peste des petits ruminants virus (PPR), as the ‘model chapter’ to present relevant amendments to Members. The revised articles have been circulated three times for comments, the last time in the Commission’s February 2020 report. At its September 2020 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed comments received and agreed to defer its discussion until its February 2021 meeting given that selected comments relevant to the official recognition of animal health status had been sent to the Scientific Commission for its opinion.

Discussion

**General comments**

Although Article 14.7.1 was not circulated for comments, a Member requested that ‘cattle, camels and buffaloes’ be added to the definition of infection with PPRV in the second paragraph. The Code Commission did not agree with this comment and in agreement with the Scientific Commission, reiterated that at current time, there is not enough evidence on the epidemiological role of these species and wildlife in the transmission of PPRV. As additional data emerges on the role of wildlife and other species in the epidemiology of the disease, the surveillance guidance of this chapter would be revised accordingly.

**Article 14.7.3**

In point 6, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘since the cessation of vaccination’ with ‘for rearing’ as this point was not to address the potential spread of the disease from vaccinated animals, but rather was a condition for the recognition of the free status of a country or zone. It noted the advice of the Scientific Commission that in the absence of marker vaccines or a test to differentiate infected from vaccinated animals (DIVA) and the demanding level of surveillance that would be required to ensure the traceability of all vaccinated animals, the prohibition of imports of vaccinated sheep and goats by a country or zone having an official PPR free status should be maintained.

**Article 14.7.24**

In point 3(a), the Code Commission proposed changes to improve the readability of this point.

Revised Articles 14.7.3, 14.7.7, 14.7.24 and 14.7.34 are presented as **Annex 20**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

4.17. Infection with classical swine fever virus (Chapter 15.2)

Comments were received from Canada, China (People’s Republic of), Chinese Taipei, Ecuador, Switzerland, Thailand, the UK, the USA, the Members of the OIE Americas Region and the EU on the annex circulated in the Code Commission’s February 2020 meeting report.

Background

The revision of Chapter 15.2, Infection with classical swine fever virus, was undertaken in response to comments submitted by Members, experts, and the *ad hoc* Group on Classical swine fever, and to ensure relevant alignment with recent amendments to Chapter 15.1, Infection with African swine fever virus (ASF), adopted in 2019, as well as with disease-specific chapters with official recognition of status. The revised chapter has been circulated four times for comments, the last time in the Code Commission’s February 2020 report. At its September 2020 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed comments received and agreed to defer its discussion until its February 2021 meeting given that selected comments relevant to the official recognition of animal health status had been sent to the Scientific Commission for its opinion.

Discussion

**Article 15.2.1**

In the fifth paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘may’ before ‘be persistently infected’ for clarity.

The Code Commission did not agree to comments proposing the reinstatement of the sixth paragraph concerning the imposition of bans on the trade in commodities of domestic and captive wild pigs in response to a notification of infection with CSFV in wild and feral pigs. However, the Commission addressed the proposal by introducing a modified text harmonised with the equivalent provision in Chapter 10.4, Infection with avian influenza viruses, which was inserted as a new paragraph after the case definition.

In addition, the Code Commission wished to emphasise that harmonisation across different disease-specific chapters does not imply using the exact same text, and that the provisions would also depend on the conditions or specificities for each disease. In this disease-specific chapter, the Commission highlighted that the free status of CSF only concerns the domestic and captive wild pig subpopulation, making it possible, as in Chapter 10.4, for Members to have a free status while cases are notified in wild animals. The Commission reminded Members that this is unlike Chapter 15.1 where a free status could be for all suids, not just domestic and captive wild pigs.

**Article 15.2.2**

The Code Commission proposed to delete ‘CSF’ before ‘free country or zone’ as it considered this to be implied here and was consistent with other recently updated chapters. This change was also applied to the rest of the chapter, where appropriate.

**Article 15.2.3bis**

In response to a comment seeking clarification on the inclusion of Article 15.2.3bis in this chapter and not in other relevant chapters, the Code Commission clarified that the article on ‘country or zone infected’ is harmonised with other disease-specific chapters on diseases for which the OIE grants official recognition of status, whereby countries or zones that are not recognised as officially free by the OIE are considered infected.

The Code Commission proposed to replace ‘shall be’ with ‘is’ for consistency with the language used in the *Terrestrial Code.*

**Article 15.2.4**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to modify the text for consistency with Chapter 10.4, and clarified that for diseases for which the OIE grants official status recognition (such as classical swine fever), there are specific provisions pertaining to status recognition that should be covered, including provisions on containment zones.

In the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission proposed to replace ‘these areas’ with ‘the areas outside the containment zone’ for clarity. The Commission also proposed to replace ‘is established’ with ‘has been approved by the OIE’. In the same paragraph, it did not agree with a comment requesting to reinstate the last sentence as it considered this unnecessary since reference has been made to Article 4.4.7, and there was no need to duplicate the point.

A comment was received to delete the fifth paragraph with the rationale that the sentence is inconsistent with point 7 of Article 4.4.7 and to harmonise with Chapter 10.4. While the Code Commission agreed on the necessity to align this paragraph with the revised Article 4.4.7, it did not agree to delete it, but added ‘as described in point 7 of Article 4.4.7’ after ‘containment zone’ for clarity. This is also consistent with the other chapters on diseases for which the OIE grants official status recognition.

In the sixth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘and be achieved within 12 months of its approval’. It noted the explanation provided by the Scientific Commission in its September 2020 report, that a containment zone is an instrument to quickly control limited outbreaks that are epidemiologically linked in order to reinstate the free status of the rest of the territory outside the containment zone. Should a more long-term strategy be needed, the permanent establishment of zones should be considered.

**Article 15.2.5**

In the first sentence, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘recovered’ with ‘reinstated’, as this article refers mainly to the conditions that countries have to comply with for the recovery of status, irrespective of the official reinstatement of the status by the OIE, as stated at the last paragraph of the article. Furthermore, the use of the term ‘recover’ is consistent with the title of this article.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to move the word ‘validated’ before ‘means’, as it considered that this would have the same meaning as currently written without providing any additional value.

**Article 15.2.5bis**

In the title of the article, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to italicise ‘free zone’ as terms are not italicised in titles as per conventions in the *Terrestrial Code.*

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment requesting a review of the provisions in this article and that a reduction of the radius from 10-km to three km, or a reduction in the waiting period of three months would be of an equivalent risk if the requirements for biosecurity and treatment of meat and meat by-products are maintained. Although the Code Commission concurred with the comment that the airborne transmission of CSF is less important than FMD, it agreed with the Scientific Commission, that based on the highly infectious nature of CSF, as well as its potential for not showing apparent clinical signs and the likelihood of delayed or under-reporting in backyard farms, as well as the prolonged presence of the live virus in products and fomites, the 10-km radius together with the three month period without occurrence of CSF would provide an adequate level of safety and confidence in moving pigs from an infected zone.

In response to a comment seeking clarification of the italicised term ‘approved biosecurity’, the Code Commission explained that ‘approved’ and ‘biosecurity’ are two terms that are separately defined in the Glossary.

In response to a comment stating that the slaughterhouse/abattoir should not be approved for export until the sixth indent is also complied with, i.e., disinfection is completed, the Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, proposed to merge the fifth and sixth indents to reflect this point.

**Article 15.2.6**

While the Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to include the type of commodity in the title of the article, it decided not to make this change now, and requested the OIE Secretariat to explore this as part of its work on developing a framework for*Terrestrial Code* standards (refer to Part B of this report), as this would also impact other disease-specific chapters*.* This rationale also applies to similar comments from the same Member made elsewhere in the text.

In point 2, the Code Commission noted a comment requesting to replace ‘past’ with ‘previous’. However, since this change would be inconsistent with the rest of the *Terrestrial Code*, the Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to explore this as part of the work to develop a framework for *Terrestrial Code* standards.

**Articles 15.2.9 and 15.2.11**

In point 1(c)(iii), the Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, did not agree with a comment to replace ‘collection’ with ‘vaccination’. The Code Commission agreed with the Scientific Commission that the requirement does not imply the ‘re-vaccination’ of each donor pig before testing. The Code Commission referred to the explanation in the Scientific Commission’s report of September 2020 that such an amendment would imply that vaccination is a sufficient risk management measure regardless of the timing of vaccination in relation to collection, whereas the intent of the requirement is to demonstrate that, if a donor animal is seropositive in the period following collection this is due to vaccination and not to infection. The Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, also did not agree with a comment to specify that the antibodies present in the donor animals should be a result of vaccination as they considered this to be implicit in the text as currently written.

**Article 15.2.12bis**

In point 4(b), in response to a comment enquiring if ‘shipment for export’ means the same as the time when the meat is dispatched from the abattoir, the Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, explained that there should be no case of CSF between the last disinfection carried out before the last slaughter and the dispatch of meat from that slaughterhouse/abattoir for export. For clarity, the Code Commission proposed to revert to the original text, but replaced ‘shipment’ with ‘consignment’.

**Article 15.2.17**

In point 2, after consultation with the OIE Collaborating Centres on Food Safety on how temperature-pressure conditions should be presented, the Code Commission proposed to add ‘under saturated steam conditions’ after ‘maintained’, and to replace ‘3 bar’ with ‘2 bar’. The Commission highlighted that there were no changes made to the minimum requirements, but a stipulation of the processes already involved in the heating process. It noted the advice of the Collaborating Centres that the temperature parameter was paramount, and that under saturated steam conditions, a pressure of 3 bar would bring the temperature to 133°C, and that a pressure of 2 bar would be sufficient to achieve a temperature of 121°C.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘demonstrated to inactivate’ with ‘validated for inactivation’. The Commission noted that ‘validated’ would imply specifications on ‘who’ should be the entity to validate the procedure. Furthermore, the Commission did not agree with the comment that ‘demonstration’ implied that it might have only occurred in one attempt and considered the statement to be clear as written, and consistent with the other relevant disease-specific chapters in the *Terrestrial Code.*

**Article 15.2.18**

In point 1(b), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘demonstrated to inactivate’ with ‘validated for inactivation’ for the reason given above (in Article 15.2.17).

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to reinstate the last sentence and clarified that the critical parameters are aw value and pH, and not time. As long as points 2(a) and 2(b) are achieved, it was not necessary to specify a time requirement.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to reinstate points 3(a) and 3(b) and to delete the sentence ‘meat should be cured with salt and dried for a minimum of six months’. It reiterated its previous explanation that more specificity as to the different styles of ham was not needed, and this provision was in line with the equivalent provision in Chapter 15.1, Infection with African swine fever virus.

**Article 15.2.19ter**

In points 1 and 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘internal core’ before ‘temperature’, but instead added ‘which should be reached throughout the product’ for consistency with Article 15.2.18.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with comments to replace ‘30 minutes’ with ‘60 minutes’, reiterating its previous explanation that this would not be consistent with point 1 of the same article. Furthermore, the comparison of swill to manure by the Member is inappropriate, as swill, unlike manure, is not homogeneous, and therefore would demand specific requirements.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘demonstrated to inactivate’ with ‘validated for inactivation’ for the same reason given above (in Article 15.2.17).

**Article 15.2.21**

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘free’ before ‘status’. It proposed to delete ‘CSF’ as it considered this to be implied. This rationale also applies to similar comments from the same Member made elsewhere in the text.

In the second sentence of the second paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘and’ with ‘or’ after ‘wild’.

**Articles 15.2.24 and 15.2.25**

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘CSF’ before ‘free’ in the title of Article 15.2.25 for consistency with Article 15.2.5. For the same reason, it proposed to delete ‘CSF’ from the title of Article 15.2.24.

**Article 15.2.26**

In point 4(e), the Code Commission agreed with a comment that farms that feed swill are at high risk with regard to CSF, and thus in agreement with the Scientific Commission, proposed to add a new point on ‘establishments that feed swill’.

The Code Commission, in agreement with the Scientific Commission, did not agree with a comment to replace point 4(f) with a more general statement on opportunistic wildlife surveillance. It considered the current description of high-risk hunting areas in 4(f) to be more specific. Furthermore, the opportunistic collection of samples is already covered in Article 1.4.4.

Revised Chapter 15.2, Infection with classical swine fever virus, is presented as **Annex 21**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 88th General Session in May 2021.
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