



WORLD ORGANISATION FOR ANIMAL HEALTH
Protecting animals, preserving our future

*Original: English
February 2022*

**REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE OIE
TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL HEALTH STANDARDS COMMISSION
Paris, 1–11 February 2022**

PART A – Texts to be proposed for adoption in May 2022

The OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) held its meeting electronically from 1 to 11 February 2022. The list of participants is attached as **Annex 1**.

Considering the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic the 89th Annual General Session of the World Assembly of Delegates will be held in a semi-hybrid format from Monday 23 to Friday 27 May 2022. During the 89th 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 2022 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 89th General Session; and **Part B** (to be published in April 2022) will provide information about other topics discussed at the Commission's February 2022 meeting including texts circulated for comments and information.

In preparation for the 89th General Session, the OIE will once again organise information webinars to ensure that Members are 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 89th General Session, and in particular the process for the adoption of standards.

The Code Commission thanked the following Members for providing comments: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China (People's Republic of), Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Japan, Mexico, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Norway, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom (UK), the United States of America (USA), Zimbabwe, the Member States of the European Union (EU), the African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) on behalf of African Members of the OIE. The Commission also thanked the following organisations for providing comments: the Global Alliance of Pet Food Associations (GAPFA), the International Meat Secretariat (IMS), the World Renderers Organization (WRO), as well as various experts of the OIE scientific network.

The Code Commission reviewed all comments that were submitted prior to the deadline and supported by a rationale. The Commission made amendments to draft texts, where relevant, in the usual manner by 'double underline' and '~~strike through~~'. In relevant annexes, amendments proposed at this meeting are highlighted with a coloured background to distinguish them from those made previously. Due to the large number of comments, the Commission was not able to provide a detailed explanation on the reasons for accepting or not each of the comments considered, and focused its explanations on significant issues. 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 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 (the Laboratories 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 reports of the Scientific Commission, the Laboratories Commission, Working Group or *ad hoc* Groups, 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](https://www.oie.int).

Table of Contents:

Item No.	Agenda	Page No.	Annex No.
1	Welcome from the Deputy Director General	2	
2	Meeting with the Director General	3	
3	Adoption of the agenda	3	
4.	Texts proposed for adoption in May 2022	Page No.	Part A: Annex No.
4.1.	Glossary definitions for ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Veterinary Authority’, ‘Veterinary Services’, ‘Stray dog’ and ‘Protein meal’	3	3
4.2.	Diseases, infections and infestations listed by the OIE (Articles 1.3.2., 1.3.4., 1.3.6.)	5	4
4.3.	Introduction to Recommendations on Veterinary Services (Article 3.1.1.) and Quality of Veterinary Services (Articles 3.2.3. and 3.2.9.)	6	5, 6
4.4.	Veterinary legislation (Articles 3.4.5. and 3.4.11.)	7	7
4.5.	Zoonoses transmissible from non-human primates (Chapter 6.12.)	8	8
4.6.	Stray dog population control (Chapter 7.7.)	9	9
4.7.	Infection with rinderpest virus (Chapter 8.16.)	13	10
4.8.	Infection with <i>Echinococcus granulosus</i> (Chapter 8.5.) and Infection with <i>Taenia solium</i> (Porcine cysticercosis) (Chapter 15.4.)	15	11, 12
4.9.	Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.4.), Application for official recognition by the OIE of risk status for bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 1.8.)	17	13, 14, 15
4.10.	Theileriosis (Chapter 11.10.)	26	16
4.11.	Terminology: Use of the term ‘sanitary measure’	27	17

1. Welcome from the Deputy Director General

The OIE Deputy Director General, International Standards and Science, Dr Montserrat Arroyo, welcomed members of the Code Commission. She thanked all members for their contributions, noting the efforts to maintain outputs of high quality despite the significant challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. She also extended her appreciation to the members’ employing institutions and national governments. Dr Arroyo briefed the members on the ongoing process to prepare the 89th OIE General Session, including the planning of pre-General Session webinars that will be conducted by the OIE Specialist Commissions to inform Members on the revised and new standards being proposed for adoption. She also informed the Commission that the Technical Item would be on OIE and Veterinary Services engagement in global, regional and national Emergency Management Systems. Dr Arroyo summarised ongoing work on the OIE standards development and review system, including the development and planning for digital tools. Finally, she informed the Commission of an ‘after-action review’ conducted by the OIE in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The members of the Code Commission thanked Dr Arroyo for the excellent support provided by the OIE Secretariat. They highlighted the work done to improve the information provided to Members on the management of the Code Commission’s work programme, in particular, the better follow up on the progress of different topics. The Commission highlighted the importance of strengthening the process to identify needs for standards setting work and their prioritisation, prioritizing quality over quantity, involving Members and in good coordination with the other OIE Specialist Commissions to ensure efficient management of their workload and quality outputs.

Dr Arroyo and the members of the Code Commission discussed and agreed on the importance of promoting Member's involvement in the OIE standards setting process, and how to best support them. In this regard the Commission highlighted the value of providing clear, evidence-based information in its report. They also agreed on the importance of ensuring alignment of the texts produced in the three OIE official languages.

2. Meeting with the Director General

The OIE Director General, Dr Monique Eloit, met the Code Commission on 8 February 2022 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 the 89th OIE General Session preparation and informed the Commission of new initiatives to review the OIE science system.

Dr Eloit informed the Code Commission of the budgetary situation of the Organisation and noted that due to the continued increase of activities, the current regular budget would not be sufficient to ensure the sustainable delivery of some core OIE activities, which should not rely on voluntary donor funding through the OIE World Fund. Dr Eloit highlighted that this situation might impact how the Commission and its Secretariat undertake some of their work and 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 the prioritisation of their work.

The Code Commission discussed with Dr Eloit some of the new work it had planned and prioritised for this term, notably on Sections 4 (Disease Prevention and Control) and 5 (Trade Measures, Import/Export Procedures and Veterinary Certification) of the *Terrestrial Code*. The Commission welcomed the initiative to review the OIE science system and noted that this work should also take into consideration how this system interacts with the OIE standard setting process. Dr Eloit and the Code Commission discussed and agreed on the importance to consider the roles and responsibilities of the Specialist Commissions and how they contribute to these systems, as well as the importance of achieving unified management of their standard setting role, which would avoid possible duplication or contradiction. The Commission also highlighted the importance of ensuring clarity on different outputs of the Organisation, and their alignment with OIE standards, which have a specific value in the context of the WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement as well as for a robust practical guidance of the Members' Veterinary Authorities.

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 virtual meetings.

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 2022

4.1. Glossary A ('Competent Authority', 'Protein meal', 'Stray dog', 'Veterinary Authority', and 'Veterinary Services')

a) 'Competent Authority', 'Veterinary Authority' and 'Veterinary Services'

Comments were received from Australia, Mexico, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the UK, the AU-IBAR and the EU.

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission agreed to revise the Glossary definitions for 'Competent Authority', 'Veterinary Authority' and 'Veterinary Services' in the *Terrestrial Code* following Member requests and feedback from the *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Services. The revised definitions were circulated for comments in the Code Commission's September 2018 report. The *ad hoc* Group on Veterinary Services considered the comments submitted and proposed revised definitions.

At their respective September 2020 meetings, the Code Commission and the Aquatic Animals Commission discussed the importance of ensuring alignment of these definitions in the two Codes except where differences could be justified and agreed to circulate the revised Glossary definitions for ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Veterinary Authority’ and ‘Veterinary Services’ in the *Terrestrial Code* and ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Veterinary Authority’ and ‘Aquatic Animal Health Services’ in the *Aquatic Code* for comments in the September 2020 report of the Code Commission and the Aquatic Animals Commission, respectively. Neither Commission addressed comments received during their respective February 2021 meetings due to time constraints.

In preparation for the September 2021 meetings, the Presidents of the Terrestrial and the Aquatic Commissions met to review all comments previously received. They acknowledged that the comments received indicated some confusion amongst some Members as to the intended meaning and use of these terms and that their September 2020 Commission reports did not provide sufficient information about the rationale for the proposed amendments. The Presidents agreed that the proposed definitions did not need significant changes and they proposed to provide a more detailed explanation of the rationale for the proposed amendments in the respective September 2021 Commission reports, as well as some more detailed information on the use of these terms in each Code.

At its September 2021 meeting, the Code Commission considered the comments received on its September 2020 report, as well as the feedback from the Presidents discussions. The Aquatic Animals Commission made one additional amendment to the definition for ‘Veterinary Authority’ that was not included in the Code Commission proposal, as not relevant for the *Terrestrial Code*. The revised definitions were circulated for comments in the Code Commission September 2021 report.

Discussion

The Code Commission considered the comments received on its September 2021 report and the President’s feedback regarding the coordination with the Aquatic Animals Commission. The Code Commission was informed that, after considering the comments received, the Aquatic Animals Commission would not propose any further amendments at its February 2022 meeting to the revised definitions to be proposed for adoption in the *Aquatic Code*.

General comments

The Code Commission acknowledged a comment to review the foreword to the *Terrestrial Code* and other published OIE documents to ensure the use of consistent language with regards to the standards to provide certainty to Members about the roles of Competent Authorities, Veterinary Authorities and Veterinary Services as described in the new definitions. The Commission requested that the OIE Secretariat review this request once the revised definitions are adopted.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to modify the wording of the definitions as this comment did not consider the explanations provided in its September 2021 report.

‘Competent Authority’

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace “a Governmental Authority” by “any Governmental Authority” as it considered that the term is defined in singular, and as written it does not refer to a specific authority but to any given one that complies with the definition.

‘Veterinary Authority’

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to include “and for communication with the OIE with this regard” at the end of the proposed text. The Commission explained that the definition is not intended to provide specific recommendations in this regard, which are specifically included in relevant chapters of the Code (e.g. in Chapter 1.1.).

b) ‘Protein meal’

In response to a comment requesting further clarification on the scope of the Glossary definition for ‘protein meal’, the Code Commission explained that the definition included all products regardless of intended uses as long as they meet its definition. The Commission reminded Members that the objective of the Glossary is to provide definitions of key terms that require precise interpretation for the purpose of their use in the Code, and definitions are expected to be as concise as possible and should not contain unnecessary descriptive detail or further elaborations beyond what is necessary to define the term. Further descriptive detail or explanation that may be necessary for the implementation of a standard are normally provided within relevant chapters.

In response to a query on possible impacts that the adoption of this new definition may have throughout the Code, the Code Commission referred Members to its discussions on the use of terms ‘meat-and-bone meal’ and ‘greaves’ (see item 4.9. of this report).

c) ‘Stray dog’: Proposed replacement with ‘Free-roaming dog’

During work to revise Chapter 7.7. Stray dog population control, it was agreed that the term ‘free-roaming dog’ was more appropriate than ‘stray dog’ because ‘free-roaming’ described the behaviour of a dog that is currently roaming freely regardless of its ownership status. Consequently, it was agreed to replace ‘stray dog’ with ‘free-roaming dog’ throughout the chapter.

Given that ‘Stray dog’ is a defined term in the Glossary, it was agreed to replace ‘Stray dog’ in the Glossary with ‘Free-roaming dog’ and amend the definition accordingly.

In response to comments received on the proposed Glossary definition for ‘Free-roaming dog’, the Code Commission did not agree with a proposal to add the word ‘restriction’, as it considered the concept was already addressed by the term ‘control’ when describing the relationship between dogs and humans. In addition, the Commission did not agree to add text that described other categories of dogs as it considered this could be confusing.

The Code Commission confirmed that if the proposed Glossary definition for ‘Free-roaming dog’ is adopted, the term ‘Stray dog’ will be replaced by ‘Free-roaming dog’ throughout the *Terrestrial Code* for the 2022 edition.

Revised Glossary definitions for ‘Competent Authority’, ‘Protein meal’, ‘Stray dog’ (replaced by new definition for ‘Free-roaming dog’), ‘Veterinary Authority’, ‘Veterinary Services’ are presented in [Annex 3](#) and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

4.2. Diseases, Infections and Infestations listed by the OIE (Articles 1.3.2., 1.3.4., 1.3.6.)

Article 1.3.2.

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

Background

As part of the revision of Chapter 11.10., Theileriosis (refer to item 4.10. of this report), the Code Commission has agreed to replace ‘Theileriosis’ with ‘Infection with *Theileria annulata*, *Theileria orientalis* and *Theileria parva*’, and had circulated a revised Article 1.3.2. in its September 2021 report.

Discussion

The Code Commission noted comments in support of the proposed change and that no other comments had been received.

Article 1.3.4. and Article 1.3.6.

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission of some discrepancies observed between the names of some listed diseases in Chapter 1.3. and the corresponding disease-specific chapters (i.e. Chapter 12.6., Chapter 12.8. and Chapter 10.5.). The Commission discussed this issue and agreed to amend the disease names in the list to align with those in the disease-specific chapters as they had been adopted more recently. The Commission decided to propose the revised articles for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022, given that these amendments were of editorial nature.

In Article 1.3.4., the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘equine influenza’ with ‘infection with equine influenza virus’, and replace ‘infection with equid herpesvirus-1 (EHV-1)’ with ‘infection with equid herpesvirus-1 (Equine rhinopneumonitis)’.

In Article 1.3.6., the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘avian mycoplasmosis (*Mycoplasma gallisepticum*)’ with ‘infection with *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* (Avian mycoplasmosis)’, and ‘avian mycoplasmosis (*Mycoplasma synoviae*)’ with ‘infection with *Mycoplasma synoviae* (Avian mycoplasmosis)’.

The Code Commission also acknowledged the discrepancy between the listed disease ‘haemorrhagic septicaemia’ in Article 1.3.2. and Chapter 11.7. Haemorrhagic septicaemia (*Pasteurella multocida* serotypes 6:b and 6:e), but decided not to amend Article 1.3.2. for the time being, considering that the Scientific Commission was considering the possibility of expanding the scope of this disease to include other strains of *Pasteurella multocida*.

Revised Articles 1.3.2., 1.3.4. and 1.3.6. are presented as part of **Annex 4**, and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

4.3. Introduction to Recommendations on Veterinary Services (Article 3.1.1.) and Quality of Veterinary Services (Articles 3.2.3. and 3.2.9.)

Comments were received from Australia, Chinese Taipei, Mexico, New Caledonia, Saudi Arabia, the USA, the AU-IBAR and the EU.

Background

A new Chapter 3.1. Introduction to Recommendations on Veterinary Services and a revised Chapter 3.2. Quality of Veterinary Services were adopted at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

At its February 2021 meeting, in response to comments, the Code Commission agreed to consider the development of a definition for ‘One Health’ to ensure a shared understanding of the concept in the context of the *Terrestrial Code*, and requested the OIE Secretariat to explore relevant work on the development of a definition of ‘One Health’ by the Tripartite and other relevant partners. Similar comments were also raised during the 88th General Session in May 2021.

At its meeting in September 2021, the Code Commission proposed to include some text in Article 3.1.1. to explain the meaning of the ‘One Health approach’ given that this was the first instance where this term was used in the *Terrestrial Code*, rather than including a specific definition of ‘One Health’. The Commission noted that the explanatory text was aligned with the definition for ‘One Health’ used in the [Tripartite Zoonoses Guide](#).

The Code Commission also proposed amendments to Article 3.2.3. in consideration of the ‘One Health approach’, and Article 3.2.9. in response to a comment to refer to the storage of veterinary medicinal products.

Discussion

The Code Commission considered the definition of ‘One Health’ recently developed by the [One Health high level expert panel \(OHHLEP\)](#) and agreed that its proposed amendments in Article 3.1.1. are aligned with this definition.

Article 3.1.1.

In the second sentence of paragraph 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘interaction’ with ‘collaboration’, noting that this better describes the One Health approach.

In the same sentence, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘all relevant sectors and disciplines’ with ‘governmental and non-governmental individuals and organisations’ as this is already covered by the definition for ‘Veterinary Services’.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘all’ before ‘relevant sectors and disciplines’ as it considered it was important to clarify that this means ‘all’, not ‘some’, reflecting the comprehensive approach of One Health.

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘terrestrial’ before ‘animal health’ to align with paragraph 2, and explained that the last paragraph referred to Section 3 of the *Terrestrial Code* which concerned terrestrial animals specifically.

Article 3.2.3.

In the first sentence, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘epidemiological’ with ‘epidemiology’, but not to move ‘and’ before ‘economics’.

In paragraph 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘other relevant governmental authorities’ with ‘all governmental and non-governmental individuals and organisations’, as it considered that the involvement of non-governmental authorities was already covered by the term ‘stakeholders’ in point 8.

For the same reason, in point 8, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘other relevant governmental authorities and stakeholders’ with ‘all governmental and non-governmental individuals and organisations’. It reiterated its explanation in its February 2021 report that these entities were addressed by the term ‘stakeholders’.

Article 3.2.9.

In paragraph 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘as well as monitoring and observe the food that comes from farms’, and noted that the term ‘including’ meant that the mentioned activities were not exhaustive.

In point 1(b), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘and appropriate safe storage and disposal’ with ‘safe storage and appropriate disposal’, noting that ‘disposal’ should be not only appropriate but also safe.

Revised Article 3.1.1. and Articles 3.2.3. and 3.2.9. are presented as **Annexes 5 and 6** and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

4.4. Veterinary legislation (Article 3.4.11.)

Comments were received from Australia, Chinese Taipei, New Caledonia, Saudi Arabia, the AU-IBAR and the EU.

Background

A revised Chapter 3.4. Veterinary Legislation was adopted at the 88th General Session in May 2021.

At its meeting in September 2021, the Code Commission proposed amendments to point 1(b) of Article 3.4.11. in response to comments received at the 88th General Session, and also introduced changes to Article 3.4.5. as a consequence of the revision of the term ‘sanitary measures’ across the *Terrestrial Code* (see item 4.11. of this report).

Discussion

Article 3.4.11.

In the first sentence of paragraph 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘safety and effectiveness’ after ‘quality’. Although the Commission considered that safety and effectiveness were addressed by ‘quality’, it agreed that it was important to emphasise these attributes.

In the same paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and determining the period of drug withdrawal from animal products such as meat and dairy, and when will be able to consume by humans’ as it considered that this point was covered in points 3(b)(iv) and 3(b)(v).

Revised Articles 3.4.5. and 3.4.11. are presented as **Annex 7** and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

4.5. Zoonoses transmissible from non-human primates (Chapter 6.12.)

Comments were received from Mexico, Saudi Arabia, the UK, the USA, the AU-IBAR and the EU.

Background

At its February 2019 meeting, in response to a request from the European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA), the Scientific Commission requested the Working Group on Wildlife to conduct a review of whether hepatitis B is a zoonotic disease that can be transmitted from gibbons to humans. As reported in its March 2020 meeting report, the Working Group on Wildlife concluded that hepatitis B was a disease of humans, not a zoonotic disease, as the *Hepadnaviridae* strains affecting humans are different from those affecting non-human primates. Moreover, current diagnostic techniques have made it possible to differentiate the different hepatitis B virus strains circulating in humans and non-human primates.

At its February 2021 meeting, the Code Commission considered the Scientific Commission’s proposal to amend Chapter 6.12. to reflect that hepatitis B is a disease of humans and agreed to revise Articles 6.12.4., 6.12.6. and 6.12.7. accordingly. The revised articles have been circulated twice for comments.

Discussion

The Code Commission noted comments suggesting the possible inclusion of SARS-CoV-2 in Chapter 6.12. and requested that the OIE Working Group on Wildlife and the *ad hoc* Group on Covid-19 and safe trade in animals and animal products be consulted on this matter. The Code Commission also noted comments requesting the inclusion of “*Macacine Herpesvirus 1*”, and requested the OIE Secretariat to seek expert opinion.

As noted in its February 2021 and September 2021 reports, the Code Commission reiterated that the scope of the proposed amendments to Chapter 6.12. was to reflect that hepatitis B is a disease of humans and not a zoonotic disease, and that only this point was under review, i.e. other texts in the chapter were not under review. However, the Commission noted that some comments received on the test schedule and animal species to be tested for tuberculosis in Articles 6.12.5. and 6.12.6. may need to be reviewed. Consequently, the Code Commission requested that the opinion of the Laboratories Commission be sought on these comments.

Article 6.12.4.

In point 2(b), in response to a comment to specify a laboratory that is ‘official, regulated by the Competent Authority of each country’, the Code Commission proposed to replace ‘laboratory approved for this purpose’ with ‘approved laboratory’, given that ‘approved’ is a defined term in the Glossary.

In paragraph 2, in response to a comment questioning the inclusion of measles, the Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to seek expert opinion.

Article 6.12.7.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and have the necessary facilities according to the level of risk posed by possible zoonoses’, after ‘personal hygiene practices’. While the Commission agreed that this was important, it noted that this point referred to the management measures to be followed by staff and not the physical facility. Furthermore, elaboration on the necessary facilities according to the level of biological risk is described in Chapter 1.1.4. Biosafety and biosecurity: standard for managing biological risk in the veterinary laboratory and animal facilities of the *Terrestrial Manual*.

Revised Articles 6.12.4., 6.12.6. and 6.12.7. are presented as **Annex 8** and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

4.6. Stray dog population control (Dog population management) (Chapter 7.7.)

Comments were received from Australia, Canada, Mexico, Norway, New Caledonia, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, the USA, the AU-IBAR, the EU and the GAPFA.

Background

In September 2018, the Code Commission agreed to revise Chapter 7.7. Stray dog population control to ensure it was aligned with the Global Strategic Framework for the elimination of dog mediated human rabies by 2030.

The *ad hoc* Group on the Revision of Chapter 7.7. Stray dog population control was reconvened for a third time in 2021 to address comments on the revised draft chapter circulated in the Code Commission’s September 2020 report. The Commission considered the Group’s proposal and agreed to circulate the report and draft chapter for Member comments after its September 2021 meeting.

Discussion

The Code Commission reviewed comments received on the draft chapter circulated in its September 2021 report.

General comments

The Code Commission considered comments that proposed to replace the concept of ‘five freedoms’ with ‘five domains’ and while it recognised the importance of ‘five domains’, it agreed not to make any changes until more consideration is given to the possible inclusion of this concept in Chapter 7.1. Introduction to the recommendations for animal welfare. The Commission recommended the OIE Secretariat to work with the Animal Welfare Collaborating Centres to provide more information about this concept for further consideration at its September 2022 meeting.

Article 7.7.1.

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a sentence to emphasise the percentage of dog-mediated rabies cases in humans, as this chapter is relevant not only for rabies but also for other dog-mediated diseases.

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘animal health and public health’ to specify the problem that may be reduced by the Dog Population Management (DPM), as it considered that any concern or nuisance, and not only those related to animal or public health could be a problem.

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘group of’ before ‘dogs’ because the chapter addresses all dogs whether in groups or alone. The Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘within a specific area’ because it considered that it was unnecessary to limit the geographical scope of the DPM approach.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to remove ‘unwanted’ when referring to the reduction of puppies as it was implicit. The Commission did not agree with comments to change the text of this paragraph to specify that mass culling is not an effective long-term method, as the Commission considered that this may imply that short-term mass culling is acceptable. In addition, the World Health Organization (WHO) states that mass culling (whether short-term or long-term) is ineffective (WHO Expert Consultation on Rabies, third report. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018 (WHO Technical Report Series, No. 1012). The Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘integral part of’ for sustainable rabies control as it does not provide any additional clarity.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a new paragraph regarding the use of routine vaccination as it considered it was not needed in this context.

Article 7.7.2.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to remove the term ‘DPM’ as it agreed it was redundant to use the defined term within its definition.

Article 7.7.3.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to amend the text to specify that the zoonotic diseases of concern are those transmitted by dogs and added ‘dog-mediated’ as this term is already used in the text.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and more specifically free-roaming dog population dynamics’ to the description of the scope of this chapter and highlighted that the scope is to manage the whole population of dogs and not just free roaming population.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘human health’ with ‘animal health, public health’ as it considered ‘human health and safety’ as clear as written and that ‘animal health’ is already included in the sentence.

Article 7.7.4.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘dependent on’ with ‘have a strong relationship with’ as it considered that domesticated dogs are dependent on humans to some extent even when resources to which dogs have access are not provided to them intentionally.

Article 7.7.5.

In the first bullet point, the Code Commission agreed with the proposal to add ‘in accordance with Article 7.7.17’ to provide the link to the relevant article.

In the third bullet point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘manageable’ with ‘minimum’. However, the Commission deleted ‘to a manageable level’ which did not add meaningful information.

In the fourth bullet point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace the whole point by ‘promote and support the sterilisation of stray dog’ because these points describe objectives and not specific measures.

In the fifth bullet point, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add examples such as ‘leishmaniosis and echinococcosis’, as it considered them to be relevant examples.

In the seventh bullet point, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to remove all examples because it considered that they were unnecessary. The Commission rephrased the text to clarify that this point is about the nuisance that might be caused by dogs when roaming freely.

Article 7.7.6.

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘environment’ to the list of areas where the Competent Authorities have responsibilities.

Article 7.7.7.

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘relevant stakeholders’ to the list of entities between which a DPM should be coordinated to include non-governmental stakeholders.

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘should be identified as’ by ‘is’ to simplify the sentence and emphasise that a DPM is under the responsibility of the Competent Authority.

In point 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘resources including’ when describing the access to appropriate veterinary medicinal products as it did not provide any additional clarity. The Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘in collaboration with the multi-sectoral group’ to the last sentence because this group was already addressed in the first paragraph.

Article 7.7.8.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘or education institutions’ as an entity with which Veterinary Services should coordinate because many others could potentially be involved.

In point 3(a), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘would normally’ with ‘usually’ for clarity.

In point 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘dog behaviour’ with ‘ethology’ as it considered the text clear as currently written.

Article 7.7.9.

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to change ‘DPM Legislation’ by ‘Legislation that addresses DPM’ to include other legal instruments not primarily for DPM but could be important when implementing a DPM programme.

In the third bullet point, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete ‘in centralised or interoperable databases’, and to add ‘in an animal identification system’, a defined term in the Glossary that addresses options for registration and identification of dogs.

In the fourth and fifth bullet points, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘*Registration*,’ but instead of replacing ‘authorisation and licensing’, it was added as an additional option to authorisation and licensing.

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘and should be adapted to the national context’ at the end of the sentence.

Article 7.7.10.

In the title, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘DPM’ for clarity and consistency.

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘in collaboration with the multi-sectoral group’ as it considered that it was important that additional groups with relevant experience collaborate with the Competent Authorities.

Article 7.7.11.

In point 5, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘and greater local engagement’ given the importance of ensuring adequate engagement when estimating the dog population size.

In the second paragraph of point 5, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to modify the example for monitoring changes in population trends as it considered that it was appropriate as it is to target areas with a high density of free-roaming dogs to create a more efficient and sensitive way of measuring changes in free-roaming dog density.

Article 7.7.12.

In the first bullet point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add the word ‘information’ after ‘responsible dog ownership’ but agreed to replace ‘they are receiving’ with ‘there is’ to avoid misinterpretation.

In the second bullet point, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete the text at the end of the sentence as it was considered too specific.

In the third bullet point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to reinstate the reference to the two disease-specific chapters as the reference to disease names (i.e. rabies and echinococcus) is sufficient.

Article 7.7.13.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to move the fourth bullet point up, as the list is not hierarchical and thus it would not change the understanding of this point.

In the sixth bullet point, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to change ‘vaccination’ to ‘vaccinate’ to accurately describe the acronym i.e. CNVR. This change was applied throughout the draft chapter.

Article 7.7.14.

In the penultimate paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace the sentence ‘in centralised or interoperable databases’, with ‘an animal identification system’, to be consistent with the modification made in Article 7.7.9. The Commission also agreed with a comment to add a sentence at the end of the paragraph to describe the potential partnerships that may be needed to develop and operate relevant databases.

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to make an amendment to clarify that the database remains under the authority of the *Competent Authority*.

The Code Commission noted a comment that resources are needed to implement databases and emphasised the importance of collaboration with other stakeholders.

Article 7.7.15.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a new outcome ‘prevention of uncontrolled reproduction of the dog population’ to the list as it considered that controlling commercial breeding and sale would not achieve the outcome of preventing uncontrolled reproduction of the dog population; non-commercial dogs have an important role to play.

In the second paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘professional’ when referring to breeders and sellers because ‘mandatory registration of all breeders’ is needed to gain control of breeding where puppies are sold; whether the breeders are professional or not.

In the last paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to specify ‘sales from the street’ because there are many other places where these unregulated sales can take place.

Article 7.7.17.

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘is a choice’ with ‘comes with responsibilities’ as it considered dog ownership to be a ‘choice’ and if the choice is taken, it comes with responsibilities which is noted in the next sentence.

In point 2, in the first indent, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace the concept of ‘five freedoms’ with ‘five domains’ (see explanation in the General comments above).

Article 7.7.18.

The Code Commission did not agree with a proposal to add text to address the concept of owner’s consent as it considered this to be an unnecessary detail.

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a new outcome of controlling reproduction in dogs as it considered that there was no strong evidence that there is a reduced risk to the human population when male free-roaming dogs are castrated, and the impact on the population is lower than reproduction controls with a focus on females.

Article 7.7.19.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add text about the level of immunity that free-roaming dogs have to have developed prior to adoption, as it did not consider that the measures were feasible.

Article 7.7.20.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to remove the text ‘as an alternative to abandonment’ because it would imply that relinquishment was a bad choice and might be seen as a disincentive. Relinquishment in an *ad hoc* place is not the same as abandonment on the street.

Article 7.7.25.

In the third paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘where appropriate’ to add flexibility.

Article 7.7.27.

In the first sentence of the first paragraph, the Code Commission deleted the terms ‘humanly’ and added ‘in accordance with Article 7.6.1.’, to improve clarity, as the defined term ‘Euthanasia’ clearly describes how the induction of death of an animal should be done and Article 7.6.1. describes the general principle to consider. Consequently, it also deleted the term ‘humane’ under point 1 and point 3 for consistency.

The Code Commission did not agree with a comment to elaborate the text on euthanasia because this paragraph is about the role of euthanasia as a specific activity within DPM.

In the last paragraph of point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘and any other methods that could compromise the welfare of the animal’ to be more encompassing.

Revised Chapter 7.7. Stray Dog population control is presented as **Annex 9** and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

4.7. Infection with rinderpest virus (Chapter 8.16.)

Comments were received from Australia, China (People’s Republic of), New Caledonia, New Zealand and the EU.

Background

At its September 2018 meeting, the Code Commission considered Member requests to clarify the definitions of ‘case’ and ‘suspected case’, the reporting obligations of Members, and the inclusion of measures that should be implemented if there is a re-emergence of rinderpest virus, and agreed that there should be a thorough review of Chapter 8.16.

The Code Commission also agreed with the Scientific Commission that in this post-eradication era, the priority should be the maintenance of global freedom from rinderpest and its prompt recovery in case of re-emergence, and consequently, the structure of the chapter and trade provisions should be revised to ensure they are aligned with this objective.

A thorough review of Chapter 8.16. Infection with rinderpest virus was undertaken by the *ad hoc* Group on Rinderpest (March 2020 report). A revised chapter was circulated for comments on three occasions, the last time as an annex in the Code Commission’s September 2021 report.

Discussion

Article 8.16.1.

In response to a comment on the lack of clarity as to whether potential and suspected cases may be confirmed in a national laboratory, or whether this needs to be done at an OIE Reference Laboratory in order to meet the definitions for potential and suspected cases, the Code Commission explained that samples from potential cases of rinderpest virus (RPV) may be submitted to an approved laboratory for diagnosis, not necessarily an OIE Reference Laboratory for rinderpest. However, as elaborated in Article 8.16.5., if there is a positive reaction in a diagnostic test for RPV conducted outside of an OIE Reference Laboratory for rinderpest, samples should be sent to an OIE Reference Laboratory for confirmation. The Commission clarified that cases could only be confirmed by an OIE Reference Laboratory for rinderpest, because rinderpest is the only globally eradicated disease. To ensure that this important point was clear to Members, the Commission proposed to add the sentence ‘a case of infection with RPV shall be confirmed in an OIE Reference Laboratory for rinderpest’ to point 1. It also proposed similar amendments to Article 8.16.3.

In point 2(c)(iii), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete ‘with or’ before ‘without clinical signs’, noting that the detection of RPV-specific antibodies that are not a consequence of vaccination in a susceptible animal with clinical signs would constitute a case in accordance with point 2(b)(iii), or a suspected case in accordance with 2(c)(ii), depending on whether the diagnosis was performed at an OIE Reference Laboratory for rinderpest.

Article 8.16.2.

The Code Commission proposed to add the title ‘safe commodities’ for consistency with other disease-specific chapters.

In point 2(a), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to reinstate the text ‘which have been submitted to the usual chemical and mechanical processes in use in the tanning industry’. The Commission reiterated that for commodities to be assessed as safe, the processing or treatment of these commodities should use standardised protocols, as described in Chapter 2.2. Criteria applied by the OIE for assessing the safety of commodities, and as such this addition would not provide any added value. The Commission proposed to delete the example of ‘wet blue and crust leather’ in parenthesis as it did not consider that examples were necessary, and agreed to include this issue in its work on the development of a standard operating procedure for safe commodities. (See Part B of this report).

Article 8.16.2bis.

The Code Commission proposed amendments to the second sentence to clarify that point 2 of Article 8.16.5. would apply in the event of re-emergence of rinderpest.

Article 8.16.3.

In the title, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘post’ with ‘during’ for clarity.

In the third sentence of paragraph 1, in line with proposed amendments made in Article 8.16.1., the Code Commission proposed amendments to clarify that countries may send samples from potential cases to an approved laboratory, which may not necessarily be an OIE Reference Laboratory. The Commission also proposed to delete ‘for routine checking’ as it considered this to be vague.

The Code Commission acknowledged a comment on the obligation for all countries to keep rinderpest a notifiable disease in their territory given the global freedom of rinderpest.

Article 8.16.5.

Similarly, the Code Commission acknowledged a comment that the obligation to notify a suspected case of infection with RPV to the OIE is an exceptional circumstance, justified because of the globally eradicated status of the disease.

In paragraph 3 of points 1 and 2, the Code Commission proposed to delete ‘appointed’ as it considered this to be unnecessary.

In paragraph 4 of point 2, the Code Commission proposed to replace ‘may’ with ‘should’ to emphasise the implementation of a containment zone for consistency with Article 8.16.8.

In the last paragraph of the same point, the Code Commission proposed to delete ‘with the infected country or countries’ as it was considered redundant.

Article 8.16.8.

In paragraph 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘should’ with ‘may’ and explained that the implementation of a containment zone should be clearly recommended for the purposes of disease control and eradication of rinderpest should it reoccur. This also ensured alignment with proposed changes in paragraph 4, point 2 of Article 8.16.5. In the same paragraph, the Commission agreed with a comment to delete ‘safe’ before ‘commodities’ as it was not considered necessary given there is a reference to Article 8.16.2. The Commission also agreed with a comment to add ‘for the whole country in accordance with Article 8.16.9.’ to clarify that this applies to the whole country.

Article 8.16.9.

In point 2(a), the Code Commission agreed to replace ‘animal disease reporting’ with ‘disease notification’ given this is a defined term in the Glossary and to ensure consistency with Chapter 1.1. Notification of diseases and provision of epidemiological information.

Article 8.16.11.

In point 4, the Code Commission proposed to delete ‘appointed’ before ‘OIE Reference Laboratory’ to align with its proposed changes in Article 8.16.5.

Revised Chapter 8.16. is presented as **Annex 10** and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

4.8. Infection with *Echinococcus granulosus* (Chapter 8.5.) and Infection with *Taenia solium* (Porcine cysticercosis) (Chapter 15.4.)

Comments were received from Mexico, New Caledonia, New Zealand, the UK, the USA, the AU-IBAR and the EU.

Background

In February 2020, the Code Commission agreed with a request from the WHO to update Chapter 8.5. Infection with *Echinococcus granulosus* and Chapter 15.4. Infection with *Taenia solium* (Porcine cysticercosis) of the *Terrestrial Code*, as well as the corresponding chapters in the *Terrestrial Manual*, because of developments in vaccine production and vaccination.

The Code Commission was informed that relevant amendments had been proposed by the Laboratories Commission for Chapter 3.10.3. Cysticercosis (including infection with *Taenia solium*) of the *Terrestrial Manual*, which was subsequently adopted in May 2021, and Chapter 3.1.6. Echinococcosis (infection with *Echinococcus granulosus* and with *E. multilocularis*) which would be proposed for adoption in 2022.

At its September 2021 meeting, the Code Commission proposed amendments to Chapters 8.5. and 15.4. to align with the latest modifications included in the corresponding chapters of the *Terrestrial Manual*. The Commission also proposed to include provisions on vaccination as a prevention or control tool.

Discussion

a) Infection with *Echinococcus granulosus* (Chapter 8.5.)

Article 8.5.1.

In the fifth paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment concerning the sole Spanish version, to replace the word ‘hombre’ with ‘ser humano’, which is gender neutral.

Article 8.5.3.

In response to comments and for consistency with the amendments of some terms being proposed in the revised Chapter 7.7. Stray dog population control (Dog population management) and in the Glossary, the Code Commission proposed to replace ‘stray’ with ‘free-roaming’ throughout this article (see item 4.1. of this report). The Commission noted that these changes would only be made should the proposed amendments in Chapter 7.7. and the Glossary are adopted in May 2022.

In points 1 and 2, the Code Commission proposed to delete ‘(owned and stray)’ as the scope of dogs is already covered in the chapter.

In point 2(b), the Code Commission noted a comment regarding the preference to use vaccination in view of antimicrobial resistance (AMR), and the impracticability of disposal of faeces by incineration or burial. The Commission explained that there was no vaccine against *Echinococcus* infection in dogs described in the corresponding revised *Terrestrial Manual* chapter. The Commission also wished to inform Members of the [new publication: A key role of veterinary authorities and animal health practitioners in preventing and controlling neglected parasitic zoonoses – A handbook with focus on *Taenia solium*, *Trichinella*, *Echinococcus* and *Fasciola*.](#)

In point 3(c), the Code Commission agreed with a comment noting that vaccines registered for use in livestock are limited to a few countries and that its use should remain optional, and proposed to add ‘where indicated’ at the beginning of the sentence.

b) Infection with *Taenia solium* (Porcine cysticercosis) (Chapter 15.4.)

Article 15.4.1.

In the first sentence of paragraph 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘parasite’ with ‘parasitic infection’, noting that *Taenia solium* as used here refers to the pathogenic agent. In the second sentence, the Commission noted a comment to add ‘Eastern Europe’ to the geographical areas where *Taenia solium* may be found, and proposed to delete as a whole the information on spatial distribution as this is not normally included in other disease-

specific chapters of the *Terrestrial Code* and is difficult to keep up to date. In the third sentence of the same paragraph, the Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and cat’ after ‘dogs’, but proposed to replace ‘dogs’ with ‘other carnivores’ for completeness, as mustelids are also susceptible.

If the first, second and fifth paragraphs, the Code Commission agreed with a comment concerning the sole Spanish version, to replace the word ‘hombre’ with ‘ser humano’, which is gender neutral. This change was also applied in Article 15.4.3.

Article 15.4.3.

In paragraph 2, in response to a comment querying whether the use of ‘animal health management’ is appropriate, the Code Commission explained that this was in line with the Glossary definition.

In point 1(f), the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘where indicated’ to the beginning of the sentence, noting that the use of vaccines may be limited to a few countries and therefore vaccine use may not always be possible.

Regarding a comment querying whether point 1(f) is a control measure which should be in point 2, the Code Commission clarified that point 1(f) should remain under point 1 as point 2 pertains to veterinary public health measures and not to the individual treatment of pigs.

Revised Chapter 8.5. Infection with *Echinococcus granulosus* and Chapter 15.4. Infection with *Taenia solium* (Porcine cysticercosis) are presented as **Annex 11** and **Annex 12**, respectively, and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

4.9. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 11.4.), Application for official recognition by the OIE of risk status for bovine spongiform encephalopathy (Chapter 1.8.) and Glossary definition for ‘protein meal’

Background

In February 2018, following preliminary work and discussions, the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission agreed to an in-depth review of Chapter 11.4. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE). The OIE convened three different *ad hoc* Groups between July 2018 and March 2019: i) an *ad hoc* Group on BSE risk assessment, which met twice, ii) an *ad hoc* Group on BSE surveillance, which met once, and iii) a joint *ad hoc* Group on BSE risk assessment and surveillance, which met once.

At its September 2019 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed the four *ad hoc* Group reports together with the opinion of the Scientific Commission and circulated a revised draft Chapter 11.4. for comments.

At its February 2020 meeting, the Code Commission considered comments received and requested that the joint *ad hoc* Group on BSE risk assessment and surveillance be reconvened to address comments of a technical nature as well as to review Chapter 1.8. Application for official recognition by the OIE of risk status for bovine spongiform encephalopathy to ensure alignment with the proposed changes in Chapter 11.4.

At its September 2020 meeting, the Code Commission reviewed the joint *ad hoc* Group report and the revised draft Chapters 11.4. and 1.8. and made some additional amendments and circulated the revised chapters for comments in its September 2020 report.

At its February 2021 meeting, the Code Commission considered comments received and amended the chapters, as appropriate, and circulated the revised chapters.

In preparation for the September 2021 meetings, nominated members of the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission met to discuss key aspects of the revision of Chapters 11.4. and 1.8. to ensure a common understanding of the main concerns raised by Members, the decisions made on the revised chapters and their impact on the OIE official status recognition, as well as on the adapted procedures that will be required. Both Commissions addressed specific issues of relevance at its respective September 2021 meetings.

At its September 2021 meeting, the Code Commission considered comments received and amended the chapters, as appropriate, and circulated the revised chapters for a fourth round of comments.

Discussion

a) Chapter 11.4. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy

Comments were received from Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China (People's Rep. of), Chinese Taipei, Japan, New Zealand, the UK, the AU-IBAR, the EU and the WRO.

General comments

The Code Commission noted concerns raised by some Members on the determination and publication of the date from which the risk of BSE agents being recycled within the cattle population has been negligible. The Commission also noted that a Member questioned some of the details of suspension of negligible BSE risk status described in Article 11.4.3bis., and eligibility for countries and zones that are currently recognised as having a controlled BSE risk status and that could meet the conditions of the new Article 11.4.3. to apply for negligible risk status. The Code Commission explained that the specific procedures related to OIE official status recognition would be discussed by the Scientific Commission at its February 2022 meeting. The Code Commission encouraged Members to refer to the February 2022 report of the Scientific Commission for outcomes of this specific point of discussion.

The Code Commission noted that some Members expressed their interests in the "Guidelines for BSE surveillance" that the Scientific Commission had requested the OIE to develop to help Members revise their surveillance programmes in accordance with the new BSE chapter, especially for some countries posing currently a negligible risk. The Code Commission clarified that these guidelines would not create a need for any further modifications to the chapter. The Code Commission was informed that a proposal to develop the guidelines would be discussed by the Scientific Commission at its February 2022 meeting.

The Code Commission noted a comment that it is essential that any changes to the chapter do not increase the administrative burdens or trade barriers for countries that hold a negligible BSE risk status, given the global context and epidemiology with respect to diminishing overall BSE and vCJD risks. The Commission explained that the proposed text was based on the scientifically justified concept that even negligible BSE risk countries may have two subpopulations (the cattle population born before the date from which the risk of BSE agents being recycled has been negligible and the cattle population born after that date). The Commission also highlighted that, although this might create some administrative burden, the outcome of the risk assessment described in Article 11.4.2. could often conclude that the date from which the risk of BSE agents being recycled has been negligible occurred at a time point dating back for longer than the maximum life span of cattle, and, in that specific case, it would not be necessary to differentiate the two subpopulations at all.

The Code Commission considered concerns raised that the proposed recommendations are not proportionate to the current BSE risks and that the OIE should re-evaluate the negative impact on the international trade of protein meal and other by-products. In response, the Commission agreed and proposed some amendments on the recommendation for importation of cattle-derived protein meal from a country, zone or compartment posing negligible BSE risk and the recommendation in relation to the trade of the commodities with the greatest BSE infectivity (see Article 11.4.12. and Article 11.4.14. below).

The Code Commission noted that some Members disagreed with the Code Commission's position that the risk of atypical BSE being recycled in cattle through oral exposure to contaminated feed is significant enough to warrant the new risk assessment and management measures proposed in the draft text. The Commission also noted that some Members requested the OIE to consider a broader scale of evidence and experience relating to BSE risk over time and to conduct an epidemiological field study to conclude if an amplification of an atypical case is a realistic probability, rather than putting weight on isolated experimental transmission study. In response to these comments, the Commission reiterated that the joint *ad hoc* Group on BSE risk assessment and surveillance had concluded that atypical BSE is considered to be capable of being recycled in a cattle population if cattle are exposed to contaminated feed, as atypical BSE arises as a spontaneous disease in any country. The Commission emphasised that the conclusion on possible recycling of atypical BSE in a cattle population had been based on the result of an experimental transmission study, which is highly relevant, and reiterated that both the Code Commission and the Scientific Commission had considered that the risk of atypical BSE being recycled in cattle needs to be addressed. The Code Commission encouraged Members to refer to the relevant information provided in the March 2019 report of the *ad hoc* Group on BSE risk assessment and surveillance, notably Annex IV of the report which provides the overview of relevant scientific findings on atypical BSE.

In response to a suggestion to include in the Glossary a description as to how to differentiate 'risk' from 'likelihood' in the *Terrestrial Code*, the Code Commission explained that the term 'risk' was defined in the Glossary as 'the likelihood of the occurrence and the likely magnitude of the biological and economic consequences of an adverse event or effect to animal or human health', likelihood meaning probability while risk includes likelihood and consequences.

In response to a comment that the requirements in this chapter are nearly impossible to be met for some Members in some regions and that testing to prove absence of BSE is very expensive and that many Members in the region cannot afford, the Code Commission highlighted that the proposed Article 11.4.18. focuses on passive surveillance rather than active surveillance, which would facilitate the Members' application for the official recognition of the BSE risk status.

Lastly, the Code Commission was informed that the OIE Secretariat had considered implications on official status recognition and maintenance with regard to the potential adoption of the revised BSE standards and that the best way to address the transition from the current to the new standards would be discussed at the February 2022 Scientific Commission meeting. The Code Commission encouraged Members to refer to relevant part of the February 2022 Scientific Commission meeting report for the agreed way forward.

Article 11.4.1.

In point 3, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to revert to 'PrP^{BSE}' or to change to 'PrP^{TSE}' and reiterated the need to ensure alignment with the corresponding *Terrestrial Manual* chapter. The Commission requested that this comment be forwarded to the Laboratories Commission for its advice on this point.

In point 4(b), the Code Commission agreed to delete the definition for protein meal given that the Glossary definition would be proposed for adoption in May 2022 (see item 4.9.(c) of this report).

Article 11.4.2.

In point 1(a)(i), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add 'sheep and goats' in the commodities that should be considered in the entry assessment, as it had agreed with the *ad hoc* Group's opinion that, 'although the evidence provided (on the emergence of classical BSE from atypical/Nor98 scrapie in small ruminants) represents a hazard of interest, the revised standards account for mitigation strategies to avoid the exposure of cattle to ruminant-derived protein irrespective of the source of that ruminant-derived protein'. The Commission encouraged Members to refer to the June 2021 *ad hoc* Group report on the revision of BSE standards and its impact on the official status recognition for relevant information.

In point 1(c)(iii), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘number of BSE cases reduced due to the’ before ‘impact of cattle industry practices’. The Commission considered that this point describes the impact of cattle industry practices or the implementation of BSE-specific mitigation measures under a feed ban, which were considered in the exposure assessment, and the degree of decrease in BSE cases is not necessarily considered relevant and not possible to estimate for countries with no cases.

In point 1(d), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘, and to’ with ‘. When applicable, it may also’ and explained that all Members that apply for an official BSE risk status have to estimate the date from which the risk of BSE agents being recycled within the cattle population has been negligible in the step of risk estimation.

In the same point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add descriptions on possible dates for countries and zones with negligible BSE risk status or controlled BSE risk status, as it considered this article describes the process for the determination of the BSE risk.

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with comments to delete ‘classical’ to align with the proposed addition of the first paragraph of Article 11.4.18.

Article 11.4.3.

In point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and routes’ after ‘all potential risk factors’ as it was important to ensure alignment with the wordings in point 1 of Article 11.4.2.

In the same point, in response to a comment to reinstate the deleted point 1(a) and 1(b) to clearly describe what requirement Members must fulfil, the Code Commission reiterated that the reinstatement was not necessary as the two pathways, described in these deleted points, have already been well addressed in the new point 1 of Article 11.4.2. The Commission reiterated that in the dossier for the OIE the applicant Members should provide documented evidence that ruminant-derived protein meal has not been fed to ruminants, and the measures implemented to ensure that, including a feed ban, as explained in the June 2020 report of the *ad hoc* Group on BSE risk assessment and surveillance. Nevertheless, in order to make that clear in the text of the article, the Commission proposed an amendment to highlight the fact that the major risk factor is feeding cattle with ruminant-derived protein meal and this must be considered in the risk assessment and the related risk mitigation measures.

In point 3(b)(ii), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment that an indigenous case of classical BSE in animals born after the date from which the risk of BSE agents being recycled within the cattle population has been negligible indicates that there has either been a breakdown in control measures (specifically, in the feed ban) or in surveillance. The Commission reiterated that the cases do not necessarily reflect a breakdown of effective control measures, considering that the BSE agent can remain biologically active for many years and therefore isolated pockets of residual infectivity in a complex network of rendering, feed production, distribution and storage may account for rare, sporadic opportunities of exposure to contaminated protein meal. The Commission encouraged Members to refer to the July 2018 report of the *ad hoc* Group on BSE risk assessment, in which the outcome of a detailed investigation of 60 classical BSE cases in the EU born after the “total” feed ban was discussed. The Commission also noted a recently published modelling study ([Epidemiol. Infect. \(2017\), 145, 2280-2286](#)) to which the Members could also refer.

In the same point, the Code Commission agreed with a comment that the word ‘mitigated’ did not reflect the importance of the control measures, and proposed to replace it with ‘controlled’. The Commission proposed a similar amendment in Article 11.4.3bis.

In the same point, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to replace ‘a case was’ with ‘any cases were’ and explained that if the applicant country has two or more cases born after the date, the information on subsequent investigations for all the cases should be included in the dossier that must be submitted to the OIE. In response to a comment to clarify what would

happen if the source of a classical BSE case born after the date cannot be determined by the subsequent investigations, the Commission explained that such a situation is possible, given the uncertainties resulting from the timespan between the confirmation of any BSE cases and their potential exposure to the BSE agent within their first year of life; in that case, additional risk mitigation measures would not be needed as long as the country could demonstrate that the risk of BSE agent being recycled within the cattle population has continued to be negligible.

In point 4, in the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘disposed of’ as it considered that whilst destruction is not related to inactivation of the pathogenic agents, some disposal procedures such as the ones described in Article 11.4.17. could inactivate BSE agents, and inclusion of ‘disposed of’ was relevant here.

Article 11.4.3bis. (proposed to be renumbered Article 11.4.5bis.)

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add ‘and atypical’ after ‘classical’ and reiterated that the occurrence of atypical cases would not affect the BSE risk status.

In the same paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace ‘within the preceding eight years’ with ‘after the date from which the risk of BSE agents being recycled within the cattle population has been negligible’ as it considered it necessary to align with the approach taken throughout the chapter.

In response to a comment to develop a new article on maintenance of controlled BSE risk status aligned with Article 11.4.3bis., the Code Commission agreed to amend Article 11.4.3bis. based on the Scientific Commission’s proposal to develop an article on maintenance of negligible or controlled BSE risk status after detection of an indigenous case of classical BSE born after the date (from which the risk of BSE agents being recycled within the cattle population has been negligible) in a country or zone recognised as posing a negligible or controlled risk for BSE. The Code Commission proposed some amendments to Article 11.4.3bis. to reflect this change and ensure alignment with text used throughout the chapter, and it also proposed that the article be renumbered 11.4.5bis.

Article 11.4.4.

In the first paragraph, in response to comments to clarify the meaning, the Code Commission proposed an amendment to improve clarity. The Commission also highlighted that ‘all of the conditions of Article 11.4.3. are met’ is written in present tense (i.e. at the time of application), but the part after ‘but’ is written in present perfect tense (duration).

Article 11.4.7.

In point 1, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete ‘came from a country, zone or compartment posing a negligible or controlled BSE risk and’, as this is covered by point 2 and ensures alignment with the amendments which have been introduced in Articles 11.4.10., 11.4.12. and 11.4.13.

In the same point, in response to a comment that the requirement for an animal identification system is not mentioned as a requirement for negligible BSE risk countries under Article 11.4.2. and that an animal identification system is not necessary for the appropriate management of risk of BSE, the Code Commission reiterated that BSE concerns the lifespan of an animal and therefore an animal identification system is essential to enable the Veterinary Authority to trace the origin of animals for the purpose of effective control. The Commission highlighted that this point refers to an animal identification system, as defined in the Glossary, meaning that it could involve identification and registration by animals individually, or collectively by its epidemiological unit or group. It also highlighted that this requirement concerned live animals destined for exportation, for which common sanitary measures require such identification.

In point 2, the Code Commission did not agree with comments to replace 'a country, zone or compartment' with 'one or more countries, zones or compartments'. The Commission explained that this point does not mean that the cattle selected for export must be born and kept in only one country (or zone or compartment) posing a negligible or controlled BSE risk and that as long as the cattle selected for export were born and kept in such countries (or zones or compartments) after the date (from which the risk of BSE agents being recycled within the cattle population has been negligible), the number of countries/zones/compartments where the cattle were kept does not matter in terms of BSE risk mitigation. The Commission noted that this response also applies to similar comments submitted for Articles 11.4.10., 11.4.12. and 11.4.13.

Article 11.4.10.

In response to a query as to whether Articles 11.4.10. and 11.4.11. apply to meat and meat products only for human consumption, the Code Commission explained that they are not limited to human consumption as long as it meets the Glossary definitions. Additionally, the Code Commission reminded that the recommendations within the Code for trading commodities were to provide sufficient risk mitigations measures in relation to the relevant disease, and apart few exceptions, irrespectively of the final destination of those commodities.

Article 11.4.12.

In response to a query on the scope of protein meal to be defined in Glossary, the Code Commission clarified that the proposed definition could include protein meal for all uses as long as they meet the Glossary definition.

The Code Commission noted a number of concerns on the recommendations described in Article 11.4.12. These concerns included: some Members considered that the revised recommendations for the importation of cattle-derived protein meal from a country, zone or compartment posing a negligible BSE risk is disproportionate to the objective of reducing BSE and vCJD risks; some Members and the rendering industry pointed out that it would not be possible to implement the recommendations in many countries due to lack of a system to trace back the derived cattle; and queries that in the revised chapter the rendering procedures are not considered as a risk mitigation measure for safe trade of cattle-derived protein meal. In response to these, and in order to prevent unjustified trade barriers whilst ensuring effective risk mitigation measures, the Commission proposed to add a new point that allows for the possibility of protein meal being derived from cattle that cannot be certified as born after the date, as long as the protein meal was subjected to the procedures for reduction of BSE infectivity as described in Article 11.4.17.

Article 11.4.14.

In the title, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add 'potential' before 'greatest BSE infectivity' as it considered it was clear as written.

In point 1(b), regarding the recommendation not to trade the listed commodities from country, zone or compartment posing negligible BSE risk, the Code Commission agreed to remove the reference to this risk category in line with the amendment to Article 11.4.12., noting that the overall burden would significantly exceed the risk.

In the same point the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete 'a controlled BSE risk or'. In this case, the risk represented by the cattle population born after the date from which the risk of BSE agents being recycled has been negligible warrants this measure.

In point 2, in response to a comment as to what is meant by 'pharmaceuticals including biologicals', the Code Commission explained that this term is used in the current Article 11.4.14., and was also included in the revised text at its September 2020 meeting, following a request from a Member to ensure completeness of potential commodities that pose a risk. The Commission noted that while the nomenclature for veterinary biological products varies from country to country, this term is used extensively in the *Terrestrial Manual*, e.g. in relation to veterinary medicinal products.

Article 11.4.15bis.

In point 3, in response to a comment as to how a minor amendment proposed by the *ad hoc* Group on the Revision of BSE standards and its impact on the official status recognition was reflected in the current draft, the Code Commission clarified that the Group's proposal had been to revert to the text of point 3 of current Article 11.4.18. The Commission did not agree with the proposal as it considered the revised wording clearer. In the same point, in response to a comment to add 'by' before 'transesterification' to clarify that the expression 'that uses high temperature and pressure' only applies to the transesterification process, the Commission did not agree as it considered the current text clear as written, the verb 'uses' being at the third-person of singular. The Commission proposed to add a comma for clarity.

Article 11.4.17.

In the chapeau paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to revert 'BSE' to 'transmissible spongiform encephalopathy'. The Commission reiterated that this chapter pertains to BSE, not all TSEs, and that not all TSEs are listed diseases.

Article 11.4.18.

The Code Commission agreed with a comment to include the objective of BSE surveillance for clarity and proposed to add a sentence at the start of the article.

In point 2, the Code Commission agreed with comments to replace 'Veterinary Authority' with 'Veterinary Services' as it considered that more accurate from the perspective of the first step of field passive surveillance. The Commission did not agree to add 'where appropriate' before 'follow-up', as it considered that a follow-up is always necessary.

In point 2, in the second paragraph, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to replace the terms 'intensively reared' and 'extensive systems' with 'production and farming systems' as this wording is used previously in the text and improves clarity.

In point 2, in the fourth paragraph, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add 'All' before 'The following animals' as it did not add any clarity. However, the Code Commission made an amendment to highlight that while the animals that should be targeted for BSE surveillance were all those showing signs of the clinical spectrum of BSE, only the animals listed in points 2(a) to 2(d) should be followed up with appropriate laboratory testing to confirm or rule out the presence of BSE agents.

In points 2(c) and 2(d), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to clarify the meaning, as it considered the text clear as written.

In point 3(d), in response to a comment to clarify the meaning of 'candidates', the Code Commission proposed an amendment to improve clarity. The Commission noted that this change was also made in Article 1.8.6. in response to a similar comment.

The Code Commission wished to inform Members that all of the reports of BSE *ad hoc* Groups are available on [the OIE website](#).

b) Chapter 1.8. Application for official recognition by the OIE of risk status for bovine spongiform encephalopathy

Comments were received from Australia, Chinese Taipei, New Caledonia, New Zealand, the USA, the AU-IBAR and the EU.

General comments

In response to a comment that many of the requirements in the questionnaire are not included in Article 11.4.2. General criteria for the determination of the BSE risk of a country, zone or compartment, the Code Commission reminded Members that the *ad hoc* Groups had revised the text in Chapter 1.8. with the aim of providing guidance to Members who wish to apply for official recognition of BSE risk status.

In response to a comment that the proposed chapter includes the use of fertilisers and compost although previous Specialist Commission reports did not present evidence that grazing land exposed to such commodities represent a risk of exposure or infection of BSE to cattle, the Code Commission explained that fertilisers have already been taken into consideration in the BSE risk assessment based on current standards, and the risk of misuse of fertilisers containing rendered products of ruminant origin or the risk that cattle ingest the fertilisers applied to land is a potential hazard that should be properly assessed in the exposure assessment.

The Code Commission noted a comment from a Member stating that there are very few countries that could meet the conditions to apply for official recognition of BSE risk status in their region. The Commission reiterated that the proposed Article 11.4.18. focuses on passive surveillance rather than active surveillance, which would make the Members' application for the official recognition of the BSE risk status easier.

In response to a request to ensure that the terms 'likelihood' and 'probability' used in Articles 1.8.5. to 1.8.7. are consistent with Chapter 2.1. Import risk analysis, the Code Commission considered that the proposed usage of these terms is correct.

Article 1.8.2.

In point 1(a), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add 'of each indigenous case of classical BSE' at the end of the point, as it considered that the purpose of this point was to provide general information on BSE cases that applicants experienced irrespective of classical/atypical or indigenous/imported, whereas point (b) focuses on indigenous case of classical BSE.

In point 1(b), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add '(or, if imported, the year of import)' after 'the year of birth of each indigenous case', and clarified that this point was about information needed to assess the outcome of BSE risk mitigation measures taken in the country, rather than information required in the entry assessment. The Commission noted that an imported case by definition implies that exposure occurred before import.

Article 1.8.5.

In the third indent of point 1, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment that some countries use packaged and labelled pet food for livestock species and therefore they should be considered in the entry assessment, as it considered that this was not necessary given that packaged pet food is much more expensive than livestock feed and the practice of feeding livestock with packaged and labelled pet food is uncommon. The Commission encouraged Members to refer to relevant discussions noted in its September 2021 report for more details on this point.

In point 1(a), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add 'and the quantity imported' at the end of the point. The Commission encouraged Members to refer to the November 2018 report of the *ad hoc* Group on BSE risk assessment which considered that detailed quantitative information (e.g. volume, statistics, etc.) on imported commodities was not informative for the entry assessment as long as they were imported under conditions consistent with the recommendations in Chapter 11.4. or where it can be demonstrated that an equivalent level of assurance was provided.

In the second paragraph of point 2, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to delete ‘indigenous’, as it considered that in the exposure assessment, the likelihood of cattle being exposed to the BSE agents as a result of the presence of BSE agents in the cattle population of the country or zone, which includes both populations born in the country or zone and populations imported from other countries, should be properly evaluated.

In point 2(a)(v), the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to delete ‘labelling’, as it considered it necessary to include given that correct labelling is essential to confirm that the prevention of cross-contamination of contaminated materials has been managed. In the first paragraph of point 2(a), the Commission proposed to add labelling so the text stated ‘production, labelling, distribution and storage of feed’ to ensure alignment with point 2(a)(v).

In point 2(a)(v), the Code Commission partially agreed with a comment to clarify which feed producing facilities are referred to, and proposed an amendment.

In point 2(b), as also noted above for Article 11.4.3., the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add text stating that the implementation of a feed-ban should be a mandatory risk mitigation measure in countries where livestock industry practices do not prevent cattle from being fed with ruminant-derived protein meal, noting that Chapter 1.8. is a questionnaire for applications for official recognition by the OIE of risk status for BSE. Nevertheless, the Commission made some amendments to highlight the importance of a legislated feed ban to properly address the risk, as demonstrated by the list of measures from i) to vii), to be described in the dossier.

In the first paragraph of point 4, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment to add a sentence ‘the risk estimation can be qualitative or quantitative’ and reiterated that it is not a quantitative assessment.

Article 1.8.7.

The Code Commission proposed to amend the article to ensure alignment with the proposed new article on maintenance of BSE risk status in Chapter 11.4.

c) The use of terms ‘meat-and-bone meal’ and ‘greaves’ throughout the *Terrestrial Code*

Background

At its September 2021 meeting, the Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to review the use of terms ‘meat-and-bone meal’ and ‘greaves’ throughout the *Terrestrial Code* to determine where these terms would need to be replaced by ‘protein meal’ should the new proposed definition for ‘protein meal’ be adopted.

Discussion

The OIE Secretariat informed the Code Commission that six disease-specific chapters (Chapter 8.1., Chapter 8.4., Chapter 8.11., Chapter 10.4., Chapter 14.8. and Chapter 15.3.) used the terms ‘greaves’ or ‘meat-and-bone meal’ and provided a summary as to where the terms were used.

The Code Commission agreed to propose the Glossary definition for protein meal for adoption in May 2022 and to propose the deletion of the definition described in point 4(b) of Article 11.4.1. However, due to time constraints, the Commission was not able to finalise the discussion regarding where in the other relevant chapters ‘greaves’ or ‘meat-and-bone meal’ should be replaced with ‘protein meal’ and agreed to discuss at its next meeting should the new definition for ‘protein meal’ be adopted.

The Code Commission acknowledged that many changes have been made to the revised Chapter 11.4. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy during the period of revision. For this meeting report, the Commission agreed to provide as **Annex 13**, for Member information only, a version that shows the changes made at this meeting in the version circulated in its September 2021 report. The Commission noted that Annex 13 does not show in track changes all amendments being proposed.

The revised Chapter 11.4. Bovine spongiform encephalopathy is presented as **Annex 14** and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022. The Code Commission wished to note that due to the extensive number of amendments being proposed, the French and Spanish versions of Chapter 11.4. to be proposed for adoption in the French and Spanish versions of the February 2022 Code Commission report are presented as clean text only.

The revised Chapter 1.8. Application for official recognition by the OIE of risk status for bovine spongiform encephalopathy and the Glossary definition for ‘protein meal’ are presented as **Annex 15** and as part of **Annex 3**, respectively, and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

4.10. Theileriosis (Chapter 11.10.)

Comments were received from New Caledonia, New Zealand, South Africa, the USA, the AU-IBAR and the EU.

Background

A revised Chapter 11.10. Infection with *Theileria annulata*, *T. orientalis* and *T. parva* was first circulated for comments in September 2017, following the work of the *ad hoc* Group on Theileriosis that met in February 2017. At the Code Commission’s February 2018 meeting, in response to some comments which questioned the listing of some *Theileria* spp., the review of comments was put on hold while expert advice was sought regarding listing.

At its September 2019 meeting, the Code Commission was informed that *T. orientalis* (Ikeda and Chitose) had been assessed by experts against the criteria for listing in accordance with Chapter 1.2. and were found to meet the criteria for listing (refer to Annex 19 of the Scientific Commission’s February 2019 report).

At its September 2020 meeting, the Code Commission considered comments received previously on the revised Chapter 11.10. and circulated a revised chapter for comments. At its September 2021 meeting, the Commission considered comments received, together with advice from the Scientific Commission and the Laboratories Commission on selected comments, and circulated a revised chapter for comments.

Discussion

General comments

In response to a question as to why the recommendations in the revised chapter only address bovines and water buffalo, the Code Commission reminded Members that a revised Chapter 11.10. Infection with *Theileria annulata*, *T. orientalis* and *T. parva* and a new Chapter 14.X. Infection with *Theileria lestoquardi*, *T. luwenshuni* and *T. uilenbergi* were first circulated in September 2017, following the work of the *ad hoc* Group on Theileriosis that met in February 2017. The Commission encouraged Members to refer to the relevant part of its September 2017 report for the background of the decision to have the two separate chapters.

Article 11.10.1.

In the first paragraph, the Code Commission noted a comment that water buffalos and African buffalos are also bovines. Acknowledging that there were some variations in the use of terms of ‘bovines’, ‘bovids’ and ‘cattle’ in the *Terrestrial Code*, the Code Commission agreed to further discuss this issue and requested that the OIE Secretariat review the use of the terms and report back to the Commission at its September 2022 meeting to ensure that it can assess and prioritise the work needed to ensure consistency throughout the *Terrestrial Code*.

In point 3, the Code Commission agreed with a comment to add ‘that are not a consequence of vaccination’ after ‘antibodies specific to *Theileria*’ to ensure alignment with other disease-specific chapters.

Article 11.10.5.

In point 4, the Code Commission did not agree with a comment that the second test should occur after at least one incubation period (35 days), as it considered it unjustified as the current time would allow to detect a positive animal, and also to be impractical given the justified isolation time (35 days) described in point 2. The Commission reminded Members that the modification of point 4 regarding the duration of 25 days between the two tests had been proposed in agreement with the Laboratories Commission, and that the other three risk mitigation measures in this article should also be met.

In the same point, regarding a comment to replace ‘serological and agent identification tests’ with ‘serological or agent identification tests’, the Code Commission noted that the Laboratories Commission had considered that even though the tests are rated as ‘recommended’ method for individual animal freedom from infection prior to movement in the Table 1 of Chapter 3.4.15. in the *Terrestrial Manual*, because of possible cross-reactions both tests complement each other and therefore are needed to ensure individual animal freedom from infection. The Code Commission agreed with the Laboratories Commission that no further amendment was needed in the point, and encouraged Members to refer to the February 2022 report of the Laboratories Commissions for more details regarding its rationale.

Revised Chapter 11.10. is presented as **Annex 16** and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

4.11. Terminology: Use of the term ‘sanitary measure’

Background

Following the adoption of the Glossary definition of ‘sanitary measure’ in 2020, the Code Commission requested the OIE Secretariat to assess whether the terms ‘sanitary measure’ and ‘biosecurity’ have been used appropriately throughout the *Terrestrial Code*.

At its September 2021 meeting, the Code Commission noted that the term ‘sanitary measure’ has not been used appropriately in the following articles and consequently it had proposed amendments which were circulated for comment in its September 2021 report:

- Article 3.4.5. of Chapter 3.4. Veterinary legislation (see item 4.4. of this report),
- Article 4.15.6. of Chapter 4.15. Official health control of bee diseases,
- Article 6.3.3. of Chapter 6.3. Control of biological hazards of animal health and public health importance through ante- and post-mortem meat inspection.

Discussion

The Code Commission noted that no comments were received on the circulated texts.

Revised Article 4.15.6. of Chapter 4.15. Official health control of bee diseases and Article 6.3.3. of Chapter 6.3. Control of biological hazards of animal health and public health importance through ante- and post-mortem meat inspection, are presented as **Annex 17** and will be proposed for adoption at the 89th General Session in May 2022.

.../Annexes