



SC on PAFF, AHW A.05 – a follow up on the EFSA scientific opinions related to infection with Equine Herpesvirus -1

E. Camara
SANTE/G2

15-16 December 2022

Introduction

1. The EFSA opinions presented at the meeting of the Standing Committee on PAFF on 30 November 2022
 - EFSA opinion 10.2903/j.efsa.2022.7036: Assessment of listing and categorisation of animal diseases within the framework of the Animal Health Law (Regulation (EU) No 2016/429): infection with Equine Herpesvirus-1 <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/efsajournal/pub/7036>
 - EFSA opinion 10.2903/j.efsa.2022.7230: Clinical impact, diagnosis and control of Equine Herpesvirus-1 infection in Europe <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/efsajournal/pub/7230>
2. The Standing Committee on PAFF on 15-16 December 2022
 - Suggestions for ways forward

EFSA Findings: Article 5 - listing

Criteria to be met by the disease: According to AHL, a disease shall be included in the list referred to in point (b) of paragraph 1 of Article 5 if it has been assessed in accordance with Article 7 and meets all of the following criteria		Outcome			
		Median range (%)	Criterion fulfilment	Number of "not applicable (n.a.)"	Number of experts
A(i)	the disease is transmissible	99-100	Fulfilled	0	20
A(ii)	animal species are either susceptible to the disease or vectors and reservoirs thereof exist in the Union	99-100	Fulfilled	0	20
A(iii)	the disease causes negative effects on animal health or poses a risk to public health due to its zoonotic character	95-100	Fulfilled	0	20
A(iv)	diagnostic tools are available for the disease	99-100	Fulfilled	0	20
A(v)	risk-mitigating measures and, where relevant, surveillance of the disease are effective and proportionate to the risks posed by the disease in the Union	33-90	Uncertain	0	20

In addition to the criteria set out above at point A(i)-A(v), the disease needs to fulfil at least one of the following criteria					
B(i)	the disease causes or could cause significant negative effects in the Union on animal health, or poses or could pose a significant risk to public health due to its zoonotic character	66-95	Fulfilled	0	20
B(ii)	the disease agent has developed resistance to treatments and poses a significant danger to public and/or animal health in the Union	10-33	Not fulfilled	17	20
B(iii)	the disease causes or could cause a significant negative economic impact affecting agriculture or aquaculture production in the Union	10-33	Not fulfilled	0	20
B(iv)	the disease has the potential to generate a crisis or the disease agent could be used for the purpose of bioterrorism	0-10	Not fulfilled	0	20
B(v)	the disease has or could have a significant negative impact on the environment, including biodiversity, of the Union	5-30	Not fulfilled	0	20

EFSA Findings: categorisation

Category	Article 9 criteria										
	1° set of criteria					2° set of criteria					
	1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	3	4	5a	5b	5c	5d
	Geographical distribution	Transmissibility	Routes of transmission	Multiple species	Morbidity and mortality	Zoonotic potential	Impact on economy	Impact on society	Impact on animal welfare	Impact on environment	Impact on biodiversity
A	0-1	33-66	10-33	95-99	5-10	0-1	33-66	10-33	10-66	5-10	10-66
B	1-5	66-95	10-33	95-99	66-90	0-1	33-66	10-33	10-66	5-10	10-66
C	95-99	66-95	99-100	95-99	33-66	0-1	10-66	10-33	10-66	5-10	10-66
D	66-90										
E	33-90										

Some examples of uncertainty: Article 5 - listing

Criterion A(v): Risk-mitigating measures and, where relevant, surveillance of the disease are effective and proportionate to the risks posed by the disease in the Union

- diagnostic testing is inaccurate in detecting latent infection,
- available diagnostic methods are not suited for all epidemiological conditions (absence of DIVA test for vaccinated horses; low specificity to differentiate EHV-1 with EHV-2 to 9)
- factors for re-activation of the infection are not known
- effectiveness of vaccination to prevent spread of EHV-1 is not described or is variable against the different forms of disease
- some biosecurity measures as quarantine and segregation of horses are hardly feasible

Summary on EFSA findings

The Commission studied EFSA scientific opinions

- Lots of useful available information on the disease that can help Member States in the future
- Several levels of uncertainty

Risk management option

Key considerations

- Criteria in the AHL
- Rules for listed diseases
- Efficiency and proportionality (burden) of regulation vs. non-regulatory alternatives
- Subsidiarity
- On the basis of EFSA assessment and the above considerations:
no listing of EHV-1
- Welcome comments from Member States (if any)

Thank you



© European Union 2020

Unless otherwise noted the reuse of this presentation is authorised under the [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. For any use or reproduction of elements that are not owned by the EU, permission may need to be sought directly from the respective right holders.

Slide xx: **element concerned**, source: e.g. [Fotolia.com](https://www.fotolia.com/); Slide xx: **element concerned**, source: e.g. [iStock.com](https://www.istock.com/)

