

CHAPTER 1.2.

CRITERIA FOR LISTING DISEASES

EU comments

The EU welcomes the OIE work on this chapter. This work should be done in conjunction with what is currently done by the Aquatic Commission.

EU comments are inserted in the text below.

Article 1.2.1.

[presented as clean text for Member comments]

The criteria for the inclusion of a *disease* in the OIE List are as follows:

EU comment

According to the proposed new way of listing disease by their agent, it might be relevant to already add here the word "agent" after the word "disease".

1. International spread of the agent (via live animals, their products or fomites) has been proven on three or more occasions.

EU comment

The EU would like to know the justification for the words "on three or more occasions". For the EU, "at least one occasion" of international spread would seem sufficient. However, the words "international spread" should be defined, i.e. minimum number of countries or regions affected.

AND

EU comment

The numbering here is confusing. It should be:

"1. a) International spread:

The international spread of the agent (via live animals, their products or fomites) has been proven on three or more occasions;

AND

b) Free status:

i) or ii)

AND

c) Impact of the disease/infection

i) or ii) or iii)

AND

d) Diagnostic and definition

OR

2. Emerging disease

- i) A number of countries with populations of susceptible animals are free of the disease/infection or face impending freedom (based on the animal health surveillance provisions of the *Terrestrial Code*, in particular those contained in Chapter 1.4.)

EU comment

The freedom status conditions are often described in the specific chapters. The text between brackets above should read: "(based on the provisions of the specific chapter of the *Terrestrial Code* relating to the disease/agent or on the animal health surveillance provisions of Chapter 1.4 of the *Terrestrial Code*, in particular those contained in Chapter 1.4.)".

OR

EU comment

The wording 'a number of countries' in point i) above and point ii) below is very vague and needs to be more specific, such as "at least one (or 2 or 3 etc) countries". Because the OIE mandate is wider than only trade aspects and includes improvement of animal health worldwide, a disease that is present in the quasi totality of OIE Members could nevertheless be listed for the sake of combating it or its effects, as long as it has been proven to be possible and worthwhile. Thus the word "a number of countries" in points i) above and ii) below could be replaced by "at least one country".

- ii) OIE annual reports indicate that a number of countries with susceptible populations have reported absence of the disease for several consecutive years (based on the animal health surveillance information notified in WAHIS)

EU comment

The first part of the sentence is redundant with the last part between brackets: OIE annual reports are indeed based on WAHIS. It should be simplified, e.g.: "the OIE animal health surveillance information in WAHIS indicates that a number of countries with susceptible populations have reported absence of the disease for several consecutive years".

AND

- i) Transmission to humans has been proven, and human infection is associated with severe consequences (death or serious illness)

EU comment

The word "serious" should be better defined, e.g. "illness leading to hospitalisation or chronic invalidity".

OR

- ii) The disease/infection has been shown to cause significant production losses in domestic animals at the level of a country or a *zone*, excepting the situation where there is an efficient and affordable vaccine and vaccination is carried out by most Members

OR

EU comment

While acknowledging the fact that some diseases are indeed dealt with quite easily with a good vaccine, the EU questions the validity and possible interpretation of the words "affordable" and "carried out by most Members", as well as "efficient" (which should be "effective"). Most Members carry out at different levels anti-FMD vaccination, and there are effective and relatively "affordable" vaccines against FMD...

Another wording might better take that point into account: "excepting the situation where worldwide standard production systems include routine vaccination, prevention, cure or treatment procedures that have shown to effectively avoid those losses".

- iii) The disease/infection has been shown to, or scientific evidence indicates that it would, have a significant negative effect on wild animal populations

AND

- i) A repeatable and reliable means of detection and diagnosis exists and a precise case definition is available to clearly identify cases and allow them to be distinguished from other pathologies.

EU comment

The word "pathologies" should be replaced by "diseases/infections".

OR

2. The disease is an *emerging disease* with apparent zoonotic properties, rapid spread, or possible significant production losses and a case definition is available to clearly identify cases and allow them to be distinguished from other pathologies.

EU comment

The word "pathologies" should be replaced by "diseases/infections".