Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare

Minutes of the 100th Plenary meeting

Held on 18-19 October 2016, Parma, (Italy)

(Agreed on 01 November 2016)

Participants

- Panel Members

Anette Bøtner, Dominique Bicout, Andy Butterworth, Paolo Calistri, Klaus Depner, Sandra Edwards, Bruno Garin-Bastuji, Margaret Good, Christian Gortazar Schmidt, Virginie Michel, Miguel Angel Miranda, Simon John More, Mohan Raj, Søren Saxmose Nielsen, Liisa Sihvonen, Hans Spoolder, Jan Arend Stegeman, Hans-Hermann Thulke, Preben Willeberg, Christoph Winckler

- EFSA

ALPHA UNIT: Francesca Baldinelli, Beatriz Beltran-Beck, Alessandro Broglia, Denise Candiani, Edoardo Carnesecchi, Ewelina Czwienczek, Sofie Dhollander, Chiara Fabris, Andrea Gervelmeyer, Andrey Gogin, Joana Morgado, Giuseppe Stancanelli, Frank Verdonck, Gabriele Zancanaro

- EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Marina Marini, Pierangelo Bernorio, Laszlo Kuster, Barbara Logar, Laura Perez Alvarez, Maria Pittman, Stanislav Ralchev (DG SANTE)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The chair welcomed the meeting participants. Apologies were received by Antonio Velarde Calvo.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of Interest of Scientific Panel Members

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Declarations of Interests (DoI), EFSA screened the Annual (ADoI) and Specific Declaration of Interest (SDoI) provided by the Panel Members for the present meeting. The Panel members were asked to confirm that no further interests had to be declared in the context of the agenda of the meeting. No conflict of interest has been identified.

4. Agreement of the minutes of the 99th Plenary meeting held on 13 and 14 September 2016, Parma (Italy)

The minutes of the previous plenary meeting have been adopted by written procedure.

5. New Mandates

None

6. Scientific outputs submitted for possible adoption/endorsement

- **Request for a joint EFSA and EMA scientific opinion on measures to reduce the need to use antimicrobial agents in animal husbandry in the European Union and the resulting impacts on food safety (EFSA-Q-2015-00216)**

The scientific opinion was discussed for endorsement, before adoption by the BIOHAZ Panel/EMA Committee for Medicinal Products for Veterinary Use (CVMP) in November/December. The sections prepared by AHAW (Abstract, Summary, Chapter 1.7: circumstances and diseases that require most AM, Chapter 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.: management and husbandry procedures reducing the need for AM) were endorsed by the AHAW Panel. The discussion mainly focussed on the section on alternative production systems and related conclusions and recommendations.

7. Scientific outputs submitted for discussion

- **Scientific opinion on entry routes into the EU of vector borne diseases (EFSA-Q-2014-00187)**

The thorough discussion of the draft opinion was postponed until the November plenary meeting. During this plenary meeting, the Panel has been updated on the progress made on the storymaps, which will be used to characterise the VBD (ToR1). The comments received from the Panel on the 36 different draft sections for the storymaps have been collected in 1 document and will be taken into account. A short presentation was given on the visualisation of the systematic review outputs, using micro strategy. These

microstrategy outputs will be incorporated in the storymaps. The need to archive the storymaps outputs to reflect the state on the day of adoption of the opinion was discussed, as the storymaps will be published on-line, with the idea of updating them when new crucial information becomes available.

The Panel was informed about the progress made on the risk assessment (ToR2-5), using the Mintrisk model. The results of the risk assessment will be presented in the November plenary.

8. Feedback from the ad-hoc Working Groups of the AHAW Panel

- **Scientific opinion on avian influenza (EFSA-Q-2015-00214)**

The description of the model on HPAI entry (Appendix C) and the corresponding outcomes (sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) were discussed in detail. The Panel requested to mention in the beginning of the model description that the model is designed to simulate HPAI entry via one wild bird entry route and one migration season. It will not be possible to assess when (e.g. in which week during the migration season) and where (location in the EU) the risk will be highest for an HPAI entry, due to a lack of data. Defecation of wild birds is possible when they are flying but its impact is considered to be limited compared to the defecation when wild birds are on land or in water. It was agreed that defecation when flying should not be included in the model, but its possible impact on the final model outcome should be included in the uncertainty analysis. The outcome will be taken into account when biosecurity measures are assessed (e.g. recommendation or not to install a roof in outdoor housing facilities). In the description of the four entry routes, it should be clearly indicated that south-east Asia is often a source of HPAIV transfer to migratory wild birds. The legend and text explaining the predictive risk map of HPAI occurrences in wild birds in Europe should be edited to clarify how it is generated and which wild bird cases are presented. The Panel agreed with the four scenarios that will be assessed, differing in proportion of migratory/resident wild birds and proportion of water/non-water birds. The provided model outcomes (prevalence in wild birds, probability of a holding to be infected at the end of the migration season and the cumulative infection probability over the migration season) were considered sufficient to respond to the TOR on HPAI entry. It was suggested to use other figure types to present the probabilities in order to focus on the median instead of the confidence intervals. Ornithological input is required to better describe the relevance of the high wild bird population capacities in the EU (10^5 and 10^6). Currently, only the results of HPAI clade 2.3.4.4 entry via the NE route are assessed. The WG will perform a qualitative assessment for the other viral clades and entry routes in the coming weeks. It was noted that the role of sea water in the introduction of H5N1 has been observed (e.g. in Denmark) and should be taken into account in the assessment.

- **Scientific Opinion on the listing and categorisation of animal diseases in the framework of the new Animal Health Law (EFSA-Q-2015-00713; EFSA-Q-2016-00156)**

The Panel has been updated on the progress made on the following specific aspect of the methodological approach of the mandate.
1) Mapping- the mapping of the art.7 parameters into the art.5 and 9 criteria has been finalised within the WG.
2) Reviewing phase- the Panel agreed on the instructions/guidelines for reviewing the disease fact-sheets elaborated by the WG. The Reviewers will assess the integrity of the fact-sheet indicating by art.7 parameter whether i) knowledge gaps, ii) missing/wrong information, iii) missing references, iv) excess information not related to the art.7 parameters, v) possible biases introduced by the DS (e.g. overestimation of impact of the disease) are present.

3) Expert judgement- the Panel agreed on the dates for conducting the collective judgement: the first collective judgement on the 18th and 19th January; the second collective judgement on the 8th and 9th March. The training of the expert judgement will be held during the November Panel meeting. Moreover the templates for presenting the questions and collecting the answers were presented. The Panel agreed on presenting the overall results of the assessment of the eligibility of the diseases for listing according to art.5 and for categorization according to art.9 criteria by reporting the categorical answer (Y/N/na) and the indication of the level of consensus: full consensus (indicated in green); no consensus (in yellow, when not enough robust evidence is available or different interpretation of the evidence). Experts will also indicate the lack of knowledge (in red). In case of no consensus having been reached also the number of different interpretations will be provided.

- **Scientific opinion on Bluetongue (EFSA-Q-2016-00160)**

The mandate from the Commission on Bluetongue (BT) includes 5 TORs. Two opinions will be produced to answer the mandate. The first one covering ToR 1-3 will be tabled for discussion in November 29-30 and for adoption in January 2017. The second opinion covering the ToR 4-5 will be presented for adoption in June 2017.

The draft opinion has been presented at the plenary meeting. TOR 1.1 and part of ToR 1.2 (assessment of the duration of a BT vaccination campaign intended to achieve disease freedom in a country and persistence in domestic animals) are assessed through a spread model simulating BTV spread in a certain area after incursion of the virus, and testing how many vaccination campaigns are required to lead to a fade out of the epidemic. The Panel was requested to review the description of the model, its parameterisation and assumptions in the Annex and to provide comments.

For the TOR 1.2 about the low level BTV circulation in wildlife a literature review and comments provided by Panel wildlife specialists were presented.

TOR 2 (protection from maternal antibodies and vaccination as options for safe trade applicable to movements of live animals from restricted zones) is addressed through a systematic literature review. It was suggested to report the outcome in the body text, to insert summary tables in the Appendix and publish data extraction tables separately.

For ToR 3.1 the evidence from previous opinions as regards vectors ecology are updated in order to indicate considerations about the criteria for the determination of the vector-free period. A first draft was presented at the Panel. In addition, vector abundance data in winter is compared with BTV circulation data in selected areas in Italy as a case study.

For TOR 3 (over-wintering mechanisms and use of insecticides and repellents), a draft has been presented where the previous EFSA opinion is updated with recent literature and expert knowledge. The new draft will be distributed two weeks before the November plenary in order to provide enough time for a thorough reading.

- **Scientific opinion on animal welfare aspects in respect of the slaughter or killing of pregnant livestock animals (cattle, pigs, sheep, goats, horses) (EFSA-Q-2015-00477)**

A short update on the state of art of this scientific opinion was presented. The Panel was informed about the agreement with the requestors of the mandate, to proceed with the development of ToR 4 and 5 of the mandate - ToR4 (methods for stunning and killing of foetuses) and ToR5 (methods for establishing gestational age at slaughter) – which were conditional depending on the results of ToR3. It was agreed to deliver the scientific opinion in May 2017.

- **Scientific opinion concerning the use of low atmosphere pressure system (LAPS) for stunning poultry (EFSA-Q-2016-00327)**

The Panel was informed that the assessment of the reporting and methodological quality identified several shortcomings of the reported data. It was agreed that the WG will ask for clarifications regarding the behaviour definitions, particularly behaviour occurring before or after the loss of consciousness, and its redefinition in the discussion.

It was agreed that for further assessment of the methodology, the applicant will be requested to submit to EFSA the raw data that has been recorded during the experiments together with the appropriate statistical analyses, with detailed instructions on how to conduct these analyses. A meeting will be organised with the applicant to explain the shortcomings and the required solutions in order to facilitate this next step.

9. Other scientific topics for information and/or discussion

- **Request for scientific and technical assistance on Lumpy Skin Disease**

An update was given about current state of the project and the next steps. Representatives from the affected and at-risk countries will be invited to Parma in the first half of December to discuss what kind of data and in which format these could be provided. Regarding the suggestion to involve also Israel in this work, it was pointed out that Israeli epidemiologists, who were closely involved in the control of LSD in Israel, are involved in this project.

- **Request for a scientific and technical assistance and a scientific opinion concerning the risk of survival, establishment and spread of *Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans* (Bsal) in the EU**

An update on the interpretation of the ToRs and the proposed methodological approach to addressing the ToRs for the scientific and technical assistance (Art. 31) has been presented. The main actions that have been identified to address the mandate are: i) extensive literature search and data extraction; ii) retrieval and collection of data on the population, distribution and trade of salamanders in the EU; iii) critical appraisal of the literature dealing with the potential causal relationship between Bsal and disease/mortality and that satisfy specific inclusion criteria; iv) establishment of a working group of experts to support the assessment and provide data and information on hazard characterisation and host profiling.

The EFSA draft scientific report will be peer-reviewed by two Panel members (Hans Spoolder and Preben Willeberg) before approval. The peer-reviewers will be updated and asked to provide feedback at different stages during the procesandreas of assessment.

Due to the complexity and sensitivity of the issue (high quality and robust assessment to address ToR-1 and data retrieval from MSs), there is a possible agreement with EC for shifting the deadline to 2017.

The AHAW Panel members have been asked to provide input on the expertise of the experts that should be included in the working group on the risk of survival, establishment and spread of Bsal in the EU, and to suggest experts/institutions in this field that are operating in the European context to be contacted and involved in the development of EFSA's project.

- **Request for a scientific and technical assistance on ASF**

The Panel was updated about the content of the draft Scientific report, main findings and conclusions. General situation on ASF in Europe and in certain affected countries,

possible routes of introductions, preventive measures and indicators and possible have been discussed. It was noted that some definitions such as a category of farms considered in the Report as a backyards and also case and outbreak definitions need to be specified in accordance with the existing nomenclature. It was suggested to define countries which are potentially at risk of introduction of the virus into wild boar population.

Any other business

The new authorship rules of the EFSA Journal were presented and explained by Arthur Healey.

The timelines for submitting documents for review to experts (Panel, WG) were discussed. It was agreed to aim for submission of documents to be reviewed for discussion (or adoption) at least 2 weeks before meeting; others that require less reviewing should be sent one week before the meeting. It was suggested that experts could also block their agendas ahead of the meetings to reserve time for this reviewing. It was also highlighted that WG chairpersons should be following up with the WG experts to assure timely delivery of inputs. Clear indications of the deadlines at which comments need to be submitted should be provided by the Scientific Officers in charge of the opinions. Increasing the intervals between plenary meetings, while extending their duration to 3 days, provides more time for WG to prepare documents, thus potentially facilitating earlier submission for review. This option will be further discussed at the next plenary meeting.