Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare

Minutes of the 110th Plenary meeting

Held on 6-7 March 2018, Parma, (Italy)

(Agreed on 16 March 2018)

Participants Plenary 6-7 March

- Panel Members

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

- Hearing expert

Andy Hart (only on 06/03 for uncertainty topic)

- EFSA

ALPHA UNIT: Laura Amato, Francesca Baldinelli, Alessandro Broglia, Denise Candiani, Sofie Dhollander, Chiara Fabris, Andrey Gogin, Nikolaus Kriz, Frank Verdonck, Gabriele Zancanaro

AMU UNIT: José Cortinas Abrahantes, Olaf Mosbach-Schulz

SCER UNIT: Caroline Merten, Raquel Garcia Matas

- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (via teleconference)

DG SANTE: Francesco Berlingieri, Maria Pittman

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The chair welcomed the meeting participants. Apologies were received from Bruno Garin-Bastuji and Antonio Velarde.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted, adding a discussion on the difference between Art29 and Art31 mandates.

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 109th Plenary meeting held on 23-24 January 2017, Parma, (Italy)

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

5. New Mandates

5.1. New Art29 Mandate: Request for a scientific opinion on African swine fever (EFSA-Q-2018-00141)

The TORs of the mandate were presented to the Panel and the background was explained by the EC. A discussion took place on the possible approaches that could be used to address the TORs.

For the first TOR, the reliability and comparability of different methods of wild boar density estimation methods will be described in a narrative section and guidance will be provided how to estimate density in a harmonised way. Data on the numbers of harvested wild boar per hunting grounds in the EU will be submitted to EFSA's data collection framework, as currently there are no comparable density figures available. The limitations of these data in terms of density estimates will be discussed. The data collection and a collection of background information related to the wild boar density estimation methods is assigned to the Enetwild consortium through a specific service contract. The Panel will assess the external report that will be delivered from the Enetwild consortium and summarise the relevant conclusions into the Scientific Opinion.

The second TOR on the wild boar density threshold below which no ASF is sustained will be discussed in a theoretical chapter, highlighting the difficulties in estimating the threshold, as it is a function of many factors such as the hunting pressure, exposure time and contagiousity. Further, the threshold will be brought into relation with the outcomes of TOR1, namely the difficulties in estimating wild boar density, and the comparability and reliability of the wild boar density estimates.

For the 3rd and 4rd TOR an extensive literature review will be carried out to evaluate the reported efficacy of measures to reduce wild boar density and to separate wild boar populations. Primary outcomes of this review will be the reduction of wild boar density and the efficacy of artificial and natural barriers to separate wild boar. Secondary outcomes will be extracted from the papers, such as the practicability, the cost-effectiveness, species specificity and the potential disturbance of the population. Based on the outcomes of the review, recommendations will be tailored for different scenario's, i.e. the

measures that would be appropriate to be implemented in disease-free and affected areas.

The 5th TOR will be addressed in a theoretical section, discussing the role of passive and active surveillance at different stages of an epidemic. The chapter will provide field evidence (odds ratio) that passive surveillance is a more appropriate and cost-effective approach for detecting ASFV and will discuss the key aspects that should be taken into account to enhance passive surveillance.

The 6th TOR will deal with best practices to enhance passive surveillance and involve stakeholders. This will be based on experience from the ASF affected MS, but also from experiences from surveillance programmes for other diseases in wildlife (e.g. LSD, rabies).

Deep readers /reviewers were appointed from the Panel to have a critical look at the opinion. A web/physical meeting with Panel reviewers will be held in May, in case of critical issues, as there will be no plenary meeting before June, when the opinion will be presented for adoption. An EFSA standing WG will be established.

The Panel suggested transforming the EFSA WG that is currently working on the ASF Art31 into a Panel Standing Working Group (SWG) on ASF that will deal with both ASF mandates (Art29 and Art31). Following a discussion within the Panel, the chair of the Panel appointed the chair of the SWG.

6. Scientific outputs submitted for possible adoption

None

7. Scientific outputs submitted for discussionScientific opinion on *Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans* (Bsal) (EFSA-Q-2017-00205)

The comments submitted by the Panel and the EC were discussed in detail. The description on the niche model will be better explained in the text to ensure a basic understanding. The description of the test sensitivity and the section on surveillance were edited to be as precise as possible. The possibility of demonstrating absence of Bsal in "close populations" of kept salamanders will be also detailed. Several lines have been edited throughout the document to increase clarity and tables/figures will be updated to make their headings/legends understandable and comparable. The conclusions and recommendations were reviewed and edited where required, for instance to differentiate if they relate to wild or kept salamanders. Some comments were identified that need input from the WG. The Panel decided to submit a revised version of the draft opinion for written adoption in April.

7.2. Revision of guidance of the assessment criteria for studies evaluating the effectiveness of stunning interventions regarding animal protection at the time of killing (EFSA-Q-2017-00711)

The updated structure of the document has been presented, in particular regarding the administrative steps that will be addressed by EFSA before an application will be submitted to the Panel. Handling uncertainty has been discussed in detail and interaction between SCER and ALPHA unit will take place to ensure compliance to the implementation plan. The checklist has been reviewed. The Panel endorsed the document, which will be submitted to public consultation.

8. Update on ongoing mandates

8.1. Art. 31: Scientific and technical assistance on avian influenza (EFSA-Q-2017-00825 & EFSA-Q-2017-00829)

The Panel has been updated on the status of the draft AI monitoring report, which will cover the reporting period between 16 November 2017 and 15 February 2018. The report structure of the document has been revised to describe the main findings early on in the report. The WG is reviewing the risk of AI introduction via Africa and the Middle East since there is an increase on the number of outbreaks, differentiating wild birds and poultry products as introduction pathways. The report will be published by the end of March.

The current EFSA WG on AI will be transformed into an EFSA Standing Working Group, allowing one expert group to work on both Art31 mandates. The EC is reviewing the guidelines on avian influenza surveillance taking into account the 2017 scientific opinion and will continue to liaise with EFSA to ensure fit-for-purpose data collection and reporting.

8.2. Art. 31: Scientific and technical assistance on African swine fever (EFSA-Q-2018-00053)

The methodology to deal with the request for an epidemiological analysis of the ASF situation in the affected EU countries was presented to the Panel, some suggestions concerning the descriptive epidemiology, the risk factor analysis and the evaluation of the wild boar management measures to reduce the population density or to separate wild boar populations were made with the aim to control the spread of ASF. The Panel suggested basing the assessments not only on the models and the literature review, but to include also experiences that were encountered in the field (e.g. electrical fence in Czech Republic). Additional risk factors were suggested that could have an effect on the occurrence of ASF in wild boar which would need to be investigated, such as the abundance of wild boar in the area. The Panel

pointed out that the seasonality of ASF occurrence should evaluated also for domestic pigs and not only for wild boar.

The current EFSA WG on ASF will be transformed into a Panel Standing Working Group as described above.

9. Feedback from the Scientific Committee/Scientific Panels, EFSA, the European Commission

9.1. EFSA including its Working Groups/Task Forces

9.1.1. Discussion on implementation of uncertainty guidance in AHAW field

The AHAW Panel has implemented complex uncertainty assessments in previous outputs. Some TORs from past and current work have been selected to explain some light approaches to assess uncertainty. For each TOR, uncertainty analysis should be performed but the Panel should define the level of detail required and feasible within the given timelines. If possible, prevent making conclusions conditional (e.g. on a model, on assumptions) to facilitate their interpretation by risk managers. Risk assessors are often better qualified than risk managers to estimate how well the used assessment approach fits the purpose and/or reflects the real world. Probability judgements of individual experts are very useful to identify underlying uncertainties and to define the most suitable probability (range). Experts tend to underestimate uncertainty. The Panel could adapt the outcomes of an EKE as long as the original and final results as well as the rationale for the adjustment are described.

9.1.2. BIOHAZ Panel scientific opinion on *Salmonella* control in poultry flocks (EFSA-Q-2017-00692)

An update was provided on the recent WG teleconference (5 March 2018) where amongst other topics the data collection was discussed. To answer to ToR 3 and 4, an extensive literature search and request to Member States will be carried out to review the risk factors for the *Salmonella* occurrence in laying hens and broiler chickens in relation to the farming methods farming methods (literature + MS request) and other animal welfare indicators (literature).

9.1.3. Data collection on animal diseases and surveillance (SIGMA) (EFSA-Q-2018-00080)

An update was presented on the progress made since the January plenary meeting. The draft structure of the data model has been discussed in detail by the WG. Entities (data categories) are defined (including animal movements and vaccination), attributes (specific information) and enumeration (values) are agreed and the

description/interpretation of definitions is initiated. Listing of data providers for disease and population information also started.

9.2. **European Commission**

No updates

10. Any other business

10.1. The Panel was updated on the main outcomes of the Vectornet Annual General Meeting.

10.2. The main topic of the AH Network meeting (14-15 May) will be data collection and reporting (in relation to SIGMA project) and the main topic of the AW Network meeting (26-27 June) will be on-farm killing of animals.

10.3. Third EFSA Conference 2018: interested persons can subscribe via the EFSA website.

10.4. The difference between Art29 and Art31 mandates has been presented and an overview has been given on the type of outputs that will be delivered on AHAW topics in 2018.