



Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare

Minutes of the 116th Plenary meeting - OPEN

Held on 20 March 2019, 14.00 – 18.00h
21 March 2019, 09.00 – 13.00h

EFSA, Parma (Italy)

(Agreed on 05 April 2019)¹

Participants

■ Panel Members:

Julio Alvarez, Dominique Bicot, Paolo Calistri (21 March by skype), Klaus Depner, Julian Ashley Drewe, Bruno Garin-Bastuji, Jose Luis Gonzales Rojas (20 & 21 March by skype), Virginie Michel, Miguel Angel Miranda, Christian Gortazar Schmidt, Helen Roberts, Liisa Sihvonen, Karl Ståhl, Arvo Viltrop, Christoph Winckler, Søren Saxmose Nielsen (chair).

■ Hearing Experts²:

None

■ European Commission:

None

■ EFSA:

ALPHA UNIT: Sotiria-Eleni Antoniou, Inma Aznar, Francesca Baldinelli, Alessandro Broglia Chiara Fabris, Denise Candiani, Sofie Dhollander, Andrey Gogin, Rodrigo Guerrero, Nikolaus Kriz, Marie Louise Schneider, Gabriele Zancanaro, Laura Gonzales Valetta, Yves Van der Stede

■ Observer physically attending the meeting

Robert Rettenmaier

Marina Catallozzi (only 20 March 2019)

Michele De Angeli

¹ Minutes should be published within 15 working days of the final day of the relevant meeting.

² As defined in Article 17 of the Decision of the Executive Director concerning the selection of members of the Scientific Committee, the Scientific Panels, and the selection of external experts to assist EFSA with its scientific work:
<http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/expertselection.pdf>.



1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The chair welcomed the meeting participants. Apologies were received from Hans Spoolder.

2. Guidelines for observers attending the open plenary

The chair explained the guidelines.

3. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

4. Declarations of Interest of Scientific Committee/Scientific Panel Members

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence³ and the Decision of the Executive Director on Competing Interest Management⁴, EFSA screened the Annual Declarations of Interest filled out by the Working Group members invited to the present meeting. No Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process, and no interests were declared orally by the members at the beginning of this meeting.

5. Agreement of the minutes of the 116th Plenary meeting held on 23-24 January, Parma, (Italy)

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

6. New Mandates

6.1. **Art 29 - Request for a scientific opinion on the evaluation of public and animal health risks in case of a delayed post-mortem inspection in ungulates**

The TORs of the mandate were presented and discussed and the composition of the ad hoc WG was proposed. BIOHAZ will be the leading panel and parts of the opinion will be endorsed by the AHAW panel. For the AHAW panel Bruno Garin-Bastuji was appointed by the chair of the AHAW panel as vice-chair of the ad hoc WG and Julio Alvarez was appointed as WG member.

6.2. **Art 29 - Scientific opinion as regards specific maximum levels of cross-contamination for 24 antimicrobial active substances in non-target feed**

The TORs of the mandate were presented and discussed with the AHAW panel and coordinator and secretariat of the BIOHAZ Panel (leading Panel for this opinion). This mandate is a collaboration between the BIOHAZ Panel (lead), AHAW Panel, Feed Panel and EMA (European Medicine Agency).

³ http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/policy_independence.pdf

⁴ http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/competing_interest_management_17.pdf



The expertise required and the contributions of the AHAW panel in this mandate were proposed and discussed. The discussion allowed to propose members of the AHAW panel to contribute in this mandate and/or to search for other expertise.

7. Scientific outputs submitted for possible adoption

None

8. Other scientific topics for information and/or discussion

8.1. Art 29 - Slaughter of animals for human consumption (domestic birds) ([EFSA-Q-2018-00715](#))

The interpretation of ToRs and the approach to the mandate were presented together with the methodologies that have been used to address the mandate. In the new structure of the SO each ToR is addressed by phases of the slaughter process: phase 1- pre-stunning; phase 2 – stunning (including restraint); phase 3 - bleeding (including slaughter without stunning).

Regarding the uncertainty analysis, it was emphasised that, owing to the limited time available to draft the SO, there will not be a detailed uncertainty analysis of all the underlying factors. A conceptual model on risk assessment in animal welfare at slaughter and its (qualitative) uncertainty developed by the WG were presented and discussed. It was agreed that the uncertainty approach will be better defined by the WG after discussing it with the ambassadors for AHAW panel with relation to uncertainty assessment.

Differences to the draft SO on slaughter of rabbit were pointed out and explained.

8.2. Art 29 – Stunning and killing methods for rabbits ([EFSA-Q-2018-00909](#))

An updated overview of the different TORs was provided as well as the approach to the mandate were presented together with the methodologies that have been used to address the mandate. Clarifications on the selection of indicators based on estimated Se & Sp and feasibility were provided. The approach to assess the uncertainty (qualitative) developed by the WG was presented and agreed. It was agreed that the uncertainty approach will be discussed in the WG with the ambassadors for AHAW panel with relation to uncertainty assessment.

8.3. Art 29 - Killing for other purposes than slaughter (domestic birds): ([EFSA-Q-2018-00716](#))

ToRs, approach to the mandate and methodologies to address the mandate were presented in analogy with the presentation of the draft SO on poultry slaughter (see previous point 8.1).

8.4. Art 29 - Health and welfare of rabbits farmed in different production systems ([EFSA-Q-2018-00593](#))

An update on the methodology and different steps (selection of target animal population; selection and description of relevant housing systems, definition of welfare consequences and associated risks, estimation of severity and comparison of welfare in different systems). The progress of the survey and potential outcomes were discussed. The survey established to estimate the prevalence and duration of welfare consequences has been launched in March and preliminary response rates were discussed (109 received out of 180 surveys sent out). The EKE to estimate the severity is planned for the first week of April 2019. The approach and potential outcome of the EKE was discussed.



8.5. Art 29 – African Swine Fever Risk assessment in south-eastern Europe (EFSA-Q-2019-00049)

The structure of the draft opinion was presented to the Panel. The data collected to address ToR 1 (risk of spread of ASF in south-eastern Europe) were presented and discussed. The Panel discussed the methodology for the assessment of possible factors that may influence the spread of ASF in south-eastern Europe.

Also the data collected to address ToR2 were presented briefly and the methodology for the survey that will be circulated to involved stakeholders to assess the risk of transmission of ASFV through different products and materials. The Panel agreed with the methodology proposed.

9. Updates on ongoing mandates

9.1. Art. 31- African Swine Fever gap analysis (EFSA-Q-2019-00050)

The preliminary results of the on-line gap analysis survey were presented and the methodology to analyse the results was discussed and agreed upon.

9.2. Art. 31 - Scientific and technical assistance on African swine fever - epidemiological analyses (EFSA-Q-2018-00053)

A very short update on the activities for the assessment of risk factors for the occurrence of ASF in domestic pig farms in Romania was discussed

9.3. Art. 31 - Scientific and technical assistance on avian influenza monitoring (EFSA-Q-2018-01043)

The Panel was informed on the main contents of the AI report VII (occurrence of AI outbreaks within and outside Europe in birds and humans, conclusions and suggestion), the current status of the report, the next steps before publication (28 March) and on the activities foreseen in 2019.

9.4. Update on Story maps for vector borne diseases

A very short update on EFSA's activities to update the storymaps on vector-borne diseases was discussed with the Panel. A link was distributed to discuss the potential visualisation of a systematic review on experimental infection of hosts with different vector borne disease agents. Outcomes to be visualised in the storymaps of the review are, amongst others, the incubation period and infectious period of the infection.

9.5. Art 31 - Mandate on Lumpy Skin Disease (EFSA-Q-2018-00289)

The recently published scientific report on LSD was presented, by reminding the panel the main findings, i.e. no outbreak reported in 2018 in Balkans but still in Turkey, effectiveness of homologous vaccination, estimation of within village spread. The comments provided by the Panel about how to address the uncertainty in the conclusion point on the outbreak reporting and vaccine side effects based on literature were discussed.

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



A short update on the SIGMA project was presented. Currently 5 countries are engaging in the SIGMA project, two MSs are pending and 8 Pre-Accession countries are interested in the project. Next steps with relation to communication plan on SIGMA and ongoing contracts were communicated.

10. Implementing uncertainty guidance and checklist in AHAW outputs (varroa example)

The final checklist (version 3) was presented by Dominique Bicout and Julio Alvarez (ambassadors for AHAW panel with relation to uncertainty assessment). It was explained and shown how this checklist was implemented in a case study (Varroa opinion). The checklist was agreed and it was further discussed how the AHAW panel will proceed – using the checklist – and how uncertainty assessment will be implemented in the ongoing and future mandates. Ambassadors will liaise with the chairs of the WGs if questions are raised.

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

It was agreed that panel members could volunteer for the trainings on Expert knowledge elicitations (EKE) courses organised by the SC and AMU unit for the different panels.

12. Any other business

12.1. CLEFSA project

The CLEFSA project (Climate change and Emerging risks for Food Safety) was presented by Angelo Maggiore (SCER Unit). CLEFSA will develop a method for identifying emerging risks related to climate change. It will allow to rank and prioritise risks in food and feed safety, plant and animal health. Volunteers within the AHAW panel were requested to complete and score the animal health related issues collected by the CLEFSA survey.

12.2. Survey EUSRs Zoonoses & FBO

The survey on EUSR Zoonoses & FBO was presented by Frank Boelaert (BIOCONTAM Unit). The survey aims to get insight from EFSA's stakeholders on impact and usefulness of the European Summary report on Zoonoses & FBO and where it can be improved. Volunteers within the AHAW panel were requested to complete this survey. The volunteers will be contacted by the contractor.

13. Questions and Answers from observers

The questions raised by the observers during the Plenary session were answered. In total 4 questions were raised (two on welfare in poultry, one on LSD vaccination and one on ASF). A summary of the questions and answers is given in the table below.



Question	Answer
<p>In your presentation you insisted a lot on the fact that animal based indicators for slaughter of poultry and rabbits would be used only for animals that are moved in crates. How about the subsequent phases, such as shackling in the case of live birds, stunning effectiveness, etc., which do not happen when the animals are in crates?</p> <p>Will such animal based indicators also be included?</p>	<p>During the presentation it was emphasised that several ABMs can be retrieved in the scientific literature to assess welfare consequences in poultry/rabbits; but some of them are not feasible to be used in the slaughter context and while the animals are in containers (i.e. during the processes of Phase 1 -pre-stunning).</p> <p>This is the case for example of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "pinch skin " which is reported in the literature as a valuable ABM to assess "dehydration": but this ABM is practically impossible (not feasible) to be examined on live poultry/rabbits while they are in containers (e.g. at arrival of the truck at slaughterhouse). - "blood parameters" that can be used to assess distress in animals; however, in the context of the slaughter process it is not practical to collect blood samples from poultry/rabbits. <p>The presentation did not mean that ABMs to assess welfare of poultry and rabbits would be used only when the animals are moved in containers. In fact, they need to be used to assess welfare of the animals also in the processes grouped under Phase 2 (stunning) and 3 (bleeding). In this sense, specific reference to EFSA, 2013 SOs on monitoring procedures at slaughter was repeatedly provided.</p>
<p>What are the reported side effects of LSD vaccination? What proportion of animals presents these side effects? Thanks</p>	<p>These may vary from local reactions at the vaccination site (swelling), up to fever, milk production drop and generalised skin reactions (nodules) in some vaccinated animals. More information at https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.2903/j.efsa.2015.3986</p>
<p>As straw is considered as an optimal enrichment material for pigs and fully compliant with the requirements of the PIG Directive for preventing tail biting, it will be important to include in the analysis the mitigation strategies for this risk because we do not want farmers to be discouraged from using straw as bedding/enrichment whenever possible.</p>	<p>Yes, indeed, straw will be included in the risk assessment, and when there is no risk for ASFV transmission from straw, this will be mentioned in the conclusions</p>
<p>How qualitative data could be used in the ASF risk assessment?</p>	<p>The goal is prioritisation. To inform the risk managers.</p>

