ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH UNIT

Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare

Minutes of the 123rd Plenary meeting -Open

Held on 6-7 May 2020

EFSA, Parma, WEBMEETING[1]

(Agreed on 20 May 2020)[2]

Participants

- **Panel Members:**

  ALVAREZ Julio, BICOUT Dominique, CALISTRI Paolo (6 May 2020), DEPNER Klaus, DREWE Julian, GARIN-BASTUJI Bruno, GONZALES ROJAS Jose Luis, GORTAZAR SCHMIDT Christian, MICHEL Virginie, MIRANDA Miguel Angel, NIELSEN Søren Saxmose (Chair), ROBERTS Helen, SIHVONEN Liisa, SPOOLDER Hans, STAHL Karl, VELARDE Antonio, VILTROP Arvo, WINCKLER Christoph.

- **European Commission:** RALCHEV Stanislav (point 5.1 and point 6.1), LOGAR Barbara (points 6.2 and 6.3), FORCELLA Simona (Points 6.4 and points 7.1 to 7.4), COHEN Iulia (point 6.7), SIMONIN Denis (point 8), Marina Marini (Point 9.2).

- **EFSA:**

  ALPHA UNIT: Antoniou Sotiria-Eleni, Aznar Inmaculada, Baldinelli Francesca, Broglia Alessandro, Candiani Denise, Carfagnini Roberta, Donohue Claire, Sofie Dhollander, Dorbek-Kolin Elisabeth, Ivanciu Corina, Nik Križ (HoU), Omodeo Sara Gisella, Rapagna Cristina, Yves Van der Stede, Gabriele Zancanaro

  AMU UNIT: CORTIÑAS ABRAHANTES José

  SCER UNIT: GERVELMEYER Andrea

- **Hearing experts[3]:** not applicable.
- **Observers:** List enclosed as annex.

[1] All meetings were rescheduled to web meetings due to Covid-19

[2] Minutes should be published within 15 working days of the final day of the relevant meeting.

[3] 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.

European Food Safety Authority
Via Carlo Magno 1A – 43126 Parma, Italy
Tel. +39 0521 036 111
info@efsa.europa.eu | www.efsa.europa.eu

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The first day (6 May 2020) is an open plenary meeting. The Chair welcomed the meeting participants and 42 registered observers. Instructions to observers and panel members were provided for the Web meeting. Apologies were received from Paolo Calistri for 7 May 2020.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of Interest Scientific Panel Members

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence[4] and the Decision of the Executive Director on Competing Interest Management[5,] EFSA screened the Annual Declarations of Interest filled in by the Scientific Panel Members invited for the present meeting. No Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in this meeting had been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of Interest at the beginning of this meeting.

4. Agreement of the minutes of the 122nd Plenary meeting held on 18 & 19 March 2020, Parma, (Italy)

The minutes of the 122nd Plenary meeting were agreed by written procedure on 31 March 2020.

5. Scientific outputs submitted for possible adoption or endorsement

5.1. Art.29- Scientific opinion concerning the slaughter of pigs (EFSA-Q-2018-00717)

This draft opinion was thoroughly discussed with the Panel members. All the comments (mainly in the sections conclusions and recommendations) by the EC and Panel members were discussed and taken into consideration. It was agreed that some conclusions and recommendations should be made more specific (e.g. indicating specific concentration of CO2 when referring it to as "high CO2"). The AHAW Panel adopted the Scientific Opinion unanimously.

6. Scientific outputs submitted for discussion (pre-adoption)

6.1. Art.29 - Scientific opinion concerning the killing of pigs for other purposes than slaughter (EFSA-Q-2018-00718)

This draft opinion was thoroughly discussed with the Panel members. All the comments made by the Panel members on the document were discussed and addressed. The Panel requested further clarifications to be addressed before next meeting: expand the text on tonic/clonic seizures as

[4] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/policy_independence.pdf
[5] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/competing_interest_management_17.pdf

animal based measures used for assessing unconsciousness in pigs; expand text and recommendation on gas mixtures killing methods (small bubbles)also with view to possible back up methods. The Panel recommended to be consistent in the language/wording used to describe welfare consequences such as pain and the use of 'better welfare'. In relation to the section on unacceptable methods it was agreed with the Panel to reword the section and seek for written approval by all panel members before the adoption. This scientific opinion is scheduled for adoption in the next Panel meeting.

6.2. Art. 29- Disease control measures category A diseases AHL (EFSA-Q-2020-00193-00198)

The general approach, the timeline and TORs of this mandate were presented. An update following the first WG meeting was provided to the Panel. WG members have been tasked to suggest methodologies for answering ToRs 2 and 3. The methodology for answering these two ToRs will be discussed at the next WG meeting. Once the methodologies will be agreed, subgroups will be formed to work on each of the five diseases in parallel. Also, work related to ToR 4 will start. Several WG members may be added to the core group (to support with ToR 4 and with some of the diseases.) The Panel and EC agreed with proposed methodology.

6.3. Art.29-Scientific opinion for the listing and categorisation of transmissible animal diseases caused by bacteria resistant to antimicrobials, in the framework of the Animal Health Law (EFSA-Q-2019-00760)

The general approach, the timeline and TORs of this mandate were presented. Data collection will be delivered through procurement. The WG will finalise the list of bacteria causing transmissible diseases in animals, the Panel will be asked to review that list after 18 May and provide feedback by the end of May 2020. The working group will have to draft and finalise the review questions and clarify with the EC interpretation of ToR 1 & 2 (procurement procedure). The Panel and EC agreed with proposed methodology.

6.4. Art 29 - TOR2: African Swine Fever Risk ranking matrices (EFSA-Q-2019-00618)

The updated work plan for the three Expert Knowledge Elicitations (EKEs) that are organized in the context of this assessment was presented. All meetings had to be changed to Web meetings due to COVID-19 related restrictions. The EKEs will be concluded by the end of July. The outcome of the EKEs will be used in the parameterization of the agreed assessment model. The Panel agreed on the new timing. The opinion should be delivered by the end of 2020. The vice-chair of the working group was assigned (Helen Roberts).

6.5. Art.29 -Scientific opinion on the evaluation of public and animal health risks in case of a delayed post-mortem inspection in ungulates (EFSA-Q-2019-00124)

The methodology and the disease matrix as well as the lesion/organ disease map were presented to the Panel. The results of the questionnaire, sent to meat inspectors in the EU, were also presented. The EKE that was organised in order to assess the reduction of the sensitivity doing

meat inspection after 24h and 72h (compared to immediate), for each lesion/organ disease, and its related uncertainty was presented by Julio Alvarez. Discussion followed and Panel members provided comments and input for the WG. It was agreed by the Panel members that the results of the EKE should be benchmarked with diagnosis at farm, ante mortem inspection. The related conclusions should consider this aspect. The AHAW panel will endorse this part of the scientific opinion in September 2020. Adoption of the scientific opinion will be done by BIOHAZ Panel in December 2020.

6.6. Art.29 - Scientific opinion as regards specific maximum levels of cross-contamination for 24 antimicrobial active substances in non-target feed (EFSA-Q-2019-00221)

The methodology was presented. AHAW and FEEDAP are supporting BIOCONTAM opinion. A public consultation will be launched in July 2020 on applied methods. Adoption of the scientific opinion will be done by BIOHAZ Panel in December 2021.

6.7. Surveillance and control measures for rift valley fever (RVF) in EU (EFSA-Q-2019-00420)

A short update was presented on RVF about preliminary results of simulations of RVF spread in Mayotte, no comments were received. The WG will present a draft opinion with the results and draft conclusion at June Plenary , and it will be adopted the opinion in September. The Panel and EC agreed with approach presented.

7. New Mandates

7.1. Art. 29 - Request for scientific opinion on African swine fever: Exit Strategy

The TORs were presented and discussed by the AHAW Panel. The SO on **exit strategy** for ASF in EU includes 2 TORs (TOR1: the risk factors possibly contributing to ASF persistence in affected areas over a number of years in wild boar populations; the role of seropositive wild boar in the context of ASF infection, and in particular in areas with no current evidence of virus circulation; TOR2: define pathway(s) to ASF freedom in relevant areas in accordance with the Strategic approach to the management of African Swine Fever for the EU and recommend criteria for defining an area as free from ASF in wild boar). It was agreed that the literature search should also include Genotype I for Sardinia. The chair requested to volunteer and confirm deep reviewers by next panel meeting. The vice-chair of the working group was assigned (Arvo Viltrop).

7.2. Art. 29 - Request for scientific opinion on African swine fever: Outdoor farming

The Art 29 request for a scientific opinion on outdoor farming of pigs in the EU and related biosecurity measures was presented. The interpretation of the ToRs and their translation into scientific questions was discussed. An overview of different types of outdoor systems was given and a definition of outdoor pig farming was proposed. Further, an overview of different biosecurity measures was provided, with the intention to focus the scientific opinion on bio-exclusion measures related to the outdoor farming aspects. S. Dhollander proposed that all subgroups on ASF align on

terminology and conclusions related to risk factors of introduction and spread of ASF. The chair requested that Panel members volunteer to act as deep reviewers by the next panel meeting. The vice-chair of the working group was assigned (Christian Gortazar). The opinion should be delivered by the end of 2020.

7.3. Art. 29 - Request for scientific opinion on African swine fever: Research Gap Analysis

The TORs were presented and discussed by the AHAW Panel. The Art 29 Scientific opinion on GAP research studies in the EU includes these TORs: design and evaluate studies related to (i) the impact of reducing the wild boar population densities in relation to transmission of African swine fever virus (ASFV); (ii) the natural behaviour of wild boar to improve wild boar population management. (iii) the role of arthropod vectors in ASF transmission (biological and mechanical);(iv) ASF survival and transmission from contaminated environment and residual infectivity of buried wild boar carcases. In addition, the it is requested to design studies that to investigate patterns of seasonality in wild boar and domestic pigs and identify main factors that determinate these patterns and to provide recommendations in particular in relation to risk mitigation options to address these factors. The Panel agreed to outsource the drafting (entirely or partly) of the research protocols to a contractor and to be reviewed by the working group. The Panel and other networks will be involved in the identification of the research objectives that will be prioritised. The chair requested to volunteer and confirm deep reviewers by next panel meeting. The vice- chair of the working group was assigned (Miguel Miranda).

7.4. Art. 31 - technical and scientific assistance: EPI-5 report

The TORs were presented and discussed by the AHAW Panel.

The chair requested to volunteer and confirm deep reviewers. An overview of existing methods as well as additional methods were discussed and proposed. Related to the secondary cases network analysis (nearest neighbour method to calculate R0) it was agreed with the Panel to discuss in the next panel meeting this methodology in order to better understand underlying assumptions (infectious period, distance of nearest neighbour to cause secondary infections, bootstrap method). It will be investigated if new dynamic story maps can be included for the epidemiological report. The vicechair of the working group was assigned (Christian Gortazar).

8. Feedback from the Scientific Committee/Scientific Panels, EFSA, the European Commission-Activities from other Panels

8.1. Feedback from the EC & Discussion on future AHAW Panel activities on welfare mandates

EC official provided updates on the new farm to fork strategy and introduced potential new welfare mandates that may arrive in this context. The approach to collaborate and discuss between EC and EFSA during the future development of the opinions was fruitfully discussed.

9. Any other business & wrap up

9.1. Uncertainty (checklist)

The use of the Uncertainty checklist was discussed among Panel Members. It was highlighted that in EFSA there are quite a few guidance to follow while drafting an opinion. The Chair of the Panel will address this point to next scientific committee of EFSA.

9.2. Covid-19 in animals

A short round table was organised to collect information on ongoing risk assessments of COVID-19 in animals (including pets). Helen Roberts reported that few studies on risk assessment transmission of COVID-19 from human to animals have been produced by OIE /FAO and DG SANTE.

9.1. Wrap up and next meeting

A short wrap up was provided and tasks were distributed. Next Plenary meeting will be via WEB (TEAMS) on 24-25 June 2020. A draft agenda will be distributed by end of May 2020.

Questions and Answers from observers

Q&A sessions were held before lunch and before meeting closure. The questions raised by the observes during the Plenary session were tabled and answered. In total 3 questions and 1 comment were raised. A summary of the questions and answers is given in the table below.

DAY 1: open session - Q&A

No	Topic	QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
5	**Scientific outputs submitted for discussion and possible adoption**	
5.1	Art.29- Scientific opinion concerning the slaughter of pigs (EFSA-Q-2018-00717)	**1. [via registration] I would like to know if there is any analysis made (and how to obtain it) regarding the difference of the meat (eggs in our case) quality between animals kept in Cages and Free ranged animals. This would be of great help especially in communication with people and in Raising Awareness. *Marco Micic – NGO Cage Free Greece*** Yes, in pigs there are effects on growth, carcass composition, pork colour, muscle fibre types and probably texture and water holding capacity. A literature search will yield sufficient data. Examples from an Italian group are: a. Pugliese C., Calagna G., Chiofalo V., Moretti V.M., Margiotta S., Franci O., Gandini G. Comparison of the performances of Nero Siciliano pigs reared indoors and outdoors: 2. Joints composition, meat and fat traits. Meat Sci. 2004 Dec; 68(4):523-8. DOI: 10.1016/j.meatsci.2004.02.020. b. Pugliese C., Madonia G., Chiofalo V., Margiotta S., Acciaiolia A., Gandini G. Comparison of the performances of Nero Siciliano pigs reared indoors and outdoors. 1. Growth and carcass. Meat Science 65 (2003) 825–831 • Broilers: some references https://doi.org/10.1016/S0309-1740(01)00124-3 https://www.ajas.info/journal/view.php?number=22599 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09712119.2016.1190735 • Eggs & Laying hens: [JL Gonzales, Virginie Michel] ○ https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/aoas/11/4/article-p607.xml ○ H. Van Den Brand Dr., H.K. Parmentier & B. Kemp (2004) Effects of housing system (outdoor vs cages) and age of laying hens on egg characteristics, British Poultry Science, 45:6, 745-752, DOI: 10.1080/00071660400014283 ○ G. Minelli, F. Sirri, E. Folegatti, A. Meluzzi & A. Franchini (2007) Egg quality traits of laying hens reared in organic and conventional systems, Italian Journal of

		Animal Science, 6:sup1, 728-730, DOI: 10.4081/ijas.2007.1s.728 ○ https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00071660400014283?casa_token=qKavSjVpw5YAAAAA:0kNATm_diwVmt6It3H9K4xI5w9z5irVWc6bmQOcsU4peAFaTtINVcT368OMiRkorV1Iaippb-Lu9 ○ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228657799_Effects_of_organic_farming_on_egg_quality_and_welfare_of_laying_hens/stats **2. Michele De Angeli (at 17.29h 6 May): Is there is any correlation between concentation of carbon dioxide and exposure tipe for stunning, if yes why don't consider a higther concentration?** Antonio Velarde (Panel Member) answered: "There is a positive correlation between the CO2 concentration and the duration of exposure and the depth and duration of unconsciousness. However, other factors such as the animal and the speed at which animals are lowered towards the bottom of the pit, where the highest CO2 concentration is achieved play also an important role (Raj and Gregory, 1996; Troeger and Woltersdorf, 1991). Under commercial conditions the concentration of CO2 should be at least 80%, but more and more slaughterhouse use 90% or higher in an attempt to increase throughput rates (Velarde et al., 2007) and guarantee effective stun duration"
	Scientific outputs submitted for discussion (pre-adoption)	
6.1	Art.29 - Scientific opinion concerning the killing of pigs for other purposes than slaughter (EFSA-Q-2018-00718)	**No questions by observers** **Comments provided by observers during:** -by Noella Yusta: "electric is the noun- the actual thing; electrical is an adjective" -by Helen Roberts (Panel member): Electrical and electric are interchangeable in many uses, but there are some differences. Electrical is of or relating to electricity and is used as a broad term for anything which uses electricity. Electric refers to devices or machines which run on electricity. In other words, you can have electric methods – where it refers to the devices delivering the current, and electrical methods where it refers to how the device is applied.
6.2	Art. 29- Disease control measures category A diseases AHL (EFSA-Q-2020-00193-00198)	**No questions by observers**
6.3	Art.29- Scientific opinion for the listing and categorisation of transmissible animal diseases caused by bacteria resistant to antimicrobials, in the framework of the Animal	**No questions by observers**

	Health Law (EFSA-Q-2019-00760)	
6.4	Art 29 - TOR2: African Swine Fever Risk ranking matrices (EFSA-Q-2019-00618)	**No questions by observers**
7	**New Mandates**	
7.1	Art. 29 - Request for scientific opinion on African swine fever: Exit Strategy	**No questions by observers**
7.2	Art. 29 - Request for scientific opinion on African swine fever: Outdoor farming	**No questions by observers**
7.3	Art. 29 - Request for scientific opinion on African swine fever: Research Gap Analysis	**3. [Via registration] Which are the arthropod vectors more influential in ASFV transmission that needs to be further investigated? [Adanela Musaraj - Italian National Authority]** **Answers** 1. [Christian Gortàzar] + [Miguel Miranda] + [GZ] The role of vectors remains mostly unclear for most of the areas where ASFV is circulating now in Europe, but there are some evidences about their role in some areas such as Portugal and Spain where in the past the possible role of soft tick for local persistence of ASFV was demonstrated. It appears that only some species of the soft tick genus *Ornithodorus* (e.g. *O. erraticus* in Europe) are known to act as biological vectors for ASF virus, mainly in its native range in Africa were *O. moubata* is the main vector. Nonetheless, laboratory trials have suggested that soft ticks and several dipterans such as *Stomoxys* stable flies can act as mechanical vectors, for instance if entering the farm and being eaten by a pig. Thus, theoretically, mechanical vectors could possibly represent a bridge between wild boar and pig farms. However, considering the farm environment (for pigs) and nature environment (for wild boars) in areas affected during the current epidemic, there is to date no evidence of any role of biological vectors such as soft ticks. However, for mechanical vectors questions have been raised for a possible role for local transmission (e.g domestic pigs from infected wild boar) of haemotophagous insects such as biting midges, stable flies, horse flies or even mosquitoes. In conclusion, the actual role of soft ticks and possible mechanical vectors, is a subject that deserves attention and further investigations.
7.4	Art. 31 - technical and scientific assistance: EPI-5 report	**No questions by observers**
6.5	Art.29 - Scientific opinion on the evaluation of public and	**No questions by observers**

	animal health risks in case of a delayed post-mortem inspection in ungulates (EFSA-Q-2019-00124)	
6.6	Art.29 - Scientific opinion as regards specific maximum levels of cross-contamination for 24 antimicrobial active substances in non-target feed (EFSA-Q-2019-00221)	**No questions by observers**

List of Observers via WEB

SURNAME	NAME	COUNTRY	AFFILIATION
ADEOLA	Emmaniel	Nigeria	Bayero University Kano
AL-ERYANI	Hesham	Yemen	Yemen Foundation for Protection
ALLOCCO	Francesca	Italy	Private sector – Ambientalex law firm
AVDIKOU	Ifigenia	Greece	National authority
BARCELÓ	Seguí	Spain	University of the Balearic Islands
BELOUS	Madalina	Romania	Spiru Haret Veterinary University
BERTI	Silvia	Italy	Private sector - self-employed DVM
BOKARIEV	Bohdan	Ukraine	National authority
CASANOVAS	Nuria	Spain	University/public research institute
CHUZHAKINA	Kateryna	Ukraine	National authority
DE ANGELI	Michele	Italy	University of Udine
DENDAS	Liesbet	Belgium	Private sector - AnimalhealthEurope

DUNOYER	Charlotte	France	ANSES
FIGUEIREDO	Pedro	Portugal	ICBAS- University of Porto
GARZELLI	Antonellla	United Kingdom	NGO – Fair trade
GORACCI	Jacopo	Italy	Organic mixed farm
GUILLEN	Carlos	Spain	Private sector
HALAJIAN	Ali	South Africa	Private sector
HLUKHONETS	Yuliia	Ukraine	National authority
HTWE	Vo	Republic of the Union of Myanmar	National authority
LÄHTEINEN	Tanja	Finland	National authority
LANZARINI	Francesca	Italy	University of Parma
MICIC	Marko	Greece	NGO - Cage Free Greece
MINDUS	Claire	Canada	University of Guelph
MUSARAJ	Adanela	Italy	National authority
PELATTI	Elena	Italy	Private sector - Freelance
PORTA	Francesca	Belgium	NGO - Eurogroup for animals
RAJU	Jayadev	Canada	National authority
REGUILLO	Lucia	Spain	Andalusian Knowledge Agency
REHO	Stefania	Italy	Press/media - Diritti a Tavola
RENZINI	Franco	Italy	Private sector - Renzini SpA
RINARELLI	Lorenzo	Italy	University of Pavia
SEPPÄ-LASSILA	Leena	Finland	National authority

SGARIOTO	Serena	Italy	ELT management company - Ecopneus
SRINIVAS	Gunturu	Norway	Private sector - GS Indus AS
STELLA	Simone	Italy	University of Milano
SUHARJU	Suffien	Australia	National authority
VANOVA HRNCIRIK	Romana	Netherlands	Private sector - Meatable
VIANELLO	Cristina	Italy	University of Milan
VILLALBA	Teresa	Spain	National authority
YUSTA	Noelia	United Kingdom	University of Glasgow
ZILLMANN	Ana	Germany	NGO - Deutscher Tierschutzbund e.V.