

ALPHA UNIT**Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare****Minutes of the 89th plenary meeting****Held on 05-06 May 2015, Parma****(Agreed on 24 May 2015)****Participants****• Panel Members:**

Charlotte Berg, Anette Bøtner, Howard Browman, Aline De Koeijer, Klaus Depner, Christian Ducrot, Mariano Domingo, Sandra Edwards, Christine Fourichon, Frank Koenen, Simon More, Mohan Raj, Liisa Sihvonen, Hans Spooler, Jan Arend Stegeman, Ivar Vågsholm, Antonio Velarde, Preben Willeberg

• European Commission representatives:

Maria Pittman, Francesco Berlingieri (DG SANTE, Unit G2), Pedro Rosado-Martin (DG SANTE, Unit G5) (by phone).

• EFSA:

ALPHA Unit: Franck Berthe, Alessandro Broglia, Denise Candiani, Marianne Carson, Sofie Dhollander, Chiara Fabris, Andrea Gervelmeyer, Andrey Gogin, Per Have, Renata Leuschner, Frank Verdonck, Matthew Watts

AMU Unit: Fulvio Barizzzone, Jose Cortinhas Abrahantes

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants. Apologies were received from Hans-Hermann Thulke.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of interest

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes¹ and the Decision of the Executive Director on Declarations of Interest², EFSA

¹ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencepolicy.pdf>

screened the Annual Declarations of Interest and the Specific Declarations of Interest filled in by the Panel Members invited for the present meeting. For further details on the outcome of the screening of the ADol or the SDol, please refer to Annex. Oral Declaration of Interest was asked at the beginning of the meeting and no additional interest was declared.

4. Agreement of the minutes of the 88th Plenary meeting held on 10-11 03 2015.

The minutes were agreed on 23 02 2015 and published on the EFSA website 24 03 2015.

5. New Mandates

5.1 Request for a Scientific opinion on Avian Influenza (EFSA-Q-2015-00160)

The mandate was presented by the Commission. It was clarified that the risk of introduction of HPAI into Europe through wild birds and by other means should be considered by the opinion. Furthermore, the risk of introduction of HPAI into poultry holdings and onward spread through EU should be addressed. With view to the suitability of the current provisions on biosecurity measures, protection measures, early detection measures, the opinion should ideally present the different risks, the potential measures to mitigate these risks and their effectiveness. It was explained that the consideration of backyard poultry flocks is important in the context of ToR 4.

6. Opinions presented for adoption

6.1. Update of a scientific opinion on increased mortality events in Pacific oysters, *Crassostrea gigas*, associated with ostreid herpes virus 1 μ var and/or *Vibrio aestuarianus* (EFSA-Q-2014-00188)

The draft opinion was presented for adoption. Conclusions and recommendations were discussed and reviewed. The opinion was adopted unanimously.

6.2. Scientific opinion the welfare assessment of dairy cows in small scale farming systems (EFSA-Q-2014-00096)

The draft opinion was presented for adoption. Conclusions and recommendations were discussed and reviewed. The opinion was adopted unanimously.

6.3. Scientific opinion on perches for laying hens (EFSA-Q-2014-00242)

The draft opinion was presented for adoption. Conclusions and recommendations were discussed and reviewed. The opinion was adopted unanimously.

7. Opinions submitted for discussion

7.1 Scientific opinion on African swine fever (ASF) (EFSA-Q-2014-00897)

A new structure for ToR 1 section was proposed and accepted by the Panel. The epidemiological characteristics of the outbreaks in the 4 EU countries will be described in more detail. The following aspects will be addressed for all the affected countries together: Data: Wild boar (WB) populations/ Domestic pig (DP) populations/ASF detections (summary tables) /Description of outbreaks and surveillance activities in 4 infected EU countries /Wild boar habitat modelling data; Methodology: Data aggregations/ Kernel density estimation

² <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules2014.pdf>

/Scoring and ranking of risk factors; Assessment: Circulation/fading out / Incidence and mortality/ Temporal patterns of notifications/ Spatial patterns and clustering / Interaction with domestic pigs /Ranking of risk factors leading to further spread of ASFV from affected wild boar meta-populations

For the section dealing with ToR 2 it was suggested to replace the term ‘potential carriers’ with “chronically infected animals”. The following structure was agreed for the section: 1. *Description of experimental infections with circulating Genotype 2 strains* (diagram showing viraemia (PCR) and serology (Ab production) based on 4 experimental infections with circulating genotype 2; lack of evidence shedding Genotype 2 by carriers, but intermittent viraemia shown for 1 pig); 2. *Evidence of shedding by carriers for other genotypes in experimental observations* (Literature review (table), showing evidence of shedding by low-moderate virulent strains up to 3 months pi under experimental conditions); 3. *Evidence of chronically infected animals in field observations* (problem: it is not possible to prove shedding under field conditions, thus field evidence is only available for chronically infected animals, occurrence of healthy, seropositive pigs/wild boars (some of which also PCR positive), define ‘evolution’ of the pathogens, and ‘sub-acute infections in the section provided by EURL, EURL data will be provided in a table, discussion that sample is not random and thus may not provide an un-biased estimate of the chronically infected animals in the affected population); 4. *Relative importance of carriers in maintenance of the infection* (discussion of other factors, e.g. human related long term circulation).

For section on ToR 3 and 4 an update with the advantages and disadvantages of the different wild boar management measures that were discussed during the stakeholder meeting should be provided. Further, a short overview of the on-going wild boar management activities in the 4 affected countries should be provided.

The definitions of the model parameters have been discussed. It was suggested to provide a cross-tabulation of the model outcomes, comparing the combinations of the different management options with their different efficacy of implementation, so the risk managers would be presented with a range of combinations out of which they could choose the most suitable combination.

It was agreed to have an intermediary written round of comments from panel members before the opinion will be presented to the next plenary meeting (Anette Bøtner, Christian Ducrot, Simon More, Liisa Sihvonen, Arjan Stegeman and Preben Willeberg kindly volunteered).

7.2 Report on Oral vaccination of foxes against rabies (EFSA-Q-2014-00864)

The draft opinion was presented for discussion. The comments provided were analysed.

The comments focussed mainly on the need to include an assessment of the conclusions of the previous report, to shorten the section about ecology of target species, to further develop the section of the interpretation of ToRs and to add concluding statements at the end of the sections. Furthermore, it was suggested to clarify the difference between the terms effectiveness and efficacy of vaccination campaign and to improve the consistency of their use in the document. The safety of vaccines should be addressed in a broader way, including safety with respect to humans, other (non-target) species, and the environment

7.3 Scientific opinion on enzootic bovine leukosis (EFSA-Q-2013-00546)

Comments receive were presented and discussed. A better integration of the narrative and systematic review on disease impact should be attempted, and the basis for appraisals in the systematic review should be presented more clearly in the tables. Clarification of a few concepts should also be reached before presentation of the draft opinion for adoption at the June plenary meeting.

8. Scientific outputs submitted for update on progress

8.1 Request for an update of the 2011 scientific opinion on hatchery waste as animal by-products (EFSA-Q-2014-00902)

The BIOHAZ (leading Panel) and AHAW Panels received a request from the European Commission for an update of the 2011 scientific opinion on hatchery waste as animal by-products (EFSA-Q-2014-00902). The animal health-relevant sections of the opinion shall be endorsed by the AHAW Panel in September 2015 and the opinion is scheduled for adoption at the BIOHAZ Panel in October 2015. The list of identified potential hazards to animal health was presented to the panel experts and discussed.

8.2 Scientific opinion concerning the risk of survival, establishment and spread of the small hive beetle (*Aethina tumida*) in the EU (EFSA-Q-2014-00938)

The interpretation of the different ToRs, the available data and the approach suggested by the working group were presented and discussed. The limited availability of data in relation to ToR1 and the consequences for the approach to take was discussed in detail.

In ToR1a, survival and spread of SHB via natural movement of the pest within Calabria and Sicily and to other parts of Italy will be assessed taking into account the geographical and meteorological conditions and the applied emergency conditions. In addition, this ToR aims to identify natural barriers, which might have contributed to limited spread of the SHB, and areas within Europe where SHB is not likely to establish. Data from the Italian outbreak, locations of the apiaries in the south of Italy and estimations of the number of apiaries in central and north of Italy at NUTS2 level are available. An SHB opportunity map for Europe will be made based on temperature and elevation. A spread model framework has been build and the model is been parameterised. A spread map for Italy will be generated.

ToR1b aims to assess the risk of SHB spread from Calabria and Sicily to other Member States via intra-EU movement of live bees (honey bee queens, colonies or swarms) or non-living bee products/materials (bee products to be used in apiculture, non-extracted comb honey and used beekeeping equipment). The implementation of the currently existing or identified (see ToR2) risk mitigation measures will be taken into account, whereas no implementation of risk mitigation measures will be assumed in ToR1c. Export of live bees from Italy to other Member States are retrieved from Traces, although they might not reflect the real situation and at the moment do not distinguish queen or colony/swarm consignments. There are also estimates on the number of apiaries per Member States but no data on trade of bee products from Italy to other Member States. The suggested approach is to present the probability of introduction for different combination of shipment size, prevalence and overall detection of SHB sensitivities. This could be seen as a theoretical representation of a wide range of scenarios, which has the advantage that Member States will be able to see the estimated risk of introduction of SHB into their territory for the scenario that is closest to their situation. In addition, a practical example will be given based on the available export data of live bees from Italy to other Member States to estimate the introduction of SHB via import. At the moment, the lack of trade data for other commodities makes it impossible to assess the risk they pose on introduction of SHB from Italy to other Member States.

The proposed approach for ToRs 1b and 1c mainly addresses the risk of SHB introduction from Italy into other Member States based on export information from Italy to other member states. An assessment of the possible SHB spread in the other Member States is only possible when the locations of the apiaries are known, or at least the number of apiaries per NUTS2 regions, in order to randomly locate the apiaries in the corresponding region and use

this information to model the spread to other Member States. Member States will be contacted.

8.3 Scientific opinion on health of honey bee colonies (EFSA-Q-2015-00047)

The definitions of attributes, indicators and (groups of) factors were explained and the approach and outcome of ToR1 on the definition of a healthy managed honey bee colony were presented to the Panel. Regarding ToR2, the strategy to identify indicators/factors was explained as well as the draft criteria to categorize indicators in three levels of importance. The highest level of importance would include indicators that should be included in studies monitoring the health status of managed honey bees. The second level indicators could be included in more detailed health monitoring studies or in particular areas/conditions whereas indicators belonging to the third level could be included in very detailed health monitoring studies or are relevant to few areas/conditions in Europe. A similar categorization of the factors will be done based on their expected relation to indicators. Finally, the aim of the upcoming meeting with stakeholder representatives was discussed.

9. Other scientific topics for information and/or discussion

9.1 Feedback on EFSA Scientific opinion on the assessment of studies on the use of carbon dioxide for stunning rabbits

The panel discussed how to handle feedback on its scientific opinions issued in the context of the EFSA guidance on the assessment criteria for studies evaluating the effectiveness of stunning interventions regarding animal protection at the time of killing. It was reasoned that while the panel should not enter into a dispute of considered opinions with scientists who do not agree with the panel's view, it is important to provide a sufficient depths of scientific detail in the opinions and in potential feedback to scientists to assist EFSA's stakeholders in understanding the reasoning of the panel experts. A proposal how to handle potential feedback will be prepared by the unit.

9.2 Feedback on AHAW Panel period 2013-2015

A feedback session on the AHAW Panel period 2013-2015 will be held at the June plenary meeting. Prior to the meeting panel members will be given the opportunity to provide comments on a number of aspects of the panel's work, which will be collated and presented to stimulate the discussions in June. It is foreseen to share the feedback with the new Panel members. A document on best practices for the opinion production process prepared by the ALPHA unit will be disseminated to the panel and discussed at the June meeting.

9.3 July inaugural plenary meeting

The preliminary agenda for the inaugural plenary meeting of the new AHAW Panel in July was presented and discussed. It was suggested to hold the AHAW specific session of the inaugural plenary meeting on 2 July in the afternoon, followed by a dinner of the AHAW Panel in the evening, and return on 3 July.

Annex

Interests and actions resulting from the screening of Annual Declarations of Interest (ADoI) or Specific Declarations of Interest (SDoI)

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: The screening of the SDoI of Dr. Klaus Depner resulted in the following interest: occasional consultancy on African swine fever. In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes³ and the Decision of the Executive Director on Declarations of Interest⁴, and taking into account the specific matters discussed at the meeting in question, the interest above was deemed to represent a Conflict of Interest.

This results in exclusion of the expert from any discussion, voting or other processing of item 7.1, Scientific opinion on African swine fever (ASF) (EFSA-Q-2014-00897), by the concerned scientific group.

³ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencepolicy.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules2014.pdf>