

---

ALPHA UNIT

## Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare

### Secretarial notes of the 1<sup>st</sup> Working Group (WG) meeting on the mandate on listing and categorisation of seven animal diseases in the Animal Health Law

15-16-February 2016, Brussels

(Agreed on 23.02.2016)

#### Invited participants:

WG members: BICOUT Dominique, DEPNER Klaus, GOOD Margaret, MIRANDA Miguel Angel, NIELSEN Søren Saxmose, SIHVONEN Liisa, THULKE Hans Hermann

EFSA: Francesca BALDINELLI, Alessandro BROGLIA, Gabriele ZANCANARO (ALPHA)

European Commission (EC): Francisco REVIRIEGO-GORDEJO, Barbara LOGAR, Maria Del Mar ALONSO LLORENTE

#### 1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants. Apologies 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 Processes<sup>1</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests<sup>2</sup>, EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of interest and the Specific Declaration of interest) filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of interest at the beginning of this meeting.

---

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

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

## 4. Discussion

The mandate was presented and the following points were discussed and clarified with EC:

1. What is needed by EC by this mandate is an assessment on criteria of article 5 and 9 on the basis of art 7. Firstly, an assessment of all art. 7 criteria should be provided.
2. EC advises to perform an exercise that should be simple, robust, and defensible. EFSA should keep in mind the use and the purpose of this assessment for the RM, that is to have clear and robust information in order to qualify the importance of each disease in the Union, if and which measures are justified and/or should be taken in the EU.
3. An assessment should be provided to each art. 7 criteria as a whole, and not a set of sub-criteria. In case a breakdown of the art 7 criteria into parameters is needed, for any methodological reason (in that case explanation is needed) or for a better definition of a given criterion, EFSA shall propose a clear method of integration of those parameters afterwards. Still EC advises to minimize splitting of the art 7 criteria.
4. The approach could be stepwise: if a given disease does not fulfil a required criterion for eligibility for listing or for categorisation, then it falls out and the assessment may stop there.
5. Interpretation of «significant impact on...»: the assessment should provide clear and robust information to describe the extent of the impact of each disease in the Union. Whether this extent is significant or not will be defined by the RM.
6. Criteria B-iv of art 7 «impact of the disease on biodiversity and the environment” is to be intended as the impact of the disease on wild species of particular interest, such as endangered species or species of naturalistic/ecological value.

The RA steps to be followed have been discussed and agreed as:

1. The art. 7 criteria should be kept as such when they are clear and specific enough for data collection, otherwise, proceed with breaking them down as needed;
2. The WG should finalise the screening of the list of art 7 criteria breakdown and reach a consensus;
3. Perform an assessment of art 7: i) data collection, ii) data extraction, iii) production of a narrative assessment for each of the art.7 criterion. The appropriateness of the semi-quantitative method to score the criteria is still under discussion.
4. The WG should agree on the mapping of the information from art 7 so to fulfil art 5 and 9 criteria, i.e. which elements from art 7 assessment are needed to inform art 5 and art. 9 criteria.
5. The mapped information from art. 7 will be used to evaluate art 5 in a stepwise approach: if one of the “obligatory” criteria (group A) or none of the “additional” criteria (group B) is not fulfilled, then the disease falls out and the RA process stops there (matrix table).
6. How to assess art. 5 criteria: where possible provide a final assessment as Y/N to each criterion so to help risk managers in decision for eligibility for listing (e.g. the

ones of group A which are clear-cut), whereas for the criteria where this would not be possible because they have to be referred to a range of scenarios (impact of the disease under different situations such as different Member States, different animal populations, etc., e.g. the criteria of group B about impacts), then a different assessment methodology should be agreed.

7. The mapped art. 7 information will be used for the categorisation exercise, to check the fitness of each disease into the different categories of Art 9, as follows:
  - To check whether a given disease fits all the “obligatory” criteria of each category plus at least one of the facultative criteria. It starts from criterion 1 of category A: if yes, go ahead with criterion 2; if not, switch to category B and start again.
8. In order to refine this approach, a working case could be created already for EBL, for which the recent adopted opinion may be used to compile the narrative assessment according to art.7 criteria.
9. The work on this mandate has mutual synergy with the work started on the general framework on disease impact, thus the outcomes of these two projects could be refined along their development.

## 5. Distribution of tasks

Who	Action	Deadline
All WG experts	Screen, comment and agree on breakdown of the art. 7 criteria	23 February
EFSA staff	Formulate a proposal about the mapping of elements from the list of art. 7 criteria or sub-criteria to inform art 5 and 9.	26 February
All WG experts	agree on the mapping of the information from art 7 so to fulfil art 5 and 9 criteria	4 March

## 8. Any other business

n/a

## 9. Next meeting(s)

The next WG meeting is foreseen on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016, depending on the advance of the work could be re-scheduled.

## 10. Adoption of minutes from previous meeting

This was the first meeting for this mandate.

---

ALPHA UNIT

**Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare**  
**Secretarial notes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> WG meeting of the Working Group on listing and categorisation of seven animal diseases in the Animal Health Law**

4-5 April 2016, Berlin

(Agreed on 11 April)

**Invited participants:**

WG members: BICOUT Dominique, DEPNER Klaus, GOOD Margaret, MIRANDA Miguel Angel, NIELSEN Søren Saxmose, SIHVONEN Liisa, Hans Hermann THULKE

EFSA: Alessandro BROGLIA, Gabriele ZANCANARO (online) Francesca BALDINELLI (online)

**1. Welcome and apologies for absence**

The Chair welcomed the participants.

**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 Processes<sup>1</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests<sup>2</sup>, EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of interest and the Specific Declaration of interest) filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of interest at the beginning of this meeting.

**4. Discussion**

- AB presented a proposal for the assessment: the proposal is to group and organise criteria of art.7 according to macro-categories (frequency, transmissibility, severity, risk

---

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

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

mitigation measures, impact on PH, impact on economy, impact on environment) that they are relevant and functional to assess criteria art 5 and 9. In this way also to group criteria under macro categories, even without scoring or aggregating the information, the reader can get deduct the level of importance of each macro-category. The information should be displayed in a synthetic way, and the possible answers to each descriptor under each macro-category should be comparable across the diseases as much as possible. Where further details are needed to better understand the differences, these could be provided in the narrative assessment (factsheets). The assessment about fulfilment of criteria of art 5 is either directly derived from the summary table (e.g. for criteria 5A) or, for complex criteria, (e.g. about impact, group 5B or group of art 9) could be done by expert judgement based on the information provided<sup>3</sup>. This is because the assessment of impact (either economic, health, environmental) is described by a set of heterogeneous descriptors and not by a single measure, then integration could be done on expert-based. For assessment of art 9 on categorisation, AB showed how the discriminant variables that allow assignment to each category could be reduced to frequency, epidemiological character, morbidity and mortality. The answers to the variables are already provided by each criterion, so the assessment is basically the check of the fitness of the disease to the correct category defined by a group of variables. This could be also done by expert judgement using the summary table as source of information. The degree of consensus and of uncertainty can be displayed.

- DB presented the advantages of a system based on scoring of criteria, of the possible aggregation methodology and the construction of a framework for a disease characterising table.
- **Discussion on the two proposals presented and on the methodology to use for the mandate**
  - A thorough discussion was held about the validity and the limitations of the different elements in the two proposals presented. The vision of the WG is to rather avoid scoring of criteria by semi-quantitative approach. This because is not needed to do a scoring for this mandate, since no ranking is requested. In order to attribute scores, lower and upper bounds for the range of each criterion would be needed, these are not provided, thus any bounds would be arbitrarily set. This level of arbitrariness would not add any real value to the assessment.
  - By scoring criteria there would be also the problem about how to flag variability: e.g. variable symptoms of a disease (e.g. paraTB). The method to squeeze all diseases into a fixed scheme of criteria and related scores is very difficult if not impossible and could be risky. Not all diseases have the same pathobiology and not all may fit the same framework, e.g. the impact is expressed with very different outcomes across diseases. The risk is trying to fill in parameters that are not interpretable if it should be done across diseases. Whereas a narrative review, still based on systematic literature review, can provide an overview to the RM about each disease.

---

<sup>3</sup> The assessment of art 5 and 9 is the check of criteria fulfilment as previously agreed, see <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ahawahllisting.pdf>

- Due to the above mentioned limitations of the scoring approach, , as assessed at this stage, the following assessment methodology is proposed by the WG as the best option:
  - to prepare a narrative assessment of criteria of art 7, such as in a form of factsheets, based on the data collected with the procurement for the literature review (the data model to be used was presented by GZ and discussed). A supplementary synthetic way of presenting summarised information could be provided (summary table or other methods). These factsheets will provide the baseline information.
  - To provide the mapping, i.e. the indication of which criterion or sub-criterion or parameter from art 7 inform art 5 and 9 criteria. Since each criterion of art. 7 will be described in the factsheets, the mapping will help to highlight what piece of information from art 7 is relevant to assess criteria of art 5 and 9, e.g. criterion art. 7 “animal species concerned by the disease” informs criterion art. 5 A2 “animal species are either susceptible to the disease or vectors and reservoirs thereof exist in the Union”.
  - The criteria of art 5 and 9 will be assessed for their fulfilment by Y/N assessment based on expert judgement, on the basis of the factsheets. The “significance” of impact will not be assessed as such. An uncertainty assessment will be indicated, based on the level of available information and level of consensus.
- The idea of the methodological framework based on scoring system is not discarded as such, but it would require a set of criteria and anchor points designed for that purpose.
- The WG dismissed the possibility of having a public consultation on the assessment methodology as it has been formulated in the points above.

#### 4. Roadmap and timeline

Next deadlines are:

26-27 April	AHAW Plenary in Parma: discussion of the proposals of assessment methodology for art. 7, 5 and 9
16 or 17 June	possible WG meeting (physical or TC)
20-21 June	AHAW Plenary in Parma – Panel briefing
End of August	Data from procurement available
12 September	possible WG meeting (physical)
13-14 September	AHAW Plenary in Parma - Panel briefing
18-19 October	AHAW Plenary in Parma - Panel briefing and presentation of

	draft opinion
7-8 November	possible WG meeting (physical or TC)
29-30 November Dec	AHAW Plenary in Parma – thorough discussion of draft opinion
January 2017	AHAW Plenary in Parma - adoption

## 8. Any other business

None.

## 9. Next meeting(s)

16 or 17 June, to be confirmed.

## 10. Adoption of minutes

The minutes from previous meeting were adopted and will be published on EFSA's website (see <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/ahaw/ahawwgs.htm> ).



---

**ALPHA UNIT**

**Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare**

**WG meeting of the Working Group on listing and categorisation of seven animal diseases in the Animal Health Law**

17 June 2016, Parma

**Invited participants:**

WG members: BICOUT Dominique, MIRANDA Miguel Angel, Hans Hermann THULKE, STEGEMAN Arjan

EFSA: Alessandro BROGLIA, Gabriele ZANCANARO, Francesca BALDINELLI (ALPHA)

**NOTES**

**1. Welcome by the WG Chair**

The Chair welcomed the participants

**2. Declarations of interest**

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes<sup>1</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests<sup>2</sup>, EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of interest and the Specific Declaration of interest) filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of interest at the beginning of this meeting.

**3. Adoption of agenda**

The agenda was adopted without changes.

**4. Format of the factsheets**

The WG agreed on developing narrative fact-sheets. The structure should follow the one of the criteria and related parameters of Art.7 of the new AHL. An in depth revision of the parameters, linked to Art. 7 criteria, was performed. The information

---

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

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

retrieved on each parameter, combined in a consistent way indicated in the mapping exercise, should be the basis for elaborating the text for each relevant criterion.

#### **5. Methodology for compiling the factsheets: from data model used for literature review to parameters of art.7 and factsheets**

The data models developed in view of a full systematic literature review (SLR) at primary study level were considered not fit for this purpose. The elements leading to this conclusion were: the failure of the procurement call because of time constraint (no application could fulfil EFSA's requirements), the considerable number of diseases that need to be evaluated, the very likely event that this number will increase in the next future, the considerable number of 'data model *items*' that need to be filled in a formal SLR. In summary, the mandate requires to elaborate multiple and diverse information in a relatively short time. The WG concluded that for this synthesis process the data models and a SLR are not suitable as they would in other circumstances (e.g. in view of a meta-analysis).

The WG proposes to select disease-scientist in a formal way (1 disease-scientist per disease) and to provide them with clear instructions on how to perform the data extraction and the synthesis. These instructions need to be carefully elaborated in order to guarantee the transparency and the repeatability of the process. The WG elaborated a hierarchical list of sources of information to be consulted by the disease-scientist, with the aim of harmonising the information that will be reported in the fact-sheets.

Once the fact-sheets will be compiled, they will be submitted for evaluation to the Panel, as in a peer-review process, to ensure quality and bias containment.

#### **6. Methodology of expert judgement procedure**

The peer-reviewed fact-sheets will serve as a basis for the expert judgement process. The latter will be structured following the principles of an Expert Knowledge Elicitation and the method of choice will be the Sheffield method (aiming at consensus). The domain experts could be selected among the AHAW panel members.

The experts will have to make decision on every criterion of Art.5 and Art.9. The outcome will be in the majority of the cases dichotomous (YES / NO). This final outcome will be associated to a colour, to improve readability of the outcomes: 'green' will indicate full consensus among the experts; 'yellow' will indicate no consensus or disagreement among the experts. In case the experts were not comfortable in expressing any judgement because the available information was not sufficient, the colour used will be 'red'.

The WG agreed on this definitive version to be presented at the Panel.

---

**ALPHA UNIT**

**Minutes of the meeting of the Working Group on listing and categorisation of seven animal diseases in the Animal Health Law**

Held on 22 July 2016, web meeting

(Agreed on 2 August 2016)

**Participants:**

WG members: BICOUT Dominique, DEPNER Klaus, GOOD Margaret, MIRANDA Miguel Angel, NIELSEN SAXMOSE Søren, SIHVONEN Liisa, STEGEMAN Arjan

EFSA: Alessandro BROGLIA, Gabriele ZANCANARO, Francesca BALDINELLI (ALPHA)

**NOTES**

**1. Welcome by the WG Chair**

The Chair welcomed the participants

**2. Declarations of interest**

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes<sup>1</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests<sup>2</sup>, EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of interest and the Specific Declaration of interest) filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of interest at the beginning of this meeting.

**3. Adoption of agenda**

The agenda was adopted without changes.

**4. Indications for Disease Scientist (DS) and rules for factsheets compilation**

The WG revised and agreed on the instruction to be given to the DSs in order to retrieve information (section 2.4.3 of the draft opinion) and compile the fact-sheets (section 2.4.4). DSs will use scientific literature as sources of information, giving priority to peer-reviewed literature and based on the evidence pyramid. Furthermore a list of sources of information will be provided to the DSs. The most relevant and up to date information extracted from the relevant sources will be

---

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

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

reported and discussed in the fact-sheets. A template of the fact-sheet will be provided to the DSs and will consist of the Art.7 criteria and parameters as headings and sub-headings of the different sections. Regarding the diseases (e.g. VBDs, EBL) for which specific information and data have been already retrieved and collected in EFSA, they will be provided to the DS as a toolbox. The WG agreed in excluding the involvement of the Panel members in writing the fact-sheet.

### 5. Expert judgement procedure (EJ)

It was clarified that the Panel members participating to the EJ will be trained on the procedure and the method in the November plenary meeting, before the first round of the EJ will take place. When receiving the fact-sheets, participants will be asked to share via mail any other additional evidence they have on the diseases, in order to ensure that the judgement will be done on the basis of the same knowledge.

In the individual judgment performed via mail (first step), the participants will provide the categorical answers (Y/N/NA) to each art.5 and art.9 criteria. When discussing the individual answer in the physical meeting aiming at consensus, the final outcome will be a collective answer of Y/N/NA with the level of consensus reached as follows: green= consensus; yellow= no consensus (e.g. when not enough robust evidence is available or evidence is interpreted differently). In addition to the level of consensus, participants also indicate whether there is a lack of knowledge (red= lack of knowledge). The level of consensus indicated as green, yellow or red will give an indication of the level of uncertainty related to that answer. In case of consensus, no uncertainty is indicated; the yellow highlights that a certain degree of uncertainty exists, and it does not allow participants to interpret in the same direction the available evidence; a red answer highlights that participants cannot give an answer due to the lack of knowledge. Further considerations need to be done by the WG on how to deal with items for which the consensus is not reached (i.e. yellow). Table 13 below gives an overview of the possible output (collective judgement) of the assessment of the Art.5 criteria as example.

Table 13. Assessment art. 5 – example

DISEASE	All these criteria to be fulfilled				
	A(i)	A(ii)	A(iii)	A(iv)	A(v)
	disease is transmissible	animal species are either susceptible to the disease or vectors and reservoirs thereof exist in the Union	disease causes negative effects on animal health or poses a risk to public health due to its zoonotic character	diagnostic tools are available for the disease	risk-mitigating measures and, where relevant, surveillance of the disease, are effective and proportionate to the risks posed by the disease in the Union
Art.7 parameters	<a href="#">(a)(vi) 1</a>				
	<a href="#">(a)(vi) 2</a>				
Assessment	Y	N	Y% N%	Y	NA

<b>Consensus</b>					
<b>Reasoning</b>	<i>text</i>	<i>text</i>	<i>text</i>	<i>text</i>	<i>text</i>

## 6. Task distribution, timeline, next meetings

### Task distribution

EFSA:

- Complete the selection of the DSs
- Prepare the toolbox with all relevant information to give to the DSs for EBL, BT, West Nile Fever, Venezuelan, Eastern and Western Equine Encephalomyelitis, Japanese encephalomyelitis, and any other diseases for which EFSA output have been published in the last years
- Amend section 2.5 on Expert judgement of the draft opinion according the outcome of the discussion (chapter 2.5.2; table 13 pag.35)

WG experts:

- support EFSA staff in case any specific query will pop up by DSs about any aspects of any particular disease

### Timeline

- 13-14/09 (Plenary)- update the Panel on
  - DSs selection,
  - EJ procedure,
  - Identification of reviewers of the factsheets (results of the doodles), and remind timeline for revision
  - organize the peer-reviewing of the fact-sheet and the training for the EJ
- 18-19 October Plenary:
  - update on factsheets compilation
- 30 Nov (Plenary)- training of the EJ participants (proposal: use one of the disease for which the fact-sheet will be delivered by 30<sup>th</sup> Sep to perform the EJ as example in the training)
- from 5 Dec to 9 Jan- individual judgement (via email)
- 16 or 19 Jan (one day before or after the Plenary) Collective judgement.

---

ALPHA UNIT

## Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare

### WG meeting of the Working Group on listing and categorisation of seven animal diseases in the Animal Health Law

17 October 2016, Parma

(Agreed on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016)

**Meeting date:** 17/10/2016 (14:00 – 18:00)

#### Participants:

WG members: BICOUT Dominique, DEPNER Klaus, GOOD Margaret, MIRANDA Miguel Angel, NIELSEN SAXMOSE Søren, SIHVONEN Liisa, THULKE Hans Hermann

EFSA: Alessandro BROGLIA, Francesca BALDINELLI (ALPHA)

#### NOTES

##### 1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

##### 2. Declarations of interest

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes<sup>1</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests<sup>2</sup>, EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of interest and the Specific Declaration of interest) filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of interest at the beginning of this meeting.

---

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

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

### **3. Adoption of agenda**

The agenda was adopted without changes.

### **4. Mapping**

The mapping of the art.7 parameters into the art.9 criteria was finalised within the WG.

### **5. Reviewing phase**

The WG 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) critical/relevant references, iv) excessing 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.

### **6. Expert judgement**

The templates for presenting the art.5 and art.9 criteria/questions and collect the answers were presented and agreed. A proposal on how to show the overall results of the EJ was discussed. The WG agreed in presenting by art.5 and art.9 criteria: i) the categorical answer as Y/N/na ii) the level of consensus as full consensus (indicated in green), no consensus (in yellow) and the lack of knowledge (in red). In case of no consensus, the WG agreed in reporting the number of raised interpretations and not the number of Y, N and na.

### **7. Next meeting**

7th November from 12 to 14.30

---

ALPHA UNIT

## Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare

### WG meeting of the 6<sup>th</sup> Working Group on listing and categorisation of animal diseases in the Animal Health Law

7 November 2016, Web-meeting

(Agreed on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2016)

**Meeting date:** 7/11/2016 (12:00 – 14:30)

#### Participants:

WG members: BICOUT Dominique, DEPNER Klaus, GOOD Margaret, MIRANDA Miguel Angel, SIHVONEN Liisa, STEGEMAN Jan Arenden, THULKE Hans Hermann

EFSA: Alessandro BROGLIA, Francesca BALDINELLI (ALPHA)

#### NOTES

##### 1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

##### 2. Declarations of interest

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes<sup>1</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests<sup>2</sup>, EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of interest and the Specific Declaration of interest) filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of interest at the beginning of this meeting.

---

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

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



### 3. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

### 4. Discussion

The WG was updated on the state of the completion of the fact-sheets, and discussed what disease would be eventually used to test the expert judgement method in the training in the November plenary meeting. It was agreed to judge on a well-known disease in order to focus the exercise on testing the feasibility of the method more than on discussing the disease per se. The interpretation of the art.5 and art.9 criteria/questions for the purpose of the assessment was discussed, in particular experts identified the need to further discuss on the interpretation of the term 'significant'. It was decided to circulate a document collecting the proposed interpretation by question in order to use it as a working document to develop a common interpretation of the different questions.

---

ALPHA UNIT

## Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare

### WG meeting of the 7<sup>th</sup> Working Group on listing and categorisation of animal diseases in the Animal Health Law

9 February 2017, Web-meeting

(Agreed on 18<sup>th</sup> February 2017)

**Meeting date:** 9/02/2017 (9:00-12:00)

#### Participants:

WG members: BICOUT Dominique, DEPNER Klaus, GOOD Margaret, MIRANDA Miguel Angel, NIELSEN SAXMOSE Søren, STEGEMAN Jan Arenden, THULKE Hans Hermann

EFSA: Francesca BALDINELLI, Alessandro BROGLIA, Lisa KOHNLE, Joana MORGADO (ALPHA)

#### NOTES

##### 1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

##### 2. Declarations of interest

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes<sup>1</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests<sup>2</sup>, EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of interest and the Specific Declaration of interest) filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of interest at the beginning of this meeting.

---

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

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

### 3. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

### 4. Discussion

The structure and the content of the scientific opinion (SO) on method for the assessment on listing and categorisation of animal diseases within the framework of the Animal Health Law was extensively discussed. The WG agreed to structure the main contents in sections '2. Data' and '3. Results', to move figure 1 at the beginning of '3. Results'. When reporting the results of the EJ, the final outcome of each question will be indicated with a colour code: green- consensus, yellow- no consensus, red- no sufficient evidence, impossible or not relevant to judge. Only for the consensus questions in green, Y/N will be reported besides the colour code. For the non-consensus questions further information will be provided in a separate table: the concordance rate (as total number of different supporting views / total number of judges), the Y/N/na response rate, followed by the detailed list of different supporting views.

Regarding the discussion on the structure of the 'disease opinions' (the one on Aujeszky disease was used as example), the WG agreed in including the Background and Terms of Reference as they are in the methodological SO. The minimum number of judges will be reported at the beginning of the assessment section, whereas the number of judges by question will be specified in the appendix A.

---

ALPHA UNIT

**Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare**

**WG meeting of the 8<sup>th</sup> Working Group on listing and categorisation of animal diseases in the Animal Health Law**

23-26 June 2017, Web-meeting

(Agreed on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2017)

**Meeting date:** 23-26/06/2017 (9:00-12:00)

**Participants:**

WG members: BUTTERWORTH Andrew, DEPNER Klaus, GARIN-BASTUJI Bruno, GORTAZAR SCHMIDT Christian, MIRANDA Miguel Angel, MORE Simon, NIELSEN SAXMOSE Søren, ROSENKRANZ Peter, SIHVONEN Liisa

EFSA: Denise CANDIANI (ALPHA)

**NOTES**

**1. Welcome and apologies for absence**

The Chair welcomed the participants. Apologies were presented for Dominique Bicout, Jan Arenden Stegeman, Hans Hermann Thulke and Margaret Good.

**2. Declarations of interest**

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes<sup>1</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests<sup>2</sup>, EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of interest and the Specific Declaration of interest) filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of interest at the beginning of this meeting.

---

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

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

### 3. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

### 4. Discussion

The discussion aimed at the finalisation of 7 disease fact sheets: Bovine genital campylobacteriosis, Trichomonosis, Border disease, Ovine epididymitis, Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia, Contagious caprine pleuropneumonia, Varroa infestation, *Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans* (Bsal). For each fact sheet, the comments raised by the reviewers and addressed by the disease scientists, were discussed in order to amend the text accordingly.

---

ALPHA UNIT

**Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare**

**WG meeting of the 9<sup>th</sup> Working Group on listing and categorisation of animal diseases in the Animal Health Law**

4-5 September 2017, Mallorca (Spain)

(Agreed on 11 September 2017)

**Meeting date:** 04-05/09/2017 (9:00-15:00)

**Participants:**

WG members: Dominique BICOUT, Andrew BUTTERWORTH, Bruno GARIN-BASTUJI, Margaret GOOD, Christian GORTÁZAR SCHMIDT, Virginie MICHEL, Miguel Angel MIRANDA, Simon MORE, Søren NIELSEN SAXMOSE, Jan Arend STEGEMAN, Hans Hermann THULKE, Antonio VELARDE, Preben WILLEBERG, Christoph WINCKLER

EFSA: Francesca BALDINELLI, Alessandro BROGLIA, Lisa KOHNLE (ALPHA)

**NOTES**

**1. Welcome and apologies for absence**

The Chair welcomed the participants. Apologies were presented for Anette BØTNER, Paolo CALISTRI and Liisa SIHVONEN.

**2. Declarations of interest**

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes<sup>1</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests<sup>2</sup>, EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of interest and the Specific Declaration of interest) filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of interest at the beginning of this meeting.

---

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

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

### 3. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

### 4. Discussion

The results of the individual judgement on bovine genital campylobacteriosis, trichomonosis, Border disease, ovine epididymitis (*Brucella ovis*), contagious bovine pleuropneumonia, contagious caprine pleuropneumonia, infestation with *Varroa* spp (Varroosis) and *Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans* (Bsal), according to the Articles 5 and 9 of the Regulation (EU) 2016/429 were presented. By disease, for the non-consensus questions the reasoning supporting the Yes, No, not applicable (na) answers were extensively discussed aiming at reaching consensus. For all diseases and art.5 and 9 questions the outcome of the discussion were recorded as Y, N, na, as well as, in case of no consensus, the supporting reasoning.