



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 22 May 2008

**9536/08
ADD 1**

AGRILEG 78

ADDENDUM TO THE OUTCOME OF PROCEEDINGS

of : Working Party of Chief Veterinary Officers
on : 22 February 2008

Subject : Community Animal Health Strategy
- CVOs "Adelbrecht Process"

Delegations will find attached the document reflecting the outcome of Workshop I (Priorities).

EU ANIMAL HEALTH STRATEGY

**Non-paper on PRIORITISATION OF ANIMAL-RELATED THREATS AND
BIOSECURITY****Revised version after 2nd meeting of CVO Working Party #1 (18 February 2008)****Preamble**

The purpose of this document is **not only** to define priorities for EU funding of animal disease prevention, control and/or eradication. It is a **global tool** for assessing priorities in all animal-related threats, in order to better **adapt EU** legislation, allocations of funds and other resources and field actions (whether in relation to awareness campaigns, training, vaccination campaigns or external cooperation, etc), but also **MSS'** relevant legislation and actions, as well as the role and actions of the **private sector**, all of which form part of the **EU animal health strategy**.

This exercise will lead to the definition of **different types of priorities**, which will have to be **linked with the other Working Parties on financing and trade** (especially when dealing with **control measures**), as well as the **objectives** of the EU animal health policy; hence the division into chapters relating to each of the four objectives: **public health, farming economy, society and trade**.

There will not only be specific priorities regarding certain diseases, but also **general priorities** that could concern much more than specific disease control (e.g. biosecurity, cooperation with TC, research, etc).

This document and its subsequent decisions will also provide the EU with **reliable scientific grounds** whenever its health regulations differ from the OIE standards. The difference between this document and the OIE list of diseases is that the latter is a simple "yes or no" that does not quantify the **level of risk** posed by a given threat, whereas the present exercise is a real **decision-making tool**. Moreover, it is directed not only at trade problems, but also in the main to **disease control**, of which trade measures can be considered to form a part.

It should be borne in mind that the overall importance of the threat as regards animal and public health, economy and society should be compared to the threat as regards trade. If there are trade problems but no significant effects elsewhere, this means that the international standards (or EU or MSs' regulations) should be amended or withdrawn.

Once the risk managers (i.e. CVOs) have examined it in **practical terms** and drawn up the general framework, the **scientists** (epidemiologists, statisticians and risk analysts) will be requested to give their advice in order to obtain reliable data, in particular regarding **methodologies to quantify each criterion** (from 1 to 5), mainly in Chapters A, B and C. Furthermore, as the number of criteria in the chapters varies, **each criterion should be attributed a relative weight** within the chapter in such a way that each chapter represents the **same amount of points**. The questions could be asked in precise terms (e.g. addressed to EFSA).

The final step will remain in the hands of the decision-makers, who will consider the weight to be allocated to each objective of the EU Animal Health Strategy, and consequently to **each chapter C** to F, as well as the chapter-specific and general **thresholds**, with a view to eventually classifying each threat in a **category of priority** (horizontal: biosecurity, import control, TC assistance... or vertical: EU, MS, private sector...).

Of course, this should be a **permanent "living" exercise** in order to permanently update the document according to the latest data. Indeed, the **epidemiological situation** - both within the EU and internationally - modifications in the OIE standards, new findings on diagnostic tests, treatments or vaccines, will modify the overall ranking of diseases. It should therefore be clear from the beginning that the exercise **should be conducted regularly**, and in any case each time it is justified by a new event. This emphasises the importance of a **permanent survey**. The **future EU animal health law**, while being solid enough to provide a **permanent basis** for Member States with regard to their animal control measures, should incorporate this.

The following table reflects discussions during the meeting on 18 February, written comments and the results of informal field trials conducted by some MSs and the Commission on the basis of 5 diseases (FMD, LPAI, TB, PRRS, and RVF). These results demonstrated the relevance of the exercise, despite certain discrepancies linked to the different approaches adopted by different MSs: for that reason, this exercise should be conducted **without consideration** for its future use, and **the methodologies for the criteria should be defined precisely** on the basis of scientific advice and practical experience, not only in the MSs or EU, but also in the world as a whole.

The table has been modified as regards its order, the position of certain criteria and the titles of the chapters, but it remains unchanged as regards the data required. A and B provide answers to the questions "What is the risk?" and "Can we control it?", while C, D, E and F provide answers to the question "What is the potential impact of the threat?"

Some **examples** of methodology and criterion coefficients are given. Each criterion has a coefficient so that the total of weighted criteria in each chapter is 10 (the total count of each chapter is therefore between 10 and 50). This ensures equality between the chapters, and each chapter can be subsequently weighted.

TABLE OF CRITERIA (+ Explanations and examples/proposals of methodologies)

A	EPIDEMIOLOGY 10 criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Co eff
1	Speed of spread <i>This criterion could be assessed by qualitative of quantitative data</i>	Very slow	Slow	ND <i>If unknown, the rating should be medium</i>	Medium	High	1.1
2	Range of animal species involved	One species	ND or expected to be limited	Limited <i>2 species</i>	Medium <i>3 species</i>	High <i>4 species and over</i>	1
3	Persistence of agent in the environment, including wildlife	No <i>Never found</i>	Rare <i>Occasionally found</i>	ND <i>If unknown, the rating should be medium</i>	Constant <i>Animal reservoir or vector</i>	Not removable from environment <i>Resistance in the ground</i>	1
4	Potential risk of spreading to susceptible populations	No <i>Not contagious</i>	Low <i>Transmissible / Direct contact contagion</i>	ND <i>If unknown, the rating should be medium</i>	Medium <i>Indirect contact contagion</i>	High <i>Airborne contagion</i>	1.1
5	Risk of wildlife diseases, potential threat to animal health and public health	Negligible <i>No wildlife reservoir</i>	Minor <i>Prevalence in remote wildlife</i>	Moderate <i>Wildlife reservoir: no direct contact with humans or domestic animals</i>	Significant <i>Wildlife reservoir and vector- borne</i>	Serious <i>Wildlife reservoir in close contact with humans and/or domestic animals</i>	0.7
6	Presence of the disease in the EU <i>Prevalence, frequency of occurrence throughout EU territory</i>	Exotic and no specific risk of occurrence	Sporadic or exotic but with specific risk of occurrence <i>Neighbour, migratory, trade</i>	Endemic with neutral or favourable trend <i>Prevalence stable or decreasing for 2 consecutive years</i>	Emergent / Epidemic <i>Newly diagnosed and spreading, or occasional recurrent epidemics</i>	Endemic-unfavourable trend <i>Prevalence increasing for at least one year</i>	1.2
7	Presence of the disease in a MS <i>Prevalence, frequency of occurrence in the territory of a specific MS</i>	Exotic and no specific risk of occurrence	Sporadic or exotic but with specific risk of occurrence <i>Neighbour, migratory, trade</i>	Endemic with favourable trend <i>Prevalence decreasing for 2 consecutive years</i>	Emergent / Epidemic <i>Newly diagnosed and spreading, or occasional recurrent epidemics</i>	Endemic-unfavourable trend <i>Prevalence increasing over the past year</i>	0.8
8	Variability of the disease <i>Agent types and mutations, hosts and vector range</i>	Negligible <i>One type, stable host/vector</i>	Low <i>Few types, not mutating, stable host/vector</i>	Moderate <i>Few types, not mutating, low host specificity, stable vector if any</i>	High <i>Numerous types or mutating, low host or vector specificity</i>	Very High <i>Numerous types and mutating, low host or vector specificity</i>	1
9	Impact on animal health <i>Clinical symptoms, prognostic</i>	Negligible <i>No clinical symptoms</i>	Low <i>Limited clinical symptoms, favourable outcome with or without vet intervention</i>	Moderate <i>Clinical symptoms with no risk of death but possible chronic evolution without vet intervention</i>	High <i>Severe clinical symptoms liable to lead to death in spite of vet intervention</i>	Very High <i>High risk of rapid death, vet usually unable to cure</i>	1
10	Impact on herd health <i>Morbidity / mortality without vet intervention</i>	Negligible <i>No clinical signs at herd level</i>	Low <i>Low morbidity (less than 10%)</i>	Moderate <i>High morbidity without mortality</i>	High <i>High morbidity with some mortality</i>	Very High <i>High mortality (more than 20%)</i>	1.1
							10

B	CONTROL MEASURES 8 criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Co eff
1	Disease knowledge <i>Scientific data, technical and field experience</i>	Very high <i>Aetiology, epidemiology, (all types)</i>	High <i>Aetiology, epidemiology, (not all types)</i>	Moderate <i>Aetiology but not epidemiology</i>	Low <i>Uncertain aetiology</i>	Limited <i>Emerging disease</i>	1.5
2	Effectiveness of prevention tools <i>Border / trade / movement control / restrictions, zoning, biosecurity</i>	High <i>Effective bans, simple movement, measures efficient</i>	Moderate <i>Effective bans but needs special movement measures</i>	Low <i>Bans difficult to implement (wildlife, ...) but specific movement measures effective</i>	Very low <i>Bans difficult to implement (wildlife, ...) and movement control difficult</i>	None <i>Bans not effective (e.g. incubation) and movement control difficult or ineffective</i>	1.3
3	Effectiveness of farm biosecurity measures <i>Including compartments</i>	High <i>Simple measures effective</i>	Moderate <i>Needs specific measures</i>	Low <i>Needs complex measures</i>	Very low <i>Compartments and highly protected farms</i>	None <i>Only compartments</i>	1.2
4	Effectiveness of surveillance measures <i>Clinical surveillance, pathological surveillance, tests</i>	High <i>Clinical /pathological surveillance easy, sensitive and specific tests, vaccinated discrimination possible</i>	Moderate <i>Clinical surveillance difficult, pathological surveillance possible, sensitive and specific tests, but vaccinated discrimination impossible</i>	Low <i>Clinical / pathological surveillance difficult, tests not sensitive</i>	Very low <i>Clinical surveillance impossible, pathological surveillance difficult, tests not sensitive or specific, or only isolation</i>	None <i>Clinical / pathological surveillance impossible, no reliable test except difficult isolation</i>	1.5
5	Effectiveness of control measures <i>Monitoring, test / slaughter, vaccination, treatment</i>	High <i>Vaccination with discrimination, test / slaughter easy, treatment effective</i>	Moderate <i>Vaccination without discrimination, test / slaughter possible, treatment difficult</i>	Low <i>Vaccination without discrimination, test / slaughter difficult, no treatment</i>	Very low <i>Vaccination without discrimination, test / slaughter impossible, no treatment</i>	None <i>No vaccination, no treatment, test/slaughter impossible</i>	1.5
6	Experience / success of prevention and control in other countries <i>Including MSs, TCs, including developing countries</i>	Consistently high <i>Disease eradicated in numerous countries</i>	High <i>Disease eradicated in some countries and controlled in others</i>	Moderate <i>Disease not eradicated but controlled in a majority of countries</i>	Low <i>Disease only controlled in some countries</i>	No success / experience <i>Disease not controlled or emerging</i>	1
7	Vaccine / Treatment availability	Very high <i>Existing stocks available at vet/farm level</i>	High <i>Commercial banks of vaccines, rapidly available to vets</i>	Moderate <i>Official banks of antigens in the EU, treatments on special request</i>	Low <i>Official bank of antigens outside the EU, no validated / registered treatment</i>	None <i>No availability at field level, even for research</i>	1
8	Availability of diagnostic tools	Very high <i>Commercial kits at vet/farm level</i>	High <i>Commercial kits at lab level</i>	Moderate <i>Kits developed by laboratories</i>	Low <i>Only highly specialised labs</i>	None <i>No diagnostic tool available, in spite of research</i>	1
							10

C	IMPACT ON PUBLIC HEALTH 4 criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Co eff
1	Risk to Public Health <i>Propensity to contaminate and/or harm humans directly or indirectly including through food</i>	Negligible <i>No transmission or no contact possible or highly improbable (food not affected)</i>	ND <i>No known transmission / contamination of humans occurred or no data concerning modes</i>	Minor <i>Possible transmission and existing contacts with live animals and/or source</i>	Moderate <i>Possible transmission or contamination through direct or indirect contact (vector) or food</i>	Severe <i>Very low species barrier, possible airborne contamination or through environment</i>	3
2	Likelihood of occurrence in humans <i>Probabilities calculated on the basis of experience, studies or projections</i>	No <i>Proven impossibility of transmission to humans through live animals, animal products, vectors or food</i>	Extremely rare <i>Probability lower than 1/1000000</i>	Occasionally <i>Occurs at an incidence lower than 1/10000</i>	Regularly <i>Occurs at an incidence lower than 1/1000</i>	Frequent <i>Occurs at an incidence higher than 1/1000</i>	2
3	Impact of occurrence in a human individual <i>Signs described in scientific literature</i>	No <i>Unapparent infection</i>	ND <i>Never described but suspected</i>	Low <i>Mild clinical symptoms</i>	Medium <i>Clinical symptoms requiring specific treatment</i>	High <i>Hospitalisation required, death possible</i>	3.5
4	Bioterrorism potential	None <i>Agent unavailable or impossible to handle or no potential harm</i>	Very low <i>Agent available but difficult to handle (backlash) or low potential harm</i>	Low <i>Agent available and easy to handle by pros/labs, but low potential harm</i>	Medium <i>Agent available and easy to handle by pros/labs and high potential harm</i>	High <i>Agent available and easy to handle by individuals and high potential harm</i>	1.5
							10

D	IMPACT ON ECONOMY (trade excluded) 4 criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Co eff
1	Impact on production <i>On farm losses due to clinical symptoms</i>	No <i>Production not affected</i>	ND	Low <i>Production reduced by less than 20%</i>	Medium <i>Production reduced by more than 20%</i>	Severe <i>Production reduced by more than 50%</i>	3
2	Direct economic impact <i>Production losses + private and public control measures</i>	No <i>No loss due to disease, no control measures needed</i>	ND	Low <i>Production reduced but not banned, treatment / vaccination</i>	Medium <i>Production reduced and partially banned, test and slaughter</i>	High <i>Production reduced and banned, total slaughter</i>	3.5
3	Indirect economic impact <i>Probable market / fall in prices, tourism</i>	No <i>Products continue to be distributed, no fear of visit</i>	ND	Low <i>Herd products redirected to lower-value markets</i>	Medium <i>Market/price reduced temporarily by less than 30% in a specific region</i>	High <i>Reduction by more than 30%, over a month or country-wide, ban on movement</i>	2
4	Impact on specific production and supply channels <i>Markets, raw materials for agro-industry, ...</i>	No <i>No disruption of production or distribution of supply</i>	ND	Low <i>Problems in supply but production and distribution still possible</i>	Medium <i>Targeted and canalised supply chains</i>	High <i>Disruption of production chain, final products undeliverable except imports</i>	1.5
							10

E	IMPACT ON SOCIETY 4 criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Co eff
1	Impact on animal welfare and biodiversity <i>Both disease and related control measures</i>	No <i>No culling, no endangered wild species affected</i>	ND	Low <i>Endangered wild species may be affected, slaughter in slaughterhouses</i>	Medium <i>Limited slaughter on farms, and/or endangered wild species threatened</i>	High <i>Zone stamping-out measures, and/or can include wildlife, incl. in zoos</i>	3.5
2	Wildlife and pet species under threat	Negligible <i>None or never occurred</i>	Minor <i>One species</i>	Moderate <i>2 species</i>	Significant <i>3 species</i>	Serious <i>4 or more species</i>	2
3	Impact on security of food supply <i>Remote areas, or developing world</i>	Extremely limited <i>Anecdotal supply problems</i>	Low <i>Only some remote areas may have supply problems</i>	Moderate <i>Some remote areas may be temporarily out of stock</i>	High <i>Some areas / countries may be out of stock</i>	Very high <i>May cause or increase hunger problems</i>	2
4	Potential impact on media <i>Probability of media crisis</i>	No <i>Subject discussed positively in the media</i>	Low <i>Subject referred to in specialised media only</i>	ND <i>New subject</i>	Medium <i>Subject recently discussed in general media</i>	High <i>Subject already under public discussion</i>	2.5
							10

F	IMPACT ON TRADE 4 criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Co eff
1	Impact on International Trade / Export from EU <i>OIE standards and/or TC regulations</i>	Negligible <i>No restrictions or only at animal level</i>	Minor <i>Only at herd level</i>	Moderate <i>At zone level and/or list of commodities, no loss of official status</i>	Significant <i>Zone standstill and/or no list of commodities, loss of official status, short recovery period</i>	Serious <i>Possible nationwide ban / standstill with or without list, official status difficult to recover</i>	3.5
2	Impact on EU intra-Community trade <i>EU regulations</i>	Negligible <i>No restrictions or only at animal level</i>	Minor <i>Only at herd level</i>	Moderate <i>At zone level and/or list of commodities</i>	Significant <i>Zone standstill and/or no list of commodities</i>	Serious <i>Nationwide ban / standstill with or without list</i>	3
3	Impact on national trade <i>Domestic MS regulations</i>	Negligible <i>No restrictions or only at animal level</i>	Minor <i>Only at herd level</i>	Moderate <i>At zone level and/or list of commodities</i>	Significant <i>Zone standstill and/or no list of commodities</i>	Serious <i>Nationwide ban / standstill with or without list</i>	1.5
4	Possibility of zoning <i>In the MS, EU or OIE regulations / standards</i>	High <i>Zoning possible at the farm level</i>	Moderate <i>Zoning possible 1 to 10 km</i>	Low <i>Zoning possible but more than 10 km</i>	Very low <i>Zoning using wider administrative borders</i>	None <i>Only compartments</i>	2
							10