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Overview

- Background for survey
  - The New Directive 2006/88
- Methodology
- Questions & Results
  - Quantitative
  - Qualitative
- Discussion of results – round table what is behind the answers. What can be done?
Background for survey

- New directive (2006/88EC) adopted in 2006
- Much more complex than the old!
- Problems with implementation foreseen
- Mini-workshop at the AM for fish NRLs revealed delays and frustrations...
Group behind the survey

- OIE Collaborating Center on Epidemiology and Risk Assessment of Aquatic Animal Diseases
  (Britt Bang Jensen & Edgar Brun)
- EU ref lab for Fish Diseases
  (Niels Jørgen Olesen)
- EU ref lab for Mollusc Diseases
  (Isabelle Arzul)
- EU ref lab for Crustacean Diseases
  (Grant D Stentiford)
Intentions of The New Directive

- More focus on prevention than control/eradication
- More flexibility
  - New/exotic diseases
  - New production
- Modern, cost-effective surveillance
The New Directive

- Registration and authorisation of enterprises
  - Early warning system
  - Detection of increased mortalities

- Risk based surveillance
  - Listed diseases

- Based on OIE guidelines & SPS agreement
  - Minimum requirements
  - Transparency

- What is the status of implementation?

- Which problems have been incurred?
  - Expected
  - Unexpected

- Have the intentions of the directive been fullfilled?

- Questionnaire
  - 10 multiple choice questions, with follow-up questions
    - Part A on establishment of registers
    - Part B on risk-ranking and contingency plans
  - 1 open question on overall opinion

- Sent to all member states + candidate countries + other countries within Europe = 34 in total

- Relatively short response time given

Part A: Registers

- From Directive:
  - Member States shall establish, keep up to date and make publicly available a register of Aquaculture Production Businesses (APBs) and authorised processing establishments.
  - Member States shall establish an Internet based information page with the register (Decision 2008/392/EC)
  - To be completed by **July 31 2009**...
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

Question: Have your country established an Internet-based information page on...

1. Aquaculture production businesses keeping fish?
2. Aquaculture production businesses keeping molluscs?
3. Aquaculture production businesses keeping crustaceans?
4. Authorized processing establishments slaughtering aquaculture animals for disease control purposes?

No. of replies

Yes
No
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

Reasons for not establishing internet-based registers:

- It is still being worked on
- Difficulties obtaining data
- Difficulties harmonising different registers / different authorities
- Has not been prioritised....

- Part B: Risk-ranking of farms
- From Directive: All APBs must be placed into one of five health-status categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Health status</th>
<th>Import from:</th>
<th>Export to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Disease free</td>
<td>Only I</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Surveillance programme</td>
<td>Only I</td>
<td>III and V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>I, II and III</td>
<td>III and V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Eradication programme</td>
<td>Only I</td>
<td>Only V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Infected</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Only V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

Regarding placing all aquaculture production businesses in the five risk-categories, have your country finished this for:

5.a. Fish farms?
5.b. Mollusc farms?
5.c. Crustacean farms?

No. of replies 0 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20

25.05.2011
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

Reasons for not risk-ranking APBs:

- It is still being worked on
- Delayed, because the registration is not finished
- More complex than imagined

Part B: Risk-based surveillance scheme

- From Directive (art.10):
  1. Risk-based surveillance on all APBs
  2. Purpose of §1. is to demonstrate:
     a. Increased mortality
     b. Listed diseases

- Surveillance scheme and frequency of visits based on the risk-ranking and the health category
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

Part B: Risk-based surveillance scheme

“Have your country drawn up and approved such a scheme?”

“If yes, when will it commence?”

- 2008:2
- 2009:2
- 2010:2
- 2011:6
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

Part B: Risk-based surveillance scheme

Reasons for not having drawn up a surveillance scheme:

- Delayed because of delays in risk-ranking and health categorising
- Decided to treat all farms similarly
- Not prioritised...

![Bar chart showing responses to why a surveillance scheme was not drawn up.](chart.png)

Part B: Health categorisation

- Category III: Undetermined status
- Not known to be infected, but not subject to a programme for achieving disease-free status

Intention behind this:
- Transition status, until a programme has been set up or disease-status determined
- Not desirable to have farms in this category
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

For which diseases have your country placed farms in category III (undetermined status)?

No. of replies:

- SVC: 8
- VHS: 16
- IHN: 14
- KHV: 18
- ISA: 4
- Martella refringens: 4
- Bonamia ostreae: 4
- White spot disease: 14
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

“Have your country applied for approval of any surveillance programmes for achieving disease-free status for farms that are now in category III?”

- Yes: 4 (for VHS/IHN/KHV)  No: 21

Reasons why not:
- It is not economically feasible (6 resp)
- Working on it (4 resp)
- Not relevant (4 resp)
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

- “Have your country applied for approval of any surveillance programmes for achieving disease-free status for farms that are now in category V (Known to be infected)?”
  - Yes: 2 (for VHS/IHN) No: 23

- Reasons why not:
  - It is not economically feasible (4 resp)
  - Is being considered (2 resp)
  - Not relevant (8 resp)
  - Is impossible to become free of *B. ostrae* (3 resp)

- Part B: Contingency plans
- From Directive: Plan to ensure awareness and preparedness for exotic and emerging diseases
- Shall be submitted to and approved by the EU
- Shall be updated every 5 years
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

- Part B: Contingency plans
- "Have your country drawn up and submitted a contingency plan regarding handling of emerging and exotic diseases?"

- None has been approved...

25.05.2011
Survey on the Implementation of The New Directive - Results

Part B: Contingency plans

- Reasons for not drawing up a plan:
  - Under preparation (14 resp)
  - Too expensive (1 resp)
  - Not relevant (1 resp)
  - Not prioritised (1 resp)

- Should have been in place in 2008

Part C: General comments

- Implementation has put a heavy workload on those responsible
- Some governments do not prioritize aquaculture
- The industry is complex, and have many APBs
- It is especially challenging regarding small enterprises and ponds
- Because of this, it might be preferable to be in category III

Part C: General comments

- Calling for guidelines on:
  - Creating zones and compartments
  - Official opinion on the closing of an outbreak
  - What to do about sampling? (The old directive is repealed)
  - Decision on Diagnostic manual – when?

- Useful guidelines for risk-ranking
The end
Extra slides for the discussion

How many fish do you see?
What are the ”advantages” of listing a disease?

- Eksample: OsHV-1 μvar
- Not listed
- Regulation on testing, movement etc...
Requirements for listing:

- Exotic diseases:
  - Is exotic

  And

  - Has potential for significant economic impact

  Or

  - Has potential for detrimental environmental impact
Requirements for listing:

- Non-exotic:
  - Several regions are free
  - Is difficult to control
  - But may be controlled
  - Risk of spread
  - Reliable and simple tests are available

  And
  
  - Has potential for significant economic impact

  Or
  
  - Has potential for detrimental environmental impact
Listed diseases:

- **Fish:**
  - Listed exotic diseases: EHN and EUS
  - Listed non-exotic diseases: (SVC), VHS, IHN, KHV and ISA

- **Molluscs:**
  - Exotic: Bonamiosa excitosa, Perkinsosis & Microcytosis
  - Non-exotic: Marteiliosis, Bonamiosa ostrae

- **Crustaceans:**
  - Exotic: Taura-syndrome & Yellowhead
  - Non-exotic: Whitespot
Disease notification

- Early warning system
  - Notification to Competent authority
    - Suspicion and confirmation of listed diseases
    - Increased mortalities
    - Obligation to notify: any person with a relationship with the aquatic animals
  - Notification internationally via Animal Disease Notification System (Decision 2008/650/EC)
    - Confirmation of listed diseases
Contingency planning
- exotic and emerging diseases

- Legal powers to effect a rapid and successful eradication campaign
- Access to emergency funds
- Cooperation mechanism with environmental and fisheries authorities
- Adequate personnel, equipment and laboratory capacity
- Updated operation manual describing measures to be applied
- Plans for emergency vaccination
- Identification of sites for the treatment or disposal of animal carcasses.
4 pathways to achieve disease freedom

1. None of the species susceptible to the disease is present in the area – refer to list of susceptible species...

2. The pathogen is known not to be able to survive in the area

3. Based on historical grounds

4. Based on targeted surveillance
Disease freedom
Historical grounds

- Susceptible species are present, but disease has not been detected in previous 10 years and:
  - Basic biosecurity measures has been in place for that period
    - Mandatory reporting
    - System for early detection (further specified)
  - No known infection in wild population
  - Conditions to prevent introduction is effective
Disease freedom:
Targeted surveillance (art. 44)

- A MS that is not known to be infected, but not declared free (cat. III), can present a programme for surveillance and eradication for approval.

- A MS that is known to be infected, can present a programme for eradication for approval (cat. IV).

- Requirements for programmes (art. 45):
  - Description of the epidemiological situation
  - Cost-benefit analysis
  - Expected duration and objectives
  - Description of area
Part B: Risk-ranking of farms

- From Directive: All APBs must be evaluated according to their risk of contracting and spreading disease, and then placed into one of three risk-categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood of contraction</th>
<th>Likelihood of spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk level of farms Guidelines 2008/896/EC

- Step I: likelihood of contracting disease:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Via water/proximity to other farms</th>
<th>Movement of animals</th>
<th>Level of risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk level of farms Guidelines 2008/896/EC

Step II: likelihood of spreading disease:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Via water/proximity to other farms</th>
<th>Movement of animals</th>
<th>Level of risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good intentions.....
OIE Collaborating Center on Epidemiology and Risk Assessment of Aquatic Animal Diseases

www.eraaad.org