



11/12/2013

SCRPD

Report of the first meeting of the Special Committee for Research and Program Development

Frascati, Italy 12 – 14 November 2013 | EuFMD)



**Report of the first meeting of the
Special Committee for Research and Program Development
(SCRPD)**

Frascati, Italy

12 – 14 November 2013

Contents

Summary	3
Recommendations	4
Introduction	6
Programme of the meeting.....	6
Plenary sessions	7
Pillar 1	7
Recommendations and actions points.....	8
Pillar 2	9
Recommendations and actions points.....	9
Pillar 3	10
Recommendations and actions points.....	10
- Identify and develop suitable training courses for local delivery. Action: Secretariat/Pirbright.....	10
Working groups.....	11
Appendix 1: Findings and recommendations of the working groups	13
1. Wild Boar	13
2. Laboratory networking	13
3. Modelling-policy interface.....	14
4. On monitoring the implementation and outcome of PCP	16
5. Bio-containment group	16
Appendix 2: SCRPD members associated with each component.....	17
Appendix 3: Meeting participants.....	18
Appendix 4: Agenda	19
Appendix 5 Presentations	22

Summary

A meeting of the EuFMD Special Committee for Research and Program Development was held in Frascati, Italy, on 12-14 November 2014. The objectives of the meeting were:

- To inform the SCRPD about the new EuFMD strategic plan and the related component-based work program.
- To hold discussions on the key areas of the EuFMD work program and to elicit expert opinion and feedback from the SCRPD, and from other invited attendees at the meeting, to support the Secretariat in improving the strategic planning and implementation of the work program.
- To agree ad hoc working groups for specific areas of the program as needed.

The components of the EuFMD work program were discussed and specific technical issues were the focus of dedicated workshop or working group sessions. A series of recommendations were made relating to specific components of the EuFMD program, giving guidance to the Secretariat on implementation of the program and providing feedback to the EuFMD Standing Technical Committee on key areas for further research and program development.

Recommendations

1. Real Time Training: the Secretariat should explore how to use the real time courses as opportunities for advocacy with European opinion formers such as MEPs, industry leaders and those from DG-Research and Innovation, in the same way that the Australian DAFF have sent Australian opinion formers on EuFMD real-time courses in Nepal. **Action: Secretariat**
2. Modelling/decision support tools
 - a. It is recommended developing a position paper for the Standing Technical Committee (STC) on the potential to develop ‘all-Europe’ FMD spread modelling based on all-Europe animal movements and demographic data. The aim of this paper is to better identify how such a model could estimate the consequences of introduction of FMDV in time and places around Europe, and consider mapping of vaccination and non-vaccination zones, the number of countries likely to be directly affected, etc. **Action: SCRPD modelling subgroup.**
 - b. There will be an AHVLA modelling workshop in the UK in February 2014. This could be an opportunity for some of the EuFMD team to discuss with leading modellers how to develop a European modelling network. **Action: Secretariat.**
 - c. A mapping exercise should be carried out for the use of disease spread models in Europe. This could be assessed in the context of the “Five stages to modelling maturity” proposed by the working group. **Action: Secretariat.**
 - d. The STC could consider options identified by a working group for better networks between users and developers of models, a so-called ‘European policy-modelling interface group’. **Action: STC, SCRPD modelling subgroup, Secretariat.**
3. Develop guidelines/protocols for safe transport of FMD virus and RNA. **Action: SCRPD biocontainment subgroup.**
4. Summarise progress to date and gaps on wild boar and wildlife non-invasive surveillance. **Action: SCRPD wild boar/wildlife subgroup.**
5. Develop a “frequently-asked questions” section on the EuFMD website on FMD control issues. **Action: SCRPD pillar 1 group/Secretariat.**
6. The WG on monitoring PCP programmes presented conclusions which will form the basis of further discussions; it is recommended that these discussions be continued and a draft document on how best to further develop PCP program monitoring be developed. **Action: SCRPD subgroup on PCP monitoring.**
7. Post vaccination monitoring (PVM)

- a. A PVM guideline document should be rolled out when the OIE/FAO Guidelines have been finalised. **Action: OIE/FAO/EuFMD FMD subgroup on PVM**
 - b. An E-learning module on PVM should be developed, following the release of the PVM guidance document; EuFMD should consider the feasibility of such a module under the EuFMD programme, for example in Component 3.2; **Action: Secretariat**
 - c. Serious consideration should be given to establish a system whereby a match between serological diagnostic kits and commercial vaccines would be agreed between reference laboratories, diagnostic kit suppliers and vaccine suppliers to progress the use of PVM in a way that provides results accepted by all parties.
Action: SCRPD reference laboratory members, Secretariat.
- 8. The WG on monitoring PCP programmes presented conclusions which will form the basis of further discussions; it is recommended that these discussions be continued and a draft document on how best to further develop PCP program monitoring be developed. **Action: SCRPD subgroup on PCP monitoring.**
 - Focus of a monitoring programme for countries in stage 2 should be on processes.
 - Focus of a monitoring programme for countries in stages 3-5 should be on outcome of the control measures. For recognition of a certain status by the OIE, a country has to fulfil their requirements.

Introduction

The SCRPD was established following a recommendation of the 40th EuFMD General Session (Rome, 2013). The SCRPD comprises 15 experts nominated at the 40th General Session based on their specific areas of expertise which relate to the EuFMD strategic plan, plus one expert in an *ex-officio* capacity from each of the three FAO FMD Reference Centres in Europe (Pirbright Institute, CODA-CERVA-VAR, IZSLER Brescia). Functions of the SCRPD are to provide:

1. Scientific and technical assessment of regular reports, specific evaluations of programmes or projects that are funded or supported by the Commission;
2. Scientific and technical assessment of proposals for research put forward for funding or support by the Commission;
3. Specific guidance relating to their expertise and the needs of the EuFMD programme, including considering scientific and technical issues suggested by the Executive, Standing Committee or others.

The SCRPD was organized along the 3 Pillars of the EuFMD programme, with one subgroup of experts per Pillar for efficiency (Annex 1 members of SCRPD).

The participants are listed in **Appendix 3**.

Programme of the meeting

The programme on day 1 of the meeting focused on Pillar 1 ‘Improving preparedness for FMD emergencies in member states’; on Day 2 on Pillar 2 ‘Reducing risk from the European neighbourhood’; on Day 3 on Pillar 3 ‘Promoting the Global FMD Control Strategy’. The agenda of the meeting is shown in Annex 2.

Plenary sessions

Pillar 1

The session started with two talks on training programs, the EuFMD real-time training (ER) and the EU-funded Better Training for Safer Food program (SM). Key points from the discussions included the importance of clearly identifying the competencies to be acquired (or the learning objectives), the benefits of cascade training, and the value of conducting pre- and post-course knowledge assessments. The benefits of developing a section on frequently-asked questions for FMD issues were discussed, and it was agreed that these should be developed and put online. The need for tailored courses to address specific issues (such as biogas plants in an FMD surveillance zone) was highlighted; this can be further explored by the Secretariat in cooperation with the relevant members of the SCRPD and demand from member states can be assessed by asking the training focal points. The group also noted the need to identify any potential overlaps between the BTSF program (which covers primarily the EU) and the EuFMD training program (which covers 37 member states), and also to determine whether there are gaps not yet covered by either program.

The research project on wild boar, funded by the EuFMD research fund, was described (TA). During the discussion, it was mentioned that FMD has been reported in wild boar in Iran, and that in Israel wild boar in the north often share watering holes with cattle. Wild boar movement across the Bosphorus has been caused in the past by environmental disruption, confirming the finding from the EuFMD project that wild boar can cross bodies of water such as the Danube. The group concluded that the data collected thus far from the research activities should be summarised in a report.

The research program of FAZD was presented (TB) and several areas of alignment with the EuFMD program were highlighted. A key point was the value of using “negative data” as inputs in surveillance programs, and also the related point of the utility of scanning/syndromic surveillance programs. Other issues of alignment included biocontainment standards and training, and the utility of novel data capture methods using hand-held devices and apps.

The state of the art of modelling disease spread in FMD-free countries was presented (MW), and the discussion centred around how best to enable policy/decision-makers to make use of these models. Issues included the need to communicate uncertainty effectively, how to make use of TRACES data, and the need to account for the importance of hubs in disease spread.

Recommendations and actions points

- Real Time Training: the Secretariat should explore how to use the real time courses as opportunities for advocacy with European opinion formers such as MEPs, industry leaders and those from DG-Research and Innovation, in the same way that the Australian DAFF have sent Australian opinion formers on EuFMD real-time courses in Nepal. **Action: Secretariat**
- Modelling/decision support tools
 - It is recommended developing a position paper for the Standing Technical Committee (STC) on the potential to develop ‘all-Europe’ FMD spread modelling based on all-Europe animal movements and demographic data. The aim of this paper is to better identify how such a model could estimate the consequences of introduction of FMDV in time and places around Europe, and consider mapping of vaccination and non-vaccination zones, the number of countries likely to be directly affected, etc. **Action: SCRDP modelling subgroup.**
 - There will be an AHVLA modelling workshop in the UK in February 2014. This could be an opportunity for some of the EuFMD team to discuss with leading modellers how to develop a European modelling network. **Action: Secretariat.**
 - A mapping exercise should be carried out for the use of disease spread models in Europe. This could be assessed in the context of the “Five stages to modelling maturity” proposed by the working group. **Action: Secretariat.**
 - The STC could consider options identified by a working group for better networks between users and developers of models, a so-called ‘European policy-modelling interface group’. **Action: STC, SCRDP modelling subgroup, Secretariat.**
- Develop guidelines/protocols for safe transport of FMD virus and RNA. **Action: SCRDP biocontainment subgroup.**
- Summarise progress to date and gaps on wild boar and wildlife non-invasive surveillance. **Action: SCRDP wild boar/wildlife subgroup.**
- Develop a “frequently-asked questions” section on the EuFMD website on FMD control issues. **Action: SCRDP pillar 1 group/Secretariat.**

Pillar 2

The session started with a summary of the lessons learnt from the West Eurasia PCP Roadmap and developing risk based strategic plans (MM), with discussion focussed around the need to strengthen management capacity. This was followed by the lessons learnt from supporting the creation of a laboratory network in Iran (LBK). The importance of establishing specific rules and roles for the component labs was highlighted, and the relevance of the lab network paradigm for other EuFMD program areas such as the West Balkans was noted.

The work on post-vaccination monitoring and vaccine effectiveness studies was described (DP), and the discussion covered issues including methods for outcome monitoring, the need for antigen matching within the serological tests used, and the fact that antibody levels do not fully correlate with protection.

The session was followed up with workshops on risk-based strategic plans for Turkey, Israel and global PCP monitoring, with the objective of familiarising SCRPD members with the processes involved in EuFMD missions in support of countries wishing to develop their own risk-based strategic plans. Specific topics covered included value chain analysis, identifying risk hotspots, and developing monitoring and evaluation modalities.

Recommendations and actions points

➤ Post vaccination monitoring (PVM)

- A PVM guidance document should be rolled out when the OIE/FAO Guidelines have been finalised. **Action: OIE/FAO/EuFMD FMD subgroup on PVM**
- An E-learning module on PVM should be developed, following the release of the PVM guidance document; EuFMD should consider the feasibility of such a module under the EuFMD programme, for example in Component 3.2; **Action: Secretariat**
- Serious consideration should be given to establish a system whereby a match between serological diagnostic kits and commercial vaccines would be agreed between reference laboratories, diagnostic kit suppliers and vaccine suppliers to progress the use of PVM in a way that provides results accepted by all parties. **Action: SCRPD reference laboratory members, Secretariat.**

Pillar 3

The work of the global FMD working group was described (GF). The discussion included the issue of countries submitting dossiers to OIE for FMD plan recognition without having been properly assessed as being at PCP stage 3. This relates to the broader point of the need to work out assessment procedures, which the global FMD working group is discussing. The work of the WRL in relation to regional networks was described (VM), and the discussion included issues such as support to individual laboratories, sample transport and biocontainment, and the role of WRL within the new FAO/OIE global laboratory network as the global coordinating laboratory.

Recommendations and actions points

- The WG on monitoring PCP programmes presented conclusions which will form the basis of further discussions; it is recommended that these discussions be continued and a draft document on how best to further develop PCP program monitoring be developed. **Action: SCRPD subgroup on PCP monitoring.**
 - Focus of a monitoring programme for countries in stage 2 should be on processes.
 - Focus of a monitoring programme for countries in stages 3-5 should be on outcome of the control measures. For recognition of a certain status by the OIE, a country has to fulfil their requirements.
- The WG elaborated a vision for coordinated effort between European and external laboratories to support the capacity for and reporting of FMD threats emerging on the borders of Europe.
 - Developing a plan and joint working practises. **Action: Secretariat/Pirbright**
 - Identify and develop suitable training courses for local delivery. **Action: Secretariat/Pirbright.**

Working groups

During the meeting, a number of ad-hoc working groups were convened and discussed specific areas of the EuFMD program with a view towards evaluating the current status of EuFMD workplan components, identifying options for further work, and recommending follow up actions to the Secretariat.

Working groups were convened on wild boar; on laboratory networking; on modelling-policy interface; on PCP monitoring; and on biocontainment.

- Wild boar WG. The results of the EuFMD-funded wild boar study in Bulgaria and Turkey were discussed. This study has been finished in 2013, and during the STC meeting in Lyon on 16th of October, it was suggested a follow up was desired, but that more information was needed before a decision could be made. The discussion in this WG could provide useful recommendations with respect to the data needed for a follow-up could be submitted.
- Laboratory networking WG. The group discussed the role of the WRL and their tasks as global coordinating laboratory, in relation to European laboratory partners. The vision elaborated was to coordinate effort between European and external laboratories to support the capacity for and reporting of FMD threats emerging on the borders of Europe. The mission is to fill the gaps in early warning for emergence of new FMDV strains in the neighbourhood of Europe and specifically related to threats from Africa and Near Asia. The proposed arrangements are that WRLFMD would benefit from support of other EuFMD Laboratory partners in developing links with laboratories in different African and Asian countries for building capacity and filling surveillance gaps. WRLFMD will therefore coordinate a joint effort of service provision in agreement with the EuFMD Secretariat. Key workplan components would include:
 - Training of epidemiologists and laboratory personnel based in primary endemic countries
 - Provision of diagnostic kits to support diagnosis and selection of referral samples
 - Support for sample shipment to reference laboratories
 - Analysis of submitted samples and collation and interpretation of findings

Contacts for European labs were identified as : ANSES – Senegal, Nigeria, Benin, Ghana, Mali, Mauretania; CODA – Nigeria; IZSLER – Libya; Lindholm – Uganda and Kenya; Pirbright – Tanzania, Ethiopia, Egypt, others to varying extents. The activities to initiate this were discussed (develop an action plan, training courses, review sample shipment methods) and the criteria for support were stated (openness, important livestock populations, access to cases, regional contacts and credibility). This system of laboratory networking is relevant to pillar 3 (global support) but it also

cross-cutting to pillars 1 (support to member states, in particular with regard to the Western Balkans) and 2 of the EuFMD program.

- Modelling-policy interface WG. The group discussed how best to develop a program for support to decision/policy-makers so that they can benefit from the use of disease spread models and decision support tools. Learning objectives and formats for workshops and e-learning were discussed, and ways for the Secretariat to benefit from the input of the working group when designing training activities. The concept of “five stages of modelling maturity” was developed, using the PCP idea to assess how countries use modelling. This relates to component 1.1/1.2 of the EuFMD program.
- Monitoring PCP WG. The discussion focused on the development of a programme to monitor the implementation and outcomes of a PCP in a country. The aim of this monitoring programme is to determine the extent to which control measures and other activities result in a reduction of FMD related problems and/or spread of the virus. This relates to component 3.2 of the EuFMD program.
- Bio-containment group WG: the aim was to identify what needs to be done with respect to safe sample transport for samples containing FMD virus or RNA, with a view towards developing evidence-based guidelines which may lead to more risk-appropriate and cost-effective ways to transport samples.. This is a cross-cutting element relating to many components of the EuFMD work program, in particular components 1.4 (Balkans), 2.1 (Turkey and Georgia), 2.2 (Neighbourhood of Israel and Cyprus) and 3.3 (Global lab network).

Appendix 1: Findings and recommendations of the working groups

1. Wild Boar

- The optimum frequency of non-invasive sampling should be estimated, based on analysis of existing data and using data from more research if necessary.
- Virus survival in baits in different weather conditions should be evaluated.
- The following issues should be studied to inform NI surveillance systems:
 - Role of the WB population density
 - Studying the movements of each single tracked WB and its home range analysis
 - Interactions between different WB social groups
 - Interaction between wildlife population and livestock
 - Monitoring FMD antibody titers in wildlife
- Training courses on wildlife management and FMD signs for farmers, hunters, veterinarians are needed
- More investigations to define the nature of FMD-like lesions in wildlife are needed, based on field and experimental studies.

An EuFMD ad hoc group for wild life diseases should be created to design and review studies on NI surveillance and wild boar/wildlife ecology/interactions, perform statistical analyses on the data already collected on wild boar tracking and ecology, and publish all results.

2. Laboratory networking

Collaboration should be promoted in international surveillance between European FMD laboratories, with the following vision, mission and working arrangements that support the EuFMD member states and the global GF-TADS Strategy:

- Vision: Coordinated effort between European and external laboratories to support the capacity for and reporting of FMD threats emerging on the borders of Europe.
- Mission: To fill the gaps in early warning for emergence of new FMDV strains in the neighbourhood of Europe and specifically related to threats from Africa and Near Asia. This requires information on FMD dynamics and on the nature of viruses from primary endemic foci.
- Proposed arrangement: WRLFMD would benefit from support of other EuFMD Laboratory partners in developing links with laboratories in different African and Asian countries for building capacity and filling surveillance gaps, and so will therefore coordinate a joint effort of service provision in agreement with the EuFMD Secretariat.

Key workplan components should be

- a) Training of epidemiologists and laboratory personnel based in primary endemic countries.
- b) Provision of diagnostic kits to support diagnosis and selection of referral samples.
- c) Support for sample shipment to reference laboratories.
- d) Analysis of submitted samples and collation and interpretation of findings.

Activities should include:

- a) Developing a plan and joint working practises.
- b) Identifying and develop suitable training courses for local delivery
- c) Collection, testing and submission of samples, laboratory management principles
- d) PCP awareness, epidemiology principles, monitoring for infection, PVM
- e) Review sample shipment methods and make recommendations

Regarding the criteria for targeting of provision to veterinary services in primary endemic countries, with focus on Pools 3, 4 and 5, it is recommended that the following factors are included in the evaluation of labs to receive support:

- a) Openness and willing to share information and samples
- b) Important livestock populations
- c) Access to cases
- d) Available and dedicated individuals
- e) A certain level of existing capability
- f) Support for national competent authority
- g) Regional contacts and credibility

In addition to the above there is also a need for an expert to assist with establishing arrangements for effective national and/or cross-border laboratory service provision in the Balkan region (Component 1.4 of the EuFMD Workplan).

3. Modelling-policy interface

This WG had the following recommendation:

- Recognising the need for veterinary service personnel to be able to communicate with modellers to ensure that modellers understand the needs of policy and decision makers, and the potential that modelling can bring to the work of the veterinary service (VS).

Next steps are:

- a) Build on this initial work by training staff in MS to fulfil the Modelling Intelligent Customer Function (ICF) role using the work commissioned of the modellers and turning this into e-learning support.

- b) Undertake a mapping exercise to find out availability of models for FMD among MS: to give EuFMD and MS a picture of:
- a. Which countries are currently using models?
 - b. What is their current use and model type?
 - c. What policy questions can they answer?
 - d. What data and assumptions do they use?
 - e. What sorts of questions do countries want to use modelling to help support?
 - f. What data is held at a population and movement level?
 - g. (This could be done by contacting universities and asking any of those interested to complete the attached template which will describe the basis of how each model works, the sort of data it needs and the sort of questions that it can help to answer- blank template attached along with example one completed for the UK Exodis model).
- c) A similar approach to the PCP could be used to help MS progress along the path of using models:
- i. Step 1-understanding data needs, identify, create or enhancing data collection in the MS to allow modelling to be used (population and movement data)
 - ii. Step 2 Geo-referenced Risk factor data (markets, abattoirs, disposal sites, throughputs, seasonal movements)
 - iii. Step 3 use of models to build different disease outbreak scenarios
 - iv. Step 4 Use of scenarios to support contingency planning/alternative control strategies and use in exercises
 - v. Step 5 Ready to use models in an emergency
- (c) Develop the European ‘FMD modelling network’ by participation in events such as the AHVLA modelling workshop (5th February 2014). The WS is entitled: ‘getting the message across: modelling in emergencies’. The workshop’s aim is to bring together mathematical modellers and policy makers to discuss how to disseminate, often complex, modelling outputs to a wide and varied audience, including policy makers, industry and the general public, and will discuss examples from animal, aquatic, plant and human health emergencies.
- The network could also share opinions/outcomes of previous events (2013 WS looked at the influence of human behaviour, economics and politics on the validity, credibility and reliability of scientific models) (

<http://veterinaryrecord.bmjjournals.com/content/172/17/438.extract?etc>).

4. On monitoring the implementation and outcome of PCP

The following recommendations were made:

- Focus of a monitoring programme for countries in stage 2 should be on processes.
- Focus of a monitoring programme for countries in stages 3-5 should be on outcome of the control measures. For recognition of a certain status by the OIE, a country has to fulfil their requirements. Outcome measures should be endorsed by OIE. A separate monitoring programme for EuFMD is not needed.

5. Bio-containment group

It was recommended to provide protocols for safe sample transport to laboratories.

Appendix 2: SCRPD members associated with each component

Topic	Component	Manager	Member of SCRPD associated with component
Training	1.1/1.2	Clare Taylor Wild	Kate Sharpe
THRACE	1.3	Fabrizio Rosso	Tsviatko Alexandrow
Balkans	1.4	Iulia Turiac	Sten Mortensen
Research Fund	1.5	Keith Sumption	David Paton
Emergency	1.6	Keith Sumption	N/A
PTS	1.7	Eoin Ryan	N/A
West Eurasia/WELNET	2.1	Melissa McLaws	Naci Bulut
Israel/Cyprus/Egypt/EARLN	2.2	Eoin Ryan/Kees van Maanen	Michel Bellaiche
REMESA (Resolab)	2.3	Fabrizio Rosso	Gregorio Torres, Stephan Zientara
Global Monitoring	3.1	Keith Sumption	Katharina Staerk
PCP (PVM)	3.2	Chris Bartels	Ron Bergevoet, Giancarlo Ferrari
Global Lab Network	3.3	Eoin Ryan	Lab sub-group

Appendix 3: Meeting participants

First name	Surname	Email	Affiliation	Status
Tammy	Beckham	TBeckham@tvmdl.tamu.edu	US	Observer
Tsviatko	Alexandrov	tsv.alexandrov@yahoo.com	BG	SCRPD
Labib	Bakkali	labib.bakkali-kassimi@anses.fr	FR	SCRPD
Michel	Bellaiche	michelb@moag.gov.il	Israel	SCRPD
Ron	Bergevoet	ron.bergevoet@wur.nl	NL	SCRPD
Keith	Biggers	kbiggers@fvmdl.tamu.edu	US	Observer
Anne Marie	Bouma	annemarie.bouma@fao.org	EuFMD	Secretariat
Emiliana	Brocchi	emiliana.brocchi@izsler.it	IT	SCRPD
Naci	Bulut	nacib@sap.gov.tr	BG	SCRPD
Kris	De Clercq	kris.declercq@coda-cerva.be	BE	SCRPD
Giancarlo	Ferrari	giancarlo.ferrari@izslt.it	IT	SCRPD
Bernd	Haas	Bernd.Haas@fli.bund.de	DE	SCRPD
Lindsey	Holmstrom	tholmstrom@fvmdl.tamu.edu	US	Observer
Jenny	Maud	jmaud@rvc.ac.uk	UK	Observer
Melissa	Mc Laws	melissa.mcLaws@fao.org	EuFMD	Secretariat
Alessia	Menegotto	alessia.menegotto@fao.org	FAO	Observer
Valerie	Mioulet	valerie.mioulet@pirbright.ac.uk	UK	Ex-officio SCRPD
Sten	Mortensen	stm@fvst.dk	DK	SCRPD
David	Paton	david.paton@pirbright.ac.uk	UK	STC
Nadia	Rumich	nadia.rumich@fao.org	EuFMD	Secretariat
Eoin	Ryan	Eoin.ryan@fao.org	EuFMD	Secretariat
Kate	Sharpe	Kate.Sharpe@ahvla.gsi.gov.uk	UK	SCRPD
Katharina	Staerk	katharina.staerk@safoso.ch	CH	SCRPD
Keith	Sumption	Keith.sumption@fao.org	EuFMD	Secretariat
Clare	Taylor	Clare.TaylorWild@fao.org	EuFMD	Secretariat
Gregorio	Torres	gitorresp@magrama.es	ES	SCRPD
Iulia	Turiac	iulia.turiac@fao.org	EuFMD	Secretariat
Jean-Francois	Valarcher	jf.valarcher@sva.se	SV	SCRPD
Marleen	Werkman	M.Werkman@warwick.ac.uk	UK	Observer
Stephan	Zientara	szientara@vet-alfort.fr	FR	SCRPD

Appendix 4: Agenda

Time	Item	Day 1 Pillar 1 : Improving preparedness for FMD emergencies in member states	Presenter/Comments
Objectives:			
Review EuFMD program plans after discussion on what has been learnt in European preparedness exercises in past two years			
Identify further ways to increase value to Member States			
Identify difficult technical areas for Member States which may need future training or further technical work			
09.00-10.30		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learnt from Real Time Training • Lessons learnt from Better Training for Safer Food (contingency planning and animal disease control) • Progress on the wild boar surveillance work • Progress in application of risk based surveillance (TRACE) for confidence in freedom • Research program of FAZD (US) on FMD • FMD modelling 	Eoin Ryan Sten Mortensen Tsviatko Alexandrov Eoin Ryan Tammy Beckham (FAZD) Marleen Werkman (Warwick)
10.30-11.00		Coffee	
11.00-13.00		Discussion (including preparation for Group work pm)	
13.00-14.00		Lunch	
14.00-16.00		Group work: Group 1 Group 2 Group 3 : Suggestion for a programme to monitor the progress of control programmes (to be presented on Day 3)	
16.00-17.00		Feedback to be prepared for Day 2 (summary of Day 1) and Day 3 (Recommended way ahead)	

Time	Item	Day 2 Pillar 2 : Reducing risk from the European neighbourhood	Presenter/Comments
Objectives:			
<p>Review EuFMD program plans after discussion on what has been learnt in past two years</p> <p>Identify further ways to increase value and impact and co-ordination with partners</p> <p>Identify difficult technical areas for MS/VS involved which may need future training or further technical work</p>			
09.00-09.15 <i>Start with feedback from Day 1 for those joining on Day 2</i>			
09.15-11.00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learnt from West Eurasia Roadmap/PCP application + development of Risk Based Strategic Plans (RBSP) for Turkey • What we have learnt on principles for establishing lab networks: example of Iran (and France) • Introducing the Post-Vaccination Monitoring (PVM) Framework • Progress on vaccine effectiveness studies: what have we learnt for its future application? • Progress in modeling FMD control in endemic countries : update from work with Turkey 	Melissa McLaws Labib Bakkali David Paton David Paton Marleen Werkman
11.00-11.30	Coffee break		
11.30-13.00	Discussion and preparation afternoon session		
13.00	Lunch		
14.00-16.00		Group work: to be decided Group Exercise: PCP exercise on the assessment of impact of FMD (moving from problem identification to impact and acceptability of solutions) Follow-up to Exercise with specific groups – for example looking at the technical difficult parts of the PCP where training should focus, or technical on methodologies/guidance should focus (e.g. modeling):	Melissa McLaws
16.00-17.00	Feedback to be prepared for Day 3		Melissa McLaws

Time	Item	Day 3 Pillar 3 Promoting the Global FMD Control Strategy	Presenter/Comments
Objectives:			
Review EuFMD Pillar 3 program plans after discussion on what has been learnt in past 2 years			
Identify further ways to increase value and impact and co-ordination with partners			
Identify difficult technical areas which may need future training or further technical work			
Component 3.1: Monitoring progress			
Component 3.2 : support PCP development and roll out			
Component 3.3: support global laboratory services to the Strategy			
9.00-09.15		<i>Start with feedback from Day 2</i>	
9.15-10.00		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAO: Work of the Global FMD Working Group Secretariat and view of the WG on support needed On laboratory services, information flow and information access: Work of the WRL in relation to regional networks 	Giancarlo Ferrari Valérie Mioulet
10.00-10.30		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On monitoring progress of regional /global health initiatives: perspective on monitoring programmes: what indicators matter? 	Rapporteur Group 3
10.30-11.00		Coffee break	
11.00-12.00		Group work focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - global monitoring programmes - vaccine selection 	
12.00-12.30		Feedback from Group work, Discussion on Pillar 3	Rapporteur Group 3
12.30		<i>Lunch break</i>	
Time	Item	Day 3 Pillar 3 The way ahead	Presenter/Comments
13.30		Feedback from Rapporteurs on Pillars 1 to 3.	
15.30		Action Plan, future meetings; Open Session 2014: Dubrovnik	
16.00		Closure of meeting	

Appendix 5 Presentations

Presentations

- Welcome and Introduction about EuFMD (**Keith Sumption**)
- Lessons learnt from Real Time Training (**Eoin Ryan**)
- Lessons learnt from Better Training for Safer Food (contingency planning and animal disease control) (**Sten Mortensen**)
- Progress on the wild boar surveillance work (**Tsviatko Alexandrov**)
- Progress in application of risk based surveillance (THRACE) for confidence in freedom (**Eoin Ryan**)
- Research program of FAZD (US) on FMD (**Tammy Beckham**)
- Developments in FMD-free countries (**Marleen Werkman**)
- Lessons learnt from West Eurasia Roadmap/PCP application + development of Risk Based Strategic Plans (RBSP) for Turkey (**Melissa McLaws**)
- What we have learnt on principles for establishing lab networks: example of Iran (and France) (**Labib Bakkali**)
- Introducing the Post-Vaccination Monitoring (PVM) Framework (**David Paton**)
- Progress on vaccine effectiveness studies: what have we learnt for its future application? (**David Paton**)
- Progress in modeling FMD control in endemic countries : update from work with Turkey (**Marleen Werkman**)
- FAO: Work of the Global FMD Working Group Secretariat and view of the WG on support needed (**Giancarlo Ferrari**)
- On laboratory services, information flow and information access: Work of the WRL in relation to regional networks (**Valérie Mioulet**)
- Lab networking for European borders (**D.Paton**)
- Points for the wrap-up (**K.Sumption**)

Presentations can be found on

<http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/commissions/eufmd/commissions/eufmd-home/reports/workshops/en/>