Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

European Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth disease

Report

Standing Technical Committee

of the European Commission for the control of foot-and-mouth disease (EuFMD)

20 September 2023
Online

European Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease

2023-2027 Strategy
Move FAST
Get prepared

Funded by the European Union

FAO Four Better's. Better life, Better environment, Better nutrition, Better production.

EuFMD's programme, tools and initiatives

FAST
Foot-and-mouth And Similar Transboudary animal diseases

Dt
EuFMD digital transformation

Tom
EuFMD training management system

Micro learning
EuFMD micro learning

Vlearning
EuFMD virtual learning

SimExOn
Simulation exercises online

Get prepared
Emergency preparedness toolbox

Risk Comms
EuFMD risk communications

RMT-FAST
Risk monitoring tool for foot-and-mouth and similar transboundary animal diseases

Pragmatist
Prioritization of antigen management with international surveillance tool

EuFMDiS
European foot-and-mouth disease spread model

Vademos
FMD vaccine demand estimation model

GVS
Global vaccine security

POv
Vaccine prequalification

PCP
Progressive control pathway

PSO
Pcp practicioner officers

PPP
Public private partnership

The European Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease Standing Technical Committee

20 September 2023

Report

Contents

Acronyms

ARP	Applied Research Programme
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EuFMD	European Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease
EuFMDiS	European Foot-and-Mouth Disease Spread model
EURLs	European Union Reference Laboratories
FAR	Fund for Applied Research
FAST	Foot-and-mouth disease And Similar Transboundary animal diseases
FMD	foot-and-mouth disease
GF-TADs	Global Framework for the Progressive Control of Transboundary Animal Diseases
LFD	lateral flow devices
LSD	lumpy skin disease
MN	Member Nations
PPR	peste des petits ruminants
RVF	Rift Valley fever
SEEN	South East European Neighbourhood
STC	Standing Technical Committee
UN	United Nations

General information

The meeting was held online, with the participation of Stéphan Zientara (SZ), Giancarlo Ferrari (GF); Sten Mortensen (SM); Katharina Staerk (KS); German Caceres Garrido (GCG); James Wood (JW); Dónal Sammin (DS); Fabrizio Rosso (FR); Nadia Rumich (NR); Etienne Chevanne (EC); and Marcello Nardi (MN).

The meeting started at 14:00 PM and ended at 17:00 PM.

Agenda

Item	Session	Moderator
1	Welcome and introduction	S.Zientara (ANSES)
2	Election of chairperson	F.Rosso; D.Sammin (EuFMD)
3	Structure and theme of the Open Session 2024	S.Zientara (ANSES)
4	Evaluation of Applied Research programme 2019-2023	E. Chevanne (EuFMD)
5	Self-assessment options for learning pathways (TOM)	M.Nardi (EuFMD)
6	Programme of Special Committees	F.Rosso
7	Technical inputs on new elements of the EuFMD programme (optional)	

Item 1: Welcome and introduction

Stephan Zientara (SZ) opened the meeting welcoming Dónal Sammin (DS) as the newly nominated Executive Secretary of the EuFMD. DS expressed his appreciation for the work done by the Standing Technical Committee (STC) and is looking forward to a fruitful collaboration. Fabrizio Rosso (FR), in his introductory remarks, outlined the outcome of the EuFMD General Session held in May 2023 and informed that the meeting was very successful. The EuFMD team is currently working on developing a work programme in line with the strategy discussed at the General Session. The grant agreement is currently under discussion and shortly should be finalized and funds secured for the next four years.

Item 2: Election of Chairperson

SZ asked if anyone from the STC was available to chair the group but there was consensus from the STC members to support SZ to be re-confirmed as chairperson.

Item 3: Structure and theme of the Open Session 2024 (OS24)

SZ invited Nadia Rumich (NR) to give a presentation on the topic. She explained that there were some changes if compared with what was presented in previous meetings. Originally, the proposed location for the OS24 was Greece but the Greek authorities expressed the preference for the OS24 to be held elsewhere. The candidate country is now Spain although the specific location has not been identified yet.
Candidate cities are Madrid, Malaga and Seville and the proposed dates are from 29 to 31 October 2024.
NR made also reference to the registration fee proposed to be 450 EUR (it was 350 in OS22).
As per the previous Open Session, the focus will remain on FMD and there will be side events on Foot-and-mouth And Similar Transboundary (FAST) animal diseases.
In the last OS, the workshops were very successful and the intention is to have those also in the next OS. They will be designed to be an in-depth exploration of the selected OS24 themes.
An innovative initiative the EuFMD team is proposes, is to have what are presently called “FAST pills”. These are intended to be very focused brief sessions (maximum 30 minutes) during which an expert can deliver a presentation on very specific topics.
The format of the OS24 will be hybrid although maybe not as interactive as in Marseille as that proved to be very demanding. Discussion panels is also something that was very successful in Marseille and will be re-proposed for the next OS24.
A very tentative lists for the workshops “FAST pills” were also indicated by NR.
The general structure of the OS24 foresees half-a-day (day 0) dedicated to the registration and welcoming of participants, day 1 and day 2 fully dedicated to the Keynotes and presentations while day 3 will most probably be a half-day to allow participants to travel back because of 1 November being official holidays in several countries.
NR showed also some topics which are a very tentative list of themes (Horizon scanning, Risk perception, Megatrends, Big data, Innovation) for the OS24. The EuFMD team suggests combining the OS with one awareness day for FAST diseases. Additional inputs for discussion were: (i) how to better organize the poster session considering that as per previous discussion within the STC it was considered as an important session although it may require a different way to be organized, avoiding paper posters which prove to be logistically complicated; (iii) how to promote more involvement from universities.

NR anticipated that EuFMD has been approached by Global Foot-and-mouth Research Alliance (GFRA) on the possibility/opportunity of holding the GFRA meeting back-to-back with the OS24 and also highlighted that, differently from previous years, there will be less engagement from partners from the private sector which may determine less fundings to be available that in turns justifies the proposed increased registration fee.
In relation to the potential GFRA engagement, DS added that currently there is an evaluation of the Phase V programme of the EuFMD. The evaluation is led by Alejandra Capozzo from the GFRA and she asked about the possibility of having joint meetings with the EuFMD. The question to be considered was if the STC would consider appropriate to join forces with the GFRA and asked the STC on whether the event should look like a global joint conference or rather a back-to-back separate initiative (which may mean three days dedicated to the OS and probably two additional days for the GFRA meeting).
SZ recalled that as per the current arrangements of the OS, room is already provided to the GFRA. FR reiterated that Alejandra Capozzo suggested a joint initiative with a specific focus on policies and to what are the key issues at global level affecting the control of FMD. FR added the need (if a joint initiative is pursued) to share not only the costs but also the efforts (in terms of logistics) to support such joint initiative. Moreover, he pointed that the EuFMD OS has been widely recognized as an important and unique initiative and would like to see this "branding" to be maintained and maybe a back-to-back initiative would seem more appropriate.
Keith Sumption (KS) while acknowledging the importance of having research exposed to policy issues, has expressed some doubts about participants being able to attend a longer meeting. Maybe a partial overlapping might be a solution (such as a common day). Certainly, it should be organized in such a way that the administrative and financial burden are well divided and that the programme should be jointly developed, in order to not dilute the topics that the two organizations wish to discuss.
James Woods (JW), while agreeing with KS, raised the point that such joint initiatives might require a comparable efficiency from the two organizations. The EuFMD team has proved to be very efficient in organizing events and asked if there is confidence that in a joint initiative may result in an unbalanced load on EuFMD. He considered that a back-to-back initiative may lead to a number of days that people might not be able to afford (as KS has indicated) then a joint initiative might seem more appropriate, although to be carefully evaluated before a final decision is reached.
Giancarlo Ferrari (GF) raised the issue that (if the meetings are held back-to-back) participants may also face the issue of having to pay two registration fees, which may discourage attendance from low-income countries. He mentioned that in the past there was an unspoken agreement between EuFMD and GFRA not to have their respective meetings held during the same calendar year. In any case, the focus of GFRA remains on FMD while EuFMD has expanded on other diseases which may further require thorough planning.
SZ recalled that the issue is somehow similar to the discussions had in the past between EPIZONE and European Society for Veterinary Virology (ESVV), which was solved by having meetings of the two organizations to run every other (not overlapping) year and providing that the non-organizing organization had some room during the conference. He also agreed that five days conference might be too long and reminded also that for EuFMD, the choice of the location is bound to the EuFMD member nations while GFRA does not have such limitation (its next meeting will be organized in November 2023 in Uganda).
FR, in relation to linking together policy and research, recalled that EuFMD in the past has already addressed this issue.
In relation to the possible joint initiative with GFRA, FR recalled that two regional meetings (online meetings) for Asia and for Africa have been organized with GFRA. In those occasions most of the logistic burden was on EuFMD. FR, while considering important the collaboration with the GFRA, thought that a mediation could maybe be achieved offering GFRA to sponsor (and fund) a one-day initiative addressing the issue of policy and research, but leaving all the organizational aspects to the EuFMD.

DS stated that the concerns expressed are well understood and maybe it could be useful to pick up the discussion at a later date, , have further discussion with Alejandra Capozzo to better explore opportunities and then keep the STC informed on how things are developing. He suggested one member of the STC could join the EuFMD to carry on the discussion with GFRA.
SZ agreed saying that once the date of the next meeting is known the STC can be contacted to check who might be available.
Further to the above, DS asked if the STC could provide some comments on the tentative themes displayed by NR in her presentation that would help with the on-going internal discussion for planning purposes but also in discussing with GFRA.
NR recalled the tentative themes: (i) Horizon scanning; (ii) Risk perception; (iii) Megatrends; (iv) Big data; (v) Innovation.
KS pointed that already in the previous OS22 innovation (digitalization and innovation) was among the themes. JW commented that he could see the links between megatrends and big data and had the impression that the themes seem to be skewed to surveillance and was wondering if might be appropriate to have something on interventions (in terms of practical actions).
German Cáceres Garrido (GCG) added that innovation was indeed addressed during the OS22 and agrees that focusing on actions/interventions could be relevant and practical. He considers the issue of how risk is perceived among different stakeholders and the consequences this may have on the level of collaboration and engagement required for all those activities related to surveillance and control, to be important. He briefly outlined the recent experience in Spain for the control of sheep pox and goat pox and highlighted how human factors play an important role. He expressed the view that, although indirectly, issues related to climate change might have an impact on the perception of risks and so it appears important to identify which actions can be taken in terms of risk mitigation. He mentioned that an approach could be exploring in the OS24 the link between megatrends (climate change, people movement, trade, market prices, etc. and risk assessment / perception and risk mitigation at national/regional/local level, something like “from megatrends to *micro* risk - actions”.
NR and Marcello Nardi (MN) provided a clarification in relation to a proposed theme (megatrends and micro-learnings) indicating that he EuFMD is trying to have very short learning modules to respond to very specific issues. YouTube™ or Telegram™ might be possible platforms.
In relation to megatrends, Sten Mortensen (SM) commented that it is important to look on what might happen in the coming years especially in the European neighborhood and how this will affect EuFMD’s work. Many things are changing, and it might be possible that vector-borne diseases will play a dominant role in the next future and so it appears important where EuFMD will position itself in this changing landscape. Both SZ and JW agreed on this although it might not be so straightforward (if compared to vector-borne diseases) to understand how FMD can be impacted by issues such as climate changes.
DS reiterated that those issues can be explored by the EuFMD team, who would come back to the STC for some practical proposals on how these could be possibly addressed during OS24 in terms of workshops and other initiatives.

Item 4: Evaluation of Applied Research programme 2019–2023

FR introduced the item highlighting the importance of the Applied Research Programme (ARP), despite some controversy being raised by the EU Commission to fund research programmes through the EuFMD and that indeed has led to a significant reduction of funds.
Etienne Chevanne (EC) presented the work that has been carried out to evaluate the ARP for 2019-2023. He mentioned that the EuFMD ARP was set up in 2008 to produce tools/knowledge through small and specific projects, that have practical application for the benefit of Member Nations’ preparedness against FAST

diseases. For 2019-2023, the expected results were to have 20 peer-reviewed papers and reports published with an average impact level of seven (on a scale from zero to ten) to be assessed with the support of an external technical panel (composed by two STC members, namely SZ and KS and two members from the Special Committee on Surveillance and Applied Research, namely Michel Bellaiche and Phaedra Eblé).
EC stated that, for the period being evaluated, there were three Global Fund for Applied Research (FAR) calls for applications and two more specific calls within the South Eastern Europe (SEE) region. The ARP has funded 20 studies in total.
The work that has been done in the past months was to review all the research studies completed (due to some constraints such as COVID-19, some studies obtained a no-cost extension and the final report are supposed to be finalized by mid-end of October 2023. Currently 60 percent of the studies have been already checked and for the remaining the final reports are still awaited.
The evaluation framework to assess the level of impact of the funded studies is supposed to respond to three basic questions: (i) What are the outputs and outcomes that can be attributed to activities supported by the ARP?(ii) How well did the EuFMD Secretariat internal processes operate in executing the ARP/FAR? (iii) How did the ARP support the development of external academic/external collaboration and relationship?
In this regard ten indicators have been formulated to evaluate each study outputs, with each indicator being scored as either 0, or 1 or with an intermediate value of 0.5 to accommodate partial achievements. The sum of the scores assigned to each of the ten indicators will produce the final results (impact level) on a scale from 0 to 10.
EC went through the indicators one by one, anticipating that the rationale behind the formulation of these indicators will be shared with the external panel for further evaluation and feedback.
EC mentionedthe timelines of the whole process that started in April 2023, May–August was spent to fine-tune the indicators and use these indicators to assign scores to those studies for which material was already available. The current phase is the validation one from the external panel, in order to produce the final report.
EC asked for guidance on next steps and whether the external panel should receive the studies to be evaluated all atonce, or a staggered approach.

KS asked the expectations from the members of the external panel. The scores have already been assigned and he expressed confidence in the technical work carried out. At first glance, the indicators seem robust and maybe the support from the external panel might be limited to those reports either with very low scores or where indicators have generated some controversy, and the scores assigned did not seem to be consistent between evaluators.
FR clarified that the EuFMD is primarily asking the STC to provide feedback on whether the process and the indicators used are clear and efficient to assess the usefulness/impact of the ARP and if there is confidence that the work has been done properly, then an endorsement from the STC would be very important. Another point important to be addressed is the role of EuFMD in promoting further small research grants.
GCG gave his availability to further assist the external panel. He stated that the contribution could be limited to those indicators where the scores assigned did not appear to be consistent. In relation to the role of EuFMD in promoting fields research grants, he recalled previous discussions on the position of the EU Commission, which does not seem to appreciate EuFMD funding applied research, considering that there already is a DG dealing with research.
SZ expressed full confidence on the work done by the EuFMD team and might consider more appropriate to more closely look into those issues where some inconsistencies have been spotted.
FR further commented that it would be extremely important that the whole evaluation process of applied research and the criteria selected to perform such evaluation, be endorsed by the external panel. FR proposed the indicators formulated could be submitted to the STC to obtain validation. The whole process will be concluded based on the criteria developed so far and the final reports of the 20 field studies submitted for endorsement (highlighting where assistance from the STC members could be sought).

GF agreed with previous comments made by KS, SZ and GCG and suggested that once the whole process of evaluation is finalized, to indicate in advance to applicants that the criteria to evaluate the field study will be based on the ten indicators, to ensure the information required to assign a score to the indicators will be in the final report.
He asked if in formulating the indicators, different weights could be assigned, so as to have a maximum final score of ten, but with indicators providing a different contribution according to the weights assigned.
FR commented that when calls for ARP are launched, the criteria through which the proposals are evaluated already includes standards such as: value for money, innovative solutions, etc. The issue regarding the ARP is not in relation to the usefulness of this activity (already discussed and agreed in previous meetings), but rather that the amount of funds for field research has been drastically reduced (from EUR 350 000 to 75 000 expected for 2023-2026). The decision that will also need to be made is how many calls will be issued. Field research will remain part of the strategy of the EuFMD (this was agreed also in the last GS) and the terminology adopted will make reference to the development of tools, field studies, etc. to avoid any potential controversy with the EU Commission.
DS added that the issue of budget cut is wider than the EuFMD grant, and all the animal health programs will have seen their budget reduced. This is also why there should be cared to make clear what applied research is all about, to avoid that the EU Commission could consider the budget cut appropriate because it is something that is covered under a different DG.
DS added that alternative sources of funding for field research are to be sought and there will be a need for a strong message from the STC to the EuFMD Executive Committee of the importance of this EuFMD piece of work. In addition, he recalled that when discussing with Alejandra Capozzo, the issue of research was also discussed. DS considers this as an additional opportunity to join forces with GFRA to leverage fundings from other sources.
Both SZ and KS expressed complete agreement that opportunities for extra-fundings should be thoroughly explored, and the partnership with GFRA might be an important one.
FR further highlighted the importance for having the ARP fully evaluated, as this is not part of the current evaluation of the Phase V programme which is focused more on other elements of the overall programme and thus it will be important to provide evidence, as an example, that the impact level indeed achieved the average target of seven out of ten. FR is aware that the STC has expressed a strong support to the ARP but there is a need for further strengthened, bringing the evidence as may come from the framework evaluation.
In relation to how the indicators have been formulated, EC explained that (to respond to a comment raised by GF on the possibility of weighting the indicators) attention has been paid to avoid collinearity and certainly would welcome any proposal from the STC to further elaborate including the introduction of weights.
DS (responding to a query raised by SZ on whether EuFMD is in the position to receive funds from extra-sources, other than the EU Commission), confirmed that this is possible.

Item 5: Self-assessment options for learning pathways

MN presented the training management system TOM, and some upgrades . He reminded all that the tool is supposed to assist Veterinary Services in identifying gaps and needs and to ensure that learners will effectively increase their competencies on their respective areas of concern so to contribute to the overall capacity. The tool has been updated with some new features (such as mapping of the learners which in turn may assist in identifying areas where the level of competency might not be enough), that was well appreciated by countries that have already been engaged in piloting the tool. The approach to assess the level of competence was based on participant self-assessment and the EuFMD team is aware that this approach may result in biased estimates if individuals either over or under rank their respective level of knowledge.

MN further explained that the EuFMD team is trying to build the tool in such a way that the support will be less and less needed, and to provide also the possibility of including other diseases than FMD. Five pilots have already been conducted and the next one is supposed to be run for Armenia in October 2023. MN recalled that the purpose in presenting to the STC members is to receive feedback and comments, especially on the self-assessment module that has been recently developed and currently being piloted.
MN, acknowledging that a lot of the information needed to build the profile of each learner is indicated by the learners themselves, is seeking assistance from the STC on whether the self-assessment is an efficient way to identify the level of learners against specific competencies, and how the reliability of the self-assessment could be improved.
GCG sees the utility of the tool in a situation like Spain where there are many training initiatives that might require to be better coordinated with the central level. He considers the tool very good and unfortunately did not have the chance for the tool to be piloted in Spain.
SM recalled a recent meeting of the focal points for training and asked if the tool was discussed and the feedback.
MN replied that there was no specific discussion on the above aspects. The tool was very appreciated and found to be very useful for the calendarization of training courses.
One question that MN considers crucial is to what extent the self-assessment should be integrated with knowledge questions so as to have a more objective evaluation level of the level of competency of individuals, and asked if an additional step in the whole process might help, for example someone supposed to validate what the individuals have indicated when self-assessing their respective level of competency on specific items. MN showed a practical example on how the procedure for self-assessment works. The self-assessment is performed against various Survey Sections (Epidemiology, Biosecurity, Sampling, Emergency and Disaster Management, Emergency Preparedness, Veterinary Products and Animal Welfare. Each section contains a list of specific tasks against which the learner is supposed to indicate the level of experience ranging from “unable” to “can perform the task with confidence”.
At the end of the process, the tool will elaborate an overall score for the competency selected.
Once the user navigates into a specific survey section, a set of questions is displayed and the user is supposed to indicate, on a scale from 0 to 5, the level of knowledge/compliance. As an example, one of the questions in the Epidemiology section asks the learner to indicate to what extent he/she knows how to conduct and epidemiological enquiry in case of occurrence of a reportable disease. A score of 0 would indicate no ability while a score of 5 would indicate full compliance. Once all the questions of a specific section have been answered, the tool elaborates the scores and automatically assigns a level of competency ranging from “Awareness” to “Expert”. MN asked the STC on whether the score elaborated based on a self-assessment should be validated either through the introduction of knowledge questions or through an external manager/supervisor.
KS has some reservations on proposing a manager/supervisor and rather considers important that those filling the self-assessment have no point in cheating or providing wrong information as it may result in providing trainings which are not necessary.
GF asked a clarification in relation to the use of the tool and whether its use has to be seen with the purpose of identifying if within the staff of the VS certain competencies are present and at which level.
MN clarified that the objectives are both at general and individual level.

Item 6: Programme of Special Committees

FR presented briefly on the topic and the programmes for the next two years. He suggested a few questions to facilitate discussion. “Do the committee programmes address the main need of the Commission?”; “Do they need additional input/resources (i.e. permanent observers)?”; “Programme of SCPQv in case the

Vaccine Prequalification (PQv) is not supported by donors?"; "How the STC can better oversee the work of the other committees and priorities of the Commission?".
There are four committees that were endorsed at the GS45, namely: (i) Standing Technical Committee (STC); (ii) Special Committee on Biorisk Management (SCBRM); (iii) Special Committee on Risk Monitoring, Integrated Surveillance and Applied Research (SCRISAR) and (iv) Standing Committee on Prequalification of Vaccines against FAST diseases (SCPQv).
Concerning the SCBRM, FR explained that all members have been confirmed and that two new members have been added from Türkiye and Israel respectively, so to have the perspective of endemic countries. FR illustrated the programme of the SCBRM for the biennium 2023-2025 spanning from the creation of standards for countries in tiers C and D (endemic) to training for MNs on biosafety and biosecurity (all the key points are available in the presentation made by FR). One important objective is to support the establishment of a system for evaluating and advice missions in FMDv laboratories, something that before was carried out through the FVO and such inspections are no longer taking place from the FVO.
As already discussed in previous meetings, EuFMD cannot take directly this responsibility but can support the establishment of such system.

Concerning SCRISAR. the committee is composed by 14 members coming from National Reference Laboratories for FAST diseases. The committee, in previous years, had a different format and the number of members has been reduced. The programme for the next biennium 2023-2025 is to steer and advise on FAST priorities for MNs and risk areas for Europe. FR recalled the Thrace model for early detection and confidence of freedom that could possibly be adapted for other areas. FR added that prior to the GS, EuFMD has undertaken an exercise with the SCRISAR to identify which of the FAST diseases deserved a priority and these were indicated as Rift Valley fever and sheep pox and goat pox.

In relation to the Standing Committee on Prequalification of Vaccines against FAST diseases (SCPQv) established one and half year ago, that is composed by ten members and observers. the programme for the 2023–2025 biennium will focus on the formulation and adoption of documents defining the data requirements and standards to operate the PQv procedures, review and approve reports and recommendations from expert evaluation teams for inclusion of products into the list of prequalified vaccines (PQv list), act as an arbitration body in situations where expert evaluation teams are unable to reach a decision, act as an expert committee for EuFMD MNs on topics related to evaluating the quality of FAST vaccines and provide guidance and advice to the Secretariat for the progressive development of the PQv system.

Lastly, FR outlined the 2023-2025 programme of the STC: (i) advice on issues affecting FMD prevention, preparedness and control; (ii) oversee the programmes and results of special committees; (iii) provide specific advice on issues related to diagnostics, surveillance and research/training and contribute to the specific items covered by other committees such as: prioritization of FAST diseases, priorities for field studies, safe shipment of samples, laboratory/veterinary services resources upscale options in case of emergencies and finally define and endorse the scientific programme of the OS24.

SZ commented on the SCBRM reiterating that it is an important piece of work, after the FVO dismissed the audits that they used to carry out. He agrees that EuFMD cannot take direct responsibility, but certainly can facilitate the whole process of establishing criteria through which such audits should be carried out.

In relation to this point, SM highlighted that currently the responsibility for such audits lies within each EU Members in absence (at the moment) of established and agreed (and comparable) criteria. In this regard, he askeed if a questionnaire could be prepared and circulated among the EuFMD member countries to

understand who the Competent Authority is to carry out such task, what are the regulations behind and how it is operated within each country.
KS reported that laboratory safety in Switzerland has been recently discussed with the members of parliament (mainly because of COVID-19 and the theories that have been raised of a laboratory leakage). KS reported that a lot of discussions were held on how to make labs safer and also what other countries are doing, so the questionnaire that SM has proposed seems to be a timely and good idea. EuFMD can certainly play an important role in this subject.
SZ concluded that it is within the scope of EuFMD to address this topic and SM volunteered to assist the SCBRM to work on this topic.
FR recalled that in the work programme EuFMD is committed in identifying mechanisms through which the mechanism can be self-sustainable. The meeting of the SCBRM will be held in November and this topic certainly will be something to be discussed.

SZ highlighted that the issue is not only for public laboratories but for private as well and they are also in the need to receive guidance on how things should be established and organized.

Item 7: Technical inputs on new elements of the EuFMD programme (optional)

The last item of the agenda was not addressed and will be done in next meeting/s.

The next meeting of the STC will be held either late 2023 or early 2024. NR will circulate a doodle.

The meeting ended at 5 PM.

PROTECT
RESPOND
CONTROL

MOVE FAST

FAST, Foot-mouth
And Similar Transboundary
animal diseases.

EuFMD Committees

Executive Committee, Standing Technical Committee (STC), Special Committee for Surveillance and Applied Research (SCSAR), Special Committee on Biorisk Management (SCBRM), Tripartite Groups.

EuFMD Secretariat

Animal Production and Health Division,
NSHA / European Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease (EuFMD)

eufmd@fao.org

fao.eufmd.org

eufmdlearning.works

eufmd-tom.com

Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations
Rome, Italy

Thinking of the environmental footprint

Together against wasting resources, think twice before printing

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS