

**·TRANSCRIPTION/TRANSCRIPTION
NEWS CONFERENCE/CONFÉRENCE DE PRESSE
Transcription prepared by Media Q Inc. exclusively for DFO
Transcription préparée par Media Q Inc. exclusivement pour MPO**

DATE/DATE: November 8th, 2011 - 11:00 a.m.

LOCATION/ENDROIT: Vancouver, British Columbia

PRINCIPALS/PRINCIPAUX: Dr. Con Kiley, director of national aquatic animal health program, Canadian Food Inspection Agency
Steven Stevens, director of biotechnology and aquatic animal health science, DFO
Peter Wright, director, Moncton Laboratory, DFO
Dr. Paul Kitching, chief veterinarian officer, British Columbia
Guy Gravel, moderator

SUBJECT/SUJET: The Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Province of B.C. hold a news conference on the suspected infectious salmon anaemia investigation in B.C.

Operator: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the technical briefing conference call. I would now like to turn the meeting over to Mr. Guy Gravel. Please go ahead, Mr. Gravel. Bonjour mesdames et messieurs. Bienvenue à l'appel conférence séance d'information. J'aimerais maintenant céder la parole à monsieur Guy Gravel. A vous la parole, monsieur Gravel.

Guy Gravel: Thank you, merci. Today's conference is being run by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. Just so that you're all aware, we do have representatives from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Fisheries and Oceans Canada as well as the province of British Columbia. Nous avons aujourd'hui avec nous des représentants de l'Agence canadienne d'inspection des aliments, ainsi que le ministère des Pêches et océans et la province de la Colombie-Britannique avec nous aujourd'hui.

I will let you know who we are – have online with us today. We have from the CFIA Dr. Con Kiley, he's director of national aquatic animal health program, from the departments of Fisheries and Oceans, we have Dr. – sorry, Steven Stevens, director of biotechnology and aquatic animal health science as well Peter Wright, he head of the Moncton Laboratory in – that has been helping us with the testing of ISA as well Paul Kiching, chief veterinarian officer for British Columbia.

Des énoncés seront livrés sous peu par nos experts techniques et après ça, nous allons avoir une brève période de questions et réponses. Je demande à tous les médias d'avoir seulement une question et une question de suivi. Shortly, we will have a brief announcement from the – from the representatives we have with us today, followed by a brief question and answer period where media will be requested to have one question and one follow-up question so that we can get as many

done through as possible today. I'll pass the mic on to Con Kiley from the CFIA for his announcement.

Dr. Con Kiley: Yes, good afternoon everyone. The Canadian Food Inspection Agency, the CFIA, in close collaboration with Fisheries and Oceans Canada, DFO, the province of British Columbia and the Atlantic Veterinary College continues to investigate reports of infectious salmon anemia virus in Pacific salmon in B.C. Based on analysis conducted at the DFO National Reference Laboratory, there have been no confirmed cases of infectious salmon anemia in wild or farmed salmon in British Columbia. Testing in support of this investigation has been ongoing since mid-October when a laboratory at the Atlantic Veterinary College reported that it had detected the virus.

DFO has tested all 48 samples received as part of the original investigation and the results are all negative for the virus. These results are consistent with the findings of an independent laboratory in Norway which also tested samples associated with this investigation and provided a report to the CFIA. All additional samples that have been collected and tested as part of this investigation have also been negative for infectious salmon anemia. However, these supplementary results must be considered inconclusive because of the poor quality of the samples. Additional testing continues and results will be provided when ready.

In Canada under the CFIA's national aquatic animal health program, suspected federally reported diseases such as infectious salmon anemia must be confirmed at the DFO National Reference Laboratory. As part of the investigation, the CFIA and DFO are also looking at how the samples were collected, handled, transported and stored. This information will be critical in validating the virus test results and establishing Canada's health status for this disease. Historically, over 5,000 wild and farmed salmon in B.C. have been tested by the federal government and the province of B.C. and none have ever tested positive for this disease.

The CFIA in collaboration with DFO, the province of British Columbia is assessing the current testing levels for this virus in both wild and aquaculture populations in B.C. and will increase surveillance activities as required. Infectious salmon anemia poses no risk to people, but could have serious impacts on the aquatic animal health and the economy. Infectious salmon anemia is a federally reported disease in Canada. This means that all suspected or confirmed cases must be immediately reported to the CFIA. While the agency does have a very good fact sheet on this particular disease up on their website, infectious salmon anemia or specifics on the disease, I would ask that you go there to get that material.

Guy Gravel: Thank you, Dr. Kiley. I will now pass the mic on to Steven Stevens from the department of Fisheries and Oceans. Steven?

Steven Stevens: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone. I will just, to expand a little bit on the national aquatic animal health program and DFO's role within that program, the program was started in 2005 and as a partner with the CFIA

and the program, Fisheries and Oceans Canada has – provides diagnostic services and diagnostic research with respect to aquatic animal health and we also provide scientific advice to the CFIA related to that diagnostic activity.

We have three national reference laboratories within Canada, one in Moncton, one in Winnipeg and one in Nanaimo and our Moncton Laboratory, as Dr. Kiley pointed out, is our national infectious salmon anemia virus reference laboratory. We have a team of experts, scientists that conduct research and diagnostic testing on behalf of the program and they have many many years of experience, both for fin fish as well as crustacean and mollusk disease testing. Thank you.

Guy Gravel: Thank you Steven and now, I'll pass the mic over to Dr. Paul Kiching from British Columbia.

Dr. Paul Kiching: Thank you very much and good morning. Until recently, the province was responsible for undertaking health audits of the salmon farmed in British Columbia, and during that time, we tested over 4,000 Atlantic salmon from the fish farms and a large number of different species of Pacific salmon. At no time have we found any positives for infectious salmon anemia virus in B.C. As far as we're aware, Pacific species of salmon are resistant to infectious salmon anemia virus infections and disease, although it does cause disease in Atlantic salmon. In fact, only the P.E.I., the Prince Edward Island laboratories reported positive in salmon and that was in Chile in 1999.

I was therefore surprised to hear that two out of 48 sockeye salmon had tested positive for the European strain of ISA, but not only that, samples of chinook, coho and chum, all Pacific species of salmon taken over at random had also tested positive by the same laboratory in P.E.I. However you look at these results, statistically, epidemiologically or virologically, they defy common sense. Up to this time, we've seen no ISA virus or disease in B.C. The laboratory in Prince Edward Island did not confirm the positive PCI test that they reported was definitively part of the infectious salmon anemia virus, let alone part of the whole living ISA virus.

For anyone to say that infectious salmon anemia virus is present in B.C. on the basis of the Prince Edward Island laboratory result is misrepresenting the science, either because they do not understand the science or for other reasons and I could also say that as editor-in-chief of an international veterinary journal, this would be considered poor science and not likely publishable in a referee scientific journal. Thank you.

Guy Gravel: Thank you, Dr. Kiching. Maintenant j'aimerais ouvrir la session de questions et réponses à tout le monde. As I open up the question and answer period, operator, can you please provide us with our first media call.

Operator: Thank you. If you have a question, please press star one on your telephone keypad. If you wish to cancel the question, please press the pound key. Please press star one at this time. There will be a brief pause while the participants

register. Thank you for your patience. Si vous désirez poser une question, vous faites étoile un. Si vous désirez annuler cette question, vous faites le dièse. Alors appuyez sur étoile un maintenant. Il y aura un court délai vous permettant de vous enregistrer dans la file d'attente. Merci de patienter. The first question, la première question est, is from Quentin Dobb (ph.) from Hatchery International, la première question est de Quentin Dobb de Hatchery International. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: Good morning. Could please ...

Dr. Con Kiley: Good morning.

Question: ...explain to me whether the virus strain that was identified by Dr. Kabange (ph.) was the viral or non viral variety and how he was able to – whether it was from Europe or not?

Guy Gravel: Peter, would you be able to provide us with a response?

Peter Wright: Hi, Quentin, this is Peter Wright.

Question: Hi, Peter.

Peter Wright: Based on the report that Dr. Kabange issued, on those particular samples that you're questioning, he ran three different molecular techniques, one being the screening technique that just picks up all ISA genotypes and then he went on to test for either North American or European strains. So all he can really say, based on that particular PCR was that it reacted with his European genotype ISA and not the North American one. He can't pinpoint it any further than that and I would point out, there was no sequencing data made viable nor any attempts that virus isolation and cell cultures had been successful. So that's all we know, nothing more and that's based on his original report.

Question: Are you able to tell me please, what kind of chain of custody and process was behind those samples and how he became to receive them, who handled them before the – he received them?

Peter Wright: I will let CFIA answer that. They're conducting that part of the investigation.

Dr. Con Kiley: We already have spoken to this already on our news release and the briefing we provided earlier. What we're doing as part of our investigation is we're looking at how the samples were collected, handled, transported and stored and this information is very important in validating the virus test results and establishing our health status for the disease. In the ideal world, the samples are picked up by government officials and we know the status of the stock they're picked up from, in other words, their health status, whether they have symptoms of disease, where they're located and as part of normal surveillance, they will move through the system where we have identification from them all the way through the entire process of

picking them up, storing them, transporting them and them arriving at a particular lab. That is a normal chain of custody that's very important when we ultimately have to try and make a determination about the health status of the samples that were tested and that is our normal expectation. In this situation, it was not ideal. Nevertheless we continue to investigate and that will be part of our final report on this particular occurrence.

Question: Thank you.

Operator: Thank you. The next question is from Craig Wells from Seattle Times. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: Thank you. The first speaker actually said that the results of the test were negative for the virus and that that conforms to the findings in Norway, but the doctor in Norway himself actually says that while his results are not conclusive, they do suggest that the results – along with the results obtained by Dr. Kabange, that an ISA virus is actually present. Could you please explain the discrepancy?

Dr. Con Kiley: The – I know Peter could answer this as well too. We're speaking about Dr. Nyland and that...

Question: So am I.

Dr. Con Kiley: Sorry.

Question: I'm too.

Dr. Con Kiley: You are too and you're talking about the work that he has done on those samples.

Question: Yes.

Dr. Con Kiley: From the CFIA's point of view, we would consider his report and the information he provided in there, we would consider the one result that he refers to as inconclusive. We would consider that negative and the reason is that it was not repeatable. The many times he did it, it was not repeatable. So we would consider that, technically from a CFIA and the government of Canada point of view to be negative.

Question: And then as a follow-up, could you please tell me in a general sense for lay people whether or not, given the test that you've just done, you consider any of this a concern?

Dr. Con Kiley: Any of this? Well, what we're doing today is reporting that all of the sampling and testing that we have provided today, to date and we have the qualifications around some of the samples, their poor quality, we're reporting that they're all negative.

Question: And – but is that a concern or do you think there is any concern for fish on the Pacific coast or not?

Dr. Con Kiley: There's no evidence that ISA virus occurs in fish off the waters of British Columbia. Now we know that more test to continue throughout this investigation to find its way through to the end and we know that in time, we will look at surveillance and possibly enhancing that. Nevertheless, at this time, there's no evidence that ISA B virus occurs in that part of the world.

Operator: Thank you. The next question is from Judy Lavoie, the Time Columnist. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: Yes, hello. I was hoping you could tell me what further surveillance you might be doing and when that might start? Would the surveillance be on wild fish and farmed fish?

Dr. Con Kiley: Yes, we spoke to that in the information that was provided earlier and that is – it's that we're collaborating with the department of Fisheries and Oceans, the province of British Columbia in assessing the current testing levels for the virus in both wild and aquaculture populations in B.C. and based upon all of that, based on that assessment, we will make determination as to whether we need to change what's currently done or increase it.

Question: And when will you be doing that and when might we see some changes?

Dr. Con Kiley: There are ideal times of the year when testing can occur for fish populations and based upon the species we wish to sample and the locations we wish to collect them from, that will determine how soon it will begin.

Operator: Thank you. The next question is from Gerry Cose (ph.) from the Vancouver Media Co-op. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: Yes, my understanding is after listening to the confirmation and looking at the evidence there, that the fish farms in British Columbia right now are actually assessing themselves which is that since April of 2010, neither does the DFO nor the province vets have been collecting samples and studying them themselves from the fish farms. Can you please comment on that?

Dr. Con Kiley: I'll pass that on to Paul Kiching. Paul?

Dr. Paul Kiching: Yes, we've still been getting samples from the fish farms, sent in privately, not part of the fish or provincial audits that we have before. It was passed over to DFO responsibility, but yes, we're still getting regular samples from the fish farms, but just from their own health audit which they want to maintain over size and what the disease condition of the fish are and again, we've had absolutely zero

evidence of ISA virus.

Question: So further to that, have you actually been testing them for ISA with the appropriate PCR and sequencing tests?

Dr. Paul Kiching: Absolutely and in fact, I have to say that this, this was reported by the P.E.I. lab, we went back to all our samples from this year and repeated them using about four different PCR tests including the one which Dr. Kabange published in his report, but also the – well, we follow the OIE guidelines anyway, so we've been looking at virtually always possible – trying to find the virus and we're still unable to find the virus.

Question: And I'm assuming that you've been collecting a minimum of 60 samples from each farm given that you're trying to find a 5% presence of the virus?

Dr. Paul Kiching: Well, I don't know what the percentage is. If you look at the results from what's being reported, I mean if you just take these fish at random out of the Fraser River or the sea, you find it. I mean it's in over 30% of the fish in the sea if you believe the report.

Question: Well, you just said that if you take random samples of fish in the sea, you find ISA. What do you mean by that?

Dr. Paul Kiching: Yes, well that's what's reported, you see, which is clearly statistically – unless it's everywhere we...

Question: So has ISA been reported?

Dr. Paul Kiching: Well, this is what these samples which were sent in by the Simon Fraser University to the P.E.I. lab, there was four samples and two out of 48, three out of 10, whatever, I mean, they're all coming up positive. It doesn't make statistical sense.

Question: So they are coming up positive and not negative then.

Dr. Paul Kiching: In the P.E.I. test, that's correct.

Dr. Con Kiley: Let's backtrack and understand clearly what's being said here. All of the samples that were done on the 48 and the tissues that the agency has been able to derive from those 48 original samples that went to the P.E.I. lab have all tested negative for ISA B virus and we've had a broader sampling of the original sample set where hundreds of samples have actually been done and they have also all been negative. That is the work that this investigation has brought forth to this point in time. It is not completed. We have more work to do, we have more validation to do on the testing and at the end, we will describe what the entire investigation comes up with.

Operator: Thank you. The next question is from Dolores Rotchen (ph.)

from Watershed Sentinel. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: Thank you. I'm curious to know whether the retesting that you did, did you use the same protocols as the P.E.I. lab when you – you know, you took 48 and you came up negative and did you use the same – I don't know what you call it in virus testing, but in chemistry, you call it limits of detection.

Dr. Con Kiley: We're getting quite technical here, Con Kiley. I will pass this on to Peter, but we don't want to get too technical because that material can go out in a separate class.

Peter Wright: Hi. It's Peter here. What we have done through information that Dr. Kabange provided to us at the National Ref Lab here is, as we have compared – I don't want to get technical, the primers and probes that would be used as the presumptive screening test and we're detecting in the same region of segment 8 that Dr. Kabange has in terms of his ISA that detects all ISA genotypes, so we're using a very comparable ISA. We have not determined yet – CFIA is going to be assessing both labs and then we'll be able to get drilled down in the technical details in terms of limited detection, but they're probably going to be very very close.

Dr. Paul Kiching: And I could add to that, we've also followed Dr. Kabange's protocol and exactly as he describes it and as he describes it in the OIE reference manual.

Question: And was that done also on those fish that you said that B.C. tested, 4,000 fish farm fish and also wild Pacific fish, you know, up until DFO took over or didn't take over, or whatever went on there? And did you also use all of these protocols on those when you tested those fish for ISA, did you test specifically for ISA on those fish, fish as well?

Dr. Paul Kiching: Yes, yes, we've done all those.

Question: Using the same protocols?

Dr. Paul Kiching: We've used 30 – this year, we've done – we've been back to all our samples which we have stored and using the exact same protocols and we were unable to find it.

Question: So you just – you retested those...

Dr. Paul Kiching: That's right.

Question: ...4,000 fish?

Dr. Paul Kiching: Not, we don't – we've tested about 1,000 over the last couple of years which we collected in the last two years.

Steven Stevens: Peter, if I can point out, the normal procedure, these are exceptional circumstances we're talking about now, but under normal procedures, it is that segment 8 of the virus which would be used for screening and it's a very sensitive ISA, it picks up all genotypes of ISA, but any of those results would be considered presumptive positive and they would have to go on to either other types of PCR or cell culture for confirmation. Otherwise, they're just considered presumptive and no further than that.

Operator: Thank you. The next question is from Janine Stewart from Interfish Media. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: I'm just – I'm just wondering what the next steps are in terms of coming to a final conclusion, because I find it – I mean we know that – that you're saying that there's no evidence of ISA in British Columbia salmon, but there's still some loose ends to tie up and I'm wondering if anything could change? I mean, could anything change in your understanding of the situation?

Dr. Con Kiley: Dr. Kiley here answering your question, everybody knows that I don't speculate or answer speculative questions. Our investigation will continue and we'll continue to do the testing and we'll continue with the investigation where the samples came from and the work that's done in both laboratories and when we're ready to provide more information, we will do that. Clearly understand that the CFIA is a science-based regulator, a science-based agency and our raison d'être is science and science will guide us. We will be objective and the report will also be so.

Question: And just one more thing, will you be working with U.S. government at all on this?

Dr. Con Kiley: We're always proactive when it comes to these types of incidences. The agency has a long history in how we manage our relationships, or potential trade issues that may occur when reports like this one find their way into the public realm. So we immediately with our manager of import-export, Dr. Joanne Constantine here at national headquarters, went out to the main – our main partners who take both wild and aquaculture salmon and told them like we're telling you here today what the Agency and the department of Fisheries and Oceans are doing with respect to this information being in the public realm and we have continued to keep them updated on the occurrence.

Operator: Thank you. The next question is from Bard Hicks from Aquaculture North American. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: Hi, thank you. I guess the information we have today is that the evidence suggests that there is no ISA virus in British Columbia. The question I have, is there any other evidence of ISA disease present in any fish in B.C.

Dr. Con Kiley: No.

Question: Thank you.

Operator: Thank you. Please press star one if you have a question. Faites étoile un si toutefois vous avez une question. The question that we have is from Fan Lee from the Associated Press. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: Hi, my question I guess is a follow-up to others. So regardless of the outcome of this investigation, do you feel that there should be more attention focused on this virus in terms of research and other surveillance? I believe that the U.S. is – there's a bill right now that would charge a task force to look into these matters and I would like to hear about the Canadian officials about what your viewpoint is on that?

Dr. Con Kiley: I'll let Steven speak to this but I would say that research is always a good – a good thing. New information about specific diseases is always good information. It's what – it is really what informs our science. Steven, do you wish to add anything?

Steven Stevens: Yes, Con. Thank you very much. Thank you, Miss Lee, for your question, I think you would have to ask – you would have to ask the American government as to why and if they want to pursue this, but the national aquatic animal health program is designed specifically to look at questions around aquatic animal disease, to survey for aquatic animal disease in Canada and to – on behalf of Fisheries and Oceans, our part as I mentioned earlier on, is to conduct diagnostic research. We do this in consultation with the Canadian Food Inspection Agency which is the lead for the program and look for their direction and input into what diseases they want us to work on. Most of our research involves looking at diagnostic testing capacity and developing or validating test that can stand international scrutiny. So that's – when we're faced with questions with respect to our testing and/or surveillance, that they can stand scrutiny. Thank you.

Operator: Thank you. The next question is from Craig Wells from Seattle Times. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: Do you have any interest or willingness to share any of the raw samples with researchers in the U.S. if they were inclined to try and do their own testing?

Peter Wright: It's Peter.

Dr. Con Kiley: Sorry, we have to figure out the point, what value that would – would really give, but I'll let Peter answer that.

Peter Wright: I mean, one of the problems we have is the fact – when we checked the quality of these samples and we checked it using a separate PCR that looks at some of host's RNA and through the most part, these samples are either partially, and I say over the halfway mark or totally totally degraded, and sharing those

samples would not be good science. They are – they are in very – they're in poor condition, we received them in poor condition and move them out anywhere else is not going to help anybody.

Question: And is that true of the samples from the Fraser and tributaries of the Fraser River or just of those, those from rivers and lakes?

Peter Wright: No, this is true of the majority of the – well, all of the samples that we've received to this date. Some of them were collected very early on in May, June and stored at minus 20 and what we have to remember here is that the RNA in any sample is extremely liable to degradation, even storing it at minus 20. So when you leave them for that long, the degradation is – that's why we call things inconclusive, because the degradation is so bad, you cannot form an opinion from a test standpoint as to whether or not you were capable or not capable. The fact that they come up negative doesn't really mean anything because they're so badly degraded.

Dr. Con Kiley: Or that you get a result that's positive.

Peter Wright: That's a possibility too, but nevertheless, that's why we have to go to confirmatory testing and basically right now, we're – as we've said, nobody has done any sequencing data on these positives, the presumptive positives nor has there been anything out of virus isolation. So I mean sharing these is really quite pointless in my opinion.

Question: And I apologize, I asked this question earlier and I still don't know that I understand the answer. When – when I spoke with Dr. Nyland by email, the message that he said to me, and I would be happy to share it with you, was that based on the samples he reviewed and the samples that Dr. Kabange reviewed, there is at least evidence in his opinion of the presence of ISA virus and what I'm hearing you say is that's not the case. Is the distinction just whether or not the tests you were able to run meet your level of confirmation? Or can you actually say there is no evidence of ISA virus on the west coast?

Peter Wright: It's Peter and I can appreciate the confusion here. Basically, based on Dr. Nyland's report, he only got one positive well out of multiple multiple testing on that same sample which he knew beforehand that Dr. Kabange also tested positive. He tested those two samples that Dr. Kabange found positive in the 48 repeatedly and there was only one single well that he got a reaction in and he did say in his original report that the quality of the sample was poor and it could affect the ISA result and he also said the result was not reproducible and there has been no confirmatory evidence coming out of either Dr. Nyland's lab or Dr. Kabange's lab with any sequencing data or any cell culture data that would indicate that there's anything there. There's no confirmation. These are all presumptive positives.

Question: Okay, thank you.

Operator: Thank you.

Guy Gravel: Operator, I will ask that we have time – we have time for two more questions, so two more called in and then we will have to end the session today.

Operator: Very well, sir. So the next question is from Roxanne Dichitin (ph.) from the Yukon News. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: Hi there. Thank you. I apologize if I repeat anything as I had to come in a little bit late to this conference, but my first question is just whether or not there has been any testing or whether or not this investigation will spread any further north, more specifically to the chinook and the chum that run through the Yukon River.

Dr. Con Kiley: I can answer that. You're clearly very late to the call here.

Question: Yes.

Dr. Con Kiley: We addressed that significantly earlier on in the call here. We're stating that all of the testing that was done is all negative. So there's no indicator for you that there would be any problems with ISA – ISA B virus. It's not known to occur at this moment in time in the North Pacific.

Question: I understood that aspect, but you had also said that you're continuing your investigation. I'm wondering if any of that continued investigation will spread further north. That was my question.

Dr. Con Kiley: No, we do our investigation in Canadian waters.

Question: Well, the Yukon River is in Canadian water. It's in the Yukon territory in Canada.

Dr. Con Kiley: The territory, okay. We're not anticipating to go there at this moment in time. There's no reason why we would.

Question: I'm wondering if you can confirm to me, the doubt that you are (inaudible) on the presumptive positives, could it not be also applied to your assumed negatives here? I mean if you're saying that the assumption here is that there are positive and there's all these reasons including degradation of the samples to say that we cannot trust those positives, can the same not be said for your – for your findings of negatives – of ISA in the samples that you've tested?

Peter Wright: It's Peter. I think we've addressed that in the sense that we said that the test result is actually negative, but any interpretation of that result would be inconclusive because of the poor quality of the sample. So you can't say one way or the other, but more you're erring – if you want, you're erring on the side of caution in a way and that you know, if you can't – if something is so badly degraded that you can't measure it, you can't say with any extreme confidence that it's either positive or negative.

Steven Stevens: Peter, it's Steven. If I could just add though, we did say earlier on that we were able to confirm the negatives in the original 48 samples because we did confirm that the quality of the tissues were still good enough to give us confidence in those 48 negatives, correct.

Peter Wright: Yes, that is correct. Those were 40 – these were kidney extracts that were retrieved from another laboratory. It was a DFO laboratory that had received them, but they hadn't done any testing on them so we got those samples and it would appear that they had been extracted fairly early on before there was a lot of degradation. So there was partial degradation however, but that would give us some degree of confidence in those original 48 of calling them negative and we haven't been calling those ones inconclusive. We've been calling the ones where degradation is almost complete as inconclusive.

Question: Thank you.

Operator: Thank you. The next question is from Damien Gillis from the Canadian Orca. Please go ahead, la parole est à vous.

Question: Well, I'm just wondering, I guess this is the last question here, so it's fitting we will provide just a bit of a wrap-up, a broader overview question here, I'm wondering to what – I'm not hearing a lot of the precautionary principle running through your approach to the issue here and I'm wondering to what extent that does factor into your planned testing here? I'm not hearing the kind of emergency status that calls for testing that we're hearing from regulators across the border in the United States. There's a tremendous crisis of confidence I think right – right now in Canadian lawmakers and regulators with regards to how this issue is being handled. We've seen demonstrated outright collusion between the aquaculture industry and federal regulators on full display throughout the Cohen Commission recently and I'm wondering how, again with regards to applying precautionary principle to your – your testing going forward and in terms of dealing with this obvious crisis of confidence in Canadian regulators and government agencies here, how you plan to address that going forward?
I would like any of you to answer.

Dr. Con Kiley: From the Canadian Food Inspection Agency's point of view, we take any particular finding or possible finding of a report of an animal disease like ISA B virus very seriously. That is the agency...

Question: It doesn't sound like that though to an outside observer and that needs to be brought up to you I think.

Dr. Con Kiley: You need to look at the work that we're doing and we have tests performed, we have samples taken and we have to use science as our guiding principle and that will guide us always and there is at this moment in time no evidence based upon the analyses that we provided to date, any evidence that ISA B virus

occurs in the Pacific waters off British Columbia.

Question: It sounds like the opposite of the precautionary principle what you've just – what you've just stated today in the entirety of your conference call today.

Dr. Con Kiley: Well, we all -- we all have our own opinion.

Question: You're looking to rule things out as – as being the priority as opposed to the other way around.

Dr. Con Kiley: We take it seriously, that's all I can say, sir.

Question: Anybody else?

Guy Gravel: At this point, I would like to thank everybody for participating in our conference call. Merci d'être là aujourd'hui. I would like to just remind everybody who are a participant today, from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, we had Dr. Con Kiley, from the department of Fisheries and Oceans, we had Dr. – sorry, Steven Stevens, we also have Peter Wright from the Moncton laboratory for DFO as well as Dr. Paul Kiching, chief veterinarian officer for British Columbia. Should any media require additional questions answered, specifically to testing, please contact the department of Fisheries and Oceans, media relations team, at 613-990-7537. For all other questions related to this issue, please contact the Canadian Food Inspection Agency's media relations team at 613-773-6600. Merci à tous, thank you very much. Have a good day.

Operator: Thank you, merci. The conference has now ended. La conférence est maintenant terminée. Please disconnect your lines at this time. Veuillez raccrocher votre ligne et merci à tous les participants qui se sont joints. Thank you for your participation.