

final rule removes some importation restrictions on animals and products from certain foreign regions with regard to CSF and SVD, the importation of swine and swine products from the EU may continue to be prohibited or restricted due to the presence in the EU of other diseases affecting swine, such as brucellosis, pseudorabies, and tuberculosis.)

We will first discuss the issues raised by commenters in response to our June 1999 proposed rule, then we will discuss the issues raised in response to our revised risk analysis.

Comments on the June 1999 Proposed Rule

Of the five comments we received in response to our June 1999 proposed rule, three supported the proposal as written. Of the other two comments, one generally supported the proposal, but recommended certain changes. The other expressed concerns with a number of provisions of the proposal and its supporting documentation. We discuss below the issues raised by the commenters.

SVD in Italy

As discussed above, in our June 1999 proposed rule, we proposed to list eight Regions in Italy as those in which SVD is not known to exist. (In Italy, a "Region" is a type of political jurisdiction.) Those eight Regions were Abruzzi, Emilia-Romagna, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Liguria, Marche, Molise, Piemonte, and Valle d'Aosta. One commenter requested that we also recognize the following nine Regions as those in which SVD does not exist: Lombardia, Trentino-Alto Adige, Veneto, Toscana, Umbria, Lazio, Basilicata, Puglia, and Sardegna. We have carefully evaluated the information contained in the comment, and believe that it would be appropriate to allow members of the public to comment on the change requested by the commenter. Therefore, we are not making any changes in this final rule in response to this comment, but we intend to initiate a separate notice and comment rulemaking regarding those additional Regions.

Further, because SVD was diagnosed in the Regions of Abruzzi, Emilia Romagna, Molise, and Piemonte in 2002, we are not including those Regions in this final rule as regions in which SVD does not exist. However, we are developing an updated evaluation of the SVD situation in those Regions. We will publish a notice in the **Federal Register** when the updated evaluation is ready for public review and will accept comment on the evaluation for a

specified period of time. Following review of any comments we receive, we will determine whether it is appropriate to consider those Regions as regions in which SVD does not exist. If such a determination is made, we will publish a final rule to that effect in the **Federal Register**.

FMD in Greece

We proposed in our June 1999 proposal to recognize Greece as a region in which FMD does not exist. Following publication of that proposal, FMD was diagnosed in the summer of 2000 in cattle in several prefectures in Greece. However, since September 2000, there have been no incidences of FMD in that country. Therefore, on March 21, 2002, we published a proposal in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 13105–13108, Docket No. 01–059–1) to recognize Greece free of FMD. We solicited comments concerning our proposal for 60 days ending March 20, 2002, and received no comments. Following the comment period, we published a final rule in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 44524–44526, Docket No. 01–059–2) in which we adopted the proposed rule as a final rule without change.

Change in Terminology

Our regulations in 9 CFR chapter I use the term "hog cholera." When we published our June 1999 proposed rule, consistent with the existing regulations, we used the term "hog cholera." However, it is standard practice among veterinary practitioners in the international community to refer to hog cholera as "classical swine fever" or "CSF." Therefore, in the remainder of this final rule, including the regulatory text at the end of this document, we use the term "classical swine fever" (or "CSF") rather than "hog cholera." Additionally, for the sake of consistency throughout our regulations in 9 CFR chapter I, we are removing the term "hog cholera" wherever it appears in the existing regulations (*i.e.*, parts 71, 93, 94, 98, and 130) and adding in its place the term "classical swine fever."

Administrative Units Considered

As noted above, in Italy, the smallest administrative jurisdiction we considered for purposes of regionalization was the "Region." In Germany, we used the "kreis." One commenter said that it was not clear from the proposal why APHIS concluded that the Italian Region and the German kreis should be considered for regionalization purposes. The commenter stated that the proposal did not include information relating to unique characteristics of the regions and

physical boundaries that may or may not be present. Another commenter agreed with our use of the kreis in Germany for CSF regionalization purposes but recommended that, in Italy, we use instead the "Unita Sanitarie Locali."

As discussed in our proposed rule, we chose to use the Italian "Region" and German "kreis" for purposes of regionalization because we considered them to be the smallest administrative jurisdictions in those countries that have effective oversight of normal animal movements into, out of, and within those jurisdictions, and that, in association with national authorities if necessary, have the responsibility for controlling animal disease locally. The commenter who suggested we use the Unita Sanitarie Locali as the smallest administrative jurisdiction in Italy did not offer any information as to how the Unita Sanitarie Locali meets those criteria. Therefore, we are not making any changes based on the comments received, but we welcome further information on this issue.

Information on Outbreaks

One commenter stated that the proposed rule did not include information relating to specific outbreaks in the regions addressed by the proposed rule, and that it would have been instructive for APHIS to have included in the proposed rule a map indicating where the CSF outbreaks occurred in relation to the proposed regionalization, along with a list of reasons for the outbreaks (*e.g.*, wild boar exposure, feeding of uncooked garbage, transport into the area, or unknown origin).

We agree that the type of information referred to by the commenter is important in assessing the CSF risk presented by imports from particular regions, and we considered those factors in our risk analysis. At the time we published the proposed rule, some of the information was available on the APHIS Internet website, which was referenced in the proposed rule. The supplement to our initial risk analysis illustrates in more detail the type of information referred to by the commenter.

Concern With Regionalization

One commenter on our June 1999 proposal expressed concern that, following publication of the proposed rule, an outbreak of CSF occurred in the Kreis Uckermark in the Land of Brandenburg in Germany, which was included in the proposal as an area in which CSF is not known to exist. The commenter stated further that, even