

RAPPORT DE MISSION/ MISSION REPORT

Dr Bernard Vallat, Directeur général

Lyon (France)

Dates de la mission/Dates of the meeting : 20 novembre 2007

Objet de la mission / aim of the meeting:

- Assurer l'ouverture et participer à la première journée du séminaire sur les retours d'information de la part d'experts PVS certifiés par l'OIE, sélectionnés à cet effet.
- Visiter les locaux du futur Centre de formation du Centre collaborateur de Lyon (encore en construction).

Autres participants / Other participants:

- Dre Sarah Kahn, Chef du Service Commerce international de l'OIE,
- Dr Yamato Atagi, Chargé de mission, Service Commerce international de l'OIE,
- Dr Alain Dehove, Coordonnateur du Fonds Mondial (OIE),
- Dr Alejandro Thiermann, Président de la Commission du Code de l'OIE,
- Dr Gaston Funes, Adjoint au Chef du Service des Actions régionales de l'OIE,
- Stéphane Berlaud, Chargé de mission, service des Actions régionales de l'OIE,
- Mme Alejandra Balmont, Assistante de conférence.

Le Dr Schneider, Président du Groupe ad hoc de l'OIE sur la qualité des Services vétérinaires, la Dre Véronique Bellemain, le Dr Eric Fermet-Quinet, membres de ce groupe ainsi que l'équipe actuelle de l'ENSV-Lyon (de même que le Dr Olivier Faugères, futur Directeur) participaient également au séminaire.

Résumé et conclusions / Summary and conclusions:

Le rapport détaillé du Séminaire rédigé par le Dr Yamato figure en annexe.

Ma participation a permis de lancer les débats et de répondre à de nombreuses interrogations des experts ayant trait aux choix politiques de l'OIE destinés à faire avancer la généralisation mondiale de l'emploi du PVS.

Ce séminaire a été très utile car il a permis aux participants d'échanger leurs expériences et de faire des propositions d'amélioration des différents outils utilisés, à savoir le PVS lui-même y compris la liste des compétences dites critiques, les indicateurs et les différents éléments contenus dans le Manuel destiné aux experts.

Les experts ont également discuté de la mise au point d'un outil de présentation du PVS à utiliser en début de mission dans les pays sur la base d'un premier projet préparé par la Dre Véronique Bellemain. Les 23 recommandations issues des discussions du séminaire figurent dans le rapport ci-annexé.

La visite du bâtiment en construction à l'ENSV a permis de vérifier que d'ici quelques mois, l'ENSV sera en mesure d'organiser des stages de formation in situ au bénéfice des Services vétérinaires des Pays Membres de l'OIE.

Il conviendra pour cela que l'ENSV sélectionne à proximité du site ou à Lyon un hôtel correspondant aux normes internationales.

P.J. : un rapport détaillé

Diffusion : Directeurs généraux adjoints, Chefs de Service et adjoints, A. Dehove, Chargé(e)s de mission, S. Bègue, C. Brusckhe, M. Teissier, M. Zampaglione, Représentants régionaux et sous-régionaux, R. Abila,, C. Planté, A. Thiermann

Report of the PVS assessor's seminar
20 - 22 November 2007
ENSV (Lyon-France)

Day 1

18 PVS experts and members of the OIE Ad Hoc Group of Veterinary Services attended the seminar, as well as 4 ENSV (OIE Collaborating centre) representatives and 11 OIE staff from OIE-Headquarters and from OIE-Regional and Sub-regional Representations.

Context, Key issues, Expected outputs of seminar

Dr Vallat, Director General of the OIE opened the meeting with an overview of the PVS procedures and associated policy issues. Dr Vallat thanked the experts for their ongoing support of the OIE and for making themselves available to participate in this important meeting. He indicated that many countries are supporting the PVS activities and three collaborating centres (in Argentine (CEBASEV), France (ENSV) - and the United States (in May 2008) will be ready to support PVS related capacity building in the veterinary services.

Dr Vallat indicated that the OIE PVS focuses on support for building capacity in veterinary services. The approach is different to that of the original IICA approach, which focuses on government/private sector partnerships and not on compliance of quality of veterinary services with the OIE Code. He also announced the change of the name of the PVS (Performance of Veterinary Services). Dr Vallat also mentioned that the current initiative of the OIE to develop a standardised approach to gap analysis is an important element in the follow up to a PVS evaluation.

Dr Kahn made some comments in support of Dr Vallat, with an emphasis on the need for the OIE to reflect on the experience gained in this first year of operation of PVS and to take steps to improve quality, performance and accountability in delivery of this important OIE activity. The feedback of experienced PVS reviewers is crucial to this process of reflection.

All participants introduced themselves and the extent of their experience in conducting PVS evaluations and/or peer reviews of draft PVS reports. Dr Vallat then presided over an interesting exchange of views on policy issues; wherein the following points were discussed.

Countries are asking if the PVS can be used (with involvement of OIE certified PVS assessors) in the context of market access negotiations. Dr Vallat advised that OIE Members are encouraged to use the PVS Tool and procedures in the context of bilateral discussions and, in the same context, to make reference to PVS evaluations that have already been conducted. Involvement of OIE certified assessors is recommended to support a consistent approach to PVS evaluations.

There are many different contexts to a PVS Evaluation. In some cases it can be a political initiative; in others, a request from the veterinary services themselves; in other cases, the private sector may ask that their government request the OIE to conduct a PVS assessment. It is important that the PVS evaluation team understand the role of veterinary services in the contexts of the countries under evaluation: In developing countries; the veterinary services have a critical role in supporting the livelihoods of rural people who depend on small scale agriculture. In developed countries the veterinary services may focus more on large scale agriculture and trade issues. The PVS assessment must be appropriate to the context.

It is recognised that countries may see the PVS evaluation as a threat. The participants discussed what can be done to alleviate this and it is generally agreed that transparency of the process and the behaviour of the PVS assessors in an evaluation is very important. The OIE has always emphasised that a PVS evaluation is a supportive process and not a 'policing' process or a formal audit. Care must also be taken to ensure that the veterinary services being evaluated have a good understanding of the PVS process. In some cases countries expect that the PVS evaluation is directly associated with the provision of new resources. The relationship between the PVS evaluation and subsequent steps (gap analysis and preparation of funding requests) needs to be clarified. It was agreed that this would be explained in the standard presentation on the PVS.

Dr Vallat noted that, depending on the context of the evaluation, the involvement of experts with more specific experience (e.g. in laboratory systems or in analysing the financial needs in association with a gap analysis) may be supported.

Regardless of the context of an evaluation, Dr Vallat explained that costs associated with an evaluation should be shared between the OIE and the country evaluated, because PVS evaluation is a collaborative activity between the OIE and its Members. Countries are expected to cover the cost of local transportation, interpreters and accompanying staff.

Dialogue between the OIE and key partners, such as the European Commission (EC) and the FAO, is important to supporting the integrity of the OIE PVS procedures. Dr Vallat mentioned that the OIE appreciates the EC undertaking to make reference to OIE standards and the OIE PVS procedure under the new “Animal Health Strategy for the EU (2007-2013)” where “Prevention is better than cure”.

Dr Vallat also indicated that the OIE and the FAO have a good understanding and collaboration in regard to capacity building. The OIE standards are the reference point for performance of veterinary services. The PVS is a tool to evaluate performance against the recommendations in the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code. The FAO makes an important contribution to capacity building to assist countries meeting OIE standards. Eight FAO veterinarians have been trained as OIE certified PVS assessors. The OIE will work with the FAO in conducting gap analysis and preparing funding proposals. The follow up of PVS assessments must be made under the OIE procedure by OIE accredited experts.

Dr Vallat also noted that the FAO, with World Bank funding, has launched a procedure for developing Integrated National Action Plans (INAP), based on urgent assessments of the veterinary and medical infrastructure relevant to avian influenza, with a focus on short/medium term capacity building activities. The World Bank, OIE, WHO, AU-IBAR and FAO collaborate in INAP assessments and the findings of an OIE PVS assessment (if one has been carried out) are taken into account in the INAP procedures; otherwise the INAP team strongly recommends that an OIE-PVS is requested by the country. When PVS has not yet been made in countries having an INAP team evaluator, a rapid and provisional PVS is made using only critical competencies relevant to avian influenza prevention and control. This provisional evaluation must be made by an OIE accredited expert.

OIE has also established a good collaboration with the private sector, through its agreement with a coalition of global retailers (Safe Supply of Affordable Food Everywhere, SSAFE), which strongly supports OIE standards and PVS and opposes the intrusion of private standards in international trade. Dr Vallat explained that members of SSAFE consider that reinforcement of the veterinary services is the best means to prevent animal health incidents and crises in consumer confidence. Consumers are not experts in risk assessment and as a result private standards driven by consumers will reflect a ‘zero risk’ approach that is not based on science and is not appropriate.

Dr Vallat noted the importance to improve the quality of the evaluation and mention that some experts were deleted from the list of qualified assessors. The participants agreed that the relationship between team leader and members is crucial throughout the mission. Although the principle responsibility for production of the report lies with the team leader, all team members should be involved in preparing the report.

Participants agreed to the proposal of the OIE to introduce financial and administrative penalties in the case where reports are very late and/or inadequate.

Outcomes of ad hoc group meeting and overview of the revised PVS Tool

Dr Schneider presented the conclusions and recommendations of the ad hoc Group meeting on Evaluation of Veterinary Services July 2007 and highlighted a number of recommendations for further discussion, noting that some of these would be addressed at the ad hoc Group’s meeting in 2008. In consultation with the participants, Dr Schneider clarified the terminology to be used when referring to indicators (e.g. zoning and compartmentalisation) that are ‘not applicable’: i.e. “not applied at this stage”. Participants agreed that a country should not be penalised by choosing not to apply zoning and compartmentalisation.

Dr Schneider confirmed that the proposal to rename the Tool as “**OIE Tool for the Evaluation of Performance of Veterinary Services (OIE PVS Tool)**” was unanimously adopted by the ad hoc Group.

The main item that remains to be resolved from the ad hoc Group meeting is in relation to the evaluation of laboratories as a component of a PVS evaluation. It is clear that the PVS evaluation does not have the primary objective of assessing laboratories against the OIE quality standard for laboratories as this is a specific procedure that is beyond the scope and mandate of a PVS evaluation (although it could be the subject of a subsequent mission if the country requested this). The International Trade Department will continue to consult with the Biological Standards Commission, which will advise the names of some experts who could assist the OIE in refining the approach to laboratories in PVS but the group agreed that it was not necessary to add a laboratory expert in each team of assessors.

Dr Schneider also commented on the discussion in various meetings of the ad hoc group on the distinction between veterinary para-professionals and community animal health workers (CAHW). The definition of veterinary para-professionals in the *Code* clearly states that “ *the tasks authorized for each category of veterinary para-professional should be defined by the veterinary statutory body depending on qualifications and training, and according to need* ” . Hence it depends on the country itself to place CAHW in this category or not.

Consideration of Feedback from experienced PVS assessors (continued on day 2)

Dr Pfister, ENSV, presented the results of the assessors' feedback to the OIE questionnaire. The main issues discussed were as follows:

Issue 1: Problems with the provision of information prior to the visit

Problems have been encountered in the provision of information to the PVS assessors prior to the visit to the country. This will be addressed by the action described elsewhere in this report.

The letter from the OIE asks a country to contact the team leader and to assign a contact person (CVO or other) to act as the focal point for communication. However, countries often fail to follow this request. It was confirmed that the team leader should be the primary point of contact in communication with the country evaluated.

While some information requirements are important and it is desirable to obtain these before the mission starts, the OIE is not in favour of postponing missions as the goal of the PVS mission is to support countries. The PVS is not a policing activity and the OIE does not intend to penalise countries by postponing missions or taking other steps that could be seen as penalties.

The OIE is not in a position to develop "country profiles" in the context of PVS evaluations. However, information available from international organisations (e.g. OIE, World Bank, FAO or EC (FVO reports)) should be obtained if possible.

Some information may be considered confidential between the international organisation and countries concerned and in this case the team should obtain the information from the country evaluated. If the country is undergoing other missions at the same time, the PVS team should try to meet with or obtain relevant information from other groups, subject to agreement of the host country.

The OIE will take steps to reinforce with Member countries and Territories the importance of providing relevant information, including documents, before the mission.

The possibility of assessors arriving in the country a day or two before the mission officially starts was raised. The OIE can accept this approach in principle but it would need to be the subject of logistics, financing and communication to make sure that the country understood the situation.

If they wish to start missions early, the OIE asked assessors to advise of proposed modifications, with an estimated budget, well in advance of the mission. In practice the OIE has found that assessors cannot always make themselves available for longer missions.

Issue 2: Sampling of sites for the visit

It is important that the evaluation team make decisions about the sites to visit and do not simply follow the country's recommendations. Some problems have been encountered with bias in the approaches taken to site visits (for example, assessors making visits only to sites in urban areas). A formal statistically based

process is generally not going to be feasible due to practical and logistical issues. It is necessary to use purposive reasoning rather than statistically based sampling. Transparency is also important. There is some guidance in Annex 8 of the Manual for Assessors but some participants saw the need for more guidance. The provision of numerical indicators to aid in making decisions on the sites to be visited could be contemplated if assessors generally feel that this would be useful. It was agreed that some additional guidance is needed to harmonise approaches and that some additional guidance on relevant considerations in sampling sites could be useful to assessors. It was also agreed to add to the manual a table template with categories of sites to visit indicating (i) number of sites in the country and (ii) number of sites actually visited during the mission. This table may be used in the report template (see below).

Issue 3: Report template

The participants discussed whether recommendations and/or recommended actions should be included in the report and agreed that they should be included when it is appropriate to the context of the evaluation. The OIE emphasised that the primary purpose of the evaluation is to identify and prioritise gaps. The actual gap analysis will be done as a separate exercise after the PVS mission.

The participants agreed that the phrase “Action plan” should not be used in the context of PVS reports. The participants also discussed background information should be attached as annexes or included in summary form in the report. See recommendations elsewhere in this report.

Issue 4: Exit meeting

The participants agreed that the exit meeting should be conducted as a general briefing to the country and specific findings on levels of competency should not be provided. These meetings should not lead to negotiations with the country.

Issue 5: Others

Depending on the country evaluated, longer missions or more experts may be required. However, availability of assessors and budget considerations are limiting factors. Dr Vallat indicated that missions would normally be for 1 to 2 weeks by 2 assessors and in the case of large countries/more complex evaluations, 3 weeks and three experts.

An assessor told it is difficult sometimes to find time to work during the mission. It is recommended for a country to allow more working time especially in the evenings during the mission.

The issue of “follow-up” PVS Evaluations was also raised, with a general consensus that such action could be beneficial to the VS in question.

Day 2

Expectations of the OIE

Dr Funes made a presentation on this topic; covering the current status of PVS missions, reports and peer reviews and the process of reporting and peer review. He explained and discussed main issues and constraints detected up-to date from missions and reports.

Dr Funes also provided examples of 'good' and 'bad' reports (with identifiers removed).

Some of the problem areas identified by Dr Funes had been discussed previously; additional points and discussion are outlined below. Dr Funes noted that the OIE had issued a document clarifying roles and responsibilities of the team members and the team leader in September 2007.

Dr Funes asked the experts to contact the OIE more frequently when problems of communication with the country for the preparation of missions arise. There was general agreement on the possibility to involve more actively the OIE Regional and Sub-Regional Representatives in helping such preparations, acting as facilitators or intermediate communicators whenever necessary.

Dr Funes then informed participants on the progress achieved to date in performance of PVS reviews. The participants agreed that peer reviewer should not make a second guess and should not agree/disagree the

evaluation but should help assessors to make report be clear and consistent with OIE expectations. This could involve checking that there is a logical link between findings, evidence, conclusions and levels of advancement, and that the report covers and describes all Critical Competencies.. The format of the report should be as described in the Manual. Dr Funes stressed the need, in the OIE's view, to achieve agreement between the peer reviewer and the team leader on the report of the evaluation. He also pointed out that if this is not the case, a, final decision will be made by the Director General.

Regarding the quality of the report, the participants agreed that the executive summary should be concise and should cover the main findings of the evaluation and the process followed. The participants also agreed that findings in regard to each critical competency should be mentioned in the report and the reasons for all findings clearly explained and justified.

Participants noted that compliance with lower levels of advancement were prerequisite to competence with a higher level.

The OIE has more than met its target for PVS reviews but some problems have been encountered in meeting deadlines for reporting, including drafting reports and undertaking peer reviews. The OIE is taking steps to improve the timeliness of its internal processes.

There was agreement among the participants that, once the OIE receives comments from the evaluated country on the draft report,, the report and the comments and requests for modifications from the country should be sent to both the Team Leader and the Peer reviewer with a view to amending the report. Nevertheless, as in the first draft version, the responsibility for finalising the report remains with the Team leader.

Dr Funes noted that a logical, coherent and achievable time-frame, based on assessors' and peer reviewers' experiences and a number of improvements in critical aspects for each step of the process, should be proposed and agreed by the group. Practical feed back (how many days should be allowed for each main step?) and other suggestions from the assessors and peer reviewers would be useful.

In respect of the inclusion of photos taken during the mission, the general feeling was that this could be beneficial in illustrating some evidence. However, due care must be taken in respect of the confidentiality of the report and the prevention of misuse of such photo material. If deemed appropriate and necessary, photos could be indexed in the list of references

Standard presentation of PVS

Dr Bellemain presented the standard Powerpoint that she had prepared in collaboration with the OIE Headquarters. She explained that the presentation would help to correct any misunderstandings and to establish the distinction between the PVS evaluation and other inspections/audits.

Some participants proposed to add pictures and reduce or simplify the words. After discussion, some changes were recommended and the OIE agreed to finalise the presentation accordingly. The OIE will prepare translations into French, Spanish, Russian and Arabic. While there is some flexibility (e.g. modifying certain graphics, using some but not all slides) Dr Kahn specified that the content and the overall presentation of the standard Powerpoint should be respected.

It was agreed that elements of this presentation could also be used at the exit meeting.

Day 3

Recommendations of the Seminar

Dr Thiermann chaired a panel discussion, which had the objective of drawing together the recommendations of the meeting overall. Key points discussed included:

1. Transparency of the PVS - PVS without indicators should be published on the web and available to public. PVS with indicators, Manual for assessors and standard presentation should be limited to the OIE and the assessors for the time being. The OIE will keep under review any need to put additional information on PVS into the public domain

2. Dr Dehove confirmed that it was agreed that (i) the revised internal OIE administrative instruction (*Note de service*) on the organisation of the PVS missions and peer reviews and on the budgetary rules, including possible penalties on payments, will be added to the Manual for assessors for their information and complete transparency. (ii) The letter model to peer reviewers will also be added to the Manual.
3. The issue of how to address veterinary laboratories, including quality assurance systems, within the framework of PVS evaluation. It was agreed that the International Trade Department will continue to liaise with the Biological Standards Commission to obtain advice to be considered by the ad hoc Group on Evaluation of Veterinary Services, at its next meeting or via electronic communication. Inclusions of laboratory experts in PVS team will not be considered at that time.
4. The appropriate approach to compartmentalisation and zoning - it was agreed that the phrase 'not applied at this stage' would be appropriate to use in the case of countries that are not employing zoning or compartmentalisation and thus no Level of Advancement would be indicated. A country should not be penalised due to having chosen a policy of not applying zoning and compartmentalisation.
5. It was suggested that reference to the existence of 'databases' as indicators of performance be added in the section on disease surveillance. The ad hoc Group on Evaluation of Veterinary Services had discussed this at its July 2007 and had tended to support removing specific references to databases in the indicators, because the term implies electronic databases. However, some references to databases remain (e.g. in regard to risk analysis). It was agreed that the references to databases throughout the PVS Tool should be reviewed for consistency.
6. English, French, Spanish, Russian or Arabic are languages used commonly in the countries requesting PVS evaluations. The OIE is trying to train assessors who can work in at least one official language plus Russian or Arabic, as required in a country evaluated and where the country does not provide interpreters, the OIE is prepared to cover costs associated with local translation. Interpreters could be obtained from the veterinary services or via the OIE Regional Representation. Team leaders should try to obtain an estimate of the expenditure likely to be associated with translations required and provide advice to the OIE before the field mission.
7. The administrative guidelines of the OIE will in future be included in the Manual, including guidance on the role and responsibility of the team leader/members. Proposed budgets will in future be sent by the OIE to the team members as well as the team leader. The OIE can agree to the early arrival of the team leader and members in the country, limited to 2-4 days maximum including the weekend, as appropriate to the circumstances.
8. The OIE confirmed that the request to the country for the provision of baseline documents would be provided with the letter from the DG to the country evaluated. The request shall be such that documents are to be provided to the Team leader.
9. Interpreters could be obtained from the veterinary services or via the OIE Regional Representation. In selecting interpreters it is important to respect the independence and the confidentiality of the OIE process. This should specifically be kept in mind, where 'translation' services are provided by the VS evaluated.
10. Some participants recommended that assessors take steps to contact stakeholders/beneficiaries of the veterinary services' activities. Networking is encouraged. However, cultural issues must be respected and different cultures have different philosophies on the relationship between government services and stakeholders. Participants concluded that the key point to emphasise is the 'partnership, cooperation and ownership' feature of the PVS process. The relationship between the veterinary services and stakeholders should be reflected appropriately in the PVS report.
11. The competence dealing with 'preparation and implementation of legislation' was identified as problematic, given that these two functions are separate and competence in one does not necessarily mean competence in the other. Moreover, there is another important factor: the existence (or not) of legislation to underpin activities of veterinary services. It was agreed that this matter would be referred to the ad hoc Group with a request to review the approach to the legislation throughout the PVS Tool.

- 12.** There was much discussion on the provision of information before the field mission. It was agreed that the OIE should revise the list of 'minimum information requirements' (Manual Annex 5a). With this in mind, all participants should inform Dr Schneider, by December 15, of the minimum information requirements they wish to receive before the field mission starts. Dr Schneider will work with Dr Funes to develop a short list of essential information needs. The letter from the DG to the country to be evaluated will make reference to the list of information, which must be submitted to the team leader before the mission commences.
- 13.** The difficulties encountered in preparing the logistics of the mission were discussed in some detail. The importance of communication among the team members and between the team leader and the OIE was again emphasised.
- 14.** There was general support for the inclusion of a table as an aid to decision making on the sites to be visited during the review. While not statistically based, this could help the team in the process of planning the visit as it will be possible to see the number and type of facilities present in the country. The inclusion of two columns (one showing the total number of facilities and one showing which have been visited) helps to illustrate the context of the review. It is not possible at this stage to establish a minimum number or a statistically significant number of sites to be visited.
- 15.** Several participants found it useful to include a map illustrating the itinerary (sites visited) in the report of the evaluation. It was agreed that this would be included in the Manual Appendix 14 dealing with the report.
- 16.** Drs Fernet-Quinet and Fernandez commented on a template that they have used to show the findings and recommendations of the PVS mission. Many participants felt that this template was helpful in providing a clear summary of the mission findings. Note: (i) the term 'Action plan' will not be used in future; rather, the experts should confine themselves to making 'recommendations'; (ii) "average levels of advancement" should not be calculated from the result of the evaluation and can thus not be presented in the form of graphs. Text and tables may both be used as long as the presentation is coherent overall. The template prepared by the experts will be further discussed by Drs Schneider, Funes and Kahn and additional guidance will be incorporated into the Manual (Appendix 14).
- 17.** The question of how evidence and documentary/picture references should be treated in reports was also discussed. It is important that findings and conclusions are supported by evidence. Relevant references and other documentation (which may include photos) should be available, even if not included in the report. This is important for the peer review process. Even though the peer reviewer does not need to read all references, it is important that he/she can review them if necessary to be satisfied that the conclusions of the report are supported by relevant evidence.
- 18.** The need for reviewers to respect the format presented in the Manual when they draft their reports was emphasised. Dr Kahn briefly presented the OIE online facility for PVS reports. Participants felt that this could be useful, especially in providing file exchange features and portal access to most recent relevant documents, templates required for evaluation on line. Though some assessors felt that this could aid the efficiency of the reporting process, a capacity to create and submit the PVS report on line is not currently available. The OIE will look into the possibility of enhancing this function.
- 19.** As illustrated by the presentation of Dr Funes on the timeframe of the overall PVS process, several key areas for improvement have been identified. Among these, it was noted that although the OIE gives a specific deadline for the Peer Review, slow communication between the Peer Reviewer and the Team Leader can greatly hamper the production of the report due to slow /no feedback by the Team Leader to the Peer Reviewer's requests. Communication and letters to the Team Leader should therefore strive to ensure his/her full commitment and availability to the overall PVS mission, with an emphasis on timely collaboration in the peer-review process.
- 20.** Dr Thiermann provided an update to the group regarding a proposal to include specific competencies on communication in the PVS Tool. Participants recommended that some clarification be provided, including that communications equipment (telephones, faxes etc) is already covered under the physical infrastructure. There is the potential for confusion in that communication is relevant to many different competencies (eg risk management, partnership with stakeholders) and the approach to evaluating competence in communication needs to be considered carefully.

- 21.** Dr Dehove recalled the agreement that the standard Powerpoint presentation, after incorporation of most of the modifications discussed on Day 2, will be translated into the OIE official languages (French and Spanish) and into Russian and Arabic. Some options will be built into the standard presentation (e.g. spider web or bar chart graphic can be used), provided that the content is respected. This is the official OIE presentation on the PVS procedures and it should not be modified without approval of the Director General.
- 22.** Dr Bellemain presented a tabular summary that can be used as a means to present the overall results, for example in the executive summary. Participants generally found this useful and it was agreed that the template would be sent to assessors on request to Dr Facelli.
- 23.** There was a general agreement that PVS assessors should take care to avoid giving detailed information and should not be drawn into 'negotiations' on the findings during the exit interview. Presentations should be limited to broad comments (e.g. areas of strength and areas needing improvement) and acknowledgement of the assistance provided by the veterinary services. It is OIE policy that no specific statement should be made on the rating (levels assigned) for the competencies. It is important to emphasise the next steps, including a timely response from the country to the draft report, at the exit interview. The OIE is taking steps to improve the timeliness of internal processes but it is also important to improve the speed of response from the countries.