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Summary
A questionnaire was sent to the 167 Member Countries of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) in 2004 and 2005. The organisation and functioning of national Veterinary Services were analysed based on the responses from 85 of these countries. Leaving aside variations between countries, Veterinary Services are very involved in animal health and food safety controls at farm level (including animal feed), and during primary and secondary processing, whether alone or in conjunction with other services. At the lower end of the chain, namely distribution and the food service industry, responsibilities tend to be more widely shared. Veterinary Services have a central responsibility in international trade in animals and animal products. The main weaknesses in the chain of controls concern the logistical and financial resources of Veterinary Services, and insufficient involvement of livestock producers and even of field veterinarians. The many recent reforms are tending to provide a more consistent, integrated approach to animal health and food safety controls ‘from the stable to the table’.
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Introduction
The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) attaches increasing importance to the capacities of its Member Countries’ Veterinary Services. Indeed, the quality of the animal health information collected by the OIE depends on the Veterinary Services, as does the implementation of international animal health standards, the safety of trade in animals and animal products and, more generally, the way the Organisation’s work is applied at national level.

Animal production food safety has evolved, indeed is still evolving, towards an integrated approach throughout the food production chain, ‘from the stable to the table’ – or ‘from farm to fork’. The action of Veterinary Services must be viewed in this new context.

The 21st Conference of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe, held in September 2004, included a technical item entitled ‘Structure and organisation of Veterinary Services to implement the concept “from the stable to the table”’ (1). The report for the technical item was based on the 31 responses to a questionnaire sent to the Delegates of the 50 OIE Member Countries of Europe.

Given the value of the information collected, it was decided to extend the study worldwide and conduct a more detailed analysis.

In July 2005, the OIE sent the questionnaire to the Delegates of the remaining 136 Member Countries (i.e. 167 Member Countries, minus the 31 in Europe that had already replied).
Responses were received from 85 countries (31 for the first group of questionnaires and 54 for the second group; see list in Appendix 1) and subsequently analysed. Particular attention was given to comparing the responses from developing countries with those from developed countries.

Materials and methods

A questionnaire (Appendix 2), prepared by the authors in 2004, was sent by the Director General of the OIE to the Delegates of the 167 Member Countries, in hard copy and electronic format, in two phases. The 50 countries of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe received the questionnaire in 2004. All the other Member Countries, and those European countries that had not replied in 2004, were contacted in July 2005, with a reminder in October.

The questionnaire was written in French and translated into English and Spanish so that each country could receive it in whichever of the three official OIE languages was most appropriate.

The questionnaire comprised 22 closed-ended questions and a final open-ended question. Some of the closed-ended questions included sub-sections and several possible responses to choose from.

The topics covered were chosen with the aim of obtaining a description and evaluation of the organisation of animal health and food safety controls throughout the food production chain ‘from the stable to the table’ and dealt specifically with the following:

– economic importance of animal production
– organisation of central and field Veterinary Services
– organisation of animal health and food safety risk analysis
– distribution of tasks and responsibilities among the various services
– coordination between the different administrations involved
– participation in the work of international organisations
– recent or planned reorganisations
– staff numbers and involvement of the various stakeholders
– a general self-assessment
– the role of the OIE.

All the responses received before 6 December 2005 were analysed. Data entry and processing were carried out using the computer application Sphinx Lexica (v 4.5).

Countries were divided into developed countries and developing countries in accordance with the classification adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) for the Special Programme for Least Developed, Landlocked and Island Developing Countries (2).

Throughout this paper the results are presented with the number and, where meaningful, the percentage of countries that replied.

Group comparisons were performed using the Pearson chi-square test and, where appropriate, the Fisher exact test, with a 5% significance level.

Annotated results

The analysis covers the information provided by the 85 different countries who returned the questionnaire, representing approximately half the Member Countries of the OIE. However, most of the questionnaires contained one or more non-responses, which explains why the analysis rarely relates to all 85 respondents. Whenever figures are presented, the number of respondents is therefore systematically indicated.

Distribution of responding countries

Table I and Figure 1 show the distribution of responding countries according to their level of development (United Nations) and their geographical location (source: OIE).

European countries provided the highest proportion of responders, most likely due to their having been canvassed on more occasions (first questionnaire in 2004, then twice in 2005). Though the difference did not reach significance, a smaller proportion of developing countries than developed countries completed the questionnaire, probably due to there being far fewer developing countries in Europe.

The OIE classifies some countries in two different regions due to their size, the dispersal of parts of their territory or their geographically intermediate position. However, for the purposes of this study, it was decided to classify them on a geographical rather than a political basis.

Economic importance of animal products

The economic importance of livestock was deemed major or fairly major by most of the responding countries (70/84, 83%). A difference was found between developing countries and developed countries for the economic importance of agrifood industries, which was significantly
higher for developed countries (55/64; 86%) than for developing countries (12/21; approximately 57%).

Generally speaking, the importance of livestock production was positively correlated with that of agrifood industries: out of 83 respondents, the importance of both these sectors was considered to be high in 62 countries and low in 9 countries.

Organisation of central and field services

In the majority of cases (70/84; 83%), with no difference between developing and developed countries, Veterinary Services are supervised by the Ministry of Agriculture. The Ministry of Health is in second place as the ministry responsible for Veterinary Services. It should be noted that, in two countries, Veterinary Services are directly responsible to the Prime Minister.

The name of the Veterinary Administration differs depending on whether a country is a developing country or a developed country. Among all the countries, the term ‘veterinary’ was the most frequently cited, by 48 countries out of 85 (56%), comprising 14/21 developing countries and 34/64 developed countries. For developing countries, the next most frequent term was ‘livestock’ (11/21), with the following terms cited far less frequently: ‘health’ (2), ‘inspection’ (1), ‘animal’ (1), ‘agriculture’ (1) and ‘public’ (1). For the developed countries, the terms most commonly cited after ‘veterinary’ were ‘food’ (17/64) and ‘health’ (17); these were followed by ‘animal’ (10), ‘agriculture’ (8), ‘inspection’ (7), ‘safety’ (5), ‘plant’ (5), ‘livestock/animal production’ (4), ‘quality’ (3), ‘consumer’ (2), ‘industry’ (1), ‘protection’ (1) and ‘public’ (1).

Several questions sought to evaluate the level of decentralisation in decisions and actions relating to animal health and food safety. In the field of animal health, for most of the respondents (83), the State retains responsibility for risk evaluation (75; 90%), drafting regulations (81; 98%), surveillance and control (71; 86%); in the field of food safety the State is responsible for risk evaluation (71; 86%), drafting regulations (78; 94%) and surveillance and control (64; 77%). Only a few countries have instituted a true system of decentralisation extending as far as the drafting of animal health and food safety regulations (21 [33%] in animal health and 18 [29%] in food safety). No significant differences were found between developing and developed countries on any of these points.

The field Veterinary Services are under the responsibility of the State in the majority of the responding countries (80/85; 94%), with no difference between developing countries and developed countries. However, 11/62 developed countries (13%) (but no developing countries) declared that all or part of the field Veterinary Services are placed under the responsibility of an agency.

Organisation of animal health and veterinary public health risk analysis

Fifty-eight of the 81 responding countries (72%) (no difference between developed and developing countries)
indicated that animal health and veterinary public health risk analysis is performed by more than one organisation, only 23 countries (28%) stating that it is performed by a single organisation. The organisations mentioned come under the Ministry of Agriculture (55 countries [68%]), followed by the Ministry of Health (12 countries [15%], including the four countries where the Ministry of Health is responsible for the central Veterinary Administration) and, far more rarely, the Ministry for Economic Affairs (two countries, where this ministry is also responsible for the central Veterinary Administration). Five countries have an agency that is independent of the Veterinary Services.

Forty-two of the 79 responding countries (53%) indicated the existence of a document recommending or promoting a ‘stable to table’ approach for the application of food safety measures. Although the difference did not reach significance, a smaller proportion of developing countries than developed countries had a document of this type.

**Distribution of tasks and responsibilities between the different services**

Table II and Figure 2 present the involvement of Veterinary Services in the various activities related to animal health (animal identification, prophylactic treatment, health policing, animal traceability, laboratory activities, export certification).

Not surprisingly, Veterinary Services are heavily involved in these activities, for which they are, in the majority of countries, solely responsible (significant difference from a 50% indifference level). Only animal identification is as frequently the exclusive responsibility of the Veterinary Services as it is shared with other services.

Table III and Figure 3 present the involvement of Veterinary Services in activities related to food safety and hygiene.

Veterinary Services are less frequently solely responsible for food safety activities than they are for animal health activities (Table II and Table III). For many food safety functions, responsibility is shared with other bodies. Veterinary Services are, however, largely predominantly responsible for matters relating to the export certification of animal products (65/83; 78%) and for import controls on animal products (54/82; 64%).

Conversely, in the 78 countries that replied to questions about safety and control during food transportation and in the food service industry, Veterinary Services have no responsibility for food distribution in 26 countries (33%) and no responsibility for the food service industry in 39 countries (50%). The differences observed between
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**Table II**

**Responsibilities in animal health activities: assumed by the Veterinary Services (VS) alone, by the VS and other services or by other services only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>VS alone</th>
<th>VS and other services</th>
<th>Other services</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>40 (51%)</td>
<td>35 (45%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>78 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease prevention campaigns</td>
<td>57 (70%)</td>
<td>23 (28%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>82 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health policing</td>
<td>65 (78%)</td>
<td>18 (22%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal health laboratory</td>
<td>53 (64%)</td>
<td>26 (31%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>83 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live animal export certification</td>
<td>77 (93%)</td>
<td>6 (7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live animal import controls</td>
<td>70 (85%)</td>
<td>11 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>82 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal traceability</td>
<td>52 (65%)</td>
<td>26 (32%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>80 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures correspond to the number of countries that responded to the relevant question and the percentages have been established accordingly.
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**Fig. 2**

**Responsibilities in animal health activities: assumed by the Veterinary Services (VS) alone, by the VS and other services or by other services only**

Legend: **VS alone**, **VS + other services**, **Other services**
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**Table III**

**Responsibilities in food safety activities: assumed by the Veterinary Services (VS) alone, by the VS and other services or by other services only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>VS alone</th>
<th>VS and other services</th>
<th>Other services</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>13 (16%)</td>
<td>29 (37%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>43 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease prevention campaigns</td>
<td>14 (18%)</td>
<td>35 (44%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>54 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health policing</td>
<td>11 (14%)</td>
<td>47 (61%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>59 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal health laboratory</td>
<td>15 (19%)</td>
<td>43 (55%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>60 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live animal export certification</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>20 (26%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>25 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live animal import controls</td>
<td>11 (14%)</td>
<td>48 (62%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>62 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal traceability</td>
<td>13 (16%)</td>
<td>27 (35%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>42 (54%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures correspond to the number of countries that responded to the relevant question and the percentages have been established accordingly.
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**Fig. 3**

**Responsibilities in food safety activities: assumed by the Veterinary Services (VS) alone, by the VS and other services or by other services only**

Legend: **VS alone**, **VS + other services**, **Other services**
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developing countries and developed countries are not significant except at the distribution stage, where the Veterinary Services of developing countries are significantly less involved than those of the developed countries.

Table IV and Figure 4 present the involvement of Veterinary Services in activities relating to animal feed and veterinary medicinal products. These types of activities are just as frequently under the responsibility of Veterinary Services alone as they are shared with other services. Veterinary Services have no responsibility in the area of animal feed production or distribution in 22% and 33% of countries, respectively. While other services have sole responsibility for the production of veterinary medicinal products in 21% of countries, Veterinary Services are almost always responsible for controlling their use – which is consistent with the presence of these services at farm level.

Table V and Figure 5 present the involvement of Veterinary Services in various other activities. Veterinary Services are heavily involved in animal welfare (96% of countries, with sole responsibility in 45%) and aquatic animal issues (83% of countries, with sole responsibility in 36%). Logically, they are more rarely concerned with plant protection (30%), genetically modified organisms (GMOs) (57%) or the environment (46%).

The responsibilities of the Veterinary Services of developing countries are globally less diversified than those of developed countries. The difference between these two categories of countries is significant in terms of their involvement in GMO and aquatic animal issues. This most likely – and logically – reflects a lower level of concern or less activity in such areas in developing countries.
### Table IV
Responsibilities in activities related to animal feed and veterinary medicinal products: assumed by the Veterinary Services (VS) alone, by the VS and other services or by other services only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>VS alone</th>
<th>VS and other services</th>
<th>Other services</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal feed production</td>
<td>31 (38%)</td>
<td>32 (40%)</td>
<td>18 (22%)</td>
<td>81 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal feed distribution</td>
<td>27 (35%)</td>
<td>25 (32%)</td>
<td>26 (33%)</td>
<td>78 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal feed produced on the farm</td>
<td>28 (35%)</td>
<td>31 (39%)</td>
<td>20 (25%)</td>
<td>79 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of veterinary medicinal products</td>
<td>34 (44%)</td>
<td>27 (35%)</td>
<td>16 (21%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of veterinary medicinal products</td>
<td>39 (48%)</td>
<td>31 (38%)</td>
<td>12 (15%)</td>
<td>82 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of veterinary medicinal products</td>
<td>46 (56%)</td>
<td>32 (39%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>82 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures correspond to the number of countries that responded to the relevant question and the percentages have been established accordingly.

### Fig. 4
Responsibilities in activities related to animal feed and veterinary medicinal products: assumed by the Veterinary Services (VS) alone, by the VS and other services or by other services only

Figure 6 collates all these data, arranged according to the concept 'from the stable to the table', and differentiates between the following sectors: upstream (farm inputs: animal feed and veterinary medicines); livestock production (comprising the various animal health activities, including those related to imports and exports and to essential control activities such as identification, traceability and laboratory procedures); processing (including abattoir procedures and the subsequent stages of processing which interface with the final distribution stage), and, lastly, distribution and the food service industry. The other sectors, which are collateral to this linear view, are shown on the right of the figure. The broken-line diagram makes it easier to grasp the relative role of each player in the continuum. The symbols for each of the players are open when the difference compared to the other players is not significant and closed when the difference is significant.

This figure emphasises a number of points. First of all, it shows that in a large majority of cases Veterinary Services are involved, with sole responsibility, in everything directly concerned with animals (livestock production, animal welfare, aquatic animal issues), and that Veterinary Services are continuously present, whether with sole responsibility or in association with other services, throughout the chain. At both ends of the chain, there are far more areas in which Veterinary Services do not have sole responsibility, e.g. animal feed production, food transportation and, especially, the activities of the food service industry. Certification and import controls are activities where Veterinary Services are strongly represented, both for live animals and animal products. Conversely, quality control activities needed to ensure safety (traceability, identification, laboratory procedures) are more often shared with other services, or even predominantly under the responsibility of other services.

### Coordination between the different administrations

As the responses relating to the types of coordination between the different administrations involved could not readily be synthesised, only the question concerning the evaluation of the quality of coordination was analysed.

The quality of coordination was considered satisfactory by 55 of the 62 developed countries (89%), only seven developed countries (11%) considering it unsatisfactory or a source of serious malfunctions.

The developing countries seemed less satisfied with the quality of coordination, over half of the respondents (11/20) considering it unsatisfactory or a source of serious malfunctions.

### Participation in the work of international organisations

When asked for their assessment of the quality of national coordination in preparing the country's participation in the work of international organisations, a large majority of countries (60/67; 90%) answered that it was 'good' or 'very
Table V
Responsibilities in various other activities: assumed by the Veterinary Services (VS) alone, by the VS and other services or by other services only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>VS alone</th>
<th>VS and other services</th>
<th>Other services</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal welfare</td>
<td>35 (45%)</td>
<td>39 (51%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic animals</td>
<td>28 (36%)</td>
<td>36 (47%)</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>77 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant protection</td>
<td>10 (14%)</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
<td>52 (70%)</td>
<td>74 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMOs</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>24 (39%)</td>
<td>27 (43%)</td>
<td>62 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>35 (42%)</td>
<td>45 (54%)</td>
<td>83 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GMOs: genetically modified organisms
The figures correspond to the number of countries that responded to the relevant question and the percentages have been established accordingly.

Fig. 5
Responsibilities in various other activities: assumed by the Veterinary Services (VS) alone, by the VS and other services or by other services only

There is perhaps a need to verify whether the assessments given mean that the existing procedures result in effective participation or merely that the arrangements themselves are deemed satisfactory.

Recent or planned reorganisation
Sixty-nine of the 82 responding countries (84%; no difference between developing and developed countries) indicated that the services involved in the safety of the food chain ‘from the stable to the table’ had recently been reorganised (i.e. during the previous ten years) or that reorganisations were planned.

In the majority of cases (42/59; 71%), these reorganisations were explicitly aimed at establishing a coherent approach to food safety, ‘from the stable to the table’.

Involvement of different categories of players
The animal health and food safety actions of the public services can only be effective if they are adaptable, so as to be able to deal with any crises, and if all the various socio-professional groups play their part in turn, namely livestock farmers and field veterinarians at one end of the chain and agrifood professionals at the other.

The possibilities that exist for mobilising supplementary personnel to deal with animal health and food safety crises
The possibility of strengthening teams exists in at least 80% of the responding countries, both for animal health crises and for food safety crises, which is consistent with the need for a rapid response, as for example in the event of an epizootic. The mobilisation of veterinary students appears to be less common (approximately 60%) (Table VI).
Table VI
Additional personnel that can be mobilised in the event of a health crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal health crises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety officials</td>
<td>67 (84%)</td>
<td>13 (16%)</td>
<td>80 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary students</td>
<td>43 (60%)</td>
<td>29 (40%)</td>
<td>72 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other service personnel</td>
<td>64 (84%)</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
<td>76 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42 (86%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>49 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety crises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal health officials</td>
<td>71 (80%)</td>
<td>8 (10%)</td>
<td>79 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary students</td>
<td>38 (53%)</td>
<td>34 (47%)</td>
<td>72 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>60 (80%)</td>
<td>15 (20%)</td>
<td>75 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51 (71%)</td>
<td>21 (29%)</td>
<td>72 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures correspond to the number of countries that responded to the relevant question and the percentages have been established accordingly.
The different ways in which private veterinarians participate

Private veterinarians participate to varying degrees in activities that are under the responsibility of the Veterinary Services. They are quite widely involved in disease prevention campaigns (67/85; 79%), mostly under the terms of an animal health accreditation mandate (44/67; 66%) or else under contract. Their participation is more restricted in sectors such as animal health policing, abattoirs, zoonoses, laboratories and animal welfare, sectors in which only 32 to 40 countries (38% to 47%, out of 85) stated that they were assigned these tasks. They are even less frequently involved in food safety (24 countries, 28%) and matters concerning aquatic animals (22 countries, 26%). For all these activities, the animal health accreditation mandate is the most commonly used method of assigning official duties to veterinarians. There was no significant difference between developed countries and developing countries on this point (Table VII and Figure 7).

The involvement of livestock producers

On the whole, the links with livestock producers appear to be insufficiently formal given the importance of their role in animal health. Livestock producers have statutory animal health responsibilities in 65 countries out of 83 (78%), with a significant difference between developed countries (86%) and developing countries (55%). However, the proportion of countries with livestock producers’ organisations that can liaise with the administration is low (approximately 60%), without any significant difference between developed countries and developing countries. The existence of formal partnerships with these organisations is not systematic, even in developed countries (59%), and is very infrequent in developing countries (3/20; 15%) (Table VIII).

Table VII
Framework for participation of private veterinarians in official animal health and food safety activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Accreditation mandate (%)</th>
<th>Contract (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total (% out of 85)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disease prevention campaigns</td>
<td>44 (66%)</td>
<td>23 (34%)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health policing</td>
<td>23 (61%)</td>
<td>15 (39%)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td>21 (66%)</td>
<td>11 (34%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abattoirs</td>
<td>22 (55%)</td>
<td>18 (45%)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety</td>
<td>13 (54%)</td>
<td>11 (46%)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoonoses</td>
<td>28 (74%)</td>
<td>10 (26%)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal welfare</td>
<td>22 (69%)</td>
<td>10 (31%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic animals</td>
<td>16 (73%)</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Accreditation mandate (‘mandat sanitaire’): contract between the Administration and the private veterinarian, entrusting permanent tasks to the veterinarian (disease surveillance, intervention in the case of an epizootic, etc.)
b) Contract: private veterinarians employed part-time by the State

Table VIII
Involvement of livestock producers in animal health decisions and actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of involvement</th>
<th>Developing countries</th>
<th>Developed countries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory responsibilities *</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a producers’ organisation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal partnerships with the Veterinary Services *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant difference between developed countries and developing countries
The involvement of agrifood professionals

The majority of countries, regardless of whether they are developed or developing countries, place statutory responsibilities on agrifood professionals to control the quality of the products they provide (67/78; 86%). In the developed countries, agrifood industries are significantly more highly organised than in the developing countries (Table IX).

General self-assessment

Each respondent assessed the strengths and weaknesses of their country's Veterinary Services for guaranteeing food safety throughout the production chain, based on a list of 19 items. This was used to determine a score for each country (Fig. 8).

The scale used in the questionnaire ranged from -- ('unsatisfactory aspects') to ++ ('strong points'). To establish a global score, each response was assigned a score, ranging from -2 (--) to +2 (++). The global score was the sum of the scores for each of the 19 questions. Developing countries had a mean score of 0, and developed countries a mean score of 16, with a relatively high degree of dispersion of values in each case.

Figure 9 shows the mean score for each question, for the whole sample, for developing countries and for developed countries. The maximum score for any given question is 2. Only responsiveness to an animal health crisis (score: 1.4) was close to the threshold value of 1.6, corresponding to 80% of the maximum score for the whole sample, a proportion that can be considered satisfactory.

A far less ambitious threshold, namely a score corresponding to 50% of the maximum value (i.e. a value of 1) was reached for some other items, including general organisation (1.1), transparency of the tasks of Veterinary Services (1.0), responsiveness to a food safety crisis (1.1) and qualifications of official veterinarians (1.1).

If one considers that a score equal to or less than 40% of the maximum value (0.8) is low, the following items are weaknesses for the whole of the sample: coherence of the decision-making chain (0.6), coordination between risk assessment and risk management (0.4), coordination between the people in charge (0.6), traceability (0.4), human resources (0.5) and especially the involvement of private veterinarians (0.1), organisation of livestock producers (0.4) and qualifications of livestock producers (0.4), accountability of manufacturers (0.4), and, most glaringly, logistical and financial resources (-0.1).

Developed countries differed significantly from developing countries in that they considered their main strengths to be independence of the veterinary public health services (1.2), coherence of the decision-making chain (0.9), circulation of information (0.9), integration between risk

Table IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of involvement</th>
<th>Developing countries</th>
<th>Developed countries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory responsibilities</td>
<td>14(74%)</td>
<td>5(26%)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of an organisation *</td>
<td>5(28%)</td>
<td>13(72%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant difference between developed countries and developing countries
assessment and risk management (0.8), coordination between the people in charge (0.9), traceability throughout the chain (0.65), responsiveness to a food safety crisis (1.5) and accountability of manufacturers (0.75).

Developing countries considered these same points to be among their weaknesses, with the exception of responsiveness to a food safety crisis. The weakness of logistical and financial resources and the lack of involvement of private veterinarians were significantly more acute for developing countries.

The role of the OIE

Nearly all the respondents considered that the OIE could support its Member Countries in the area of public service organisation, to guarantee better control of the safety of animal foodstuffs, by:

- organising study seminars and exchanges of practice at regional or international level (78/80)
- raising the awareness of political decision-makers (75/79)
- developing common approaches with WHO, FAO and the Codex Alimentarius Commission regarding these aspects (79/80)
- indicating the relevant provisions of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code (75/78).

These wishes, expressed by the Delegates of OIE Member Countries, are consistent with the growing involvement of the Organisation in support of the Veterinary Services of its Member Countries.

General discussion

a) The response rate (approximately 50% of the countries approached) was relatively high for a survey of this type. The response rate was high for Europe (three-quarters of the countries approached), average for Africa, the Americas and Asia (half of the countries approached), and low for the Middle East (one sixth). Various hypotheses can be put forward to try to account for this variability but they cannot be verified: sensitivity to the food safety issue; relations between countries and the local OIE Regional Representation; other priorities, be they health, economic or political.

Despite the high rate of participation, the returned questionnaires cannot be considered representative of the Member Countries of the OIE, since the respondents’ willingness to reply introduces a bias that prevents the results obtained being extrapolated to all countries. As a result, the possible effect of certain factors or interactions between different variables could not be analysed, since these interpretations might have been contradicted by an analysis performed on a more complete sample. The results presented take this difficulty into account and are intentionally cautious as to any epidemiological interpretation that might be drawn from them.

The results have been analysed taking into account the definitions of developed and developing countries used by UNCTAD insofar as it seemed a priori that the available resources in a country constituted one of the key factors in the organisation of its Veterinary Services. The small number of developing countries that actually replied to the questionnaire did not allow a finer analysis according to the level of development.
The wording of the questionnaire was a source of difficulty for some of the respondents and as a result not all the questions could be analysed in detail.

Many of the questions made provision for subjective answers, because if the questions had principally asked for documented facts the response rate would undoubtedly have been lower.

Yet, despite the various constraints and potential bias, several main themes seem to emerge from this study.

b) The organisation of Veterinary Services and, in a wider sense, that of the services involved in controlling the safety of the food chain, is largely determined by the administrative organisation of the country (centralised, decentralised or regionalised) and the importance of agrifood production for the economy of the country. The organisation of Veterinary Services seems to be more centralised in developing countries than in developed countries, where there is a trend towards the decentralisation of responsibilities.

c) The missions assigned to Veterinary Services vary from country to country, and other control services may share their responsibilities or take over responsibility at one or other point in the chain.

Beyond the inevitable variability and complexity of national organisations, in the vast majority of countries Veterinary Services seem to be present, either alone or with other services, at almost all stages of animal production and processing.

Historically, Veterinary Services were set up to control animal diseases at farm level. Now, in addition to animal health and protection missions, they may also carry out the control measures needed to guarantee the subsequent safety of animal-derived food products.

The survey confirms that Veterinary Services have a predominant, or even exclusive, role in livestock farming. They are always responsible for animal health policing and nearly always for prophylactic treatment, and are involved in animal identification and the traceability of animals. They are very frequently involved, often with shared responsibility, in animal feed issues (over 73% of countries) and the use of veterinary medicinal products (95% of countries for controls on their use).

Downstream from livestock production, the involvement of Veterinary Services has extended to include the abattoir, in secondary processing, in controlling the traceability of food products and, in 80% of countries, in their transport and storage. In approximately half of the countries, responsibilities in these areas are shared with other services.

One cannot, however, deduce from this that Veterinary Services are capable of guaranteeing a health and safety continuum at all stages of the production chain. An analysis on a case by case basis would be the only way of identifying breaks in the chain. In many countries, especially developing countries, the coherence of the decision-making chain is not considered very satisfactory. In contrast, some countries consider this to be one of their strengths. To identify any organisational failures and study the sensitive issue of inter-service coordination would require a detailed analysis on an individual country basis.

At the end of the production chain, namely distribution and, especially, the food service industry, Veterinary Services are less systematically involved, and in most cases responsibilities are shared. Given the nature of the controls at these stages, this does not at first sight call into question an integrated approach to sanitary control.

Fully justifying the importance attached to them by the OIE, Veterinary Services play a key role in the safety of international trade. They assume responsibility, and often sole responsibility, for sanitary controls on imports and more particularly exports (signing of sanitary certificates), whether for live animals or for food products, regardless of the distribution of responsibilities between control services.

It should also be noted that Veterinary Services are key players in the field of animal welfare (96% of countries), often with shared responsibilities, though this is not necessarily an indication of whether or not a country attaches importance to the welfare issue. They have a strong presence in the sanitary control of aquatic animals, a responsibility that is also often shared.

Lastly, in an appreciable number of countries Veterinary Services have responsibility for environmental matters relating to farms and agrifood firms (46%) and the control of GMOs (57%).

Developing countries generally direct their efforts towards animal health, whereas developed countries have clearly begun to turn their attention to food safety and other concerns, such as animal welfare and, albeit in a minority of cases, health risks for the environment.

d) The animal health and food safety actions of the control services can only be effective if they are coordinated with the various socio-professional groups involved, namely farmers and field veterinarians at one end of the chain, and agrifood sector professionals at the other.
Livestock producers are the first sentinels for the early detection of animal diseases, a vital condition for implementing the appropriate rapid response. Their practices also have an impact on the subsequent quality of food products: use of veterinary medicinal products and other inputs (growth factors) likely to leave residues in products, salmonellas in poultry production, etc. If livestock producers are to act responsibly they must be adequately trained. Training of this kind can be provided by livestock producers’ organisations, with the technical support of the public services or private veterinarians operating under the terms of an animal health accreditation mandate. Field veterinarians, or veterinary operators, the official services now providing a second level of control, whereas this modern concept is still at the embryonic stage or totally absent in developing countries. The tasks they are contracted to perform, mainly involving disease prevention campaigns, do not enable them to provide effective support.

The survey reveals major weaknesses at the level of livestock producers’ organisations and their veterinary public health responsibilities, and especially for training of livestock producers. Apart from the resources allocated to Veterinary Services, these points were considered the least effective in the system, whether for developed countries or for developing countries (though in the latter the situation was even worse).

The intervention of veterinarians does not appear to compensate for these inadequacies, since their involvement was considered very unsatisfactory, especially in developing countries. The tasks they are contracted to perform, mainly involving disease prevention campaigns, do not enable them to provide effective support.

It would therefore appear that the first link in the chain of surveillance systems for animal diseases (zoonotic or otherwise) and the production chain for food products of animal origin is the weakest at a worldwide level.

The accountability of manufacturers appears to be only moderately satisfactory in developed countries, whereas it is markedly deficient in developing countries. In developed countries, this is probably correlated with primary responsibility for the quality of the products they place on the market having been transferred to the operators, the official services now providing a second level of control, whereas this modern concept is still at the embryonic stage or totally absent in developing countries.

e) Regarding the organisation, resources and effectiveness of animal health and food safety controls, significant differences were found between developed and developing countries. The responses to these questions were, by design, highly subjective, and an evaluation of resources/missions/results was beyond the scope of this study.

The respondents were relatively satisfied with the overall organisation of food safety control, the transparency of the tasks of the health services and the qualifications of official veterinarians.

Independence of the health services, coherence of the decision-making chain, circulation of information, coordination between the people in charge, integration between risk assessment and management, and traceability throughout the chain were seen by developed countries as among their strengths, whereas they were seen as weaknesses in developing countries, especially with regard to circulation of information.

Responsiveness to crises was seen as the major strength of Veterinary Services, especially in the area of animal health. Developing countries, however, seem less effective in dealing with food safety crises. This could well be related to the lack of accountability of manufacturers and therefore of any partnership with them in the management of crises, as well as to a poorer integration of risk management throughout the production chain.

Veterinary Services of all the responding countries complained of insufficient logistical and financial resources, the most glaring inadequacies being in the developing countries. This item received the lowest score when the respondents assessed their services. The survey therefore provides confirmation, if any were required, of the need for capacity-building policies for Veterinary Services, which can now be expected to develop, with the help of international funding agencies (in particular the World Bank), as a consequence of the avian influenza epizootic. Many respondents also complained of a lack of human resources.

f) A very high proportion (84%) of countries that completed the questionnaire underwent a reorganisation of their control services between 1997 and 2005, or reported that one was planned, which clearly shows that policymakers have felt the need to adapt the administrative organisation to suit changes in the situation in which they work. In 71% of cases, the reorganisation was specifically aimed at ensuring greater consistency ‘from the stable to the table’.

Although the data relate to a single moment in time for each country, the juxtaposition of the results very clearly suggests a general movement towards implementing the concept ‘from the stable to the table’, even if countries still have, albeit to varying degrees, some way to go.

Conclusion

While the organisation of Veterinary Services and their areas of competence vary considerably from one country to another, several major themes can be identified worldwide.
The concept of integrated control of sanitary risks ‘from the stable to the table’ is becoming widely accepted, though the pace of introduction varies from country to country. This concept implies that all the different professionals involved are accountable. While a high proportion of countries have regulations making manufacturers and livestock producers accountable, many of these countries lack specific organisations for these categories of professionals.

In the majority of countries Veterinary Services are involved in sanitary control activities throughout the food chain, whether alone or in conjunction with other authorities. The degree of economic development is unquestionably an important factor in determining whether a country adopts this approach.

The Delegates who completed the questionnaire were almost unanimous in wishing to see the OIE help to promote and develop the capacities of national Veterinary Services, in view of the weaknesses they reported, the main one being the lack of resources. The present study should prove helpful in this context, particularly during the evaluation of a country’s Veterinary Services, by showing how they compare to the national Veterinary Services of other countries.
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Appendix 1

List of the 85 countries that completed the questionnaire

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Moldavia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, New Caledonia, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Taipei China, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe.
Appendix 2
Questionnaire sent to OIE Member Countries

Questionnaire
Structure and organisation of Veterinary Services
to implement the concept ‘from the stable to the table’
Rapporteur: Véronique BELLEMAIN

Country: ...........................................................
Delegate’s name: ...............................................
Date: ..................................................................

Introduction
The ‘stable to table’ (or ‘farm to fork’) concept calls for an integrated approach to health issues throughout the production chain, a risk assessment and management continuum that starts upstream (including the conditions for producing animal feed) and extends downstream with the delivery of products to the consumer. Food safety is assured by controls and guarantees geared to each production phase and by constant links and interactions between the phases.

Definitions:
- Veterinary Administration means the governmental Veterinary Service having authority in the whole country for implementing the animal health measures and international veterinary certification process which the OIE recommends, and supervising or auditing their application.
- Veterinary Authority means a Veterinary Service, under the authority of the Veterinary Administration, which is directly responsible for the application of animal health measures in a specified area of the country. It may also have responsibility for the issuing or supervision of the issuing of international veterinary certificates in that area.
- The Veterinary Services comprise the Veterinary Administration and all the Veterinary Authorities.

Note:
This questionnaire relates to animals used to produce food for human consumption, as well as to products derived from these animals. It does not concern companion animals, waste, etc.

Grading:
For several of the questions, a qualitative grading scale is proposed: “-“ (minor), “-” (fairly minor), “0” (neutral, average), “+” (fairly major) or “++” (major, positive).
Questionnaire used to prepare the food technical theme of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe – September 2004
Sent to all the OIE Member Countries on June 2005, in the framework of the OIE Scientific and Technical Review
V8/15/06/2005

**Contextual elements: Importance of animal products**

1 – What is the economic importance of animal products in your country’s economy? (from - to ++)

Livestock production: ........................................
Agrifood industries: ........................................
Exports: ........................................................

2 – What is the economic importance of the different animal sectors in the production of foodstuffs for human consumption? (from - to ++)

Cattle (meat): ...................................................
Cattle (dairy): ..................................................
Sheep: ..........................................................
Small ruminants: ...........................................
Sheep: ..........................................................
Poultry (meat and eggs): ..................................
Horses for meat: ............................................
Lamas: .........................................................
Aquatic animals: ...........................................
Bees: ..........................................................
Other (specify): ...............................................

**Services involved in food safety from the stable to the table: administrative organisation and fields of intervention**

3 – Central Services

Veterinary Administration:

Ministry supervising the Veterinary Services: .............................................................................

Full name of the Veterinary Administration: .............................................................................

Acronym (to be used throughout the rest of the document where required): ..........................

Other structures concerned: (repeat this section as many times as necessary)

Supervisory ministry: ............................................................................................................

Full name: ............................................................................................................................

Acronym: .............................................................................................................................

Supervisory ministry: ............................................................................................................

Full name: ............................................................................................................................

Acronym: .............................................................................................................................
4 - Organisation of health risk analysis

Evaluation and management depend on a single organisation [ ]
- on separate organisations [ ]

Organisation(s) in charge of evaluating health risks: (repeat this section as many times as necessary)

Name: ........................................................................................................................................

Link with one or more ministries: ............................................................................................

Field of competence: ..............................................................................................................

Acronym: .................................................................................................................................

Name: ........................................................................................................................................

Link with one or more ministries: ............................................................................................

Field of competence: ..............................................................................................................

Acronym: .................................................................................................................................

Name: ........................................................................................................................................

Link with one or more ministries: ............................................................................................

Field of competence: ..............................................................................................................

Acronym: .................................................................................................................................

5 – Territorial organisation

What are the administrative levels responsible for the following tasks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational level</th>
<th>(1) Name of the administrative division concerned</th>
<th>(2) Total number in the country</th>
<th>(3) Existence of organisations responsible for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for AH*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AH = animal health, FS = food safety
(1): Give the exact name (land, department, județ, etc.)
(2): Number of these administrative divisions throughout the country
(3): Put a cross in the boxes corresponding to the situation in your country

Provide any further details: See org. chart ......................................................................................

6 – Field services
Veterinary Authorities:

The Veterinary Authorities are:
- State services
- Services reporting to a regional or local authority
- Integrated into an independent organisation (Agency)

Full name: ____________________________________________________________

Acronym (to be used throughout the rest of the document where required): ....................

Other structures: (repeat this section as many times as necessary)

Full name: ______________________________________________________________________

Acronym (to be used throughout the rest of the document where required): ....................

7 – Distribution of tasks and responsibilities for veterinary issues at the central and devolved levels (other than for risk assessment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sole responsibility of the VS</td>
<td>Shared responsibility of the VS</td>
<td>Sole responsibility of other services</td>
<td>Other structure(s) involved (if column 2 or 3 ticked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traceability of animal movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traceability of food products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophylactic treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health polling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety of animals and animal products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal feed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary medicinal products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VS = Veterinary Services
(1), (2) and (3) = answer “yes” or “no”
(4) = Use the acronyms defined in the previous questions
8 - Coordination between the different administrations involved in controlling the safety of the food chain

List the organisations concerned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preparing international applications</th>
<th>Drafting regulations</th>
<th>Risk assessment</th>
<th>Risk management</th>
<th>Central services</th>
<th>Field services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination is systematically organised:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Within a regulatory framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- By a specific organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- By customary work practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination is occasional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Vet. Services are responsible for coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no proper coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer YES or NO

Overall you consider coordination to be:
- Highly satisfactory.............................. []
- Satisfactory........................................... []
- Unsatisfactory....................................... []
- A source of serious malfunctions.................. []

Comments: ...............................................................................................................................

9 - Have official documents been published that recommend (and/or promote) an integrated "stable to table" approach for the application of food safety measures?

YES [ ]

NO [ ]

If you answered yes, which ones? What is their legal status?

..................................................................................................................................................  

10 - Participation in international organisations

What is the lead organisation in the preparatory work and other activities of the following international organisations? Which other organisations are involved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Lead organisation (or sole competence)</th>
<th>(2) Other organisations involved</th>
<th>(3) Quality of coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIE</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) and (2) = use the acronyms defined in the previous questions
(3): From 1 to 2
11 – Recent or planned reorganisations

Has the organisation of the services involved in the safety of the food chain "from stable to table" been reformed in the past ten years, or are reforms planned or in progress?  

YES [ ]  NO [ ]

If you answered yes, state when and which ones:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

12 – Summary

To summarise the answers to the previous questions, briefly describe the administrative organisation of the services involved in controlling safety throughout the food chain (append a diagram if possible):

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Staff numbers

13 – Number of public officials employed by the Veterinary Services

Definition: This concerns staff working full time for the official Veterinary Services who are prohibited from engaging in private practice in the same fields of competence.

Number (approximate) of public officials in the Veterinary Services:
- Central Administration (including regional levels): ...........
- Number of these who are veterinarians: ...........
- Decentralised administration:
  Number of these who are veterinarians: ...........
- Devolved or field services:
  Number of these who are veterinarians: ...........

14 – Possibility of mobilising supplementary personnel

In the event of a serious health crisis, such as the occurrence of an epizootic that spreads rapidly throughout the territory, is it possible easily to mobilise extra personnel, other than those normally responsible for the field concerned?

To cope with an animal health crisis:
- Mobilisation of food safety officials?  YES [ ]  NO [ ]
- Mobilisation of veterinary students?  YES [ ]  NO [ ]
- Mobilisation of officials from other official services?  YES [ ]  NO [ ]
- Other?  YES [ ]  NO [ ]
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To cope with a food safety crisis:
- Mobilisation of animal health officials? YES [ ] NO [ ]
- Mobilisation of veterinary students? YES [ ] NO [ ]
- Mobilisation of officials from other official services? YES [ ] NO [ ]
- Other? YES [ ] NO [ ]

If you answered yes, within which regulatory framework? Under which authority? ...

Cite an example of a crisis that led to such extra personnel being mobilised: ...

---

16 - Participation of private veterinarians in controlling food safety and animal welfare

Do private veterinarians carry out tasks under the authority of the VS?
YES [ ] NO [ ]

If you answered yes, in which field(s) and within which legal framework(s)? How many private veterinarians are involved? What proportion do they represent of the total number of private veterinarians? (differentiate between rural, mixed and canine veterinarians where appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Legal framework</th>
<th>(2) Veterinarians involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal health accreditation mandate (3)</td>
<td>Employed part time (contracts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease prevention campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health policing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abattoirs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety (outside the abattoir)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoonoses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1): Answer YES or NO
(2): State the number (order by size) and the percentage of the total number of private veterinarians, or a comment (e.g. "nearly all rural veterinarians")
(3): The animal health accreditation mandate ("mandat sanitaire") is a contract between the Administration and the private veterinarian, entrusting permanent tasks to the veterinarian (disease surveillance, intervention in the case of an epizootic, etc.)

Comments: .................................................................

.................................................................
Involvement of producers

Livestock producers

16 – Do livestock producers have statutory responsibilities in controlling animal health and the quality of the products supplied?

YES [ ]
NO [ ]

If you answered yes, which ones?

17 – Are livestock producers organised to control animal diseases?

YES [ ]
NO [ ]

If you answered yes, how?

18 – Are there formal partnerships with the Administration?

YES [ ]
NO [ ]

If you answered yes, which ones?

Agrifood professionals

19 – Do food producers have statutory responsibilities in controlling the quality of the products supplied?

YES [ ]
NO [ ]

If you answered yes, which ones?

20 – Are they organised to promote the health quality of their products?

YES [ ]
NO [ ]

If you answered yes, how?

General assessment

21 – What, in your view, are the strengths and weaknesses of your country’s organisation for guaranteeing the continuous control of safety of the food chain from the stable to the table? (from “-” for unsatisfactory aspects to “++” for strong points)

General organisation of the services concerned ......
Transparency of the tasks of the health services ......
Independence of the health services ......
Coherence of the decision-making chain ......
Circulation of information ......
Integration between risk assessment and management ......
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- Coordination between the people in charge
- Traceability throughout the chain
- Effectiveness in routine activities
- Responsiveness to an animal health crisis
- Responsiveness to a food safety crisis
- Human resources
- Qualifications of official veterinarians
- Qualifications of other Veterinary Service officials
- Logistical and financial resources
- Involvement of private veterinarians
- Organisation of livestock producers
- Qualifications of livestock producers
- Accountability of manufacturers

Other: ..................................................

Other: ..................................................

Comments: ..........................................................................................................................

..........................................................................................................................

Role of the OIE

22 – Do you think the OIE could support its Member Countries in the area of public service organisation, to guarantee better control of the safety of animal foodstuffs?

YES [ ] NO [ ]

If you answered yes, how?

- Study seminars and exchanges of practice
  - At regional level
  - At international level

- Raising the awareness of political decision-makers of the need for an integrated approach to health issues

- Developing common approaches with the WHO, FAO and Codex Alimentarius regarding these aspects

- Specifying the relevant provisions of the International Animal Health Code

- Other (specify) .................................................................

Further information - Comments

23 - ..........................................................................................................................