

FOOD LAW ENFORCEMENT PRACTITIONERS  
Working Party – Managing on Effects

FLEP PEER REVIEW INITIATIVE (FPRI)  
MANUAL

---

A voluntary scheme  
for reporting and  
offering advice on  
food inspectorates,  
procedures and  
official controls

**Table of Contents**

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Project Submission Document</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>The Scheme</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Code of Conduct</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Questionnaires</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1	Official Controls	23
5.2	Model Organisation/Regulatory Authority	25
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Planning</b>	<b>26</b>
6.1	Overview of the Peer Review Process	27
6.2	Peer Review Plan	29
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Peer Review Reports</b>	<b>29</b>
7.1	Report Format	31
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Appendix I</b>	<b>32</b>

*Peer Review: A Tool for Cooperation & Change (OECD Working Method)*

## 1.0 Introduction

DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT

## 1.0 Introduction

Following the FLEP Forum meeting in Vilnius, March 2006, the Working Party on Managing on Effects have developed a manual for the operation of the Peer Review process amongst member state food control inspectorates. The Peer review model detailed in the manual provides for a system of independent scrutiny and evaluation of members states food inspectorates and for the operation and effectiveness of associated official controls and food related activities. It is a voluntary scheme for member states participate in and can also be used as a form of external review and scrutiny to supplement the requirements of Article 4.6, Chapter II, of Council Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004.

In general the only type of external assessment to which official control agencies have been subject to are the missions conducted by the European Communities Food and Veterinary Office (FVO). These missions often tend to be narrow in scope and many member states feel they have tended to concentrate on shortcomings identified rather than recognizing well functioning practices, activities and organizations.

With the introduction of Multi Annual National Plans in 2007, the nature of the FVO missions will change. The missions will become audits of the implementation of the multi annual national control plan and assess whether food safety control system are operating according to plan. The Peer Review rather than helping food control agencies to identify best practice, and to provide them with information which will allow them assess themselves against their peers.

A voluntary peer review scheme amongst official food control agencies could complement the FVO missions. It could greatly assist agencies at any level – national, regional or local to develop their operational plans and to ensure that they work an effective manner. IMPEL (2003) identified the potential benefits of a peer review scheme as: -

- Encouragement of capacity building in inspectorates
- Encouragement of further collaboration between EU Member States inspectorates on common issues and on exchange of experience and on development and dissemination of good practice in environmental regulation
- Provision of advice to inspectorates who may be seeking an external review of their structure, operation or performance by trusted, knowledgeable and independent counterparts for the purpose of benchmarking and continuous improvement of their organisation
- The spread of good practice leading to improved quality of inspectorates and inspections and contributing to continuous improvement of quality and consistency of application of environmental laws across the EU ("the level playing field")

It can be argued that similar benefits could also apply from peer view in food control.

The FLEP Working Party on Managing on Effects have reviewed several working models of Peer Review in operation and used by similar types of inspectorates and organizations and where tangible and meaningful results have been delivered in accordance with expectations. The group have tried to incorporate the most relevant aspects from these models that best fit with the operation of food control inspectorates and related food safety activities and which are incorporated within this manual.

## 2.0 Project Details

DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT

## 2.0 FPRI PROJECT DETAILS

No.	Name of Project
2.0	FLEP Peer Review Initiative (FPRI) – Project Details
Project Manager	Mr Raymond Ellard

<b>Objectives</b>	<i>To devise a voluntary scheme for reporting and offering advice on Member State Food Inspectorates, Procedures and the Performance of their Food Safety Activities</i>
-------------------	--

<b>Scope</b>	<p><i>The Organisational Scope of the scheme could include a review of any or all of the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Performance of the member states' food safety activities, including for example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ø <i>the effectiveness of their Official Controls (MANCP/Reg No. 882/2004)</i></li> <li>Ø <i>compliance with Food Law(Reg No. 178/2002)</i></li> <li>Ø <i>the legal and constitutional bases of the food inspectorate, including interfaces with other bodies</i></li> <li>Ø <i>delivery of objectives/goals</i></li> <li>Ø <i>Qualifications, skills and experience of regulatory staff</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Etc...</i></li> </ul>
--------------	--

<b>Potential Benefits</b>	<p><i>The potential benefits of such a scheme might include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Encouragement of capacity-building in EU Member State inspectorates.</i></li> <li>• <i>Encouragement of further collaboration between EU Member State inspectorates on common issues or problems, on exchange of experience and on development and dissemination of good practice in environmental regulation.</i></li> <li>• <i>Provision of advice to inspectorates (“candidate inspectorates”) who may be seeking an external view of their structure, operation or performance by trusted, knowledgeable and independent counterparts for the purpose of benchmarking and continuous improvement of their organisation.</i></li> <li>• <i>The spread of good practice lead to improved quality of inspectorates and inspections, and contributing to continuous improvement of quality and consistency of application of food law across the EU (“the level playing-field”).</i></li> </ul>
---------------------------	--

<p><b>The Basics</b></p>	<p><i>Necessary features of the scheme designed to deliver these benefits should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a well-defined scope of application.</i></li> <li>• <i>Practical and easily understood arrangement for scheduling, organising, funding, conducting and reporting on any review of a candidate inspectorate, and with minimal bureaucracy.</i></li> <li>• <i>Absence of any threat of self-incrimination of infraction proceedings arising specifically from application of the scheme.</i></li> <li>• <i>Control, by the candidate inspectorate, in selection of personnel to carry out any review.</i></li> <li>• <i>Effective follow-up arrangements for support of any candidate inspectorate seeking further advice or assistance on issues identified during review.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Effective arrangements for dissemination across Member States of training or educational material on lessons learnt and good practice identified during any review.</i></p>
--------------------------	--

<p><b>Product(s)/output(s) of the Reviews</b></p>	<p><i>In addition to the benefits listed above tangible products will include,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Written reports of reviews for candidate inspectorates,</i></li> <li>• <i>Relevant extracts from review reports, as agreed with candidate inspectorates, for dissemination to FLEP members and the EC,</i></li> <li>• <i>Training and Educational material on “lessons learnt” and on examples of good practice for incorporation into training schemes of Member State inspectorates.</i></li> </ul>
---	--

<p><b>Participants</b></p>	<p><i>All FLEP Members who wish to participate.</i></p>
----------------------------	---

<p><b>Administrative Support</b></p>	<p><i>Administrative support to be provided by FLEP acting as scheme secretariat.</i></p>
--------------------------------------	---

<p><b>Project team</b></p>	<p><i>It is proposed that the project team be composed of FLEP Members who wish to participate, or their representatives, and that work is coordinated by Mr Raymond Ellard Chairman of the FLEP Working on Managing on Effects</i></p>
----------------------------	---

<b>Project Manager</b>	<i>Project Manager - Chairman of the FLEP Working Group -Managing on Effects - Mr Raymond Ellard</i>
<b>Reporting arrangements</b>	<i>The results of the first xxx stages of the project will be reported directly to FLEP, for approval. Arrangements for reporting on test reviews will depend on results of the first stage of the project, particularly in regard to any provision for control by the candidate inspectorate over dissemination of review details.</i>
<b>Project Development</b>	<p><i>It is proposed to develop the project in three stages as follows,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Design of arrangements for scheduling reviews, for selecting review teams, for managing and supporting reviews, for reporting results or reviews, lessons, lessons learnt, etc. and for allocating associated costs.</i></li> <li>• <i>Drafting a questionnaire to be used as the basis for reviews.</i></li> <li>• <i>Testing of the scheme by way of xx reviews over a period of xx</i></li> <li>• <i>Post Review meeting to discuss effectiveness/usefulness of the review mechanism and deliverables</i></li> </ul>
<b>Quality Review Mechanisms</b>	<i>The quality and success of this project will be judged directly by FLEP on the basis of reports reviewed at the FLEP Forum</i>
<b>Project Planning Approval</b>	<i>For consideration at FLEP Forum</i>
<b>Start Review</b>	<i>As soon as possible after approval.</i>

## 3.0 Peer Review Scheme

DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT

### 3.0 FLEP PEER REVIEW INITIATIVE (FPRI) – THE SCHEME

<b>3.0</b>	<b>FLEP Peer Review Initiative (FPRI) – The Scheme.</b>
------------	---

### 3.0 FLEP Peer Review Initiative (FPRI) – The Scheme.

<b>Objectives</b>	<i>To devise a voluntary scheme for reporting and offering advice on Member State Food Inspectorates, Procedures and the Performance of their Food Safety Activities</i>
-------------------	--

<b>Scope</b>	<p><i>The Organisational Scope of the scheme could potentially include a review of any of the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Performance of the member states' food safety activities, including for example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ø <i>the effectiveness of their Official Controls (MANCP/Reg No. 882/2004)</i></li> <li>Ø <i>compliance with Food Law(Reg No. 178/2002)</i></li> <li>Ø <i>the legal and constitutional bases of the food inspectorate, including interfaces with other bodies</i></li> <li>Ø <i>delivery of objectives/goals</i></li> <li>Ø <i>Qualifications, skills and experience of regulatory staff</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Etc...</i></p>
--------------	---

<b>General Arrangements for Trial Reviews and the Role of the FPRI Project Manager</b>	<p><i>The review period and number of reviews should also be agreed at the FLEP Forum</i></p> <p><i>Arrangements should also include selection of volunteer candidate inspectorates and agreement of the appointment of Review Team Leader(s).</i></p> <p><i>A contact point should be provided by the host member state/organisation to be reviewed.</i></p>
--	---

	<p><i>The FPRI Project Manager will make contact with the host member state contact point and Review Team Leaders to agree on Peer Review dates.</i></p> <p><i>Secretarial support should be provided or paid for by the candidate inspectorate.</i></p>
--	--

<b>Peer Review Programme</b>	<i>The Peer Review Programme is approved by the FLEP Forum</i>
------------------------------	--

<b>Peer Review Questionnaire</b>	<p>A questionnaire is developed by the FLEP WG on Managing on Effects which should include ‘indicators’ or statements of best practice and forms the principle document against which organisations/agencies/procedures can be assessed.</p> <p>The questionnaire should incorporate the principles of recognised International Standards of performance of Quality Management Systems for example, ISO 9000 &amp; 9004:2000 and regulatory requirements depending on the activities to be audited.</p> <p>This could include for example certain requirements of Council Regulations (EC) No. 882/2004 on Official Controls or 178/2002 on Food Law/Food Safety (see section 5.0 for examples of Questionnaires).</p> <p>The questionnaire includes examples of evidence which would support the achievement of each indicator. The evidence will be collected by interviews and from documentation; there will be no observations of staff.</p>
----------------------------------	---

<b>The Rating</b>	The rating system is taken from ISO 9000:2000.		
	<b>Maturity level</b>	<b>Performance level</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
	1	No formal approach	No systematic approach evident; no results; poor results or unpredictable results.
	2	Reactive approach	Problem- or corrective-based systematic approach; minimum data on improvement results available.
	3	Stable formal approach	Systematic process-based approach, early stages of systematic improvements; data available on conformance to objectives and existence of improvement trends.
	4	Continual improvement emphasised	Improvement process in use; good results and sustained improvement trends.
	5	Best-in-class	Strongly integrated improvement

	performance	process; best-in-class benchmarked results demonstrated.
<p><b>NB – In practice</b>  Level 5 Impossible to attain, as it requires that results are compared with results from other agencies and found to be best-in-class.  Level 4 Also difficult to attain, as continuous improvement results must be shown over a number of years.  Level 3 Needs documentation to support  Level 2 Process not defined and documented  Level 1 (Almost) nothing in place, documented or otherwise.</p>		

<b>Role of the Peer Review Team Leader</b>	<i>The Peer Review Team Leader is responsible for ensuring that the Review Process is conducted in a professional and efficient manner and that the outputs and targets for the Review are delivered by the Review Team in accordance with the Code of Conduct and Peer Review Scheme requirements</i>
--	--

<b>Structure of the Review Process</b>	<p><i>Elements of the Scheme:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Team Leader Selects Team Members</i></li> <li>2. <i>TL meets with host country and contact person(s) to discuss/agree on the scope of the review and the conduct of the Peer Evaluation.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Team leader meets with team members to outline roles and responsibilities and the elements/specifics of the Review</i></li> <li>4. <i>Peer Review Team produce PR Questionnaire.</i></li> <li>5. <i>The PR Questionnaire is sent to the MS/Organisation and is used to conduct a Self Assessment</i></li> <li>6. <i>The completed self assessment/questionnaire is then sent by the MS/Organisation to the PR Team Leader and this forms the principle reference material for document review before on-site activities take place.</i></li> <li>7. <i>Following a review of the questionnaire the PR Team will produce a Peer Evaluation Plan which is sent to the MS/Organisation xx weeks ahead of the on-site review. The Evaluation Plan must be agreed/accepted by both parties before the on-site review can commence</i></li> <li>8. <i>FPRI Team prepare for On-Site Activities</i></li> <li>9. <i>FPRI Team conduct On-Site Activities</i></li> <li>10. <i>FPRI Team produce Draft Peer Review Report</i></li> <li>11. <i>FPRI Team produce Final Peer Review Report which is sent to the FLEP Forum upon agreement with the candidate inspectorate</i></li> </ol>
--	---

<b>Selection of Review Team</b>	<i>The TL selects team members from a pool of volunteers from Member State inspectorates. Review teams should comprise of a minimum of three</i>
---------------------------------	--

<b>Members</b>	<p><i>and a maximum of five members including the team leader. This should include individuals with experience of peer reviews/audits, policy and regulations, technical and organizational issues.</i></p> <p><i>All team members must abide by the code of conduct for Peer Reviews</i></p> <p><i>Upon selection of the PR team members the Team Leader must confirm with the host country/organisation that they are satisfied with composition of the review team.</i></p>
----------------	--

<b>Preliminary Meeting with MS/organisation to be reviewed</b>	<p><i>At least three months ahead of the Review the Team leader meets with host country to discuss in detail the various elements of the review process.</i></p> <p><i>The review team-leader should confirm and agree with the candidate inspectorate, the scope and the conduct of the review, the nature of documentation / briefing material to be supplied by the candidate body (bearing in mind the need for minimal bureaucracy) and should make arrangements with the candidate inspectorate for any necessary security clearances and / or access to sensitive sites or documentation.</i></p>
--	--

<b>Peer Review Questionnaire</b>	<p>A questionnaire developed by the FLEP Managing on Effects WG which includes ‘indicators’ or statements of best practice is tailored by the Review Team for the Review Process. It is against these indicators that agencies/organisations can be assessed.</p> <p>The Questionnaire is sent to MS in order to carry out a self assessment</p>
----------------------------------	--

<b>Self Assessment</b>	<p>The organisation carries out a self-assessment before the FLEP assessors visit and rates itself on the level of achievement of best practice for each indicator.</p> <p>Self-assessment is best carried out by the proposed interviewee and senior department staff.</p> <p>Step 1: Read and understand the indicators  Step 2: Discuss the available evidence, focussing (though not entirely) on the examples  Step 3: Find the relevant documentation, copy it to a folder for the interviews  Step 4: Complete the questionnaire with a comprehensive but succinct description of the evidence and referenced documents, preferably itemised as an aid to the interviewee  Step 5: Rate, realistically but pessimistically</p>
------------------------	---

	<p><b>Step 6: Role-play interview</b></p> <p>The self-assessment work and the completed questionnaire should aim to maximise the potential rating which the assessors will give. The aim should be to present evidence of a stable system for many years with a continuous improvement programme in place. Evidence of a stable documented system, no matter how good, will not be rated more than a 3, unless documented evidence of continual improvement is given.</p>
<p><b>Desktop Review</b></p>	<p><i>The results of the self assessment are then sent to the review team. Prior to the on-site activities, the PR Team will review the completed questionnaire and any associated documentation submitted by the Official Agency.</i></p> <p><i>The review should take into account the size, nature and complexity of the MS/Organisations' activities, the objectives and the scope of the Review. If the documentation provided is found to be insufficient or incomplete, it is the responsibility of the Team Leader to communicate with the MS/Organisation requesting additional information and/or further clarification.</i></p>
<p><b>Peer Review Evaluation Plan</b></p>	<p><i>The TL will be responsible for drawing up an evaluation plan. The evaluation plan will clearly provide an overview of the Peer Review and should provide all necessary information to the Review Team and host MS/Organisation. The amount of detail provided in the plan will reflect the scope and complexity of the review.</i></p> <p><i>The EP should specify:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Peer Review date(s)</i></li> <li>• <i>PR Objectives</i></li> <li>• <i>PR Team</i></li> <li>• <i>Evaluation Scope and Depth</i></li> <li>• <i>PR Criteria and Reference Documents to be used by the PR Team</i></li> <li>• <i>Schedule of Meetings and Visits</i></li> <li>• <i>The expected time and duration for PR activities, including times of opening and closing meetings</i></li> <li>• <i>The PR Report topics (including grading, format and structure, expected date of issue and distribution).</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The evaluation plan shall be sent to the host MS/Organisation approx 4 weeks?? in advance of the Review. Once the evaluation plan has been accepted an itinerary can then be drawn up and confirmed before visits commence.</i></p>
<p><b>Itinerary</b></p>	<p>Prior to the commencement of on-site activities the MS/Organisation should provide a proposed Itinerary to the PR Team Leader at least one</p>

	<p>month ahead of the Review taking into account the requirements of the EP and striving to maximise the efficiency usefulness of the PR process.</p> <p>The Itinerary needs to be approved by the PR Team Leader</p>
--	---

<p><b>Duration of On-Site Peer Review Activities</b></p>	<p><i>The duration of FLEP Peer Reviews will be decided at the FLEP Forum</i></p>
--	---

<p><b>Preparation by PR Team Prior to Conducting On-Site Activities</b></p>	<p><b><i>Assigning Work to the Audit Team</i></b>  <i>The TL will assign tasks to each team member. Review team members will review their assignments to ensure they are competent to carry out these tasks. Individual team members will be responsible for ensuring they are familiar with all relevant reference documentation</i></p> <p><b><i>Preparing Work Documents</i></b>  <i>Work documents will be prepared and used by the Review team for reference purpose and for recording the proceedings of the review. Such work documents will include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The completed Questionnaire</i></li> </ul> <p><i>May include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Checklists</i></li> <li>• <i>Review Trail Documentation</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Note: the use of checklists and review trails should not restrict the extent of the review activities by the use, for example of questions with yes/no answers. Such documents should act purely as prompts for the review.</i></p>
---	---

<p><b>The Peer Review Visit &amp; the conduct of On-Site Activities</b></p>	<p><b><i>Opening meeting</i></b>  This should be held with the key high level staff of the organisation with overall responsibility for the areas being reviewed. It should be attended by the chief executive, the relevant directors, the quality manager, the relevant quality co-ordinators and any other interviewee.</p> <p>The objective of the meeting is to introduce the assessors to the organisations' staff, review the scope and objectives of the visit, and finalise the visit schedule. The lead assessor will explain the process and the outcomes of the visit. The communication channels during the week will be agreed. The organisation will explain any rules, e.g., health and safety, confidentiality of information, etc.</p> <p>The meeting should be followed by an overview of the organisation</p>
---	---

**The Peer  
Review Visit  
& the conduct  
of On-Site  
Activities  
(contd)**

*The interviews*

The assessors should have a dedicated interview room at their disposal for the duration of the review. All the interviews should be held there.

It is likely that they will rotate the questioning on the basis of their individual expertise.

The interviewees should be the directors of the relevant departments or, for some indicators, their senior staff. They should be accompanied by their quality co-ordinator and relevant senior staff. The quality manager will attend also.

The assessors should be looking for examples of achievement of the indicators and of best practice. They are likely to use the examples in the questionnaire as a guide during their questioning but they will not be limited to the examples.

The visit is not an audit, i.e., there should be no element of findings faults or detecting non-conformances or non-compliances.

The evidence should be presented clearly and comprehensively. Itemising the evidence helps the assessors understand it better, and helps build a picture to support higher ratings. Documents should be provided when requested.

After the interviews, the assessors will assign the ratings, with the organisation/agency staff present. Each of the assessors should give their rating and then they should agree a rating between them. They may, however, carry out the rating by having the assessor who led the questioning propose a rating which the others discuss and come to an agreement on.

Each member of the assessment team will give his/her rating per question. In case of discrepancies, a compromise will be reached by the team members upon suggestion of the team leader.

Rating will take place while the agency's management is present.

Scorings of 0.5 are possible (so 1.5, 2.5, 3.5, etc.)

There will be no gap-analysis between self-assessment conducted by the agency and the rating of the assessment team, though if the rating of the visiting team is much lower than during the self-assessment it may be useful to look if a. The self-assessment was too optimistic, 2. Whether the manager or staff member left the agency and whether the system fell apart as a consequence, 3. Whether the visiting assessor overlooked an achievement, which was considered during the self-assessment and not during the FLEP-visit. In the last case staff/management should provide evidence.

If the rating by the assessment team is much higher, motivation for the rating by the assessment team should be provided, but the rating will remain the same.

	<p>Interviewees should be available at times other than their scheduled interview times, in case the assessors need to speak to them again.</p> <p><i>Closing meeting</i> The closing meeting should be attended by those present at the opening meeting and key staff that were interviewed may also be present. Before the closing meeting, the organisation should receive the draft completed questionnaire from the assessors, with the ratings included. Depending on time, this will be reviewed by the relevant staff and comments prepared.</p> <p>At the meeting, the lead assessor should communicate the findings and conclusions, in general terms. It is unlikely that each indicator and rating will be discussed. The lead assessor should describe the next steps. The organisation can comment on the findings, particularly if there are errors or it is felt that the findings do not take our achievements into account.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Draft and Final Reports</b></p>	<p>The assessors draft a report, with their findings and ratings. The text is agreed with the agency. Any errors can be corrected and any overlooked achievements can be proposed. Once all correction/amendments have been made and final agreement has been reached the TL will issue the final report.</p>
---------------------------------------	---

<p><b>Post Review</b></p>	<p><i>Following completion of the Programme of Reviews a meeting should be held by to discuss the operation of the Peer Review Scheme/Programme and the identification of opportunities for improvement. At this meeting key deliverables of the Review Process should be discussed including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Publication of Written reports of reviews for candidate inspectorates,</i></li> <li>• <i>Relevant extracts from review reports, as agreed with candidate inspectorates, for dissemination to FLEP members ,</i></li> <li>• <i>Training and Educational material on “lessons learnt” and on examples of good practice for incorporation into training schemes of Member State inspectorates.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Following agreement and the production/publication of the key deliverables a follow up meeting of the FLEP Forum should review the success and continuation of the FPRI Project</i></p>
---------------------------	---

## 4.0 Peer Review Code of Conduct

DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT

## 4.0 CODE OF CONDUCT FOR FLEP PEER REVIEWS

4.0	FLEP Peer Review Initiative – Code of Conduct
-----	---

### Guiding Principles

This Code of Conduct takes the form of a set of guiding principles. Agreement to adhere to the Code will contribute to efficient and effective benchmarking and will act as a confidence building measure between the participants

<b>1. Contact</b>	<p>Respect the corporate culture of visited organisation(s) and work within mutually agreed procedures.</p> <p>Agree with the Agency Contact how communication and responsibility is to be delegated in the course of the visit. Check mutual understanding.</p>
-------------------	--

<b>2. Information acquisitions and exchange</b>	<p>Communicate fully and early in the relationship to clarify expectations, avoid misunderstandings, and establish mutual interest in the exchange.</p> <p>Be willing to provide the same type and level of information that you request from the visited organisation, your benchmarking partner</p> <p>Do not ask the visited organisation for data outside the agreed scope of the exercise.</p> <p>Do not put pressure on the visited organisation to provide sensitive data or cause the visited organisation to feel that it must provide such data to keep the process going.</p> <p>Do not accept any inducement, gift, commission, discount or any other profit from the visited organisation, from its representatives, or from any other interested person. Meals are not considered a gift since the time of the meal extends the time to benchmark.</p>
---	--

<p><b>3. Confidentiality</b></p>	<p>Any information obtained from a visited organisation should be treated as you would treat any internal confidential communication.</p> <p>Benchmarking reports must not be communicated to third parties, unless appropriately anonymised and after agreement from the involved benchmarking partner(s).</p>
----------------------------------	---

<p><b>4. Use of Information</b></p>	<p>Use information obtained through benchmarking only for purposes stated and agreed in the terms set out in the benchmarking manual.</p>
-------------------------------------	---

<p><b>5. Legality</b></p>	<p>Refrain from the acquisition of information by any means that could be interpreted as improper including the breach, or inducement of a breach, of any duty to maintain confidentiality.</p> <p>Do not disclose or use any confidential information that may have been obtained through improper means, or that was disclosed by another in violation of a duty of confidentiality.</p> <p>In the event of any alleged breach of this Code, co-operate fully in any formal enquiry procedure.</p> <p>Do not pass on benchmarking findings other organisation without first getting the permission of your benchmarking partners and, if requested, without first ensuring that the data is appropriately “anonymised” and anonymous so that the participants identities are protected.</p>
---------------------------	---

<p><b>6. Completion</b></p>	<p>Follow through each commitment made to the visited organisation in a timely manner.</p>
-----------------------------	--

## 5.0 Questionnaires

DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT

## 5.1 FLEP Peer Review Questionnaire (Template) – Official Controls

**Member State:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date of completion:** \_\_\_\_\_ **FLEP assessor:** \_\_\_\_\_

	Question	Examples of Best Practice	Rating	Evidence-Comments
	<b>Organisation</b>			
	Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 OFFICIAL CONTROLS BY MEMBER STATES CHAPTER I GENERAL OBLIGATIONS Article 3 General obligations with regard to the organisation of official controls			
<b>1</b>	Does the Member State ensure that official controls are carried out <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly</li> <li>• on a risk basis</li> <li>• with appropriate frequency</li> </ul> [Ref. Chap. 1 Art 3.1 (a)]			
<b>2</b>	Does the Member State ensure that official controls take account of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) identified risks</li> <li>(b) feed or food business operators' past record</li> <li>(c) the reliability of any own checks</li> <li>(d) any information that might indicate non-compliance.</li> </ul> [Ref. Chap. 1 Art 3.1 (a) (b) (c) & (d)]			
<b>3</b>	Etc.....			

## 5.1 FLEP Peer Review Questionnaire (Template) – Official Controls

**Member State:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date of completion:** \_\_\_\_\_ **FLEP assessor:** \_\_\_\_\_

	Question	Examples of Best Practice	Rating	Evidence-Comments
	<b>Organisation</b>			
	Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 OFFICIAL CONTROLS BY MEMBER STATES CHAPTER II COMPETENT AUTHORITIES Article 4 Designation of competent authorities and operational criteria			
<b>1</b>	Has the Member State designated the competent authorities responsible for the purposes and official controls set out in this Regulation. <small>[Ref. Chap. 2. Art . 4.1]</small>			
<b>2</b>	Do the competent authorities ensure: (a) the effectiveness and appropriateness of official controls on live animals, feed and food at all stages of production, processing and distribution, and on the use of feed; (b) that staff carrying out official controls are free from any conflict of interest; (c) etc..... <small>[Ref. Chap. 2. Art . 4.2 (a), (b), (c), ...(g)]</small>			
<b>3</b>	Etc.....			

## 5.2 FLEP Peer Review Questionnaire (Template) – Model Organisation/Regulatory Authority

**Member State:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date of completion:** \_\_\_\_\_ **FLEP assessor:** \_\_\_\_\_

	Question	Examples of information to be examined/Best Practice	Rating	Finding-Evidence-Comments
<b>Organisation</b>				
Prerequisites for an Efficient Competent Authority Reference to ISO & EFQM Models of Competency/Performance/Excellence				
<b>1</b>	Describe how objectives or targets are set for the different processes of the organisation, and they are reported publicly. (ISO 9004: 5.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mission Statement                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- does the statement reflect the vision of the organisation?</li> <li>- describe relevant issues and opportunities?</li> <li>- give a short and powerful indication of tasks and competences?</li> <li>-</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Strategic Plan is publicly available.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are general objectives of the policy-section described?</li> <li>- Are activities described in a 'SMART' manner and coupled to operational objectives of the organisation, are these in part, coupled to the general objectives of the policy-section?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Annual reports of the Agency are published.</li> </ul>		

DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT

## 6.0 Planning

DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT

<b>6.1 Example of a Peer Review Process - Overview</b>					
Timeframe	x months	x months	x months	0	x days
Process	Preparation	Pre-review meeting	On-Site Mission(s)	Peer review Meeting	Editorial session
<b>Documentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Code of Conduct</li> <li>ii. Scheme</li> <li>iii. xxxxx</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Questionnaires</li> <li>ii. Field Mission report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Code of Conduct</li> <li>ii. Main Findings</li> <li>iii. Main Report</li> <li>iv. Field Mission report</li> <li>v. Main Issues Paper</li> <li>vi. Press Release</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Main Findings</li> <li>ii. Press Release</li> <li>iii. Main Report</li> </ul>
<b>FLEP Chairman's role</b>	Xxxxxx			Chair of peer Review meeting.  Responsible for press release.	
<b>Project Manager's Role</b>	Xxxxxxx				
<b>Team Leader's Role</b>	Selection of Examiners.  Meeting with examiners.		Drafting Questionnaires. Leading Field Mission. Drafting Field Mission Reports.	Process supporting examiners.	Reviewing and considering proposed amendments.
<b>Secretariat's role</b>	.Meeting with examiners.		Drafting Questionnaires. Drafting Field Mission Reports.	Process supporting examiners.	Reviewing and considering proposed amendments.
<b>Assessors role</b>			Review, comment, Draft questionnaire and field mission reports Participating in Mission.	Leading discussions based on main issues paper.	Reviewing and considering proposed amendments.
<b>Examined Member's role</b>	Submission of relevant documentation.		Selects location for field visit  Preparation of agenda. Organizing meetings with relevant parties.	Responding to issues /questions raised by examiners and other DAC members.	Presenting factual information for amendments /additions to main findings and main report.

**Notes on Timing of Documentation**

- i. Peer Review Scheme: Submitted by on xxx and to be agreed by xxx 2006.
- ii. Questionnaire (for field visit): Sent to relevant interlocutors approximately 4-8 weeks before visits???
- iii. Field mission reports: Normally drafted approximately 6-8 weeks after field visit???
- iv. Main report (including main findings and recommendations): Submitted on oils approximately 3-4 weeks before the peer review meeting.
- v. Main issue paper: Submitted on oils approximately 3-4 weeks before the peer review meeting.
- vi. Press release: Released on the day of the review or the following day on the responsibility of the flep chairman.

DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT

## 6.2 Peer Review Plan

x-x<sup>th</sup> 200X

Peer Review Reference	Date	Member State to be Reviewed	Scope	Team Leader
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-

## 7.0 Peer Review Reports

DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT

## 7.1 Report Format

<b>7.1</b>	FLEP Peer Review Initiative – Report Format

### Draft Report Structure

**1.0 Executive Summary**

**2.0 Introduction**

2.1 Background

2.2 Objective- From the TOR

2.3 Scope- From the TOR

2.4 Structure- Dates of: Pre- meeting with review

Team Leader, Dates of Review.

**3.0 Regulatory Arrangements**

**4.0 Main Findings**

**5.0 Summary of Findings**

**6.0 Conclusions**

**7.0 Appendices**

Appendix 1- TOR

Appendix 2- Summary of Information submitted in advance of the Review.

**8.0 Participants**

**9.0 References**

## 8.0 Appendix I

*Peer Review: A tool for cooperation and change-*

Unclassified OECD Document

<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/33/16/1955285.pdf>