EUROPEAN MEDICINES AGENCY
SCIENCE MEDICINES HEALTH

21 November 2016
EMA/765052/2016
Veterinary Medicines Division

Focus group on promotion of pharmacovigilance for food producing animals

23 November 2016, 11.00-17.00, Room 3F, European Medicines Agency, London

1. How useful did you find the meeting?

	Very useful	Reasonably useful	Not useful	Comments
Welcome and aims of meeting	8	7		
Introduction: Overview of EudraVigilance Veterinary (EVVet) data and pharmacovigilance system	9	7		As I am from regulatory side, it was familiar but good to know anyway (x1)
Introduction: CVMP reflection paper on promotion of pharmacovigilance reporting	8	9		As I am from regulatory side, it was familiar but good to know anyway (x1)
Presentation: Outcome of Federation of Veterinarians of Europe (FVE) survey on adverse event reporting	14	5		I had seen this presentation (x1)
Presentation: Veterinarians experiences: cattle	15	3	1	
Presentation: Veterinarians experiences: pigs	16	2	1	
Presentation: Veterinarians experiences: Pharmacovigilance in poultry experience from the field☐	15	4		

30 Churchill Place ● Canary Wharf ● London E14 5EU ● United Kingdom
Telephone +44 (0)20 3660 6000 **Facsimile** +44 (0)20 3660 5555
Send a question via our website www.ema.europa.eu/contact

	Very useful	Reasonably useful	Not useful	Comments
Presentation: Veterinarians experiences: fish	15	4		
Presentation: Veterinarians experiences: other species e.g. horses	15	4		
Presentation: Role of national veterinarian associations☐	10	9	1	
Presentation: Stakeholders experiences: Benefits of AE reporting	18	1		• Very interesting, very, very useful (x1) • Very interesting presentation (x1)
Presentation: Stakeholders experiences: Benefits of AE reporting: MAH view	12	7		I was tired. Lack of coffee breaks (x1)
Discussion session: challenges of reporting adverse events: common factors and species differences	12	3		
Discussion session: measures to address challenges	10	5		
Discussion session: improving feedback to reporters	11	4		I was tired. Lack of coffee breaks (x1)
Discussion session: improving dialogue between veterinarians and the regulatory network	10	4	1	I was tired. Lack of coffee breaks (x1)
Discussion session: Next steps	10	3	1	I was tired. Lack of coffee breaks (x1)

2. For which element(s) would you like to have had extra details/time?
    - There was no time for serious discussion
    - Examples of P.V. experiences
    - Modality of access to reporting date at present time
    - Feedback to reporters
    - n/a
3. In your opinion, what were the most positive aspects of the meeting?
    - Very different views

- Start of the dialog between regulatory network and veterinarians
- Stakeholders experience
- Exchange of information between practitioners and regulators
- Wide views and broad presentations
- Large overview of the problem
- A mix of people
- Discussion session
- Willing to cooperate
- To better know the veterinarian perspective
- Discussion session
- Gathering input from vets
- Very well prepared. Very interesting. Congratulations to the organisers.

4. What were the most negative aspects of the meeting?
    - Too little time for presentation
    - Too many leaving the meeting early
    - Maybe it needed more concrete suggestions for improvement of future cooperation
    - Lack of time
    - Cows and pigs
    - None (x2 people)
    - No breaks
    - The mention of VMD in one presentation. It was about not sending feedback. I am not from VMD myself, but it was not elegant for this international forum.
    - n/a
5. Would you recommend similar meetings to other colleagues?

Yes (x 15) No Why?

- Dialog is important
- To see if we have changed anything
- It was very interesting to learn from different aspects (different species)
- Regulatory pharmacovigilance bodies cannot function without the most important part in the system i.e. veterinarians

6. How do you think this meeting should be followed up and in which other areas of veterinary pharmacovigilance would you recommend further meetings/workshops?
    - Signal detection
    - Regular presentations all over Europe

- Summary and discussion at PhVWP-V meeting
- Establishment of information exchange forum with different vet representative groups
- Work group + objectives
- Yes, it should be. Information about bees
- We need to progress on improving the relation between vets and NCA and to convince vets of the useful work done
- Should follow by sending recommendations to head of agencies
- Wide national meetings of vets as well as specialists groups
- In my opinion, roundtable with industry and activities at national level should be encouraged

7. Other comments.
    - Why are there no vets in practice on the PhVWP-V group?
    - I think we all recognise the challenge to improve the visibility and the value to vets/clients for Pharmacovigilance

The feedback questionnaire is anonymous however it would be helpful if you would state if you are a regulator (PhVWP-V member/expert) (x 4 people) or stakeholder (1 person)

Thank you for your participation!

Evaluation based on 19 answers out of 42 participants