

**Georgios Tsiogas**  
**My speeches during the Plenary Session in Potsdam**  
**for the minutes.**

For the WG “Dental Team”

The WG “Dental Team” worked hard, gathered in variant countries and a lot of money was spend from the involved Dental Associations to create the present proposal which, if will be adopted, leads to the creation of a new dental profession that doesn’t exist now, but the majority of the WG members believes that will be accredited and ready for offering services perhaps after ten to fifteen years.

The Dental Preventive Assistant (DPA), this is the title of the new profession, is going to replace in the field of appropriateness the Dental Hygienist, as the majority of the WG members issues today to the Plenary Session. But the Dental Hygienists, who exist now as dental professionals, work and have rights in their countries, will remain as a profession, as none can ignore them or intent to change their professional status, their title, their rights and their duties.

So, today, if we vote “yes” to the WG proposal that means we are of the willing to create new inter-dental relations establishing new professions, instead of solving the problems with the existed ones. When the Plenary Session decided to make a new WG under the title “Dental Team” four years ago, it was because in the European Labour Market there was and still there is a variety of dental professions with different access to the market, different studies, different rights, different duties, asking continually for bigger pieces from Dentistry’s pie. And we were late in responding to the challenges and the progress in the dental market without any holistic plan. The WG’s goal would be accomplished in making a new model of all the dental professions that would absorb and harmonize all the existed auxiliaries or dental professions in it, in the progress of time. So our job is not to duplicate the Health System or the future plans that one of the European countries has in the field of Dentistry. Our job is to create a new European System that would be suitable to all the European countries, their NHS and in the progress of time to shape the frame of practicing Dentistry by all the relevant professions in harmony and clear boundaries.

To the today proposal we have to declare our oppositions because

We have objections to the title of the new profession as a non proper one.

We don’t agree with the duration of its studies, lasting five years, creating a “mini dentist” with high remuneration. Besides there is (or it might potentially be) a danger in conflicts to the Bologna process.

We don’t agree with the hierarchy of the dental staff the “preamble” addresses, as the DPA must become firstly DCA. We want independent auxiliaries under dentist’s supervision working in cooperation as a team. Someone would have the right to become a DPA directly.

We don’t agree with the opinion that the DPA would be educated in a High School level or in an Institute of Professional Training. There are so many institutions in the European countries with so different education systems that none can guarantee the DPA education will remain a High School internal matter.

We don’t understand the difference between “Certificate” (obtained by High Schools alumnus) and “Diploma” (obtained by University alumnus) and how it is going to be translated to the national languages and how it is going to be defined in to the national state legislations.

Taking in consideration that the Nordic countries are absent from this forum as well as U.K., the East European countries are absent or not interested in such

“developments”, the South European countries face new conditions of practicing dentistry in contrary to a few Central European countries, we believe that the today proposal the majority of the WG brings to the Plenary Session will not have any practical effect even it will be or it will be not adopted by the Plenary Session, because the proposal is not taking in consideration the existed situation in the average European countries, their NHS and the existed legislation of the dental professions.

Our objections are on a fundamental and institutional base and are not of some expressions, words or phrases. Our oppositions are not personal but a matter of principles. We simply cannot see any use of this statement or decision. We move to wrong direction and as everyone moving wrong it would take time to understand it, to come back and start again from the right beginning.

Further more we would like the WG “Dental Team” to continue its works with all the auxiliaries Anthony Kravitz refers in the relevant tables in his manual to the Council of European Dentists.

This is the way we have to work and the WG must have the autonomy to program its work to this direction.

Thank you for your attention.

#### Miscellaneous

I would like to express my delegation thankful feelings to the German colleagues for their warm hospitality in the historic city of Potsdam.

In the Prague Plenary Session I made a notice for the way ERO WGs work and it is in the advantages of this Council that in the next two months it gave a solution by addressing a paper with “rules of procedure”. I think it is time to fulfill its demands and complete it.

I am talking about article 2.2 where the nomination of the members has to be confirmed by the ERO Plenary Session and about article 2.3 where only ten members will compose each WG. Until now those articles are not active and the previous way of working with the same problems remains. Besides it has to be clarified that when we talk about members we refer to persons and not to Dental Associations. I saw the previous behavior to be continued by colleagues participating in WGs for the first time, replacing colleague from the same country that are absent today. But new persons mean new ideas and balances that is not good for the WG’s work progress.

I think we have to complete the “Rules” by adding articles in which way the WGs work out in presenting a proposal to the Plenary Session. The questions are

- A) by consensus, by majority or by what. It has to be clarified in cases of disagreements or contraries when the proper discussion doesn’t lead to a common decision.
- B) What about minority’s opinion or proposal. A note about this issue has to be included in the text for acceptance. Minorities are not for smashing, ignoring and disappearing them. It is of the rights of the Plenary Session participants to know all the issued proposals and differences before voting and taking the last decision. So minority’s ideas have to be announced in abstract.
- C) The text will be presented to the Plenary Session has to be sent to the Dental Associations at least three months earlier of the scheduled assembly asking them for their opinion. In this way the ERO Plenary Session will get into direct contact with the Associations as the Constitution says and not only with the representatives.