

Minutes: Special General Meeting; Friday 26th October 2007

Purpose: to discuss the review of the functioning of CPLOL

Venue: Paris, France

Present:

Named delegates from each association:

Name	Representing
Heike Muench	Austria (LA)
Marie Claire Coets	Belgium (UPLF)
Rositsa Yakimova	Bulgaria (BNAL)
Maria Christopoulou	Cyprus (SLC)
Olga Havelkova	Czech (AKL CR)
Bent Kjaer	Denmark (ALF)
Merit Hallap	Estonia (ELU)
Liisa Miettinen	Finland (FAST)
Nicole Denni Krichel	France (FNO)
Monika Rausch	Germany (DBL)
George Kalomoiris	Greece (PAL)
Valdís B Guðjónsdóttir	Iceland (FTT)
Irene Vernero	Italy (FLI)
Baibe Trinite	Latvia (LLA)
Gertrude Sammut	Malta (ASLP)
Hanneke Kalf	Netherlands (NVLF)
Piotr Jaworski	Poland (PLA)
Maria Emilia Santos	Portugal (APTF)
Zsolt Cséfalvay	Slovakia (SAL)
Joe Reynolds	United Kingdom (RCSLT)
Birgitta Rosen- Gustafsson	Sweden (SLOF)

Observer Members

Michele Kaufmann Meyer Switzerland (C/ASPL)

Additional attendees

Philippe Bétrancourt France(FNO)
Adriana de Filipis Italy (FLI)
Pirkko Rautakoski Finland (FAST)

Apologies:

Ulrika Guldstrand Sweden (SLOF)

Note taker: Aileen Patterson, General Secretary CPLOL

Minutes:

Opening and Introduction

Birgitta Rosen- Gustafsson, The President, welcomed members, especially new delegates, and explained for the benefit of everyone present the background to the evening's meeting. She outlined the history from 2004-2007; CPLOL had agreed in October 2004 to change its way of working to accommodate the enlarged Europe to take effect from May 2005. CPLOL would also be increasing its membership with the new countries. Following this, the FNO had proposed in November 2004 that further changes be made to structure, function and financing of CPLOL. It was agreed in to set up a working group to review the new ways of working. In 2006 no-one had volunteered to be part of the working group

- October 2004: New structure adopted by the GA.
 - November 2004: Proposals from FNO to change functioning, structure and funding
 - May 2005: New structure of CPLOL came into force
 - October 2005: Information about the decision of EC to proceed:
 - May 2006: Formation of working group
 - January 2007: Report from working group > EC
 - May 2007: Discussion at GA
-
- *Octobre 04; changement de structure adopté par la AG*
 - *Novembre 04; proposition par la FNO de changer le fonctionnement, la structure, et le financement*
 - *Mai 05: nouvelle structure du CPLOL rentre en vigueur*
 - *Octobre 05: information sur l'avis du CE sur les démarches à adopter*
 - *Mai 06: formation du groupe de travail*
 - *Janvier 07: groupe de travail soumet son rapport au CE*
 - *Mai 07: discussion à l'AG*

Birgitta then presented questions previously circulated to open the discussion.

Taking account of the objectives of CPLOL

1. In relation to the way CPLOL is organised to allow us to meet these objectives
 - a. What are the good things about the way CPLOL is organised?
 - b. Do you/your organisation think there should be changes to the way CPLOL is organised? If so what? Why? How might this be done better?
2. Resources
 - a. How can CPLOL best engage all its members and use the resources of its members to best effect?
 - b. How do you think CPLOL should address increasing costs of meetings
3. How should we monitor and evaluate CPLOL's functioning and be accountable to the associations whom we represent?

Considérant les objectifs ci-dessus ; et le nombre d'associations nationales
1. en ce qui concerne à la manière CPLOL est organisé pour nous permettre de répondre à ces objectifs

a. Quelles sont les bonnes choses au sujet de la manière que CPLOL est organisé ?

b. Est-ce que votre association pense /vous pensez qu'il fasse faire des changements à la manière que CPLOL est organisé ?

i. Si oui - quelles choses?

ii. Pourquoi ?

iii. Comment peut-on le faire mieux ?

2. Ressources

a. Comment CPLOL peut-il s'assurer que tous ses membres s'engagent et employer les ressources de ses membres pour faire de son mieux ?

b. Comment vous pensez CPLOL devrait adresser l'augmentation des coûts de réunions ?

3. Comment devrions-nous surveiller et évaluer comment CPLOL fonctionne et être tenu responsable.

Open discussion: commentary

M-CC (APLF, Belgium) informed that her association had discussed these issues. She believed that we should make greater use of email and electronic communication. She felt it not useful to have an item on the Commission agenda reporting from the EC. She asked that every member should receive the minutes of the EC. Currently they are on the web with password access for EC members. Discussed whether or not it is necessary for them to be made available to all members.

JR (RCSLT, UK) Current structures and statutes are reasonable but improvements could be made in the way project planning is organised, articulated and evaluated as to whether or not outcomes were successful and if results are implemented. He suggested more detailed structures/protocols re planning, implementing, evaluating and follow up of projects.

MKM (C/ASPL Switzerland) Structure is easy to agree but functioning depends on engagement of people. She felt the Professional Practice commission has been working quite well and has becoming better organised in recent times. Tackling structures and statutes is not the solution but getting commitment of members is the answer.

BRG (President/Sweden) In reality it is people who effect change in organisations. We are reaching 20th birthday and it is a good time to reflect.

ND-K(FNO, France) Nicole said that in thinking about how to get ready for this weekend she can't see clearly which Commission she should be in . France is a big country and has advantages over smaller ones in being able to send

additional delegates to each commission and – it is not a criticism – but we have a lot of projects, themes of work etc.

We need to re-establish our ways of working. We need to avoid duplication and delineate which commission is responsible for each piece of work. We need to coordinate the work of commissions. There are lots of ideas and hard work in commissions but when we go home we get involved in our working day to day activities. Feel we could do more between meetings. We thank the EC for distributing the FNO request for information by questionnaire on Competences.

PR (VP Educ/Finland) No work in commissions should overlap as the VPs coordinate who does what and for example decide which commission should ask which questions in surveys to avoid duplication.

PR asked if people felt we should work between meetings and ND-K replied yes – there was general agreement that this should be done efficiently by email.

PB (France, FNO) felt that 2 or 3 subgroups working on particular topics can accelerate the work by working between meetings.

BRG commented that this was why we had planned it to be, with smaller groups being more efficient than large commissions.

PB also commented that all work in small working subgroups should be sent to the larger group (commission)

M K-M commented that projects are large and ambitious and someone should be appointed to track how it is working. Each of us has a commitment to our country and to our organisation to work. This commitment should be made explicit when someone is appointed to be a representative with a Statement of expectations/commitment. It is about being more “strict” in demands we make of our representatives

ND-K the turn over of representatives creates problems.

MC (Cyprus,STC) Maybe we should send a letter to each association re implications of being a member.

MK-M It needs to be clearer

PB commented that we were asked what is good about CPLOL and he felt that we are in a strong position with the expanding Europe – we have made good contacts across EU, we are familiar with people in every country

IV (Italy, FLI) We have charged a number of our SLTs to work on the subgroups; there are too few links between work of subgroups; It took three years to reach the Minimum standards conclusion of the work – that is too long. There is not enough detail. CPLOL risks becoming the lawyer of the profession rather than the agent /actor of the profession. In Italy we have pressing problems – we need

to know how other countries are dealing with the EU directive. One of the difficulties is in relation to other Health Professions The Italian Association hasn't a Euro political agenda.

OH Czech (AKL-CR) We need help from time to time and need information quickly.

ND-K I am delighted with what has been said. We need to work on Euro projects. Health Care is in a bad way everywhere. In France, like everyone else, we are a small profession compared to others like medicine and therefore united we can influence more. She gave an example of meeting a technical adviser to a Minister and it was important to tell him that ALL countries in Europe did whatever or agreed certain standards – not just large countries. She felt that while it is not important for her personally she has an obligation to the young people in our profession to ensure that it continues and does not die.

RY (Bulgaria BDAL) Currently we have a strike in Bulgaria that has been running for 5 weeks now and it was very helpful to have the support of CPLOL for our profession. For Eastern European countries we see CPLOL as a single body we can look to for advice and support, protocols etc.

Discussion about coordination of surveys/questionnaires. Suggested that the EC should coordinate these rather than having many individual ones being sent round by different countries.

LM (Finland, FAST) Last time was my first time in CPLOL. I found it easy to work in the subgroups and agree to work to be done between meetings but I found it difficult to fit in supplementary questions that arrived which overlap with ongoing work.

PB CPLOL is European therefore lobbying should be done to European Parliament. We should be proactive, in seeking funding/subsidies and in making our presence visible at European level.

GK (Greece, PAL) Suggested perhaps we should think about what sort of Association we want - perhaps what we have been doing with additional activities. Is sue fo EC directives might be more stable than some other issues therefore should we act at European level e.g. prepare dossier to send to each country, write as a collective body to Universities across Europe?

BRK then suggested we look at the other questions which had been sent round in the remaining time.

Resources: How can we more cost effective?

ND-K reminded members of the correspondence of 16 November 2006 with proposals from FNO (Shown on screen by AP and reproduced below).

Discussion on Conference fees – agreed Keynotes are usually paid in International conferences but not free paper speakers.

BRG proposed we now set up the working group. This was agreed unanimously.

Agreed we have a heterogeneous small working group to include representatives from both new and old member countries; large and small and geographically spread countries - to review the functioning and financial implications of the way CPLOL works and prepare a discussion paper for March 2009 to discuss in May 2009 and put proposal forward to GA in October 2009.

Terms of reference:

- To present a concrete proposal to the GA 2009
- Draft paper by March 2009; discuss in associations prior to May meeting
- How CPLOL should function
- What kind of association should we be
- How we use resources
- Take account of minutes and questions raised in the session.

Members

- | | |
|------------------------|----------|
| • Marie Claire Coets | Belgium |
| • Rositsa Yakimova | Bulgaria |
| • Jean Marc Kremer | France |
| • George Kalomoiris | Greece |
| • Joe Reynolds | UK |
| • Valdis Guðjónsdóttir | Iceland |

Coordinator: group to nominate Coordinator from their membership

Observer member

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| • Michelle Kauffman- Meyer | Switzerland |
|----------------------------|-------------|

Propositions de la FNO et de l'UNADREO (?) Pour le budget CPLOL

L'élargissement de l'UNION EUROPEENNE à 25 membres le 1^{er} mai 2004, puis à 27 le 1^{er} janvier 2007 pose évidemment des problèmes au CPLOL, non seulement quant à son fonctionnement et à son organisation, mais aussi quant à son budget.

Si le passage à 2 membres pour les délégations nationales (au lieu de 3 précédemment) a donné, temporairement, un peu d'oxygène aux finances du Comité, on s'aperçoit à la fin du mandat en cours que les recettes actuelles, fondées essentiellement sur une assiette de cotisations des membres, ne suffisent plus.

Il est donc possible d'envisager plusieurs pistes :

-1. Réduire les dépenses :

- cela serait possible en supprimant le dîner payé par le CPLOL aux membres des délégations lors des réunions (AG et/ou commissions de travail) ; en effet, s'il est convivial d'organiser un dîner collectif (en dehors de ceux qui sont traditionnellement offerts par le pays accueillant l'Assemblée générale), il est tout à fait possible que ces frais soient supportés par les convives eux-mêmes pris en charge éventuellement par leurs organisations membres respectives ;

- il serait aussi possible de supprimer certaines pauses café (par exemple celle du dimanche matin, alors que nous commençons réellement vers 9 heures, une pause a lieu à 10 heures alors que la fin de la réunion est prévue à 11h30 !).

- **2. Augmenter les recettes** : c'est une piste qu'il faut exploiter aussi, en observant de près la composition et l'organisation actuelles du CPLOL, ainsi que le poids des frais fixes, quel que soit le nombre des adhérents de chaque organisation membre ; actuellement, les organisations membres payent un part forfaitaire de 150 €, à quoi s'ajoutent 2,50 € par adhérent à l'association membre jusqu'à 5000 adhérents, la cotisation par adhérent passant ensuite à 1,25 € au-delà de 5000 adhérents. Nous faisons donc deux propositions :

a) la part forfaitaire par organisation membre passerait de 150 à 500 €

b) la cotisation par adhérent serait de 3,00 € par adhérent jusqu'à 2500 adhérents de l'organisation membre, puis de 2,50 € de 2500 à 5000 adhérents, puis de 2,00 € de 5000 à 9000 adhérents, et enfin de 1,50 € au-delà.

3. Concernant les congrès : il nous paraît désormais inadmissible que les conférenciers soient obligés de payer même leur inscription au congrès ; nous proposons donc de les en dispenser à l'avenir, en construisant bien évidemment le budget du congrès avec ce paramètre de dépense supplémentaire, toutes naturelles.

Voilà les propositions de la FRANCE.

Thionville, le 16 novembre 2006

Jean-Marc Kremer

Chargé de mission aux affaires européennes et internationales

Proposal for CPLOL budget From FNO and UNADREO (?)

The enlargement of EU to 25 members from May 1st 2004, and to 27 members as from Jan. 1st 2007 is causing obvious problems to CPLOL, concerning its structure and functioning as well as its budget.

Considering the fact that the reduction of the number of national representatives to 2 (instead of 3) gave a little more oxygen to the CPLOL treasury, we can now see at the end of the mandate that the current CPLOL income, mainly based on its members' subscriptions, is insufficient.

We can therefore envisage different solutions :

-1. Reducing expenses :

-this could be possible if CPLOL did not pay for the dinner organised for the delegates during the meetings (GA and/or working groups) ; indeed, however friendly it is to organise such a dinner (without counting the traditional dinner organised by the association hosting the general

Assembly), it may be possible for the participants to cover this cost, with the possible support of their national association, member of CPLOL;

- it would also be possible to avoid some of the coffee breaks (i.e the Sunday morning one, since we really start working at 9. a.m., a 10. o'clock break may not be necessary since the end of the meeting is planned at 11.30 a.m. !)

- 2. Increasing income :

We think this area should also be considered, starting with a close observation of the way CPLOL is currently structured and organised, as well as an examination of the amount of fixed expenses, whatever the number of members in each association; at the moment, each member organisation pays a fixed rate of 150 euros, plus 2,50 euros per association subscriber up to 5000 members. The fee per subscriber is then reduced to 1,25 euros above 5000 subscribers. We make the two following proposals :

a) the fixed rate per CPLOL member organisation could increase from 150 to 500 euros

b) the fee per subscriber could become 3 euros per subscriber up to 2500 subscribers within the member organisation, then 2,50 euros between 2500 to 5000 subscribers within the association, finally 1,50 euros hereafter.

-3 . **About congresses:** it now seems to us inadmissible that speakers have to pay for their subscription to the congress ; we propose that they would not pay any subscription fees in future. Of course this would have to be included in the congress budget, keeping in mind this is a normal expense.

These are the proposals from France.

Thionville, November 16th 2006

Jean-Marc Kremer
European and International Affairs Commissioner