

**Report of the UEMO Working Group on  
Continuing Medical Education**

29 /10 /1999 - 9:30 to 11:00 a.m.

Portoroz, Slovenia

Chairman: Dr. Jan Bergen (NL)

Rapporteur: Dr. Peter Mortensen (DK)

Participants: P. CH. DK, NL, IRL, B, UK, N, SLO, S, I, D, SF, H, Esp, Observer: UEMS

I. Report of Last Meeting of working group, Lisbon, June 12, 1999 (UEMO 99/201)  
received without correction.

II. Follow-up of UEMO Questionnaire Responses (UEMO 99/191)

The chairman and rapporteur had compiled and issued a summary of the responses received to the preliminary questionnaire UEMO 98/037-

The summary, circulated as UEMO 99/191, was presented and discussed. The rapporteur underlined the importance of reaching agreement as to the content of the final questionnaire it had been agreed to prepare and send out on the background of the current discussion.

II.1 Comments on summary note attached to UEMO 99/191:

with specific reference to that summary, the following suggestions were made:

- page 1, item 1: Delete »Are the preferred CME activities national?« (as this is covered elsewhere).

**Add** accreditation.

- page 2, item 4: Change »inducements« to »resources«. Possibly place »inducements« as a sub-item.

- page 2. item 5: **Add** the need to specify areas of responsibility for the medical-political sector, the academic sector and the joint academic-political cooperative responsibilities.

## II.2 General Discussion

Further points suggested in general discussion included:

- the importance of discovering not merely where the country is at present, but where it is going and what might be expected for the future;
- attention was called to the CME document in CP (CP 99/025 Rev 1) and the need for UEMO to consider it;
- the issue of cost-effectiveness;
- the issue of standardization;
- IJEMO's political role and the possibility for UEMO of employing the results of the work done by the ESGP;
- the importance of obtaining an evaluation from each country of the CME structure being employed;
- the importance of the questionnaire being brief enough to attract many replies but detailed enough to be of use;
- the importance of UEMO being seen as an active leader in the field and issuing statements on CME;
- the inclusion of all aspects - political, scientific (content), individual and group responsibility;
- the inclusion of terminological definitions for terms such as:
  - revalidation
  - certification
  - recertification
  - reregistration
  - competence
  - assurance
- the question of who has control of (re)certification - a definition of good CME.

On further discussion, the question was of how frequently the questionnaire should be issued. Every other year was suggested, but the rapporteur thought that if UEMO were to take a lead, more frequent updates (e.g. every year) would be needed. The importance of all delegations replying was stressed. On request from the chair, the British delegation briefly presented developments in the U.K. where within five years a system was expected to be in place whereby every doctor in every field would have to be revalidated periodically. Faced with this challenge, the profession had decided to take the lead and produced a document setting forth a possible system of revalidation. The rapporteur agreed on the importance of the profession itself devising a system that would be satisfactory to the government- In Norway a system was in place for GPs, with which the profession was satisfied, but not for the other specialties.

The prime argument against mandatory CME was that of finance: who would pay for the training and the loss of earnings- It was important that governments come to see CME as an investment in time and resources into the quality of the system.

- II.4 In conclusion, It was agreed to propose to plenum that the working groups go forward with the questionnaire on the above background. The chairman and rapporteur would prepare a draft for circulation to the working group's member delegations for comment and then a final draft for consideration at the Florence meeting in spring 2000, where after it would be sent out to all national delegations for response.

### III. CME Symposium

The working group was informed that PWG was holding a one-day CME/CPD symposium on May 11, 2000 in Lisbon and that all European medical bodies would be invited, including UEMO. It was proposed that UEMO itself, in co-operation with ESGP should consider preparing a CME symposium with specific reference to general practice

#### 4. CMED Paper

Philip Evans called attention to a paper issued by CMED listing UEMO as a collaborator.

#### 5. Presentation of EMN (UEMO 99/021)

Mr. Winistoerfer had been invited by president Cricelli to speak on the European Medical Network (EMN), an internet system of distance learning in CME and self-directed physician education. The UEMS was represented on the EMN board.

#### 6. Next Agenda

The agenda of the next meeting would include:

- new draft questionnaire on CME
- CP paper on CME (CP 99/025 Rev 1 in its most recent form).

#### 7. Closure

There being no further business the meeting adjourned to report to plenum on October 30,1999.