

UEMO 2000/027 Rev. 1

UEMO PLENUM MEETING Portoroz (SLO), 29th-30th October 1999

Minutes

Item 1: Opening by UEMO President

The Chairman, Dr. Claudio Cricelli, opens the plenum meeting greeting the delegates who are present and expressing his thanks to the Slovenian delegation for the hospitality offered.

In his paper the Chairman stresses the role played by UEMO for European General Practitioners, despite the differences in the various national health services, and the special first-rate role played by the Union in relation to the social context in which medicine is practised in Europe at present.

The Chairman went on to mentioned some of the main problems that European general practitioners have to deal with: relationships with specialists, basic and permanent professional training, specific training in general medicine, information technology and remote medicine, therapeutic (pharmaceutical) prescription and the reduction of health service spending. He also denounced the lack of political representation of European General Practitioners, as well as insufficient recognition of the basic role entrusted to them.

In this connection the Chairman pointed out the need to strengthen the role of UEMO to acquire more visibility. He then stressed the importance of a wider circulation of the news on the activities of the association, and of the creation of a special forum at the European Community level, while at the same time identifying the common problems of national associations. "Our main goal - the Chairman pointed out - is to become the political sponsor of international medical activities, such as the promotion of preventive campaigns, campaigns for the protection of the environment as well as to report on the role of general practitioners".

As regards information the Chairman Dr. Cricelli urged the Delegations to make more intense use of advanced technologies (computers), whereby they would achieve large savings both in communications and in the retrieval of material and documents.

The Chairman also pointed out how important UEMO should be at the level of European institutions in Brussels, as the representative of European General Practitioners and sounding board for their needs and expectations.

At the end of the presentation of the general policy statement, the Chairman gives the floor to the delegates for the discussion in the plenary session.

The following persons take the floor in this order:

Item 2 : Approval of Minutes of Plenum ,Lisbon June 11-12 , 1999

THE NETHERLANDS: proposes to end the proceedings by 1 o'clock.

FINLAND: States that the Killarney's meeting's Minutes had not been approved in Lisbon.

THE NETHERLANDS: asks that the document on CME be approved by the plenary.

SECRETARY: replies that the CME document was already approved and adopted by the plenum in Lisbon.

GERMANY: Make some remarks: about the delay in the delivery of documents and the huge quantity of documents sent by the Secretariat including Documents of the Associated Organisations.

Also raises some objections on the balance sheet (page 4 of the Lisbon Minutes).

SECRETARY: replies that the paper on Medical Informatics was presented by Dr. Zollner and not Dr. Jolla; he apologizes for late delivery of documentations and minutes.

TREASURER: gives explanations on the balance sheet.

PORTUGAL: requests that the minutes be rectified under section 1, line 4 of page 6: "begin to consider". Restates that most of the Documents sent was probably unnecessary – (PWG and CP).

DR. CRICELLI: explains that most of the documentation arrives at the last minute before the deadline . He accepts the suggestion not to distribute the documents sent by the Associate Organisations , bearing in mind that many Delegates do not share information from the CP and UEMS and PWG by their National Delegations .

GERMANY: suggests that the Secretariat receives screened documentation and put an end to this practise, also for reasons of savings.

Dr. PUGA: requests that the minutes be emended on page 10, section 5: -"She also illustrates... There will be on CME/CPD an International Conference..."

IRELAND: States that the present form of the minutes is rather difficult to understand, in the future it would be useful to underline the decisions approved by the plenary session with bold-face type.

U.K.: the minutes should also contain the Portuguese statement in quotation marks.

PORTUGAL: it is possible to record the paper literally (proposes transferring the recording directly to the computer).

CHAIRMAN: proposes not to remove item 3 that expresses the point of view of the delegations. Underlines the difference between Minutes and Proceedings (Literal Transcription) . Promises a balanced version of the Minutes .

DR. JAN BERGEN (Vice-President): requests that the decisions made by the plenary session be added to the minutes.

GERMANY DR. ZOLLNER: we want the minutes not to be abbreviated but in a form that reflects the effective discussion (all that was said during the meeting).

CHAIRMAN: in Lisbon the situation was very complex, it is not so much a question of minutes but of complexity of problems discussed.(and in any case, abbreviated minutes will be sent).

BELGIUM: it is up to the Portuguese to give the written texts to the Secretariat.

CHAIRMAN: “My chairmanship is not responsible for previous events”.

The plenum approves the minutes with all the proposed amendments.

Item 2 :The Killarney minutes are also discussed and approved with the following changes/amendments

FINLAND: page 7, issues regarding dues and distribution key.

Page 9, item 6.7 questionnaire.

Page 10, item 6.8

In the plenary session it was resolved to draw up a questionnaire which is approved with changes.

ITEM 3 – Meeting with WONCA–ESGP

CHAIRMAN: illustrates the London meeting held on 11/9/99 between UEMO and ESPG/FM, where roles and collaboration among medical associations were defined. A decision ensued that a European Conference named “GP 2000” should be jointly organized in Florence at the end of May ,2000. Asks dr. Evans to comment on the meeting.

DR. PHILIP EVANS (U.K.) brings the greetings of Chris Van Weel; considers the London meeting a historic meeting, during which no discrepancy emerged in the discussion. Thanked UEMO for organizing together the meeting in Florence.

CHAIRMAN: expresses his gratitude for collaboration with European associations.

Statutes and By-laws

CHAIRMAN: we discussed with the Heads of the Delegations on the changes to the UEMO Statutes and we decided to entrust a legal expert with the task of giving legal advice to be sent to the various delegates by the beginning of March.

On that date a meeting of UEMO Heads of Delegations will be held for a discussion of the legal background.

Asks the Plenum to accept this proposal , in which case ITEM 4 in the Agenda will be exhausted without discussion.

Plenum : approves the proposal

Proposal of a W.G. on “Drugs in GP”

Chairman : Proposes to establish a new working group to study laws and issues related to drugs and drugs prescription in General Practice .

DR. CHAPMAN: The UK agrees on the working group on drugs; we suggest that Dr. Terry John be appointed Chairman of the group.

BELGIUM: we also would like to participate in the working group and we would also like the Irish to participate.

GERMANY: Agrees with the UK on the chairmanship: their suggestion must be accepted as a proposal and we can wait before deciding. Although the decision could be made now, bearing in mind the German situation it is necessary to think it over carefully and before deciding I ask to wait a week to consult our experts.

CHAIRMAN: Suggests that the chairman must be experienced. Other member countries can also send experts to work together in the group.

AUSTRIA: has a political objective been set for this working group: what is the result to be expected?

CHAIRMAN: the responsibility of GPs in drug prescription is growing, the political *objective is to understand what is happening, to become political interlocutors to Health Authorities and other Stakeholders including EFPIA (Pharmaceutical Industry), EMEA , and AESGP (Self Medication) and The Economic and Social Committee of the EU , who has set a WG on drug prescription .* This is mainly a political problem .

PORTUGAL: *votes for candidate proposed by the British Delegation Dr. Terry John as chairman;* the problem is urgent and topical. It is necessary to appoint a competent person and to send other possible suggestions quickly.

IRELAND : *Are interested* in participating in the working group on drugs. Each group should have clear objectives and precise programs, as for example: surveillance and supervision of pharmaceutical firms and pharmaceutical expenditure. Indeed, because of drug deregulation we are drifting towards self-treatment which “burdens” the patient with the responsibility of the treatment he is taking, that has not been prescribed by the GP (drugs purchased through the Internet raise deontological issues).

BELGIUM: we must affirm that in the field of drugs we GPs are the true specialists. We often have to adjust others’ doctors’ prescriptions.

GERMANY: we need a quick panoramic view on this subject. The delegation agrees on the proposal of UK chairmanship and later each country will submit its representatives.

Chairman : asks dr. Terry John , as appointed Chairman of the new WG , to make proposals

DR. TERRY JOHN (U.K.): takes the floor and tells the delegates about his proposals on a Working Group on the policy of UEMO about drugs.

- policy of prescriptions
- costs/effectiveness
- freedom of prescription

out of these analyses derive the objectives to be reached at a European level

CHAIRMAN: Proposes to establish a new group with a new working method. Confirms the UK (Dr. Terry John) as chairman and an experienced German delegate as reporter. Also suggest that the reporter and the chairman of the working group meet and keep the Chairmanship informed. They shall propose a name to the Working Group that will be made official in Florence.

COFFEE BREAK and RESUMPTION OF WORKS

ITEM 4 – Discussed under Item 3

ITEM 5 - Secretariat in Brussels

CHAIRMAN: UEMO has received and disseminated a Dutch paper on lobbying. We all agree on the setting up of an office in Brussels. We must decide how and when. It is necessary to have new by-laws before deciding the new office in Brussels. Asks Dr. Roland Van Velzen to speak.

THE NETHERLANDS: Seems obvious that our proposal is for a stronghold in Brussels in order to lobby the European Commission for a specific three-year training course. We should have a permanent secretariat in Brussels rather than sending a new one every four years. In the text presented you will find all the specific details.

BELGIUM: They estimated the cost of a permanent secretariat. A permanent secretary would cost 62.150 Euro/year more than a secretariat changed every three years.

THE NETHERLANDS: 1st strategic problem: our priority is to set up a permanent secretariat in Brussels; costs are a secondary issue. How to manage logistics is one problem. We have to decide if it is worth being in Brussels like other medical associations.

CHAIRMAN: before speaking of costs someone should list the issues: what do we expect from Brussels? Are our expectations strong to the point of justifying the costs?

THE NETHERLANDS: Dr. Van't Grunewald takes it upon himself to carry out the assessments assuming he has already performed an analysis. He will prepare a written synthesis of the benefits for having a stronghold in Brussels.

DR. ROMAIN STEIN (VICE-PRESIDENT): Wonders if it is possible, as far as costs are concerned, to share a secretariat with CP – UEMS, etc.

CHAIRMAN: States UEMO has already talked about this issue. Proposal also shared by Dr. Grunewald is that UEMO should not assess the costs before having decided what to do. Therefore, first the potential benefits and then how to organize ourselves.

THE NETHERLANDS: suggests a narrow working group that will present its proposals on the Brussels secretariat in Florence.

AUSTRIA: Delegate declares his skepticism because there is no reason why we should not have an office in Brussels but we have economic problems also with a previous question of this kind with the Portuguese Delegation. One of the reasons for restructuring the CP was a secretariat in Brussels. **Lobbying is one of the most important things to do. It is a mistake to lobby for individual groups of doctors: we must work together with all other medical associations.**

GERMANY: the political decision is important, as pointed out by Dr. Brettenthaler (Austria), assuming UEMO is in scarcity of funds. **The economic issue is as important as the political one. In Germany, trade unions share secretariats; the German delegation wants to take part in this group.**

SWITZERLAND: declares it is in favour of a UEMO office in Brussels. The deadlines for lobbying fall in the next weeks. The opening of our Brussels office runs the risk of being late because important issues (mainly specific training for GPs) are about to be decided.

UK: speaks in favour of adequate representation in Brussels. We general practitioners are many and we are in favour of the Dutch proposal of a working group that will make clear proposals to be discussed in the next plenary session: different sectors with the relevant costs and whether we can afford certain expenses. Yes to the working group.

BELGIUM: interested in working with CP. All important decisions will be examined by the CP before passing to the European Parliament. At present the CP wants to keep the role it plays now.

FRANCE: before deciding whether working group or office in Brussels, it is necessary to know the relevant costs, which should not imply increasing the dues which were already revised and are considered to be high. Anyhow we are not against the office in Brussels.

BELGIUM: complementary training was obtained through the work of CP.

CHAIRMAN: since 1993 UEMO policy has made itself known through lobbying. Also with CP, but it was UEMO that did all the lobbying. We spent lots of time in Brussels to reach our goals. It is getting more and more difficult to lobby in Brussels. If we want to obtain certain objectives, we have to propose adequate investments, I ask you to concentrate on the goals. If we are not able to intervene in the heart of the discussion in the European Parliament, it is difficult to take part in the decision-making process: I ask you to be aware of that.

BELGIUM: in the 60s the situation was more in our favour because we occupied two positions which made lobbying easier. We were always united with CP to obtain results.

GERMANY: if we decide to have a representative office in Brussels we want to understand who we represent. Who do we represent? (GPs and nothing else)

UK: I believe that the Dutch colleagues have made a proposal. We have to make a decision regarding the working group.

AUSTRIA DR. BRETTENTHALER: GPs feel they are in competition with the specialists. **He reminds being in the CP Secretariat since January '99 and considers agreements with CP useful.** If we speak of the GPs' interests, only GPs should be involved. In Austria there is a trend towards self-employed professionals and to do away with GPs in order to cut costs.

GERMANY: how should this lobbying activity be carried out? We must also obtain some results from such an activity.

DR. JAN BERGEN (VICE-PRESIDENT): the working group will have to conduct a comparative analysis on hypotheses and costs with the pros and cons.

CHAIRMAN: we need new means, on behalf of everybody we ask the types of activities be defined.

The delegations of Germany, England, Belgium and the Netherlands constitute the working group: these will collaborate with the Chairmanship and the Secretariat. Any decision will be made in Florence or in March with the Heads of Delegations.

DENMARK/DR. PETER MORTENSEN: it's better to be thorough for the two groups (by-laws and Bruxelles)

NETHERLANDS: There is a connection between the works of the two groups. The secretariat will ask the working groups to arrange a calendar to be agreed upon.

IRELAND: Who will be chairman of the working group on the secretariat in Bruxelles?

U.K.: proposes a Dutchman as Chairman.

THE NETHERLANDS: accepts and expresses thanks.

CHAIRMAN: recommends to use quick technology such as tele-conference in order to save on costs and speed up the works.

ITEM 6

DR. PHIL EVANS: intervenes in the name of ESGP, 3 spheres of collaboration between UEMO and ESGP.

?? 1st Level Collaboration at the level of Chairmanship and working groups.

?? 2nd level: develop contacts with representatives of the European Health Commission before the end of the year.

?? 3rd level: joint conference of Florence 2000. Meeting with members of the European Parliament: not only influence political decision but also procure resources for training and research for the General Practitioners. The existing European resources are currently minimal for general medicine.

IRELAND: I would propose to adopt Dr. Evans' proposal: it deals with new opportunities for general medicine in Europe.

CHAIRMAN: the Florence meeting will be divided into two separate events.

Dr. Evans' proposal is approved.

ITEM 7: Interim Report by UEMO Treasurer

TREASURER: presents draft Budget 2000.

BELGIUM: we have noticed the excellent book-keeping and the thoroughness of the treasurer: we are satisfied with his work.

AUSTRIA: Asks about payments from Greece and France .

CHAIRMAN: Regarding Greece, they haven't participated in the works of UEMO for the last three years. I've received a letter of apologies from the Greek Chairman. As regards France, we have talked about the reasons for the arrears: the delegates have changed and we can't expect the new members to pay past debts. Regarding Portugal, there doesn't exist a balance sheet item that could allow the payment of expenses for the chairman's delegation.

PORTUGAL: I will briefly respond to Austria: we want the situation resolved. The amount requested by us for 1998 is equal to the Secretariat's salary and the travel expenses of the in-coming Chairman. Presently we ask 19,180 Euro. We believe that the country and not the person be elected for the office. These organizations must continue to work.

GERMANY: what would have happened if the Chairmanship hadn't changed? How did we proceed in the transfer of office between Denmark and Ireland?

SPAIN: we must keep in mind of the Portuguese position in a definitive way. The expenses relative to the Dr. Sousa Chairmanship should be assumed by UEMO.

DR. JOHN CHISOLM (UK): One of the problems is the transfer of chairmanships. I propose to continue to negotiate and relate to Florence the result of same.

CHAIRMAN: With regard to the Portuguese Controversy declares his intention to close the problem with a definite decision in this Plenum .Declares that in the case Uemo has surplus resources the Presidency is prepared to acknowledge the expenses. But the Plenum can also decide to pay all expenses claimed by the Portuguese also in absence of a surplus . It is mainly a political decision. If the Plenum so decides , the amount shall be divided by all countries and added to the basic contribution.

PORTUGAL: we are prepared to hold a meeting to define and start a negotiation regarding the credits we claim as Order of Portuguese Doctors from UEMO. The Italian chairmanship has shown inflexibility about the matter. We want to know from the present delegations if UEMO should pay arrears to Portugal.

The works are suspended at 13:15h for lunch

Resumption of works: 14:20h

DR. ROGER CHAPMAN: asks the plenary to

- Adopt the Irish statement of account without debits and/or credits.

- Invite the plenary to take notice of the special circumstances taken place, aided by unclear by-laws.
- Proposes to reimburse to the Portuguese delegation (19,180 Euro). Proposes to do this operation, keeping in mind to adopt a strict budget next year.
- Acknowledge that the statutes is inadequate.
- Define responsibility for the preliminary expenses of the new chairmanship.

UK proposal is voted and approved by the Plenary session.

DR. CHAPMAN: invites the Treasurer session will reimburse our Portuguese colleagues for the 1998 expenses, keeping under control the next budget and evaluating the by-laws' reform.

TREASURER: the correct amount requested by the Portuguese delegation is 19.179 Euro.

BELGIUM: I would like to be sure of the UK proposal, because I would like the Portuguese issue to be resolved in this 1999 balance.

TREASURER: why not divide in 2 financial years the reimbursement to the Portuguese?

DR. CHAPMAN: we need to draw on the balance reserve in order to close the settlement to the Portuguese.

CHAIRMAN: within a week, Treasure will evaluate the size of the reserve of the account to see if there is the amount necessary to settle the Portuguese account.

GERMANY: agrees with UK proposal to resolve the problem today. The German delegation expresses its desire to resolve this problem as soon as possible.

UK: Resolve the matter today with the credit balance or with subscription to the increase of the countries' dues.

GERMANY: insists on the fact that this money can be saved and increase the dues as the last possibility.

AUSTRIA: agrees with Dr. Chapman.

TREASURER: accepts Dr. Chapman's proposal and confirms the will of paying arrears to the Portuguese if .

THE NETHERLANDS: the UK has proposed that the debt be settled as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN: *(directed to the Portuguese delegation) "in accepting this proposal(19,179 Euro)??", do you officially renounce to any other claim from UEMO ?*

PORTUGAL: *“this is the amount that the delegation requests. If this payment is done by UEMO we renounce to any other claim of reimbursement. This payment concludes the transaction definitively ”*

DR. CHAPMAN: I say to our Portuguese colleagues that we have taken steps forward in resolving this problem and I would like to involve everyone for a possible increase of the single dues if necessary.

CHAIRMAN: requests again if the figure 19,179 Euro is definitive in order to settle the matter with the Portuguese delegation.

PORTUGAL: *accepts and confirms to the Chairman the figure 19,179 Euro requested.*

The Plenary gives permission to the Treasurer to pay as soon as possible on the basis of the technical times.

ITEM 8 Working Groups

The Plenary session establishes that the reports of each single Working Group be written.

DR. ROMAIN STEIN (VICE-PRESIDENT): as chairman of Specific Training, we think that Chairman Dr. Cricelli should send a letter to the European Commission and to the CP to inform the latter of the operation for lobbyism that we are putting forward.

DR. CHAPMAN: document 99/261.

We would like the Plenary to adopt it as a resolution to send to the European Commission.

The whole Plenary agrees with Dr. Chapman’s proposal and adopts document 99/261

SPAIN: explains document 99/256

CHAIRMAN: asks that the Spain’s specific proposal be presented in written form.

DR. WILLY BUSS (VICE-PRESIDENT): new group on Deprived Areas. Communicates to the delegates the sending of a questionnaire as a way to present results in the next reunion meeting.

THE NETHERLANDS: there has been a UK and German proposal in the group on General Medical Services. He asks to vote document 99/262 and asks that the Plenary approve it.

SLOVENIA DR. MATEJA BULC: as chairman, asks for attention on document 99/258.

AUSTRIA: thinks the resolution of document 99/262 can be approved, but would emend the word “extended” on the first page, substituting it with “change”.

SPAIN: emphasizes that resolution 99/262 is very important.

BELGIUM: It is an excellent motion, but if it were published it would be little understood (besides those assigned to the works)

AUSTRIA: A resolution could never cover all the topics.

CHAIRMAN: judges document 99/262 positive.

DR. CRISTINA FABIAN VICE-PRESIDENT): asks to substitute extension with development.

CHAIRMAN: supports and asks to approve document 99/262.

The plenary approves document 99/262 with the amendments proposed.

ITALY DR. RAFFAELLA MICHIELI: thanks his colleague Dr. Chapman. The group has concluded its work and proposes to change the name of Document 99/260

GERMANY: At the end of item 8, I would like to emphasize document 99/025. In the meeting of 2000 I ask if we could finish this document in view of the new by-laws and to improve the organization.

CHAIRMAN: Today we use more telematics and the Web site. Next time we will try to supply the documents on CD. We are steering towards an advanced and satisfactory solution, new forms of information to decide on in May 2000 in Florence.

GERMANY: Fundamental work change. I would like to clarify what they meant with this proposal. The German delegation proposes that the members of the working groups decrease by utilizing all the means of communication. In the Plenary, if necessary we can introduce corrections and finally propose the motions.

CHAIRMAN: We have adopted many German proposals on the organization of UEMO. However, UEMO is a sufficiently complex organization and we can't expect that everyone adapts right away. We must first convince everyone that the new means of communication be utilized.

IRELAND: Document on Shared Care, last paragraph (change). The group after this reunion winds up. Shared Care is finished and the documents are to be distributed to our

specialist colleagues and CP. It has been decided to start up a new working group on clinical directions.

CHAIRMAN: Acknowledges that the WG on Shared Care has finished its work after this meeting

ITEM 9: Internal Cooperation

UEMS :Dr. Kuttner: expresses thanks for the hospitality received from UEMO. Last week in Vienna there was a meeting for the election of the new Chairmanship UEMS (Finland Dr. Kimi, the new relations officer). There are still fears in relation between UEMO and UEMS. The politicians would like to see us divided and we must fight together.

DR. CHAIRMAN: thanks Dr. Kuttner

PWG : DR. PUGA: We give great importance to Document 99/264 on CME. This document explains in 6 items the quality in training and we believe that CME/CPD is an ethical obligation for doctors. He refers to the press release of the PWG Chairman who congratulates the European Commission. We have sent a questionnaire and already some countries have responded.

AUSTRIA: As assurance of the guarantee of quality, we have talked about re-certification and we must talk about this again more in depth in a near future within UEMO.

PWG DR. PUGA: UEMO will be invited in May at the press conference.

R.ZOLLNER reports on EANA: European training, a report presented in Lisbon. The next meeting will be in London. Now UEMO should point out a high-ranking delegate to maintain contacts with EANA.

SPAIN DR. SOLLA: asks what EANA means and what its tasks are.

A short description is done by the German Delegation: It represents only doctors that have settled in various European Countries who have their own doctors' surgery and it deals with doctors who have their own doctors' surgery and of their problems.

DR. ROMAIN STEIN (VICE-PRESIDENT): I participated at the European Parliament on the theme of CME on the 21st of October. There should be a managerial organization for a professional accreditation body in Europe.

CHAIRMAN : UEMS on CME. It's not important to send anyone because it is more advisable to work with the European Commission. There are no European funds for the setting up of a European accreditation body.

BELGIUM:DR. HILDE ROELS: In Belgium 80% of doctors attend CME's courses and are regularly accredited.

DR.ROMAIN STEIN (VICE-PRESIDENT): we talk about a European system of accreditation.Suggests it's not worth sending anybody to those meetings. It's a waste of time.

CHAIRMAN: We must pay a lot of attention to accreditation.

GERMANY: announces EANA can send an invitation to UEMO for the next meeting in London.

AUSTRIA: Proposes Dr. Pruckner as Liaison officer to EANA.

Dr. Pruckner accepts.

EMN Project

DR. JAN BERGEN (VICE-PRESIDENT): The presentation was very nice. We have seen that it deals with collaboration between IBM Deutsche Telekom and UBS.

CHAIRMAN: It is a project started by the specialists. It is a complex and interesting system. Both the telematics group and the CME group could be involved for the next project. We would like to know how UEMO could be involved. UEMO has no financial responsibilities in the project. This is a collaborative project to be presented to the EU . UEMO telematics and CME will be involved and we have been reassured that UEMO will receive return benefit from the project once it has been accepted by the Fifth Framework Programme . We shall report to the Plenum

ITEM 10

CHAIRMAN : reports about a Meeting with Kensington in London . There is a standing contract with Kensington Publication for the UEMO Reference Books. This is economically and politically favourable and profitable to UEMO , with no financial risk for the UEMO. Kensington has presented new ideas , in particular suggesting an increase in the number of copies printed and distributed to a list of GP , selected by each National Delegation . Invites Tom Kennedy , who is in charge for the Reference Book to report.

DR. TOM KENNEDY: Kensington have changed staff and we are looking for new collaborators. The contract UEMO – Kensington remains in effect until July 2001. We want to increase the publications (up to 4 a year). UEMO delegate will be in London on Monday next to discuss new publications and speak with the new Kensington person in charge.

CHAIRMAN: Observes that more copies must be distributed and the Reference Book should be improved. Kensington has proposed also the use of the INTERNET: they have

requested to UEMO the mailing lists of doctors in each nation. We will decide on how to proceed, respecting the contract.

GERMANY: Expresses positive assessment on the work carried out and thanks Tom Kennedy to produce this reference book and the Chairman to have it put in Internet. Supports the hypothesis that the book be presented in Florence and a bi-annual edition be prepared .

ITEM 11 – Florence Meeting 2000

CHAIRMAN: We will send you further letters in order to book hotel rooms. The whole organization will be rather costly because of the Holy Year. We will prepare you a few surprises.

Next UEMO Meetings: dates to be confirmed in Zurich
?? Switzerland/Zurich: 13th and 14th October 2000 (Final)
?? Italy/Venice 2001: 15th and 16th June 2001
?? Malta: October 2001

GERMANY: Ask for details about high hotel prices in Florence (May 25.26-27 May 2000)

CHAIRMAN: The hotel rooms are already discounted for UEMO, but there are conditions for the Church Jubileum that will double the costs for May 2000. UEMO shall provide room reservation for all delegates . Those willing to select different accommodations shall be free to do so. UEMO will try to select the cheapest possible rates .Possibly no adjunctive costs will be charged to UEMO for the Organisation. Ethical sponsorship will be looked for .

Item 12 Adjunctive :Election of a new Vice President

CHAIRMAN: Proceeds to the election of the new Vice-President. He states that for a mistake the schedule has not been printed out correctly and the datum has remained in the computer. Accepting the procedural suggestion of the German Delegation , asks the Plenum to vote for an Addendum to the Agenda introducing the Election of a new Vice President in substitution of Dr Roman Stein .

PLENUM : accepts unanimously

CHAIRMAN : Bids goodbye to Dr. Roman Stein who leaves UEMO.He thanks dr.Stein for his work in UEMO both as Delegate and Vice President A new Luxembourg head of delegation is needed and a new vice-President shall be elected.

DR. ROMAIN STEIN: ‘Thank-you colleagues. For the first time, I will give a speech. When I studied in Vienna, I asked who dealt with the problems of GPs in Europe. I have learned a lot in these years and I hope I have contributed something and not only been a

burden. My successor will be Dr. Guy Ross as Head of the Luxembourg delegation who will follow my direction” .

CHAIRMAN: **Announces that two candidatures have been presented, one from Denmark and one from Spain.**

GERMANY: asks if an item of the agenda is foreseen in the schedule.

GERMANY: *Presents the candidature of Dr. Brettenthaler (Austria).*

AUSTRIA :Dr Brettenthaler : “ I thank Dr. Zollner, but I’m not available for this assignment “.

CHAIRMAN: *Confirms* there are two candidatures for the election of Vice-President.

GERMANY: Acknowledges dr.Brettenthaler refusal to be a has withdrawn his candidature. The matter is resolved. We can’t elect anyone against his will.

BELGIUM: Suggests the President presents the two Candidates.

CHAIRMAN: The chairmanship is not directly involved in the selection of Vice – Presidents . this being a task of the Delegations and of the Plenum . **Two candidates have been presented, one being Dr. Mortensen (Denmark) and one of Dr. Solla (Spain) . Suggests the Delegation present their candidates and make official statements prior to vote.**

DENMARK: As stated in our 99/247 document, **officially proposes Dr. Mortensen as vice-President.** Asks for supports .

SPAIN: Reminds the Plenum that **Spain has never had a representative** in the chairmanship.

UK : DR. CHISOLM: *Proposes voting by secret ballot.*

GERMANY: *Proposes voting a country , not the individual candidate .*

CHAIRMAN: Candidates are proposed by their National Delegation but the Plenum votes for the person.

Plenum :proceeds to vote by secret Ballot

VOTING REPORT

Voters 13

Entitled to vote : 18 Delegations

Scrutineers: Dr. Willy Buss, Dr. Cristina Fabian.

Results

Dr. Peter Mortensen: 14 votes

Dr. Solla: 4 votes

New vice-chairman Dr. Peter Mortensen (Denmark) is elected.

CHAIRMAN: congratulates Dr. Mortensen.

DR. SOLLA acknowledges Dr. Mortensen's election

DR. MORTENSEN: "I have been with UEMO for 12 years and I still hope to work well with you".

CHAIRMAN: In conclusion of the plenary session, declares his satisfaction for solving one of the big problems of the last months, namely the controversy with Portugal. He thanks the Slovenian delegation for excellent organization and hospitality offered for the 1999 autumn meeting. Thanks all the interpreters and the secretarial staff, especially Dr. Judy Carter for her help and patience. Also thanks the Secretary General and the Treasurer. He accepts fair criticisms that help to improve.

SPAIN : DR. GARZON: Informs all Delegates that this year is the 5th centennial of a great Spanish doctor. Dr. Andrea Laguna, 500 years ago presented the proposal that all European doctors be united. There will be a convention in November in Segovia on Andrea Laguna, born in Segovia in 1499.

CHAIRMAN: Finally thanks the vice-Presidents and all the delegations. Adjourns the Plenum to Florence, 25-26 May 2000.

At 5:00 p.m. the meeting is closed

***MINUTES ARE APPROVED DURING THE
FLORENCE MEETING ON 25TH MAY 2000***