

**NDPHS Strategy Working Group
Second Meeting
Brussels, Belgium
2 March 2009**



Reference	SWG 2/4/1
Title	Agreed division of responsibilities and related SWG 1 decisions
Submitted by	Secretariat
Summary / Note	This division of responsibilities has been agreed upon by the SWG during its first meeting on 21 January 2009. Additionally, for the ease of reference, the Secretariat has also listed the SWG 1 decisions related to the respective topics.
Requested action	For reference

Topic and specific recommendations as listed in Appendix 1 to the ToR for the <i>ad hoc</i> SWG (where available) ¹	Countries invited to present preliminary ideas regarding the follow-up actions	Outcome of the considerations during the SWG 1 Meeting (when available) ²
<p>Mid term vision and goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose mid-term vision and linked to it mid-term goals. 	<p>Norway and Russia (to be worked on after the CSR 15 Meeting in spring).</p>	<p><i>Mid term vision and goals</i> are among the issues to be addressed by an external consultant. However, the SWG needs to present to the consultant its preliminary ideas. However, the SWG needs to present to the consultant its preliminary ideas.</p>
<p>Social well-being facet within the NDPHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose a definition of social well-being in the NDPHS context; Decide if the two-fold approach towards health and social well-being is to be maintained or the current focus on health issues should be made an official policy (Sec. 3.3.4, Rec. 1); If the increased focus on the social well-being facet is recommended, propose how NDPHS activities can better address it. 	<p>Entire SWG (ideas how the NDPHS could more actively embark on social well-being issues have been received from Denmark and NCM).</p>	<p>The SWG 1 Meeting agreed that the “social well-being” part in the name of the NDPHS should be addressed above all, for instance by connecting social well-being issues with already existing health topics that the Expert Groups have been working on. Further discussions on how to better include social well-being issues could be held when discussing the new mandates of the EGs.</p>
<p>Strategies and policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose how the strategies and policies paradigm could be addressed by the NDPHS; Propose thematic areas on which the NDPHS would focus in the mid-term, and which would be linked to the mid-term goals. 	<p>Canada and Poland.</p>	<p>The Meeting agreed that the Partnership should be active in policy and strategy development as well as in the exchange of best practices and policies (those are prioritized). Further, it should identify problems in the region and develop project ideas and put them in a market place, but also facilitate and “outsource” projects via the pipeline.</p>
<p>Success indicators and criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put in place indicators and criteria by which to measure success of the NDPHS (Sec. 4.2.6, Rec. 1). 	<p>Canada and Poland.</p>	<p><i>Success indicators</i> are among the issues to be addressed by an external consultant. However, the SWG needs to present to the consultant its preliminary ideas.</p>

¹ For each recommendation listed in Appendix 1 to the ToR for the *ad hoc* SWG, both section number and recommendation’s individual number is provided in parentheses.

² At the time of preparation of this present document, the SWG 1 Minutes were still undergoing the adoption procedure. Consequently, the information included in this column is based on the first draft distributed to the participants for adoption.

<p>Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NDPHS should be more oriented towards project-activities (and take project facilitation seriously), but avoid the pitfall of being too much an implementing agency on its own (facilitation means: formulation of project proposals in collaboration with suitable implementation agencies, taking note of developments within projects (receiving and scrutinizing reports), evaluating the impact of these projects, raising the findings from a project level to a policy level (Sec. 5, Rec. 1); • NDPHS should be not only a facilitator of projects, but foremost a facilitator of ideas and concepts, mainstreaming and dissemination agency into the level of political decision-making in its member-states (Sec. 5, Rec. 2); • Encourage the Secretariat [...] to apply for additional project-oriented funding. (Sec. 3.1.3, Rec. 6); • Plan for at least one continuous project directly applied for, implemented, monitored and evaluated by the Secretariat. Projects should be chosen for an overall benefit of the whole NDPHS (focus on research or filling in loopholes within the NDPHS' activities, which are not addressed by the Expert Groups (Sec. 4.2.6, Rec. 5); • If the Secretariat is to continue as an agency for project implementation, then increase the number of the permanent staff of the Secretariat (Sec. 3.1.3, Rec. 7); • Define clearly how the term “project facilitation” should be used in the future and what it includes if an Expert Group claims it facilitates a concrete project. When the definition is agreed upon, adhere to it in all reporting and monitoring (Sec. 4.2.6, Rec. 4); • Expert Groups: facilitate, support in application and evaluate at least one “flagship project” per EG, and at maximum two to three. Projects clearly linked to the NDPHS should be featured prominently on the NDPHS website (Sec. 4.2.6, Rec. 6).¹ 	<p>Finland and Norway (with possible comments and suggestions from the Expert Groups).</p>	<p><i>Projects</i> are among the issues to be addressed by an external consultant. However, the SWG needs to present to the consultant its preliminary ideas.</p>
---	--	---

¹ This particular recommendation might be worked on in tandem with Sweden and Lithuania that are suggested to deal with recommendations concerning Expert Groups. Also, Expert Groups' comments and suggestion might be asked for.

<p>Funding of Partnership's activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the “financier and/or facilitator” paradigm in the NDPHS, as well as the Partners’ willingness and possibility to contribute to the NDPHS. The following financing areas should be taken into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overall funding (NDPHS budget, NDPHS Appropriations Account); ○ EG related; ○ Project related; ○ Other related issues. <p>It is recommended that, as stipulated in the Oslo Declaration, funding from, e.g., the public sector and from the private sector be taken into account, and national financing, bilateral financing and multilateral financing be considered.</p> <p>(NB. Non-payment of membership fees is supposed to be addressed also through the rules regarding the NDPHS Membership/ Partner status).</p>	<p>Finland and Poland.</p>	<p><i>Funding</i> is among the issues to be addressed by an external consultant. However, the SWG needs to present to the consultant its preliminary ideas.</p>
<p>NDPHS Membership/Partner status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise and make as concrete as possible the legal and financial requirements for becoming and staying as a member. Possibly abolish “Associated Partner” status (Sec. 3.2.4, Rec. 1); • NDPHS Partners and Participants: ensure proper coordination of the NDPHS-related work at own countries and organizations. 	<p>Germany and Norway.</p>	<p>The Meeting decided to return to the proposal in its next SWG meeting: There are two kinds of participants – Partners (decision making partners and partner organizations) as well as Observers. Countries that establish the legal capacity of the Secretariat and pay their annual membership fee have a decision-making right and are called Partners. Countries that do not match the above criteria are observers. Observers that pay contributions stay observers. Founding organizations, as mentioned in the Oslo Declaration, are also called Partners. Observers and Partners organizations can discuss, but can't take part in the decision-making process. New membership rules will need to be developed when the Secretariat's own legal capacity is in place.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Germany submitted document “Proposal for a</p>

		revised NDPHS Member status,” which takes into account the respective considerations of the SWG 1 Meeting (submitted as document SWG 2/4/3).
<p>Expert Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop criteria and a transparent process upon which new Expert Groups should be established and dissolved (Sec. 3.3.4, Rec. 2); • Consider establishing a mechanism, which forces Expert Groups to defend at regular intervals their own existence, with the possibility of dissolution in the case of EG’s failure to legitimize its continuation (Sec. 3.3.4, Rec. 3); • Review the NDPHS collaboration with the CBSS WGCC and discern how far the NDPHS is really benefiting from the groups holding an associated EG status, and decide if and how the cooperation can be intensified or the formal bond should be abolished (Sec. 3.3.4, Rec. 5). • The Expert Groups should be tasked with the duty to compile and assess evaluations available for projects they claim to have facilitated. The current database could be extended with a separate access to evaluation reports (which would be different from the “Papers” section) (Sec. 4.2.6, Rec. 2); • Ask Expert Groups to identify and describe opening for dissemination and mainstreaming of their own topics in national decision-making in the Partner Countries (Sec. 4.2.6, Rec. 3); • Expert Groups should develop their proposals to the CSR about the focus of their activities always in an inclusive way, adding ownership to the topics chosen. Some minimum standards of participation should and could be defined and adhered to. If it is a minority that is eager to work on a given topic, and this topic is, nevertheless, regarded as important by the NDPHS, other forms of organizational setting could be considered instead of an Expert Group (Sec. 4.2.6, Rec. 8). 	Sweden, Lithuania (with involvement of the other two EG Lead Partners: Finland and Norway, if they would like to join in).	<i>Expert Groups</i> are among the issues to be addressed by an external consultant. However, the SWG needs to present to the consultant its preliminary ideas.

<p>Publication guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop strict formal guidelines for future publications prepared by the Expert Groups in regard to structure, wording and other format issue (Sec. 4.2.6, Rec. 7). 	<p>Secretariat (this issue has already been discussed with the EG Chairs and ITAs).</p>	
<p>Other recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hold PAC every second year and agree that the last CSR meeting of a non-PAC year would be officially mandated to decide on behalf of the PAC (Sec. 3.2.4, Rec. 3); - Specifically design and prepare bi-annual PAC to allow the generation of political legitimacy and endorsement of the best possible quality (Sec. 3.2.4, Rec. 4); - Repeat an external evaluation every four or five years (Sec. 4.2.6, Rec. 9). 	<p>Entire SWG (during the SWG 2 meeting so that follow-up actions could be addressed already to the CSR 15 Meeting on 23-24 April 2008).</p>	<p><i>Administrative rules and procedures for a Secretariat with legal capacity¹</i> are among the issues to be addressed by an external consultant. However, the SWG needs to present to the consultant its preliminary ideas.</p>

¹ Although SWG 1 decision to have an external consultant address the “administrative rules and procedures for a Secretariat with legal capacity” has not been mentioned in “Other recommendations” column of this present document, it has been listed in this row as there is no other more relevant part of this document.