

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

Title	Minutes
Submitted by	Secretariat
Summary / Note	This document recalls the main discussion points and decisions made during the 2 nd meeting of the SWG
List of Annexes	Annex 1 – Adopted SWG Work Plan Annex 2 – List of documents submitted to the meeting Annex 3 – List of participants

1. Welcome and opening of the meeting

Ms. Kerstin Ödman, the Chair of the *ad hoc* Strategy Working Group (SWG), opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The Meeting **adopted** the provisional agenda (submitted as document SWG 2/2/1).

3. SWG Work Plan

The SWG Chair presented a draft SWG Work Plan (submitted as document SWG 2/3/1). This document has been developed consistent with the “Terms of Reference and Timeline of the *ad hoc* Strategy Working Group” (submitted as document SWG 2/3/Info 1).

Germany and Finland considered the possibility to provide financial support for the hiring of a consultant, Germany on the condition that CEval would be tasked with this job.

The Meeting **agreed** that the Terms of Reference for a consultant needed to be finalized by the middle of March according to the Work Plan and **adopted** the Work Plan with a small time correction, attached as Annex 1.

4. Preliminary ideas regarding the selected recommendations to be addressed by the SWG

With reference to the different section of the document SWG 2/4/1 (“Agreed division of responsibilities”), the SWG Chair opened discussions concerning the various topics covered in the document:

4.1. Other recommendations, prepared by Sweden and the Secretariat

The SWG Chair introduced the proposal concerning PAC and evaluations (cf. document SWG 2/4/2).

- **Proposal concerning holding a PAC meeting only every second year**

The SWG Chair explained that the consultant's recommendation to hold PAC only every second year was not feasible as this would mean to change the Oslo Declaration.

The Meeting **agreed** to propose to the CSR 15 to hold a PAC meeting every year, in accordance with the Declaration. The possibilities to organize side events would remain. It also **agreed** that the number of CSR meetings could be limited, especially during the non-ministerial PAC years, and that the use of the teleconferencing should be considered, if necessary. The text of the proposal to the CSR was to be more open and less specified than in the document.

- **Proposal on increasing legitimacy of the Partnership at the PAC at ministerial level**

The Meeting **acknowledged** that forward looking topics of high political relevance needed to be identified and that both CSR and Expert Groups would need to work on the development of these. It further **agreed** to present the revised proposal on increasing legitimacy of PAC to the CSR 15.

- **Proposal concerning evaluator's recommendations as regards evaluation**

The SWG Chair proposed that the Partnership would undergo an evaluation every five years, which would be aided by an external consultant.

Poland stressed that the evaluation should not be strictly conducted every five years but rather when there was a clear need for it.

The Meeting **agreed** to propose to the CSR regular evaluations around every five years. It **further noted** that the evaluation would also have financial implications and that the financial part would need to be reflected in the NDPHS annual budget accordingly.

Finally, the Meeting **agreed** that the revised recommendations would be sent to the SWG Members for approval before they would be submitted to the CSR 15 Meeting.

4.2. Proposal for a revised NDPHS Member status prepared by Germany and Norway.

The SWG Chair pointed out that Norway, in its proposal at the SWG 1 had distinguished between Partners and Observers, while Article 2 of the Oslo Declaration (Composition of the Partnership) distinguished between "Partners" and "Participants".

Norway suggested to consider those countries as "Partners" that paid into the NDPHS budget, while "Participants" were those countries that did not pay an annual contribution. Nonetheless, a Partner countries' payment into the NDPHS budget needed to be linked to the NDPHS overall activities, such as for instance an evaluation of the Partnership, the running of the Secretariat, etc, and should not necessarily be a financial project contribution to support an Expert Group.

Canada wondered if the financial contribution into the NDPHS annual budget would suffice to be recognized as a Partner.

Norway proposed that every country that contributes into the yearly budget should be considered a Partner.

Germany proposed that instead of signing the Secretariats ToR it might be a possibility to acknowledge the Secretariat's Terms of Reference (because, for example, Canada might not be able to sign such an agreement either). Germany could not be a Partner in the establishment of a new organization.

The Meeting **agreed** to propose to CSR to abolish the Associate Partner status. Partner countries should be considered those countries that contribute to the yearly budget of the NDPHS. Organizations should also be considered Partners. The non-payment of a contribution of a country should be brought to PAC to decide whether the country would continue to be counted as a Partner. As a guideline for PAC, the Meeting **agreed** to suggest that if a country did not pay, but wanted to keep up its Partner status, it was necessary that all other countries would agree to cover for the missing contribution. If such an agreement was not found, the country would normally be considered as a "Participant" during the period of non-payment. The Meeting further **requested** the SWG Chair to seek advice on this formula with experts in the field.

Referring to the SWG 1 meeting minutes, Finland remarked that the Partnership should be open, friendly and inviting to all actors who wished to participate in its work, not restricting their contribution.

The Meeting **agreed** to propose to CSR that both, Partners (incl. organizations) and Participants should have the right to send their representatives to Expert Group meetings. It further **agreed** to propose to the CSR that new countries, wanting to join the Partnership, needed to apply for a Partner status, while "Founding Partners" did not need to re-apply, in case they wanted to join the Partnership again¹. It **requested** Norway and Germany to work on a more detailed proposal which would differentiate the roles and rights of Partners and Participants.

4.3. Proposals concerning evaluator's recommendations regarding Expert Groups prepared by Sweden and Lithuania (cf. document SWG 2/4/5) and comments to it prepared by Finland (cf. document SWG 2/4/7)

The SWG Chair summarized the proposal concerning Expert Groups (cf. document SWG 2/4/5) and noted that Finland had provided additional comments to it (cf. document SWG 2/4/7).

Norway underlined the necessity to establish a link between the goals, especially mid-term goals, and the establishment of Expert Groups. The Expert Groups should be important tools for the NDPHS to reach its goals. And furthermore, the CSR and the Expert Groups needed to be consulted in order to define short-term and mid-term goals of the NDPHS.

Germany stressed the need for the NDPHS to have the ability to quickly respond to any emerging health issue in the region. Instead of Expert Groups, an expert pool could bring experts together, who could provide such immediate responses. This could also be an efficient way to transport experiences and lessons learned. The work could be of an *ad hoc* nature (maybe for half a year or one year) and then, new work tasks should be defined, in order for the NDPHS to stay up to date

¹ Such as Spain or the Netherlands, who are mentioned as the "Founding Partners" in the Oslo Declaration, but, who have left the Partnership.

with the developments. Germany also saw a need and potential to make use of the existing bi-lateral structures between NDPHS countries, so that the NDPHS could better benefit from its Partners, for example by establishing contacts and exchanging more information about ongoing projects.

Canada stated a need for Expert Groups to cover both, long term and short terms tasks, and emphasized that the NDPHS should not eliminate the possibility for experts to participate in Expert Group meetings. Canada had a strong interest in the exchange of knowledge and this interest was one driving factor for Canada to participate in NDPHS.

Poland remarked that it did not see a single pressing health-related topic that could be resolved on a short term basis (half a year) in the region by forming ad hoc Expert Groups.

Norway felt that the focus of the Expert Groups could be more concrete, and that an Expert Group could, for example, create its own sub-group(s), or create sub-groups jointly with other EGs and external experts, to work on a specific issue. If the tasks were assessments of health situations, the development of best practices in the region, etc, then this was more of a long term task, while short projects could be done in smaller groups and in a shorter timeframe.

Germany explained that the Expert Groups could produce much more concrete results, like best practice models, concrete actions, etc. Furthermore, clinical partnerships with universities, hospitals, prisons, etc could be established and these activities could be set up in a timeframe of 6 months.

The EC proposed to include an explanatory note in the Swedish and Lithuanian proposal in Section 3.3.4 that one reason for dissolving an Expert Group would be when it has accomplished its task.

The SWG Chair **concluded** that there was a need for both, mid-term as well as long-term goals to define the content of the work of the Expert Group. At the same time, flexibility needed to be ensured in order for the CSR to set up the group or groups that were needed to achieve a certain goal. The NDPHS Expert Groups or *Ad Hoc* Expert Working Groups should serve to achieve the goals and priorities of the Partnership. Expert Groups also needed to be of added value to the Partnership and their work needed to be supported by the majority of the Partners.

Canada suggested that every non-ministerial PAC meeting should be used for a brainstorming to identify work issues that should be taken up by the Expert Groups and the NDPHS for the next two years. Organizations such as WHO or the EC should be considered key players for the planning and programme discussions of the NDPHS. Expert Groups could be included in these discussions to define how long it would take to accomplish a certain task.

Norway proposed to first seek an opinion from the CSR on mid-term goals before addressing the Expert Groups.

The Meeting **agreed** to propose that mid-term goals should be set for four years, covering two chairmanship periods and be adopted by PAC at ministerial level.

It further **agreed** to invite the EG Chairs and ITAs to the 3rd SWG meeting on 22 April and **requested** Sweden and Lithuania to develop a set of questions for the EG Chairs and ITAs which would be circulated to the EG Chairs and ITAs prior to the Meeting, based on the recommendations of the evaluator. These questions could revolve around the topics of project facilitation, implementation and project management, fund raising, EGs capacity in providing advice to the CSR, achieving the NDPHS goals, involvement of other (non-NDPHS) regions, advantages and difficulties when working with/for the NDPHS, etc.

With reference to Section 4.2.6 of document SWG 2/4/7, the Meeting **agreed not** to follow the recommendations about evaluations for Expert Groups. It was agreed that the proposal concerning evaluation of the NDPHS would also apply also to the Expert Groups and other NDPHS Groups.

The Meeting **agreed** to use the document SWG 2/4/7 as a preliminary working paper and **requested** Sweden and Lithuania to revise it after the meeting with Chairs and ITAs. Among other things, they should address the issues of flexibility of Expert Groups and other NDPHS Working Groups and their potential linkages and input to the short, mid, and long-term goals of the Partnership.

4.4. Proposal concerning projects, prepared by Norway and Finland

Norway introduced the proposals presented in document SWG 2/4/6 and recalled that a part of these proposals can only be discussed after agreements are in place with regard to structure, the role of the Secretariat, the role of the EGs – how they are to be financed, established, etc.

Norway and Finland considered the Expert Groups as project facilitators, rather than project implementers, as implementation activities might soon drain out the limited resources available within the Expert Groups. However, it could be expected from the Expert Groups to evaluate projects, to provide health themes-related overviews, to provide technical and - to a certain extent - political advice, to establish and deepen contacts and to be multipliers for the work of the NDPHS.

Finland added that the pipeline was working, but that not all the projects had been evaluated by the Expert Groups.

The Secretariat informed that there could always be a series of projects, where EGs were not involved. Such an involvement could be increased, if the financing agencies made it a habit to request the opinion of the EGs through the pipeline. The financing agencies could also advise the EGs which thematic areas are of high importance for funding. Due to the limited time that the Expert Groups can spend on appraising project proposals, it would be recommendable that the Expert Groups would be requested to appraise only proposals for large regional projects.

Norway and Finland stated that their respective financing agencies had already relied several times on the opinions from Expert Groups.

The Meeting **considered** document SWG 2/4/6 as a preliminary working paper and **requested** Norway and Finland to update their proposal as soon as other results - linked to it - would become pertinent.

4.5. Proposal concerning evaluator's recommendations as regards success indicators and criteria

Poland introduced its proposal concerning strategies and policies and invited the Meeting to discuss the proposed indicators under the Action lines 1 – 7 (cf. document SWG 2/4/8 submitted by Poland).

Canada stressed that it was important to gain a better understanding of the financial size of the NDPHS. It suggested that the costs related to the hosting of meetings for CSR, PAC, Expert Groups, etc. should also be reported as well as the expenses related to the running of the Expert

Groups. Furthermore, other channels, like the funding through the pipeline should be included in an indicator.

The EC focused on (1) indicators of the process and (2) indicators of the outcome, with the understanding that a financial indicator (or an indicator on the amount of documents produced) was an outcome indicator; but that the number of meetings held, or partner countries involved was a process indicator. The EC was not fully convinced that the costs of meetings should be reported as there were discrepancies of purchasing powers and different price levels in the NDPHS Partner countries. What was important to know was that the NDPHS had accumulated a certain (total) sum. The biggest value in a process indicator was for example that the meetings took place. But measuring the impact of the meetings, depended on what kind of strategic goals the NDPHS had defined. As an example, the long-term goal (impact indicator) for the HIV/AIDS EG could be to limit the number of infections.

The Secretariat remarked that it was important to first answer a question why such indicators were needed and how they could best be measured. For example, one possible answer could be that the NDPHS wanted to show that all Partners shared the burden of running the Partnership. Another possible answer could be that the NDPHS wanted to show success in this specific area.

Canada suggested to also make use of the evaluation questions when formulating impact indicators².

Norway felt that an impact indicator always had the weakness that the impact could also come from somewhere else and not necessarily from the work of the NDPHS, and that they primarily should be linked to results (concrete outputs).

Sweden suggested that an impact indicator could also be a better cooperation in the ND area, better exchange of knowledge and the learning from each other.

The Meeting **agreed** to use the document SWG 2/4/8 as a working document and to mandate a consultant to further develop the NDPHS success indicators and criteria. It **requested** Poland and Canada to elaborate the paper further.

5. Documents to be presented to the CSR

5.1 Progress report to be presented to the CSR 15 Meeting

The SWG Chair proposed to include the following issues in the progress report that would be submitted to the CSR 15:

- The progress made by the SWG;
- The proposals concerning "Other recommendations" on PAC and regular evaluations of the NDPHS;
- Information about participants in the SWG;
- Information about the planning of the remaining work.

² The evaluation questions are available in the Document SWG 2/4/Info 1 NDPHS Evaluation questions – answers by Iceland.

The Meeting **agreed** on the proposal from the SWG Chair and **added** that, in case the timeline could not be kept, the CSR 16 would need to be presented with an updated work plan and that the final report could then only be circulated after the CSR 16 meeting.

5.2 Final report to be presented to the CSR 16 Meeting

Canada was concerned about the SWG's ability of keeping the timeline as the summer holiday season in July and August usually delayed the process of consensus finding and that, therefore, the report needed to be already finished by June.

The SWG Chair suggested holding another meeting after CSR 15, which would review the draft, add missing components and include the input from the CSR in order to finalize the final report on time. The SWG Chair also suggested that the report should be limited in size.

The Meeting **agreed** to move forward as fast possible with the SWG member contributions and remaining tasks, and also **agreed** that the report should be limited in size.

6. Assignment for an external consultant to assist the SWG

SWG Chair discussed each topic as outlined in document SWG 2/4/1 ("Agreed division of responsibilities and related SWG 1 decisions") and asked the responsible Partners if they needed the help of an external consultant:

a. Mid term vision and goals

Norway stated the need for a consultant, but informed that the complexity of the topic required the input from the other Partners first and that the consultant tasks could only be clearly described after the next SWG meeting.

b. Social Well-being

In view of the recent discussions held and the papers presented by NCM and Denmark, the Meeting agreed that the issue on Social Well-being did not require the support of a consultant.

c. Strategies and policies

Canada and Poland stated that this topic did not require the support of a consultant.

d. Success indicators and criteria

Poland and Canada promised to elaborate the paper further. Support in reviewing the draft and the further formulation of indicators was required from a consultant.

Germany mentioned the possibilities of using internal (ministerial) support.

e. Projects

Finland and Norway promised to formulate their possible needs for a consultant before the 10th of March.

f. Funding of Partnerships activities

Poland and Finland expressed their need for a consultant to further elaborate on this topic. The work of the consultant would include, e.g. financing aspects of the pipeline and its sustainability, membership fees solutions to be proposed, exploring the possibility of private funding, etc.

g. NDPHS Membership/Partner status

Germany and Norway stated that they would continue working on the NDPHS membership status and that no consultant was needed for this task.

h. Expert Groups

Sweden and Lithuania reiterated that they would develop a set of questions for the EG Chairs and ITAs and revise their proposal based on the discussions.

Canada proposed to include a consultant to work on the Expert group related issues. The consultant, if feasible, could even facilitate the next SWG meeting, with the EG Chairs and ITAs present.

Sweden and Secretariat agreed to work on identifying a suitable consultant, with the help of Germany and Finland.

The Meeting **agreed** that all Partners should inform the Secretariat **by 10 March 2009**, if they required additional help of a consultant to further develop their strategic input. Furthermore, it **requested** the Partners to provide adjustments to the papers **by 10 March**, so that the consultant's job description could be developed.

7. Any other business

As a follow-up on the SWG 1, the SWG Chair informed that the meeting requested by SWG 1 between the Chairs of SWG and CSR and the Russian Ministry of Health and Social Development and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs had not been possible to hold on the occasion of Council of Europe Conference of Ministers responsible for Social Cohesion, 26-27 February, in Moscow.

Finland informed about a meeting between the Russian Minister of Health and Social Development and the Finnish Minister of Social Affairs and Health during the same Council of Europe Conference. The priorities of the Russian Ministry of Health revolved around infectious diseases and healthy lifestyles. Russia was also very interested in the Finnish health-experiences. The possible decision of the Russian Ministry of Finance concerning NDPHS was still pending and therefore it was difficult to give a commitment for a possible Russian NDPHS Chairmanship at this stage.

8. Adoption of the SWG 2 meeting minutes

The Meeting **requested** the Secretariat to send out draft SWG 2 Meeting minutes to the participants on 10 March 2009 and that comments on the draft would be due, at the latest, on 13 March 2009. A revised report would then be distributed on 16 March 2009 to be adopted *per capsulam* provided that no further comments are submitted within one week.

9. Closing of the meeting

On behalf of the SWG, the Chair thanked the Canadian host for its warm welcome and generous hospitality. The Meeting closed at 16:15 hours.

Reference	Annex 1
Title	SWG Work Plan
Submitted by	Secretariat
Summary / Note	This Work Plan was adopted during the SWG 2 meeting

Action	Date	Remarks
<p>1. SWG discusses preliminary ideas regarding the selected recommendations to be addressed by the SWG. It agrees on follow-up actions regarding "Other recommendations" to be presented to the CSR 15 Meeting on 23-24 April 2008 for decision.</p> <p>2. SWG agrees on selected issues regarding documents to be presented to the CSR 15 and the CSR 16.</p> <p>3. SWG agrees on key points and messages to be taken into account by the SWG Consultant during his/her assignment (to be included in the ToR for the SWG Consultant).</p>	2 March	Ref. documents: SWG 2/4/1 "Agreed division of responsibilities and related SWG 1 decisions" and other documents submitted under item 4.
<p>4. SWG Chair attends the EG Chairs and ITAs 8 Meeting and informs about the progress in the SWG work and the plans for the future (with a special focus on the interaction with the EG Chairs and ITAs with regard to the recommendations concerning the Expert Groups).</p>	3 March	One issue to discuss with the EG Chairs and ITAs is a SWG meeting with the participation of the EG Chairs and ITAs, which is mentioned further down in this Work Plan (cf. item 11).
<p>5. SWG Members, who need to revise their preliminary papers concerning the follow-up of the recommendations and to include the outcome of the SWG 2 discussions into their papers, submit the revised papers to the SWG Chair and the Secretariat.</p>	10 March	These preliminary papers will be taken into account by the SWG Chair and the Secretariat when they will be developing draft ToR for the SWG Consultant.
<p>6. SWG Chair and the Secretariat submit draft ToR for the SWG Consultant to the SWG Members for comments and approval (through a written procedure).</p>	16 March	Additional draft paper approval round(s) to be made, if necessary. The whole process will begin only when funding is made available for employment of a consultant.
<p>7. The ToR for the SWG Consultant approved by the SWG Members.</p>	26 March	
<p>8.1 The SWG Chair discusses the assignment with the recommended consultant (in coordination with the sponsoring institution and the SWG Members).</p> <p>8.2 The Secretariat concludes the contract with the selected consultant (in coordination with the sponsoring institution and the SWG Chair).</p>	<p>Week 13</p> <p>Week 14</p>	

9. SWG Chair and the Secretariat submit draft progress report for the CSR to the SWG Members for comments and approval (through a written procedure).	Week 14	The draft progress report will also include the proposed decisions on the follow up of the three recommendations listed in the last section (<i>Other recommendations</i>) of document "Agreed division of responsibilities and related SWG 1 decisions." Additional approval round(s) to be made, if necessary.
10.1 The progress report for the CSR approved by the SWG Members. 10.2 SWG Chair submits the approved progress report to the CSR15 Meeting.	6 April 7 April	The report to be disseminated with the nearest submission of documents to the CSR 15 Meeting.
11. SWG 3 Meeting with the participation of the EG Chairs and ITAs.	22 April	If the SWG Consultant is available, and funds permit, he/she could also be invited to attend.
12. SWG Progress report presented during the CSR 15 Meeting. Assuming that the SWG issues would be tackled during the first day of the CSR 15 Meeting, the SWG Members might quickly discuss the outcome of the CSR discussions during the evening of 23 April.	23/24 April	If the SWG Consultant is available, and funds permit, he/she could also be invited to attend the SWG agenda item during the CSR 15 Meeting.
13. Assignment of the SWG Consultant begins	4 May	
14.1 The SWG Consultant submits a draft paper. 14.2 Draft paper immediately submitted to the SWG Members for comments.	29 May 1 June	EG Chairs and ITAs could be asked to comment on the section(s) of the report of direct relevance to the EGs.
15. Comments on the SWG Consultant's paper submitted by the SWG Members (and the EG Chairs and ITAs, if invited) to the Secretariat and subsequently forwarded to the SWG Consultant.	5 June	
16.1 The SWG Consultant submits a revised paper. 16.2 Revised paper immediately submitted to the SWG Members for comments.	16 June	

17. Final comments on the SWG Consultant's paper submitted by the SWG Members to the Secretariat and subsequently forwarded to the SWG Consultant.	22 June	
18.1 The SWG Consultant submits the final version of his/her paper. The SWG Consultant's assignment ends. 18.2 The final paper immediately submitted to the SWG Members.	30 June	
19. SWG 4 Meeting discusses points and messages to be included in the SWG final report for submission to the CSR 16.	Mid-late August	Place and date to be agreed upon. Other issues to be addressed by the SWG 4 need to be agreed upon later.
20. SWG Chair and the Secretariat submit draft SWG final report for the CSR to the SWG Members for comments and approval (through a written procedure).	2 September	Additional approval round(s) to be made, if necessary.
21.1 SWG final report for the CSR approved by the SWG Members. 21.2 SWG Chair submits the approved final report to the CSR 16 Meeting.	Week 37 Week 38	The report to be disseminated with the nearest submission of documents to the CSR 16 Meeting.
22. SWG final report presented during the CSR 16 Meeting. End of the SWG assignment.	Date to be decided on by the CSR	Supporting documents, such as a ppt presentation to be developed for the meeting in due time.

Reference	Annex 2
Title	List of documents submitted to the meeting
Submitted by	Secretariat
Summary / Note	This list includes all documents submitted to the meeting

Main documents

Code	Title	Submitted by	Date
• SWG 2/2/1	Provisional agenda	Secretariat	10/02/09
• SWG 2/2/2	Provisional annotated agenda	Secretariat	10/02/09
• SWG 2/3/1	Draft SWG Work Plan	Secretariat	10/02/09
• SWG 2/3/Info 1	Terms of Reference and Timeline for the NDPHS <i>ad hoc</i> Strategy Working Group (SWG)	Secretariat	10/02/09
• SWG 2/4/1	Agreed division of responsibilities and related SWG 1 decisions	Secretariat	10/02/09
• SWG 2/4/2	Proposals concerning evaluator's recommendations as regards PAC and CSR meetings as well as external evaluation cycles	Sweden and Secretariat	20/02/09
• SWG 2/4/3	A note on social well-being	Denmark and the NCM	10/02/09
• SWG 2/4/4	Proposal for a revised NDPHS Member status	Germany	10/02/09
• SWG 2/4/5	Proposals concerning evaluator's recommendations as regards Expert Groups	Sweden and Lithuania	20/02/09
• SWG 2/4/6	Proposal concerning projects	Norway and Finland	25/02/09
• SWG 2/4/7	Proposals concerning evaluator's recommendations as regards Expert Groups – comments by Finland	Finland	25/02/09
• SWG 2/4/8	Proposals concerning strategies and policies, success indicators and criteria, funding of Partnership's activities, social well-being, etc.	Poland	03/03/09
• SWG 2/4/Info 1	NDPHS Evaluation questions – answers by Iceland	Iceland	25/02/09

Auxiliary documents

Code	Title	Submitted by	Date
• SWG 2/Info 1	Practical information for participants	Secretariat	10/02/09
• SWG 2/Info 2	Preliminary timetable	Secretariat	10/02/09
• SWG 2/Info 3	List of documents	Secretariat	10/02/09
• SWG 2/Info 3/Rev 1	Revised list of documents	Secretariat	20/02/09
• SWG 2/Info 3/Rev 2	Second revised list of documents	Secretariat	25/02/09
• SWG 2/Info 3/Rev 2	Third revised list of documents	Secretariat	03/03/09
• SWG 2/Info 4	Preliminary list of participants	Secretariat	25/02/09
• SWG 2/Info 4/Rev 1	Final list of participants	Secretariat	03/03/09

Reference	Annex 3
Title	List of participants
Submitted by	Secretariat
Summary / Note	This list includes all persons who attended the meeting

Sweden (SWG CHAIR)

Ms Kerstin Ödman
Senior Adviser
Ministry of Health and Social Affairs
103 33 Stockholm
SWEDEN
Phone: +46 8 405 22 46
Fax: +46 8 21 78 76
E-mail: kerstin.e.odman@social.ministry.se

Germany

Mr. Thomas Ifland
Officer
Federal Ministry of Health
Rochusstr.1
53123 Bonn
GERMANY
Phone: +49 228 941 3311
Fax: +49 228 941 4945
E-mail: thomas.ifland@bmg.bund.de

Canada

Mr. Robert Shearer
Health and Social Affairs Counsellor
Mission of Canada to the European Union
Avenue de Tervuren, 2
1040 Brussels
BELGIUM
Phone: +32 2 741 07 80
Fax: +32 2 741 06 97
E-mail: robert.shearer@international.gc.ca

Lithuania

Mr. Mindaugas Plieskis
Attaché for Health
Permanent Representation of Lithuania to the
European Union
Rue Belliard 41-43
B-1040 Brussels
BELGIUM
Phone: +32 27881863
Fax: +32 22824250
E-mail: mindaugas.plieskis@eurep.mfa.lt

Finland

Ms Maria Waltari
Senior Officer
Ministry of Social Affairs and Health
P.O.BOX 33, 00023 Government,
FINLAND
Tel: +358 9 16074193
Fax: +358 9 160 73296
Mobile: +358 50 364 7815
E-mail: maria.waltari@stm.fi

Norway

Ms Toril Roscher-Nielsen
Director General
Ministry of Health and Care Services
P.O. Box 8011 Dep
0030 Oslo
NORWAY
Phone: + 47 22 24 8420
Fax: + 47 22 24 9577
E-mail: trn@hd.dep.no

Ms Vibeke R. Gundersen
Senior Adviser
Division for International Cooperation and
Preparedness
Ministry of Health and Care Services
P.O. Box 8011 Dep
N-0030 Oslo
NORWAY
Phone: +47 22 24 87 73
Fax: +47 22 24 95 77
E-mail: vrq@hod.dep.no

Poland

Ms Jadwiga Jaszczyk
Office for Foreign Aid Programs. in Health Care
Aleje Jerozolimskie 155
02-326 Warsaw
POLAND
Phone: +48 22 658 22 61
Fax: +48 22 658 26 17
E-mail: j.jaszczyk@bpz.gov.pl

Russia

Ms Maria Churilova
Second Secretary
Permanent Mission of the Russian
Federation to the European Communities
Drève de Lorraine 45
1180 Brussels
Phone: +32 2 374 45 88
+32 2 375 66 29
Fax : +32 2 375 66 50
E-mail : churilovamv@mail.ru

European Commission

Mr. Boguslaw Suski
Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-
General
Directorate C - Public Health & Risk
Assessment
F101 08/91
Rue Froissart 101
B-1040 Brussels
BELGIUM
Phone: + 32 2 29 522 60
Fax: + 32 2 29 217 53
E-mail: boguslaw.suski@ec.europa.eu

NDPHS SECRETARIAT

Mr. Marek Maciejowski
Head of Secretariat
P.O. Box 2010
103 11 Stockholm
SWEDEN
Phone: +46 8 440 1938
Fax: +46 8 440 1944
E-mail: marek.maciejowski@ndphs.org

Mr. Bernd Treichel
Senior Adviser
P.O. Box 2010
103 11 Stockholm
SWEDEN
Phone: +46 8 440 1946
Fax: +46 8 440 1944
E-mail: bernd.treichel@ndphs.org