



**NDPHS Strategy Working Group 2014  
Fourth Meeting  
Vilnius, Lithuania  
17 October 2014**

<b>Title</b>	Minutes from the 4 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the NDPHS Strategy Working Group 2014
<b>Submitted by</b>	Secretariat
<b>Summary / Note</b>	This document outlines the main discussion points and decisions made during the 4 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the SWG 2014
<b>List of Annexes</b>	Annex 1 – List of participants Annex 2 – List of documents submitted to the meeting

### **1. Welcome and opening of the meeting**

The meeting was opened and chaired by Dr. Marja Anttila, the Strategy Working Group Chair. Dr. Kęstutis Miškinis welcomed the participants and wished them a fruitful meeting.

### **2. Adoption of the agenda**

Given the fact that the PAC 11 was cancelled due to delays in preparing the Strategy and its Action Plan, the Meeting agreed to delete agenda item 7 “Presentation of the SWG’s work and results to the PAC 11” and **adopted** the Provisional agenda with timetable (submitted as document SWG2014 4/2/1) with this change.

### **3. Draft NDPHS Strategy 2014-2020**

#### **3.1 Presentation of the draft by the SWG Consultant and 3.2 Discussion and the SWG’s recommendations to the SWG Consultant**

With reference to the document SWG 4/3/1, the Meeting addressed, one-by-one, the comments received to the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of the NDPHS Strategy 2014-2020:

- **Title of the Strategy** (Comments No. 1 and 8<sup>1</sup>)

Having discussed the issue, the Meeting **agreed** on a title “NDPHS Strategy 2020”.

- **Numbering of chapters** (Comment No. 2<sup>2</sup>)

The Meeting **agreed** to revert to the issue when discussing Sweden’s proposal on the order of chapters.

---

<sup>1</sup> “We need to decide whether we keep the starting year in the heading or just call this NDPHS Strategy 2020.”

<sup>2</sup> “We need to number the paras.”

- **A.1. Introduction** (Comments No. 3, 4<sup>3</sup> and 5<sup>4</sup>)

Russia stressed the importance of inclusion of a statement that the NDPHS Strategy is a combination of the NDPHS Partners' strategies. Following an exchange of views with Germany, it was agreed that a reference to "combination of NDPHS Partners' priorities" would be a term acceptable to both Russia and Germany.

Having discussed the issue, the Meeting **agreed** to:

- 1) Delete the detailed description of the Strategy development process in the "Introduction" section;
- 2) State clearly that: (i) the priorities have been approved by the ministerial-level PAC 10 meeting, (ii) the Strategy builds on the political level discussions and decisions concerning the future work of the Partnership taken during the ministerial-level PAC held in 2013 and (iii) the Strategy takes into account and links to relevant global and regional policies and strategies.

- **A. 2 General background**

After the SWG Chair's explanations, Germany agreed to withdraw its Comment No. 6<sup>5</sup>.

Further, following the suggestions of Sweden and the WHO/Europe, supported by Lithuania and Russia, the Meeting **agreed** to move information of a technical nature contained in the "General background" to an annex.

Further, in response to Russia's comment No. 7<sup>6</sup>, the Secretariat recalled the process of the Partnership's engagement in coordinating the health priority of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea region (EUSBSR) and referred, *inter alia*, to the following documents and processes:

- 1) The invitation to take the Lead Partner role was expressed during the CSR 16 meeting (cf. the meeting minutes, item 6.2, and in particular the following excerpts: "the EC pleaded to the CSR that the NDPHS would take up the lead role for the priority sub-area of health". It should be noted that the conclusion in this item ("Further, the Meeting agreed that, if invited, the NDPHS will take the Lead Partner role for the Health priority sub-area of the Strategy"), was not entirely correct because the Partnership had already been invited, as reflected in the minutes);
- 2) The Conclusions by the Chair from the 6<sup>th</sup> Partnership Annual Conference and in particular the following excerpt on page 2: "It (*the PAC*) appreciated the European Commission's invitation for the NDPHS to take the role of Lead Partner for the coordination of the health sub-area of Priority Area 12 of the EU Strategy Action Plan and welcomed the CSR decision to accept this invitation";
- 3) The procedure of preparing the NDPHS input to the EUSBSR, through a "Silent procedure ending at COB on 13 January 2009 - NDPHS contribution to the EU BSR". Comments and suggestions of Partners, including revisions proposed by Russia.

The Meeting took note of the information provided by the Secretariat and **agreed** to make a reference, in the "Introduction" chapter, to the respective conclusions by the PAC 6 Chair.

---

<sup>3</sup> Secretariat's suggestion supported by the SWG Chair, to shorten the "Introduction" section.

<sup>4</sup> "It is important to mention that the overall priorities were firstly approved by the Ministers."

<sup>5</sup> A comment regarding the status of Denmark and Iceland.

<sup>6</sup> A reference must be given as to when and at what level the Partnership accepted an invitation from the European Commission to develop, lead and coordinate the Health Priority Area in the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region Action Plan.

Following a suggestion of Russia, the Meeting **agreed** to make a reference, in the “Introduction” chapter, to the Agreement on the Establishment of the NDPHS Secretariat (the text of the reference to be agreed).

Further, having discussed comments No. 9 and 10<sup>7</sup>, the Meeting **decided** to move the last paragraph of the “General background,” as well as any other information of a strategic nature, to the “Introduction” chapter, whereas information of a technical nature from both chapters would be moved to an annex.

- **A.4. Working principles** (Comment No. 11<sup>8</sup>)

Russia, with reference to the participation in the projects and the rights to vote in the working groups upon the NDPHS projects, stressed that, should the co-financing principle be mentioned, its meaning must be defined very clearly because Russia does contribute to the financing of the Secretariat and work of Expert Groups, but like many other individual countries-NDPHS members it may have a serious difficulty with contributing national country resources to project activities. Should the “project co-financing” become essential part of the entire “co-financing of the NDPHS partner” definition, Russia would have to reconsider its participation in the Partnership.

Germany, the SWG Chair and the Secretariat clarified that the term “co-financing” was the Northern Dimension policy principle as spelled out in the Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document of 01 January 2007, therefore it would not be necessary to further define it in the NDPHS Strategy. Germany also stressed that financing of the Secretariat and work of experts is already co-financing of the Partnership.

Russia stressed that the issue was of crucial importance and therefore a detailed definition of co-financing should be included.

The SWG Chair requested the SWG Consultant to look into the issue of the co-financing and invited the SWG members to share their ideas regarding the solution.

Having discussed the issue, the Meeting **agreed** as follows:

- 1) The title of the chapter, “Working principles,” is not precise enough and should be renamed to “Guiding principles,” “Working methods” or similar and the chapter should be moved just before the “Action Plan” chapter;
- 2) To add the principles of (i) co-financing (as spelled out in the Northern Dimension Policy Framework Document of 01 January 2007) and (ii) bottom-up processes, combined with top-down approaches (as proposed by the EGs when commenting on the first draft of the Strategy);
- 3) The principle of added value is important, however, the wording should be adjusted to make it clear that the added value refers to the added value of the work of the Partnership, not the added value of the Strategy.

Furthermore, the Meeting:

- 4) **Invited** the SWG members to send any further comments regarding the “Working/guiding principles/methods” chapter to the SWG Consultant, with a focus on strategy implementation principles, not strategy development principles;
- 5) **Requested** the SWG Consultant to revise the section in accordance with the comments expressed during the meeting and submitted after the meeting.

---

<sup>7</sup> Suggestion to move the last paragraph of the “General background” section to the “Introduction”.

<sup>8</sup> “We need to discuss the text in this para (Working principles) further. The explanations for the principles may not now be clear to all and capture all aspects of working principles.”

- **A. 5 Linkages with relevant global/regional strategies and policy frameworks**  
(Comments No. 12-17)

Having discussed the issue, the Meeting **agreed** to shorten the chapter and in particular the middle section in the table (the table itself would be deleted) and link it with the Working/guiding principles/methods chapter.

Furthermore, Russia recalled that the 3rd Ministerial meeting of the Renewed Northern Dimension held in Brussels on 18 February 2013 had called for a more systematic approach to cooperation in the Northern Dimension area, including the Baltic Sea region and Barents region, and encouraged to keep this in mind in the Partnership's work in general and in particular when developing the Strategy. Furthermore, it informed that the dialogue for elaborating EU-Russia priorities for cooperation in the Baltic Sea region had been temporarily suspended due to the change of the responsible authority on the Russian side (the authority responsible for the matter would be the Ministry of Economic Development) and the changes in the authorities in the European Commission.

The Secretariat complemented the information presented by Russia and informed about the Meeting of the Four Regional Sister Councils (AC, BEAC, CBSS, NCM) held on 1 September 2014 where the ND Partnerships were also present. The Secretariat stressed that it would be foremost for the NDPHS Partner Countries concerned to ensure that there would be a proper input to the NDPHS discussions, including the strategy development, of the aspects relevant to the High North.

Norway encouraged the countries concerned to be in contact with their national Northern Dimension representatives and inform them about the work done and planned by the Partnership.

- **A. 6 Monitoring and Evaluation**

Estonia drew the meeting's attention to the fact that there are currently no agreed upon targets and also suggested mentioning EG and TG annual reports in this section.

Having discussed the issue, the Meeting **agreed** to delete the reference to the EUSBSR targets and indicators, revise the chapter and move it after the "Action Plan" chapter.

- **3. Cross-cutting objectives**

Having discussed the chapter, the Meeting **agreed** to:

- 1) Include short explanations under each cross-cutting objective and shorten the explanation under the "Health in All Policies" cross-cutting objective;
- 2) Regroup the cross-cutting objectives and place the "Inclusion of vulnerable groups" as the last one because of its different nature (a specific target rather than approach as in the case with other cross-cutting objectives). The Meeting also re-affirmed the understanding that the sequence of the bullet points is not an indication of importance.

Furthermore, the Meeting took note of the views of one Expert Group that "the cross-cutting issues were decided by the SWG, so they need to give clarification of those ones, not the EGs" and **mandated** the SWG Chair to ask the EG/TG leaderships to provide short explanations under each cross-cutting objective.

- **4. Objectives**

Having discussed the issue, the Meeting **agreed** as follows:

- 1) In line with the written comments submitted by Sweden, the titles of all objectives should be formulated in a consistent way – as objectives to be achieved. The SWG Consultant, together with Sweden and EG representatives, is mandated to revise the titles and present them to the SWG for approval;
- 2) In the beginning of the chapter 4 it should be clearly stressed that the Partnership will work towards the objectives, but it is not the Partnership alone that will achieve them.

Further, the WHO/Europe drew the attention of the Meeting to the fact that, taking into account the overall aim to add value and work with other regional strategies, it was surprising that references to the relevant WHO strategies were often missing and many indicators were totally new and different from those adopted by the WHO and the EU. It further stressed that there would be nothing wrong with such an approach, provided that it was indeed the intention. However, if needed, they would be willing to offer help with aligning the wording to the WHO strategies and indicators.

- **Objective 4.1** (Comments No. 19<sup>9</sup> and 20)

Having discussed the chapter, the Meeting:

- 1) **Agreed** to include Latvia's suggestion (Comment No. 19);
- 2) **Agreed** with the SWG Chair (Comment No. 20) that specific EGs should not be mentioned, given the uncertainty about the future expert-level structures of the Partnership.

- **Objective 4.2**

The Meeting took note of the fact that the comments regarding the Objective 4.2 submitted by Norway had been mistakenly omitted and **requested** the SWG Consultant to include them in the next draft of the Strategy.

- **Objective 4.3** (Comment No. 21)

The Meeting **agreed** to delete “public” from “healthier public lifestyles”.

- **Objective 4.4** (Comments No. 22 and 23)

Norway recalled the statement of the WHO representative regarding the use of globally agreed terminology and asked that the word substance abuse be removed from objective 4.4. and return to the original version developed by the ASA EG.

The Meeting **agreed** to the following title based on the original proposal:

“Strengthen and promote multi-sectoral approaches to reduce social and health harms from ~~substance abuse~~ alcohol, tobacco and illicit drugs”.

- **Objective 4.5** (Comments No. 24 and 25)

Having discussed the chapter, the Meeting **agreed** that the PPHS EG would revise the text in paragraph 1 to read that international experience shows that “the countries with strong primary health care approaches cope better with increasing health care costs and health inequalities,” followed by reference to the Alma Ata declaration.

---

<sup>9</sup> “Not only risk groups – drug users, those involved in prostitutions a.o. – are likely subjects of being imprisoned, but one must take into account that persons released from prisons, becoming again a full member of the society and unfortunately – HIV along with him/her.”

Further, as regards the “individuals from vulnerable groups”, the Meeting **agreed** to delete the phrase “individuals from” and to make a reference to explanations under the “vulnerable groups” cross-cutting objective. The description of the “vulnerable groups” should be very general due to different understandings about its scope among the NDPHS Partner Countries.

- **5. Action Plan** (Comment No. 26)

Germany suggested referring to “Implementation Plan”, rather than “Action Plan”, because of the associations with actions plans of the WHO addressed to national experts and presumably involving significant workload at the national level. The Meeting **did not agree** to the proposal.

- **Written comments submitted by Sweden on 13 October 2014**

The Meeting discussed the written proposal of Sweden regarding changing the order of the chapters and **agreed** to it.

\*\*\*

The Meeting considered the presented proposals and the views expressed and **requested** the SWG Consultant to revise the 3<sup>rd</sup> draft of the NDPHS Strategy 2020 as agreed during the Meeting and submit it to the Strategy Working Group at his earliest convenience.

## **4. Development of an Action Plan accompanying the NDPHS Strategy 2020**

### **4.1 State of play**

The SWG Chair reported on the progress and the state of play in the process of the development of the Action Plan accompanying the NDPHS Strategy 2020. She noted, in particular, that the idea of drafting teams combining expertise from different EGs and possibly other actors outside the NDPHS did not work out exactly as planned, even though there had been some cross-fertilization among the groups. Even though inputs to all objectives had been submitted, the conclusion from the EG Chairs and ITAs meeting held on 25 September 2014 was that it would not be possible to finalize a good quality Action Plan for the PAC 11 planned for late 2014. Consequently, the PAC was cancelled and all actors engaged in the development of the Strategy and Action Plan would have more time to further elaborate inputs.

The Meeting **took note** of the presented information.

### **4.2 The SWG Consultant’s comments on the methodology and received draft inputs**

With reference to document SWG 4/4/1, the SWG Consultant presented his comments on the methodology and received draft inputs to the Action Plan. He shared the SWG Chair’s view that one of the major reasons for inconsistencies in the received draft inputs was that the EGs/TGs were not given a consistent guidance as to what kind of results and impacts were expected, the level of detail etc. He further presented a number of comments and observations, including:

- The number of results per objective was very different, ranging from very few to a dozen;
- It was very difficult to interpret what the results, activities and aims are – the understanding of the logical framework differs among the groups;
- The resources problem was very evident – some groups had been very ambitious in formulating what the Partnership would achieve, with no backup at all;

- A mix of different results – some groups were trying to influence policies by drafting papers and organizing events, whereas others would like to contribute to the overarching aims of the WHO, without saying how exactly it would be achieved. There should be a consistency in defining results and the SWG Consultant would suggest operating on two levels: (i) immediate results (such as sharing information, papers, studies, events) and (ii) indirect results that the Partnership is able to influence, in cooperation with other stakeholders;
- It was not clear whether the Strategy and its Action Plan were addressed only to the NDPHS or the NDPHS and other stakeholders. If case it was the latter, the indicators should refer to involvement of other stakeholders;
- A clear guidance would be needed as to the level of detail expected; it should be such that any change in internal or external circumstances would not immediately demand a revision of the Action Plan;
- It would help to slightly change the format for submission of information, e.g. it would be very useful for each group to look back at the achievements during 2009-2013, which would be a very good indication of what can realistically be achieved.

The Meeting **took note** of the presented comments.

### 4.3 The SWG's comments on the received draft inputs

Germany and Russia commented that they were expecting to learn exactly what resources would be needed to implement a given objective. For a potential donor it would not be sufficient to know that “resources are not available” – it would need to know exactly how much in terms of money and resources was missing.

Germany further commented that indicators should be consistent with those used by the WHO, since those were already agreed by the NDPHS Partner Countries. It also invited other groups to include in their inputs information about the added value, as the PPHS EG had done.

The SWG Chair and Russia commented that the WHO indicators should be used only when feasible, since the NDPHS is not to reach the WHO indicators for the country (partner), but rather to support/ facilitate the partner country to reach the WHO recommended indicators.

Estonia supported the SWG Consultant's comment on separating the results into immediate results and indirect results. It also brought up the question of the Action Plan's final structure.

The WHO/Europe clarified that its comment about indicators was triggered by the NCD part and in particular the PYLL indicator that was not used by the WHO. Further, it commented that some of the proposals for the Action Plan were very ambitious.

Norway commented that it was very much in favor of establishing the drafting teams and asked whether it would be too late to come back to this plan, as previously agreed.

The Secretariat commented that the Action Plan should include a solid list of the results that the Partnership could realistically expect to achieve, not a wish list, whereas in some presented cases the proposals were going far beyond the Partnership's capacity and, therefore, required revising. It further commented that, it believed, revisions would need to be made by the groups themselves, not the SWG Consultant or the SWG, consistent with the overall approach taken in the process and to avoid situations such as in the past, when the groups were strongly criticizing the governing body for not being given a good chance to influence the shape of the previous strategy and its operational targets. To that end, the Secretariat noted that whereas one group (the ASA EG) commented that “the cross-cutting issues were decided by the SWG, so they need to give clarification of those ones, not the EGs,” one should be aware that the ToR of the SWG provides for that “the main task of the

SWG is to facilitate the development of the NDPHS Strategy for the period 2014-2020 and act as the focal point for inputs from the NDPHS Partner Countries and Organizations, the Participant and the Expert and Task Groups.” This should be recognized by the expert-level structures of the NDPHS as an important role and a tremendous opportunity in designing the Partnership’s work for the next period of time.

The SWG Chair suggested deleting the “cross-cutting objectives” column in the template or moving it to the subheading of each objective because almost all groups indicated that the results contribute to all cross-cutting objectives. She also commented that the target values should be indicated, e.g., as the Secretariat did by including indicators’ target values.

The PPHS EG ITA clarified, regarding the prison health – related objectives, that the prison health experts of the PPHS EG had been advised that their input significantly exceeded the scope of the objective defined by the CSR, however, the experts had decided to continue with a very ambitious approach.

The WHO/Europe commented that the drafters were welcome to contact the WHO for advice, especially in those cases where the WHO involvement was mentioned but the WHO had not been contacted yet to discuss the respective provisions.

Having thoroughly discussed the received draft inputs to the Action Plan, the Meeting **agreed** as follows:

1. The Action Plan should be much shorter than the presented version, the results should be concrete and realistic and the inputs under different objectives should be consistent (the level of detail, the number of results, ambition etc.);
2. To achieve the above, the SWG Consultant is invited to prepare a guidance document, to be disseminated by the SWG Chair to the SWG members, the EGs and TGs by the end of October 2014;
3. The SWG Consultant will revise the template for submission of the inputs to the Action Plan, to include information on the lessons learned from the past four years (including those mentioned in the NDPHS Evaluation report 2013);
4. Information on the added value of the proposed NDPHS’ actions should also be included, explaining the rationale behind the proposed activities.

#### **4.4 Further steps towards finalization of the Action Plan**

Having discussed further steps, including the timeline, towards finalization of the Action Plan, the Meeting **agreed** as follows:

1. The SWG Consultant will prepare a guidance document to the existing drafting Expert Groups to help them to further elaborate their inputs;
2. Based on the guidance document, the existing drafting Expert Groups will finalize their inputs to the Action Plan until 15 December 2014 and forward their inputs to the Secretariat;
3. A final drafting team, consisting of maximum two representatives per existing drafting Expert Group as well as any interested CSR members, will be formed and tasked with finalizing the received inputs, combining them into one consistent Action Plan and submitting it to the SWG by the end of January 2015;
4. The SWG will meet for its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting on 10 February 2015, review the submitted Action Plan and agree on further steps to finalize it for submission to the CSR 24 for adoption;
5. The CSR 24, to be held in April 2015, should be planned as a two-days meeting to allow for a sufficient time to agree on the Strategy and the Action Plan.

In addition, the Meeting **agreed** that the SWG Chair, supported by the Secretariat, would send out two letters:

- A letter to the CSR members informing about the above-mentioned further steps and timeline towards finalization of the Action Plan and requesting the CSR members to allocate further working days and funding to the experts participating in the drafting Expert Groups' work and meetings;
- A letter to the EG and TG Chairs, requesting them to revise their inputs to the Action Plan according to the guidelines developed by the SWG Consultant, and, if necessary, convene a drafting meeting. The EG and TG Chairs would be requested to send the revised inputs to the Secretariat by 15 December 2014, as well as inform the Secretariat about (maximum) two representatives that the respective EG/TG delegated to the final drafting team tasked with finalizing the draft Action Plan.

## 5. Definition of a “NDPHS project”

With reference to the document SWG2014 4/5/1, the Secretariat presented proposals for definitions of various types of projects vis-à-vis which the NDPHS can play a role. It mentioned, *inter alia*, that the suggested approach was both theoretical but, at the same time, pragmatic in trying to foresee the implications of different approaches, as well as took into account lessons learned from the past, e.g. as regards the NDPHS-facilitated and the NDPHS-labeled ImPrim project. Furthermore, based on the experience thus far and to take into account the comments received from Estonia, the Secretariat offered to simplify its proposal and reduce the number of types of projects from three to two (“NDPHS project” and “NDPHS-facilitated project”). Finally, it advised that the distinction between the two above-mentioned types of projects should be kept for purely legal reasons.

Norway clarified that defining an NDPHS project as a “project where the NDPHS secretariat acts as the beneficiary (lead partner)” as suggested by the document might give the wrong signals to the partner countries. The rationale behind the proposed revisions (cf. Summary/Note section of the document SWG2014 4/5/1) was to ensure that there is an independent Secretariat in place to serve the CSR and PAC. If the Secretariat would become a project implementing body dependent on external projects, as the proposed definition suggested, it might be more difficult to argue that countries should continue paying their membership fee. At least that would be the case for Norway.

Germany recalled that the Secretariat was engaged in projects because of the budget deficit.

In response to a request of Russia to clarify the meaning of the term “Beneficiary,” the Secretariat responded that in this context the meaning was according to EU grant contracts terminology, according to which, the beneficiary is the lead partner (other project partners can be “co-beneficiaries), responsible for implementing the project in accordance with the grant contract, as well as the owner of the title and intellectual property rights to the project’s results, reports and other documents. Thus, if an organization designated by an EG to implement a project would disagree, a given project could not be claimed as a NDPHS project. Further, to provide a different example to demonstrate a need for a clear-cut definition of a NDPHS project, the Secretariat recalled that the former HIV/AIDS EG used to list many projects as NDPHS projects, but later on it turned out that these were only one or two organizations represented in the EG that were aware of the projects that were claimed as NDPHS projects.

Russia suggested that if one NDPHS Partner initiated a project, involved at least two<sup>10</sup> more NDPHS Partners and wished to claim/label it as a NDPHS project, it would be an issue for a

---

<sup>10</sup> The initially suggested criterion “one more” was changed into “two more” to avoid the situation when all the bilateral projects may be called NDPHS projects.

CSR decision. Further Russia asked the Secretariat to provide various scenarios of projects so far conducted with any level of involvement of NDPHS so that partners could better suggest their visions on appropriate definition of the NDPHS project.

Having thoroughly discussed the issue, the Meeting **agreed** as follows

1. To recommend to the CSR abandoning the “NDPHS-labeled” project approach and revise the two remaining definitions in line with the comments expressed during the meeting;
2. For each definition, practical examples should be provided, to make it easier to understand;
3. The Secretariat will submit the revised proposal to the SWG 5 meeting for a final adoption.

## **6. Roles of and expectations from various NDPHS actors**

With reference to the document SWG2014 4/6/1, the Meeting discussed how to address the CSR’s request “to look into the roles of and expectations from the various NDPHS actors” and **agreed** as follows:

1. The following corrections should be made: correction in the title of the Director of the NDPHS Secretariat, Expert Groups and Task Groups are not the only operative instruments of the NDPHS (Secretariat should be mentioned, too), the note on the employment of the EGs and TGs leaders should be moved to the corresponding section;
2. A new section on the role of and expectations from the CSR Chair Country should be included;
3. The SWG Members are invited to submit any further comments to the HIV/AIDS&AI EG Chair by 28 November 2014;
4. The HIV/AIDS&AI EG Chair will submit the revised proposal to the SWG 5 meeting for a final review and decision on how to present it to the CSR to make sure that the CSR carefully looks into this valuable information and utilizes it.

## **7. Next SWG meeting**

The Meeting considered possible dates and places of the next SWG meeting, and **decided** that the 5<sup>th</sup> Strategy working meeting would be held on 10 February 2015 in Stockholm, Sweden (place subject to confirmation by Sweden<sup>11</sup>).

## **8. Any other business**

No issues were discussed under this agenda item.

## **9. Adoption of the SWG 4 meeting minutes**

The Meeting **agreed** that the Secretariat will send out draft SWG 4 meeting minutes to the participants on 29 October 2014 and that comments on the draft will be due, at the latest, on 5 November 2014. The revised minutes will then be distributed on 7 November 2014 to be adopted *per capsulam* provided that no further comments are submitted within one week.

---

<sup>11</sup> After the meeting, Sweden confirmed that it would host the 5<sup>th</sup> SWG meeting on 10 February 2015 in Stockholm, Sweden.

## **10. Closing of the meeting**

The Meeting terminated at 16:10 hours on 17 October 2014.