



CPME Working Group on Professional Qualifications DRAFT Minutes of the Meeting (CPME 2014/087 DRAFT)

14 November 2014, Budapest
15.30h - 16.30h

Chair: Prof. Dr Frank Ulrich Montgomery

Participants: Nathalie HOLZER (AT), Dimitar LENCOV (BG), Andreas DEMETRIOU (CY), Alkis PAPADOURIS (CY), Helena STEHLÍKOVÁ (CZ), Milan KUBEK (CZ), Andreas RUDKJØBING (DK), Camilla Noelle RATHCKE (DK), Indrek ORO (ES), Mervi KATTELUS (FI), Andreas BOTZLAR (DE), Ruth WICHMANN (DE), Ramin PARSA-PARSI (DE), Katrín Fjeldsted (IS), Neil BRENNAN (IE), Vanessa HETHERINGTON (IE), Gunta ANCANE (LV), Daiva BROGIENE (LT), Claude SCHUMMER (LU), Martin BALZAN (MT), Lars DUVALAND (NO), Hege GJESSING (NO), Marit Halonen CHRISTIANSEN (NO), Bjarne Riis STRØM (NO), Grzegorz MAZUR (PL), Heidi STENSMYREN (SE), Joel HELLSTRAND (SE), Brane DOBNIKAR (SI), Jacques de HALLER(HR), Monique GAUTHEY (HR), Rutger Jan Van der GAAG (NL), Aart HENDRIKS (NL), Annette de WIND (NL), Terry JOHN (UK), Paul LAFFIN (UK), Zdravko HEINRICH (HR), Maja LACKOVIĆ (HR), Bayazit ILHAN (TR), Jannis PAPAZOGLU (EMSA), Carsten MOHRHARDT (EJD), Tilde OSTBORG (EJD), Thomas ZILLING (AEMH), Joao de DEUS (AEMH), Ferenc HAJNAL (UEMO).

Secretariat: Ms Sarada DAS, Ms Kristina MICKEVICIUTE.

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved without amendments.

2. Minutes of WG meetings

The draft minutes of the WG meeting on 4 April 2014 and the WG web-meeting on 14 April 2014 were approved without amendments.

3. Professional Qualifications Directive – implementation

The Chair of the WG Prof. Dr Frank Ulrich Montgomery gave the floor to Dr Alexander Jäkel to introduce the latest developments regarding the on-going implementation of the Professional Qualifications Directive. Dr Jäkel reiterated that Directive 2013/55/EU amending Directive 2005/36/EC was published in the Official Journal of the EU on 28 December 2013. The Member States must transpose the Directive into national law before 18 January 2016.

He went on to summarise the points discussed at a meeting between CPME and Mr Martin Frohn, Head of the unit 'Professional Qualifications' at DG MARKT, which took place in October 2014. Mr Frohn confirmed that doctors would not be included in the first phase roll-out of the European



Professional Card (EPC), but rather be considered for the second phase which is to be implemented by January 2018. Experience from the first phase implementation, which will include i.a. nurses and physiotherapists, can therefore inform the EPC for doctors.

As regards the provision on the alert mechanism, Dr Jäkel reported that its implementation is also underway, including the technical integration with the Internal Market Information System (IMI).

Dr Jäkel also reported on the discussion on the implementation of the provisions establishing 'Common Training Framework' (CTF). The Maltese delegation enquired into the scope and criteria for the set-up of a CTF. It was explained that a CTF can be established for qualification not listed in Annex V of the Directive, upon request of the profession itself. It was also remarked that the positions of UEMS and CPME on this point were divergent and the organisations may wish to find common grounds regarding the subject since both have done work on this matter. The WG Chair agreed that this would be desirable, but pointed to the current positions. The Dutch delegation suggested that National Medical Associations should consolidate the communication of the respective national positions presented in European Medical Organisations. The UK delegation added that past cases such as the EPC, it had proven useful to have a lead voice in a policy debate, therefore, where no common approach can be found, it may be necessary for one organisation to take on the principal role.

4. Standardisation of Healthcare Services

The WG Chair recounted that in June 2014, the European Committee for Standardisation (CEN) voted on the adoption of a European Standard on Aesthetic Surgery Services. The German and the Dutch members of CEN had appealed against the adoption process due to the low number of votes cast and consequent lack of consensus. In the last days it was confirmed that CEN had rejected the appeal and the standard was therefore adopted, pending the completion of the ratification process, and national standardisation bodies were required to adopt it. Prof. Montgomery pointed to two courses of action: firstly joint action at European level is taking place, e.g. through joint statements of the European Medical Organisations appealing to European and national decision-makers to refrain from any further initiatives aiming to standardise healthcare services; secondly, Prof. Montgomery advised members to try to access national level action contributing to CEN's activities to affect the process. The Belgian delegation expressed its disappointment at the outcome of the vote and appeal relating to the European Standard on Aesthetic Surgery Services. The UK delegation reported on meetings with the British member of CEN, which had referred to the voluntary nature of the standard in response to the concerns presented. The WG Chair explained that while the standard was voluntary, it could easily acquire a de facto status as a legitimate point of reference for professional practice, e.g. in judicial proceedings on professional liability. It was agreed to remain cautious on this subject and take action wherever possible to deter further standards for healthcare services.

5. European Skills/Competences, Qualifications and Occupations (ESCO) project

CPME Senior EU Policy Advisor Ms Sarada Das up-dated the WG on progress made by the ESCO project, which is implemented under DG Employment and Social Affairs. CPME has liaised with the European Commission to express its concerns regarding the taxonomy project which establishes definitions of occupations in the medical profession, including medical specialisations, and related



skills and competences. EJD, which is also represented at the ESCO meeting, agreed that to variations of definitions at national level, the adoption of European-level definitions does not seem feasible. Upon request by the Maltese delegation as to the project's effects, it was clarified that there is no problematic impact in immediate framework for which ESCO is being developed, i.e. the facilitation of recruitment and job seeking on the basis of common terminology. However once the taxonomy is established, it is likely to act as a point of reference for the occupations described and could be applied to contexts such as the Professional Qualifications Directive or the policy action on European Health Workforce. CPME is therefore seeking meetings with the European Commission to present these concerns and will provide an up-date to members.

6. Planning for WG activities in 2015

Since the Professional Qualifications Directive has been adopted and major points of its implementation addressed, Prof. Montgomery suggested considering the WG's mandate to be fulfilled and to conclude the work of the WG.

In light of the various issues which are currently on the CPME agenda beyond the Professional Qualifications Directive but relevant to medical practice and healthcare services, the WG Chair asked the WG to comment on the proposal to request the CPME Board to approve the creation of a WG on Professional Practice. The Swedish delegation suggested that the new WG may also wish to consider the provisions potentially included in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) agreement which create the possibility for the mutual recognition of qualifications between the US and the EU. The Luxembourg delegation also proposed to address continuous professional development (CPD) and reported on plans for a joint event of the European Medical Organisations on this topic, to be held in coordination with the Luxembourg Presidency of the Council in December 2015. The WG Chair agreed that specific topics may also warrant the creation of a special WG. Based on the WG's feedback, the WG Chair concluded that a proposal for the creation of a WG on Professional Practice would be presented to the CPME Board at its meeting with a request for approval.

7. A.O.B.

No other business was discussed.

8. Date of next meeting

Following the proposal to conclude the WG, no further meetings will be scheduled.