



**ASSOCIATION EUROPÉENNE DES MÉDECINS DES HÔPITAUX
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF SENIOR HOSPITAL PHYSICIANS
EUROPÄISCHE VEREINIGUNG DER LEITENDEN KRANKENHAUSÄRZTE
EUROPESE VERENIGING VAN STAFARTSEN
DEN EUROPÆISKE OVERLÆGEFORENING
ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟΣ ΣΥΛΛΟΓΟΣ ΝΟΣΟΚΟΜΕΙΑΚΩΝ ΙΑΤΡΩΝ ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΤΩΝ
ASSOCIAZIONE EUROPEA DEI MEDICI OSPEDALIERI
DEN EUROPEISKE OVERLEGEFORENING
ASSOCIAÇÃO EUROPEIA DOS MÉDICOS DE HOSPITALARES
ASOCIACIÓN EUROPEA DE MÉDICOS DE HOSPITALES
EUROPEISKA ÖVERLÄKARFÖRENINGEN
EVROPSKO ZDRŽENJE BOLNIŠNIČNIH ZDRAVINIKOV
EUROPSKA ASOCIACIA NEMOCNICNÝCH LEKAROV
EUROPSKA UDRUGA BOLNIČKIH LIJEČNIKA**

Document :	AEMH 04/009
Title:	Comments from the Danish Delegation on Document CPME 2004/003 “Management of Documents submitted by the AOs to the CPME”
Author :	Danish Medical Association
Purpose :	Information
Distribution :	AEMH National Member Delegations
Date :	9 March 2004

COMMENTS OF THE DANISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ON CPME 2004/003

Re: The Relationship between European Medical Organizations (new draft document CPME 2004/003 proposed to replace old document CPME 2000/075).

TITLE

The title of the new draft is apparently intended to minimize the emphasis on CPME as an umbrella organisation by changing it to "The Relationship between European Medical Organisations" from the existing title, "The management of documents submitted by the Associated Organisations to the Board/General Assembly of CP", but also to expand the scope of the document from one of process to one of the principle of the relationship among the organisations concerned.

While that expansion may be necessary and/or desirable, the new title seems to introduce some confusion. The term "European Medical Organisations" is used in the title as well as in the body of the document (sometimes in singular) with capital letters, thus giving the impression that reference is being made to an actual "European Medical Organisation". Perhaps the intention is to make a first step toward the creation of such a European Medical Organisation. Shouldn't this be clarified?

Otherwise perhaps something closer to the original title should be used – for example,

"The Relationship Between CPME and the European Medical Groupings (or Bodies) Associated with it".

Or possibly,

"The Cooperation Procedure Amongst the European Medical Groupings Associated with the CPME".

Or simply,

"The Cooperation Procedure Amongst the European Medical Groupings".

PRINCIPLES:

Paragraph 1: no change from original paragraph 1 in document 075

Paragraph 2: The only real change here is the addition of the names of all the associated organisations. While it is true these organisations are all associated with CPME, a requirement of unanimity amongst all the groupings on matters of major policy interest for the central groupings could create difficulties. This should be discussed.

Paragraph 3: no substantive change; however the term "European Medical Organisation" is used here with capital letters and in singular and might cause confusion (as noted above).

Paragraph 4: This is a new paragraph, introducing the "Presidents' Steering Committee" which, however, is already in function. (Here again, too, as in several of the other

paragraphs the term "European Medical Organisation/s" is used. This refers to nearly all of the paras below as well, and the comment is not repeated each time.)

Paragraph 5: This is an amended version of old paragraph 4. The introduction of the word "when" in line one modifies slightly the concept of independence of the other groupings and is perhaps a good clarification. The last sentence, however, is weakened in a manner which seems undesirable from "The CP secretariat should be informed when such institutions are approached and vice versa" to: "When relevant, the CPME Secretariat..." etc. **This change could weaken the spirit of cooperation and the position of CPME as the single voice of the profession in Europe. The Danish position has always been that the CPME should always be informed of what is happening in this respect (and vice versa) so that the CPME president or secretary general never finds him/herself in a position of appearing ill-informed etc. It is suggested that the existing sentence from the old document should be even further strengthened by changing the word "should" to "must".**

Paragraph 6: This is the old paragraph 5 and there is no substantive change. **However, the following amendments of the last sentence are proposed** (the first of substance, the second linguistic) (new words underlined): "**However, while every reasonable effort will be made to achieve such harmony**, as these documents are the results of extensive deliberations between the members of the originating organisation and represent the agreed European position of that organisation, such documents are not subject to amendment (instead of "alterable") by the other organisation." One should further consider adding: "**unless the representative of that organisation present so allows.**"

Paragraph 7: This is the old paragraph 6 and there is no substantive change.

Paragraph 8: This is the old paragraph 7 and there is no change. However, since CPME is called upon to speed up the handling of documents, it really ought to be recognized that the various procedures called for under the "Methods" section will inevitably slow things down.

METHODS:

Paragraph 1: This is based on old para 3 under methods. And this is one of the matters likely to slow things down. Also perhaps there should be a clarification as to precisely which documents are being referred to here (as well as in the next para). Does it mean every single document adopted by any of the organisations? Or can it be specified as referring only to major policy documents which are to be issued to the European institutions etc.?

Paragraph 2: This is the old para 1 under methods. Re "all documents" see comment above. Further, a small linguistic change would seem appropriate: **Change "the generation of the document" to "concerning the origin of the document".**

Paragraph 3: This is a modified version of old paragraph 4 under methods which only referred to "endorsement". **The new version would seem a good improvement.**

Paragraph 4: This is an essentially unchanged version of old para 6.

Paragraph 5: This is old para 7 slightly changed for the better. However, as noted above under para 2 of principles. The requirement of unanimity could create difficulties and should be discussed.

Paragraph 6: This is an expanded version of old para 8 under methods and is an improvement in that it includes an acceptable course of action in case of dissent – which might also cover the problem mentioned in the comments under 5 above and under para 2 of Principles.

Paragraph 7: this is old para 5 without substantive change.

Paragraph 8: This is old para 9 with no substantive change.

Paragraph 9: This is new and would seem a good addition in that it makes allowance for action in urgent situations.