CED-GM-M-2018-01-FIN-E
20 August 2018

Minutes		**Date:** 25 – 26 May 2018	
CED GENERAL MEETING		**Venue:** Hilton Tallinn Park Hotel, Fr. R. Kreutzwaldi 23, 10147 Tallinn, Estonia	
		Time start: 9:00	**Time end:** 17:00
Chair		Dr Marco Landi, CED President	
Participants		See list attached	
Representatives of the Brussels Office		Lea Pfefferle and Kathy Sauvage	
1. Welcome, quorum and apologies			Rapporteur: Marco Landi
Working document	List of Participants		
Welcomed the participants. Apologies from the Polish delegation. Quorum was established.			
2. Welcome Address			Rapporteur: Marco Landi
President thanked the Estonian Dental Association for the warm welcome and organisation.			
3. Approval of the agenda			Rapporteur: Marco Landi
The GM approved the agenda.			
Nico Diederich	Asked for clarification on order of discussion for Statutes and Internal Rules in the agenda. President specified that Statutes will be discussed first.		
4. Notification of the minutes of the last General Meeting			
Working document	• Minutes of CED General Meeting on 17 November in Brussels (CED-GM-M-2017-02-E/F/D)		
One comment received on the French translation. The issue was rectified. The minutes were notified.			
5. Report from the President			Rapporteur: Marco Landi
Working document	• CED Board Strategy (CED-DOC-2018-005-E)		
Reported on a) CED Board Strategy progress, and Strategy's main priorities; b) Budget Reference Committee; c) Merging of several WGs; d) FEDCAR start of collaboration on education throughout Europe; e) 50th Anniversary invitation of Cyprus Dental Association			
6. Report from the Brussels Office			Rapporteur: Lea Pfefferle
a) Introduced a new staff member, Nikoleta Arnaudova (maternity cover); b) shared an update on moving the CED office to a new location and the benefits a new office; c) discussed political developments at EU level, including Brexit, the draft EU budget and the next Council Presidency; d) reminded the members about the meeting highlights and that the updated documents were sent after the Board meeting; e) encouraged members to tweet about the meeting.			
President	Stressed the up-to-date technical equipment that the new office will have and which will facilitate members to join meetings online, and welcomed members to visit the new office once the move is completed.		

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">7. Changes to CED Statutes and Internal Rules</td><td>Rapporteur: Marco Landi</td></tr>
<tr><td>Working document</td><td colspan="2">• CED Internal Rules (CED-DOC-2018-002-REV3-E/D/F)
• CED Statutes (CED-DOC-2018-001-REV3-E/D/F)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">The President explained that the proposal is not only a reaction to Brexit but also a consequence of the risk assessment and strategy discussions that the Board had in the past months, which takes a broader view of the changes in the EU. One of the aims was the need to rebalance the rights of members and observer countries (no requests came from any of the CED observers). It is the duty of the CED Board to be proactive and align the CED with the needs of the modern dental profession and how health policy and policy regarding the dental profession is taken in Brussels. The President stated that the Board followed the timeline discussed at the General Meeting in November 2017. Three sets of comments were received during the first round (from Portugal, Poland and Belgium). The Board discussed these suggestions and sent its decision to all members together with the second draft in April. A second round of comments from Poland and the UK were received and discussed at the Board meeting preceding this General Meeting. The suggestions were not approved in line with previous Board statements on the issues. In addition, the Board received a letter from the Croatian Dental Chambers asking to postpone the decision and Dr Pezo clarified that the Croatian delegation is looking for more explanation on the different membership categories. The delegates will have time to discuss the proposal at this meeting. The President reviewed the different membership categories and pointed out that:
The proposal does not affect the role of CED full members, which must represent EU Member States.
Affiliate members, which represent countries that are heavily affected by EU legislation, will pay the full membership fee and have the right to be present at the General Meetings and vote. They will not be able to stand for Board elections or chair Working Groups.
Observer members come from countries that are candidate or potential candidate countries for EU membership, meaning they will be or can be subject to EU regulation. They have to pay 80% of the membership fee and will not be allowed to stand in Board elections nor to vote.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stefaan Hanson</td><td colspan="2">Pointed out that a strong CED is comprised of representative of the dental associations from EU members since only EU members can influence the Commission. Dental associations from EU Member States have a lot of things in common with non-EU Member States and therefore the CED welcomes them to the meeting. However, ERO meetings are already a forum where statements are made for the whole of Europe. Made two proposals:
- Secret vote on the postponement of the discussion until next spring (while waiting for more information on Brexit).
- Discuss members' amendments on the proposal of the Board and separate the debate into two different discussions (on the one hand Brexit and, on the other hand EEA/EFTA countries).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Orlando Monteiro Da Silva</td><td colspan="2">Supported the first proposal to postpone the discussion.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Robin Foyle</td><td colspan="2">Stated that inclusivity and expertise from full members and the proposed affiliate members is very valuable to the CED and would welcome a decision at this meeting in order to move on with the work of the CED.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Peter Engel</td><td colspan="2">Welcomed the discussion and encouraged the delegates to continue the discussion and take a decision at this meeting. Pointed out that observers are not on the same footing as affiliate members, and that the discussion should not just focus on Brexit, since the Statutes have to be changed to reflect interest of all members. He agreed that there is a clear distinction between CED and ERO.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Roman Šmucler</td><td colspan="2">Highlighted that it is unclear what will happen to UK after Brexit and therefore supports the decision to postpone the discussion.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Hans Schrangl</td><td colspan="2">Responded that despite the fact that it is still unclear how the UK will exit the EU, clear structures are needed for the CED, promoting the best interest of the CED and European dentists. Suggested that the CED should try to have a broader range of representation because the CED needs the best people, whether they come from EU member countries or are strongly affiliated with the EU.</td></tr>
</table>

Nico Diederich	Reminded the members that this is the first time that a country is leaving the EU. Proposed to add one sentence in the Statutes that would state that a country which has been a long-time member of the CED still has the opportunity to be present at the GM as an observer once it leaves the EU. Recalled that the CED is not ERO. Stated that the delegates should discuss any amendments and then decide whether the decision should be postponed.
Marco Landi	Clarified the Board proposal, stating that it does not foresee what will happen with the UK after Brexit. At the same time, the new category of affiliate members (including Norway, Iceland and Switzerland) are heavily affected by EU (health and professional) legislation.
Jörg Krainhöfner	Explained that representation of the CED to the EU would not be compromised since only members from EU Member States could be Board members and chair Working Groups. Agreed with other members that postponing the discussion will not be constructive and that a decision should be taken at this meeting.
Nico Diederich	Responded that being heavily affected by EU legislation is a very elastic concept and therefore not a valid criteria. Affiliate members would still have the right to vote on policy that needs to be applied in EU Member States but not in other non-EU countries. Affiliate members should therefore not be able to vote on such issues.
Michael Frank	Expressed that it is unfortunate that the discussion on Brexit and on the EEA/EFTA members are coinciding but that it is necessary to make a change to the CED Statutes. Affiliate members would have bilateral agreements with the EU and therefore EU policy impacts them, as it does for example Switzerland, where many EU decisions are directly applicable and therefore they should have the right to vote. It is correct that ERO is a different organisation with a different scope and goal. It makes sense to have observers from other Eastern neighbourhood countries to show them the work of the CED. Concluded that the proposal from the Board is well-balanced and that it would not be useful to postpone the decision.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Stated that there is no reason to take a decision at this meeting and there should be a vote on the postponement to give more time to members to present the proposal in their national organisations.
Stefaan Hanson	Considered that in the future other countries may leave the EU, which could potentially lead to more non-EU voting members than EU voting members.
Piret Väli	Recounted the experience of the Estonian Dental Association joining the CED as an observer. Argued that the CED needs to be ready for this new political context and that there is no reason to postpone the decision.
Hrvoje Pezo	Argued that more information on the proposal is needed. Wondered what would be the obligations of countries that have a contract with the Commission and what would be the impact on health policy. It would pose a problem if countries from the Balkan neighbourhood, which have a different educational system from EU Member States could vote in the CED.
Marco Landi	Clarified that there is no right to vote for observer countries and that the current Statutes already allow EU candidate countries to become observers.
Freddie Sloth-Lisbjerg	Expressed that this discussion should have taken place four or five years ago already. The CED is a lobby organisation for dentistry, which is stronger with affiliate members. There is a tiered system that allows for the strongest rights for full members and the least rights for observers, while allowing observers to gain knowledge about the CED and the EU.
Philippe Rusca	Pointed out that Switzerland has been an observer country for many years, paying full contributions. More than 3000 dental practitioners with EU degrees are active in Switzerland. Switzerland contributes €1.3 billion to the EU cohesion fund. Switzerland is instantly required to implement decisions coming from Brussels. It is clear that countries like Switzerland cannot be Board members, but the Statutes need to be changed to recognise the current observer countries.

Nico Diederich	Agreed that Statutes need to be changed but the delegates should discuss each point in the proposal. Acknowledged that observers would not have voting rights. However, affiliate members have the right to vote. Concerned that if the CED has a lot of affiliate members, decisions could depend on the vote of the affiliate members and therefore it would no longer be the full members taking the decision. Cautioned that some of the proposals are contradicting the strategic plan, for instance deletion of "in the EU" in the Statutes (Article 4) when the strategic paper discussed the work of the CED in the EU. The decision should be taken at a subsequent meeting after the discussion at this meeting.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Reiterated support for the postponement of the decision as no reason was presented to vote at this meeting.
Beat Wäckerle	Clarified that Norway, Switzerland and Iceland immediately implement EU decisions on dentistry. A clear distinction has to be made between the Brexit discussion and the discussion about EEA/EFTA countries. Affiliate members would always be a small minority. Liechtenstein would be interested in the affiliate membership.
Pierre-Olivier Donnat	Reminded the members that the work on the Statutes has been on-going for several months and it would be good to take a decision. There should be a vote in which the General Meeting would decide if the changes are adopted.
Veronique Pellegrain	Explained that legal experts from a number of different CED member countries that participate in the CED BTF Internal Market worked on the proposed changes to the Statutes. From a legal standpoint countries with bilateral agreements need to implement EU policies and should therefore be reflected in a different category than observers. As has been stated before, affiliate members cannot join the Board.
Nico Diederich	Expressed that the members should go through the Statutes change by change and not vote on the Statutes as a whole. Affiliate members would not become the majority but they might have a major influence on decisions to be applied in the EU. Agreed that the discussion needs to be separated from Brexit even if it was the occasion and that the CED needs to discuss a way for the UK to remain within the CED. Added that it is up to the delegates to defend the changes in the national associations.
Marco Landi	Clarified that the Board did not suggest to vote the Statutes and Internal Rules as a package. There will be a vote on single articles.
Audrey Camilleri	Stated that the decision should not be postponed.
Doniphan Hammer	Reminded the members of the procedure of updating the Statutes and Internal Rules. At the November 2017 General Meeting, delegates agreed on the procedure to be followed on proposing changes to the Statutes. The received suggestions for amendments were discussed at the Board and the feedback was shared with the members together with the Board's feedback.
Filipa Carvalho Marques	Expressed Portugal did not see concrete reasons why the PDA's suggestions were not accepted. It should first be voted if the discussion should continue.
Nico Diederich	Read the minutes from the November 2017 General Meeting in which it stated that the President encouraged members to send comments and that the Board will review it. These comments should be discussed at this meeting. There should not be any bilateral discussions between the Board and the respective country.
Peter Engel	It is important to acknowledge the different positions and they need to be discussed. The discussion cannot be postponed.
Ioannis Tzoutzas	Doubted that all EU candidate countries accept the European democratic values. It is important for the CED to underline that the EU candidate countries should be guided by the values that the EU cherishes, including democracy, rule of law, acquis communautaire, respect for the dignity of the people, human rights, promotion of democracy and citizens. The Board Task Forces and Working Groups are the information giving bodies for the CED and it would pose a problem if new countries wanted to participate in meetings and impose their opinion.

Marco Landi	Clarified that the current Statutes already allow candidate countries to become observers. The Board is not proposing any changes regarding these observers.
Stefaan Hanson	Cautioned that if members are asking for a vote to postpone, this vote should be taken. The delegates cannot come to an agreement in one or two hours of discussion.
Marco Landi	Explained that there will be enough time for discussion. Asked delegates to vote on the question of continuing the discussion.
Vote took place on continuing the discussion **Who is in favour of continuing the discussion?** In favour: 31 Against: 9 Abstentions: 2	
Henk Donker	Asked for clarification regarding the benefits, advantages and disadvantages to the CED members and observers to introduce the new category of affiliate members.
Marco Landi	Explained that it is in the interest of EU members to have the possibility to interact with countries that have similar or the same health legislation/policy. It is in the interest of the CED members to have countries as members with whom there is an exchange of professionals.
Alexander Tolmeijer	Added that current observers (Norway, Iceland, and Switzerland) will receive the right the vote. Other countries could apply – and could do so today – and the CED does not want to give them a vote – therefore they would be observers. It is good to have a distinction between observers and affiliate members.
Susie Sanderson	Elaborated that the changes are making sure that dentists that are influenced by European law have an opportunity to have a say within the CED. It will be a very long time before the UK will cease to be affected by EU policies on dentistry and health. Agreed with the Board proposal. The BDA was pleased to be part of the Board but fully understands that it is not appropriate for a non-EU country to be part of the Board. The BDA wants to continue to participate in the working bodies since the issues remain the same. If the BDA is to pay the full subscription, it should have the right to vote. It would be difficult to persuade the BDA to be a CED member that is paying the full fee without a vote.
Freddie Sloth-Lisbjerg	Reminded the delegates that both EU member countries and EEA/EFTA countries are impacted by EU health policies. UK is an EU member at this moment and a full CED member. A decision what to do with the UK can be taken once the political process has been finalised.
Roman Smučler	Agreed with the principle that CED has to talk to everyone affected by EU healthcare policy. But there are other countries that react to EU policy, like the US and Russia. There needs to be a more precise definition, for instance, Schengen.
Marco Landi	Clarified that the proposed principle is that affiliate members must have bilateral agreements that relate significantly to the objectives of the CED.
Stefaan Hanson	Asked for clarification on which countries have an EEA agreement.
Elisabeth Scarpello	Explained that Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein are part of the EEA agreement, which extends the single market to those countries. All EU legislation regarding the four freedoms, health and dental profession is automatically applicable in Norway. EFTA is a bilateral agreement between Switzerland and the EU.
Stefaan Hanson	Asked for clarification what ‘significantly’ means in Article 9.1 of the Statutes. Expressed that there is no objective criteria to establish what significantly means. Added ‘former EU member states’ should not be a separate category and that Article 9.1 should only refer to EFTA/EEA countries. These are the only countries that are objectively impacted by EU policy.
Mick Armstrong	Recalled that the General Meeting has the right to admit/refuse admission/expel affiliate members.

Jörg Krainhöfner	Clarified that 'significantly' in Article 9.1 refers to that they are obliged to apply EU health legislation in their territory.
Marco Landi	Asked the GM to consider Article 9 and then vote on it.
Nico Diederich	Asked that the Statutes are reviewed and voted on chronologically.
Marco Landi	Clarified that each article will be discussed but that Article 9 will be discussed first as it is the biggest change.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Recalled that the PDA proposed changes but that the Board did not approve them. Wants the GM to discuss them since the PDA did not receive a satisfying justification why they were not approved.
Marco Landi	Clarified that the justification was sent to all members at the end of March together with the second proposed draft.
Doniphan Hammer	Explained that the voting should start with Article 9 instead of Article 4 because the vote should be guided by consistency. If the vote starts with Article 4 the delegates will have to discuss changes that are introduced by Article 9.
Hrvoje Pezo	Highlighted that the problem in the Balkans is a complex issue. Article 9 mentions dental associations. In some former Yugoslav republics, there may be 20 different dental associations, whereas the chamber is the appropriate representative. If the ministry or governments translate the Statutes, this will cut out the chambers.
Marco Landi	Expressed that the definition of dental association is inclusive and refers to the representatives of the dental profession. This situation can be clarified through internal agreements.
Nico Diederich	Reiterated that the discussion has to start at the beginning of the Statutes. If there are any cross-references these can be discussed subsequently.
Peter Engel	Pointed out that countries themselves should decide which body is a member of the CED, not the General Meeting. Only one association per country should be a member to avoid conflict in the CED. Suggested to delete "former EU Member State" from Article 9.1.
Stefaan Hanson	Highlighted that the discussion should also refer to Article 7.2.1 which takes up the question of conflict between members from the same countries. Suggests to delete "former EU Member State with bilateral agreements" from Article 9.1 or alternatively change it to countries that have to automatically implement legislation related to the dental profession.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Agreed that the connection between Article 9 and Article 7 is important. The PDA suggested an amendment to Article 7, namely that the competent authority which represents the profession should automatically be accepted into the CED. Requested a justification from the Board why this amendment was not approved.
Marco Landi	Clarified the Board's reasoning for not approving the suggestions, as stated in the document sent to the members, namely that members can already invite the competent authority to be a part of their delegation. The General Meeting must have the freedom to approve any new members, which would be taken away by such an automatic approval process.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Responded that the proposal should be discussed by the General Meeting. Asked for clarification what happens if there is a severe conflict between national associations, i.e. if the decision for membership should then be taken by the CED or the members of the country.
Marco Landi	Explained that it is up to the national delegations to decide this. In case there is a conflict it will be decided by the CED General Meeting as written in the existing Statutes.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Stated that this decision should be taken by the General Meeting and not the Board.

Michael Frank	Recounted that Article 9.1.1 already states that the General Meeting and not the Board will take the decision, as does Article 7.2.1.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Argued that public or competent authorities that represent all the members of the profession must be accepted. The delegates should vote on the PDA suggestion.
Doniphan Hammer	Specified that there are structures in Europe for the competent authorities, namely FEDCAR. The CED must remain an organisation with voluntary membership.
Hrvoje Pezo	In the Eastern countries, there are many dental associations with a small membership and they are not representative.
Doniphan Hammer	Set forth that the strength of the CED is that the members can work together. Every country can determine the best solution for themselves.
Ralf Wagner	Asked for clarification if the PDA is proposing, either for a) countries to decide on their own or b) the decision to be taken by the CED GM.
Jörg Krainhöfner	Expressed that this problem is not part of the change of the Statutes.
Peter Engel	Cautioned that it would be unfortunate if the General Meeting influenced discussions at the national level. Each country should decide how they want to be represented at the CED.
Nico Diederich	Argued that there are already problems because of the current text of the Statutes and therefore it should be improved now.
Stefaan Hanson	Stated that Article 9.1.2 is worrisome because if there is a problem in a country, the General Meeting could decide and an organisation from a full member would be accepted as an affiliate member with voting rights.
Beat Wäckerle	Clarified that one country cannot have delegates representing full members and affiliate members (in case of a dispute of membership).
Michael Frank	Affirmed that the decision has to be taken at the national level. Since there are only two delegates per country, they have to agree amongst themselves who can cast those votes.
Hrvoje Pezo	Asked for clarification on who will make a decision in the country.
Marco Landi	Explained that the CED cannot interfere with that decision at national level.
Filipa Carvalho Marques	Stated that the CED Statutes should preserve the CED. The Statutes should state that public authorities must be approved as members of the CED, all the other members should be a decision of the countries.
Marco Landi	Responded that there is no reason at the moment to change the Statutes to give the absolute right to be present to the chamber or the national association. The CED does not represent public authorities.
Beat Wäckerle	Pointed out that health authorities are political authorities. They are represented by MEPs in Brussels and have nothing to do with the dental profession. The decision of allowing associations to join the CED needs to be left to the General Meeting.
Edoardo Cavallé	Recounted the Italian experience where ANDI/AIO were asked to give an opinion on the Italian medical chamber joining the CED, which they did not agree with because the chamber deals mostly only with registration and ethics. There are countries in which the chambers also represent the profession which is more in conformity with the activities of the CED. There needs to be a binding agreement of the CED member for the additional member to join. In the past, if the national committee could not find a solution, the CED General Meeting took a decision. Each new member needs to be examined before joining the CED to understand if they fulfil the CED membership criteria.
Ralf Wagner	Expressed that, in general, the CED General Meeting should not take decisions on what happens in the countries. If a country can find a solution there is no issue. If it cannot reach an agreement, the General Meeting needs to examine the issue and take a decision.

Marco Landi	Welcomed the members back in the room after the lunch break. Stated that some amendments were made to Article 9 according to the delegates' suggestions: a) deleted "is either a former EU Member State" in 9.1; b) added "affiliate" member country in 9.1.2. Asked the delegates to vote on Article 9.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Asserted that Article 7 should be dealt at the same time as Article 9.
Michael Frank	Responded that Article 7 can be dealt with later on. Pointed out that the quorum needs to be established to know what the two-third majority is that is necessary to pass the vote.
Stefaan Hanson	Suggested that the members should first discuss the voting right of the affiliate members. Belgium proposes that affiliate members do not have full voting rights and do not have to pay full membership fees.
Marco Landi	Explained that the proposed article is a compromise. 49 delegates are registered to the meeting.
Jörg Krainhöfner	Voiced that it should be clarified what the quorum is. The Internal Rules, Article III.7.2, state that "abstentions shall be permitted. Abstentions may not be counted amongst either the "yes" or "no" votes". This means that it cannot be established in advance how many votes are needed for a two-thirds majority.
Nico Diederich	Argued that the outstanding issues should be discussed since there was no time to discuss the changes.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Agreed that the General Meeting should continue to discuss the issue and vote on the Belgian proposal. Requested an explanation as to why the PDA's proposal has not been voted on by the delegates and expressed that the voting procedure should start with Article 7.
Marco Landi	Responded that there was a thorough discussion in the morning. During the discussion in the morning there was no proposal regarding the voting rights of affiliate members.
Vote on Article 9 took place (see decision below)	
Nico Diederich	Recalled that the Internal Rules, Article III.7.2, state that "abstentions shall be permitted. Abstentions may not be counted amongst either the "yes" or "no" votes; they shall, however, count as valid votes. The President must also count the abstentions."
Jörg Krainhöfner	Explained that either a "yes" or "no" vote can be included in calculating the quorum. An abstention is a valid vote and must be counted. But the Internal Rules state that only cast votes count.
Marco Landi	Asked the delegates to move on and discuss and vote on Article 11 of the Statutes on the role of observers.
Peter Engel	Articulated that observer members should not be members of Working Groups.
Marco Landi	Clarified that the current Statutes allow observers to be members of Working Groups.
Peter Engel	Responded that with the new categories of membership, the new observer members should not participate in Working Groups or Board Task Forces.
Fotios Tzermpos	Concerned about the definition of potential candidate members, since everyone can be a potential candidate. Agreed that observers should not be part of Working Groups or Board Task Forces since decisions taken at that level are later brought to the General Meeting for a vote.
Ioannis Tzoutzas	Suggested that Article VI.4.3 of the Internal Rules which refers to the fact that only full members can become Working Group chairs, should be included in the Statutes.
Michael Frank	Expressed that the issue should be tackled in the Internal Rules.
Marco Landi	Agreed that the change could be made in the Internal Rules, in order to remove observers' access to Working Groups and Board Task Forces. If the delegates agree, "potential candidate countries" can be deleted from Article 11. The definition of candidate countries is an official EU term.

Peter Engel	Reminded that what applies to the Working Groups should also apply to the Board Task Forces.
Vote on Article 11 took place (see decision below)	
Stefaan Hanson	Expressed that it is clear that abstentions are valid votes. Article 16.2.1. of the Statutes states that amendments can only be approved with a majority of two-thirds of votes cast.
Marco Landi	Responded that the lawyers' opinion differs from this. Therefore the vote is valid. Asked delegates to move to Article 4.1. An additional amendment has been suggested to re-insert "in the EU" under the first bullet point.
Nico Diederich	Thanked the President for aligning the Statutes with the strategic plan. Asked to vote on each article.
Vote on Article 4.1 took place (see decision below)	
Peter Engel	Cautioned that it is not good if the members cannot agree on the objectives of the CED. The objectives under Article 4 have so far not been controversially discussed.
Sakha Fathi	Stated that the different votes can be explained since the delegate has the impression that he is not heard and that the rules are not applied. There needs to be an external legal assessment.
Marco Landi	Responded that the CED will ask for an external legal assessment.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Voiced that no delegate has the right to question the vote of other members. The delegate does not agree with the methodology.
Marco Landi	Asked delegates to move to Article 7.2.1.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Suggested that the text should not say "disagreement", which has a negative connotation. The decision should be up to the General Meeting not the Board. The CED should make sure that the most representative association is a member.
Marco Landi	Proposed to change the wording to "no agreement" instead of "disagreement".
Jane Renehan	Suggested to change it to "absence of agreement".
Marco Landi	Referred to the suggestion regarding the representativeness of an association, stating that it is not easy to define the criteria of representativeness.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Proposed to use for instance the number of recognised members.
Nico Diederich	Pointed out that there is a similar sentence in Article 9 for the affiliate members. There should not be a different text for members and affiliate members. If the wording is changed in Article 7, the delegates must return to the vote on Article 9.
Michael Frank	Agreed that both articles need to have the same wording.
Stefaan Hanson	Found it positive to add language on the most representative association. It could be measured differently in different countries, and if there is no agreement in the country, the most representative should be accepted into the CED.
Doniphan Hammer	Agreed that representativeness is very important. But it is not correct to apply this in the case of obligatory membership (e.g. chambers).
Edoardo Cavallé	Highlighted that the organisations must share the aims and goals of the CED.
Pierluigi Delogu	Expressed that the CED should not exclude organisations but should rather be inclusive and would therefore like to delete the paragraph entirely.
Marco Landi	Repeated that it should be up to the country to decide who is the most representative. The CED should only get involved in the absence of agreement.
Ralf Wagner	Stated that many countries can sort it out. If there is no agreement, then the General Meeting will decide. The countries can appoint/nominate members and the Statutes should be formulated in a way that allows for leeway. It should not be made more complicated by introducing the concept of representativeness.
Marco Landi	Suggested to add "taking into account the representativeness of the profession".

Robin Foyle	Proposed to add to "accept into membership on the basis of their convergence with other CED member organisations". The idea is to organisations that are similar to the organisations present. Considered that representativeness is an arbitrary term.
Nico Diederich	Repeated that Article 7.2.1 and 9.1.1 need to be identical in wording. If the delegates agree with the aforementioned proposal, there needs to be another vote on Article 9, which is why the vote should have been chronological.
Hans Schrangl	Expressed that the simplest thing would be to have the same text as in Article 9.1.1 and not amend Article 7.2.1.
Jörg Krainhöfner	Agreed that Article 7.2.1 should not be changed.
Michael Frank	Agreed that the easiest solution would be to stick to the original proposal of Article 7.2.1 since the text is very clear.
Roman Smučler	Voiced that if there is no agreement on these basic things the vote should be postponed to the next meeting.
Hans Schrangl	Responded that the General Meeting should continue the discussion since the delegates will be in the same position next time.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	Argued that it would be wise to give more time. Proposed to have an objective criteria on representativeness.
Edoardo Cavallé	Asked to vote on the proposal made by R. Foyle.
Marco Landi	Stated that no future General Meeting should take a decision against representativeness. Proposed to vote on Article 7.2.1 in line with the Board proposal.
Paulo Melo	Expressed that it would be good to see what the delegates think and therefore both versions should be put to a vote, the original Board proposal and the amended version as per suggestions made by R. Foyle and O. Monteiro Da Silva.
Beat Wäckerle	Urged delegates to be cautious to add restrictions to the text since these are legal provisions.
Doniphan Hammer	Voiced that each member country should make their own decision.
Ralf Wagner	Cautioned that if there are two different proposals it will be difficult to have a two-thirds majority. The difference between the two versions is very small.
Stefano Colasanto	Pointed out that it is not the task of the CED to establish for a country which association should join.
Marco Landi	Put on vote the Article 7.2.1 as proposed by the Board.
Vote on Article 7.2.1 took place (see decision below)	
Marco Landi	Reviewed the remaining amendments.
Peter Engel	Made a reference to Article 18.9, and asked that an insurance should be taken out for Board Members to protect them against financial claims.
Marco Landi	Responded that there will be an update at the next General Meeting on the CED liability policy for Directors.
Vote on the remaining articles (see decisions below)	
Marco Landi	Asked the members to move on to the amendments to the Internal Rules. Returned to the proposal of restricting observers from participating in Working Groups and Board Task Forces. Suggested to delete observer association from Article VI.5.1, VI.7 and VII.1.3 Proposal amended accordingly. The other changes are editorial or reflect the new membership categories. Asked for a vote on the whole internal rules as a package.
Vote on the Internal Rules as a whole took place (see decision below)	
Decisions	**Statutes Article 9** In favour: 29 Against: 10 Abstentions: 10 *Proposal accepted*

	Statutes Article 11 In favour: 37 Against: 0 Abstentions: 10 *Proposal accepted*
	Statutes Article 4.1 In favour: 37 Against: 0 Abstentions: 7 *Proposal accepted*
	Statutes Article 7.2.1 In favour: 39 Against: 4 Abstentions: 2 *Proposal accepted*
	Statutes Article 10 In favour: 37 Against: 1 Abstentions: 3 *Proposal accepted*
	Statutes Article 12.2 In favour: 41 Against: 0 Abstentions: 3 *Proposal accepted*
	Statutes Articles 13.2; 13.2.1; 13.4.1; 15.5; 18.3.1; 18.3.1; 18.9 Unanimously approved
	Bundled vote: **Amendments in the following articles in the Statutes reflecting the new categories: 4.1; 6.4; 6.41; 12.1; 12.2; 13.1; 13.3; 14.1; 14.2; 15.3; 15.4; 15.4.1; 15.5; 15.7; 16.1; 16.1.1; 16.4; 17.2; 17.3; 17.4; 20.3; 24.2; 26.2.1** **Editorial amendments in the following articles in the Statutes: Introduction, 13.4; 18.3.4; 26.1; 26.2.1** Unanimously approved
	Internal Rules Unanimously adopted

8. Finances	Rapporteur: Mick Armstrong
Working document	• Report of the auditors: Final Accounts 2017 (CED-DOC-2018-038-E) • Treasurer's letter to members (CED-DOC-2018-022-E) • CED Final Accounts 2017 (CED-ACCOUNTS-2017-01) • CED Budget 2019 (CED-BUDGET-2019-01)

A) Discussed the first report of the external statutory auditors, which approved of the accounts but made some minor suggestions of how to improve the accounting. Unfortunately, the auditors could no longer join by teleconference due to the delayed agenda; b) Presented the Treasurer's letter to members that cites a surplus of €61.000 due to lower costs mainly as a result of staff absences. Income was €10.000 higher than the planned budget due to the delayed payment for CED contribution to the Joint Action on Health Workforce. Costs were significantly lower overall than budgeted, by over 10% or €56.000 mainly due to staff absences and decreased costs for interpretation; c) Shared feedback from the first Budget Reference Committee meeting that took place after the Board meeting and was attended by P. Engel, S. Andersen and M. Pöyry. The minutes of the meeting will be shared with the members; d) Reported on the 2018 finances, which are largely affected by the office move. Despite the initial cost, it will allow for savings in the long-term due to the integrated board meeting room. The Treasurer shared the cost structure of the move with the members and informed them about the nine-year lease contract that allowed for a twelve months' discount. The move will

largely be financed from reserves. In addition, 2018 personnel costs are higher due to staff absences and the need to hire additional personnel as a result and an increase in salaries; e) Reviewed other projects that the CED would like to take on, including the EU Manual, website update and recruitment of an EDSA intern. It needs to be discussed how these will be funded; f) Introduced the 2019 budget and asked the members to approve an average increase of 4% in membership fees to cover increased running costs of the new office. The Treasurer also pointed out that the CED expects savings from holding the Board meetings in the office and that an increase in personnel costs and staff travel cost has been budgeted.		
Nico Diederich	It should be discussed how the Budget Reference Committee can be scheduled more conveniently for all members so that more delegates can participate. Asked if the Treasurer could elaborate how many unpaid expenses and not received income the CED had on 31 December 2017.	
Peter Engel	The Budget Reference Committee is a service by the CED that allows members to ask questions and receive clarification, all of which can also be discussed during the General Meeting. It should not be viewed as an official finance committee that has a control function.	
President	The reserves are there to cover 6 months of expenses. All members are welcome to visit the new office once it is ready in September.	
Doniphan Hammer	A 4% fee increase cannot be repeated next year.	
Decision	2017 Final Accounts and 2019 Budget unanimously approved.	
9. Communications		Rapporteur: Lea Pfefferle
Working documents	• CED Annual Report 2017	
Stated that a) the Annual Report was published in May and sent to all members; b) the annual CED event in the European Parliament will take place on 19 June, hosted by MEP Nessa Childers, on the topic of oral health inequalities; c) the CED is planning another joint event in the European Parliament together with CPME and PGEU in September/October; d) another workshop together with FVE and CPME is planned for December in Paris to discuss the "one health approach". Academics, practitioners and students will take part in the workshop; e) generally the collaboration with other healthcare professional stakeholders has been very fruitful.		
10. WG Education and Professional Qualifications		Rapporteur: Paulo Melo
Working document	• Brussels Office Update on the WG Education and Professional Qualifications (CED-DOC-2018-028)	
Informed about the: a) upcoming revision of the CED resolution Continuing Professional Development from 2013; b) next steps in the strategy towards the update the revision of Annex V.3/5.3.1 of Directive 2005/36/EC; c) results of the questionnaire on dental hygienists sent in March 2018; d) past and current collaboration with ADEE on the Professional Qualifications Directive; e) CED attendance at the EDSA congress; f) progress to date on the One Health Skills Conference in Paris; g) CED position on dental professions in the European classification of Skills, Competences, Occupations and Qualifications (ESCO); h) CED position on Professional Qualifications Directive i) upcoming revision of FEDCAR statement.		
Ralf Wagner	Stressed the issue of dental therapists' definition and existence of this profession across Europe.	
11. Position of the Portuguese Dental Association on the CED-ADEE Press Release on the Implementation of the Professional Qualifications Directive		Rapporteur: Orlando Monteiro Da Silva
Working document	• CED-ADEE Press Release on the Implementation of the Professional Qualifications Directive (CED-DOC-2018-029-E)	
Stressed that before being published, the CED position should be firstly discussed with all interested parties. Informed that three Portuguese universities replied to the CED position. Requested to publish all the replies and PDA statement on the CED website. Highlighted the repercussion such a position might have on the reputation of the private dental faculties and PDA.		

President	The need for the CED position on this case was requested at the last GM. The CED acts in a transparency and the CED did not accuse the PDA and Portuguese universities but posed a question based on the judgement of the Supreme court.
Doniphan Hammer	Shed more light on the details related to the lack of compliance with PQD. France was also targeted as the entities that provide illegal education exist there. Ensured that there is no conflict of interest in the CED Board on this issue.
Edoardo Cavallè	Transfers of students from one country to another could facilitate the illegal practices, therefore, there is a need to call and ensure the highest quality of dental education.
Orlando Monteiro Da Silva	The issue should be addressed to the competent authorities and the European Commission before launching the position. Stressed that the case described in the CED position is an internal issue between the CNSD - Confédération Nationale des Syndicats Dentaires and the French authorities. In case of any violation the PDA will be the first to bring it to the attention of respective authorities.
Robin Foyle	In Ireland there are also unregistered entities advertising dental education.
Filipa Carvalho Marques	Expressed support for automatic recognition and main provisions of PQD. However, raised concern towards the method of automatic recognition. Stressed that all requirements of PQD are fulfilled in Portugal. In connection to the PDA statement, highlighted that the CED should be concerned about the regulation and its implementation.
Decision	Decided to publish the replies by the Portuguese universities and PDA statement on the CED website.
12. WG Dental Materials and Medical Devices	Rapporteur: Jane Renehan
Working documents	• Draft Mandate for the WG Dental Materials and Medical Devices (CED-DOC-2018-031-E/D/F) • Brussels Office Update on the WG Dental Materials and Medical Devices (CED-DOC-2018-032-E)
President	Thanked the chairs of the Working Groups Amalgam and other restorative materials (Susie Sanderson), Medical Devices (Edoardo Cavallé) and Tooth Whitening Products (Stefaan Hanson/Paulo Melo) for their work. Proposed Jane Renehan as the Chair of the new Working Group.
a) Updated on the next steps in the implementation of the Mercury Regulation and reminded members about the CED guidance that was shared in February. Asked members to share any feedback they have had and asked Denmark and Sweden to present how their respective countries dealt with the phase-out of dental amalgam; b) Informed that the WG together with the lawyers is tasked to work on the CED guidance on Medical Devices Regulation (MDR); c) Explained that the Working Group is working on an advocacy document on the issue of tooth whitening in persons under 18 that can be used at national level.	
Hans Göransson	Presented a brief history of the opposition to amalgam in Sweden. A change in the high-cost protection system meant that patients did no longer receive it for amalgam. In 2005, for environmental reasons, amalgam was banned with a few exceptions. Amalgam is still present in Swedish dental pipes, and therefore amalgam separators are still needed. There are no conclusive data yet on the longevity of composite fillings compared to amalgam fillings.
Joakim Lilholt	Added that in Denmark the issue of mercury in the environment and especially in dental care was raised by the media in 1997 and the ministry prohibited the use of mercury in 2003 unless absolutely necessary. The phase-out of amalgam followed as a consequence without any specific legislation.
Hans Göransson	The issues of bisphenol A and nanoparticles have been raised in connection with composite resins, but there is so far no evidence of any negative health effects. Stated that there has not been an access to medicines issue in Sweden as a result of the amalgam ban.

Susie Sanderson	Stated a) that there is very little evidence on the cost of providing restorations with different materials (incl. consent process, materials, time); b) that there is little research on the environmental impact of the composite materials used, including nanomaterials. Also encouraged delegates to read the Steve Mulligan paper on the environmental impacts of amalgam and composite resins published in the BDJ that could also be shared with the CED members as a follow-up.	
Freddie Sloth-Lisbjerg	The price for composite fillings increased two-to-three times for patients after amalgam was phased out but it did not impact patients' behaviour.	
Nick Sharkov	The fear of patients is growing towards bisphenol A and this needs to be on the CED agenda.	
Michael Frank	There is an FDI resolution on dental materials and it would be useful to review what FDI has already been prepared and what is being prepared at FDI level.	
President	Thanked the Spanish delegation for their opinion on CAD/CAM produced devices.	
Decision	The GM unanimously approved Jane Renehan as Chair of the new Working Group. The GM unanimously adopted the revised Mandate of the Working Group.	
13. WG Patient Safety, Infection Control and Waste Management		Rapporteur: Ioannis Tzoutzas
Working document	• Draft Mandate for the WG Patient Safety, Infection Control and Waste Management (CED-DOC-2018-010-E/D/F) • Brussels Office Update on the WG Patient Safety, Infection Control and Waste Management • (CED-DOC-2018-033)	
Reported on the: a) revision of the Mandate of the merged WG; b) intervention of ECDC at the last WG meeting; c) provisional text of the Proposal for a Directive amending Directive 2008/98/EC on waste; d) upcoming consultation on the Water Directive; e) publication of the guidelines on the infection, prevention and control in dentistry on the ECDC website.		
President	Thanked the chairs of the Working Group Patient Safety (Matti Pöyry) and Infection Control and Waste Management (Ioannis Tzoutzas). Stressed the importance of collaboration with the ECDC. Underlined that the patient safety must be emphasized and therefore it also remained in the title of the WG.	
Decision	The GM unanimously approved Ioannis Tzoutzas as Chair of the new WG. The GM unanimously adopted the revised Mandate of the WG.	
14. Discussion of country reports		Rapporteur: Delegates
Six delegates presented the results of their country reports during the session (Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, the Netherlands, and Slovenia).		
Joakim Lilholt	Reported on the implementation of data protection rules in local clinics of private practitioners, and in municipal clinics.	
Matti Pöyry	Reported on a) health reform affecting public and private healthcare (dentistry included) on subsidised care, and b) changes in VAT (value added tax) being added to laboratory price for occlusal splints.	
Pierre-Olivier Donnat	Reported on a) newly elected head of the national association and b) final meeting held in Paris on the negotiations for collective bargaining agreements regarding healthcare insurance.	
Katalin Nagy	Reported on a) the organisation and functioning of the Hungarian Dental Association, Dental Chamber, and Dental Professional Decision Board; b) the changes within the Hungarian Ministry of Health and upcoming elections; c) recent protest which led to increase in salary of government subsidised dentists; d) harmonisation of dental specialty exams.	

Henk Donker	Reported on a) settlement agreement between the Royal Dutch Dental Association and Dutch Collecting Society for Music Neighbouring Rights and b) the upcoming regulation on the position of the dental hygienist, as well as the steps taken by the Royal Dutch Dental Association on this matter.	
Plenary	The issue of the position of dental hygienists was discussed further as the topic is of concern to different countries. The discussion focused on the need to defend the dental profession and its structures; underlined the need to distinguish between different professions within EU legislation, especially considering the increasing bureaucratic burden on liberal professions. Highlighted the need to be politically proactive to move forward on such bureaucratic issues. - Need to speak to national governments to highlight that a 4-year programme is too lengthy for dental hygienists - Focus on the preventative element of the dental hygienist position should be a priority - Raised the idea of developing a comprehensive strategy on addressing industrial level costs of the dental profession; possibility of setting up a task force in this field In addition, the situation of dentists coming from the EU or third countries was discussed.	
Krunoslav Pavlovic	Reported on efforts around establishing a new dental chamber in Slovenia (independent from medical doctors). Requested a letter of support from the CED on this issue.	
Marco Landi	The Board will write a letter of support as requested by Slovenia.	
15. WG Oral Health		Rapporteur: Henk Donker
Working document	• Draft Resolution on Third Party Payers (CED-DOC-2018-030-E/D/F) • Brussels Office Update on the WG Oral Health (CED-DOC-2018-034-E)	
Presented a) the draft resolution on Dental Practice and Third Parties in Europe; b) the CED event to take place on 19 June in the European Parliament hosted by MEP Nessa Childers to discuss oral health inequalities and invited members to join the event if they had not yet signed up for it; c) the Working Group's work on vaccines, including the submission to European Commission consultation on vaccine hesitancy.		
Doniphan Hammer	Explained the amendments to the draft resolution that were introduced on behalf of the CNSD.	
Decision	The resolution on Dental Practice and Third Parties in Europe was unanimously adopted.	
16. WG eHealth		Rapporteur: Piret Väli
Working documents	• Brussels Office Update on the WG eHealth (CED-DOC-2018-035-E)	
Reported on the: a) results of the CED survey on eHealth; b) progress of work on the CED Resolution on eHealth; c) CED participation at the workshop in Portugal and the main objectives of the EHaction project; d) outcome of the eHealth Stakeholders Group meeting and the future plans for the Group.		
President	Stressed the increasing attention to eHealth and amount of data to be dealt with by dentists.	
17. BTF Antibiotics in Dentistry		Rapporteur: Susie Sanderson
Working documents	• Brussels Office update on the BTF Antibiotic is Dentistry (CED-DOC-2018-036-E)	
A) Stated that is very important to work together with other organisations like FDI but also other health professional organisations. Shared that the AMR stewardship library is now online on the members-only part of the CED website; b) Updated members on the issue of pharmaceuticals in the environment, the Commission's upcoming strategy and encouraged members to visit the 'medsdiposal' website that is supported by the CED and provides information about the disposal of unused medicines.		

18. BTF Internal Market	Rapporteur: Alexander Tolmeijer
Working document	• Brussels Office update on the BTF Internal Market (CED-DOC-2018-037-E) • Final Text Directive for a Proportionality Test before the Adoption of New Regulation of Professions (CED-DOC-2018-039-E) • Open Letter to President Juncker and Budget Commissioner Oettinger on the Multi-Annual Financial Framework (CED-DOC-2018-040-E) • Letter to the Dutch Health Minister on Oral Hygienists (CED-DOC-2018-041-E)
a) Updated on the legislative development of Proportionality Test Directive, which was a good example of working closely with other health professional organisations; b) asked members if the CED should work on the definitions for dental assistant staff like hygienists or therapists; c) shared that the General Data Protection Regulation is implemented differently in different countries, for example with regard to the data protection officer. Considered whether the CED should provide a definition for what a small practice is; d) mentioned that the draft EU budget foresees a smaller budget for health than the existing one; e) introduced the idea to publish a CED position on corporate dentistry.	
Nick Sharkov	Attended the European Economic and Social Committee conference on liberal professions in Rome in December 2017 that adopted the manifesto of liberal professions that was based on the Joint Charter on Liberal Professions that was also co-signed by the CED.
Marco Landi	Stressed the importance of the CED commitment to the promotion of the liberal professions in EU, starting from the work already done by the BTF Liberal Professions, namely the Charter on Liberal Professions, and supporting any development by the EESC regarding this issue.
Roman Šmucler	Urged to find a definition for small practices with a view to the cut-off point for data protection officer, and for the different dental assistant professions.
Paulo Melo	There is already a CED resolution on the dental team that states what each profession should do. We need to be careful providing a definition for a small office and the cut-off point for data protection officers as this might impact national discussions negatively. It should be made clear to legislators that it does not make sense to have data protection officers in dental practices. The right to be forgotten is also not in accordance with existing laws on keeping patient records.
President	The existing CED guidance on data protection is based on the current legal documents and creating a definition could lead to negative effects in countries where the application of the Regulation has been more lenient.
Any Other Business	
The Austrian Dental Chamber is looking forward to welcoming the General Meeting in Vienna in May 2019. The President encouraged the members to visit the new office when they are in Brussels.	
a) Dates and places of next meetings	
• 16 November 2018, Brussels • 24-25 May 2019, Vienna • 22 November 2019, Brussels • May 2020, date and place to be determined • November 2020, date and place to be determined	

PRESIDENT **BRUSSELS OFFICE**