



**UNION EUROPÉENNE DES MÉDECINS SPÉCIALISTES  
EUROPEAN UNION OF MEDICAL SPECIALISTS**

20, Av. de la Couronne  
B-1050 BRUSSELS  
www.uems.net

tel: +32-2-649.5164  
fax: +32-2-640.3730  
e-mail: [uems@skynet.be](mailto:uems@skynet.be)

D 0303

*Minutes Board Meeting  
European Board of Urology/UEMS Section of Urology  
Prague, 9 November 2002*

**Place:** ILF Hotel, Prague

**Date:** Saturday, 9 November 2002, 09.00 - 13.00 hrs

**Participants:**

**Officials and national representatives:**

W. Artibani Italy President  
M. Donovan Ireland Secretary  
E. Kiely Ireland Secretary-elect  
J.M. Nijman Netherlands President-elect  
M. Gunst Switzerland Treasurer

**Officials:**

M.M. Peil The Netherlands Chief Executive EBU  
J. Mattelaer Belgium Immediate past Secretary

**National representatives:**

G. Ludvik Austria  
E. Fonteyne Belgium (substitute van Poppel)  
D. Mladenov Bulgaria  
M. Tzvetkov Bulgaria  
T. Hanus Czech Republic  
P. Mogensen Denmark  
K. Møller-Ernst Jensen Denmark  
L. Kukk Estonia  
G. Timberg Estonia  
O. Lindell Finland  
Z. Tchanturaia Georgia (substitutue Managadze)  
K. Schalkhäuser Germany  
G. Moutzouris Greece  
E. Montanari Italy  
A. Kohl Luxembourg  
P. Chłosta Poland  
A. Antoniewicz Poland  
A. Gomez de Oliveira Portugal  
F. Rolo Portugal  
M. Manu Romania  
I. Sinescu Romania  
J. Kliment Slovak Republic  
L. Valansky Slovak Republic  
B. Trsinar Slovenia  
A. Allona-Almagro Spain  
M. Brehmer Sweden  
O. Schmucki Switzerland  
M. Çek Turkey  
S. Tellaloğlu Turkey

**Experts:**

Th. Becopoulos Greece Expert RRC  
S. Fuglsig Denmark ESRU (Chairman-elect)  
J. Kvist Kristensen Denmark Expert EBU  
S. Parkar Norway ESRU (Chairman)  
D.S.M. Brouwn Netherlands minutes

**Observers:**

J. Breza Slovak Republic  
A. Petrik Czech Republic  
S.C. Muller Germany

**Apologies for absence:**

H. Madersbacher Austria  
H. v. Poppel Belgium  
J.E.G. Lorge Belgium  
Z. Kastelan Croatia  
Z. Marekovic Croatia  
F. Z'atura Czech Republic  
M. Ruutu Finland  
M.O. Bitker France  
Ph. Thibault France  
G. Bochorishvili Georgia  
L. Managadze Georgia  
P. Fornara Germany  
F. Sofras Greece  
L. Pajor Hungary  
P. Tenke Hungary  
G.V. Einarsson Iceland  
C.H.L. Lamy Luxembourg  
L. Cutajar Malta  
J. Zwartendijk Netherlands  
P. Lundmo Norway  
N.M. Ulvik Norway  
N. Vodopija Slovenia  
D.M. Castro-Diaz Spain  
L.J. Norlén Sweden  
I. Eardley United Kingdom  
P. Whelan United Kingdom

**1. Welcome/apologies for absence**

The President, Artibani welcomed those present and thanked the hosts, Hanus and Petrik for their warm hospitality and the perfect organisation of this meeting in Prague. Most of the countries represented in the European Board of Urology were present at this meeting. However, Croatia, France, Hungary, Iceland, Malta, Norway and United Kingdom were not represented for different reasons.

It was mentioned that two new EBU delegates were present: Ludvik from Austria and Møller-Ernst Jensen from Denmark.

**2. Minutes of the Board Meeting UEMS Section of Urology/European Board of Urology, Innsbruck, 11 May 2002**

Further to what was discussed at the meeting in Innsbruck, Mattelaer confirmed his commitment to write the history of EBU in a period of 4 years. Schröder had offered his assistance.

***The minutes were studied, accepted and signed as a correct record of the meeting of UEMS Section of Urology/European Board of Urology, held in Innsbruck on 11 May 2002.***

**2.1 Action points**

Further to action point 3 of the meeting in Innsbruck, 'Study the possibility to send averages per country of the In-Service Assessments to the delegates', Nijman stated that in order to draw sensible conclusions at least 40 candidates from similar groups in

each country were needed. As this is not the case the information that could be provided now was felt not be very useful.

Further to action point 4, 'Send letter to the delegates with a package of duties and expectations' Artibani asked whether the delegates had any comments to the letter. As no comments were received it was assumed that all delegates agreed with their duties, which was felt to be very important.

There were two matters arising from the minutes:

\* The issue of EBU Dip. for non-Europeans was discussed at the last meeting of the EBU in Innsbruck. New rules from UEMS make this issue redundant, as the new rules state that everybody from every country in the world can become a 'Fellow of a European Board'. There is no legal recognition of the title FEBU but the title was felt to be a mark of excellence that could be used for the CV. It was thus recommended that everybody passing both parts of the EBU examination successfully, should be given a Fellowship of the European Board of Urology.

Furthermore, it was explained that any Board can set their standards to be submitted to the examination.

The exchange of doctors between European countries was defined by the Directives of the European Community.

The eligibility criteria to be admitted to the examination of EBU would be discussed in more detail later during the meeting.

### 3. **Matters UEMS Section of Urology**

*3.1 UEMS Specialist Sections and European Boards - Meeting with UEMS Executive, Brussels, 11 May 2002*

This issue was already discussed above.

*3.2 Representation Sections in Management Council UEMS*

It was decided by the Management Council that only six Sections would be nominated by lottery of 2 Sections from 3 balanced groups of Sections. Urology was incorporated in group 2 and this year the Section of Gynaecology and Obstetrics and the Section of Neurosurgery were elected to be admitted to the meeting of the Management Council as observers. The EBU Office had already requested an update on the outcome of the meeting of the Management Council UEMS from these Sections.

*3.3 EU Commission proposal new 'Doctors Directives'*

It was mentioned that this proposal from EU could have great impact on the rules regarding the exchange of specialists throughout Europe. The proposal from EU was to change the doctors Directives by subdividing the specialists in two parts; the sectoral part and the general part. The sectoral part consists of 17 specialities, including urology, all recognised throughout Europe. For this part there would be an automatic exchange.

The general part is related to other specialties which are not recognised in all countries. In the general part there would be a case-to-case decision concerning exchange.

This system was felt to be very complicated and UEMS as well as other National Associations opposed to this proposal from EU.

Although this new ruling does not have an impact on urology, it might have an impact on the kind of work and the competition urologists get from other specialists. It was therefore stressed again that this issue was very important and should be kept a close eye on.

### 4. **President's Report (enclosed)**

The President summarised the main events of EBU during the last 6 months and highlighted the short-term goals.

- The new structure EBU is completed and Peil was thanked for all the work she put into this.

It was stressed that as the core of the executive of the Foundation EBU and the EBU Management foundation was the same, this was the best guarantee of effectiveness and intrinsic strength of the EBU.

- The ongoing implementation of the EBU-EAU strategic alliance is proceeding in a fair spirit of cooperation. The second meeting of the joint EAU-EBU on CME would take place 1 week later.

It was mentioned that the name of the Rome course, which was now organised by ESU, would more or less stay the same: Annual European Course in Urology for Residents. This AECU-R course was stated to become part of a wider programme from EAU for residents, named European Urological Residents Education Programme.

The President mentioned that no firm decisions were made yet concerning the venue or the format, but it was clear that the course will remain in preparation for the EBU Examination. Nijman, Artibani and Chapple (Chairman ESU) will continue to be the Directors of the course. Continuation of the cooperation with EAU was stated to be the goal.

The offer from EAU to move the EBU Office to the 'Centre of Urology' in Arnhem was discussed in depth by the Executive Board and it was decided not to accept the proposal yet. It was explained that a move of the EBU Office was felt to be premature financially as well as politically, but EBU would propose EAU to share a part-time secretary in the 'Centre of Urology' involved in the common activities, especially CME.

- The role of the delegates as explained in the letter sent by the President was once more underlined: EBU delegates were delegates of the National Urological Associations and thus have an important role in the contact with the National Urological Associations. The structure of EBU with 30 countries, 58 delegates and close contact with the National Urological Associations was a very powerful one and this strength should be used.

The President stated quantifiable outcomes for each delegate and added that he was fully aware that there are smaller and bigger countries. Also the delegates from smaller countries were encouraged to use their professional power and recognition to promote the EBU activities and be in contact with the National Associations, Programme Directors and companies. This was felt to be important for the financial survival of EBU and also for this purpose the participation in EBU activities should be doubled.

The President informed the EBU Board that it was decided by the Executive Board to grant honorary membership to two persons who contributed a lot in the past and present to the EBU; Alberto Matos Ferreira, who was the founding father of the EBU CME Credit System and to Hugh Whitfield who promoted the EBU and clarified the role of EBU as a regulatory body in Europe.

Furthermore, the Executive Board agreed to give a 'Distinguished Service Award' medal to Bennie Nerström and Gerhard Struhal, who also meant a lot for EBU, which was supported?

It was stressed that one of the main reasons for setting up the EBU Management Foundation next to the EBU Foundation was the financial liability, which was now put on the members of the EBU Management Foundation and not the EBU delegates.

Breza (Slovak Rep.) Stressed that EBU should consider the differences between urology in Eastern, Central and Western Europe. Urology is the same all over the world but it is done under different economical and political conditions. Breza therefore proposed that EBU officially visits e.g. Slovak Rep. to obtain information about the education and continuing medical education system.

Tellaloglu (Turkey) raised the possibility to encourage industry to sponsor participation in examinations. Nijman stated that there had been discussions about sponsorship of the EBU Examinations but it had been decided within the EBU that examinations should not be sponsored by industry. The question was raised whether this decision should be reconsidered and industry may be approached for sponsoring of the examinations.

After discussion it was decided to remain with the decision that only sponsorship may be found for participation in the EBU In-Service Assessment. The EBU examination should stay clear of any reference to industry. All sponsorship should be directed to EBU and no reference should be made during the examination.

Tellaloglu (Turkey) suggested to have the National Associations set up a fund with money from industry to pay for participation in EBU activities. In this respect Brehmer (Sweden) mentioned that in Sweden industry puts money in a trust and from this trust fees for participation in the EBU examinations are paid. This was felt to be a good suggestion.

#### 5. **Secretary's Report (enclosed)**

The Secretary, Donovan mentioned the establishment of the EBU Management Foundation, the merger of the Education Committee and the EBU Management Foundation, the decision not to accept the proposal of EAU, to join the 'Centre of Urology' in Arnhem, for the moment and the publication of the third Edition of the UEMS compendium which will contain a statement about the EBU Management Foundation.

Donovan thanked Mattelaer, the immediate past Secretary for the great service he provided to the EBU. Furthermore, Peil and her team were thanked for their excellent contribution.

#### 6. **Treasurer's Report - Budget 2003**

The Treasurer, Gunst presented the budget 2003 (enclosed), which was also presented in Innsbruck. It was mentioned that EBU had to contribute EURO 30,000 to the EBU Education Committee to balance the budget of the Education committee.

It was explained that further to the new EBU structure all costs were transferred to the EBU Management Foundation and would no longer appear on the budget of the EBU, thus in the coming budgets only the costs of the activities of the EBU foundation will appear.

It was stated that due to the devaluation of the Dollar, EURO 20,000 were lost on these assets. As the value of the Dollar was expected to fall even more EBU would change these Dollar money funds into EURO.

The Treasurer stated that almost all countries had paid their new increased fee. The EBU delegates were asked to insist that the Treasurers of the National Urological Associations would pay the bank transfer costs themselves, so EBU would receive the full amount of the annual fee.

It was mentioned that the EBU Manpower Committee and the Quality of Patient Care Committee were sponsored by EBU, as they could not generate money themselves yet.

It was expected that the financial situation at the end of 2003 would not differ very much from the present situation. It was stressed that the income had to be increased. Therefore, the EBU delegates were asked to encourage participation in the EBU activities.

In this respect it was stated that companies were interested in sponsoring the EBU as long as real projects were proposed.

#### 7. **Status strategic alliance with EAU**

The President mentioned that the spirit of cooperation between EAU and EBU was very good. However, EBU would propose an even better interaction by having a representation of EAU in EBU Committees and vice-versa.

The ongoing practical cooperation was particularly in the field of Continuing Medical Education. It was expected that at the next meeting of EAU and EBU concerning CME, 16 November, decisions would be taken regarding further cooperation on CME.

Artibani announced that an agreement had been reached between the Italian Urological Association (SIU) and EAU to register all members of SIU as active EBU members and thus for the EBU CME/CPD Credit System. It was felt that this might be an example for other countries to follow.

Breza (Slovak Rep.) explained that in the Slovak Rep. CME was mandatory and there was a common system for all specialties. Therefore the EBU system could not be adopted.

Further to a question of Brehmer (Sweden) Nijman stated that applications for accreditation as National activities could be very brief and not necessarily in English but applications for accreditation at a European level more information was required and in English.

#### 8. **Nomination of new Board members to the European Board of Urology**

It was mentioned that G. Ludvik from Austria and K. Müller-Ernst were nominated officially as EBU Board members, which was approved and they were welcomed.

~BREAK~

#### 9. **Status reports**

##### **9.1 EBU Management Foundation**

The President mentioned that the third meeting of the EBU Management Foundation was held the day before and all the activities would be organised.

The proposal for the eligibility criteria of the EBU Examination was discussed, which was felt to be very important as it would mean a change of strategy. The proposal was a result of a discussion and agreement of the Accreditation Committee and approval from the EBU was necessary.

The main change from the present structure was that also urologists educated in non-European countries could receive the title FEBU. This change in

strategy was proposed due to the change in policy of UEMS and the strong reaction of candidates from non-European countries.

Further to the question whether this new strategy would not decrease the value of the FEBU title, it was mentioned that it was evident from experience that the participants from non-European countries were very motivated and well prepared and thus the value of the FEBU title was expected to remain if not raised.

Furthermore, the initial proposal to restrict the participation of the EBU examination to those educated fully in EBU certified Training Programmes as of 2007 was proposed to be abandoned, because the number of certified RTPU's was still low and would exclude the non-Europeans.

The idea was raised that the EBU Accreditation Committee would set up the list of minimal requirements for surgical procedures in close cooperation with RRC, which was accepted.

***The new eligibility criteria were accepted.***

### **9.2 EBU Accreditation Committee**

The members of the Accreditation Committee were partly the same people as the members of the 'old' Education Committee:

Nijman (Chairman), Andreasson (ESRU), Bitker, Artibani, Antoniewicz, de Reijke (Chairman Examination Committee), Matos Ferreira, Müller, Petrik, Romano, Schröder (Editor EBU Update Series). During the Brainstorming meeting of the Accreditation Committee in October the eligibility criteria and CME, specially in relation with EAU, were discussed.

It was mentioned that a committee had been set up to discuss the specific collaboration of EBU and EAU concerning CME, which met once in Innsbruck. From this meeting it became apparent that EAU wants EBU only to keep track of EAU and ESU activities. This was felt to be too limiting as it was believed that there were many other CME activities that should be included in the programme. This would be discussed with EAU during the next meeting of the joint committee, 16 November 2002.

At this moment all CME and CPD (Continuing Professional Development) activities are acknowledged by EBU. Furthermore, it was felt that CPD was the future and not CME.

Another important issue for the Accreditation committee was the language in which the examinations are offered. Initially the examination were proposed only to be organised in English but after discussion in the EBU it was decided to organise the examination in more languages. The issue was now raised as with the expansion of EU more languages would need to be offered.

The general opinion was that there should only be one language, but further discussion was postponed to May 2003. This issue would be put on the agenda for the Spring meeting 2003 of EBU.

It was stated that although it was felt that re-certification of urologists is the future, there were only a few countries where this was obligatory. Furthermore, it was doubted if National authorities would give up re-certification to EBU, as it brought in money.

Nijman was thanked for his presentation.

### **9.3 EBU Residency Review Committee**

In absence of the Chairman of the RRC, Donovan was asked to present the report of the RRC.

Donovan explained that it had been decided during the RRC meeting that certification would from now on be granted to the programme instead of the programme director.

Furthermore, it was stressed that RRC is fully aware of the differences in the number of urologists in the various countries. Therefore it was explained that the possibility was already in existence that also smaller institutions could apply by rotating the residents between more institutions.

As some applications had been received where the criteria of the EBU were not fully met, the proposal had been raised during the meeting of the RRC to issue certification for excellent centres in a sub-specialty. In this way it would be possible to offer an exchange to other training programmes for training in a sub-specialty.

It was furthermore decided during the RRC meeting that if certification of a Residency Training Programme in Urology was denied by the National site-visit authority, EBU would also not certify this training programme, unless they joined with other institutions and thus met the EBU requirements even though joining with other institutions was not possible Nationally.

The composition of the RRC Board was presented: Castro-Diaz (Chairman), Ludvik (Secretary/Treasurer), Chłosta, Rolo, Çek, Van Poppel, Müller, Bitker, Mogensen, Montanari, Necknig (ex officio - ESRU), Becopoulos (expert) and Madersbacher (expert).

The certification of the following programmes was proposed and accepted:

- The Residency Training Programme in Urology in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany
- The Residency Training Programme in Urology in Coimbra, Portugal
- The Residency Training Programme in Urology in Örebro, Sweden

Letters of recommendation would have to be sent to the Training Programmes in Urology of Prof. Alken in Mannheim, Germany and Prof. Thüroff in Mainz, Germany.

The President thanked Donovan for her contribution.

#### **9.4 EBU Manpower Committee**

The Chairman of the EBU Manpower Committee, Kiely reported that the project 'classification of urological procedures' had been completed and would be available shortly and can be used for discussions with Health Care management, insurers, etc.

The Manpower survey would be repeated at the end of 2003 and the results were expected to be ready at the beginning of 2004. It was explained that this survey was performed in 1998 and published in the BJUI in 1999. This survey included the demography of urology within the individual countries, clinical services in terms of investigation and treatments provided. Kiely mentioned that the results of this survey allowed EBU to have a clear indication of the practice and training of urology within the different countries in Europe and allowed access to pan-European data as a reference for discussion with Health Care, education and training authorities.

Kiely stated that the survey would be repeated as the number of EBU countries had increased and also the Manpower Committee wanted to assess the changes in the urologist/population ratio, whether trends that appeared during the last survey had continued and the influence of EU regulations regarding the progressive reduction in the number of hours that urologists and trainees are allowed to work.

Kiely mentioned that the Manpower Committee had decided not to survey the availability of facilities, because it appeared from the last survey that facilities are widely available but there were changes in the practice and use of the facilities throughout the member countries and this would be concentrated on this time. Emphasis would also be put on how and by whom patients are treated in different areas.

The President thanked Kiely for the hard work done in past and present.

#### **9.5 EBU Quality of Patient Care Committee (QPC)**

It was mentioned that the Chairman of QPC, Thibault was not present at the meeting as at the moment he is the special advisor to the Ministry of Health in France and therefore was very busy. It was hoped that he would be available as of next year, otherwise another hard working person would be asked to replace him. It was stated that this committee would be very much connected with EAU as it deals with Urological guidelines.

#### **9.6 EU Liaison Officer**

The EU Liaison Officer, Schalkhäuser stated that the European Commission decided to make its own general directive of Health Care and Consumer Protection. The programme of community action in the field of public health was agreed by the European Parliament and Council on 15 May 2002. An important task of this programme would be to improve the identification of the main burdens of 5 disease determined by EU in the community and the main health determinant. In this programme not only governmental officials and

offices could be involved but also independent organisations. Therefore, Schalkhäuser sent a letter further to a meeting he had with three senior officials of the European Commission. In this letter Schalkhäuser explained the role and function of EBU, stated what EBU could do in the field of prostate cancer and requested application forms to join the new health care and consumer protection programme.

It was stressed that no other Boards under the umbrella of UEMS has connections to EU and EU had no clear view yet on what was expected from the Boards.

During the meeting of the EBU Executive Board it had been decided to await the reaction to the letter and discuss the matter again later in the Executive Board. Schalkhäuser felt this was a good chance to join the health care and consumer protection programme for which 312 million EURO was budgeted by EU.

The President encouraged delegates who had the opportunity to personally in touch with members of the European Parliament to do so.

It was furthermore stated that the original programme was available at the EBU Office for those interested.

Schalkhäuser was thanked for his contribution.

### **9.7 European School of Urology (ESU)**

Kvist Kristensen mentioned that Artibani and himself were the EBU representatives in the ESU Board. It was stated that originally ESU was responsible for the organisation of post-graduate courses but further to the strategic alliance between EAU and EBU it had been decided that pre graduate courses would also be organised by ESU. Further to this development a new programme had been set up: EUREP: European Urological Residents Education Programme. Kvist Kristensen mentioned that the former Rome course will be organised under the name AECUR (Annual European Course in Urology for Residents) and would remain a course in preparation of the EBU Examination. The aim of the AECUR was to have 500 resident to attend two 5-day courses over 2 years and spread the course more widely. The fee for the course would be EUR 500 per year and the intention was to refund the money if the candidates complete the EBU examination successfully.

The course directors will remain Chapple, Artibani and Nijman. It was felt to be important to have a continuation of the content of the original Rome course as it has always been very successful, regardless of the name of the course or the organiser.

The President thanked Kvist Kristensen for his clear presentation.

### **9.8 European Urological Scholarship Programme (EUSP)**

There was a written report of the EUSP, which is enclosed with the minutes.

### **9.9 European Society of Residents in Urology (ESRU)**

The Chairman of ESRU, Parkar stated that at present there are 24 countries represented in the ESRU Board and these representing 4500 residents in Europe.

A questionnaire about urological training was sent out to member countries and Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Norway, Turkey and the UK responded. The questionnaire will be sent out again, this time including all new countries.

The results of the questionnaire were presented and are enclosed in the report of ESRU.

It was stated that ESRU had evaluated the proposal of EUREP, which resulted in some comments:

- It was questioned whether AECUR was a good replacement of the former Rome course and thus suitable as a preparation for the EBU Examination.
- ESRU was concerned about the role of ESRU as ESRU was not involved in the scientific programme unlike the Rome course.
- Presentation of ESRU was not included in the present draft of the programme.
- The size of the workshop groups, 40-50 residents, was felt to be too large.
- As the modules are repeated throughout the course, it was doubted whether the faculty could stay motivated.

- The duration of 5 days spread over 2 weeks was felt to be an obstacle for most residents to attend.
- The fee of EUR 500 per course was thought to be too high and refund should be done right after the course.
- It was questioned whether English courses should be included in the programme, maybe this money, EUR 50,000 could be used to lower the registration fee for the course in general.

Parkar stated that in September 2001 the EAU and the ESRU had signed a strategic alliance. However, during the last Executive Committee meeting, 25 October 2002, the Secretary General of the EAU invited the ESRU to join the EAU as a Section. This proposal would be discussed during the ESRU Board meeting later that afternoon.

It was stated ESRU appreciates the close collaboration between the EBU and the ESRU and it was felt that ESRU can contribute to the work of the various EBU committees.

Parkar thanked EBU for the cooperation, as this was her last meeting as Chair of the ESRU.

The President thanked Parkar for the report and stressed the importance of the ESRU as an independent body at present and in the future. It was felt that if ESRU became a section of EAU this would mean a reduction of the role and the independency of ESRU.

Parkar added that the proposed venue for the AECUR 2003 would be evaluated by ESRU as 19 ESRU members were accommodated at this location during this weekend. The results will be sent to EBU as soon as it is finished.

Nijman stated that Chapple made a new proposal of the programme of AECUR as in his view repeating the course was not necessary and the programme should be limited to a one week programme. It was felt that the new proposal resembled the original Rome course but with the modular aspects. It was questioned whether the number of 500 participants for this course was realistic, which was doubted.

#### **10. Structure, date and venue future meetings**

It was stated that the next meeting would be held in Slovenia, Ljubljana on 16-17 May 2003.

The organisers of the Spring meeting in Romania, Bukarest in 2004 were asked to contact Peil as soon as possible with dates.

The President mentioned that further to the new structure there would only be one Plenary Session committee meetings in Spring per year as of 2003. As of 2003 in Autumn 1 day will be reserved for the meeting of the EBU Management Foundation and its committees. The first Autumn meeting in this new format will be organised in Amsterdam, 8 November 2003.

#### **11. Any other business**

It was stressed that although the United Kingdom was not represented at this meeting the delegates and BAUS were very dedicated to EBU.

The Secretary mentioned that further to new regulations of the Dutch Chamber of Commerce, all new EBU delegates have to send a signed and authorised copy of their passport to the EBU Office. It was stressed that if the correct copy was not received by the EBU Office this EBU delegate would not receive voting rights as officially he was not in the Board. Therefore, all new delegates were asked to send in the signed and authorised copy of the passport.

The President encouraged the EBU delegates to visit the EBU website: <http://www.ebu.com/>

Furthermore, the delegates were requested to send a written report in the future of the activities on a National level for the first time to be presented in Spring 2003 in Ljubljana..

It was suggested by Kvist Kristensen to involve the EBU delegates in small groups of 5 EBU delegates the afternoon preceding the Plenary Session dealing with problems/questions concerning EBU. The result of these sessions will be presented in the Plenary Session.

The President thanked those present for a fruitful meeting and the hosts for the organisation.

Enclosures:

- **President's report**
- **Secretary's report**
- **Treasurer's report**
- **Budget 2003**
- **Report EBU Accreditation Committee**
- **Report EUSP**
- **Report ESRU**

Rotterdam, December 2002

DSB

## **ACTION POINTS**

1. EBU delegates should strive the quantifiable goals set by the President

**EBU delegates**

2. Introduce the new eligibility criteria

**EBU Accreditation Committee**

3. Propose dates for the EBU Spring meeting 2003 in Bukarest

**Organisers Spring Meeting 2004**

4. Send in a signed an authorised copy of the passport

**New EBU delegates**

5. Send a written report in the future of the activities on a National level

**EBU delegates**

6. Create small groups of 5 EBU delegates the afternoon preceding the Plenary Session dealing with problems/questions concerning EBU.

**EBU delegates**

Rotterdam, November 2002