Minutes EACH: Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
9 AM to 6 PM Thursday 10 March 2016
Centro Studi Campostrini, Verona

Item	Subject
1	**Welcome and introductions, timing of AGM** **Attendees**: Denmark: Chair of pEACH: DNR: Gitte Thybo Pihl Sara Rubinelli Israel: Chair of rEACH: NR: Hadass Goldblatt Gerry Humphris Italy: Past-President: NR: Lidia Del Piccolo Myriam Deveugele DNR: Federico Fioretto President: Switzerland: Jonathan Silverman NR: Sara Rubinelli President-Elect: The Netherlands: Evelyn van Weel-Baumgarten NR: Ellen Smets Treasurer: DNR: Julia Van Weert Karolien Aelbrecht UK: PEC: DNR: Rebecca Riddell Arnstein Finset Representative of SAS: Fiona Grant **Timing of AGM:** AGM to occur at 1 PM (CET) via GoToWebinar
2	**Apologies and those attending by GoToMeeting** **GoToMeeting Attendees:** **Apologies:** **Countries not represented:** Belgium: Australia: Australia NR: Marc Van Nuland Kirsten McCaffery China Norway: Ireland: France NR: Hilde Eide NR: Veronica Lambert Germany Spain: DNR: Eva Doherty Ireland NR: Ana Carvajal Japan: Japan USA: NR: Hiroshi Miyashita Poland NR: Richard Brown Chair of tEACH: Portugal Marcy Rosenbaum AACH: Som Saha
3	**Confirm minutes of the previous meeting in London August 2015** RR reported that Lorraine Noble would like an amendment to the minutes - she requested an electronic copy of a leaflet to circulate about tEACH Otherwise the minutes were accepted
4	**Matters arising from the minutes that are not covered on this agenda** No matters arising

5	**Achievements since last meeting**
	a) Received 671 Heidelberg submissions, which is excellent and just under the 690 received for the Amsterdam conference
	b) Porto has been officially appointed for the 2018 ICCH conference
	c) rEACH has had key changes since the major discussion in the last steering committee meeting and these will be reported on later in the agenda
	d) pEACH committee is progressing very effectively, again this will be reported on later in the agenda
	e) tEACH is meeting in 3 weeks time to reinvent itself and consider it's next 5 year plan
	f) Confirmed that financial negotiations with SAS are complete and that a draft contract has been drawn up that the EACH executive are considering
	g) Confirmed that there is a new process for electing National & Deputy National Representatives and President-elect and Treasurer through the establishment of an electronic voting system. All details about the elections including the timetable can be found on the EACH website in the members area
	h) Membership numbers were the highest ever in 2015 with 494 members
	i) EACH have been working hard to increase their profile and have three examples of this:
	i. EvWB has forged a collaborative partnership between EACH and WONCA
	ii. The executive are now receiving too many invitations for EACH to attend conferences, to be discussed later in agenda
	iii. EACH are also receiving invitations to collaborate on research grants, which will be discussed in more detail later in the agenda
	j) Jozien Bensing has been awarded the first 'Special Distinction' award for her considerable work for the organisation. The three presidents and Sandra Van Dulmen will present her with a statuette on the 30th March in Nijmegen, which was crafted especially for her.
6	**Financial overview of projections for the future following renegotiations with SAS**
	The Steering Committee were invited to contribute ideas on what they would like EACH to invest money in, in the future:
	a) to help develop research database
	b) to subsidise Summer School & other young research training
	c) website development for all three committees
	d) as a grant for countries that struggle to attend events
	e) costs for pEACH to network/PR
	f) to allow EACH members to attend conferences etc that they are invited to present at
	g) to help fund tEACH's work helping national networking in various countries
	h) to set up a course in methods in communication research - this can be linked to rEACH workshops that are currently being developed & should be self funding and profit-making
	i) to aid communication in healthcare in disadvantaged and deprived communities
	ES suggested that it might make sense that the allowance for the three sub-committees is increased to allow these activities above to be achieved
	JVW asked for conference fees to be capped in order to make it affordable to more people
	JS reported that EACH offer reduced rates for undergrads and offering scholarships to attend too for 2016 and fees have remained the same as Amsterdam 2014
	Decided that it would be good to have two streams of funding - an annual allowance that can be applied for as well as a reactive allowance for any activities that come up throughout the year

	Action: FG to provide projected forecasts to help EACH decide how much they can afford to use in the current year and projections for the next year **Action: Executive to produce a plan for how this will work for the future**
7	**Report on continued negotiations with Elsevier** EACH renegotiated their contract with Elsevier in 2015 so that EACH pay a fixed amount of €12,000 to Elsevier in order for all members to receive either hardcopy of online access to PEC (dependent on their membership type). In return Elsevier pay EACH a guaranteed royalty of €15,000, giving EACH a net profit of €3,000 which is a very good deal. This was negotiated for a minimum of 250 members up to 400 members, JS negotiated an increase to 500 members in 2015 due to the increase in EACH membership numbers. Elsevier have not come back with a new proposal of what happens if EACH's membership increases beyond 500 members. JS has been advised that the overall profit that EACH receives is likely to decrease with the more members EACH has, and we are awaiting a reply from Elsevier. It was noted that it is important to EACH to continue to have a close relationship with PEC and Elsevier MVN raised the point that there would be a new sister journal to PEC and perhaps this could be used in the renegotiations AF agreed this was an interesting idea and not one that had previously been considered MD highlighted that EACH also get a large discount when submitting papers to PEC as open access as part of their negotiated benefits with Elsevier
8	**Report on membership numbers** <ol type="a"> - EACH currently have 377 members for 2016 Numbers of Australian members have increased dramatically as a result of a promotional drive there Also a large increase in Chinese members as a result of a recent recruitment drive by Angela Liu JS highlighted that all steering committee members need to help with a promotional drive for EACH in order to help try to increase numbers to the projected 650 for 2016 Confident that membership will increase in 2016 as it is a conference year GTP stated that Denmark are still having difficulty paying with a VISA card for their membership and that this is putting some people off renewing their membership **Action: SAS to investigate the Denmark problem with VISA card payments** - Discussion was invited on whether to increase membership fees for 2017 and if so by what amount FG advised that the reason EACH should increase its membership fee is in order to deliver the various activities listed in point 6 of this agenda. She advised that membership should be considered a key source of income as it is annual and consistent, rather than the conference profit which happens every two years. FF raised the issue that members need to see more benefits in order to raise fees and that at present to many benefits are available as a non-member of EACH. This will be addressed later in the agenda HG suggested that increasing membership each year was too often MD asked if members could sign up for 2 years of membership and get a discount, this was set-up in 2015 and will continue. This enables members to pay the current rate of membership for the following year. RR highlighted that some health professionals need to be members of many associations so do not want EACH to be too expensive EvWB responded to say that EACH needs to get their offer right so that EACH are the

	association that all health professionals want to join first and any extra associations are secondary
	Agreed that membership fees need to increase in order to deliver activities that EACH wish to implement Agreed that this needs to be looked at annually in order to assess if the amount will allow EACH to achieve its aims Agreed that for 2017 it would be increased by 7% to €130 - a vote was taken with a unanimous yes. **Action: executive to communicate the increase and reason why to the membership**
9	**Income from courses** **Courses provided by EACH** FG argued that EACH should set a member and non-member rate for all EACH courses in the future so that members get the benefit of lower fees. EACH takes the financial risk of these events so members should get some benefit. These courses should aim to make a small profit for EACH. Agreed that this should be implemented **Courses for external institutions** EACH are often asked to give training courses for external institutions, in the past the EACH facilitators were paid but no money came to EACH. EvWB outlined a new collaboration with WONCA which has enabled EACH to collaborate on certain training courses. WONCA use the following model: 20% of facilitator fee goes to the organisation EACH want to adopt this model in the future, the 20% is to be added on to the facilitator fee so that the facilitator does not lose out EACH will consider the percentage increase on a case by case basis so as not to miss opportunities of working in countries that cannot afford to pay a lot Agreed that this should be implemented - a vote was taken with a unanimous yes **SIG Meetings** All agreed that in order to be a member of a SIG you must be a member of EACH and therefore all SIG meetings will be member only and therefore not need a member rate. If it is necessary to have non-members attend the event and these are invited then a non-member rate will be charged. JS outlined that if EACH take on the financial risk of a SIG meeting then it is to be budgeted and organised by SAS in order to reduce the risk of the event making a loss. The budget should always have a small amount of contingency built in to help reduce the possibility of loss. The aim of these meetings should not be to make EACH a profit. Agreed that this should be implemented - a vote was taken with a unanimous yes Agreed that if the SIG is able to get a grant to cover the cost of their meeting and therefore not expecting EACH to take financial risk then this can be arranged by the SIG
10	**Organisational chart and reporting systems within EACH and with SAS** KA has created an organisational chart to help explain to members and non-members the structure of EACH Everyone agreed that this was extremely useful, some amendments were suggested to help develop this further: - Need two charts: structure and reporting - Membership need a direct line to NRs - SIGs need to be added

	• AGM needs to be added to show where this sits in relation to the Steering Committee • EACH National Networks to also be added Once complete this is to be added to the website with links to contact details **Action: KA and MD are to work together to produce a further draft of this organisational chart**
11	**a) Responding to requests for external speakers and the creation of a list of potential speakers and expertise amongst members** EACH executive receive a lot of requests to speak at external events as EACH, it is not possible for the exec to attend all requests and so it was suggested that it would be good to have a list of credible speakers from the membership who would be able to speak on behalf of EACH It was agreed that it would be useful to compile this list, but that it was important that anyone on the list must: • Be credible • Be able to represent EACH well • Have good presentation skills • Have good communication skills • Have a good command of English, or the language required to present in Various suggestions were made about how this list could be compiled: • GH suggested that the rEACH networking subgroup would be a good group to take this task on, it could be linked to the research database that they are developing • MVN stated that tEACH also have a networking subgroup that would also be good to help on this and that perhaps the three subcommittee groups need to work on this together • JS would like to open this call up to the whole membership to allow them to be on the list, but emphasised the need for the importance of screening • SR suggested that nominees should provide publication references needed in order to help prove expertise **Action: Executive to decide how to progress this** **b) Responding to requests for participation in EU projects** EACH were recently asked to be a partner in an EU project. There is a financial commitment to being a partner in an EU project where you need to be able to co-finance the project (25%). Whilst this is possible for institutions and universities to do as they have salaried staff, it is not possible for EACH as EACH have no paid employees. This is frustrating for EACH as there are a huge amount of resources that would be available through EU projects and where EACH could contribute. It might however be possible for EACH to be an adviser or supporter or collaborator on a project instead which would not involve financial commitment. GH stated that it would be good to look into other ways EACH can draw money from an EU budget, and that EACH should look beyond Horizon 2020 projects. For example, EACH could provide letters of endorsement for bids FF highlighted that for EU bids the dissemination of information is very important too and EACH can play an important role here AF & SR agreed that it is most realistic for EACH to have a less formal role in EU bids, but can help promote collaboration between networks or as a consulting role particularly in dissemination and can look in to achieving this through white papers **Action: rEACH to investigate how EACH can have a more informal role in EU bids** **Action: Executive to produce a policy document on this to put on the website**
12	**New Contract with SAS** The new financial arrangement with SAS was agreed at the special Steering Committee meeting in

	January A draft contract has been drawn up by SAS which, as agreed, establishes that the contract will be for 5 years with annual reviews to check workload SAS will bill for additional tasks on a quarterly basis SAS fee is fixed with an annual increase in line with inflation, subject to annual review Steering Committee agreed that the executive could finalise the draft contract on the Steering Committee's behalf. The contract has been sent to EACH'S lawyer for comment.
13	**Progress with 2016 elections for national representatives and President-elect / treasurer** NR are able to hold their position for up to 6 years. This means that there are three NRs that must stand down in 2016: Lidia Del Piccolo, Italian NR; Jette Ammentorp, Danish NR; Ana Carvajal, Spanish NR Myriam Deveugele will also step down as Past-President at the Heidelberg Conference An enormous thank you to all four was expressed at the meeting for all their work and efforts The election process will now occur electronically All information about the election process including timeline and criteria can be found on the EACH website under the members area Call for nominations will open for all positions on 25th April
14	**Revisit decision about which documentation goes into the protected website for members, such as Verona codes manual** EACH agreed in the past that in general, materials would be open access on their website, with each subcommittee making a final decision. However, there is a counter argument to this, that it would be good to provide some materials as a benefit to being a member All tEACH materials are currently open access with the exception of assessment tools for which we do not have author permission to share publicly. VR-Codes manual is also open access, and if this were to change it would need agreement from the group, so GH and LDP will take this to the Verona Workshop over the following two days FG reported that at present 124 people have downloaded VR-Codes manual and only 19 of these are members. There is a charge to EACH (in order to log names of who is downloading) every time someone downloads the manual so if one person logs on to do this multiple times EACH get charged £4.20 every time. Suggested that a good compromise would be for tEACH and rEACH material to be visible to everyone for free, but that non-members would have to pay a small fee to download the material **Action: FG to investigate if this is possible and what the minimum administrative cost of this would be** **Action: SAS to provide figures of how many people are looking at resources on EACH website**
15	**Report on next EACH conference in Heidelberg, Germany 2016** There was a planning meeting last week and the conference is progressing extremely well

16	**Report on progress for Porto 2018**
	    a) Dates for the conference are proposed to be from the 2nd - 5th September 2018 with pre-conference workshops occurring on the 1st & 2nd September and the Steering Committee on the 5th & 6th September 2016.
	        This is to avoid AMEE conference (which has proposed dates of 25th - 29th August), Fresher's Week at Porto University (starts on 10th September), Rosh Hashanah (10th - 11th September)
	    b) A brief outline of the venue was presented by FG, together with a draft budget to show that EACH should be able to comfortably make their target of a €60,000 profit

		EACH will take on the financial risk of the Porto 2018 conference, SAS will charge a management fee to organise the conference, and EACH will take the entire profit An outline of a conference dinner was suggested to include a cruise of the river Duoro and dinner at one of Porto's wine cellars for approx €75 per person. JS stated that it would be good to keep dinner costs to a minimum in order to make this accessible to as many people as possible It was also raised that the cost of the conference should be kept as low as possible, and if possible the ticket price should not be increased from Heidelberg. It was however confirmed that the conference ticket price has remained the same since Amsterdam Every effort will be made when budgeting for the event to keep the ticket cost as low as possible, without adding any risk to EACH's finances **Action: FG will send JS draft conference budget for consideration** **Action: FG will look in to including cost of dinner into the conference budget so one ticket price would cover the entire event**

17		**Summer Event 2017**
		  a) 2015 feedback
		    Excellent feedback on venue & event so decided to go back to Regent's University in London for 2017 event. Returning to the same venue considerably cuts down on administrative time and costs as new venue research is not required. Feedback from participants was that the event needs to have a formal opening and closing plenary session, a separate poster session and a social event in the evening. Every effort will be made to incorporate these points in the next event.
		  b) Location & dates
		    To be held at Regent's University, London. Proposed dates are for the 4th - 6th September 2017, dependent on venue availability
		  c) Structure and content
		    Agreed that this time the event would consist of workshops from all three sub-committees - pEACH, rEACH & tEACH
		  d) Planning committee
		    Need to appoint a planning committee for this event, which need to also be the scientific committee as they will be reviewing the workshop applications
		    Decided that the committee should be made up of:
		      i. Sub-committee chairs - pEACH, rEACH & tEACH
		      ii. President - JS
		      iii. A member from each sub-committee
		      iv. An early career member
		    The committee needs to be set up by July
		  e) Finances
		    This sort of event is expensive to run due to the high ratio of facilitators to participants, however this is required in order to achieve the high-quality workshops and outputs that are desired
		    Agreed that there would be an open call for some of the workshops in order to try to reduce the amount of renumeration for facilitators. The call for workshops will be in October. Possible ratio of 8 open call workshops to 4 commissioned. Also suggested that it may not be necessary for facilitators all to repeat their workshops twice
		    The planning committee must consider what they should offer facilitators in way of remuneration for their efforts; suggested free entrance to the whole event.
		  f) Summer School

	Feedback from Summer School participants in 2015 was a preference to have the Summer Event sandwiched between the Summer School. The planning committee need to look at how feasible this is. There will be no grant for the Summer School this year from rEACH. **Action: Executive to set up planning committee**
18	**Proposal that anyone involved in EACH groups to be a member of EACH including all committees, all SIGs, EACH country networks et cetera** Discussed under agenda item 9. Proposed that if someone is a member of a SIG then they must be a member of EACH. Members of specific EACH country networks must also be a member of EACH. It was acknowledged that country networks are a bit trickier to police as some networks are not solely EACH based. Agreed that all networks with EACH in the name must only be open to EACH members. **Action: Executive to produce a policy document to outline this**

19	**Progress with group membership for**
	    a) The National Cancer Facilitators UK has failed to materialise as an organisation at present and therefore aren't able to join EACH as a network at this moment in time
	    b) CB reported in AGM that the Simulated Patient network are now a SIG of tEACH and are looking at how to progress this

20	**Institutional membership progress** KA researched institutional membership packages offered by other organisations, what they charge and what benefits they offer. It was decided that at this point there is little demand for this in EACH, and it would potentially cost EACH members and the current goal is to increase membership numbers. So this is not being pursued further at present

21	**Methods of talking to the membership**
	    a) Newsletters get sent out regularly and will continue
	    b) PEC pages were reported on at the AGM by AF. EACH provides content pages every two months. AF commented that he is very happy with this process and thinks that the EACH pages make good reading in PEC and he is keen to keep this going. With regards to Editors choice, AF asked for input on what EACH would like to see and how this could be a way of communicating specifically with EACH members and perhaps create an interactive element on the EACH website for this. Steering Committee reported that they were happy with AF to choose papers for them as he has a wide sense of what is published
	    c) Want a mechanism for improving EACH's profile on social media. Need to think about what EACH want to tweet about, and which other social media outlets would be good to use. Decided it would be good to ask younger members to take a lead on this and for pEACH, rEACH and tEACH network groups to take a lead on this.
	    d) Twitter/social media: we need to reach out to the membership to help us with using social media in general
	Action: Executive to explore how to involve membership in helping us utilise social media

22	**Discussion of relationship between EACH and AACH and agreements so far** Reported on in AGM JS will take on the role on the AACH board in the Autumn when he becomes EACH's past president EACH and AACH both have agreed not to have joint membership as it is not financially feasible JS had an informal meeting with the new President of AACH, Auguste Fortin to discuss the delicate issue of EACH's name. EACH is no longer simply a European association as EACH has considerable number of members from outside Europe, members of the Steering Committee from outside

Europe and now allow their president to be from outside Europe

This creates problem with the name - European Association for Communication in Healthcare

It also makes it difficult to recruit members from outside of Europe as it gives a confusing message as to what EACH is about. It was noted that if no other organisations existed it would be a logical step for EACH to change its name to be International or Worldwide, but EACH recognises that this is politically sensitive when considering EACH's relationship with AACH. EACH nor AACH could consider creating a world umbrella organisation but are both concerned that this might just create another layer of administration with no benefits

AF clarified that neither EACH or AACH are looking to merge together, but do need to look at how to take things forward to accurately show that EACH is a worldwide association

RR stated that it is important for EACH to keep its brand and the same letters, but that strategically it needs to become international in order to grow

JS highlighted some difficulties associated with this, namely that the EACH conference could then be held anywhere in the world and not confined to Europe

Agreed that there is an inextricable movement for EACH to change its name. In discussion with Auguste Fortin, Jonathan and Auguste agreed that these discussions should be openly discussed with AACH as they proceed. A name change needs considerably more thought and it is to be brought back to the next Steering Committee meeting after the executive has worked this through further

23	**Report on progress of the donation fund to support grants for participants from low income countries or students**
	There is approximately €1,700 within the donation fund which will be used for Heidelberg conference to help students who are presenting to attend. the voluntary donation website page also states that the fund can be used for those from less-developed countries, countries in financial difficulties as well as students., but this was hard to set a criteria for. Need to think about this moving forward.
24	a) **Jozien Bensing award**
	Awarded every two years at EACH conference
	Planning committee is chaired by AF and consists of past-presidents & previous winners
	This will go ahead for 2016 and future years: this is the final year that has the €2,000 allocation from the Jozien Bensing fund
	AF asked Steering Committee to help think about who would be suitable to be proposed for this award to ensure a higher number of nominations
	This will be advertised widely in rEACH too
	AF highlighted that need to re-look at who makes up the planning committee for this award as it grows by 2 members every 2 years
	b) **progress in establishment of new teaching award**
	A planning committee has been established for this with Wolf Langewitz chairing.
	Decided that this award is designed for people who have made a significant impact on teaching
	There is no prize for this award at present, in future it is thought this would probably simply be a free invitation to attend the conference. It was felt that the honour of receiving an award was more important than any financial prize
	MD suggested the same should be offered for the research award once the Jozien Bensing money runs out

25	**Steering committee national representative responsibilities and reports**
	A reminder to all National Representatives that they must write an annual report of their activities. In order to re-stand in the next elections this report must be submitted with their nomination.
	RR - suggested it would be helpful to have a deadline for producing the report
	The deadline for 2016 will be the election nomination process as a report will need to be submitted if a NR wishes to re-stand for election
26	**tEACH**
	Report from Cadja Bachmann
	tEACH have bi-annual meetings, the 2015 meetings were in Lisbon and Krakow. 8 new members were recruited in Krakow.
	The next meeting will be in April in Cambridge and the purpose of this is to re-structure tEACH and set new project groups are next 5 years. The second tEACH meeting in 2016 will be at the Heidelberg conference.
	Two highlights from tEACH's activities in 2015:
	i. Established a database with over 100 tools. This is all on the EACH website as open access, with the exception of the assessment database which is in the members' area of the website.
	ii. Held a large symposium for more than 100 teachers in Poland including deans of medical schools, which aimed to provide a good network across the nation
	Heidelberg conference representation:
	tEACH will have a symposium, orals, posters and pre-conference workshops and will have a student symposium delivered by students. Marcy Rosenbaum is responsible for the pairing programme at the conference.
	Future activities:
	i. tEACH members have been invited to participate in a round table at a conference of Well Being in Greece
	ii. Collecting information from different countries on what people's needs are from tEACH, what do they want tEACH to provide and this will be discussed in detail at the next tEACH meeting in Cambridge
	iii. Simulated Patient SIG has been formed of 6 members from 6 countries, they are looking at how they can attract more simulated patients to join EACH
	AF asked if tEACH was now open to all members
	JS clarified that a call went out to members recently about this and that tEACH have selected more members from this based on expertise; further calls will be made in the future
27	**rEACH**
	Report from Gerry Humphris
	A lot has happened since the last AGM, rEACH has entirely restructured itself. An open meeting was held in Ghent in December which was attended by 37 people. The meeting generated around 80 action points which were grouped into 7 sub-groups and include topics such as funding, training, and networking. The full list will be placed on the EACH website. Some highlights were shared with the group:
	i. Sharing Information sub-group are progressing the research database and hope to have a beta version to present at the Heidelberg conference for participants to give feedback on
	ii. Network and Connection sub-group which is working on a survey which will be sent

	out in August looking for people's opinions on networking preferences
	iii. Two new SIGs - oral healthcare communication & language and culture
	iv. Creating a series of new policy documents to help run the rEACH committee including how to construct a new SIG and criteria for the Chair and Co-Chair
	v. a new EU proposal which will be sent off in April
	vi. The Verona Workshop will be held over the next two days
	vii. Heidelberg conference representation - rEACH will be holding a symposium and 4 pre-conference workshops
	Gerry wanted to express his thanks for the fantastic support from the EACH membership
	Meeting in Ghent has completely re-energised this committee with lots of ideas and a 35 members to help push things forward
	GH thanked Myriam for all her help as wouldn't have been possible without her
	JS asked if rEACH courses could be developed to be run for a fee and provide a small income stream for EACH, asked this to be high on the agenda for rEACH
	RR asked if members could be alerted when new material was added to the EACH website. GH suggested this could be added to the newsletters or via Twitter
28	**pEACH**
	Sara Rubinelli outlined that the purpose of pEACH is to increase networking and improve the profile of EACH. pEACH are working on a set of projects:
	i. Education - to create tailored content in knowledge translation and policy making in health communication. This will be presented in a symposium at Heidelberg
	ii. Evidence in health communication - to create summaries of main findings on specific topics. pEACH want experts to help contribute what their main areas of evidence are to help take this forward. Their medium term goal is to guide the production of white papers that present the main evidence and can be used to inform policy making
	iii. Patient representation - there will be a meeting in Ghent in April where Anouk Knopf has been invited to help contribute to this
	iv. Communication with immigrants - to collect evidence on what promotes effective communication with immigrants and how to implement this evidence
	v. Responding to policy submission calls - pEACH want to contribute to policy documents, so this group will monitor what is there and see how pEACH can influence the content.
	vi. Networking - to identify, connect and collaborate with the main relevant stakeholders in the field
29	**Information about PEC**
	Reported on in AGM
	AF asked for more interaction between EACH and PEC and wants EACH to have a role in helping PEC commission papers
	EvWB suggested all three sub-committees should be involved in this
	Action: a meeting with the three sub-committee chairs and AF to take this forward
	The committee wished to thank Arnstein Finset for his fantastic input
30	**Next steering group meeting**
	The next meeting will be in Heidelberg at the end of the conference from Saturday 10th September at 4 PM, restarting on Sunday 11th September from 9 AM - 12PM

	This meeting will be for the newly elected Steering Committee, so a huge thank you was extended to the existing Steering Committee for all their hard work.
31	**AOB** There was no other business
32	Grateful thanks were expressed to Lidia Del Piccolo, Italian National Representative, for organising our excellent meeting space and catering