

**Meeting of Coordinating Committee**

**13th September 2017**

**2-5 pm**

**NYU School of Medicine Translational Research Building,**

**227 east 30th street NY, NY 10016**

**7th floor, room 718**

**NOTES**

Part A: Business meeting

1. **Opening**

Meeting starts 20 minutes late. Jennifer, Sven, Joan, Niamh and Paul are there.

Waiting for Jean Bernard, Richard and Emily.

Excuses from Gallus, Dag, Lidia, Toni and Pablo.

1. **Notes from previous meeting**

No issues arising

1. **NY conference**

JM reports about the organization of the conference how they managed it. She informs that around 200 participants registered from 30 different countries.

She explains that due to the grant received from NIAAA and NIDA and the registration figures the final balance should be fine. JM commits to send the list of registered participants to Inebria Secretariat as soon as she gets it.

Maristela joins.

1. **President, secretary and treasurer report**

SA summarizes briefly the main points discussed during these couple of years in the CC. He comments Inebria is turning into a formal society and points out the need to discuss whether Inebria members are prepared to engage more or if there is the need to hire someone to help us with some of the issues.

He also comments how Inebria has been expanding to new parts of the world, mainly Inebria Latina but as well India, where the thematic meeting took place and was a success even if they did not make it to come to NY. He adds that thematic meetings provide the opportunity to meet on site, but he highlights the difficulties to meet. The streaming options and videoconferences could be a solution and he points out the need to work on this.

SA reports about the introduction of the scholarship due the surplus from the Atlanta conference but he comments the need to find other ways of financing the attendance since not all conferences may have such a surplus.

He also introduces all the work done on vested interests on the pharmaceutical industry following the position statement on the alcohol industry and the collaboration with WHO in the new ICD-11 addiction criteria and the new SBI training manual for WHO Europe.

JC presents the Secretary and treasurer report. He points out the low participation in the different on-line platforms Inebria has (website, google group, mailing). MM comments the need to find out other ways to count the active members. LS commits, on behalf of the Secretariat, to explore and do a research to get to know about the members’ activity and check about their valid e-mail addresses.

LS comments that Inebria received few membership applications from India even though the success of the thematic meeting. It is commented that only Sven and Joan could travel to India from the CC and JM comments that they did not receive any abstract submission from India.

Regarding the new approvals, they agree on accepting all of them expect from Bettina since they doubt about her link with the alcohol industry. They agreed to investigate.

LS suggests to send the money that Inebria have left to Chile to support scholarships. They comment on the need to agree under which terms Inebria send the money and the purpose and to check with the local organizers if they can get the money and how they could support the attendance of professionals from LMI countries.

1. **Chile conference**

LS explains Pablo edited a flyer and it will be distributed during the conference. He will also announce it on the AGM. Regarding the coordination, LS reports she has been in regular contact with him and since he belongs to a governmental institution, the permissions are taking long but they are confident.

MM suggest promoting the Chilean conference in the welcome reception. Everybody agrees.

1. **Proposals for meetings**
   1. 2019 Yearly conference and onwards

NF explored the possibility of Scotland. She contacted with colleagues and did her best to motivate them, but they are just open to welcome it to 2020 but not for 2019. Sven will have a word with them, on behalf of Inebria, to encourage and try to convince them. NF can support it.

LS reports that no one presented a proposal and Barcelona is suggested as a safe option. Germany, Scandinavia, Colombia and Argentina are some possible options also suggested. It is agreed to appeal members on the AGM for more options.

* 1. 2018 Thematic meetings and onwards.

SA reports that there are not any on the way now. They agreed that EIBI group could organize thematic meeting and virtual ones as well.

1. **Election of office bearers in 2017**

Gallus and Sven are members of the nomination committee. SA comments that should be an external body in charge of the nomination but it has not been achieve yet. Possibility to discuss it.

SA reports that three people agreed to join the CC: Jennifer Mcneely, Dorothy Newbury and Marcin Wojnar. Marcela and Amy O’Donell are also interested in join.

Since there are 5 professionals willing to join, SA comments about the possibility to welcome all since in the statutes it is not written about a fix number of members in the CC. Need to be discussed.

1. **Affiliation with a journal**

EW reports Inebria has an affiliation and offers herself to be the liaison but not from the CC.

It is commented the need to include a direct link to the journal website on the Inebria website, information about the journal and about the advantages. They suggest sending two mailings per year on journal developments.

EW will write a small text to announce it and describing the advantages of having a liaison with the journal. She will also post it on the google group.

1. **Follow-up of the Special Interest groups**

PW explains briefly about the eBI group, how they start with it and the components. They drafted terms of reference during the last conference meeting with 30-40 interested people. There is a permanent group leading the group, they met 5 times and discussed in between times and conversations through e-mail. He explains on the scope of the group. They have done some issues like promoting the number of ebi related abstracts. JM comments that it was not easy to manage it since the workshop was not accepted. It is commented the need to have explicitly stablished some dedicated sessions without having to be reviewed by a scientific group in the future. SA comments that other workshop had the same problem. He also reports that they have done collaboratively work with Anne Berman group, developing a tool to characterization and standardization, that has gone quiet a long way. In order to rate the system of the internet application, they carried out a survey to see the engagement and interest in the topic. The results will be presented in the conference. Feed in some ideas on INEBRIA.

MM comments the need to have small spaces to discuss and find new approaches. She comments that a Pre-workshop is ok and she suggest that the CC should tell how to do it in the future not an add-on but part of the mainstream.

They discuss about the role that should be given to the group and PW asks for the need to clarify it. JM says that ebi topic is quite dominant in the whole session and SA suggests the development of thematic meetings to give space to this topic and encourage the participation at the same time.

LS suggest PW to send all documents related to SIG in order to post on the SIG area on the Inebria website. MM suggests linking it with Inebria Latina. Hugo López is suggested to lead the Spanish part.

1. **ICARA report**

Part B: Strategic discussions

1. **Report from COI Pharma industry working group**

NF explains the work done on the pharma industry and present the document theu have been working on.

RS comments to have a separate procedure from policy since it is more difficult to be discussed and changed that procedure. It is agreed to separate the two issues.

RS comments that it is strange that belonging to industry does not refrain to be members but being from pharmaceutical industry does not allow to join it.

It is agreed to include an statement to the AGM document that will be presented after the discussions in the CC.

In the AGM will be only presented the position statement on the pharmaceutical industry.

It is commented that the statement should be on posters. NF will write some notes for the notes.

1. **WHO-INEBRIA collaboration**

SA reviews what it has been done. No comments received for ICD-11 report. WHO Europe manual. Nothing heard from the field-testing.

Jennifer is leaving.

Discussion on WHO – Collaborating Center or organization with official relation with WHO. Maristela can send the guidelines on how to apply. Negotiation and decision. Focal point, agree on several activities. Need to clarify this with Vladimir.

Never have applied for this…!!!

Views for WHO