	(GROW)
From:	(ENTR)
Sent:	20 January 2014 10:06
To:	COZIGOU Gwenole (ENTR)
Cc:	(ENTR); (ENTR); (ENTR); (ENTR);
Subject:	Minutes - EFPIA meeting 15/1/14
Dear Gwen, Please find below the sum Best,	mary of our discussions with EFPIA last Wednesday.
Meeting with EFPIA repres	entatives 15/01/2014

EFPIA had requested a meeting with the EC in order to discuss proposals for an industrial policy in Europe. EFPIA mentioned that great innovation is being developed, that is not always being recognised when it comes to pricing and reimbursing medicines.

EFPIA: Richard Bergström, EC: Gwenole Cozigou,

GwC confirmed that all 6 topics highlighted by EFPIA in the document that they had circulated ahead of the meeting (Improving Health Outcomes, Reducing Inequalities, Advancing Patient Access, Fostering Growth & Stability, Regaining Leadership in Health Research, Aligning Incentives for Innovation) are on DG ENTR's agenda.

Industry needs to demonstrate that their products are not a financial burden, but contribute to save overall costs. This would help Member States to wisely plan budget savings.

EFPIA asked whether they could be involved as stakeholders in the process of the European semester. It was underlined that this is not possible, but the Commission internal consultations will be strengthened in the future, so DG ENTR would flag whether suggested measures/recommendations of European semester would be counterproductive, bearing in mind the relevant input provided by EFPIA.

The Transparency Directive was mentioned by EFPIA as very important to speed up reimbursement. DG ENTR underlined that the file is back on the Presidency agenda as the third Health priority, so it is important that national industry/economy ministers put a bit of pressure on their health counterparts in order to speed up negotiations. DG ENTR mentioned that the revision of the TD is also important for negotiations with 3rd countries, as it is difficult to impose anything outside EU if nothing can be agreed inside EU. Using TTIP as a mean of pressure for changing the EU legislation (or for the negotiations on the TD) was however considered unrealistic. From experience gathered with REACH, as soon as concrete proposals are tabled during negotiations meant at minimising costs for industry (eg, recognition of inspections), difficulties arise from US side reluctant to recognise non-US practices/standards.

EFPIA flagged the importance to keep science developments in EU, to create a virtuous circle. It was however not clear that EFPIA members are externalising their research towards emerging countries, as they mentioned that investments in emerging countries mostly concern manufacturing. DG ENTR made it clear that research aspects are well represented in the draft policy strategy.

EFPIA pleaded for being "kept safe from stupid legislation" in the years to come, and the example was provided of a consultant to DG SANCO mentioning in a study report that environmental issues created by endocrine disruptors would require that the environmental impact be considered as the 4th criterion for marketing authorization of pharmaceuticals. DG ENTR underlined that if citizens had to choose between their health and environmental problems, they would most probably be in favour of pharmaceuticals so that the likelihood of this suggestion being incorporated in EU legislation should be rather low. It was left to EFPIA to decide as to whether they want to be proactive on this issue.

EFPIA finally raised again the negative impact ERP has for the EU industry, quoting GR as an example. They also quoted the price database Euripid as a source of concern to them when it comes to price correctness, and stated that they are willing to contribute to populate this database, including financially. EFPIA is of the opinion that this would

provide DG ENTR with negotiating power for the discussions on the transparency directive. EFPIA however didn't provide a clear answer about which "public" prices would be included in the database.		