
Report of the informal working group on Activity C to survey the technologies, methodologies and “track and trace” models in place and to be developed to analyse their advantages and disadvantages and to survey the available authentication and detection technologies and methodologies and analyse their advantages and disadvantages

1. The informal working group meeting was held on 21 November 2016 in Geneva and was chaired by Mr Maximiliano Derecho (Argentina).
2. Representatives from 15 Member States and one non-State actor (United States Pharmacopeia) were present.
3. The Chair opened the informal working group meeting and welcomed all delegates.
4. The agenda which had previously been circulated to all participants by the Secretariat, was agreed by the meeting.
5. The meeting based its discussion on the document entitled, “Available authentication technologies for the prevention and detection of SSFFC medical products,” which had been prepared by Argentina and uploaded on the MedNet platform for comments. The Chair mentioned that a number of Member States and the non-State actor had commented on the first draft and that Argentina had then consolidated their comments into a second draft that would be the subject of discussion at the informal working group. The method of work was discussed and it was decided that the seven sections of the document would be considered in turn and any agreed changes to the text could be made on screen during the meeting.
6. Each section of the document was examined, with Member States suggesting amendments to some of the sections. Discussion centred on improving the language for some technical references, avoiding the recommendation of any particular technology, and the tables of advantages and disadvantages of the technologies. The discussions were conducted in a spirit of cooperation and flexibility and agreement was reached on all sections of the document. The informal working group on Activity C recommended the document for approval by the fifth meeting of the Member State Mechanism.

7. Discussions then focused on the next steps required in order to complete the remaining element of the working group's mandate, namely, the assessment of field detection technologies. In this regard, Member States stated that, several organizations, such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the United States Pharmacopeia and the Infectious Diseases Data Observatory, are currently working on assessing the available field detection technologies. The outcomes of such ongoing work could be very useful for the purposes of the working group. So, it was decided that, in order to better leverage the efforts and avoid overlap, it is advisable to wait until those studies are finished before analysing the advantages and disadvantages of available field detection technologies. Therefore, the working group decided to propose to the Steering Committee that it suspend its work for a year and ask the organizations listed above to make updated reports on the progress of their work during the next year, and especially in the plenary of the sixth meeting of the Member State mechanism, in order to decide whether if any additional work is needed or not.

8. Finally, the Chair opened the floor to representatives wishing to raise any additional issues and the Islamic Republic of Iran presented details of its national experience in applying technologies for preventing and combating SSFFC medical products.

9. The Chair will provide a verbal report to the Steering Committee and to the plenary of the fifth meeting of the Member State mechanism on the progress of work under Activity C of the prioritized workplan.

10. The meeting concluded and Argentina was thanked for its leadership in progressing this effort.

= = =