



ECDC Management Board

# Minutes of the Thirty-fourth Meeting Stockholm, 16-17 June 2015

*Adopted by the Management Board at its Thirty-fourth meeting, 25-26 November 2015*

## Contents

Summary of Proceedings – ECDC Management Board Meeting.....	i
Opening and welcome from the Chair (and noting the Representatives).....	1
Welcome from the Acting Director, ECDC .....	1
Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) ( <i>Document MB34/01 Rev.1</i> ) .....	1
Adoption of the draft minutes of the 33 <sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Management Board, including the minutes of the Third Extraordinary Management Board meeting (Stockholm, 24-25 March 2015 and 26 March, respectively) ( <i>Documents MB34/02 and MB34/03</i> ).....	1
Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (24-25 March 2015) ( <i>Document MB34/04</i> ) .....	2
Update from the European Commission: Migration in an enlarged EU .....	2
Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2015 up until present ( <i>Document MB34/05</i> ).....	3
Request for approval of continuation of Ebola mission in Guinea beyond June 2015 ( <i>Document MB34/06 Rev.1</i> ).....	3
ECDC Work Programme 2016 ( <i>Document MB34/07 Rev.1</i> ).....	5
Second Independent External Evaluation: Conclusions and recommendations of the ECDC Management Board External Evaluation Drafting Group ( <i>Document MB34/08</i> ).....	5
Summary of discussions held at the 29 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (15 June) including its recommendations: .....	6
a) Final Annual Accounts 2014, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management ( <i>Document MB34/09</i> ) .....	6
b) ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy ( <i>Document MB34/10</i> ) .....	6
c) Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2015 ( <i>Document MB34/11</i> ) .....	7
ECDC Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan 2016-2018 ( <i>Document MB34/12</i> ).....	7
Policy on data submission, access, and use of data within TESSy – 2015 revision ( <i>Document MB34/13</i> ) .....	8
Update from ECDC Compliance Officer .....	9
a) Revised Independence Policy ( <i>Document MB34/14</i> ) .....	9
b) Mitigation measures taken for the Management Board and the Advisory Forum .....	10
ECDC MB meeting dates 2016 and 2017 ( <i>Document MB34/15</i> ) .....	11
Opening and welcome by the Chair.....	11
Update from the EU Presidencies .....	12
a) Update from Latvia.....	12
b) Update from Luxembourg .....	12
ECDC Public Health Training Strategy ( <i>Document MB34/16</i> ).....	12
Final Report of ECDC Stakeholder Survey ( <i>Document MB34/17</i> ) .....	13
Update on ECDC Building Project .....	14
Update from the European Commission.....	14
a) Joint Procurement Agreement: status report .....	14
b) Development of Country Health Profiles.....	15

c)    Ebola Lessons Learned Conference, 12-14 October 2015 in Luxembourg .....	15
Any other business.....	16
Annex: List of Participants .....	17



## Summary of Proceedings – ECDC Management Board Meeting

The Thirty-fourth meeting of the ECDC Management Board (MB) convened in Stockholm, Sweden, on 16-17 June 2015. During the meeting, the Management Board:

- ❖ adopted the programme;
- ❖ adopted the minutes of the Thirty-third meeting and the minutes of the Third Extraordinary meeting of the Management Board;
- ❖ took note of the update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting;
- ❖ took note of the update from the Commission on migration;
- ❖ unanimously approved the Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2015 up until present;
- ❖ requested information on the percentage of postponed activities due to the Ebola crisis against the overall workload of the Centre;
- ❖ unanimously approved the continuation of the ECDC's mission to Guinea;
- ❖ adopted the ECDC Work Programme 2016;
- ❖ approved the conclusions and recommendations of the ECDC Management Board External Evaluation Drafting Group on the Second Independent External Evaluation of the Centre;
- ❖ expressed their gratitude towards the Drafting Group members for their substantial work and dedication;
- ❖ agreed that the Management Board would need an action plan in order to follow up on the implementation process;
- ❖ approved the Final Annual Accounts 2014, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management;
- ❖ adopted the ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy, while keeping in mind the comments made by the ECDC Audit Committee;
- ❖ took note of the Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2015;
- ❖ approved the ECDC Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan 2016-2018;
- ❖ agreed that the policy on data submission, access, and use of data within TESSy should be looked at by the Advisory Forum and amended to take into account the Board's comments, and be resubmitted for the next meeting in November;
- ❖ agreed that ECDC shall revisit the ECDC Independence Policy document and report back to the next MB meeting;
- ❖ agreed to revisit the matter of mitigation measures taken for the Management Board and Advisory Forum in November in order to reach to a common understanding on the procedures;
- ❖ requested to revise the meeting dates for 2016 March meeting;
- ❖ agreed to adopt the meeting dates for 2016 and 2017 via Written Procedure;
- ❖ took note of the presentations from the Latvian and Luxembourgish EU Presidencies;
- ❖ endorsed the ECDC Public Health Training Strategy;
- ❖ took note of the Final Report of the ECDC Stakeholder Survey and agreed that the action plan should avoid duplication with the External Evaluation action plan;
- ❖ took note of the latest status of the ECDC Building Project;
- ❖ agreed to re-establish the ECDC Management Board Working Group on Building Project and discuss the composition of same during the November meeting;
- ❖ took note of the update from the European Commission.



## Opening and welcome from the Chair (and noting the Representatives)

1. Françoise Weber, Chair of the ECDC Management Board (MB), welcomed all the participants to the Thirty-fourth meeting of the Management Board. A special welcome was extended to Loïc Ledent, newly appointed Alternate, Belgium and Martina Brix, representing Austria. Apologies had been received from Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Spain and the European Commission Directorate General for Research and Innovation. Considering the number of attending delegates, the quorum was checked and existing proxies were noted as follows: Cyprus – proxy given to Slovak Republic, Estonia – proxy to Latvia, Poland – proxy to Jacques Scheres, Member, European Parliament, Greece – proxy to Belgium and Directorate General for Research and Innovation – proxy given to Martin Seychell, Member, European Commission, DG SANTÉ. No other proxies were announced.

## Welcome from the Acting Director, ECDC

2. The Chair highlighted that the ECDC Management Board gratefully appreciates that Dr Andrea Ammon was willing to step into the role of Acting Director, following the results of the election in March. Andrea Ammon, Acting Director, ECDC, welcomed the MB delegates and noted that she was looking forward to fruitful and productive discussions during the meeting. She also thanked the Board for their support and assured them that during the acting period, ECDC will carry out its business as usual. The Acting Head of Resource Management and Coordination Unit Jean-Claude Brival, was introduced to the Board. The Board was also informed that for the Procurement Section, the Centre will be receiving a Seconded Expert from the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA).

## Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (*Document MB34/01 Rev.1*)\*

3. Prior to adopting the programme, the Chair asked each member whether s/he wished to add any oral declaration(s) of interest to her/his existing Annual Declaration of Interest (DoI) submitted previously. None were declared.

4. In reference to the meeting programme, the MB Alternate for France requested to allocate some time to discuss the Second Joint Strategy Meeting, scheduled to take place in September.

The Management Board adopted the draft programme.

## Adoption of the draft minutes of the 33<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Management Board, including the minutes of the Third Extraordinary Management Board meeting (Stockholm, 24-25 March 2015 and 26 March, respectively) (*Documents MB34/02 and MB34/03*)\*

The Management Board adopted the minutes of the Thirty-third meeting and the minutes of the Third Extraordinary meeting of the Management Board.

---

\* Item for decision.

\* Item for decision.

## Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (24-25 March 2015) (*Document MB34/04*)\*

5. Andrea Ammon, ECDC Acting Director, provided the Board with an update on the main activities since the last meeting, including the follow up of the decisions made in March.<sup>1</sup> The presentation also highlighted the main visits and meetings, such as the ECDC Ten Year Anniversary Event with all staff on 20 May. The Board was also informed of the rapid risk assessments published since the last meeting, including the most recent outbreak of MERS-CoV in South Korea.

6. In reference to the presentation, the European Commission representative recalled the letter of Commissioner Vytenis Andriukaitis, and it was noted that the Commission is working on an analysis at Member State level regarding health threats and communication in order to identify possible gaps. Additionally, in reference to hepatitis, tuberculosis and HIV, it is envisioned to link the three diseases in order to have a common approach.

7. In reference to the recent diphtheria case in Spain, it was questioned what ECDC had done in this case and the Board was informed that the Centre had taken the opportunity to issue a reminder on the risks of low vaccination coverage. The issue of growing pockets of unvaccinated populations, as well as limited access to antitoxins, are also being discussed with the ECDC Advisory Forum.

The Management Board took note of the update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting.

## Update from the European Commission: Migration in an enlarged EU \*

8. Martin Seychell, MB Member, DG SANTĒ, European Commission, provided an update on the topic of migration in an enlarged European Union, highlighting the health aspects migration encompasses, even if minor in the overall picture.<sup>2</sup> There are short-term needs, such as immediate health care, and long-term needs, such as the need for health care systems in general. There is a growing need for more trained health care workers, including advice. On a political level, migration is a complex network issue and coordination of activities and information is very important. On the EU level, the issue of migration has been on the agenda for quite some time, including many high-level meetings held in the context of EU Presidencies. As a result, a new European Agenda exists on Migration, adopted on 13 May, which includes four main pillars: i) reducing irregular migration, ii) saving lives and securing borders, iii) having in place strong asylum policies and iv) having a stronger policy on legal migration. The new European Agenda on Migration also proposes EU tools and instruments that can aid Member States in preventing human tragedies and reinforcing mechanisms to deal with emergencies: 1) an increase by €57 million for 2015 of the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF); and 2) an increase by €5 million to the Internal Security Fund (ISF) to cover emergency assistance for the surveillance activities carried out in the context of FRONTEX operations Triton and Poseidon (such as first medical aid, identification of migrants). Countries may also request assistance as appropriate via the Union Civil Protection Mechanism, e.g. for mobilisation of health experts. Overall, it is clear that the most urgently needed response is immediate general medical attention/health care. The migrants who manage to survive the voyage from Africa to Europe are usually in good health, most of them are also young. General health issues are dehydration, exhaustion as well as psychological issues. The matter of communicable diseases comes up in media, however, this should not be over exaggerated and any support offered by the EU should thus have a holistic approach. ECDC should be ready to step in when needed, either on the field or via risk assessments. The Commission also praised the Centre for its activities on migrant health, especially the study on migrant health, which is included in the Work Programme for 2016.

9. The function of the Union Civil Protection Mechanism was questioned and it was further clarified that this co-funding mechanism can be used for transportation, such as sending medical experts to a field, i.e. Member States can request for help and logistical support and can thereafter be

---

\* Item for information.

<sup>1</sup> Update on ECDC activities (A Ammon)

\* Item for information.

<sup>2</sup> Update from EC - Migration in enlarged EU (M Seychell)

assured. It was also noted that many of the mechanisms discussed have been in existence for a longer time, however, they have not been used for such instances before.

10. It was questioned whether the European Commission and the Health Security Committee (HSC) possess an assessment of the situation in the most affected areas, especially on communicable diseases, in order to see where there are major gaps. In response, it was commented that there are more resources needed at the point of entry, more experts in place, also noted that the migrant flows can change quickly and dramatically.

11. The complexity of migration was further discussed, and it was pointed out that as Europe has had to move from providing humanitarian aid on a national level to offering aid at the European level, under common laws, it would bode well to reflect on how countries are organised on a national and European level. It is not just humanitarian aid that needs to be provided, but rather long-term care, also taking into consideration the cultural diversities, etc. A comparison of temporary emergencies was made, such as tornados or earth quakes, which also require aid, however, they are limited in time, as opposed to the issue of migration, which will most likely not slow down. Thus one of the main challenges is to learn how to adapt quickly, continue accordingly and keep the funds available. The overall EU coordination is of paramount importance in order to be successful.

The Management Board took note of the update from the Commission.

## **Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2015 up until present (Document MB34/05)\***

12. Philippe Harant, Head of Section, Quality Management, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented an update on the implementation of the ECDC Work Programme 2015 up until present.

13. The Board requested receiving details on what percentage of the postponed activities amount to, considering the Ebola crisis, as it is currently difficult to compare this against the total workload of the Centre. The ECDC agreed to look into this matter and provide the requested information.

The Management Board unanimously approved the Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2015 up until present.

ECDC agreed to provide information on the percentage of postponed activities due to the Ebola crisis against the overall workload of the Centre.

## **Request for approval of continuation of Ebola mission in Guinea beyond June 2015 (Document MB34/06 Rev.1)\***

14. Denis Coulombier, Head of Unit, Surveillance and Response Support, ECDC, presented an update on the Centre's mission to Guinea related to the Ebola outbreak, including the request to continue the mission beyond June 2015.<sup>3</sup> The outbreak of MERS-CoV was highlighted as this may have an impact on the resource distribution for the response for Ebola.

15. Clarification was sought on how the roles of ECDC staff in the field are identified, e.g. risk assessment, advice, risk management, etc. Further on the experts in the field, the status of so-called Member States' experts was queried, including how they are covered financially. In reference to the costs table, it was queried whether the costs indicated cover only ECDC staff or all people involved. It was also highlighted that the role of the Centre in such cases as the Ebola outbreak in West Africa should be clarified, including the status, roles and responsibilities of the EPIET fellows, i.e. the overall added value. The Board also asked how ECDC is coordinating the work with WHO and how the Centre foresees the future of these kinds of missions. Further to collaboration, it was asked how the coordination is organised between Guinea and Sierra Leone. Considering that the epidemic has not yet ended, the strategic work was questioned in terms of what needs to be carried out in order to reach zero cases. There was also an interest on the number of staff members who have been in the field in

\* Item for decision.

\* Item for decision.

<sup>3</sup> Support to WHO for Ebola in Guinea (D Coulombier)

total and considering that, it was also questioned how the selection of volunteers had been conducted, i.e. whether the professional development of staff members was taken into consideration or the selection was only made on first-come-first-serve basis.

16. Overall, the Board members strongly supported ECDC's mission to Guinea, including the continuation of same. The health systems in the affected areas are not ready in case something like this should happen again and thus ECDC and European Commission should continue to invest in this effort until it is brought to an end. Considering the work already done, it is also useful to analyse lessons learned including the added value of the Centre's work in such situations. This would also clarify the role of ECDC in similar situations in the future. It was recommended to ensure that the lessons learned exercise could be carried out sooner rather than later.

17. In response, ECDC made reference to the Founding Regulation noting the technical support and confirming that this is what the Centre is offering. Input from the people in the field has been invaluable for the risk assessments. Considering WHO, the Centre has been mobilising staff and offering a service to facilitate the mobilisation from Member States for those not using the GOARN mechanism. Thus there is collaboration between the two organisations and no duplication of activities. The teams are sent to West Africa in pairs, which has proven to be extremely useful, also from a security point of view. This has also enabled the dispatch of more junior people with more senior experts for the purpose of personal and professional development. There are weekly teleconferences with the people on the field where the priorities and pairing of experts are discussed prior to any actions. The location and assignment are also agreed in advance. Coordination across borders remains an issue due to the political situation and the strong sense of mistrust. However, the countries are arranging campaigns in order to coordinate between themselves. Even though the approach used by the two countries is not the same, they have regular contact with WHO in an attempt to coordinate actions in each country, which is improving over time. Considering evaluation and lessons learned, the Board was informed that as the evaluation function is built into the PHE plan, the Centre has already conducted an evaluation, with conclusions drawn from this exercise. The deployments have been determined, including their added value, and it is hoped that this would feed into the requests from the European Commission.

18. Regarding the people deployed, it was pointed out that it might be a useful idea to obtain rapid feedback from these people once they arrive, as this would feed well into the overall understanding of what really happens in the field, which could also serve as a motivation to other experts. It was noted that this comment had already previously been submitted to ECDC and it was confirmed that the Centre has agreed to this idea.

19. The coordination and role of ECDC in mobilising Member States' experts was deemed unclear and it was clarified that the Centre has conducted two types of calls: firstly, ECDC contacted all the main stakeholders and issued a call for French-speaking experts and facilitated their mobilisation via WHO thereafter. In parallel, a second and more open call was issued aimed at expertise. ECDC does not know exactly how many of such experts were provided by Member States and how many were individual spontaneous applicants. NGOs and experts alike applied. Thereafter, ECDC reviewed their CVs and forwarded the information to WHO, the latter of which made the decision. It was highlighted that ECDC is not coordinating the work on the field, but providing information and support as needed to WHO.

The Management Board unanimously approved the continuation of the ECDC's mission to Guinea.

20. In connection with the MERS-CoV outbreak, the representative of the Slovak Republic informed the Board that there is a suspected case in the country, a person from South Korea, was admitted to the hospital with respiratory symptoms. The patient remained separated and an analysis is being conducted. EWRS was informed and samples of the test were sent to a laboratory in Prague. Following the investigation in Prague, all samples were ruled negative. However, the patient's health is still under constant monitoring. It was noted that the Slovak Republic has multiple automobile companies with employees from South Korea, and it was thereby decided to place some information leaflets in relevant languages in the respective airports and factories.

## ECDC Work Programme 2016 (*Document MB34/07 Rev.1*)\*

21. ECDC Acting Director, Andrea Ammon, presented the ECDC Work Programme for 2016.<sup>4</sup>

22. Overall, the Board was very pleased with the structure of the document. It was highlighted that it is in line with the applied regulations and requirements, offering a more concise, concrete view on planning and related costs. The Acting Director noted that from 2016, the Centre will follow a different structure, which is the single planning document for all EU Agencies.

23. Considering the content, the postponement of a conference on vaccination that had already been postponed since 2014 was questioned. ECDC responded that this will be verified further. It was also noted that the role, mission and added value of ECDC in connection with molecular surveillance needs to be reflected upon. It was clarified that in general, if the MB expresses an interest to discuss the fundamental issue of microbiology, the mandate of the Centre needs to be revisited. For the time being, all items related to microbiology laboratories and surveillance are in line with the Founding Regulation. Regarding Lyme disease, which was noted to have been purposely omitted from the Work Programme, the ECDC clarified that it is included in the document under various chapters. In relation to the breakdown between operational and management staff, it was pointed out that a discussion is welcome on how to allocate more staff from management to support the operational tasks, also considering the future shift in all Agencies in this direction. It was also requested to hear more information on the follow up regarding immunisation and the related ECDC Management Board Working Group on New Business Models and Financing of Large-scale EU Level Activities. On the latter, the ECDC informed that the Centre has been working together with EMA and the final report from the Working Group shall be submitted to the European Commission in the coming weeks. The representative of the Commission added that the Commissioner emphasised the issue in his letter to the Health Ministers and DG SANTÉ is working on an initiative that will take into account the various aspects of vaccination.

The Management Board unanimously adopted the ECDC Work Programme for 2016.

## Second Independent External Evaluation: Conclusions and recommendations of the ECDC Management Board External Evaluation Drafting Group (*Document MB34/08*)\*

24. Daniel Reynders, Chair, External Evaluation Drafting Group and Member, Belgium, presented the conclusions and recommendations of the Drafting Group on the Second Independent External Evaluation of the Centre. The Chair of the Working Group extended a special thanks of appreciation to all the members of the Drafting Group for their substantial efforts and commitment. The Board was reminded that the process was initiated in 2011, following multiple meetings. The usual period of the evaluation was exceeded due to cancellation of the first contract. It was difficult to find common recommendations as one of the conclusions of the external evaluation is that all the Member States have divergent views and ideas. Nevertheless, it was concluded that the evaluation was successful and the report was good. The Drafting Group based its work on the recommendations made by the evaluators while drafting the comments and recommendations of the Board. The evaluation report was examined from the perspective of where the recommendations emanated from, including their rationale.

25. The ECDC wished to clarify the implementation process for the recommendations, including the timeline and it was cleared that the adopted recommendations should first be submitted to the Parliament and the Council and it is the role of the Board to discuss with ECDC how to implement the various recommendations and to assist the Centre. Further on the distribution of the recommendations, it was noted that the MB should issue to the Commission recommendations which refer to the changes in the Agencies, considering that in case of some conclusions, the Commission might not be the appropriate audience. It was also proposed that the report should be made public. The Board also supported the idea of having a clear action plan in order to follow up on the recommendations.

---

\* Item for decision.

<sup>4</sup> ECDC Work Programme 2016 (A Ammon)

\* Item for decision.

The Management Board unanimously approved the conclusions and recommendations of the ECDC Management Board External Evaluation Drafting Group on the Second Independent External Evaluation of the Centre.

A special thanks of appreciation was extended to the Drafting Group, under the lead of Daniel Reynders, for their substantial work and dedication.

It was agreed that the Management Board would need an action plan in order to follow up on the implementation process and ECDC was tasked to prepare a proposal for the next MB.

26. Prior to the next programme item, the Alternate from France, Anne-Catherine Viso, informed the Board of the preparations of the Second Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM), and invited ECDC Chief Scientist to highlight some of the most important items. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, briefed the Board about the upcoming JSM meeting, listing the attending bodies, i.e. Management Board, Advisory Forum, Directors and National Coordinators of Coordinating Competent Bodies, National Focal Points for Microbiology and Surveillance, and representatives from other EU institutions and bodies. With regards to the preparation process, it was noted that a Programme Committee has been established, which includes representatives from the aforementioned constituencies. The MB will be invited to participate in the first half day of the JSM. Of note, the views on the external evaluation and the importance of ECDC added value was highlighted as an important element for the JSM. All stakeholder groups will be invited to remark upon their challenges, followed by a plenary session. Breakout sessions will address strategic and operational issues, focused on challenges and also considering technology.

### **Summary of discussions held at the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (15 June) including its recommendations:**

27. Johan Carlson, Member, Sweden, and Chair of the ECDC Audit Committee (AC), summarised the discussions from the 29<sup>th</sup> AC meeting which took place on the previous day, 15 June 2015.<sup>5</sup> It was noted that one of the members of the Committee, Michel Pletschette, is no longer representing the Unit for Audit and Evaluation in the Commission, and the AC discussed how to solve this gap. It was further explained by the representative from the Commission that it has been decided to centralise the audit function throughout the organisation and thus all previously separated units are now amalgamated under one DG. Due to this change, a suitable replacement for Mr Pletschette needs to be identified and the Commission will be submitting their proposal in due course.

#### **a) Final Annual Accounts 2014, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management (Document MB34/09) \***

28. Anja Van Brabant, Head of Section, Finance and Accounting, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented the Final Annual Accounts for 2014, including the Report on Budgetary and Financial Management.<sup>6</sup> The presentation was followed by the AC recommendation.

The Management Board approved the Final Annual Accounts 2014, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management.

#### **b) ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy (Document MB34/10) \***

29. Stefan Sundbom, Internal Control Coordinator, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented the ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy to the Board.<sup>[3]</sup> The Chair of the Audit Committee provided the comments and conclusions of the AC. The Audit Committee asked ECDC to clarify the circumstances when fraud should be reported to the Audit Committee and Management Board, but agreed that it should be done in another document than the Anti-Fraud Strategy (e.g. in Internal Control Standard no. 9 or in an Internal Procedure).

<sup>5</sup>Summary of 29th AC meeting

\* Item for decision.

<sup>6</sup> Final accounts 2014 (A Van Brabant)

\* Item for decision.

<sup>[3]</sup> Anti-Fraud Strategy (S Sundbom)

The Management Board adopted the ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy.

**c) Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2015** (Document MB34/11)\*

30. Anja Van Brabant, ECDC, presented the Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2015, including the comments of the AC.<sup>7</sup>

31. Clarification was sought as to the extent to which it be possible to highlight the implementation of the Work Programme 2015, considering that some activities were cancelled due to Ebola. Currently, it seems that the impact of the outbreak had little effect on the overall budget, and thus it would be good to further clarify this. In response, it was pointed out that it would be complicated to list all the transfers and thus the AC/MB could decide upon the threshold to which the transfers are shown. Alternatively, a list of activities that did not take place, including information on what was done instead, could be shared with the Board. The Chair concluded that it would be a good idea for the Board to be able to see the activities postponed in a simple list, including some information on the impacts to the budget. One of the Members pointed out that the existing Activity Based Budget (ABB) tool could be useful in order to visualise the impact.

The Management Board approved the Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2015.

**ECDC Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan 2016-2018** (Document MB34/12)\*

32. Jessica Mannheim, Head of Section, Human Resources, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented the ECDC Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan (MSPP) for 2016-2018, followed by comments and recommendations of the ECDC Audit Committee.<sup>8</sup>

33. In reference to the presented MSPP, clarification was sought in respect to gender balance vis-à-vis junior and senior posts and how this breaks down in terms of managers and middle managers. Members of the Board also inquired whether any analysis was conducted in respect to the geographical balance of experts. In relation to the external evaluation, clarification was also sought whether there is any room for manoeuvre in terms of certain staff issues previously raised, i.e. rotation of staff and other factors that led to the recommendation about outsourcing.

34. The representative of the Commission recalled that the basic rules of recruitment are laid down in the staff regulations and that each Agency implements those regulations. Agencies are requested either to implement the rules of the Commission or (where such rules exist) adopt so-called model rules for agencies which are developed jointly by agencies and the Commission. The aim is to have a common set of implementing rules as to simplify the process. The amount of flexibility is evidently limited.

35. Jessica Mannheim recalled that it is always endeavoured to ensure high quality when applying the implementing rules, and there is some room for manoeuvre although limited. Regarding the qualitative aspects of staff policies, the MSPP is a model document that specifies whether ECDC follows the legal framework. However, ECDC staff surveys and external evaluations are valuable sources for input when further developing the Centre's human resources' policies and practices. In reference to 'junior' experts, these incumbents are actually junior in rank, albeit they nonetheless have to have several years of professional experience. With regard to gender balance, middle managers, i.e. Heads of Sections, are normally designated AD8 grades. Still, gender imbalance persists in staff affiliated with middle management as well as senior management.

36. ECDC Acting Director noted that in terms of the quality of staff, the MSPP is merely to ensure that the Centre manages its human resources according to the applicable rules. There are several levels to ensure that staff meet the job requirements, namely, ensuring the vacancy notice includes the qualifications and job description; conducting an interview to verify the potential staff possess the

\* Item for decision.

<sup>7</sup> Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2015 (A Van Brabant)

\* Item for decision.

<sup>8</sup> ECDC\_MSPP\_2016-2018 (J Mannheim)

necessary qualifications. Further, the staff members will develop in their roles and become managers where applicable.

37. Regarding gender balance, the MB members expressed their wish to obtain more details regarding the AD grades. The Chair agreed that some clarifications are needed as per the preceding discussion and subsequently proposed to adopt the document.

The Management Board approved the ECDC Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan 2016-2018.

## **Policy on data submission, access, and use of data within TESSy – 2015 revision (Document MB34/13)\***

38. Gaetan Guyodo, Expert/Group Leader, Data Management, Surveillance and Response Support Unit, ECDC, provided an update on the policy on data submission, access, and use of data within TESSy, highlighting the main changes.<sup>9</sup>

39. The Management Board agreed not to approve the document until the following considerations were met satisfactorily: i) present the document to the Advisory Forum to obtain their feedback, ii) clarify the involvement of third parties; iii) describe how the Member States whose data are part of the extraction will be informed; iv) specify the actual deadline within which ECDC should reply to a request; v) understand more about the validation of this policy by the Data Protection Supervisor. Furthermore, the document must be discussed with the Advisory Forum and the Coordinating Competent Bodies to ensure consistency and uniformity. As a priority, ECDC should focus more on data quality prior to sharing data and spending additional resources.

40. It was confirmed by ECDC that the document has not been presented to the Advisory Forum. Regarding informing the Member States when there is a request, this was not carried out in the past, however, it has been planned to inform via the extranet, rather than sending emails. The policy declares that it is for research purposes only; therefore, the third party needs to provide the outline of the research for which the data is requested (ECDC does not analyse the purpose of the research, but rather, verifies the compliance of the request with the EU regulation). Regarding data publication, it has been clarified that case-based data can normally not be published.

41. The MB members subsequently inquired about the number of refused requests, the reason(s) and also the rationale for establishing a peer-review group. Concern was also expressed over security vis-à-vis requests emanating from journalists. One of the representatives of the Commission noted the complexity to have restrictions on data access due to the generic principle of the right of the public for access to data. Exceptions are not a rule and have to be evaluated case by case. The usual test is whether the data is in the public interest. Another member agreed with the general principle, noting that ECDC relies on data collectors and can only share data which was transmitted to the Centre. If the MB adopts the published general data sharing document without the agreement of the individuals who are collecting data, complications could arise, e.g. incurring risks that the data will no longer be transmitted or is transmitted late. It is vital to explain this document to the scientific community since they are the centre of the data collection.

42. The Chair summarised that while the MB agrees in principle, the opinions of the AF and CCBs are essential. The publication of the document should also be done in parallel with a message to the Member States and also to the collectors of data in order to ensure transparency and mutual understanding. ECDC should also have assurance from the EDPS that the processing of personal data in the framework of the policy complies with EU data protection rules. Some questions remain open, for instance, what to do if a Member State does not agree to share its data and does not agree to allow a third party to access such data.

The Management Board agreed that the paper should be looked at by the Advisory Forum and amended to take into account the MB comments, and to resubmit the paper for the next meeting in November.

\* Item for decision.

<sup>9</sup> Policy on data submission access and use of data within TESSy (G Guyodo)

## Update from ECDC Compliance Officer

### **a) Revised Independence Policy (Document MB34/14)\*<sup>10</sup>**

43. Jan Mos, Compliance Officer, Director's Office, ECDC, presented the revised ECDC Independence Policy.<sup>11</sup> Two major drivers underly the revision. The first is the decision on which of the ECDC staff is eligible to submit an Annual declaration of Interest, an issue wherein DG HR has reacted previously. The second driver is the expressed 'proportionality principle' that has been expressed in the Roadmap for Agencies and the letter of DG HR, in other words, each Agency has to base its policy on an assessment of the magnitude of the risks and the measures should be proportional as well as the resources.

44. The Representative of the European Commission recalled that the Policy on DoI is also to promote transparency, noting the need to ensure that everyone knows what the text means in the document and provide an example regarding the categories of external experts. Also, although the advice of DG HR is that every Agency is responsible for its own independence policy, the Agencies are being compared, thus it would be good to have processes which are comparable. This can be facilitated by the Commission. As well, there are cases cited in the policy where for purely technical meetings no DoI are requested, which leads to some reservations on the side of the Commission. If it is not possible to provide that there is no risk at all, an exemption to have DoI would be dangerous. Regarding publishing experts' DoIs solely on a case-to-case basis, notwithstanding transparency, the Agency should strive to publish all DoIs. In terms of the 24-month period for evaluation, it would be reasonable to consider a shorter evaluation period, namely one year.

45. MB Members stated that the document is very detailed, noting some unclarities such as the description of the third step in the policy related to the decision making on mitigation measures at the different levels and how the various elements can be brought together to improve the procedure through time. In relation to Annexes I and II, the title refers to a Decision of the Director and it was commented that such texts should not be changed without consulting the MB. There is also a text which states that only the MB Chair can take mitigation measures on behalf of the Board, wherein such measures could be pertinent to the entire Board.

46. Further clarification was sought on whether compliance can be improved in general and consequently how external experts in particular can be encouraged to understand better the rationale and implications of filling in forms and declaring interests, where applicable.

47. The Chair supported the idea of finding a balance between simplifying the process and complete, user friendly and valid at the same time. In reporting on the implementation, more information on the mitigation measures and a clear view on improvements could be given.

48. ECDC's Compliance Officer responded to the comments, noting the need to be careful, especially when only a few experts are available and there is no balance of power in the external advice. Regarding transparency of the application of the independence policy to the public, the choice was made to clarify the specific roles of individuals and experts. Reference was made to the EMA risk matrix presented earlier as well as to continuous collaboration between EMA and EFSA. In respect to cases where an ADoI is not required, such decisions are made based on the nature of the meeting/event. Concerning the issue of publishing, in case the Board opts for everything to be published, faulty declarations might be published. It has already proven to be a significant work to publish ADoIs for the MB and AF, also considering that all declarations are manually checked and thus some are not published due to errors. With regard to the review period, this can be shortened to one year. From a decision making stance, the involvement of the DoI Review Committee is the most important step when an action is to be taken and subsequently communicated. However, there are often situations where the algorithm cannot be drafted beforehand, and the Centre thereby must weigh the importance of the expertise versus a (potential) conflict of interest. The balance between getting the best expertise and not compromising the Agency's independent scientific position requires careful consideration; a part of this procedure is decentralised. With regards to noting only the MB Chair in the document, the Compliance Officer clarified that the MB Chair can consult with the Review Committee in order to avoid making a decision alone. One of the most important tasks is to obtain the DoIs and ensure their correctness. There are two ways to improve compliance: either strive to improve the

---

\* Item for decision.

<sup>10</sup> Please note that the title of this item should read only ECDC Revised Independence Policy.

<sup>11</sup> Revised independence policy (J Mos)

declarations by working actively with each person, or use exclusion to participate as a 'motivator'. The Centre has chosen the latter, i.e in case a DoI is requested but not submitted, the person in question is not allowed to take part in the event/meeting, or in case the DoI indicates a conflict, the person will be excluded from relevant parts of the discussion(s).

49. The representative of the European Commission expressed concerns over the verification of the DoIs as there is no link between checking and publishing. DoIs are, in principle, required to be public on request; thus even if faulty, they would still need to be released. Resources still need to be allocated in order to verify declarations of interest; simply opting not to publish declarations does not suffice.

50. ECDC Acting Director noted that the Centre has been, and will continue to, work hard in order to ensure no/low risks in relation to conflicts of interests. However, in case it is felt that the policy should be revised, it will be done accordingly. There is a need for a very clear internal process so that everyone is aware of their roles, if applicable, and that all similar items are handled in one unified manner throughout the organisation. It is apparent that the implementation of such policy requires internal training as well as information for external people in order that they may understand what is expected of them. ECDC will explore the feasibility of carrying out the aforementioned suggestions. In conclusion, it was agreed to revisit this item in November and to present a further revised policy to the Board.

The Management Board agreed that the paper should be amended to take into account their comments and to resubmit the paper for the next meeting in November.

### ***b) Mitigation measures taken for the Management Board and the Advisory Forum\****

51. Jan Mos, ECDC, presented the mitigation measures taken for the MB and AF.<sup>12</sup>

52. It was questioned how the mitigating measures will be communicated. It was noted that if members wish, all the mitigating measures can be communicated to the entire Board. The Chair agreed with sharing the mitigating measures on the MB extranet and communicating same to the whole Board. This was supported by MB Members.

53. The Chair also informed the Board that there are currently two MB Members who have been identified as having potential conflicts of interest; however, based on the meeting programmes and the order of business, it has not yet been deemed necessary for these individuals to declare their conflicts at the meetings. It was also pointed out that during each MB meeting, all delegates are asked whether or not they have any conflict(s) in respect to the meeting programme. Further on this, the Chair noted that such a clause could be added under each item.

54. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen, Member, Finland, informed the Board that she is one of the two Members who has been identified as having conflicts of interests, which has also been previously noted in the relevant minutes of the meeting. The Board was also informed that the Finnish Member was only notified of the potential conflict very close to the actual meeting dates which was very upsetting for her. Further to the actual conflict, it was noted that the Finnish Member owns stock in a pharmaceutical company (Orion), which has been duly declared in her DoI. In conclusion, the Finnish Member wished to clarify how long her name would be recorded in the list of Members with conflicts.

55. Following the statement from Finland, both the MB Chair as well as the ECDC Compliance Officer offered their sincere apologies for the delays in the process of notification and thus for the resulting inconvenience caused. It was also clarified that the conflict in question has been looked into and the MB Chair has deemed that it does not interfere with the proceedings of the meeting. Considering the timeline for keeping a member's name in the list of conflicting interests, it was suggested that examples from other Agencies should be looked at.

56. The MB Members requested to receive information on who might have conflicts prior to the meeting and it was proposed that someone should look into this in order to create a possibility to anticipate similar situations before they become too cumbersome for the individual in question. It was also reinforced that the mitigating measures should not be seen as a form of punishment, and that it is vital to have a shared understanding of what lies behind such measures in order to make ECDC and

---

\* Item for information.

<sup>12</sup> Update mitigation measures MB and AF (J Mos)

Members of the MB less susceptible to any harm. It was suggested to continue the discussions on this important matter in November.

The Management Board agreed to revisit this matter in November in order to reach a common understanding on the relevant procedures.

## **ECDC MB meeting dates 2016 and 2017** (*Document MB34/15*)\*

57. The draft meeting dates for 2016, as well as the preliminary dates for 2017 were presented to the Board.<sup>13</sup> In relation with the item as well as considering the low participation rate at the meeting, the question of frequency and timing of meetings in general was brought forth by the European Commission. Reference was made to the Founding Regulation where it is stated that the MB should meet at least two times per year. Considering this, it was questioned whether it would suffice to only hold two meetings each year, instead of three, also considering that the current meeting programmes include multiple 'for information' items next to the decision items, where the real focus should lay. Additionally, arranging only two meetings would also mean significant savings in resources, travelling time and costs, etc. In conclusion, it was proposed for the Board to consider having two meetings, with the possibility to convene a third meeting, if needed.

58. This proposal led to wider discussion in the Board and it was overall supported to look into this matter. For the current March and November meetings, these were deemed most necessary, and the Head of Section, Corporate Governance, ECDC, was assigned with the task of looking into past meetings in order to identify the most important items and thus provide a basis for further discussions. Based on the above, however, some Members still felt that having 'for information' items should still remain important part of each meeting as the MB should not present itself as only relevant for decision making. Additionally, it was pointed out that the Member States require more time for preparations for each meeting, making it more difficult to convene only two meetings each year. Regardless of the decision, the structure of the meetings should also be discussed. ECDC Acting Director noted that in consideration of certain decision items for each meeting, some of the statutory deadlines set for the Centre may not be flexible enough to hold only two meetings. It was agreed that the Head of the ECDC Corporate Governance Section will prepare a list with an overview as requested above, including relevant obligatory deadlines for deliverables to provide the Board with a wider base for discussion.

59. In regard to the proposed meeting dates for 2016, the MB pointed out that the March meeting is too close to Easter holidays and should preferably be changed to the beginning of the month.<sup>14</sup>

The Management Board requested to change the date of the meeting in March 2016 and to further discuss the number of meetings held annually in November.

It was agreed to adopt the meeting dates for 2016 and 2017 via Written Procedure.

## **Timeline and process for nomination of ECDC Director for 2015-2020\***

60. The timeline and process for nomination of ECDC Director for 2015-2020 was discussed in a closed session open to the Management Board members only.

### **Opening and welcome by the Chair**

61. The Chair opened the meeting and thanked the ECDC Acting Director and her staff for the dinner during the previous evening and conveyed a message from Dr Marc Sprenger who wished to thank all the MB Members for a memorable evening and wonderful presents.

62. The Chair also shared some of the main conclusions from the closed session during Day One concerning the matter of the timeline and process for nomination of ECDC Director. It was stated that the Board will recirculate the detailed election procedure used the last time in order to review the

\* Item for decision.

<sup>13</sup> ECDC MB meeting dates 2016 and 2017

<sup>14</sup> Please refer also to the item Opening and welcome by the Chair

\* Item for decision.

document. Regarding the scheduling of MB meetings, it was proposed to cancel the proposed meeting in January/February 2016, as initially suggested by the ECDC, and instead to set up a three-day meeting in the beginning of March, if possible, during the first week of March, also considering that the initially proposed dates in the end of March 2016 were rejected by the Board. The proposal will remain subject to a technical confirmation from the European Commission.

## Update from the EU Presidencies\*

### a) Update from Latvia

63. Dzintars Mozgis, Alternate, Latvia, gave an update from the current Latvian EU Presidency highlighting the main events and conferences.<sup>15</sup>

### b) Update from Luxembourg

64. Robert Goerens, Member, Luxembourg, provided the Board with an update on the upcoming Luxembourgish EU Presidency.<sup>16</sup>

The Management Board took note of the presentations from the Latvian and Luxembourgish EU Presidencies.

## ECDC Public Health Training Strategy (Document MB34/16)\*

65. Karl Ekdahl, Head of Unit, Public Health Capacity and Communication, ECDC, presented the new ECDC Public Health Training Strategy.<sup>17</sup> He explained that the initial intention was to present a first draft for discussion, but given the useful input from recent the written consultation with the Management Board as well as the supportive input from the Advisory Forum and the National Focalpoints for training, the presented paper is a final version for endorsement.

66. In general, the Board expressed their great satisfaction with the presented document. Some aspects were asked to be further clarified, such as e-learning, whether a subscription is needed, whether there are associated costs, and the reason to have EPIET and EUPHEM as two training paths as they to a large extent follow the same training. The reason to keep the two training paths separate for EPIET and EUPHEM fellows is that the latter largely follow the same training. The importance of equity and quality of conditions in host countries, including available resources in the countries, was emphasised, while also considering the inclusion of the evaluation of programmes in the strategy. In addition to previous comments, the German Board Member raised the problem of the federal protocol of Germany, particularly in terms of the division of responsibilities between national experts versus the regional experts and asked to delete on page 1, "Strategies objectives" the word "national" and add "experts nominated by the MS".

67. In response to the comments made, it was confirmed that there is no intention to charge money for the e-learning, but there is also a need to differentiate between more moderated and unmoderated e-learning activities and offer the latter for free. Regarding EPIET and EUPHEM, there is an emphasis on one single fellowship programme with two paths (EPIET and EUPHEM). Currently, the majority of courses are similar for both epidemiology and microbiology. Further operational discussion on this matter will take place with the Advisory Forum and NFPs for Training as outlined in the strategy. In reference to country structures, it is clear that in case of a federal country where responsibility for dealing with cross-border health threats is the responsibility of the regions within the country, these experts dealing with cross-border health threats should be seen as "national experts". Therefore a change is not needed. In respect to evaluation, as the training programme is a huge part of ECDC activities, with a significant financial impact, evaluation is vital. Methodologies for discussions should be developed together with the AF and National Focal Points for Training. In terms of capacity building in countries through the fellowship programme, it is in the interest of all countries that the these

\* Item for information.

<sup>15</sup> Update from Latvia (D Mozgis)

<sup>16</sup> Update from Luxembourg (R Goerens)

\* Item for endorsement.

<sup>17</sup> Public Health Training Strategy (K Ekdahl)

competencies exist in all countries. However, considering the quality aspects, there are some Member States who might not have the internal capacity to provide sufficient training resources to fellows. Therefore, ECDC needs to have a vigorous check of countries prior to sending fellows, and in case of any challenges, ECDC should strive to offer assistance and resolve the issues, if and where possible. There are not enough qualified teachers in some countries and ECDC is doing its best to assist with that as well.

68. The Chair summarised that overall, the MB is very satisfied with the document. Some questions still remain to be elaborated with the AF and the National Focalpoints for Training in the implementation.

The Management Board endorsed the new ECDC Public Health Training Strategy.

69. The Board was informed that the International Health Regulations Emergency Committee had decided during their ninth meeting on 16 June 2015 that the conditions for a Public Health Emergency of International Concern with regards to the MERS-CoV have not been met.<sup>18</sup>

### **Final Report of ECDC Stakeholder Survey (Document MB34/17)\***

70. Philippe Harant, Head of Section, Quality Management, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, provided a summary of the final report of the ECDC Stakeholder Survey, following the initial discussions during the previous meeting in March.<sup>19</sup> The presentation also included an action plan.

71. Considering the recommendations from the second external evaluation, it was proposed to ensure that the action plan(s) are aligned accordingly, to avoid duplications, as many of the issues are addressed in both reports. As many Members felt that the response rate could have been better, it was also welcomed to look into methods in order to guarantee a higher response rate for the next survey. It was also questioned whether it would be possible to have the list of stakeholders the survey was submitted to. Further to the target audience of the survey, it was noted that some of the questions in the survey could have referred to the actual tasks of the specific stakeholders, e.g. the work of the MB and AF is not the same.

72. With regards to future surveys, some concerns were expressed in reference to identification of stakeholders, as this is an important part of the success of the survey. Again, the external evaluation was brought out as a useful tool in order to possibly benefit from examining the stakeholder list used for the exercise. In order to potentially increase the response rate, also considering the very poor results amongst the MB, it was suggested to look into best approaches to carry out the survey in the future, while also considering the balance of mandatory and non-mandatory questions, as well as the frequency of the survey.

73. Echoing the comments made by the MB, the ECDC affirmed that there will be no duplication for the action plan regarding the external evaluation. The survey was carried out by examining the questions and trying to align these with the external evaluation. In reference to the stakeholder list, it was noted that this can be shared separately due to its length. In terms of the frequency of such surveys, the feedback generated from the Work Programmes will be analysed in further detail. The actual questions used in the future will be aimed to be more in line with the role of the relevant stakeholders. Further to this matter, it was noted that as in some countries, one person may hold many different roles in respect of ECDC, the Centre tried to identify such persons in order to avoid multiple submissions of the survey. Additionally, in the survey, efforts were made to direct the recipients to the 'right' questions relevant for their role.

74. The MB supported all the work done and remains keen to receive information regarding the follow up in 2016.

The Management Board took note of the Final Report of the ECDC Stakeholder Survey.

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/statements/2015/ihr-ec-mers/en/>

\* Item for information.

<sup>19</sup> Stakeholder survey 2014 final report (P Harant)

## Update on ECDC Building Project\*

75. Andrea Ammon, ECDC Acting Director, provided the Board with an update on the status of the ECDC Building Project.<sup>20</sup> She recalled that in March, the call for tender was launched, 98 companies were invited to participate. By the deadline of 4 May, ECDC had received 3 offers and the committee only deemed 1 to be eligible. This was supposed to be followed by negotiations, however, it was decided to cancel the whole process due to the lack of competition. As a result, the entire procedure will be simplified and a negotiated procedure will be launched as soon as possible. The Board was reminded that 31 July 2016 is the deadline to confirm to the current landlord, Akademiska Hus, whether the Centre remains at its current premises for an extended duration, which makes the overall timeline quite challenging. ECDC is currently refining the market prospection, then 3 companies will be selected, followed by negotiations. Thereafter, the timeline should be aligned with the original planning. Considering this, the plan is still to submit the final proposal to the MB in February or March 2016, and subsequently to the Council and the Parliament in April and finally sign the contract in July 2016.

76. Concerns were expressed with respect to the proposed timeline, in particular, transmission of the final proposal to the Parliament and the Council. It was however clarified that the European Parliament and the Council have defined time periods which fit into the ECDC anticipated timeframe and thus it should not be an issue.

77. The coinciding deadline for transmitting the proposal to the Parliament and the Council with the hearing of the new ECDC Director was pointed out. The Acting Director noted that in case it is considered essential for the new Director to ultimately take the decision on the building, the entire process should be abandoned. The Board agreed that the appointment of the new Director cannot be intertwined with the building project. In the end, the newly appointed Director simply needs to defend a decision which he/she was not involved with.

78. Considering that one procedure was abandoned and while keeping in mind that a whole range of Agencies are currently opting for a simplified procedure, it was pointed out that there is a need to ascertain how to proceed with the procedure, while also ensuring the requisite legal safeguards are in place.

79. Further on the building project, it was clarified that the planned capacity for the new building is calculated for 320 people, keeping in mind the reduction of posts and of external consultants.

80. The MB inquired about the timetable of the process and their involvement thereto. It was highlighted that the MB needs to have a clear explanation about the situation. The Acting Director noted that a dossier has been compiled over time explaining in detail the entire situation and various steps taken to date. Additionally, the MEP liaison, Ms Katerina Konečná, has been engaged and has shown great interest in this matter.

81. The MB accepted the proposal that the MB Working Group on the Building Project would be re-established during the November meeting, and also requested to be informed as much as possible, even via email, in order to monitor this matter closely.

The Management Board took note of the latest status of the ECDC Building project.

The composition of the Management Board Working Group on the Building Project will be decided upon in the November Board meeting.

## Update from the European Commission \*

### *a) Joint Procurement Agreement: status report*

82. John F Ryan, Member, European Commission, DG SANTÉ, updated the Board on the Joint Procurement Agreement, which provides that the participating countries are using the EU procurement and not national regulations, thus the process will be simpler. In order to achieve this, the Joint Procurement Agreement, which provides for a set of rules under which the procurement will take place, requires ratification from all the Member States who wish to participate. The Commission is currently in

\* Item for information.

<sup>20</sup> Update on ECDC Building Project (A Ammon)

\* Item for information.

the process of collecting the signatures. The 21<sup>st</sup> signature will be received on 19 June, which indicates an overall positive response. The Commission has set up a Steering Committee wherein the potential use of this mechanism was discussed and as a result, personal protective equipment was identified. Tender specifications will be circulated this week. The Steering Committee will meet in July to discuss the next tender. Pandemic vaccines are a priority, amongst other items.

83. It was noted that although 21 signatories is a good result, the population sizes vary, when considering infections and related vaccination coverage. In response, it was clarified that differentiation should be made between countries that will never sign such an Agreement and countries who are in the process of ratification, such as France and Italy, for example. The Agreement is open for all Member States. It was also further clarified that under this Agreement, even if signed, the countries are not obliged to participate, as the Joint Procurement Agreement is a tool as opposed to a process. It was informed that further information on this matter will be shared during the next MB meeting in November.

### ***b) Development of Country Health Profiles***

84. John F Ryan, European Commission, provided an update on the development of country health profiles. It was recalled that one of the goals of the Commissioner is to see how the health data could be used in a better way and how to deploy this data more efficiently to find out where there are gaps and to ascertain how to assist such countries. Additionally, it is aimed at helping the countries to identify financial support which they could use from the EU. It was assured that this project would not duplicate any other work done in the similar area and that it is being discussed with a group within the Commission.

85. The level onto which the Commission is intending to go, i.e. national or regional, was questioned. Additionally, it was inquired whether the Commissioner will be informing the Health Ministers about this initiative. In response, it was assured that the Commission is developing a model country profile and once these are finalised, it will be discussed with the Ministers, most likely end 2015. Additionally, in the letter which Commissioner sent to all Ministers, the issue was mentioned and the Commission has been trying to collect all relevant data for the last months and to find out which mechanisms would be useful to address specific issues.

86. The MB Members also inquired about who will be responsible for compiling the summary of indicators outside the communicable diseases, which resources would be dedicated, how to envisage the implementation and the frequency. It was explained the work has been done in Commission based on the data available. It is a mixture of communicable diseases and non-communicable, policy information and policy indicators, all of which are collected differently by using the resources inside the Commission. The Commission has already worked recently on model country profiles, and if the results are positive, the exercise can be repeated for other countries, making the entire process easier. At EU level, the Commission's focus is to observe certain outcomes, ascertain where the sizeable variations lay, and also to achieve and share best practises. This process will be done in collaboration with the Member States, who will decide themselves how they wish to follow up.

### ***c) Ebola Lessons Learned Conference, 12-14 October 2015 in Luxembourg***

87. John F Ryan, European Commission, provided feedback on the Ebola lessons learned conference. Reference was made to the presentation from Luxembourg on their agenda for the upcoming EU Presidency, which has agreed to support the organisation of the conference. The ECDC, WHO and the Member States will be involved. The conference will be designed in a way that the lessons learned can be identified in workshops and the aim of the EU Presidency is to prepare the Council Conclusions. A similar exercise following the influenza pandemic will be used as a model example. The Conclusions will be the elements to other 'lessons learned' processes on national and international levels. It is foreseen to also involve the NGOs for their benefit as well as vice versa. In connection with the conference, the Board was informed that it has been decided to discontinue the Journalist Prize, which has existed for years, and instead convert it into the Health Prize, which will focus on the NGOs. The Commission has already established a call for interests. The first Health Prize should go to an NGO involved with the Ebola outbreak and will be awarded during the conference.

88. Another conference on the topic was mentioned, scheduled to take place on 7-8 July 2015, organised by DG ECHO. As this conference will be focused mainly on the three countries affected in

Africa, it will differ from the conference in Luxembourg, which will be more inclusive, and, considering that it will result in Council Conclusions, it shall provide for a hopefully longer-lasting result.

The Management Board took note of the update from the European Commission.

## Any other business

89. The Representative from the European Parliament informed the Board that on 4 May, the Parliament launched a resolution on patient safety and fighting the antibiotic resistance.<sup>21</sup> As it is a very relevant document, including recommendations and appeals for action, it should be taken into consideration. The mentioned resolution is in line with ECDC's Work Programme 2016, and it was suggested to refer to this document within the Programme.

90. In connection with the previous speaker, the representative of the European Commission added that the Commission has launched the evaluation of the antimicrobial resistance action plan and that Commissioner Andriukaitis has attached great importance to AMR. Secondly, regarding the HSC, the Commission will establish a working group on AMR. Collaboration with the USA on this important topic was also brought out and an agreement has been reached to prolong such collaboration in the future. In October, the Commission is planning to organise a meeting with the USA, including representatives from the EU Member States. Once the meeting arrangements are finalised, the MB will be duly notified.

91. The Chair of the Management Board thanked all the delegates for their valuable input during the meeting. A special thanks of appreciation was extended to the interpreters and the ECDC staff for their hard work. The Chair also recalled that the ECDC Management Board members are invited to attend the ECDC Ten Year Anniversary Event, which is scheduled to take place on 22 September 2015, including the first half day of the Second Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) on 23 September.

92. The next Management Board meeting will take place in Stockholm on 25-26 November 2015.

93. The meeting was adjourned.

---

<sup>21</sup> Please refer to email correspondence submitted via ECDC Corporate Governance Secretariat on Wednesday, 17 June 2015

## Annex: List of Participants

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Austria	Martina Brix ( <i>Day One, morning</i> )	
Belgium	Daniel Reynders	Member
	Loïc Ledent	Alternate
Denmark	Dorte Hansen Thrige	Member
Finland	Anni Virolainen-Julkunen	Member
France	Françoise Weber ( <i>Chair</i> )	Member
	Anne-Catherine Viso	Alternate
Germany	Susanne Wald	Member
	Gesa Lücking	Alternate
Hungary	Beatrix Oroszi	Alternate
Latvia	Dzintars Mozgis	Alternate
Luxembourg	Robert Goerens	Member
Netherlands	Marianne Donker	Member
Portugal	Maria da Graça Gregorio de Freitas	Member
Slovak Republic	Ján Mikas	Member
Sweden	Johan Carlson	Member
	Anita Janelm	Alternate
United Kingdom	Helen Shirley-Quirk	Member
<b>European Parliament</b>		
	Minerva-Melpomeni Malliori	Member
	Jacques Scheres	Member
<b>European Commission</b>		
DG SANTÉ	Martin Seychell	Member
DG SANTÉ	John F Ryan	Member
<b>EEA Countries</b>		
Norway	Sverre Berg Lutnæs	Member

Stockholm, 26 November 2015

On behalf of the Management Board

Daniel Reynders

Chair of the ECDC Management Board