ECDC Management Board

# Minutes of the Fortieth Meeting

# Stockholm, 13-14 June 2017

*Adopted by the ECDC Management Board at its Forty-first meeting, 21-22 November 2017*

# Contents

# Summary of Proceedings – ECDC Management Board Meeting

The Fortieth meeting of the ECDC Management Board (MB) convened in Stockholm, Sweden, on 13-14 June 2017. During the meeting, the Management Board:

- adopted the programme;
- adopted the minutes of the Thirty-ninth 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 on the implementation of the Joint Action Plan to address Recommendations arising from the Second External Evaluation, and agreed that an end-of-term report be presented at the following Management Board meeting in November 2017;
- endorsed the final conclusions of the ECDC Management Board Working Group on Complementarity between Management Board and Advisory Forum, and agreed that a formal document shall be presented for approval at the following Management Board meeting in November 2017;
- took note of the joint feedback to the Management Board on EU Reference Laboratory Networks;
- approved the proposed timeline for the Third External Evaluation of ECDC, and appointed the members of the MB External Evaluation Steering Committee;
- approved the Report on the implementation of the Work Programme 2017 up until present, including the proposed changes to the Financing Decision;
- approved the proposed steps to revise ECDC indicators, and agreed to set up a small group that will provide feedback on ECDC's proposals in the coming months. A final set of indicators will be presented to the Management Board for adoption in November 2017;
- took note of the presentation of the ECDC Single Programming Document 2019, and agreed to include a *tour de table* session on the SPD 2019 at the following Management Board meeting in November 2017. A written consultation on the SPD 2019 will be organised prior to such meeting;
- approved the composition of the ECDC Audit Committee as well as the membership of the Sub-group mandated to review Implementing Rules;
- took note of the Progress report – Overview of 2017 Budget Implementation since the last Management Board meeting;
- approved the final Annual Accounts for 2016, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management;
- took note of the First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2017;
- took note of the ECDC International Relations Policy 2014-2020 - Mid-term Review 2016. A revised International Relations Strategy, including ECDC's strategic vision on global outbreak response, will be presented to the Board for adoption in November 2017;
- took note of the options presented for the planning of the Third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM), and agreed that ECDC will present a further refined proposal at the following Management Board meeting in November 2017;
- approved the ECDC Management Board meeting dates for 2018 and provisionally for 2019;
- took note of the implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy;
- approved the proposal to re-establish the Working Group on Revised Rules of Procedure of the ECDC Management Board;

- took note of the WHO/ECDC Joint Work Programme;
- took note of the update on Surveillance activities;
- took note of the update on the ECDC Building Project;
- took note of the update from the European Commission;
- took note of the presentations from the Maltese and the Estonian EU Presidencies.

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

1. The Chair of the ECDC Management Board welcomed all participants to the Fortieth meeting of the Management Board. A special welcome was extended to Antonio Correia de Campos, MB Alternate, European Parliament, who attended the MB for the first time, and to Patricia Vella Bonanno, newly appointed Member, Malta. Apologies had been received from Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic, including Martin Seychell, DG SANTE, and Line Matthiessen, DG RTD, European Commission.

2. Proxies were duly noted as follows: Hungary – proxy given to Finland, Portugal – proxy given to Estonia, Slovak Republic – proxy given to Slovenia, and Martin Seychell – proxy given to John F Ryan, DG SANTE, European Commission. The Chair informed the Board that Johan Carlson, Member, Sweden, needed to leave the meeting around lunchtime on day 1, and that Helen Shirley-Quirk, Member, United Kingdom, would attend the MB meeting only on the first meeting day.

## Welcome from the Acting Director, ECDC

3. Dr Andrea Ammon, Acting Director, ECDC, welcomed the Management Board members and noted that she was looking forward to having fruitful and interesting discussions during the meeting. She added that the Chair of the Management Board had not yet received the formal confirmation of the European Parliament to endorse her appointment as ECDC Director; until such time, the same arrangements as previously agreed would be in place.

## Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) *(Document MB40/01 Rev.1)*

4. 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.

The Management Board adopted the programme.

## Adoption of the draft minutes of the 39th meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 21-22 March 2017) *(Documents MB40/02 and MB40/02 CONF)*

5. The Chair pointed out that a comment had been received from France regarding the discussion on the role of ECDC in international missions (*cf.* point 18). This had been addressed in the minutes circulated to the Board ahead of the meeting.

The Management Board adopted the minutes of the Thirty-ninth meeting of the Management Board.

## Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting (Stockholm, 21-22 March 2017) *(Document MB40/03)*

6. Andrea Ammon, Acting Director, ECDC, provided the Board with an update on the main activities since the last MB meeting, including key meetings, visits and country missions.

7. In the discussion that followed, one MB Member sought further information on the strategic meeting planned between ECDC and DG SANTE, and how this related to the discussion on the ECDC Work Programme foreseen in the November MB meeting. Andrea Ammon clarified that the purpose of the strategic part of the discussion was to ensure alignment of the Work Programmes, and to avoid duplication. This being said, the expectation to support the Commission priorities may of course have repercussions on the ECDC Work Programme. ECDC is expecting to receive comments on the SPD 2018 from the Commission at the beginning of July.

8. John F Ryan, Member, European Commission, added that the purpose of the visit of Dr Prats-Monné had mainly been to prepare for the visit of the ECDC Senior Management Team (SMT) to DG SANTE in October. The rationale was to explain to the SMT the Commission priorities in the health area, as well as other priorities that may impact upon ECDC's work, one example being the Commission's flagship initiative on the digital single market, which could have implications in respect to e-health, electronic health records, electronic registries, etc. Another topic for discussion will be antimicrobial resistance: in the following two weeks, the Commission will adopt a new action plan on AMR. This action plan follows the health in all policies approach covering pharmaceutical policy, veterinary medicine, research, international cooperation, food safety, animal health and human health, and ECDC needs to be aware of this bigger picture. Finally, it is important that the ECDC becomes better acquainted with the ongoing discussions on the Multiannual Financial Framework. He concluded that, for all these reasons, it was necessary to reinforce contact between the senior management of the two institutions.

9. The Chair inquired what concrete implications the strategic discussion on the EC priorities would have for the work plan that had to be prepared for the November meeting. Did it mean that ECDC should highlight, in the limit of its mandate, which activities were related to the EC priorities, or that ECDC should focus its activites within the remit of these priorities?

10. John F Ryan reiterated that the main purpose of the meeting was to have a regular exchange between the senior management teams of ECDC and DG SANTE on current activities and priorities. With respect to the digital single market, there might be initiatives that could benefit ECDC, such as the possibility of exploring electronic records or registries; however, for this to happen, ECDC needed to be involved from the very beginning. He assured the Board that the core activities of ECDC remained valid, but it was useful to identify where, in respect of current priority issues, ECDC could highlight its role as a player.

11. With respect to e-health, one MB Member pointed out that there were already several ongoing EU-level projects, as well as a Joint Action on e-health, many of which were not addressing communicable diseases, and asked how all these different activites were to be coordinated.

12. Andrea Ammon agreed that the developments in the area of e-health were not driven by the public health or infectious diseases area, but rather by the health care sector. As she had previously mentioned when outlining her vision for ECDC for the next five years to come, e-health was one of the biggest challenges for the future, and it was important to explore the possibilities now in order not to miss out on the opportunity.

13. John F Ryan explained that, through the digital single market initiative, the Commission is trying to identify projects that are of benefit for the improvement of the collection of health data through electronic means, and to identify Member States interested in participating in such activities. In other words, it will clearly be a Member State driven exercise.

14. The Chair acknowledged that the four Commission priorities were all very valid, but agreed that there was quite a number of current initiatives on these priorities. It would therefore be useful to have an overview of all the ongoing activities at EU level. In conclusion, he clarified that in the November meeting, the Management Board had to adopt the Single Programming Document 2018; this document will include the current priorities of the Commission. He stressed that there will be a discussion in the Board prior to the final adoption of the SPD 2018.

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

## Joint Action Plan to address Recommendations arising from the second External Evaluation: Progress Report *(Document MB40/04)*

15. Before entering into the next topic, the Chair sought clarification on the planned External Evaluation of the ECDC Disease Programmes referred to by the Acting Director in her presentation, and how this related to the Third External Evaluation of ECDC.

16. Andrea Ammon explained that the Third External Evaluation, similar to the two previous evaluations, will look at the organisation as a whole, and the Management Board will determine the priorities that the evaluators should focus on. However, there is also a need to perform a more in-depth external evaluation of certain parts of the ECDC programme. In addition to the external evaluation of Disease Programmes, there will be an evaluation of the EPIET programme and the whole ECDC training, as well as of the EU surveillance systems.

17. The Chair thanked the Acting Director for this clarification, and urged ECDC to provide the External Evaluation Steering Committee, once appointed, with a list of all ongoing external evaluations in order to avoid duplication.

18. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, presented an update on the Draft Joint Action Plan to address Recommendations arising from the Second External Evaluation.

19. In the discussion that ensured, several MB Members congratulated the ECDC for the progress made in implementing the action plan. Further details were requested on the progress made to meet recommendation 14 (coordination mechanisms with other agencies), and on the pilot call for expression of country needs.

20. Regarding the coordination with other EU agencies, Andrea Ammon responded that a review of activities had been performed, and the next step was to look at ways to enhance the coordination. One outcome was that the SPD was now sent for comments also to other relevant agencies. In addition, at the beginning of July, the Acting Director was scheduled to meet with other Heads of Agencies, and on this occasion, her intention was to discuss with Directors from ECDC's sister agencies about how to plan activities. The initiative was to be proactive instead of reactive.

21. Karl Ekdahl, Head of Unit, Public Health Capacity and Communication, ECDC, explained that a call for expression of needs had been sent out to the Member States in April. In total, 16 requests from seven countries had been received, and ECDC was currently in discussion with the countries to better understand what exact support they needed, and how this could be integrated in the Work Programme. He added that the implementation of the country support will be presented at the next CCB meeting.

22. Responding to a question on the Atlas of Infectous Diseases, Denis Coulombier, Head of Surveillance and Response Support Unit, ECDC, explained that there were currently analyses for 42 diseases and AMR visible interactively in the Atlas; it is foreseen that all 52 communicable diseases and related special health issues will be included by the end of 2017.

23. The Chair then inquired how much of the recommmendations of the Second External Evaluation will be fully implemented before the start of the Third External Evaluation.

24. Mike Catchpole responded that, broadly, he estimated all the Joint Action Plan actions endorsed in 2015 to be completed by the end of 2017, and added that some of the actions had year on year targets going beyond 2018-2019. He suggested that an end-of-term report be presented at the next Management Board meeting. The report should look not only at whether all actions have been completed, but present a genuine evaluation of how the completed actions meet with the conclusions of the External Evaluation.

25. Andrea Ammon agreed that the aim should be to assess the improvements made compared to two years ago when the Joint Action Plan was agreed upon.

The Management Board took note of the update on the implementation of the Joint Action Plan to address Recommendations arising from the second External Evaluation, and agreed that an end-of-term report should be presented at the following Management Board meeting in November 2017.

## Final conclusions of the ECDC Management Board Working Group on Complementarity between the Management Board and the Advisory Forum *(Document MB40/05)*

26. Anne-Catherine Viso, Alternate, France, informed the Board about the conclusions of the Management Board Working Group on Complementarity between the MB and the AF. She clarified that she had only chaired the last meeting of the Working Group after Marianne Donker had left the Management Board in January 2017. She briefly recalled the background and the rationale for setting up the Working Group. As a starting point, the Management Board had acknowledged that it was the responsibility of each country to ensure consultation and cooperation between its AF and MB members; nevertheless, a mechanism for facilitating collaboration was seen as beneficial. The Working Group had focused on the clarification of the roles of the Management Board, the Advisory Forum and the Coordinating Competent Bodies, the channels of communication, and the mechanisms for the Management Board to request Advisory Forum input. Concerning the channels of communication, it was proposed that the ECDC Director or Chief Scientist report to the MB on advice provided by the AF, by presenting a summary document prepared by the Chief Scientist. It was also suggested that the Chief Scientist provide an annual report to the MB summarising the AF work, highlighting key issues for the

MB's consideration and awareness. The WG further suggested the creation of a shared work area for MB and AF; however, the structure and documents to be included in the shared area needed to be reflected upon carefully. Finally, the WG agreed that an induction package for new MB and AF members would be useful. Concerning the mechanisms for requesting AF input, the WG concluded that certain topics could be easily foreseen, such as the Single Programming Document. For other topics, ECDC could take a more proactive role in considering which MB items would benefit from AF input. In conclusion, the Working Group considered that further attention could be given to exploring the potential role of the CCB/NC in complementing the communication mechanism between the AF and the MB.

27. The Management Board members appreciated the conclusions of the Working Group. One MB Member asked whether it could be made more explicit that the role of the Advisory Forum was to provide input from a European perspective rather than from an individual country perspective, in particular, when providing feedback on important documents, such as the SPD.

28. Responding to a question on the role of the AF in advising on the ECDC Work Programme, Mike Catchpole clarified that, according to the Founding Regulation, the Advisory Forum shall ensure close cooperation between the Centre and the Competent Bodies in the Member States on a number of issues, of which "scientific and public health priorities to be addressed in the Work Programme".

29. Anne-Catherine Viso pointed out that these issues had been discussed for many years now in different instances (MB, AF, Joint Strategy Meeting), but had never really been formalised in the way of working of the AF and MB members. For this reason, the Working Group suggests to provide a document to new members in order to introduce them to their mandate and to create a collective view on the role of and expectations pertaining to the two Governing Bodies.

30. The Board then discussed the next steps and the best way to formalise the conclusions of the Working Group into a document that would be sufficiently formal, but at the same time easy to update when necessary. It was commented that certain items in the report could certainly be operationalised rather quickly, such as the creation of a shared work space, and structuring the AF discussions in a way of obtaining clear feedback including information on diverging views. It was suggested to include these operational commitments in the final report of the Joint Action Plan.

31. The Chair proposed to use the current report as a basis for drafting a more formal document to be approved at the next Management Board meeting. He recommended to maintain the chapter on the roles of the different bodies even if these are stated in the Founding Regulation in order to make this clear to all parties. The Management Board agreed with this approach.

The Management Board endorsed the final conclusions of the ECDC Management Board Working Group on Complementarity between the Management Board and the Advisory Forum, and agreed that a formal document shall be presented for approval at the following Management Board meeting in November 2017.

## Joint feedback to the Management Board: EU Reference Laboratory Networks (*Document MB40/06*)

32. John F Ryan, Member, European Commission, updated the Management Board on the work in the area of public health microbiology. He recalled that the first report on this topic had been developed as a result of the Second External Evaluation of ECDC, and explained that the present note addressed the request from the Board to receive 1) a more detailed overview of the roles and responsibilities of ECDC and the Commission in the field of laboratory support and 2) a summary of the various EU initiatives run by different DGs.

33. One MB Member inquired how the cost benefit study referred to in the note was going to be used. John F Ryan responded that, as a follow-up to the note presented to the Board, the Commission will prepare an internal note before the summer looking at different reports including the cost-benefit study. The note will be discussed with other Commission services and concerned EU agencies after which it will be presented to the Health Security Committee in order to recieve their input.

34. The Chair inquired about the possibilities of having an overall picture on what capacities are available per agent within the EU.

35. Marc Struelens, Chief Microbiologist, Office of the Chief Scientist, ECDC, responded that during the last three years, the EULabCap project has been examining key capabilities and capacities in the

Member States. With regard to the capability to confirm emerging infections or emergency related threats, he commented that the project has not looked at a comprehensive list of known and unknown threats, but for generic non emerging diseases and specific emerging diseases, the overall capabilities are fairly well distributed based on the surveys conducted. Where the national diagnostic confirmation capability is not fully available, arrangements are in place either through EU projects (e.g. EMERGE Joint Action) or through other ECDC supported laboratory networks. He concluded that the degree of preparedness over Europe is quite satisfactory even if some improvements are needed.

36. Referring to the Joint Action Plan discussed earlier, Andrea Ammon asked the Board what results they expected to see in order to close this action in November.

37. The Chair asked whether the EULabCap project will end with a sustainable reference capacity to cover all known pathogens and the readiness to collaborate with countries that lack a specific capacity.

38. Andrea Ammon responded that the EULabCap has two functions: to assess and to monitor the capacity; it is therefore a sustainable element for improving preparedness in the EU.

39. John F Ryan recalled the recommendations from the Second External Evaluation (recommendations 2, 3 and 4) and commented that the nature of these was such that ongoing work will be needed, but progress could certainly be reported for all of them.

40. The Chair proposed that, based on the Commission note, part of the tasks could be addressed in an operationalised way in the next Work Programme.

41. Andrea Ammon responded that most tasks are already addressed in the Work Programme (EQA, monitoring, genome sequencing, etc.). She suggested looking at the original recommendations and listing the actions taken in the last two years to meet these recommendations.

42. The Chair agreed with this approach. However, given the importance of the topic, he requested that an overview of the laboratory issue be periodically presented to the Board.

The Management Board took note of the joint feedback to the Management Board on EU Reference Laboratory Networks.

## Third External Evaluation of ECDC: Appointment of the MB External Evaluation Steering Committee *(Document MB40/07)*

43. Andrea Ammon explained that approximately every five years, an independent external evaluation of the Centre needs to be performed. She provided a brief background of the previous two external evaluations, and explained that the third evaluation should cover the period 2013-2017. Based on previous experience, a Commission contract for evaluations will be used. She recalled that, for the last evaluation, an MB External Evaluation Steering Committee (MEES) had been set up; the MEES had prepared the draft terms of reference to be discussed and approved by the Board, and also defined the stakeholders to be involved and the types of questions to be asked. She suggested using a similar process this time, and asked for volunteer MB members for the establishment of a steering committee consisting of 8 members/alternates representing countries, 2 representatives from the European Parliament, and 1 representative from the European Commission.

44. The Management Board members agreed with the proposed process and timeline as stipulated in the document. One MB Member inquired about the rationale for having two representatives from the European Parliament in the Steering Committee, and only one from the Commission. It was also mentioned that the previous evaluations had looked mainly at ECDC's results, and it was suggested to take a more prospective approach when defining the terms of reference in order to also provide elements for reflection on the future of ECDC while taking into account the different developments and challenges previously discussed (technological developments, changes in the landscape of international health security, the European context, etc.). It was also recommended to develop terms of reference that are as focused as possible. It was suggested to use the Founding Regulation as a basis and to also look at the interaction between the Founding Regulation and the cross-border health threats decision, as well as the link between ECDC and other agencies such as EMA and EFSA.

45. Responding to the question about the composition of the MEES, Andra Ammon mentioned that the suggested composition was based on the previous evaluation but this was of course up to the Board to decide.

46. The following MB Members/Alternates volunteered to take part in the MEES: Martina Brix, Alternate, Austria, Taneli Puumalainen, Alternate, Finland, Anne-Catherine Viso, Alternate, France, Gesa Lücking, Alternate, Germany, Georgios Saroglou, Member, Greece, Hanna Páva, Member, Hungary, Michael Smith, Member, Ireland, Mårten Kiwi, Alternate, Sweden, John F Ryan, Member, European Commission, and Zofija Mazej Kukovič, Member, European Parliament.

47. The Chair requested that the Steering Committee receive an overview of all the ECDC external evaluations currently ongoing or foreseen in the near future prior to its first meeting.

The Management Board approved the proposed process and timeline for the Third External Evaluation of ECDC, and appointed the members of the MB External Evaluation Steering Committee.

## Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2017 up until present *(Document MB40/08)*

48. Philippe Harant, Head of Section, Quality Management, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, updated the Board on the implementation of the Work Programme 2017. He informed the Board that, as of 23 May 2017, 2% of the activities were fully achieved, 63% had started and were on schedule, 1% were delayed, 19% had not started, and 16% were activities not being monitored as such (fixed permanent work, such as human resources, finances, management activities or administrative support). He clarified that a list of proposed changes in the procurement plan had been included in Annex 1 of the document; this list will be updated and presented at each Management Board meeting. In case future changes need an urgent approval from the Management Board, such approval could be requested through a written procedure.

49. Andrea Ammon added that one such urgent situation was already emerging as the Vaccine Preventable Diseases Programme was facing an important shortfall in human resources (currently four vacancies open and one staff member going on maternity leave), which meant that there would be a need to shift resources and possibly also to reshuffle the budget to other activities. It was expected that a written procedure would be sent to the Board in the coming two-three weeks. She added that the procurement situation will be assessed after summer; this will be the last opportunity to reshuffle funds that are not going to be used and therefore there could be a need for another written procedure in September.

The Management Board approved the Report on the implementation of the Work Programme 2017 up until present, including the proposed changes to the Financing Decision.

## Review of Indicators in the Single Programming Document 2018 *(Document MB40/09)*

50. Andrea Ammon recalled that the current set of indicators had been approved as part of the Strategic Multi-annual Programme (SMAP) 2014-2020 and included in the annual work programmes since 2014. However, a review of some of the indicators and issues with current indicators need to be addressed before the final version of the SPD 2018 is approved. It is necessary to include indicators for the multi-annual part of the SPD, to review some of the indicators, which might be obsolete, or for which the experience showed they were not sufficiently relevant, and to take into account the fact that ECDC will not conduct annual stakeholder surveys as initially anticipated.

51. To further analyse and improve the set of indicators, she proposed to set up a small group (3 to 4 members) that could provide their perspective as stakeholders and beneficiaries of ECDC's intervention, and give feedback to ECDC's proposals in the coming months.

52. In the discusson that followed, the MB Members agreed with the proposed process and timeline. One MB member asked whether the ambition was to replace the entire indicator or to reduce the number of indicators.

53. Andrea Ammon clarified that, in principle, the indicators should move from only measuring the number of outputs to coming as close as possible to measuring the actual impact of an activity. This is of course more difficult to put in place. One outcome could also be to reduce the number of indicators.

54. Philippe Harant, Head of Section, Quality Management, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, added that the discussion was open, and if it was considered more efficient to reduce the number of indicators while retaining satisfactory reporting, this was clearly a possible option. He clarified that ECDC will send an initial proposal to the group and ask for feedback on the proposed indicators.

55. The following MB Members/Alternates volunteered to join the consultation group: Bolette Søborg, Member, Denmark, Anne-Catherine Viso, Alternate, France, Francesco Maraglino, Alternate, Italy, Jean-Claude Schmit, Member, Luxembourg, and John F Ryan, Member, European Commission.

The Management Board approved the proposed steps to revise ECDC indicators, and agreed to set up a small group that will provide feedback on ECDC's proposals in the coming months. A final set of indicators will be presented to the Management Board for adoption in November 2017.

## ECDC Single Programming Document 2019 *(Document MB40/10)*

56. Andrea Ammon presented the first draft of the Single Programming Document 2019. She explained that the document presents the list of activities and resources for 2019, but also includes a three-year rolling plan for 2019-2021. She pointed out that 2019 will in many ways be a year of transformation: a new European Parliament and a new Commission will be put in place during the year, Brexit will be effective with all the potential repercussions to the budget, and possibly, a new EU Multi-annual Financial Framework will be finalised. In this context, EU agencies will have to demonstrate efficiency and added value. In addition, technological changes (e-health, big data, sequencing, use of social media for public health monitoring) will have an impact on the work. In 2019, ECDC will also prepare and adopt a new long-term strategy as from 2021 based on results of the next External Evaluation (2013-2017) and expected results of other evaluations previously mentioned (ECDC surveillance systems (EPHESUS project), Disease Programmes and joint Fellowship Programme).

57. She explained that the current estimations of the resources were based on a Commission Communication from 2013 spanning the current Multi-annual Financial Framework 2014-2020. According to this, the ECDC budget for 2019 would be 59.3 M€; in reality, the figure will most likely be lower. The number of staff is estimated at the same level as in 2018 (280 TA + CA). She added that, unless there are already concrete figures available ahead of the November meeting, the planned activities will be presented and the ones that might be dropped in case of a budget cut will be marked. The areas of particular attention will be tackling AMR, improving vaccine coverage in the EU, further supporting the Commission and the Member States in strengthening preparedness for cross-border health threats, supporting the Commission and the Member States in addressing the Sustainable Development Goals in the area of HIV, TB and hepatitis, focusing on strategic partnerships to create synergy and avoid duplication of work (e.g. country cooperation support, relations with EU agencies, WHO, other CDCs), and further enhancing ECDC's performance and monitoring. A written consultation on the SPD will be addressed to the MB, AF and CCBs in the summer months. A final draft, including resources, will be presented to the Management Board in November.

58. In the discussion that ensued, a number of points were raised. The European Commission highlighted the importance of the work on antimicrobial resistance, in particular, the role of ECDC in the implementation of the Commission Action Plan on AMR, as well as support for the joint procurement of vaccines (if this process is to be continued). Other priority areas will be vaccination, e-health and crisis preparedness and response including the link to health security. Concerning AMR, the MB also stressed the importance of being in close contact with other relevant EU agencies, as well as with the hospital sector. One member pointed out that there had not been any meeting of National Focal Points for AMR since 2015, and questioned whether the Disease Programme on Antimicrobial Resistance and Healthcare-Associated Infections (ARHAI) was not too big and should be split. Concerning vaccination, it was mentioned that a large number of countries are planning to take part in a Joint Action on vaccination, and the importance of ensuring alignment with ECDC work was stressed. Given that the Member States will have to define their contributions to the JA on vaccination during the summer, it was requested that a document summarising what ECDC is planning to do in this field be shared with the Member States, for instance, via the NFPs for vaccination. Some concerns were also expressed regarding the EPIET/EUPHEM programme, and the fact that Member States were not sufficiently involved in the recruitment process.

59. The Chair asked how the strategic meeting between DG SANTE and ECDC would impact on the SPD, and how the MB would be able to appreciate the changes made after the strategic discussions. He suggested highlighting the changes in some way in order to make them more visible to the Board.

60. Responding to some of the comments received, Andrea Ammon clarified that there will still be the possibility to provide comments on the SPD 2019 during the November meeting. The final draft will be submitted at the end of January, and until then, changes can still be made unless they are very substantial. Concerning the priority areas discussed, she mentioned that ECDC was part of the two Joint Actions on AMR and vaccination that were about to start, and agreed that it was important to ensure complementarity in the outputs in these areas. She added that, following the Commission conference on vaccination that had taken place the previous month, ECDC was working on a reflection paper on what should be done in the area of vaccination at EU level and how ECDC could contribute to this work; this paper could be made available to the Member States. She pointed out that ECDC was happy to contribute to the work on vaccination and AMR on a longer term, but it was important to recognise that sufficient resources would need to be allocated to these activities in this case, meaning that other areas might get fewer resources. She agreed on the importance of coordination with other EU agencies, such as EMA and EFSA. Concerning the ARHAI Disease Programme, she recognised that it was a big programme, but felt that splitting it in two programmes would not be beneficial given the close links between the two areas.

61. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, agreed with the Acting Director that it was important to keep the AMR and HAI activities together. He confirmed that the last meeting had taken place in 2015, but assured that the Disease Programme on AMR/HAI was certainly an active programme.

62. The Chair reiterated the importance of making all the changes in the SPD document clearly visible to the Board (for instance, activities suggested to be cancelled or postponed, as well as the reflection process behind). He further suggested to arrange a *tour de table* on the SPD 2019 at the November meeting, and to put forward one-three concrete questions in order to collect the MB inputs on the final draft.

63. Philippe Harant informed that normally changes are highlighted in yellow in the text. Concerning the reflection behind the changes, he recalled that since two years, a repository of comments is compiled and made available to the Board. The repository lists all the individual comments received as well as the response from ECDC.

The Management Board took note of the presentation of the ECDC Single Programming Document 2019, and agreed to include a *tour de table* session on the SPD 2019 at the following Management Board meeting in November 2017. A written consultation on the SPD 2019 will be organised prior to such meeting.

## Summary of discussions held at the 35th meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (13 June 2017), including its recommendations:

64. In the absence of Johan Carlson, Chair of the Audit Committee, John Ryan, Member, DG SANTE, briefly summarised the discussions and conclusions from the 35th AC meeting, which took place in the morning on 13 June 2017. Concerning the regular update on audit activities, he noted that 6 observations had been closed by IAS (no. 32-37) since the last meeting, and 1 observation had been closed by ECDC (no. 46) and was ready for IAS review. The remaining 16 observations are all planned to be implemented by the end of 2017 (4 in Q2, 3 in Q3 and 9 in Q4).

### *a) Confirmation of Audit Committee Membership and Sub-group mandated to review Implementing Rules (Documents MB40/11 a&b)*

65. Corinne Elizabeth Skarstedt updated the Board on the situation pertaining to the Audit Committee membership and the Sub-group mandated to review Implementing Rules. She recalled that a written procedure on AC membership had been sent to the Board on 7 March 2017. Following the March MB meeting, a second written procedure was sent on 30 May 2017 recalling the (self)nominations received to date, and calling for a volunteer to fill the outstanding vacancy (1 member representing a country). Thus far, no nomination had been received for the remaining vacancy. Notwithstanding the need to fill this vacancy, she stressed the existing challenge of ensuring fuller representation of the AC members, and consequently quorum at Audit Committee meetings.

66. Martina Brix, Alternate, Austria, agreed to join the Audit Committee. The membership of the Audit Committee was thereby fulfilled.

The Management Board approved the composition of the ECDC Audit Committee as well as the membership of the Sub-group mandated to review Implementing Rules.

## b) Progress report – Overview of 2017 Budget Implementation since the last Management Board meeting

67. Anja van Brabant, Head of Section, Finance and Accounting, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented an overview of the 2017 budget implementation since the last Management Board meeting. She explained that there was a significantly lower commitment rate in the second quarter of 2017 compared to the previous year. This was due to two important developments: firstly, much more money will be committed towards the second part of the year for expenses related to the ongoing building project; secondly, on Title 1, salaries have been committed until September only in order to keep funds available for possible transfer. On Title 3 (operational budget), a significant increase in the budget execution was noted.

68. John F Ryan summarised the discussions in the Audit Committee mentioning that the AC had taken note of the explanations given regarding the lower budget implementation in Title I and II in comparison to the previous year. ECDC had confirmed that the building project was on track and that there was an exit clause in the contract should ECDC leave Sweden. ECDC also clarified that the reason for not having paid all carry-forwards (C8s) yet was that some contracts were still running (e.g. EPIET) or invoices had not yet been received.

The Management Board took note of the Overview of 2017 Budget Implementation since the last Management Board meeting.

## c) Final Annual Accounts 2016, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management (Document MB40/12)

69. Anja van Brabant presented the final Annual Accounts for 2016, and informed the members about the conclusions from the discussions at the Audit Committee meeting. She recalled that the Provisional Annual Accounts had been presented to the Board and the Audit Committee in the March meeting. In the meantime, the accounts were audited by an external audit firm (Ernst & Young) on 13-17 March 2017, and a follow-up audit took place on 19 May 2017. The report from the Court of Auditors on the annual accounts 2016 with preliminary observations had been received in May. No changes had to be made to any amounts in the annual accounts 2016. However, a number of comments were received; replies to these are currently being drafted and will be finalised in collaboration with the Court of Auditors.

70. John F Ryan summarised the discussions of the Audit Committee mentioning that the AC proposed the Management Board to adopt the Final Annual Accounts 2016.

The Management Board approved the final Annual Accounts for 2016, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management.

## d) First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2017 (Document MB40/13)

71. Anja van Brabant presented the First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2017, which represents all transfers that have taken place up to 16 May 2017. During this period, no budget transfers were carried out between Titles. All budget transfers were approved by the Director within the limits of Article 27 point 1 of the Centre's Financial Regulation. She then briefly presented the actions which had received new or more funding.

72. John F Ryan summarised the discussions in the Audit Committee and mentioned that, in response to a question on the supplementary funding of some of the activities, ECDC had clarified that the increase for HIV/AMR/HAI surveillance and Antibiotic Awareness Day would be procured through existing Framework Contracts.

73. One MB Member commented that there was a large amount of money allocated to these framework contracts, and asked when the present contract started and when it would end.

74. Andrea Ammon clarified that there were different contracts with different contractors. In total, for the actions mentioned, there were five different framework contracts.

The Management Board took note of the First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2017.

## ECDC International Relations policy 2014-2020 – mid-term review 2016 *(Document MB40/14)*

75. Maarit Kokki, Senior Adviser to the Director/Head of Section, International Relations, ECDC, presented a mid-term review of the International Relations Policy 2014-2020. The policy, which was adopted by the Board in 2014, aims to provide a coherent framework for action and priority setting to support all ECDC activities with non-EU/EEA countries and organisations. The priority setting has been following very closely the Commission priorities, and EU enlargement countries and European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) partner countries have been the focus of most of the activities. The mid-term review shows that important progress and tangible results have been achieved in cooperation with EU enlargement and ENP countries, contributing to increased capacity in the countries to detect, assess, and manage threats. Remaining challenges include limited or absent resources, the lack of an internal strategy on the use of non-EU data, and the fact that many actions have been ad hoc rather than strategic.

76. Since 2014, new activities and opportunities for technical collaboration have emerged, such as support to outbreak support outside the EU and the launch of the new Africa Centres for Disease Control and Prevention in 2017. For the period 2017-2020, and based on the results achieved and the lessons learned, it is suggested to maintain cooperation with EU enlargement and ENP countries, and to reconsider a number of other strategic objectives. In addition, it is suggested to develop a new strategic objective related to the request for assistance and support to outbreak response activities outside the EU/EEA.

77. The MB Member from the United Kingdom noted the continuing importance of sharing surveillance data in the wake of the UK's exit from the EU. John F Ryan commented that the European Council has given the Commission the mandate to negotiate on Article 50 with the United Kingdom, and aspects related to ECDC will be part of a larger package. With regards to the policy document, he stressed the importance of streamlining the ECDC international activities with the international priorities of the Union and the health security policy. One area where ECDC's contribution can clearly be of added value for the EU enlargement and ENP countries is training (e.g. field epidemiological training activities). It is important that ECDC develops a strategic vision on how to offer field support to outbreaks, in particular, taking into account new community mechanisms such as the European Medical Corps and the Civil Protection Mechanism. He further commented that the work with CDCs should not be structural but based on needs. Other areas to keep in mind were AMR, IHR, and crisis preparedness and management. He added that detailed feedback from the Commission would be provided in writing.

78. Several MB Members congratulated the ECDC on the positive results achieved. One MB member commented that there was generally little awareness about the activities carried out outside the EU and felt that it should be better communicated what the ECDC does beyond the EU. It was suggested to look more closely at ongoing activities and projects run by the Member States or the Commission in specific geographical areas (e.g. in Africa or in the neighbouring countries) in order to pool best practices, and to see how the different activities can complement each other. The EU can also play a role in transferring knowledge to these countries. One MB member asked what would be the benefit of entering the TESSy and EPIS systems for the non EU countries if they cannot benefit from a response; on the other hand, providing a response would imply mobilisation of resources, and it was inquired how ECDC would deal with this situation.

79. Maarit Kokki thanked the Board members for their comments and support. She clarified that the strategic vision on outbreak response was curently being drafted, and will contribute to the revised strategy that will be presented in the November meeting. The work with the African CDC will need some further internal discussions. Some thematical work has already been carried out in enlargement and ENP countries, in particular, on AMR. Concerning IHR implementation, on request of the Commission, ECDC has carried out EU assessments in enlargement and ENP countries; these are based on EU legislation and therefore the support to IHR implementation is also factored into the follow-up of the recommendations. She agreed that the impact of the ECDC international activities should be better demonstrated, and that it was becoming more and more important to pool resources; one possibility was to have partnerships with the Member States. With regard to the question on response, she commented that some of the ENP

countries are very active in the EPIS, and some requests for support have been received. Based on Article 9 of the Founding Regulation, such support can be provided according to available resources. In general, EU enlargement countries would, of course, be more willing to participate and provide data if the return was visible and concrete. This being said, some support has been provided, for instance, to hospital outbreaks in enlargement countries. She concluded that this was a complex issue that will require further discussions internally.

80. Andrea Ammon mentioned that she agreed in principle with the comments from the Commission regarding collaboration with CDCs. However, there was a need to have a basic infrastructure in place or at least a designated contact person. Based on lessons learnt from the Zika outbreak, she felt that it was beneficial if possible issues could be dealt with proactively.

The Management took note of the ECDC International Relations Policy 2014-2020 - Mid-term Review 2016. A revised International Relations Strategy, including ECDC's strategic vision on global outbreak response, will be presented to the Board for adoption in November 2017.

## Planning of the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) *(Document MB40/15)*

81. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, recalled that ECDC had organised two Joint Strategy Meetings (JSM), the last of which was held in conjunction with ECDC's 10 year anniversary in 2015. The common factor has been that the meetings have involved key stakeholders such as the Advisory Forum, the Coordinating Competent Bodies (Director and/or National Coordinator) and a range of different National Focal Points. Feedback from the second JSM indicates that it was considered a positive, useful and generally well-organised meeting. The MB members were asked to provide their feedback on whether ECDC should host a third JSM in 2018, as well as on the theme, content and format of the meeting and the level of involvement of the stakeholders in the planning. He added that the matter had been discussed with the Advisory Forum in May. There had been broad support within the AF that a JSM Programme Committee should be established, with representation drawn from the envisaged stakeholder groups to be invited. There was also a clear consensus that the discussions within the JSM should be about well formulated proposals or options for adoption by ECDC and its partners, rather than asking the JSM to consider and advise on more general and abstract topics/questions.

82. In the discussion that ensued, some MB members felt that it was quite a heavy investment to arrange such a big meeting, and inquired about the added value and practical utility of such a meeting. On the other hand, some MB members acknowledged that the opportunity for different stakeholders to meet and to exchange on common topics was beneficial per se, and therefore the ambitions should not be too high in terms of expected outcomes. One MB member felt that it was perhaps more useful to meet in 2019 so that the results from the Third External Evaluation as well as the Commission priorities could be fed into the strategic planning for the future. In general, it was felt that the meeting should have a forward looking approach and focus on one or a few topics only (e.g. how to use e-health for public health purposes).

83. In response to the comments, Mike Catchpole reiterated that the feedback from the previous JSM had been positive and the outcomes had been fed directly into the Joint Action Plan. He clarified that the suggestion was not to cover all the proposed topics but to choose one or two; in particular, e-health and genome sequencing are real changes that will happen independently of policy shifts, and discussions on these topics would certainly be useful for the shaping of the ECDC strategy in this area. He concluded that, broadly, the Board seemed to be in favour of a greater involvement of the Member States in the planning. He stated that the added value would emanate from the choice of topics, the stakeholders involved, and how the outcomes would shape what ECDC does as an organisation and what ECDC' partners do, and how these can contribute to developing a common understanding.

84. Andrea Ammon thanked the Board for their comments, and agreed that planning such a meeting was of course an investment. She pointed out that in 2019, ECDC will start developing its new long-term strategy with input from the Third External Evaluation, as well as from the other external evaluations that will be carried out. In this respect, 2019 could be a more opportune point in time, but possible budget constraints also need to be taken into account. In general, she considered it important to bring the stakeholders together and to incorporate their different perspectives into the next five-year strategy. She suggested to discuss the matter further internally, and to present a further refined proposal at the next Management Board meeting.

The Management Board took note of the options presented for the planning of the Third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM), and agreed that ECDC will present a further refined proposal at the following Management Board meeting in November 2017.

## ECDC Management Board Meeting Dates 2018 and 2019 *(Document MB40/16 Rev. 1)*

85. Corinne Elizabeth Skarstedt, Head of Section, Corporate Governance, Director's Office, ECDC, presented the proposed meeting dates for 2018 and 2019. The MB agreed with the proposed schedule of meetings in 2018 as below:

- MB42: 20-21 March 2018
- MB43: 19-20 June 2018
- MB44: 13-14 November 2018

And provisionally in 2019:

- MB45: 20-21 March 2019
- MB46: 18-19 June 2019
- MB47: 13-14 November 2019

The Management Board approved the ECDC Management Board meeting dates for 2018, and provisionally for 2019.

## Opening and welcome by the Chair

86. The Chair opened the meeting on the second day and informed the Board that the appointment of Andrea Ammon as ECDC Director had now been officially confirmed.

## Update on ECDC Compliance: Implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy

87. Andrea Iber, Head of Section, Legal Services and Acting Head of Section, Procurement, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, provided a brief update on the implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy. She mentioned that five Annual Declarations of Interest (ADoI) were still missing from MB Members and Alternates (2 MB Members and 3 Alternates). ECDC was still awaiting feedback from DG HR on the policy for staff. Upon receipt of comments, the documents will be re-submitted to the MB for formal adoption under Article 110 of the EU Staff Regulations. In conclusion, she mentioned that further improvements had been made to the eDoI tool, and guidelines had been prepared for staff to assist with the implementation of the Independence Policy.

88. The Chair concluded that there had been significant improvement with compliance, but invited all the members and alternates to provide there AdoIs without further delay. He recommended to write individual letters to the five members/alternates who have not yet provided their declarations. He further asked the Commission to approach DG HR in order to get clearance on the policy concerning staff.

The Management Board took note of the update on ECDC Compliance.

## Appointment of the MB Working Group on Rules of Procedure of the ECDC Management Board *(Document MB40/17)*

89. Corinne Elizabeth Skarstedt recalled the work previously carried out with respect to the Revised Rules of Procedure (RoP) of the Management Board. The original Working Group was set up following MB29 in November 2013; the WG had convened three audio conferences, and a revision of the current RoP was presented to MB31 in June 2014. The discussion on the RoP was subsequently postponed, and in the Extraordinary MB meeting held in January 2015, it was agreed to postpone the discussion and

adoption of the Revised RoP until after the recruitment procedure of the ECDC Director was finalised. With Andrea Ammon being now officially appointed as ECDC Director, it was now appropriate to finalise the RoP; it was therefore suggested to re-establish the Working Group on revised Rules of Procedure. She added that it might bode well to also re-examine the procedure for the election of ECDC Director. She assured the Board that the re-established Working Group would receive full support from the ECDC Corporate Governance and Legal Services Sections. As far as possible, face-to-face meetings will be arranged back-to-back with Board meetings.

90. The following MB Members/Alternates volunteered to join the Working Group: Anne-Catherine Viso, Alternate, France, Gesa Lücking, Alternate, Germany, John F Ryan, Member, European Commission, and Marilena Koppa, Member, European Parliament.

91. The Chair concluded that two volunteers representing Member States were still needed, and suggested contacting representatives not present at the current meeting in order to stimulate participation, but added that this did not of course exclude volunteers among the members present.

The Management Board approved the proposal to re-establish the Working Group on Revised Rules of Procedure of the ECDC Management Board.

## WHO/ECDC Joint Work Programme *(Document MB40/18)*

92. Maarit Kokki updated the Board on the WHO/ECDC Joint Work Programme. She recalled that cooperation with WHO is mentioned in the Founding Regulation of ECDC. The latest administrative agreement between ECDC and WHO/Europe was signed in 2011; the agreement covers coordination of surveillance and alert activites, cooperation on epidemic intelligence, preparedness and response, and exchange of best practices. Over the years, several joint initiatives and activities have taken place, including joint missions and reports, joint press releases and other communication activities. Joint coordinated surveillance takes place on HIV/AIDS, TB and influenza. A large number of activities are ongoing in the disease specific areas; these are listed in the document provided to the Management Board (information on influenza and AMR will be added at a later stage). During the last big coordination meeting that took place in November last year, the 2016 joint activities were reviewed and the activities for 2017 were agreed. Several cross-cutting issues, such as data protection, were also discussed. One of the most important objectives is to reduce the burden for the Member States and, in particular, to decrease double reporting to the minimum.

93. In the discussion that followed, several MB Members congratulated ECDC for the ongoing collaboration with WHO. Referring to dengue outbreaks in Madeira, as well as European citizens being infected with dengue in the Seychelles islands, one MB Member asked how European citizens can be protected and better informed. The Finnish MB Member reported on the positive experience of the Joint External Evaluation on IHR, which had recently taken place in Finland; this was a quite laborious exercise but also very stimulating and useful to discuss with the experts from the different organisations involved in the mission (WHO, FAO, ECDC, European Commission, Member States repesentatives).

94. Denis Coulombier, Head of Unit, Surveillance and Response Support, ECDC, informed that it was commonly known that the Seychelles were regularly affected by dengue fever; the last significant outbreak occurred in 2016, with more than 400 cases reported among returning travellers. Information on the risks can be found on specialised travel medicine sites. In addition to the imported cases, in a couple of instances, there has been evidence of further transmission in EU; this was the case in Madeira a couple of years ago, but also in Croatia (German tourist returning from Croatia). In terms of information, he mentioned that there are fact sheets on dengue for the general public and health care professionals available on the ECDC website. These fact sheets include information on protection measures. In addition, ECDC publishes mosquito maps and risk assessments, which also include clear instructions on prevention.

95. John F Ryan, Member, European Commission, asked for further details on the status of the data protection issue. Concerning joint country mission reports, he noted that sometimes these were delivered two-three months following the mission, which seemed to be a long time if investigating a measles outbreak for instance. He added that he had never seen any of the country reports being presented to the Health Security Committee, and it might be worth discussing how to feed this information to the HSC.

96. Andrea Iber, Head of Section, Legal Services and Acting Head of Section, Procurement, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, clarified that ECDC has negotiated data protection clauses regarding data transfers with WHO and has submitted these to the European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS) for review. The EDPS has provided informal comments; these were in general positive and some

very constructive suggestions were received. There is one open question related to the exercise of the data subject rights since WHO is not subject to any Court or jurisdiction. ECDC had suggested an arbitration mechanism to allow data subjects to approach the International Chamber of Commerce to enforce their data subject rights. The feedback from the EDPS was, however, that this would be a bit too costly for the inividuals. ECDC therefore made an alternative proposal to the WHO to find an internal arbitration mechanism in case of complaints. ECDC is currently awaiting feedback from the WHO legal service.

97. With respect to joint country mission reports, Maarit Kokki explained that compiling the final report can be a rather tedious process as several parties are involved. However, information was certainly shared faster than this. She added that the reports were basically country owned, and it was therefore up to the country to release reports as such.

98. John F Ryan requested ECDC to regularly report to the European Commission on data protection matters and stressed that the issue had been pending for a long time and it was important to reach an agreement. He added that a discussion might be needed to see to what extent the country reports should be notified to the HSC; in general, information should be shared for the benefit of all. He added that the Commission has recently started country visits on AMR. As this is a new process independent of the WHO, he suggested that a discussion should take place between the Commission and ECDC before ECDC agrees the next work plan with WHO.

99. Some MB Members remarked that, while they understood the Commission's point of view, it was not ECDC's responsibility to share the reports, but it was up to the HSC to ask the Member States for further information.

100. John F Ryan clarified that he was not arguing about the ownership of the report, which was a legal question, but the point he wanted to make was that there was a need to discuss with ECDC how the type of information collected in country visits can be fed into the risk assessment and the risk management process provided for in the European legislation.

101. Maarit Kokki thanked the Board for their comments and added that it was necessary to distinguish the nature of the country visits as the outbreak related missions were totally different from the planned country visits.

The Management Board took note of the WHO/ECDC Joint Work Programme.

## Update on Surveillance activities

102. Denis Coulombier, Head of Surveillance and Response Support Unit, ECDC, updated the Board on two ongoing ECDC projects: the 'Evaluation of EU/EEA public health surveillance systems' (EPHESUS) project and the Surveillance System Reengineering (SSR) project.

103. The EPHESUS project is a four-year project outsourced to EpiConcept. As ten years have passed since the integration of the surveillance systems of the various networks, there is a need to revisit the systems and carry out an external evaluation. The main objectives are to evaluate if the systems are still fit for purpose (do they meet their surveillance objectives?), if they are useful (are they adding value to the Member States and how do they contribute to public health action or policy?), and if they are efficient (type and amount of data collected, processes, resources). The project covers all 52 diseases/health topics under EU/EEA surveillance. It addresses the EU system as a whole and does not look at the performance of individual Member States. In terms of Member States involvement, he informed that there had been a consultation of the Advisory Forum and the National Focal Points for Surveillance on the evaluation protocol. Each final report will be submitted to the Advisory Forum for a joint AF opinion. He then presented the timeline of the project mentioning that the first systems to be evaluated will be HIV, followed by AMR/HAI.

104. The SSR project aims at addressing the current surveillance system's inefficiencies and technical weaknesses, to reduce the reporting burden and to maximise the EU/EEA surveillance benefits for the Member States. It looks at the processes and tools in place for indicator based as well as event based surveillance and the method used is enterprise architecture. A reenginering roadmap is currently being prepared, and implementation will start in August 2017. He stressed that the project was a joint venture between the ECDC Surveillance and ICT Units. Stanislav Danchev, Deputy Head of Unit, Information and Communication Technologies Unit, ECDC, provided further details on the technical developments carried out as part of the project.

105. The Chair asked whether the surveillance system needed to be excluded from the Third External Evaluation to avoid duplication.

106. Denis Coulombier responded that the Third External Evaluation can build on the results of the EPHESUS rather than duplicate the work.

107. Concerning the SSR project, one MB member sought clarification on the surveillance data provided by the Member States versus information on possible threats emanating from other sources. One MB Member inquired whether the technical changes in the ECDC system will require some changes also in IT technologies in the Member States.

108. Denis Coulombier clarified that the main outcome of the SSR project was in fact to integrate the indicator-based and the event-based surveillance, i.e. the surveillance for which there is no data transmitted routinely by the Member States and for which the Epidemic Intelligence activities have been developed. ECDC will ensure that the impact on Member States is reduced to the absolute minimum. On the contrary, it is anticipated that the enhanced system will bring important benefits for the Member States.

109. Following the presentation, Susanne Wald, Member, Germany, gave a brief update on the G20 Health Ministers' summit, which had taken place in Berlin on 19-20 May 2017. This was the first time that the G20 Health Ministers had met. Two main topics were discussed: antimicrobial resistance and health crises. During the meeting, a health crisis simulation exercise was carried out in cooperation with WHO and the World Bank. This exercise had required substantial preparation, but the outcome had been very positive and showed the importance of mutual trust and open discussion. The meeting ended with the publication of a Berlin Declaration.

110. The Chair thanked Germany for the update and asked if it was foreseen to provide feedback from the exercise at the next HSC meeting, and if something similar could be arranged in the EPSCO Council.

111. Susanne Wald responded that it would certainly be interesting for the EPSCO Council to have a report on the exercise, but added that arranging a similar event was rather complex and required substantial preparatory work.

112. John F Ryan, Member, European Commission, commented that the Commission also appreciated the work done by Germany. He stated that a scenario-based exercise could possibly be introduced into the informal Council rather than in the EPSCO. He suggested including this issue in the HSC as an Any Other Business point to see if any forthcoming presidencies would be interested based on the presentation of the German experience.

The Management Board took note of the update on Surveillance activities.

## Update on ECDC Building Project

113. Andrea Ammon updated the Board on the progress of the building project, noting that the landlord was currently refurbishing the new premises. Due to the removal, which is planned to take place around Easter next year, the Management Board meeting in March 2018 will need to be organised outside ECDC. She added that a visit to the new premises could be arranged during the November MB meeting in case Board members were interested.

114. The Chair inquired whether any organisational changes were foreseen in connection with the removal.

115. Andrea Ammon responded that some changes in the organisational structure were likely to take place. However, she preferred to disconnect any possible changes from the removal process, and added that one of the prerequisites for the building was that the office spaces would be easy to rearrange. She added that, based on past experience, it was preferable to take the time to ensure there was a good rationale prior to carrying out any organisational changes.

## Update from the European Commission

116. John F Ryan, Member, European Commission, updated the Board on the state of play of the implementation of Decision 1082/2013/EU on cross-border threats to health. He mentioned that three legal texts were currently under preparation: firstly, a Commission Recommendation on personal data that may be exchanged for the purpose of contact tracing, secondly, an Implementing Decision on

updating the list of communicable diseases and special health issues subject to surveillance, including case definitions, and thirdly, an Implementing Act on the operation of surveillance networks.

117. He then briefed the Board about the vaccination workshop that had taken place on 31 May. The aim of the workshop was to see how cooperation at EU level could increase the coverage of vaccines to address vaccine shortages and to strengthen routine immunisation programmes. He remarked that currently the investment of industry in vaccine supply is reducing in Europe, and most of their production is being exported. To address these issues, representatives of the pharmaceutical industry had been involved in the workshop from the beginning. He hoped that the Estonian Presidency and future Presidencies would take forward some of the discussions from the workshop in different settings.

118. With regard to the joint procurement mechanism, he mentioned that there were four joint procurements in progress: the tender for pandemic vaccines will be launched before the summer holidays, followed by BCG vaccines and tuberculin, and the tender for personal protective equipment will be re-launched during the second half of the year. He added that nine Member States have expressed interest in procuring Diphtheria antitoxin, but according to WHO, there are no available stocks on the market. Following discussion between the Commission and the Strategic Advisory Group of Experts (SAGE) on Immunisation, it was concluded that UNICEF could identify the producers of this vaccine to initiate production, and that Member States might be able to link to that process rather than launching a joint procurement.

119. Concerning preparedness, the Commission has prepared a plan of actions together with the ECDC, and in cooperation with WHO/Europe, to strengthen preparedness and to support the implementation of IHR. This paper will be presented in the plenary meeting of the HSC at the end of June. There will also be a discussion on a document on preparedness and response to terrorist attacks.

120. He informed that the AMR action plan will be adopted by the Commission on 29 June, and it is anticipated that the Council will adopt Council Conclusions on the topic in December under the Estonian Presidency. Finally, the Commission has decided to relaunch the HIV Civil Society Forum and to extend it to cover also tuberculosis and hepatitis. The first meeting of this group will take place on 20-22 June. In parallel, there will be a think tank of government representatives who will meet back-to-back with the civil society representatives.

121. The Chair took the opportunity to inform the Board that Belgium was currently purchasing Diphtheria antitoxin in Denmark.

122. Responding to a question from the Board, John F Ryan clarified that the report from the vaccination workshop would be finalised by the end of the week, ahead of the Health Council taking place on 15 June. He added that, if agreeable, he would inform Member States about the Danish supply of Diphtheria antitoxin.

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

## Update from the EU Presidencies:

### *a) Update from Malta*

123. Patricia Vella Bonanno, Member, Malta, informed the Board about the work of the current EU Presidency. The Presidency Priorities in the area of health include childhood obesity, structured co-operation between health care systems, and HIV. A technical meeting on HIV took place in January; the aim was to discuss how Europe can improve its response to HIV and achieve the targets outlined in the Sustainable Development Goals.

124. Andrea Ammon thanked Patricia Vella Bonanno for the presentation, and added that the joint workshop on HIV had been very well organised and was a good example of how ECDC can support presidencies.

125. One MB Member commented that it was often difficult to achieve inclusion of health issues in the Council Conclusions and asked if there was any information in this respect.

126. John F Ryan responded that there would be Council Conclusions on Structured Cooperation on Health Systems as well as on Childhood Obesity. The outcomes of the HIV Conference and the work on food reformulation would also be presented during the EPSCO Council.

### *b) Update from Estonia*

127. Tiiu Aro, Member, Estonia, presented the highlights of the Estonian presidency, which will start on 1 July 2017. The Presidency Priorities in the area of health include tackling harmful use of alcohol, e-health, medicines, antimicrobial resistance and HIV. A high-level meeting on AMR will be held in Brussels on 23 November 2017.

The Management Board took note of the presentations from the Maltese and the Estonian EU Presidencies.

## Any other business

128. The Chair thanked the Board Members for their active contributions and, in particular, the Members who had volunteered to take part in the various Working Groups. He also thanked the interpreters for their professional support and wished everyone a safe trip home.

129. The next Management Board meeting will take place in Stockholm during 21-22 November 2017. The meeting was adjourned.

# Annex 1. List of participants

| Country / Organisation | Representative | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Austria | Martina Brix | Alternate |
| Belgium | Daniel Reynders *(Chair)* | Member |
| | Carole Schirvel | Alternate |
| Cyprus | Irene Cotter | Member |
| Czech Republic | Jozef Dlhý | Alternate |
| Denmark | Bolette Søborg | Member |
| Estonia | Tiiu Aro | Member |
| Finland | Anni Virolainen-Julkunen *(Deputy Chair)* | Member |
| France | Anne-Catherine Viso | Alternate |
| Germany | Susanne Wald | Member |
| | Gesa Lücking | Alternate |
| Greece | Georgios Saroglu | Alternate |
| Ireland | Michael Smith | Member |
| Italy | Francesco Maraglino | Alternate |
| Latvia | Jana Feldmane | Member |
| Luxembourg | Jean-Claude Schmit | Member |
| Malta | Patricia Vella Bonanno | Member |
| Netherlands | Judith Elsinghorst | Member |
| Poland | Pawel Gorynski | Member |
| Romania | Amalia Serban | Member |
| Slovak Republic | Ján Mikas | Member |
| Slovenia | Mojca Gobec | Member |
| Spain | Maria Araceli Arce Arnáez | Alternate |
| Sweden | Johan Carlson | Member |
| | Mårten Kivi | Alternate |
| United Kingdom | Helen Shirley-Quirk | Member |

| Country/Organisation | Representative | Status |
|---|---|---|
| **European Parliament** | | |
| | Zofija Mazej Kukovič | Member |
| | Antonio Correia de Campos | Alternate |
| **European Commission** | | |
| DG SANTE | John F Ryan | Member |
| **EEA Countries** | | |
| Iceland | Sveinn Magnússon | Member |
| Norway | Karl-Olaf Wathne | Member |