



ECDC Management Board

Minutes of the Forty-sixth Meeting Stockholm, 18-19 June 2019

Adopted by the ECDC Management Board at its Forty-seventh meeting, 13-14 November 2019

Contents

Opening and welcome from the Chair (and noting the Representatives).....	4
Welcome from the Director, ECDC.....	4
Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (<i>Document MB46/01 Rev.2</i>).....	4
Adoption of the draft minutes of the 45 th meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 20-21 March 2019) (<i>Document MB46/02</i>).....	4
Update on the Third External Evaluation of ECDC.....	4
Main findings of the Draft Final Report of the Third External Evaluation of ECDC (<i>Document MB46/03 Rev. 1</i>).....	5
Draft conclusions from the external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme (<i>Document MB46/04</i>)	6
Draft ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 (<i>Document MB46/05</i>).....	8
ECDC Single Programming Document 2021 (<i>Document MB46/06</i>).....	9
Follow-up on the comments from the written procedure: ECDC Preparedness and Response Support Strategy (<i>Document MB46/07</i>)	10
Summary of discussions held at the 41st Meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (18 June 2019), including its recommendation	11
<i>e) Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2019 up until present (Document MB46/11).....</i>	13
ECDC Management Board meeting dates 2020 and 2021, and the meeting date of the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) (<i>Document MB46/12</i>).....	13
Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (20-21 March 2019) (<i>Document MB46/13</i>).....	14
Update on Next Generation ECDC	14
Internal Rules concerning restrictions of data subject rights under Article 25 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725	16
Implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy	16
Update from the European Commission.....	17
Update from the Romanian Presidency of the Council of the EU	17
Update from the Finnish Presidency of the Council of the EU	17
Update from the European Parliament.....	18
Any other business.....	18
Annex: List of Participants	19

Summary of Proceedings – ECDC Management Board Meeting

The Forty-sixth meeting of the ECDC Management Board (MB) convened in Stockholm, Sweden, during 18-19 June 2019. During the meeting, the Management Board:

- ❖ adopted the programme of the meeting;
- ❖ adopted the minutes of the Forty-fifth meeting of the Management Board;
- ❖ approved the Final Annual Accounts 2018, including the Report on Budgetary and Financial Management;
- ❖ approved the ECDC Financial Regulation, conditional upon approval of the European Commission DG BUDG of the ECDC requests for derogation;
- ❖ approved the Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2019 up until present, including the proposed changes in the Financing Decision;
- ❖ approved the ECDC Management Board meeting dates for 2020, and took note of the proposed meeting dates for 2021;
- ❖ discussed the Draft ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 in a *tour de table* session; a further revised version of the Strategy will be submitted to the Management Board for approval during MB47 in November 2019;
- ❖ discussed the ECDC Single Programming Document 2021;
- ❖ discussed the follow-up on the comments arising from the written procedure¹ on the ECDC Preparedness and Response Support Strategy;
- ❖ took note of the update on the Third External Evaluation of ECDC provided by the Chair of the MB External Evaluation Steering Committee (MEES), and discussed the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the External Evaluation Draft Final Report presented by the evaluation team (PwC EU Services);
- ❖ took note of the main findings and recommendations of the external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme;
- ❖ took note of Audit Committee updates on Audit Activities and Audit Observations, the ECDC Internal Control Framework, and the IAS Final Audit Report on Preparedness and Response in ECDC;
- ❖ took note of the Progress report – Overview of 2019 Budget Implementation up until 13 June 2019;
- ❖ took note of the First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2019;
- ❖ took note of the update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting;
- ❖ took note of the update on the Next Generation ECDC;
- ❖ took note of the ECDC Internal Rules concerning restrictions of data subject rights under Article 25 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725. Following final approval by the European Data Protection Supervisor, the ECDC Internal Rules will be circulated to the Management Board for approval via written procedure;
- ❖ took note of the update on the implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy;
- ❖ took note of the update from the European Commission;
- ❖ took note of the update from the Romanian Presidency of the Council of the EU;
- ❖ took note of the update from the Finnish Presidency of the Council of the EU;
- ❖ took note of the update from the European Parliament.

¹ Launched in September 2018

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

1. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen, Chair of the ECDC Management Board, welcomed all the participants to the Forty-sixth meeting of the Management Board. A special welcome was extended to Dariusz Poznański, Member, Poland, Manuel Cuenca Estrella, newly appointed Alternate, Spain, and to Arjon Van Hengel, European Commission, DG RTD, who was participating as an observer.
2. Apologies had been received from Greece. In addition, the following countries did not attend the meeting: Iceland and Liechtenstein.

Welcome from the Director, ECDC

3. Andrea Ammon, Director, ECDC, warmly welcomed the Management Board members and noted that she was looking forward to having fruitful and inspiring discussions during the meeting.

Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (*Document MB46/01 Rev.2*)

4. The Management Board adopted the draft programme without changes. Following the adoption of the programme, the Chair asked each member whether s/he wished to add any oral declaration(s) of interest to her/his Annual Declaration of Interest (ADoI) submitted previously. None were declared.

The Management Board adopted the draft programme.

Adoption of the draft minutes of the 45th meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 20-21 March 2019) (*Document MB46/02*)

5. The Chair noted that the European Commission had requested amendments in points 66 and 72 of the draft minutes, and Germany had requested a minor amendment in point 47; these changes had been addressed in the minutes circulated to the Board ahead of the meeting. There were no further comments on the draft minutes.

The Management Board adopted the minutes of the Forty-fifth meeting of the Management Board with the above mentioned changes.

Update on the Third External Evaluation of ECDC

6. As agreed by the MB External Evaluation Steering Committee (MEES), this session was held without the presence of the contractor. Anne-Catherine Viso, Chair of the MEES, MB Alternate, France, updated the Board on the latest developments of the Third External Evaluation. She informed the Board that the MEES had not been fully satisfied with the interim report. On 29 May, the MEES had met with the contractor to discuss the draft final report of the external evaluation. As the report still required several improvements, it had been decided not to circulate the full report to the Management Board at this stage. Instead, a summary of the main findings, conclusions and recommendations was tabled for the participants. Overall, the current version of the report provides limited analysis to draw conclusions on improvements needed at the level of ECDC or at the level of other stakeholders.

7. With regards to the timeline, she mentioned that the MB Recommendations Drafting Group would have its first meeting during the lunch break the same day. A revised version of the draft final report is expected to be submitted on 26 June and the final report around mid-July. Lastly, as a lessons learnt from

the evaluation process, she stressed the need for the MEES (and the Drafting Group) to identify the main challenges before embarking in such an evaluation to be able to anticipate and prepare properly.

8. After this update, the contractor (PwC EU Services) was invited to enter the Board room and present the main findings of the external evaluation to the Management Board.

The Management Board took note of the update on the Third External Evaluation.

Main findings of the Draft Final Report of the Third External Evaluation of ECDC (*Document MB46/03 Rev. 1*)

9. Guy Brandenbourger and Tsvetelina Blagoeva, PwC EU Services, provided a presentation on the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the external evaluation. They recalled that the objective of the evaluation was to address two different streams; firstly, a backward-looking assessment of the work carried out by ECDC in the period 2013-2017, and secondly, a forward-looking analysis of the possible need for an extension of the ECDC mandate.

10. Overall, the evaluation shows that the relevance of ECDC's activities for different types of stakeholders in the Member States is high, in particular for public health experts and policy makers. However, the relevance of its outputs for regional stakeholders, the media, and the general public was found to be lower. The Centre has demonstrated capacity to adapt its activities to socio-economic developments, but less so to reduced national public spending on public health. The Zika and Ebola crises demonstrated the relevance of ECDC's international activities, but also the limits due to the availability of resources. With regards to effectiveness, the evaluation shows that ECDC has largely implemented all tasks mandated by Decision 1082. There are, however, remaining issues with the completeness of surveillance data. There is an overall positive assessment of ECDC outputs including Rapid Risk Assessment (RRA), even if these could benefit from being more tailored to national contexts. A number of activities of the Centre provide added value in terms of efficiency gains for Member States. There is a positive assessment of the complementarity between ECDC's and Members States' activities, and of the coordination with international stakeholders (WHO, GOARN, European Commission, and other EU agencies). Lastly, while the overall resources available to the Centre have remained unchanged over the evaluation period, the Centre has expanded its activities in a number of areas, which could indicate an increase in the overall efficiency of the Centre.

11. According to the evaluation results, the majority of the consulted stakeholders consider that there is a need for the Centre to have a clarified and potentially extended mandate in the area of cross-border threats to health from other sources than communicable diseases. The evaluation also identified the need to strengthen the EU-level work on non-communicable diseases (health information, health monitoring, health promotion), and to provide a more sustainable structure for these activities. ECDC could be suited for this task based on e.g. infrastructure, public health expertise, and reporting. Nevertheless, the analysis does not give a clear indication for a recommendation on the ECDC mandate.

12. The contractor then presented the recommendations arising from the evaluation, focusing on three areas out of nine identified in the draft final report:

1) Strengthened relevance of work for Member States: ECDC should consider ways of reflecting better Member States' needs related to reductions in national spending in the area of public health. ECDC should also adapt its methodology for cost impact analyses to better understand the impact of its activities on resources used at national level, and tailor its activities to the present constraints. In general, ECDC should streamline in all areas of its work, and focus on addressing structural gaps and deficiencies in Member States' public health systems, which affect their ability to effectively contribute and optimally benefit from ECDC's activities.

2) ECDC's international activities: ECDC and the relevant Commission services should clarify as a matter of priority the modalities and financing mechanisms through which ECDC can carry out international activities, with a view to ensuring their long-term sustainability. In addition, ECDC and the relevant Commission services should strengthen their mechanisms for coordination in this area.

3) Extension of the Centre's mandate: Given the identified evidence of needs for strengthened EU-level activities in the area of non-communicable diseases and the potential strengths and opportunities of ECDC for taking on these additional tasks, a full Impact Assessment, in line with the European Commission Better Regulation Guidelines, should be carried out on this issue, comparing the options of: no change, extension of ECDC's mandate to these areas, or establishing a new EU Agency with a mandate in the areas considered. The Impact Assessment should also consider other areas where ECDC's mandate can be revised – in the areas of international activities and cross-border threats to health other than from communicable diseases.

13. In the discussion that followed, several MB members commented that they had hoped for some more tangible conclusions on the mandate, while at present the conclusion seemed to be only that an impact assessment will be needed. Some members felt that the input they had provided in surveys and interviews did not seem to be reflected in the results.

14. Concerning the recommendation on strengthening the relevance for Member States, it was pointed out that the reference to national spending was not completely clear and could be interpreted as an incentive for Member States to spend less on public health. On the other hand, as noted by one MB member, the fact that less money is spent could also be due to the fact that some Member States have seen that there is less need to carry out certain tasks, such as international risk assessments, as this is done by ECDC. With reference to the conclusions on impact and added value, it was mentioned that the roles and responsibilities of different actors would need to be better defined as sometimes it is not clearly expressed at what level action should be taken (ECDC or Member States for instance). Lastly, several MB members thanked the MEES for their dedicated work all along the process of the external evaluation.

15. In responding to the comments, the evaluation team clarified that they had tried to compare the opinions of all respondents, and if a specific opinion was not reflected in the results, the reason was probably that there was not broad enough support for it among the respondents. More information on the survey results was provided in the full report. Concerning the conclusions made on the extension of the mandate, it was stressed that in the scope of an impact assessment, a dedicated data collection is carried out on the concerned topic, while such an exhaustive analysis could not be made in the framework of this evaluation. Concerning the question on national spending of Member States, there were two main elements: firstly, some less resourced Member States are not able to fully benefit from some of ECDC's activities (e.g. Fellowship Programme), and secondly, when assessing new activities, the cost implications for Member States are not systematically looked at.

16. In conclusion, the Chair asked whether it would be useful for the Recommendations Drafting Group to receive input from the Management Board on the final report.

17. Anne-Catherine Viso responded that such feedback could of course be useful for the work on the recommendations, but the MEES did not foresee to comment again on the final report.

The Management Board discussed the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the External Evaluation Draft Final Report. The final report will be submitted to the Management Board for approval via written procedure as soon as available. At this occasion, the Board members will be requested to provide comments on the recommendations to be considered by the MB External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group.

Draft conclusions from the external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme (Document MB46/04)

18. Tsvetelina Blagoeva, PwC EU Services, gave a presentation on the main conclusions of the external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme. She recalled that the preliminary findings of the evaluation had been presented to the Management Board in March 2019. As already mentioned at the time, the evaluation confirms that the overall aims and the objectives of the Fellowship Programme are met. Both the EU- and the MS-tracks are found to be relevant and to complement each other. There is, however a clear pattern of relatively fewer fellows being hosted by new Member States compared to other Member States of comparable population size. Additional efforts are therefore needed to strengthen the

effectiveness of the MS-track with the aim of reducing inequalities. Concerning the current two-path format of the programme (EPIET and EUPHEM), there is a persistent lack of clarity among stakeholders on the objective of the consolidation of the two paths into the "One Fellowship Programme", and there are diverging views and expectations on the future direction of the programme. The evaluation also found that the current name "ECDC Fellowship Programme" should be revised to better reflect the nature of the programme and its European scope. Overall, the Programme has been successful in fulfilling the intended learning outcomes. The evaluation finds that attaining academic accreditation for the Programme would further strengthen its added value for the fellows in their career progression. Lastly, the evaluation shows that there is room for improvement in the administrative and organisational arrangements of the programme. The identified options include outsourcing activities related to the organisation and logistics of training modules, currently carried out in-house, and replacing (some) site visits and meetings with video or phone conference calls.

19. The Chair thanked the PwC team for the presentation. She asked Karl Ekdahl, Head of Unit, Public Health Capacity and Communication, ECDC, how he planned to use the findings of the report.

20. Karl Ekdahl responded that the recommendations could be divided in three main parts: firstly, the administrative and organisational aspects; secondly, the question of accreditation; and thirdly, issues related to the structure of the Programme, which is the most important part. Concerning the accreditation, he mentioned that ECDC has a collaboration agreement in place with ASPHER, and one option is to see if there is a mechanism to provide accreditation through the ECDC-ASPHER network, which is currently being built up. With regards to the structure of the programme, he mentioned that the evaluation results will be discussed in a meeting gathering representatives of the Advisory Forum, NFPs for training, and the Training Site Forum. He confirmed that there are divergent views on the matter, but in the end, it will be necessary to conclude on the future direction.

21. In the discussion that followed, the Management Board acknowledged that this is a complex issue as the needs and size of the Member States vary, and it is necessary to find a balance between epidemiology and microbiology. It was noted, that very little of the results of this evaluation were reflected in the findings of the third external evaluation, and it was suggested that the MB Recommendations Drafting Group should consider also the findings of the fellowship evaluation. Concerning the question of accreditation, some MB members underlined the importance of academic recognition of the programme, while others considered this less important and stressed the need to maintain the current learning-by-doing approach of the fellowship programme. The pros and cons for the programme to be accredited should be analysed and shared with the MB. The representative of the European Commission suggested looking at the example of veterinary health, where an IT platform entirely for vets has been built up on EU level.

22. Concerning the financial and administrative aspects, it was questioned whether virtual meetings would be the right way to reduce costs. One member commented that the technologies should be improved to allow everyone to participate given the problems encountered so far. Furthermore, it was mentioned that face-to-face meetings are important for networking purposes. Given the European dimension of the programme, one MB member suggested exploring whether there were other options for complementary funding through the European Commission. In this context, the representative of the European Commission referred to the recent Health Council discussion on funding mechanisms for supporting investments in health. The idea is that Member States establish their needs after which the Commission facilitates the access to funds. This could also include elements notified by the agencies. He suggested circulating the concerned Presidency paper to the Management Board. ²

23. Andrea Ammon thanked the Board members for their input. As a former EPIET fellow, she noted that the most valuable outcome of the training for her has been that through it she acquired the skills and knowledge needed to do her job. It is clear that the field of public health is changing but there cannot be a separate path for all disciplines. The inequalities between Member States should surely be addressed. She stressed that the action plan would need to be developed together with those who train fellows in their countries. The focus should be on what the programme is aiming at; the question about virtual or

² The Presidency note "Facilitating investments to transform and improve health systems" was shared with the Management Board members on the second day of the meeting as part of the update on the Romanian EU Presidency.

physical meetings can be addressed later. She concluded that the objective was not necessarily to spend less but to spend smarter.

The Management Board took note of the main findings and recommendations of the external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme. An update on the matter will be provided during the next Management Board meeting in November 2019.

Draft ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 (Document MB46/05)

24. Andrea Ammon, Director, ECDC, recalled that the Draft ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 had been discussed in the last Management Board meeting in March 2019. Based on the comments received, the Strategy now focused on five strategic objectives instead of seven, and the purpose of the document had been further clarified. She noted that many ECDC tasks are defined in the Founding Regulation and thus recurrent from one year to another. Therefore, in order to make a difference, the priorities and the way things are done can be changed, but not so much the tasks themselves. She added that the Management Board had now received presentations on the main findings of the ECDC external evaluation and the evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme, and hoped that there could be agreement at least on the goals/strategic objectives and focus areas proposed in the document so that ECDC could proceed with the internal planning of 2021. During the next Management Board meeting in November, the final Draft Strategy will be presented for approval including a roadmap for implementation. The September Advisory Forum will be used to prioritise activity areas for the roadmap.

25. Following the presentation, the Management Board discussed the document in a *tour de table* session. Overall, the Management Board welcomed the strategic goals as outlined in the document. A number of comments were raised. Firstly, for better clarity, it was suggested to highlight the changes made in the next version of the document, and to pay attention to the terminology in some instances (e.g. Member States versus countries, health security). It was recommended to link the goals to a set of measurable indicators to allow for better monitoring. Referring to the determinants for infectious diseases (page 9), it was suggested to also consider the effects of tourism and migration. Climate change, microbiology, and inequalities between Member States were also highlighted as important areas to consider. Some clarification was requested concerning the focus on international activities. Several MB members stressed the need for flexibility, and for aligning the strategy with the recommendations of the external evaluation. Some concern was raised regarding the long-term perspective as it is difficult to make forecasts in the area of communicable diseases, and the fact that even the mandate of ECDC could change in the coming years. Some concern was also raised regarding possible political changes and how the new Commission priorities will be integrated in the document if the strategy is approved before these are known. Lastly, for better clarity, it was suggested to describe visually how the roadmap and multiannual SPD are derived from the Strategy.

26. Andrea Ammon thanked for the valuable comments. She recognised the concerns regarding the seven-year time period in such a rapidly changing area as infectious diseases. Nevertheless, there are certain developments which will take time, and also recommendations to be implemented, and therefore there is clearly a need for long term thinking while dealing with day to day changes at the same time. Concerning indicators, she mentioned that these will be added in connection to the roadmap. Regarding the international perspective, she stressed the need to build a network globally even if the focus is the EU. Responding to the comments on the mandate, she noted that any changes in this domain would surely take time, at least until half way through the strategy, and therefore there was not, in her view, any reason for concern. She ensured that the wording of the document would be looked into for better clarity. She agreed with the suggestion of adding a visual demonstration of how the roadmap, and subsequently the SPD, are derived from the Strategy. In conclusion, she noted that, with some rewording, the goals seemed to be acceptable to the Board members.

27. The Chair confirmed that, to her understanding, the tone of the feedback was positive. The Management Board will receive a third draft of the Strategy for approval in November 2019, including the roadmap for implementation.

The Management Board discussed the Draft ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 in a *tour de table* session; a further revised version of the Strategy will be submitted to the Management Board for approval during MB47 in November 2019.

ECDC Single Programming Document 2021 (Document MB46/06)

28. Andrea Ammon presented the ECDC Single Programming Document 2021. She explained that 2021 will be the first year to start the implementation of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027. The work plan for 2021 will thereby have three parts: 1) ECDC's statutory and recurring tasks (e.g. basic surveillance, RRAs, provision of scientific advice at the request of the European Commission, the European Parliament or Member States), 2) activities and projects carried forward from 2020 due to their multi-annual nature, and 3) items derived from the strategy. The following activities will be stopped or reduced: surveillance of variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease (a discussion on discontinuation will take place in the Advisory Forum in September 2019), and the evaluation of surveillance systems due to the fact that the EPHESUS project will be finalised in 2020. While the SPD 2021 will be adapted to the new strategic priorities, it will still follow the common template for all EU agencies. A more detailed final draft of the SPD 2021-2023 will be presented to the Management Board in November, including the resource allocation. The next version of the SPD will also include a new set of indicators more focused on impact.

29. In the discussion that followed a number of comments and questions were raised. In general, the Management Board welcomed the fact that the SPD document already integrated elements of the strategy. The focus on partnerships and coordination was also welcomed. One MB member inquired about the consequences of the EPHESUS project being finalised. As for the strategy, the new Commission priorities will also need to be integrated in the SPD. More generally, one member raised the question how European citizens and the European Parliament can be made more aware of ECDC and its work, and cited the European Antibiotic Awareness Day as a successful example. It was suggested, that this question could perhaps also be taken on board when discussing the recommendations of the external evaluation. The Representative of the European Parliament agreed that it would be important to strengthen the links between ECDC and the Parliament; one possibility could be to arrange a joint annual conference. She further suggested examining whether one of the three Management Board meetings could be organised outside Sweden as a way of increasing the visibility of ECDC in the Member States.

30. Responding to the question on EPHESUS, Andrea Ammon explained that this project has been running for two years and will be completed in 2020. After this, an overarching analysis of all the evaluations will be carried out to identify the needs for more general improvements of the entire EU level surveillance. She ensured that any changes to the strategy will also be included in the SPD; however, the priorities of the new Commission might not be known by the time of the next Management Board. Thus, the strategy would be amended, if necessary. Lastly, she assured, that there is a good interaction between ECDC and the European Parliament through the ENVI Committee. For instance, apart from the annual hearing, a delegation of the ENVI committee is visiting ECDC every other year. An annual conference with the Parliament could be considered, but it would be necessary to find a MEP who would be willing to champion this initiative. Regarding the suggestion to arrange one of the Board meetings outside Sweden, she mentioned that this was the practice in the early years of ECDC but it was discontinued due to the substantially higher costs associated with arranging the meetings abroad. Some parallel activity in connection to the Board meeting would also be needed to increase the visibility. This being said, she suggested that ECDC could prepare a few options to be presented to the Management Board in November 2019.

31. In conclusion, the Chair mentioned that a more detailed SPD document, including resource allocation, will be presented at the next Management Board meeting in November.

The Management Board discussed the ECDC Single Programming Document 2021.

Follow-up on the comments from the written procedure: ECDC Preparedness and Response Support Strategy (*Document MB46/07*)

32. The Chair recalled that the ECDC Preparedness and Response Support Strategy had been circulated to the Board for written procedure in September 2018. The matter had thereafter been put on hold due to the need to further clarify the role of ECDC in this area. She gave the floor to Anne-Catherine Viso, MB Alternate, France, who had requested the inclusion of this item on the draft programme.

33. Anne-Catherine Viso explained that the purpose was not to discuss the preparedness strategy again at this stage, but to give the opportunity to the Member States (in particular Germany and Netherlands) and the European Commission to explain their respective positions expressed in the written procedure. She added, that some of the considerations made by the external evaluation also suggest that the way forward in this area is not clear to everyone.

34. Susanne Wald, MB Member, Germany clarified that the point made by Germany mainly concerned prioritisation; it was important to acknowledge that priority should be given to the Member States in case of several requests for support. When there are requests coming from outside of the EU, ECDC will need to approach the Commission and request additional resources if necessary. She added, that the external evaluation also stresses the need to clarify the modalities and the financing mechanisms through which ECDC can carry out international activities.

35. Ciska Scheidel, MB Member, Netherlands, pointed out that looking at the preparedness strategy it was not clear enough how it was supposed to be implemented in practice.

36. Taneli Puumalainen, MB Alternate, Finland, agreed that the EU should be prioritised in principle, but the judgment would need to be made case by case and based on the threat level.

37. Paula Vasconcelos, MB Alternate, Portugal, considered that what was missing in the document was what this activity implied for ECDC's own structure, and the question was how the Centre can take on board this challenging task if it is not structured for it internally.

38. John F Ryan, MB Member, European Commission, confirmed that the Commission welcomes ECDC's work on preparedness planning and support to Joint Actions among other things. The main comment of the Commission was that the document lacked the gap analysis, and it was suggested that ECDC should develop country specific information on preparedness. ECDC also has a role in identifying cross-border threats to health from communicable diseases of intentional nature such as bioterrorism.

39. Andrea Ammon recalled that the reason for putting the work on the preparedness and response support strategy on hold was that the discussion on the topic was not finished, and as such it would have clashed with the overarching strategy under preparation. After finalisation of the Strategy 2021-2027, the existing specific strategies will be looked into to determine whether they are still necessary. This being said, it was important that the different points had now been further clarified; these could perhaps be taken up by the Recommendations Drafting Group and be formulated as recommendations. Having heard the explanations, the comments seemed now less contradictory, and it was more a question of how activities are prioritised. The threat and needs based approach suggested by the Finnish Alternate member was interesting in this context. Lastly, referring to the point made on ECDC's structure, she noted that with the upcoming restructuring it is foreseen that all the public health functions (generic surveillance, epidemic intelligence, lab based surveillance, preparedness and response, as well as training) will be placed in one unit, with preparedness and response support being grouped in one section.

The Management Board discussed the follow-up on the comments arising from the written procedure on the ECDC Preparedness and Response Support Strategy.

Summary of discussions held at the 41st Meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (18 June 2019), including its recommendation

40. In the absence of Johan Carlson, Chair of the Audit Committee, Anni Virolainen-Julkunen, Member of the Audit Committee, summarised the discussions from the 41st Audit Committee meeting, which took place in the morning of 18 June 2019.

41. Concerning the regular update on audit activities, she noted that one observation had been formally closed by the Internal Audit Service (IAS). Only one observation is currently open and will be implemented by Q4 2019. The Audit Committee had also received an update on the Internal Control Framework (ICF) approved by the Management Board in November 2018. The Audit Committee had taken note of the ongoing work; a detailed ICF will be presented to the Management Board and the Audit Committee in November 2019. Colleagues from the IAS had then presented the results of the IAS audit on preparedness and response. The audit makes five recommendations (two very important and three important), all of which have been accepted by ECDC, and a number of actions are already being implemented. She clarified that the report has been classified as sensitive, but Management Board members can access it via the Audit Committee Extranet.

a) Progress Report – Overview of 2019 Budget Implementation up until 13 June 2019

42. Anja van Brabant, Accounting Officer and Head of Section, Finance and Accounting, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented an overview of the 2019 budget implementation since the last Management Board meeting. She noted that, by 16 June 2019, € 48.6 Million were committed from the 2019 budget of € 59.2 Million. An increase in title 1 and 2 was noted, and a decrease in title 3 as compared to Q2 2018. In terms of executed payments, a slightly lower payment execution was noted on title 2 and 3 compared to the previous year. With regards to carry-forwards from 2018, she noted that 71.4% (€ 7.2 Million out of € 10.04 Million) had been paid. A decreased payment implementation was observed on title 2 compared to the previous year, while increases were noted on titles 1 and 3.

43. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen informed the Management Board that the Audit Committee had taken note of the 2019 budget implementation. For better clarity, the Audit Committee had requested that a description of the different titles (1, 2 and 3) be included in future presentations to the AC and MB.

The Management Board took note of the Progress Report – Overview of 2019 Budget Implementation up until 13 June 2019.

b) Final Annual Accounts 2018, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management (Document MB46/08)

44. Anja Van Brabant presented the Final Annual Accounts 2018. She recalled that the Provisional Accounts had been presented to the Management Board in March 2019. The accounts were audited by an external audit firm (E&Y) during 4-8 March 2019. As a result, one change had to be made to the accounts related to the obligation from the lease agreement to restore the building to its original state at end of the lease. The provision, booked in full in the provisional accounts to reflect this obligation, has now been reduced to an annual provision that will gradually be increased, year after year, until the end of the lease agreement. She clarified that the changes made to the final accounts were highlighted in the text.

45. A report from the European Court of Auditors (ECA) on the annual accounts 2018 with preliminary observations was received in June 2019. The opinion stated that the annual accounts of the Centre present fairly in all material respects, the financial position at 31/12/2018, the results of its operations, its cash flows and changes in net assets at year-end in accordance with its Financial Regulation and the accounting rules applicable. Revenue and payments underlying the accounts are legal and regular in all material respects. The report makes three observations related to internal control; these observations do not call into question the Court's opinion on the regularity of the accounts. ECDC is in the process of re-negotiating the text of the observations and will then send its replies to ECA. Anja van Brabant noted that the ECA report had been tabled due to the fact that the initial report had contained a number of mistakes. The

proposed Draft Opinion of the Management Board on the annual accounts 2018 was also tabled for MB approval.

46. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen summarised the discussions in the Audit Committee mentioning that clarification had been given on the intangible fixed assets, accounts payable at year-end, and the pension obligations. A question was raised regarding the staff turn-over rate 2018 (6.7% compared to 5.3% in the previous year). In conclusion, she noted that the Audit Committee recommended the Management Board to approve the proposed MB opinion on the Annual Accounts 2018.

47. Following the presentation, one MB member asked for an explanation on the observations of the Court of Auditors regarding ex-ante controls not being carried out, and carry-forwards from 2017 (for an amount of € 10.3 Million) not being used.

48. Anja van Brabant clarified that this text was currently being re-negotiated with ECA, and the comment on budgetary management (carry-over) had actually been removed. Concerning the ex-ante controls, she noted that the framework contract referred to in one of the observations is a contract procured by the European Commission and not by ECDC, and the text of the ECA report will need to be corrected accordingly.

49. The Representative of the European Commission thanked for the explanations and suggested that the final version of the ECA report could be shared with the Management Board for information once available. The Audit Committee could then come back on the comments on internal control during their next meeting in November.

50. Following these clarifications, the Management Board approved the Annual Accounts 2018.

The Management Board approved the Final Annual Accounts 2018, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management.

c) First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2019 (Document MB46/09)

51. Anja Van Brabant presented the First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2019, consisting of the budget transfers approved by the Director since the last Management Board meeting held in March 2019 and up until 17 May 2019. All budget transfers were approved by the Director within the limits of her powers (Article 27 point 1 of the Centre's Financial Regulation). No budget transfers were made between titles.

52. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen informed the Board that the Audit Committee had not discussed this topic due to lack of time, but noted that this item was for information only.

The Management Board took note of the First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2019.

d) ECDC Financial Regulation (Document MB46/10)

53. Anja Van Brabant informed the Management Board that following the adoption of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/715 on the framework financial regulation ("FFR 2019") for Union bodies on 18 December 2018, ECDC had drafted a new ECDC Financial Regulation. The draft ECDC Financial Regulation was presented to the Management Board for adoption, including two requested derogations currently under consideration by the European Commission. The proposed derogations concern Article 7: Contribution agreements, grant agreements and financial framework partnerships - a clarification that ECDC is entitled to continue to conclude contribution agreements and grant agreements with the services of the European Commission, and Article 18: Use of Euro - a derogation to allow ECDC to carry out operations in other currencies than Euro also for operational expenditure (only in exceptional cases, such as the payment of open access fees for publications in scientific journals). She clarified that the proposed changes were highlighted in yellow in the document (pages 6, 11 and 12). In addition, following the Audit Committee meeting, three further amendments (in Articles 113 and 114) were proposed by the European Commission, and tabled for the approval of the Management Board.

54. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen mentioned that the Audit Committee had discussed the derogations proposed by ECDC and the additional amendments requested by the European Commission. The Audit Committee invited the Management Board to adopt the ECDC Financial Regulation, conditional upon approval by the European Commission DG BUDG of the wording of the two proposed derogations. Should the European Commission not accept one or both of the two derogation requests, or propose amendments to their wording, the Financial Regulation shall not be deemed adopted and a new version of the ECDC Financial Regulation will be circulated to the Board for adoption via written procedure.

The Management Board approved the ECDC Financial Regulation, conditional upon approval of the European Commission DG BUDG of the derogations requested by ECDC.

e) Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2019 up until present (Document MB46/11)

55. Philippe Harant, Planning and Monitoring Manager, Executive Office, Director's Office, ECDC, provided an update on the current status of the implementation of the Work Programme 2019. He explained that a number of changes were proposed in the list of procurements (Annex 1), and these were marked in red in the document. Most of the changes related to delays in procurement or underestimated budget. As an example, additional funds were added in the area of training to be used for operationalisation of the recommendations from the external evaluation of the Fellowship Programme. He recalled that any significant change in the list (20% or more of the budget per line of the Financing Decision) requires a prior approval of the Management Board.

56. Referring to point 1.3 in the list of procurements, one MB member asked for a clarification on the proposed change whereby the programme management for geographic information systems (GIS) was to be transferred to ICT, and questioned how ICT could provide the expertise in this area.

57. Vicky Lefevre, Acting Head of Unit, Surveillance and Response Support, ECDC, clarified that this related to the budget for programme management of the Surveillance System Reengineering project and that an ICT framework contract had been used for this purpose.

The Management Board approved the Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2019 up until present, including the proposed change in the Financing Decision.

ECDC Management Board meeting dates 2020 and 2021, and the meeting date of the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) (Document MB46/12)

58. Maarit Kokki, Head of Executive Office, Director's Office, ECDC, presented the proposed meeting dates for 2020 and 2021. The Management Board agreed with the proposed schedule of meetings in 2020 as below:

- MB48: 26-27 March 2020
- MB49: 16-17 June 2020
- MB50: 24-25 November 2020

In addition, the Management Board took note of the following meeting dates proposed for 2021:

- MB51: 23-24 March 2021
- MB52: 15-16 June 2021
- MB53: 23-24 November 2021

59. Maarit Kokki further informed the Board that the Third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) is scheduled to take place on 13-14 May 2020, with a celebration of ECDC's 15-year anniversary planned on 13 May.

The Management Board approved the meeting dates for 2020, and took note of the provisional meeting dates for 2021.

Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (20-21 March 2019) (Document MB46/13)

60. Andrea Ammon, ECDC Director, provided the Management Board with an update on the main activities since the last Management Board meeting. The presentation referred to past and upcoming visits and meetings of the ECDC Director, as well as an overview of what had been discussed at the 57th meeting of the Advisory Forum (May 2019). An overview of ECDC Rapid Risk Assessments was also provided.

61. With reference to the requests received from the European Commission (p. 6 of the document), one MB member asked for further information on the request for feedback on the Draft of the European response plan for mass burn casualty disasters, the ECDC involvement in the Expert Group on Health Information, and the EU vaccination card tender specifications. Another MB member inquired about the concrete work carried out by ECDC employees in the last months. An update was requested on the actions taken since the spread of Ebola from DRC to Uganda. It was further pointed out that the recent mission of the ECDC EVD team in Madeira was not listed in the document.

62. Responding to the question on the work carried out by staff, Andrea Ammon mentioned that the report on the main activities is actually an overview of what staff did in the concerned period. To compile the report, all entities are asked to insert their highlights. From a political point of view, the measles risk assessment was probably one of the most critical activities, and the intention was of course that it would have a positive impact.

63. Concerning the request from the Commission to provide feedback on the draft European response plan for mass burn casualty disasters, Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, clarified that the request did not touch on particular areas for comment from ECDC but was a generic request. Regarding the Expert Group on Health Information, he mentioned that one ECDC colleague had attended the meeting, but he did not have at this point detailed information on the discussions held. Andrea Ammon mentioned that, without anticipating any mandate extension, there are elements in connection to ECDC's area of work that are useful also for building up health information. As an example, ECDC might be involved in a small part of the Joint Action on Health Information, which is in preparation by Belgian colleagues. With regards to the EU vaccination card tender specifications, Mike Catchpole clarified that ECDC contributed to the issue as part of work carried out in support of the implementation of the Council Recommendations on vaccination. Coming back to the discussions in the last Advisory Forum meeting, he noted that there had been a lively debate on Lyme disease, and ECDC was now in the process of securing some additional support to the Member States in this area. The most concerning issue reported by the AF was that a German court injunction had prevented the publication of expert guidelines on the disease.³

64. Lastly, responding to the question on actions following the spread of Ebola to Uganda, Andrea Ammon mentioned that the cases registered in Uganda were exported cases from DRC and therefore did not significantly change the situation. If autochthonous cases were registered, then the situation would of course be different.

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

Update on Next Generation ECDC

65. Andrea Ammon gave an update on the Next Generation ECDC initiative focusing on the ongoing reorganisation. She recalled that three potential organisational models had been tested in a simulation exercise with three key processes during the spring. These processes were chosen due to their importance, or because they were perceived as pain-points: planning and resource allocation, Rapid Risk Assessments,

³ According to information received after the 46th Management Board meeting, a judgment of the Berlin Court allowed the publication in March 2018 in its intended scientific form without addressing specific interests of individuals.

and handling requests for scientific advice. The outcome of the exercise was that all three groups involved put forward the same model. The chosen model suggested the most radical change and also the abolishment of the matrix structure. In translating the outcome of the simulation exercise into a proposed organigram, the main elements of the strategy 2021-2027 were taken into account. The suggested organisational model was announced to staff on 16 May and thereafter sent to the Staff Committee for consultation. The new organisation will become effective as from 1 January 2020.

66. She then presented the proposed organisational structure, mentioning that most comments of the Staff Committee concerned the structure and the names of the Disease Programmes, which are suggested to become physical entities grouped in two areas: behavioural and programmatic diseases on the one hand (HIV, STIs, TB, VPD), and diseases related to the one health approach on the other hand (ARHAI, FWD, EVD). All entities will be asked to come up with names that would fit them best. Other comments concerned the appointment of managers, and the managerial layers and span of control. She clarified that, similarly to the current structure, there will be four levels of administration in the new structure: Director, Heads of Unit, Heads of Section and Group leads.

67. Another issue raised was the potential (perceived) conflict of interest of *Eurosurveillance* being placed under the Chief Scientist, who gives clearance for ECDC contributions to the journal. A survey was carried out among the editorial advisers and associate editors of *Eurosurveillance*; according to the results, the majority did not consider the envisaged placement as critical as long as the current policies that guarantee independence would be kept. She asked the Management Board for their opinion on the matter. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, added that *Eurosurveillance* has been successful in stimulating innovation and dialogue. He is truly committed to maintain the independence of the journal but added that if it would be better from a perception point of view, *Eurosurveillance* could of course be placed elsewhere in the organisation as well.

68. In the discussion that followed, a number of comments and questions were raised. It was noted that timing and speed are important aspects in a reorganisation process, and it was questioned whether waiting until the beginning of 2020 would not create unnecessary uncertainty among staff. It was further commented that the new structure may also be a challenge to the CCBs who are used to the current division of public health functions and roles, and the consequences on the networks would need to be properly explained to CCBs. Clarifications were requested on the outsourcing of ICT services and its implications for staff. It was also questioned whether there was going to be a call for candidates for the new positions or whether these were decided by the Director. Regarding the implementation of the new structure, it was inquired whether some measures were planned to guide staff to their new tasks (shadowing or similar), how a collaborative environment would be ensured, and how the success of the new structure is going to be measured. No particular concerns were raised with respect to the placement of *Eurosurveillance* as long as the process to guarantee the independence of *Eurosurveillance* was clear and respected.

69. Andrea Ammon thanked the Board members for their comments and questions. She noted that building a collaborative culture will not happen over-night but will be a process. The reason for installing the matrix in the current structure was in fact to avoid silos and create synergies; in the new structure, cross-collaboration will need to be ensured by other means, for instance by putting in place cross-cutting task forces or working groups. Concerning the HR part, she clarified that some current managers will not have managerial roles in the new structure, while others will continue to be managers but with new tasks assigned to them. The reassignment of tasks is done following the decision of the Director. Concerning the outsourcing of IT systems, she mentioned that a rather advanced implementation plan is already in place, including measures for the retraining of staff.

70. Regarding the speed of the reorganisation, she noted that priority has to be given to the delivery of the work plan, and given the rather fundamental change, it will take some time to align all processes, budget lines, etc., to the new structure. Concerning the measurement of success, she explained that this will be based on two elements; the satisfaction of staff on one hand, and the increase of efficiency on the other hand, which is in fact the desired goal of the reorganisation. She added that an implementation plan was currently being finalised and an important aspect was of course to put in place good handovers and transitions where needed even if, for the majority of staff, the tasks will remain the same. Regarding the consultancy support received along the process, she clarified that the consultancy company (BearingPoint) had picked up the report on organisational performance delivered in January 2018, and had provided support to the reorganisation since December 2018. She agreed that ECDC partners will need to be informed about the restructuring and how this affects the contact points. The single functions will be

mapped in the last quarter, and more information will be provided at that stage; however, most likely there will not be a fundamental change in the contact points. The final organigram will be circulated to the Management Board as soon as available.

The Management Board took note of the update on Next Generation ECDC.

Internal Rules concerning restrictions of data subject rights under Article 25 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725

71. Andrea Iber, Head of Section, Legal Services and Procurement, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, informed the Management Board on the necessary steps for adopting internal ECDC rules for the restriction of data subject rights. She explained that in accordance with article 25 of Regulation (EU) (2018/1725) (GDPR for EU bodies), data subject rights (e.g. right to access, erasure, rectification of data) may need to be restricted on important public interest grounds, such as for the prevention, investigation, detection, and prosecution of breaches of ethics for EU staff, or the protection of the data subject or the rights and freedoms of others. According to the new regulation, such internal rules have to be adopted at the highest level of management of the Union bodies and published in the Official Journal of the European Union.

72. Consequently, a set of "model" internal rules were developed by the Network of Agencies' Data Protection Officers and endorsed by the European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS) on 20 May 2019. The rules cover standard restrictions in the following areas: administrative inquiries and disciplinary proceedings; irregularities reported to OLAF and whistleblowing cases; procedures of harassment; internal and external complaints; internal audits, investigations by the Data Protection Officer and internal IT security investigations, and processing of certain medical data of ECDC staff. In addition, ECDC has requested a restriction for the interest of public health for pseudonymised personal health data in databases. She added that final approval of the ECDC rules was expected from the EDPS in the coming days and comments from the ECDC Staff Committee by 5 July. After this, the ECDC internal rules will be sent to the Management Board for approval via written procedure. Any deviation from Agency model rules developed by the Network of Agency's DPOs will be clearly marked and an explanation provided. Following approval by the Management Board, the internal rules will be published in the Official Journal.

The Management Board took note of the ECDC Internal Rules concerning restrictions of data subject rights under Article 25 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725. Following final approval by the European Data Protection Supervisor, the ECDC Internal Rules will be circulated to the Management Board for approval via written procedure.

Implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy

73. Andrea Iber, Head of Section, Legal Services and Procurement, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, provided a brief update on the implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy. She mentioned that 89% of the Annual Declarations of Interest (ADoI) had been collected from MB Members and Alternates, and 79% from AF Members and Alternates. A few relevant interests had been identified in 2019 (three for MB and AF respectively), but no mitigation measures had been necessary. For expert meetings, 437 Declarations of Interest had been collected since the beginning of 2019 (2 DoIs missing). Mitigation measures were applied in ten cases; these included screening of the input of experts by an ECDC independent staff member for potential bias, and restricting participants from being chair or vice chair for the group. For Rapid Risk Assessments, the compliance rate was 100%.

The Management Board took note of the update on the implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy.

Update from the European Commission⁴

74. John F Ryan, MB Member, DG SANTE, briefed the Management Board about the topics to be discussed at the next Health Security Committee meeting (3-4 July). He also informed the Board about recent discussions within the Global Health Security Initiative and HSC concerning the Ebola outbreak and the availability of Ebola vaccines. The presentation also referred to ongoing and planned Joint Actions in the area of vaccination and preparedness, as well as ongoing work on EWRS and AMR.

75. Isabel de la Mata, MB Alternate, DG SANTE, provided further information on the work to implement the Council Recommendation on vaccination, where ECDC is a leading partner for several deliverables. She informed the Board that the Commission is co-organising with WHO a Global Vaccination Summit on 12 September 2019. ECDC is taking part in the Programme Committee, and has contributed to the preparations by giving feedback on the draft technical background papers.

76. Arjon Van Hengel, Observer, DG RTD, informed the Management Board about the recent reorganisation of DG RTD. In the new organigram, infectious diseases research is covered by the unit "Combatting diseases", which will be the main contact point for ECDC and will represent DG RTD in the Management Board. He then briefed the Board about ongoing and planned calls within the Horizon 2020 framework programme. Horizon 2020 will be followed by the new "Horizon Europe" programme. One of its three pillars ("global challenges") will be of particular relevance for SANTE.

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

Update from the Romanian Presidency of the Council of the EU

77. Amalia Serban, MB member, Romania, gave a presentation on the Romanian EU Presidency (1 January-30 June 2019). She recalled that the overall priority in the area of health was the "Guarantee of access to health for all European citizens". The sectorial priorities included Antimicrobial Resistance and Healthcare Associated Infections as well as Vaccination. One of the key events was the Ministerial Conference on AMR, which took place on 1 March 2019. The event raised the AMR topic on both national and European level, and contributed to creating a legal base for a national "one health" approach to combat AMR in Romania. The new Council Conclusions on AMR, focusing on preventive measures, were approved during the last EPSCO meeting (14 June). The EU health ministers also discussed funding mechanisms for improving health systems. In this context, the Romanian Presidency together with the European Commission prepared a short presentation of the possible European funding programme for the next period (2021-2027). The Presidency note related to this item was shared with the Management Board members for information.

The Management Board took note of the update from the Romanian Presidency of the Council of the EU.

Update from the Finnish Presidency of the Council of the EU

78. Taneli Puumalainen, MB Alternate, Finland, briefed the Management Board about the upcoming Finnish EU Presidency (1 July-31 December 2019). He noted that the newly appointed Finnish government has initially identified three main themes for the Presidency: 1) EU as a global climate leader, 2) EU that strengthens the rule of law and human rights, and 3) Competitive and socially cohesive Europe. The final Presidency programme will be finalised just before the start of the Presidency period. One of the key themes will be the economy of wellbeing with the aim of looking into how human wellbeing can promote economic growth – and vice versa. The Presidency will also focus on EU's contribution to global health. Lastly, he highlighted the European Conference on Preparedness and IHR Strengthening, which will take place on 14-15 October 2019.

The Management Board took note of the update from the Finnish Presidency of the Council of the EU.

⁴ A written summary of EC activities was circulated to the Management Board following the meeting.

Update from the European Parliament

79. Zofija Mazej Kukovič, MB Member, European Parliament, reported on the results of the recent European elections mentioning that this was the first time ever in the history of EP elections that the voter turnout had increased (more than 50% turnout compared to 42% in the last elections in 2014). As a next step, the political groups will negotiate the composition of the Parliamentary Committees; the composition of the ENVI Committee is naturally of interest for ECDC.

80. Marilena Koppa, MB Member, European Parliament, added that this was the first time that the European People's Party (EPP) and the socialist group will not have own majority, thus providing a strong position to the liberals. She added that the new Parliament will take office on 2 July and the new President will be elected the same week.

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

Any other business

81. The Chair informed the Management Board that Emma Reed, MB Member, United Kingdom, had expressed her interest in joining the MB External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group. The Management Board thereby appointed Emma Reed as member of the Drafting Group.

82. The Chair thanked all the Board Members for their active participation and valuable contributions. A special thanks of appreciation was extended to the interpreters and ECDC staff for their hard work. The next Management Board meeting will convene in Stockholm during 13-14 November 2019.

Annex: List of Participants

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Austria	Bernhard Benka	Member
Belgium	Lieven De Raedt	Member
Bulgaria	Angel Kunchev	Member
Croatia	Bernard Kaić	Member
Cyprus	Irene Cotter	Member
Czech Republic	Jozef Dlhý	Alternate
Denmark	Marlene Øhrberg Krag	Member
Denmark	Bolette Søborg	Alternate
Estonia	Heli Laarmann	Member
Finland	Anni Virolainen-Julkunen (<i>Chair</i>)	Member
Finland	Taneli Puumalainen	Alternate
France	Anne-Catherine Viso	Alternate
Germany	Susanne Wald	Member
	Gesa Lücking	Alternate
Hungary	Ágnes Dánielisz	Member
Ireland	Daniel Shine	Alternate
Italy	Francesco Maraglino	Alternate
Latvia	Dzintars Mozgis	Alternate
Lithuania	Audrius Ščeponavičius	Member
Luxembourg	Jean-Claude Schmit	Member
Malta	Mariella Borg Buontempo	Alternate
Netherlands	Ciska Scheidel	Member
Poland	Dariusz Poznański	Member
Portugal	Paula Vasconcelos	Alternate

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Romania	Amalia Serban	Member
Slovakia	Ján Mikas	Member
Slovenia	Maja Sočan	Alternate
Spain	Manuel Cuenca Estrella	Alternate
Sweden	Johan Carlson	Member
Sweden	Andreas Johansson	Alternate
United Kingdom	Emma Reed	Member
European Parliament		
	Zofija Mazej Kukovič	Member
	Maria Eleni Koppa	Member
European Commission		
DG SANTE	John F Ryan	Member
DG SANTE	Isabel de la Mata Barranco	Alternate
DG RTD	Arjon Van Hengel	Observer
EEA Countries		
Norway	Karl-Olaf Wathne	Member