



ECDC Management Board

Minutes of the Twenty-fifth Meeting of the ECDC Management Board

Stockholm, 19-20 June 2012

Adopted by the Management Board at its Twenty-sixth meeting, 14-15 November 2012

Contents

Summary of Proceedings – 25 th Management Board meeting	i
Opening and welcome by the Chair (and noting the Representatives)	1
Introduction from Marc Sprenger, Director, ECDC	1
Item 1 – Adoption of the draft agenda (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (<i>Documents MB25/2 Rev.1, MB25/3 Rev.1</i>).....	1
Item 2 – Adoption of the draft minutes of the 24 th meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 9-10 November 2011) (<i>Document MB25/4</i>)	1
Item 6 – ECDC Management Board meeting dates for 2013 and 2014 (<i>Document MB25/9</i>)	2
Item 7 – Director’s briefing on ECDC’s main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (<i>Document MB25/Info Note 1</i>).....	2
Item 17 – Update on the External Evaluation	2
Item 16 – Update from the European Commission:	3
Item 16a – 12 point action plan: proposed approaches for AMR, animal health, food safety and research.....	3
Item 16b – Substances of Human Origin	3
Item 16c – Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on serious cross-border threats to health	3
Item 13 – Update to the position statement of the Commission and ECDC on human pathogen laboratories: a joint vision and strategy for the future	4
Item 15 – Update on the activities between the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) and the WHO Regional Office for Europe (WHO/Europe) (<i>Document MB25/12</i>).....	4
Item 8 – Update regarding the EU Presidencies	5
Item 8a – Update from Denmark	5
Item 8b – Update from Cyprus	5
Item 4 – ECDC Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan (2013-2015) (<i>Document MB25/7 Rev.1</i>)	5
Item 3 – Summary of discussions held at the 20 th meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (18 June 2012), including its recommendations	7
Item 3a – Final Annual Accounts 2011, including the Report on Budget and Financial Management (<i>Document MB25/5 Rev.1</i>).....	7
Item 3b – Supplementary and Amending Budget 2012 (<i>Document MB25/6</i>).....	7
Item 21 – Update on ECDC Working Group Building Project.....	8
Item 3a – Final Annual Accounts 2011, including the Report on Budget and Financial Management (<i>Document MB25/5 Rev.1</i>) – <i>Continued</i>	9
Item 9 – Report of implementation of the Work Programme 2012 in the first six months: ECDC cross-cutting priorities 2012	9
Item 9a – Short introduction from ECDC Director.....	9
Item 9b – Working with EU Enlargement Countries.....	10
Item 9c – Addressing Issues around Health Inequalities and Migrant Health.....	10

Item 9d – Advancing Measles Elimination in Europe	10
Item 9e – Mediterranean Programme on Intervention Epidemiology Training (MediPIET)	10
Item 9f – Strengthening Microbiology Laboratory Capacity in Europe	11
Item 5 – ECDC Annual Work Programme 2013 (<i>Document MB25/8</i>)	11
Item 10 – ECDC Strategic Multi-annual Programme (2014-2020)	13
Item 14 – ECDC vision on EU level monitoring and evaluation of immunisation programmes and related vaccines (<i>Document MB25/11</i>)	13
Item 22 – Update from ECDC regarding staff matters.....	15
Item 22a – Evaluation of the reorganisation (results of the staff survey)	15
Item 22b – Information on results of CO-DO and action plan (<i>Document MB25/Info Note 2</i>).....	15
Item 22c – Recent organisational adjustments (<i>Document MB25/Info Note 3</i>).....	15
Item 19 – Independence policy and implementing rules on Declarations of Interest (<i>Document MB25/14</i>).....	16
Item 11 – Interactions with Member States for support to response activities.....	16
Item 12 – Update on simulation exercise spring 2012.....	16
Item 18 – Overview of all Agreements signed between ECDC and other organisations	16
Item 20 – Update on Transatlantic Task Force on AMR (TATFAR)	16
Item 24 – Any other business	16

Summary of Proceedings – 25th Management Board meeting

The 25th ECDC Management Board (MB) meeting convened in Stockholm, Sweden, on 19-20 June 2012.

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

Introduction from Marc Sprenger, Director, ECDC

Marc Sprenger, Director, ECDC, welcomed the meeting participants on his behalf to the silver jubilee meeting.

Item 1 – Adoption of the draft agenda (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (*Documents MB25/2 Rev.1, MB25/3 Rev.1*)*

The draft agenda was adopted by the Management Board.

Item 2 – Adoption of the draft minutes of the 24th meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 9-10 November 2011) (*Document MB25/4*)*

The Management Board adopted the draft minutes with one amendment.

Item 6 – ECDC Management Board meeting dates for 2013 and 2014 (*Document MB25/9*)*

The Management Board adopted the meeting dates for 2013 and took note of the provisional dates for 2014.

Item 7 – Director's briefing on ECDC's main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (*Document MB25/Info Note 1*)

The Management Board took note of the Director's briefing on ECDC's activities since the last meeting.

Item 17 – Update on the External Evaluation

The Management Board took note of the update on the second independent external evaluation.

* Item for decision
* Item for decision
* Item for decision

Item 16 – Update from the European Commission:

Item 16a – 12 point action plan: proposed approaches for AMR, animal health, food safety and research

The representative of the European Commission updated the Management Board on the 12 point action plan on AMR.

Item 16b – Substances of Human Origin

SANCO is developing EU-wide support in the area of substances of human origin, namely, a rapid alert platform, a traceability system and a system to provide scientific advice as needed. The alert prototype has been developed and a functioning system will be finalised during summer 2012.

Item 16c – Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on serious cross-border threats to health

The Management Board took note of the update and emphasised the importance of discussing this matter further in the November meeting.

Item 13 – Update to the position statement of the Commission and ECDC on human pathogen laboratories: a joint vision and strategy for the future

The Management Board took note of the update. It was agreed that a report on the implementation of the joint vision and strategy for the future will be provided in sufficient time for the Management Board at its November meeting.

Item 15 – Update on the activities between the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) and the WHO Regional Office for Europe (WHO/Europe) (Document MB25/12)

The Management Board was positive about the progress made on the collaboration between ECDC and WHO/Europe. Discussions will continue on this matter in future Management Board meetings.

Item 8 – Update regarding the EU Presidencies

Item 8a – Update from Denmark

Dorte Hansen Thirge, Alternate, Denmark, gave an update on the Danish EU Presidency.¹ It was noted that the ECDC Management Board could be privy to the Council's conclusions, which will be adopted at the Health Council.

Item 8b – Update from Cyprus

Irene Cotter, Alternate, Cyprus, updated the Management Board on the activities of the Cypriot EU Presidency.² A sincere thank you was extended to ECDC for having supported the Cyprus Presidency Conference, 'Cross border health threats in the EU and its neighbouring countries – focus on communicable diseases.'³

¹ Item 8a - Update Denmark EU Presidency

² Item 8b - Update Cyprus EU Presidency

³ Please also refer to handouts on the MB Extranet relating to the Cyprus EU Presidency

Item 4 – ECDC Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan (2013-2015)

*(Document MB25/7 Rev.1)**

The Management Board unanimously adopted the Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan 2013-2015. The Board requested to receive further information on the rationale for the turnover rate at the 26th MB meeting.

Item 3 – Summary of discussions held at the 20th meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (18 June 2012) including its recommendations

Irène Nilsson-Carlsson, Swedish Board Member and the Chair of the ECDC Audit Committee, updated the MB on the discussions and overall recommendations of the Audit Committee.

Item 3a – Final Annual Accounts 2011, including the Report on Budget and Financial Management (Document MB25/5 Rev.1)*

Notwithstanding the revised text of the 'Opinion of the Management Board on ECDC 2011 Final Accounts', the Management Board unanimously adopted the Final Annual Accounts 2011, including the Report on Budget and Financial Management.

Item 3b – Supplementary and Amending Budget 2012 (Document MB25/6)

The Management Board took note of the Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2012.

Item 21 – Update on ECDC Working Group Building Project

With one abstention, the Management Board unanimously agreed with the proposal made by the Chair.

Item 9 – Report of implementation of the Work Programme 2012 in the first six months: ECDC cross-cutting priorities 2012

Following a short introduction from the ECDC Director, the following presentations were made: "Working with EU Enlargement Countries"; "Addressing Issues around Health Inequalities and Migrant Health"; "Advancing Measles Elimination in Europe"; "Mediterranean Programme on Intervention Epidemiology Training (MediPIET) and; "Strengthening Microbiology Laboratory Capacity in Europe".

The Management Board unanimously adopted the list of three activities cancelled or postponed until 2013. The Board also took note of the ECDC cross-cutting priorities 2012.

* Item for decision

* Item for decision

Item 5 – ECDC Annual Work Programme 2013 (*Document MB25/8*)*

With one abstention, the Management Board provisionally adopted the Work Programme 2013, while taking into consideration that the final Work Programme will only be presented and adopted in November.

It was agreed that a paper on EPIET would be developed for the next meeting in November.

Item 10 – ECDC Strategic Multi-annual Programme (2014-2020)

The Management Board took note of the presentation and will be included in the consultation process, which will begin in September 2012. A timetable, including information on what documents will be produced when, will be sent to the Board as soon as it becomes available.

Item 14 – ECDC vision on EU level monitoring and evaluation of immunisation programmes and related vaccines (*Document MB25/11*)

The Management Board agreed to establish a small working group, consisting of the European Commission, ECDC, EMA and Member States. A document will be presented at the next Board meeting in November.

Item 22 – Update from ECDC regarding staff matters

The Management Board took note of the update from ECDC regarding staff matters and looks forward to hearing further progress made in respect to a) evaluation of the reorganisation (results of the staff survey); b) results of CO-DO and action plan; and c) recent organisational adjustments at the next meeting in November.

Item 19 – Independence policy and implementing rules on Declarations of Interest (*Document MB25/14*)

The Management Board took note of the presentation. Due to scheduling constraints, Document MB25/14, Independence policy and implementing rules on Declarations of Interest, including a stakeholder survey, will be sent to the Board via written procedure in due course.

Item 11 – Interactions with Member States for support to response activities

Due to scheduling constraints, this item was postponed to the MB26 meeting in November.

Item 12 – Update on simulation exercise spring 2012

Due to scheduling constraints, this item was postponed to the MB26 meeting in November.

* Item for decision

Item 18 – Overview of all Agreements signed between ECDC and other organisations

Due to scheduling constraints, this item was postponed to the MB26 meeting in November.

Item 20 – Update on Transatlantic Task Force on AMR (TATFAR)

Due to scheduling constraints, this item was postponed to the MB26 meeting in November.

Item 24 – Any other business

The Twenty-sixth meeting of the ECDC Management Board will convene in Stockholm on 14-15 November 2012.

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

1. The Chair, Hubert Hrabcik, welcomed everyone to the Twenty-fifth meeting of the ECDC Management Board (MB) in Stockholm. The following new delegates were welcomed: Dorte Hansen Thrige from Denmark, newly appointed Alternate, Colette Bonner from Ireland, newly appointed Member, Giuseppe Ruocco from Italy, newly appointed Member, Robert Goerens from Luxembourg, newly appointed Member and Adriana Pistol from Romania, appointed Alternate. Apologies had been received from Line Matthiessen-Guyader, European Commission (proxy given to John F Ryan, European Commission), Greece, Liechtenstein, Malta (proxy given to Italy), Portugal (proxy given to Poland) and Slovenia. It was noted that the Swedish Member would arrive in the afternoon on 19 June and that John F Ryan, European Commission, had to depart from the meeting in the afternoon of 19 June (proxy would be given to Martin Seychell, European Commission). During the morning session, the Chair also announced the newly appointed Alternate from Germany, Gesa Lücking.

Introduction from Marc Sprenger, Director, ECDC

2. Marc Sprenger, Director, ECDC, welcomed the meeting participants on his behalf to the silver jubilee meeting.

Item 1 – Adoption of the draft agenda (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (*Documents MB25/2 Rev.1, MB25/3 Rev.1*)*

3. All members were reminded to fill in their Declarations of Interest. The following written declarations were submitted: with reference to item 5 (ECDC Annual Work Programme 2013), Anni Virolainen-Julkunen, Alternate, Finland, stated her involvement with the disease-specific work: surveillance of *C. Difficile* and laboratory surveillance of IBD. Anne-Catherine Viso, Alternate, France, declared that the InVS is involved with the coordination of EPIET. Martin Seychell, Member, Commission, stated under item 14 (ECDC vision on EU level monitoring and evaluation of immunisation programmes and related vaccines) that the European Commission is overall responsible for policy aspects, including pharmacovigilance. John F Ryan, Member, Commission, declared, in reference to all agenda items, except for items 1-2, 6-9 and 23, his role as a sub-delegated Authorising Officer of the Public Health Programme, Director of Public Health.

The draft agenda was adopted by the Management Board.

Item 2 – Adoption of the draft minutes of the 24th meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 9-10 November 2011) (*Document MB25/4*)*

4. The Chair cited an additional paragraph 81 requested by France, to be included into the final minutes.

The Management Board adopted the draft minutes with one amendment.

* Item for decision

* Item for decision

Item 6 – ECDC Management Board meeting dates for 2013 and 2014 (*Document MB25/9*)*

The Management Board adopted the meeting dates for 2013 and took note of the provisional dates for 2014.

Item 7 – Director’s briefing on ECDC’s main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (*Document MB25/Info Note 1*)

5. ECDC Director gave a short presentation on the latest activities since the last MB meeting.⁴
6. It was highlighted by one of the Members that the meeting documents should be sent out to the Board well in advance and not at the last minute.
7. In reference to the update, members asked questions as to whether ECDC is planning any kind of cooperation with the US CDC and/or other national bodies that have been visiting the Centre, and concerning the approach ECDC will take in responding to the request for a meeting made by the vaccine manufacturers. The Director responded that ECDC has very regular operational and technical contacts with the US CDC and other key national public health institutes. Regarding the vaccine manufacturers, ECDC has not yet convened any meeting as ECDC has been reviewing how it should interact with stakeholders, such as industry. The Centre has recently finalised a procedure on stakeholder consultation, which will give stakeholders opportunities to submit written comments on certain papers from ECDC. These comments will be published by ECDC, so the process is open and transparent.
8. With regards to the European Parliament’s resolutions of 10 May 2012 concerning the discharge of the EU Agencies, and in line with previous discussions during the Twenty-fourth Management Board meeting, questions were posed as to whether ECDC proposes any specific actions and whether some actions have already been undertaken. Regarding the discharge procedure, it was noted that for ECDC there is no direct issue, Parliament granted ECDC discharge for its 2010 budget on 10 May. However, the fact that three Agencies (EEA, EFSA and EMA) had their 2010 discharge postponed, despite having received positive reports from the European Court of Auditors, is an issue for the entire network of Agencies. There will be further discussions on this within the Network of EU Agencies in July, and in the autumn. In relation to the conflict of interest issue, it was questioned whether the level of personal information that some paragraphs of the European Parliament’s resolutions suggest should be disclosed is compatible with the EU’s data protection laws. It was clarified that high level of disclosure could be compatible with EU data protection rules provided that Board members and external experts are notified of the need for disclosure at the start of their mandate. However, the focus should be on what happens in case a conflict of interest is discovered at a later stage. A procedure should be put in place in order to determine whether a conflict of interest has influenced a decision made, or guidance given, by ECDC. The procedure should allow for the decision or guidance to be withdrawn in such case.

The Management Board took note of the Director’s briefing on ECDC’s activities since the last meeting.

Item 17 – Update on the External Evaluation

9. Jacques Scheres, Member, European Parliament, and the Acting Chair of ECDC MB External Evaluation Steering Committee, updated the Board on the latest developments of the second independent external evaluation of ECDC. The Board was informed of the Evaluation Committee meeting of 31 May 2012, chaired by Rebecca Trott, Senior Legal Adviser and Head of the Legal and

* Item for decision

⁴ Item 7 – Director’s briefing (M Sprenger)

Procurement Section, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC. Nine eligible tenders were evaluated. During the meeting, disclosure of a conflict of interest was noted in relation to one of the tenderers and thus a decision was made to evaluate the tender, but not to include it in the selection process. Out of the nine tenders, two were selected as reaching the quality threshold required in the Terms of Reference. Based on the allocated budget of 220 000 EUR, the tender with the best price won. Currently, the process had now entered a standstill period, during which tenderers not selected have the right to appeal. The contract will be signed in the weeks following the MB meeting.

The Management Board took note of the update on the second independent external evaluation.

Item 16 – Update from the European Commission:

Item 16a – 12 point action plan: proposed approaches for AMR, animal health, food safety and research

10. The representative of the Commission updated the Board on the 12 point action plan on AMR. It was noted that the Commission has launched an additional five-point action plan, which includes all parties involved with AMR. The plan covers seven areas and sets clear actions without any hierarchy. In parallel, the Commission is working towards the prudent use of antibiotics, new molecules/products, as well as disease prevention. It was highlighted that more information is needed in order to assess the effectiveness of the applied measures. Strengthening surveillance is a key element. The Commission has proposed a new legal framework; technical support has been requested from EFSA. On the research side, the Board was informed of a new IMI call published. The Danish EU Presidency received a resounding appreciation for their support to the action plan.

11. One of the Members requested further information on the IMI call. It was noted that precise figures could be provided for in writing.

12. The contribution of ECDC and the Member States, with regards to data, was questioned. In his reply, the Director of ECDC noted that of key importance is the provision of surveillance data and data on consumption. European Antibiotic Awareness Day (EAAD) was also highlighted as an important tool to help ensure the prudent use of antibiotics.

13. With regards to the involvement of both the veterinarian and human side, it was clarified that the basis under which the data is collected has been reinforced and the veterinarian side is working in parallel with the human side; for instance, a separate legal background is used for achieving the same goal and work is conducted in parallel for better coordination and synchronisation. It was added by ECDC that an internal decision has been made to increase the human resources in the ARHAI programme via a reallocation of staff.

Item 16b – Substances of Human Origin

14. SANCO is developing EU-wide support in the area of substances of human origin, namely, a rapid alert platform, a traceability system and a system to provide scientific advice as needed. The alert prototype has been developed and a functioning system will be finalised during summer 2012. It is planned to have the pilot system up and running in the autumn. The platform will emanate from SANCO. For the traceability, an external consultant has been involved in the process. The compendia will be ready by the end of 2013/beginning of 2014. With regards to scientific advice, ECDC has recruited an expert to strengthen its in-house capacity to produce risk assessments on communicable disease risks in this area. A framework contract is being developed by the Centre to enable it to further reinforce this capacity using external expertise.

Item 16c – Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on serious cross-border threats to health

15. The Board was informed that the proposal is currently being negotiated at the Parliament and Council of the EU. The Council is in the process of developing its position, based on comments from Member States. It is expected for the Parliament to adopt its report on the proposal in September.

The position of the Council is hoped to become clearer under the Cypriot EU Presidency. The representative of the Commission was hopeful to be able to provide the Board with more information in November.

16. Some of the Members debated the discussion paper on the proposal put forward by the Danish EU Presidency, and noted that there are still outstanding issues, even though progress has been made.

The Management Board took note of the update and emphasised the importance of discussing this matter further in the November meeting.

Item 13 – Update to the position statement of the Commission and ECDC on human pathogen laboratories: a joint vision and strategy for the future

17. Marc Struelens, Chief Microbiologist and Head of Section, Microbiology Coordination, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, gave an update on the position statement of the Commission and ECDC on human pathogen laboratories.⁵

18. It was highlighted that, notwithstanding the utility of receiving the interim report, it would be preferable to issue it well in advance of the November Management Board meeting in order to have sufficient time to discuss the report in the Member States and to provide comments and/or guidance. The Commission, in collaboration with ECDC, endeavours to develop a paper on this matter in sufficient time for the November meeting.

The Management Board took note of the update. It was agreed that a report on the implementation of the joint vision and strategy for the future will be provided in sufficient time for the Management Board at its November meeting.

Item 15 – Update on the activities between the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) and the WHO Regional Office for Europe (WHO/Europe) (Document MB25/12)

19. Maarit Kokki, Senior Advisor to the Director and Head of Section, International Relations, Office of the Director, updated the Board on the activities between ECDC and WHO/Europe. Reference was made to previous discussions on collaboration between the two organisations and the concerns over duplication of work. It was noted that WHO/Europe will also be presented with the document as submitted to the ECDC Management Board. The general principle of the document is highly operational and which provides guidance on working with WHO/Europe on a daily basis, i.e. arranging meetings and missions, etc. The annexed Disease Programme work plans are a result of a joint meeting, which convened in ECDC on 21 February 2012. The ECDC Director conveyed that daily collaboration with WHO/Europe is continuous and positive.

20. One of the MB members was hopeful that ECDC would develop such collaboration further and to a greater degree. Considering the many information systems available in the European region, it was questioned how this has actually been coordinated between the two Organisations. It was clarified that the Commission has requested that WHO/Europe establish closer collaboration with ECDC. The roadmaps are available on the Commission's website. Annual meetings are held at a senior level in order to reach the target as established in the roadmap. Improved coordination of surveillance and information systems is included therein. With regards to reporting systems, discussions are being held on this, however, more so on non-communicable diseases.

21. The representative of the European Parliament pointed out that there is no information in the document regarding collaboration with WHO Headquarters. The Commission's representative agreed that more could be done in this respect, while noting that the main focus lies in avoiding duplication

⁵ Item 13 - Update to lab position statement of the Commission (M Struelens, J F Ryan)

of work and demands set for the Member States. However, it should not be assumed that WHO/Europe shares the same mission and tasks as ECDC. The two organisations have different mandates and different tools to achieve their goals. WHO/Europe serves as a link between ECDC/EU and WHO Headquarters.

22. The Management Board agreed that the proposal could be more ambitious, but also highlighted that substantial progress has already been made. It was suggested to discuss this matter further in future MB meetings.

The Management Board was positive about the progress made on the collaboration between ECDC and WHO/Europe. Discussions will continue on this matter in future Management Board meetings.

Item 8 – Update regarding the EU Presidencies

Item 8a – Update from Denmark

23. Dorte Hansen Thrige, Alternate, Denmark, gave an update on the Danish EU Presidency.⁶

24. It was noted that the ECDC Management Board could be privy to the Council's conclusions, which will be adopted at the Health Council.

Item 8b – Update from Cyprus

25. Irene Cotter, Alternate, Cyprus, updated the Management Board on the activities of the Cypriot EU Presidency.⁷ A sincere thank you was extended to ECDC for having supported the Cyprus Presidency Conference, 'Cross border health threats in the EU and its neighbouring countries – focus on communicable diseases.'⁸

Item 4 – ECDC Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan (2013-2015) *(Document MB25/7 Rev.1)**

26. Andrea Ammon, Deputy to the Director and Head of Resource Management Unit, gave a presentation on the ECDC Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan (2013-2015).⁹ It was noted that the MSPP had also been discussed at the Audit Committee meeting the previous day and that the AC supports the plan and recommends that the MB adopt it.

27. The Commission's representative stated that while a five per cent cut to staffing levels in the EU administration is what has been proposed by the Commission, it does not mean that this is what will be agreed upon by Parliament and Council in the end. It is possible that the final deal on the EU's long-term finances requires an even higher level of staffing cuts. In reference to internal mobility, it should be pushed for and it could be useful to discuss possibilities for horizontal mobility as opposed to promotions only.

28. With regards to internal mobility, members asked whether ECDC staff is given any priority over external applicants, and whether the posts are opened at the same time for both internal and external applicants. Additionally, there were questions about how recruitment processes could be used for staff coming to the end of their contract, beyond reclassification. In reference to the fact that the contracts of many staff members are coming up for renewal in the next two years, and in the light of the foreseen cuts in staffing levels, some members stressed the need for transparency regarding how the cuts would be made, in order to avoid unnecessary stress for staff. In terms of a decision to extend a contract, clear criteria extending to all staff should be developed. With regards to savings, it was queried whether more staff would be working overtime with less staff in place. The turnover rate in ECDC was also questioned.

⁶ Item 8a - Update Denmark EU Presidency

⁷ Item 8b - Update Cyprus EU Presidency

⁸ Please also refer to handouts on the MB Extranet relating to the Cyprus EU Presidency

* Item for decision

⁹ Item 4 - MSPP (A Ammon)

29. ECDC reminded the Board that there is uncertainty as to the level of staffing cuts that may be required in the coming years: as implied by the Commission, a five per cent cut is probably the minimum that ECDC can expect. This makes it hard to offer a clear medium- to long-term perspective to staff on how the cuts will be implemented. If the final level of cuts demanded is higher than five per cent, then ECDC may need to stop some of its activities. However, ECDC and its Board are not in a position to make these decisions yet. Being transparent means admitting that the situation is uncertain at present. In reference to overtime, the revised Staff Regulation sets increased working hours for staff, eight hours per day, instead of seven and a half hours. In terms of internal mobility, a proposal was put forward in 2011 to advertise every post internally prior to advertising it externally. However, the Commission stated that this could be done only for the Temporary Agents (TAs) and thus the proposal was dropped as a large group of staff members (the Contract Agents) would not be able to apply for these internal posts. In reference to contract renewals, it is not in the interest of ECDC to not prolong contracts, unless different expertise is needed. It is in the interest of ECDC to carry the cuts out in the least painful manner for everyone. Relevant information is posted and available on the ECDC Intranet. Staff is informed at least seven months in advance of whether their contract will be renewed (or not). As to the turnover rate of eight per cent at ECDC, there are many reasons for this. The high number of available posts is also related to internal mobility, i.e. upon taking a new post, a staff member will leave his/her previous post free. ECDC Director summarised that cutting even just one or two posts a year is a big deal for ECDC staff, especially considering that until now, the Centre has only been growing. The Centre's staff is overloaded with work, and it is vital to realise whether they are actually able to deliver everything that ECDC promises in its Work Programme.

30. The comment on the criteria for the potential extension of contracts was recalled and ECDC clarified that these criteria already exist. Firstly, it is checked whether a post corresponding to the renewed contract would be available in ECDC's establishment plan, whether the job profile is still required by ECDC, and whether there is a budget available for continuing the contract. While all of these elements need to be considered, a staff member's overall performance shall also be taken into account. These criteria have been communicated to staff and are published on ECDC's Intranet.

31. The Management Board expressed a difference of opinions in relation to the turnover of staff at ECDC, as some believed that a turnover of around eight per cent, or even higher, is good for the Centre in terms of acquiring 'fresh blood', 'new ideas' and a renewal of the Centre's expertise. Others opined that a turnover of fewer than five per cent would be more desirable as this would lead to more stability and security for staff. It was also noted that frequent internal mobility in one organisation is not preferable. All in all, the Board suggested that, whether positive or negative, the causes of the high turnover rate should be investigated. It was requested to receive further information on staff turnover and factors underlying it at the November meeting. The Board agreed that it is most important to ensure the wellbeing of staff by ensuring they feel comfortable and safe, even with temporary contracts.

32. ECDC informed of some of the reasons for staff departures, such as obtaining a higher graded job in another EU Agency, returning to field epidemiology in Africa with the NGO 'Doctors Without Borders' or simply not being able to cope with the long winters in Sweden. It was noted that decisions on contract extensions are not made by a single manager, but rather are a joint decision of the Senior Management Team (SMT). In the light of developing the new Multi-annual Strategic Programme, there are possibilities to plan the future work of ECDC that may give staff some reassurance as to their long-term prospects in their area of expertise.

The Management Board unanimously adopted the Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan 2013-2015. The Board requested to receive further information on the rationale for the turnover rate at the 26th MB meeting.

Item 3 – Summary of discussions held at the 20th meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (18 June 2012), including its recommendations

33. Iréne Nilsson-Carlsson, Swedish Board Member and the Chair of the ECDC Audit Committee, updated the MB on the discussions and overall recommendations of the Audit Committee.¹⁰

Item 3a – Final Annual Accounts 2011, including the Report on Budget and Financial Management (Document MB25/5 Rev.1)*

34. Anja Van Brabant, Head of Finance and Accounting, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, gave a presentation on the Final Annual Accounts 2011, including the Report on Budget and Financial Management.¹¹ Reference was made to the tabled report from the European Court of Auditors on 'Preliminary observations with a view to a report on the annual accounts of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control for the financial year 2011' and the 'Opinion of the Management Board on ECDC 2011 Final Accounts'.¹²

35. The background for the preliminary qualified opinion by the Court was further explained to the Board. It was noted that ECDC had taken the initiative and informed the Court of Auditors of a problem concerning the overuse of an ICT framework contract and listed the actions taken until now in order to solve the issue. The Chair of the Audit Committee concluded by presenting the Committee's recommendations.

36. One of the Members wished to receive further information on the carry-forwards. It was clarified that the Court of Auditors has noted the improvements ECDC has made. The level indicated by the Court is 70% in Title III to be completed, in 2011 ECDC reached 60%, thus the situation is improving.

37. Comments were made on the late receipt of the Court of Auditors report as well as the opinion of the MB and it was proposed to, in general, decide on Audit Committee related topics during the second day of the meeting. Suggestions were made on the wording of the opinion. ECDC responded and noted that the report was only received on 15 June 2012, and thus it was not possible to submit this important document to the Board any sooner, even when considering that the June MB meeting dates in general have been postponed in comparison with previous years. With regards to the report and the Court of Auditors preliminary opinion, it was highlighted that it is still open to the Court to revise aspects of the opinion, though major changes are unlikely.

38. The Chair of the Audit Committee agreed to amend the text of its opinion during the coffee break and return to the Board with a revised version for adoption.

Item 3b – Supplementary and Amending Budget 2012 (Document MB25/6)

39. Anja Van Brabant, Head of Finance and Accounting, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, presented the Supplementary and Amending Budget 2012.¹³

The Management Board took note of the Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2012.

¹⁰ Item 3 - Summary of 20th AC meeting (I Nilsson-Carlsson)

* Item for decision

¹¹ Item 3a - Final Annual Accounts 2011 (A Van Brabant)

¹² Please see MB Extranet, Handouts, for the documents

¹³ Item 3b - Supplementary and Amending Budget 2012 (A Van Brabant)

Item 21 – Update on ECDC Working Group Building Project

40. The Chair recalled previous discussions on ECDC staff's housing issues in Stockholm and quoted a letter received from the Swedish Minister of Public Administration and Housing, Stefan Attefall. It is realised that the Swedish Ministry of Health and Social Affairs is fully aware of the issues and is working on improvements.

41. ECDC Director expressed his gratitude to the members of the MB Working Group on Building Project for being able to take part in the study visit to Hague (EUROPOL) and Lisbon (EMSA) in order to investigate the office conditions in other Agencies. The Director stated that in his view, adequate facilities come with good collaboration with the host country. He referred to a letter from the ECDC Staff Committee, listing reasons why the current facilities are not appropriate. As discussed during the last MB meeting in March, the MB was informed of the two interested parties willing to take over the lease. However, there has been no progress to date as the landlord of the facilities is not willing to collaborate. ECDC has also visited sites in Stockholm. It was noted that EUROPOL has agreed to evaluate the ECDC buildings and provide their opinion.

42. The Members of the ECDC Working Group Building Project provided their input on the matter. The Chair conveyed that it is not viable for ECDC to work in the current conditions for another six years. With regards to the study visit, it was noted that as both of the Agencies visited have new buildings, it is not possible to compare the situation. In both cases, building up the new structures was based on collaboration with the host country. The Deputy Chair added that, based on his visit to the portable offices at ECDC, the working conditions are not in accordance with the standards set by the European Commission's building office (OIB). Satisfactory working conditions, however, play a major role in the morale and wellbeing of staff across the Centre. Additionally, it was highlighted that Portugal and the Netherlands have a different approach as host countries compared to Sweden.

43. Iréne Nilsson-Carlsson, Swedish Board Member, provided her opinion from the host country perspective and stated that Sweden does not have (and cannot have) any opinions on which landlord or venue the Centre has decided (or will decide in the future) to use. There are no functions in the Swedish ministries to provide such services to any agencies residing in Sweden. Total freedom is offered to all organisations to choose the best possible premises. She noted that if ECDC is unhappy with the current lease, it is neither possible for the Swedish Government to intervene in, nor to influence relations between ECDC and its landlord.

44. The Commission suggested that perhaps it would be possible to relocate a limited number of staff to new premises to ease the overcrowding. The Commission warned against building an extension to the current building as this would be too costly. The Commission also brought to the attention of the Board that the obligations of host countries towards EU Agencies was one of the matters being looked at by the Commission in the follow up to the Inter-Institutional Working Group on EU Agencies. It was proposed to look at the building and hosting arrangements for ECDC in the second external evaluation of ECDC. A decision on the statement on the Governing of Agencies should be made available in the near future and thus a proposal was made to discuss the building issue further in November meeting, in the light of this proposal. The Chair clarified that there are no plans to build an extension to ECDC's current building.

45. One of the Members questioned the rationale for the inflexibility of the landlord and asked whether ECDC is considering any further options.

46. Some of the Board Members proposed to visit the mobile offices, if possible, during the coffee break.

47. It was questioned whether the issue lies with the space in absolute terms, or whether the buildings are not suitable for the way in which ECDC operates. Accommodating certain functions at another location could be feasible. In addition, ECDC should explore the general dynamics of working and the rate of teleworking, i.e. look into realistic (interim) solutions.

48. The Commission's representative noted that there is a buildings policy document for the Commission available which sets the conditions for accommodating staff.

49. Rodrigo Filipe, representative of ECDC Staff Committee, noted that the current buildings accommodated the staff needs a few years ago, but as the situation has changed and the Centre has

grown remarkably in such a short period of time, the staff no longer fit in the same Centre, and the level of security is non-existent.

50. Rebecca Trott, Senior Legal Advisor, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, added that, based on the findings of the internal working group, the running costs for the current buildings were disproportionately high. An internal review, utilising the OIB guidelines, indicated that the current premises did not comply on a single point. Similarly, initial findings of the review team from Europol, which had recently conducted an external audit of the building based on OIB standards, indicated that their report would also confirm these significant shortcomings. The Europol review team had especially commented on the safety and security problems with the current premises and these could clearly not be resolved by short-term proposed solutions such as teleworking.

51. One of the Members of the Board, who had visited the portable offices during the break, noted that the overall situation is not ideal; however, it is also not too unbearable.

52. The Chair noted that the MB could advise the Director of ECDC to request an investigation of the facilities and its accordance with the OIB guidelines. The report on this could be submitted to the Board in November.

With one abstention, the Management Board unanimously agreed with the proposal made by the Chair.

Item 3a – Final Annual Accounts 2011, including the Report on Budget and Financial Management (Document MB25/5 Rev.1)* – Continued

53. The Chair cited the revised opinion of the Management Board on ECDC 2011 Final Accounts. Further textual changes were proposed by the Management Board.

Notwithstanding the revised text of the 'Opinion of the Management Board on ECDC 2011 Final Accounts', the Management Board unanimously adopted the Final Annual Accounts 2011, including the Report on Budget and Financial Management.

Item 9 – Report of implementation of the Work Programme 2012 in the first six months: ECDC cross-cutting priorities 2012

Item 9a – Short introduction from ECDC Director

54. ECDC Director gave a short introductory presentation.¹⁴ An agreement from the Board was sought with respect to the list of three activities cancelled or postponed until next year stated in the handout, "Implementation of ECDC Work Programme for 2012": 1) FWD surveillance report 2010-2011; 2) Implementation of new tools and approaches to eliminate TB; and 3) Severe disease influenza surveillance, including intensive care units and mortality.¹⁵ It was clarified that it was a draft text and not a final decision.

55. One of the Members commented that ECDC should have the capacity to carry out the tasks, even when considering cuts, overtime work and/or various leaves of staff. It was reinforced that ECDC should have this in mind for the Work Programme 2013 in order to consider the postponements. It was, however, also realised by the Board that even with an approved Work Programme, sudden changes might occur and some activities might necessarily be postponed or cancelled, even if not planned so from the start.

56. On the request of the Board, Johan Giesecke, Chief Scientist, briefly explained the background and rationale behind the proposal for the three activities.

* Item for decision

¹⁴ Item 9a)b)c)d)e) and f) - Report of Implementation of the WP2012

¹⁵ Handout "Implementation of ECDC Work Programme for 2012", MB Extranet, Handouts

Item 9b – Working with EU Enlargement Countries

57. Maarit Kokki, Senior Advisor to the Director and Head of Section, International Relations, Office of the Director, updated the Management Board on developments with working with the EU Enlargement Countries.¹⁶

Item 9c – Addressing Issues around Health Inequalities and Migrant Health

58. Jan Semenza, Senior Expert, Health Impact, Office of Chief Scientist, gave a presentation on health inequalities and migrant health.¹⁷

59. It was questioned as to why ECDC is working with vulnerable populations as such while considering that everything ECDC works with in general relates to vulnerable groups. Additionally, in the EU, it is complicated to work with migrants due to open borders. Thus, it was questioned whether this activity really fits within the remit of the Centre. One of the Board Members highlighted that some of the communicable diseases occur amongst groups that are neither uneducated nor poor, and thus it may not be wise for ECDC to take on this topic. A hesitation between 'vulnerable groups' and 'not so fortunate groups' (such as the Roma) was noted, and it was stated that ECDC should analyse the situation and explore the indicators prior to advocating for the activity.

60. The representative of the Commission expressed support with the activities ECDC has taken on in this area and noted that the vulnerability is first and foremost related to groups outside the normal health security systems, such as migrants. And such groups are increasing in Europe and thus it is important to work on this matter.

61. ECDC was advised to not broaden the scope of this issue too much, i.e. not to take on all social inequalities, etc., and to focus primarily on communicable diseases. One of the Members noted that, in general, it is not important how this issue is labelled, as long as something is done to improve the situation. ECDC assured that the Centre will not venture off from the course of communicable diseases. It was noted that all comments will be incorporated into the strategy.

Item 9d – Advancing Measles Elimination in Europe

62. Johan Giesecke, Chief Scientist, presented an update on measles elimination in Europe.¹⁸

Item 9e – Mediterranean Programme on Intervention Epidemiology Training (MediPIET)

63. Karl Ekdahl, Head of Public Health Communication Unit, gave a presentation on the Mediterranean programme on intervention epidemiology training (MediPIET).¹⁹

64. It was questioned how the programme is financed. The Commission noted a special financing tool under DG DEVCO. It was confirmed by ECDC, as a response to a next query, that this activity has been added into the Work Programme of 2013 with staff time only.

65. The Board was informed that, effective 1 June 2012, Alena Petrakova is Senior Advisor to Karl Ekdahl. She has also been assigned to take on the MediPIET Project within the Centre. He also informed that, in addition to their existing roles and responsibilities, Maarit Kokki, Senior Advisor to the Director, is now Head of Section, International Relations, and carries out work with the EU Enlargement Countries. Corinne Skarstedt, Head of Section, Corporate Governance, is now also responsible for safeguarding smooth transparent and efficient relations between ECDC and the Member States.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

Item 9f – Strengthening Microbiology Laboratory Capacity in Europe

66. Marc Struelens, Chief Microbiologist, Head of Section, Microbiology Coordination, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, updated the Board on activities on strengthening microbiology laboratory capacity in Europe.²⁰

67. One of the Members brought out the current parallel systems for data, which is not a preferable solution. ECDC welcomed presenting best practice models Member States use/wish to use.

The Management Board unanimously adopted the list of three activities cancelled or postponed until 2013. The Board also took note of the ECDC cross-cutting priorities 2012.

Item 5 – ECDC Annual Work Programme 2013 (Document MB25/8)*

68. The ECDC Director gave a presentation on the ECDC Annual Work Programme 2013.²¹

69. The representative from the Commission emphasised the need for good coordination between ECDC and the Commission in the field of health economics, given that both organisations are working jointly on this initiative.

70. One of the Members expressed concern that the I-MOVE project is being discontinued and feared that this could constitute a waste of some of the resources already invested by ECDC and some Member States in this project.

71. It was confirmed that the five per cent cut in staff was incorporated into the Work Programme. Some of the Board Members expressed slight confusion about what they should decide upon at this meeting and what will be adopted in November. It was also queried in which manner the MB should discuss further cuts and how the changes made during the year should be assessed. It was agreed that a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in order to accommodate new activities, if needed, as long as it is clear how such activities should be approached. The Chair clarified that the Work Programme is for the Board to adopt; and in case of changes, it will be in the hands of the ECDC Director. Further to the flexibility challenge, it was suggested to have a ratio of 80-20, where 20% of the Programme would be flexible.

72. The EPIET Programme was highlighted, and it was noted that even though Member States strongly support it due to its added value for Europe, the planned budget cuts will affect the Programme in a negative way. Notwithstanding the fact that only seven fellows are planned instead of 12, this year for the first time, ECDC has decided to propose to the training sites that all the pertinent costs for the fellows will be paid by the sites, and funded through grant agreements by ECDC (see paragraph 78 below). It is understood that the fellows should be paid well; however, it should not become an obstacle for a country to send a fellow to be part of EPIET. It was suggested to review and change the call for tender in order to rectify this issue.

73. Other comments and questions were raised, such as why ECDC is indicating in figures for example how much it is planned to reduce outbreaks. Instead of indicating a number in black and white, which might be very hard to measure, ECDC could state that they are planning to "drastically reduce FWD outbreaks". It was also questioned whether indicators could be used for the quality of reports. In relation to discussions on the 2012 Work Programme and the proposal for postponing/cancelling three activities, it was questioned whether such items have been included in the Programme for 2013. This was confirmed by ECDC.

74. One of the Members noted that some important activities, such as effectiveness studies for vaccines, are not in the Work Programme.

75. Echoing previous comments on the EPIET, one of the Members noted that the Programme has become elitist, which might result in some fellows not returning to their countries. The importance of EUPHEM was also highlighted, and it was noted that in comparison to epidemiology

²⁰ *Ibid.*

* Item for decision

²¹ Item 5 - ECDC Annual Work Programme 2013 (M Sprenger)

fellows, there are insufficient fellows for microbiology. It was noted that perhaps it would be worth looking into possibilities of these fellows being absorbed into the labour market.

76. Suggestions for improvements to the Programme were made on the topics of vulnerable populations and migrant health, as well as improving cooperation with WHO/Europe in order to avoid duplication of work. In reference to the vulnerable populations and migrant health, ECDC was again cautioned not to take this issue too far and only to work with the health part falling under the Centre's mandate.

77. ECDC Director reflected on the comments and questions. Firstly, it was confirmed that ECDC will cooperate closely with the Commission in the area of health economics. With regards to the process for the Work Programme, it has been speeded up in order to provide the Board in June with the Programme with detailed budget for Title III. The human resource/staff time will be added to the Programme and the document will be presented again for final adoption in November. The final approval of the budget takes place in December by the Parliament and the Council. With regards to the I-MOVE project, this has indeed not been included in the Work Programme for 2013 as there are no finances available. ECDC agreed that it is important to be flexible and maybe only 80% of activities should be carved in stone. However, it was also pointed out that in some cases, such as Head of a DP leaving, flexibility would be difficult to achieve. In summary, it was stated that ECDC will take all the comments on board and will strive to incorporate them into the Programme.

78. Karl Ekdahl, Head of Public Health Capacity and Communication Unit, presented the evolution of EPIET 2000-2013.²² In relation to the announcement for the cut in the number of fellows, it was noted that it was portrayed to be more drastic than it really was; indeed by the end of 2012, more fellows would be in training than ever before in the history of EPIET. However, there are important equity issues that need to be addressed. Poorly resourced countries have been sending brilliant fellows to other countries and many of these people never returned. This problem has been partly addressed via the MS-track. Concerning employment issues, when ECDC took over EPIET, the fellows were employed as ECDC staff (Contract Agents). This was an ideal solution both for the fellows and for ECDC. However, the Commission pointed out that ECDC could not continue this practice due to legal/administrative reasons. Then it was decided to move from ECDC employment to an individual grant system, at the same salary level (about 2600 EUR net per month). The grant system turned out to be unsustainable for the fellows, as they often had immense difficulties with taxation, insurance and pensions. Therefore, ECDC moved from individual grants to institutional grants with 2012 as the first year to test this system. This created new challenges. As ECDC is paying the net sum, it was difficult to foresee the gross amounts. 2600 EUR net is the basic salary, but the real value depends on the taxes. Additionally, ECDC included in the salary a flat rate to cover language courses and removal expenses. This leads to a situation where some fellows might have higher salaries than their supervisors. To balance the 2013 budget, ECDC has to adjust the number of fellows. It is important to realise that EPIET is a two-year programme, so any change in one year will impact upon the following years. Therefore, ECDC announced in May plans to reduce the number of 2012 cohort EU-track fellows to seven. By cutting other training-related costs, ECDC is currently looking into having eight MS-track (four less than planned) and fourteen EU-track fellows (two more than planned) in 2012. In conclusion, ECDC requested the Board to approve the number of fellows as proposed.

79. One of the Members reinforced that the call for tender should be amended as otherwise it would just not be possible to pay this much money for the fellows. It was clarified by ECDC that the level of salaries has actually not increased. However, for the first time, the salaries are visible as the money is paid by the countries. However, in hindsight, it was a mistake to include remuneration for the removals, etc., in the salary. In the future, reimbursement of such costs will be done based on actual costs and receipts. With regards to re-writing the call for tender, this would have huge consequences not only for ECDC, but also for the national programmes. ECDC has considered this option and decided not to go through with this. Thus, it was proposed to accept the status quo for 2012 and take further actions for next year after a broad consultation in order to avoid any further "quick fixes".

²² Item 5 - Evolution of EPIET 2000-2013 (K Ekdahl)

80. The ECDC Director proposed for the Board to have a more principled discussion on EPIET in general in order to ascertain any possible alternative solutions to avoid such high levels of administrative burden.
81. In reference to the Work Programme, one of the members proposed to consider redrafting some text under the social determinants section. Additionally, regarding VPD and testing the intervention strategies, it was doubted whether this is within the remit of ECDC.
82. One of the Members recalled the discussions from the previous meeting and queried whether it would be possible to also receive the report from the Advisory Forum on this item.
83. The ECDC Director reinforced that all the comments and recommendations noted would be taken into consideration.
84. Germany stated that they will abstain from adopting the Work Programme 2013 at this point.

With one abstention, the Management Board provisionally adopted the Work Programme 2013, while taking into consideration that the final Work Programme will only be presented and adopted in November.

It was agreed that a paper on EPIET would be developed for the next meeting in November.

Item 10 – ECDC Strategic Multi-annual Programme (2014-2020)

85. ECDC Director gave a short presentation on the ECDC Strategic Multi-annual Programme 2014-2020,²³ hereafter referred to as 'SMAP'.
86. The definition of 'external stakeholders' was questioned, including the actual role that the EU Member States play. It was agreed that the Member States should be included in the consultation process, which will begin in September 2012, and which will also include the Advisory Forum and the Coordinating Competent Bodies. It was also questioned when the document(s) would become available.
87. One of the Board members recalled the programmes of WHO/Europe and the Commission, while noting that it would be useful to clarify how they overlap with ECDC's planning.
88. As the next SMAP would run up to year 2020, it was observed that the Programme should be highly strategic in nature.
89. In reply to an earlier query, the Director noted that the Member States are not considered as 'external stakeholders' and he assured the Board that their needs will be explicitly prioritised. It was noted that the timetable would be submitted to the Board once finalised. Additionally, the Board was informed that the SMAP will also be discussed during the Q4 meeting in September 2012.

The Management Board took note of the presentation and will be included in the consultation process, which will begin in September 2012. A timetable, including information on what documents will be produced when, will be sent to the Board as soon as it becomes available.

Item 14 – ECDC vision on EU level monitoring and evaluation of immunisation programmes and related vaccines (Document MB25/11)

90. Maarit Kokki, Senior Advisor to the Director and Head of Section, International Relations, Office of the Director, presented ECDC's achievements and vision on EU level monitoring and evaluation of immunisation programmes and related vaccines.²⁴ Much has been achieved in a short period of time, especially around influenza vaccines through projects like I-MOVE, VENICE and

²³ Item 10 - Strategic Multi-annual WP 2014-2020 (M Sprenger)

²⁴ Item 14 - ECDC vision_immunisation programmes (M Kokki)

VAESCO. However, ECDC has no budget to really keep this important topic 'alive'. A new EU-level public/private partnership under the Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI) extending that from developing medicines to include monitoring and evaluation was noted, and it was considered in detail by Maarit Kokki along with two other options for doing this sort of work in Europe for monitoring and evaluating vaccine programmes after licensing. Notwithstanding the IMI initiative (Option 1), there was also simply awarding more resources to ECDC (Option 2) and having the European Commission holding funds, perhaps from industry, and having ECDC involved along with Public Health Institutes from Member States.

91. The Board acknowledged the high importance of this issue. It was questioned whether the IMI approach was correct and it was stressed that it was important to also draw on surveillance systems to obtain data. A harmonised policy at the European level would be welcomed.

92. One of the members highlighted the issue of vaccine safety testing and the related conflicts of interest, while noting that a system allowing the tendering of such studies would be preferred and which would also allow for a comparison of products. Another Board member highlighted that while there is no opposition against private-public relationship, it should be allowed only if any conflicts of interest are eliminated. The Chair cautioned the Board that, in respect to the topic, vaccine licensing is within the remit of EMA and ECDC cannot be involved in that.

93. It was pointed out that pharmacovigilance legislation (effective July 2012) will be insufficient to cover all necessary areas, such as vaccine effectiveness and rapid investigation of concerning vaccine safety signals, and thus the Board should agree with the proposals brought out in the document.

94. In reference to vaccine effectiveness studies, it was noted that they should be conducted independently from the industry. The importance of collaboration between countries and the involvement of public health institutes and ECDC was also highlighted and welcomed since supporting vaccine programmes is in ECDC's Founding Regulation.

95. With regards to the three options proposed in the presentation for increasing budget availability, the Member from the United Kingdom expressed dissent in respect to the first and second option, yet she supported the third option (establishing a common fund supplied with public and private funding, managed by the Commission). A number of other national representatives spoke and, with one exception, essentially supported the UK view.

96. It was stated that there should be a clear separation between vaccine efficacy (the findings from trials on healthy people in optimal conditions and used for vaccine licensing) and effectiveness (how well the vaccines work in practice). It is not recommended to take any actions which may undermine the new legislation, especially as it is not yet in place. The licensing of medicinal products is under EMA's remit, which should not be undermined. The representative of the Commission disagreed with the effectiveness part noted in the presentation. It is necessary to ascertain, together with the Member States, how to approach this issue in the light of the new legislation. A role for ECDC can be examined. It was highlighted that it is incorrect to state that there is a general problem with vaccination as this is not the case. The conflict of interest issue would be difficult to solve merely by conducting the vaccine study tests in universities (or similar institutions), as suggested by one of the Members. While the conflict of interest issue is very relevant, it should not depend on who is conducting the tests. Instruments for detecting conflicts of interest should be developed further. Any activities in this field carried out by ECDC should be complementary to EMA's work.

97. On the issue of effectiveness, it was noted that it might not be possible to regulate this issue. Additionally, there can be different rates of effectiveness in different countries and national authorities may want to know this.

98. With regards to previous comments on the vaccine studies, it was hoped that the ideas and activities that might be related to the new legislation (like the new IMI initiative) could still be discussed, even if the process of putting the new legislation in place is underway.

99. It was hoped that the discussions on this topic could continue in the future meetings. In reference to EMA and ECDC, and in particular their remit in the light of the issue, it was requested to receive a legal analysis on the pharmacovigilance legislation.

100. The previous statement was argued by the next speaker from Finland, who pointed out that even as EMA is the leader in this activity for efficacy and licensing, many of the national health institutes are already (and must be) involved when it comes to safety and investigating safety signals. She cited the recent work in Finland and by ECDC. With regards to effectiveness, the focus should be on both established and new vaccines.

101. The Chair proposed creating a small working group, including the Commission, ECDC, EMA and Member States. A suggestion was made to also give the opportunity to the Advisory Forum to comment on Document MB25/11.

The Management Board agreed to establish a small working group, consisting of the European Commission, ECDC, EMA and Member States. A document will be presented at the next Board meeting in November.

Item 22 – Update from ECDC regarding staff matters

Item 22a – Evaluation of the reorganisation (results of the staff survey)

102. Andrea Ammon, Deputy to the Director and the Head of Resource Management and Coordination Unit, elaborated on the results of the ECDC staff survey. The key positive finding of the survey was that about 70% of staff enjoy their work in ECDC. Amongst the indicators that had improved since the 2010 staff survey, a positive relationship between the staff and their direct line managers was highlighted. On the negative side, the biggest decrease compared to previous surveys was the trust towards the Senior Management Team (SMT). Some of the areas where ECDC feels the need to work on the most include career development (which is already in place, but it must be further clarified what is expected from the staff side); communication; and recognition of staff. The Board was informed that the evaluation of the reorganisation has not yet been conducted. Originally, it was proposed to combine this with the staff survey; however, it was decided not to include specific questions on the reorganisation into the staff survey. To evaluate the reorganisation, ECDC continues to work with the same working group set up to oversee the staff, survey but with some additional members from the parts of ECDC most affected by the reorganisation. Timing wise, the results are expected to be received by the end of October.

Item 22b – Information on results of CO-DO and action plan (Document MB25/Info Note 2)

103. See the next item.

Item 22c – Recent organisational adjustments (Document MB25/Info Note 3)

104. The ECDC Director presented information on the process and results of the CO-DO initiative, including the action plan as well as on the recent organisational adjustments.²⁵ It was highlighted that the CO-DO initiative resulted in many useful comments and proposals.

105. ECDC was cautioned to take the results of the CO-DO initiative seriously and to follow up on the proposals in order to increase transparency and trust towards the Senior Management Team (SMT). It was hoped that the Board would be privy to the results of ECDC's internal evaluation of the reorganisation ahead of the November Board meeting. It was also noted that in the line of improvements, additional time would be allocated for change to occur smoothly prior to applying further changes. Even though the staff survey results were perceived as somewhat surprising, several members pointed out that ECDC is not the only organisation in the public health sector where staff satisfaction has decreased. It was pointed out that budget cuts and austerity had made life more

²⁵ Item 22b and c - Information on results of CO-DO and Recent organisational adjustments (M Sprenger)

difficult for public health professionals in most EU countries. One Board member proposed that ECDC should revitalise its mission as a way of inspiring staff.

The Management Board took note of the update from ECDC regarding staff matters and looks forward to hearing further progress made in respect to a) evaluation of the reorganisation (results of the staff survey); b) results of CO-DO and action plan; and c) recent organisational adjustments at the next meeting in November.

Item 19 – Independence policy and implementing rules on Declarations of Interest (*Document MB25/14*)

106. Rebecca Trott, Senior Legal Advisor, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, gave a brief presentation in order to highlight the background and timeline for redrafting the Independence Policy and Implementing Rules on Declarations of Interest.²⁶

107. Some discontent was expressed with the fact that such an important issue was discussed minutes before the end of the meeting.

108. It was confirmed that Document MB25/14,²⁷ including a stakeholder survey, will be dispatched to the Management Board via written procedure in due course.

The Management Board took note of the presentation. Due to scheduling constraints, Document MB25/14, Independence policy and implementing rules on Declarations of Interest, including a stakeholder survey, will be sent to the Board via written procedure in due course.

Item 11 – Interactions with Member States for support to response activities

Due to scheduling constraints, this item was postponed to the MB26 meeting in November.

Item 12 – Update on simulation exercise spring 2012

Due to scheduling constraints, this item was postponed to the MB26 meeting in November.

Item 18 – Overview of all Agreements signed between ECDC and other organisations

Due to scheduling constraints, this item was postponed to the MB26 meeting in November.

Item 20 – Update on Transatlantic Task Force on AMR (TATFAR)

Due to scheduling constraints, this item was postponed to the MB26 meeting in November.

Item 24 – Any other business

109. ECDC Director thanked all the Members for their participation and fruitful discussions. He also extended a special thank you to Corinne Skarstedt, Head of Section, Corporate Governance, Office of the Director, and her team, Johanna Banks and Silja Marma, for having smoothly prepared and organised this meeting. He also thanked Philippe Harant, Head of Section, Quality Management, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, for his excellent work.

²⁶ Item 19 - Independence Policy_Introduction (R Trott).

²⁷ Due to scheduling constraints, Document MB25/14 was not submitted to the ECDC Management Board with the corresponding MB25 meeting documentation.

110. The Chair then thanked the Management Board for their fruitful contributions and he also took the opportunity to extend his thanks to the interpreters for their work.

111. The Twenty-sixth meeting of the ECDC Management Board will convene in Stockholm on 14-15 November 2012.