ECDC Management Board

Minutes of the Thirty-third Meeting of the ECDC Management Board

Stockholm, 24-25 March 2015

Adopted by the Management Board at its Thirty-fourth meeting, 16-17 June 2015

Contents

Summary of Proceedings – ECDC Management Board Meeting

The Thirty-third meeting of the ECDC Management Board (MB) convened in Stockholm, Sweden, on 24-25 March 2015. The election of the Director of ECDC was conducted during the Third Extraordinary meeting of the ECDC Management Board on 26 March.[1] During the Thirty-third meeting, the Management Board:

- adopted the draft programme;
- adopted the draft minutes of the Second Extraordinary meeting (20 January 2015);
- took note of the update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting;
- took note of the update from the External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group; the Drafting Group will convene its Third Meeting in Brusselson 12 May 2015 (date subject to change);
- unanimously adopted the Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2015 up until present;
- took note of the ECDC Work Programme priorities for 2016 and agreed that the Work Programme 2016 will be presented to the Management Board for approval in June;
- took note of the first ECDC Annual Stakeholder Analysis 2014; the final report will be presented to the MB in June 2015;
- approved the Annual Report of the Director on the Centre's Activities in 2014, including the Draft Analysis and Assessment of the Authorising Officer's (Activity) Report 2014;
- adopted the proposal of the IAS Strategic Audit Plan 2014-2016;
- took note of the ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy and agreed that a revised strategy, taking into account comments and proposals made by the Management Board, would be presented at the June meeting;
- endorsed the Provisional Annual Accounts 2014, including the Report on Budgetary and Financial Management;
- approved the First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2015;
- endorsed, with the abstention of the European Commission, the proposed Draft Budget for 2016, considering the restrictions;
- took note on the Annual Report of the Compliance Officer to the Director on the implementation of ECDC's Independence Policy in 2014;
- requested regular updates on the implementation of ECDC's Independence Policy, including a presentation on the number of declarations brought forward containing conflicts and measures taken;
- took note of the update from the European Commission;
- took note of the updates from the Latvian EU Presidency (January-June) and the upcoming Luxembourgish EU Presidency (July-December);
- marked World TB Day 2015 with a presentation from ECDC on the epidemiological situation of TB and its Multi-drug Resistance in Europe.

[1] Please refer to the related correspondence dated 18 March 2015 announcing the Third Extraordinary Management Board meeting session.

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

1. Françoise Weber, Chair of the ECDC Management Board (MB), welcomed all the participants to the Thirty-third meeting of the Management Board. A special welcome was extended to Marijan Erceg, Member, Croatia, who was attending the meeting for the first time. Apologies had been received from Denmark, Liechtenstein and Romania.

2. Further to attendance, the Board was informed that Paula Vasconcelos, Alternate, Portugal, would be unable to be present for the whole duration of the 33rd meeting and during her absence, Portugal had given their proxy to Tiiu Aro, Member and Deputy Chair, Estonia. In reference to the Third Extraordinary meeting on 26 March, Portugal would be present. The Board was also informed that Denmark had given their proxy to the United Kingom for the Third Extraordinary Management Board meeting on 26 March.[2] No other proxies were announced.

3. The Chair thanked the Board for their understanding and collaboration considering the last-minute organisational changes in the meeting arrangements, i.e. splitting the Thirty-third MB meeting and the Third Extraordinary MB meeting. The main rationale for this decision was to ensure continuous governance and management of the Centre as well as to be fair with all parties involved in the process, considering the election of the ECDC Director.

Welcome from the Director, ECDC

4. Marc Sprenger, Director, ECDC, welcomed the MB delegates and noted that he was looking forward to fruitful and productive discussions during the meeting. The new head of the ECDC Legal Services Section, Andrea Iber, was introduced to the Board.

Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) *(Document MB33/01 Rev.2)**

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

The Board adopted the draft programme.

Adoption of the draft minutes of the Second Extraordinary meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 20 January 2015) *(Document MB33/02)**

The Board adopted the draft minutes of the Second Extraordinary meeting.

Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (18-19 November 2014) *(Document MB33/03)**

6. Marc Sprenger, ECDC Director, provided the Board with an update on the main activities since the last meeting.[3] Amongst other items, the update touched upon the Ebola outbreak and ECDC

[2] During the Third Extraordinary Management Board meeting on 26 March 2015, Dorte Hansen Thrige, newly appointed Member from Denmark, had given proxy to the United Kingdom.
* Item for decision.
* Item for decision.
* Item for information.
[3] Update from ECDC on activities since MB32 and MB Extraordinary 2 (M Sprenger)

deployment to West Africa, country visits to Croatia and Cyprus, as well as the first joint annual ARHAI meeting on 11-13 February. Andrea Ammon, Deputy to the Director and Head of Resource Management and Coordination Unit, also briefed the Board on the current status of the ECDC building project, noting that the tender was published on 3 March with a deadline of 4 May 2015. Upon receipt of tenders and processing of same, it is hoped that by the end of June/mid-July, the top three tenders will be selected and the negotiation process can commence. Final proposals from the three finalists will be expected around the end of 2015 and thus the Centre should be able to present a final solution to the Board shortly thereafter.

7. The representative from Cyprus extended a special thanks from their Ministry of Health in reference to the recent country visit carried out by ECDC.

8. One of the Board Members made reference to page 13 of the report and requested more information regarding the EU vaccines task force. It was later clarified by ECDC that while the EU vaccines task force existed during the pandemic, it has not convened since the end of the pandemic and no meetings have taken place in 2014. Thus this activity is rudimentary and will be removed from the report.

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

Update from the ECDC Management Board External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group*

9. Daniel Reynders, Member, Belgium, and Chair of the External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group, updated the Board on the discussions of the Drafting Group. It was recalled that during the first meeting of the group on 19 January 2015, it was concluded that some of the recommendations were difficult to translate into operational measures. As a result, all members of the group were assigned with dedicated chapters of the report for in-depth analysis and comparisons with the recommendations proposed by the evaluators. During the second meeting on 23 March, the group went through the recommendations and managed to discuss ten of the eighteen general recommendations. Consequently, another meeting is necessary before presenting the final conclusions at the June Board meeting, as planned and agreed previously.

The Management Board took note of the update from the External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group.

The Drafting Group will convene its Third meeting in Brussels on 12 May 2015 (date subject to change).

Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2015 up until present *(Document MB33/04)**

10. Philippe Harant, Head of Section, Quality Management, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented an update on the implementation of the ECDC Work Programme 2015 up until present.[4]

11. In reference to the hepatitis framework, the representative of the European Commission pointed out that as it is one of the main priorities for the new Commissioner, as well as for the DG SANTÉ, it is very positive that the Centre would be continuing with this activity. In reference to any concrete actions in the near future, it was noted that discussions with ECDC on the operational level could start within a couple of weeks. Several Board Members also joined in thanking ECDC for keeping the hepatitis framework activity on the Work Programme.

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

* Item for information.
* Item for decision.
[4] Report on Implementation of WP 2015 (P Harant)

ECDC 2016 Work Programme Priorities*

12. ECDC Director, Marc Sprenger, updated the Board on the priorities of the ECDC Work Programme for 2016.[5] It was noted that during the June meeting, the Work Programme 2016 will be presented for approval.

13. In reference to ECDC willingness to reduce outsourcing in the follow up of the external evaluation report, one member of the Board questioned whether an analysis was carried out on the outsourced activities in the Centre, clarifying the competencies needed in order to ensure that such activities could indeed be carried out by 10 Contract Agents, as ECDC has requested. Given the lack of such analysis, the MB felt that more input would be needed in order for the MB to take a stand on this matter. Further to the proposal for tranferring the budget from Title 3 to Title 1, corresponding to the creation of 10 new Contract Agent posts, it was highlighted that this would be unacceptable for the European Commission to have such an increase, as the new Staff Regulations stipulate that all the Community Institutions, inluding all Agencies, should reduce their staff. The proposal is thus contrary to the Staff Regulations.

14. With regards to the external evaluation, it was noted by the representative of the Commission that it is important that the Centre reflects upon the conclusions and recommendations stemming from the evaluation report. An example from the report referring to double funding of activities between the health programme and the ECDC was brought out. This is an area in which ECDC could be vulnerable and therefore it is recommended that in the process of building up the Work Programme for 2016, such possible overlaps should be examined in order to avoid this in the future. The ECDC Director noted that the Centre will look into this matter.

15. In reference to the new Commission, the MB was also informed that based on the priorities set for Commissioner Vytenis Andriukaitis, the issue of serious cross-border health threats is high on the agenda and shall remain a strong focus for the future.

16. It was confirmed by ECDC that an in-depth analysis of all outsourcing activities has been carried out, available to the Board upon request. It was also noted that it is clear that all such activities cannot be carried out by internal resources.

17. In reponse to the query regarding the role of the Advisory Forum (AF) in the prioritisation process, ECDC Chief Scientist, Mike Catchpole, confirmed that the Centre has a well-established process for the prioritisation (IRIS), which has been used for several years. Additionally, based also on the conclusions from the external evaluation questioning how items had been selected for the IRIS process, it has been planned to invite the AF members to put forward their proposals which will thereafter be discussed at the next AF meeting, prior to initiating the IRIS process. In reference to IRIS, one member of the Board questioned how the other priorities not related to scientific advice are established. It was confirmed by ECDC that the IRIS could be used for a wider range of activities, other than only scientific. Currently, the Centre reviews all the request and proposals, such as from the Commission, in the annual internal planning processes. It was added that an EU survey tool, which had been used for the recent annual stakeholder survey, could also be used for the Work Programme priorities in the future. The aforementioned tool would also allow for more structured feedback.

18. The Chair recalled that as the MB has repeatetly requested information regarding the conclusions from the AF meetings, it would be desirable that the Board would have some feedback from the conclusions of the AF in order to better understand their position.

The Board took note of the ECDC Work Programme priorities for 2016.

The Work Programme 2016 will be presented to the Board for approval in June.

Results of the ECDC Annual Stakeholders Analysis 2014*

19. Philippe Harant, ECDC, presented the results of the first ECDC Annual Stakeholders Analysis for the year 2014.[6]

* Item for information.
[5] ECDC 2016 Work programme priorities (M Sprenger)
* Item for information.

20. Overall, the MB agreed that such survey is very important for the Centre and it was queried whether the full report as well as the questionnaire used could be made available for the Board. Concerns were raised in reference to the low response rate, and it was agreed that the Centre should look into the reasons. In reference to this, it was argued that as in some (smaller) countries, several functions are covered by one individual, this may have led to the low numbers. ECDC noted that there was only one questionnaire used for the survey and every effort was made to avoid duplications. Additionally, as this was the first of such surveys, the Centre has the possibility to use lessons learned for future surveys, such as grouping the stakeholders, if feasible. The Board was also informed that the ECDC is more than pleased to share the report and questionnaire with the MB.

21. Further to the response rate, it was also noted that it might help to adapt the questions to the different targets by a better consideration of the sometimes complicated route between ECDC and the policy makers/public. In addition, several MB members brought out that the recipient is not always able to answer all the questions without inputs from others at national level given the wide range of questions. This situation could have led to give up answering the questionnaire and could contribute to explain the low response rate.. The issue of anonymity was also highlighted, as some requested data was quite explicit, this might have caused some issues for receipients to respond. The matter of potentially outsourcing such a survey was acknowledged.

22. Regarding the content of the survey, it was pointed out that in case the Centre is considering carrying out this survey on a yearly basis, the questionnaire could perhaps be made shorter. Additionally, it was highlighted that providing feedback to involved stakeholders (both respondents and non-respondents) would be most useful, also from the perspective of motivation of the non respondents (?). The final report will be presented to the Management Board in June 2015 and will be made available to all stakeholders following that meeting.

The Board took note of the first ECDC Annual Stakeholder Analysis 2014. The final report will be submitted to the 34th Management Board meeting in June 2015.

Annual Report of the Director on the Centre's Activities in 2014 (including Draft Analysis and Assessment of Authorising Officer's [Activity] Report in 2014) *(Document MB33/05 Rev.2)**

23. Marc Sprenger presented the Annual Report of the Director on the Centre's Activities in 2014, including the Draft Analysis and Assessment of Authorising Officer's (Activity) Report.[7] The presentation was followed by the Acting Chair of the Audit Committee, Jacques Scheres, European Parliament, who provided the assessment on the annual report according to the ECDC Audit Committee.

24. The new format of the report was very much appreciated by the Board members, as well as the addition of the highlights publication. With regards to the content, reference was made to multiple examples demonstrating various innovative ideas the Centre has taken on board. It was also noted that the mission of the Centre to support the Member States, the Commission and Parliament should be kept in mind, also in the context of global health.

25. The geographical imbalance within ECDC staff was brought out and questioned. It was noted by ECDC that this is a very important matter for the Centre and it is believed, also in comparison with other EU Agencies, that the existing geographical balance is satisfactory. It was also questioned why some Member States might be more represented than others, for example, based on the specific skillset of Romania, there are many staff members working within ECDC's IT from that country. The balance of representation of countries is also an item for discussion during ECDC country visits.

26. With regard to the content, reference was made to page 19 in which it is mentioned that around thirty percent of the Rapid Risk Assessments produced in 2014 were associated to zoonotic influenza and other respiratory viruses. Considering the possibility of underreporting, it was noted that perhaps this should be clarified. It was noted by the ECDC that efforts are made in order to activate laboratories all over EU to have adequate facilities to pick up the signal and diagnose Enterovirus D68 infection.

---

[6] Results of the ECDC Annual Stakeholders Analysis 2014 (P Harant)

* Item for decision.

[7] Annual report of the Director 2014 (M Sprenger)

The Management Board approved the Annual Report of the Director on the Centre's Activities in 2014, including the Draft Analysis and Assessment of the Authorising Officer's (Activity) Report 2014.

Summary of discussions held at the 28th meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (23 March) including its recommendations:

27. Jacques Scheres, Member, European Parliament, and Acting Chair of the ECDC Audit Committee (AC), briefly summarised the discussions from the 28th AC meeting which took place on the previous day, 23 March 2015.[8]

*a) Update of IAS Strategic Internal Audit Plan 2014-2016 (Document MB33/06) **

28. Stefan Sundbom, Internal Control Coordinator, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, updated the Board on the IAS Strategic Internal Audit Plan for 2014-2016, followed by the conclusions and recommendations of the AC.[9]

29. In reference to the presented audit plan, and specifically the audit on data management, it was questioned how the Member States would be involved. It was clarified that further information is available in the initial document from 2013. Additionally, more details will be discussed during the planned visit of auditors in the end of April 2015.

30. The Chair concluded that the Board can follow the advice of the AC, however, the Board also insisted that the important item of procurement should be on the list of audit topics for next year.

The Management Board unanimously adopted the proposal of the IAS Strategic Audit Plan 2014-2016.

*b) ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy (Document MB33/07)**

31. Stefan Sundbom, ECDC, presented the ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy to the Board.[10] The background and rationale for such strategy was clarified, along with initial outcomes of the process and an action plan. The Audit Committee presented its conclusions, pointing out that further explanations on the (fraud) risks would be desireable and thus it is recommended to submit a revised version of the strategy in June.

32. The Board welcomed the strategy in general and supported the AC in their recommendation. Additionally, it was proposed to clarify which criteria were used for the risks and which measures will be used in order to detect such risks. The Board considered that the risk analysis, which offers the basis for the strategy, is not yet complete and should include more layers, such as recruitment, budget implementation, grants, etc., especially as the European Court of Auditors noted weaknesses in these areas in the Centre some years ago. Also, conflicts of interests, procurement and leackage of information are not listed in the action plan, and it would augur well to have specific references to these important issues. With regards to proposed actions, none of the important issues noted previously above are addressed explicitly and it was thus agreed that the Centre should revise the strategy. The inclusion of scientific fraud was also pointed out as a potential risk also for ECDC, and should be considered.

The Management Board took note of the ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy.

It was agreed that a revised Strategy, taking into account comments and proposals made by the Management Board, would be presented at the June meeting.

[8] Summary of 28th AC meeting_short (J Scheres)
* Item for decision.
[9] Update of IAS Strategic Audit Plan 2014-2016 (S Sundbom)
* Item for decision.
[10] ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy (S Sundbom)

*c) Provisional Annual Accounts 2014, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management (Document MB33/08)**

33. Anja Van Brabant, Head of Section, Finance and Accounting, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented the provisional Annual Accounts of 2014, including the Report on Budgetary and Financial Management.[11] The ECDC presentation was followed by conclusions and recommendations of the Audit Committee to endorse the Provisional Annual Accounts 2014.

The Board endorsed the Provisional Annual Accounts 2014, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management.

*d) First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2015 (Document MB33/09)**

34. Anja Van Brabant, ECDC, presented the First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2015.[12] The Audit Committee concluded its deliberations and recommended approving the proposal.

35. The matter of EFTA countries contribution was brought out and it was questioned whether this is mandatory or planned, as the Board has previously adopted a Work Programme and thereafter it seems that the Centre has more money added from the EFTA. It was explained that the EFTA contribution is a percentage which is added to the EU budget. As the percentage for the coming year is not approved in advance, the Draft Budget is developed while considering the percentage from the current year and thus slight changes might occur on a yearly basis, different from what has been planned initially.

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

*e) Draft Budget 2016 (Document MB33/10 Rev.1)**

36. Anja Van Brabant, ECDC, presented the Draft Budget 2016.[13] The presentation was followed by the recommendation from the ECDC AC, noting that the AC heavily discussed the 10 additional Contract Agents as opposed to outsourcing, and in conclusion, it was proposed that the MB adopt the presented Draft Budget 2016 with a caveat that this might be rejected and thereafter amended in the subsequent regular EU budget process. The European Commission, based on the proposal to adopt the Draft Budget 2016 as presented, abstained.

The Management Board endorsed the proposed Draft Budget for 2016, considering the restrictions. The European Commission abstained.

Annual Report of the Compliance Officer to the Director on the implementation of ECDC's Independence Policy in 2014 *(Document MB33/12)**

37. Jan Mos, Compliance Officer, Director's Office, ECDC, presented the Annual Report on the implementation of ECDC's Independence Policy in 2014.[14] It was highlighted that delegates who have not submitted their declarations are not allowed to take part in the Governing Bodies meetings, which has proven to be a working measure in order to reinforce the policy. Overall, the current measures in place ensure that the Centre is not placed in any avoidable risk. It is envisaged to present the revised policy in June.

---

* Item for decision.
[11] Provisional Annual Accounts 2014 including report (A Brabant)
* Item for decision.
[12] First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2015 (A Brabant)
* Item for decision.
[13] Draft Budget 2016 (A Brabant)
* Item for information.
[14] Independence Policy 2014 (J Mos)

38. It was generally agreed that ECDC has made progress on implementing the Centre's Independence Policy; however, further improvements are vital, considering the paramount importance of the policy.

39. With regards to the presented report, it was questioned what the expert database, noted to be offered to the Board, entails. The issue of using CRM was also brought out. The Board also questioned how many cases of conflicts of interests have there been and which measures have been taken in order to mitigate the risks. In reference to Rapid Risk Assessments and external experts, major concerns were expressed regarding the high number of non-compliance, in accordance with the presentation. It was also questioned how other Agencies are dealing with similar issues and whether ECDC has been collaborating with other Agencies in order to learn from their experiences and perhaps use similar/same system(s).

40. On the side of the submission rate from various groups, the validity of the content was highlighted and the mitigating measures were questioned. Of note, reference was also made to the increasing number of staff leaving the Centre, as presented in the report, and the reasons for this were questioned. It was also pointed out that the Conflicts of Interests matter is valuable for the entire EU (and not only ECDC).

41. The representatives of the European Commission acknowledged that even though much work has been done with the policy, there are still serious concerns. It is a fundamental issue, leading to a potential questioning of the Centre's credibility. Considering the use of external experts, it was felt that it is very difficult to defend the fact that the experts are needed, as there is no know-how on a specific issue within the ECDC and yet at the same time these experts might not have submitted their declarations, which raises questions. The example of EFSA was brought out and it was noted that the Agency has offered to share their electronic tool with ECDC, although they will build a new electronic submission system. It is also understood that even a good tool still needs to be used in an appropriate manner. Regarding the content of declarations which may contain any kind of information, it was proposed that at least a sample should be verified. In conclusion, it was suggested that the entire process should be simplified and improved follow-up should be implemented, including mitigating measures, such as ensuring that no expert who has not submitted a declaration is allowed to conduct any meaningful activities for the Agency.

42. The ECDC Compliance Officer acknowledged that there is indeed room for improvement. It was highlighted that the most challenging part of the process is to obtain the declarations. An example of the two main Governing Bodies was brought out in this regard. Also, there is still a high error rate, receiving the data is time consuming and complex. In response to the remark regarding the use of external experts, it was clarified that external experts are utilised since ECDC does not possess top level expertise and detailed knowledge on every topic. Moreover, declarations of interest are vital in order to avoid a partial and biased opinion. It is understood and agreed that the process should be as easy as possible. The Centre has also been in contact with EFSA, EMA and ECHA regarding this matter and the Agency needs to evaluate which system is best for ECDC. In reference to earlier mention of expert directory, it was clarified that as there are currently various systems used in collecting the declarations, it could be considered to streamline and try to use only one system, a system which would be searchable and would not accept incomplete declarations. With regards to measures, it is not a part of the policy to openly disclose this information. In the case of the AF and MB, the mitigating measures lay in the hands of the Chairs of these meetings. It was agreed that the ECDC will include information on how often the Centre is undertaking mitigating measures in the report for next year. With regards to the Rapid Risk Assessments, the proposal is to have a shorter version of a declaration of interest and in case this is not filled in by the expert, he/she will have no access to the Rapid Risk Assessment document. Regarding the validity of the content, the Centre conducts checks in order to ensure the data is accurate. Currently, there are no random sample checks in place to verify the truthfulness of the declared interests. Even though it does eventually not help with the perception of the Centre, there is still also some trust towards the people being solely responsible for the data and the vast majority is affiliated with National Public Health Institutes, Governments, NGOs and to a low degree to academic institutes, reducing the chances for direct commercial interests in pharmaceutical and diagnostic companies. Regarding increasing numbers of staff leaving, it was pointed out that the role of the Compliance Officer is only to follow up on the whereabouts of staff who depart from the Centre. In conclusion, it was highlighted that the collaboration of the Member States in order to make the implementation of the policy a success is highly appreciated.

43. One of the Board Members queried whether a staff satisfaction survey is foreseen or available in reference to the staff figures noted in the presentation. The Chair concluded that this matter could be discussed at future meeting(s).

44. Further to the simplification of the process, it was questioned whether secretarial support could be considered. It was also proposed to start the process of collecting the declarations earlier in the year, for example in October, in order to facilitate the process and possibly ensure lower error rates.

45. The discussion was concluded and the Board paid tribute to ECDC on all the work which has been done. However, the MB is still concerned about this matter, for example, in reference to the Rapid Risk Assessments. The MB is also interested in the number of declarations made which have led to the use of mitigating measures. The Chair also reminded the Board that at the beginning of each meeting, the MB delegates are asked to declare any additional conflicts which may occur based on the meeting agenda and such information is public. The Board welcomes the facilitation of the process and would like to receive regular updates on this matter at each meeting. It was also proposed to provide the Board with a short presentation on how many declarations have been brought forward with issues and what have been the measures taken, excluding any private information except in case of MB delegates during participation in the Board meetings.

The MB took note of the Annual Report of the Compliance Officer to the Director on the implementation of ECDC's Independence Policy in 2014.

The Board requested regular updates at each meeting on this matter, including a presentation on the number of declarations brought forward containing conflicts and measures taken.

Update from the European Commission*

a) Implementing acts of Decision 1082/2013/EU on serious cross-border threats to health: progress update

46. Martin Seychell, Member, European Commission, updated the Board on the acts of Decision 1082/2013/EU on serious cross-border threats to health. Article 11.5 of the decision requires the European Commission to prepare and propose an implementing decision on the coordination of response, exchange of information and communication. The Commission has presented this proposal to the Health Security Committee on 27 February with the deadline for submitting comments by the end of March. Following this, the draft can be finetuned and the consultation process within the Commission can be initiated. The final approval in the process lies with the College of the Commissioners. The implementing act on the early warning and response system, required by Article 8.2, is currently being revised internally and upon finalisation of the consultation with the Commission's Legal Service, the internal consultation within the Commission will follow in order to see how the EWRS can be linked with other EU rapid alert systems. Once this is clarified, the Commission shall consult with the Committee's Working Group, followed by the similar route as in the case of Article 11.5.

47. In reference to Article 4 on the requirement of declaring the state of preparedness by November 2014 based on the template developed in July 2014, this template was communicated to relevant parties, and in response, many requests were received to extend the deadline due to the Ebola outbreak. It was, however, not possible to allow any changes after the deadline and thus as a follow up with the Health Security Committee, the Member States were reminded to submit their data. Currently, 13 Member States and 1 EEA country have submitted information. Based on this, it is not possible to prepare the progress report required by Article 4 nor to take any further steps. Thus all countries who have not yet replied are urged to do so as soon as possible.

b) Commission Roadmap on the follow up to the Common Approach Outcome of the Inter-Institutional Approach Decentralised Agencies

48. John F Ryan, Member, European Commisison, provided an update on the Commission Roadmap on the follow up to the Common Approach Outcome of the Inter-Institutional Approach Decentralised Agencies. The Commission, together with the other Institutions, developed a roadmap to

* Item for information.

follow up the Commission's communication from March 2008 on the future of European Agencies. This inter-institutional working group was tasked to assess the existing situation and specifically the coherence, the effectiveness, the accountability and transparency of the EU Agencies and to find a common ground on how all the Agencies could contribute to improving their performance and organisations. The outcome of this work was a common approach on the EU decentralised Agencies which was adopted in July 2012, based on this work and Commission has been following up on this by identifying a number of actions which need to be followed up with a target date of implementation by the end of 2014. A progress report was provided by the Agencies Network to the European Parliament, to the Council and to the Commission on fifteen of the actions which were implemented collectively up until the end of 2013. During 2014, there were a number of other areas of work which were taken forward, such as the new Staff Regulations, new Financial Regulations and so on. In March 2015, the Agencies Network drafted a report on the implementation of this common approach and it appears that 96% of the actions identified have now been implemented by the Agencies. A report will be published shortly by the Secretary General of the Commission on the entire process.

c) Feedback on the Senior Officials meeting between the European Commission and the World Health Organisation

49. John F Ryan, Member, European Commission, provided the Board with feedback from the meeting of the Senior Officials meeting between the European Commission and the WHO. Reference was made to the Moscow agreement which established a system for cooperation between the two organisations, setting out roadmaps in a series of areas. On a yearly basis, the two organisations negotiate on the activities. There are also regular meetings in place to screen the progress of the roadmaps and the tasks ahead. The most recent of such meetings focused on the Ebola outbreak and conclusions were drawn to lessons learned for all parties involved. On the side of Ebola, the issue of AMR was also discussed. In reference to future collaboration, it was agreed to abandon the roadmaps and instead try and identify areas where the two organisations can work together, and it is envisaged to make a new agreement shortly. Over the years, the Commission has tried to continuously work on ways to work better together, and in many areas, this has been successful and thus it is hoped to establish continuous good collaboration in the future.

d) Update on Research Activities

50. Cornelius Schmaltz, Alternate, European Commission, gave an update on the research activities.[15]

51. The DG SANTÉ and DG RTD were complimented by the Board on demonstrating smooth collaboration with the Member States during the Ebola outbreak. Further to the presentation, and more precisely considering the Ebola vaccine developments, it was questioned how the coordination between the multiple international organisations and institutions involved was put in place, also the coordination with the vaccine developers. Collaboration between ECDC and DG RTD was also questioned. With regards to the funding of vaccine effectiveness studies which were raised in several occasions at the MB level and led to the MB/WG on New Business Models for large EU Scale Surveys, it was noted that the IMOVE project is now funded under Horizon 2020. DG RTD explained the iMove project is a result of a very broad call on the effectiveness of healthcare interventions in the elderly.The Calls in Horizon 2020 are very broad and it is virtually impossible to make them specific for example on vaccine effectiveness. Regarding the query on coordination in the light of the Ebola vaccine, this is of course very complex and difficult and the DG RTD has tried to make this one of the two key priorities, one being able to get the funding activities started and the second to ensure international coordination. A meeting was held for all parties involved recently and issues addressed included concrete actions in the Ebola vaccine developments.

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

[15]Update on Research Activities (C Schmaltz)

Update from the EU Presidencies*

a) Update from Latvia

52. Dzintars Mozgis, Alternate, Latvia, gave an update from the current Latvian EU Presidency.[16]

53. In connection to the Latvian EU Presidency, as well as in the light of World TB Day, Marieke van der Werf, Head of Disease Programme, Tuberculosis, Office of Chief Scientist, ECDC, provided a presentation to the Board on the situation of tuberculosis in the EU.

b) Update from Luxembourg

54. Robert Goerens, Member, Luxembourg, provided the Board with an update on the upcoming Luxembourgish EU Presidency.[17]

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

Any other business

55. As the regular Board meeting was convened in good time and all the topics were covered, it was decided to convene Day 2 of the meeting at 14:00. It was confirmed that the bus would pick up the Board members at midday and lunch would be offered at ECDC as scheduled at 12:30. Thereafter, the Board would convene the closed session as planned.

Opening of Day 2 of the meeting

56. Prior to convening the planned closed session, ECDC Director, Marc Sprenger, took the opportunity to thank the ECDC Management Board for their excellent work during the years. As the Thirty-third MB meeting was the last for the current Director during his five-year mandate, a special thanks was also extended from the Director to the ECDC staff and the Senior Management Team.

Preparation for the election of the Director of ECDC*

57. This item was conducted in a closed session for Members of the Management Board only.

58. Upon the request from the Chair, it was asked to note down that the Board requested for clarification from the ECDC Corporate Governance Section with regards to the membership of Denmark and Romania. ECDC Corporate Governance team confirmed the following:

1) As per correspondence from the Ministry of Health of Denmark, dated 25 March 2015, Dorte Hansen Thrige, previous Alternate of the ECDC Management Board, was nominated as the new Member of the Board and thus is able to provide a vote/proxy, as per Rules of Procedure of the Management Board.
2) Romania does not have a Member of Management Board since February 2014 and no new Member has been nominated. As the Alternate, Adriana Pistol, has informed the Secretariat that she is not able to attend the Thirty-third meeting of the Management Board and neither the Third Extraordinary Management Board meeting. Thus there is no possibility for a proxy vote to be given to any other present Member.
3) In conclusion, while considering that there is no vote for the Romania and while keeping in mind the ECDC Founding Regulation, the Board agreed on the total number of votes for the election process.

---

* Item for information.
[16] Update from Latvia (D Mozgis)
[17] Update from Luxembourg (R Goerens)
* Item for consideration.

Annex: List of Participants

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Austria	Peter Kreidl	Alternate
Belgium	Daniel Reynders	Member
Bulgaria	Angel Kunchev	Member
Croatia	Marijan Erceg	Member
Cyprus	Irene Cotter	Alternate
Czech Republic	Jozef Dlhý	Alternate
Estonia	Tiiu Aro *(Deputy Chair)*	Member
Finland	Anni Virolainen-Julkunen	Member
France	Françoise Weber *(Chair)*	Member
	Anne-Catherine Viso	Alternate
Germany	Susanne Wald	Member
	Gesa Lücking	Alternate
Greece	Maria Pirounaki	Alternate
Hungary	Hanna Páva	Member
	Beatrix Oroszi	Alternate
Ireland	Colette Bonner	Member
Italy	Maria Grazia Pompa	Alternate
Latvia	Dzintars Mozgis	Alternate
Lithuania	Audrius Ščeponavičius	Member
Luxembourg	Robert Goerens	Member
Malta	Anthony Gatt	Member
Netherlands	Marianne Donker	Member
	Herbert Barnard	Alternate
Poland	Michał Ilnicki	Alternate
Portugal	Paula Vasconcelos	Alternate
Slovak Republic	Ján Mikas	Member

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Slovenia	Mojca Gobec	Member
Spain	Karoline Fernández de la Hoz	Member
Sweden	Anita Janelm	Alternate
United Kingdom	Helen Shirley-Quirk	Member
European Parliament		
	Minerva-Melpomeni Malliori	Member
	Jacques Scheres	Member
European Commission		
DG SANTÉ	John F Ryan	Member
DG SANTÉ	Martin Seychell	Member
DG RTD	Cornelius Schmaltz	Alternate
EEA Countries		
Iceland	Sveinn Magnússon	Member
Norway	Sverre Berg Lutnæs	Member