



ECDC Management Board

Minutes of the Forty-third Meeting

Stockholm, 19-20 June 2018

Adopted by the ECDC Management Board at its Forty-fourth meeting, 13-14 November 2018

Contents

Opening and welcome from the Chair (and noting the Representatives).....	4
Welcome from the Director, ECDC.....	4
Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (<i>Document MB43/01 Rev.1</i>).....	4
Adoption of the draft minutes of the 42 nd meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 20-21 March 2018) (<i>Document MB43/02 Rev. 1</i>).....	4
Procedural information pertaining to the election of Chair and Deputy Chair of the Management Board (<i>Document MB43/03</i>).....	4
Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (20-21 March 2018) (<i>Document MB43/04</i>).....	5
Update on Next Generation ECDC	5
Update on the Third External Evaluation of ECDC (<i>Document MB43/16</i>).....	7
ECDC Preparedness and Response Strategy (<i>Document MB43/05</i>).....	7
Review of Indicators: measuring the impact of ECDC's work in the Member States (<i>Document MB43/07</i>)	8
ECDC Single Programming Document 2020 (<i>Document MB43/08</i>).....	9
Update on the planning of the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting (<i>Document MB43/09</i>).....	10
Summary of discussions held at the 38 th Meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (19 June 2018), including its recommendations.....	10
Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2018 up until present (<i>Document MB43/06</i>).....	12
Selection of experts for ECDC Rapid Risk Assessments (<i>Document MB43/13</i>)	13
ECDC Management Board Meeting Dates 2019 and 2020 (<i>Document MB43/14 Rev. 1</i>)	13
Update on ECDC Compliance: Implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy.....	14
Update from the MB Working Group on Code of Conduct of the Management Board	14
Attendance at Management Board meetings and admission of observers (<i>Document MB43/15</i>).....	14
Update from the European Commission	16
Preferred location(s) of future hotel accommodations in Stockholm.....	16
Any other business.....	17
Annex: List of Participants	18

Summary of Proceedings – ECDC Management Board Meeting

The Forty-third meeting of the ECDC Management Board (MB) convened in Stockholm, Sweden, during 19-20 June 2018. During the meeting, the Management Board:

- ❖ adopted the programme;
- ❖ adopted the minutes of the Forty-second meeting of the Management Board;
- ❖ took note of the procedural information pertaining to the election of the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Management Board, which is foreseen to take place during the 44th meeting of the Management Board (13-14 November 2018);
- ❖ took note of the update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting;
- ❖ took note of the update on Next Generation ECDC;
- ❖ took note of the update on the Third External Evaluation of ECDC;
- ❖ discussed the revised ECDC Preparedness and Response Strategy and suggested a number of additional amendments. The Management Board agreed that an updated version of the Strategy be circulated to the Board as soon as possible for approval via written procedure;
- ❖ approved the proposed approach in relation to indicators for measuring the impact of ECDC's work in the Member States. The Management Board thereby agreed to wait for the results of the Third External Evaluation, and to postpone the discussion on such indicators after receipt of the Final Report of the External Evaluation;
- ❖ discussed the ECDC Single Programming Document 2020 in *a tour de table* session;
- ❖ took note of the update on the planning of the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting;
- ❖ took note of the Progress Report: Overview of 2018 Budget Implementation since the last Management Board meeting;
- ❖ approved the Final Annual Accounts 2017, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management;
- ❖ with reference to the First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2018, 1) took note of the budget transfers approved by the Director; 2) approved the proposed change of the name and description of budget line 2005 "Security of Building"; 3) approved the proposed budget transfers from Title II to Title III;
- ❖ approved the ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy (2018-2020);
- ❖ took note of the update of audit activities and audit observations;
- ❖ approved the Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2018 up until present;
- ❖ discussed the selection of experts for ECDC Rapid Risk Assessments;
- ❖ approved the ECDC Management Board Meeting Dates for 2019, and provisionally for 2020;
- ❖ took note of the update on the implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy;
- ❖ took note of the update from the MB Working Group on Code of Conduct of the Management Board;
- ❖ discussed the attendance at Management Board meetings and admission of observers and requested ECDC to prepare a proposal concerning participation of ECDC staff at Management Board meetings including options for the interaction of the Board with the Staff Committee to be presented at the next meeting in November 2018;
- ❖ took note of the update from the European Commission;
- ❖ discussed the preferred location(s) of future hotel accommodations in Stockholm, and agreed that, for the 44th meeting in November 2018, Corporate Governance Secretariat will explore possible hotels within walking distance of Stockholm Central Station.

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

1. Daniel Reynders, Chair of the ECDC Management Board, welcomed all the participants to the Forty-third meeting of the Management Board. Apologies had been received from Greece (proxy given to Cyprus), Poland, Romania, John F Ryan, DG SANTE, and Line Matthiessen-Guyader, DG RTD, European Commission.

Welcome from the Director, ECDC

2. Andrea Ammon, Director, ECDC, warmly welcomed the Management Board members to the new ECDC premises, and noted that she was looking forward to having fruitful and inspiring discussions during the meeting. She apologised for the fact that some of the meeting documents had been delivered late, and assured them that efforts will be made to ensure timely circulation of documents ahead of the next meeting. Lastly, she introduced the new Head of ECDC's Resource Management and Coordination Unit, Pontus Molin.

Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (*Document MB43/01 Rev.1*)

3. The Management Board adopted the draft programme without changes. The Chair noted that, in accordance with the new Rules of Procedures of the Management Board, the proceedings would no longer be recorded.

4. Following the adoption of the programme, the Chair asked each member whether s/he wished to add any oral declaration(s) of interest to her/his Annual Declaration of Interest (ADoI) submitted previously. None were declared.

The Management Board adopted the programme.

Adoption of the draft minutes of the 42nd meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 20-21 March 2018) (*Document MB43/02 Rev. 1*)

5. The Chair noted that the draft minutes had been circulated to the Board and that no comments had been received. There were no further comments in relation to the draft minutes.

The Management Board adopted the minutes of the Forty-second meeting of the Management Board without changes.

Procedural information pertaining to the election of Chair and Deputy Chair of the Management Board (*Document MB43/03*)

6. The Chair informed the Board that he would soon be retiring and thereby this was his last Management Board meeting. In any case, the current mandate of the Chair and Deputy Chair expires in November 2018, and elections are therefore scheduled to take place during the first day of the Forty-fourth Management Board meeting (13-14 November 2018). Nominations for the Chair and Deputy Chair must be communicated to the Corporate Governance Secretariat no later than four weeks prior to the start of the meeting. Candidates shall submit a statement in support of their candidature at the time of nomination. The list of candidatures/nominations received by the Corporate Governance Secretariat will then be distributed to the Management Board no later than three weeks before the Forty-fourth Board meeting. The Chair invited all members to reflect on their possible candidature for these important functions.

The Management Board took note of the procedural information pertaining to the election of Chair and Deputy Chair of the Management Board.

Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (20-21 March 2018) (Document MB43/04)

7. Andrea Ammon, ECDC Director, provided the Management Board with an update on the main activities since the last Management Board meeting. The presentation referred to the key decisions of MB42, their status and progress, as well as an overview of what had been discussed at the 53rd meeting of the Advisory Forum in May 2018. The Board was also updated with the main visits and meetings of the ECDC Director.

8. In the discussion that ensued, one MB member noted that migration policy is increasingly becoming a major challenge at European level, and asked what activities ECDC is carrying out in the area of migrant health. With reference to the discussion on EU/EEA NITAG collaboration that had taken place in the last Advisory Forum meeting, it was inquired whether the Management Board was expected to give its approval on the document. In relation to the same topic, one MB member asked whether this activity was being developed in coordination with the WHO Global Vaccine Action Plan in order to avoid duplication. The Member from the European Commission asked for further details on the recent meeting with the network of National ECDC Correspondents in the EU enlargement countries. In light of the next Multiannual Financial Framework, DG SANTE is currently engaging in dialogue with DG NEAR and it would therefore be timely to assess the needs in this area.

9. In response to the question raised on migration, Andrea Ammon explained that ECDC is involved in only a small part of this area as the main issues at stake are not infectious diseases but rather trauma, dehydration, as well as political issues. ECDC is, however, running a project on guidance for screening on migrants; this project will soon be finalised. Concerning the EU/EEA NITAG collaboration, she clarified that this was a technical document that had been discussed in the AF and would not be brought to the MB for approval. She stressed that the whole activity was being developed together with WHO; the aim was to find synergies and to identify activities that could be carried out at EU level. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, noted that the WHO had been supportive of the discussion in the Advisory Forum. He added that there was a tendency in the EU Member States to use the same vaccines while other vaccines are used in other regions. Consequently, the scientific evidence might be different inside and outside EU. With reference to the meeting of enlargement countries, Maarit Kokki, Head of Section International Relations, ECDC, commented that the meeting report had already been shared with DG SANTE. She was happy to contribute to any notes for the discussions with DG NEAR.

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

Update on Next Generation ECDC

10. Andrea Ammon recalled that her presentation on Next Generation ECDC had generated a lot of comments and questions during the last Management Board meeting (20-21 March 2018). Several questions related to the staff survey results and how these are going to be addressed. Others related to the Next Generation ECDC initiative and, in particular, the composition of the working groups, the selection of the contractor, and the issue of decision making.

11. Concerning the staff survey, Andrea Ammon explained that an in-depth analysis had been done for all organisational entities with five or more staff to preserve their anonymity; the sections where the engagement rate was lower than average will receive support through HR, for instance in terms of team building. Concerning the frequency of staff surveys, she noted that surveys every other year better allow to set up and implement an action plan compared to having the survey every year. She then described the efforts made in the area of staff development mentioning that, in 2017, 127 training events took place in ECDC, and a total of 82 experts attended trainings outside ECDC. In addition, yearly trainings on performance management are offered to staff in managerial positions. The annual reclassification exercise offers the opportunity for staff to be promoted to a higher grade.

12. Concerning Next Generation ECDC, she explained that the four working groups had been set up with the aim of having staff from different units and grades and with different length of service. She stressed that, according to their terms of reference, the working groups develop proposals for further discussion; when an action is ready for implementation it will be discussed more broadly in order to have a wider contribution across the organisation. The contractor (Ipsos MORI) had been selected through a negotiated procedure based on specific selection and award criteria. Already in the initial phase, the contractors had shown an excellent understanding of ECDC and therefore she was confident that they would be able to provide a good analysis.

13. She recalled that decision making was one of the problem areas identified in the staff survey. As from 1 July, the input for Director's decisions will be reorganised with the creation of thematic "Director Consultation Groups" and only resource discussions will be restricted to Heads of Unit. By the end of the year, it is foreseen to have in place a responsibility chart showing which decisions are taken at which level in the organisation, and a management charter indicating the required skills and competencies of ECDC managers. An executive office for strategy implementation will also be put in place. In relation to transparency and staff participation, she mentioned that all staff have access to all working group documents via the Document Management System (DMS), and specific outputs are published on a dedicated intranet page. Documents and minutes from the Director Consultation Group meetings will also be published on the intranet. So far, three rounds of Word Café sessions took place with 60-80 staff participating in each. The ECDC draft strategy and the draft management charter will be further discussed in an ECDC staff retreat in the autumn. Further communication and participation opportunities are also being planned.

14. Lastly, the ECDC Director presented the ECDC vision which had been developed by one of the working groups based on the input from a World Café session on "Vision & Strategy". She explained that the need for a clear strategy and vision had been identified in the report of Ipsos MORI as well as from the results of the staff survey. The proposed ECDC vision is as follows: "Improve lives in Europe and globally by driving public health policy and practice through scientific excellence".

15. The MB members thanked the Director for the presentation and for clarifying the points raised in the previous meeting. The European Commission expressed its full support for taking this initiative further. The importance of training was underlined, and ECDC was encouraged to explore possible EC trainings that ECDC staff could benefit from as well as possible collaboration with other EU agencies, for instance trainings on health and security in collaboration with Europol. Concerning the working groups, and especially the one on Strategy, the Commission could provide inputs on for instance the Multiannual Financial Framework and the instruments that will be lined up. Input from Member States could also be useful in order to ensure that the ECDC Strategy is fully aligned to the Member States' priorities.

16. Concerning the ECDC vision more specifically, the MB members generally welcomed the holistic approach reflected in the vision. Some members thought that the word "driving" was unfortunate and would have preferred a word such as "enabling", "catalysing" or "supporting". It was inquired how the vision was connected to the first part of the presentation, i.e. to staff and staff engagement. It was further commented that there could perhaps be a more proactive approach in the vision.

17. Andrea Ammon thanked the Board members for their encouraging remarks. She explained that the vision is important for the Work Programme and for prioritisation, but also in order to have something that unites staff and motivates them to work towards a common goal. The vision is firstly directed externally but the link is between the vision and the work being done internally by all staff. When developing the vision, there was awareness that the word "driving" could be problematic, but she hoped that with the explanation of the rationale behind it was clear that the intention was not to take over the responsibility from the Member States, but to enable them to do their work. Concerning the suggestion to have a more proactive approach, ECDC's Director said that she would look into it, but added that this approach was at least visible in the work programme with a focus on forecasting per se.

18. Referring to training, she noted that there was already connection to the European Commission in terms of using the Commission Framework Contract for trainings. Specialised training with other agencies had been carried out for the training of confidential counsellors, but this could certainly be further explored. Workshops on health security have already been carried out in collaboration with Europol.

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

Update on the Third External Evaluation of ECDC (*Document MB43/16*)

19. Anne-Catherine Viso, Chair, External Evaluation Steering Committee (MEES), MB Alternate, France, updated the Board on the Third External Evaluation of ECDC. She described the activities performed by the MEES, and mentioned that the DG SANTE Better Regulation team had provided useful advice on the use of the Better Regulation guidelines for the external evaluation. DG SANTE had also agreed to fully support the MEES in verifying the implementation of the use of these guidelines by the contractor. During the 13th MEES meeting in Brussels, the MEES nominated Mårten Kivi (Alternate Sweden) and Michael Smith (Member Ireland) to represent the MEES in the Evaluation Committee for the reopening of the competition.

20. She recalled that the draft Request for Services (RFS) had been presented to the Management Board during MB42 (20-21 March 2018). The Board had agreed to have a written procedure for the approval of the final RFS, and also gave the MEES the mandate to approve the inception report and interim report for the external evaluation on its behalf. The RFS was approved by the Management Board through written procedure with a deadline of 8 May 2018. Following signature of the Framework Contract on 8 May, the final Request for Services was sent to the five potential contractors on 1 June 2018. The specific contract is expected to be signed in the second half of August, which means a six-week delay compared to the original timeline. The kick-off meeting is foreseen to take place at the beginning of September. According to this timeline, the final report should be ready by mid-July 2019 to be discussed in the Management Board meeting in November 2019. The Recommendations Drafting Group should be set up during MB45 in March 2019.

21. In the discussion that followed, Zofija Macej Kukovič, MB Member, European Parliament, and member of the MEES, stressed that there were some important differences between the Third External Evaluation compared to the two previous evaluations. In fact, this time, the evaluation tried to look also at the future of ECDC and focused more on the needs of the Member States. In addition, important aspects such as sustainable development, scientific and administrative excellency, as well as staff satisfaction, were included in the evaluation questions.

22. The Chair of the Management Board asked how the delay in the timeline will affect the financial cycle. Martin Seychell, MB Member, European Commission, responded that, at this point in time, there were no indications that this would be an issue, but the Commission would look into the matter. Concerning the scope of the External Evaluation, the Chair of the MEES stressed the importance of a common understanding of the evaluation questions. As an example, she mentioned the questions related to global outbreaks and suggested that it could be useful to have a session in the Management Board where the concerned Commission services could provide input. The Chair of the Board pointed out that, in general, the contractor has to be well aware of what is expected under each question. Michael Smith, MB Member, Ireland and member of the MEES, thanked the European Commission for its support in clarifying the Better Regulation guidelines, which should help make the evaluation more robust and also provide the possibility to look at the mandate of ECDC.

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

ECDC Preparedness and Response Strategy (*Document MB43/05*)

23. Karl Ekdahl, Head of the Public Health Capacity and Communication Unit, ECDC, presented the revised ECDC Preparedness and Response Strategy following discussions in the previous MB meeting. As requested by the Board, concerning the mandate of ECDC, there was now a clearer reference to the relevant articles in the Founding Regulation. Some clarifications on how ECDC works with external partners had also been included, in particular, how the work fits with the Joint External Evaluations (JEEs). An annex listing the comments received from the Advisory Forum had also been included in the document submitted to the Board.

24. The Management Board discussed the revised document and a number of additional questions were raised. It was inquired how the actions listed in paragraph 28 are going to be executed, in particular, the needs assessments, as Member States are already performing self-assessments and it was important to avoid duplication of work. Referring to the section on EWRS, it was asked whether the issues raised

during MB42, in particular, the issue of confidentiality, had been taken into account. In paragraph 45, for reasons of clarity, it was suggested to mention the full name of the Joint Action on preparedness while also making reference to the contribution of ECDC in possible similar JAs in the future. The need to link the actions to country capacity support was stressed, in particular, in the laboratory field but also in other areas. Also, there was little said about civil protection while this is becoming increasingly relevant. Lastly, one MB Member pointed out that comments previously raised concerning the legal references in paragraph 15 had not been fully considered in the revised document, and suggested that the revised Strategy be sent for approval via written procedure as there were still some amendments that needed to be made. The Management Board agreed with this proposal.

25. Karl Ekdahl thanked the members for their comments and ensured them that the additional comments would be taken on board. Referring to the actions listed in paragraph 28, he explained that ECDC has developed an assessment tool that countries can use when they work on their own planning, and it should therefore complement the work carried out in the Member States.

26. Regarding the section on EWRS, Vicky Lefevre, Acting Head of Unit Surveillance and Response Support, ECDC, clarified that a reference to the General Data Protection Regulation had been added to the text. As this was a high level Strategy, the text did not go into details concerning the functionalities of the new EWRS. For more details in this regard, she referred to a document that had recently been circulated in the Health Security Committee.

27. The Chair asked the Corporate Governance Secretariat to transmit the summary of minutes of this item as soon as possible in order to amend the document accordingly and share it with the Board for written procedure.

28. Andrea Ammon, ECDC Director, clarified that the deadline for written procedures is generally five working days.

The Management Board discussed the revised ECDC Preparedness and Response Strategy and suggested a number of additional amendments. The Management Board agreed that an updated version of the Strategy be circulated to the Board as soon as possible for approval via written procedure.

Review of Indicators: measuring the impact of ECDC's work in the Member States (*Document MB43/07*)

29. Philippe Harant recalled that the Management Board had previously discussed the need to introduce indicators measuring the impact of ECDC's work in the Member States. He pointed out that formulating such indicators cannot be done by ECDC alone, but would require the active participation of the Member States as this implies measuring the balance between the additional workload requested from Member States, and the added value brought by ECDC to the Member States. Given that the Third External Evaluation, just launched in June 2018, is expected to provide some elements on the perceived added-value by Member States from ECDC's work, it is suggested to wait for the results thereof, and to postpone the discussion on the indicators after the final external evaluation report has been delivered. The reflection on dedicated indicators could take place when discussing the recommendations based on the outcome of the external evaluation and the new long-term strategy of ECDC 2021-2027.

30. Martin Seychell, MB Member, European Commission, commented that the Commission can agree to wait until the results of the external evaluation are available. In the meantime, however, it could be useful to look at how other EU agencies are working with indicators to measure their impact.

31. Andrea Ammon responded that, as of 1 September 2018, ECDC will be chairing the network of EU Agencies. She suggested addressing this issue in the performance network in order to join forces with other agencies.

32. The Chair concluded that the Management Board accepts to postpone the discussion on indicators measuring the impact of ECDC's work in the Member States, while asking ECDC to explore how other EU agencies tackle this issue.

The Management Board approved the proposed approach in relation to indicators for measuring the impact of ECDC's work in the Member States. The Management Board thereby agreed to wait for the results of the Third External Evaluation, and to postpone the discussion on such indicators after receipt of the Final Report of the External Evaluation.

ECDC Single Programming Document 2020 (*Document MB43/08*)

33. Andrea Ammon, ECDC Director, presented the first draft of the ECDC Single Programming Document 2020. She recalled that 2020 will be the last year of the current financial framework. It is foreseen that the budget for 2020 will be increased to 60.5 million €, compared to 59.3 million in 2019. The strategic objectives and priority areas will not change. There is a focus on strategic partnerships to create synergy and avoid duplication of work, and on continued efforts to gradually assess technological and scientific advances. Two cross-unit projects are proposed in the area of e-health and foresight. She added that ECDC was currently looking at introducing the concept of baseline in the planning process in order to identify the recurrent activities to avoid re-discussing everything each time. The SPD baseline will be established by November 2018. Concerning the next steps in the process, she clarified that the draft SPD would now be sent to the Management Board and other stakeholders for written feedback with a deadline envisaged for the end of July. An updated version will be presented to the MB in November with all comments integrated as well as information on resources. She stressed that this is still a preliminary draft that might be amended at a later stage based on received input and the results of various evaluations.

34. Following the presentation, the Board members provided their feedback in a *tour de table* session. The MB members congratulated ECDC on the comprehensive and ambitious programme. In general, the Board expressed their support for the priority areas, although there were some concerns that these were perhaps too many. It was also somewhat difficult to have a clear overview as long as the resource allocation for the various activities was not indicated. The Board members welcomed the focus on strategic partnerships and e-health; with respect to e-health, it was inquired whether any meetings or other ways of sharing best practices between Member States are foreseen. Some countries are rather advanced for instance in the use of innovative surveillance methods and it could be useful to share experiences in this area. One member pointed out that the document did not mention anything about migrant health. Another member mentioned that the project with the NITAGs should be clearly identified as a priority in the introduction. There was also no reference to Brexit while this would certainly have an impact on the work programme. It was also proposed to refer explicitly to the role of ECDC in support to the Joint Actions on vaccination and preparedness (in particular in the area of laboratory preparedness), and to further highlight laboratory support and exchange between Member States on rare pathogens. The importance of the one health approach was also stressed. The baseline concept was considered interesting, but would nevertheless need to be regularly reviewed.

35. Andrea Ammon thanked the Board members for their valuable feedback. Concerning e-health, she explained that this activity would entail an assessment of the quality and representativeness of data and the way in which data sets are dealt with. In fact, the whole methodology might need to be reviewed in the future which will have implications on the required skills of the workforce. In the lab area, whole genome sequencing has already transformed the work of microbiologists; this also has an impact on the EPIET programme as there is a need to anticipate the future working environment. Concerning the sharing of experiences between Member States, she mentioned that there are expert groups where countries share best practices and the same will be done for e-health. Regarding laboratory support, she mentioned that the EULabCap project produces regular reports on the laboratory capacity in the Member States; these can give an indicator on the level needed in all Member States. ECDC can act as a broker in this area by linking Member States with a specific need to other countries having expertise in the concerned area or pathogen. With regard to Brexit, she noted that it was difficult to say anything concrete at this stage but possibly there would be some additional information available in November. She was looking forward to receiving written comments on the document and added that, as previously, a table with all received comments will be compiled to ensure transparency.

The Management Board discussed the ECDC Single Programming Document 2020 in a *tour de table* session. The draft SPD will be sent to the Board for written consultation in the coming weeks.

Update on the planning of the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting (Document MB43/09)

36. Mike Catchpole presented an update on the planning of the third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM). ECDC was currently in the process of setting up a JSM Programme Committee with representation from the Management Board, the Advisory Forum and the Coordinating Competent Bodies. Expressions of interest will be requested in the coming weeks, and the committee is foreseen to start working immediately after the summer. The JSM is planned to take place late 2019 or possibly early 2020. Possible topics for discussion include the conclusions arising from the Third External Evaluation (with the caveat that these will only be available in November 2019), the implementation of the next ECDC Long-term Strategy (2021-2027) and ECDC's International Relations Strategy. Other possible topics identified during the CCB Directors meeting in April 2018 include AMR, adapting skills and competence, determinants of infectious disease, as well as various topics linked to e-health.

37. The Management Board discussed briefly the proposed topics. Generally, the Board members agreed with the need to discuss the outcome of the Third External Evaluation and the ECDC long-term strategy, but felt that some of the proposed sub-topics were too technical. It was suggested to focus more on sharing experiences and using the JSM as an opportunity to look at how the different stakeholder groups interact with ECDC. It was also suggested to look at rapid risk assessments and similar issues which are useful for policy makers, and to discuss standards where these do not yet exist, for instance related to surveillance. Scientific excellence was also suggested as a topic. In general, it was advised not to include too many topics and it would be necessary to prioritise a few.

38. Mike Catchpole thanked for the feedback and proposed to take the suggestions further to the Programme Committee. Lastly, he encouraged the MB members to volunteer for participation in the Committee.

The Management Board took note of the update on the planning of the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting. Expressions of interest to participate in the Programme Committee will be sent to the Board members in the coming weeks.

Summary of discussions held at the 38th Meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (19 June 2018), including its recommendations

a) Progress Report – Overview of 2018 Budget Implementation up until 15 June 2018

39. Anja Van Brabant presented the overview of budget implementation since the last Management Board meeting. She mentioned that the quarterly commitment rate was approximately at the same level as the previous year, while the payment rate was slightly higher compared to the same period 2017. As for the budget execution per line, a significant increase is noted on Titles 2 and 3. Concerning carry-forwards from 2017, the payment execution rate is significantly higher on titles 2 and 3; on title 2 the increase is mainly due to payments made related to the new building. Lastly, she clarified that this topic was for information only.

40. In the absence of Johan Carlson, Chair of the Audit Committee, Anni Virolainen-Julkunen, MB Member, Finland, and member of the Audit Committee, summarised the discussions in the AC mentioning that the Audit Committee had taken note of the satisfactory progress on the budget implementation.

The Management Board took note of the Progress Report: Overview of 2018 Budget Implementation until 15 June 2018.

b) Final Annual Accounts 2017, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management (Document MB43/10)

41. Anja Van Brabant, Head of Section, Finance and Accounting, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented the Final Annual Accounts 2017. She recalled that the Provisional Annual Accounts had been presented to the Board in March 2018. The accounts had been audited on 5-9 March; as a result, two changes related to the former premises were agreed upon. The changes were highlighted in yellow in the document that had been circulated. The report from the European Court of Auditors on the Annual Accounts 2017 with preliminary observations was received in May 2018. There were no observations from the Court of Auditors.

42. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen summarised the discussions in the Audit Committee mentioning that the AC was very pleased with the results, and the fact that there were no negative comments (observations) at all from the Court of Auditors. She noted that ECDC agreed to further discuss the issue of differentiated appropriations with DG SANTE Finance. Lastly, the Audit Committee recommended the Management Board to adopt the proposed MB opinion on the Annual Accounts 2017.

The Management Board approved the Final Annual Accounts 2017, including Report on Budgetary and Financial Management.

c) First Supplementary and Amending Budget 2018 (Document MB43/11 Rev. 1)

43. Anja Van Brabant clarified that the document circulated to the Board included three different items. Firstly, it presented the budget transfers already approved by the Director, within the limits of her powers, since the last Management Board meeting held in March 2018 and up until 20 May 2018. No budget transfers had been made between Titles. This item was presented to the Board for information. Secondly, the paper proposed a change of the name and description of budget line 2005 "Security of Building" to cover also the reception services present in the new premises. Thirdly, ECDC had identified an additional need to transfer funds (413.000 €) from Title II into Title III due to a revised need of furniture for the new premises. The last two items were presented to the Board for decision.

44. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen reported that the Audit Committee had taken note of the budget transfers made, all under the responsibility of the Director, in order to implement the budget for 2018. Concerning the proposed additional transfers, ECDC had clarified that a new framework contract is being put in place to purchase furniture, which is likely to be available only in 2019. The activities chosen to receive additional funding in 2018 will not have reduced funding in the future work programmes. She concluded that the AC had no objections to the transfers proposed.

45. The Chair asked what the impact will be on the budget for 2019 given that the money will be needed for furniture.

46. Andre Ammon responded that there was furniture in place so there was no urgency in that sense. The additional funds had been allocated firstly to the monitoring of vaccine efficiency (I-MOVE project) allowing for additional studies which will make the results in the end more robust but does not mean that more money will be needed the following year, secondly to the ECDC library due to increased library prices, and thirdly to activities under the Euro GASP network which was motivated for instance by the recent outbreaks of resistant gonorrhoea.

47. Following these clarifications, the Management Board approved the proposed budget transfers from Title II to Title III. The Board also approved the change of name and description of the current budget line 2005 "Security of Building". The new name and description are: BL 2005 "Security and reception services for building" - "The appropriation is intended to cover the cost of security, surveillance and reception services for the ECDC occupied buildings."

The Management Board took note of the budget transfers approved by the Director, within the limits of her power, in accordance with in accordance with Article 27.1 of ECDC's Financial Regulation. The Management Board approved the proposed change of the name and description of budget line 2005. The Management Board approved the proposed transfers from Title II to Title III.

d) ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy 2018-2020 (Document MB43/12)

48. Stefan Sundbom, Internal Control Coordinator, ECDC, presented the updated ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy (AFS) 2018-2020. He explained that the updated Strategy was a continuation of the AFS approved by the Board in June 2015. The AFS is based on the Common Approach on EU decentralised agencies as well as a methodology developed by the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF). He briefly described the AFS action plan 2015-2017 and implemented actions. The conclusions of the Fraud Risk assessment are similar to last time, i.e. the risk of significant undetected fraud is low, but it is however considered important to continue to be vigilant in a certain number of risk areas. The action plan 2018-2020 includes a number of specific actions such as information for newcomers, training and workshops, an annual review of the fraud risk assessment, and measures to further improve the controls in place. Lastly, he explained that, in line with the Common Approach, it is recommended to treat this issue at the highest level and therefore the Strategy was presented to the Board for approval.

49. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen summarised the discussions in the Audit Committee mentioning that ECDC had clarified that procurement was a prioritised area, which is followed closely and will be subject to further training. In conclusion, the AC recommended the MB to adopt the ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy 2018-2020.

The Management Board approved the ECDC Anti-Fraud Strategy 2018-2020.

50. Concerning the regular update on audit activities, Anni Virolainen-Julkunen noted that no new audit observations had been received by ECDC since the last meeting. 10 observations had been formally closed by the IAS after review. Only two observations are thereby open, and both are planned to be implemented in Q4 2018. Lastly, the Audit Committee had concluded that the current set-up of having the AC meetings in the morning prior to the Management Board works very well and is the preferred option.

51. One MB member thanked the Audit Committee for its work which facilitates the responsibilities of the Management Board substantially.

The Management Board took note of the summary of discussions held at the 38th meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee.

Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2018 up until present (Document MB43/06)

52. Philippe Harant, Head of Section, Quality Management, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, updated the Board on the implementation of the Work Programme 2018. He informed the Board that, as of 5 June 2018, 64% of the activities had started and were on schedule, 1% was delayed, 1% was cancelled, 14% had not started, and 20% were activities that were not monitored as such (fixed permanent work, such as human resources, finances, management activities or administrative support). He then explained the main changes in the Financing Decision, and added that these were visible in track changes in the annex to the document. An additional column with comments had been inserted to explain why the change was needed. In case future changes require urgent approval from the Management Board, such requests could be conducted via written procedure.

The Management Board approved the Report on the Implementation of the Work Programme 2018.

Selection of experts for ECDC Rapid Risk Assessments (*Document MB43/13*)

53. Vicky Lefevre, Acting Head of Unit, Surveillance and Response Support, ECDC, presented a paper on the selection of experts for Rapid Risk Assessments (RRA) as requested by the Board during the 42nd Management Board meeting in March 2018. She explained that the decision to produce a Rapid Risk Assessment is normally taken in the ECDC Roundtable after which a team is set up. External experts are not necessarily used, but relatively often external expertise is required. For the selection of experts, ECDC mostly relies on lists of National Focal Points (NFP) or on experts indicated by the NFPs. For events outside EU, the experts are mainly directly identified from the DP networks or via WHO/Europe. In conclusion, ECDC considers that the procedure ensures the diversity of the participants, their impartiality and the requested expertise and therefore there is no need to change it at this stage.

54. In the discussion that ensued, one MB member noted that during the last Management Board meeting, some concerns had been raised regarding the fact that the same experts were often used for the RRAs. Having received now a presentation of the process followed, she concluded that it was perhaps the task of the MB members to approach the NFPs at country level to highlight the issue. In the light of Brexit, it was noted that UK seemed to have provided quite a high number of experts for RRAs, and it was commented that experts from other countries will need to come forward as well. Some members inquired whether the involvement of experts from the Member State concerned by the event does not create a bias in the risk assessment. Vicky Lefevre clarified that experts in the Member State need to be involved in order for ECDC to receive necessary facts about the event. She stressed that the risk assessment is an ECDC product made by ECDC staff while the external experts are requested to review the assessment where necessary.

55. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, added that for the most common diseases there is a fairly good expertise in-house, but ECDC would rely upon the Member State experts to receive factual information. In situations with an emerging disease or diseases occurring outside EU there is a greater need to consult with external experts.

56. For increased transparency, one MB member suggested that it could be useful to include a clarification of the role of the expert when used.

The Management Board took note of the presentation on the selection of experts for ECDC Rapid Risk Assessments.

ECDC Management Board Meeting Dates 2019 and 2020 (*Document MB43/14 Rev. 1*)

57. Corinne Elizabeth Skarstedt, Head of Section, Corporate Governance, Director's Office, ECDC, presented the proposed meeting dates for 2019 and 2020. The MB agreed with the proposed schedule of meetings in 2019 as below:

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

And provisionally in 2020:

- MB48: 26-27 March 2019
- MB49: 16-17 June 2020
- MB50: 24-25 November 2020

The Management Board approved the meeting dates for 2019, and provisionally for 2020.

Update on ECDC Compliance: Implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy

58. Andrea Iber, Head of Section, Legal Services and Acting Head of Section, Procurement, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, provided a brief update on the implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy. She mentioned that four Annual Declarations of Interest (ADoI) were still missing from MB Members and seven from MB Alternates. For the Advisory Forum, the figures were two and five respectively. She then described the overview of mitigation measures for MB and AF in 2018. For the MB, three relevant interests had been identified but no conflict with the actual agenda points or tasks of the MB were perceived, and no mitigation measures were needed. For the AF, two relevant interests were identified but no mitigation measures were deemed necessary. Lastly, she mentioned that for Rapid Risk Assessments, the compliance rate was 100%; for expert meetings taken place in 2018, 391 eDoIs had been collected (6 ADoIs missing).

59. The Chair urged participants, where applicable, to encourage their fellow Member/Alternate to submit their missing annual declaration without further delay.

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

Update from the MB Working Group on Code of Conduct of the Management Board

60. Gesa Lücking, Chair of the Management Board Working Group on Code of Conduct, MB Alternate, Germany, presented the work done so far by the Working Group that was established during the MB meeting in March 2018. The WG was composed of Members/Alternates from Austria, France, Germany, Portugal, the European Parliament and the European Commission. Thus far, the WG held one audio meeting and one face-to-face meeting. As a starting point, the WG looked at existing Codes of Conduct (CoC) of other agencies. It was considered more useful to look at examples of EU agencies with a similar Management Board composition, and therefore the WG had chosen to look more closely at the CoCs of ECHA and EASA as well as getting inspiration from the public service principles of the European Ombudsman. The WG had identified a number of areas to be covered by the CoC such as the individual and collective duties of the Management Board, the responsibility of the Chair and Deputy Chair, etc., while some issues are already included in the ECDC Independence Policy and the MB Rules of Procedure. Concerning the timeline, she mentioned that the aim is to present a first draft in the MB in November 2018, and the final draft for approval during MB45 in March 2019.

The Management Board took note of the update from the Working Group on Code of Conduct.

Attendance at Management Board meetings and admission of observers (*Document MB43/15*)

61. The Chair introduced the topic, recalling that following the 41st Management Board meeting in November 2017, the Deputy Chair had met with the ECDC Staff Committee on their request and discussed a number of matters including how the Staff Committee can better interact with the Management Board. Due to scheduling constraints during the 42nd meeting in March 2018, it had been proposed to discuss this matter as a specific topic in the June meeting. This was also an opportunity to discuss the issue of attendance at Board meetings more broadly.

62. Andrea Iber, Head of Section, Legal Services and Acting Head of Section, Procurement, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, provided a brief overview of the legal context concerning attendance at Board meetings. She mentioned that there are no provisions on observers in the Founding Regulation, and the text only makes reference to members and alternates. Article 6 of the MB Rules of Procedure stipulates that the Management Board may invite any person whose opinion can be of interest to attend its meetings or part of its meetings as an observer. In this instance, there would normally be a

justification (case-by-case) depending on the topics. For clarity and consistency, an ex-ante definition of possible categories would be recommended. Concerning representatives of third countries, three categories can be identified: firstly, representatives of EEA/EFTA countries (Norway, Iceland) which are entitled to participate fully except for the right to vote; secondly, representatives of States which have applied for membership of the European Union (on condition that the accession negotiations have been successfully completed) and who may be invited to attend (part of) MB meetings as observers; and thirdly, representatives of other third countries who may only be invited to participate in agenda items that are of particular interest to these countries. For this category of countries, alignment with the ECDC International Relations Policy is recommended.

63. The Deputy Chair provided some additional information on the meeting she had had with the Staff Committee in November 2017. She mentioned that there had been open and frank discussion with the SC on issues of their interest. The Staff Committee had expressed willingness to interact with the MB increasingly up until present, and raised some concerns about equal treatment of staff given that some staff are allowed to be present during MB meetings while others are not. She asked the Board members to share their views on the matter of staff representation in the Management Board, admitting that it was a bit difficult to decide how staff could and should be represented without knowing what possible changes were foreseen in the light of Next Generation ECDC.

64. The Board members discussed the issue of admission of observers focusing, on one hand, on the participation of representatives of third countries and, on the other hand, on the attendance of ECDC staff in the meetings. Concerning the participation of Western Balkan countries, it was considered important to encourage these countries on the path of reform and to promote collaboration between them. The European Commission offered to examine how the interaction can be improved within the existing legal boundaries.

65. Concerning staff representation, several MB members expressed their opinion. Most of them were not in favour of the Staff Committee being present in the MB meetings. However, one member explained that in his country attendance of representatives of the Staff (with voting rights) is current practice in the Boards of public bodies such as the national public health agency. It was recalled that the direct interlocutor of the Board is the Director, and involving the staff committee in the meetings may create a risk of the MB being drawn into industrial relations-like discussions as well as into micromanaging. On the other hand, some countries addressed the need that staff may have to address the MB and that possibility should be given within the transparency value of the MB and of ECDC. The presence of staff in the MB is obviously needed for presentations, logistics of the meeting and the necessary dialogue between the MB members and ECDC on strategic, legal, and financial issues on the agenda (as currently), with staff that need to attend, to provide presentations or to support on the logistics and functionality of the meetings, but also other reasons were given for the staff to be present. Some proposals were brought to be considered as ways to enhance the interaction of the staff and the Board, namely regular meetings with the Chair or Deputy Chair and inviting the Staff Committee, as representative of the staff, once a year, for a session to address the Board.

66. The Chair summarised the discussion, noting that there were two main issues discussed, on the one hand, the participation of non-EU countries, and on the other hand, the participation of different categories of ECDC staff. Concerning the latter, it was necessary to distinguish between: i) staff that need to ensure the smooth functioning of the meeting; ii) staff that need to participate for particular topics; iii) staff committee representatives. It was recommended to separate the discussion on third countries from the staff issue as the matters vary significantly and require different lines of consultation in the Member States. ECDC was requested to prepare a proposal concerning staff attendance at Board meetings, including the rationale for which staff should attend permanently, including a draft proposal for the process regarding *ad hoc* participation. The document should also describe how the Staff Committee could best interact with the Management Board. The proposal should be presented to the Management Board for decision in November 2018.

The Management Board discussed the attendance at Management Board meetings and admission of observers. The Board requested ECDC to prepare a proposal concerning participation of ECDC staff at

Management Board meetings including options for the interaction of the Board with the Staff Committee to be presented at the next meeting in November 2018.

Update from the European Commission

67. Martin Seychell, MB Member, European Commission, informed the Board that he had been requested to provide an update on the next Multi-Annual Financial Framework (MFF) and the future of health debate. In the interest of time, a document on the ongoing activities in the area of communicable diseases had been tabled this time, and he would only say a few words on one of the key priorities of the Commission, namely vaccination. In this area, there was currently a critical situation in Europe, not only in terms of trust and hesitancy, but also concerning the supply of vaccines. For this reason, the Commission has presented a proposal for a Council Recommendation on strengthened cooperation against vaccine preventable diseases. He thanked the ECDC for its contribution to this work, and also for its involvement in the Joint Action on vaccination. In addition, the Commission is relying on ECDC for the creation of a European information system on vaccination.

68. Concerning the Multiannual Financial Framework, he explained that, in the new MFF, the health programme has been retained under the Social Fund Plus (ESF+). He stressed that this did not mean an absorption of health in the Social Fund, but was based on an attempt to rationalise and to regroup activities. Health will have its own dedicated strand within the ESF+ with a budget of 413 million €. This is a slight reduction compared to the current budget, but at the same time, there is a stronger reference to health in several other programmes such as the Digital Europe or the research programme (Horizon Europe) where health has its own dedicated cluster. He therefore encouraged the Member States to exploit how other programmes could also benefit health. This will require some extra effort and coordination from DG SANTE and also in the Member States but there is certainly a lot to gain. He added that security and protecting citizens of any threat is a topic that will surely be high on the agenda, which gives a good opportunity also for ECDC as there is a clear need for expertise on health security matters, for instance on CBRN. Lastly, referring to the ongoing debate on what will happen with DG SANTE, he mentioned that the future composition of the Commission was of course a matter of the next College so there was no point in speculating. However, the current College has shown that there is an emphasis on health.

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

Preferred location(s) of future hotel accommodations in Stockholm

69. The Chair informed the Board that this topic had been added to the agenda on the request of one Member State, and he had therefore asked ECDC to prepare a few scenarios on possible hotels including information on the cost and distance to the ECDC premises. The concerned MB Member noted that, to her understanding, this was not only a request from one Member State, but also other MB members had expressed a preference to be located in the city centre to facilitate contacts with other Board members, especially in the evening upon arrival to Stockholm.

70. Corinne Elizabeth Skarstedt, Head of Section Corporate Governance, ECDC, mentioned that the Governance team had looked into a few hotels (Courtyard by Marriott, First Hotel Reisen and the Winery Hotel) with the caveat that some rates still need to be agreed upon vis-à-vis negotiations.

71. The Board members discussed the pros and cons of being located in the city centre versus proximity to ECDC premises. A majority of the members were in favour of a hotel in the city centre and preferably within walking distance of the Central Station. In view of the next MB meeting in November, the Chair asked the Corporate Governance Secretariat to explore possible hotels within walking distance of Stockholm Central Station.

Any other business

72. The Chair thanked all the Board Members for their active participation and valuable contributions. A special thanks of appreciation was extended to the interpreters and ECDC staff for their hard work. The next Management Board meeting will convene in Stockholm during 13-14 November 2018.

Annex: List of Participants

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Austria	Bernhard Benka	Member
Belgium	Daniel Reynders (<i>Chair</i>)	Member
	Carole Schirvel	Alternate
Bulgaria	Angel Kunchev	Member
Croatia	Bernard Kaić	Member
Cyprus	Irene Cotter	Member
Czech Republic	Jozef Dlhý	Alternate
Denmark	Bolette Søborg	Member
Finland	Anni Virolainen-Julkunen (<i>Deputy Chair</i>)	Member
Finland	Taneli Puumalainen	Alternate
France	François Bourdillon	Member
France	Anne-Catherine Viso	Alternate
Germany	Susanne Wald	Member
Germany	Gesa Lücking	Alternate
Hungary	Ágnes Dánielisz	Member
Ireland	Michael Smith	Member
Italy	Francesco Maraglino	Alternate
Latvia	Jana Feldmane	Member
Lithuania	Audrius Ščeponavičius	Member
Luxembourg	Pierre Weicherding	Alternate
Malta	Mariella Borg Buontempo	Alternate
Netherlands	Ciska Scheidel	Member
Portugal	Paula Vasconcelos	Alternate
Slovak Republic	Ján Mikas	Member

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Slovenia	Mojca Gobec	Member
Spain	Maria Araceli Arce Arnáez	Alternate
Sweden	Johan Carlson	Member
Sweden	Mårten Kivi	Alternate
United Kingdom	Emma Reed	Member
European Parliament		
	Zofija Mazej Kukovič	Member
	Maria Eleni Koppa	Member
European Commission		
DG SANTE	Martin Seychell	Member
EEA Countries		
Iceland	Sveinn Magnússon	Member
Norway	Karl-Olaf Wathne	Member