ECDC Management Board

Minutes of the Thirty-eighth Meeting

Stockholm, 21-22 November 2016

Adopted by the ECDC Management Board at its Thirty-ninth meeting, 21-22 March 2017

Contents

Summary of Proceedings – ECDC Management Board Meeting

The Thirty-eighth meeting of the ECDC Management Board (MB) convened in Stockholm, Sweden, on 15-16 November 2016. During the meeting, the Management Board:

- adopted the programme;
- adopted the minutes of the Thirty-seventh meeting of the Management Board;
- elected Dr Daniel Reynders as the new Chair, and Dr Anni Virolainen-Julkunen as the new Deputy Chair of the ECDC Managment Board;
- took note of the ECDC Independence Policy and the current status of its implementation;
- took note of the update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting;
- took note of the update on the ECDC Management Board Working Group on Complementarity between Management Board and Advisory Forum and welcomed the proposal to expand the Working Group with 1-2 members. Gesa Lücking, Alternate, Germany, volunteered to join the Working Group. The final conclusions of the Working Group will be presented to the Management Board in March 2017;
- took note of the update on the implementation of the Joint Action Plan to address Recommendations arising from the second External Evaluation;
- took note of the EU Reference Laboratory Networks: a joint vision to strengthen Member State capacity in public health microbiology, and acknowledged the need to receive a regular progress report on this issue;
- approved the ECDC Communication Strategy;
- approved the Report on the implementation of the Work Programme 2016 up until present;
- took note of the ECDC Strategic Multi-annual Programme (SMAP) 2014-2020 Mid-term review, and agreed with the proposal to close the SMAP document with this review and to focus on the Single Programming Documents;
- took note of the Progress report – Overview of 2016 Budget Implementation since the last Management Board meeting;
- took note of the Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2016;
- approved the ECDC Single Programming Document 2017;
- approved the Budget and Establishment Table 2017;
- took note of the ECDC Single Programming Document 2018. The final draft will be sent to the Management Board for approval via written procedure by 20 January. ECDC will provide an update on the evolution of the SPD 2018 in the MB meeting in March 2017, in particular, on the SoHO related activities;
- approved the Draft Budget 2018;
- agreed to postpone the replacement of Audit Committee members and the replacement of Sub-group mandated to review Implementing Rules pending the confirmation of MB membership of Ireland and Poland, and to subsequently decide on these matters via written procedure;
- agreed to schedule the next Audit Committee meeting in the morning of the first day of the 39th Management Board meeting on a pilot basis;
- took note of the update on the ECDC Building project;
- took note of the criteria, actors and timelines for hosting the ESCAIDE Conference outside Sweden;
- took note of the update on the criteria for the One Fellowship Programme and requested ECDC to provide an update on this matter at the next MB meeting including formal advice from the Advisory Forum;
- took note of the impact of ECDC's publication of vacancy notices in 24 EU languages;

- took note of the proposed ways of collecting ECDC stakeholders feedback, and recommended to combine the collection of information through regular or informal channels with a stakeholder survey to be performed every 2-3 years;
- took note of the update from the European Commission;
- took note of the update on the EU Presidency of the Slovak Republic;
- took note of the presentation on IMI2 DRIVE Proposal – Potential Benefits, Costs and Issues, and agreed that ECDC should produce a position paper to be presented to the Advisory Forum in order to recieve their advice on the possible engagement of ECDC in the DRIVE project, and subsequently get back to the Management Board via written procedure depending on the input from the Advisory Forum.

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

1. The Chair of the ECDC Management Board welcomed all participants to the Thirty-eighth meeting of the Management Board.

2. A special welcome was extended to the following newly appointed members: Carole Schirvel, Alternate, Austria; Bernard Kaić, Member, Croatia; Irene Cotter, Member, Cyprus (previously MB Alternate); Jana Feldmane, Member, Latvia; Marija Magajne, Alternate, Slovenia; Zofija Mazej Kukovič, Member, European Parliament, and Maria Eleni Koppa, Member, European Parliament. Apologies had been received from Bulgaria, Greece, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, United Kingdom, John F Ryan, DG SANTE, and Line Matthiessen, DG RTD.

3. Proxies were duly noted as follows: Lithuania – proxy given to Estonia, Malta – proxy given to the Netherlands, and Line Matthiessen – proxy given to Martin Seychell, DG SANTE, European Commission.

Welcome from the Acting Director, ECDC

4. Andrea Ammon, Acting Director, ECDC, welcomed the Management Board members and noted that she was looking forward to working with the new members, and also to having productive discussions during the meeting.

Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) *(Document MB38/01 Rev.1)*

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) previously submitted. None were declared.

6. Andrea Ammon requested to add one item on the new project on influenza vaccine effectiveness that had already been discussed in previous meetings (IMI JIVES), and suggested that Mike Catchpole and Maarit Kokki provide an update on the results of the kick-off meeting of the Consortium, which had taken place the previous day.

The Management Board adopted the draft programme with the above-mentioned addition.

Adoption of the draft minutes of the 37th meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 14-15 June 2016) *(Document MB38/02)*

The Management Board adopted the draft minutes of the Thirty-seventh meeting of the Management Board.

Election of the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Management Board *(Document MB38/03)*

7. The Chair recalled the procedure for the elections and noted that the following nominations had been received: Daniel Reynders, self-nomination for the position of Chair of the Management Board, and Anni Virolainen-Julkunen, self-nomination for the position of Deputy Chair of the Management Board.

8. Following the voting, the election results were announced: for the Chair, 25 positive votes out of 25 votes in total, no abstention; for the Deputy Chair, 25 positive votes out of 25 votes in total, no abstention.

9. Daniel Reynders thanked the Board members for their continued trust, and Tiiu Aro for her support as Deputy Chair during the previous mandate. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen also thanked the Board

for their confidence, and mentioned that she was looking forward to collaborating with the Chair and the Management Board in this new role.

ECDC Independence Policy

10. Andrea Iber, Head of Section, Legal Services and Acting Head of Section, Procurement, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, gave a brief general introduction to the ECDC Independence Policy stressing the importance of ensuring that the Centre, in all its workings, is independent and perceived to be independent from any external influence. For this reason, an Annual Declaration of Interest (ADoI) has to be submitted when a new Management Board Member is appointed; submission of a duly filled ADoI is a condition for participation in the MB meetings. She then explained briefly the process for reviewing the ADoIs as well as the procedure for imposing mitigation measures when needed. For the MB, the submission of DoIs is an annual exercise, and ECDC will soon approach members to receive an updated ADoI for 2017.

11. She recalled that the Revised ECDC Independence Policy had been endorsed at the previous MB meeting in June. On 4 November, ECDC received comments from DG HR regarding ECDC staff. As DG HR wishes to comment only on the staff part, it may be necessary to split the policy document in two parts. This issue will be addressed in the next MB meeting when more details from DG HR have been received.

12. Concerning the main achievements in 2016, she mentioned that a higher collection rate had been achieved for both MB and AF compared to previous years. For concerned ECDC staff, all DoIs have been collected, reviewed and published. For external experts participating in Rapid Risk Assessments, improvements in the workflow have led to 100% compliance. ECDC is currently developing criteria and guidelines for determining which expert meetings require interest management. Efforts are also being made to harmonise assessments and mitigation measures across the Centre. An electronic submission system has been put in place; the use of the expert database for DoIs will be phased out so that, in the future, only one tool will be used for the collection of DoIs.

13. The Chair commented that the Independence Policy had been one of his priorities during the last year, and added that he would continue to consider it a priority in the future. He urged all MB Members to ensure their Alternates fulfil their declarations, and also to swiftly update their own ADoIs when these are requested.

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

Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting (Stockholm, 14-15 June 2016) *(Document MB38/04)*

14. Andrea Ammon, Acting Director, ECDC, started by congratulating the new Chair and Deputy Chair for the election results. She also thanked Tiiu Aro for her support as Deputy Chair during the previous mandate.

15. She then provided the Board with an update on the main activities since the last Management Board meeting, including key meetings, visits and country missions. Referring to the discussions in the last Advisory Forum meeting, she mentioned that the AF members had strongly suggested a common platform for information sharing between the MB and the AF in order to improve complementarity of the two bodies. The presentation also referred to the key decisions of MB37, their status and progress. In conclusion, she informed the Board that ECDC had received the Public Health Award 2016 for the European Antibiotic Awareness Day (EAAD). She stressed that the success of this campaign was only possible because so many countries have taken up this initiative in their own campaigns.

16. The Chair agreed with the importance of the relationship between MB and AF, and emphasised the need to find some concrete means to improve complementarity between the two bodies.

17. Before passing to the next agenda point, the Chair announced that Portugal had now formally given proxy to Denmark.

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

Update from the ECDC Management Board Working Group on Complementarity between Management Board and Advisory Forum

18. Marianne Donker, MB Member, Netherlands, recalled the reasons for establishing the Working Group on complementarity between MB and AF, mentioning that the Second External Evaluation had identified this issue as one of the most important problem areas. The Working Group had met twice so far via audio conference. During the meetings, four main issues had been covered: 1) Clarification of the roles of MB, AF and CCB; 2) Clarity and channels of communication from the Advisory Forum; 3) Mechanisms for MB requesting AF input; and 4) Shared work space. She mentioned that the WG would need to meet at least one more time to fine-tune its suggestions, and to be able to present a finalised document at next MB meeting. She noted that the Working Group was composed of only three members, which made it challenging to ensure a sufficient number of participants for the meetings, and asked whether there were any volunteers to join the WG.

19. In response to this request, Gesa Lücking, Alternate, Germany, volunteered to join the Working Group.

20. The Board members agreed that it was fundamental to have clarity about the roles and responsibilities of the two bodies. The members welcomed the idea of a shared workspace, but stressed the importance of having clear rules about which documents were to be shared. The process and the timing for transmitting formal Advisory Forum input to the Management Board also needed to be further clarified. In addition, it would be necessary to identify on which items the AF should provide formal advice in the format of collective conclusions, and eventually also divergent views.

21. Marianne Donker commented that the timing and alignment of the meetings of the MB and AF was one of the most difficult issues to be solved. She agreed that the shared area should be very selective and it should be very clear what stage any shared document is in. Concerning the items on which formal AF advice should be sought, the Working Group had identified some main items such as the strategic work plans and prioritisation of activities. She suggested that the Working Group look into this in more detail, and present its conclusions at the next MB meeting.

22. Andrea Ammon pointed out that the items mentioned (Work Programme, strategic documents, etc.) are certainly items where discussions already took place with the AF. The issue is therefore more about how, and in what format, this feedback is brought back to the Management Board.

The Management Board took note of the update from the ECDC Management Board Working Group on Complementarity between MB and AF, and welcomed the proposal to expand the Working Group with 1-2 members. Gesa Lücking, Alternate, Germany, volunteered to join the Working Group. The final conclusions of the Working Group will be presented to the Management Board in March 2017.

Joint Action Plan to address Recommendations arising from the second External Evaluation: Progress Report *(Document MB38/05)*

23. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, presented an update on the implementation of the Joint Action Plan to address recommendations arising from the second External Evaluation. Focusing on a number of highlights, he noted that the Communication Strategy paper had been discussed in the Advisory Forum and was now on the agenda of the MB. The new Training Strategy had also been discussed with the AF and the CCBs, and a significant amount of work was going on in the area of training. In June, the Management Board had endorsed the Country Support Strategy and implementation was now under way. Addressing the recommendation related to health determinants, ECDC had published a paper on vaccine hesitancy among health care workers and two guidance documents in the area of communication with health care workers and public health programme managers. Concerning relationships with external partners, he noted that a coordination meeting with WHO would take place at the end of the week. In addition, relevant agencies had been involved in the consultation process on the Single Programming Document 2018.

24. In the discussion that followed, one MB Member pointed out that it was difficult to identify what had changed in the document compared to last time, and it was suggested to highlight the changes in a more visible way. A question was also raised regarding the ECDC staff outsourcing policy.

25. Andrea Ammon clarified that, until now, the Senior Management Team had approved a set of principles on how ECDC deals with outsourced staff. The actual outsourcing policy will be finalised by mid-2017, as part of the IAS action plan, and will subsequently be presented to the Management Board.

The Management Board took note of the update on the implementation of the Joint Action Plan to address Recommendations arising from the second External Evaluation.

EU Reference Laboratory Networks: a joint vision to strengthen Member State capacity in public health microbiology *(Document MB38/Info Note 01)*

26. Michael Huebel, MB Alternate, DG SANTE, presented an Info Note outlining the roles and distribution of tasks between the Commission and the ECDC in the area of microbiology and laboratory support, as well as the ongoing activities on both sides. He clarified that the document should be seen as an element in an ongoing discussion rather than as a finalised vision as suggested by the agenda point. Public health microbiology is a complex and rapidly evolving area and continued discussions will clearly be needed on this topic.

27. He recalled that the External Evaluation lists three recommendations dealing with microbiology and laboratory support. Significant progress has been made on the specific work addressing these recommendations. For instance, ECDC is currently running the third round of the EU LabCap report, which means that there is a tool in place addressing recommendation 3 (strengthening the monitoring of laboratory expertise across the EU), the implementation of the molecular surveillance strategy is in line with recommendation 4 (keeping abreast of technological developments), and the EQA activities and review have created more transparency in the budget representation, which addresses recommendation 2 (increased transparency and clearer structure of budget). In terms of future activities and forward planning, the Commission recently concluded two studies which provide a background for discussion on future activities particularly in terms of coordination, clarity of objectives and sustainability. In addition to the activities described in the Info Note, there is also laboratory related work funded across the Commission (RTD, ECHO, AGRI, etc.). Through the EMERGE Joint Action, DG SANTE has put in place an activity which aims at mapping and providing a platform for different networks in the area of emerging diseases. The EURLOP project has developed a number of strategic options for an overarching system of EU reference laboratories. In addition, a cost-benefit analysis was conducted on European reference labs: the study shows that the benefits of such a system would probably outweigh costs both from a Member State and an EU budget perspective. However, several issues will have to be addressed in the future, in particular the need for infrastructure at national level, the need for an adequate legal framework, and the question of sustainability. DG SANTE will continue to work closely with the ECDC but, more importantly, these issues will need to be addressed with the Member States; the strategic discussion will therefore also be brought to the Health Security Committee next year, together with the lessons drawn from the studies conducted. The articulation of such an architecture and the role of the ECDC will of course be a subject for discussion in the Management Board.

28. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, added that one of the complexities is that public health microbiology has a key role in both risk assessment and risk management. ECDC has worked very closely with laboratories over many years through its network activities and external quality assurance programmes, particularly developing common methods and competencies in support of its key risk assessment activities. When it comes to risk management, the paper is beginning to look at what can be done in terms of coordination at EU level. He added that the ECDC budget allocated to laboratory activities is roughly €1.7 million.

29. Marc Struelens commented on the progress made in assessing the current situation of the EU wide networks of reference laboratories, noting that it had benefitted greatly from the input from Member State experts; notably, the cost-benefit analysis conducted by the Commission had taken stock of the accumulated experience and expertise of the existing networks across the sectors.

30. The Management Board welcomed the discussion on laboratory activities and agreed that this is a discussion that will need to be continued for some time given the complexity of the issue. Public health microbiology is a dynamic field in terms of innovative technologies, but also in terms of the way laboratories are organised in national, EU wide and even worldwide networks. Given this complexity, it would not be useful to strive for a comprehensive system; instead, it would be helpful to develop a

transparent way of communicating between all the relevant parties at EU level in order to have a clear understanding of the ongoing developments and to ensure better coordination. From a one health perspective, the issue merits close cooperation with the food and veterinary sectors. Concerning reference laboratories, it might be needed to address the issue of who, and at which level, the laboratories report to.

31. The MB also requested a more detailed overview of the roles and responsibilities of ECDC and the Commission in this field, and a summary of the various EU initiatives run by different DGs including their aim. One MB member added that EU LabCap is very much appreciated at country level as it clearly shows where the country is situated compared to other Member States, and which improvements are needed.

32. The Chair stressed the importance of country laboratory capacities for routine surveillance, and commented that a lot of opportunities might be missed if too much focus is put on potential threats without having a well-functioning first line network. This aspect should also be addressed in the vision document. For this reason, he questioned that the title of the agenda item focused only on reference laboratory networks.

33. Michael Huebel thanked for the valid comments and agreed with the Chair on the full importance of the different functions of laboratories. He expressed scepticism about the idea of having one vision in such a complex area; instead, when taking forward the process, it will be necessary to look at synergies where these are possible, and to ensure good complementarity taking into account the one health approach.

34. Referring to the issue of surveillance, Mike Catchpole pointed out that the EU LabCap study looks at a range of different domains of activity including capacity to support surveillance. Having undertaken a couple of surveys and mapped rather clearly where the strengths and gaps are, the focus of the Centre's capacity building efforts will be around those areas where ECDC can support key activities around identification, assessment and communication of threats to health, i.e. in the area of surveillance.

35. In conclusion, the Chair requested a regular progress report on this issue and, as far as possible, a timeline or at least targets for the future work. He added that this topic had been discussed for several years now and it would be time to have some real results.

The Management Board took note of the EU Reference Laboratory Networks: a joint vision to strengthen Member State capacity in public health microbiology, and requested a regular progress report on this issue.

ECDC Communication Strategy *(Document MB38/06)*

36. Karl Ekdahl, Head of Unit, Public Health Capacity and Communication Unit, ECDC, recalled that the previous ECDC Communication Strategy had been adopted in 2009; there was therefore a need to update the Strategy, not only in the light of developments in the area of social media and web technologies, but also in the light of the increased requests from countries for support in capacity building. The document outlines the vision and the objectives for ECDC communication until 2020. The Strategy is based on the results of the second External Evaluation and stakeholder surveys, as well as on feedback from the Advisory Forum and extensive consultation with the NFPs for Communication.

37. He pointed out that communication had been a rather sensitive issue in many of the past MB discussions. This links to the specific role of ECDC in the EU landscape: where ECDC has a very clear role in risk assessment and scientific advice, risk communication to the general public is mainly the responsibility of the Member States and the Commission. The role of ECDC is to support and facilitate risk communication, and to support countries in communication capacity building. This is also reflected in the target audiences; ECDC mainly addresses health professionals, but also policy makers, health communicators, and media, while the general public is not a direct audience for ECDC communication activities. Concerning communication capacity support, he commented that these days there is a big request for support and guidance on vaccine hesitancy; this topic will be a priority for the next two years.

38. In the discussion that followed, it was questioned why the general public is not directly targeted by ECDC's communication efforts. Several MB members commented that vaccine hesitancy was a real challenge in their country, and collaboration in this area was welcomed. It was further inquired how ECDC works with the social media in this context. One MB member inquired about the

possibility to develop the use of e-learning in the area of communicating scientific information, and the possibility to strengthen Eurosurveillance, which is an ideal tool for communicating scientific information and sharing best practices between countries.

39. The European Commission welcomed the emphasis on training and capacity development in the Member States, as well as the continued effort to provide scientific excellence. With respect to the latter, it was requested to receive more details on how ECDC plans to strengthen their outcome measurement.

40. Referring to the issue of target audiences, Karl Ekdahl responded that, in a crisis, reaching out to the citizens was probably best done in a national context; the communication landscape is rather different from one country to another, and it is important that the message is delivered in a context suitable for the population. This is also a view that has been expressed in several MB discussions. The e-learning could certainly be increased for general communication skills. He agreed with the importance of Eurosurveillance as a communication channel between the Member States. With respect to outcome measurement, he mentioned that ECDC is looking at how to find the best key performance indicators. The impact of ECDC science is an issue that should also be discussed with the ECDC Chief Scientist; how to get from science to practical implementation would be a good topic for discussion in the Advisory Forum. Concerning vaccine hesitancy, he stressed the need to find new ways of using the social media. He added that ECDC has previously worked on a tool kit addressing health care workers; a new toolkit is under development on how to engage in dialogue with parents.

41. Martin Seychell, European Commission, agreed that embarking on direct communication with citizens on social media is very sensitive as there is an element of mistrust towards institutions and authorities. It is therefore advisable to work together with health professionals and public health advocacy groups, for instance NGOs, and provide them with the arguments, toolkits, etc.

42. Following the discussion, the Management Board approved the ECDC Communication Strategy. The Chair asked ECDC to take into account the comments received in the implementation of the Strategy.

The Management Board approved the ECDC Communication Strategy.

Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2016 up until present *(Document MB38/07)*

43. Philippe Harant, Head of Section, Quality Management Section, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, updated the Management Board on the current level of implementation of the Work Programme 2016. He noted that no new activities had been added since the last meeting, and no activities had been cancelled. 4% of the activities had been achieved, 74% are on schedule, 1% delayed, 1% postponed, and 20% relate to core activities, such as HR and finance, for which there is no monitoring as such.

The Management Board approved the report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2016 up until present.

ECDC Strategic Multi-annual Programme (SMAP) 2014-2020 Mid-term review *(Document MB37/08)*

44. Andrea Ammon recalled that, when the SMAP was adopted in 2014, it was decided that a review would be made in the middle of the seven year period covered by the SMAP. The fact that the new structure of the annual Single Programming Documents (SPD) also includes a three year rolling horizon means that the multiannual part of the SPD 2018 coincides with the remaining period of the SMAP. The objective of the review was therefore to assess the level of achievement, and to align the SMAP with the Single Programming Document. She suggested continuing to regularly monitor the implementation of the remaining activities of the SMAP as part of the SPD, and to replace the SMAP indicators by the SPD indicators, which will be developed by June next year. She proposed to consider the SMAP document as concluded, and to focus on the SPDs in the future in order not to maintain two documents in parallel.

45. One MB Member inquired about the reasons behind the proposal to abandon the SMAP, and questioned whether, in today's fast paced world, the time frame of the SMAP was no longer considered relevant. The Chair asked whether, in practice, the activities marked in yellow (postponed) and red (cancelled) in the SMAP document had been integrated in the SPD with readjusted timelines.

46. Andrea Ammon recalled that already at the time of developing the SMAP, ECDC had signalled that, in the context of infectious diseases, seven years is a very long timeframe. For this reason, it was suggested to draft a mid-term review. She clarified that the reason for abandoning the SMAP was, however, mainly due to efficiency given that the SPD 2018 covers the same timeframe. When developing the SPD, a cross-check was made with the SMAP in order to transpose the activities of the SMAP into the SPD. In conclusion, she repeated that the revision of the indicators will be presented at the MB meeting in June.

47. The Board agreed with the proposal to close the SMAP and to hereafter focus on the Single Programming Documents.

The Management Board took note of the ECDC Strategic Multi-annual Programme (SMAP) 2014-2020 Mid-term review, and agreed with the proposal to close the SMAP document with this review, and to focus on the Single Programming Documents.

Update on the IMI2 DRIVE Proposal

48. This item was added to the programme in order to provide the Management Board with an update of the results of the kick-off meeting of the DRIVE Consortium that had taken place the day before.

49. Mike Catchpole provided a short background to the topic explaining that the Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI) is an EU initiative creating public-private partnerships. The driver for the proposal to use the IMI funding model for financing influenza vaccine effectiveness studies is the change in requirements from the European Medicines Agency obliging industry to provide brand specific vaccine effectiveness estimates for influenza vaccines. A call was launched by IMI earlier this year, with the purpose of setting up a platform under a public-private partnership to develop a pan-European network to evaluate the effectiveness of influenza vaccines; in stage 1 of the call, the DRIVE Consortium was selected by IMI to develop a full project proposal during stage 2. The DRIVE Consortium includes two national public health institutes (Finland and Italy) and a number of other public sector bodies, academia and some commercial companies in the area of consultancy and statistical support services. The Consortium organised a kick-off meeting on 14 November with the purpose to meet with the ECDC, the prospective drug companies, and any other actor willing to participate. It was added that, at the end of October, a letter had been forwarded by ECDC to all CCBs on behalf of the Consortium inviting them to contribute to the project proposal. Positive replies to attend the kick-off meeting were received from Public Health Institutes from Austria, Belgium, Greece, Netherlands, Norway and Slovenia, and declines from Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein and Slovak Republic. From the remaining countries, no response was received.

50. He then briefed the Board on the results of the kick-off meeting. Among the positives, he mentioned that the Consortium certainly has a broad range of competencies, the acceptance of the ECDC Advisory Forum criteria for ECDC engagement (industry excluded from any decision-making in respect of design, conduct and primary reporting of scientific studies), and the budget foreseen for the project. At the meeting, ECDC had put forward a draft governance model based on the original model proposed by the Consortium. According to this model, outputs from the work packages would be submitted to an Independent Scientific Committee that would review the deliverables and decide whether or not these were scientifically sound. Some concerns were however raised on the fact that industry partners were foreseen in many of the work packages, including those related to scientific study design (but not on the Independent Scientific Committee that approves design proposals), and on the lack of response, or decline of invitation, by several of the larger national Public Health Institutes. Other potential issues were that the Consortium would ask the I-MOVE to make their data available to the Consortium, that the involvement/leadership of ECDC in the Independent Scientific Committee would require significant investment of ECDC resources, and that the proposed sub-tendering process would result in bypassing of national Public Health Institutes.

51. In conclusion, he commented that, even if the above mentioned governance model was implemented, ECDC could still be perceived as not being scientifically independent. He asked the

Management Board members to give their view on whether their perception was such that they would recommend ECDC to be part in the project or advise against it.

52. In the roundtable discussion that followed, many MB members expressed that they needed to consult with their counterparts at national level before making a decision. They also requested more details in terms of risks and benefits as well as implications on staff resources. It was agreed that ECDC would produce a paper for the following day providing more details on these aspects. The Chair asked the MB members to discuss with their partners at national level in the meantime.

The Management Board requested ECDC to provide a more detailed analysis of the potential benefits and risks of ECDC involvement in IMI2 DRIVE to be presented on the following day.

Summary of discussions held at the 32nd meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (13 June 2016), including its recommendations:

53. Johan Carlson, Member, Sweden, and Chair of the ECDC Audit Committee (AC), briefly summarised the discussions and conclusions from the 33rd AC meeting, which took place on 14 November 2016. He mentioned that the Internal Audit Service (IAS) had presented their final audit report on the procurement process in ECDC. The report makes five recommendations of which three are classified as very important and two as important. Concerning the regular update on audit activities, he noted that 6 observations had been implemented since the last meeting, 23 observations are currently open, of which 7 are ready for IAS review. The 16 remaining observations are due to be implemented within the coming year.

a) Progress report – Overview of 2016 Budget Implementation since the last Management Board meeting

54. Anja Van Brabant, Head of Section, Finance and Accounting, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented an overview of the 2016 budget implementation since the last Management Board meeting. The overview showed that the Centre has increased its commitment rate by 2%, and the payment execution by 2,5% compared to the previous year.

55. Johan Carlson informed the Board that the Audit Committee had taken note of the improvements regarding commitment and payment rates compared to last year, and the timely efforts taken during the course of 2016 to improve the budget implementation this year.

56. The Chair asked for a clarification on the payment execution related to carry forwards from 2015. Anja van Brabant clarified that the majority of the payments that still need to be executed are recognised as having a multiannual character, such as invoices related to EPIET programme.

The Management Board took note of the Progress report – Overview of 2016 Budget Implementation since the last Management Board meeting.

b) Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2016 (Document MB38/09)

57. Anja Van Brabant presented the Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2016 explaining that, since the previous MB meeting, 800.000€ had been transferred out of Title I (Staff expenditure), of which 758.000€ to title III (Operational expenditure) and 42.000€ to Title II (Infrastructure and operating expenditure). These budget transfers had been executed as soon as funds became available, in order to improve timely the budget implementation for 2016.

58. Johan Carlson concluded that the Audit Committee had taken note of the budget transfers made, all under the responsibility of the Director. The Audit Committee also welcomed the fact that the budget transfers had been executed quicker than usual.

The Management Board took note of the Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2016.

c) ECDC Single Programming Document 2017 (Documents MB38/10, MB38/10 Corrigendum, MB38/11 Rev.1)

59. Andrea Ammon presented the Single Programming Document 2017 explaining that this document was brought to the Board again due to a number of additional comments received by the Commission. The main comments referred to the need to reinforce the link between annual objectives and strategical objectives, some clarifications on wording, and clarifications on resource allocation. There were also several comments related to blood transfusion and tissues, cells and organ transplantation (SoHO), some of which will require further discussion. This being said, ECDC will accommodate a number of SoHO related activities linked to infectious diseases, in line with what has been done in the past. For the other parts, all comments have been included and the document should now be final.

60. Michael Huebel, DG SANTE, thanked the ECDC for the way in which the comments had been taken on board. He added that if some points needed further clarification they should not delay further the adoption of the SPD, but time could be set aside later on to discuss these issues with the Management Board where necessary.

61. In the discussion that followed, several MB Members raised questions about the SoHO related activities and whether these were within the mandate of ECDC. In the light of the previous discussion on the complexity of public health microbiology, one MB Member suggested rephrasing slightly the reference to an "overarching laboratory strategy for human pathogens" (page 44, point 5).

62. Andrea Ammon recalled that, as a consequence of past MB discussions, ECDC has now one staff member working on the infectious disease aspects of SoHO, and contributing to the policies and risk assessments, for instance the West Nile Fever maps with regard to blood donation purposes. In other words, a number of ECDC activities are already devoted to the issue of infectious diseases in relation to SoHO. However, some of the requests from the Commission go beyond what has been done so far and this is what needs to be clarified.

63. Michael Huebel recommended that the content of the Commission comments be discussed in relation to the SPD 2018 instead of reopening the discussion on the SPD 2017; in fact, the activities included in the SPD 2017 are all clearly within the mandate of ECDC.

64. The Chair concluded the discussions saying that, in the SPD 2017, the SoHO activities are limited to infectious diseases. For the SPD 2018, some time will be devoted in the March MB to discuss the Commission requests in this area. He suggested approving the SPD 2017 pending the formal letter to be received from the Commission.

The Management Board approved the ECDC Single Programming Document 2017.

65. Anja van Brabant presented the Budget and Establishment Table 2017. She recalled that the draft budget had been approved via written procedure in January 2016 as part of the Single Programming Document 2017. The initial total amount requested was € 58.1 Million, including funding for the new premises. Following negotiations with the European Commission, the initial requested amount was accepted. As a result of a lower EFTA contribution, the final budget of ECDC for 2017 amounts to € 58 Million (150.000 € less than drafted budget), which is approximately the same as in 2016.

66. The European Commission inquired about the establishment plan and, in particular, the likelihood of filling the foreseen AD14 positions. In this context, it was also requested to receive some details on the vacancy rate of the Centre.

67. Jessica Mannheim, Head of Section, Human Resources, explained that the likelihood of filling the AD14 posts was very small; the reason for keeping these was partly to cater for possible reclassification opportunities in the future.

68. Andrea Ammon mentioned that the current vacancy rate is approximately 7%. She added that the changes requested by the European Commission prior to the Management Board meeting were reflected in the revised document that had been tabled before the start of the meeting.

The Management Board approved the Budget and Establishment Table 2017.

d) ECDC Single Programming Document 2018 (Documents MB38/12, MB38/12 Corrigendum)

69. Andrea Ammon recalled that, as mentioned earlier, the ECDC Single Programming Document 2018 basically contains the review of the SMAP. For this reason, the vision and strategic objectives for the three year period 2018-2020 have been included in the document. She described the adoption process of the SPD clarifying that the final draft has to be sent to the European Commission, Parliament and Council on 31 January 2017. The opinion of the Commission should be received during the summer, after which the document will be sent for final adoption by the Management Board in September 2017. She then briefly presented the highlights for 2018.

70. In reference to the planned external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme, it was inquired whether this evaluation could be extended to also include other training activities. It was also questioned why the SoHO activities were not specified in the document.

71. Karl Ekdahl clarified that the Continuous Professional Development Programme (CPDP) will only be fully operational in 2018, and it would therefore be too early to have an external evaluation of the CPDP that year.

72. Referring to the SoHO activities, Andrea Ammon explained that these were not indicated as further discussions with the Commission will be needed on this matter.

73. Micheal Huebel clarified that the formal comments from the Commission will come later than March, but possible issues on SoHO could however be brought to the attention of the MB in the spring meeting.

74. The Chair suggested that ECDC provide an update on the evolution of the SPD 2018 in the next MB meeting, in particular on the SoHO related activities.

75. Andrea Ammon asked for the opinion of the Board on how to deal with finalisation of staffing documents given that these will be ready only by beginning of January 2017. The Board agreed to approve the final draft including budgetary aspects via written procedure in January 2017.

The Management Board took note of the ECDC Single Programming Document 2018. The final draft will be sent to the Management Board for approval via written procedure by mid-January. ECDC will provide an update on the evolution of the SPD 2018 in the MB meeting in March 2017, in particular on the SoHO related activities.

e) Draft Budget 2018 (Document MB38/12 (Annex II Table 1 & 2; Annex III Table 1 & 2 – figures 2018)

76. Anja van Brabant presented the Draft Budget 2018 mentioning that ECDC will request € 58,1 Million, including the EFTA contribution. The staff expenditure (title I) is increased compared to 2017, but lower than in years before 2017 (€ 31.4M). The infrastructure and administrative expenditure (title II) are decreasing compared to 2017, but an increase in the rental budget for the coming years is foreseen. (€ 8.4M). There is a small decrease in the operational budget (title III) (€ 18.3M).

77. Johan Carlson summarised the discussions in the Audit Committee commenting that the AC had taken note of the SPD 2018, and welcomed the fact that this document was replacing the SMAP. At this early stage of the process, the Audit Committee recommended to leave the discussion and approval of the SPD 2018 and the Draft Budget 2018 to the Management Board.

78. Andrea Ammon mentioned that the corrigenda to the 2017 and 2018 SPDs included a list of proposed activities for deprioritisation in case of public health emergency. In response, the Chair suggested to rank these activities rather than presenting them by area of work.

79. For the sake of clarity, the Chair recommended to present the Draft Budget in a separate document in this early stage of the planning.

The Management Board approved the Draft Budget 2018.

e) Membership matters

80. Johan Carlson introduced the matter explaining that the Audit Committee had recently lost two members given that Jacques Scheres from the European Parliament was no longer a Member of the Management Board, and that Michel Pletschette, who has been participating as an expert, will retire from the Commission. In addition, Poland and Ireland have not yet renewed the mandate of their Management Board members while these two members were also serving at the Audit Committee. He therefore suggested to come back to the issue via written procedure once the MB membership of these two countries had been clarified. The replacement of the European Parliament representative and the external expert also needed to be decided.

81. At times, the Audit Committee has also suffered from low attendance at meetings. Johan Carlson therefore asked the Board whether the Audit Committee should be maintained or whether the discussions currently taking place in the AC should be held within the Management Board. Another issue is the timing of the Audit Committee meetings; the current scheduling of the AC meeting means one extra meeting day for many of the members.

82. The Chair asked the Board members whether they would agree with expanding the Audit Committee with one or two members, and whether it was considered of any added value that the issues currently discussed in the Audit Committee would take place in plenary.

83. Martin Seychell, DG SANTE, pointed out that it was certainly possible to replace Michel Pletschette if the Board so decided. He suggested that there might be a need to look at the remit of the Audit Committee, and possibly to have a budgetary sub-committee preparing the work for the Management Board. He advised against bringing the discussions of the Audit Committee into the MB as these matters require going into the details, which makes it time consuming.

84. Johan Carlson commented that a paper had been prepared for the Audit Committee meeting on the advantages and disadvantages of establishing a budgetary committee, but with so few members present he had suggested to get back to this issue at another occasion.

85. The Chair summarised the discussions concluding that the Board was in favour of maintaining the Audit Committee. The Board agreed with the proposal to schedule the next Audit Committee meeting at the beginning of the first day of the Management Board on a pilot basis.

86. Andrea Ammon recalled that, in the past, it was agreed to set up a small sub-group of the Audit Committee to facilitate the adoption process for Implementing Rules, and to provide guidance to the Management Board. She suggested postponing this item until the composition of the Audit Committee had been clarified.

The Management Board agreed to postpone the replacement of Audit Committee members and the replacement of Sub-group mandated to review Implementing Rules pending the confirmation of MB membership of Ireland and Poland, and to subsequently decide on these matters via written procedure. The Management Board further agreed to schedule the next Audit Committee meeting in the morning of the first day of the 39th Management Board meeting on a pilot basis.

Timeline and process for nomination of ECDC Director for 2017-2022

87. Closed session. Members of the Management Board only.

Opening and welcome by the Chair

88. The Chair opened the meeting and thanked the ECDC Acting Director and her staff for the dinner during the previous evening.

Update on ECDC Building Project

89. Andrea Ammon updated the Board on the ECDC Building Project mentioning that the contract for the new building had been signed on 26 July. The work has now reached the design phase. Previously a work place analysis was performed in order to identify the main work related requirements. This work will be looked at by a focus group that will provide their proposals based on a number of guiding principles identified by the Senior Management Team. The architect will then provide a drawing according to the proposals, after which the Building Steering Committee will decide. A visit for all staff was organised on 8 September. The removal is foreseen to take place around Easter 2018.

90. A question was raised about the investment plan for the new building.

91. Andrea Ammon clarified that the budgetary information was provided during the MB meeting in March 2016; this documentation is available on the MB Extranet. Concerning the costs related to the new building, she added that the rent will increase, but the new building will be much more efficiently run in terms of maintenance.

The Management Board took note of the update on the ECDC Building Project.

Hosting ESCAIDE outside Sweden: criteria, actors and timelines *(Document MB38/14)*

92. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, recalled that, in its previous meeting, the Management Board had decided that ESCAIDE should be hosted using bi-annual rotation, namely the conference should be organised in Stockholm, Sweden, one year and in a city of another EU/EEA country the following year. Following the request of the Management Board, ECDC developed a paper outlining the criteria to be used for selecting the hosting city and country as well as the decision process in terms of timelines and actors. He presented the proposed essential criteria as well as the selection criteria, recalling that one of the main arguments for rotation was to increase participation in a way of increasing equity across Europe. Expressions of interest will be sought approximately two years before the conference.

93. Martin Seychell, DG SANTE, welcomed the document and added that the ESCAIDE offers a high EU added value. Having said this, he suggested that ECDC should try to maximise further the EU dimension of the conference. For the Commission, the willingness and availability of the Member State to contribute (criterion 3) should be the corner stone of any proposal. In this context, the specific EU added value should be underlined in the criteria. One way of doing this could be by linking to the EU presidency priorities.

94. Mike Catchpole thanked for the comment and assured that this point would be taken into account.

The Management Board took note of the criteria, actors and timelines for hosting the ESCAIDE Conference outside Sweden.

Update on the criteria for the one fellowship programme

95. Karl Ekdahl, Head of Unit, Public Health Capacity and Communication, ECDC, recalled that the two fellowship programmes, EPIET and EUPHEM, had recently been merged into one fellowship programme with two paths, (EPIET for epidemiology and EUPHEM for public health microbiology), and for each path, one EU-track and one MS track. An extensive consultation process took place in the spring and autumn 2016 with the Advisory Forum, National Focal Points for Training and Training Site Forum (TSF) to address a number of issues related to the merger of the two programmes as well as the selection process.

96. The consultation showed that each of the former two programmes (EPIET and EUPHEM) have their strong defenders. At the same time, the difference between the two paths is very small in terms of training modules. As discussed in the Advisory Forum meeting in September, the reality is also that needed competencies are slowly merging (traditional and molecular epidemiology); for these reasons, a growing number of stakeholders support a further merger into one programme without paths. Given that such a merger would in theory go against the Training Strategy approved the previous year, which makes reference to two different paths, the Management Board Members were asked whether they would support a development in this direction.

97. In the discussion that followed, the Board agreed that this was a question that would merit a formal opinion from the Advisory Forum.

The Management Board took note of the update on the criteria for the One Fellowship Programme, and requested ECDC to provide an update on this matter at the next MB meeting including formal advice from the Advisory Forum.

Impact of ECDC's publication of vacancy notices in 24 EU languages

98. Andrea Ammon introduced the topic recalling that, following a court ruling, EU Agencies have to publish their vacancy notices in all 24 official languages unless there is a clear Management Board decision on the working language of the Agency. In March, the Management Board had a discussion on the working language of ECDC, but there was no conclusion on the topic. In addition, according to the new implementing rules, all EU agencies are obliged to publish their vacancy notices for expert positions on the EPSO website, and EPSO only accepts them in all 24 languages, unless there is a derogation from the Management Board. As a consequence, ECDC has decided to publish also the vacancy notices for Contract Agents in all 24 languages. The translation is ordered from the Commission translation centre: the delay due to the translation and administrative process is approximately 2-3 weeks. Since April this year, 17 vacancy notices have been published and the average cost per vacancy notice is 9.500 €, which means a total of roughly 160.000 €. In order to reduce the costs, the vacancy notices have been shortened. From next year, there is also an agreement in place with the Translation Centre so that the text that remains the same (description of Centre, etc.) will be charged less.

99. The Chair questioned why the standard text is still translated into all 24 languages, and commented that a possible solution could be to consider using a template for the vacancy notices with a fixed and a variable part.

The Management Board took note of the impact of ECDC's publication of vacancy notices in 24 EU languages.

Proposed ways of collecting ECDC Stakeholders feedback *(Document MB38/15)*

100. Philippe Harant, Head of Section, Quality Management, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented a paper on proposed ways of collecting ECDC Stakeholders feedback. He recalled that two Stakeholder Surveys had been performed in 2015 and 2016. Considering the low response rate (31% for the first survey, and 37% for the second), the Management Board had suggested to rethink the concept of the annual survey and seek for alternative ways of obtaining information in order to reach more targeted objectives with less frequency.

101. To address these concerns, ECDC prepared a paper proposing a set of alternative options: 1) Continue survey with the same format but lower frequency (every 2, 3 years), and possibly reduce number of recipients; 2) Conduct yearly targeted interviews with small random number of different categories of stakeholders; 3) Collect information through regular or informal channels.

102. In the discussion that followed, several MB members suggested investing more in option 3, combining it with a Stakeholder Survey to be performed less frequently, for instance every 2-3 years. It was also proposed to involve the National Coordinators of CCBs in the transmission of the Stakeholder Survey; the NCs could explain the purpose and the importance of responding to the survey to other stakeholders.

103. Andrea Ammon concluded the discussion stating that ECDC will make efforts to target better its feedback gathering and will work on the Key Performance Indicators so that annual stakeholder surveys are not required.

The Management Board took note of the proposed ways of collecting ECDC stakeholders' feedback, and recommended to combine the collection of information through regular or informal channels with a stakeholder survey to be performed every 2-3 years.

Update from the European Commission

a) AMR update State of play of implementation of Decision 1082/2013/EU, including the Joint Procurement Agreement

104. Martin Seychell, MB Member, DG SANTE, recalled that the Roadmap for 2017 Commission Communication on a One-Health Action Plan to support Member States in the fight against Antimicrobial Resistance had been published on 24 October, and was open for comments until the end of the week. The Action Plan will include a set of concrete measures under 3 pillars: 1) Supporting Member States and making the EU a best-practice region on AMR 2) Boosting research, development and innovation against AMR; 3) Shaping the global agenda on AMR. The aim of DG SANTE is to have the Action Plan ready in the first half of 2017. He added that the Health Security Committee discussed the draft guidelines for prudent use of antimicrobials in human health during its meeting on 10 November. The Committee expressed its appreciation of the work of ECDC in this context. The aim of DG SANTE is to publish the guidelines in 2017. Finally, he mentioned that a proposal for a Joint Action on antimicrobial resistance and health care associated infections had been submitted to CHAFEA on 3 November. The work is coordinated by France and involves partners from 21 Member States plus Norway and Serbia, including collaborating stakeholders from another seven Member States and Moldova. The Joint Action envisages a very close collaboration with ECDC, including involvement by ECDC in the Joint Action stakeholder forum. He thanked ECDC for its precious contribution to the planning of the JA.

b) Update on 1082 implementing acts

105. Martin Seychell updated the Board on the state of play of the implementation of decision 1082, mentioning that the draft Commission implementing decision on the procedures for the notification of alerts in the EWRS, and for information exchange (based on articles 8 and 11) had been discussed with the Committee on Serious Cross-border Health Threats on 23 September. The main comments from the Member States focused on the EWRS contact points, and the deliberations of the Health Security Committee on the coordination of the national responses. Following the meeting, the Commission has prepared a revised draft, which will be sent to the Committee members for opinion in the coming days. He then briefed the Board on the ongoing preparatory work on the implementing act under article 6 related to the list of communicable diseases covered by the epidemiological surveillance network. Discussions are currently ongoing with ECDC on the possible revision of case definitions for some diseases such as syphilis and AMR aspects of case definitions for the reporting of communicable diseases. The adoption of this implementing act is foreseen in 2017. Preparatory work is also ongoing regarding the revision of the template used by Member States for reporting on their preparedness and response planning (article 4).

c) Update on HSC of 10 November

106. Michael Huebel, MB Alternate, DG SANTE updated the Management Board on the last meeting of the Health Security Committee, which had taken place on 10 November in the presence of the DG SANTE Director General giving the opportunity for more strategic discussions. In the future, the Committee will work on the basis of a medium to long term planning. In the meeting, Belgium had also briefed the Committee about their experiences and lessons learnt from the Brussels attacks; this feeds well into the preparedness work required as part of the activities under Decision 1082. The Committee considered positively the options paper on vaccination setting out a number of paths for future action in the area of vaccination. This document will be finalised in approximately four weeks. Finally, the Committee reviewed work on preparedness. Also in this area, the work will be based on an overall action plan, with a medium to long term perspective. The HSC provided guidance on the directions to

be taken on exchanging medical counter measures as well as a brief update on the modernisation of the EWRS.

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

Update from the Slovak EU Presidency

107. Ján Mikas, Member, Slovak Republic, gave an update on the Slovak EU Presidency covering the period July-December 2016. The Health Priorities of the Presidency include tuberculosis and antimicrobial resistance and vaccination. An Informal Meeting of Health Ministers took place on 3-4 October. In the area of communicable diseases, the following topics were discussed: Towards the end of tuberculosis and Specific challenges concerning vaccination.

The Management Board took note of the presentation from the Slovak Republic regarding the EU Presidency.

IMI2 DRIVE Proposal – Potential Benefits, Costs and Issues *(Document MB38/Briefing Note)*

108. The Chair reopened the discussions initiated the previous day mentioning that, as requested, ECDC had prepared a paper analysing the potential benefits, costs and other issues related to the participation of ECDC in the IMI2 DRIVE project. Before opening the floor for comments, he asked Mike Catchpole to summarise the main points of the document.

109. Mike Catchpole explained briefly the Scientific Governance Proposal made by ECDC, and mentioned that ECDC is awaiting a response from the DRIVE Consortium on this proposal. He then presented the potential benefits of the project as well as the possible risks of ECDC engaging in DRIVE, the most important risk being the potential loss of reputation for scientific independence. Concerning the resource implications, he estimated that a minimum of 2 FTEs of ECDC scientific expert and senior expert time would be needed annually for the duration of the project. In conclusion, the paper identified four questions that could be put forward to the Advisory Forum in order to seek their opinion on the matter.

110. In the discussions that followed, a number of MB members expressed their support for the initiative while others had concerns related to the involvement of industry in the project, as well as the impact of DRIVE on the sustainability of the I-MOVE project. Some questions were also raised regarding the actual public health benefits of the project. Some members were concerned that by not collaborating with the industry, a difficult situation was created for the public sector as the industry might carry out their own studies in a more narrow way.

111. The Chair stressed that the impact on staff resources and the need to postpone or cancel some other activities was a management decision that needed to be taken by the Management Board. However, in order for the Management Board to take a decision, a clear proposal from the ECDC would be needed.

112. Andrea Ammon suggested that ECDC draft a proposal based on the discussions of the Management Board as well as further reflection on ECDC side. The proposal would include an analysis of the impact on the DRIVE project on I-MOVE. After discussion with the Advisory Forum, ECDC will get back to the Management Board via written procedure before Christmas given that the deadline for stage 2 submission of the project is 10 January 2017.

113. The Chair summarised the discussions saying that a position paper will be presented to the Advisory Forum; if the negotiation with the Consortium does not fit with the requirements expressed by the AF as regards scientific independence it will be proposed that ECDC step out of the project. The Board agreed with this proposal.

The Management Board took note of the presentation on IMI2 DRIVE Proposal – Potential Benefits, Costs and Issues, and agreed that ECDC should produce a position paper to be presented to the Advisory Forum in order to receive their advice on the possible engagement of ECDC in the DRIVE project, and subsequently get back to the Management Board via written procedure depending on the input from the Advisory Forum.

Any other business

114. The Chair thanked the Management Board members for their active participation in the meeting and wished them a safe trip home.

115. The next Management Board meeting will take place in Stockholm on 21-22 March 2017. The meeting was adjourned.

Annex 1. List of participants

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Austria	Bernhard Benka	Alternate
Belgium	Daniel Reynders *(Chair)*	Member
	Carole Schirvel	Alternate
Cyprus	Irene Cotter	Member
Czech Republic	Jozef Dlhý	Alternate
Denmark	Lisbeth Høeg-Jensen	Member
Estonia	Tiiu Aro	Member
Finland	Anni Virolainen-Julkunen	Member
France	François Bourdillon	Member
	Anne-Catherine Viso	Alternate
Germany	Susanne Wald	Member
	Gesa Lücking	Alternate
Hungary	Beatrix Oroszi	Alternate
Italy	Francesco Maraglino	Alternate
Latvia	Jana Feldmane	Member
Luxembourg	Jean-Claude Schmit	Member
Netherlands	Marianne Donker	Member
	Ashna Nakched	Observer
Slovak Republic	Ján Mikas	Member
Slovenia	Marija Magajne	Alternate
Spain	Elena Andradas Aragonés	Alternate
Sweden	Johan Carlson	Member
	Mårten Kivi	Alternate
European Parliament		
	Maria Eleni Koppa	Member
	Zofija Mazej Kukovič	Member

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
European Commission		
DG SANTE	Martin Seychell	Member
DG SANTE	Michael Huebel	Alternate
EEA Countries		
Iceland	Sveinn Magnússon	Member
Norway	Karl-Olaf Wathne	Member