



ECDC Management Board

Minutes of the Forty-seventh Meeting Stockholm, 13-14 November 2019

Adopted by the ECDC Management Board at its Forty-eighth meeting, 26 March 2020

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 MB47/01 Rev.1</i>).....	4
Adoption of the draft minutes of the 46 th meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 18-19 June 2019) (<i>Document MB47/02</i>).....	4
Third External Evaluation of ECDC: Conclusions and recommendations of the ECDC Management Board External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group (<i>Document MB47/03</i>)	5
Update on the process for developing an action plan to address the recommendations of the external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme	7
ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 – updated version, including roadmap for implementation (<i>Document MB47/04</i>)	7
Summary of discussions held at the 42nd Meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (13 November 2019), including its recommendations.....	8
Reporting Officers for the Director’s appraisal (closed session).....	11
ECDC Single Programming Document 2021-2023 (<i>Document MB47/11</i>)	11
Location of future Management Board meetings (<i>Document MB47/12</i>).....	12
Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (18-19 June 2019) (<i>Document MB47/13</i>).....	13
Update on Next Generation ECDC	13
Annual address of the ECDC Staff Committee to the Management Board	14
Implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy	15
Update on the planning of the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM)	15
Update from the European Commission.....	16
Update from the European Parliament.....	16
Update from the Finnish Presidency of the Council of the EU	16
Update from the Croatian Presidency of the Council of the EU	16
Any other business.....	17
Annex: List of Participants	18

Summary of Proceedings – ECDC Management Board Meeting

The Forty-seventh meeting of the ECDC Management Board convened in Stockholm, Sweden, during 13-14 November 2019. During the meeting, the Management Board:

- ❖ adopted the programme of the meeting;
- ❖ adopted the minutes of the Forty-sixth meeting of the Management Board;
- ❖ discussed the draft Conclusions and Recommendations of the ECDC Management Board External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group. An updated document will be circulated to the Management Board for approval via written procedure in January 2020;
- ❖ took note of the update on the process for developing an action plan to address the recommendations of the external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme;
- ❖ agreed to postpone the approval of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027, including roadmap for implementation, to the 48th Management Board meeting in March 2020 in order to await the conclusions and recommendation of the Management Board External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group;
- ❖ took note of Audit Committee updates on Audit Activities and Audit Observations;
- ❖ approved the proposed amendments in the Internal Control Framework (ICF), and agreed that the detailed ICF will in the future be discussed at the level of the Audit Committee;
- ❖ took note of the Progress report – Overview of 2019 Budget Implementation up until 4 November 2019;
- ❖ took note of Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2019;
- ❖ took note of the Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2019 up until present;
- ❖ approved the ECDC Single Programming Document 2020;
- ❖ approved the Budget and Establishment Table 2020;
- ❖ took note of the update on recent phishing attacks targeting ECDC partners;
- ❖ discussed the ECDC Single Programming Document 2021. The final draft SPD 2021 will be sent to the Management Board for approval via written procedure in January 2020;
- ❖ discussed the location of future Management Board meetings;
- ❖ took note of the update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting;
- ❖ took note of the update on the Next Generation ECDC;
- ❖ took note of the annual address of the ECDC Staff Committee to the Management Board;
- ❖ took note of the update on the implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy;
- ❖ took note of the update on the planning of the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting;
- ❖ took note of the update from the European Commission;
- ❖ took note of the update from the European Parliament;
- ❖ took note of the update from the Finnish Presidency of the Council of the EU;
- ❖ took note of the update from the Croatian Presidency of the Council of the EU.

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

1. Anni Virolainen-Julkunen, Chair of the ECDC Management Board, welcomed all the participants to the Forty-seventh meeting of the Management Board. She mentioned that all the MB members were invited to attend a reception in the evening at the Residence of the Finnish Ambassador. All the EU ambassadors as well as Ambassadors of enlargement countries in Sweden had also been invited to the reception.
2. Apologies had been received from Greece, Ireland, Portugal (proxy to the Netherlands), Romania (proxy to Bulgaria), Slovak Republic (proxy to Austria), and Slovenia, as well as from Barbara Kierstens, European Commission, DG RTD, (proxy to John F Ryan, European Commission, DG SANTE). In addition, the following countries did not attend the meeting: Iceland and Liechtenstein.

Welcome from the Director, ECDC

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

Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (*Document MB47/01 Rev.1*)

4. The MB Member from the Netherlands raised an ongoing issue in her country related to the availability of products for mosquito control, and requested the inclusion of this item under Any Other Business on the second meeting day. Referring to discussions in the last meeting of the Health Security Committee, she asked whether some further information could be provided on the vaccination portal currently being developed by ECDC and, in particular, whether the portal is targeting the general public or a professional audience.
5. The Chair agreed to include the item requested by the Netherlands under AOB on day 2 of the meeting. She suggested that the Director would address the issue of the vaccine portal in her update on ECDC activities the following day.
6. The Management Board adopted the draft programme with the above-mentioned addition under AOB. Following the adoption of the programme, the Chair asked each member whether s/he wished to add any oral declaration(s) of interest to her/his Annual Declaration of Interest (ADoI) submitted previously. None were declared.

The Management Board adopted the draft programme.

Adoption of the draft minutes of the 46th meeting of the Management Board (Stockholm, 18-19 June 2019) (*Document MB47/02*)

7. The Chair noted that France had requested amendments in points 6, 21, 22 and 68 of the draft minutes, and Germany had requested a minor change in point 63; these changes had been addressed in the minutes circulated to the Board ahead of the meeting. There were no further comments on the draft minutes.
8. For the future meeting minutes, it was suggested to specify, where possible, whether a statement was given by a representative of the European Parliament, by a member representing a Member State or by a representative of the European Commission. It was further proposed to present the amendments in track change mode.

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

Third External Evaluation of ECDC: Conclusions and recommendations of the ECDC Management Board External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group (*Document MB47/03*)

9. The Chair introduced the item recalling that the Management Board had approved the final report of the external evaluation via written procedure in October. The MB External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group had prepared a draft document on the conclusions and recommendations arising from the external evaluation, which had now been tabled for the Management Board. As the MB members had not had the possibility to review the document ahead of the meeting, this item was presented for information and guidance, and the final document would need to be approved through written procedure at a later stage.

10. Anne-Catherine Viso, Chair of the MB External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group, MB Alternate, France, thanked the Chair for the opportunity to present the document, which had been further discussed in the Drafting Group meeting the day before and still needed some improvements. She apologised for the late submission of the document; this was because it had taken some time to figure out how to best formulate the recommendations based on the final evaluation report. As a general recommendation from the Drafting Group to the Management Board, she highlighted the need to identify indicators, which could be used to measure the impact of ECDC work in the Member States. In fact, the current evaluation showed that it was difficult to collect any tangible information on the impact at Member State level. She added that the MB External Evaluation Steering Committee (MEES)/MB Drafting Group was planning to carry out a lessons learnt exercise to reflect on the overall process of the external evaluation, and to draw conclusions to be considered for future evaluations.

11. In terms of general conclusions arising from the evaluation report, she highlighted the overall positive assessment of ECDC. She added that, since the second external evaluation, some areas have become more important to consider, in particular the sustainability of Joint Actions and ECDC's role in their planning and implementation: ECDC's international activities and the resources available for this work; the expansion of ECDC's tasks in the area of preparedness following Decision 1082, and the possible extension of the mandate of ECDC to other threats than communicable diseases and to other Community level activities.

12. Following these introductory remarks, the Drafting Group members presented briefly each of the nine recommendations identified in the report, along with the Drafting Group's considerations as outlined in the draft document. Concerning recommendation 9 on the extension of the mandate, the Chair of the Drafting Group clarified that the text was a first draft, which still needed to be reviewed. The Drafting Group had addressed only the extension to cross border threats to health other than from communicable diseases, and the extension to health monitoring and health information, as these were the areas most supported by the consulted stakeholders. She explained that the recommendation of the evaluation was to carry out an impact assessment on the extension. However, the Drafting Group considered that this was not feasible at this stage. Instead, the Drafting Group members recommended that the European Commission initiate a strategic forward-looking appraisal of the situation related to health monitoring and health information at the EU level. Concerning cross-border threats to health other than communicable diseases, this topic could be considered when evaluating the implementation of Decision 1082 given that ECDC already operates the upgraded EWRS for all threats.

13. The Management Board discussed the conclusions and recommendations presented by the Drafting Group. One of the MB members representing the European Commission recalled that there needed to be a link between the conclusions of the Management Board and the evaluation report, and this was what the Drafting Group had tried to do, i.e. to see what recommendations can be legitimately formulated based on the report. The first thing to acknowledge was that there were no negative conclusions on ECDC,

and the question was therefore where ECDC can do even better. He suggested exploring whether some concrete examples could be given, for instance in the areas of AMR or vaccination, or regarding the coherence of reporting obligations between ECDC and WHO. Concerning preparedness, he mentioned that the implementation of Decision 1082 will indeed be subject of an evaluation, which will also look at the link between Decision 1082 and the ECDC Founding Regulation. Concerning the sustainability of Joint Actions, he stressed that there were no additional financial resources that could be provided to ECDC for its involvement in these activities. This being said, there were also other funding possibilities which could be used better for specific topics, for instance through the research programme. The question how EU agencies could be better aware of and participate in different projects had been recently discussed in a meeting between DG SANTE and the Directors of the agencies under SANTE remit. He noted that reference to increased resources from the European Commission was made in different parts of the document. He stressed that the discussion on the new Multiannual Financial Framework was currently ongoing, and the tendency was rather to say that if new priorities arise, then something else will most likely need to be deprioritised. Lastly, for reasons of ECDC independence, he recommended extending the mandate of the Drafting Group to continue for the time of the written procedure.

14. One of the MB members representing the European Parliament said that, in general, the external evaluation was a good tool for identifying areas for improvement. The current report was overall very positive about the work of ECDC, and it had been a demanding task for the Drafting Group to analyse the text and, based on this, formulate recommendations for further improvements. It was difficult in this short time to say what else should be added. One MB member representing the Member States mentioned that he could endorse all the recommendations presented by the Drafting Group. He added that there were some recommendations in the final report that did not appear very relevant, and it seemed that the contractor had not fully understood some parts of ECDC's work. For future evaluations, it would be important to ensure that the contractor had the necessary subject matter expertise. Another MB member noted that, in one instance, the text made reference to funding available for research projects (last paragraph under recommendation 6) but it was not clear how such funding would be mobilised as ECDC was too far from the research area. Referring to recommendation 1 on strengthening the relevance of ECDC's work for the Member States, one MB member commented that ECDC had made a huge step forward in this area. She agreed with the recommendation on the need to identify existing gaps in the Member States, but added that it was not only a question of gaps, but also about different priorities and strategic orientations in different countries, and this was of course the responsibility of each Member State. With regards to the recommendations related to the collection and dissemination of data, several MB members mentioned that efforts were still needed to avoid duplication in reporting, in particular for the reporting on vaccine coverage. There seemed to be a correlation between recommendation 4 on data collection and recommendation 6 on coordination, and this could perhaps be better explained in the text.

15. Andrea Ammon thanked all the members of the MB External Evaluation Steering Committee (MEES) and the Drafting Group for their work during the external evaluation process. She was pleased that the value of ECDC's work was acknowledged. She added that several of the recommendations put forward by the Drafting Group addressed improvements that ECDC was already implementing or planning to implement. She confirmed that ECDC was involved in relevant Joint Actions, and usually already in the initial phase, but there could be cases where this had worked more or less successfully. Referring to the discussion on project funding, she mentioned that EU agencies wished to be more involved in the research planning; this had been discussed in a recent meeting between DG SANTE and the agencies under SANTE remit as already mentioned by the member from the European Commission. In conclusion, she said that there was a need to discuss how to proceed once the recommendations had been approved. She recalled that a Joint Action Plan (JAP) had been established following the second external evaluation.

16. The Chair concluded the discussion mentioning that an updated version of the document will be sent to the Management Board for approval via written procedure in January 2020. The Drafting Group will incorporate the comments received into the final document. The MEES/Drafting Group will also prepare a lessons learnt document to guide future evaluations.

The Management Board discussed the draft Conclusions and Recommendations of the ECDC Management Board External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group. An updated document will be circulated to the Management Board for approval via written procedure in January 2020.

Update on the process for developing an action plan to address the recommendations of the external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme

17. Karl Ekdahl, Head of Unit, Public Health Capacity and Communication, ECDC, recalled the main recommendations of the external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme, which were presented to the Management Board in June 2019. The recommendations addressed both operational and administrative issues. An initial meeting to discuss key issues such as the scope and format of the programme (paths and tracks), how to address inequalities between countries, and the question of academic accreditation will be arranged on 10 December. Representatives of the Advisory Forum, National Focal Points for Training (NFPTs), Training Site Forum (TSF), and the EPIET Alumni Network will participate in the meeting. An external consultant will facilitate the discussions based on a discussion paper prepared by ECDC. In parallel, ECDC has initiated an internal review of the administrative set-up of the Fellowship Programme. Following the discussions in the December meeting, a concrete proposal will be elaborated. A wider consultation with the network (NFPTs and TSF) will take place in March 2020. Based on the consultations, a Director's decision on the future of the programme is expected around mid-2020. The full implementation of the changes is foreseen earliest for cohort 2022.

18. In the discussion that followed, one MB member representing the Member States acknowledged that the academic accreditation is important for some, but added that there are advantages and disadvantages related to the accreditation. In particular, there are concerns that academic accreditation will make it difficult to maintain the current learning-by-doing approach of the programme. She further noted that there had been some dissatisfaction expressed over-time on the governance of the programme, and asked how this was going to be addressed. Lastly, she questioned the benefit of involving an external consultant in the discussions rather than relying on the engagement of partners.

19. Karl Ekdahl responded that the academic accreditation of the programme was a long-standing issue. He recognised that the Fellowship Programme is indeed a practical on-site training. There are however examples for instance from Germany of accreditation of similar programmes. Concerning the governance aspects, he noted that the proposal will include a process for handling complaints. He clarified that the reason for using an external consultant was to avoid the perception of bias; the consultant will only facilitate the discussions and will not be asked to contribute to the content discussions.

The Management Board took note of the update on the process for developing an action plan to address the recommendations of the external evaluation of the ECDC Fellowship Programme.

ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 – updated version, including roadmap for implementation (*Document MB47/04*)

20. Andrea Ammon, Director, ECDC, presented the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027. She mentioned that the comments provided during the last Management Board meeting in June had been addressed to the extent possible, and the text had been edited and further clarified. The first high level Roadmap had been developed based on the input received during the September Advisory Forum meeting, where the AF was asked to prioritise a number of proposed activities under Strategic Objectives 1-4 for 2021-2024 using the IRIS prioritisation tool. A workshop was then organised with ECDC managers on the Strategic Objectives 1-5 and taking into account the results of the AF prioritisation. The defined actions have been included in the SPD 2021-2023. The Roadmap will be further elaborated in 2020 to include any new actions arising from the third external evaluation and the priorities of the new Commission. Key performance indicators (KPI) will also be identified; the objective is to define indicators that capture the impact of ECDC's activities. A set of draft KPIs will be presented in March 2020. A more detailed Roadmap will be presented towards the end of 2020, at the same time as the more detailed Single Programming Document for 2021.

21. Following the presentation, a number of points were raised. One of the representatives of the European Commission suggested that it would perhaps make more sense to align the Strategy with the five-year political planning cycle of the Commission rather than the seven-year financial cycle. Another

question was how to ensure alignment with the priorities in Member States. Referring to the text regarding ECDC's work outside the EU, he stressed that the available resources were not yet determined and would also depend on the priorities of the new Commissioner. It was therefore advisable to use a more careful wording to avoid raising false expectations. One MB member representing the Member States stressed that ECDC's role was not to support single Member States as such but the focus should be on the EU added value. She also questioned the reference to "global" CDCs and suggested using another wording (e.g. regional). Another MB member felt that the Roadmap was somewhat difficult to read because the items were sometimes presented at different levels. One of the representatives of the European Parliament pointed out that the recommendations of the third external evaluation were not yet finalised, and recalled that during its last meeting in June 2019, the Management Board had agreed that the Strategy would be approved when all elements were available. She therefore suggested postponing the approval to the next meeting in March 2020. She further inquired how the execution of the Strategy was going to be monitored, and stressed the need to come closer to the citizens by finding ways to communicate clearly about the concrete results of the work carried out.

22. Andrea Ammon thanked the Management Board members for their input. She pointed out that the Strategy was kept on high level as agreed during previous discussions in the Management Board. Therefore, the recommendations arising from the external evaluation would rather be incorporated in the Roadmap or even in the annual work plans. Concerning the monitoring, she recalled that a mid-term evaluation of the implementation of the Strategy was foreseen in 2024. In response to the comment on the readability of the Roadmap, she suggested addressing this issue for the final roadmap to be presented in 2020. Lastly, she noted that there were diverging views on whether citizens were part of the Centre's target audience, and stressed that ECDC would need to get guidance from the Management Board on this aspect.

23. The Management Board discussed whether it was preferable to postpone the approval of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 to the next Management Board meeting in March 2020. Some members supported the suggestion to postpone the approval in order to provide the opportunity to take on board the results of the external evaluation, and to be consistent with agreements of previous MB meetings in terms of alignment of the two processes. Others felt that it was preferable to proceed with the approval of the Strategy as there did not seem to be any contradictions between the Strategy and the recommendations of the external evaluation.

24. The Chair suggested voting on the matter due to the divergent views expressed. The Management Board voted via show of hands; the majority voted in favour of postponing the approval of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 to the next Management Board meeting.

The Management Board agreed to postpone the approval of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 to the 48th meeting of the Management Board in March 2020 in order to await the conclusions and recommendation of the Management Board External Evaluation Recommendations Drafting Group.

Summary of discussions held at the 42nd Meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (13 November 2019), including its recommendations

25. Johan Carlson, Chair of the Audit Committee summarised the discussions from the 42nd Audit Committee (AC) meeting, which took place in the morning of 13 November 2019.

26. Concerning the regular update on audit activities, he noted that eight new observations had been received from the Internal Audit Service and the European Court of Auditors, three of which have been closed by ECDC. The AC had asked ECDC to report back in March 2020 on the implementation of the observation regarding differentiated appropriations.

a) Update on the ECDC Internal Control Framework (Document MB47/05)

27. Stefan Sundbom, Internal Control Coordinator, Executive Office, Director's Office, ECDC, recalled that the Management Board had approved the ECDC Internal Control Framework (ICF) in November 2018. Since then, ECDC has been developing a more detailed version of the ICF, including the specific indicators for the internal control principles and/or characteristics. An update on the progress of the work will be provided to the AC in March 2020. The new detailed version of the ICF will also be reviewed in Q2 2020, to assess the appropriateness of the selected indicators. It is proposed that the detailed ICF (specific indicators etc.) will be discussed in the AC in the future as part of the AC mandate, and that it will only be brought to the Management Board in case of changes proposed to the main text (principles and/or characteristics). He explained that the document was presented to the Management Board for guidance. In addition, the Board was invited to approve the deletion of characteristic 2.4 given that, in ECDC, the responsibility for the Annual Activity Report (and Risk Management and Internal Control) is directly under the Director. This also renders the Declaration of Assurance in appendix 2 obsolete and it is thereby proposed to be deleted.

28. Johan Carlson summarised the discussions in the AC mentioning that ECDC had explained that the role of Internal Control Coordinator is different in ECDC from the Commission, where this role lies with the Director of Resources. ECDC had further explained that the Internal Control Coordinator will still prepare the building blocks of assurance for the Director, as part of the Director's Declaration of Assurance for the Annual Activity Report. ECDC will also exchange experiences with other EU agencies with regards to the implementation of the ICF. Lastly, he concluded that the AC recommended the Management Board to endorse the proposed working practices, and to approve the deletion of characteristic 2.4.

The Management Board approved the proposed amendments in the ECDC Internal Control Framework (ICF), and agreed that the detailed ICF will in the future be discussed at the level of the Audit Committee.

b) Progress report – overview of 2019 Budget Implementation up until 4 November 2019

29. Anja Van Brabant, Accounting Officer and Head of Section, Finance and Accounting, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, presented an overview of the 2019 budget implementation since the last Management Board meeting. She noted that, by 6 November 2019, EUR 55.9 Million were committed from the 2019 budget of EUR 59.2 Million. EUR 0.9 Million are in the workflow to be committed, mostly in Title 3 (operational expenditure). In terms of executed payments, EUR 36.6 Million had been paid (62% compared to 65.2% in the same period 2018). A decrease was noted in Title 3 for both committed appropriations and executed payments as compared to the previous year.

30. Johan Carlson summarised the discussions in the AC mentioning that ECDC had explained that the budget implementation in Title 3 was lower than in the same period of the previous year. ECDC also explained that discussions have taken place and actions have been taken on the best way to implement the budget of 2019.

The Management Board took note of the Progress Report – Overview of 2019 Budget Implementation up until 4 November 2019.

c) Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2019 (Document MB47/06)

31. Anja Van Brabant presented the Second Supplementary and Amending Budget 2019, consisting of the budget transfers approved by the Director since the last Management Board meeting held in June 2019 and up until 14 October 2019. One budget transfer from multiple budget lines in Title II (Infrastructure and administrative expenditure) and III (Operational expenditure) to the salary lines in title I had been carried out between the titles, for a total amount of EUR 383.911. All budget transfers were approved by the Director within the limits of her powers (Article 27 point 1 of the Centre's Financial Regulation).

32. Johan Carlson informed the Board that the AC had taken note of the transfers made.

33. One MB member asked for a clarification on the connection between these transfers and the recent written procedure to the Management Board on changes in the Single Programming Document.

34. Andrea Ammon explained that this written procedure, as well as other similar written procedures in the past, did not concern transfers but changes to the Financing Decision (i.e. changes to the list of procurements) and the transfers made were the implementation of the approved changes.

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

d) Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2019 (Document MB47/07)

35. Philippe Harant, Planning and Monitoring Manager, Executive Office, Director's Office, ECDC, provided an update on the status of the implementation of the Work Programme 2019. He explained that 14.3% of the key outputs had been implemented, 73.5% were on schedule, 3.1% not started, 5.4% postponed, and 1.8% cancelled.

36. Johan Carlson informed the Management Board that the AC had taken note of the implementation of the work programme 2019.

37. One of the MB members representing the European Commission inquired about the forecast for the activities monitored as being on schedule (73.5%), i.e. whether it was expected that these would all be implemented by the end of the year. He also requested some further details on the cancelled and postponed activities.

38. Philippe Harant responded that the monitoring of activities also looks at the risks involved and, based on this, he was quite confident that the activities would be implemented as planned. Concerning the cancelled outputs, he noted that these include activities that the Management Board had agreed to cancel in March 2019 due to the high workload in AMR. He added that a more detailed breakdown of the cancelled and postponed activities could be shared with the Management Board after the meeting.

The Management Board took note of the Report on Implementation of the Work Programme 2019 up until present.

e) ECDC Single Programming Document 2020

i) ECDC Single Programming Document 2020 (Document MB47/08)

39. Andrea Ammon presented the ECDC Single Programming Document 2020. She noted that the final EU budget for 2020 had not yet been adopted, and it was not clear at this stage whether a possible reduction would be cascaded down to the agencies. In case of a reduction in the ECDC budget, it will be necessary to re-submit the SPD 2020 to the Management Board before Christmas. She mentioned that 2020 would be a year of preparation for the implementation of the new long-term strategy 2021-2027. In addition, the implementation of the recommendations of the external evaluation and the priorities of the new Commission will need to be considered. The areas of priority for 2020 are largely the same as for 2019 (AMR, VPD, support to the Commission in addressing the Sustainable Development Goals, support to the Commission and Member States in cross-border health threat preparedness). In addition, ECDC will focus on two cross-organisational programmes in the area of e-health and foresight respectively. Lastly, referring to the feedback received on the SPD 2020, she noted that 208 comments had been received from Member States and other key stakeholders, and 57 comments from the European Commission. All changes from the previous version of the document had been marked in yellow.

The Management Board approved the ECDC Single Programming Document 2020.

ii) Budget and Establishment Table 2020 (Document MB47/09)

40. Anja Van Brabant presented the Budget and Establishment Table 2020. She recalled that the Draft Budget 2020 had been approved through written procedure in January 2019 as part of the Single Programming Document 2020. The requested amount has been accepted, and the draft budget for 2020 amounts to EUR 60 million. This means an increase of EUR 1 million compared to 2019, while the Establishment Plan for staffing 2020 is the same as in 2019. She then presented the break-down of the budget per title as compared to 2019 noting that the biggest increase (3.9%) was in the operational area.

41. Johan Carlson summarised the discussions in the AC noting that ECDC had confirmed that the procurement plan (Financing Decision) would be attached to the SPD 2020 as usual, and had now been tabled for the Management Board. The AC recommended the Management Board to approve the Budget and Establishment Plan 2020 pending the final adoption of the EU budget 2020 by the Budgetary Authority.

The Management Board approved the Budget and Establishment Table 2020.

f) Phishing attacks targeting ECDC partners (Document MB47/10)

42. Andy Hjortenfeldt, ICT Security Officer, ICT-Quality, Information and Communication Technologies Unit, ECDC, informed the Management Board that there has been an increase of phishing attacks towards the EU over the last few years. Many of the attacks use personal information from Management Board members to look more genuine. There are several types of ongoing phishing attacks; however, three main types of attacks can be distinguished: 1) Outside in towards internal EU staff, 2) Outside pretending to be EU staff towards persons in other EU agencies, and 3) Outside pretending to be internal EU staff towards other internal EU staff. ECDC has experienced all three types of attacks in the last few years. The attack type 1 is relatively easy to prevent as it is often blocked by the ECDC firewall, or it is possible to configure filters to block for known patterns once the attack is detected. The blocking is also possible for attack type 3, while the attack type 2 is not possible to prevent as it is outside ECDC control.

43. ECDC has taken a number of actions to improve the defence against phishing attacks. These include security awareness messages to staff, phishing test with CERT-EU to identify and improve weaknesses, email warnings to staff when phishing attacks are ongoing, blocking of both well-known phishing types and when new attacks happen, and security improvements by removing and simplifying text (with names, emails and telephone numbers) on the ECDC public sites. He stressed that there is no silver button to avoid phishing altogether, but the best defences are security awareness and due diligence by all users. He recommended the Management Board to take extra care about what information they share as they are often targeted.

The Management Board took note of the update on phishing attacks targeting ECDC partners.

Reporting Officers for the Director's appraisal (closed session)

44. The Chair informed the Management Board that there was a need to appoint a new reporting officer for the appraisal of the ECDC Director to replace Johan Carlson, MB Member, Sweden. The Management Board unanimously appointed Lieven De Raedt, MB Member, Belgium, to fill this function.

The Management Board appointed Lieven de Raedt, MB Member, Belgium, as reporting Officer for the Director's appraisal replacing Johan Carlson, MB Member, Sweden.

ECDC Single Programming Document 2021-2023 (Document MB47/11)

45. Andrea Ammon presented the Single Programming Document 2021. She mentioned that the current draft followed the orientation document presented to the Management Board in June 2019. The structure of the SPD was aligned with the strategic objectives of the Strategy 2021-2027. The proposed budget (EUR 60.5 Million) is conditional upon the approval of the Budget Authority, and the result of the Multi-Annual Financial Framework (MFF) 2021-2027. The particular areas of priority for 2021 will remain the same as in 2020. At the same time, 2021 will be a year of gradual transition into the Strategy; in parallel with delivering on core missions set in the Founding Regulation and continuing the projects launched in previous years, ECDC will start setting the first milestones to implement the Strategy. As in previous years, the document including the detailed resource allocation (budget and FTEs per activities) will be circulated to the Management Board for approval via written procedure in January 2020, and thereafter sent to the European Commission, Council, and Parliament by 31 January 2020.

46. In the discussion that followed few points were raised. The European Commission stressed that the Commission priorities for the next five years had to be taken into account. The document would also

need to be more precise in the activities described; as an example, in the section on VPD it would be useful to include a narrative on the activity and the expected outputs. One MB member representing the Member States inquired about the activities in the area of international health security, and how the sustainability of this work was going to be ensured. Several members felt that it was difficult to comment on the document at this stage as it was written on a rather high level and did not provide so much concrete information about the work to be carried out.

47. Andrea Ammon responded that the SPD 2021 had indeed a new format, which required some adaptation also internally. The SPD document had been kept on a higher level this time also because it appeared that it was not helpful to go too much into details. She suggested circulating the document to the Management Board for written comments with deadline beginning of December. In January 2020, the Management Board will then receive an updated version including annexes and indicators. She proposed that a follow-up discussion on the SPD 2021 could be scheduled in March 2020 if the Management Board wished to have another opportunity to discuss the matter.

48. The Chair summarised the discussions noting that the document will be sent to the Management Board for written consultation providing three weeks' time to comment. She suggested including a short discussion on the SPD 2021 on the agenda of the next Management Board meeting in March 2020.

The Management Board discussed the ECDC Single Programming Document 2021. The final draft SPD 2021 will be sent to the Management Board for approval via written procedure in January 2020.

Location of future Management Board meetings (*Document MB47/12*)

49. Maarit Kokki, Head of Executive Office, Director's Office, ECDC, recalled that during the last Management Board meeting (18-19 June 2019), it had been suggested that ECDC should examine whether one of the three yearly Management Board meetings could be organised outside Sweden as a way of increasing the visibility of ECDC in the Member States. She explained that in the early days of ECDC one of the three annual meetings took place in a Member State by invitation of the respective public health authorities. In 2011, it was agreed that the Management Board would meet abroad once in every two years. In 2013, the Management Board agreed to convene all meetings in Sweden due to the increased financial burden for ECDC and the Member States, as well as the logistical challenges associated with organising the meetings abroad. She noted that, according to the calculations made ahead of this meeting, the mission costs for ECDC staff involved in MB meetings would amount to 25 500 EUR and the costs related to interpretation and IT equipment to 12 000 EUR. The total amount (37 000 EUR) equals one extra MB meeting to be budgeted. She invited the Management Board members to provide their views on what the added value would be for the Member States to host the MB meeting, and how the meetings should be arranged in practical terms (frequency of meetings, mechanism to establish a list of future meetings). Another issue to reflect on was the possible financial model for organising MB meetings in the Member States: ECDC covering all costs, or a shared model whereby the Member State for instance provides the venue.

50. In the discussion that followed some divergent opinions were expressed. Some members questioned the added value of arranging MB meetings outside Sweden, and argued that increasing the cost would send the wrong message. Others felt that the option of arranging MB meetings abroad once a year or once every two years should not be ruled out altogether, and a Member State willing to host a meeting should have the possibility to do so, for instance as part of their Council Presidency programme. Even if convening MB meetings outside Sweden would not significantly increase the visibility of the Centre in the Member States, it could contribute to raising awareness about the national situation, as well as about work being done in the EU, which was important in this era of rising Euroscepticism.

51. The Chair summarised the discussion pointing out that some advantages and disadvantages of arranging MB meetings outside Sweden had been expressed. In any case, the Board members agreed that hosting an MB meeting should be voluntary, and it should not cause extra costs for ECDC. There was a need for a more thorough analysis of the costs. The Chair requested ECDC to look into this matter, and to provide an updated document to be discussed in March or June 2020.

The Management Board discussed the future location of Management Board meetings.

Update from ECDC on the main activities since the last meeting of the Management Board (18-19 June 2019) (Document MB47/13)

52. Andrea Ammon, ECDC Director, provided the Management Board with an update on the main activities since the last Management Board meeting. The presentation referred to past and upcoming visits and meetings of the ECDC Director. She highlighted in particular the country visits carried out in Georgia, Hungary, and Israel. She also informed the Board about the discussions in the last Advisory Forum meeting, and explained that the first half day had been spent on the roadmap for implementing the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027. The AF prioritised activities for the first three years (2021-2023) using the IRIS prioritisation tool. She also informed the Board about recent Rapid Risk Assessments.

53. Lastly, as agreed during the previous day, the Director provided some further details on the European Vaccination Information Sharing (EVIS) system. She noted that the Council Recommendation does not define the target audience for the vaccination portal. In order to get input on this aspect, ECDC commissioned the consortium of Technopolis Group and Schuttelaar & Partners to conduct a scoping study and develop a content strategy for the EVIS. As part of the study, a number of stakeholders were consulted. All these stakeholders defined the target audience as healthcare professionals and those parts of the general public who had concerns with regards to vaccination. The need for providing additional information to supporters of vaccinations was also mentioned by the majority of interviewees.

54. The Management Board members discussed the importance of involving Member States in the development of the portal to ensure coherence with information provided at national level. One of the representatives of the European Commission mentioned that one possibility was to set up an editorial board with Member State representation, similar to what has been done for other EU portals. He agreed that the linkage between national/regional level and the EU level, and the coherence with national materials were indeed essential for the success of the portal. He suggested continuing the discussions on the governance of the portal in the Health Security Committee. One MB Member representing the Member States stressed that the portal should first and foremost target healthcare professionals as communication to the general public was for the national level to handle.

55. Andrea Ammon stressed that the prototype of the portal was expected to be ready by the end of 2019. If there was no agreement on who the target audience was, then this needed to be urgently agreed upon. She supported the suggestion to set up an editorial board, and invited the MB members to reflect on who from their country should be involved in the work.

56. With reference to the Rapid Risk Assessment on zika virus disease in Var department in France, one MB member asked how ECDC had come to the conclusion that no measures were suggested. She added that using Member States experts in the RRAs was delicate, and the risk of conflict of interest needed to be taken into account.

57. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, responded that there was no evidence of extended spread. Taking into account the season, and based on the input from the consulted experts, ECDC's conclusion was that the risk for transmission was very low.

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

Update on Next Generation ECDC

58. Andrea Ammon gave an update on the Next Generation ECDC initiative focusing on the ongoing reorganisation. She noted that the structure had not changed since her presentation during the last Management Board, but only a few names of sections had changed. She added that the new structure and rationale would be communicated to the Management Board and other ECDC stakeholders in the next few weeks. The mapping of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 towards the organisation will be done once the Strategy has been approved. An implementation plan for the new structure has been developed to ensure a smooth transition, and to align processes and systems with the new structure. Support is also being

provided to old and new managers. She mentioned that staff had been continuously informed about the reorganisation through staff meetings, Town Hall sessions, news items, and the dedicated Next Generation intranet page. In addition, "pulse checks" have been carried out on several occasions during the year, and two additional checks will be performed at the beginning and end of 2020 to see how the new structure is accepted by staff. An extraordinary staff meeting will take place in December to present the results of the staff survey. In conclusion, she stressed that the structure should facilitate the implementation of the Strategy, and adjustments will be made if necessary.

59. Responding to a question on how staff perceives the upcoming change, she said that the pulse checks showed that staff were overall feeling informed about the reorganisation, and want to contribute to make it a success. She added that there was a dedicated email box where staff can ask questions regarding the new structure. She had also personally spoken to about 30 managers during the process; this was important in order to address any issues or concerns.

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

Annual address of the ECDC Staff Committee to the Management Board

60. Lars Söderblom, Member of the Staff Committee, ECDC, thanked the Management Board for the opportunity to present the work of the ECDC Staff Committee in its first annual address to the MB. He briefly described the history and legal mandate of the Staff Committee, noting that the current Staff Committee consists of six elected members whose mandate cover the period 2019-2022. The Staff Committee represents the interests of staff in organisational processes (consultations on implementing rules, recruitment panels, joint committees, reorganisation), and channels the expression of opinion by the staff through staff meetings and monthly meetings with the Director and the Head of the Resource Management and Coordination Unit (RMC). The Staff Committee also proposes improvements of staff working conditions, and participates in the management of social welfare bodies. In its work, the Staff Committee applies a rotating weekly chairmanship, and strives to achieve consensus. For 2020, the Staff Committee has chosen to focus on health and wellbeing. The expected deliverables of this work are key measurements and indicators to assess staff health, wellbeing, and stress levels, as well as recommendations on how the indicators can be gathered, and how they can be used to inform decision making, for consideration by the Director.

61. Following the presentation, a few questions were raised. Concerning the indicators on staff well-being one of the members representing the European Commission asked whether the Staff Committee was cooperating with staff committees of other EU agencies noting that collecting indicators and interpreting them might be challenging if there was nothing to compare with. Another MB member noted that some of the SC members seemed to be working at ECDC already for some time, and asked how the SC ensures that also the more silent voices as well as new staff members are heard.

62. Lars Söderblom agreed that benchmarking with other agencies was important, and the intention was to invite all the staff committees of other EU agencies to exchange on the matter. Responding to the second question, he mentioned that the engagement from all staff was of course important. As an example, for the Next Generation initiative, the Staff Committee has suggested to bring in lower level staff in order to receive input from all categories of staff.

63. The Chair thanked the ECDC Staff Committee for the presentation. She noted that the Internal Audit Service had chosen HR management as its next audit topic, and there seemed to be some interlinkage between these different levels of work. She wished the Staff Committee members all the best for their future work. Lastly, she clarified that the Staff Committee had requested to be present during the discussion on the recommendations of the third external evaluation and she had refused this request. The reason for this was that it was the first time that the Management Board discussed this topic.

The Management Board took note of the annual address of the ECDC Staff Committee to the Management Board.

Implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy

64. Andrea Iber, Head of Section, Legal Services and Procurement, Resource Management and Coordination Unit, ECDC, provided a brief update on the implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy. She mentioned that 89% of the Annual Declarations of Interest (ADoI) had been collected from MB Members and Alternates, and 81% from AF Members and Alternates. This was significantly lower than in the same period of the previous year (96% for MB and 89% for AF in November 2018). She urged the Management Board members to bring back the message to their colleagues with the aim of reaching 100% compliance in 2020. She clarified that members/alternates who have not submitted their ADoIs are excluded from participating in Management Board meetings. In practice, this can however be solved on the spot by filling in the necessary form before the meeting starts. Another option, which has not been used to date, is to remove access to documents for members who have not filled in their ADoI.

65. A few relevant interests had been identified in 2019 (three for MB and four for AF respectively), but no mitigation measures had been necessary. For expert meetings, 640 Declarations of Interest had been collected since the beginning of 2019 (two DoIs missing). Mitigation measures were applied in 21 cases; these included screening of the input of experts by an ECDC independent staff member for potential bias, restricting participants from being chair or vice chair for the group, and declaring interests prior to presentation. For Rapid Risk Assessments, the compliance rate was 100%. Planned compliance activities in 2020 include further development of the eDOI tool (new features and more user-friendly approach), integration of eDOI to the new meeting tool, and information meetings with staff members responsible for interests review to provide training and practical guidance on how to deal with potential conflicting interests.

66. Referring to the four AF members with relevant interests declared, one of the members representing the European Commission noted that it might be worth looking into this matter in more detail, as it was reasonable to think that other AF members and alternates also had employers receiving research funding from national and/or international foundations. One MB member representing the Member States asked what was meant by an ECDC independent staff member, noting that there could be a bias as well.

67. Responding to the comment on research funding, Andrea Iber noted that ECDC obviously had to rely on the information that members insert in the system. Spot checks against CVs are carried out, but some information can be missing of course. Concerning the screening done by ECDC staff, she clarified that a group of ECDC staff members with no declared interest are asked to do the screening.

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

Update on the planning of the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM)

68. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, updated the Management Board on the planning of the third Joint Strategy Meeting. He mentioned that the Programme Committee had held three audio meetings so far. Based on the discussions in the last meeting, a draft programme had been drawn up and was now presented to the Management Board. According to this proposal, the main part of the meeting will be based around working group discussions on four different topics: 1) Future perspectives on Infectious Disease in Europe, 2) Addressing the silent 'P' in ECDC, 3) How can ECDC get closer to Member States, and 4) ECDC work beyond EU-borders and EU health security – what path to take? A summary of the recommendations arising from the third external evaluation and of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 will be provided at the start of the meeting to set the scene for the working group discussions.

69. Following the presentation, a few points were raised. With reference to the recommendations of the third external evaluation, the Chair of the MB External Evaluation Drafting Group suggested that the JSM could provide the opportunity to start discussing the role of ECDC in preparedness, as well as in Joint Actions. One of the MB members representing the European Commission raised some concern regarding the suggestion to discuss the ECDC Strategy and the recommendations of the external evaluation in the JSM while these were to be agreed upon within the Management Board. He further noted that discussing about the work beyond EU could raise false expectations.

70. Mike Catchpole thanked the Chair of the Drafting Group for her input and suggested to discuss the issue further on. In response to the comment from the European Commission, he clarified that the purpose was to discuss the roadmap for implementing the ECDC Strategy, and not to revise the Strategy as such. Likewise, it was not suggested to revise any of the recommendations arising from the external evaluation, but to look at the implementation. As mentioned during previous Management Board meetings, it is clear that the JSM as such does not have any decision-making role.

The Management Board took note of the update on the Third ECDC Joint Strategy Meeting.

Update from the European Commission

71. John F Ryan, MB Member, DG SANTE, briefed the Management Board about recent activities in the area of communicable diseases. He mentioned that the new Commission was in the process of being nominated and it is anticipated that it will enter into function at the beginning of December. The mission letter addressed by the President of the Commission to Ms Stella Kyriakides, the Commissioner for Health focuses on affordable medicines, medical devices, e-health, prioritising vaccination, and a global agreement on AMR. He added that the Multiannual Financial Framework is currently being discussed with the Council and the European Parliament. The Health Programme will be incorporated as a separate chapter in the European Social Fund+. The Horizon Europe research programme, which follows up on the Horizon 2020 programme, will include a health part co-managed by DG SANTE and RTD. Lastly, he informed the Management Board on some of the main topics to be discussed at the next Health Security Committee on 11 December: vaccination roadmap, action plan on AMR, access to medical products, Ebola, and hepatitis.

72. The Chair thanked the Commission for the update, and added that the Management Board will receive a written report from DG SANTE following the meeting.

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

Update from the European Parliament

73. Marilena Koppa, MB Member, European Parliament, gave a short update mentioning that the hearing of the Health Commissioner-designate Stella Kyriakides had taken place at the beginning of October. She also referred to the hearing of the ECDC Director in the European Parliament earlier in November as part of the introduction of all agencies under the ENVI Committee, where the Director had provided a comprehensive presentation on the ECDC work. She added that the new contact MEP for ECDC had shown willingness to work closely with the Centre.

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

Update from the Finnish Presidency of the Council of the EU

74. Taneli Puumalainen, MB Alternate, Finland, briefed the Management Board about the Finnish EU Presidency (1 July-31 December 2019). He mentioned that the three main priorities in the area of health were Economy of Wellbeing, Gender Equal Economies, and Silver Economy, focusing on healthy ageing. A number of high-level events had been organised around these topics. He also highlighted the European One Health Security Conference, which had taken place on 14-15 October 2019. The Finnish Presidency also focused on EU in Global Health.

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

Update from the Croatian Presidency of the Council of the EU

75. Bernard Kaič, MB Member, Croatia, gave a presentation on the Croatian EU Presidency, which will start on 1 January 2020. During its Presidency, Croatia will take forward the priority areas defined in the trio programme drawn up by Romania, Finland, and Croatia. The focus will be on life-long health care and

organ donation and transplantation. A high-level conference on organ donation and transplantation will take place in March 2020, with the aim of adopting Council Conclusions that will urge national health authorities to further commit to the enhancement of organ donation and transplantation programmes through a more synchronised and common approach at the EU level.

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

Any other business

76. The MB member from the Netherlands explained that her country was experiencing issues relating to the authorisation of the product currently used for mosquito control. She had now received information that the matter was moving forward, but the manufacturer still needed to provide additional information in order to complete the authorisation process. She invited the MB members to look at the document and to contact her in case they were experiencing similar issues, and she could then connect the relevant experts together.

77. One of the MB members representing the European Commission added that if any other Member State had similar concerns, they could also contact DG SANTE as SANTE is dealing with biocides.

78. 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 26-27 March 2020.

Annex: List of Participants

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Austria	Bernhard Benka	Member
Belgium	Lieven De Raedt	Member
Bulgaria	Angel Kunchev	Member
Croatia	Bernard Kaić	Member
Cyprus	Maroussa Konnari Jeronymides	Alternate
Czech Republic	Jozef Dlhý	Alternate
Denmark	Bolette Søborg	Alternate
Estonia	Heli Laarmann	Member
Finland	Anni Virolainen-Julkunen (<i>Chair</i>)	Member
Finland	Taneli Puumalainen	Alternate
France	Anne-Catherine Viso	Alternate
Germany	Gesa Lücking	Alternate
Hungary	Ágnes Dánielisz	Member
Italy	Francesco Maraglino	Alternate
Latvia	Jana Feldmane	Member
Lithuania	Audrius Ščeponavičius	Member
Luxembourg	Pierre Weicherding	Alternate
Malta	Patricia Vella Bonanno	Member
Netherlands	Ciska Scheidel	Member
Poland	Michał Ilnicki	Alternate
Spain	Manuel Cuenca Estrella	Alternate
Sweden	Johan Carlson	Member
United Kingdom	Emma Reed	Member

European Parliament		
	Zofija Mazej Kukovič	Member
	Maria Eleni Koppa	Member
European Commission		
DG SANTE	Martin Seychell	Member
DG SANTE	John F. Ryan	Member
EEA Countries		
Norway	Karl-Olaf Wathne	Member