



ECDC Management Board

Minutes of the Fifty-fourth Meeting

Stockholm, 23 March 2022

Adopted by the ECDC Management Board at its Fifty-fifth meeting, 29-30 June 2022

Contents

Opening and welcome from the Chair (and noting the Representatives).....	3
Welcome from the Director, ECDC.....	3
Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (<i>Document MB54/01 Rev. 2</i>).....	3
Adoption of the draft minutes of the 53 rd meeting of the Management Board (videoconference, 24 November 2021) (<i>Document MB54/02</i>).....	3
Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2021 (<i>Document MB54/03</i>).....	3
Closed session on the extension/selection of the ECDC Director	4
ECDC Policy on Scientific Integrity and Independence (<i>Document MB54/04</i>)	4
Proposal for the future hosting arrangements for ESCAIDE (<i>Document MB54/05</i>).....	5
Update on the implementation of the action plan to address the recommendations from the third external evaluation and the strategic and performance analysis of the ECDC response to COVID-19 (<i>Document MB54/06</i>).....	6
Update from the Director including on COVID-19 related activities	7
Summary of discussions held at the 48 th meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (Stockholm, 23 March 2022), including its recommendations	8
Follow-up from the Third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM).....	10
Update from the French Presidency of the Council of the EU.....	11
Update from the European Commission.....	11
Any other business.....	11
Annex: List of Participants	13

Summary of Proceedings – ECDC Management Board Meeting

The Fifty-fourth meeting of the ECDC Management Board convened on 23 March 2022 as a hybrid meeting. During the meeting the Management Board:

- ❖ adopted the programme of the meeting;
- ❖ adopted the minutes of the Fifty-third meeting of the Management Board;
- ❖ approved the ECDC Policy for Scientific Integrity and Independence;
- ❖ approved the proposal for the future hosting of ESCAIDE;
- ❖ approved the Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2021;
- ❖ approved the Provisional Annual Accounts 2021, including the Report on Budgetary and Financial Management;
- ❖ endorsed the Final 2022 IAS Audit Plan for ECDC;
- ❖ appointed Mr Daniel Shine as Chair of the ECDC Audit Committee;
- ❖ appointed Dr Karin Tegmark Wisell as Member of the ECDC Audit Committee;
- ❖ discussed the follow-up from the Third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM);
- ❖ took note of the update on the implementation of the action plan to address recommendations from the third external evaluation and the strategic and performance analysis of the ECDC response to COVID-19;
- ❖ took note of the update from the ECDC Director on activities related to COVID-19;
- ❖ took note of the summary of discussions held at the 48th meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee;
- ❖ took note of the Progress report – Overview of 2022 budget implementation;
- ❖ took note of the Fifth Supplementary and Amending Budget 2021;
- ❖ took note of the Progress Report on the Implementation of the Work Programme 2022;
- ❖ took note of the update on the implementation of the ECDC Independence Policy;
- ❖ took note of the update on the French Presidency of the Council of the EU;
- ❖ took note of the update from the European Commission.

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 Fifty-fourth meeting of the Management Board (MB). The meeting convened as a hybrid meeting with roughly half of the MB members participating in person and half attending remotely via Webex. A special welcome was extended to Stine Ulendorf Jacobsen, newly appointed Alternate, Denmark, and Amalia Serban, newly appointed member, Romania. The Chair informed the MB members that Dr Karin Tegmark Wisell, Director General of the Public Health Agency of Sweden, would participate in the meeting as an observer.
2. Apologies had been received from Barbara Kerstiens, DG RTD, European Commission.

Welcome from the Director, ECDC

3. Andrea Ammon, Director, ECDC, warmly welcomed the MB members and noted that she was happy that it had been possible to arrange at least a hybrid meeting this time. She hoped to be able to meet all MB members in person over the course of the year.

Adoption of the draft programme (and noting the declarations of interest and proxy voting, if any) (*Document MB54/01 Rev. 2*)

4. The MB Observer representing Norway requested to include an item under "Any other business" regarding the situation in Ukraine and its impact on the vaccine supply.
5. The Draft Programme was adopted with the above-mentioned amendment. 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 53rd meeting of the Management Board (videoconference, 24 November 2021) (*Document MB54/02*)

6. The Chair noted that the draft minutes of the 53rd meeting had been circulated to the MB ahead of the meeting. The European Commission had requested an amendment in point 26 of the minutes (correction of the full name of HERA). This change had been taken into account in the version shared with the MB. There were no further comments on the minutes.

The Management Board adopted the minutes of the Fifty-third meeting of the Management Board.

Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2021 (*Document MB54/03*)

7. Andrea Ammon, Director, ECDC, presented the Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR) 2021. She clarified that her presentation would concentrate on the policy part while the Audit Committee (AC) had discussed the internal control part of the report during their meeting the same morning, and this would be covered in the summary from the AC scheduled in the afternoon.
8. The Director noted that in 2021, for the second year in a row, ECDC continued working in a Public Health Emergency (PHE) mode due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Under these circumstances, 74% of the outputs planned in the Single Programming Document (SPD) were delivered. 32% of ECDC staff were directly engaged in the first-line response to the pandemic. Over 600 unplanned requests were addressed in response to the pandemic. ECDC was also tasked with laboratory capacity building activities under the EU Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Authority (HERA) Incubator. More than EUR 77 Million

were awarded to 24 EU/EEA countries to strengthen their whole genome sequencing and RT-PCR infrastructures. In 2021, ECDC reached its highest count of staff members (351) and budget (EUR 168.1 Million) in its history. Concerning budget execution, she noted that the commitment rate was the second highest ever (99.4%), while there was a decrease in the payment rate (64.1% compared to 75.3% in 2020); this was largely due to the HERA grants, where the final payments would be made only in September 2022. She then presented an overview of the main outputs in 2021 related to COVID-19 response. Lastly, she showed the proposed text for the MB analysis and assessment of the CAAR noting that this part would be further touched upon during the reporting back from the AC.

9. The Chair opened the floor for any comments on the content of the report. One of the MB members representing the European Commission thanked the ECDC for all the work done and congratulated the Centre in particular for the good results related to *Eurosurveillance*. He noted some delays in procurement and added that some of the performance indicators seemed not to have been achieved, e.g., related to the IRIS process and staff engagement survey. Several MB members thanked the ECDC staff for their valuable work on COVID-19 and recognised ECDC's efforts to be more proactive in its guidance and advice. One MB member thanked the ECDC specifically for the help in reviewing the COVID-19 testing policy in his country; this support had been very valuable even if provided fully virtually. Another MB member underlined the importance of the Advisory Forum (AF) for the validation of scientific documents. There were also questions on the follow-up to the HERA Incubator actions and on the total budget finally allocated to the Member States for the HERA Incubator grants. One MB member suggested adding a sentence on the outcomes of the Third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) to the MB analysis and assessment of the CAAR. It was agreed that ECDC would present a proposed wording for this sentence/paragraph during the reporting back from the AC.

10. The Director thanked the MB members for their positive feedback on the work carried out in 2021. With regards to the staff engagement survey, she mentioned that she had herself set the target of 75% for the overall staff engagement as she felt this was a level that should be aimed at, but the current score of 61% was still a significant increase from the 2019 figure of 51%. The staff engagement survey looked at several dimensions and she was happy to see that the score for leadership had improved by 16%. Based on the survey results, several actions will be implemented at ECDC and Unit level. Concerning the delayed procurements, she stressed that the HERA grants had taken up most of the procurement resources during more than two months' time and recalled that the extraordinary MB meeting held in May 2021 had been devoted to discussing the impact of the HERA Incubator activities on the 2021 work programme. In response to the question on the budget allocated for the HERA grants, she explained that out of the EUR 106 Million received in May 2021, EUR 77 Million had been used by Member States and EUR 20 Million had been returned to the European Commission. Regarding key performance indicators (KPIs), she clarified that ECDC will present updated KPIs to the MB in November as these will need to be adjusted to the new mandate. She confirmed that the importance of the AF had become very clear during 2021. Following some concerns among AF members on how their advice was taken into consideration in ECDC outputs, a specific session had been organised at the beginning of 2022 to discuss how the process for AF consultation could be further improved.

Closed session on the extension/selection of the ECDC Director

11. This item was conducted in a closed session (Members of the MB only).

ECDC Policy on Scientific Integrity and Independence (*Document MB54/04*)

12. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, presented the ECDC Policy on Scientific Integrity and Independence noting that scientific independence, and the perception thereof, was fundamental to ECDC's mission as defined in its Founding Regulation. The aim of the policy is to provide greater clarity for ECDC staff with regards to their rights and responsibilities when it comes to scientific integrity, in particular while collaborating with external partners. The policy is intended to make clear ECDC's position on, and the measures that it takes to ensure, the integrity and independence of its scientific activities.

13. Following the presentation, a few points were raised. One MB member noted that this was indeed a very important matter and commented that there had been a discussion in the AF in September on the

external political pressure experienced by many public health experts during the pandemic. Referring to the Chief Scientist's Annual report on the work of the AF in 2021, the deputy Chair and MB member representing the European Parliament commented that there had been divergent opinions in the AF on some topics, such as the testing policy for COVID-19, the use of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), COVID-19 vaccine booster doses, etc., and asked how ECDC was acting in such situations. Another MB member asked whether there was any specific reason why the document was presented at this point in time. He also asked where ECDC would draw the line when it comes to cooperation with for instance pharmaceutical industry. One of the members representing the European Commission agreed that the perception of scientific independence was very important and requested to receive a regular report from the Chief Scientist in case any issues arose. He asked how the scientific independence was going to be evaluated in practical terms and whether the policy was a stand-alone document, or some parts would be defined in more detail.

14. Mike Catchpole thanked the MB members for their feedback and noted that the policy had not generated any specific comments from the AF, which he interpreted as broad support from the AF on the main principles. He agreed that the pressure from political lobbying had increased during the crisis and was something that would continue. With regards to situations where AF members had divergent opinions on specific issues, he mentioned that ECDC would try to understand the rationale behind the differences and where possible find a compromise. In some situations, the divergence of opinion could be explained by differences in the epidemiological situation or infrastructure context, which might need to be considered in any guidance or advice. ECDC could of course also decide not to take on board a specific standpoint depending on the situation. Concerning the timing of the policy document, he said that with the new mandate, ECDC's recommendations will have a bigger weight; it is thereby even more important that the advice is based on a solid ground.

15. With regards to collaboration with industry, he recalled that the question of ECDC's engagement in public-private partnerships (e.g., IMI) had been previously brought to the MB for discussion. There were certainly shades of grey in this context and, ultimately, the decision how to act in a specific situation was left to the discretion of the Director, the Chief Scientist, or the MB. Concerning the practical implementation of the policy, he clarified that the document referred to the independence policy for staff and non-staff respectively and there were examples of situations where experts had been invited to provide information but not to be part of the discussions on a specific topic due to a conflict of interest. He also mentioned that, according to ECDC's procedures, it was mandatory to consult the AF on the composition of ad-hoc expert panels being set up on specific topics.

The Management Board approved the ECDC Policy on Scientific Integrity and Independence.

Proposal for the future hosting arrangements for ESCAIDE (Document MB54/05)

16. Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, recalled that in 2016 the MB had endorsed a proposal to reintroduce the rotation of ESCAIDE conferences between Stockholm and venues in other EU countries on an alternating basis (i.e., hosting the conference in Stockholm every two years). Since 2016, ESCAIDE was hosted once as an in-person event outside Stockholm (in Malta, 2018), but plans to hold the conference in Poland in 2020 could not be carried out due to COVID-19. Consequently, ESCAIDE was held as a fully virtual event in both 2020 and 2021.

17. The experience gained since 2016 shows that the rotation of the physical venue appears to have a small impact on the participation mix and number, while the on-line format of the event led to a significant increase in participants and greater equity in the geographical representation. ESCAIDE also continued to receive high scores for the scientific quality and professional relevance when held as a fully virtual event in 2020 and 2021. Participant feedback, as well as the conclusions from the recent external evaluation of ESCAIDE, however strongly call for ESCAIDE continuing as a physical event with additional on-line participation available (hybrid event). It is also likely that the objectives of the ESCAIDE conference in terms of fostering scientific debate and professional networking and providing opportunities for professional development are better met through in-person events.

18. Based on these conclusions, it is suggested that ESCAIDE be delivered as a hybrid event, with in-person and on-line participation available. It is also proposed to continue with the rotation of the conference between Stockholm and EU venues outside Sweden on alternate years. This might increase participation by experts from the hosting and neighbouring countries and would provide an opportunity to give greater visibility to the conference and to ECDC in the hosting countries. It could also provide opportunities for the organisation of associated national conferences or seminars. The total cost of a hybrid event is likely to be higher, but this will depend on the in-person participation and registration fee value.

19. The floor was opened for discussion. Overall, the MB members supported the suggestion of arranging ESCAIDE as a hybrid event as it allowed for more flexibility and had a positive impact on the participation and geographical representation. For the future, hybrid events and in particular the engagement of virtual participants should however be evaluated. It would also be useful to have a more exact estimate of the cost of a hybrid conference. A majority of the MB members also supported the suggestion to rotate the ESCAIDE conference between Stockholm and another Member State venue every other year. The European Commission expressed its preference for option 1 in the document, i.e., having Stockholm as a fixed venue for ESCAIDE as this would increase the visibility of ECDC. One MB member representing a Member State agreed with this opinion but added that there were some advantages and disadvantages with each option.

20. Following some discussion, the MB approved the ECDC proposal as outlined in points 10 and 11 of the document, i.e., to arrange the ESCAIDE conference as a hybrid event and to continue with the previous MB decision of rotating the event between Stockholm and other EU venues in alternate years.

The Management Board approved the proposal for the future hosting arrangements for ESCAIDE.

Update on the implementation of the action plan to address the recommendations from the third external evaluation and the strategic and performance analysis of the ECDC response to COVID-19 (Document MB54/06)

21. Andrea Ammon, Director, ECDC, gave an update on the progress made in addressing the recommendations of the third external evaluation on one hand, and the strategic and performance analysis of ECDC's response to the COVID-19 pandemic (McKinsey report) on the other hand. She briefly explained the actions taken so far to respond to the recommendations of the third external evaluation while noting that some of the actions were linked to the implementation of the new ECDC mandate and would therefore be continued in the following years. She mentioned that most of the recommendations from the McKinsey report had been implemented and the final Public Health Emergency (PHE) plan was expected to be approved the following month.

22. Following the presentation, a few points were raised. With reference to the activities related to targeted country support, the Chair noted that it would be useful for the MB to better understand how this area of work was now organised and requested a presentation of this topic at the next MB meeting in June. She also asked for further information on the ways in which ECDC would create stronger links with research, and on the role of the research coordinator post that had been re-established in 2020. One MB member recalled that the third external evaluation had also touched upon the possible extension of the ECDC mandate towards some aspects of non-communicable diseases (NCD) and asked the European Commission how this issue was going to be addressed in the long term. She stressed that the European Parliament had put forward at least two points based on the lessons learnt from the COVID-19 pandemic: mental health and long COVID, and it would be important to address these points by involving the right experts. In response to this comment, one of the MB members representing the European Commission said that the new ECDC mandate was being tailored to support linkages with health determinants. He thanked ECDC for the thorough follow up of the recommendations of the external evaluation and for the work done to support those Member States with a lower COVID-19 vaccination coverage. Another important area of work was surveillance and understanding the root causes for gaps in data reporting.

23. In response to the question on ECDC's links to research, Mike Catchpole, Chief Scientist, ECDC, explained that the research coordinator was in continuous dialogue with DG RTD and was participating for

instance in research meetings on COVID-19. Another task was to keep an overview of all ECDC staff involved in Joint Actions and other research activities. This was a new post, but the ambition was to look at the whole approach of engaging in research activities.

24. The Director agreed that the question of NCDs and their linkages with infectious diseases was very interesting, but it was a vast topic which merited a separate discussion. It was of course not only a question of COVID but also other areas. As an example, she mentioned the impact of HPV vaccination on cervical cancer where ECDC does not have access to the information as data is not collected. She agreed that understanding better the root causes behind the challenges in data reporting or in any other area was crucial and something she wanted to discuss also as part of the country support activities.

The Management Board took note of the update of the action plan to address the recommendations from the third external evaluation and the strategic and performance analysis of the ECDC response to COVID-19.

Update from the Director including on COVID-19 related activities

25. The Director gave an update on recent ECDC activities following Russia's invasion of Ukraine. She mentioned that a first meeting had taken place on 28 February with CCB representatives from the five EU Member States neighbouring Ukraine (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Slovakia) and Moldova (through the Health Security Initiative) to discuss how ECDC could best support them. The aim was to have weekly meetings to identify the needs. Based on the discussions, ECDC had produced guidance to health care workers on the vulnerabilities of displaced persons, and guidance on COVID-19 prevention and control in reception centres. A Ukraine Task Force (separate from the PHE) had been set up in ECDC to coordinate the work internally. Two ECDC staff were currently deployed in Poland as part of a mission led by DG ECHO.

26. The Director also updated the MB on the latest developments related to the Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Authority (HERA) noting that the discussions on a Memorandum of Understanding between HERA and ECDC were moving forward. With reference to the work done to support Member States in enhancing their whole genome sequencing (WGS) capacity and infrastructure, she explained that ECDC was currently working together with DG SANTE, HERA, and the European Health and Digital Executive Agency (HaDEA) on the implementation of EU action grants to be funded through the EU4Health Programme. One part of the project would be targeting those five EU Member States that did not previously receive support through the HERA Incubator grants, and one part the remaining EU/EEA countries that already received support with the aim of consolidating the activities and outcomes of the previous grants. A letter had been sent to the National Coordinators to inform them about the EU action grants.

27. The Director noted that the new ECDC mandate will require a very different level of interaction with Member States. In this sense, the EU action grants were a test case as this was one way in which ECDC could support Member States by tapping into other EU funds; if this turned out to be successful, the digitalisation of surveillance systems could be another potential topic. The support provided to 11 EU Member States with lower COVID-19 vaccination coverage was another example of how ECDC could offer targeted support to countries, and the recent deployment of ECDC staff to Poland would serve as a test also for the reflection on the implementation of the EU Health Task Force. Concerning collaboration with international partners, she said that ECDC was in contact with Australia, Brazil, and Japan for possible future Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs), and discussions on MoUs with HERA, EMA, and WHO were ongoing. As a last point, she mentioned two questions that had been raised during her hearing in the European Parliament the previous day: one concerned the role of prevention in ECDC's work, and the other the balance between infection control and individual freedom. She recalled that the ethical aspects related to some of the restrictive measures introduced during the pandemic were an issue that she had herself also brought up in the MB, and she still felt that involving an ethics specialist in the discussions would be very valuable.

28. The MB members thanked the Director for the interesting update. Several members commented on the importance of the ethical aspects and the need for a thorough assessment of the efficacy of the non-pharmaceutical interventions and other issues such as mandatory vaccination, children's right to

proper education, etc. The MB agreed that a broader debate on these issues would be necessary. Several MB members asked whether all Member States could be involved in the meetings and information sharing on Ukraine as their countries were also expecting increasing numbers of displaced people. The Director suggested offering the possibility to participate in future meetings on Ukraine to all Member States' CCBs and then each country could choose whether they wished to participate or not.

The Management Board took note of the update from the Director.

Summary of discussions held at the 48th meeting of the ECDC Audit Committee (Stockholm, 23 March 2022), including its recommendations

29. Johan Carlson, Chair of the Audit Committee, gave a summary of the discussions from the 48th Audit Committee (AC) meeting, which took place in the morning of 23 March 2022. Concerning the regular update on audit activities, he mentioned that no new observations had been received and one had been formally closed by the ECDC. The AC noted that some delays had been experienced in the implementation of the audit recommendations, primarily linked to the delayed recruitment of a Head of Legal Services whose function includes that of Ethics Officer. Seven observations were currently open, two of which had target dates in Q1, three in Q2, one in Q3 and one in Q4 2022.

30. With regards to the Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR), the AC had discussed the difficulties in assessing the overall control system of ECDC and concluded that as external audits or internal assessment have not found remarkable issues, the system is considered as appropriate. The AC had also brought up an element for the future, namely the effectiveness of remote working and how it could be measured. In conclusion, the AC recommended the MB to endorse the assessment of the CAAR.

31. In response to the suggestion from one of the MB members to include a sentence on the Third JSM in the MB analysis and assessment, Maarit Kokki, Head of Executive Office, ECDC, presented a suggested wording and indicated where in the text it was proposed to include the paragraph. One of the MB members representing the European Commission noted that since the negotiations on the EU Health Union legal package were still ongoing, it was advisable from the Commission perspective not to include the last sentence which was indicating that the JSM discussions would guide the implementation of the new mandate. The Chair asked whether there were any objections to the text as such or to the suggestion from the European Commission. No objections were raised.

The Management Board approved the analysis and assessment of the Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2021.

a) Provisional Annual Accounts 2021, including the Report on Budgetary and Financial Management (Document MB54/07)

32. Anja Van Brabant, Accounting Officer and Head of Section, Finance and Accounting, Resource Management Services, ECDC, presented the Provisional Annual Accounts 2021. She recalled that the Accounts consist of two parts: the financial statements of the Centre and the report on the implementation of the budget of the Centre. The provisional accounts were audited by an external audit company (Baker Tilly) during 7-10 March 2022. ECDC received their report on 10 March with a clean opinion on the annual accounts 2021. Previously, the Court of Auditors had performed two audits (in November 2021 and January 2022), which resulted in no preliminary findings.

33. Anja Van Brabant then presented the budget execution in 2021 as compared to 2020 noting that from the total 2021 budget of EUR 168.1 Million, 99,35% had been committed (compared to 96,7% in 2020), while 64,08% had been paid (compared to 75,26% in 2020). From the EUR 13.5 Million carried forward from 2020, EUR 12.4 Million or 92,4% had been paid.

34. Johan Carlson reported that the AC had noted the clean opinions received from the auditors and congratulated the ECDC on the high budget execution considering the extraordinary budget increases in 2021. The AC recommended the MB to approve the Provisional Annual Accounts 2021.

The Management Board approved the Provisional Annual Accounts 2021.

b) Progress Report – Overview of 2022 budget implementation

35. Anja Van Brabant, Accounting Officer and Head of Section, Finance and Accounting, Resource Management Services, ECDC, gave an overview of the 2022 budget implementation up until 16 March 2022 as compared to the first quarter of 2021. From the total budget of EUR 95.9 Million, EUR 58.1 Million had been committed (60.6%), and from the committed amount, EUR 11.7 Million (12,2%) had been paid. A total of EUR 59.3 Million had been carried forward from 2021; of this amount, EUR 6.6 Million (11,2%) had been paid, but most of this budget would only be paid when the HERA grants had been fully implemented.

36. Johan Carlson reported that the AC had discussed the budget implementation for 2022 and had noted that the comparison with previous years was difficult given the large fluctuations in the yearly budgets.

The Management Board took note of the Progress Report: Overview of 2022 budget implementation since the beginning of 2022.

c) Fifth Supplementary and Amending Budget 2021 (Document MB54/08)

37. Anja Van Brabant, Accounting Officer and Head of Section, Finance and Accounting, Resource Management Services, ECDC, presented the Fifth Supplementary and Amending Budget 2021, consisting of the budget transfers approved by the Director since the last MB meeting and until the end of 2021. A transfer for the amount of EUR 779 330 had been carried out from Title I to Title III. All transfers had been approved by the Director within the limits of Article 26(1) of the Centre's Financial Regulation.

38. Johan Carlson mentioned that the AC had not discussed this item due to time constraints.

The Management Board took note of the Fifth Supplementary and Amending Budget 2021.

d) Progress Report on the Implementation of the Work Programme 2022 (Document MB54/09)

39. Maarit Kokki, Head of Executive Office, ECDC, briefed the MB on the current level of implementation of the work programme 2022. She noted that the report had been structured differently compared to previous reports with the aim of providing a better overview of the activities undertaken during the concerned period (January-February 2022), and an update on their implementation status. The presentation focused on the work progress and achievements along the Strategic Objectives and Action Areas. With regards to ECDC's response to crisis situations, she mentioned that the activities within the Public Health Emergency for COVID-19 had been planned as part of the 2022 work programme. As mentioned earlier by the Director, an ECDC Ukraine Task Force had been established following Russia's aggression against Ukraine; the potential impact of the crisis on the work programme was being monitored.

40. Johan Carlson said that the AC had noted the positive start of the implementation of the annual work programme 2022 but raised concerns regarding the possible impact of the crisis in Ukraine. The AC requested ECDC to monitor the situation closely and keep the MB/AC informed as needed.

The Management Board took note of the Progress Report on the Implementation of the Work Programme 2022.

e) Final 2022 IAS Audit Plan for ECDC (Document MB54/10)

41. Stefan Sundbom, Internal Control Coordinator, Executive Office, Director's Office, ECDC, recalled that the 2022-2024 IAS Strategic Internal Audit Plan (SIAP) had been endorsed by the MB in November 2021. The SIAP proposed three prospective audit topics for the period 2022-2024: 1) Information security management; 2) Grant management for implementing HERA incubator actions; 3) Preparation, review, and validation of external communication content.

42. The IAS had now adopted the Final 2022 IAS Audit Plan for ECDC and had decided to perform the following two audits in 2022: 1) Audit on the adequacy of the design and effectiveness of the information security management in ECDC, and 2) Limited review on the adequacy of the cooperation and coordination mechanisms aimed to prevent, detect and respond to cross-border health emergencies in HERA, DG SANTE, EMA and ECDC. The audits are scheduled to start in 2022 but will be finalised in 2023. The ECDC Director endorses the Final 2022 IAS Audit Plan for ECDC.

43. Johan Carlson reported that the AC had taken note of the audits selected by the IAS and was pleased especially with the planned audit on Information Security Management. The AC recommended the MB to endorse the 2022 IAS Audit Plan for ECDC but suggested inviting the IAS to present the detailed scopes of the audits when available (if possible, at the next MB and AC meetings in June). The MB supported this proposal.

The Management Board endorsed the final 2022 IAS Audit Plan for ECDC while requesting to invite the IAS to present the detailed scopes of the audits when available.

f) Replacement of outgoing AC member and selection of AC Chair

44. Johan Carlson informed the MB that he was stepping down from his functions as MB member and AC member and Chair due to retirement. Consequently, there was a need to appoint a new Chair of the AC as well as an AC member representing a Member State. This matter had also been raised in the AC the same morning. The AC recommended the MB to appoint Karin Tegmark Wisell (who will replace Johan Carlson as MB member representing Sweden), as member of the AC, and Daniel Shine, MB alternate, Ireland, as Chair of the AC.

45. The MB approved the suggested nominations. The Chair of the MB thanked Daniel Shine and Karin Tegmark Wisell for their willingness to take up these functions. She then thanked Johan Carlson on behalf of the whole MB for his dedication and precious contribution to both the Management Board and the Audit Committee. The ECDC Director also thanked Johan Carlson for all his work over the years and added that his experience from leading a big organisation had been very valuable in this context.

The Management Board appointed Daniel Shine as Chair and Karin Tegmark Wisell as member of the ECDC Audit Committee.

Follow-up from the Third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM)

46. Maarit Kokki, Head of the Executive Office, Director's Office, ECDC, gave a brief presentation on the follow-up from the Third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) and how the guidance received was going to be used. She recalled that the decision to arrange the Third JSM had been taken by the MB already in 2018; the JSMs have been seen as a unique opportunity to consult with a range of key external stakeholders (Management Board, Advisory Forum, and ECDC Coordinating Competent Bodies) and for these to engage in dialogue on strategic matters.

47. Due to the pandemic, the JSM had been conducted fully virtually and in three different phases: a kick-off meeting was held in May 2021, followed by virtual working groups and a final plenary meeting in September 2021. The working groups had addressed five main themes: 1) the need to enhance surveillance; 2) the Silent P in ECDC – prevention; 3) EU standards for emergency preparedness; 4) ECDC's role in the global health security, and 5) how ECDC could get closer to the EU Member States. The guidance received in these five areas will be used in defining or developing strategic pathways for ECDC, in particular in view of the implementation of the amended ECDC mandate, once approved. An implementation plan for the new mandate is planned to be presented to the MB in November 2022. In the meantime, some specific activities have already been initiated based on the feedback from the working groups (e.g., in the area of surveillance and prevention) and these are approved in the SPD 2022-2024.

48. In terms of more general feedback provided during the JSM, Maarit Kokki noted that the need for a more comprehensive approach to public health had been stressed in many interventions, i.e., the need to consider also social and behavioural aspects and linkages with NCDs, and to bring health care and public health closer to each other. Data should be used to provide a comprehensive picture, easily understandable also for policymakers (e.g., using multiple data sources, data analytics). Lastly, she mentioned that the

role of ECDC could be defined according to the three C model: Collaboration – Coordination – Communication, which together contributed to increased awareness.

49. Following the presentation, a few comments were made. One MB member remarked that the question of data collection had been discussed in Working Group E (How ECDC could get closer to the Member States) as part of the discussion on country knowledge and country overviews. It was important to avoid collecting too much data and a stepwise approach was therefore recommended. The Chair commented that this reminded her of the discussions in the early days of ECDC regarding the importance of “added value” and this was still a very valid point. One of the MB members representing the European Commission reiterated his point previously made about the JSM discussions on one hand and the formal negotiations on the ECDC mandate on the other hand. He remarked that the legal requirements on data collection will be supported by a Commission proposal for an implementing act, which will be reviewed by a comitology committee with representation from all EU Member States following the usual procedure. Therefore, the advice received from a strategic working group was surely useful, but it couldn’t replace the outcomes of the comitology group.

The Management Board took note of the follow-up from the Third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM).

Update from the French Presidency of the Council of the EU

50. Anne-Catherine Viso, MB Alternate, France, gave an update on the French Presidency of the EU (FPEU) taking place in the first half of 2022. The presentation focused on the strategic priorities in the area of health. In terms of legislative priorities, it was expected to find an agreement on the Regulation on cross-border threats to health and to thereby finalise the EU Health Union legal package during the Presidency period. She also provided an overview of the main events taking place during the Presidency and noted that the 55th MB meeting was planned to take place in Paris on 14-15 June as a “FPEU labelled” event.

51. Genevieve Chêne, MB Member, France, said that the French Presidency programme indeed showed that the main goal was to strengthen the EU Health Union and the EU’s capacity to respond to crisis and improve the public health of citizens. She was looking forward to welcoming the MB members in Paris for the next meeting.

The Management Board took note of the update on the French Presidency of the EU.

Update from the European Commission

52. John F Ryan, MB member, DG SANTE, European Commission, briefed the MB about ongoing activities in the area of health. With regards to the situation in Ukraine, the issue of transfer of patients had been discussed in the Health Security Committee. This involved logistics and transport through the civil protection mechanism and was a substantial challenge given the intensity of the event. Concerning the EU Health Union legal package, he reported that the negotiations on the regulation on serious cross-border threats to health were continuing and the final trilogue was planned to take place in April. The updated regulation on the ECDC mandate had already been agreed but the final adoption would be done simultaneously with the cross-border health threats regulation.

53. Following the presentation, one MB member asked whether a written note summarising the update from DG SANTE could be shared with the MB members after the meeting. John F Ryan confirmed that such a note could be circulated following the meeting.

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

Any other business

54. The MB Observer representing Norway asked the ECDC Director if she had any comments on the possible impact of the Ukraine crises on vaccine supply. The Director responded that ECDC was part of

these discussions but not directly involved in the COVID-19 vaccine supply, which was monitored by the European Medicines Agency (EMA).

55. The MB member from Estonia reported that similar discussions had taken place in her country and her colleagues were looking at the amount of vaccine needed also for childhood vaccinations; some issues had been identified but she was not in the position to provide further details at this point. The Chair commented that vaccines other than COVID vaccines were of course under national responsibility and an exchange of experience between Member States could be useful. The MB member from Denmark agreed that this was a very relevant issue; there were discussions in her country that medicines for RTB and shortage of some vaccines could become a challenge. One of the MB members representing the European Commission reported that the matter of childhood vaccines for children fleeing Ukraine had been discussed also in the Health Security Committee, and it seemed that there were mainly supply shortages of a momentary nature. EMA had confirmed that there were no structural shortages of COVID-19 vaccines and there was also insurance from providers of COVID vaccines that these should be covered.

56. Following this discussion, the Chair thanked all the MB Members for their active participation and valuable contributions, and the ECDC staff for their support. The next regular Management Board is planned to take place in Paris on 14-15 June 2022. Further information on a possible extraordinary MB meeting would be circulated in due course.

Annex: List of Participants

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Austria	Sigrid Kiermayr	Member
Belgium	Lieven De Raedt	Member
Bulgaria	Angel Kunchev	Member
Cyprus	Irene Cotter	Member
Czech Republic	Jozef Dlhý	Member
Denmark	Bolette Søborg	Member
	Stine Ulendorf Jacobsen	Alternate
Estonia	Heli Laarmann	Member
Finland	Anni Virolainen-Julkunen (<i>Chair</i>)	Member
	Taneli Puumalainen	Alternate
France	Geneviève Chêne	Member
	Anne-Catherine Viso	Alternate
Germany	Gesa Lücking	Alternate
Hungary	Ágnes Dánielisz	Member
Italy	Francesco Maraglino	Member
	Sandro Bonfigli	Alternate
Ireland	Colette Bonner	Member
	Daniel Shine	Alternate
Latvia	Jana Feldmane	Member
Lithuania	Audrius Ščeponavičius	Member
Luxembourg	Jean-Claude Schmit	Member
	Thomas Dentzer	Alternate
Malta	Patricia Vella Bonanno	Member
Netherlands	Ciska Scheidel	Member
Poland	Dariusz Poznański	Member

Country/Organisation	Representative	Status
Portugal	Rui Portugal	Member
Romania	Amalia Serban	Member
Slovakia	Lucia Paulíková	Alternate
Slovenia	Mojca Gobec	Member
Spain	Pilar Aparicio Azcárraga	Member
Sweden	Johan Carlson	Member
	Andreas Johansson	Alternate
	Karin Tegmark Wisell	Observer
European Parliament		
	Zofija Mazej Kukovič (<i>Deputy Chair</i>)	Member
	Maria Eleni Koppa	Member
European Commission		
DG SANTE	John F. Ryan	Member
DG SANTE	Isabel De La Mata Barranco	Member
EEA Countries		
Liechtenstein	Silvia Dehler	Member
Norway	Riise Øystein	Member