



ECDC Management Board

Fifty-first Meeting

Stockholm, 24 March 2021

Action plans to address the recommendations from the third external evaluation and the strategic and performance analysis of the ECDC response to COVID-19

Document number: MB51/06	Date: 2 March 2021
Summary:	<p>The third external evaluation of ECDC was finalised in 2019, and since that the Drafting Group of the Management Board worked on the Conclusions and Recommendations related to this evaluation. These conclusions and recommendations were approved by the Management Board in June 2020.</p> <p>WHO declared a COVID-19 outbreak as a Public Health Event of Concern in January 2020, when ECDC was already working in the Public Health Event (PHE)-mode. Since that the majority of technical experts have been away from their assigned tasks working for the response to COVID-19 pandemic. Once it was clear that this pandemic will continue for a long time, ECDC commissioned an external strategic and performance analysis of ECDC response to COVID-19 pandemic. This work was finalised in October 2020 with a report, which was presented to the Management Board in November 2020.</p> <p>ECDC has examined the recommendations of these two external evaluations, and presents the following tables to the Management Board: a table combining the recommendations from the third external evaluation and strategic and performance analysis, and an action plan covering these recommendations combined. Additionally, ECDC provides the Management Board with an action plan covering the rest of the recommendations from the strategic and performance analysis, which are focussed to improving the functioning of processes and procedures in the PHE. The recommendations from the third external evaluation will be largely covered through the implementation of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027, and the 17 strategic and performance analysis recommendations are prioritised and implementation of these will be finalised by the end of 2021 in order to influence already the work in the ongoing pandemic.</p>
Action:	For information and guidance

Background:	<p>ECDC Founding Regulation 851/2004 https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=celex%3A32004R0851</p> <p>Report of the third external evaluation and the Management Board's conclusions and recommendations https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/third-external-evaluation-ecdc-2013-2017</p> <p>Strategic and performance analysis of ECDC response to COVID-19 pandemic https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/ECDC_report_on_response_COVID-19.pdf</p>
--------------------	--

Contents

Summary.....	1
Annexes:	2

Summary

1. ECDC Founding Regulation EC 851/2004¹ Art.31 establishes regular external evaluations and their scope, to be carried out every five years.
2. The third external evaluation was launched in August 2018 and covered the period 2013-2017. The final report was approved by the Management Board in 2019. Since that the drafting group of the Management Board worked on the conclusions and recommendations of the Management Board, which were approved in June 2020.
3. The Management Board pointed out that their conclusions and recommendations have been approved in the context of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic reflecting the early lessons learned from it, while the evaluation itself was conducted and the final report delivered before the start of the outbreak.
4. ECDC moved to Public Health Event (PHE)-mode of working in January 2020 due to start of the COVID-19 outbreak, which quickly travelled from China to all continents, thus constituting an unprecedented pandemic, which is still ongoing.
5. For ECDC the PHE-mode of work means that most of the technical experts are designated to work for the response instead of their normal day-to-day tasks. Furthermore, this means that within one organisation there is a response-part and a core business part.
6. Once it became clear that the COVID-19 pandemic would be the most intense and longest so far, ECDC decided to conduct an external analysis of its response to COVID-19 crisis to have an evidence based view on elements it could improve its response.
7. This external analysis looked ECDC response between January and September 2020 and delivered its report with 26 recommendations in October. The report and prioritized recommendations were discussed with the Management Board in November 2020.
8. In November 2020 the European Commission put forward three legal proposals for the European Health Union: proposal to strengthen the mandate of ECDC, to expand the mandate of the European Medicines Agency (EMA), and an updated Regulation on the serious cross border health threats.
9. Based on the above, ECDC has considered the recommendations from these two evaluations and presents the action plan/state of play in this regard. The recommendations from the Third External Evaluation as well as part of the recommendations from the strategic and performance analysis will be covered through the implementation of ECDC Strategy 2021-2027.
10. ECDC Management prioritised 17 out of 26 recommendations of the external strategic and performance analysis and these are planned to be implemented by the end of 2021. These recommendations focus on improvements in the internal processes and procedures in use during the PHE-mode of working, and should already improve the effectiveness and efficiency of ECDC response during COVID-19 pandemic.
11. In both evaluations there were recommendations regarding the mandate of the ECDC or specific tasks within the ECDC mandate, which will not be addressed, as the ongoing discussions in the Council and the European Parliament will clarify ECDC's role in strengthening the preparedness and response in the EU and beyond.

¹ Regulation (EC) No 851/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 establishing a European Centre for disease prevention and control

Annexes:

I. Overlapping recommendations and action plan to address the recommendations from the third external evaluation and the strategic and performance analysis of the ECDC response to COVID-19

II. Action plan for the prioritised 17 recommendations from the external strategic and performance analysis of the ECDC response to COVID-19

Third external evaluation and strategic and performance analysis – overlapping recommendations

External evaluation recommendation	MB recommendation	McKinsey report recommendation
<p>Recommendation 1: Strengthened relevance of ECDC's work for Member States</p> <p>Although the Centre's work is found to be relevant for the needs of public health professionals and decision-makers at EU and national level, ECDC should consider better ways of reflecting Member States' needs related to reductions in national spending in the area of public health. This consideration can be integrated and applied consistently in existing mechanisms for planning, prioritisation and provision of country support. ECDC should adapt its methodology for cost impact analyses to better understand the impact of its activities on resources used at national level and tailor its activities to the present constraints. In general, ECDC should streamline in all areas of its work a focus on addressing structural gaps and deficiencies in Member States' public health systems that affect their ability to effectively contribute and optimally benefit from ECDC's activities.</p>	<p><i>The MB suggests that gaps identified in MS public health systems should be shared with the MS and the European Commission to support MS in the most appropriate way.</i></p> <p><i>ECDC should develop country knowledge to advise the European Commission on priorities for national capacity strengthening and measures which could be supported by EU instruments described above, including surveillance, preparedness, training, and control of CDs.</i></p>	<p><i>22. ECDC has strong local ties to, and good knowledge of, the health system in each Member State</i></p> <p><i>6. There is a proactive and systematic assessment and dissemination of country-by-country approaches.</i></p> <p><i>7. ECDC provides effective response support to Member States and contributes to cross country learnings</i></p> <p><i>12. ECDC effectively uses peacetime to ensure preparedness of Member States</i></p>
<p>Recommendation 2: ECDC's mandate under Decision 1082/2013/EU</p> <p>While ECDC is found to have effectively and efficiently integrated its additional tasks under Decision 1082/2013/EU, the evaluation identified areas for improvement that can be addressed through the following recommendations:</p> <p><i>2A. The European Commission and ECDC should undertake a review of current EU and international obligations in the</i></p>	<p><i>2A. Therefore, the Management Board recommends that the European Commission and ECDC examines how the</i></p>	<p><i>12. ECDC effectively uses peacetime to ensure preparedness of Member States</i></p>

area of preparedness and allocate more clearly the tasks between the EC, ECDC and Member States in order to avoid duplications and ensure synergies, including with obligations under IHR;

allocation of preparedness tasks between these different stakeholders could be more clearly communicated and described, in particular, in relation to the terms of reference of HSC Working groups, expected deliverables and their time line, as well as the processes for their validation.

The Management Board asks ECDC and the European Commission to review their websites with regards to comprehensive and linked information on the division of tasks between these stakeholders for the general public and the relevant stakeholders.

...

Furthermore the Management Board recommends that the European Commission and ECDC - also in line with the implementation of the recommendations of the second external evaluation - prepare information packages for ECDC stakeholders as well as HSC members to clarify roles and responsibilities in the area of preparedness.

...

2B. ECDC should carry out a study of the use of Rapid Risk Assessment recommendations and strengthen the methodology for recommendation development, so as to increase their relevance and use. ECDC should also make more efforts to further involve the CCBs in the preparation of RRAs, as this can be expected increase the relevance of the assessments, stakeholders' buy-in to their results and follow-up.

2B. The Management Board invites ECDC to address the issue in a different way. Instead of carrying out an additional study on the use of RRA, the Management Board invites ECDC to install a systematic feedback system on the use and relevance of RRAs.

The Management Board endorses the recommendation that ECDC should also make more efforts to further involve the CCBs in the preparation of RRAs, as this can be expected to increase the relevance of the assessments, stakeholders' buy-in to their results and follow-up.

The Management Board encourages ECDC to call upon the best expertise available in the Member States involved in the drafting of RRAs.

19. ECDC's Advisory Forum and expert networks are used as effective tools for ad hoc problem solving of prioritised issues of common interest

Recommendation 3: ECDC's international activities

The evaluation found ECDC's international activities to have provided added value for the EU, but to have been

25. ECDC further strengthens cooperation with global and international partners (including in particular the WHO and

<p>constrained by resource limitations. Therefore, the evaluation recommends that:</p> <p>3A. ECDC and the relevant Commission services should clarify as a matter of priority the modalities and financing mechanisms through which ECDC can carry out international activities, with a view to ensuring their long-term sustainability;</p> <p>3B. ECDC and the relevant Commission services strengthen their mechanisms for coordination in this area.</p>	<p>3A. The Management Board calls upon the European Commission to develop a substantiated process to ensure a long term and structural agreement on the use of ECDC resources in support of external requests.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The Management Board is committed to taking a stronger role in evaluation, monitoring and validation of ECDC's international activities to ensure that the strategic priorities are met.</p>	<p><i>other CDCs) to ensure strong global intelligence on emerging health threats and during global crises</i></p>
<p>Recommendation 4: Collection, validation, analysis, and dissemination of data</p> <p>The analysis of the effectiveness of ECDC's activities that related to the collection, validation, analysis and dissemination of data, identified room for improvement which can be addressed through the following recommendations:</p> <p>4A. Given the remaining gaps and differences in Member States' surveillance reporting for a number of diseases, <i>ECDC's mechanisms for ensuring consistent and systematic surveillance reporting should be strengthened</i> and the Centre should <i>provide support</i> (e.g. training) to Member States with low reporting frequency.</p> <p>4B. The effectiveness of the analysis of TESSy data and quality of the ECDC outputs involving external expertise could be increased <i>via further involvement of Member States' experts</i>.</p>	<p>4A. The Management Board agrees that it would be important for ECDC to better understand the root causes for the low reporting in order to be able to provide the right type of support to Member States. ECDC should, therefore, take action to <i>gather the information on the matter from the Member states</i>.</p> <p>4B. Concerning the involvement of Member States experts in the analysis of TESSy data and other ECDC outputs, the Management Board view was that Member State involvement is beneficial, but it needs to be clear where expert advice would add the greatest value, e.g. <i>which products are the most valuable and would most greatly benefit from such input</i>. Different aspects, such as handling of possible conflict of interest of the Member State experts being involved, need to be taken into account.</p>	<p><i>14. ECDC receives data in a more harmonised and timely manner from Member States</i></p>

<p>Recommendation 5: Awareness and utility of ECDC's outputs</p> <p>ECDC should increase its outreach to media stakeholders in order to increase awareness and use of its work. As part of this, ECDC should benchmark the performance of its communication activities against that of other relevant actors (e.g. WHO Europe, EFSA) through the media analytics tools it already applies.</p>	<p>The Management Board has already stated in the ECDC Communication Strategy (approved by the MB in November 2016) that raising awareness and communication to national audience is the primary responsibility of the Member States. ... Key for success is for ECDC to continue providing MS with evidence-based and objective information.</p> <p>The Management Board considers that reaching out to media stakeholders can be most effective and successful in the context of existing global public health campaigns such as EAAD (and WAAW), Vaccination Week, TB day, AIDS Day. ECDC should continue to make the best use of these platforms established for the public health campaigns to reach out to the European media and European level stakeholders.</p> <p>As far as RRAs are concerned, they are promoted at the HSC to facilitate the coordination of measures between MS.</p> <p>The Management Board is not convinced of the necessity to benchmark the activities with other actors. ...</p> <p>The Management Board supports the monitoring of the communication activities as planned in the ECDC communication strategy (2016).</p> <p>The Management Board invites ECDC to present an analysis of its Communication strategy – whether there has been increased uptake of ECDC publications by different users (media, public, Member States, specialised stakeholders) – and adapt it where necessary, in light of the results of this analysis and of the guidelines in the Communication Handbook for EU Agencies (December 2013).</p>	<p>20. ECDC is viewed by its stakeholders as a transparent organisation, that makes its information and priorities easily accessible</p> <p>2. Outputs are timely and adapted to the needs of the requester</p> <p>1. Outputs are actionable and easy to interpret</p>
---	---	--

Recommendation 6: Coordination and complementarity

6A. There is still room to *improve cooperation/coordination with WHO* in facilitating Member States' compliance with reporting obligations under EU and international law, including *in the area of vaccination coverage*.

6B. ECDC and the EC should find a solution for ensuring more *involvement of ECDC in the implementation of Joint Actions* in order to avoid duplication and increase the sustainability of their EU-level outputs.

6A. **The Management Board recommends that, under the MoU between ECDC/WHO Euro, areas for improvements are addressed by the Joint Coordination Group and reported back to the Management Board.**

6B. The Management Board recommends that *the ECDC should be fully involved in both the planning and implementation of all Joint Actions that impact on, or could benefit from, the Centre's activities to ensure they are more efficient.*

ECDC should be invited systematically by the European Commission to participate in the planning stage of the Joint Actions; ...

All relevant stakeholders should take in consideration that due to their limited duration, the Joint Actions face the challenge of sustainability that could be solved with *better integration of the results/deliverables in the multi-annual planning processes of ECDC, and by the MS and stakeholders.*

This recommendation would apply for other actions undertaken by the MS and the EC when similar to the Joint Actions. ***This situation can apply to other types of projects funded by the European Commission***

25. *ECDC further strengthens cooperation with global and international partners (including in particular the WHO and other CDCs) to ensure strong global intelligence on emerging health threats and during global crises*

23. *ECDC coordinates European collaboration on building a scientific fact base to: (1) enable a more complete overview of scientific findings and (2) reduce overlaps and the duplication of work in Europe*

24. *ECDC has an independent, strong voice and position, coordinated with the WHO, but not bound or delayed by WHO coordination*

21. *ECDC's role within the EU landscape is well defined and its unique purpose understood clearly*

	<p>The Management Board has noted that there is significant correlation between this recommendation and recommendation 4 on data. It is important to consider how action in these areas are complementary and to avoid duplication in reporting.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 7: Implementation of the Common Approach on EU Decentralised Agencies and its Roadmap</p> <p>In order to address the actions of the Common Approach on EU Decentralised Agencies and its Roadmap which are only partly implemented, the following recommendations are made:</p> <p>7A. The Centre should consider the possibility of increasing the multilingual accessibility of (parts) of its website that would be most relevant for the general public through the use of automated translation tools.</p> <p>7B. As regards the Centre's activities in the area of evaluation, it is for the Management Board to consider whether they need more input from the Centre in the line of ex-ante assessments and whether more detailed versions of the currently used opportunity value studies could be of interest to them.</p>	<p>7A. The Management Board <i>does not agree with the recommendation that ECDC should use automated translation tools on its websites.</i></p> <p>However, in the light of the Commission Communications Handbook 2013, the Management Board recommends that <i>ECDC should review its communication strategy in order to make ECDC and its contribution to communicable disease prevention and control Europe more visible</i> to the general public and known as an objective and reliable source of information.</p> <p>Therefore, the Management Board <i>suggests that some general information on ECDC should be available and easily accessible on the website in different languages</i> from the top of the homepage. In addition, some officially translated documents should be available, including an explanation of why only few documents are translated.</p> <p>7B. The Management Board endorses the view that further input on ECDC activities is needed from the Centre. The Management Board considers that <i>ECDC should give more systematic feedback to the Board, for example on the Advisory Forum's meetings and activities and communicate earlier the budget and human resources allocated to the activities in order to guarantee more transparency.</i></p>	

<p>7C. Should the Founding Regulation of ECDC be revised, it should include the requirement that the European Parliament is involved in the approval of its multi-annual or annual programme, as is currently done in practice.</p>	<p>The Management Board would find useful to receive <i>more detailed information about planned projects as part of the work plan preparation</i> (ex-ante assessments). Currently, the Advisory Forum is involved in the prioritisation of ECDC activities for the work plan, yet the first moment for the MB to discuss the work programme is late in the process, making it difficult for the MB members' influence the planned activities. It could be useful if there was a "second loop" of consultation of the Management Board, whereby the Management Board could receive and comment on the planned activities and the outcomes of the AF prioritisation. It was stressed that the roles of the MB and AF should not be mixed; the AF naturally looks at the proposed projects from a scientific advice point of view while the Management Board looks in particular at the resource allocation. In general, it is of interest for the Management Board when new activities are proposed (such as the e-health and foresight projects included in the work plan for 2020). When providing the draft SPD for discussion it should therefore be clearly stated what is new, what is continuous and what is deprioritised.</p> <p>There is a need for more systematic feedback from the AF in general. This had been raised earlier in relation to the discussions on complementarity between the MB and the AF but there was probably a need to stress this point again. One possibility could be that the MB draft programme is shared earlier in order for the MB to better identify the need for AF input. It was also noted that the annual report on the work of the AF provided by the Chief Scientist could perhaps be more precise about the debates and possible divergent views of the AF on different discussion points.</p>	<p>7C. <i>Involvement in the approval of the multi-annual programme or annual programme by the European Parliament</i> ...</p>
---	---	--

	The Management Board acknowledges that this recommendation has been already implemented with the approval of the ECDC financial regulation in August 2019.	
<p>Recommendations 8: Efficiency</p> <p>Several specific recommendations can be made to improve the efficiency of ECDC in terms of its organisation and process:</p> <p>8A The <i>continuing need for more cooperation between the Management Board and Advisory Forum</i> should be addressed as a matter of priority, following up on the work done by the Working Group set up to define measures in response to the issues noted by the previous evaluation.</p> <p>8B. ECDC should continue improving <i>the efficiency of its planning processes by reviewing and reporting on its</i></p>	<p>... if there is a need to strengthen activities in new areas, the Commission and European Parliament <i>should be aware of the need for further resources</i>, so as not to impact on existing areas of work.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The Management Board highlights that, in light of these conclusions, the following initiatives should be finalized to further optimise operational efficiency:</p> <p>Revision of the internal (matrix) organisational structure. Finalization of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027.</p> <p>Review of the role and task definition of managers.</p> <p>Review of the outsourcing practice with regard to flexibility and costs.</p> <p>Strengthen the communication between ECDC and CBB through organigrams and infographics and description of EPIS, TESSY and networks.</p> <p>The Management Board draws the attention of ECDC that putting a new organisational structure in place is not the same as changing the working culture or working methods, and efforts will be needed to implement collaborative practices.</p> <p>8A. Concerning the concrete recommendations, the Management Board endorses the recommendations of the continuing need <i>for more cooperation between the Management Board and Advisory Form</i> and the implementation of measures taken in response to the second external evaluation.</p> <p>8B. The Management Board encourages ECDC to continue the <i>efficient management of its financial and human</i></p>	

<p><i>activity-based budgeting and costing in a systematic manner, and ensuring that both activities for prioritisation and deprioritisation are taken into account during the elaboration of the annual work programme.</i></p> <p>8C. The Key Performance Indicators through which ECDC monitors its performance <i>should be revised to include more outcome-level indicators</i>, as used in the present evaluation, in order to better capture the use, value and impact of the Centre's activities and outputs. The objective of measuring and demonstrating the impact delivered can be streamlined throughout the Centre's different streams of activities including the Disease Programmes and sections.</p> <p>8D. ECDC's <i>internal procedure for evaluation should be revised</i> to include stronger mechanisms for ensuring the follow-up on recommendations from internal evaluations and thus ensuring that the targeted improvements to the Centre's operations are achieved.</p>	<p>resources including the introduction of new efficient procedures to reduce micro-management.</p> <p>With regards to auditing and monitoring of performance, the Audit Committee currently looks mainly at budget issues. <i>It could be explored whether the Audit Committee could take the discussions up a level and also look at programming issues such as indicators and monitoring of implementation</i> and whether another set up of the Audit committee would be needed.</p> <p>8C. The Management Board takes note of the recommendation concerning key performance indicators and refers to the draft ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 where this is foreseen</p> <p>8D. The Management Board endorses the recommendation concerning the revision of internal procedures for evaluation.</p>	
<p>9. ECDC Mandate</p> <p>The evaluation report included a specific recommendation that the possibility of extending the remit of ECDC should be further considered via the competition of a full impact assessment to be undertaken to assess the level of this need.</p> <p>Given the identified evidence of needs for strengthened EU-level activities in the area of non-communicable diseases and the potential strengths and opportunities of ECDC for taking on these additional tasks, <i>a full Impact Assessment should be undertaken.</i> This should be in line with the European Commission Better Regulation Guidelines. The Impact assessment should be able to further define the needs (problems, drivers, consequences), the</p>	<p>The external evaluation report recommends a full Impact Assessment on the extension of the mandate given the diversity of views. This is not a recommendation that the Management Board supports. One reason for this was that the Management Board considered insufficient documentary evidence had been presented on the strategic, scientific and technical analysis which would lead to the appropriate discussions with the relevant stakeholders and policy leads at both national and European level.</p> <p>....</p> <p>The Management Board concludes, having considered the possible need to extend the scope of the Centre's mission</p>	<p><i>26. There is clarity of ECDC's role in supporting the coordination of management of national response measures whereby ECDC's interpretation of its existing mandate enables a more direct and larger role in supporting the Member States, European Commission and other stakeholders, institutions, and agencies.</i></p>

<p>corresponding policy objectives and then consider the options of: no change, extension of ECDC's mandate to these areas, or establishing a new EU Agency with a mandate in the areas considered. The Impact Assessment should also consider other areas where ECDC's mandate can be revised – in the areas of international activities and cross-border threats to health other than from communicable diseases</p>	<p>to other Community level activities in the field of public health, in particular health monitoring, that such an extension cannot be justified only on the basis of the current external evaluation. Instead, the Management Board requests <i>the Commission to consider to propose how to put the question forward, for example based on a scoping analysis.</i></p>	
--	---	--

Third external evaluation – Action plan

External evaluation recommendation	MB recommendation	ECDC action/ response
<p>Recommendation 1: Strengthened relevance of ECDC's work for Member States</p> <p>Although the Centre's work is found to be relevant for the needs of public health professionals and decision-makers at EU and national level, ECDC should consider better ways of reflecting Member States' needs related to reductions in national spending in the area of public health. This consideration can be integrated and applied consistently in existing mechanisms for planning, prioritisation and provision of country support. ECDC should adapt its methodology for cost impact analyses to better understand the impact of its activities on resources used at national level and tailor its activities to the present constraints. In general, ECDC should streamline in all areas of its work a focus on addressing structural gaps and deficiencies in Member States' public health systems that affect their ability to effectively contribute and optimally benefit from ECDC's activities.</p>	<p><i>The MB suggests that gaps identified in MS public health systems should be shared with the MS and the European Commission to support MS in the most appropriate way.</i></p> <p><i>ECDC should develop country knowledge to advise the European Commission on priorities for national capacity strengthening and measures which could be supported by EU instruments described above, including surveillance, preparedness, training, and control of CDs.</i></p>	<p>Develop internal process and procedure for ECDC country visits. Develop ECDC Policy for ECDC country visits. Time: Q1/Q2 2021</p> <p>Develop common, agreed methodology for analysis of the vulnerabilities, needs and strengths, on the basis of data and information collected. Explore the principles for data visualisation with countries as entry point – country overviews. Based on all above, a Targeted Country Support (TCS) TCS cycle will be developed. This will be aligned with the ECDC corporate planning cycle so countries in most need and the highest priority topics will be addressed efficient and efficaciously. Time: Q2/Q3 2021</p> <p>The Working Group E: <i>How to get closer to the EU Member States?</i> in the third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) will seek the best ways how ECDC could accomplish this, based on the work of targeted country support. Time: Working group Q2/Q3 2021 JSM plenary Q3 2021</p> <p>These activities are part of the implementation of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027; Strategic Objective 2 and in particular AA2.1</p>

External evaluation recommendation	MB recommendation	ECDC action/ response
<p>Recommendation 2: ECDC's mandate under Decision 1082/2013/EU</p> <p>While ECDC is found to have effectively and efficiently integrated its additional tasks under Decision 1082/2013/EU, the evaluation identified areas for improvement that can be addressed through the following recommendations:</p> <p><i>2A. The European Commission and ECDC should undertake a review of current EU and international obligations in the area of preparedness and allocate more clearly the tasks between the EC, ECDC and Member States in order to avoid duplications and ensure synergies, including with obligations under IHR;</i></p> <p><i>2B. ECDC should carry out a study of the use of Rapid Risk Assessment recommendations and strengthen the methodology for recommendation development, so as to increase their relevance and use. ECDC should also make more efforts to further involve the CCBs in the preparation of RRAs, as this can be expected increase</i></p>	<p>2A. Therefore, the Management Board recommends that the European Commission and ECDC examines how the allocation of preparedness tasks between these different stakeholders could be more clearly communicated and described, in particular, in relation to the terms of reference of HSC Working groups, expected deliverables and their time line, as well as the processes for their validation.</p> <p>The Management Board asks ECDC and the European Commission to review their websites with regards to comprehensive and linked information on the division of tasks between these stakeholders for the general public and the relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Furthermore the Management Board recommends that the European Commission and ECDC - also in line with the implementation of the recommendations of the second external evaluation - prepare information packages for ECDC stakeholders as well as HSC members to clarify roles and responsibilities in the area of preparedness.</p> <p>...</p> <p>2B. The Management Board invites ECDC to address the issue in a different way. Instead of carrying out an additional study on the use of RRA, the Management Board invites ECDC to install a systematic feedback system on the use and relevance of RRAs.</p>	<p>2A. Preparedness is an important element in the legal proposal of the EC in November 2020 to strengthen the mandate of the ECDC. In this proposal the tasks of ECDC in preparedness are defined, and the role of the HSC is set in the proposed Regulation on serious cross border threats to health.</p> <p>Describe the roles of the EC, HSC, and ECDC clearly in the www-sites of the EC and ECDC.</p> <p>Time: Once the legal texts are adopted.</p> <p>Information packages on the roles of the EC, HSC, and ECDC prepared for MB, AF, CCBs, and HSC members.</p> <p>Time: Once the legal texts are adopted.</p> <p>2B. Explore the best method to obtain feedback on the use and relevance of RRAs (e.g. stakeholder survey, direct feedback loop.</p> <p>Time: Q3-Q4 2021</p>

<p><i>the relevance of the assessments, stakeholders' buy-in to their results and follow-up.</i></p>	<p>The Management Board endorses the recommendation that ECDC should also make more efforts to further involve the CCBs in the preparation of RRAs, as this can be expected to increase the relevance of the assessments, stakeholders' buy-in to their results and follow-up.</p> <p>The Management Board encourages ECDC to call upon the best expertise available in the Member States involved in the drafting of RRAs.</p>	<p>The inclusion of CCBs in the preparation of RRAs has started in February 2021.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: ECDC's international activities</p> <p>The evaluation found ECDC's international activities to have provided added value for the EU, but to have been constrained by resource limitations. Therefore, the evaluation recommends that:</p> <p>3A. ECDC and the relevant Commission services should clarify as a matter of priority the modalities and financing mechanisms through which ECDC can carry out international activities, with a view to ensuring their long-term sustainability;</p> <p>3B. ECDC and the relevant Commission services strengthen their mechanisms for coordination in this area.</p>	<p>3A. The Management Board calls upon the European Commission to develop a substantiated process to ensure a long term and structural agreement on the use of ECDC resources in support of external requests.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The Management Board is committed to taking a stronger role in evaluation, monitoring and validation of ECDC's international activities to ensure that the strategic priorities are met.</p>	<p>3A. At this point no ECDC action. The European Commission's legal proposal to strengthen ECDC mandate expands its international dimension.</p> <p>Review the situation regarding resources allocated for international tasks. Time: Once the legal text is adopted.</p> <p>Note: To be able to implement large scale activities with e.g. Western-Balkans, European Neighbourhood Policy partner countries, and Africa CDC ECDC would need additional resources either through relevant EU Financing mechanism or amending ECDC core budget.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: Collection, validation, analysis, and dissemination of data</p> <p>The analysis of the effectiveness of ECDC's activities that related to the collection, validation, analysis and</p>		

dissemination of data, identified room for improvement which can be addressed through the following recommendations:

4A. Given the remaining gaps and differences in Member States' surveillance reporting for a number of diseases, *ECDC's mechanisms for ensuring consistent and systematic surveillance reporting should be strengthened* and the Centre should *provide support* (e.g. training) to Member States with low reporting frequency.

4B. The effectiveness of the analysis of TESSy data and quality of the ECDC outputs involving external expertise could be increased *via further involvement of Member States' experts*.

4A. The Management Board agrees that it would be important for ECDC to better understand the root causes for the low reporting in order to be able to provide the right type of support to Member States. ECDC should, therefore, take action to *gather the information on the matter from the Member states*.

4B. Concerning the involvement of Member States experts in the analysis of TESSy data and other ECDC outputs, the Management Board view was that Member State involvement is beneficial, but it needs to be clear where expert advice would add the greatest value, e.g. *which products are the most valuable and would most greatly benefit from such input*. Different aspects, such as handling of possible conflict of interest of the Member State experts being involved, need to be taken into account.

4A. Gathering information on the root causes for the low reporting was started with the EPHESUS project which will be completed in 2021.

Put in place relevant surveillance systems descriptors and data quality monitoring systems to keep the information on Member States' surveillance systems updated.

Time: TBC

Note: The EC proposal for a strengthened ECDC mandate Provides ECDC with the framework for proactively engaging in systematic surveillance systems evaluations which, while allowing ECDC to gain an in-depth knowledge of MS surveillance systems, will also lead to progressive improvements.

4B. ECDC does already involve Member States in the interpretation and implications of surveillance findings. This happens before the publication of significant outputs, and more regularly during annual meetings of the surveillance networks.

Explore the possibility to receive input from Member States on public health actions informed by the various outputs through e.g. stakeholder survey, direct feedback loop from the outputs.

Time: Q3-Q4 2021

Note: In the third Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) the future of the EU surveillance, including e.g. standards will be discussed.

Time: Working Group A Q2/Q3 2021
Plenary Q3 2021

<p>Recommendation 5: Awareness and utility of ECDC's outputs</p> <p>ECDC should increase its outreach to media stakeholders in order to increase awareness and use of its work. As part of this, ECDC should benchmark the performance of its communication activities against that of other relevant actors (e.g. WHO Europe, EFSA) through the media analytics tools it already applies.</p>	<p>The Management Board has already stated in the ECDC Communication Strategy (approved by the MB in November 2016) that raising awareness and communication to national audience is the primary responsibility of the Member States. ... Key for success is for ECDC to continue providing MS with evidence-based and objective information.</p> <p>The Management Board considers that reaching out to media stakeholders can be most effective and successful in the context of existing global public health campaigns such as EAAD (and WAAW), Vaccination Week, TB day, AIDS Day. ECDC should continue to make the best use of these platforms established for the public health campaigns to reach out to the European media and European level stakeholders.</p> <p>As far as RRAs are concerned, they are promoted at the HSC to facilitate the coordination of measures between MS.</p> <p>The Management Board is not convinced of the necessity to benchmark the activities with other actors. ...</p> <p>The Management Board supports the monitoring of the communication activities as planned in the ECDC communication strategy (2016).</p> <p>The Management Board invites ECDC to present an analysis of its Communication strategy – whether there has been increased uptake of ECDC publications by different users (media, public, Member States, specialised stakeholders) – and adapt it where necessary, in light of the results of this analysis and of the guidelines in the Communication Handbook for EU Agencies (December 2013).</p>	<p>Continue participation in the established global public health campaigns (e.g. EAAD). Time: Ongoing as per schedule.</p> <p>Continue monitoring of ECDC communication activities (and different media used). Time: Ongoing</p> <p>Develop and draft a new ECDC Communication policy 2021-2023. Time: Q4 2021.</p>
<p>Recommendation 6: Coordination and complementarity</p>		

<p>6A. There is still room to <i>improve cooperation/coordination with WHO</i> in facilitating Member States' compliance with reporting obligations under EU and international law, including <i>in the area of vaccination coverage</i>.</p> <p>6B. ECDC and the EC should find a solution for ensuring more <i>involvement of ECDC in the implementation of Joint Actions</i> in order to avoid duplication and increase the sustainability of their EU-level outputs.</p>	<p>6A. <i>The Management Board recommends that, under the MoU between ECDC/WHO Euro, areas for improvements are addressed by the Joint Coordination Group and reported back to the Management Board.</i></p> <p>6B. <i>The Management Board recommends that the ECDC should be fully involved in both the planning and implementation of all Joint Actions that impact on, or could benefit from, the Centre's activities to ensure they are more efficient.</i></p> <p><i>ECDC should be invited systematically by the European Commission to participate in the planning stage of the Joint Actions; ...</i></p> <p><i>All relevant stakeholders should take in consideration that due to their limited duration, the Joint Actions face the challenge of sustainability that could be solved with better integration of the results/deliverables in the multi-annual planning processes of ECDC, and by the MS and stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>This recommendation would apply for other actions undertaken by the MS and the EC when similar to the Joint Actions. This situation can apply to other types of projects funded by the European Commission</i></p>	<p>6A. Review the areas of collaboration between ECDC and WHO Europe and identify the areas where improved coordination is still necessary. Time: Q4 2021 Reporting back Q1 2022.</p> <p>6B. The post of a Research coordinator was re-established in 2020.</p> <p>Explore with the Commission the possible role of ECDC in DG SANTE and DG RTD future planning cycles. Time: Q1/2 2021</p> <p>Develop an internal procedure re how ECDC would engage in the research projects Time: Q4 2021</p> <p>Explore, together with the EC, the development of mechanism for regular consultation on ongoing and planned Joint Actions and other research projects. Time: Q4 2021</p> <p>Note: this is part of the implementation of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 SO3 AA 3.2.</p> <p>No action needed at this junction. The ECDC participation in the EC financed project is addressed in the EC legal proposal to strengthen ECDC mandate.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>The Management Board has noted that there is significant correlation between this recommendation and recommendation 4 on data. It is important to consider how action in these areas are complementary and to avoid duplication in reporting.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 7: Implementation of the Common Approach on EU Decentralised Agencies and its Roadmap</p> <p>In order to address the actions of the Common Approach on EU Decentralised Agencies and its Roadmap which are only partly implemented, the following recommendations are made:</p> <p>7A. The Centre should consider the possibility of increasing the multilingual accessibility of (parts) of its website that would be most relevant for the general public through the use of automated translation tools.</p> <p>7B. As regards the Centre’s activities in the area of evaluation, it is for the Management Board to consider whether they need more input from the Centre in the line of ex-ante assessments and whether more detailed versions of the currently used opportunity value studies could be of interest to them.</p>	<p>7A. The Management Board does not agree with the recommendation that ECDC should use automated translation tools on its websites.</p> <p>However, in the light of the Commission Communications Handbook 2013, the Management Board recommends that <i>ECDC should review its communication strategy in order to make ECDC and its contribution to communicable disease prevention and control in Europe more visible</i> to the general public and known as an objective and reliable source of information.</p> <p>Therefore, the Management Board <i>suggests that some general information on ECDC should be available and easily accessible on the website in different languages</i> from the top of the homepage. In addition, some officially translated documents should be available, including an explanation of why only few documents are translated.</p> <p>7B. The Management Board endorses the view that further input on ECDC activities is needed from the Centre. The Management Board considers that ECDC should give <i>more systematic feedback to the Board, for example on the Advisory Forum’s meetings and activities and communicate earlier the budget and human resources allocated to the activities in order to guarantee more transparency.</i></p>	<p>s</p> <p>Develop a new Communication policy [which will cover the way ECDC communicates to the general public about its work and contribution to communicable disease prevention and control in Europe]. Time: Q4 2021</p> <p>Include some general information on the ECDC website in different languages, as needed. Time: Ongoing</p> <p>7B. Discuss with the Management Board what kind of systematic feedback they would find useful (e.g. projects, KPIs). Time: Q4 2021</p>

<p>7C. Should the Founding Regulation of ECDC be revised, it should include the requirement that the European Parliament is involved in the approval of its multi-annual or annual programme, as is currently done in practice.</p>	<p>The Management Board would find useful to receive <i>more detailed information about planned projects as part of the work plan preparation</i> (ex-ante assessments). Currently, the Advisory Forum is involved in the prioritisation of ECDC activities for the work plan, yet the first moment for the MB to discuss the work programme is late in the process, making it difficult for the MB members' influence the planned activities. It could be useful if there was a "second loop" of consultation of the Management Board, whereby the Management Board could receive and comment on the planned activities and the outcomes of the AF prioritisation. It was stressed that the roles of the MB and AF should not be mixed; the AF naturally looks at the proposed projects from a scientific advice point of view while the Management Board looks in particular at the resource allocation. In general, it is of interest for the Management Board when new activities are proposed (such as the e-health and foresight projects included in the work plan for 2020). When providing the draft SPD for discussion it should therefore be clearly stated what is new, what is continuous and what is deprioritised.</p> <p>There is a need for more systematic feedback from the AF in general. This had been raised earlier in relation to the discussions on complementarity between the MB and the AF but there was probably a need to stress this point again. One possibility could be that <i>the MB draft programme is shared earlier in order for the MB to better identify the need for AF input</i>. It was also noted that the annual report on the work of the AF provided by the Chief Scientist could perhaps be more precise about the debates and possible divergent views of the AF on different discussion points.</p> <p><i>7C. Involvement in the approval of the multi-annual programme or annual programme by the European Parliament</i> ...</p>	<p>Present the revised planning process to the MB. Time: Q2 2021</p> <p>Highlight new activities in the SPD document. Time: Q4 2021.</p> <p>Note: The SPD document is brought to the MB for their approval twice: in November year N-2 (draft) and in November N-1 (final).</p> <p>Provide the Management Board with a draft rolling MB programme for the coming year. Time: Q2 2021.</p> <p>7C. Implemented.</p>
---	---	---

	The Management Board acknowledges that this recommendation has been already implemented with the approval of the ECDC financial regulation in August 2019.	
<p>Recommendations 8: Efficiency</p> <p>Several specific recommendations can be made to improve the efficiency of ECDC in terms of its organisation and process:</p> <p>8A The continuing need for more cooperation between the Management Board and Advisory Forum should be addressed as a matter of priority, following up on the work</p>	<p>... if there is a need to strengthen activities in new areas, the Commission and European Parliament <i>should be aware of the need for further resources</i>, so as not to impact on existing areas of work.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The Management Board highlights that, in light of these conclusions, the following initiatives should be finalized to further optimise operational efficiency:</p> <p>Revision of the internal (matrix) organisational structure.</p> <p>Finalization of the ECDC Strategy 2021-2027.</p> <p>Review of the role and task definition of managers.</p> <p>Review of the outsourcing practice with regard to flexibility and costs.</p> <p>Strengthen the communication between ECDC and CBB through organigrams and infographics and description of EPIS, TESSY and networks.</p> <p>The Management Board draws the attention of ECDC that putting a new organisational structure in place is not the same as changing the working culture or working methods, and efforts will be needed to implement collaborative practices.</p> <p>8A. Concerning the concrete recommendations, the Management Board endorses the recommendations of the continuing need for more cooperation between the Management Board and Advisory Form and the</p>	<p>The new organisational structure in place as of January 2020.</p> <p>ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 approved by the MB in June 2020.</p> <p>Management charter in place as from 2019. Guidelines on Level of responsibilities by grade and Competency framework.</p> <p>Include topic on the Agenda of the meeting of the CCB National Coordinators. Time: Q2 2021.</p> <p>Review ECDC values - 2022. Enhance the use of change management support Time: Ongoing</p> <p>Governance charter with new governance bodies in place since Q2 2020.</p> <p>8A. Review the implementation status of the recommendations for enhanced collaboration between the MB and the AF. Time: Q3 2021.</p>

<p>done by the Working Group set up to define measures in response to the issues noted by the previous evaluation.</p> <p>8B. ECDC should continue improving <i>the efficiency of its planning processes by reviewing and reporting on its activity-based budgeting and costing in a systematic manner</i>, and ensuring that both activities for prioritisation and deprioritisation are taken into account during the elaboration of the annual work programme.</p> <p>8C. The Key Performance Indicators through which ECDC monitors its performance <i>should be revised to include more outcome-level indicators</i>, as used in the present evaluation, in order to better capture the use, value and impact of the Centre’s activities and outputs. The objective of measuring and demonstrating the impact delivered can be streamlined throughout the Centre’s different streams of activities including the Disease Programmes and sections.</p> <p>8D. ECDC’s <i>internal procedure for evaluation should be revised</i> to include stronger mechanisms for ensuring the follow-up on recommendations from internal evaluations and thus ensuring that the targeted improvements to the Centre’s operations are achieved.</p>	<p>implementation of measures taken in response to the second external evaluation.</p> <p>8B. The Management Board encourages ECDC to continue the efficient management of its financial and human resources including the introduction of new efficient procedures to reduce micro-management.</p> <p>With regards to auditing and monitoring of performance, the Audit Committee currently looks mainly at budget issues. <i>It could be explored whether the Audit Committee could take the discussions up a level and also look at programming issues such as indicators and monitoring of implementation</i> and whether another set up of the Audit committee would be needed.</p> <p>8C. The Management Board takes note of the recommendation concerning key performance indicators and refers to the draft ECDC Strategy 2021-2027 where this is foreseen</p> <p>8D. The Management Board endorses the recommendation concerning the revision of internal procedures for evaluation.</p>	<p>Report and possible recommendations Q4 2021.</p> <p>8B. In the coming years through process optimisation, implementation of relevant IT-tools, improved monitoring, and increased integration of different management frameworks the efficiency is expected to increase. Develop Integrated Management Framework implementation plan. Time: Q4 2021</p> <p>Discuss with the Management Board the various feedback they would like to have. In this light, discuss the role of the Audit Committee Time: Q4 2021.</p> <p>8C. Strategic KPIs were approved by the MB in November 2020. First report of strategic KPIs to the MB in March 2022</p> <p>8D. Internal procedure for evaluation was updated in February; expected approval March 2021.</p>
<p>9. ECDC Mandate</p> <p>The evaluation report included a specific recommendation that the possibility of extending the remit of ECDC should be further considered via the competition of a full impact assessment to be undertaken to assess the level of this need.</p>	<p>The external evaluation report recommends a full Impact Assessment on the extension of the mandate given the diversity of views. This is not a recommendation that the Management Board supports. One reason for this was that the Management Board considered insufficient documentary evidence had been presented on the</p>	<p>No action from ECDC needed. Due to COVID19 crisis the European Commission has, in November 2020, put forward a legal proposal to amend ECDC Founding Regulation and Decision 1082/2013/EU.</p>

<p>Given the identified evidence of needs for strengthened EU-level activities in the area of non-communicable diseases and the potential strengths and opportunities of ECDC for taking on these additional tasks, <i>a full Impact Assessment should be undertaken</i>. This should be in line with the European Commission Better Regulation Guidelines. The Impact assessment should be able to further define the needs (problems, drivers, consequences), the corresponding policy objectives and then consider the options of: no change, extension of ECDC's mandate to these areas, or establishing a new EU Agency with a mandate in the areas considered. The Impact Assessment should also consider other areas where ECDC's mandate can be revised – in the areas of international activities and cross-border threats to health other than from communicable diseases</p>	<p>strategic, scientific and technical analysis which would lead to the appropriate discussions with the relevant stakeholders and policy leads at both national and European level.</p> <p>....</p> <p>The Management Board concludes, having considered the possible need to extend the scope of the Centre's mission to other Community level activities in the field of public health, in particular health monitoring, that such an extension cannot be justified only on the basis of the current external evaluation. Instead, the Management Board requests the <i>Commission to consider to propose how to put the question forward, for example based on a scoping analysis</i>.</p>	
---	--	--

External strategic and performance analysis – action plan

Recommendation N according to the report	Status of the Action
<p>1. Outputs are actionable and easy to interpret</p> <p>To ensure that outputs are more action-oriented and directly support decision making in the European Commission or in MS, ECDC could place a larger emphasis on practicality of outputs, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adapting research/response processes to the expressed needs of requestor • When relevant, drawing more on the capabilities of the requestors and expert networks when creating outputs, such as by convening small ad-hoc (external) working groups to solve issues directly in a knowledge-sharing workshop • Giving recommendations explaining caveats, shortcomings and needs for contextualisation/local adaption (rather than refraining from recommendations due to these caveats) • Clear and consistent communication from management that practicality is a priority equal to scientific excellence • Considering developing recommendations that are specific to certain groups of countries, regions or stakeholders with common special characteristics, such as islands, smaller countries, federal versus centralised countries and countries relying heavily on travel and transport. Furthermore, ECDC can create an easy to understand and actionably oriented ‘so what’ synthesis at the beginning of important documents that is easily understood by the relevant audience (including decision makers without detailed expertise). To this end, ECDC could involve communication expert(s) from early on in the production of outputs, to assure interpretability of the broader audience. 	<p>Develop a specific working guide and revised PHE output template(s) including short working instructions to strengthen good practices regarding the summary, analysis and interpretation of scientific and technical data and information.</p> <p>Time: Finalised Q1 2021</p> <p>In the mid and long term, training opportunities should be made available to ECDC staff to further develop writing skills.</p>

<p>2. Outputs are timely and adapted to the needs of the requester</p> <p>To ensure that outputs are timely and adapted to the needs of the requester, ECDC could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop guidelines and processes for scoping of all incoming requests (such as adapting the outputs to requestors' needs), including a clear view on the nature and format of desired outputs and an understanding of how the outputs will be used through adapting lean processes, such as assessing process efficiencies and assigning the right competencies to the right priority level of requests • Define and apply different response approaches depending on the nature of request and needs of requestor – for example, when relevant and helpful, employ a multistep approach (day 1 answer based on best available evidence – including which knowledge gaps remain - updated with 1-week answer, finalised with 3-week scientific report); ad-hoc expert workshop; referral to other sources or previous responses • Create guidelines and process for triaging and prioritising requests, based on relevance, and alignment with overall strategic agenda agreed upon with the European Commission (see also below) 	<p>Prepare a guideline for the assessment and prioritisation of requests coming to ECDC during the PHE.</p> <p>Time: Ready by Q2 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The prioritisation of requests will be based on the relevance of the task and the hierarchy of the requestor. Additional criteria to be considered are the urgency of the task, the impact of the task, the resource implications, if it is applicable to more than one country and if it can only be done by ECDC. <p>Time: Finalised Q2 2021</p>
<p>3. ECDC's activities and outputs are guided by a proactively defined agenda and forward-looking approach</p> <p>Better prioritisation and clear processes for resource allocation to tasks will free up resources, which could be used to for more proactive agenda setting – a more proactive approach in turn supports prioritisation and resource allocation. Create and solidify the strategic agenda of the PHE regularly, in dialogue with the European Commission, to enable better prioritisation and triaging of requests, thus freeing up resources to work on more proactive tasks/outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the appropriate seniority level is present at these meetings from both ECDC and the European Commission. <p>Strengthen and solidify the role of the strategic analyst by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring continuity by evolving the Strategic Analyst position to a permanent more senior Strategic Lead position, supported by additional rotating Strategic Analyst(s) 	<p>To achieve the objective that "ECDC's activities and outputs are guided by a proactively defined agenda and forward-looking approach", the following structural changes and developments are agreed with ECDC management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transform the current strategic analyst function into a permanent mechanism for continuous collection of information, assessment, forecasting of changes and developments in the pandemic and proposing concrete actions; ensure it is properly staffed. • Implement a procedure for defining ECDC's strategic intelligence needs (i.e. which questions regarding future changes and developments in the pandemic we want/need to know to answers to). • Implement a procedure for collection, validation, and assessment of information with relevance to the strategic developments of the pandemic. • Implement a procedure for forecasting and concluding regarding the strategic developments of the pandemic based on the intelligence information.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Co-creating the strategic agenda and reviewing the approach and interim findings regularly with the Management Team - Developing guidelines and a process for how to incorporate the output from strategic analysts into the workflow of the PHE (for example, by assigning a dedicated team) - Clearly defining the responsibilities and who the strategic analyst reports to by determining where in the PHE organisation structure the role fits 	<p>Time: Finalised Q1 2021</p>
<p>4. Internal resources and expert's time are used efficiently, especially in times of urgency and resource shortage</p> <p>Develop and apply guidelines for resource and time allocation of staff, based on the effort needed (scope and approach), priority and urgency of the task, and apply agile best practices (such as quick daily stand-up meetings where daily targets and bottlenecks are defined and staffing an agile coach)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free up resources through a larger share of fast, focused answers in the mix of response approaches. Ensure that personnel do not take on additional tasks without being assigned through the proper channels (such as by the PHE manager or group head) • Consider tracking resource allocation per task to assess efficiency and time requirements for tasks, specifically for larger requests from external requestors (such as the European Commission) 	<p>As part of a guideline the following is agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The estimate of the time needed for the work on a task will be done by the assigned responsible using a planning template. It will cover the expert time and the time of administrative support staff. • The planning of a task can include different approaches for response to the request e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -multistep approach, i.e. day 1 answer based on best available evidence –(including which knowledge gaps remain) - updated with 1-week answer, finalised with 3-week scientific report -input from or work done by ad-hoc expert workshop -in collaboration with ECDC networks and/or other external stakeholders, e.g. WHO -use of volunteers • On-going discussions with HR to enable the tracking of resources at the level of outputs while avoiding access to tools with personal information. <p>Time: Finalised Q2 2021</p>
<p>5. Decision-making guidelines are clear within the PHE at each level</p> <p>The decision-making guidelines are clear within the PHE at each level, that is, it is clear which decisions can be made by PHE managers and/or Group heads, and which decisions need to go to the Management team.</p> <p>Guidelines and criteria on which decision types are tackled at which level of the PHE organization (e.g. PHE managers and/or Group heads versus HoUs).</p> <p>Transfer of text from Recommendation N2: Increase the decision-making mandate of the PHE manager role, after reviewing the selection criteria of the role and/or increasing the</p>	<p>Develop guidance on the decision-making of the PHE manager on all steps from the assessment of request to task management and monitoring and how to escalate when a decision is outside of scope or when agreement cannot be reached.</p> <p>Time: Finalised Q1 2021.</p>

<p>seniority level of the person(s) responsible for defining and ensuring adherence to the priority levels of each request/activity</p>	
<p>8. ECDC's PHE plans are adapted to effectively handle emergencies of different severities and durations</p> <p>Develop a PHE plan to differentiate not only between PHE levels but also different scenarios of crisis depth and length, adapting procedures and the organisation to the nature of the PHE. Consider integrating PHE functions into the 'ordinary' organisation in a lengthy and largescale PHE (like COVID-19)</p>	<p>Revise the PHE plan to increase ECDC effectiveness and efficiency in responding to different types of outbreaks (external support).</p> <p>The successful deployment of the PHE plan depends on the swift resource allocation and de-prioritisation of the annual work programme, and therefore this action will be considered jointly with action N13.</p> <p>Time: Finalised Q4 2021</p>
<p>9. There is an appropriate balance between continuity on strategic positions and rotation on the high workload response roles within the PHE</p> <p>Identify the strategic decision-making roles that benefit from long-term perspective and continuity – this could include, for example, evolving the strategic analyst position to a permanent more senior strategic lead position and/or reducing the rotation on the PHE manager role.</p>	<p>Revise the current set-up for the following roles: PHE Managers, Strategic Analyst, Technical Group leads, and Internal evaluators.</p> <p>Time: Finalised Q1 2021</p>
<p>13. ECDC has an effective business continuity plan in place for future PHEs of varying durations</p> <p>Align with key stakeholders (such as the European Commission and MS) on what the exact key 'regular' activities are that must be kept up and running during a PHE (per PHE level) and codify into a new business continuity plan.</p> <p>Clearly identify the minimum level of resources (per type of personnel) needed to uphold these 'regular' activities for each Unit/Section through, for example, establishing a score card for effectiveness of business continuity using a weekly pulse tracker or other KPI.</p>	<p>Identify and confirm with key external stakeholders the core activities of the Centre ensuring that the minimum level of resources is defined, ideally for each output.</p> <p>Specify the minimum number/amount of each output to be produced in times of PHE.</p> <p>Design a mechanism to reprioritise annual work programme.</p> <p>Time: Finalised Q4 2021</p>
<p>16. ECDC has more personnel to draw upon during a PHE, in flexible and timely manner (such as an emergency response workforce)</p>	<p>Ensure additional human resources during the PHE (e.g. re-assignments of PHE roles, list of staff members trained for PHE, interim services).</p>

<p>Create processes for enabling, during a PHE, flexibility in obtaining staff without long-term commitments, for example and when possible, through shorter secondments and/or with the possibility to work remotely</p>	<p>Develop a plan in agreement with the MS, the EC and relevant EU agencies on how to rapidly increase ECDC's capacity, and accordingly put in place the needed procedures (procurements/MoU/agreements).</p> <p>Time: Finalised Q4 2021</p>
<p>17. All ECDC staff is PHE trained and willing to transition into the PHE organisation as needed</p> <p>Develop e-learning course/s describing the role and function of ECDC in situations of public health events and the (current) PHE structure. The courses will be developed under the frame of the induction programme for newcomers and will be made compulsory for all staff already working at ECDC, covering current and future staff (statutory and non-statutory).</p>	<p>Identify training needs and based on this decide on the type of training courses to be developed (ECDC internal work).</p> <p>Develop the content for the e-learning (outsourced).</p> <p>Time: Finalised Q4 2021</p>