



**Minutes**  
**of the ENISA 9<sup>th</sup> Management Board Meeting**  
**26 January 2007**  
**09.00 – 16.00**

**Centre Albert Borschette (Room CCAB 3A), Rue Froissart 36, Brussels,  
Belgium**

**Participants:**

**Member States Representatives:** Reinhard POSCH (Member, AT), Rudi SMET (Alternate, BE), Stoicho STOIKOV (Member, BL), Slavcho MANOLOV (Alternate BL), Flemming FABER (Member, DK), Mait HEIDELBERG (Member, EE), Kristiina PIETIKÄINEN (Chairperson, FI), Isabelle VALENTINI (Alternate, FR), Anja DIEK (Alternate, DE), Nikolaos VLASSOPOULOS (Member, EL), Constantine STEPHANIDIS (Alternate, EL), Ferenc SUBA (Vice-Chair, HU), Aidan RYAN (Member, IE), Giandonato CAGGIANO (Member, IT), Valdemaras SALAUSKAS (Member, LT), François THILL (Member, LU), Joseph N. TABONE (Member, MT), Edgar R. DE LANGE (Member, NL), Krzysztof SILICKI (Member, PL), Pedro Manuel BARBOSA VEIGA (Member, PT), Manuel Filipe PEDROSA DE BARROS (Alternate, PT), Peter BIRO (Member, SK), Gorazd BOZIC (Member, SL), Salvador Soriano Maldonado (Alternate, ES), Pernilla SKANTZE (Alternate, SE), Geoff SMITH (Member, UK)

**Management Board Commission Representatives:** Fabio COLASANTI (Member, Director General DG INFSO); Gregory Paulger (Member, Director Information Society and Media DG), Francisco Garcia Morán (Member, Director General Informatics DG)

**Management Board Stakeholders' Representatives:** Kai RANNENBERG (Member, Academic Rep.), Markus BAUTSCH (Member, Consumer Rep.)

**EEA-Country Representatives (observers) to the Management Board:** Björn GEIRSSON (IS), Jörn RINGLUND (NO)

**ENISA:** Andrea PIROTTI (Executive Director) Giorgos DIMITRIOU (Secretariat to the Board), Andreas MITRAKAS, Alain ESTERLE, Ronald DE BRUIN, Tim MERTENS, Aimilia FILIPPIDI, Sandra ZIAKAS

**Other Participants:** Michael Niebel (Alternate, Head of Unit DGINFSO, Internet; Network and Information Security), Rogier Holla (DG INFSO), Andrea SERVIDA (DG INFSO)

The Chairperson welcomed the participants to the 9<sup>th</sup> Management Board Meeting.

The Chairperson also welcomed the new Member States: Bulgaria and Romania. She announced the new members of the Management Board: Mr. Stoicho Stoikov and the alternate Mr. Slavcho Manolov representing Bulgaria as well as Prof. Giandonato Caggiano and the alternate Mr. Ciro Esposito who are the new members representing Italy.

## **1. Adoption of the Agenda**

The Chairperson informed that two changes have been brought to the agenda previously circulated. The proposed changes are:

- Point 2 b – “The confidential part of the meeting to become point 1 to be discussed in a closed session (confidential part);
- Point 3 (a + b) - “Points for information” to become point 2;
- Point 4 – “Approval of the non automatic carry-over regarding the Tender “An organizational survey at ENISA” to become point 3;
- Point 2 c – “Dates of the next MB meetings” to become the point 4;
- Point 2 a (i + ii) – “Mid Term Evaluation of the Agency” to become the point 5.

The amended agenda was approved.

## **2. Points for information**

- a. Call for Tenders “An organisational survey at ENISA”.

The Chairperson called the Head of Administration of ENISA, Mr. Andreas Mitrakas, to briefly present to the Board this Tender.

During his presentation, Mr. Mitrakas explained that the scope of the tender is to study the satisfaction of the staff of ENISA towards their work at the Agency and to measure work satisfaction in various areas (management, recognition and reward, cooperation and information sharing e.t.c.), He also

mentioned that the survey will be carried out by a consultant company “Ramboll Management” from Denmark.

The Chairperson informed the Management Board that a kick-off meeting took place on the 25th of January 2007 with the Consultant from and the Steering Committee.

b. The tender on strategic advice, information from the Agency

ENISA Head of Administration, Mr. Andreas Mitrakas, gave a presentation about the tender on strategic advice at ENISA.

In autumn 2006 the Agency initiated its strategy orientation process that involved the MB and the PSG. The scope of this strategy orientation process is to determine ENISA strategy, in the years to come, by taking into account and elaborate on ENISA priorities in line with Regulation (EC) 460/2004, appropriate EU requirements and input from bodies of the Agency, in particular the MB & PSG. To anticipate the potential input required by the Agency a Tender was tentatively launched for the provision of services. There was only one offer that was deemed inconclusive by the selection panel.

### **3. Points for approval**

a. Approval of the non-automatic carry-over regarding the Tender “An organisational survey at ENISA”

The Head of Administration of ENISA, Mr. Andreas Mitrakas, explained the reason why an automatic carry-over has been requested. He explained that a call for tender with the subject: “For an Organizational Survey at ENISA” has been launched in the last quarter of 2006 and offers have been received late last year.

The contract was sent to the contractor on 28 December 2006. It was then signed by the contractor on 2 January 2007. The financial commitment has been introduced to Budget 2006 (Budget Item 1421 – Consultancies), in order to cover the cost of the contract which is 49,530 EUR.

In order to cover the cost of the contract with 2006 funds, the Financial Regulation of ENISA gives the opportunity to transfer those funds to 2007 budget, subject to the approval of the Management Board. For that reason, there is a need for a non-automatic carry-over procedure.

The Management Board approved the non-automatic carry-over of the amount 49,530 EUR regarding the Tender “An organisational survey at ENISA”.

#### 4. Points for discussion

##### a. Dates of the next Management Board Meetings

**The Chairperson** suggested having a 1½ day meeting on the 22-23 March 2007 due to the fact that there are many issues to be discussed and concluded.

**Mrs. Diek** invited the MB to the joint meeting on 6 June 2007 in Berlin.

**Portugal** invited the Board to meet in Lisbon in October during their Presidency.

The Members of the Board have agreed on the following dates:

- **10<sup>th</sup> meeting** on 22 - 23 March 2007 in Heraklion.  
(on 23 March 2007 the meeting will end at 13h00);
- **Joint meeting MB/PSG** on 6 June 2007 in Berlin;
- **11<sup>th</sup> meeting** on 10 October 2007 in Lisbon.

#### 5. Points for discussion

##### a. Mid Term Evaluation of the Agency

The Chairperson invited the consultants from the company that has produced the report on the Evaluation of ENISA to give a presentation to the Board.

Mrs. Gabriella Cattaneo and Mr. Eric Domage from “IDC EMEA” presented their conclusions to the Management Board Members.

The evaluation has been made in a very short time with a very good collaboration from all the stakeholders, and it represents a snapshot of what is happening at ENISA. The recommendations are basically opinions of the external experts and that their evaluation constitutes input to the assessment of the Agency. The evaluation report has been distributed to all the Members of the Board

In the evaluation report the following recommendations were presented:

- Break with the past: new phase for the Agency based on the a consensus vision and lessons learnt;
- Appoint a taskforce to develop a strategic roadmap and a rolling action plan for the next 3 years including impact indicators;
- Focus on the specific value added of the Agency's main activities, in order to provide strategic guidelines for resource allocation and priority decision-making;
- Specific effort on marketing to improve visibility in the short-medium term and at least one high profile action within 1 year;
- Revise management processes and internal organization;
- Deal with the location problem consequences.

The long term-recommendations were also presented in the report by focusing on the three elements below:

- Extend the mandate of the Agency maintaining original policy rationale, but with revisions to strategy and structure based on lessons learnt;
- Revise the Regulation to clear ambiguities, focus on main objectives, allow for flexibility in operations and adaptation to evolving conditions;
- Appoint a high-profile figure as "ambassador" and voice of the Agency, perhaps as a non-executive chairman.

It was further proposed to increase the size and the resources of the Agency in order to reach the 'necessary critical mass'. The goals of ENISA should be taken into consideration with regard to the location.

The Chairperson thanked the Consultants for the excellent and useful presentation and the floor for questions was opened. The Board discussed intensively with the consultants about their recommendations.

i. Setting up a task force and its work plan

After the general discussion with the consultants the Chairperson explained that she has requested Mr. Smith to lead the team that will draft the recommendations regarding eventual appropriate changes to the regulation establishing ENISA. The team consists of Mr. Suba (Hungary), Mrs. Valentini (France), Mrs. Skantze (Sweden), Mr. Silicki (Poland), Mr. Ryan (Ireland), Mr. Pedrosa (Portugal), Mrs. Diek (Germany), Mrs. Gailume (Latvia).

Mr. Gaggiano (Italy) volunteered to be part of this task force.

**Mr. Pirotti** asked if Mr. Esterle could represent ENISA in this team.

**The Board** responded negatively and explained that this is the responsibility of the Management Board.

**The Chairperson approved** this composition of the task force.

**Mr. Colasanti** gave an overview of the timeline for the evaluation and regulation process. The Commission plans to issue a Communication on the mid-term evaluation of the Agency by mid-March based on the findings of the IDC report. The communication will be issued for public consultation, which will likely finish in April - May and will be followed by Commission proposal for a revised regulation during summer. In order to allow the Board's recommendations to have an impact on the Commission's proposal on a revised regulation, it is needed to produce a final report of recommendations quite soon after the March MB meeting. As far as the location of the Agency is concerned Mr. Colasanti stated that people can express their opinion and discuss on possible constraints that may derive from the location. Nevertheless, according to his opinion ENISA will remain in Crete for the next 30 years.

The provisional timetable of the work of the task force was agreed to be the following:

- The task force receives the input from the outcome of the meeting of the 9<sup>th</sup> MB meeting;
- During February the first draft of the recommendations should be sent electronically to the Board;
- The final draft of the comment should then be sent by the task Force to the Board on 14<sup>th</sup> of March latest

The work of the Task Force will be to focus on the recommendations that the Management Board has to give to the Commission regarding the new regulation of ENISA and on the orientations to be provided to the Agency for the mandate expiring in 2009.

**Mr. Smith** as chair of the Task Force had prepared a paper on the recommendations and conveyed it to the board. According to Mr. Smith the short-term recommendations identified in the IDC report means that the Task Force would have to identify the added value of the Agency's activities and offer guidelines for resource allocation and priority decision-making. It should be able to create a multi-annual rolling action plan with greater emphasis on potential impacts and success/failure indicators. The Agency's internal organisation and business process should be revised to reflect the new priorities and the need for flexibility and collaborative working. Efforts should be made to increase the operational staff. Issues around the location should be examined and mitigating actions should be explored. This could include establishing hub offices.

As for the long-term recommendations, the most important question is to decide if the Agency's mandate should be extended beyond 2009. The Regulation should be revised to reflect a more strategic role and to remove ambiguities on how far the Agency can be a real centre of expertise and provider of technical advice. The Agency's size and resources should be increased. Mr. Smith also stressed the importance to look carefully at the problem of the scope of the Agency.

**Mr. Colasanti** explained that it should be clear that although the short term recommendations are important the main task of the task force is to produce long term recommendations which could be combined with the strategy.

**Mr. Garcia Morán** proposed to the task force to name the document "Orientations" in order to comply with what the European Commission is seeking.

#### ii. Orientation debate based on the evaluation report

**The Chairperson** proposed to divide and separately discuss the recommendations in two parts concentrating on the long term recommendations:

- Short-term recommendations
- Long-term recommendations

On the long term recommendations, the issues that were discussed are the following: **The scope, the organisation, the governance, the resources and the location.**

#### i. Scope:

**Mr. Colasanti** said that there are three options:

- To continue in the future by keeping the same status quo;
- To close the Agency and replace it by something else;
- To increase the size of the Agency in order to enhance the capacity of the Agency in the NIS field and in becoming a strong player as a central information sharing Body among the stakeholders in Europe.

**Mr. Tabone** mentioned that the scope should derive from the strategy. It is impossible without a process about the strategic orientation of the Agency to say whether the size of the Agency is adequate or not.

**Mr. Silicki** noticed that from the report it is clear that there are contrasting expectations from the Member States, the European Commission and the Industry. It is important to understand what the industry would like to have. For example: A label/certification institution?

**Mr. Stephanidis** stated that the most difficult issue is the scope of ENISA and supported the option mentioned by Mr. Colasanti concerning the enlargement of the scope. The scope should be defined primarily and then the strategy will fit to this.

**Mr. Suba** welcomed the idea of a larger Agency but also wondered whether there is a will to extend the scope beyond the first pillar. **Mr. Suba** stressed the importance of the operational tasks of the Agency.

**Mr. Smith** stated that article 3 of the Regulation is something of a burden. He favoured a think-tank approach where the operational tasks should not be that precisely defined.

**Mr. Colasanti** replied by saying that the legal basis of the Regulation is the internal market. If we seek something related to national security (third pillar) then the adoption of the Regulation is getting difficult because it is required to have unanimity.

**Mr. De Barros** proposed to continue approaching it as it is in the first pillar.

**Mr. Caggiano** added that there is no way to overcome the legal basis of the article 95 because it is still the only basis available and it is also difficult to find the consensus if the legal base is related to the third pillar.

## ii Organisation:

The size of the MB, the need of an ambassador and the roles and responsibilities of different groups such as PSG was discussed.

**Mr. Suba** expressed an opinion regarding the issue of the number of the Management Board members by proposing to keep the current number of members as no Member State will agree to be left out. In addition, he proposed to structure the work of the Management Board by setting up task-forces and ad-hoc groups for different things such as drafting of a Work Programme . **Mr. Suba** also stated that an Ambassador is not needed.

**Mr. Posch** raised that the Management Board is ‘overregulated’ and its work should be more goal oriented than management oriented.

**Mr. Colasanti** stressed out the importance to make a distinction between the general orientation and the strategic orientation for the next meeting. He commented the idea of the Ambassador and proposed to have a kind of ‘Chief in Security’ in order to increase the visibility of the Agency. He further recommended that the Management Board should not interfere too much with the operational tasks of the agency and the tasks of the Executive Director.

**Mr. Vlassopoulos** stated that an Ambassador can not add anything into making things better. He proposed that instead of appointing an “ambassador”



to invite somebody from the Management Board to perform this task. Greece also added that the Regulation should be as general as possible.

**Mr. Caggiano** proposed the Chair of the MB to perform the duty of an ambassador.

iii The resources of ENISA

**Mr. Tabone** said that this issue goes with the scope and strategy of ENISA.

**Mr. Rannenberg** suggested that the resources should be increased by more than 25 staff.

**Mr. de Lange** mentioned that the size of the Agency is related to its goal.

**Mr. Vlassopoulos** added that the broader the scope the larger the resources should be. Given the scope we can optimize the resources.

**Mrs. Diek** argued the opinion of giving more resources to the Agency and wondered on which grounds this should be done. Firstly the scope should be finalized and then the issue of the resources should be dealt.

#### **iv Location:**

The issue of the location was discussed taking into consideration that it is a political decision to have the agency in Greece. In the discussion different aspects of the location such as schooling, flight connections, the presence of FORTH, the privileges of the staff of ENISA etc. were discussed.

**Mr. Stephanidis** on behalf of Greece strongly contested the accuracy of the results of the IDC report. He informed the Management Board that Greece will send an official communication to the Board stating the Greek position to the results of this evaluation.

**Mr. Caggiano** stated that the location is not an issue to be discussed by the Management Board and that decision concerning the location are taken in a higher level. Mr. Caggiano expressed his support to the position of the Greek delegates.

**Mr. Colasanti** suggested that the issue of the location should only be considered in the long-term orientation. Mr. Colasanti also stated that ENISA is not the only Agency situated in the periphery and gave the example of Alicante and Parma.

**Mr. Pirotti** expressed his gratefulness to the Greek authorities for the school and he explained how the school and other facilities work.

**Mr. Posch** stated that the infrastructure of FORTH impressed him positively during the last visit in Heraklion and wondered whether this could help ENISA to overcome their overhead.

**Mr. Stephanidis** took this opportunity to propose the establishment of a possible synergy between ENISA and the FORTH.  
ENISA could benefit from FORTH in overcoming various problems and proposed that ENISA asks the contribution of FORTH and its experts.

**As the conclusion from the discussion Mr. Smith** asked any other written comments to be sent to him by e-mail as soon as possible in order to be discussed within the task force. Mr. Smith also invited ENISA to send any possible comments.

**The Chairperson** asked the Board to send its input about the future of ENISA.

For the Management Board,  
Kristiina Pietikäinen  
*Chairperson*