Minutes: Steering Board meeting, 2 September 2020

1. Vaccine portfolio and preparation for the Informal EPSCO Council

The [redacted] indicated that the aim of the extraordinary meeting was to have preparatory talks ahead of the Informal EPSCO meeting that would discuss how to complete the portfolio on the procurement of COVID-19 vaccines [redacted].

The [redacted] stressed that the goal was to obtain a broad portfolio of vaccine candidates that contained different technological approaches, in order to achieve the highest possible chances of a successful vaccine against COVID-19.

The [redacted] underlined that the diversity of the portfolio was good, with three mRNA and two non-replicating viral vector vaccines, but that there was, for the time being, only one candidate vaccine based on the platform of Proteine subunit.

In this light, some Member States were proposing to have Novavax, with whom discussions were ongoing, as a seventh candidate in the portfolio, as an early vaccine on the market, based on protein subunit.

The [redacted] asked the Members of the Steering Board to indicate during the meeting whether they would agree with:
(i) the expansion of portfolio to 6+1
(ii) [redacted].

The [redacted] also asked for further reflection on how proceed with the companies with whom discussions have started [redacted].

[redacted] would to inform the Ministers that the portfolio negotiated by the Commission and MSs aimed to be a broad one, including all candidates expected to be early available and with different technological approaches (non-replicating viral vector, Proteine subunit, mRNA). [redacted] agreed on the importance of adding another Proteine subunit vaccine to the portfolio.

[redacted] would also inform Ministers that in order to ensure that contracts were concluded quickly, making thus available the potential vaccine candidates as soon as possible,
In this light, [REDACTED] would ask Ministers whether they would agree to the necessity of a balanced portfolio regarding the different types of technologies. [REDACTED] also called for a collective and coordinated approach, in the context in which the risk of not having the potential successful vaccine(s) available to all MSs would be more important than having too many doses.

[REDACTED] called for a broad portfolio of vaccine candidates that contained different technological approaches, indicating that [REDACTED] would like to secure all chances of having the successful vaccine when available.

[REDACTED] supported the proposal for a portfolio of 6+1 and asked what would happen with potential new candidates.

[REDACTED] supported [REDACTED] proposal, stressed that Novavax should be covered in the portfolio, and pleaded for an EU common approach. Furthermore, [REDACTED] stressed that talks with other producers should continue and in December the portfolio should be reanalysed and see if it needed to be increased.

[REDACTED] agreed with [REDACTED] proposal, was in favour of an EU common approach and agreed to the necessity of a varied portfolio. [REDACTED] echoed the [REDACTED] question regarding the new potential candidates and also ask for clarification regarding the

[REDACTED] expressed support to [REDACTED] proposal and look forward to details regarding the financial implications.

[REDACTED] informed on the fact that their [REDACTED] attribution would be [REDACTED] their estimation in needs and indicated that a possible way forward for them would be [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] underlined the need for a common EU approach, a diversified portfolio regarding the technologies, and advised against too much interruption and reshuffling, [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] raised questions regarding [REDACTED].
supported strongly a diversified portfolio with 6+1 and additional candidates in the future.

The Commission informed that dialogue with other possible candidates remained open pending Member States decision and that candidate companies were invited to provide updates regarding the development of the vaccines.