

DRAFT AGENDA

261st MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

*Conseil Central de l'Economie (CCE), Room 6, 20 Avenue d'Auderghem, 1040 Brussels,
Friday, 20 January 2017, 09h30-13h00*

1. Draft Agenda (B 261/1), *For Adoption*
2. 2.1 Draft Minutes of the 260th Bureau meeting of 9 December 2016 (B 261/2) *For Adoption*

2.2 Draft minutes of the 258th Bureau meeting, 16 September 2016 (B 259/2) *For adoption*
3. Progress Report of the Director (B 261/3), *For Information*
4. Revision of Founding Regulation and Evaluation exercise - update by the Commission (B 261/4), *For Information*
5. Draft Programming Document 2017-2020, version 2018 – final draft (B 261/5), *For Adoption*
6. Foundation Forum 2017 (B 261/6), *For Information*
7. Programming Document, version 2019 – planning schedule (B 261/7), *For Discussion*
8. ICC work programme 2017 (B 261/8), *For Information*
9. Cooperation agreements with EU Agencies (B 261/9), *For Information*
10. AOB
 - 10.1. *Advisory Committees*
 - 10.2. *Reporting Officers*
 - 10.3. *Location of Bureau meeting in March 2017*

FINAL REVISED MINUTES
261ST MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

9.00-13.00, Friday, 20 January 2017

Room 6, Conseil Central D'Économie, Avenue d'Auderghem, Brussels

Mr Fonck	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
Ms Bulgarelli	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Governments)
Mr Närhinen	Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
Mr Kokalov	Member of the Governing Board (Workers)
Ms Andersen	Member of the Governing Board (Employers)
Ms Welter	Member of the Governing Board (Coordinator Governments)
Ms Bober	Coordinator (Employers)
Ms Hoffmann	Deputy Coordinator (Workers)
Ms Kauffmann	European Commission
Ms Scanferla	European Commission
Mr Menéndez-Valdés	Director
Ms Mezger	Deputy Director
Mr Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Governing Board
Mr Storrie	Eurofound

1. Welcome to meeting and adoption of agenda (B 260/1)

Mr Fonck (Workers) chaired the meeting in the absence of the Chairperson, Ms Rossi. Regrets were received from Mr Mühl who was replaced at the meeting by Ms Andersen.

The Chairperson proposed the following additions to the agenda: the role of academic experts in the Advisory Committees; nominations for Reporting Officers for the Director; and the location of the Bureau meeting in March.

2. Adoption of minutes of Bureau meetings

2.1. Minutes of the Bureau meeting, 9 December 2016 (B 261/2a)

- 2.1.1 4.7 The **Chairperson** asked for the following changes to be inserted in the text after 'evaluation criteria 'The Workers' Group voiced in the Bureau of May 2014 their strong disappointment about the way Eurofound had transposed the joint concerns of the Bureau to attach very strong importance to the criterion of excellent expert knowledge of the national industrial relations system and social partners in the selection procedure. The report and justification given to the bureau after the selection showed that in some cases the score awarded to rather administrative criteria (e.g. the description of a mechanism to keep deadlines) was three times more important in the weighting of scores than the criterion on the strategy to access and maintain the connection with relevant social partners, policymakers and other practitioners. He insisted that the design and weighting of the criteria be adapted in order to capture better the concerns of the Bureau to select centers with expert knowledge of the national industrial relations systems.

The Director wished to state for the minutes that in procurement procedures there was

a distinction between Selection and Award criteria, whereby applicants had to pass the selection criteria and score above 70% in a range criteria before progressing to be evaluated on distinct Award criteria. This explained why it might appear that certain criteria were ranked as less important. In any case, concerns of the groups were noted.

2.1.2 **Ms Welter (Governments)** made the following comments.

Point 2.12 She noted minor editorial changes at 2.12.

Point 4.9 Contrary to the statement in the minutes that Eurofound did not wish to restrict meetings between the national correspondents and stakeholders to face to face meetings only, she said that in some member states face to face meetings were not more costly but were more effective.

Point 5. The final sentence should be deleted as the Bureau needed more information before deciding whether to accept or refuse the Director's request regarding participation in Bureau meetings.

The amended minutes were adopted and the Director's statement was recorded.

2.2 Adoption of minutes of Bureau meeting, 16 September 2016 (B 261/2b)

2.2.1 These minutes had not been submitted in November due to the shorter Bureau meeting which discussed only the work programme.

- **Mr Maes (Commission)** had submitted a number of changes in writing.
- 3.8 The Director corrected that it should read 'European Commission' and not ETUC.

The minutes were adopted subject to the Commission's changes.

3. Progress report of the Director (B 261/3)

3.1 The Director outlined activities in Eurofound since his last progress report in November.

- A highlight of the period had been the launch of the 6th European Working Conditions Survey (6EWCS) overview report in the European Parliament on 17 November. A number of Board members had participated and the experience of the event was a positive one.
- The national cluster seminar was held in Berlin on 28-29 November and had focused on the labour market integration of migrants and refugees.
- The second regional seminar of the pilot project on the Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME) was held in San Sebastian, also on that date.
- On 7 December the Coordination of the Agencies had organised an Agencies' Forum in the European Parliament. Eurofound was a member of the coordinating body until the end of February. The forum was an opportunity to present the work of the EU Agencies to key stakeholders.
- On 13 January Eurofound had welcomed Mr Calvet Chambon, rapporteur on revision of the Eurofound's new founding regulation in the European Parliament.
- There were good preliminary results for Eurofound's key performance indicators in 2016, including programme delivery with the target overachieved, correcting the situation of previous year.
- He informed the Bureau on the results of the annual user satisfaction survey which were positive.
- He highlighted recent publications including a new type that featured the contributions of participants in Eurofound's recent Foundation Seminar Series which looked at the digitalisation of work. This was a good way to realise added

- value from what was a costly exercise relative to the number of participants.
- Cooperation with the ILO was ongoing in relation to the EWCS report and the production of global guidelines for developing national contributions. The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences had ultimately decided to reduce the number of questions they used from Eurofound's questionnaire, so the results would be less ambitious than originally intended but interesting nevertheless.
 - Within the EurWORK observatory a number of longer topical updates would be published on *Capacity building initiatives for social dialogue* and *Social Dialogue in the context of digital challenge*. The *Annual update on pay/minimum wages* was due.
 - The further analysis of the European Company Survey (ECS) on *Reported changes in European Companies* promised to be an interesting report.
 - Following the Comparative Analytical Report (CAR) exploring fraudulent forms of contracting work and self-employment in the EU, further in-depth analysis on five forms of fraudulent forms of contracting, including some in-depth interviews, would be published at a later date.
 - He outlined the different Representativeness Studies which had been published or were in the pipeline including: Personal services (hair and beauty sector); Postal and courier activities; Railways and public urban transport; sugar; shipbuilding; Tanning and leather, Footwear; Metal; and Steel. Discussions with DG Employment on Sector studies would start in 2017 subject to NACE code clarification.
 - The feasibility study on the *European Social Dialogue Database* development had been finalised and would inform further work on the Representativeness Studies and presentation of data in 2017.
 - The fieldwork of the 4th *European Quality of Life Survey* had been extended to the end of January, possibly in one case to February. There was however no change to the scheduled date for publication of the overview report.
 - He presented a slide with an update on the *Future of Manufacturing in Europe* (FOME) project including developments with the test site for the planned re-shoring monitor. He would be happy to take any questions on the project.
 - He presented provisional year-end financial figures that in comparison to 2015 included a higher level of unplanned carryovers, though they were still at a reasonable level (at 5.2% of the overall). The overall budget execution remained high.
 - He outlined the transfers between budget lines in the final amended budget, noting that he was obliged to report this to the Bureau. He informed of upcoming written procedures to approve the Programming Document and the 2018 work programme, as well as the approval of carryovers.
 - The report of the Court of Auditors had established a preliminary finding in relation to an error in the salaries of staff in place during the time of transition to the new staff regulations in 2005. An error in the so-called multiplication factor applied to the salaries resulting in under payments and overpayments to several staff. The underpayments had been regularised in November 2016. The over payments would not be recovered, in line with Article 85 of the staff regulation (confirmed by DG HR) corresponding to the fact that the staff members could not have been aware of the error. As a further consequence Eurofound would carry out an external evaluation of its salary function.
 - The audit of the 2016 accounts would be carried out in March 2017 by Mazars

Ireland.

- The Internal Audit Service (IAS) had carried out an audit to ensure that project management procedures supported the achievement of Eurofound's business objectives. The report, which was available on the extranet, made four recommendations. They concerned project governance (clarification of roles and guidelines), project monitoring and reporting (addition of data on human resources in projects), recommendations in relation to workload allocation and deadlines planning, and data quality checks in the project management information system. Eurofound would be addressing the recommendations. There would be scope for more detailed discussion of the audit reports in the Bureau meeting in March, as usual. It was required to submit the action plan to the IAS by 30 January 2017.

3.2 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that that it would have been good to discuss the action plan in the Bureau.

3.3 The **Deputy Director** responding to concerns that the Bureau had not been duly informed about the Internal Audit Service report, explained that it had been received quite late in the year on 23 December. It had been published on the extranet for the Governing Board on 4 January.

It is normal procedure that Eurofound would develop an action plan in response to an audit's findings, and would then inform the Governing Board and Bureau about the plan.

3.4 The **Chairperson** said that he had seen the report having received it by mistake instead of the new Chairperson Ms Rossi.

The recommendations did seem quite serious and he felt that as a matter of transparency the Governing Board should have been better informed.

3.5 **Mr Grimmeisen** said that follow up of internal audit reports were usually an internal matter, whereby Eurofound would have to develop actions in relation to the findings that the IAS would come back again on Eurofound's response and would also follow up on the implementation of the action plan. It was routine that the Governing Board was informed throughout the process but it was not usually involved in it.

3.6 **The Director** agreed that there could have been more information to the Board, but for a number of reasons Eurofound had not wanted to send a mail to the new Board members before they had received information about their role and details of how to login to the extranet, where the documents were published.

He did not agree with all of the comments in the report and there had been a number of exchanges with the IAS. However in spite of that, Eurofound preferred to concentrate on recommendations and he did consider that a number of valid points had been raised and that the actions in response were reasonable and would be helpful.

- 3.7
- **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** thanked the Director for his progress report. She said that the presentation of the 6th European Working Conditions Survey report in the European Parliament had been an excellent event.
 - Regarding the matter of academic experts on Advisory Committees, she urged Eurofound to launch a call for such experts, not only to ensure transparency but also to allow more people to come forward and propose themselves.
 - The FOME project was interesting and she wondered if any research results were available to be shared.
 - In relation to the IAS report, although she had not yet had time to read the report, it

should be emphasised that there were no critical findings. If the Director had disagreements about some of the material findings it was important to point that out. However she felt that the activity based budgetary approach was an opportunity to understand how the resources of the research project managers were utilised, particularly with regard to missions and travel.

- 3.8 **The Director** replied that Eurofound was in the process of preparing a call for interest similar to that described by Ms Bulgarelli.

The work of the FOME project was still at a preliminary stage, restricted to workshops and conferences on a regional level.

- 3.9 **The Chairperson asked that all Board members receive the IAS report as soon as possible.** There were strong sentences about weaknesses in project management at Eurofound and important recommendations.

- 3.10 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** agreed that it was important to distribute the report to the Governing Board. In relation to the reports of the Internal Audit Service she added that Eurofound should be precise in relation to any points in the IAS report with which it did not agree. It was important to correct any misunderstandings both for the record and in terms of accountability.

She added that she also found the seminar launching the Sixth European Working Conditions Survey to be an excellent event.

- 3.11 **The Director** agreed to focus mainly on recommendations and outlined areas where Eurofound had engaged with certain statements in the report. The action plan would be presented to the Bureau in March.

- 3.12 **The Director** concluded his progress report.

- He updated the Bureau on HR matters, including recruitment activity, a follow up to the staff engagement survey and the organisational development which had been undertaken in line with the new Programming Document.
- An *ad hoc* information request had been received from the European Commission in the context of the follow-up to the European Pillar on Social Rights. It would concern a customised report '*Recent evidence on the labour situation of workers in new types of employment, temporary employment and the self-employed*'

4. Update by the Commission on the revision of the Founding regulation and the evaluation exercise (B 261/4)

- 4.1 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** informed the Bureau that the Commission's proposal had passed through the Council and was now with the European Parliament. It still included elements such as suppression of the Deputy Director's post, and that the Governing Board was the Appointing Authority. The Employment Committee of the Parliament were in charge of the procedure with voting expected in June 2017.

With regard to the cross-cutting evaluation of the tripartite agencies in 2017, a contract had been awarded to Ecorys UK and the terms of reference had been sent to the Director and the Bureau earlier in the week. It would be completed by December 2017 and an internal Commission working paper with the key results of the evaluation was foreseen in 2018. As mentioned by the Director in the Governing Board meeting, members of the Board if approached should treat the evaluation seriously, as it was an important matter the outcome of which was not certain.

Ms Scanferla added that following adoption of the report in June there would likely be further meetings between the Council, Parliament and the Commission. The duration

of this phase depended on whether it was considered a technical or political decision. The role of the Commission in that phase was usually to explain and sometimes defend its position.

4.2 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** regarding the cross-cutting evaluation noted that the terms of reference made provision for an inception report and that it was not foreseen to consult the agencies in order to confirm or check the facts and figures.

4.3 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** replied that a Commission inter-service Group had been set up, which would be responsible for the evaluation. The agency would be informed about the developments but it was not foreseen that it would be involved in steering the evaluation.

4.4 **The Director** said that the Agency would be willing to assist the evaluation process, for example by informing the Governing Board members about the process and also by providing up-to-date and correct facts or figures to the evaluators.

5. Final Draft Programming Document 2017-2020- version 2018 (B 261/5)

5.1 The **Director** briefly introduced the programme, noting that this final draft included clearly marked areas where clarification from the members was required.

5.2 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** made the following remarks:

- In the context of discussions on negative priorities, she had consulted with colleagues in the Platform on Undeclared Work who were currently setting the priorities of the platform. Following discussions with them, her suggestion was that Eurofound should proactively provide an input of its own data on undeclared work to the platform. It would be an opportunity to demonstrate Eurofound's valuable tripartite approach to the issue. It was misleading to include it in the negative priorities and it should be deleted.
- She welcomed the information provided by the Commission on research carried out by them on the integration of third-country nationals. Based on this list, it would appear that there was scope for discussion between the Commission and Eurofound on additional work that was possible in the future in the area of migrants.
- Line 983-984 the sentence Eurofound is not among the Agencies that have been given additional resources to deal with the situation should be deleted, as the situations in the different EU Agencies were not comparable.
- Similarly Line 985-989 should be reworked. Eurofound had a good deal of expertise in the area of undeclared work, and the paragraph should be more general such as 'Eurofound will cooperate with the Platform'. At line 1145 the description of the project on undeclared work would also have to be amended.
- The Group reiterated their call to increase the time spent by Eurofound's research managers on research, by reducing the time spent travelling.
- She outlined a proposal by the Governments for an event in which Eurofound would invite papers from organisations and researchers using its data. It would be an excellent way to disseminate its information further, and to capitalise on its data through collaborating in this way. Such an event need not be expensive.
- She made a number of points in relation to the budget, asked what exactly was meant by 'external services' with a foreseen increase of EUR 120,000 and commented on the risk table.

5.3 **Ms Bober (Employers)** made the following remarks on behalf of her Group.

- The programme was quite overloaded and the Group would not therefore be requesting additional projects, although they understood the points made by the Governments on the theme of undeclared work.
- On the other hand, they would foresee deleting a project in which it did not seem there was great interest, and over which there had been a difference of opinion, namely the Social Dialogue project investigating the articulation and level-linkages between the European social dialogue and social dialogue at national level, with a particular focus on the company level (line 1164-1171). The Group could support the insertion of the project on undeclared work if this project were deleted.
- There had been discussions with ETUC on the capacity building project however they were not at a point where a joint proposal was possible. This was an important topic and along with the other partners the Employers had signed a declaration about social dialogue that included commitments to capacity building. A subgroup had been created in the Social Dialogue Committee to look at capacity building. The Commission had also published a report on social developments in Europe with a chapter on capacity building. Eurofound's contribution would have to be seen within the context of all of these activities, so the Group would need more time to reflect on what that might be. They would be ready with a proposal by 2019. Without a mandate to propose something however what was proposed by Eurofound was a good preparatory base and so the Group could agree to that.

5.4 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** made the following comments:

- The Group appreciated that some of the uncertainties around the European Working Conditions Survey had been removed but noted that line 1805 again picked up on 'cost-saving scenarios and their quality implications'.
- Line 1106 in relation to the survey, said that the approach for sectoral and occupational comparisons in job quality from the EWCS data would be decided in 2019 i.e. three years after the data had been collected. She wondered if it could be done sooner.
- She reiterated the interest of the Group in the subject of articulation and made some fresh arguments in favour of the research. It was, she said, becoming clear in the reports on the recast European Works Councils Directive that the gap in the knowledge was in relation to how EWC or transnational company level social dialogue translated into actually Europeanising a multilevel system. The Group felt that Eurofound was well placed to do this study, because of its expertise and experience on the European Works Councils worked in practice.
- She agreed with the Employers' comments on capacity building. The Group had the idea that Eurofound could build on its database work have a biannual or annual report on the state of play of social dialogue, in terms of the agreements, what had been signed or implemented, and what to cover. It would be good if Eurofound could provide an overview. The analysis would be done by the social partners, but such an overview would be enormously helpful.
- Line 1292 it was not clear that the Workers' comments on the link between employment protection and segmentation had been answered in the changes. Some clarification was required.
- Line 1386 it would be useful to be more explicit about how the outputs here covered the issue of migrants and refugees.

5.5 **The Chairperson** reiterated that lines 1805-1808 which appeared to put in doubt the future of the survey should be deleted.

5.6 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** made the following comments:

- In the document currently the staff table on page 27 did not include the figure of 91 posts in 2018 which the agency was obliged to achieve as part of the 10% reduction. If this was not achieved the Commission would have to reserve its opinion on the written procedure for approving the programme.
- The proposals made today on the platform of undeclared work sounded feasible, and as they did not represent additional work but were more a gathering of existing material, it did seem that the topic should stay in the area of negative priorities with a slightly different formulation, as requested.
- On the capacity building, the understanding had been that the Employers and Workers could bring a clear proposal by 10 January so it was disappointing that this had not been possible. The Commission attached great importance to this work. The proposal of the Workers' Group in relation to a database of agreements did not reflect what was proposed in the document. She looked forward to a more concrete proposal at a later date.
- The project on articulation was important, and she supported its inclusion in the programme.

5.7 **The Director** responded to some of the comments.

- He outlined Eurofound's interaction to date with the Platform on Undeclared Work that included undertaking a feasibility study for transforming the database into a knowledge bank. Eurofound had presented information at the European Parliament and had offered to present information to the first meeting of the Platform, an offer which had been declined at the time. Eurofound had made available the results of the work on fraudulent forms of work there. Given the budgetary constraints however, Eurofound was not in a position to do more at this stage and hence this was included in the area of negative priorities, pending on decisions of the work programme of the Platform.
- It was in his opinion justified to reflect in the document that EU Agencies (e.g. FRA) had been given additional resources by the Budgetary Authority to deal with the migrant and refugees issue whereas Eurofound had not received additional resources. He would concur with the Bureau's wishes that the sentence should be deleted but he wanted to state the point.
- He noted and would further explore the suggestion about an event with organisations and researchers using Eurofound data. He added that Eurofound released its data as soon as possible to select organisations such as the OECD for their job strain index.

5.8 **The Deputy Director** in relation to this proposal said that she did not see the need for additional parallel activities, because the kind of collaboration described was already underway in Social Science networks like the InGRID project organised by DG Research and Innovation at the European Commission.

5.9 **However, the Chairperson proposed that the idea of an event with organisations using Eurofound data be taken up in a later meeting of the Bureau.**

5.10 **The Director** noted that the missions budget covered all staff participating in meetings where there was a cost.

Once again he assured the Bureau members that the European Working Conditions Survey would go ahead as planned in 2020. He said that it was important that the Bureau and in particular the representatives of the Workers trusted his assurances in

this regard. However as he had stated on many occasions it was also necessary to undertake to review all the surveys, in relation to timing, cycle, exploration costs, quality implications, parameters.

- 5.11 **The Deputy Director** referred to the new strategic activity in the work programme on the development of surveys. It was necessary to explore in terms of methodology and collaboration. The Governing Board of course would be informed and would ultimately decide about any changes.
- 5.12 **Ms Bober and Ms Andersen (Employers)** agreed that it was necessary to have this long term strategic approach.
- 5.13 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** also agreed that it was important to reflect on these issues and to reflect broadly, so that no one survey was excluded from discussion.
- 5.14 Further to questions from the Governments' Group, **Mr Grimmeisen** explained that the budget line for external services was mainly composed of fees for Service Level Agreements with the Commission for software, as well as the cost of trainees. The increase in this figure was due to the fact that Eurofound was expected to take up the Commission's HR system (SYSPER) and had restored the trainee budget to normal levels, following the budgetary pressures in the previous year.
- Concerning the types of procurement indicated in the table in Annex IX, he said that subject to the financial rules there was scope for selecting heavier open tender procedures or negotiated procedures where applicants were invited to tender. An explanatory footnote would be inserted in the programme to outline the different procedures.
- 5.15 The **Chairperson** summarised the textual amendments required in relation to the assurances about the EWCS, and noted that there remained a difference of opinion over the project on articulation of social dialogue and a requirement for clarification on the capacity building.
- 5.16 The **Director** proposed that the Employers and Workers come together with a joint text on the two research projects on articulation of social dialogue and capacity building. He said that on the capacity building project, they should consult with the Commission who also had an interest in this area.
- The project on articulation followed a request of the European Parliament in 2016 that 'Eurofound takes account in its 2018 work programme studies examining cooperation between European Works Councils and European Framework Agreements'.
- 5.17 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** did not wish to link the two projects so that one might be deleted in order to undertake the other.
- 5.18 **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that the Group could agree to the text on capacity building as it was on the basis that discussions with ETUC would continue and that it might be possible to add to the text at a later stage.
- However the Group did not support the text as it stood on the articulation between the EU and national levels of social dialogue, as they had never received a satisfactory explanation of the reasons behind the project.
- 5.19 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** putting it in the larger context of years of work done by Eurofound on European Works Councils, on information consultation, on social dialogue at work this was the only item in the work programme focusing in particular on articulation.

- 5.20 **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that the Directive was very clear on what was meant by articulation and whilst it was sometimes difficult to apply it was working. The Group did not understand the reasoning behind this project and did not support the focus on articulation.
- 5.21 The **Chairperson** indicated that it was necessary to reach a compromise on the issue in order to adopt the programme. There followed a protracted discussion between the Employers and Workers on the research.
- It was not appropriate to delete the project as it was linked to a direct request from the Parliament.
- The Groups agreed to delegate the task to Eurofound of finding a text that was acceptable to all the Groups in order to submit the work programme for approval by written procedure. A joint proposal on capacity building could be suggested at a later stage for the final programming document.
- Discussion on the final draft 2018 work programme concluded and the Groups agreed that the document with the amendments could be sent for approval by a written procedure.
6. The Bureau decided that **the next meeting would be held in Dublin** on 10 March 2017.
7. The **Director** said that the Foundation Forum (B 261/6) would consider upward convergence in living and working conditions, including employment, a theme that was in line with the strategic objectives of the Four-Year Programme. Any ideas about the kinds of sessions that could be held should be sent to Eurofound. He reminded the members that the Forum was a high level event, that invitations would be issued at the highest level in the organisation, and he asked the members to alert the people within their own organisations.
- In relation to figures in the budget table for 2018 he noted that in order to avoid disruption to the business he would be appealing to the Commission for a margin of manoeuvre in the non-compliance with the required staff reductions (he mentioned a period of three months).
- He informed the Bureau that the notice of the tender for the Network of European Correspondents would be sent to the Official Journal of the EU on 10 February 2017.
8. The date of the next meeting would be Friday, 10 March 2017 in Dublin.

Chairperson

Director

DRAFT AGENDA
262nd MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
CC2, Raymond-Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound, Dublin
Friday, 10 March 2017, 09h00-13h00

1. Draft Agenda (B 262/1), *For Adoption*
2. Draft Minutes of the 261st Bureau meeting of 20 January 2017 (B 262/2), *For Adoption*
3. Progress report of the Director (B 262/3), *For Information*
 - incl. presentation of projects 2017
 - update on Foundation Forum
4. Revision of Founding Regulation and Cross-Agency evaluation - update by the Commission (B262/4), *For Information*
5. Update on Information & Communication activities - focus on approach to events (B 262/5), *For Information*
6. Advisory Committees - functioning of Advisory Committees and participation of academic experts (B 262/6), *For Information*
7. IAS audit report on project management – state of play (B 262/7), *For Discussion*
8. AOB

Date and venue of **next Bureau meeting**:

Friday, 12 May 2017 at 9:30 hrs

Brussels, Conseil Central de l’Economie (Eurofound’s Brussels Office)

REVISED FINAL MINUTES
262nd MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

9.00-13.00, Friday, 10 March 2017

Room CC2, Raymond-Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound

Ms Rossi	Chairperson of the Governing Board (Employers)
Mr Fonck	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
Mr Närhinen	Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
Mr Mühl	Member of the Governing Board (Employers)
Mr Kokalov	Member of the Governing Board (Workers)
Ms Welter	Member of the Governing Board (Coordinator Governments)
Mr Scherrer	Coordinator (Workers)
Ms Hoffmann	Deputy Coordinator (Workers)
Ms Kauffmann	European Commission
Mr Maes	European Commission
Mr Menéndez-Valdés	Director
Ms Mezger	Deputy Director
Mr Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Governing Board
Mr Storrie	Eurofound
Ms McCaughey	Eurofound (for point 5)

1. Welcome to the meeting and adoption of Draft Agenda (B 262/1)
Apologies were received from Ms Bulgarelli (Governments) and Ms Bober (Employers).
The draft agenda was adopted.
2. Adoption of draft minutes of Bureau meeting 20 January 2017 (B 262/2)
 - 2.1 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** requested the following changes to the minutes.
 - 3.7 At this point, Eurofound may wish to include for the record that she had stated that she also found the presentation of the Sixth European Working Conditions in the European Parliament to have been an excellent event.
 - 3.10 The last sentence should be amended: It was important to correct any misunderstandings both for the record and in terms of accountability.
 - 4.1 As mentioned by the Director in the Governing Board meeting, members of the Board if approached should treat the evaluation seriously, as it was an important matter, the outcome of which was not certain.
 - 4.3 Ms Kauffmann replied that a Commission inter-service group had been set up and would be responsible for the evaluation. It was not foreseen that it would be involved in steering the evaluation.
 - 5.8 It was not Ms Kauffmann, but rather the Deputy Director who had intervened at this point.
 - 2.2 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** said that he was included in the list of participants but had not attended the meeting.

- 2.3 **Ms Welter** following up from the minutes (which she felt did not reflect the richness of the discussion) asked whether a decision had been taken on whether to prepare a resumé of existing Eurofound research in the area, in order to submit it to the Platform on Undeclared Work.

The Director replied that Ms Gerstenberger had presented the preliminary results of the report on *Self Employment* to the Platform on 9 March 2017 and he had asked her to also present a short overview of Eurofound's work in the area to date.

2.3 **With the above amendments the minutes were adopted.**

3. Director's progress report (B 262/3)

- 3.1 **The Director** highlighted some of the activities since the last Bureau meeting on 20 January, which were outlined in greater detail in the progress reports submitted.

- Implementation of the new 2017-2020 programming document had begun, with Eurofound presenting the new activities in the usual meetings in the European Parliament and the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC). The EESC had provided a longer slot on the day as it was also presenting its opinion on the new Founding Regulation for Eurofound.
- He noted that the Social Partners had not yet submitted an alternative joint proposal for the project on capacity building. The draft programme sent to the Commission in late January, contained the original research proposal.

Mr Scherrer responded, informing the Bureau that a meeting had been held in recent days between the social partners and the Commission. He said that capacity building was considered an important topic for the stakeholders and that written exchanges were ongoing in order to prepare a joint submission. Eurofound should expect a proposal in the near future.

- The **Director** alerted the Bureau to the upcoming discussions on the rolling work programme which would include planning for the period to 2021, while this goes beyond the current Multiannual Financial Framework. It was clear that by that time, the implications of the UK's departure from the union would affect all EU budget lines. The rolling part of the Programming Document would remain unchanged but it would be necessary to present a brief outline for 2021, considering the budgetary pressures in the future. For example although a cycle of the EQLS was due in 2021 it would not be feasible in that year.
- The European Parliament's discharge procedure was almost complete and it looked as though the budget would be discharged without difficulty for all EU Agencies, including Eurofound.
- EQLS fieldwork in 28 countries was now complete and the recent delays were not expected to have a major impact on the schedule publication of the report.
- Regarding the Sixth European Working Conditions Survey (6 EWCS), he informed the Bureau that a weighting error had been discovered in relation to the data for Spain. The analysis remained valid but there were slight changes in the EU figures. The database and Survey Mapping Tool had been corrected. Further actions were ongoing that included correcting the dataset deposited in the UK Data Archive and in the related publications, and notifying anyone who had worked with the dataset to date.
- A number of meetings had been held with colleagues in the European Commission in order to further improve communications with the agency, and to introduce Mr Baussaud the recently appointed head of Eurofound's Brussels office.

- The tender for the Network of European Correspondents had been published on 28 February 2017.
- Planning was underway for the Foundation Forum in November 2017 and an early draft programme had been circulated to the Bureau and would be discussed later during the meeting.
- Eurofound's action plan to address the Internal Audit Service (IAS) recommendations on its audit of project management in Eurofound, had been accepted by the IAS.
- He highlighted a number of publications including the 2016 *European Restructuring Monitor* (ERM) report which would focus on offshoring and reshoring in Europe. It was this kind of qualitative assessment that demonstrated the greatest value of the ERM.
- At the request of a number of MEPs, Eurofound had hosted a visit by members of the European Parliament on a cross-party basis which included Eurosceptic groups. It was felt that the visit had been successful, with a good level of interest shown by the visitors in the programme that was presented.
- A joint report with the ILO *Working anytime, anywhere: the effects on the world of work* had proven to be an interesting way to extend Eurofound's reach, providing a higher visibility than usual. Eurofound had used data of the EWCS and a Comparative Analytical Report (CAR) and had covered a number of European countries, whilst the ILO had covered non-European countries. There was press coverage beyond Europe.
- In his slides he outlined the list of 2017 projects grouped by activity and said that more detailed information on the status of each project was available in the update report.
- He highlighted the project on *Casual work – characteristics and implications* which would complete the earlier work on new forms of employment that had mapped nine new forms of work (the research on new forms of work in ICT and Job Sharing had been completed – new forms of casual work and crowd employment would be tackled in this phase).
- He informed the Bureau that preparations had started for the 7th EWCS, planned for 2020.
- Work was ongoing on preparations for the joint European Company Survey with Cedefop. A steering group composed of members of the two Governing Boards would meet on 11 May 2017 in Brussels.

The feasibility of using a web-based survey mode had been investigated (whilst Eurofound's other surveys were conducted face-to-face, the ECS was conducted by telephone interview). However although the technological future of surveys might be in this direction, it appeared that it would not yield many cost savings. There were some difficulties with the coordination of the procurement with Cedefop. In this sense the joint procedure was more labour intensive and took longer than usual.

- He mentioned the upcoming joint OECD event on *Social Mobility and Equal Opportunity* on 4 May in Paris. Whilst it had originally been planned to launch Eurofound's report on *Social Mobility in EU Countries* at this event, the OECD whose own report in the area was due for publication only after the event, did not support this idea. Therefore, Eurofound would launch its own report in April. This kind of joint event provided an excellent opportunity for greater public visibility.
- In a slide he updated the Bureau on the Future of Manufacturing in Europe

(FOME) project, which was a project funded by the European Parliament. The *European Reshoring Monitor* on the website was now fully operational. Meetings had been held on 2 March 2017 with potential contractors for preparation of *Manufacturing Employment Scenarios*, and explorations were underway with the inter-service steering group on relevant and feasible scenarios such as Trade, Energy, Investment, Technology and Growth.

- The tender for the Network of European Correspondents had been published and he outlined how the concerns of the Bureau and Board had been taken on board in both the selection and award criteria. He encouraged the members to disseminate the tender within their own networks. The Deputy Director added that the Governing Board members would soon receive a letter asking them to make a quality assessment of their collaboration with the networks in the previous year.
- Regarding the Foundation Forum, he noted that the programme was a very early draft and included the names of persons who had not yet been contacted, so members should not distribute it further. He encouraged the members of the Bureau to ensure participation at the highest level within their organisation. There was a short exchange on the Forum with members offering advice based on their own experiences.
- He informed the members of upcoming written procedures of the Governing Board, on the appointment of Reporting Officers for the Director and Deputy Director, and certain implementing rules regarding the staff regulations.
- **Mr Grimmeisen** reported that in discussions on the upcoming revised general financial regulations, the Court of Auditors had indicated that it would in the future externalise the audit process fully so that the first visit of the auditors every year in November (which looked into procurement and recruitment) would also be carried out by a private audit firm. This was not the preferred outcome for the EU Agencies, as in the past a pilot project had revealed certain difficulties as the private-firm auditors were not experienced in the EU Staff Regulations or the Financial Regulation. There would also be cost implications.
- The **Director** informed the Bureau about the Sysper2 project, a significant ICT project whereby the agencies would implement the Commission's software for managing human resources.
- Eurofound had received two *ad hoc* research requests. One from the European Commission concerned the labour market situation of workers in new forms of employment, temporary employment and self-employment (a customised report of existing findings) and was required before May 2017. The other on work-life balance (a Comparative Analytical Report (CAR)) had been requested by the member for the Austrian governments.

3.2 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that there were serious doubts about the request in relation to the CAR, as the Commission's own proposal on work-life balance was due for publication on 26 April 2017, with an impact assessment and a report to follow. It seemed that there was a high risk of duplication of effort.

3.3 There followed a discussion on procedures for *ad hoc* research requests and the role of the Bureau in the process.

The **Chairperson** summarised that the procedure was such that these requests were managed by Eurofound although the Bureau was informed about them in a transparent way. Whilst it was not necessary to have tripartite agreement beforehand it was important that a request was generally supported.

As it appeared that there were concerns that in this case the request would duplicate work done elsewhere, no further action would be taken in relation to the CAR until the Commission had reported from its own impact assessment after April.

It was noted that Eurofound had published a CAR on promoting the uptake of parental and paternity leave amongst fathers in the European Union in 2014, which in some ways addressed the request.

Mr Storrie added that there was provision in the budget in 2017 for addressing *ad hoc* requests, with resources assigned that were equivalent to a full CAR.

- 3.4 **Ms Welter (Governments)** said that in the list of events in the progress report, it was the case that some countries were not represented at all and she wondered why.

In relation to the tender for the correspondents, one member from her Group was curious to know if the tender included provision for input to CARs, as the evaluation of the network had indicated some declining use of this aspect of the national correspondent's activities.

In relation to the Foundation Forum it was felt that the Governing Board members were noticeably absent from the programme.

- 3.5 There followed a short discussion on the Foundation Forum, touching on the concept of the event, the profile of the speakers and the involvement of members of the Governing Board.

- The **Director** explained that the Forum had a more external orientation but the involvement of some Board members was foreseen, in relation to Chairing roles etc.
- The **Chairperson** said that the Forum presented an opportunity for Eurofound to reach out to other people within the stakeholder organisations, beyond the usual Governing Board members.
- **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** encouraged Eurofound to strive to be innovative in the Forum, to avoid that the event would be a high level event with lofty declarations but without subsequent actions.

- 3.6 Responding to Ms Welter, **the Director** replied that the correspondent's contract mainly concerned regular reporting such as articles, quarterly reports and mini-CARs. The number of CARs had been reduced. A good part of the work of the correspondents was of course concerned with producing the Representativeness Studies.

The geographical split of events would be covered in the presentation by the Head of Information and Communication later.

- 3.6 The **Chairperson** thanked the Director for his progress report.

4. Revision of Founding Regulations – update by the Commission

- 4.1 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that the Commission had presented its proposal to the Employment Committee of the Parliament on 28 February 2017.

Discussion within the various Parliamentary committees was due on 22-23 March 2017, with the reports of the three rapporteurs due after that, with adoption in the Employment Committee in June and vote in the plenary at the latest in September, followed after that by a trilogue between the three institutions.

The latest information was that the rapporteur for Eurofound was proposing the following: a reduced Governing Board of nine members representing the three

Groups; retention of the post of Deputy Director; representation of the European Parliament in the Management Board and on the Executive Board; and the introduction of a reference indicating that in the future agencies could be merged following an evaluation; proposals were also included aimed at improving working relations between the Commission and Eurofound in order to avoid overlaps.

It was not clear that these proposals were supported in full by the other rapporteurs, and the final proposal would be voted on by the Committees. Some elements of the proposal were interesting but it would remain to be seen what the final text would be.

The **Chairperson** invited any questions from the Bureau.

- 4.2 **Mr Fonck (Workers)** wondered about the origin of the proposal to reduce the size of the Management Board, whether it originated from the rapporteur himself or reflected the views of the Committee. **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** asked why the three agencies had been discussed separately in the Parliament.
- 4.3 **Mr Maes (Commission)** said that the European Commission had dealt with the agencies as a package, as had the Council but the Parliament had not. The Parliament committees were aware that the proposals were almost identical so that they would not have a strong negotiation position in the trilogue if they had diverging proposals. However in the Parliament, it was the beginning of a process whereby there might be amendments from other MEPs in the Committees, and further amendments in the plenary.

The idea of a reduced Management Board was not included in the proposals of the other rapporteurs so it could be assumed to have come from the rapporteur himself. However it was expected that the various rapporteurs would converge in their opinions.

- 4.4 In relation to the **cross-agency evaluation** being undertaken by the Commission, the **Director** asked about the schedule of interviews and offered once again to provide up-to-date fact sheets about the agency to the evaluation team. He said that Eurofound would circulate a short information note to the Governing Board members, with relevant figures and performance data.
- 4.5 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that the factual information offered by the Director would be very welcome and would be shared with the contractor.

Mr Maes added that the evaluators were setting dates for interviews, with the first interviews scheduled in Brussels. Ms de Boer had been identified as contact person in Eurofound. With such a large number of interviews scheduled in the evaluation of four agencies, he said that any issues that might arise should be immediately reported to the Commission in order to be fed back to the evaluators.

The interviews would be targeted, and would include Bureau members, Governing Board members, Eurofound staff and stakeholders. There would also be a public consultation on the four agencies in the first week of April. He would inform Eurofound once this had been launched.

In response to a question from the Chairperson he said that it would also be possible for the social partners to participate in that public consultation through their organisations.

In response to a question from the Deputy Director he said that the inception report scheduled for the end of January would be used by the Steering Group and would therefore remain within the Commission. However there would be a workshop

towards the end of the evaluation exercise during which Bureau and Governing Board members as well as senior staff of the agency would be able to verify the findings of the evaluation and also to have a look at the draft recommendations emerging from this process.

He reiterated that any requests for information should be sent to the Commission. For the moment the terms of reference and the roadmap for the evaluation were the only documents that could be shared.

5. Update on Information and Communication activities (B 262/5)

5.1 **Ms McCaughey** presented an overview of communication activities with a focus on the strategy in relation to events.

The overall objective of activities was to communicate Eurofound's research in such a way as to have an impact and influence on policymakers. Target groups identified included stakeholders (the Governing Board) and primary target groups (the EU Institutions, the Social Partners etc.) as well as intermediary target groups such as research organisations, universities, media and various multipliers i.e. channels that could be used for further dissemination. The general public was not a core group for Eurofound's communication strategy, but was an audience that could be reached through social media and similar channels.

She presented the national picture of events in the period 2013-2016, a period during which the communications budget had suffered reductions. Following a decision the number of publications had been reduced from 172 per annum in 2013 to 105 in 2016)

Downloads from the website had increased, following a drop in 2015 after a difficult transition to the new website. This increase was attributable also to improved social media campaigning which encouraged click-through to the website.

Eurofound's contact management system (known as the CRM) had been further developed, with greater ability for users to subscribe to areas of interest and with regular targeted dissemination made possible.

12,500 publications had been disseminated in 2016 using the Service Level Agreement with the Official Publications Office of the EU. The development of targeted marketing lists had made it possible to reduce the costs in this contract.

In parallel email marketing had improved, with CRM contacts receiving notification of publications with a link to a download, as for example with the recent tender for the Network of European Correspondents. In the CRM it was possible to analyse how users interacted with the content, if for example they had downloaded the information, and it was also much easier to manage user subscriptions.

Press activity had to be seen in the context of a much more diverse media field, where press releases were no longer as relevant and where activities could be virtualised, or could be formed by outreach to a group or media. An issue that Eurofound was encountering in trying to assess its media impact was the problem of accessing media behind paywalls. It would appear that the EU Agencies were now able to participate in a framework tender of the European Commission for media monitoring, but how that might be facilitated in terms of costs etc. was not yet clear.

The national cluster events had been organised to ensure a broad coverage of the Member States. With regards to national-level communication there was obviously a greater focus on Belgium (in reality Brussels) but dissemination activities were generally across the Member States from the perspective of translation, and events, particularly linked to the EU Presidency events.

She presented a list of the most downloaded publications, noting that the most popular continued to be reports of the European Working Conditions Survey and its secondary analyses, as well as the Eurofound Yearbook and the report on the NEETs.

She noted that the design of the Sixth European Working Conditions Survey overview report had been updated, with new styles, new graphs and more correlation with the Survey Mapping Tool. Further to the information provided by the Director earlier about the error in the data for Spain, she informed that an updated version of the report with updated tables and figures should be available in April 2017 provided that no additional issues are identified.

Other highlights included contributions to the informal Council meetings (Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs (EPSCO) Employment Committee (EMCO) and Social Protection Committee (SPC)), which allowed Eurofound to target national players represented at those committees.

Eurofound monitored its performance in three KPIs: uptake of Eurofound's knowledge through its website (i.e. downloads), Use of Eurofound's expertise in key EU policy documents, and contribution to policy development through events. In the last year, Eurofound had made 13 contributions to EPSCO and EU Presidency events, four to EMCO meetings, two to SPC meetings, 13 to European Parliament debates, 47 to European Commission events and 18 to the EU level social and seven to EESC events.

She presented a chart detailing the internal impact tracking of references to Eurofound research in EU policy documents of the target groups that charted the references between 2013 and 2016.

She briefly outlined the communications approach linked to the new programme, and the reduced resources for communication activities.

Information on the website was presented through portals (see for example EurWORK, EMCC and EurLife).

The publication strategy had been renewed and a number of new publication types developed. In future the strategy would incorporate:

- One flagship report for each of the strategic areas during the four years plus a spotlight for each strategic area on the website,
- A maximum of two policy paper series (these were adaptations of the Foundation Findings series) per strategic area each year,
- A maximum number of reports per strategic area and the introduction of blogs.

She presented the website which had been reviewed and updated with new features. A number of audits had been carried out (online communications, search engine optimisation and usability), the findings of which were now being addressed.

Eurofound's new corporate branding had been applied across the range of outputs.

An annual user satisfaction survey had been conducted and the results implied that the target audiences were being reached, and their information needs were being met.

She then presented in more detail on Eurofound's events strategy focusing in detailed slides on how resources were allocated and utilised in this area.

Eurofound tended to have three types of events: own events (e.g. the Foundation Forum), joint events (including Presidency events) and events where Eurofound made contributions only. Joint events presented a better return on investment for a small agency like Eurofound, and the unwritten policy in the last few years had been to focus on these kinds of events.

The cost of Eurofound's contributions to events was covered under the Missions budget. There was an internal policy to prioritise high impact missions and therefore specific criteria were applied in the internal approval processes. As indicated in the presentation there was an overall downward trend in the costs of missions.

- 5.2 On behalf of the Group which had raised the issue **Mr Närhinen (Governments)** said that they were pleased to see that there was consideration of the added value of a mission.

They also welcomed the information on the events at national level, the reasons why some countries did not appear in the list, and the reassurance that they were served by other activities, as described by Ms McCaughey.

- 5.3 **Mr Kokalov (Workers)** agreed and noted that Eurofound's presentations to the Labour Market Section of the European Economic and Social Committee had been an excellent example of disseminating information to its target audiences.

- 5.4 **The Chairperson** thanked Ms McCaughey for a very thorough presentation of events. The Bureau would continue to monitor the activities in this important area of activity.

6. Functioning of Advisory Committees and Academic Experts (B 262/6)

- 6.1 The Bureau discussed this topic which had been deferred from the meeting in January.

- 6.2 **Mr Fonck (Workers)** outlined the motivation of the Group for introducing this topic which was based on comments received from colleagues on the differing experiences in the committees, and in particular where it was felt that improvements could be made. The comments in general had concerned the late delivery of documents, a lack of time for discussion of reports and the lack of flexibility around the dates of the back to back meetings.

The Group were satisfied by the answers provided in the Bureau paper but he would urge Eurofound to try to be more flexible when dates were difficult for some members.

The Workers thought that it would be useful to involve the committees in discussion at a very early stage of the work programme development, in order to bring in ideas.

- 6.3 **The Director** agreed that the concerns raised were valid and that it was important that documents were available in time, in accordance with the rules and procedures for the committees. The staff had recently held discussions to ensure that procedures in the various advisory committees were standardised.

Regarding the experts there would be an open call for experts, but he noted that at any point it was possible for the Groups to bring experts to the meetings, but that other members would not be able to attend, as it was not possible to exceed the total number of participants allowed per Group.

- 6.4 **Mr Närhinen (Governments)** conveyed the comments of Ms Bulgarelli, that experts should be nominated on a renewable rather than a permanent basis.

He also wondered what the interest would be for a scientific expert in participating in an Advisory Committee.

As a member of the Advisory Committee for Working Conditions he considered that it might be useful to reduce the number of reports for discussion, in order to allow time for discussion, and suggested that only those researchers responsible for research under discussion should be present, in order to reduce costs and to improve discussion.

- 6.5 **Mr Mühl (Employers)** said that he did not think that the Advisory Committees

should have any formal role in the development of the work programme, the adoption of which was already quite a complex process.

It seemed that the solution to the problem of meetings that were too long was to focus on only the most important reports, and to remember that an Advisory Committee was not a place for negotiation but rather a forum for an exchange of views.

He was not sure that the suggestion to have shorter terms for experts was feasible, as it usually took more than two years to become familiar with the way the committees and Eurofound worked.

- 6.6 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** clarified that the Group did not think that the work programme should be discussed in the committees as part of the formal adoption procedure, but rather the committees were an environment for a more qualitative discussion of the programme and therefore a means of providing a different more focused input, an early view into the programme to identify parallels, things that were missing or duplicated.

The Group understood that the organisation of back-to-back meetings of the Industrial relations and Working conditions committees was in order to take account of members who had interests in projects dealt with by both committees, and perhaps the new Strategic Areas programming would allow an opportunity to review which committee dealt with which topic.

She said that at least in her field, the role as expert in an Advisory Committee was an attractive one. It was an excellent opportunity to gain some European knowledge and to have an input into the debate, as well as providing excellent opportunities for building research networks.

- 6.7 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that the two days of the back-to-back meetings seemed too long. She did not think that the committees should have any formal role in the approval of the work programme. In relation to experts, it was important that there was foreseen to have the possibility of a mid-term evaluation of experts as a way to ensure the ongoing quality of experts on the committees.

- 6.8 **The Director** thanked the members for their comments.

- He agreed that continuity of expertise was important but that there should also be a mechanism to replace experts if they were not suitable.
- Any potential conflicts of interests were actively managed, and it was clear that experts should not be directly involved in Eurofound tenders.
- He agreed that it was important to have more focused discussion in the Advisory Committees (maybe with less points in the Agenda) and the research colleagues were discussing how to achieve this.
- In relation to the timing, the meetings were usually in March and September/October in order to facilitate feedback on the implementation of the work programme, and on the discussion of the new programming document before its approval. The back-to-back meetings were a compromise arrangement to facilitate the interest in overlapping projects on working conditions and industrial relations, and also to facilitate attendance of members of both committees. It had been discussed in various occasions with same outcome, and it should not be necessary to take the point up repeatedly in Bureau meetings.
- He added that the opinions of the Advisory Committees on the work programme were welcomed and could be taken into consideration, while not part of the adoption procedure.

- 6.9 **The Chairperson** concluded the discussion on this item.
7. IAS Audit Report on Project Management (B 262/7)
- 7.1 **The Deputy Director** said that the action plan in response to recommendations of the Internal Audit Service (IAS) had now been agreed and Eurofound would respond to the recommendations on the roles and responsibilities in relation to projects, and the monitoring and reporting on projects.
She reassured the Bureau that all actions would be implemented and the Bureau would be informed on a regular basis, as usual.
- 7.2 **Mr Närhinen (Governments)** said that the document should state clearly who was responsible for the overall coordination of the action plan.
- 7.3 **The Deputy Director** said that she was responsible and this would be made clear in the document.
- 7.4 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that it was not clear if in relation to recommendation no. 4 of the report, Eurofound would now be modifying its KPI no. 4 in order to reflect progress against deliverables throughout the year, rather than at the end of the year only.
She asked how the role of the Head of Unit in relation to quality control and delivery in project management would be reinforced.
In response to recommendation no. 3 which called for more time to be allocated for approval of project deliverables by Advisory Committees, the action plan stated that this was being done in 2017 and she asked for further information about that.
- 7.5 **The Director** replied to the comments.
KPI no. 4 referred to deliverables at the end of the programme year. Progress on the deliverables during the year was reported on at the Bureau and Board meeting with a very detail report. Eurofound would be retaining the current procedure. Deliverables that ran into a subsequent year would be reported on with the KPIs at the end of that year.
The suggestion in relation to the Advisory Committees was to allow some contingency in terms of time, for discussion or disagreements in the committees and this would be factored in to the revision of the guidelines for project management.
The issue of quality control would be addressed systematically in the guidelines.
8. AOB
- 8.1 **Mr Grimmeisen** informed that a written procedure for appointing the Reporting officers for the Director and Deputy Director would be launched shortly.
The next meeting of the Bureau would be held on **Friday, 12 May 2017** in Brussels.

[Signed H.Fonck]
Chairperson

[Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]
Director

DRAFT AGENDA
263rd MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
Conseil Central de l'Économie (CCE), Room 6, 20 avenue d'Auderghem, 1040 Brussels
Friday, 12 May 2017, 9h30-13h00

Item	Agenda item	Ref no.	Time	Presented by
1.	Draft Agenda <i>For Adoption</i>	<i>B 263/1</i>	<i>9.30-9.35</i>	<i>Chair</i>
2.	Draft Minutes of the 262nd Bureau Meeting of 10 March 2017 <i>For Adoption</i>	<i>B 263/2</i>	<i>9.35-9.45</i>	<i>Chair</i>
3.	Progress Report of the Director <i>For Information</i>		<i>9.45-10.30</i>	<i>Director</i>
	- Projects Publications & Events	<i>B 263/3(i)</i>		
	- Update on Foundation Forum	<i>B 263/3(ii)</i>		
4.	Revision of Founding Regulation and Cross-Agency evaluation - update by the Commission <i>For Information</i>	<i>No document</i>	<i>10.30-10.45</i>	<i>European Commission</i>
5.	Programming Document 2017–2020 – revision of 'General Context' chapter and multiannual part <i>For Discussion</i>	<i>B 263/5</i>	<i>10.45-11.30</i>	<i>Director</i>
	<i>Break</i>		<i>11.30-11.45</i>	
6.	Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR) 2016 <i>For Discussion</i>	<i>B 263/6</i>	<i>11.45-12.15</i>	<i>Deputy Director</i>
7.	Network of European Correspondents		<i>12.15-12.45</i>	<i>Deputy Director</i>
	- Annual feedback on National Correspondents' contacts with GB <i>For Information</i>	<i>B 263/7.1</i>		<i>Director</i>
	- State of Play of tender procedure <i>For Information</i>	<i>B 263/7.2</i>		
8.	Schedule of Summer Group meetings 29-30 June 2017 <i>For Adoption</i>	<i>B 263/8</i>	<i>12.45-13.00</i>	<i>Director</i>
9.	AOB		<i>tbc</i>	

Date and venue of **next Bureau meeting**:

Friday, 15 September 2017 at 9:30 hrs

Brussels, Conseil Central de l'Économie (Eurofound's Brussels Office)

FINAL REVISED MINUTES
263rd MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

9.30-13.00, Friday, 12 May 2017

Room 6, Conseil Central d'Économie, Avenue d'Auderghem, Brussels

Ms Rossi	Chairperson of the Governing Board (Employers)
Ms Bulgarelli	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Governments)
Mr Fonck	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
Ms Kauffmann	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (European Commission)
Mr Närhinen	Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
Mr Mühl	Member of the Governing Board (Employers)
Mr Kokalov	Member of the Governing Board (Workers)
Ms Welter	Member of the Governing Board (Coordinator Governments)
Ms Bober	Coordinator (Employers)
Mr Scherrer	Coordinator (Workers)
Ms Hoffmann	Deputy Coordinator (Workers)
Mr Maes	Member of the Bureau European Commission
Mr Menéndez-Valdés	Director
Ms Mezger	Deputy Director
Mr Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Governing Board
Ms Roelen	European Commission
Mr Storrie	Eurofound
Mr Baussand	Eurofound

1. Adoption of draft agenda (B 263/1)

The agenda was adopted. As the Chairperson was delayed the meeting was chaired initially by Ms Bulgarelli (Governments).

The draft agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of minutes of Bureau 10 March 2017 (B 264/2)

- 2.1 **6.8 Mr Fonck (Workers)** said that the summary conclusion of discussions did not reflect that the Group had suggested contacting the current experts on the Advisory Committees with regard to suggestions they might have for improving their role and functioning in the committees.

The **Director** confirmed that Eurofound would follow up.

- 2.2 **3.4 Ms Welter (Governments)** said that the minutes and the draft programme circulated with agenda item 3 did not fully reflect the discussion and the Group's position that Board members should be more visible in the programme of the Foundation Forum, and that at least the Chairperson should have a more visible role there.

- 2.3 **4.1 Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** requested an addition to the text as follows:

'Discussion within the various Parliamentary committees was due on 22-23 March 2017, with the reports of the three rapporteurs due after that, with adoption in the

Employment Committee in June and vote in the plenary at the latest in September, followed after that by a trilogue between the three institutions.

6.7 She had stated that it was important to foresee the possibility to have a mid-term evaluation of experts as a way to ensure ongoing quality.

The **Director** said that this would be discussed under item 3 but noted that the minutes tried to reflect discussions, and recorded conclusions only where formal decisions were required. When an item was not indicated for action it did not mean that the opinion of the Bureau members was not taken into consideration.

The draft minutes were adopted with amendments.

3. Director's Progress Report (B 263/3)

3.1 The **Director** highlighted some of the activities in the detailed progress reports provided.

- *Sixth European Working Conditions Surveys (EWCS)* the correction of the weighting errors had been completed (a problem had been identified with the weighting of the data for Spain due to the top-up sample); the Survey Mapping Tool had been corrected. As a result he had requested a more thorough check, resulting in updates to the EWCS data files. The report was being revised accordingly; further minor changes were being made to the Survey Mapping Tool and to the EWCS dataset deposited with the UK Data Archive at the University of Essex.
- *Fourth European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS)* the field work was complete. The data was currently being cleaned and work on the dataset would commence shortly, with the ambitious intention to produce the overview report by the end of the year.
- *Fourth European Company Survey (ECS)*. The agreement on the joint survey with Cedefop had now been signed and the tender procedure launched on 10 May 2017. The Steering Group for the survey including members of the Governing Boards of both Agencies had met on 11 May, with rather intense discussion on the content of the survey questionnaire.

Ms Bober (Employers) said that representatives of the Employers' Group who had participated in the meeting had expressed concern regarding the content of the survey questionnaire. The Group were keen that the survey would focus on company skills needs and skills strategies, but in the meeting there were indications that the scope would be shifted more towards the social relationship at work and the role of social partnership in the provision of training. The Employers wanted to focus on the company skills needs, and for that it was necessary to focus on the management's assessment of that. It should be noted that in the previous year Cedefop had published research on the topic of skills mismatch from the point of view of the Workers. The EWCS also focused on the training participation of workers, and the information and consultation of workers, so the Employers' Group were keen to retain in the ECS an emphasis on skills from a management perspective.

The Director noted that the previous ECS had covered work organisation, HR Management practices, direct participation or direct involvement of staff, and formal social dialogue. Two additional topics had been added to the questionnaire (Skills use and skills strategy and Digitalisation) and in order not to extend the questionnaire, it would be necessary to reduce some of the other parts.

In relation to the questionnaire, he added that the OECD was also interested in questions that could be related to their own Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) and the Programme for international Student Assessment (PISA). He reminded the Bureau that the steering group would be consulted on the questionnaire for the survey but it was not the case that the questionnaire had to be adopted by consensus.

Ms Bulgarelli (Governments) who had attended the meeting said that the crucial moment for discussion would be when the questionnaire was available. She wished to highlight that the joint survey was highly relevant in facilitating cooperation with Cedefop and bringing added value to knowledge at EU level, combining skills and work organisation, human resource practice and social dialogue.

She was co-chair of the OECD Board of participating countries and the request to link the surveys with the PIAAC came from that Group, on the basis that to make the ECS comparable with the PIAAC would introduce a global element to the company survey.

- **The Director** continued. He highlighted the reports *Working Time Patterns and Sustainable Work* and *Exploring self-employment in Europe* noting that much of the working time report concerned work life balance which was quite relevant for the Commission's initiative in the area. The Advisory Committee had facilitated a first input from the Commission's services to the report.
- The report on *Social Mobility in Europe* had been published in April. This was also the subject of Eurofound's first joint event with the OECD in Paris on 4 May 2017. The OECD were pleased with the collaborative meeting, and responded positively to suggestions to draw up a framework cooperation agreement similar to that of Eurofound's with the ILO, around the areas in Eurofound's work programme that were priorities for them namely the data in Eurofound's surveys (the EWCS had been used by the OECD in its job quality framework to measure what was termed the 'workplace environment'). Further discussions would take place, which would then be pre-cleared with the Commission as usual.

Ms Kauffmann (Commission) said that she had participated in the meeting and found the discussion very interesting, with the participants coming from a research background. The publication of the European Pillar of Social Rights on the previous day had slightly dominated the discussions. She also noted that the Employment Committee (EMCO) meeting in Malta, titled *Making Work Pay* had also been very interesting.

- **The Director** highlighted the report *Income inequalities and employment patterns in Europe before and after the Great Recession* where the work done on wages distribution in Europe had been replicated. This formed part of the basis of an intervention in the informal Employment and Social Affairs Council (EPSCO) meeting in Malta in April, with an update on wages as well.
- Eurofound had been in close contact with the ILO in relation to their tripartite national debates on the future of work. The Director had participated in their meeting in Spain, and had collaborated on their meeting in Ireland too.
- Eurofound had participated in the informal EPSCO meeting as well as the EMCO meeting of the Maltese Presidency, which was one of the most relevant for Eurofound, in particular in relation to coordination with the Commission.
- Eurofound had hosted a visit by Hugh Fraser, coordinator of the European Social Policy Network (ESPN).

- Due to recently announced staff departures, Eurofound would meet the target of a 10% reduction in staff as requested by the Commission. He referenced future challenges in Eurofound due to the EU budget.
Ms Bulgarelli (Governments) in the chair acknowledged the concerns of the Bureau vis-à-vis budget and staff and suggested that the matter might be taken up in discussions on the work programme.
- The **Director** continued that in the absence of any volunteers stepping forward to join the troika on the coordination of the EU Agencies, Eurofound would remain a member of the EU Agency Network (EUAN) along with EFSA and EIOPA, both large Agencies, until March 2018.

Implementation of the Work Programme

He highlighted some of the projects detailed in his presentation:

- *Measuring Working Conditions in a Global Perspective* was a joint report with the OECD and would include chapters on the US, South Korea, Turkey and a selection of Chinese cities as well as a chapter for other surveys. The research had been discussed at a meeting at the ILO offices in Geneva on 28-29 March 2017.
- To the Commission, he said that researchers in Chile, supported by the OECD, had been in contact with DG DEVCO and would be making a proposal for a working conditions survey in Latin America, based on the EWCS. In parallel, colleagues in DG DEVCO had expressed an interest in availing of Eurofound's technical advice in EUROsociAL, the Commission's programme for cooperation between Europe and Latin America. He had asked them to channel their request through DG Employment.
- He was pleased to report a high rate of Representativeness Studies completed.
- In relation to the EurWORK portal on collective bargaining, he informed that following discussions in the Advisory Committee on synergies with relevant institutions reporting on collective bargaining in Europe (e.g. ILO, OECD etc), Eurofound would launch an online survey asking what information the members wished to be included in that portal and he said it was important that the members identify their preferences. A feasibility study would be carried out examining the implications of the different options.
- In the new transversal research area the Digital Age, the report *Conditions of work and employment in ICT-based mobile work* was a continuation of the joint report with the ILO, and represented further use of the EWCS data plus other elements.
- He presented a slide with updated information on the *Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME)* project funded by the European Parliament.
- He provided background information on Eurofound's performance indicator measurements which remained on target, despite reduced resources. The score for the 'Recognition of Scientific quality of Eurofound's Research' was the highest to date. He presented indicators for contributions to policy development in 2016, Key EU documents, citations in key EU documents, as well as the results of the 2016 User Satisfaction survey. He reported that the topics addressed the most in EU policy documents quoting Eurofound were: employment, working conditions, labour market, youth and social inclusion.
- The programme for the *Foundation Forum* was still provisional. Although the Governing Board members would not be participating as speakers, they would

play a role by for example chairing or concluding sessions. These details would be included in the programme at a later stage.

- He informed the Bureau of upcoming written procedures on implementing rules to the staff regulations, on adoption of the annual report and the accounts, which would be launched earlier this year by request of the Commission.
- The external audit, this time by a private audit company on behalf of the Court of Auditors had taken place satisfactorily. The preliminary observations of the Court on the accounts had been received on 10 May 2017. Disappointingly, the report once again made reference to the high level of carryovers, this despite the large amount of work done by Eurofound in recent years, also as part of the network of agencies, to inform the Court and the Parliament about the unavoidable nature of these carryovers in a multiannual programming environment.

Unusually, the Court was suggesting utilising ‘differentiated appropriations’, a tool used by the European Commission for its own multiannual activities, which historically had not been considered appropriate for the EU Agencies.

- The report *Some aspects of non-standard employment in Europe*, which had been a stakeholder request from the European Commission, was almost complete. It combined information collected from the self-employment reports provided by the correspondents. In response to questions from the Bureau he said that the table of contents would be circulated to indicate what was covered there.
- He also informed the Bureau of a new stakeholder request from the Commission in relation to regular updates on European developments of the social partners in the European Semester.

He asked the Commission to forward details of the requirements as soon as possible, or the timeline for completion by October could not be achieved. As this was a new request in his opinion it should be considered by the Bureau under the provisions for *ad hoc* requests, as it had not been included in the work programme planning.

- **Mr Närhinen (Governments)** asked for clarification on this request. The National Reform Programme reports of the Member States were similar, so he wondered whether it risked duplicating that work.
- **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that the reports referred to by Mr Närhinen tended to be drafted by Governments, sometimes, but not always, with the involvement of the Social Partners, and tended therefore to reflect the Government’s position on social dialogue in a Member State. The Commission wanted a more comprehensive picture. For instance, in October the Commission had held an exercise whereby for the first time the Employment Committee EMCO (representing the Governments) had been supplemented with representatives from the national Social Partners to discuss how social dialogue worked within the context of the European Semester. The exercise was judged to have been very successful. Although it was not planned to make it an annual exercise, it might take place on a more focused level with a reduced number of Member States. The idea was to sustain the monitoring element and encourage the involvement of Social Partners in the formulation of policy and strategy. The Commission considered it to be an important element of the European Semester and the input of Eurofound was considered important for the discussion and for the monitoring elements. Eurofound had presented at the meeting, but it was hoped to facilitate an earlier input to the discussions next time.

- **Mr Maes (Commission)** indicated that the matter had been discussed already with the research units in Eurofound, whereby it had been said that it would be useful to have the outputs from the collaboration in the Employment committee in the European Semester included. It would be good and beneficial for Eurofound to present some more updated information on the involvement of the social partners in the Semester when they would be invited to EMCO to present their findings. In the October meeting there would be a selection of around ten Member States and the Commission would welcome the expertise of Eurofound on involvement of the Social Partners in the European Semester to also feed into that more specific discussion that would take place in the Employment Committee. The research was a request from the Commission but was in the interests of all the Groups and Eurofound to be in a position to present up-to-date information at the next meeting in October.
- **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** had participated in the EMCO meeting on behalf of ETUC and could report that the Workers Group had found the report on the participation of Social Partners in the Semester to be quite contentious in that they did not reflect the situation on the ground, as they saw it. It would be good to avoid such a situation by ensuring the participation of the Social Partners.
- The **Director** clarified that Eurofound was very interested in participating, but to date Eurofound had received no information from the Commission about which Member States would be involved in the process this year, and which details were required. He was highlighting the matter to the Bureau because it qualified as an *ad hoc* request in the 2017 and the 2018 programmes, and the question was therefore if the Bureau wished to allocate the *ad hoc* resource to the work.
- **Mr Fonck (Workers)** asked if it would be possible to have a short paper on the proposal as it was difficult to make a decision based on such little information.
- **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** referred to the discussions in the previous Bureau on the subject of *ad hoc* reports, the conclusions of which had not been clear from the minutes. As a quadripartite body, requests would come from every Group, and it was certainly easier for the Commission to make proposals as it did not have to consult with 28 Member States. It should be dealt with as an *ad hoc* request as it was not included in the work programme. She wondered what would be the process for dealing with this in the fairest way.
- **The Director** did not wish to repeat discussions from the previous meeting but explained that in a situation where it was necessary to plan two years in advance, more resources had been allocated to the *ad hoc* research capacity. In the past Eurofound had provided a Stakeholder Inquiry Service and Customised Reports service, without any issues. The criteria for agreeing to a request were usually that funds were available and that the request was one that made sense in light of the work programme. There was no formal approval process. For example he said, in the previous Bureau meeting it had been decided not to proceed with a research request because it became apparent that it would duplicate research being undertaken by the Commission. He reiterated that there had been no problems with *ad hoc* research requests to date.

CONCLUSIONS:

- **The Bureau noted the contents of the Director's progress report.**
- **Following a discussion on the way in which *ad hoc* research requests were approved, the Bureau members said that they would welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter at a later date as it was felt that more**

formal requests by stakeholders should be approved by the Bureau.

4. Revision of the Founding Regulation – update from the Commission (B 263/4)
- 4.1 **Mr Maes (Commission)** provided a short update.
- The Employment Committee of the European Parliament was still working on the three proposals for the three decentralised agencies, with over 200 amendments to the Commission’s original proposal.
 - There seemed to be support for a number of the proposed amendments.
 - Alternative proposals had been made in relation to the Appointing Authority powers for staff matters.
 - There was clear support for having a member designated by the European Parliament and Mr Chambon, Rapporteur for Eurofound’s regulation, was proposing also that the European Parliament should have representatives on the Bureau too, although some MEPs had raised doubts about this, particularly considering the Parliament’s role in relation to the budget and whether there was a desire to be involved in the Agencies at such a detailed level. Some proposed two, others three members of the Parliament, but the Common Approach foresaw only one.
 - The MEPs had heard the concerns of some of the Agencies in relation to the the Translation Centre, and a number of amendments foresaw the possibility of outsourcing translations.
 - Differently to the other rapporteurs, Mr Chambon maintained his proposal to reduce the size of the Governing Boards to nine for each Group. He also included a specific amendment which would require all the EU Institutions to first consult with Eurofound before outsourcing anything that would be within the field of expertise of Eurofound. This in the Commission’s view went too far. All rapporteurs however emphasised the need for the agencies to coordinate among each other also with the Commission and in order to enhance the coordination with the other agencies they all foresaw an observer status for the other agencies in each other’s Governing Boards.
 - Mr Chambon also proposed the retention of the Deputy Director post in Eurofound. A number of proposals in relation to Cedefop indicated that the management board should still have a possibility to appoint a Deputy Director although the Deputy Director role was not currently included in Cedefop’s founding regulation.
 - The next step in the process was a vote on the amendments with probably a number of compromise amendments in June. If so, the vote and plenary could take place in July or directly after the summer break. The Estonian Presidency was preparing to start the trilogues directly after the summer.
- 4.2 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** asked whether the proposal to reduce the Board was widely supported.
- Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** asked about the mechanisms for coordinating the debate on the three proposals, for example by debating them together in June. What was the role of the report by the European Economic and Social Committee (ECOSOC) in the procedure?
- The Director** noted that in some areas of the proposal there was a need for a more technical consultation to clarify the wording and align it with procedures.
- 4.3 **Mr Maes (Commission)** said that there did not appear to be support for the proposal

to reduce the size of the Board.

- Although there was a willingness to align discussion on the three proposals as much as possible, it could be seen that the process was quite complex and in the end there was a tendency to discuss them separately. He understood that at present about thirty people were discussing the amendments and trying to agree on some compromise amendments.
- He said that the technical clarifications would be dealt with at a later stage.
- The purpose of the ECOSOC report was to provide an input to the discussion.

CONCLUSION:

The Commission provided its regular update on the revision of Eurofound's Founding regulation.

5. Draft Programming Document – Revision of ‘General Context’ and multiannual part (B 263/5)

5.1 The **Director** introduced the document which updated the multiannual part of the Programming Document 2017-2020.

- In the new programming document it was a requirement to update the budget and staff details in the programme on a rolling basis. In the context of planning for the 2019 work programme (for which there was as yet no text) there was the difficulty that the EU financial framework for 2021 was not yet available.
- The budget for Title 1 (Staff) had been adjusted to take into account the rising costs of the so-called country coefficient for Ireland and he warned the members that this issue would also necessitate changes to the 2018 programme, submitted to the Commission in January to be finally approved by the Board in November 2017.
- He alerted the members to the statement in the document (p.14, line 699) that it would not be possible to carry out the EQLS in 2021 i.e. in accordance with the normal cycle, for budgetary reasons. Having just completed the EWCS in 2020 it would not be possible to run two surveys in consecutive years. The suggestion was therefore to extend the cycle of the survey to every five years. This however went beyond the budgeting period of this programme (2017-2020).
- As the budget for **Title 3** (Research) was reducing each year it would be necessary to consider the research very carefully in the future.

5.2 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** said that the Surveys were Eurofound's key and unique research outputs and the text should not indicate that it was not possible to run the EQLS in 2021. In relation to the suggestion that it might not be possible to run the surveys in consecutive years, she counteracted that it should be possible to adjust the budget, to cut in other areas, in order to retain the current cycle of the surveys. This was a decision that risked damaging Eurofound.

5.3 **The Workers Group** made the following comments:

- **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said that the document was rather confusing with the various deletions and comments, and she thanked the Director for his explanations. Lines 93-95 said that Eurofound's research showed that there were signs of a return to convergence in wages though not yet in income, and she wondered what was meant by that.

It was not clear why in parts of the document text had been deleted when it appeared that the content was still relevant. There were no references to the European Pillar of Social Rights and she wondered how reflections on what

- might be needed for the pillar would be incorporated in the text.
 - **Mr Kokalov (Workers)** asked why the reference to mapping the situation of social dialogue and the social partners had been deleted at line 537.
 - **Mr Fonck (Workers)** requested further explanation of the staff tables indicating the posts suppressed in line with the 10% reduction of staff (line 1339).
- 5.3 **Mr Maes (Commission)** noted that the first draft 2019 programme would be discussed during the Group meetings in June, but the Commission did not attend those meetings. As a matter of principle he said, the first draft of the programme should be discussed by the Bureau. The role of the Bureau should be respected.
- Lines 86-101 could be improved and streamlined. The Commission in its own *Employment and Social Development in Europe 2016* report, to which Eurofound had contributed, had a certain narrative development in terms of the overall economic situation, but also in terms of the employment and social situation and the he would propose to make this section of the document more coherent with that.
 - He noted that the official wording around the United Kingdom's triggering of the procedure foreseen by Article 50 of the Treaty should be used.
 - Lines 240-245, the Commission would propose some text here.
 - Lines 537-538, similar to the Workers' Group he wondered why the text in relation to mapping social dialogue had been replaced.
 - Lines 536-537, he asked for an explanation of the statement that the volume of Representativeness studies might be revised in the context of the available budget. He reiterated that this was a crucial element in the support of social dialogue at EU level, by identifying social partners that were covered by the Articles 154 and 155 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU. Cost savings might be sought in other areas of the work programme, such as the European Restructuring Monitor. It was not clear why only the Representativeness Studies were spoken about in this regard. The Commission were surprised that in the tender for the Network of Correspondents, the budget allocated to this aspect of the correspondents' work had not been increased.
- 5.4 **The Employers Group** could accept the document. In relation to the comments by the Governments' Group on the survey, perhaps a sentence could be added underlining the importance of the surveys.
- 5.5 **The Director** responded to the comments.
- He reiterated that Eurofound defended the surveys, whilst looking for ways to manage the costs associated with them, as for example in the joint ECS survey with Cedefop. The issue concerned the timing of the surveys and the problem of having projects which each consumed over half the research budget in consecutive years. The Bureau should be aware of the issue. He did not think that it was financially sustainable in the long term. He confirmed that the EWCS would be undertaken in 2020.
 - Some of the comments should not have been included in this version as they related to previous versions, so the members could disregard them.
 - The purpose of the policy context in the document was to introduce the work programme and the changes were intended simply to update the document. The references to the EQLS had been deleted as they were considered to be outdated.
 - The project on convergence of wages but not incomes concerned the recently published income inequalities report and an update of the previous report on

wage distribution. What had emerged was that since 2013 there was a process of catching up in terms of wages in Europe, mainly in the central and eastern European countries, whilst the top earners remained frozen, but that this was not the case if one looked at income, largely due to unemployment and, to a degree, welfare payments. The research presented at the Maltese Presidency conference indicated that whilst the single market might be helping upward convergence in wages, this was not the case for income, the message for policymakers being that additional tools were required to address income inequalities.

- The European Pillar of Social Rights had just been launched and it had been decided not to go into detail about it in this document, instead linking here to the website of the European Commission. It could be supplemented in the future with a short paragraph of text.
- In relation to the deletion of the sentence on the mapping of social dialogue, this was a problem of writing a document up to three years in advance. At national level, Eurofound would continue to map the situation of social dialogue and the Social Partners, within the framework of the research on key dimensions of social dialogue. By the time the programming document would be adopted the mapping framework would be complete, though Eurofound would continue to base its work on this mapping exercise. He reminded that Eurofound was still waiting for the joint proposal of the Employers and Workers on capacity building, for the 2018 work programme.

The members confirmed that a joint proposal would be sent to Eurofound shortly.

- He explained the figures for the staff reductions between 2013 and 2018, which were due to departures, retirements and in some cases the non-renewal of contracts.
- He acknowledged that the Bureau should have an opportunity to react on the work programme before the Group meetings at the end of June 2017. Most of the 2019 projects would be continuations of those of 2018, being the third year of the four-year programme and he imagined therefore that the level of information would be similar to last year's.
- The new programming cycle provided new challenges and new opportunities, and he suggested that in light of the changes in the programming cycle, the Groups might learn to provide a different feedback on the work programme, that rather than providing feedback on the details of a particular project they might look at the expected outcome of a particular research area or activity in a broader way. More information would come later in the process, allowing for richer discussion perhaps in the Advisory Committees.
- In response to the Commission's points about the Representativeness Studies he reiterated that the budget in Title 3 was under pressure and it was necessary to adjust the research accordingly and it would be difficult to retain the current rate of Representativeness Studies. It was not valid to compare the costs of the ERM with that of the Network of Correspondents and the Representativeness Studies. It was not that Eurofound wished to reduce the number of Representativeness Studies it was rather that it might be necessary. As this work was important for the Commission it might be opportune to request that more resource from the EU Budget be allocated to it. However the text in this part of the programme would be reviewed.

- 5.6 **The Bureau** discussed how to ensure the best consultation leading to discussion of the 2019 programme in the Group meetings in June. An opportunity would be found to have a web consultation,

CONCLUSIONS:

- **The Bureau agreed that a video conference would be held prior to the Group meetings to allow the Bureau (including the Commission) to discuss the first draft of Work Programme 2019.**
- **The Employers and Workers would forward to Eurofound a joint proposal in relation to the capacity building project in 2018.**

6. The 2016 Consolidated Annual Activity Report (B 263/6)

6.1 The **Deputy Director** introduced the report and indicated that it would be sent to the budgetary authorities by 15 June having been approved by the Governing Board by a written procedure. It set out the policy achievements, the management situation, evaluation, internal control systems and management assurance.

6.2 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** said that the report demonstrated efficiency with accountability and she congratulated the Director and Deputy Director and their team.

6.3 **Mr Maes (Commission)** echoed that and noted the improved performance in relation to the Key Performance Indicators. The Commission pointed to the need to follow up on the Internal Audit Service recommendations in relation to resource allocation in project management. However, he congratulated Eurofound on the contents of the report.

CONCLUSION:

The Bureau noted the content of the report which would be submitted to the Governing Board for approval by written procedure by 15 June.

7. **Network of European Correspondents (update) B 253/7**

7.1 **The Deputy Director** presented the results of the annual feedback from Governing Board members' on their contacts with the correspondents. Feedback had been received from 22 countries (excluding Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and the UK) with 36 members responding out of a potential 84.

Issues were identified in some countries but in general the contacts were working well, topics usually covered in meetings included communication, dissemination but also contributions to reports beyond the usual things, such as Representativeness and case studies.

A theme emerging and something that would be addressed in the new website was improving the visibility of the correspondents at national level.

This kind of internal assurance was very valuable as part of the overall quality assurance of the network.

She also presented information on the tender procedure for the new correspondents which was currently being evaluated. 40 applications had been received for 28 Member States. For 18 countries only one applicant, 8 countries with 2 applicants and 2 countries with 3 applicants.

It was intended to conclude the evaluation and sign contracts by latest October/November in order for the new contracts to commence on 1 March 2018.

- 7.2 **The Chairperson** thanked Eurofound and in particular the Deputy Director for coordinating this work. She welcomed the improvements in the process and said that it had been very transparent and that the Bureau had been regularly informed.

CONCLUSION:

The Bureau were informed about the feedback received from Board members in relation to the current correspondents and updated on the recently concluded tender procedure to renew the Network.

8. **AOB**
- 8.1 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** reported that in relation to the cross-cutting evaluation of the four agencies, the Group had forwarded the public consultation survey to its own contacts.
- 8.2 **Mr Maes (Commission)** explained that there were several surveys targeting different audiences, including the public consultation survey which was open until 5 July and available in all EU official languages. This public consultation was a requirement of all Commission evaluation procedures. There was also a stakeholder survey and a survey of the staff of the Agencies concerned.
- Any concerns or questions about the evaluation should be directed to the Commission. A contact person within Eurofound had also been identified in case of need.
9. **The Chairperson** thanked the Bureau and concluded the meeting. The next Bureau meeting would be held on Friday, 15 September 2017.

[Signed H.Fonck]

[Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]

Chairperson

Director

DRAFT AGENDA
264th MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
Conseil Central de l'Économie (CCE), Room 6, 20 avenue d'Auderghem, 1040 Brussels
Friday, 15 September 2017, 9h30-13h00

Item	Agenda item	Ref no.	Time	Presented by
1.	Draft Agenda <i>For Adoption</i>	<i>B 264/1</i>	<i>9.30-9.35</i>	<i>Chair</i>
2.	Draft Minutes of the 264rd Bureau Meeting of 12 May 2017 <i>For Adoption</i>	<i>B 264/2</i>	<i>9.35-9.45</i>	<i>Chair</i>
3.	Progress Report of the Director <i>For Information</i>		<i>9.45-10.15</i>	<i>Director</i>
	- Projects Publications & Events	<i>B 264/3(i)</i>		
	- Update on Foundation Forum	<i>B 264/3(ii)</i>		
4.	Revision of Founding Regulation and Cross-Agency evaluation - update by the Commission <i>For Information</i>	<i>No document</i>	<i>10.15-10.30</i>	<i>European Commission</i>
5.	Adoption process for Programming Document 2017–2020 – version 2018 – state of play <i>For Information</i>	<i>B 264/5</i>	<i>10.30-11.00</i>	<i>Director</i>
	<i>Break</i>		<i>11.00-11.15</i>	
6.	Programming Document 2017–2020 – version 2019 - Second draft <i>For Discussion</i>	<i>B 264/6</i>	<i>11.15-12.30</i>	<i>Director</i>
7.	Advisory Committees – Experts and practicalities <i>For Information / Discussion</i>	<i>B 264/7</i>	<i>12:30-12:45</i>	<i>Director</i>
8.	Schedule of November Board and Group meetings 16-17 November 2017 <i>For Adoption</i>	<i>B 264/8</i>	<i>12.45-13.00</i>	<i>Director</i>
9.	AOB			

Date and venue of **next Bureau meeting**:

Thursday, 16 November 2017, 13h00 – 14h30 (tbc)

Dublin, Loughlinstown House meeting room 4 (LH4)

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED ON 16 NOVEMBER 2017

REVISED MINUTES

264th MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

9.30-13.00, Friday, 15 September 2017

Room 6, Conseil Central d'Économie, Avenue d'Auderghem, Brussels

Ms Bulgarelli	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Governments)
Mr Fonck	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
Ms Kauffmann	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (European Commission)
Mr Mühl	Member of the Governing Board (Employers)
Mr Kokalov	Member of the Governing Board (Workers)
Ms Welter	Member of the Governing Board (Coordinator Governments)
Ms Bober	Coordinator (Employers)
Mr Scherrer	Coordinator (Workers)
Ms Hoffmann	Deputy Coordinator (Workers)
Mr Maes	Member of the Bureau European Commission
Mr Menéndez-Valdés	Director
Ms Mezger	Deputy Director
Mr Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Governing Board
Ms Roelen	European Commission
Mr Storrie	Eurofound
Mr Baussand	Eurofound

1. Adoption of draft agenda (B 264/1)

In the absence of the Chairperson, Ms Rossi the meeting was chaired by Mr Fonck, Vice-Chairperson.

The draft agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of minutes of Bureau meeting of 12 May 2017 (B 264/2)

2.1 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** said that the new formatting of conclusions in the minutes did not reflect the actual discussion, for example in relation to the request by Ms Bulgarelli to discuss the procedures for approving *ad hoc* research requests.

The minutes would be amended to more fully reflect discussions and the formatting, whose purpose was to be more transparent about formal decisions by the Bureau would be reviewed.

2.2 **Mr Maes (Commission)** requested the following changes.

- 4.1 A small editorial change at bullet point 5.
- 6.3 To be amended as follows: **Mr Maes (Commission)** echoed that and noted the improved performance in relation to the Key Performance Indicators. The Commission pointed to the need to follow up on the Internal Audit Service recommendations in relation to resource allocation in project management. However, he congratulated Eurofound on the contents of the report.

With the above amendments the draft minutes will be revised for adoption at the next Bureau meeting.

3. Progress Report of the Director (B 264/3)

3.1 The **Director** highlighted recent publications, events and research activities in Eurofound.

- *6th European Working Conditions Survey (ECWS)* – the corrected overview report would be published in September 2017. As previously reported to the Bureau, the updates were necessary following an identification of some mistakes in the calculations. The revised report would be sent to all Governing Board members.
- *4th European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS)* – colleagues were already working on the report. It was planned to publish the report in December, with the formal launch early in 2018.
- The tender for the *4th European Company Survey (ECS)* had received two proposals, both significantly above the estimated cost of EUR 2.5 million (costs were now expected to range between EUR 3.2 and 3.5 million). He noted that both the EWCS and the EQLS had encountered similar issues with costs, and it was something that was likely to happen in the future. Whereas in the case of the EQLS it had necessitated a reduced sample size, costs of the ECS were being shared with Cedefop so hopefully that would not be necessary. Negotiations were underway with one of the tenderers to see if adjustments were possible. It seemed that companies were keen to work with Eurofound but were not making sufficient profit from doing so.
- He highlighted a number of events in which he had participated including: the 2nd IOE Global Employers' Summit "Making the G20 a success" and joint Sociap Partners and Ministers G20 dinner on 17 May in Germany; the OECD forum on migration and integration in June; the informal EPSCO meeting on work life balance in July and the EU Presidency conference on the Future of Work in September, both in Tallinn.
- He noted changes in the Digital Age activity with the departure of a researcher to the Joint Research Centre (JRC) in Seville, but said that there was a potential to explore a subsequent agreement with the JRC.
- The 2017 budget was balanced and the work programme delivery was on track.

Strategic Areas of Intervention - Highlights

- Working Conditions and Sustainable Work
Working Conditions in a Global Perspective - There were delays in finalising country reports, work that was being coordinated by the ILO. Draft reports for Turkey and the US were complete; those for South Korea and China were still outstanding. Interesting reports on *Working Time patterns and Sustainable work*, as well as *Exploring Self-Employment in Europe* would be published in September.
- Industrial Relations
Articulation between EU and National levels of social dialogue - with the literature review now complete, there had been exchanges with the social partners on the proposed case studies.
Representativeness studies - three sector studies (tanning and leather, footwear, central government administration) had been evaluated positively at the Advisory Committee, there is work in progress for other six sectors, and the questionnaires on two sectors (banking, insurance) would be launched in September.
- Labour Market Change
He referred to upcoming publications and highlighted some projects. The

Comparative Analytical Report (CAR) on support for redundant older workers had been launched, and he noted a decision not to carry out the initially planned systematic review of evaluations in order to reduce costs. In-house and contracted research was ongoing in the areas of the living wage, effects of restructuring on remaining employees, ERM databases and the association of workplace practices and employment levels.

The steering group for the 4th *European Company Survey* would meet shortly. To Ms Bulgarelli, who was a member of the OECD working group which had made certain requests in relation to the questionnaire, he noted that it had not been possible to accommodate all their requests, though a number had been included. This work was being coordinated by Cedefop.

- Quality of Life and Public Services

The 4th *European Quality of Life Survey*, the fieldwork was complete and the dataset prepared. In September evaluation of tenders for the secondary analytical reports would be completed.

Data had already been made available to researchers requesting early access (requests had been received in relation to the EIGE gender index, the Active Ageing Index, the Resilience Report of the Joint Research Centre, and tables for the Eurostat report on Men and Women in Europe, which was a good rejoinder to questions raised in Bureau discussions in the past as to whether the EQLS data was much used.

- ‘The Digital Age’ and ‘Monitoring Convergence in Europe’ were two new areas of investigation in the work programme, with much of the work of a preparatory and developmental nature. Convergence was of course the topic of the Foundation Forum on 14-15 November 2017.

- *Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME)* project – he updated the Bureau on activities in the project which was funded by the European Parliament.

- Network of Correspondents - tender procedure

He updated the Bureau on the status of the procedure, with correspondent contracts in four Member States currently under negotiation, as no suitable tender had emerged from the public tendering process. It was likely that contracts would be signed in early 2018 with the new contract cycle starting in March 2018 for a period of four years. The Bureau would be informed of the outcome at the same time as the contractors.

- He presented a list of the most downloaded publications from the website, one of Eurofound’s Key Performance Indicators.

- Foundation Forum 2017

The programme for the Forum was almost finalised, with 26 speakers and 83 participants were confirmed. A background paper would be prepared in October.

- He presented the budget execution to date and asked the Bureau to take formal note of the budgetary transfers in accordance with Article 23.4 of Eurofound’s financial regulation.

- The European Court of Auditors had made four observations in their report on the 2016 financial year which he presented along with Eurofound’s replies. In relation to the ongoing comments on unplanned and planned carryovers the Court now recommended the Agencies to consider so-called differentiated appropriations, a tool used by the Commission. The EU Agencies would evaluate this approach

although the general opinion was that it was too heavy and bureaucratic for agencies.

- Human Resources

He outlined the latest staffing summary with 90 staff in place out of 93 approved posts in the Establishment Plan, 10 contract agents, 1 Seconded National Expert and 8 graduate trainees taking the total number to 109. He outlined current recruitments, arrivals and departures.

- *Ad hoc* research requests

He presented recent and ongoing *ad hoc* requests, which demonstrated the different kinds of requests that were possible, being either requests for background papers for events such as EU Presidency meetings or stakeholder requests such as the CAR on the involvement of the social partners in the European Semester.

3.2 The **Chairperson** thanked the Director and noted the following:

- **The Bureau had noted and agreed to the budgetary transfers as set out by the Director in his slides.**
- **It was noted that information about the contracts awarded in the Network of Correspondents would be sent to the Bureau members at the same time as the contractors.**

He invited any questions or comments on the report.

3.3 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** had a question in relation to the EWCS data from Turkey, and commented on the matter raised by the Director in relation to the OECD and the *European Company Survey* questionnaire, as she was a member of the steering committee for the survey.

3.4 **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that the issue of the skills needs of companies was an important one for the Employers and the Group would take up the issue concerning the two questions in the ECS with the colleagues in Cedefop.

3.5 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** had the following questions.

- He asked about the presentation on convergence to the European Parliament scheduled for 6 November and whether there would be social partner representation. Did the project pay attention to the involvement of social partners on a shop-floor level in the companies? He strongly advised the Commission and Eurofound to ensure Social Partner participation at the presentation in the European Parliament.
- He asked for further information about the Foundation Forum, as to what percentage of participants were speakers, and he asked if the numbers registered to date were satisfactory.
- In relation to the presentation in the EMCO committee on 22 November on the *ad hoc* research on social partner participation in the EU Semester, in light of the sensitivity of the subject, was it anticipated to involve the social partners beforehand?

3.6 **Mr Maes (Commission)** asked for further information about the reasons behind the need to revise the EWCS report and whether there would be additional costs involved.

In relation to the Network of Correspondents was it to be understood that in 18 countries there was only one tender bid, and consequently was there reason to be concerned about the quality of the network in that Member State, he wondered.

He said that the Commission had no control over the agenda of the meeting at the European Parliament, but both Eurofound and the Commission were required to report on how the money assigned to the FOME project had been spent. The meeting in the European Parliament was concerned with reporting on the project rather than discussing the content of the findings.

3.7 **The Director** responded to the questions:

- The non-European analysis of EWCS had been coordinated by the ILO with the involvement of a tripartite audience in each country. Eurofound had conducted the survey in the candidate countries, including in Turkey.
- Regarding the ECS, Eurofound was keen that its survey data should be compatible with other research, but in relation to the OECD questions the researchers had informed that the two questions suggested were in reality more like twenty questions, and that trying to identify specific skills gaps would be difficult through this tool, being the numbers too small to be significant per occupation. The issue, however is being explored.
- Page 62 of the Programming Document set out clearly the planned outputs from the monitoring of convergence project in 2018, and included a report on the socio-economic dimensions and employment, as well as two policy briefs providing in-depth analysis on selected indicators of employment and socio-economic dimensions, as well as a report on the conceptual framework including measurements and indicators, and on the web repository and the new interactive data visualisation tool.
- On the FOME project he noted that the Social Partners are represented on the steering group .

Mr Storrie informed the Bureau that there would be a mid-project reporting to the Employment and the Industry, Research & Energy Committees of the European Parliament on 7 November 2017, preceded by a normal meeting of the inter-service steering group with the usual participation of social partners. The Commission were also speaking at the meeting, which was in principle open, and in which anyone could attend. In the very limited events that had been held so far, invitations had always been extended to all social partners, channelled through the inter-service steering group.

- Preparations for the Forum were proceeding as planned and the Director was assured that there would be a good level of attendance and an interesting debate.
- Regarding the *ad hoc* request on social partner participation in the EU Semester he explained that there was a consultation procedure with the social partners between April and June. After that a questionnaire was sent to the national correspondents who had to call the social partners at national level, and the governments. The results in the form of a presentation with basic information, country by country could be made available before the presentation at EMCO.
- In relation to the 5th EWCS, he had informed the Bureau already that problems had emerged when the final data for Spain (who had paid for a larger sample size) were entered, as analysis started with the normal sample, and final data would have required different weighting. Country data hasn't change, but there are small differences in the overall averages in the EU. An thorough additional external check was carried out and had identified a number of other small issues which were also corrected. The overall findings however were not affected, and the messages of

the launch event remained valid. The checking had not been too costly, and with a new print-on-demand model for Eurofound publications, it had not been expensive to reprint the report. The updated report was already available on Eurofound's website.

3.8 **The Deputy Director** gave a brief overview of the state of play in the tender for the new Network of Correspondents.

3.9 **The Chairperson thanked the Director for his progress report.**

4. Revision of the Founding Regulation and update on cross-agency evaluation

4.1 **Mr Maes (Commission)** updated the Bureau.

- On 12 July 2017 the Employment Committee of the European Parliament adopted the report of the rapporteur Mr Chambon, which had been confirmed in the latest plenary session of the European Parliament to be a mandate for negotiations in the trilogues with the Council.
- The report contained several amendments outlined to the Bureau previously, in particular that it was foreseen that members designated by the European Parliament would participate in the Governing Board.
- There was an emphasis on coordination between the agencies so that observer status for EU OSHA and Cedefop on Eurofound's Governing Board was proposed. There was still an indication that pilot projects and preparatory actions could be given to the agencies. Additionally the report proposed that the Institutions should have to go through an agency before outsourcing any activity in the field of activity of that agency. The Commission felt that tying the hands of the Institutions in this manner might not be the best idea.
The provision on the possible use of translation services other than the Translation Centre was retained.
- The post of Deputy Director for Eurofound was retained and included now also in the regulation of Cedefop.
- Some of the rapporteur's proposals had not been carried, for example the reduction of the size of the Governing Board. It was interesting to note that the rapporteur had abstained from voting on the report, indicating that there may have been some changes to the report with which he had not agreed.
- The trilogue discussions with the Council would commence in mid-October 2017. It was not yet clear how these would be organised, but it was the intention to align discussions on the three agencies given that the majority of provisions were common to all.

4.2 **Ms Roelen (Commission)** then updated the meeting on progress with the cross-cutting evaluation of the tripartite agencies.

The contractor had completed most of the fieldwork (consisting of consultation with the public, stakeholders and staff) and some case studies were being carried out to provide additional findings. The final report would be available by the end of October 2017 and a validation workshop was foreseen in November 2017. Eurofound would be invited to comment or discuss the findings.

5. Programming Document – Version 2018 (B 264/5)

5.1 **The Director** explained that the work programme had been adopted by the Governing Board in January and sent to the Commission as usual for their opinion on the

budgetary estimates and the multiannual staff policy plan. Anything problematic in the programme should be discussed now because it was expected that the programme would be adopted by the Board in November and it was not anticipated that there would be further discussion.

- The new planning procedure meant that activities were approved two years in advance and that during the period between submission of the programme to the Commission in January each year, and the Bureau in September, more detailed planning would be undertaken looking at the resources available, as a more detailed picture emerged.
- The joint proposal from the social partners on capacity building had now been included in the programme, and he noted a small amendment following discussions with the Commission, who wished to be kept informed on the project.
- One change to note was the dropping of the project on mismatches in the labour market in the multiannual part of the programme, following feedback from the Bureau and limitation of resources.
- In the *European Jobs Monitor* for internal planning reasons, it was proposed to swap the order of the thematic research, to do a geographical analysis in 2018 and in 2020 to look at gender and age. In this area the European Restructuring Monitor's look at large transnational restructuring cases had been dropped due to human resource limitations. It was however a small project.
- There would be future small changes, including on the activity costs, due to the resource planning in the final document presented to the Governing Board for approval in November.
- **The Chairperson proposed that the Bureau agree to the minor changes outlined by the Director, and to the clarification which had been made at the request of the Commission.**
- **As suggested by the Director, for the sake of efficiency the negative priorities in the programme could be discussed in the context of the 2019 programme and then copied into the 2018 version.**
- **The Bureau agreed with this approach.**

6. Programming Document – 2019 version (B 264/6)

Following a short break, the Bureau resumed to discuss the 2019 work programme.

6.1 The **Director** introduced the document and explained that instead of the table detailing the uptake of comments it had been decided to display the changes in track changes and to indicate the reasoning behind the changes by inserting comments in the document. He apologised that some of the comments were not displaying fully.

- It was important that the proposal currently had a deficit of around EUR 460,000, Though estimates were still quite draft at this stage the Bureau should bear in mind that rather than adding any new projects, it might be necessary to drop projects.
- There had been some discussions about the future of the surveys beyond 2020 so it was clearly stated in the document that in 2019 there should be an in-depth discussion about that. At that time there would be more clarity around the new founding regulation, the cross-cutting evaluation of the agencies, the new European Labour Authority that was currently proposed and the future multiannual financial framework.
- It would be good to agree on the text for the negative priorities to a level that they

could also be used in the 2018 programme.

- Areas in the programme where it would be necessary to reach a compromise were highlighted, including in the areas of social dialogue, the Representativeness Studies, the European Semester and of course capacity building. There were suggestions by the Governments to be a bit more strategic in the policy area, for example in relation to the issue of posted workers. If this topic is agreed, the time for action was now, as an ad-hoc request.
- Some projects had been dropped and one added, relating to the impact of services designed for people with disabilities across Member States.

6.2 The **Chairperson** asked the members for their comments on the programme.

6.3 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** made the following comments on behalf of the Workers' Group.

- Page 4, line 98 did not reflect the full diagnosis by the Workers' group of the situation following the recession. The statement was rather limited.
- Line 415/416 – on the capacity building and the European Semester, the Group still had difficulties with the methodology used in the research and called for an intensive exchange on the matter in order to secure their agreement.
- He acknowledged an improvement in the text on negative priorities. Strategic discussions between the Groups to reduce the programme in light of the budgetary pressures would not be possible at this stage.
- Line 1180 – the group supported the research on the working conditions of posted workers.
- Line 1198 – the topics mentioned here (chronic disease, working conditions in companies of different sizes etc.) seemed like an area where Eurofound could cooperate with EU-OSHA, something that the Group would like to encourage.
- Line 1284 – In the social dialogue activity, there was a sentence 'The reporting will compare national developments, exploring connections between the different dimensions, such as industrial democracy (voice) and competitiveness'. What exactly did this mean?
- Line 1320 – the role of the social partners in the European Semester, the Workers' Group would like to see changes, as previously discussed.
- Line 1323 – to go from six to five Representativeness Studies was acceptable for the Group as a compromise.
- Line 1660 – the Group wished to include pre-pension poverty and regretted that it had been dropped.
- Line 2187 – he would like to discuss how the Bureau would deal with *ad hoc* requests.

Ms Hoffmann added that in relation to project 2.1.6 *Innovation and job creation in companies* the Group had asked that a more qualitative approach be taken. The Director however indicated that the approach would be more quantitative and the description should reflect that.

6.4 **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that the Group welcomed the efforts to accommodate the requests of the different groups.

- Page 18 – The Group were keen for Eurofound to explore cooperation with other agencies but felt that the sentence 'Eurofound's ambition is to continue a Company Survey in partnership with other EU Agencies in the future', should be applied

more generally to all the surveys, especially as savings would need to be found in the future.

- The Group would – along with the Workers - support the proposal to reduce the number of Representativeness Studies from six to five in order to gain some savings. However the Group thought that the Representativeness Studies should stay in Eurofound, and did not support the Governments on the point of outsourcing the studies.
- In relation to posted workers it seemed that one of the areas not covered in the debate was the longer-term postings, i.e. which sectors use longer term posting and why. She highlighted this because the current debate focused on the construction sector, which tended to use short-term posting. Current proposals to reduce the time of posting to twelve months would have consequences for example for the manufacturing companies who used posting as part of their human resource management strategy. There was an opportunity for Eurofound to look at this aspect of the issue.
- The Group supported the proposal on the EU Semester but would be open to compromise and further discussion with the Workers' Group.
- *2.1.4 Well-functioning and inclusive labour markets*
The Employers did not see the potential benefits of the research on wage inequality between companies. Although it had been amended it was not a priority for the Group and was a project that could be dropped if necessary.

Mr Mühl (Employers) made the following additional comments:

- The pillar of social rights was mentioned at several points of the document despite that it was not yet clear what the pillar would look like.
- Line 1846 – *The digital age: challenges and opportunities for work and employment*, the wording here emphasised threats rather than opportunities and a more balanced wording should be found.
The Group had proposed to include some background information on the economic side of convergence as well, and there was still scope to add more on that, and perhaps in 2019 to include the outcome of the 2018 project.

6.5 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** made the following comments on behalf of the Governments' Group.

- As suggested in the document she would take up discussions further in the Group in relation to strategic areas and activities that might be reduced in the face of budgetary pressures.
- It was good that there was now a date for the EQLS in 2022 which signalled a commitment on the part of Eurofound.
- Regarding the negative priorities, she said that the issue of undeclared work was of great importance at this time, not only for the Governments but for the social partners too. Colleagues present in the European Platform on Undeclared Work were keen that Eurofound should work with the platform. The Group proposed to channel an *ad hoc* request through the platform, but one that would be discussed beforehand with the Commission and Eurofound.
- The Governments Group felt strongly that the Representativeness studies should not be done by Eurofound, though they understood that they were a priority for the Commission and the employers who wanted to keep the studies in Eurofound. The Group, at this stage, would not discuss dropping either one or two

Representativeness Studies. Considering the budgetary problem for Eurofound, the Group proposed that REPs studies would not be done by Eurofound in the year 2019. Instead, the collection of information for the studies might be outsourced via the budget of the Commission. Quality assurance could be kept through the involvement of Eurofound in sort of a steering group for REPs studies. It would allow the Commission and Eurofound to work together and the Eurofound brand could be retained.

- Line 1665 – the Group’s proposal in relation to the research on the middle classes was not to have a specific activity but to have a report that combined findings across the research activities.
- The Social Economy and cooperatives was an issue of rising importance in the Member States, with legislation recently passed in Italy and Luxembourg, and she wondered if something more strategic could be considered in this area, beyond the research that was planned for 2018.
- In relation to the digital age, the issue of job descriptions was an important one. As the content of jobs was changing there was a need for that to be reflected in the job descriptions. Eurofound was ideally placed as a tripartite body with long experience in industrial relations, to look at the impact of changing job descriptions on collective bargaining, through the impact on wages, promotions, salaries and career progression.
- **Ms Welter (Governments)** reiterated the importance of the social economy and cooperatives as a topic of importance, as many of those working in the area were lacking any information about it, including a common understanding of what was meant by the social economy.
- She agreed that the issue of job descriptions was a significant problem in collective bargaining, where many of the job descriptions did not exist anymore.
- In relation to the digital age there was much discussion at Member State level about the future, and about the upskilling or reskilling that would be required.
- Colleagues had requested more information about the suggestion of a joint Advisory Committee with EU-OSHA on the next working conditions survey.

6.6 **Mr Kokalov (Workers)** added that in the upcoming Bulgarian EU Presidency, an important issue would be the future of work in areas such as digitalisation and Health and Safety, but also significantly in the social economy. Bulgaria’s social economic council had already produced an opinion on the area in 2016.

6.7 **Mr Maes (Commission)** made the following comments:

- Overall, the Commission were quite fine with the proposals and how they had been taken up. Obviously, they were still not particularly happy with the indications in the multiannual part under ‘social dialogue’, including the indication on the fixed volume of work in social dialogue. It might possibly need to be adjusted. It was not entirely clear why flexibility would have to be found on that particular activity
- It would be good to see the outcome of the Social Policy for Fair Jobs and Growth Summit in Gothenburg, on 17 November to see if the social pillar would be endorsed. Also, more concretely with the proposal for a social scoreboard with indicators, it would be important that any work Eurofound did (for example the proposal to develop in-work poverty indicators in 2019) would add value to the ongoing work for instance in the indicators subgroup of the Social Protection Committee and the Employment Committee and in connection also with the

European Semester where in one way or another the scoreboard would play a role.

- He agreed with the Workers' Group that it was too early to identify negative priorities. It should be seen what emerged from the cross-cutting evaluation of the tripartite agencies which would be an important source for looking at potential synergies. The issue of how to best utilise the budget was something that would also be informed by the evaluation, which had also been undertaken prior to negotiations on the next EU financial framework.
- In relation to the *ad hoc* request for research on the role of the national social partners in the European Semester, he noted that the Commission had launched the request with the support of the Council's EMCO committee. The Commission noted the suggestion by the Workers to have a possibility to exchange on the findings, which he felt was something that Eurofound might consider. Any findings already presented at the EMCO were clearly indicated as preliminary conclusions, and the Committee's review was similarly looking at different findings. It was supposed that any publication would go through the usual tripartite evaluation.
- He thanked the Social Partners for the proposal on capacity building. Social dialogue was operating in the context of quite radically changing labour markets, which also posed certain challenges for the actors involved. The 2019 proposal in this area was somewhat unambitious, where it might have been expected that more concrete proposals would be forthcoming.
- The Commission noted the response from Eurofound to its requests for research in the area of disability. Colleagues working in this area reminded that it should be taken into account in the work of Eurofound.
- They would be interested to see any *ad hoc* proposals from the Governments on posted workers. Eurofound's contribution could feed in to ongoing negotiations in the Council or Parliament, and it would be interesting to see how Eurofound could usefully feed into future discussions on the European Labour Authority which would in future deal with these questions.
- The issue of middle income groups was an important one and was the subject of a joint ILO/European Commission project on which results were presented last year. It was an extensive report with in-depth country studies of 15 Member States and an overview of 30 countries.

6.8 **The Director** noted the comments of the members, which would be taken into account. He responded to some.

- Line 1284, the key dimensions of industrial relations project sought to try to map industrial democracy by developing some key indicators for the democratic voice i.e. participation in social dialogue. The current text was in response to the request from the Employers to also look at the link between industrial relations and competitiveness, as this is also a key dimension included in the framework. However, it was not the intention, he said, to develop new indicators in the area of competitiveness, but use existing data and indicators.
- The methodology for the project on the Social Partners and the European Semester was supported by the governments, the Commission and the EMCO but if the Workers' Group had other suggestions then they should come forward with them. He suggested a pragmatic approach whereby the Groups would state during the EMCO meeting whether they thought the reports were of value to them, and whether they wished them to be continued. They could perhaps reflect on that experience in the Bureau.

- He clarified for Mr Scherrer that the European Company Survey included usually four areas of Work Organisation, HR Practices, Direct Participation and Formal Social Dialogue to which Cedefop had added the areas of Skills Strategy and Digitalisation.
- The pre-pension poverty had been dropped because it was necessary to reduce the work programme and there had not been unanimous support for it.
- Regarding the *ad hoc* research requests, he reiterated that this had not been problematic in the past. It would be possible anyway to change the procedure if required, perhaps in addition to the current acceptance criteria (that the research was in line with the work programme, there was a policy data need, it was not contentious) it would be possible to notify the Governing Board or Bureau beforehand in writing. Requests from tripartite bodies obviously were a priority and the Platform on Undeclared Work certainly qualified for that.
- Research on capacity building for national social partner organisations would be kept a bit more open in 2019 as suggested by the Commission (having extended it a little to include policies introduced by public authorities) in order to follow up on it after the stakeholder seminar.
- The *ad hoc* capacity could be used to look at cooperatives if necessary, once results of the first report are ready, though Eurofound was not currently strong in this research area.
- Regarding the Representativeness Studies, he understood there were different views for the moment. He invited the Governments and the Commission to exchange and agree on the question of the number of studies, as they held the most opposite views. For the moment, Eurofound kept the compromise as proposed in the draft. The issue of the budget and research capacity that was required to carry out these studies was a pressing one, as this has been a fix part of the programme despite a significant reduction in the overall budget available. He emphasized the importance of keeping a reference in the part on ‘negative priorities’ on the option to adjusting the volume of work on Representativeness Studies to available resources according to priorities decided on an annual basis.
- There was already a good level of cooperation with EU-OSHA. In a meeting with the Director of that Agency recently they had agreed that it was necessary to find a way to cooperate in consulting their stakeholders on common issues. However they did not support the Workers’ suggestions for a new joint advisory committee on the EWCS, as would complicate process.
- He noted the comments of the Governments’ Group in relation to being forward-looking and strategic.
- He noted the comments in relation to the Bulgarian Presidency, and the topic of the Future of Work and said that colleagues were already working on the upcoming EU Presidencies, including the Austrian Presidency in relation to crowd employment.
- He acknowledged comments by the Commission in relation to a future role for Eurofound in the social pillar, and what might emerge from the Gothenburg summit in November.

6.9 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** supported retaining the Commission’s original text in relation to the Platform, with that they could agree with negative priorities text in the multiannual part. **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that it was important that any *ad hoc* requests should not be automatically accepted.

Mr Maes (Commission) said that the Commission would welcome their previous text

being taken up again in the document.

He added that the fact that he did not comment on the proposed reduction in the volume of Representativeness Studies, did not imply that the Commission agreed with the proposal.

- 6.10
- **The Chairperson summarised that comments should be forwarded in writing to Eurofound.**
 - **The Groups should indicate where they could agree to projects being dropped in 2019 for budgetary reasons.**
 - **Draft 3 of the 2019 Programme would be discussed at the Governing Board meeting in November.**

7. Advisory Committees – experts and practicalities (B 264/7)

7.1 The **Director** briefly introduced the paper.

Following the comments of members of the Advisory Committees, internal discussions had been held around procedures and timelines for managing the meetings and circulating the documents. It was suggested that any issues should be brought up directly during the meetings.

In relation to the appointment of experts on the committees following a call for expressions of interest, **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** wondered if the over-representation of experts from the UK might be considered problematic. **The Director** said that he had received a letter from the Director General of the Commission about how to deal with Brexit. In principle there was no objection to having experts from the UK, while a clause is being included in new contracts.

The Bureau had a short discussion on the issue of back-to-back meetings of the advisory committees for working conditions and industrial relations, which was a compromise solution arrived at a number of years ago to ensure participation of experts who were represented on both committees.

8. Schedule of Governing Board, Bureau and Group meetings in November (B 264/8)

8.1 It was confirmed that all Group meetings would be held over one day only (16 November).

It was agreed that the Bureau meeting would be held over two hours at lunchtime that day, starting at 12:30 hrs, in order to allow time for the Bureau to discuss changes to the work programme.

9. AOB

9.1 **At the request of the Director, the Bureau agreed that Mr Blomsma, Seconded National Expert at Eurofound could attend Bureau meetings.**

9.2 The next meeting of the Bureau would be held on Thursday, 16 November 2017 in Dublin at 12.30-14.30.

[S.Rossi]

[J. Menéndez-Valdés]

Chairperson

Director

DRAFT AGENDA
NINETY-FIRST MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

Raymond-Pierre Bodin Conference Centre
9:00-13:00 hrs
Friday, 17 November 2017

Item	Agenda item	Ref no. GB	Time	Presented by
1.	Opening of meeting and examination of Draft Agenda (EN, FR, DE), <i>For Adoption</i>	91/1	9:00	Chairperson
2.	Draft Minutes of 90th Meeting of the Governing Board, 11 November 2016 (EN, FR, DE), <i>For Adoption</i>	91/2	9:10	Chairperson
3.	Progress Report of the Director on the activities of Eurofound, <i>For Information</i>	91/3	9:20	Director/Deputy Director
4.	Revision of Founding Regulation and Cross-Agency evaluation - update by the Commission, <i>For Information</i>	91/4	9:50	European Commission
5.	Programming Document - <i>Version 2018</i> (EN, FR, DE), <i>For Adoption</i>	91/5	10:10	Director/Deputy Director
	<i>Break</i>			
6.	Draft Programming Document - <i>Version 2019</i> (EN only), <i>For Discussion</i>	91/6	11:00	Director/Deputy Director
7.	Network of Correspondents – update on tender procedure, <i>For Information</i>	91/7	12:00	Director/Deputy Director
8.	Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and the Bureau, <i>For Adoption</i>	91/8	12.10	Director/Deputy Director
9.	Schedule of Meetings 2018 of the Governing Board, Bureau and Groups, <i>For Adoption</i>	91/9	12:20	Chairperson
10.	Advisory Committees – Composition and meeting dates 2018, <i>For Information</i>	91/10	12:30	Chairperson
11.	New IAS (Internal Audit Service) Mission Charter, <i>For Endorsement</i>	91/11	12:40	Deputy Director
12.	Administrative Questions - Implementing Rules to the Staff Regulations <i>For Adoption</i>	91/12	12:50	Chairperson
13.	AOB			

FINAL MINUTES¹

OF THE NINETY-FIRST MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

Friday, 17 November 2017, Raymond-Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound

1. Adoption of Draft Agenda (GB 91/1)

The **Chair** welcomed the members to the meeting and thanked Eurofound for the dinner the previous evening.

The Director was attending the Social Summit in Gothenburg and so the Deputy Director would represent Eurofound at the Board meeting.

She said that representatives from the Bulgarian and Austrian governments would make short presentations on upcoming EU Presidency events in 2018.
2. Adoption of Draft minutes of Governing Board, 11 November 2016 (GB 91/2)
 - 2.1 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** proposed the following changes:
 - 4.7 Whilst in future the Commission would be responsible for selecting the Director . . . [rather than ‘recruiting’ the Director].’
 - 6.5 It was necessary to ensure that the staffing resource in the document was in line with the communication of the Commission on staff reductions adopted in 2013.
 - 6.7 The eighth bullet point on the European Quality of Life Survey could be changed to: ‘He said that it referred to a very specific question in the EQLS which asked about tensions between ethnic groups and that it was necessary to use that analysis.’
 - 2.2 **Mr Fonck (Workers)** proposed that in future the minutes should be available after the meeting as it was difficult to remember details after so much time.
 - 2.3 **The Chair** concluded:
 - **The minutes were approved with amendments.**
 - **It was agreed that in future the minutes would be circulated within a month of the event.**
3. Progress Report of the Director (GB 91/3)
 - 3.1 The **Deputy Director** said that the members should note the contents of the report which would form the basis of the Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR) to be formally adopted in the second quarter of 2018, and sent after that to the Commission, Council, Parliament and the Court of Auditors.

This was the first year of the 2017-2020 programming cycle with what were termed Strategic Areas of Intervention (SAIs) (working conditions, industrial relations, living conditions, employment, and horizontal areas on digitalisation and monitoring convergence).

Whilst the progress report contained full details, she would present work in the previous year using Eurofound’s Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). KPIs and performance management was an area in which Eurofound was quite advanced, and

¹ Approved by a written procedure, 21 February 2018
Final minutes Board meeting, 17 November 2017 – for Information

were very relevant in the context of the various audits to which the Agency was subject.

Contributions to policy development through events (KPI 6):

- She highlighted Eurofound's contributions to a number of high-level Presidency events, such as the presentation on convergence and labour market inequalities at the informal EPSCO meeting in Valletta in April 2017.
- At the request of the Estonian Presidency, Eurofound had been able to contribute a background paper and presentation on *Work/life balance and flexible working arrangements in the EU* at the EPSCO meeting in Tallinn, in July 2017; as well as inputs at the informal EMCO meeting in April, on *Making Work Pay*. Eurofound had presented the programming document at the Employment Committee of the European Parliament in January 2017.
- She highlighted a number of visits to Eurofound including that of Mr Calvet Chambon, rapporteur for the European Parliament's committee considering the proposed revisions to Eurofound's founding regulation.
- Eurofound staff were invited to contribute to 133 events, of these 54 were with so-called 'priority target' organisations. She mentioned the launch of the joint Eurofound/ILO report on *'Working anytime, anywhere: the effects on the world of work'* in Geneva in February 2017; the OECD event on social mobility and equal opportunities in May, and the OECD forum on the subject of migration and integration in June, both in Paris.
- The Foundation Forum had taken place earlier in the week in Dublin Castle on *Converging economies, diverging societies? Upward convergence in the EU*, with high level representation of ministers from Sweden, Ireland, Slovenia and Czech Republic and a video message from President Juncker. The lively debates and good quality presentations would feed in to the Social Summit of Heads of State taking place in Gothenburg that day, where the European Pillar of Social Rights would be launched.

She referenced the statement by Ylva Johansson, the Swedish Minister for Employment and Integration that upward convergence was about closing the gaps or the social inequalities within and between Member States; that growth and competitiveness had to go hand in hand with social progress. The Social Pillar was about agreeing on some key principles and the power of the Member States would be crucial in achieving outcomes within the framework of the Social Pillar. Ms Johansson had said that Eurofound had an important role in monitoring and benchmarking outcomes which could feed into discussions at Member State level.

- Some of the early messages from the Foundation Forum were that:
 - Many actors should be involved in implementing the Social Pillar, including at national, regional and local levels, the social partners and civil society;
 - Proper implementation of the Social Pillar could ensure that Europe was ready to preserve social convergence in the next economic crisis;
 - Economic and social priorities should be integrated into the framework of the European Semester and social partners empowered to enable them to find solutions through collective negotiations;
 - Consideration should be given to going beyond output/outcomes indicators when measuring social progress and that input indicators measuring policy

- approaches could be included;
- and that consideration should be given to better aligning the structural funds/ the ESF with the objectives of the Social Pillar.
- She highlighted the *Fourth European Quality of Life Survey Report*, which would be digitally launched in December 2017, with broader discussion on the findings scheduled in February 2018, at an event to which some members would be invited.
- She mentioned a number of reports from 2016 which it had been necessary to finalise this year.

Publications Highlights:

- Employment and labour market - A wide range of studies had been published in 2017 in the area. *Employment effects of reduced non-wage labour costs*; ERM study on *Offshoring and Onshoring in Europe*; *Income inequalities and employment patterns before and after the Great Recession*; *Estimating Labour Market slack in the EU*.
- Two researchers from Eurofound had edited the Routledge publication *European Born Globals — Job creation in young international businesses*. Born Globals, she noted, were identified as major engines of job creation.
- Industrial Relations - The Representativeness Studies were an important output in this area and were valued by all the stakeholders. Studies had been published on Sugar manufacturing, Shipbuilding, Postal and courier activities, Railways and urban transport and the Footwear sector. Two further studies on Central government administration and the Tanning and leather sector would be available in 2017.
- Working Conditions – She highlighted publications that included five fiches on specific forms of fraudulent contracting of work in a number of EU Member States. She cited the exploratory work undertaken in a number of workshops organised by Eurofound to define fraudulent forms of work. It was an interesting aspect of work in light of the recent announcement by Commission President Juncker on the establishment of a European Labour Authority. She reminded that since 2014 the observatories on industrial relations and working conditions had been merged, with the output focused on annual reporting in the EurWORK Annual Review.
- Quality of Life – She highlighted publications on delivering hospital services and whether there was a greater role for the private sector. The *Social Mobility in the EU* report had been linked to a joint seminar with the OECD in Paris in May 2017, thus enhancing its reach and impact. The *In-work poverty in the EU* report had been positively received, producing fresh data that was not yet available in the EU and was of great relevance for policymakers.
- She highlighted the five most downloaded reports from the website, with the EWCS report at the top of the list.
- Eurofound's surveys continued to be key research outputs: Eurofound was already preparing the 7th wave of the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) and the overview report of the 4th European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS) would be digitally launched on 7 December 2017. Preparations were ongoing on the European Company Survey (ECS) which was being undertaken jointly with Cedefop. There would also be an internal reflection in 2018 on the future of surveys beyond 2021, in light of their increasing costs.
- Eurofound had been cited in EU policy documents most often by the Commission

(in 73 documents, 27 of which were so-called ‘key policy documents’). Eurofound had been able to present background information to the Commission’s consultation on establishing a European Pillar of Social Rights. In the European Parliament, of the 36 references to Eurofound, 18 were key documents on topics like the Social Pillar, gender equality, working conditions and precarious employment, and monitoring the effectiveness of the youth guarantee.

- There was less take-up of Eurofound research by the European Council, although Eurofound made contact, as mentioned earlier, through the informal Council meetings. As regards Committees, this included a review for the Employment Committee (EMCO) of the involvement of the social partners in the European Semester at the national level, a follow up to work begun in 2016. Also, a background note had been prepared for the Social Protection Committee (SPC) regarding non-standard contracts and self-employed in the EU.
- Eurofound’s research was referred to or quoted in 64 key EU documents of which 35 initiated a policy process and 14 were of an advisory nature. The number of references to Eurofound’s research in documents of the Social Partners was also increasing.

Budget implementation

- Budget implementation stood at 88% in October, which was on course, with 66% of the operational budget (Title 3) implemented, though she noted that there would be a high level of carryovers due to the multiannual nature of Eurofound research projects and measures taken to alleviate budgetary pressures for 2018.
- She informed the Governing Board of budgetary transfers between Titles in the year to date of EUR 640,000, owing to a large extent to a shortfall in planned salary appropriations and improvements in ICT infrastructure. She outlined that the increase in the salary co-efficient for Ireland (109.6 in 2013 to 118.3 in 2017) remained a cause of concern.
- She presented the Activity Based Budgeting figures that combined in-house costs (e.g. staff) and contracted costs, to have a full overview of the budget per activity. The figures illustrated that operational activities were well within budget. There were some continuations of 2016 research where more staff resources were required to finish these projects.
- As regards Programme Delivery (KPI 3), by mid-October, 51% of outputs were delivered with current forecasting indicating that this would be 92% by the end of the year. Some reasons for delay were contractual and staff vacancies.
- Staff Capacity (KPI 2) indicated that 97% of posts were filled. She presented details about the gender of the staff (there was a good gender balance, also in management) and the nationality (the highest proportion of staff were Irish, followed by Spanish). She encouraged the members to motivate people from countries not currently represented on the staff to apply for positions.

3.2 The **Chair** thanked the Deputy Director for her presentation and opened the floor for any questions or comments.

3.3 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** wished to state that although the Group were sometimes quite negative about the Forum, at the Social Summit in Gothenburg comments had been very positive about the Foundation Forum and its timeliness in relation to the summit.

3.4 **Mr Fonck (Workers)** added that the preparatory work on the Forum had been excellent, with very favourable comments in the Group about the quality of the background paper.

3.5 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** also felt that the Forum had presented a good, balanced debate between policy makers, knowledge providers and all kinds of stakeholders.

Turning to the progress report, she said that the cooperation with the EU Presidencies was welcomed by the Group, that Governments really appreciated information from a tripartite and independent body with scientifically robust research.

It was noteworthy, she added, that Eurofound was mentioned in Country Specific Recommendations within the European Semester, citing the example of the recommendations for Italy where Eurofound data in relation to GDP loss due to low participation by women in the labour market was quoted.

3.6 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** also congratulated Eurofound on the Foundation Forum. The debate was relevant in particular for the Social Summit in Gothenburg. As mentioned in the progress report, the background papers of Eurofound were an important input to preparing the way for the declaration on the European Pillar of Social Rights.

The key elements that were important for the Social Pillar were the European Semester, how social pillar elements could be implemented through analysis and policy advice, as well as the participation of the Social Partners. In this regard, the work that Eurofound had done and continued to do in relation to the EMCO meeting on social dialogue was much appreciated. The way that the Social Partners were involved in policymaking in the European Semester and more broadly, was of central importance. In this regard, the Representativeness Studies were crucial. They were also used when social partners proposed to set up a committee and it was necessary to look at their representativeness, or when there was an agreement to be implemented.

They were appreciated very much by the Commission who were making every effort to present requests in relation to the studies in a way that cost savings could be achieved.

3.7 **The Chair concluded the discussions thanking the Deputy Director for her progress report.**

4. Update by the Commission on new founding regulation and cross-agencies evaluation

4.1 The **Chair** invited Ms Kauffmann to update the meeting on developments in relation to the proposed revision of Eurofound's founding regulation, and the ongoing cross-agencies evaluation being carried out by the Commission.

4.2 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** outlined developments since the last Governing Board meeting.

- In 2016 the Commission had made proposals for revisions of the founding regulations of three tripartite agencies (Eurofound, Cedefop and EU-OSHA) and the Council had largely agreed to the proposals, with some exceptions (e.g. regarding some sunset/review clauses that had not been included).

Next, in the Parliament it was decided to deal with the three regulations separately, appointing three rapporteurs. The inter-institutional discussions were due to commence in September but had not yet started, due possibly to the difficulties in

implementing a common approach when there were three different positions regarding the agencies.

- An evaluation of the four agencies under the remit of DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion (including the European Training Foundation in Turin) had commenced in January 2017, to be finalised by the end of the year, and comprised an evaluation of each Agency and a cross-cutting evaluation. Interim reports had been finalised in October and on 8 December a validation workshop would be held where staff and Board members and external stakeholders would be invited to comment on the findings.

4.3 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** asked when it was expected that the trilogue would begin. **Ms Bober (Employers)** asked whether the evaluation would be expected to feed in to the revision of the founding regulation.

4.4 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** could give no firm date for the trilogue but expected that it could be before the end of the year. It could be foreseen that the findings of the evaluation might be of some interest in those negotiations, but that it was not linked to them. The Commission routinely carried out such evaluations, she said.

5. **Adoption of Work Programme 2018 (GB 91/5)**

5.1 **The Chair** noted that there had been an opportunity to discuss within the Groups and also the Bureau on the previous day.

The following revision to the text on negative priorities (page 30) was tabled.

‘Industrial Relations will continue to be a key strategic area for Eurofound. Research demands in the area of Industrial Relations are taking a growing share of Eurofound resources. This includes studies on representativeness of social partners, essential for the functioning of EU sectoral social dialogue and additional regular research. The volume of work might need to be adjusted to available resources according to the priorities decided on an annual basis.’

The Groups agreed to the revision.

5.2 **Mr Fonck (Workers)** said that the Workers’ Group could adopt the Programming Document 2018, which was a good compromise of the various interests, and agreed with the amended text which made explicit the importance that was attached to industrial relations and also to the representativeness of Social Partners in the EU social dialogue.

5.3 **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that the Employers’ Group could also adopt the programme and welcomed the text agreed in the Bureau which highlighted the importance of the Representativeness studies, which the Group felt should continue to be carried out by Eurofound.

5.4 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** said that the Governments’ Group adopted the work programme, with the amendments.

The Group were pleased also with a decision to leave an opening for contributions by Eurofound to the Platform on undeclared work.

Previous amendments concerning the relevance of the surveys were also welcomed by the Group.

5.5 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that the Commission could adopt the programme, following the amendments and emphasis on the importance of the Representativeness

studies.

She looked forward to discussions on the actual number of Representativeness studies in the Bureau. It was also important to understand that more could be achieved possibly through efficiency gains that could be translated into cost savings.

5.6 **The amended Programming Document 2018 was adopted.**

6. Information on upcoming EU Presidencies of Bulgaria and Austria

6.1 **Mr Angelov (Governments, Bulgaria)** outlined the priorities of the Bulgarian Presidency from January 2018 and events that were planned in cooperation with Eurofound.

- More than 200 events were planned including an international conference on demographic changes in the future of work. Topics to be covered during the conference were: Development of practical skills from an early age; Right skills for new jobs; New forms of work organisation; Working conditions and job security. Discussions were ongoing in relation to possible contributions by Eurofound staff, as well as the preparation of a background paper.
- The Bulgarian Presidency had requested support from Eurofound for high-level conferences on Demographic changes and the Future of Work, 21-22 March 2018, Sofia and The Social Economy for economic sustainability and a socially cohesive EU, 16-17 April 2018, Sofia.
- It was also proposed that a representative of Eurofound would make a presentation in the informal meeting of the Ministers of Labour and Social Affairs (EPSCO) in Bulgaria in April 2018.
- The social partners would also be interested in organising an event with Eurofound in Sofia, together with members of the Bulgarian Parliament (their parliamentary committees), and representatives from the national Social Partners and Eurofound where the results of the EQLS could be presented.

6.2 **Mr Fugger (Governments, Austria)** informed the Governing Board of the priorities and main activities of the Austrian Presidency from July 2018.

- With elections to the Parliament scheduled for 2019 the Presidency will be finalising legislation, such as Directives on the posting of workers, coordination of social security in new Member States, accessibility, work life balance and carers, as well as the founding regulations of Eurofound, Cedefop and EU-OSHA.
- Other areas in the Commission's work programme to conclude are initiatives and dossiers such as the revision of the Written Statement Directive, Social Protection of self-employed and the European Labour Authority.
- The main topic of the Austrian Presidency would be Work 4.0, labour law and social security protection of employees in the context of the platform economy.
- The Presidency had established cooperation with Eurofound in the context of the project exploring the employment and working conditions relating to crowd employment. The future of work and the platform economy would also be the main topic of the informal EPSCO council in July 2018.
- Events would include a conference on Work 4.0, on Health and Safety at the Workplace and an event with Ombudsmen in the field of persons with disabilities.
- Austria would also have a new government so there might be additional issues that would need to be considered at that time.
- To summarise, the Presidency would do its best to contribute to the aims of *Decent*

work, Decent life and At work convergence in the EU in order to have resilient societies in the Member States.

7. Programming Document 2019 (GB 91/6)

7.1 **The Chair** outlined that there had been an opportunity to discuss the programme in the Group meetings, with the aid of slides highlighting changes and new projects in comparison with the previous draft. The programme would be adopted by the Governing Board in January 2018. She invited the Groups to comment on the programme.

7.2 **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that the draft was a good basis for further work, but had the following comments.

The Group would support deletion of the following projects, should that be necessary.

- *2.1.1 Working conditions and sustainable work* – Analysis on working conditions of specific groups of workers and/or particular issues which can impact the sustainability of work. The Group had doubts why and how particular groups were selected by Eurofound. Sustainability of work was a more dynamic concept related to managing career over life.
- *2.1.4 Well-Functioning and inclusive labour markets report*: Wage distribution within and between companies. Wages were only an element of compensation and working conditions. The project was not a policy priority. The Group would propose instead a project on evaluation of selected active labour market policy measures or perhaps a project on labour market integration of refugees as we see these topics more relevant to the theme ‘Inclusive and well-functioning labour markets’)
- *2.1.9 The digital age: challenges and opportunities for work and employment* – The report on the nature of digitalised workplaces would have to be significantly amended to capture more prominently the opportunities linked to digitalisation (e.g. in terms of health and safety, more autonomy, training, access to work opportunities, work-life balance etc.). The Group was of the view that more traditional industries (incl. manufacturing) should receive more attention. If it were not amended the project would become a negative priority for the Group.
- Regarding the ad hoc proposal from the Governments for a project on posted workers, the Group considered it important that any such project be based on very reliable data sources. It was open to discussing a feasibility study on the possibility of assessing the working conditions of posted workers. The project should also focus on researching the cost of compliance with administrative requirements linked to posting. In general, the research method should be robust, to allow generalised, representative findings. The Group felt that it would be important to discuss the project further when a draft outline was available.
- *2.1.2 Social Dialogue* – The Group were interested in the project on the Social Partners in the EU Semester.
- Representativeness studies – They reaffirmed that the studies were important to the Group and they supported Eurofound’s continuing involvement in them. They looked forward to further discussion of this issue.

7.3 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** said that the posting of workers was an important topic at the moment and it was essential that Eurofound should respond to that. It was welcome therefore that there was openness to the proposals for research in the area. The Group agreed that an outline of a feasibility study should become available as soon as possible. As posting of workers would remain an issue in the coming years, further research should follow in 2019.

7.4 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** made the following comments on behalf of the Workers' Group.

- Posted workers – The Group wished to see an explicit mention in the text that depending on the results of a feasibility study conducted in 2018 about research on the working conditions of posted workers (in a broad sense, beyond the remit of the Directive to also include independents and transport workers) research would be undertaken in the 2019 work programme.

A possible wording, that was analogous to the wording used for the Industrial Action Monitor might be: 'Depending on the outcome of the feasibility study to provide reliable sound data on the working conditions and living conditions of different types of posted and cross border mobile workers (i.e. regardless of their legal status as worker, and the specific scope of the Posted Workers Directive to include independent workers, and transport workers) Eurofound will start to implement a study 2019 for output in 2020 which will systematically monitor the working conditions of posted workers'.

- *Page 30* – The sentence where strategic areas and activities that might be deleted could be listed, as the Group had discussed the matter she mentioned some areas. The list which remained more or less the same as previously: the scope and scale of EU Presidency events; revising the EQLS; the research on the role of the social partners in the European Semester (the Group considered that the scope was not appropriate); the analysis of optimism for the future; the scale of the European Restructuring Monitor; the Foundation Forum (it was clear that the aim of reaching high-level actors had not been reached, with the audience composed of academics and policymakers at a more operative level).
- *2.1.2 Social Dialogue* – In relation to the assessment of the involvement of the Social Partners in the European Semester, the Group felt that the approach in the research was rather superficial. If it was to be done at all, then it should be a more thorough and deep probe into the quality of Social Partner involvement, rather than just ticking off the incidence of formal involvement.
- *2.1.3 Reporting on working life developments* – The Group requested a specific mention in the text that the results of the feasibility study on the industrial action monitor be first discussed in the Advisory Committee (and the Bureau) before moving to implementation. The Group requested the reinstatement of the research on poverty in the pre-pension age – deleted at the request of the Governments and Employers – which was an important topic.
- *2.1.12 Reacting to Ad hoc information requests* – The Group wished to clarify the award procedure for this kind of research. Where a request involved significant amounts of workload/resources it should be decided by the Bureau/Board and not simply be the subject of ex post information. The budget for ad hoc spending seemed excessive.
- The Group reiterated their support for the 5th EWCS analyses on working

conditions of specific types of workers (e.g. shift workers, weekend workers, workers working with clients, workers holding multiple jobs) as part of the research on sustainability of work. Specific Groups of workers was a very important part of trying to operationalise a very interesting concept of what made work sustainable.

- *2.1.4 Well functioning and Inclusive Labour markets* –The Group supported, and would be interested to see the results of, the project exploring wage differentials between and within companies. It was felt that the data was largely there already, and that although wage was not the only way to compensate or remunerate employees it was an important and quantifiable one. The results would also be a response to issues of transactionalisation and internationalisation of company activities, and would provide an understanding of the impact of that on employees.
- *2.1.11 Survey management* – The Group felt that introducing a test for new indicators on in-work poverty in the next EWCS 2020 should not detract from the current scope of the EWCS.

7.5 Ms Bulgarelli (Governments) made the following comments:

- The Group were pleased to see that there was now a clear date in the document for running the European Quality of Life Survey in 2022. She reminded that it was important to keep innovating, also in the surveys. The Group would make a proposal in the Bureau regarding the gender equality perspective in the strategic priorities.
They encouraged Eurofound not to forget the importance of skills. A key take-away from the Foundation Forum was that skills were an enabling condition for upward convergence.
- The Group were proposing in 2018 an ad hoc request on a feasibility study on the needs and availability of data regarding the working conditions of posted workers and this would be linked to the proposals for possible further research in 2019. Along with colleagues in Eurofound, they would draft a proposal for submission to the Bureau in December.

7.6 Ms Welter (Governments) continued.

- The Group were happy with the evolution of the document and welcomed the balanced approach to Surveys. It was good to see that their proposals on the digital age challenges had been taken up.
- The Group would welcome research on the social economy and on cooperatives, considered to be an important topic for the future. It was felt that the future of the middle classes was a topic worth investigating and they would favour a more concrete output, such as a report.

Negative priorities

- *2.1.4 Well functioning and Inclusive Labour markets* – The Group would favour dropping the project on wage differentials.
- *2.1.7 Quality of life and quality of society* – They would also support deletion of the project on Fairness and future – perceptions and realities.
- *Representativeness Studies* – The Group could only agree to the Commission’s request for six studies per annum, if six studies could be realised within the budget foreseen.
- They supported the calls by the Workers’ Group for clear procedures for awarding ad hoc requests where there were significant resource impacts.

- Page 30– The Group suggested dropping the sentence where projects for deletion could be listed.

7.7 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** made the following comments.

- The Commission wished to state how extremely important the Representativeness Studies were. To reduce the number to five per year, rather than six would mean a review of the representativeness of a sector only every ten years, rather than the every eight years currently, which was too long. The Commission were making every effort to group the studies in such a way as to enable cost savings and synergies for Eurofound.
- 2.1.2 – The Commission agreed that if retained, then the research on the involvement of the Social Partners in the European Semester should be deeper in order to understand how social dialogue functioned, not just how many times a social partner had been consulted.
- Page 12, the text should be reviewed not to give the impression that any of the important activities under social dialogue, e.g. the representativeness studies and reporting of social partners might be revised in the context of annual priorities and available budget. This did not do justice to the importance of the activities, particularly in relation to the new social pillar.
- The Commission were open to considering the proposals on posted workers and now that the revised Directive had been approved, acknowledged that they would in the future be required to say something on data availability. Nevertheless the Commission had its own important priorities that would be considered in any negotiations in the Bureau.

7.8 **The Deputy Director** thanked the Groups for their feedback.

- She agreed that ad hoc requests with significant resources should be discussed by the Bureau, and she welcomed the proactive approach of the Governments' Group in bringing the proposal on posted workers to the table for the 2018 programme. The Bureau and Eurofound researchers would scope out the project once the request is received.
- She welcomed any feedback or suggestions regarding gender equality in the research programme.
- The 2017 programme included research on the social economy and cooperatives and she noted the interest to extend this in 2019.
- She agreed that skills was a topic that must be taken into account in working conditions, and this above and beyond the ongoing cooperation with Cedefop on the European Company Survey.
- She said that the Industrial Action Monitor had already been discussed in the Advisory Committee and once the feasibility study was completed, would return to the Bureau for further consideration, prior to any further implementation decisions.
- The research on the future of the middle classes would be a synthesis report of data that was already available.
- It would be necessary to reflect on the divergence of views in relation to the project on wage differentials.
- It was important to remember that the Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME)

project, a pilot project requested by the European Parliament was looking at digitalisation in manufacturing, chemical and automotive sectors. It was true that the impact of digitalisation in the public services, for example in care services, was missing from the research, and this was something that Eurofound would need to reflect on.

- The analysis of differences between various groups of workers was a secondary analysis of data that was available from the EWCS. Only the Employers' Group had suggested its deletion.
- She asked Mr Storrie to describe the background to the proposal regarding the in-work poverty indicators, which considered whether to put one questions as regards in-work poverty into the EWCS questionnaire.

7.9 **Mr Storrie** explained the background to the research, and noted the Groups' concerns that it should not cause undue problems for the existing questionnaire. He outlined that there were a number of problems with the current indicators for in-work poverty.

The official definition used on the Eurostat website was based on the EU-SILC (European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions) and measured the income or the earnings in a particular year, but related that to the employment status and occupational status of the following year, so that there was a mismatch between the income data in EU-SILC and labour market status. Also the measure was relative to a median, relative measure of poverty. There was a lot to indicate that more direct measures of poverty relating to material deprivation were also very useful. This could be done through the survey.

7.10 **The Chair concluded discussions on the Programming Document 2019.**

- **There would be a short consultation of Bureau members on the next draft, in order to prepare a version to be sent to the European Commission in January 2018 (following approval by the Governing Board).**
- **She noted that discussions were continuing on the Representativeness Studies.**

8. Network of Correspondents (GB 91/7)

8.1 **The Chair** noted that the list of contractors for the Network of Correspondents from March 2018 had been made available to the Board members. She thanked Eurofound for its efforts to keep the Board and Bureau informed of the process from the beginning.

8.2 **The Deputy Director** welcomed that the award decision had been made in good time.

- Twenty of the current correspondents had retained their contracts with six new correspondents (Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Spain); two were new consortia structures (France, Latvia).
- Eurofound would organise a conference with the correspondents in April 2018 to discuss their obligations, in line with a reduced budget for the network and a reduction in the number of deliverables.
- Members of the network were involved in the production of the Representativeness Studies and the Comparative Analytical Reports (CARs), currently scheduled at two reports per annum.
- Effort would be made to collaborate proactively with the networks of the European Commission such as the European Labour Network, European Social Policy

Network, and the EURES mobility network. The distinguishing feature of Eurofound's network was of course its tripartite expertise; experience of social dialogue was a requirement for the experts.

8.3 **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that the Employers had noted and discussed the relatively low number of applicants for the tender. It might be that the limited value of the contracts did not encourage research institutes to apply. It might be necessary in the future to consider the matter in relation to the interest and quality of research institutes applying for the tenders.

9. Election of the Chair, Vice-Chairs and composition of the Bureau (GB 91/8)

9.1 **The following were elected:**

- Ms Rossi (Employers) Chair
- Ms Bulgarelli (Governments) Vice-Chair
- Mr Fonck (Workers) Vice-Chair
- Ms Kauffmann (Commission) Vice-Chair

The **Bureau members were also appointed** [new appointments in italics].

- Governments: Ms Bulgarelli (Vice-Chair), Ms Welter (Coordinator), *Ms Skrebiskiene* (Member); Mr Ciechański, *Mr Voigtländer* (Alternates)
- Employers: Ms Rossi (Chair), Ms Bober (Coordinator), Mr Mühl (Member), Ms Anderson, *Ms Kwiatkiewicz* (Alternates)
- Workers: Mr Fonck (Vice-Chair), Mr Scherrer (coordinator), Ms Hoffmann (Alternate Coordinator), Mr Kokalov (Member), Mr Essemyr, Ms Keleman (Alternates).
- Commission: Ms Kauffmann (Vice-Chair), Mr Tagger (Member)

10. Adoption of dates of meetings of Governing Board, Bureau and Groups in 2018 (GB 91/9)

The schedule of meetings in 2018 was adopted.

11. Dates and composition of Advisory Committees in 2018 (GB 91/10)

11.1 **Mr Fonck (Workers)** said that the Group were happy to have reached a compromise in the Bureau whereby meetings of the Advisory Committees for Industrial relations and Working Life would be held back-to-back only in Dublin. The meetings in Brussels would be scheduled separately.

It was the opinion of the Workers' Group that the Advisory Committee should decide the location of its meetings.

11.2 **The document was for information only, but the Governing Board accepted the decision that back-to-back meetings of the Industrial Relations and Working Life Advisory Committees would in future only be held in Dublin.**

12. Endorsement of the Mission Charter of the Internal Audit Service (IAS) (GB 91/11)

12.1 The **Deputy Director** introduced the document.

The Commission's IAS carried out the internal audit function for the agency and it had revised its charter following the entry in to force of the new IIA International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing in January 2017. The charter sets out the mission, objectives, reporting and working arrangements essential to the proper fulfilment of the role of the IAS in relation to the Union bodies.

The IAS reported once a year and the internal auditor could address the Chair of the Governing Board directly. In 2018 the scheduled audit would look at prioritisation of activities and allocation of resources (HR and Financial).

12.2 The Governing Board noted and endorsed the Mission Charter of the IAS and the Chair signed the charter.

13. Administrative questions

13.1 Adoption of decision on implementing rules to the staff regulation (teleworking)

Mr Comerford explained that the rules replaced earlier ones that were based on a pilot project within the European Commission. In these rules, the number of days a staff member would use a more casual teleworking arrangement had been increased from 30 to 60 days. The rules placed more emphasis on management to manage performance from virtual workers and made provision for training managers in this particular skill.

Eurofound's experience with teleworking had, he noted, been positive.

13.2 The Governing Board decided to adopt implementing rules on teleworking.

14. The next meeting of the Governing Board would be held on Friday, 16 November 2018 in Dublin.

[S.Rossi, Chair 21.02.2018]

[J. Menéndez-Valdés, Director 21.02.2018]

Chair

Director

DECISIONS OF THE 91ST GOVERNING BOARD

FRIDAY 17 NOVEMBER 2017

1. Adopted the draft agenda for the 91st meeting of the Governing Board.
2. Adopted minutes of the 90th meeting of the Governing Board on 11 November 2016, with minor amendments. The Governing Board decided that minutes of the meeting should in future be circulated within a month.
3. Adopted the 2018 Programming Document (subject to a final decision on the EU Budget) with editorial amendments to the section on Negative Priorities.
4. Elected the Chair – Ms Rossi (Employers) and Vice-Chairs – Ms Bulgarelli (Governments), Mr Fonck (Workers) and Ms Kauffmann (Commission).
5. Appointed members of the Bureau with new member Ms Skrebiskiene (Governments), and new alternate members Mr Voigtländer (Governments), Ms Kwiatkiewicz (Employers) and Mr Tagger (Commission)
6. Adopted dates for meetings of the Governing Board, Bureau and Groups in 2018.
7. Endorsed the Mission Charter of Eurofound’s internal auditors, the Internal Audit Service (IAS). The Chair signed the charter.
8. Adopted a decision implementing rules to the staff regulation on teleworking.

List of Participants

NAME	SURNAME	GROUP	COUNTRY
Carlos	Alves	Workers	Portugal
Iskren	Angelov	Governments	Bulgaria
Juha	Antila	Workers	Finland
Rossella	Benedetti	Workers	Italy
Magdalena	Bober	Employers	Coordinator
Francisco Javier	Blasco de Luna	Employers	Spain
Dimiter	Brankov	Employers	Bulgaria
<i>Paula</i>	<i>Bueno De Vicente</i>	<i>Governments</i>	<i>Spain</i>
Aviana	Bulgarelli	Governments	Italy
Jerzy	Ciechański	Governments	Poland
Antal	Csuport	Employers	Hungary
Michel	De Gols	Governments	Belgium
<i>Ruta</i>	<i>Didike</i>	<i>Employers</i>	<i>Lithuania</i>
Vladimíra	Drbalova	Employers	Czech Republic
Raul	Eamets	Employers	Estonia
Rasmus	Eiternes Guldvik	Employer-Observer	Norway/EFTA
Mats	Essemyr	Workers	Sweden
Joseph	Farrugia	Employers	Malta
Herman	Fonck	Workers	Belgium
Harald	Fugger	Governments	Austria
Stefan	Gran	Workers	Germany
Matej	Gregarek	Governments	Czech Republic
Silvia	Gregorcova	Governments	Slovak Republic
Marija	Hanzevacki	Workers	Croatia
Thomas	Hoelgaard	Workers	Denmark
Aline	Hoffmann	Workers	Alternate Coordinator
Liina	Kaldmäe	Governments	Estonia
Patrik	Karlsson	Employers	Sweden
Barbara	Kauffmann	Commission	European Commission
Melinda	Kelemen	Workers	Hungary
Vladka	Komel	Governments	Slovenia

NAME	SURNAME	GROUP	COUNTRY
Maja	Konjar	Workers	Slovenia
Jan	Kouwenberg	Workers	Netherlands
Kristina	Krupaviciene	Workers	Lithuania
Anna	Kwiatkiewicz-Mory	Employers	Poland
Pierre-Gaël	Loréal	Workers	France
<i>Maija</i>	<i>Lyly-Yrjänäinen</i>	<i>Governments</i>	<i>Finland</i>
<i>Cara</i>	<i>Maguire</i>	<i>Governments</i>	<i>UK</i>
Orestis	Messios	Governments	Cyprus
Despoina	Michailidou	Governments	Greece
Brenda	O'Brien	Observer	EU-OSHA
Bogdan	Olszewski	Workers	Poland
Manuel	Pena Costa	Employers	Portugal
Antonia	Ramos Yuste	Workers	Spain
Susanna	Ribrant	Governments	Sweden
Manuel	Roxo	Government	Portugal
Stefania	Rossi	Employers	Italy
Dirk	Scheele	Governments	Netherlands
Peter	Scherrer	Workers	Coordinator
Nenad	Seifert	Employers	Croatia
Rita	Skrebiskiene	Governments	Lithuania
Andreas	Sommer Møller	Governments	Denmark
Vatroslav	Subotić	Governments	Croatia
Panagiotis	Syriopoulos	Workers	Greece
<i>Jörg</i>	<i>Tagger</i>	<i>European Commission</i>	<i>European Commission</i>
Mario	Van Mierlo	Employers	Netherlands
Thomas	Voigtländer	Governments	Germany
Roland	Waeyaert	Employers	Belgium
Nadine	Welter	Governments	Luxembourg

Italics denote members attending for first time

Also attending

Erika Mezger	Deputy Director, Eurofound
Markus Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Governing Board, Eurofound
Evi Roelen	European Commission
Donald Storrie	Eurofound
Ray Comerford	Eurofound
Jorge Cabrita	Staff Committee, Eurofound
Camilla Galli da Bino	Staff Committee, Eurofound
Daphne Ahrendt	Union Syndicale, Eurofound

Regrets received from

NAME	SURNAME	GROUP	COUNTRY
Michael	Antoniou	Employers	Cyprus
Régis	Bac	Governments	France
Joseph	Bugeja	Workers	Malta
Marie-Soline	Chomel	Governments - Alternate	France
Kris	De Meester	Employers	Belgium
Thierry	Durnerin	Employers	France
Veronique	Eischen	Workers	Luxembourg
Miguel	Gutiérrez	Employers	Spain
Miroslav	Hajnos	Workers	Slovakia
Thorfrid	Hansen	Governments - Observer	Norway/EFTA
Ivan	Kokalov	Workers	Bulgaria
Lutz	Mühl	Employers	Germany

NAME	SURNAME	GROUP	COUNTRY
Jack	O'Connor	Workers	Ireland
Tomas	Pavelka	Workers	Czech Republic
Polvyious	Poliviou	Employers	Cyprus
Ioan Cristinel	Raileanu	Governments	Romania
Maja	Skorupan	Employers	Slovenia
Lucie	Studnicna	Workers	Czech Republic
Ineta	Tarē	Governments	Latvia
Hedi-Loos	Toome	Workers	Estonia
Ineta	Vjakse	Governments – Alternate	Latvia
Fiona	Ward	Governments	Ireland