

**REVISED DRAFT AGENDA**  
**249th MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

*Conseil Central de l'Economie (CCE), room 6,  
20 avenue d'Auderghem, 1040 Brussels,  
Friday, 30 January 2015, 09h00-13h00*

1. Draft Agenda (B 249/1), *For Adoption*
2. Draft Minutes of the 248th Bureau meeting of 12 December 2014 (B 249/2), *For Adoption*
3. Progress Report of the Director (B 249/3), *For Information*
4. Roadmap on follow-up to Common approach on EU agencies  
- update by the Commission (B 249/4), *For Information*
5. Coordination of Network of EU agencies (B249/5), *For Information*
6. Draft Budget 2016 (B 249/6), *For Discussion*
7. Draft Multi-annual Staff Policy Plan 2016-2018 (B 249/7), *For Discussion*
8. Update on Audit activities (B 249/8), *For Information*
9. Cooperation with other EU agencies (B 249/9), *For Information*
10. Administrative questions
11. AOB

13:00 – 14:30 Appraisal meeting for the Director (room 7) – only reporting officers

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

Friday, 20 March 2015 at 9h00: Dublin, Eurofound, Conference Centre

## FINAL MINUTES

### 249th MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

9.00-13.00, Friday, 30 January 2015

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

<b>Mr Fonck</b>	Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Ms Bulgarelli</b>	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Welter</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Drbalová</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Employers)
<b>Mr Kokalov</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Mr Blomsma</b>	Coordinator, Member of Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Bober</b>	Coordinator (Employers)
<b>Mr Niemiec</b>	Coordinator (Workers)
<b>Mr Maes</b>	European Commission
<b>Ms Scanferla</b>	European Commission
<b>Mr Menéndez-Valdés</b>	Director
<b>Ms Mezger</b>	Deputy Director
<b>Mr Grimmeisen</b>	Secretary to the Governing Board
<b>Ms Gerstenberger</b>	Eurofound
<b>Ms Jacquet</b>	Eurofound

1. Adoption of Draft Agenda (B 249/1)

The draft agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of minutes of the Bureau meeting, 12 December 2014 (B 249/2)

**Mr Maes (Commission)** requested that under point 3.7 the first sentence be changed as follows: 'Mr Maes referred to the political context of these exercises'.

**Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** said the minutes did not include a proposal she had made under point 5.4 to be taken into account in future in the Single Programming Document, to add to Eurofound's mission statement the mission to provide knowledge to assist in the development of social, employment and work-related policies'.

**The minutes were adopted as amended.**

3. Progress report of the Director (B 249/3)

3.1 **The Director** outlined progress since the last Bureau meeting in December.

- The Bureau members would find detailed plans and information on projects in the 2015 work programme in the progress report which included clearer information about the timeline for projects.
- As part of the usual work programme planning process, the Director and Deputy Director had attended meetings with several key stakeholders in ETUC, BusinessEurope and the Commission. This time around, the strategic framework was until 2020 so that it was necessary to discuss on the basis of the mid to long-term priorities of these stakeholders.
- The Director would meet the new Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs

and Labour Mobility Ms Thyssen later that day, at her request, as indeed would the other tripartite agencies (Cedefop and EU-OSHA) who were newly grouped together under her responsibilities.

- The delegation agreement for the pilot project of the European Parliament on the future of manufacturing in Europe would be signed soon. Some further changes had been required. It was anticipated that the project would run for at least three years.
- Interviews for the Sixth European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) had begun in January with fieldwork continuing until June. The project leader had recently been in China discussing options for implementing the survey in a number of cities there. No firm dates or commitments were available yet.
- The Bureau were asked to look at the list of events planned during the year. It was necessary to find a date for the launch of the first findings of the EWCS during Luxembourg's EU presidency, later in the year.
- Recent publications included the latest in the *Foundation Findings* series which focused on Sustainable work. A concept paper on the subject was being finalised, following review by the stakeholders. A new spotlight on this topic would be published on the website, and would be updated with this paper and other upcoming results.
- A brochure had been produced to commemorate the 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary which would also be marked by a number of events during the year.
- At the request of the Latvian presidency Eurofound was preparing a note on social dialogue, potentially for the informal EPSCO council meeting.
- Work continued on improving the new website, though there were persistent issues with a number of bugs and search problems.
- He presented some preliminary highlights of Eurofound's performance in 2014, with very good budget utilisation and staff capacity high, but programme delivery slightly behind with delays recorded in 43% deliveries of projects. Contributions to policy developments through events had increased and he was pleased to see that the use of Eurofound's knowledge in key EU policy documents had also increased, achieving a new record and doubling numbers for policy documents of the Social Partners.
- The consolidated report on *Youth entrepreneurship in Europe* had been finalised. This was an area mentioned often by the new Commissioner and so its publication was timely.
- The Comparative Analytical Report (CAR) on Start-up support for young people, which had been delayed due to the departure of successive project managers, was now in progress and the contributions had been received in January.
- The European Restructuring Monitor (ERM) restructuring events database was back online following a transition between the old and new websites.
- It was intended to follow up with a summary of the outcomes of the Foundation Seminar Series on sustainable work. Case studies were also in hand.
- In a related field, findings of the CAR on *Employment opportunities for people with chronic diseases* had been presented and discussed at a seminar in Brussels in December.
- The overview report of the European Company Survey, previously postponed, would now be launched during the Latvian Presidency.
- Georg Fischer of DG Employment had presented the Commission's new Employment and Social developments report at an internal research seminar in Eurofound. The final chapter included a strong contribution from Eurofound on job quality, and the report included also an analysis of different kinds of companies

based on data from the European Working Conditions Survey.

- Secondary analyses of the European Company Survey looking at work organisation and employee participation were in preparation.
- In the area of industrial relations, the final questionnaires for the CAR on the concept of representativeness/role of the social partners in the European Semester had been sent to the national centres in December. The CAR would allow Eurofound to map how each Member State defined representativeness and the rules that were applicable, which had relevance for the relaunching of the social dialogue and the questions that a number of Member States were raising about the representativeness of the social partners.
- He described the shift in the observatory on working life EurWORK, from simply reporting news to collecting information through questionnaires, and preparing comparative articles in-house on issues like maternity leave. It was demanding work but it was considered that these analyses represented real added value.
- The delays to the launch of the questionnaire for the CAR on temporary agency work were due to delays mainly in finalising the questionnaire.
- He had been invited to present at the Employment and Social Protection Committee's conference in Riga on labour mobility thinking, and a number of recent publications would be highlighted there.
- The Bureau were asked to note a number of budgetary transfers presented.
- He informed the Bureau of the upcoming written procedures that included implementing policies arising from the new staff regulations.
- He updated the Bureau on recruitment procedures.
- He noted that the figures outlining the breakdown of staff by activity differed from previous figures, due to the fact that Eurofound had now to use the Commission's methodology for categorising staff engaged in operational, support and (a new category) neutral activities. Neutral activities were defined as posts such as the accounting officer that were legally required.
- He outlined the staffing proposal for the pilot project of the European Parliament on the future of manufacturing in Europe that included a project coordinator, a gender expert and a research officer.
- He referred to actions in relation to Eurofound's internal communications strategy developed in response to findings of the staff engagement survey carried out in 2013.
- He outlined plans for the 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebrations during the year. An event was planned during the heads of Agencies meeting on 22-23 October 2015 in order to align with Cedefop which was also celebrating 40 years and would be present there. An event was also planned during the Governing Board meeting in November.

He concluded his report and welcomed any comments or questions.

- 3.2 **Mr Maes (Commission)** wished to add that during the discharge proceedings in the European Parliament it was a good sign that the work of Eurofound was received positively.

He spoke about the Commission's relaunching of social dialogue which had been translated already into the structure of the new Commission, with the Vice-President Mr Dombrovskis having responsibility for the euro and social dialogue.

One of the first meetings of the new Commissioner and Vice-President had been with the social partners on 17 November 2014. The European social partners and national leaders from industry would be invited to a high level event on 5 March 2015 where a number of themes would be discussed. Eurofound, Cedefop and EU-OSHA would be

invited to this meeting as observers.

The first theme concerned the involvement of the social partners in the European semester at both European and national level, which was a topic that Eurofound was already working on. He added that there was already a discussion on this in the EU-level social dialogue committees, where the opinions of the social partners were sought prior to the publication of the annual growth survey, and their positions were made available on the website alongside the survey. The European Semester process was also being reviewed, with the Commission's assessment presented first in February or March and a period allowed thereafter for discussions with the Member States and social partners at both EU and national level, until May, when the draft country specific recommendations of the Commission would be published.

A second theme for discussion was the more traditional involvement of social partners in policymaking, traditionally in the field of social policy, but also beyond that in areas not under the portfolio of DG Employment, such as the digital single market, energy union and migration.

A third element concerned better regulation and the relationship between the agreements concluded by the social partners and their implementation through EU legislation. There was a need to clarify how the Commission assessed those agreements and this introduced the issue of representativeness. Eurofound's current mapping of the representativeness concept in the Member States could potentially have a very great input in discussions on the concept at European level. Thus far an analytical document had been developed to assess the cost benefit of the agreements, and it was necessary to see if it was possible to accelerate the process which was taking more and more time at Commission level.

A fourth theme concerned the capacity of social partners at national level, which linked to the involvement of social partners in the economic governance process and also to the autonomous agreements and their implementation. The Commission would present in 2015 a draft working document on the implementation of the framework agreement on the prevention of harassment and violence at work. A contribution from Eurofound would also be valuable in looking at how far these agreements have been implemented in the Member States and what lessons could be drawn at European level, in relation to capacity building at national level.

He wished to emphasise again the importance attached to the representativeness studies, also to improving them, with the Commission willing to play a role in that. The recent refinements to the methodology were a very positive development and the publication of this methodology on the website was welcomed.

It should be noted that Eurofound's study on the Working Time Directive would be available at the same time as the Commission's public consultation on the issue was concluding.

4. Update by the Commission on the roadmap on the common approach to EU Agencies
- 4.1 **Mr Maes (Commission)** said that the roadmap for the revision of the founding regulations of all EU Agencies was foreseen to be available in February or March and in the case of Eurofound would reflect the blueprint already outlined to the Governing Board and Bureau. A proposal would be submitted to the Parliament and the Council in June 2015.  
In Eurofound an outstanding item in the roadmap was the pending conclusion of a seat agreement with the Irish government.
- 4.2 **The Director** updated the Bureau on the progress of negotiations with the Irish government on the matter of the seat agreement.

5. Coordination of the Network of EU Agencies (B 249/5)

- 5.1 **Ms Jacquet** gave an overview of the activities planned between March 2015 and February 2016 when Eurofound would assume the coordinating role for the network of the EU agencies, highlighting the dates for the main meetings of the network (Heads of Agencies and Heads of Administration meetings), outlining Eurofound's priorities during the year, and listing the staff members involved.

One of the main priorities would be to follow the work of the second Inter-Institutional Working Group (IIWG2) of the European Council, Parliament and Commission which would last at least until 2018 and would focus on resources, both staff and budgetary and would look at the future funding of the agencies. The network had already expressed its wish to collaborate closely with the working group.

- 5.2 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** said that it seemed that it would involve a great amount of work on the part of Eurofound. Would it be possible for the network of agencies to participate in meetings of the IIWG2 she wondered.

- 5.3 **The Director** replied that it was not possible to be a formal member of the Group but that the network had been able to make contributions in writing to the first working group, and had requested to be able to make presentations and have exchanges with the working group this time. This was something that the Bureau members could also support within their own constituencies.

The Governing Board and Bureau would be informed of activities in the network, and it was hoped that they would further share this information.

6. Draft Budget 2016 ( B 249/6)

- 6.1 In line with the new Single Programming Document the draft budget was proposed to the Bureau at an earlier time than usual in the process.

- 6.2 **Mr Grimmeisen** said that in the past the budget proposal to the Bureau in January and thereafter to the Commission, had been an input to the Commission's own preparations for the budget. The new financial regulation however now required the first draft input of the agencies by 31 January each year.

As in the past, according to the founding regulation, the official application and request for budget accompanied by a first outline of next year's work programme and establishment plan would be submitted to the Governing Board for approval by a written procedure in March.

The EU subsidy available (frozen between 2013 and 2018) followed the long-term plans published by the Commission in 2013 and the budgetary circular of DG Budget.

In relation to the staff table, Eurofound was committed to reducing two posts in 2016. However Eurofound was opposing the Commission's approach which expected a 10% staff reduction over five years in so-called cruising agencies like Eurofound, as opposed to a 5% reduction in the other institutions. To address this matter the inter-institutional working group composed of the European Parliament, Council and Commission had been established to consider the actual resource needs of the Agencies.

He outlined the figures in the budget titles. He noted that it had been possible to advance expenditure for the European Working Conditions Survey in 2014 thus allowing some room for manoeuvre in 2016.

The final amount available through IPA funding for research in the candidate countries was not yet available and the figures included in this budget row were indicative only.

The 2016 figure included €2.3 million for the next phase of the European Quality of Life Survey. A figure of €600, 000 was indicated for research projects outside of the

surveys and observatories (which included the network of correspondents).

The funding for the pilot project of the European Parliament on the future of manufacturing in Europe was not included in the document, but would appear in the final draft budget proposal which would be submitted to the Governing Board in March. No additional budget was anticipated from the Commission for the projects on the European Platform on undeclared work, and the project on human trafficking. The Commission had indicated that additional funding would only be available for new tasks, and did not consider these as new tasks, though Eurofound would argue that where a permanent active involvement was required, it would consider it to be a new task.

6.3 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** asked for information about the costs associated with external audits, which she thought were done by the European Court of Auditors. Should the current reduction in energy costs be reflected in the Title 2 budget? Would it be possible to reduce some of the costs associated with promotion and marketing?

6.4 **The Director** explained that all the agencies were now obliged to contract out the services of the external audit of accounts, whilst the Court was responsible for ensuring the legality and regularity of procurement procedures, recruitment procedures, financial transactions, commitments and payments. It reduced the visits of the court, but did not eliminate them. The average cost to an agency was between €10,000 and €25,000, and the Commission and the Court had decided that the agencies should pay for that.

There had been a slight reduction in energy costs (€9,000) between 2013 and 2014 and the increased figure in the draft budget was for reasons of prudence and could be adjusted later. The budget in promotion and marketing included the media campaigns which were an important component of Eurofound's communications activities.

The debate on the staff reductions would be high on the agenda of the IIWG2, as the issue had not been yet decided between the actors.

7. Multiannual Staff Policy Plan (MSPP) 2016-2018 (B 249/7)

7.1 **The Director** noted that there had been some late revisions to the document.

7.2 **Mr Grimmeisen** outlined some of the changes to the figures in the paper. Regarding the Establishment Plan (staff table) he said that in 2016, 2017 and 2018 Eurofound wished to retain 96 posts which differed to the Commission's proposals outlined in their long term proposals for staff reductions in July 2013.

The situation was that the agencies supported by the Parliament agreed to a 5% reduction, whereas the Commission was requesting up to 10% reduction over five years in the cruising-speed agencies such as Eurofound, to support redeployment to other EU agencies like Frontex and the European Banking Authority.

The Commission's 2015 budget published in December 2014, did not account for the position of the agencies and the Parliament and provided for the larger reduction.

In 2016 the Agencies were once again calling for a reduction of just 5% and therefore the number of posts in Eurofound's proposal was recorded as 96, whereas the Commission might reduce that to 95. Having reduced posts from 101 to 96 Eurofound considered that it had already complied with the Commission's request. The Commission however were looking for a cut of 10 posts until 2020.

7.3 **Mr Maes (Commission)** said that the Commission would give its opinion on the MSPP once Eurofound had formally submitted the document.

On an initial consultation there were a number of elements in the document that should be checked for accuracy.

In section 5.1 on new tasks of the agency some of those mentioned, already referred to by the Director, were not considered new tasks and should not be included in this section of the document. Only the third bullet point in this section on the European Platform could be included there.

- 7.4 **Ms Drbalová (Employers)** noted the geographical balance of staff and wondered about strategies for attracting staff from the new Member States.
- 7.5 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** asked if contingency plans had been made, in the event that the larger staff reductions were to go ahead.
- 7.6 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** asked what was the situation regarding the employment of Seconded National Experts and also enquired about the nature of the discussion and agreement in the Joint Working Group around the implementing rules.
- 7.7 **The Director** said that in relation to the staff reductions the decision would be taken in the IIWG2. The agencies in general however preferred to retain the 5% figure.

The reduction if required would be achieved through natural wastage not through redundancies, over time. The newer standard employment contracts in Eurofound were initially for a limited duration (with the possibility for renewal) and would also provide some contingency.

In relation to the new tasks section, although the new tasks had not been entrusted through amendment of the founding regulation, Eurofound considered that additional projects from the Commission were new tasks. This was a consistent approach that would be communicated to the IIWG2. The MASPP he noted was an internal document.

The geographical balance in Eurofound was quite broad.

In relation to Seconded National Experts whose salaries were paid by their organisation, more often a national government, and to whom Eurofound paid a daily allowance, although there were no immediate plans to recruit in this area he said that Eurofound wished to retain the possibility to do so in the future.

The internal Joint Working Group had been created to facilitate dialogue with the staff committee who were the official staff representatives according to the staff regulation and the in-house trade union. The implementing rules for the staff regulations were discussed at length in this group, and decisions were taken following consultation. There were no formal social dialogue decisions there.

8. Update on the audit activities (B 249/8)

**The Deputy Director** explained that there was an internal working group responsible for following up on audit activities.

They focused on three areas: Involving stakeholders more proactively in processes and decision-making especially work programme planning; preparing a more detailed description of the stakeholders (and she noted the previous discussions around managing the unserved audiences); and the reinforcement of Customer Relations Management (CRM) in Eurofound.

An action plan around these recommendations had been proposed to the internal auditors in October 2014 which was being reviewed. The Bureau was informed on an ongoing basis of the activities in relation to this action plan.

The group was also tasked with production of the consolidated Annual Activity Report, which was presented to the Bureau before being submitted to the EU Institutions.

The Internal Audit Plan for 2015 concerned the follow up of three of sixteen internal control standards that were applicable in Eurofound, namely: the implementation of a



skills mapping exercise which was important for the Single Programming Document, a review of the existing document management system (HP TRIM); and the completion of a register of procedures to be published on the website.

The Internal Audit Service of the Commission, who were responsible for Eurofound's internal auditing, had proposed the following core areas for upcoming audits.

- What was called 'Make and buy', looking at standards used to decide whether a project was done in-house with internal resources or contracted out;
- Quality management;
- Project management.

Eurofound had indicated its preference to look at project management but had as yet received no feedback on that proposal. In future, internal audits would not be conducted annually but rather every two years.

The Internal Control Committee (ICC) followed up on audit activities, but the recommendations of the European Court of Auditors were followed up by the Head of Administration and reported on to the Bureau in the Director's progress report.

All the audit reports were available on the extranet for the Governing Board.

## 9. Cooperation with other Agencies (B 49/9)

### 9.1 The **Deputy Director** introduced this item which concerned cooperation on a regular basis with other EU Agencies.

Ongoing in a number of cases since 2004, the cooperation agreements provided for annual action plans currently with five other EU Agencies (European Training Foundation (ETF), Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA), European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop), European Agency for Health and Safety at Work (EU-OSHA) and the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE).

Looking at the action plans, it could be seen that surveys formed a core activity of a number of agencies and it was in this area that cooperation and synergies would be focused. Cooperation entailed looking at the structures of the surveys, the questionnaires and the methodology to see where added value could be gained.

Eurofound was currently involved in the development of the FRA questionnaire with the possibility for synergies in relation to harassment and violence at work. The aim was to have comparable questions and not parallel ones.

It involved a great effort and included cooperation in the area of knowledge management, information and communication, with real information sharing about the work programmes, looking for areas where joint activities were possible.

Beyond the EU agencies Eurofound also cooperated with the ILO and the OECD around exchanging expertise and peer review.

### 9.2 **Ms Bober (Employers)** welcomed this initiative and noted that the Employers' Group had for a long time expressed an interest in the issue of the match between education and skills and the labour market, so that cooperation with Cedefop was considered to be of great interest.

Also the topic of skills anticipation was of interest, and apparently there had been some cooperation between Eurofound and Cedefop at the level of the European Jobs Monitor and the EU Skills Panorama. Perhaps this issue could be further explored, and it was hoped there could be an exchange of best practice at a regional level which was where skills anticipation was actually taking place.

### 9.3 **Mr Kokalov (Workers)** welcomed this cooperation and said that in future it would be a means of defending the agencies, especially to the Commission, by delivering synergies and savings. It was necessary to deepen the cooperation at the operational

level.

- 9.4 **Ms Drbalová (Employers)** also welcomed the initiative and noted that the OECD in its research was looking more and more at policies, so that there were opportunities for comparison and cooperation, for example in relation to job strategy and measures focused on young people.
- 9.5 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** highlighted the importance of such synergies particularly in the areas of surveys where an agency's particular expertise could bring such added value to the questionnaires. It was a very positive step.  
In light of the new centralisation of the agencies within DG Employment, stronger cooperation could also be envisaged.
- 9.6 **Mr Maes (Commission)** also welcomed the initiative and said that in the context of the Single Programming Document the Commission would also have an overview which would avoid overlaps.  
He had a particular question regarding the interest expressed by the ETF in the representativeness of social partners and the innovations of social partners.
- 9.7 **The Deputy Director** would follow up with Ms Demetriades regarding the ETF interest but she thought it concerned capacity building and exchange.
- 9.8 **The Director** said that he had specifically addressed the issue of surveys with Cedefop, EU-OSHA, FRA and EIGE in the context of cooperating to reduce costs. EU-OSHA had declined due to key differences in their datasets, but it seemed that the proposal was perceived by Cedefop to have greater potential.  
ETF were involved in capacity building in their target countries, northern Africa and the former Soviet Union which explained their interest.  
The area of cooperation and synergies was a complicated one, because sometimes it might be possible to cooperate on preparation of a questionnaire but not on the survey. It was not always more efficient to cooperate, he added.
- 9.9 **The Chairperson** noted the support of the Bureau to deepen the cooperation.
10. **Administrative questions**
- 10.1 **Mr Grimmeisen** presented a paper informing the Bureau of a framework contract for the services of a temporary agency for staff recruitment with a value up to €1,200,000 over four years with Orange Recruitment (Ireland) Ltd.  
**The Bureau noted the contract.**
- 10.2 **The Director** confirmed that a background paper would be circulated prior to the brainstorming seminar on the work programme on 19 March. Nominations for participants were welcome and could include the advisory committee members, but the advisory committees would not be formally involved in the first stage, although they would be able to discuss in the next round of meetings. All members can also review the draft programme and revert to the Bureau.  
The 1 draft of the Single Programming Document would be sent to the Governing Board on 10 June, and would be discussed in the Group meetings later that month.
11. The next meeting of the Bureau would be held on **Friday, 20 March** in Dublin.

[Signed H.Fonck]

[Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]

---

---

Chairperson

Director

**DRAFT AGENDA**  
**250th MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**  
*CC2 Raymond-Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound, Dublin*  
*Friday, 20 March 2015, 09h00-13h00*

1. Draft Agenda (B 250/1), *For Adoption*
2. Draft Minutes of the 249th Bureau Meeting of 30 January 2015 (B 250/2), *For Adoption*
3. Progress Report of the Director (B 250/3), *For Information*
4. Roadmap on follow-up to Common approach on EU agencies  
- update by the Commission (B 250/4), *For Information*
5. Single Programming Document 2017–2020  
– wrap-up and next steps (B 250/5), *For Discussion*
6. Work Programme 2016 – first draft (B 250/6), *For Discussion*
7. Update by Head of Information & Communications (B 250/7), *For Information*
8. Draft Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure 2016 (B 250/8), *For Discussion*
9. AOB

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

**Wednesday, 13 May 2015 at 9h00**

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

## FINAL MINUTES

### 250th MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

9.00-13.00, Friday, 20 March 2015

Room CC2, Raymond Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound, Dublin

<b>Mr Fonck</b>	Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Ms Bulgarelli</b>	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Welter</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Mr Blomsma</b>	Coordinator, Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Bober</b>	Coordinator (Employers)
<b>Ms Hoffmann</b>	Deputy Coordinator (Workers)
<b>Mr Mühl</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Employers)
<b>Mr Maes</b>	European Commission
<b>Ms Scanferla</b>	European Commission
<b>Mr Menéndez-Valdés</b>	Director
<b>Ms Mezger</b>	Deputy Director
<b>Mr Grimmeisen</b>	Secretary to the Governing Board
<b>Ms Gerstenberger</b>	Eurofound

1. Adoption of Draft Agenda (B 251/1)  
**The draft agenda was adopted.**
2. Adoption of draft minutes of Bureau meeting, 30 January 2015 ( B 251/2)  
**Mr Maes (Commission)** introduced some minor changes to his interventions on pages 4 and 7.  
**The amended minutes were approved.**
3. **Progress report of the Director (B 250/3)**
  - 3.1 The **Director** outlined some highlights in the work programme since the previous Bureau meeting in January.
    - Eurofound had contributed to a number of high-level events during the Latvian Presidency, including a joint EMCO/SPC conference on ‘Inclusive labour markets in the EU’ where the OECD presented its report on job quality which used Eurofound data.
    - Presentations were made at the Social Protection Committee (on Active Inclusion) and the Employment Committee (EMCO) (on Labour Mobility), as well as at the meeting of the Chairpersons of the Committees of Employment and Social Affairs where Eurofound presented on the inclusion of the most vulnerable groups into the labour market. He highlighted that this had been a good opportunity to communicate with the stakeholders at the national level.
    - Eurofound had welcomed the Director of the ILO, Mr Ryder and there had been a valuable exchange. A framework of cooperation with the ILO was being drafted

and included collaboration on the European Working Conditions Survey.

- Eurofound had been invited to contribute to activities around Commission President Juncker's relaunching of social dialogue, and had prepared a background note for the Latvian presidency of the EU.
- Eurofound had presented findings in a visit by the Deputy Director and staff members to the German Ministry of Labour.
- The customised report on the 'Uptake of paternity and parental leave in Europe' had been presented to the European Parliament's FEMM committee.
- The Director had presented at a meeting in Paris on atypical employment in the aviation sector in Europe, and the event had proved interesting and was useful for informing further work.
- Eurofound had officially assumed the coordination role for the EU Agencies' Network in March, for a period of one year.
- The report on the *ex post* evaluation of the previous Four-Year Programme had been approved by the Steering Committee and made available on the extranet. It was generally positive with five recommendations for improvements that would be followed up. It would be included in the agenda of the Bureau meeting in May.
- There was some progress regarding improvement of the website. Additional resources had been assigned to the web and the exercise had certainly been more difficult than initially estimated.
- The report 'Early childhood care: working conditions, training and quality of Services – A systematic review' had been published in February and was a systematic review of the literature in the 28 Member States. It was an important exercise for the scientific community but a time-consuming and expensive one for Eurofound and it would be important to reflect on whether Eurofound wished to develop more of this kind of research in the future.
- There was a high interest in the report on 'New Forms of Employment' which had been published in March.
- The European Jobs Monitor report had been evaluated positively by the Advisory Committee in March. It included a global comparison, which had been produced at no cost to Eurofound thanks to collaboration with researchers in the United States. There would be an associated commercial publication with contributions from Eurofound's researchers.
- In the European Restructuring Monitor the launch of the case studies database was delayed due to problems with the web. In response to questions from the Chairperson he explained the background to the problems with the web but said that they were being addressed.
- The fieldwork on the Sixth European Working Conditions Survey had commenced on 18 February. In relation to the global working conditions survey there was a provisional date for fieldwork in twelve Chinese cities in October 2015, though there was as yet no firm commitment to carrying out the survey there. The questionnaire would be used as the basis for a survey in the US in March and in South Korea. There were discussions with the ILO on a joint publication on global working conditions.
- The delayed concept paper on 'Sustainable Work over the Life Course' had now been circulated to the Advisory Committee for evaluation. The fieldwork on the

case studies on national policies and strategies had been started in eleven countries. Background notes were being prepared on the Comparative Analytical Report (CAR) on 'Working time patterns and sustainable work'. The report 'Midcareer review, internal mobility and intergenerational initiatives to extend working life' would be evaluated in April.

- The Third European Company Survey overview report would be launched in Riga on 30 March in a joint conference with the Latvian Presidency.
  - EurWORK reporting included more than 100 articles and short information pieces, with 40 further articles commissioned. The quarterly reporting from the national correspondents would be further developed. Governing Board members had been asked to send their feedback on the extent and quality of their contacts with the national correspondents. This would be important information for the annual meeting of the correspondents that would be held on 25-26 March in Eurofound.
  - He outlined progress on the Representativeness Studies with reports now ready on Ports and the Graphical industries.
  - Preparations were underway for the next phase of the European Quality of Life Survey which would take place in 2016.
  - He introduced the overview of the budget implementation and noted that the figures included under services rendered concerned the top-ups of the survey in a number of countries.
  - He outlined the upcoming written procedures of the Board, including those for approval of the draft budget 2016 and the Multiannual Staff Policy Plan, both of which provided for a 5% reduction in staff in the staffing table contrary to the 10% requested by the Commission in 2013. The Agencies affected by the request for a reduction greater than the standard 5% applied in the Institutions, had decided to await the outcome of the second Inter-Institutional Working Group which was looking at the issue of resources in the Agencies and in the meantime to propose only a 5% reduction.
  - He updated the Bureau on the status of the ongoing process to assess the extent of the problem in relation to the salary calculation error for some staff transitioning from the old to the new Staff Regulation in 2005. The problem which had been identified by the Court of Auditors was thought to have occurred in other agencies too. Provision had been made in the 2015 budget to cover the likely costs.
  - The external audit had taken place in early March and focused on Budget and Accounts. It was carried out by an external audit company Mazars as the Court of Auditors had outsourced one of the two annual audit visits. The cost however was borne by the agencies.
  - He updated the Bureau on current recruitment procedures.
  - It was hoped to conclude Eurofound's seat agreement with the Irish government in the first half of 2015. This would be forwarded to the Commission for review prior to signature.
  - He concluded with information on the activities planned in the coming months with Eurofound's role as coordinator of the network of EU Agencies.
- 3.2 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** expressed her regret that an expert meeting for the project 'Inequalities in Working Conditions – Exploring fraudulent forms of contracting work and of self-employment in the European Union' had gone ahead without adequate representation from the Employers. The coordinator of the Group had not been

informed about the meeting and the Group wished to state that this was not acceptable, particularly in relation to a project around which there were sensitivities.

On a more positive note, she welcomed the efforts being made to improve the collaboration between the national correspondents in the network and the national members. She wondered how Eurofound would deal with any negative feedback that emerged following the request for feedback issued to the Board members.

She requested that the framework cooperation agreement with the ILO be sent to the Bureau when it had been finalised.

- 3.3 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** also expressed concerns in relation to the concept paper on ‘Sustainable work over the life course’. The Group were concerned that comments had been invited following the evaluation of the paper at the Advisory Committee, but those had not been circulated and the committee members were now informed that the paper was being sent for editing prior to publication. This was a sensitive project for the Workers’ Group and the manner in which the commenting process had been dealt with did not assist the feelings of trust.

- 3.4 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** welcomed the cooperation with the ILO.

In communicating the data from Eurofound’s research, it was important to give more information on individual Member States in order to show the divergence between them.

In relation to the comments made by the Employers and Workers it was important to highlight the importance of trust and to demonstrate the added value of being a tripartite agency.

- 3.5 **The Director** responded to the various comments.

- He acknowledged the difficulties with the expert meeting on inequalities of working conditions and agreed that it was important to ensure adequate representation of all the social partners. This situation would be avoided in the future.
- In relation to the concept paper on sustainable work he would extend the period for comments and ensure that they were dealt with in the final paper.

- 3.2 The **Chairperson** summarised the discussion on this point as follows:

- In future for strategic or sensitive projects, if there were expert/stakeholder meetings then all Groups would be invited or informed of the meeting. The process would be clarified in the May Bureau meeting.
- The period for comments on the concept paper on sustainable work was extended for a further two weeks, in order to allow any ongoing problems to be resolved, prior to publication.
- The feedback received from the members about the national correspondents would be discussed in the Bureau meeting in May.

4. **Work Programme 2016 – first draft (B 250/6)**



- 4.1 **Ms Welter (Governments)** who was leaving the meeting early wished to make some comments on the first draft of the programme.
- The document was a good first draft but missed the issue of the skills gap which was particularly important in relation to young people.
  - She asked if there was a suggestion of a theme for the Foundation Seminar Series and called for more information on Project 13, ‘Exploring self-employment’. In Project 15 ‘Organisational change and development in European Companies’ it might be considered to include countries outside Europe in order to have a global perspective.
  - She asked for more information on Project 17 as it was difficult to see where Eurofound had a role in finding out if the social partners at different levels had the capacity to negotiate and sign agreements.
  - Project 20, ‘Core labour standards in the Member State’ seemed interesting in relation to the project on new forms of employment project and in the context of the Directive on posted workers.
  - She asked for more information on Project 21 ‘Applying Key dimensions to European industrial relations’.
- 4.2 **The Director** responded briefly to Ms Welter’s comments.
- He welcomed suggestions for the Foundation Seminar Series.
  - Project 13, ‘Working time patterns and sustainable work’ would be based on the new data from the Sixth European Working Conditions Survey. Additional questions would help to analyse the diversity behind the data under the self-employment umbrella. It was not possible to extend Project 15 to include global comparison, as it was based on European Company Survey data.
  - Project 17, there was an interest in a number of Member States not only to know if social partners were representative, but whether they had the mandate to negotiate. The details of the research methodology had not yet been decided.
  - Project 21 followed on from the 2014 project, it remained to be seen whether the key dimensions of industrial relations identified in the 2014 project could be used to analyse industrial relations further.

Following a short break the meeting resumed.

5. Request regarding the Advisory Committees
- 5.1 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** proposed that it would be useful to reflect on the general governance of the Advisory Committees.
- 5.2 **The Chairperson invited the Director to present the general guidelines concerning the Advisory Committees to the Bureau during its May meeting and clarify the process of nominating participants for expert/stakeholder meetings.**
6. Roadmap on the follow up to the Common Approach – Update by the Commission (B 250/4)
- 6.1 **Mr Maes (Commission)** said that the Commission would publish its report on the status of the roadmap in April.

Work was ongoing on the revised founding regulation where a single approach was being taken in relation to governance aspects of the regulations of EU-OSHA, Cedefop and Eurofound. The revised timeline for delivery was autumn 2015.

7. Single Programming Document (SPD) 2017-2020 (B 250/7)
- 7.1 The **Director** said that there had been a productive discussion on the Single Programming Document the previous day. The new process provided opportunities as well as challenges. It was acknowledged that there was scope for some involvement of the Advisory Committees in the development of the document, though this role was better suited to the Bureau and the Governing Board.
- Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said that the SPD provided an opportunity to look ahead to anticipate the challenges in the future and to debate them.
- No further discussion on the SPD was required.
8. Draft Work Programme 2016 – first draft ( B 250/6)
- 8.1 The **Director** introduced the first draft of the 2016 programme noting that it was constrained by the need to complete the work cycle of the Four-Year Programme. He asked the members to keep their comments to a general level rather than going into the detail of the projects, at this early stage.
- 8.2 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** made the following comments on behalf of the Group.
- The Group felt that there were a number of projects that might be merged.
  - They welcomed the improved exploitation of the data from the surveys throughout the programme.
  - The policy context highlighted in the document was rather cautious and took no account of policies like quantitative easing, the more flexible approach to fiscal policies in the Member States and its impact on employment policies, and the new EU2020 integrated guidelines. The fact that this was a period of change for Europe was not evident.
  - The issue of the skills mismatch was a significant omission in the programme, and it was felt that there was scope for cooperation in this area with Cedefop, perhaps in the European Company Survey.
  - There was also the impact of the current low price of oil and gas on the European economy.
- 8.3 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** made the following comments:
- The Group did not feel that working conditions and industrial relations were equally represented in the list of new projects. The Group thought that the issue of work intensification would be an interesting future topic, to look at why there was too much work and not enough jobs.
  - The policy context section of the document spoke about the impact of the crisis on industrial relations but missed an important element which was in the opinion of the Workers' Group, that it was not the crisis *per se* that caused the erosion of industrial relations and social dialogue, but rather the responses to the crisis and the policy catalyst was something that for the social partners felt would be worth looking at and understanding better.
- 8.4 **Ms Bober (Employers)** made the following comments:
- There was generally a good balance of projects, but there was not much in the programme from the perspective of companies and perhaps this could be kept in mind in future throughout the programme. One suggestion was to look at working time from the company perspective.

- The Group also noted the absence of the topic of the skills gap in the programme.
- 8.5 **Mr Maes (Commission)** made the following comments:  
 The general policy context was good and it reflected the new approach of President Juncker. In this regard the Commission welcomed the emphasis on the new start for social dialogue and the European Semester.  
 The proposed employment guidelines explicitly referred to the need for Member States to better involve social partners in their efforts as part of the European Semester and also to pay attention to the quality of industrial relations within their countries.
- 8.6 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** said that concerns had been expressed that there might be too many new project proposals, considering that this was the final year of a programme with 15 projects ongoing and now 14 new ones added.
- 8.6 **The Director** said this was a valid concern, and one that would be closely monitored with colleagues.  
 He thanked the members for their comments.  
 He noted that there were new proposals also in the working conditions area including the proposed topic for the Foundation Seminar Series (the future of work).
- 8.7 **The Chairperson** invited comments on the short project descriptions.
- 8.8 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** said that some projects might be merged, for example in relation to Project 3 the European Jobs Monitor (EJM) and Project 25 ‘Income inequalities and employment patterns in Europe before and after the Great Recession’.
- The issue of skills shortages and mismatches could be included in the EJM project in relation to unemployment.
  - In relation to the project on ‘New Forms of Employment’, there was a clearly expressed desire in the Group for data about the number of jobs being created in the Member States for the different ‘new forms of employment’.
  - It was considered that there was scope to merge projects 6 and 7 which both looked at long-term unemployed and 26, ‘Return to work of long-term excluded’ and to integrate them into a single, stronger project.
- 8.9 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** wondered if there was also scope for synergies in projects 3, 25 ‘Income inequalities and employment patterns in Europe before and after the Great Recession’, and 27 ‘Policies addressing in-work poverty in the EU’.
- 8.10 **Mr Maes (Commission)** made the following comments:
- He asked for clarification as to whether EU and non-EU citizens were covered in Project 5 ‘New evidence on migrants and mobile works in Europe’. The use of the term ‘foreigners’ was unusual and should be avoided.
  - Responding to the request by Eurofound to bring proposals for additional projects involving policy evaluation, the Commission wondered if there was a role for Eurofound in assessing the uptake and implementation of the quality framework for restructuring in the 2016 work programme. A possible title of such a project would be a ‘Review of the implementation of the EU Quality framework for anticipation of change and restructuring’.
  - Project 13, it might be good to cover also the reasons for becoming self-employed.
  - On Project 17, ‘Capacity to negotiate of EU-level social partners’ he responded to some of the questions raised earlier, noting that the Commission along with

Eurofound had recently looked again at the methodology of the Representativeness Studies and the question of the capacity to negotiate and it was agreed that Eurofound would look into whether there was a mandate or a procedure for obtaining a mandate to negotiate. This had been discussed already in the Social Liaison Forum in the presence of the research manager from Eurofound, responsible for the project. The Commission also welcomed the continuation of the Representativeness Studies.

- Project 20, ‘Core labour standards in the Member State’ was welcomed because it related to discussions of the previous day on convergence and divergence, and was linked also to the Directive on posted workers. There were some doubts about the wording in the project, and it was suggested to speak instead of core labour ‘rights’.
- Project 21, it would be good to be more specific on what key dimensions of industrial relations were intended.
- He wondered if the health sector could be considered in relation to Project 25.
- In relation to Project 27 ‘Policies addressing in-work poverty in the EU’ it would be interesting to see how Member States used the concept of in-work poverty to address poverty.

8.11 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** made the following comments:

- The clear indication from discussions on the previous day had been that the stakeholders and the general audience were particularly interested in Eurofound’s surveys, and therefore the employers welcomed the suggestions of the Governments to merge some projects and to release resources for the surveys and for dissemination activities. In the final year of the work programme it would be preferable to consolidate results rather than adding new items.
- In a general remark there were areas where it would be an idea to merge ideas and projects, for example in the important and interesting area of inactivity. Though Projects 4, 6 and 7 looked at inactivity with a focus on youth, it would be good to have a single large project on activation policies in Europe. This would be an important contribution in the current crisis and would give visibility to the work of Eurofound.
- On the issue of the evolution of the employment relationship, included in Project 4 ‘New forms of employment’ it was an important subject but it was essential that in order to be a credible assessment, it should include a legal perspective, not just the economic or psychological aspects of the evolution and resources should be assigned to covering this legal aspect.
- Project 17, ‘Capacity to negotiate of EU level social partners’ was a sensitive project, so should be done in close cooperation with the social partners. The Employers were open to cooperating on this research.
- Project 27, ‘Policies addressing in-work poverty in the EU’, the Employers wished to see how activation policies could contribute to solving this problem and look at ways found at national level to address this issue.
- She asked the Commission member whether this was a formal request regarding the review of the framework on restructuring, as it was quite early in the process.

8.12 **Mr Maes (Commission)** replied that the timeframe meant that the Commission was obliged to have a discussion on the framework in 2016. The exact contribution by Eurofound could be discussed, but if Eurofound would say that from a policy

evaluation point of view this was a task that they could carry out, the Commission would welcome that.

8.13 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said that the Group agreed with many of the comments made already.

- In relation to Project 4 ‘New forms of employment’ she agreed with comments by the Employers regarding the legal perspective, and that the project was about regulation and the legal differentiation in the Member States.
- Project 20, ‘Core labour standards in the Member State’, looking at previous papers this project concerned issues like pension, lifelong learning, social protection, protection in case of dismissal, so she agreed that another term should be found rather than ‘standards’, and said that there was great interest in understanding how these standards or rights had evolved over time.
- Project 5, the Group similarly wondered if it considered EU or non-EU mobility and migration. The Group would add to the project, the question of the portability of benefits. It was an important part of the story if migrants who find a job in one place can take their rights with them elsewhere.
- The idea of merging projects 6, 7 and 25 made sense.
- The Group were missing projects in the working conditions area. There was an interest in looking at the area of work intensification which was linked to the future of manufacturing and the future of work, and the Group felt this was something that could be carried out in the next Four-Year Programme. The question was, whether attention would be paid to developments or data about work intensification as well as linked to the quality of the new jobs created.
- There was a proposal to look at the future of manufacturing in the Foundation Seminar Series and it would be a good way to involve the social partners in this project, where currently they had no role. It would be a good opportunity to have an exploratory discussion with the stakeholders on the challenges and opportunities of technological change.
- Alternatively the declining impact of industrial relations was a topic that could be looked at in the Foundation Seminar Series.
- Regarding the European Company Survey, the Group had some issues with the methodology and felt that it was important to make sure that key parts of the findings would look at paired responses of employers and employee representatives, especially regarding participation or workplace wellbeing.
- She echoed the sentiments of the Employers regarding Project 17, and thought that more information was required about the project.

8.14 **The Director** thanked the members for their comments. The brief descriptions contained the research questions and more detail and a full description of the project would be provided later in the project fiche.

He responded to the comments.

- Project 3 and Project 25, though both concerned income inequalities, one looked at jobs, looking at how many jobs had been created and how many destroyed and so it was not possible to look also at wage distribution. However it might be possible to combine them for communication purposes. The work on income inequalities was similar to the earlier wage dispersion research that had just been evaluated by the Advisory Committee, and was an in-house statistical analysis of data from

Eurostat. For this reason it was different also to the in-work poverty project which would look at policies to address that, to see if governments were compensating salaries or utilising activation methods. He reiterated that the projects might be brought together for communication purposes.

- The Project on ‘New forms of Employment’ was a continuation of this year’s project, and was an in-depth look at one of the forms identified there. He agreed with comments that it should be a very legal exercise. It was his opinion that it would be good to strengthen the internal legal expertise in Eurofound’s research team.
- Whilst the ‘New Forms of Work’ project looked at the more positive developments, the fraudulent forms of work project concerned the more negative ones, so again it would not be possible to merge these projects.
- The projects on long term unemployment and inactivity were different and therefore not suitable to be merged. One was built on research on youth unemployment that was already largely completed but not published, the other was a more quantitative analysis of long-term unemployed and inactive, those who no longer show up in unemployment statistics and the aim was to establish who they are and how many there are, and for which groups policy responses exist.
- The intra-EU mobility project was based on the *ad hoc* model of the Labour Force Survey and was a statistical analysis of the new data set at European level, whereby it was hoped that Eurofound would be first to exploit this new data source for the analysis of mobility, migration, intra-EU mobility, migration and second generation migrants. This was linked with a number of debates on integration and security in Europe.
- Policy evaluation was very important so there were four projects involving policy evaluation in this programme. In addition, there would be an interest in looking at undeclared work using the database on that subject.
- The Commission’s suggestion to contribute to the assessment of the qualitative framework for restructuring would be different from Eurofound’s approach to policy evaluation research, which relied on existing evaluations. Colleagues were concerned that the planned assessment exercise would be too big and too complex to be done by Eurofound.
- In Project 25 on income inequalities, the health sector could not be taken into account because it was a statistical exercise using the data from the EU-Labour Force Survey (LFS).
- The question of portability of benefits was an interesting one but could not be covered at this stage as it was not covered by the module of the LFS on migration.
- Work intensification was part of the job quality index of Eurofound and there would be new data as part of the normal and planned reporting of the European Working Conditions Survey.
- The Future of Manufacturing in Europe project was not formally part of the work programme, and the Commission had agreed to set up a Steering Committee in which the social partners would be represented.
- For the Foundation Seminar Series topics were welcomed, and the impact of technological change would be an interesting one, for which there was some consensus.
- The limitations of the European Company Survey were known and the authors of

the report had been very cautious in explaining what was meant when referring to wellbeing.

- The ‘Key Dimensions of Industrial Relations’ project was a continuation of a 2014 project defining those dimensions in which the Board members had participated, so it was an evolving project.

8.15 **The Chairperson concluded on the work programme and said that written comments should be forwarded to Eurofound within two weeks.**

9. Update of National Information and Communication (B 250/7)

**This item was postponed to the Bureau meeting in May.**

10. Draft Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure 2016 (B 250/8)

10.1 **Mr Grimmeisen** noted that the draft budget had been discussed by the Bureau in January and the changes in this version were the Establishment plan, or Staff table which outlined the staffing levels Eurofound would like to have.

There was a discrepancy here with the proposal by the Commission to have a 10% reduction in staff in the so-called cruising speed agencies until 2020, rather than the general 5% reduction in the Institutions.

Eurofound’s suggestion at this stage was to limit the reduction to 5% for 2016 and to wait for the outcome of discussions in the second Inter-Institutional Working Group which had been established to look in particular at the staffing levels in the agencies.

- 10.2
- **With this explanation the Bureau agreed to submit the draft budget for approval by a written procedure of the Governing Board.**
  - **The Commission member stated that the Commission retained its position on the 10% reduction in staffing levels.**
  - **The Employers reserved their opinion on the procedure.**

11. The next meeting of the Bureau would be held on **Wednesday, 13 May in Brussels.**

[Signed H.Fonck]

[Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]

---

Chairperson

---

Director

**DRAFT AGENDA**  
**251st MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

*Conseil Central de l'Economie (CCE), Room 6,  
20 avenue d'Auderghem, 1040 Brussels,  
Wednesday, 13 May 2015, 9h00-13h00*

1. Draft Agenda (B 251/1), *For Adoption*
2. Draft Minutes of the 250<sup>th</sup> Bureau Meeting of 20 March 2015 (B 251/2), *For Adoption*
3. Progress Report of the Director (B 251/3), *For Information*
4. Roadmap on follow-up to Common approach on EU agencies, update by the Commission  
*For Information*
5. Update on Work Programme 2016 (B 251/5), *For Discussion*
6. Update on Single Programming Document (SPD) 2017-2020 (B 251/6), *For Discussion*
7. Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2014 (B 251/7), *For Discussion*
8. Update on National Level Communication (B 251/8), *For Information*
9. Policy on Advisory Committees – explanatory note for clarification (B 251/9), *For Discussion*
10. Ex-post evaluation on 2009-2012 Work Programme – Action plan (B 251/10), *For Discussion*
11. Feedback on National Correspondents (B 251/11), *For Information*
12. Preparations for the Summer Group meetings (B 251/12), *For Decision*
13. AOB

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

Friday, 25 September 2015, 9h00 – 13h00

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

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions



**FINAL MINUTES**  
**251st MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

*9.00-13.00, Wednesday, 13 May 2015*

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

<b>Mr Fonck</b>	Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Ms Bulgarelli</b>	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Welter</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Mr Blomsma</b>	Coordinator, Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Bober</b>	Coordinator (Employers)
<b>Ms Hoffmann</b>	Deputy Coordinator (Workers)
<b>Mr Kokalov</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Mr Maes</b>	European Commission
<b>Ms Scanferla</b>	European Commission
<b>Mr Menéndez-Valdés</b>	Director
<b>Ms Mezger</b>	Deputy Director
<b>Mr Grimmeisen</b>	Secretary to the Governing Board
<b>Ms Gerstenberger</b>	Eurofound
<b>Ms Jacquet</b>	Eurofound
<b>Ms McCaughey</b>	Eurofound (for agenda item 8)

1. Adoption of Draft agenda

The **Chairperson** wished to add two items under AOB as follows:

- To discuss how to improve the process for written procedures of the Governing Board in light of the recent difficulties in adopting the draft budget.
- To discuss whether Eurofound had a contribution to make to the current migrant crisis.

**The draft agenda was ADOPTED.**

2. Adoption of draft minutes of Bureau, 20 March 2015 (B 251/2)

**Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** commented that it should be noted that the issues in relation to the *Sustainable Work over the life course* paper, and subsequent discussions in the Bureau arose because the extension of the deadline for comments on the paper had not been communicated to everyone.

With Ms Hoffmann's comments noted **the draft minutes were ADOPTED without changes.**

3. Progress Report of the Director (B 251/3)

Due to time constraints the **Director** made a short progress report, full details of which were available in his presentation.

- He had held a short briefing meeting with Commissioner Thyssen and colleagues in DG Employment on 5 May.
- The European Company Survey (ECS) findings had been launched at a joint event with the Latvian EU Presidency in Riga on 30 March.
- Eurofound had presented on the implementation of the Youth Guarantee at a European

Parliament meeting on 26 March.

- Also in the Parliament the first results of the customised report *Mapping of use of opt-out clause of Working Time Directive in Member States* had been presented to the Employment Committee on 16 April.
- He noted that Eurofound was now fully engaged as coordinator of the Network of Agencies until March 2016, a role that was proving rewarding but time-consuming.
- With legal agreements now signed, work would commence shortly on the pilot project on the *Future of Manufacturing in Europe*. This research project would extend for a period of four years.
- He highlighted two recent reports on *Youth Entrepreneurship in Europe* and *Recent developments in the distribution of wages in Europe* and encouraged the members to assist in their dissemination.
- The report on *New Forms of Employment* was attracting great interest.
- Work on the ERM database was delayed due to problems with the content management system on the website. There were subsequent delays to updates for the legal database and the launch of the case study database.
- Regarding the *Sixth European Working Conditions Survey*, legal agreements had been signed with research institutes in South Korea, USA, and the cooperation agreement with the ILO had been cleared by the European Commission and would be signed shortly. It was planned to launch the first findings during the Luxembourg Presidency on 24 November 2015. The fieldwork was ongoing, with delays in Turkey, FYROM, Albania, Kosovo and Montenegro due to uncertainties in IPA funding.
- Eurofound would present preliminary findings of the Comparative Analytical Report (CAR) on *The Concept of Representativeness* at the Social Dialogue Committee meeting on 24 June 2015.
- *Fourth European Quality of Life Survey*: Preparations for the next survey were underway. Contacts were being made with selected national statistics institutes with regard to accessing their registers in order to improve the quality of samples.
- He presented the current budget execution which was in line with expectations.
- He noted upcoming written procedures of the Governing Board for adopting the Consolidated Annual Activity Report, the 2014 Final Accounts and the Multiannual Staff Policy Plan 2016-2018.
- He noted that the external audit (by Masars) had highlighted the absence of a seat agreement for the agency (the Irish government promised that this would be concluded shortly) and the previously highlighted situation regarding the asset register.
- The preliminary findings of the European Court of Auditors had mentioned the underpayment to staff discussed in the Bureau in January, which would cost in the region of EUR 121,000 and would require a transfer of funds to Title 1.
- The current and future recruitment procedures were highlighted.

3.2 There were **enquiries from the Workers' Group** about the status of the reports on *Maternity Leave Provisions in EU Member States (Stakeholder Enquiry Service)*, *Opting out of the European Working Time Directive* and *Linking consultation and information processes*. The Group members were very interested in the findings of this new research.

**The particular reports were still being finalised, but it was agreed that they would be disseminated to the Bureau once they had been delivered to the requesting organisations.**

3.3 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** additionally requested that the draft report of the network of agencies to the Inter-Institutional Working Group 2 (IIWG2) be made available to the

Bureau.

3.4 **The Director** said that information could be shared, once it is presented to the Institutions.

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

4. Update from the European Commission on roadmap on follow-up to the Common Approach (B 251/4)

4.1 **Mr Maes (Commission)** said that the Commission's internal document outlining the blueprint for the revision of the Founding Regulation as presented to the Bureau in April of the previous year, and the Commission's progress report on the implementation of the common approach on the decentralised EU Agencies had been made available to the Bureau.

In relation to common approach actions still outstanding in the Agencies, Eurofound was mentioned only in relation to the conclusion of a seat agreement, a matter to which the Director had already referred in his progress report.

The internal blueprint was being circulated in the interests of transparency and to give a full overview of what was intended in the revision of the founding regulations. The Commission was adopting the same approach for Eurofound, Cedefop and EU-OSHA.

Changes were required around the definition, objectives and tasks of the agency. As Eurofound was an established brand name it was not proposed to change the name of agency.

It was the intention to refer in the regulation to the four main areas of activity, namely working conditions, living conditions, industrial relations and employment and change.

The issue of governance would also be addressed, with the aim being to increase efficiency without reducing the tripartite representation in the governance structures. The proposal was to have seven representatives (with alternates) for each of the social partner groups, retaining the same voting rights as currently. It was proposed to have a separate meeting with national representatives of the Social Partners, also referred to in the founding regulation, in order to have a direct exchange between the governing bodies and the national representatives of the Social Partners. These would be nominated by the EU Social Partners. The detailed rules for these bodies would not be mentioned in the regulation itself.

There would be changes to the role of the Governing Board and the Bureau with new supervisory tasks assigned to the Bureau, for example in relation to the agency's Communications Policy.

There would be changes in the procedures for appointing the Director and the Deputy Director, whereby the Commission would carry out the pre-selection procedure and the Governing Board would choose and appoint the candidates.

The Governing Board would become the Appointing Authority but would delegate that authority to the Director, and would take that delegation back only in very specific cases.

The role of the Advisory Committees would be situated within the regulation. The timeframe for the publication of the Commission's proposal for the revised regulation was autumn 2015, following consultation with a number of bodies.

4.2 **Ms Scanferla (Commission)** presented the Commission's progress report on implementation of the Common approach to decentralised EU Agencies which had been adopted in April 2015.

It should be noted was that the new Framework Financial Regulation and Staff Regulation

implemented in 2014 would have an impact on procedures in the agencies, and the Commission had adopted guidelines to help the agencies to prepare for the changes brought by the new Single Programming Document (SPD) and Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR). Additionally a more harmonised and transparent approach to human resources management in the agencies was implied by the efforts to streamline the implementing rules for the regulations in the Agencies. There was an initiative also to offer the Agencies the possibility to use some of the Commission's IT systems in an effort to reduce costs and harmonise procedures.

4.3 **The Chairperson** thanked the Commission members for these updates.

Although the blueprint reflected the consultations with the social partners to date on the issue of tripartism in the governance structures, a number of doubts remained.

It was not clear that reducing the members of the Governing Board to seven per group, whilst at the same time retaining the tripartite Group meetings would create efficiencies in terms of costs, and this approach risked that social partner representatives in the various bodies would have different powers and different rights.

The Workers' Group still supported the earlier proposals of both ETUC and BusinessEurope to have 14 members for each Group with alternates. They favoured a formal nomination process for members of the interest groups, to ensure continuity and representativity.

The Workers were not concerned by the possibilities of a name change for Eurofound and thought it might be beneficial to reinforce the tasks of the agency in its name. Why restrict mention of cooperation to only some agencies, when it seemed that there were other EU Agencies (e.g. the Gender agency) with whom Eurofound could usefully collaborate.

There were no objections to the proposals in relation to powers of the Bureau and Board.

As previously discussed, it was felt that the Single Programming Document was not very helpful for an agency trying to react to current situations, yet having to establish programmes a number of years in advance.

4.4 **For the Governments' Group, Ms Welter** said that the reduced representation of the social partners might be seen to contradict the European Commission's current policy to reinforce social dialogue in Europe.

She would favour a system of representation similar to that used by the ILO in order to ensure a balance of voting rights.

**Mr Blomsma** noted that the proposal did not provide for dedicated meetings of the Governments' Group. In relation to the Advisory Committees, it was important to retain the link between those members and the Governing Board. **Ms Bulgarelli** spoke of the risk of overlap in the roles and responsibilities of the management and the Governing Board and the Bureau and said that this should be clearly defined in the regulation.

4.5 **For the Workers, Ms Hoffman** said that the issue in relation to representation was not only to compensate for voting rights but to reproduce the fundamentally European dynamic of the meetings where the diversity of the social and national contexts was brought to bear on the work of Eurofound.

4.6 **For the Employers, Ms Bober** said that although the blueprint reflected the discussions held between the Commission and the social partners, it was felt the representation of only seven members each was too limited, and she asked the Commission to consider instead the possibility of having fourteen members, which would allow a better balance and richer

representation.

**Ms Rossi** agreed with the proposal of a higher number of representatives. She said that the system of representation used at the ILO whereby the social partner organisations had a degree of flexibility in how they managed the delegations at the Board and other meetings was very useful in ensuring that the views and ideas were represented.

4.7 **Mr Maes (Commission)** replied to some of the comments.

- The rationale behind the common approach was to look at the size of the Governing Boards, but it was necessary to look at the particular situation in the tripartite agencies. Suggestions for a larger representation of the social partners were duly noted and it was important to look not only at voting rights but at participation and involvement in the activities of the agency. The aim was to reduce the size of the Governing Board without affecting the representation, but as had been identified in a number of evaluations, to ensure the effectiveness of the governance was more difficult with a large governing body.
- The meetings of the so called ‘national representatives’ were seen to ensure the participation of the social partners.
- The Commission would look again at the range of EU Agencies with whom collaboration might be foreseen.
- He agreed that there should be a clear articulation of the role of the Bureau and Board *vis a vis* the management. The decision to take back the delegation of the Director as Appointing Authority would only be taken by the Governing Board itself in exceptional circumstances. However the Commission would look closely at the description of the tasks.
- The Commission’s proposal was scheduled to be available in autumn 2015. It would also be necessary to look at transitional measures.

4.8 In relation to the issue of costs, **the Director** noted that the costs associated with Eurofound’s Governing Board, were found to be within the average range in a benchmarking exercise undertaken by the Court of Auditors in 2011.

The issue of delegation of Appointing Authority powers to the Director had been the subject of much discussion in the meetings of the Heads of Agencies with regard to the legal implications. Indications from the Secretariat General were that it would be a kind of permanent delegation, but it was essential that this was very clearly defined in the regulation, in light of the legal liability of the Appointing Authority.

4.9 **The Chairperson concluded, noting that it would be opportune to discuss the proposals for the founding regulation in the Group meetings in June and to include the item on the agenda of the Bureau in September.**

5. Update on the Work Programme 2016 (B 251/5)

5.1 The **Director** noted that a second draft of the programme would be circulated to the Board members on 10 June for discussion in the Groups. Colleagues were currently revising the project fiches, based on the outcome of discussions with the extended Bureau on 20 March, details of which had been circulated in a document.

5.2 The **Workers’ Group** thought it had been agreed that where possible the Advisory Committees would have an opportunity to discuss the work programme, but this had not been the case in the recent Advisory Committee meeting she had attended. The **Governments and Employers** said that the role of the Advisory Committees was to focus on projects in the current work programme.

6. Update on the Single Programming Document (SPD) (B 251/6)
- 6.1 The **Director** presented the logic of the Programming Document which was an opportunity to have a multiannual approach to programming and to achieve improvements in the efficiency and impact of the agency. The members had received the Commission's template for the Programming Document as a background to the discussion.
- The document should include the overall policy context and Eurofound had identified the main policy areas leading to *Inclusive Growth, Better Jobs* and greater *cohesion/convergence*. Multiannual objectives and strategic areas of operation/intervention would also be given.
- Activities were the basis for the structure of the annual programme. For each activity, Eurofound needed to describe what the agency aimed to deliver towards achieving its medium-term objectives, and how the expected results would be measured.
- He briefly outlined some of the internal discussions around developing the project fiches, which would be circulated to the Governing Board, along with the draft work programme on 10 June.
- 6.2 **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that it appeared the focus would shift in future to looking at best practice and she welcomed that. However it was notable that the term 'unemployment' did not appear in the SPD. Eurofound, in its strategic objectives should focus more on the issue of unemployment.
- 6.3 **Ms Drbalová (Employers)** said that the strategy should respond to priorities identified in the Commission's Joint Employment Report, such as youth unemployment, long term unemployment and job creation.
- 6.4 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** thanked the Director for the notes from the brainstorming meeting on the SPD which were very helpful in recalling the debate.
- She agreed that the most pressing issue was the ongoing high levels of youth and long-term unemployment and this should be stated in the SPD.
- The area of inclusive growth was an important one and she felt it was essential to understand the emerging trends in this area. Another area impacting on inclusive growth was the area of human capital skills, and Eurofound needed to be careful not to stray into the research remit of Cedefop. She thought that Eurofound could instead, take as its starting point the conceptual framework of knowledge-based capital that included areas where Eurofound was competent, for example in relation to organisational capital, i.e. job quality, human resources practices and competencies, data that was captured in the European Company Survey and the European Working Conditions Survey.
- She thought it was a good selection of activities.
- 6.5 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** agreed that the issue of convergence and divergence not only between but within Member States was an important one that needed to be more clearly defined in the SPD. What exactly was meant by the term 'inclusive growth' and what were its wider implications for example for living conditions. More reflection was needed on how it was intended to provide evidence for these findings.
- Job creation was, he felt, an important topic.
- 6.6 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said that the brainstorming process had been interesting and useful, and she thanked Eurofound for the notes which allowed her to have a feeling for what had been discussed in other groups.
- 6.7 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** said that there was an overemphasis in the document on

philosophical discussions rather than on the reality of what was happening in the Member States. It was important to focus on some of the macro economic challenges in Europe like sustainable growth and the important issue of unemployment.

6.8 **The Director** responded to some of the comments and thanked the members for their contributions.

The Initial Draft of the programming document 2017-2020 and draft 2 of work programme 2016 programme would be sent to the members on 10 June, for discussion in the Group meetings.

7. Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR) 2014 (B 251/7)

7.1 **The Deputy Director** introduced the document, which followed the newly introduced format of the Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR) which had been developed by the Commission in cooperation with the Network of EU Agencies and was now applicable to all decentralised agencies (this action was part of the Common Approach and the subsequent Roadmap to harmonise the management and governance of EU agencies). It was an important document whereby the Authorising Officer (Director) gave a declaration of assurance in relation to sound financial management, legality and regularity of the activities described and the resources assigned. The report should include an analysis and assessment of the past year by the Governing Board.

7.2 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** thanked Eurofound for the informative report.

7.3 **The Chairperson** said that he would welcome further information in relation to the following aspects of the report:

- He asked for information on the Survey Methodology working Group mentioned on page 16 of the report.
- He was surprised to see the relatively high costs for legal services.
- He asked for further explanation of negotiated procedures as described on page 75 of the report.

7.4 **The Director** replied as follows:

- Eurofound was exploring the possibility of a joint survey with other agencies, and had been in contact with its sister agencies EU OSHA (who had declined the offer) and Cedefop. An internal Survey Methodology Working Group had been asked to develop a paper on options for further methodological development and possible synergies in surveys. The Working Group's report would feed in the discussion of the programming document and there would be full discussion with the Board members in this context.
- The framework contract for legal services establishes a maximum cost. He noted that, based on a previous case, legal costs in Ireland were high, but currently there are no cases ongoing.
- Negotiated procedures were allowed exceptionally where an open tender procedure had not been successful, allowing for direct negotiations on price. It was necessary however to declare these exceptional procedures.

7.5 **Ms Welter (Governments)** said that further explanation was needed as to why the target on the Key Performance Indicator for programme delivery had not been met.

7.6 **The Chairperson concluded that he would prepare an opinion on the report on behalf of the Governing Board. The CAAR would be submitted for approval by a written procedure of the Governing Board.**

## 8. Update on Communication

8.1 Ms McCaughey, Head of Information and Communication presented the highlights of communication activities in the previous year, including those at national level.

- Eurofound undertook to evaluate user satisfaction through a number of user surveys and focus groups, the results of which indicated that satisfaction levels with Eurofound outputs remained high, with the highest levels for the Foundation Findings series which brought together in single publication, diverse Eurofound research findings on a particular topic.
- Eurofound data was perceived to be reliable, independent and its pan-European scope was valued. Eurofound's analysis of trends over a period of twenty years was also valued by users.
- Eurofound was considered the top information source for fifty per cent of users, which though an acceptable figure, was one Eurofound hoped to improve on in the future.
- 89% found the research easy to understand and accessible and 66% found it was delivered in a way that was timely for informing policy. 59% indicated that reports were the preferred format for research outputs.
- The tripartite dimension of Eurofound was perceived as an added value.
- The Key Performance Indicators revealed a 42% increase in the number of EU policy documents referencing Eurofound outputs.
- There had been a 43% increase in uptake by the Council, in the Employment and Social Protection committees which had been the focus of targeted communications, but also in the Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council (EPSCO) meetings.
- A 43% increase in the uptake of Eurofound research by the Social Partners was considered very positively.
- The top three topics of interest were employment, working conditions and social inclusion.
- Much work had been undertaken in reaching out to the new European Parliament and European Commission, leading to an increase in their use of Eurofound research reports.
- The EU Presidencies programme was also a good means of establishing national contact points and had been achieved through a joint approach with colleagues in the Commission responsible for coordinating the Presidencies.
- The visibility of the agency had been improved through Eurofound's central role within the Network of Agencies.
- The Fifth European Working Conditions Survey report remained the most downloaded report in 2014, with the NEETs report on young people not in employment or training remaining popular and being quoted most often in EU policy documents. Despite problems with the new website the number of downloads had increased, indicating that interest in these reports remained high.
- The number of visits to the website however had decreased, and this was being monitored. There had been a drop off in terms of users in the last two months of 2014, linked to problems with the new website, although the number of downloads of reports was up.
- Eurofound's Key Performance Indicator No. 8 concerned contributions to policy development through events, and presented in a table was a list of the organisations targeted by Eurofound, with the highest number for the Commission, then the Parliament, closely followed by Social Partner and Parliamentary committees.



- There was an increasing demand for national level information and the number of *ad hoc* requests was increasing.
- Members of the Network of European Correspondents were now also involved in communication activities, and were tasked with identifying dissemination opportunities. They were responsible for updating contacts at national level. Correspondents provided an assessment and evaluation of the kinds of tripartite structures in place and suggested how Eurofound could channel information through or at them at national level. It had brought a new and interesting dimension to communication at national level.
- She presented a number of ways in which Eurofound was monitoring impact, with information broken down by target group, Member State etc.
- On the national level, Eurofound had organised further so-called country-cluster events, meetings on a particular topic with a cluster of countries where that topic was of greater interest. Board members were invited to volunteer to host and propose topics for cluster events. Previous events had looked at youth-related issues and posted workers, and an upcoming cluster event on sustainable workplaces had been proposed by the Polish Employers. She would be very interested in the feedback and opinion of the Bureau and Board on these seminars.
- On the matter of impact tracking, a new internal database allowed staff members to record particular impacts at national level. Staff had volunteered to assume the role of country contacts and this was proving an effective arrangement, with useful contributions for Eurofound's communication programme.
- Feedback on the core contacts was welcome.

8.2 **The Chairperson** thanked Ms McCaughey for her presentation.

**The issues of national-level communication and the national correspondents would be discussed in the Group meetings in June, and he suggested taking these areas back on the agenda of the Bureau in September, following that discussion.**

9. Policy on Advisory Committees (B 251/9)

9.1 The **Director** introduced the agenda item, reminding the Bureau that in line with procedures the new Advisory Committees would be appointed by the Governing Board at the start of the next four-year programme.

- The Committees would also be included in the new founding regulation, though the procedures would be defined in internal procedures.
- He clarified that Eurofound organised two different kinds of meetings, stakeholder meetings (like the Advisory Committees) and expert meetings (normal part of a project), but sometimes there are stakeholder/expert meetings for specific projects. In light of recent misunderstandings, Eurofound would ensure that the stakeholders were informed about stakeholder/expert meetings when they were happening.
- In relation to the Advisory Committee meetings he wished to stress that it was important that comments and opinions in the committees should be coordinated and should reflect the opinions of the Group and not an individual.

9.2 A discussion followed, with some members less in favour of additional expert meetings, though some understood that these might be necessary where the methodology of a project called for an expert focus group approach.

The **Director** said that the role of the Advisory Committees was clear. In future, where an expert meeting was envisaged it should be clearly stated in the project fiche in the work programme. The number of stakeholder/expert meetings where nominations were sought

through the coordinators should be limited.

9.3 **The Chairperson concluded that the matter could be looked at again in September, following some discussions in the Group meetings in June.**

10. Ex post evaluation of Work Programme 2009-2012

10.1 The **Deputy Director** briefly outlined the action plan drawn up by Eurofound in relation to five strategic recommendations in the report, presented but not discussed in the Bureau meeting in March.

She briefly outlined the actions that included: optimising the level and quality of input from the Governing Board; to consider where there was a need for expert involvement; to review the quality of the output of the network of correspondents; to be more strategic in terms of international cooperation and to identify areas for collaboration with sister agencies.

10.2 **Ms Scanferla (Commission)** in relation to the first action clarified that the Commission did not foresee additional Governing Board meetings following adoption of the new founding regulation.

The recommendations made elsewhere in the report in relation for example to the timeliness of delivery of the Representativeness studies, could also be mentioned in the action plan.

10.3 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** said that the recommendations and action plan indicated that in the future the Governing Board would have less say in relation to the projects.

10.4 **The Director** replied that these were findings and recommendations of an external evaluator but he noted the comments and welcomed the suggestions for how the Governing Board and Bureau members could assist Eurofound in addressing the recommendations, including in relation to work programme development.

10.5 **The Chairperson concluded.**

- **The Bureau would like to return to the discussion on the role of the Advisory Committees, expert meetings and stakeholder meetings in September.**
- **It was clarified that it was not the intention to increase the number of Board meetings.**
- **The Governing Board would take up all the recommendations in the report such as those on Activity Based Budgeting and the timelines for the Representativeness Studies.**
- **Realistic solutions would be sought to retain the involvement of Governing Board members in work programme development.**

11. Feedback on national correspondents (B 251/11)

The **Chairperson** noted that the issue concerned the low response to the request for feedback from Board members on contacts with the national correspondents for the Network of European Correspondents.

The **Deputy Director** confirmed that the feedback required was: whether there had been contact with the national correspondent (a contractual requirement); if so, what the nature of that contact had been; and also how the Board members assessed the quality of the output from the national correspondent.

The survey would be sent again to allow the members to respond or update their

responses.

**Ms Welter (Governments)** said that the quality of the research was the most important element.

**The Chairperson concluded that the issue would be discussed in the Group meetings in June with a focus on the quality of the output from the correspondents.**

12. Preparations for the summer Group meetings

The schedule for the meetings was discussed. As well as a general introduction by the Director to the programming documents, there would be a brief explanatory presentation on the *ex ante* evaluation of the next four-year programme by consultants Ipsos MORI.

13. AOB

The **Chairperson** had proposed additionally to discuss the process for written procedures, in light of the problems encountered in approving the recent draft budget. **He proposed to take this on the agenda in September.**

He had also requested discussion of the EU OSHA press release that mentioned action by Eurofound on the migrant crisis. He hoped there was still time to include a project on this area in the work programme.

The **Director** clarified that EU-OSHA press release was linked to a joint note prepared by Eurofound as coordination Agency, also published in our web. He outlined a number of research projects in this area currently being finalised (trafficking of labour, impact of migration) and indicated that there were proposals in the 2016 programme regarding European Quality of Life Survey data and migrants.

14. The next meeting of the Bureau would be held in Brussels, on Friday 25 September 2015.

[Signed H.Fonck]

[Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]

---



---

Chairperson

Director

**Decisions of the Bureau, 13 May 2015**

1. Adopted agenda.
2. Adopted minutes of previous meeting.
3. Agreed to forward the Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2014 for adoption by written procedure, with the Chairperson/Governing Board's opinion on the contents of the report.

**DRAFT AGENDA**  
**252nd MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

*Conseil Central de l'Economie (CCE), Room 6,  
20 avenue d'Auderghem, 1040 Brussels,  
Friday, 25 September 2015, 9h00-15h00*

1. Draft Agenda (B 252/1), *For Adoption*
2. Draft Minutes of the 251<sup>st</sup> Bureau Meeting of 13 May 2015 (B 252/2), *For Adoption*
3. Progress Report of the Director (B 252/3), *For Information*
4. New Founding Regulation - update by the Commission *For Information*
5. Work Programme 2016 – draft 3 (B 252/5), *For Discussion*
6. Programming Document 2017-2020 – draft 1 (B 252/6), *For Discussion*
7. Policy on Advisory Committees (B 252/7), *For Information*
8. Rules for Written Procedures (B 252/8), *For Information*
9. Schedule of November Board and Group meetings (B 252/9), *For Decision*
10. AOB

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

Thursday, 12 November 2015, 13h00 – 14h30

Dublin, Loughlinstown House meeting room 4 (LH4)

**FINAL MINUTES**

**252nd MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

*9.00-15.00, Friday, 25 September 2015*

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

<b>Mr Fonck</b>	Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Ms Bulgarelli</b>	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Welter</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Mr Blomsma</b>	Coordinator, Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Bober</b>	Coordinator (Employers)
<b>Ms Hoffmann</b>	Deputy Coordinator (Workers)
<b>Mr Kokalov</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Mr Maes</b>	European Commission
<b>Mr Menéndez-Valdés</b>	Director
<b>Ms Mezger</b>	Deputy Director
<b>Mr Grimmeisen</b>	Secretary to the Governing Board
<b>Ms Gerstenberger</b>	Eurofound
<b>Ms Jacquet</b>	Eurofound
<b>Ms Beaver</b>	Ipsos MORI (for item 6 only)

1. Adoption of Draft agenda (B 252/1)  
The draft agenda was **adopted**.
2. Adoption of minutes of Bureau meeting, 13 May 2015 (B 252/2)  
The minutes were **adopted**.
3. Progress report of the Director (B 252/3)
  - 3.1 The **Director** presented his progress report which covered the period from May 2015 including visits, EU Presidency events and presentations by Eurofound staff.
    - Visitors to Eurofound included the Employment and FEMM committees of the European Parliament, and Ms Lynch and Mr Scherrer of the new ETUC secretariat.
    - Eurofound had collaborated in a number of events with the Luxembourg Presidency, including the seminar 'A new start for a social Europe' on 19 June 2015. The Director had participated in the informal Employment, Social Policy and Consumer Affairs (EPSCO) meeting, which was followed by the joint meeting of the ministers for Employment and the ministers for Gender equality. Eurofound had provided a note for the meeting on the gender employment gap and had advanced a figure of 2.5% of European Union GDP loss just for the difference of participation in the labour market.
    - Fieldwork costs for the 4<sup>th</sup> European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS) would be higher than expected.
    - Work was ongoing in relation to development of the Programming Document 2017-2020, Eurofound's new medium-term strategic planning tool and Eurofound had

engaged in the usual stakeholder consultation and would also consult with sister agencies, in order to ensure that the programme was compatible and did not overlap with theirs.

- Eurofound had promoted the European Jobs Monitor (EJM) in a number of advertisements in *Social Europe Journal*, and in the July edition, an article presenting a summary of EJM results had had a positive impact on the number of downloads from the website.
- The fieldwork for the 6<sup>th</sup> European Working Conditions Survey had concluded (except in Spain). The final dataset would be ready on 9 October 2015. Fieldwork in the candidate countries (Turkey, FYROM, Albania, Kosovo, and Montenegro) had started in September. The first findings of the 6th European Working Conditions Survey would be launched at a Presidency event on 24 November 2015 in Luxembourg.
- The questionnaire for the project *Inequalities in working conditions: Exploring fraudulent forms of contracting work and self-employment in Europe* had been circulated to the Network of correspondents and in view of the fact that this was a sensitive project, additional information about the project had been forwarded to the Bureau members. By the time the feedback to the questionnaire had been received and presented to the Advisory Committee it would be too late for changes, so information had been provided to the Bureau in advance.

3.2 **Ms Bober (Employers)** intervened on this project noting the Employers' concern that the research be based on solid and reliable evidence. The background note made available to the members, suggested that the correspondents should include media or trade union campaigns in their research but the Group felt that the correspondents should rely on official data only, and should simply state where that data was not available rather than turning to media reports. The questionnaire was too ambitious, and the inclusion of the table listing five contractual arrangements could lead to bias.

3.3 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** understood that it was a difficult research question but he was optimistic about what could be achieved with this questionnaire. The project did, he said, require data from official sources, with only one paragraph calling for attention to be paid to public discourse.

3.4 **Mr Maes (Commission)** said that due to the importance of the project it was essential that the questionnaire contained clear and concise guidance, which was not the case in the current version or in the background note.

3.4 The **Chairperson** said that comments should be sent in writing to Eurofound by the following Monday and copied to all Bureau members.

3.5 The **Director** continued his report.

The report on the *Concept of representativeness* would serve as a starting point for a workshop on 18-19 November 2015 to discuss the methodology and process of *Representativeness Studies* with experts and stakeholders.

3.6 The **Chairperson** asked for further information on the presentation on the concept of representativeness to a thematic working group on better regulation in Brussels, mentioned on page 13 of the progress report.

3.7 **Mr Maes (Commission)** noted that this referred to one of two groups set up between the Commission and the social partners, with the participation of Member State representatives. The group was looking at the European Semester with a particular focus on the involvement of the national Social Partners in the process, also with the background of the new reference to this in the Employment guidelines [*see Guideline 7: Enhancing the functioning of labour markets*]. The group would also look at capacity building of social partner organisations in the Member States. A second thematic group was looking at the involvement of social partners in policy and law making and discussed issues related to the better regulation agenda and how this articulated with the agreements negotiated by the social partners. Another topic in this group was the concept of representativeness which was becoming more important in the discussions around the role of the Social Partners in the law making process. Though these groups were not formal there was a certain ambition that they should come to concrete outcomes towards the first anniversary of the Commission's new start for social dialogue. The second meetings of the groups would take place in October and November.

A colleague from Eurofound had presented the state of play in relation to the study at the thematic group meeting.

3.8 **The Director** continued his report touching on the project on intergenerational social mobility, noting the Bureau's questions about the feasibility of the project, and their request for more information about it, which had been provided in a scoping note establishing key concepts and approaches to measurement in the project and anchoring Eurofound's work in the ongoing academic and policy debates.

A high-level expert workshop on the project had endorsed the approach which was to focus on intergenerational social mobility across Member States.

Eurofound's network of correspondents would examine if, and to what extent social mobility had been an issue on the policy agenda and how it had been framed (for example in the context of equal opportunities or in the context of growing inequalities) and would collect information on specific barriers. In-depth case studies would seek to provide information on why the patterns and barriers of social mobility were as they were in different countries. This should help to guide policymakers in developing ways of increasing upward social mobility.

3.9 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** requested that the feasibility study and report from the expert workshop be circulated to the Bureau.

3.10 **The Director** continued.

- Member States could still exercise an option to top up the sample size of the EQLS survey in their country by paying an upfront cost.
- He updated the Bureau on the budget execution to date and informed them of budgetary transfers during the year, in accordance with article 23.4 of Eurofound's financial regulation.
- The external auditors (Mazars) had recorded no comments, though he noted that the European Court of Auditors would give the final opinion on the accounts. He reported that the Network of Agencies was following up on the impact of the cost implications of this now externally-sourced audit, previously done by the Court itself. In relation to the systemic budgetary issue of high carry-overs in the agencies, it was proposed to hold a workshop with the Court of Auditors and the European Parliament to look at the issue.



- He outlined current recruitments in Eurofound and noted that the post for a web administrator had been moved to ICT due to the importance of technological issues.
  - A second *Staff engagement survey* would be undertaken in Eurofound in October, and similar surveys were planned in other agencies, though some agencies had decided not to repeat the exercise.
  - Internally there were delays to the staff appraisal process with an impact on promotions, due in part to the delay of the adoption of an implementing rule by the Commission and the so-called Standing Working Party representing the agencies.
  - He outlined some of the ongoing activities of the Network of Agencies for which Eurofound was the coordinating agency until March 2016.
- 3.11 **The Chairperson** thanked the Director for his report and confirmed that the budgetary transfers were noted.
4. New Founding Regulation - update by the Commission
- 4.1 **Mr Maes (Commission) said that work was advancing in the area but that he did not have news on when the new founding regulation would be available.**
- The Commission in its review of the regulation had aligned the three tripartite agencies as much as possible whilst taking into account some specifics for Eurofound, in particular in relation to the advisory committees.
5. Work Programme 2016 - draft 3 (B 252/5)
- 5.1 **The Director** introduced this advanced draft of the work programme.
- He said that the impact of the higher cost of the EQLS had been incorporated in this draft with adjustments in the budgets for communication and expert meetings. The sample sizes in some of the larger Member States were relatively small because of the budgetary situation, though Member States could have this increased at their own cost.
- Delays in some projects in the 2015 work programme were being monitored for their impact in the 2016 programme and he signalled that for this reason it might be necessary to drop some of these projects. More information would be available following that review process.
- 5.2 **The Chairperson** invited the groups to give their comments on this draft of the work programme.
- 5.3 **The Bureau members** supported the inclusion in the 2016 work programme of research relevant to the refugee crisis. It was felt that it would be possible to look at integration in the labour market, possibly cooperating with Cedefop on the issue of skills. It was felt that Eurofound could bring a European added value to the topic, with its tripartite approach. It would be interesting to see how Member States were responding to the phenomenon of refugees, whether they were being integrated into the labour market, whether they were allowed to work during the asylum seeking phase. Eurofound would be well placed to help Member States to learn from each other's experience.
- The Director** said that Eurofound was already working on this issue and he referred to the current draft reports on *Migration labour market policies and effective integration of third-country nationals* and *Preventing trafficking of labour*. He took note of the Bureau's opinion and would discuss with colleagues in Eurofound.
- 5.3 **The Governments** made the following general comments and remarks in relation to the policy context of the programme.

- If it was necessary to cut projects the Group would support deletion of projects 18, 20 and 21.
  - The Group felt that the programme should indicate that Eurofound provided support to the EU Presidencies, presenting Presidency priority topics and studies during meetings and conferences, and providing relevant information to policymakers. This would provide greater visibility in the document to the impact of Eurofound's work.
  - In relation to performance indicators there were concerns regarding the low level of downloads of Eurofound reports in contrast to the relatively high use still of the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) report from 2011. On that basis the Group suggested that Eurofound should publish less, but publish more important reports with a greater impact.
- 5.4 **Mr Maes (Commission)** indicated some editorial changes and said that whilst reference was made to the work programme of the social partners usually indicating the cross industry social partners, it was important to signal the ongoing work at the sectoral level in the sectoral social dialogue committees who had their own work programmes.
- 5.5 **The Employers** felt the text was balanced and welcomed the references to the work of the social partners.
- 5.6 **The Workers** echoed their appreciation for the inclusion of the social partners. There should be more reference to Eurofound's own research findings as the inspiration for future research. There was an imbalance with less projects on working conditions, health and safety and living conditions. More information should be included on the *Future of Manufacturing in Europe* project.
- 5.7 There followed a short discussion on the remaining sections of the programme.
- There was a call to reduce the overall outputs and to focus communication efforts on a reduced number of important publications.
  - There were concerns that some of the targets in the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were not effective and should be reviewed.
  - More information was requested on the project on the *Future of Manufacturing in Europe* and questions were raised in relation to the Steering Committee for the project which, it had been proposed, should include the social partners. Mr Maes undertook to follow up with DG GROW, the Directorate with responsibility for the project within the Commission.
- 5.8 There followed discussion on the project fiches in Annex 1 of the document.
- Project 2 ERM qualitative databases – The **Employers** asked if the qualitative database would involve only restructuring related legislation or also Social Partner agreements.
- Project 4 New forms of employment
- The **Employers** wanted to be clear that the purpose of the project was not to compare employee sharing with casual work or portfolio work. The project should focus on what the characteristics and regulations are in relation to this form of work.
  - The **Workers** requested again that the scope of the project be broadened to cover the impact of the new forms of work on employment protection and workers' rights.
  - The **Governments** doubted that a statement by the Commissioner was really an indication of a beneficial outcome and thought that line 746 should be deleted.
  - The **Director** reminded the members that employee sharing had been identified in the

earlier phase of the project as the form of work with greatest potential, whilst casual work had been identified as the one with the greatest risk and the description tried to demonstrate the rationale for that choice. The project would be a description of this kind of work and not a positive or negative evaluation of it.

Project 5: *New evidence on migrants and mobile workers in Europe*

Following some discussion **the Chairperson** concluded that the Bureau would like to see a more elaborated project on refugee integration and called on Eurofound to review this project in light of what had been suggested.

Project 8: *Income inequalities and employment patterns in Europe before and after the Great Recession*

- The **Governments** welcomed the inclusion of this project in Priority area 1 (Increasing labour market participation and combating unemployment by creating jobs ...), rather than Priority Area 4 Priority area 4: Improving standards of living and promoting social cohesion ...).
- **Mr Maes (Commission)** said that it was important for Eurofound to be aware of an ongoing Commission project with the ILO on the changing world of work and the impact on middle income groups, with a conference proposed at the end of November.

Project 9: *6<sup>th</sup> European Working Conditions Survey: reporting and analysis*

The **Workers** enquired about secondary analysis of the EWCS findings in 2016, feeling that it was too late to commence this research in 2017.

The **Director** outlined that 2016 would see publication of the overview report, the global report with the ILO including data from the United States, China and South Korea. Secondary analysis would take place in combination with reports on self-employment and working time patterns and there will be a contribution to a joint publication with EU-OSHA on older workers.

It was proposed to combine the findings on work-life balance from the EWCS with analysis of EQLS data on work-life balance issues, once available. This would be in line, with suggestions to have fewer but higher-impact reports.

Project 16: *Further analysis of the European Company Survey (ECS)- Reported changes in European companies*

The **Governments** said that a rigorous approach was necessary in relation to indicators used for company performance or workers' wellbeing; the text in this section should be improved. The **Workers** supported the deletion of this project.

Project 17: *Preparation of the 4<sup>th</sup> ECS*

The **Director** informed that EU-OSHA had declined to be involved in the project and it was proposed to involve OECD experts in the expert seminars regarding the future of the ECS.

Project 18: *Towards a European Social Dialogue database*

- The **Employers** supported the deletion of this project in particular because the proposed output was a report documenting the capacity to negotiate of European social partner organisations. This was not the role of Eurofound.
- The **Governments** agreed. The project was still unclear in purpose and relevance and the criticism made in the Group meetings in June were still valid.
- The **Commission** were surprised by the negative response to the project which did not reflect the discussions currently at European level in the context of President Juncker's

new start for social dialogue. Discussions were taking place at the Council where agreements coming up from the social partners were being proposed by the Commission to be implemented as EU legislation. The Member States had realised the need for information and this was the exact purpose of this project, to get a much clearer view on the capacity of EU social partners to come to agreements. It would also highlight the need for some of those sectors to increase the capacity. He noted previous discussions around the need to do something more with the Representativeness Studies.

- The **Workers** were pleased with the revised proposal.

Project 20: Mapping elements of core labour rights at Member State level in the EU

- The **Employers** favoured deletion of this project.
- The **Governments** had reservations about the project, which though motivated to combat social dumping could also end up establishing minimum acceptable standards and it was not a priority.
- The **Workers** could support the deletion of the project.
- The **Commission** took note of the opinion, but said that the project was connected to the ongoing discussion on floors at European level, expressly referred to by President Juncker. This was an area where Eurofound could make a useful contribution.
- The **Director** expressed his frustration with the discussion and explained that Eurofound was concerned only with mapping the situation. If Eurofound did not map the minimum standards then it was certain that someone else would. Was it preferable for a non-tripartite organisation to do that he asked.

It was a modest project but one that was highly relevant for the European Union and was key to the political debate. He reminded that this was an area mentioned by the Commissioner and Director General for Employment and Social Affairs when asked about their information needs in the future. He reiterated to the members that Eurofound's remit was to provide knowledge.

He noted that the Commission had not been present at the Group meetings in June where there had been critical discussion of the project. The project would map industrial relations in Europe in a comparative way, which clearly demonstrated European Added Value.

- The **Workers** agreed that comparative research was an important part of Eurofound's work and that a mapping exercise was the least that could be done.
- **The Chairperson concluded noting some positive support to continue this project.**

Project 21: Application of the conceptual framework on key dimensions in industrial relations to the European social dialogue and national industrial relations

- The **Governments** felt that working from a conceptual framework of key dimensions of industrial relations was becoming quite an academic exercise. As a continuation of an earlier project that focused on industrial relations structures, the Group would prefer a focus in the project on what was achieved in social dialogue and industrial relations. Looking at which topics the social partners could agree on. The Group were not supportive of this project which was still fairly academic.
- The **Director** replied that the key dimensions had been defined and this project looked at mapping the practices in relation to those key dimensions. It also concerned the outcome of social dialogue. The country profiles described the process. The **Commission** member reminded the Bureau that the Commission would no longer

produce its biennial *Industrial Relations in Europe* report so there was even more reason for a tripartite agency such as Eurofound to produce information on trends in industrial relations in Europe.

- The **Commission** member reminded the Bureau that the Commission would no longer produce its biennial *Industrial Relations in Europe* report so there was even more reason for a tripartite agency such as Eurofound to produce information on trends in industrial relations in Europe.

Project 25: Reactivate: return to work of long-term excluded

- The **Commission** would welcome a reference to their recent proposal on long-term unemployed and the broader definition of long-term excluded, and the guidelines on registration that Member States would be required to take into account once adopted by the Council.

Project 26: Policies addressing in-work poverty in the EU

- The **Employers** said that in-work benefits as well as minimum wages should be looked at, as this was another tool to address the issue. A recent ILO conference in Geneva had concluded that there was no definition for a living wage. Other factors were missing such as active labour market policies, how to help people to progress, how to update their competencies and skills.

Project 27: Social dimension of intra-EU mobility

- The **Governments** discouraged an exclusive focus on central and eastern European countries, since migration from southern countries was also considerable.

The discussion concluded. **Written comments would be sent to Eurofound and the final draft programme would be sent to the Governing Board on 8 October 2015.**

6. Programming Document 2017-2020 (B 252/6)

6.1 The **Chairperson** invited Ms Beaver from Ipsos MORI to explain the *ex ante* evaluation in relation to the Programming Document.

6.2 **Ms Beaver** explained that it was a Commission requirement to conduct an *ex ante* evaluation of the work programme, which would be published alongside the final agreed programme.

The evaluation was concerned with the relevance and feasibility of the programme. The role of Ipsos MORI, in partnership with Eurofound's internal evaluation team, was to contribute to the quality of the 2017-2020 Programme and to assist in the establishment of the monitoring and evaluation framework which would ensure effective monitoring of the implementation of the programme.

Ipsos MORI had been involved early in the process to ensure the relevance and coherence of the programme.

Their activities included a:

- Stakeholder needs assessment where all inputs were reviewed in order to form the development of the context and the programming in the actual document;
- Review of competitors, mapping their activities and forward-activities where available;
- Review of the programming document with regard to internal and external coherence;
- 2<sup>nd</sup> review of the programming document to see if the programme was of good quality, relevant, meeting the needs of various stakeholders, coherent, forward-looking enough

to ensure that it was a proper four-year period document, outward-looking in terms of challenges within and beyond the EU, whether it was innovative or flexible and creative, and whether it was joined-up.

Most of the thoughts to date concerned how joined-up the programme was, meaning how feasible was it for the organisation to deliver everything in that programming document. Was the structure of the organisation equipped to deliver against the requirements? Did it build on lessons from previous programming periods? Was there a suitable monitoring and evaluation plan alongside the document?

She would provide feedback following discussions in the Bureau on the programming document.

6.3 **The Director** outlined some of the changes introduced following discussions of the initial draft by the Groups during their meetings in June.

The Programming Document was the result of merging the multiannual and annual work programme, draft estimate of budget and the Multiannual Staff Policy Plan (MSPP). The financial regulation stated that it should be approved by 31 January each year, following which it would go into inter-service consultation at the Commission.

6.4 **The Governments** made the following comments:

- The term ‘employment’ related to the labour market and should not be substituted for work-related issues and working conditions in the Mission statement.
- As stated on previous occasions there should be fewer projects and reports, but more high-impact reports. The 2017 programme did not capture this strategic idea of less but higher impact projects.
- Eurofound should invest in its surveys which were key research outputs for Eurofound.

6.5 **The Workers** made the following comments:

- They wondered if the strategic areas in the document would be the organising principles of Eurofound’s work in the future, and if so how they were aligned with its internal capacity. It was not clear how the work would be organised, including the work of the advisory committees.
- Nine strategic areas was rather a lot and there was scope to reduce or clarify somewhat as there were overlaps.

6.6 **The Employers** felt that there was little reference in the document to issues like work productivity, competitiveness, adaptability of workers, innovation, flexicurity.

- There was little focus on what was going on beyond the EU and it was felt some references could be added;
- The approach to the impact of technology and digitalisation, whilst not ignoring the challenges, should look more at the benefits to the labour market;
- The programme demonstrated an attachment to current structures within Eurofound but there was an opportunity to redefine this, and to involve staff across the organisation in the various research areas.
- The strategic areas could be modified and some amalgamated.

6.7 **The Commission** echoed the concerns of the other members in relation to the risk of fragmentation. The question should be asked as to what the possible future developments might be over the period and whether they could be aligned to the strategic areas.

- There was a need to link to tighter multidisciplinary teams working on specific topics. The number of topics raised the risk of silos within the organisation;
- In general it covered quite well the current situation but some more innovative thinking was required. It was necessary to leave room for the big challenges and it was necessary to have space for responding to *ad hoc* requests;
- He supported the Governments' comments that speaking only about the work context missed out on the broader labour market developments; having a reference to employment in the Mission statement would be a good thing;
- The surveys should be more prominent in the strategic challenges and should be treated more strategically.

The Bureau then discussed the 2017 Work Programme.

6.8 The **Governments** felt that there was too much similarity between the 2017 programme and the four-year programme.

6.9 The **Employers** made the following comments:

- They noted the large number of outputs and repeated earlier concerns about capacity and about streamlining the research output. There was scope to merge some projects;
- *2.1.1 The changing world of work* - Regarding zero hour contracts, it would be interesting to also analyse the types of workers in these contracts, to understand their qualifications, in which sectors they worked, in which EU countries this type of work was a factor, and what was the context beyond the EU.
- *2.1.4 Workplace practices and human capital development in companies* - It would be useful to see if there was an explicit link between job creation support measures and job creation.
- *2.1.5 Well-functioning and inclusive labour markets* - It was felt that well-functioning labour markets were by definition inclusive. In this area the Group would like to include the issue not only of living wage but of in-work benefits.
- *2.1.6 Monitoring structural change and managing restructuring* - There should be more links with the changing world of work and how companies needed to adapt to changes in the labour market.
- *2.1.8 Public services* - This research might also look at the cost of public services and how to make them more efficient.
- Colleagues were interested in developing a tool with Cedefop to look at the quality of vocational education.

6.10 The **Workers** made the following comments:

- *2.1.2 Monitoring working conditions and sustainable work* - The feasibility study for the index of sustainable work would look at EWCS data only. Was it possible to look at that without looking at company practices in the EWCS?
- More information was required on the proposal for an industrial actions monitor and an industrial relations climate panel.
- A quality assessment of the European Restructuring Monitor (ERM) would be welcome as it clearly continued to play an important role.
- Research on trusting people and institutions seemed beyond Eurofound's remit.

6.11 The **Governments** made the following comments:

- *2.1.1 The changing world of work* - The notion of job quality should be added. It was

surprising that Eurofound only intended to do research on irregularities in the labour market if the platform on undeclared work asked them to and if funds were available.

- *2.1.3 Social dialogue* - The Group regretted that it concerned more the processes than the content. They would also like more information about the proposal for an industrial relations climate panel.
- *2.1.4 Workplace practices and human capital development in companies* - The objectives were not clear and the Group made suggestions as to how this subject might be approached.
- The concept of a living wage was not clear to all members of the Group and should be better explained.
- *2.1.9 Monitoring convergence in EU* - When taking social expenditures as an indicator it was important to distinguish between the public and private mix in the area.
- It was important to set priorities because otherwise there was a risk of fragmentation and confusion with such a large number of outputs.

6.12 The **Commission** made the following comments:

- They supported the research on social dialogue and in the four-year programme would call for a more forward-looking approach looking at the role of industrial relations and social dialogue in the recovery. There should be a clear reference to the European Semester.
- The anticipated guidelines on integrating long-term unemployed should be considered in the section on inclusive labour markets.
- It would be interesting to look at the polarisation of labour markets linked to differing incomes. On the topic of youth employment it would be good to mention it in the context of the increase in unemployment. The segmentation of the labour market was of significance in these areas.
- *2.1.6 Monitoring structural change and managing restructuring* - It would be good if the four-year programme followed up the evaluation of the European quality framework for restructuring.
- *2.1.9 Monitoring convergence in the European Union* - It would be good to keep in mind the report *Employment and social developments in Europe (ESDE)* which established a framework for convergence.
- In light of the gap analysis undertaken by Eurofound in relation to its own research, it would be useful to set out a case in the programme for why it was necessary to deepen or expand on previous research. This was crucial to demonstrate Eurofound's added value.

The **Director** concluded the discussions, thanking the Bureau for their comments and undertaking to follow up on some of them.

- He said that the number of publications would be less than the number of outputs indicated per activity and that the volume of publications would therefore remain largely the same.
- It was felt that nothing yet existed at European level to monitor industrial actions; an industrial relations climate panel would be a panel of national experts who would report on the national level.
- There had already been a quality assessment of the ERM but if requested a further assessment could be made.



- It should be borne in mind that the research starting in 2017 would continue beyond 2017 and that the activities identified would remain over the four-year period.

6.13 **Ms Beaver** concluded as part of the *ex ante* evaluation of the programme.

- In this draft of the programme it could be clearly seen that the work of Eurofound itself had been more integrated in the context section, which the Governing Board had itself requested. It also demonstrated that it was building on lessons learned from the previous programming period and there were a number of points reflecting on learnings from the previous surveys for example.
- There was clearer evidence in this draft of the programme of the form that collaboration with the other agencies and organisations would take.
- In general the document dealt well with balancing the various stakeholder interests with the exception of youth unemployment which did not seem to be mentioned much, although today's discussion indicated that minor additions would be made to the text.
- It was welcome that the structure of the document provided much more opportunity for detail around the organisational structuring within Eurofound in order to deliver against the programme.
- They concurred with comments of the Commission to better explain the nature of the knowledge gap that would be populated by Eurofound in a particular part of the strategic intervention area, for example filling a gap which had emerged as important, or moving the knowledge to a different level of understanding, or delivering further trend data on why that gap was there. That explanation seemed to be missing in the document to date.
- Though the Governing Board had previously advised reducing information around the added value of Eurofound, this draft of the programme was incredibly light on the added value of Eurofound as an agency. As this was the document that would be visible to the world it would be good to enhance that and explain it.
- There were comments on the joined-up nature of the programme and the need to explain more clearly how the allocation of work, the responsibility for delivery, management and governance would need to change as a reflection of the way in which the task packages were now across broader themes. Interdisciplinary teams were definitely going to be part of the structures in the future. There was a need to reflect on whether the skills mix within the organisation matched its needs in the coming years.
- There was a need to properly integrate the communications strand into the main project lifecycle and this was undeveloped as yet in the programme.
- Negative priorities should be identified.
- It was not easy to discern evidence of flexibility, innovation or creativity in the document. It was rather conservative. Innovation might also be considered in the context of how the work was delivered, for example the communication activities, or perhaps in investigating additional or alternative streams of revenue.
- There should be more integration of broader global challenges facing Europe.
- In the discussions there had not been much reflection on the horizontal aspects of the programme, corporate strategic actions, which appeared slightly random in nature. It was not clear how things like workforce planning, learning and development, talent mapping were linked to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation in general. There was a need to consider this further.
- She said that Ipsos MORI would submit their comments in writing.

6.14 **The Chairperson** thanked Ms Beaver for her input and concluded discussion on the programming document.

7. Policy on Advisory Committees (B 252/7)

There was a short discussion on this information point emerging from previous discussions on expert and stakeholder meetings.

In principle where stakeholders were involved in a meeting, this should be channelled through the coordinators. There should be a streamlining of the roles of the Advisory committees and expert meetings.

The Advisory Committee procedures indicated that the committees were established at the start of each four year programme. The Advisory Committees would also be defined in the new founding regulation.

**It was decided therefore, that it was better to discuss the Advisory Committees once the new regulation was in place. The discussion then should be framed within the context also of the questions and concerns about the committees which had already been identified.**

8. Rules for written procedures (B 252/8)

- The matter concerned establishing a mechanism for recording objections to a written procedure, which had proved problematic in adopting the draft budget in March.
- The rules of procedure, if amended to include a voting system, would necessitate approval by the Governing Board, followed by the Commission in a formal and lengthy procedure. As a solution, it was proposed to interpret the rules for written procedure in conjunction with the voting rules set out in the rules of procedure of the Governing Board.
- Following adoption of the new Founding Regulation the Governing Board would have to adopt new Rules of Procedure and new Rules for Written Procedure which could then include specific provisions for a voting mechanism.

**The Bureau agreed with this approach.**

9. Schedule of November Governing Board and Group meetings (B 252/9)

The schedule was adopted with the Governments and Workers opting to retain an additional half day's meeting on 11 November 2015. The Director would make an introductory presentation to both groups on Wednesday and would be available to speak with the Employers at their convenience on Thursday, 12 November.

The Bureau would start later in order to meet Commissioner Thyssen who would be visiting Eurofound on that day. The Bureau meeting had to conclude on time so that all members were in place at Dublin Castle for the 40-year anniversary celebrations.

10. AOB

10.1 The **Bureau** members were requested to read the papers on the meeting of the Inter-Institutional Working Group (IIWG2) on the EU Agencies, supplied as part of the Director's progress report. They were asked to take note in particular of the discussions during the meeting and the list of participants, further to their previous request to know who the members of the IIWG were.

10.2 In relation to a request from the Commission, **Mr Grimmeisen** said that Eurofound had received assurances that **negotiations on the seat agreement would be concluded in November.**

11. The Chairperson closed the meeting. The next meeting of the Bureau would be held on **Thursday 12 November**, at 13.30 in **Dublin**.

[Signed H.Fonck]

---

Chairperson

[Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]

---

Director

**DRAFT AGENDA**  
**253<sup>rd</sup> MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

*Thursday, 12 November 2015, 13h30-16h00 sharp Room LH 5, Eurofound, Dublin,*

*Bureau members are requested to **meet in LH5 at 13h15** to meet and greet  
Commissioner Marianne Thyssen*

1. Draft Agenda (B 253/1), *For Adoption*
2. Draft Minutes of the Bureau Meeting of 25 September 2015(B 253/2), *For Adoption*
3. Examination of Draft Agenda of 89<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Governing Board,  
13 November 2015, Dublin (B 253/3), *For Discussion*
4. AOB

Date of next meeting:

Brussels, Conseil Central de l'Economie (Eurofound's Brussels Office),  
11 December 2015 at 9h00.

**FINAL MINUTES**  
**253RD MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

*13.30-15.00, Thursday, 12 November 2015*

*Room LH4, Loughlinstown House, Eurofound, Dublin*

<b>Mr Fonck</b>	Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Ms Bulgarelli</b>	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Rossi</b>	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Employers)
<b>Ms Welter</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Mr Kokalov</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Mr Blomsma</b>	Coordinator, Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Bober</b>	Coordinator (Employers)
<b>Mr Scherrer</b>	Coordinator (Workers)
<b>Ms Hoffmann</b>	Deputy Coordinator (Workers)
<b>Mr Mühl</b>	Alternate Member of the Bureau (Employers)
<b>Mr Maes</b>	European Commission
<b>Mr Dion</b>	European Commission
<b>Mr Menéndez-Valdés</b>	Director
<b>Ms Mezger</b>	Deputy Director
<b>Mr Grimmeisen</b>	Secretary to the Governing Board
<b>Ms Gerstenberger</b>	Eurofound

**1. Welcome and agenda**

The **Chairperson welcomed Mr Scherrer**, Deputy General Secretary of ETUC replacing Mr Niemiec as Coordinator for the Workers' Group.

It was agreed that the **minutes of the Bureau meeting of 13 May 2015 would be adopted at the Bureau meeting on 11 December.**

This shorter Bureau meeting would be concerned mainly with discussing the work programme 2016 and the Programming document 2017-2020.

**2.1 Work Programme 2016 (GB 89/5)**

**2.1 The Chairperson proposed to go through the document taking comments on each section of the work programme.**

**2.1.1 Policy context**

All Groups felt that previous comments had been taken into account in this version.

The **Governments** repeated their view that more reference should be made in this section to Eurofound's interaction with the Member State governments, the Council and in particular with the EU Presidencies. As it was also important to highlight cooperation with the social partners, the three Groups undertook to draft a suitable sentence for insertion in the document.

The Bureau members supported the idea of a feasibility study on a database for a platform on undeclared work but did not agree that it should be conditional on the availability of

funding, so urged Eurofound to review this phrase (*lines 2015-2016*).

## 2.2. Projects

### 2.2.1 *Project 4 (New forms of employment: Developing the potential of strategic employee sharing)*

The Employers asked to delete *lines 722-725* which did not provide relevant information for the justification of the project but instead was a value judgement on casual work and portfolio work as less favourable new forms; and to delete *lines 745-746*, as the intention in the project was to highlight the potential of this form of employment, rather than comparing or judging it against other forms. Both the risks and benefits should be presented, but it was not necessary to make a value judgement.

### 2.2.2 *Project 5 (New evidence on migrants and mobile workers in Europe (new))*

The **Governments** felt that the different concepts of migration and mobility should be better explained in the text. In *line 784* reference to the date of the social mobility package should be deleted as it was not clear if this would be delivered in 2015.

The **Workers** asked that attention be given to migration that was happening within the EU in order to have an understanding of the impact of the crisis on labour migration. They would introduce that request during the Governing Board meeting for future consideration. The **Director** thought that this was something that could be discussed in the Advisory Committee.

### 2.2.3 *Project 6 (Unemployment, under-employment or inactivity? Estimating labour market slack in Europe)*

The **Governments** said that there was evidence that an increasing number of workers were working less hours than they wished. There was a short discussion and it was agreed to insert at *line 841* 'for example in involuntary part-time' to indicate that the list was not limited to this situation.

### 2.2.4 *Project 9 (6<sup>th</sup> European Working Conditions Survey reporting and analysis)*

Following a short discussion it was agreed that *lines 983-986* should be amended thus 'The first wave of topics could include secondary analysis on older workers and sustainable work; work-life balance; developing workers; and forms of employment and associated risks and opportunities i.e. to remove the reference to worker 'vulnerabilities'.

### 2.2.5 *Project 11( Foundation Seminar Series)*

The **Commission** whilst acknowledging that the seminar's theme would emerge from discussions within the Groups, said that when considering the effects of digitalisation it would be good to pay attention to the retail sector which was one of the areas where the impact was greatest.

The **Governments** supported the theme of the effect of digitalisation on work.

### 2.2.6 *Project 14 (Exploring self-employment in Europe (new))*

The **Employers** suggested deleting the last part of the sentence at *line 1224* – 'To draw a picture of the working conditions of the self-employed - including earnings when data available'. The scope of 'working conditions' for self-employed might be discussed in the advisory committee.

### 2.2.7 *Project 16 Further analysis of the European Company survey – reported changes in European companies (new)*

The **Workers** would support deletion of this project as they could not see what lessons would be learned from it. The **Director** wondered if the opinion of the Group had changed in any way following the clarifications on the uptake table which had been circulated. This is existing data of the Survey that otherwise will not be used.

The **Employers** said that they welcomed further analysis of the European Company Survey

because the reports gave a flavour of what was happening at company level, of innovation and the situation of workers. They said that there were other projects which were negative priorities for their Group.

The **Governments** supported the project.

#### 2.2.8 *Project 18 (Towards a European Social Dialogue database)*

**All Groups welcomed the project but with a degree of caution in relation to the outputs and a request for clarification that the research concerned the EU level and not the national level Social Partners.**

It was clarified that it was not an assessment of the capacity of social partners at EU level, but rather a collection and presentation of the official statutes and byelaws of the various EU level Social Partner organisations.

The **Commission** pointed out that the research could potentially be an important information source for the social partners themselves in light of the Commission's new start for social dialogue. The information was already in the forty or more representativeness studies completed to date.

The reports would be internal reports, available to the stakeholders. The report documenting the mandate of European level social partners to negotiate should be screened by the Advisory Committee and the Bureau before any decision was taken to publish it.

#### 2.2.9 *Project 20 (Mapping common elements in labour rights at Member State level in the EU (new))*

**The Groups supported the deletion of this project.**

The **Commission** stated that not undertaking this research would represent a missed opportunity for Eurofound. The Commissioner had also indicated that the social partners should play an active role in all the processes of social floors and in the Commission's view this could have been through an involvement in providing data.

The **Director** said that the Commission had announced a key initiative for 2016 to promote a pillar of social rights. Eurofound proposed to fill some knowledge gaps in relation to it, as it would be very difficult to understand why the Agency's work programme was not addressing this area. In a way, not to do so was at odds with Eurofound's mission. The project proposal had been modified already compared to previous drafts, and had been narrowed down to address concerns expressed by the groups. However, as it seemed the majority of the Board did not support this project proposal as it now stood, it would be withdrawn.

He said that the resources would be reallocated to Eurofound's *ad hoc* capacity or other activities.

The **Employers** said that they had discussed the project at length during their meeting, in particular as Eurofound had been quick to react on an issue that was of course on the table at European level, but had concluded that it did not bring added value.

The **Governments** said that they too had discussed the project at length and felt that it was risky.

The **Workers** too had discussed the project, and although they saw a need to respond to the agenda did not consider that this project was the way to address it. There were problems with the project design and the clarity of the objectives. It was clear that something would have to be done in the context of the Commission's work on the social floor, but this clearly was not the right response.

#### 2.2.10 *Project 24 (Social mobility in Europe)*

The **Governments** said that some members had expressed doubts as to whether this project should continue in 2016 and a feasibility study had been discussed in the advisory committee for living conditions. However the Group had further considered the issue and were in agreement with the continuation of the project now.

- 2.2.11 *Project 25 (Reactivate: return to work of long-term excluded (new))*  
 The **Workers** would state at the Governing Board meeting that the project should explain the cooperation opportunities with EU OSHA on the issue of people with health or disabilities who might need additional support.
- 2.2.12 *Project 26 (Policies addressing in-work poverty in the EU (new))*  
 The **Employers** requested that line 1772 be amended thus Successful Measures to introduce a 'minimum' wage or 'living wage' can also be included.
- 2.2.13 *Project 28 (Europe's refugee crisis: Evidence on approaches to labour market integration of refugees (New))*  
**The Groups supported the project which they said demonstrated Eurofound's ability to react to current issues. It was suggested to broaden the scope to also take into account the issue of language courses which were a precursor to labour market integration.**  
 There should be some information on examples of integration and there should be a multiannual perspective with a broadening of the scope. There should also be a **focus** on what **actions could be taken at EU level to address the challenges.**  
 There were calls to **look at social partner initiatives** in the area.  
**Ms Gerstenberger** reminded the members that the plan was to undertake a mapping exercise as soon as possible with a focus on market integration; and noted this **implied a limited exercise. The Group agreed.**  
 The **Director** said that the multiannual perspective could be discussed in the context of the Single Programming Document (SPD). He agreed that where possible cooperation and synergies would be sought with other EU Agencies working in the field, such as the Fundamental Rights Agency who had been given additional funding to work on the issue, as other EU Agencies. He reminded that Eurofound have not received any additional resource to address this issue.
- 2.3 *Schedule of meetings of Governing Board, Bureau and Groups in 2016*  
 There had been discussions within the Groups on holding meetings of the Governing Board and Groups in the middle of the week, to make travel to Dublin easier. **It was agreed to put a proposal to that effect to the Governing Board on the following day.**  
**The Employers would also request a change in the date of the Bureau meeting in May,** which clashed with one of their own conferences.  
 There were requests also that **the buses to Eurofound from the city centre would start at 8.15** in the morning, to allow the members to take breakfast at their hotel.
- 2.4 *Draft Multiannual Staff Policy Plan 2016-2018*  
 The document still included planning for a 5% rather than a 10% reduction of staff, but was formulated in a way that would allow the member for the German governments to agree.  
 The **Chairperson** indicated that the Workers would have a question on why the field in the tables for the opt-out decisions indicated that there had not been consultation with the social partners within Eurofound.
- 2.5 *The Bureau discussed a statement to be made at the Governing Board meeting the next day, on proposed changes to the tripartite representation on the Governing Board in the new founding regulation.*  
**Mr Maes (Commission)** noted the reassuring message from Commissioner Thyssen in her meeting that morning with Eurofound, and said that she was very supportive of the tripartite representation and felt that there should be a balanced approach towards the three parties concerned. Discussions within the Commission were ongoing he noted.
- 2.6 *Draft Programming Document 2017-2020 (GB 89/6)*



2.6.1 With limited time the **Groups gave very general feedback on the Programming Document and would forward comments in writing.**

The **Employers** were not pleased with this draft, which had been significantly revised from the previous draft. The programme was not innovative. The Group would welcome new activities and a new approach, to look at what works and actions that support growth and the upward convergence of working conditions in Europe. It did not take into account the reforms that had already taken place at national level as a consequence of the economic crisis.

The **Workers** appreciated the streamlining in this draft of the document, with a reduced number of strategic areas and more transversal approach which should be further developed. The Group felt that the surveys and the Network of Correspondents should feature more prominently as they were activities that were unique to Eurofound.

Where it was relevant the significance of **Eurofound's tripartite approach** should be more strongly **highlighted**, as for example in talking about the European Company Survey.

The **communication strategy** is not explicit on how Eurofound's research would be disseminated to the social partners and national level.

The **Governments** noted that the five strategic areas reflected well the current research themes. The Group also emphasised the importance of the surveys, assuming that there was an implicit hierarchy, with the European Working Conditions Survey of greatest importance. There were some risks in relation to the European Living Conditions Survey.

The Group did not consider that **the issue of refugees had been mainstreamed** in the programme as promised.

The document had a difficult structure and there was a degree of overlap in the text outlining the strategic areas and the overviews that could be reviewed.

The **Commission** welcomed the document and the reduction in the number of strategic areas. The area of social dialogue was both specific and transversal and perhaps this could be reviewed in the document. It was good that the suggestions about the future of the surveys were included, as it was an important topic to be addressed right from the start.

The prioritising of the upward convergence of working conditions was welcomed.

The **Director** noted the comments.

The **Chairperson** concluded that the Groups should send their comments in writing.

2.7 The short Bureau meeting concluded so that the members could return to their Group meetings.

The next meeting of the Bureau would be held on **11 December 2015** in Brussels.

[Signed H.Fonck]

[Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]

---

Chairperson

---

Director

## **DRAFT AGENDA**

### **EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

*Raymond Pierre Bodin Conference Centre 9.00-13.00 Friday, 13 November 2015*

1. Opening of meeting and examination of Draft Agenda (GB 89/1) (EN, FR, DE)  
*For Adoption*
2. Draft Minutes of 88th Meeting of the Governing Board, 24 October 2014 (GB 89/2)  
(EN, FR, DE) *For Adoption*
3. Progress Report of the Director on the activities of Eurofound (GB 89/3)  
*For Information*
4. New Founding Regulation – update by the Commission (GB 89/4) *For Information*
5. Draft Programme of Work for 2016 (GB 89/5) (EN, FR, DE) *For Adoption*
6. Draft Programming Document 2017-2020 (GB 89/6) *For Discussion*
  - incl. ex-ante evaluation
7. Adoption of Multiannual Staff Policy 2016-2018 (GB 89/7) *For Adoption*
8. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and the Bureau (GB 89/8),  
*For Adoption*
9. Schedule of Meetings 2016 of the Governing Board, Bureau and Groups  
(GB 89/9) *For Adoption*
10. Advisory Committees 2016 (GB 89/10) *For Information*
11. Implementing Rules to the Staff Regulations
  - 11.1. Role of the Governing Board (GB 89/11.1) *For Information*
  - 11.2. Decisions on Implementing Rules (GB 89/11.2) *For Adoption*
12. Administrative Questions
  - Ratification of decisions by the Bureau (GB 89/12) *For Adoption*
13. AOB

### FINAL REVISED MINUTES

#### OF THE EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

Friday, 13 November 2015, Raymond-Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound

1. Welcome to the meeting and adoption of draft agenda

The **Chairperson** opened the meeting and thanked Eurofound for the previous night's dinner at Dublin Castle celebrating 40 years of Eurofound.

He welcomed the following members who were new or attending for the first time. **Ms Ioannou-Hasapi** - CY (Governments), **Ms Andersen** - DK, **Mr Arlauskas** –LT (Employers) and **Ms Kauffmann** (Commission DG Employment) and **Mr Papanagnou** – (Commission DG Research – ALT).

There would be short presentations on the EU Presidencies of Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

**The draft agenda was adopted.**

2. Adoption of draft minutes of Governing Board meeting, 24 October 2014 (GB 89/2)

**Mr Blomsma (Governments)** asked for the following corrections to the minutes.

- At 7.1 the Group had nominated Mr Ciechański as alternate member for the Bureau in 2014-2015.
- There were minor editorial amendments at 6.12 and in the list of participants.

**The minutes were adopted with amendments.**

3. Progress report of the Director (GB 89/3)

- 3.1 The **Director** reported on Eurofound activities since the previous Governing Board meeting in October 2014. The report followed the structure of the work programme to facilitate an easier understanding of how the organisation had achieved in relation to its objectives.

- As usual Eurofound had worked closely with the EU Presidencies of Latvia and Luxembourg, including the launch of the overview report of the *Third European Company Survey* in Riga on 30 March 2015, and the upcoming launch of first findings of the *Sixth European Working Conditions Survey* in Luxembourg on 24 November 2015.
- A number of high level visitors during the year included Mr Ryder, General Secretary of the ILO, with which Eurofound had concluded a cooperation agreement, as well as members of the European Parliament (Employment and Social Affairs committee in June, Women's Rights and Gender Affairs committee in September), the ETUC and most recently the European Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs, Skills and Labour Mobility, Ms Thyssen.
- A range of outputs had been produced to commemorate the 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Eurofound's founding regulation (including a brochure, video, calendar and exhibition) and a number of commemorative events had been held with key partners throughout the year including the European Commission on 26 May, ETUC on 9 September. Further events were planned with BusinessEurope on 25

November 2015, and jointly with sister agency Cedefop and the European Economic and Social Committee on 19 November 2015 in Brussels.

- The Seat Agreement for the Agency with the Irish Government was signed on 10 November 2015.
- He outlined the projects that were due to for completion in 2015 including: *Employee Participation in European Companies*, secondary analysis of the *Third European Company Survey*; *Effects of restructuring at regional level and approaches to deal with the consequences*; *Social dimension of intra-EU mobility and the impact on public services*; *Developments in collective bargaining and social dialogue into the 21<sup>st</sup> century*; *Job creation in SMEs and Labour market transitions in turbulent times* and the report *Temporary employment in Europe*.
- He noted that delays to the delivery of projects was an issue that had been flagged by Eurofound's performance indicator measurements, and was something that the management committee would address in 2016.
- The contractor for the fieldwork of the *Fourth European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS)* had been selected and a kick-off meeting held. The survey questionnaire was being finalised. Indications were that the cost of the survey would be significantly higher than anticipated, which would have an impact elsewhere in the budget. He said that Member States who wished to top up the sample size for their country at their own cost were invited to contact Eurofound as soon as possible, adding that Italy was planning to do so.
- Eurofound were currently exploring the possibility of conducting a joint company survey with Cedefop in 2017-2020.
- He presented an outline of the evolution of the costs of the surveys in relation to the overall research budget from their inception in the 1990s, where it could be seen that the most recent survey (the EQLS), was approaching 60% of the total research budget in a particular year. This was one of the reasons why it was important to reflect on the surveys and how they would be carried out in the future.
- He outlined a number of key publications including a successful report on social dialogue in the *Foundation Focus* series.
- *Ad hoc* requests had resulted in four reports: *Opting out of the European Working Time Directive*; *Maternity Leave Provisions in the EU Member States*; *Promoting Uptake of Parental and Paternity Leave among fathers in the European Union*; and *Linking Information and Consultation procedures at local and European level*.
- He highlighted the report on the *Social Inclusion of Young people*, published on 23 September following its presentation to the European Parliament's Employment Committee in September, and which had been downloaded more than 1500 times within the first two months. It demonstrated the continued strong interest in Eurofound's work on young people and on NEETs.
- Another important performance indicator for Eurofound was the number of references to Eurofound findings in EU policy documents, and he highlighted the increase in such references in documents of the social partners.
- He elaborated on the use of Eurofound's findings, predominantly by the European Commission but also by the Council (through the Employment Social Policy Health and Consumer Affairs Council (EPSCO) and the EU Presidencies) and the EU Parliament.
- The delegation agreement had been signed in relation to the European Parliament's pilot project on the future of manufacturing in Europe. It was not

included in the main Eurofound budget, but would be run with an external budget of EUR 2 million over a period of four years.

- The level of budget implementation in Eurofound was on target to be high. 95 of the 97 authorised posts were currently occupied, with the greatest number of staff recruited from Ireland followed by Spain, Italy, France, the Netherlands and UK, in that order.
- He highlighted some of the activities associated with Eurofound's leading role in the coordination of the Network of EU Agencies until March 2016 and noted the significant workload associated with that. The network provided an opportunity for cooperation and exchange amongst the EU agencies.

The high level Inter-Institutional Working Group (IIWG2) seemed likely to retain its position in relation to demands for a greater reduction in staffing levels in the so-called cruising speed agencies (10% rather than 5%) to support redeployment in the newer agencies.

Eurofound had initiated a more proactive, strategic attempt by the EU Agencies to deal with the issue of budgetary carryovers, a feature peculiar to the EU budgeting process that was often mentioned in the Court of Auditors reports on the EU agencies.

- The Director noted that his contract had been renewed for a further five years and briefly reviewed his performance in relation to his objectives for the first five years. His objectives included to increase Eurofound's relevance and impact on policymaking, to build trust with stakeholders, to strengthen the global perspective, to consolidate strong relations with the local authorities and to facilitate a good working environment in Eurofound and he outlined briefly how he had worked and achieved against those objectives.

3.2 The **Chairperson** thanked the Director and his staff for their work.

3.3 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** highlighted the value of the surveys which represented the brand and uniqueness of Eurofound. It was good to expand the scope of the surveys through cooperation with other agencies as had been outlined in relation to possibilities for cooperation with Cedefop.

She also highlighted the importance of global comparison in Eurofound's research and welcomed in particular the work with the ILO.

The increase in the uptake of Eurofound's work for policymaking was welcomed.

She also congratulated Eurofound on its work within the Network of EU Agencies and welcomed the decision to adopt more proactive strategies in the network.

3.4 **Ms Welter (Governments)** who was leaving the meeting early, was given the floor to outline previous and upcoming highlights of the Luxembourg Presidency, including the launch of the first findings of the 6<sup>th</sup> European Working Conditions Survey on 24 November 2015 and an event on *Boosting Social Enterprises in Europe* in December. She thanked Eurofound staff for their very valuable collaboration during the Presidency.

3.5 **The Chairperson** thanked the Director for his report and concluded this item.

4. Update from the Commission on the new founding regulation

4.1 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** informed the Governing Board that internal discussions at the Commission were ongoing in relation to the legal and organisational issues surrounding the new regulation. A proposal would be brought forward probably in early 2016. The Commission was appreciative of the tripartite nature of the

Agency but would have to see how that could be reconciled with the Common Approach on the decentralised EU Agencies agreed in 2012.

4.2 The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Kauffmann for her update and reflected on the consensus reached in the Bureau meeting the previous day in relation to the tripartite structures of the Governing Board.

- The Bureau had reflected that the Groups were strongly in favour of maintaining the tripartite governance of Eurofound for the future.
- The Groups were also in favour of maintaining the tripartite way of decision-making that included equal voting rights for the three groups.
- The Groups found it essential to ensure that each group would be able to meet in future with representatives from Governments, Employers and Workers from the 28 Member States in both the Governing Board and Advisory Committees, because the issues addressed by Eurofound concerned working conditions, industrial relations and employment matters which tended to differ from state to state and it was important for an organisation like Eurofound to capture those different experiences.

4.3 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** stated that the Employers' Group shared this viewpoint and that the EU-level social partners had sent an official letter to the European Commission indicating their priorities and wishes for future involvement in the EU Agencies.

4.4 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** said that the Group also believed that the tripartite element brought added value to the work of Eurofound. Notwithstanding the form that the regulation would take, it was essential to guarantee equal voting and to guarantee the possibility to give opportunities to all the Groups and especially the social partners to participate in the main activities of the agency.

Whilst the Governments' Group had to rely on the decision of the Council on these issues, they fully supported Eurofound's tripartism.

4.5 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** said that the Workers' Group adhered to the opinion stated in the letter from the EU-level social partners that a balanced tripartite representation on Eurofound's Governing Board was essential.

4.6 **The Chairperson** concluded that whereas the three groups might have different opinions about various parts of the blueprint previously presented by the European Commission, they shared the common principle of tripartism.

It was also welcomed, that Commissioner Thyssen had noted in her speech at the reception in Dublin Castle on the previous evening that she was also in favour of balanced representation on the Governing Board.

He proposed that the three Groups would state their position on tripartism in a joint letter to be sent to the Commissioner.

5. Work Programme 2016 - final draft (GB 89/5)

5.1 The **Chairperson** noted that the work programme had been discussed in the Group meetings and the Bureau where a compromise had been reached on a number of areas. He proposed that the Groups would briefly give their comments and he would then invite the Director to take the Governing Board through the changes that had been agreed.

5.2 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** made the following comments on behalf of the Governments.

- In the policy context the Group had inserted a statement on cooperation between Eurofound and the national social partners, the Member States and EU Presidencies
- There was strong support for the new Project 28 on Europe's refugee crisis and the Group favoured addressing some aspects of social integration, as well as some EU-level action to deal with the refugee crisis.
- The Group would have suggested merging projects 6, 7 and 25 but instead were satisfied with Eurofound's undertaking to produce a joint communication on these projects once completed.
- Project 18 on the social dialogue database had been discussed at length and it was felt that its purpose and relevance was still rather unclear and that it was important to be neutral and factual in the project. Both outputs would be screened by the Advisory Committee and the Bureau prior to dissemination and publication. The focus on the project would be EU-level organisations.
- Project 20 on mapping of labour standards was felt to be problematic and there were doubts in relation to its added value. The Group could support the deletion of this project.
- Project 24 on social mobility, the Group could now support the continuation of this project following discussions in the relevant Advisory Committee.

5.3 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** made the following comments on behalf of the Workers:

- The Group felt that the programme was balanced and welcomed that comments had for the most part been taken up in this draft.
- The Group shared concerns in relation to Project 18 and Project 20.
- The Group would have welcomed more concrete proposals regarding the secondary analyses of the European Working Conditions Survey, and looked forward to the proposals being available as soon as possible.
- Project 25 on reactivation of the long-term unemployed seemed a good opportunity for cooperation with EU-OSHA in dealing with the particular group of long-term unemployed who have health problems or disabilities.
- In relation to the *Foundation Seminar Series* the Group urged Eurofound to find a solution to reach out to the social partners at ground level by introducing some kind of language interpretation.
- The Group appreciated the attention paid to the refugee crisis.

5.4 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** made the following comments on behalf of the Employers:

- The Group would support this draft programme which had a balanced approach.
- It was important that Eurofound continued the work on the representativeness of the social partners.
- It was felt that a compromise had been reached in relation to the project on the social dialogue database, which was something that could be further developed in the coming years.
- There had been a strong consensus in the Bureau on the deletion of Project 20 on common labour rights, because this project as presented in the draft programme was a risky one and it was felt that more and careful reflection was required, and the Group therefore supported the deletion of the project. This did not rule out work on the subject in the future.

5.5 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** made the following comments on behalf of the European Commission:

- The Commission welcomed this draft and in particular the additional project on

migration. It was important that results would be timely in order to feed into the policy decisions.

- In relation to Project 20 on mapping of labour standards, the Commission regretted that this project had been deleted. It would have been a great opportunity for Eurofound to contribute to the current debate about upward convergence. It was hard to understand why Eurofound would not be providing data for this debate and discussion. If the Groups had concerns about how the project was presented, the Commission would have favoured an amendment to the proposal, for example to emphasise the technical aspects and decrease any political connotations in the project, rather than a decision that Eurofound should not be involved in the debate.

5.6 **The Chairperson** thanked the members for their comments and invited the Director to explain the amendments that had been agreed by the Bureau.

5.7 **The Director** outlined the changes highlighting the more substantial changes.

- As noted Project 20, ‘Mapping common elements in labour rights at Members State level in the EU’ would be deleted and the monies assigned to Eurofound’s *ad hoc* capacity for other projects. He asked the Chairperson and the Governing Board to allow Eurofound some manoeuvre to adjust the figures in the budget in light of this decision.
- Line 209 - delete the words ‘and availability of funding’ as the continuation of the project would depend on the feasibility study and not on funding.
- Project 9, Sixth European Working Conditions Survey - the following changes were made. ‘The first wave of topics could include secondary analysis on older worker[s] and sustainable work; work-life balance; developing workers ~~capacities, knowledge and skills~~; and forms of employment and ~~vulnerabilities~~ associated risks and opportunities.’
- Project 18, *Towards a European Social Dialogue database* he clarified that the social partner organisations it referred to, were EU-level social partner organisations. The objectives had been altered at Line 1409 to map the mandate of the cross sector and sector European level social partners. The project would commence by gathering data on the European social partner organisations.
- Project 26, *Policies addressing in-work poverty in the EU*, line 1772 amended ~~Successful Measures~~ to introduce a ‘minimum wage or living wage can also be included’.
- Project 28, *Europe's refugee crisis: Evidence on approaches to labour market integration of refugees*, colleagues highlighted the supportive measures that were necessary to integrate refugees in the labour market, and wanted to include references to language training which was now mentioned in the justification (line 1851) and objectives. Mention was also now made of exchange with the Fundamental Rights Agency in line 1886.

5.8 **The Chairperson** added a clarification of the decision on Project 18, that the second output (line 1433) would be an internal report documenting the mandate to negotiate of EU level social partners. If it were decided to publish the report on the website the Bureau and the Advisory Committee would first be consulted. The Director said that the report would be made available to all stakeholders.

**The Final Work Programme 2016 was adopted with the amendments, subject to editing and the Director was asked to adjust the budget accordingly.**

6. Draft Programming Document 2017-2020 (GB 89/6)



6.1 The **Chairperson** first invited each of the Groups to give their comments on the draft programme.

6.2 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** asked for more detailed information on the communication strategy such as, to whom it was addressed and why, how the results would be disseminated, and how Eurofound planned to reach the social partners not only on the European level but on the national and company level also.

He asked for an opportunity to discuss the strategy in more detail in the Bureau. The communication strategy in the medium term was of key importance in light of the critical political and social situation in the European Union with the refugee crisis and the possible exit of a Member State, and the ongoing effects of the social crisis in some Member States. In the face of such uncertainty there was a need to have a flexible approach within the communication strategy.

6.3 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** made the following comments on behalf of the Workers' Group:

- She noted positively the engagement with the comments and feedback of the Groups to date.
- The vision statement was quite passive and she suggested incorporating the Agency's remit of 'improving living and working conditions' in this part of the programme.
- It seemed that the new phrase 'upward convergence' was replacing the 'improvement of living and working conditions' and she said that although the idea of convergence as a goal was a compelling one it was still not clear what it meant, whether it was convergence to a ceiling or a floor. It would be a good compromise to use 'improvement and upward convergence'.
- The Group felt that the demographic challenges in the coming years would be changed by the refugee crisis, as at some point the refugees would become workers and would need the right skills and the right training including language training.
- The reduction of the overall number of strategic areas to five areas was welcome.
- The distinction between the three more strategic areas of research (*Working life, Labour market change and Quality of life and public services*) and the transversal ones (the *Digital age: Opportunities and challenges for work and employment*, and *Monitoring convergence in Europe*) was interesting. However the Group would prefer to see *Social dialogue and industrial relations* as a fourth strategic area of activity. Similarly it seemed that *Public Services* was also a transversal topic.
- A truly transversal approach would allow the document to be more conceptual and allow flexibility for planning the projects after that.
- It was not clear where the data from the *European Company Survey (ECS)* would be used but the Group felt that this transversal approach would be very useful in utilising the data across the programme. The Group echoed earlier statements that the surveys were unique to Eurofound and stated that they would be very willing to explore how their data could be mainstreamed in the programme.
- The *Network of Correspondents* was also unique to Eurofound and should be highlighted more in the document.

6.4 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** introducing the comments of the Employers said that the Group did not feel that the draft was ambitious enough. The programme should provide for a sound and balanced analysis of the challenges and opportunities,

capturing innovation and emphasising developments that were bringing new flavour to the labour market and industrial relations systems; exploring what works, looking at how the social partners and Member States were adapting to the challenges in order to mitigate the social impact of the crisis. This was important information for the social actors and decision-makers at national and EU level.

The *European Company Survey* was an extraordinary tool for identifying what was changing at company level and the potential for collaborating in the survey with Cedefop on the issues of skills and training was an exciting one.

She referred to the joint work programme developed by the social partners themselves and highlighted that this kind of collaboration required sound data, analysis and reporting which was the remit of Eurofound.

**6.5 Ms Bober (Employers)** made the following comments on behalf of the Employers

- As stated already by the Group's Chairperson, the Employers appreciated the cooperation with Cedefop on the *European Company Survey*.
- In the 2017 Work Programme, it would be useful to have more information about the research questions that a project was trying to answer, as at present this was quite fragmented and vague.
- Some of the proposals seemed rather academic and the Group reminded Eurofound that its remit was to produce policy-oriented research.
- The Group welcomed the focus on digitalisation of the workforce, but felt that the current focus was too much on risk mitigation rather than on how to adapt and take advantage of digitalisation. It would be useful for Eurofound to start more generally, perhaps with a reflection on how to analyse digitalisation in the context of labour markets and its opportunities for more employment and greater social inclusion, productivity, improved health and safety etc.

Following a short break the meeting resumed with feedback from the Groups on the Programming Document.

**6.6 Mr Blomsma (Governments)** thanked Eurofound for their work on this document, and made the following comments:

- As stated already by the Workers' Group the reduction of the number of strategic areas in the Programming Document was a welcome improvement in this draft. It was considered a useful and practical way to structure the document.
- The Group had also held a first exchange on the surveys which were considered priority projects for Eurofound, with however a hierarchy of importance with the European Working Conditions Survey at the top.
- The document could give more visibility to the issue of refugees and immigration to Europe, mainstreamed throughout the programme but with a statement that more work would be done on this area.
- There were overlaps between the descriptions of the strategic areas and the overview sections in the 2017 programme that could be reviewed. Also the descriptions in the 2017 programme should be more specific and the research questions more fully described. This would allow more concrete objectives and better links to the outputs.
- The Group also supported a need to address the subject of older unemployed persons in the four-year programme. This was an emerging issue, as along with ageing workers there were more and more older workers having become unemployed who faced difficulties re-entering the labour market. This was an area where it was felt Eurofound was well placed to contribute. It was felt that this was

a more interesting topic than the mismatch between supply and demand currently outlined in the document, which was considered quite theoretical.

- Although concerns were expressed in relation to the topics of the Industrial Relations Climate Panel and the Living Wage it was decided that with more clarification these activities could be looked at more positively.

- 6.7 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** added that so-called transversality should be embedded in all Eurofound activities, and supported comments by the other Groups that the surveys were not thematic and that their data could be used throughout the work programme.

It was important that Eurofound continued to ensure the quality of its data.

She complimented Eurofound on the quality of the section in the document on internal management and referred in particular to the talent-mapping exercise.

- 6.8 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** welcomed the document noting that many of the Commission's previous comments had been taken up in this draft.

- It was welcome that the document reflected the focus on upward convergence.
- The structure of the document could be further improved and the Commission agreed with the suggestions of the Workers' Group that social dialogue deserved its own heading.
- It was important to retain flexibility for *ad hoc* requirements during the lifetime of the programme. The Commission for example was interested in evaluating implementation of its own recommendations, for example the upcoming recommendation on long-term unemployed.
- She agreed with the comments on the importance of sound, robust and grounded analysis.

- 6.9 **The Director** thanked the members for their comments. He asked the Groups to forward their comments in writing as soon as possible.

It was important that the Programming Document helped Eurofound to implement its work programme and to present its work to the external audience.

Whilst adhering to the European Commission's template, it had been adjusted significantly throughout the drafting process, and was now presented to focus more on the content reflected in three pillars.

It was felt that unlike the three strategic areas which related to outputs, social dialogue was a process that impacted on working conditions and employment relations but it was also important for all areas. It was not the case that there was less research or hierarchy in this area because of this structural arrangement in the strategic areas, as it is a separate activity in the annual part with the resources agreed.

The document would make it clearer how the surveys could feed into different areas of the programme and how other topics were mainstreamed in the activities. In light of the budgetary pressures, and also qualitative issues, it would be necessary to look at future options for the surveys in the Bureau and the Governing Board and it was important therefore that the Groups were already discussing the surveys and had identified their preferences.

In the presence of the representatives from the Governments and the Commission who played a role in the budget, it was important to state that political will was needed to reinforce the continuity and quality of the surveys. If they were to be maintained and reinforced then resources had to be aligned accordingly. The quality of work in Europe and beyond was measured mainly by the EWCS, and stakeholders from EMCO, the European Commission and OECD were using this data and would like the

survey to be reinforced. He invited the Governments and the Commission to contact their representatives involved in the budgetary procedure to ensure enough resources were available to guarantee these tasks.

The Four-Year Programme and Annual Work Programme were now combined in a single Programming Document which led to a degree of overlap and repetition. This was to a certain extent unavoidable, but nevertheless the document would be reviewed to eliminate any that was unnecessary.

6.10 **The Deputy Director** noted the calls by the Governing Board for the programme to be more transversal and innovative.

6.11 The **Chairperson** summarised as follows:

- Each of the Groups should forward their comments in writing.
- A further draft would be circulated in December, to be discussed in the Bureau and disseminated once more to the Governing Board before being submitted to the European Commission in January.
- The Governing Board would approve it finally in 2016.

7. Adoption of the Multiannual Staff Policy Plan (GB 89/7)

7.1 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** said that the Governments' Group could adopt the Multiannual Staff Policy Plan with the caveat that discussions about the proposed staff reductions were ongoing.

7.2 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that the Multiannual Staff Policy Plan did not comply with the Commission's communication of 2013 which provided that also in 2016, 2017 and 2018 there should be a reduction with the target staffing levels in 2018 at 91 posts instead of the 96 posts that were envisaged in the document. The Commission would abstain from the decision.

7.3 **The Multiannual Staff Policy Plan was adopted, taking note of the caveat of the Governments' Group and the abstention of the European Commission.**

8. Election of Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and the Bureau (GB 89/8)

8.1 **The members of the Bureau were nominated and appointed as follows:**

**Chairperson**

- Mr Fonck (Workers)

**Vice-Chairpersons**

- Ms Bulgarelli (Governments),
- Ms Rossi (Employers),
- Ms Kauffmann (Commission)

**Members**

- Ms Welter (Governments),
- Ms Drbalová (Employers),
- Mr Kokalov (Workers)

**Coordinators (& Alternates)**

- Mr Blomsma (Governments), Mr Cullen (Governments)
- Ms Bober (Employers),
- Mr Scherrer, *Ms Hoffmann* (Workers)

**Alternate members**

- Ms Skrebiškienė, Mr Ciechański,

- Mr Mühl, Mr Carberry (Employers),
- Ms Kelemen, Mr Essemyr (Workers)

9. Schedule of Meetings for Governing Board, Bureau and Groups 2016 ( GB 89/9)

There was a proposal from the Workers' Group to hold meetings of the Governing Board and Groups midweek in order to facilitate easier travel connections for members.

Following a show of hands however, the majority of the members were in favour of retaining the practice of scheduling meetings towards the end of the week.

**The schedule of meetings was adopted with a decision to find an alternative date for the Bureau meeting in May 2016.**

10. Advisory Committees 2016 (GB 89/10)

The Governing Board **noted the dates and composition of the Advisory Committees.**

The Governments' Group announced that **Ms Tāre would join the Advisory Committee for Industrial Relations.**

11. Adoption of Implementing Rules to the Staff Regulation (GB 89/11.1 & GB 89/11.2)

11.1 **Mr Comerford** explained the background to the Implementing Rules.

The Staff Regulation had been amended in January 2014 and one of the objectives of the new regulation had been to increase harmonisation between the EU Agencies and the European Commission.

Article 110.2 of the regulation provided for the internal rules implementing the staff regulation to be adopted by the Governing Board.

These rules generally applied by analogy in the Agencies. However in certain cases they were not applicable and so an Agency was required to formally opt-out of the rules. In cases where the Agencies felt that the rules needed to be amended to be applicable, on agreement of a number of agencies, the Commission would draft a new model decision that would be more appropriate to the agency.

In all cases (adopting by analogy, adopting a model decision and opting-out of an implementing rule) the Governing Board should approve the decision.

He asked the members to reflect on how it could be more informed about what was happening internally with regard to the implementing rules, and suggested perhaps that the Governing Board would nominate somebody who would participate in the work of Eurofound when provisions were being reviewed in consultation with the Staff Committee and the Trade Union.

11.2 There was a short discussion on social dialogue in Eurofound, as documents provided for the opt-out decisions indicated that internal consultation had not taken place in relation to them.

Clarification was sought by the Chairperson from representatives of the **Staff Committee** who indicated that there was consultation and information in an internal working group, but that there was sometimes scope for improvement in how the implementing rules were presented in this group. The staff committee reiterated the importance of social dialogue particularly in light of the staff reductions that were ongoing.

The **Director** assured the Governing Board that there were social dialogue processes in place. He added that in relation to the Implementing Rules there was little scope for

manoeuvre or change on the part of Eurofound.

**The Governing Board decided to adopt the model decisions and to opt-out from the Implementing Rules as outlined in the document.**

12. AOB

Information on the upcoming EU Presidency of the Netherlands.

12.1 **Mr Gans (Governments)** outlined plans for the Dutch Presidency which would commence in January 2016.

There were two priorities for the EPSCO council: ‘Promoting Decent Work’ and ‘Combating Poverty’.

The activities around ‘Promoting Decent Work’ would prioritise the mobility package anticipated in December 2015, which would contain a proposal to reform the Posting Directive. For the Dutch Presidency this was an important issue as it was not considered that the current wording of the Directive was conducive to the principle of equal pay for equal work.

Another issue to be addressed during the Presidency under the Occupational Health and Safety umbrella would be the reform of the Carcinogen Directive.

The Europe 2020 strategy had targets to reduce the number of people living in poverty, but the figure was rising rather than reducing, due in part to the financial crisis. The Dutch Presidency considered that within the framework of coordination and exchange of best practice, more could be done to help the individual Member States to benefit from exchange of best practice. Within the framework of the Social Protection Committee the Presidency would prepare Council conclusions to bring the point higher on the agenda.

The issue of integration of refugees would be brought forward within the EPSCO council.

An informal EPSCO meeting in April would deal with the Commission’s labour mobility package, and a meeting in February on the subject of ‘Decent Work’ would invite a wide range of enforcement agencies and organisations related to proper cross-border enforcement. There was an ambitious programme also for the ‘Platform on undeclared work’ which would launch in 2016.

In May, a three day meeting on Health and Safety would look at carcinogens at work, with a first discussion of Commissioner Thyssen’s proposal which was due in April.

12.2 In conclusion a short video celebrating Eurofound’s 40 years was shown, including footage from the dinner in Dublin castle on the previous evening.

**The next meeting of the Governing Board would be held on Friday, 11 November 2016.**

[Signed H.Fonck]

[Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]

---

Chairperson

---

Director

## **DECISIONS OF THE EIGHTY-NINTH GOVERNING BOARD**

1. Adopted minutes of Board meeting on 24 October 2014, with amendments.
2. Adopted Work Programme 2016, subject to amendments.
3. Adopted the Draft Multiannual Staff Policy Plan taking note of the caveat of the Governments' Group and the abstention of the European Commission.
4. Appointed the members of the Bureau.
5. Decided to adopt the model decisions and to opt-out of various implementing rules to the staff regulation.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT 89<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

(New members in Bold)

	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Member/ Alternate</b>	<b>Member state</b>	
1.	Ms	Kadi	Alatalu	Workers	Alternate	Estonia
2.	Mr	Alexandru	Alexe	Governments	Member	Romania
3.	<b>Ms</b>	<b>Dorthe</b>	<b>Andersen</b>	<b>Employers</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Denmark</b>
4.	<b>Mr</b>	<b>Danukas</b>	<b>Arlauskas</b>	<b>Employers</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Lithuania</b>
5.	Mr	Martin	Blomsma	Governments	Alternate	Netherlands
6.	Ms	Magdalena	Bober	Employers	Coordinator	—
7.	Mr	Dimiter	Brankov	Employers	Member	Bulgaria
8.	Ms	Aviana	Bulgarelli	Governments	Member	Italy
9.	Mr	Jerzy	Ciechański	Governments	Member	Poland
10.	Mr	Antal	Csuport	Employers	Member	Hungary
11.	Mr	Paul	Cullen	Governments	Member	Ireland
12.	Mr	Michel	De Gols	Governments	Member	Belgium
13.	Mr	Herman	Fonck	Workers	Member	Belgium
14.	Mr	Harald	Fugger	Governments	Member	Austria
15.	Mr	Roel	Gans	Governments	Member	Netherlands
16.	Ms	Paloma	García	Governments	Member	Spain
17.	Mr	Matej	Gregárek	Governments	Alternate	Czech republic
18.	Ms	Thorfrid	Hansen	Governments	Member	EFTA
19.	Ms	Marija	Hanzevacki	Workers	Member	Croatia
20.	Ms	Aline	Hoffmann	Workers	Alternate Coordinator	—
21.	Ms	<b>Marina</b>	<b>Ioannou - Hasapi</b>	<b>Governments</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Cyprus</b>
22.	Mr	Emmanuel	Jahan	Employers	Member	France
23.	Ms	Liina	Kaldmäe	Governments	Member	Estonia
24.	<b>Ms</b>	<b>Barbara</b>	<b>Kauffmann</b>	<b>Commission</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>European Commission</b>



25.	Ms	Ilona	Kiukucane	Employers	Member	Latvia
26.	Mr	Ivan	Kokalov	Workers	Member	Bulgaria
27.	Ms	Vladka	Komel	Governments	Member	Slovenia
28.	Mr	Thomas	Kovács	Governments	Alternate	Germany
29.	Ms	Kristina	Krupavičienė	Workers	Member	Lithuania
30.	Ms	Leila	Kurki	Workers	Alternate	Finland
31.	Ms	Anna	Kwiatkiewicz	Employers	Member	Poland
32.	Ms	Katharina	Lindner	Employers	Member	Austria
33.	Mr	Raymond	Maes	Commission	Member	Commission
34.	Ms	Narcisa	Manojlović	Governments	Member	Croatia
35.	Ms	Marika	Merilai	Employers	Alternate	Estonia
36.	Ms	Despoina	Michailidou	Governments	Member	Greece
37.	Mr	Lutz	Muehl	Employers	Member	Germany
38.	Ms	Brenda	O'Brien	—	Observer, EU-OSHA	—
39.	Mr	Bogdan	Olszewski	Workers	Member	Poland
40.	<b>Mr</b>	<b>Georgios</b>	<b>Papanagnou</b>	<b>Commission</b>	<b>Alternate</b>	<b>European Commission</b>
41.	Mr	Manuel	Pena Costa	Employers	Member	Portugal
42.	Ms	Ruta	Porniece	Workers	Member	Latvia
43.	Ms	Antonia	Ramos Yuste	Workers	Member	Spain
44.	Ms	Stefania	Rossi	Employers	Member	Italy
45.	Mr	Manuel	Roxo	Governments	Member	Portugal
46.	Ms	Jenni	Ruokonen	Employers	Member	Finland
47.	<b>Mr</b>	<b>Peter</b>	<b>Scherrer</b>	<b>Workers</b>	<b>Coordinator</b>	—
48.	Mr	Paul	Sellers	Workers	Member	United Kingdom
49.	Ms	Rita	Skrebiskiene	Governments	Member	Lithuania
50.	Ms	Lucie	Studničná	Workers	Member	Czech republic
51.	Ms	Ineta	Tāre	Governments	Member	Latvia

52.	Mr	Olivier	Toche	Governments	Member	France
53.	Mr	Roland	Waeyaert	Employers	Member	Belgium
54.	Ms	Nadine	Welter	Governments	Member	Luxembourg
55.	Ms	Lis	Witsø-lund	Governments	Alternate	Denmark

The Following Staff from Eurofound participated or observed in the meeting

56.	Mr	Menéndez-Valdés	Director
57.	Ms	Mezger	Deputy Director
58.	Mr	Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Governing Board
59.	Mr	Comerford	Head of Human resources (for item 11)
60.	Mr	Vargas	Staff Committee
61.	Mr	Faller	Staff Committee
62.	Ms	Fromm	Union Syndicale

**DRAFT AGENDA**  
**254th MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

*Conseil Central de l'Economie (CCE), room 6,  
20 avenue d'Auderghem, 1040 Brussels,  
Friday, 11 December 2015, 09h00-13h00*

1. Draft Agenda (B 254/1), *For Adoption*
2. a. Draft Minutes of the 252<sup>nd</sup> Bureau meeting of 25 September 2015 (B 254/2a) *For Adoption*  
b. Draft Minutes of the 253<sup>rd</sup> Bureau Meeting of 12 November 2015 (B 254/2a) *For Adoption*
3. Progress Report of the Director (B 254/3), *For Information*
4. Revision of Founding Regulation - update by the Commission, *For Information*
5. Final Annual Work Programme 2016 (unedited) (B 254/5), *For Information*
6. Programming Document 2017-2020 – draft 3 (B 254/6), *For Discussion*
7. Amending Budget 2015 (B 254/7), *For Discussion*
8. Draft Budget 2016 (B 254/8), *For Discussion*
9. Working language for day-to-day administration and internal communication  
- draft written procedure (B 254/9), *For Discussion*
10. Administrative Questions  
Bureau meeting dates 2016 – update (B 254/10), *For Discussion*
11. AOB

The meeting is followed by a **Christmas lunch** in a restaurant close to the meeting venue

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

Friday, 15 January 2016 at 9h00

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

**REVISED MINUTES**  
**254TH MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD**

*9.00-13.00, Friday, 11 December 2015*

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

<b>Mr Fonck</b>	Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Ms Bulgarelli</b>	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Welter</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Kauffmann</b>	Member of the Governing Board (European Commission)
<b>Mr Blomsma</b>	Coordinator, Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
<b>Ms Bober</b>	Coordinator (Employers)
<b>Mr Scherrer</b>	Coordinator (Workers)
<b>Ms Hoffmann</b>	Alternate coordinator (Workers)
<b>Mr Kokalov</b>	Member of the Governing Board (Workers)
<b>Mr Maes</b>	European Commission
<b>Mr Menéndez-Valdés</b>	Director
<b>Ms Mezger</b>	Deputy Director
<b>Mr Grimmeisen</b>	Secretary to the Governing Board
<b>Ms Gerstenberger</b>	Eurofound
<b>Ms Jacquet</b>	Eurofound

1. Adoption of Draft agenda

**Agenda was adopted**

2. Adoption of draft minutes of Bureau
  - 2.1.1 Adoption of minutes of the Bureau, 25 September 2015

Mr Maes (Commission) introduced the following changes.

- Page3, line 3.7 delete the word Commission's as the employment Guidelines were adopted by the Council. *'The group was looking at the European Semester with a particular focus on the involvement of the national Social Partners in the process, also with the background of the new reference to this in the Employment guidelines'*
- In the same paragraph, replace 'requested' with 'negotiated'. *'A second thematic group was looking at the involvement of social partners in policy and law making and discussed issues related to the better regulation agenda and how this articulated with the agreements negotiated by the social partners.*
- *Page 7, on Project 20 delete 'protection' as the project was broader than that '... the project was connected to the ongoing discussion on social floors at European level, expressly referred to by President Juncker'.*
- The comment from the Commission on the *Industrial Relations in Europe Report* actually concerned Project 21, not Project 20.

- 2.1.2 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** said that on page 7 the last sentence by the Governments

on Project 20 should be amended to say that the project was not a priority rather than a risk.

**The minutes were adopted with these amendments.**

2.2 Adoption of minutes of the Bureau, 12 November 2015

2.2.1 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** asked that his intervention on Eurofound's communication strategy be included in the minutes.

The **Chairperson** proposed and the Bureau agreed to adopt these minutes at the next Bureau meeting in January, once these comments had been included.

He also asked also that the minutes of the plenary Governing Board meeting in November be available to the Bureau in January.

3. Progress report of the Director (B 255/3)

3.1 The **Director** reported on activities since the last Bureau meeting in November.

- The first findings of the 6<sup>th</sup> European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) were presented on 24 November 2015 in Brussels, in collaboration with the Luxembourg Presidency.

38 questions were already available in the Survey Mapping Tool on the website. The full dataset would be released once the overview report had been published in late 2016.

He noted that Eurofound had recently received a request to provide microdata from the survey to the OECD for an event they were holding on the future of work in January 2016. In this case a decision had been taken to provide the dataset early, as this was a ministerial meeting that would be attended by key stakeholders. By 1 December 2015, the EWCS *résumé* had already been downloaded 1200 times from the website.

- Eurofound had presented the report on *Job creation in SMEs* at the large SME Assembly 2015 in Luxembourg on 19 November 2015.
- Eurofound had made a number of presentations at meetings including:
  - European Parliament: EMCO (Employment Committee) on parental leave, 10 November 2015; Preliminary results of the Diversity of the NEETs project, 10 December 2015.
  - *The impact of the economic crisis on child wellbeing* (S&D Group, 19 November 2015) and an Interparliamentary Committee meeting (with members of the national parliaments) on Education and Youth, 3 December 2015;
  - OECD: PIAAC (Survey of Adult Skills) International Conference 2 on Tasks in the European Jobs Monitor, 23 November 2015.
  - Schöneberger Forum (DGB), where the Deputy Director presented on *Public sector industrial relations in the EU*, 25-26 November 2015.
- *Work organisation and workplace learning: Creating a win-win environment*, a joint event had been held with Cedefop celebrating the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of both agencies in the European Economic and Social Committee, EESC on 19 November 2015.
- On 27 November 2015, the Director had attended a meeting with Mr Servoz, of Eurofound's partner DG in the European Commission, DG Employment and the Directors of the three tripartite agencies under his remit, on upcoming issues.
- The 2016 Budget had now been adopted by the budgetary authority and Eurofound

was obliged to implement a staff reduction already of 6%.

- He updated the Bureau on publication activities, including any delays and issues.
- Referring to the extensive consultation process on the Comparative Analytical Reports (CARs) on the *Concept of Representativeness* and the *Role of the social partners in the National Reform Programmes and the European Semester*, he said that it was important that the publication of a report was not considered a negotiation process and that in future a more streamlined way would be found to facilitate the tripartite input in the process.
- Eurofound had published three reports on migration/mobility. Originally foreseen to accompany the Commission's Mobility Package, with the postponement of that package a decision had been taken to go ahead with the original schedule.

The reports were: *The social dimension of intra-EU mobility: Impact on public services*; *Challenges of policy coordination for third country migrants*; and in the Foundation Focus series *Workers in Europe: Mobility and migration*. The first report examined the extent to which mobile citizens from the central and eastern European Member States take up benefits and services in nine host countries. This was a subject of great debate currently in some Member States, and the findings of the report had already been widely quoted in press articles, in Ireland and at European level.

- Preparation was ongoing for the 4<sup>th</sup> European Quality of Life Survey with a review and update of the questionnaire ongoing, to be finalised in January 2016.
- He asked the Bureau to take note of the budgetary transfers, a number of year-end adjustments for which he would provide more details later in the meeting.
- There had been no new requests for Stakeholder Enquiry Reports but a customised report on the transition into employment of 14-24 year olds who do not participate in higher education had been requested by the Social Mobility Committee of the UK House of Lords.
- In its role as coordinator for the Network of EU Agencies (until March 2016) Eurofound had organised a workshop with the EU agencies and the Court of Auditors on the recurring issue of the budgetary carryovers. The outcome was that in future, carryovers that were a result of poor planning should be distinguishable from those that were justified, mainly due to multiannual activities. In this role Eurofound had also organised meetings with the Internal Audit Service on horizontal audits of the agencies, and had responded and coordinated responses to a lengthy questionnaire issued to all the agencies by the European Parliament.

3.2 The **Chairperson** thanked the Director for his report and asked if there were any questions or comments.

3.3.1 **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that the Groups had sent their comments on the questionnaire for the *Impact of fraudulent forms of contracting work on working conditions inequalities and business competitiveness* report, but had received no further information. She would welcome some information about the report.

3.3.1 The **Director** replied that there was a deadline to complete the report in time for an event of the Dutch Presidency. The comments of the Groups (and those of correspondents) on the draft questionnaire had been taken on board, the revised questionnaire had been sent out and answers received, and the next step was the production of the overview report.

The revised questionnaire (as sent to network correspondents) could be sent to the members for their information.

- 3.4.1 The **Chairperson** asked about the procedures for requesting a customised report, wondering if they were transparent.

In the progress report it was indicated that there were problems with the performance of a number of correspondents in the European Restructuring Monitor (ERM).

- 3.4.2 The **Director** replied that information on the possibility to request customised reports was available on the website encouraging stakeholders to contact Eurofound directly. For example the House of Lords had requested further information directly, following a previous presentation to one of their committees on the NEETs by Mr Mascherini, Research Manager at Eurofound. A customised report was the gathering of information already available to Eurofound. A request was usually responded to positively when it came from a legitimate stakeholder.

Stakeholder Enquiry Service (requiring budget, project management) and Customised reports were frequently requested by the sectoral social partners, though all stakeholders were encouraged to consider the service.

He informed the Bureau about the particulars of the issues with the ERM, which in some instances related to under-reporting of cases, and said that these issues were being managed. He also pointed out that the issue of low-quality input from some correspondents was not only affecting the ERM.

- 3.5.1 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** referring to the consultation on the CAR on the *Role of the social partners in the National Reform Programmes and the European Semester* said that the debate had been constructive and that the whole exercise had yielded considerable benefits.

- 3.5.2 The **Director** said that he was not referring to the outcome, which he agreed had been good, but rather to the process which had been complex and time consuming for the research staff involved.

- 3.5.3 The **Deputy Director** said that she echoed Mr Scherrer's statement that the Advisory Committee meeting where the report had been discussed had been constructive, with good input from all the stakeholders. The problems had been largely due to the impact of the extended discussions on the project schedule.

- 3.6 **Ms Welter (Governments)** took this opportunity to thank the Director and Deputy Director and their staff for their collaboration during the Luxembourg Presidency. The joint activities during the Presidency had generated good publicity for Eurofound and its work. The **Chairperson** echoed these remarks in relation to the launch of the EWCS findings. The content of the meeting was excellent and many of those present were impressed by the speed of Eurofound in delivering these results.

4. Revision of the Founding Regulation – update from the Commission

- 4.1 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that she would have more concrete information in the first quarter of 2016. As the Bureau members were aware, there were indications that the Commissioner had some sympathy for retaining the tripartite representation but matters were with the legal service of the European Commission at the moment.

5. Final Work Programme 2016 (B 255/5)

The programme was presented for information only, having been adopted with amendments at the plenary meeting of the Governing Board on 13 November 2015.

The **Director** noted an error in the version circulated whereby a figure had been included in two projects. As a result EUR 53,000 would be put back into the budget for translation.

Following internal editing the programme would be published in the new year.

6. Programming document 2017-2020 – third draft (B 255/6)

6.1 The **Director** said that some of the written comments had been received very late and were therefore possibly not properly incorporated in this draft. Areas highlighted in yellow in the table with the uptake of comments on the previous version, indicated where further guidance from the Bureau was required.

The document would be endorsed by the Governing Board through written procedure in January and would then be sent for inter-service consultation at the European Commission. Only after that could it be formally adopted by the Governing Board. In light of the tight deadlines it was important to take the comments of the Bureau members today.

- Clear guidance from the Bureau was needed in relation to the structure of the document. There were five strategic areas of intervention in this version, reduced from nine following discussions in the Governing Board and Bureau. These had been selected to better reflect the way Eurofound worked. He emphasised the presentational nature of this section, against the background of requests to include social dialogue and public services as additional strategic areas of intervention. This would change the presentation of Eurofound's work but would not have a real impact on the way the work was carried out. The Activities in the 2017 work programme were considered the important elements for planning and implementing the work programme.
- He explained that the multiannual part of the document presenting the strategic areas of intervention constituted a programme rather than a 'conceptual model', announcing work planned over the next four years. During each year of the four-year programme it would be necessary to review the topics listed there. In response to comments by the Workers' Group it was now indicated which transversal topics could be mainstreamed in the programme
- There was a need to reach agreement on hitherto contentious points such as: the addition or deletion of strategic areas of intervention and of proposed activities; whether the document dealt adequately with competitiveness and productivity; how the sensitive areas of industrial relations and social dialogue were reflected in the programme planning; identifying negative priorities (activities that were not included in the programme for reasons of lack of resources, either financial or staffing); whether the communication strategy addressed the national level as well as EU level requirements; on risk management with an invitation having been extended to the members to participate in a normally internal workshop on risk assessment.

6.2 The **Chairperson** proposed to follow the Director's indications and to try to resolve differences in relation to the six areas highlighted by him, namely:

- Whether to have social dialogue as a separate strategic area of intervention, a proposal supported by the Commission and the Workers, but not by the Governments;
- To consider the request from the Governments for research on older unemployed workers;
- To have a discussion on so-called negative priorities;
- To consider the request from the Employers to have more emphasis on competitiveness and productivity in the 2017 programme;
- To consider requests from the Commission, Governments and Employers regarding



industrial relations in the programme;

- To discuss the communications policy.

### 6.3. Social dialogue as an additional ‘Strategic area of intervention’

6.3.1 The **Workers** said that they did not consider the arguments of the Governments against their proposal to be strong, and that rather than repeating their argument today they were interested in hearing further the arguments against it. Social dialogue was broader than working conditions, and was in fact transversal. It was a key feature of Eurofound’s work and as such should be more visible.

At a time when social dialogue was clearly back on the political agenda with President Juncker’s ‘relaunch of social dialogue’ it was important that it should feature more prominently in the programme.

The **Commission agreed** that social dialogue should be one of the strategic areas of intervention.

6.3.2 The **Governments** would not agree to go back to nine strategic areas of intervention, but could agree to the addition of social dialogue as a sixth area, although unlike the others it referred to a process rather than a policy area.

6.3.3 The **Employers** said that the strategic areas were more content-oriented and the inclusion of a more process-oriented activity was strange. Social dialogue was transversal and could contribute to all the research activities.

The Group would support the addition of social dialogue, though they favoured restricting the number of strategic areas as much as possible.

6.3.4 The **Workers** agreed that social dialogue was transversal, and was more process-oriented but said that the current list already included issue-oriented (digitalisation) as well as transversal and process-oriented proposals (convergence) and that the inclusion of social dialogue did not break the logic of the list.

6.3.5 The **Director** agreed with the comments of the members but reminded them that the Programming Document was designed to be presented to the budgetary authority and the discharge authority, and that it had an activity based logic against which resources were presented, and a logic that had to be continued through all sections of the document, so that any changes here would have to be reflected in other sections. He argued that it would be better to introduce these changes at the level of activities.

6.3.6 Concerns were expressed that as the Programming Document would form the basis for later evaluation, Eurofound would have to demonstrate that research had been carried out as planned. Some members expressed concern that it risked artificially promoting projects on social dialogue in order to fit in with the strategic area.

In light of the opinions expressed in favour of the solution, and the risks outlined by the Director and some of the members, the **Chairperson asked Eurofound to find a way to incorporate this compromise (the addition of social dialogue as a strategic area) into the document.**

### 6.4. Research on older workers – request from the Governments

6.4.1 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** said that the issue of active employment policies for particular target groups was a priority for the Governments and that the four-year programme should reflect this. It was necessary to consider employment policies for vulnerable groups, but these groups could change over time.

In the 2017 programme the Group requested the inclusion of a project on active

employment policies targeting older workers, similar to the work done previously on the NEETs. She added that the Group were surprised to see the NEETs and migration indicated as negative priorities.

The employment recovery following the economic crisis was small and there were structural weaknesses in the labour market that should be addressed, in this case the situation of older workers who were finding themselves unemployed due to the later pension age introduced by the Member States.

6.4.2 **The Director** again cautioned that within the well-functioning labour market activity the current proposal was to look at labour market segmentation, and then labour market mismatch. Should one of these current proposals be dropped?

6.4.3 **Ms Bober (Employers)** supported the removal of the topics of youth and migration from the list of negative priorities. She suggested as a compromise to state in the general description of activities over the four years, that special attention would be paid to vulnerable groups.

6.4.4 **The Chairperson** urged Eurofound to find a compromise in the chapter in the programme on the labour market.

6.5 Negative priorities

6.5.1 **The Director** explained that the identification of negative priorities was mandatory in the Programming Document template, and was attracting much attention from the European Parliament's Budgetary Committee, who wanted to know, in the face of protests against the cuts in budget and staff, where the pressures were being felt and what priorities were not being pursued due to the reductions.

For example Eurofound was stating that it was not undertaking separate research programmes on youth and migration in the period due to budget cuts. This did not mean that the topics were not important, but that they would be not dealt as separate activities.

6.5.2 With this explanation **the Groups indicated** some of their negative priorities and suggested that costs could be saved by limiting the number of projects annually, by cooperating with other agencies on the surveys, by deleting projects for which there was no consensus. *Among the projects mentioned were the Foundation Forum, the European Restructuring Monitor and the European Quality of Life Survey.*

*The Director pointed out that what was required was to identify broader areas where less **would** be done in the future, for example 'events' or 'restructuring'. This would give him the possibility to identify a number of specific activities and **propose** projects that would not be pursued. He clarified, for example, that **dropping** the Forum would not lead to major savings as this event was not significantly more expensive than other **comparable** events. He said that there was no budgetary reason to drop any specific project in 2017 as the budget was balanced.*

*The Chairperson concluded that additional detailed information, including costs, should be provided in future meetings in order to be in a position to make informed decisions.*

*On youth and migration it was the opinion of the Bureau that the project should be deleted from the list of negative priorities, in light of previous drafts of the Programming Document where youth and migration appeared as separate headings.*

6.6 More emphasis on competitiveness and productivity in the programme

6.6.1 **The Chairperson** proposed to consider this in January, along with the discussion of the

projects.

6.6.2 **Ms Bober (Employers)** agreed to this proposal but added that what was currently missing from the 2017 programme was a mapping of the recent productivity reforms that had been made in a number of Member States. This mapping of reforms was an element that could also be included in the four-year programme.

**Ms Rossi (Employers)** added that it had emerged strongly in the Group meetings that if Eurofound would be investigating and analysing labour market and industrial relations developments in the coming years in terms of upward convergence, then it would be necessary to look also at productivity and competitiveness.

6.6.3 **Mr Blomsma (Governments)** agreed but said that there should also be a mapping exercise on the growth of precarious employment.

6.6.4 **The Director** did not think productivity was a natural area of research for Eurofound. He would argue that the research proposed under *Innovation and job creation in companies* can cover Eurofound contribution in this field, and will welcome suggestions to enrich this activity. Key dimensions on industrial relations also consider competitiveness.

6.7 Communication policy

6.7.1 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** said that he would welcome a more intensive discussion of the communication policy, on the basis that there might be areas for improvement, so that Eurofound could be better known and more involved in certain debates.

6.7.2 **The Director** noted that it was usual to have an update once a year on the communications activities and that this could be scheduled for the March Bureau meeting.

6.8 Requests from the Commission, Governments and Employers regarding Industrial relations

6.8.1 **Ms Gerstenberger** summarised that the request received from the European Commission was that Eurofound should pay more attention to capacity building and identify the support needed for that; that Eurofound should identify obstacles to a functioning social dialogue, though not all the Groups supported this and clarification was required; and that a mapping of industrial relations should be undertaken.

6.8.2 **The Director asked** if the Groups could agree to the textual changes proposed by the Commission indicated on page 16 of the table outlining the uptake of comments.

6.8.3 **The Employers** agreed that a mapping of the situation would be welcome, though identifying obstacles to social dialogue might be considered too much interference in national systems. It was not clear what the role of Eurofound could be in capacity building. It was not clear how to define capacity.

6.8.4 **The Director** asked the Governments how they felt about the emphasis on promoting social dialogue at national level and the role of Eurofound in that.

6.8.5 **The Governments** said that Eurofound was already engaged in this process with the Governments and the other social partners.

6.8.6 **The Commission** saw the project as an effort to understand where the issues might lie, and not to draw any policy conclusions.

It should be clearer in the document that Eurofound's activities were feeding into and not shaping the activities associated with the relaunch of social dialogue.

The new element in the proposal was the capacity building and the Member States were

turning to the Commission for answers as to how to improve this. It was considered that this was an area where Eurofound was well placed to assist.

6.8.7 **The Chairperson** summarised that there was support for a project but that it was a sensitive one and care would be necessary in drafting the questionnaire. The tripartite groups should be involved.

6.9 **Work Programme 2017**

6.9.1 **A number of points mentioned are applicable to the 2017 work programme and it would be discussed in more detail in January.**

6.9.2 **The Governments** repeated their request for a project on older workers, noting in particular the increasing problem in Member States whereby older workers in countries where the pensionable age had been raised, increasingly found themselves in situations of unemployment or poverty. The **Commission** agreed that this was an increasingly important issue and that this group would also be most affected by the digitalisation of work and the consequent skills gap.

6.9.3 **The Director** proposed to check whether research on the older unemployed could be incorporated in the 2016 programme project. It could also be included in the multiannual programme with no specific project in 2017.

6.9.4 In relation to proposals to drop the project on the feasibility of an industrial relations climate panel **the Commission** wished to consult with colleagues first, suggesting that a lighter reference might still be included in the multiannual programme.

7. Amending budget 2015 (B 255/7)

**It was agreed to submit the amending budget for approval by a written procedure of the Governing Board** following clarification in relation to questions on the increased costs in the travel budget and liquidation of damages in relation to a contract, and a caveat that some small adjustments might still be required.

8. Draft budget 2016 ( B 255/8)

8.1 **It was agreed to submit the draft budget for approval by a written procedure of the Governing Board.**

There was a short discussion of the potential for the use of web technologies to reduce the cost of meetings, including those of the Bureau. It was agreed to discuss this at a later date.

9. Working languages for day-to-day administration and internal communication (B 255/9)

9.1 The **Director** explained the background to this document, whereby a court case had resulted in the European Personnel Selection Office (EPSO) refusing to publish recruitment notices for agencies if it is not done in all official languages and the Agencies had not adopted a language regime that allowed them to operate in one or a limited number of languages. As coordinator for the Network of Agencies, Eurofound was coordinating the response of the agencies to this matter, some had adopted language regime policies by decision of the Director.

The Director however preferred that the Governing Board would adopt the decision. The Commission had indicated that considering it to be a horizontal issue, they would first like to check it with their legal department. The Commission would respond as soon as possible, as the matter was of pressing importance.

**The Bureau supported this action.**

10. Dates for Bureau meetings in 2016 - update (B 255/10)
  - The Bureau meeting in March was moved to Thursday, 10<sup>th</sup> and confirmed in Dublin.
  - The Bureau meeting in May was moved to Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> and confirmed in Brussels.
11. The **next meeting of the Bureau** would be held in **Brussels** on **Friday, 15 January 2016** starting at the later time of 9.30.

[Signed H. Fonck]

---

Chairperson

[Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]

---

Director