

DRAFT AGENDA
271st MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

*Conseil Central de l'Economie (CCE), Room 6, 20 Avenue d'Auderghem, 1040 Brussels,
Thursday, 17 January 2019, 16h00-18h00 & Friday, 18 January 2019, 09h30-13h00*

Thursday, 17 January 2019, 16h00-18h00

1. Draft Agenda (B 271/1), *For Adoption*
2. Draft Minutes of the 270th Bureau meeting of 15 November 2018 (B 271/2)
For Adoption
3. Future of surveys – preparation of upcoming multi-annual programme discussion (B 271/3), *For Discussion*
4. Draft Programming Document 2020 – final draft (B 271/4), *For Approval*

Friday, 18 January 2019, 9h30-13h00

5. Progress Report of the Director (B 271/5), *For Information*
6. New Founding Regulation – transitional arrangements (B271/6),
7. ICC work plan 2019 and update on Audit activities (B 271/7), *For Information*
8. Interim evaluation of Programming Document 2017-2020 – final report (B271/8),
For Information
9. Budgeting process at Eurofound (B271/9), *For Information*
10. Cooperation agreements with other EU Agencies (B 271/10), *For Information*
11. AOB

*Thursday, 17 January 2019, following end of first meeting day – New Year's dinner
(venue tbc)*

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

Friday, 8 March 2019 at 9:30 hrs, Eurofound, Dublin

FINAL MINUTES

271st MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

Day 1 – 16.00-18.30, Thursday 17 January 2019

Day 2 – 9.00-13.30 Friday, 18 January 2019

Ms Bulgarelli	Chairperson of the Governing Board (Governments)
Ms Rossi	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Employers)
Mr Gran	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (Workers)
Ms Kauffmann	Vice-Chairperson of the Governing Board (European Commission)
Mr Tagger	Member of the Bureau (European Commission)
Mr Ciechański	Member of the Governing Board (Coordinator, Governments)
Ms Smith	Employers (Coordinator)
Mr Scherrer	Workers (Coordinator)
Ms Hoffmann	Workers (Deputy Coordinator)
Mr Voigtländer	Member of the Governing Board (Governments)
Ms Roelen	European Commission
Mr Menéndez-Valdés	Director
Ms Mezger	Deputy Director
Mr Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Governing Board
Mr Storrie	Eurofound
Mr Blomsma	Eurofound
Mr Baussand	Eurofound
Ms Ahrendt	Eurofound

Day 1 17 January 2019

1. Draft Agenda (B 272/1)

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed Ms Ahrendt who would present the item on the surveys. Ms Ludwinek who had recently joined the Brussels Liaison Office, having worked as a research manager in Eurofound before that, also introduced herself.

The Draft Agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of Draft minutes of the Bureau meeting 16 November 2018 (B 271/2)

Ms Kauffmann (Commission) made the following requests for changes:

Page 5, in the first bullet point of her intervention it should state ‘the Commission’ would prefer instead of ‘the Group’ would prefer.

In the third bullet point: ‘labour shortages’ should read ‘labour skills’, and the part ‘and a huge issue for the digital age’ should be deleted.

The amended minutes were adopted.

3. Future of Surveys – preparation of upcoming multiannual programme discussion (B 271/3)

3.1 **The Director** outlined that it had been decided to commence discussion on priorities for the 2021-2024 programming period in 2019, and this included a discussion of

Eurofound's most resource-intensive activity, the surveys.

The activity group on Survey Management Development (SMD) coordinated by Ms Ahrendt and composed of Eurofound researchers, had been working on the future of surveys, assisted by external contractors and experts.

Various budgetary scenarios were considered, the most optimistic being that of a frozen subsidy for the period of the next multiannual financial framework (MFF 2021-2027). More details on financial scenarios would be available during the brainstorming seminar to be held in March, in Dublin. The group discussed also the challenges and necessary improvements to consider for future surveys, independently of the budget situation.

3.2 **The Chair** noted that the budget scenarios for Title 3 (Operations) in the document were rather alarming and there would be a need for thorough discussion with a holistic approach.

3.3 **Ms Ahrendt** said that she would outline the context of the report and present the three change case scenarios.

The new founding regulation was quite specific about the surveys, stating that the Agency should continue the surveys in order to secure the continuity of comparative analyses and trends in living and working conditions and labour market developments in the Union.

The report outlined that 38 Eurofound research publications were being published during the current programming period on the basis of the three surveys and that since 2013, the surveys had been cited in over 700 EU policy documents with 31% of those key EU policy documents. In 2017 the surveys were cited in 246 academic articles and books.

Because the current approach to surveys was unsustainable in the medium to long term, the survey management and development activity had been asked to develop a long-term perspective for the surveys beyond 2020. Prior to 2017 a survey methodology working group had already written several papers in which future scenarios were presented, and these were followed up on also in the paper.

The work was the culmination of a year of intensive work with an external contractor, and an intensive meeting with five renowned survey experts, as well as a limited mapping exercise which revealed how in many areas the surveys provide unique information.

The survey experts had a strong message that Eurofound had to innovate if it wanted to stay abreast of a fast-changing survey landscape and yet this was within the context of what would likely be a diminishing budget. The experts also cautioned against making changes all at once, and suggested testing any changes in the meantime. The slides outlined the frequency and share of the budget taken up by the surveys in the current scenario, which painted a grim picture of the percentage that would be taken up by the surveys in 2030.

As it was clear that Eurofound must continue to collect high quality data, moving to a cheaper scenario had not been considered. There were other issues besides budget that had an impact on the surveys, such as falling response rates (put simply, people were no longer at home), a risk that in some countries data collection agencies did not want to do face-to-face interviews, difficulties in accessing registers and administrative data, the limited number of tenderers in the field, and rapid technological changes.

On the basis of these considerations the Group had developed three potential change scenarios: To make the surveys future proof and financially feasible (scenario A); to combine the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) and the European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS), (scenario B) or to change the way the surveys are managed

and organised (scenario C).

- Scenario A focused on keeping the three surveys as individual surveys and working on each of them to make them financially sustainable and future proof. It provided for five surveys between 2021 and 2030. This implied a frequency of every six years for the surveys, so that there would always be a gap for preparation and implementation of the survey. This already achieved some savings with a figure of 17.5 million rather than 21 million over the period. This proposal was based on the scenario that the joint survey with Cedefop would continue.

The ultimate aim was to make each survey futureproof and financially sustainable and meant embarking on a well-planned testing programme for the three surveys, examining the viability of the different data collection modes (moving towards web-based mode) and the implications of mode effects for comparability particularly in the case of trend questions. In fact the current 4th European Company Survey (ECS) could be considered a large scale mode effect test of telephone vs. web interviewing, as both modes were being utilised.

If this option were selected, the next steps would be to develop a timeline for the 2021-2024 for piloting and developing, looking at the implications of moving online, looking at response and non-response. It would be necessary to look at testing the mode effects and at what it would mean to merge survey data with administrative data.

This option required piloting and she noted that there were plenty of opportunities even if carrying out face-to-face interviews to pilot ‘follow-up web’ surveys in some more digital countries, with the long-term goal ultimately of moving to a mixed mode and eventually online.

- Scenario B was to combine the EWCS and the EQLS, again with the same aims of moving to mixed mode. This option would be an individual survey covering working conditions and quality of life in a single household survey, with all types of households being selected into the sample. Given the importance of the EWCS, the balance or distribution of the sample would not have to be 50/50 and could give priority to workers.

There would be a lot of advantages to having a working and living in Europe survey. Firstly, there would be just one survey instrument instead of two, which not only meant a more efficient use of resources but reduced the burden of the fieldwork, and more significantly it would mean being able to link important policy issues, which was the real advantage of this option.

There was an opportunity to rebrand the EWCS and EQLS into a single survey that better reflected the mandate to analyse trends in living and working conditions. It would be possible to look at issues like gender, to consider work life balance with data on the position of different people, such as workers, non-workers, carers etc. living all together in one household.

The benefit of this approach would be to have four surveys between 2021 and 2030, with a time lapse between surveys of five rather than six years. Another advantage was that it would allow the costs to be spread over a three-year period in terms of budget.

She recapped that in the current arrangements there would be six surveys between 2020 and 2029. Retaining the separate surveys and focusing on improving and future-proofing them would mean five surveys in that period. With a combined EWCS and EQLS, and the ECS there would be four surveys. Scenarios A and B provided a similar saving of EUR 2.5 million already.

- Scenario C was an overarching one that related to the way the surveys were

managed or organised, regardless of whether there were any mergers. It examined the possibilities for collaboration with other EU Agencies not only on the ECS but also on the other surveys, which were used extensively by other agencies.

One risk that had been identified was the dependency on the relatively small number of tenderers. It might be considered to coordinate the preparation and implementation of the surveys in-house. Through their involvement in the EU ANSA network the Surveys Management and Development staff had seen how some agencies used national focal points, where some of the surveys could be carried out. The European Social Survey was managed in that way with a small central coordination team and the fieldwork managed in each country by different agencies, often through a focal point with links to a Government Department which allowed easier access to the national statistical institutes. It would also make it easier to have top-ups.

- Some questions that needed to be considered were the potential to collaborate with other agencies. The link between Eurofound and Cedefop for example, was clearer than that between the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) and Eurofound. It was not at a point where one could say that it was really possible to construct a survey together. It was necessary to explore possibilities for collaboration.
- Another point to be considered was how Eurofound could raise more interest from national governments in order to improve the access to Administrative data and Sampling registers.

In summary, the scenarios she presented, provided a path to a long-term approach. They did bring some savings but were not providing immediate cost savings.

If the budgetary situation was such that it was necessary to consider more dramatic solutions, it might be considered to carry out the surveys less frequently than currently or to consider cancelling a round, for example to skip the 5th EQLS in 2022. Or instead of cancelling it, to consider fielding a smaller online public services survey in a limited number of more digitally advanced countries.

One possibility was to reduce the sample size of the ECS such that it would allow analyses at EU level, but no longer at country level.

The Survey Management Development Group would incorporate feedback from the Bureau into discussions for the next multiannual programme, and they would develop the selected scenarios further once decisions had been taken, looking more carefully at budgetary implications, preparing plans for feasibility tests, carrying out initial methodological testing with a view to developing a concrete plan for surveys over the next four years.

- 3.4 **The Chair** thanked Ms Ahrendt for her very clear presentation and noted that the topic was an important one for any research institution these days, especially concerning the sustainability issues.

It was necessary to discuss the matter in the context of all the priorities not only in the context of the budget.

She opened the floor for comments.

- 3.5 **Mr Ciechański (Governments)** said that he would question some of the assumptions in relation to the availability of funds in Title 3. These were rather severe against the increasing costs in Title 1 for staff of the agency.

- 3.6 **The Director** noted that scenarios were based on the Commission's proposal for a frozen subsidy and this could be worse considering the Council's request for a reduction. Coupled with the uncertainty over Brexit, it was not unlikely that a reduction of 5-10% in the operational budget could be anticipated. In relation to staff

costs, it was necessary to allow for the annual salary increase and for promotions and the scenario assumed the same number of staff. The number of senior posts in the agency was due to the fact that it was a long-established agency, with staff of longer careers, but it was not clear that Eurofound had a higher number of staff in high grades than other EU bodies and Institutions.

3.7 **Mr Grimmeisen** said that as the costs increased in Title 1 and 2 over the years, in a frozen subsidy situation, Title 3 became proportionally less of the overall budget, hence the projections in the document. He added that the Establishment Plan was not a one-to-one reflection of the current staffing situation but had to allow for upward mobility, for the promotion of staff.

3.8 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that whilst she welcomed the paper and the opportunity to discuss the future of surveys, she had some doubts about whether it was reasonable to base discussions on the assumption of an operational budget that was just 14% of the overall budget. The fact that the assumption was rather unrealistic might lead to it being questioned one day as a basis for the reflections. Savings in Title 1 might then have to be faced.

3.9 **Mr Gran (Workers)** said that forecasts so far in advance were always rather speculative. Addressing the Director, he said that the best-case scenario was not the European Commission's proposal, but that of the European Parliament and it would be nice to consider a scenario that supported the European Parliament's position on the budget.

The Workers' did not consider that merging the EWCS and EQLS was a possibility in light of the possible impact on the quality of the EWCS data.

3.10 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** thanked Eurofound for presenting best and worst-case scenarios.

In relation to the scenario of merging the EWCS and EQLS, the paper, but not the presentation, mentioned the obvious limitations in how many questions could be asked. Combining the surveys would mean that only half or two thirds of the questions on working conditions could be asked. She would like some more information on the possibilities, as this appeared to be the biggest single drawback of this scenario.

3.11 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** thanked Eurofound for the excellent paper and presentation. She would limit her comments to some principles at this stage, as the exercise was a kind of brainstorming to develop ideas on how to reform or innovate in the surveys. The Group were open to discussing all the suggestions but they shared the view of the importance of the surveys and the need to preserve them in the best way in terms of quality and timeliness.

They would be willing to consider mergers of surveys, as it was clear that there might also be some benefits to this approach. However there would be more time for discussion during the brainstorming seminar in March.

The Group were not pleased with the priorities in the paper on the Programming Document. The Group would like to see more on the activation measures and skills for a competitive Europe.

In response to comments by the Governments' Group regarding savings in Title 1, the issue being discussed concerned the future proofing of the surveys and the considerations were not only budgetary.

3.12 **Ms Smith (Employers)** was reminded of the EU-OSHA network of national focal points, but she did not know if the network was used for its survey. She wondered if the proposal to utilise national correspondents in the surveys, whilst providing benefits

in having access to administrative data, was also risky in terms of inconsistencies between the various national centres.

- 3.13 **Mr Ciechański (Governments)** agreed with comments by the Commission that discussions on a dramatic reduction in the research budget were not realistic.

The Group considered that the surveys were the hallmark of the agency and that it was essential that their quality be retained. He felt that it seemed that each scenario did not stand on its own, but could borrow elements from the others, and he looked forward to more discussions around that.

- 3.14 **Mr Voigtländer (Governments)** emphasised that it was early days and that discussions in the Group still had to start. He added that in considering changes it was important to ensure comparability of the survey over time. The proposal that survey management would be done in-house was rather vague and he wondered if it would be possible to have more specifics about that. What would this option mean for the agency. To what extent would it be realistic? Would it be feasible financially?

- 3.15 **The Chair** would also welcome information about how the preparation and implementation of the surveys could be done in-house. If it would be necessary to bring the expertise relating to preparation and implementation in-house, there would be implications for Title 1 (staff recruitments).

- 3.16 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** remarked that all three surveys were important to the Commission, but she agreed there was an evident need to modernise the surveys with the caveat that the timeliness and quality should not be impacted. The Commission would be open to all options (including merger of surveys). Notably the Working Conditions should come out sufficiently strong from this exercise. Linking information between working life and quality of living conditions in the EWCS/EQLS merger would be really positive.

In relation to the scenario to bring development and implementation of surveys in-house, she too felt it to be an unrealistic combination with limited budget and more staff resources required. However, more in-house work (i.e. not survey development and implementation) could be considered.

She echoed comments about the relevance of the list of priorities in the paper on the Programming Document.

- 3.17 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** wondered if a shift to online surveys or mixed forms of survey administration would alleviate the problem of not having enough tenderers and whether this could create big savings.

- 3.18 **The Chair** said that based on her own experience, it was the case that research bodies were piloting web-based surveys and were finding that it did not always work and that face-to-face interviews were still the gold standard.

- 3.19 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** said that this was why it would be interesting and therefore important to conduct some pilot first, as was proposed.

- 3.20 **Ms Ahrendt** thanked the members for their comments.

She understood the concerns of the Workers' Group regarding the primary position of the EWCS but assured that in the merger scenario the aim would be to retain or to continue to give it the dominant position. It would be important to consider which questions were the most relevant and this was something that could be discussed in March. It would be an opportunity to link a lot of the issues that were related to the world of work, that also affected social policy especially looking at the temporary types of contracts. It might make the EWCS/EQLS merger survey a stronger

instrument.

She appreciated the comment of the Workers' that taking the survey online might assist with the dependence on a limited number of tenderers. These were very early ideas, taken from comparative surveys like the European social survey where it was done that way. It solved some problems but created others, for example the implications for Title 1 (staff).

There was a need to consider comparability, and this was why a pilot was very important in order to understand what these different methods would mean for the results. She was aware that even a number of large organisations had not been able to adopt the online mode and said that it required a lot of testing, as the testing is Eurofound specific, the agency too should begin testing.

The proposal to bring survey management in-house had not been developed as a fully-fledged option, but it was intended to bring suggestions to the table. It could be seen from the ECS that it was extremely labour intensive, with requirements for a large network of staff working on it, although the expertise was certainly present in-house.

In presenting rather drastic figures for budget projections, it was the intention to underline how action was required now, in order to make the surveys 'futureproof'. The options presented would keep the surveys feasible for Eurofound.

- 3.21 **Mr Storrie** added that face-to-face interviews were becoming unviable (already in some of the more advanced 'digital states' the response rate was problematic).

The good news was that in the long term, a full online survey methodology with a sampling frame with email addresses, telephone numbers and the online contact mode would definitely reduce costs and retain the quality of the survey. The problem was the issue of the transition phase to the newer methods, with the uncertainties that posed for quality, for example in terms of the EU-wide comparability of the surveys (it would be very dangerous to do one mode in one country, and another mode in another).

Changing modes would also have implications for the time consistency of the dataset. He noted that a number of academics really welcomed the comparability of the EWCS data back to 1990. For policymakers, one could imagine this was also very interesting, but Eurofound would have to decide if it was entirely necessary in a longer-term perspective.

The multi-mode approach would also present issues. It was he thought, an opportunity to take radical decisions, as there would be so many issues that would be impacted by developments in the surveys, such as the backward consistency of data sets, the cross-sectional aspects of the data. If it were decided to move to a household survey combining the EWCS and the EQLS, then it might be considered that it was perhaps the best time to do so, as there were so many areas that were risky.

- 3.22 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said that her concerns were around the impact of a combined survey on the already difficult discussions with each wave of the survey, on what kinds of questions would be retained in the questionnaire and which would be adapted/added in order to pick up on the issues that had arisen in the previous six or seven years. Her concerns were around the impact of the limited number of questions on the consistency of the survey. What were the trade-offs, she asked.

- 3.23 **The Director** responded to the comments, noting that he agreed that the surveys were a key element and contribution of Eurofound.

The purpose of the forecasting exercise was to be prepared for the implications of a declining budget in Eurofound and to define a strategy for the future. Eurofound needed to be able to fulfil the research agenda developed by the Board. And tools such as the surveys were considered important. But tools would follow priorities and topics.

One could not have it all! This input of the Board members on the future strategy was the basis of the brainstorming meeting on the next multiannual Programming Document, that would be held at Eurofound's offices in Dublin, in March 2019.

The scenario of combining the two surveys had already been suggested in 2010. However, this time, researchers were saying that it would allow the survey to look at issues like poverty much better, or work-life balance, which it was not possible to do currently. It would be interesting to consider the idea of becoming a centre of expertise on surveys, sharing services with other agencies (including a related reshuffle of financial and staff resources), but this would depend on others, not just on Eurofound.

He would be happy to listen to views and to support the option of a merger, provided that key EWCS information was kept, e.g. indices on job quality could be continued, as they were used by the OECD now, and promoted in the work with the ILO. Was it necessary however to retain all the questions in order to support the job quality indices? He noted that it was already the case that questions in the EWCS questionnaire were changed in each edition of the survey.

He would prefer a strong indication on whether or not there was any preference for such a combined survey, before he would commit the staff to developing the scenario. It was important to note that the combined survey would not be cheaper and would in fact be 1.5 or 1.3 times the cost of the EWCS alone, as it would require a larger sample in order to preserve the sample of workers.

There was the opportunity to test this combination in the 2022 EQLS slot, and if it was found not to be working, to then revert to the normal EWCS cycle in 2024.

For the general discussion in March, a questionnaire would be sent to the Bureau members, to survey the priorities of the Groups in the period of the next Programming Document, and to form the basis of the discussions at the brainstorming and Bureau meetings in March.

- 3.24 **The Chair said** that discussions confirmed that all were concerned that the surveys should be future-proofed, and that changes were required, whilst the three topics (addressed by the current surveys) should be retained.

The budgetary challenges were highly relevant and should form a background to any discussions in the brainstorming seminar in March. She expressed her appreciation for the good preparation by Eurofound of the discussion on the future of the surveys.

4. Programming Document 2020 (B 271/4)

- 4.1 **The Director** introduced draft 4 of the programme. After a written procedure the final text would be sent to the Commission by 31 January and adopted by the Board after that. A number of areas in the document were yet to be finalised, such as updating the sections on the European Labour Authority (ELA) and the new Founding Regulation (in relation to Communication).

Many comments on an earlier draft in relation to the multiannual part of the programme had not been taken into account, as this part should remain basically as it was.

The outstanding issues to be discussed were the projects on mobility and on labour shortages and the text received from the steering committee for the European Company Survey (ECS) which should be inserted in the programming document of both agencies. There would also be updates to the figures for financial and human resources.

- 4.2 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** made the following comments on behalf of the Workers' group.

2.1 Social dialogue – comments in the document stated that the impact of new forms of work on social dialogue and collective bargaining was included in other research activities and was therefore not included here as requested by the Workers. However, she could not find reference to it in other areas of the document. The Group asked Eurofound to find a way of making it explicit in the ‘Digital age’ research activity.

Line 644 – the term ‘user-generated’ data should be clarified in the section on analysing European data sets.

4.3 **The Director** replied that it was felt that the impact of new forms of work was implicit throughout the document. However, some text would be inserted.

4.4 The Bureau discussed the mobility project.

- **The Chair** noted that there had been general agreement in the Bureau in November 2018 that the scope of the project needed to be broader. The Governments’ Group was also of the view that mobility should be a strategic priority for Eurofound in the future.
- **The Commission** said that they had already done a lot of work in the area, and that it was important to avoid overlaps or duplication. They would not object if it was decided to delete the project and said that the financial resources could be allocated to ad hoc projects.
- **The Employers** felt that there was a confusion in the description of the project between cross-border mobility and frontier workers. The text on outputs of the project was very clear. The Group suggested deleting the confusing text and using the text on outputs as a starting point for reformulating the project.
- **The Workers** said that they had introduced the idea of looking at seasonal and weekly workers in order to make the research relevant. If there was no agreement on what to do in this research then it should be deleted and the money made available for ad hoc research.
- **The Director** said that there had already been too much discussion on what was quite a small project. He suggested to come to a decision on the following day.

4.5 There was a discussion also on the text in the document on the European Labour Authority, with concerns expressed by the Social Partners that the tasks of the authority were still the subject of sensitive negotiation and that it was too soon to include rather specific text on ELA in the document.

The Director said that the text was taken from the proposal of the European Commission. It was clear that this was a draft text, in an internal document. The text would be revisited once the ELA regulation was in place.

4.6 The meeting concluded with discussions on the work programme to be resumed the following day.

Day 2 Friday, 18 January 2019

5. Programming Document 2020 (B 271/4) *continued*

5.1 **The Chairperson** opened the meeting. The Bureau should come to an agreement on the remaining outstanding issues in the document, the text on the European Labour Authority, the project on mobility and the project on labour shortages.

The proposals were to remove the text on the ELA and to delete the project on cross-border labour mobility with the possibility to propose an ad hoc research project in the mobility area in 2020.

5.2 **The Director** clarified that it was proposed to delete the project on ‘employment and working conditions of cross-border workers’ and transfer the funds to the ad hoc research capacity, and to retain the project on ‘labour shortages’, taking into account

some specifications proposed by the European Commission. Conclusions were that it would be good in the future to have a broader project on mobility at a certain point, which would be careful to take into account any existing research in the area by the European Commission.

Text on the ELA would be reviewed and where it referred to factors that had not yet been decided, a placeholder indicating that the text would be added later would be inserted.

5.3 **The Groups agreed to the compromise proposal and approved that the Programming Document 2020 be submitted to the Governing Board for approval by a written procedure.**

6. Progress Report of the Director (B 271/5)

6.1 **The Director** updated the members on projects, publications and events since the Board meeting in November 2018.

- There were a large number of publications (14 reports, 4 policy briefs and over 30 articles) as was usual in light of the research cycle which tended to concentrate publication at the end of the year, or at the start of one.
- He highlighted the report on reconciling work and life in the EU which was based on data of the EWCS and the EQLS.
- Six Representativeness Studies had been published (Steel, Metal, Commerce, Inland Water Transport, Horeca, Contract catering)
- The pilot project Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME) would conclude this year, with a final event on 11 April 2019 in Brussels.
- *Wage and Task profiles of employment in Europe in 2030* was the chapter provided to Cedefop's skills forecast. Eurofound would also publish it separately. Rather than being planned the idea had emerged during discussions and exchanges with colleagues and had proved to be a very worthwhile collaboration.
- In the new programming activity *Convergence*, there was now a repository on the website with a number of indicators, and short papers on convergence in the socioeconomic area and in employment.
- He outlined recent events including the webinars which were a new venture for Eurofound that offered much in terms of allowing people to follow events either live or at a time that was convenient to them and presented savings in terms of costs and costs to the environment.
- EQLS research had been presented at the Citizen's Dialogue Event organised with the European Commission, on 13 December in Dublin. The research manager responsible for the survey was pictured alongside the Vice-President of the European Parliament, Ms McGuinness.
- He highlighted upcoming events including the informal EPSCO meeting of the Romanian Presidency, where Eurofound would present its research on gender from the surveys and other reports.
- Future webinars in 2019 would include the topics *ICT mobile workers* (March) and automation (September).
- The Annual meeting of Eurofound's network of correspondents would take place on 4-5 April in Dublin.
- Eurofound would contribute to the event celebrating the centenary of the ILO on 25 April in Vilnius.
- He presented the performance data for the 2018 period, which were in line with planning. The number of reports downloaded from the website was slightly reduced, he noted.
- Programme delivery had been a challenge. Whilst performance targets had been

met, it had been a challenge to achieve 83% with any delays to the research leading to bottlenecks in the associated processes, such as editing.

- The response rate to the user satisfaction survey was at 36% and demonstrated quite positive results in terms of overall satisfaction. Preferences were also indicated for small-scale meetings and webinars, which was reassuring. The results would be integrated in the key performance indicators.
- Preparations were ongoing for the next wave of the EWCS and he informed the members that the cognitive testing interviews to determine whether the questionnaire was understandable scheduled to take place in the UK, had been moved to Ireland in light of Brexit, with associated additional costs.
- The ad hoc research *Improving monitoring of posted workers in the EU* was being finalised following some exchanges with the European Commission. It was not clear whether it would be published as a Policy paper, a report or a Working paper, following evaluation by the Advisory Committee.
- Following the expert workshop on 24-25 October 2018, the background paper on *Exploring the scope for capacity-building for effective social dialogue* had been updated. Two exchange seminars were also planned for 2019.
- In the *Industrial Action Monitor*, a paper on feasible scenarios was under preparation with the first three batches of data obtained from monitoring of media/social media. The database for the pilot phase had been set up and web-scraping applications tested. The results would be evaluated at the Advisory Committee.
- The upcoming *European Restructuring Monitor* report would include an analysis of EWCS data, looking at working conditions after restructuring.
- The decision had been taken not to conduct the *European Company Survey (ECS)* 2019 in the Candidate Countries. Sampling plans had been adjusted for some of the other countries, the questionnaires and scripts had been updated, based on the results of the pilot. The field work was planned to start in late January 2019. He added that the cooperation with Cedefop was going well. It was time consuming, but a good example of cooperation between the agencies.
- Further analysis of the data from the *European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS)* continued with the report on *Access and quality of public services* due in Spring 2019.
- A first draft was being prepared of the consolidated report of the ad hoc study on *Out-of-school care services* that had been requested by the European Commission (DG Justice).
- He noted that a Flagship Report (with six main content chapters) was being prepared in the programming area Quality of Life and Public services. He reminded the Bureau that Eurofound undertook to produce at least one of these reports compiling all the research in a strategic area over the four-year programming period.
- The report *Upward Convergence in the EU: Concepts measurements and indicators* had been published in December 2018. It was a statistical rather than a policy report, but it was very relevant in what was a new area in the work programme.
- As noted earlier the external FOME project would conclude with a final event in April. Eurofound had been contacted recently in relation to two other potential external projects. One on Artificial Intelligence and work had not been approved. The other on inequalities had been assigned to the Joint Research Centre. Although there were some parties who would be interested in Eurofound continuing to be involved, it was unlikely.
- He outlined that budget utilisation had been high and that a sum of EUR 171,000

would be returned to the EU budget. This would have no impact on the budget for 2020. The rate of budgetary transfers had been slightly higher, due to the inexplicable drop in the country coefficient for Ireland which meant that funds were transferred from Title 1 to Title 3.

- He updated the members on staff matters including an Article 90(2) complaint in relation to appraisal. As previously informed the Article 24 request was now closed.
- He presented a summary of the ad hoc information requests in 2018. Due to technical budgetary reasons there were delays in processing the request of the Dutch government on ‘Enforcing the statutory enforcing of the minimum wage in the international road transport in selected countries’.
- He outlined the recent and upcoming written procedures, that included implementing rules to the staff regulations.

6.2 **Mr Grimmeisen** informed the Bureau members that discussions had taken place with the member representing the Austrian government with regard to the implementing rule on middle management.

Following extended discussions, the member had indicated that he might abstain from approving the written procedure, but as there had been no further follow up, no abstention had been recorded.

The Director explained that in practice there was no scope to amend these implementing rules, which were analogous to the rules of the Commission, or were applied on the basis of so-called ‘Model Rules’ designed in liaison with the agencies and tailored to their requirements.

6.4 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** asked whether when targets were missed, for example in relation to deadlines for publications, they were carried over to the indicators for the following year.

She had been impressed by the webinar on the *Future of Work* and thought that this format was something that the Commission might also consider.

With the FOME project coming to an end, she wondered if it were possible to somehow keep the European Reshoring Monitor alive, perhaps to incorporate it into the ERM.

When would the in-house report on the middle classes in Europe be available, and would it be possible to have an early preview of it she wondered.

She asked to check whether the title ‘Out of school care’ should not be changed to ‘After school care’.

6.5 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** said that in Italy there had been measures to encourage companies to reshore. It would be interesting to continue to monitor that.

6.6 **Mr Storrie** on the invitation of the Director, responded to the questions. He said that data collection for the reshoring monitor had come to an end in 2018. The monitor was based on the methodology of the ERM and represented a significant amount of work. If there was an interest to boost the resources for the ERM in order to retain the monitor he was sure that Eurofound would be interested.

As the final report was being drafted, it could be said that the number of companies moving back to Europe that were previously offshore was not as many as previously hoped. The employment impacts were not significant.

The reasons companies were moving back, though maybe partly due to cost differentials narrowing, were largely related to quality and security of supply in the supply chain and so on.

By the end of the first quarter a first draft of the report on the middle classes would be available. It was very data based, and looked at income shifts among middle classes, but combined with a more detailed analysis of the data in the EQLS would provide information relevant to the interest expressed by the Commission in terms of trust in society, institutions etc.

6.7 **The Chairperson** said that it would be good to have an idea of what additional resource would be required to retain the European Reshoring Monitor.

6.8 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** said that it would be interesting to look at what the limitations were on reshoring companies, noting that in Italy it was because the incentives were often time limited.

6.9 **The Chairperson** thanked the Director for his report and discussions were closed on this point.

- **Eurofound should follow up on the additional resource requirements in order to retain the European Reshoring Monitor.**
- **The Director should inform the members when the report on the middle classes was available.**

7. Update by the Commission on the new Founding Regulation (B 271/7)

7.1 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** presented this update.

- The new regulation was adopted on 21 December 2018 as part of a joint exercise by the European Commission in relation to the three tripartite agencies (Eurofound, Cedefop and EU-OSHA), to align them to the Common Approach adopted by the EU Institutions in July 2012, which sought to set out what an EU agency should look like. The aim was to ensure that Eurofound was fit for current and future challenges.
- The main deviation from the Common Approach was the continuation of the tripartite structure, which was stated in the recitals as being ‘extremely important for the purpose of finding joint and sustainable social and economic solutions’.
- Additionally, the retention of the Deputy Director post in Eurofound, albeit with some changes in the selection and appointment procedures, was also an exception.
- He summarised the main changes in the regulation: enlarged and revised objectives; a clearer task description; adaptation of the terminology used to the Common Approach, increased cooperation obligations with other agencies and in the international field; slight changes in the role and composition of the governing bodies, and a modified procedure for the appointment of the Director and Deputy Director. It would be necessary to see how the new tasks would impact on the activities of the Agency.
- The terminology for the governing bodies had changed with the introduction of a Management Board, an Executive Board and an Executive Director. The Management Board had been enlarged with one independent expert appointed by the European Parliament (without voting rights).
- The Management Board would have the power of appointing authority for staff and for concluding contracts.
- Specific rules for voting would mean that two thirds of members should approve the Programming Document for example. The term of the Chairperson and Deputy Chairpersons would be one year, renewable indefinitely.
- The Executive Board was reduced from eleven to eight members.
- Group coordinators were asked to use best efforts to inform members.
- The Executive Director would in future be appointed by the Management Board from a list of candidates proposed by the European Commission. They should

make a statement before the European Parliament.

- The Deputy Director would be selected and appointed by the Executive Director.
- Other technical changes included the strengthening of the equality principle, the formalisation of the Advisory Committees, explicit reference to the Brussels Liaison Office, mandatory use of the Translation Service in Luxembourg, and the fact that in the case of new studies the EU Institutions should take account of Eurofound's expertise and studies.
- The transitional arrangements were that the Governing Board would continue until the Management Board was established (the procedure for appointing the new Board had already been started by the Secretariat General of the Council) and Article 6 stipulated that the internal rules would continue to apply. The rights of staff were not affected. There was a new discharge procedure also for the budget approved under the current regulation.
- There were no transitional arrangements for the Bureau, from the day of the entry into force of the new regulation it would no longer exist, so some arrangements were necessary to get the Executive Board up and running.
- The regulation would come into force on 20 February 2019. The main issues to prepare were the delegation of appointing authority powers to the Executive Director, the re-appointment of members of the governing bodies (Management Board, Executive Board, Group Coordinators, Chairpersons and Deputies), formal establishment of Advisory Committees and new rules of procedure for the Management and Executive Boards.
- The European Commission had prepared decisions for the three agencies. He encouraged the members to accelerate the nomination process for the new Board.

7.2 **The Chairperson** thanked the Commission for this clear presentation. It would be important she said, to be informed as soon as possible of the timeline for the process of renewal of the members.

7.3 **Ms Smith (Employers)** asked whether the nomination procedures for the three tripartite agencies were as before. It was confirmed that they were.

7.4 **The Director** said that the members had been provided with an internal note on the changes that would be immediately necessary once the regulation came into force.

Also presented was a draft decision regarding the delegation of appointing authority powers by the Management Board to the Executive Director in accordance with Article 5(2) of the new Founding Regulation.

- Of primary importance was the decision regarding the delegation, as without such delegation, the whole Board for example should approve the leave of staff members and conduct annual appraisals.
- It was proposed to set up a standing committee of the Management Board that would deal with HR-related matters (matters in relation to the Accounting Officer or the response to complaints according to Article 90(2) of the Staff Regulations) as set out in Articles 2(3) and 2(4) of the draft decision of the Management Board on delegation of the appointing authority etc.
- The committee should be established shortly after the entry into force of the new regulation and it was proposed to be chaired by the Commission. This was important procedurally as it was not practical that this role would be fulfilled by the full Management Board. This was provided for in Article 2(4) of the draft decision.
- The Bureau should also consider whether to hold a constituting meeting of the Management Board on 27-28 June 2019, on the date already reserved for the Group meetings.

- As the Founding Regulation made no transitional provisions for the Bureau, it might be considered that the Executive Board was to be composed of the current Chair, Deputy Chairs and Coordinators

7.5 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** said that the delegation decision was urgent, and the Bureau should also consider what other decisions might be required, that could be submitted to the Governing Board (acting in the capacity of the Management Board) for adoption by a written procedure.

They might consider whether the Board should be asked to formally appoint the existing Advisory Committees and to adopt a decision regarding the Executive Board, which although provided for in the Founding Regulation would not have rules of procedure.

Decision on delegation of appointing authority powers to the Executive Director

7.6 **The Chairperson** said that it was necessary to consider what were the ‘exceptional circumstances’ under which the Management Board would suspend the delegation of appointing authority powers to the Executive Director as provided for in Article 4(1) of the draft decision.

She also wished to discuss the arrangements for the proposed standing committee, which was an appeals committee dealing with often complex HR issues.

She thought that the establishment of such a committee carried risks. It was the case that members of the Management Board were not HR specialists, or legal specialists in the staff regulations. They were not employed by Eurofound which also raised a concern about their role in legal matters.

7.7 **The Director** said that Eurofound used the Commission’s legal services for processing its Article 90 appeals and complaints and it was therefore the case that expert legal advice would be available to the standing committee.

According to the regulation, de facto responsibility for Article 90(2) procedures lay with the Management Board only in cases when the contested decision had been taken at the level of Executive Director.

The appointment of a standing committee was a practical concern as it would be difficult to see how the entire Board could exercise this role. It was proposed that a small committee would be established, and it was the hope that it would be chaired by the Commission who were more familiar with the staff regulations.

If there were concerns about the capacity of the members to fully understand the legal issues behind the matters, beyond the legal assistance to the committee it would be possible to provide training.

7.8 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** said that the Commission had advised all the tripartite agencies to set up such standing committees. It was the case that the number of appeals was quite rare.

There was no personal liability for the standing committee members. When cases progressed to the European Court of Justice where these issues were decided, it was the individual against the Agency not the appeal body. In the Commission, these appeals were overseen by Directors who were not usually legal experts. The role of the committee was to review the files and to apply the rules.

7.9 There followed an extended discussion of the proposed delegation decision, the conclusions of which were the following.

- The Bureau asked that the following amendments (in bold) be made to the text to be submitted for the inter-service consultation.
 1. Regarding the role of the Management Board in relation to Article 90(2)

- Article 2(4): ‘The powers referred to in paragraph 1 concerning Article 90(2) of the Staff Regulations are exercised by the Management Board *with the requisite expert legal and administrative support provided by the Agency* when the contested decision was taken at the level of the Executive Director.’
2. In relation to clarification of the exceptional conditions under which the powers would be suspended they proposed some text to be inserted.
 - Article 4(1): ‘Where exceptional circumstances so require *including but not limited to cases when the European Court of Auditors or the Internal Audit Services of the EC have established serious irregularities in HR management*, the Management Board may, by way of a decision, suspend temporarily the delegation of appointing authority powers to the Executive Director and those sub-delegated by the latter and delegate them, for a limited period of time, to one of the representatives of the Commission whom it nominates or to a staff member other than the Executive Director. The delegate shall report to the Management Board on the exercise of such a delegation.
 3. The Bureau additionally requested the insertion of a **reference to a ‘conflict of interest’ in Article 2(4)**
 - The Commission agreed to see if the text could be submitted for the Inter-service Consultation. They would report back to the Bureau as soon as possible.
 - The Bureau were requested to send their nominations for the Standing Committee which should have one member from each group. The Bureau suggested that Eurofound should find out how colleagues in EU-OSHA and Cedefop were dealing with the issue.
 - Along with the delegation decision, it was decided that the transitional measures would include decisions confirming the current Bureau as the ad interim Executive Board, the current Advisory Committees and the Accounting Officers.
 8. The Internal Control Work plan (B 271/7) was presented for information only and was not discussed.
 9. The Interim Evaluation plan (B 271/8) was presented for information only and was not discussed.
 10. It was proposed to defer discussion of the budgeting process (B 271/9) to the next meeting of the Bureau.
 11. **The Chairperson** thanked the Director and his staff for the good preparation of the meeting.
The next meeting of the Bureau would be held in Dublin on **Friday, 8 March 2019**.

_[A. Bulgarelli]

[J. Menéndez-Valdes]

Chairperson

Executive Director

**DRAFT AGENDA
FIRST MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

*CC2, Raymond-Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound, Dublin
Friday, 8 March 2019, 09h30-13h00*

Item	Agenda item	Ref.no	Time	Presented by
1.	Welcome and Draft Agenda, <i>For Adoption</i>	EB 1/1	9.30-9.35	Chair
2.	Draft Minutes of the 271st Bureau meeting of 17 and 18 January 2019, <i>For Adoption</i>	EB 1/2	9.35-9.45	Chair
3.	Progress report of the Executive Director, <i>For Information</i>	EB 1/3	9.45-10.15	Executive Director
4.	Programming Document 2021–2024 (PD): Reflections and summary of PD seminar 7 March 2019, <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 1/4	10.15-11.15	Executive Director
	<i>Break</i>		11.15-11.45	
5.	Action plan for implementing new Founding Regulation, <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 1/5	11.45-12.15	Executive Director
6.	Budgeting Process at Eurofound (topic carried over from January Bureau meeting), <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 1/6	12.15-12.45	Head of Resources
7.	AOB		12.45-13.00	

The meeting will be followed by a lunch in Eurofound's Dining Hall

Date and venue of **next Executive Board meeting**:

Friday, 17 May 2019 at 9h30 Brussels, Conseil Central de l'Economie (Eurofound's Brussels Office)

FINAL MINUTES

1ST MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE MANAGEMENT BOARD

Friday, 8 March 2019 9.30-13.00

Raymond Bodin Conference Centre, CC2/CC3, Eurofound, Dublin

Ms Bulgarelli	Chairperson of the Management Board (Governments)
Ms Rossi	Deputy Chairperson of the Management Board (Employers)
Mr Gran	Deputy Chairperson of the Management Board (Workers)
Ms Kauffmann	Deputy Chairperson of the Management Board (European Commission)
Mr Tagger	Member of the Executive Board (European Commission)
Mr Ciechański	Member of the Management Board (Coordinator, Governments)
Mr Scherrer	Workers (Coordinator)
Ms Hoffmann	Workers (Deputy Coordinator)
Ms Skrebiškienė	Member of the Management Board (Governments)
Mr Essemyr	Member of the Management Board (Workers)
Mr Menéndez-Valdés	Director
Ms Mezger	Deputy Director
Mr Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Management Board
Mr Storrie	Eurofound
Mr Blomsma	Eurofound
Mr Baussand	Eurofound
Mr Matzke	European Commission
Mr Maddocks	Eurofound (only briefly)

1. Welcome and adoption of draft agenda (EB/1)

As it was the first meeting of the newly constituted Executive Board the Chairperson opened with some preliminary administrative points.

It was agreed that although the regulation provided for just eight members of the Executive Board, those members who had previously attended the Bureau as alternates or observers would continue to attend until formal adoption of the rules of procedures at the first meeting of the Management Board (which it had been decided would be held on 28 June 2019).

The previous arrangement whereby Eurofound staff members could attend meetings of the Executive Board was reaffirmed. Mr Storrie and Mr Blomsma would participate on this basis.

A decision would be required as to how many meetings of the Executive and Management Boards would be held each year.

2. Adoption of the minutes of Bureau 18 & 19 January 2019 (EB/2)

2.1 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** wondered if it might be considered to reduce the length of the minutes in future.

She noted some minor edits and asked for small corrections to her intervention at 3.1.10.

2.2 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said that the minutes were longer than usual due to the extended meeting on the surveys and she thought it was of value to have a record of the discussions on the issues that had been raised during the meeting.

2.3 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** said that whilst it was true that shorter minutes would be better it was often the case that the minutes were used as a reference point during evaluations for example, and therefore they had an impact. Eurofound should try to find a suitable balance in the minutes.

2.4 **The Chairperson** concluded that the minutes were adopted with the changes proposed by Ms Kauffmann.

It was important that the minutes accurately reflected the discussions, but efforts might be made to reduce their length.

3. Progress Report of the Executive Director (EB 1/3)

3.1 **The Executive Director** updated the members on events and activities in Eurofound since the previous meeting in January (for further details see the Director's slides).

- There had been important media coverage of Eurofound's energy scenario report *Employment Implications of the Paris Climate Agreement*, with coverage on Belgian television, in the Financial Times. The work had been undertaken in collaboration with the contractors who had worked with Cedefop on its skills forecast. Together with Eurofound staff they had worked on models, and combined these with information in the European Jobs Monitor (EJM) to create these kinds of projects. The scenario would be presented at the Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME) event on 11 April 2019 in Brussels.
- Preparations for the 7th European Working Conditions Survey (7EWCS) were ongoing with the cognitive testing on the questionnaire in progress. The ad hoc research request on posted workers would be evaluated in the Advisory Committee in March.
- The *Industrial Action Monitor* pilot was in progress with a paper on feasible scenarios due shortly. The question of what to do next would be discussed in the Advisory Committee.
- He noted some issues in the ongoing European Company Survey (ECS) that were particular to surveys of this kind in Member States where the sample size was small and basically the list of companies was constantly reducing.
- In response to a request regarding the possible continuation of the European Reshoring Monitor he outlined two different cost options. He thought it should be easy to integrate the reshoring monitor into the European Restructuring Monitor (ERM).
- The ad hoc report on middle classes in Eurofound was a customised report of existing information and was due by the end of March. It promised to be an interesting report and there had been several enquiries about it already from the press and the European Commission.
- Eurofound's report on the impact of digitalisation on social services was relevant to previous discussions in the Board on whether digitalisation should be considered more broadly. The results might be informative for discussions on the options for the next four-year programme.
- Regarding the new topic of convergence, although there were not so many outputs from this area of the work programme yet, there was a good deal of interest in it and there had been a range of exchanges with the European Commission. He noted a request from DG ECOFIN to discuss their own research in the area.
- He updated the Executive Board on administrative matters including budget implementation and staff matters.
- He informed the Executive Board that a case had been lodged against Eurofound at the European Court of Justice in relation to the data breach in 2018, about which the Bureau had been informed at the time.
- In relation to Brexit, any UK contractors had been given formal communication of the possible discontinuation of their contracts. In relation to UK staff in Eurofound, the

European Commission had set out how it wished to proceed in relation to the contracts of its own staff in the Temporary Agent (TA) and Contract Agent (CA) categories which were the most prevalent contract types in the Agencies. It would be good to be aligned closely with this guidance and the policy of the EU Agencies, in consideration of the fact that cases might end up in the European Court of Justice later. The procedure in Eurofound would be that the Executive Director would receive a recommendation from the Head of Unit assessing the particular skills of the staff member and the practicalities of their job in order to determine whether they could be retained in the interests of the service. Following that, the staff member had a right to express an opinion, with the final decision by the Executive Director. He added that the number of staff concerned was small, as some were retiring and a number had applied for Irish nationality.

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

3.3 **Mr Scherrer (Workers)** enquired about the selection procedure for the Deputy Director post and the membership of the Selection Committee and the information was provided.

3.4 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** thanked the Executive Director for his very clear progress report.

He congratulated Eurofound on the framework report on the Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME) and the press attention that the report had received. The Commission looked forward to the FOME event on 11 April which would be attended by the Director General Mr Korte.

The report on the employment implications of the Paris climate agreement was also interesting, as the Commission's own Economic and Social Developments in Europe (ESDE) report included a chapter on sustainability.

In relation to the options presented for retaining the European Reshoring Monitor the Commission would be interested to hear the Executive Board's opinion on the less expensive option of a combination of in-house research and the use of the network of correspondents.

In relation to the projects on convergence, the progress report mentioned new projects in the area. To what extent would Eurofound use the Council's recommendation on access to Social Protection for workers and the self-employed, in particular the impact assessment published with it, he asked.

In relation to the Director's slide on budget implementation in 2018 he expressed some concerns that the figures in the column expressing the Activity Based Budget as a percentage of the 2018 budget in full were sometimes quite low.

3.5 **Mr Grimmeisen** said that the lower figures could be interpreted positively as they indicated that the programme had been delivered with less cost than originally anticipated. He assured that the figures did not concern budget utilisation, which as the Executive Director had reported stood at 99.5%.

3.6 **The Executive Director** said that Eurofound routinely monitored the Activity Based Budgeting figures and tried to identify any issues with time recording, adding that sometimes there was an underestimation of the time required in the original planning. As stated already this did not impact on the implementation of the budget and the delivery of the reports.

3.7 **The Chairperson** thanked Eurofound for the explanation and said that it was good that the situation was being monitored and that staff were being encouraged to come on board in relation to planning.

3.8 **Mr Ciechański (Governments)** thought the suggestion to incorporate the reshoring monitor within the ERM was a good one.

- 3.9 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said that as the reshoring monitor used the European Restructuring Monitor (ERM) methodology with which the Workers' Group had concerns, they would not support the more expensive option proposed for continuing it.
- 3.10 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** said that the Group supported continuing the reshoring monitor but shared the concerns of the Workers regarding the monitoring methodology and hoped that there would be an opportunity to discuss it for the next programming document.
- 3.11 **The Executive Director** said that Eurofound would investigate the feasibility of integrating the reshoring monitor within the ERM. He understood that in any case the financial implications should be kept at a modest level.
- 3.12 **The Chairperson** said that Eurofound should explore the various options and come back to the Executive Board with information.

She asked the Executive Director to also provide more details on how Eurofound would use the Council's recommendation on access to social protection and the impact assessment published with it, in its future work on convergence. This was considered relevant as in the 7 March seminar, social security had been mentioned as a possible priority in the next multiannual programme.

4. Accounting Officer

Following a short recess, Mr Maddocks the Accounting Officer presented himself to the Executive Board who now had formal responsibilities in relation to the post.

5. Programming Document 2021-2024 and summary of PD Seminar on 7 March (EB 2/4)

- 5.1 **The Executive Director** presented one slide with the priorities that had emerged from the programme development meeting on the previous day.

Discussions had indicated a preference that mobility and migration would not be a high-level Strategic Area of Intervention (SAI) in the programme. However, it was considered that there was the potential for collaboration with the new European Labour Authority (ELA) and the European Commission in this area, and conditional text based on this assumption might be included in the Programming Document.

The members should consider whether the presentation of the overarching SAIs was still relevant.

- 5.2 **The Chairperson** noted requests from all the Groups to look for a more holistic approach to presenting the programme content.

- 5.3 **Mr Gran (Workers)** said that as one of the so-called megatrends, digitalisation had featured quite heavily in discussions on the previous day even though it had been a topic of interest for quite some years now.

Another possibility would be to emphasise the importance of structural changes due to decisions made in the Member States in relation to climate change. This was not a new topic either, but it was felt that it merited a closer investigation regarding the impact on working conditions, on industry, on living and working conditions and the regions.

- 5.4 **Mr Ciechański (Governments)** mentioned the three most important issues for Eurofound to focus on in the next Four-Year Programming Document:

- Impact of digitalisation – the impact not only on the labour market, but on quality of life in general, on work-life balance, the family formation, family relationships etc. should be investigated.
- Industrial relations – not just social dialogue but also how it was going to change, and how the institutions of the labour market were changing.
- Convergence and cohesion – it was necessary to identify those problems that were significant for the European project, such as the progression of living standards and

the impact on the perception and value of the European Union, rather than using a restrictive approach about income disparities.

It was important that the programme should be written in such a way that it was very clear to the reader that Eurofound was focusing on issues that were important for the areas covered by its mandate, namely the quality of life and work.

He said that opinions within the Group diverged on whether migration/mobility should become a key priority theme in the next multiannual Programming Document. However, there was complete agreement that issues in this area should be studied by Eurofound under different headings. Eurofound should not discontinue its work here because the ELA had come into existence. That would be a misunderstanding.

5.5 **Ms Skrebiškienė (Governments)** said that at this stage the Group were discussing priorities at the level of themes, and not at the level of research proposed within the themes, and that further input would be required once the researchers had fleshed out the project descriptions. Care should be taken so that topics were not obscured in the horizontal approach.

5.6 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** said that the new programme should be aligned to Eurofound's mandate in the new Founding Regulation.

The six areas identified in the current programme were still relevant and were a good basis for development.

It was important to highlight the value of Eurofound's most successful outputs (e.g. its surveys). There should be more focus on changes in industrial relations systems and the labour market. It would be a priority to have a good analysis on labour market dynamics, including skills and mobility (it being an opportunity to work on mobility in the wider picture of labour market dynamics) and to consider activation policies for inclusion.

As indicated in the planning seminar, the Group favoured the selection of 'social cohesion' over 'convergence' as a topic.

Mobility/migration related to important issues that should not be addressed as a priority by Eurofound, as other EU bodies were leading here. Possibly Eurofound could cooperate with those bodies, in particular the ELA.

She thought that it was important to have a broader statement in the programme that would capture all the challenges that Europe was currently facing in order to make it the best place to live.

5.7 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** agreed that the Strategic Areas of Investigation (SAIs) and the title of the programme were still relevant. If two more SAIs were added, as had been suggested, she felt that this would be too much considering the budgetary challenges. One possibility might be to combine a number of topics under a single heading of megatrends.

It was not obvious that mobility should be a major topic for Eurofound.

5.8 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** said that it was important to find the correct way to explain why topics like mobility would not be prioritised, namely that it was because they were covered by other organisations.

5.9 **The Executive Director** made the following comments and posed some questions to the members.

Regarding mobility/migration, he explained that the text on cooperation with the European Labour Authority was in line with what was anticipated in the Commission's Staff Working Paper and the recommendations on reinforced cooperation. He therefore preferred to keep the cooperation with the ELA in this area conditional on whether there was a joint interest in pursuing research. At this stage there was no clarity on the issue, but there would be by the time the programme was approved.

When in 2001, the Nice Council had decided to establish a European Monitoring Centre on Change (EMCC) in Eurofound, it had been originally to look at structural changes impacting on the world of work.

It might be considered to revisit the original idea of a monitoring centre on change, looking at the megatrends impacting on the world of work and the labour market, such as digitalisation, climate change, globalisation and demography.

Should the emphasis in all Eurofound's work on Quality of Life and Public services be focused on social cohesion, he asked.

In the previous programme it had been decided that it was necessary to mainstream Social dialogue and Industrial relations throughout the programme, although it was an area of research itself looking for example at the Representativeness Studies. How to deal with this 'double role' (i.e. both vertical and horizontal)?

He asked the members to consider these questions and to provide guidance to Eurofound in relation to them.

- 5.10 **The Chairperson** said that Eurofound should not become trapped in descriptions of negative priorities.

Where possible the document should leave possibilities open, for example in relation to cooperation with the European Labour Authority.

The discussions on the previous day around convergence, were that the topic needed to be much broader and to include areas like social security. And it would be important to understand where social innovation was happening in Europe. This kind of qualitative approach was an area where Eurofound had much to contribute.

She agreed with the Employers that it was important to find a way to present the programme in an attractive way. She would not recommend using the term 'megatrends' which was linked to those trends that had been identified at international level, but instead to speak of key transversal issues that were affecting European development within the fields of Eurofound research.

- 5.11 **Mr Ciechański (Governments)** added that the Governments had expectations that the ELA would cooperate with Eurofound, noting that the ELA founding document provided a legal basis for this. Although the Group could accept that mobility/migration should not be listed as one of Eurofound's key priorities, it underlined that Eurofound should keep it open regarding what it might do in this area.

The convergence/cohesion theme as raised in the seminar was very ambitious and much broader than in current Eurofound research. This was as it should be, he said, looking at standards of living, social security and social innovation.

The Group supported the suggestion by the Workers to address 'changing labour market institutions'. Organising the approach around this (which concerned not only social dialogue, but also precarious work, labour contracts etc.) could be a way out of the presentation dilemma (i.e. horizontal, vertical, or both) for 'social dialogue'.

- 5.12 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** welcomed the Executive Director's proposals about the European Monitoring Centre on Change. It would revitalise what had been a very interesting tool at the beginning. However, this would entail a revision of the methodologies, with a significant investment of resources.

The Employers were absolutely prepared to consider this option, which would make it possible to really put together all the megatrends/drivers that were influencing the core areas of Eurofound.

- 5.13 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** felt there was some potential in developing the programme in this way, taking into account the structural changes towards services and manufacturing. A transversal approach on structural change – in combination with some of the more traditional themes of Eurofound – would really give this programme a new

and strong focus. Digitalisation as such would then no longer have to be a separate transversal theme.

She agreed with formulating conditional text in the multiannual programming document on any mobility research. Colleagues in the European Commission were already working on social innovation, so that should be taken into consideration. There was also a joint project between the Commission and the OECD on social security, so overlaps should be avoided.

The Commission proposed combining the topics of Quality of life and public services and Monitoring convergence in the programme.

- 5.14 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said that it was important that discussions were not prematurely reduced to items on the list. She welcomed the discussion and looked forward to the next draft of the programme.
- 5.15 **The Chairperson** agreed that discussion should continue, and reflections should be on an open basis. She thanked the members for their comments.
6. Action plan for implementing the Founding Regulation (EB 1/5)
- 6.1 **Mr Grimmeisen** updated the members on actions in relation to implementing the new Founding Regulation.
- As indicated in the progress report the Appointing Authority powers were now permanently delegated to the Executive Director. It seemed however that there was a need to provide further clarification in an internal paper about certain provisions in the delegation paper.
 - The Management Board had approved the appointment of the Accounting Officer, the establishment of the Executive Board, and the Advisory Committees in several written procedures.
 - The deadline for sending nominations to the Council for the new Management Board to the Council was 8 March.
 - A written procedure would be launched to deal with the Staff Matters Committee, to decide in the case of appeals by staff members. It was planned to provide training for members of the Committee. Rules of procedure should be developed and he noted that as there were four members of the committee, rules regarding how decisions were taken would be required.
 - The Board should develop rules for delegation to the Executive Director in relation to non-substantial amendments to the annual work programme, in accordance with Article 6.5 of the Founding Regulation. The decision would take account of the Commission's guidance on the definition of 'non-substantial'.
 - It was proposed to have a discussion in the Executive Board meeting in May about the new rules of procedure for the Management Board and the Executive Board and for written procedures of the Board. Attention should be paid to the voting rules, as the regulation specified quotas for various decisions; proxy voting and proxy rules should therefore be considered.
 - There should be a discussion about participation in the Executive Board. The regulation provided for two members per Group, but in the past there had been three members which had been helpful in ensuring representation at each meeting. The regulation also proposed just three meetings per year, and the members needed to consider whether this was sufficient.
 - It would also be necessary to update the internal rules on the anti-fraud strategy, data protection, public access to documents, conflicts of interest. These should be adopted at the Board meeting on 28 June 2019.
- 6.2 **The Chairperson** asked Eurofound to forward the European Commission's definition of non-substantial changes.

She suggested that the Executive Board meeting in May might be held over two days. It was agreed that this would be necessary.

7. The next meeting of the Executive Board would be held on Thursday, 16 (16.30-18.30) and Friday, 17 May 2019 (9.30-13.00) in Brussels.

Chairperson

A. Bulgarelli

Director

J. Menéndez-Valdés

**REVISED DRAFT AGENDA
SECOND MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD**

Conseil Central De l'Économie, Avenue d'Auderghem 20, Brussels
Thursday, 16 May 16h30-18h30 and Friday, 17 May 2019, 09h30-13h00

Item	Agenda item	Ref. no	Time	Presented by
1.	Welcome and Draft Agenda, <i>For Adoption</i>	EB 2/1	16.30-16.35	Chair
2.	Draft Minutes of the 1st Executive Board meeting of 8 March 2019, <i>For Adoption</i>	EB 2/2	16.35-16.45	Chair
3.	Programming Document 2021–2024 (PD): Draft 1, <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 2/3	16.45-18.30	Executive Director

4.	Progress report of the Executive Director, <i>For Information</i>	EB 2/4	9.30-10.30	Executive Director
5.	Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR) 2018 <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 2/5	10.30-11.00	Executive / Deputy Director
	<i>Break</i>		11.00-11.15	
6.	Implementation of new Founding Regulation – state of play, <i>For Information</i>	EB 2/6	11.15-12.30	
6.1	Draft Rules of Procedure for Management Board, Executive Board and for written procedures, <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 2/6.1		Executive Director
6.2	Draft Rules of Procedure for the Committee on Staff Matters, <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 2/6.2		Executive Director
6.3	Draft rules for Advisory Committees, <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 2/6.3		Executive Director
6.4	Draft decision on delegation of power to make non-substantial amendments to the work programme, <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 2/6.4		Executive Director

Item	Agenda item	Ref. no	Time	Presented by
7.	Annual feedback on National Correspondents' contacts with Board members, <i>For Information</i>	EB 2/7	12.30-12.45	Deputy Director
8.	Budgeting Process at Eurofound (topic carried over from March Bureau meeting), <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 2/8	12:40-12:50	Head of Resources
9.	Draft Agenda for 1 st meeting of Management Board, Friday, 28 June 2019 <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 2/9	12.50-13.00	Executive Director
10.	AOB			

On Thursday, the meeting will be followed by a dinner for meeting participants at 19.00 in a local restaurant.

Date and venue of **next Executive Board meeting:**

Friday, 13 September 2019 at 9h30 Brussels, Conseil Central de l'Economie (Eurofound's Brussels Office)

FINAL MINUTES

2ND MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Day 1 – 16.00-18.30, Thursday 16 May 2019

Day 2 – 9.00-13.00 Friday, 17 May 2019

Ms Bulgarelli	Chair of the Management Board (Governments)
Ms Rossi	Deputy Chair of the Management Board (Employers)
Mr Gran	Deputy Chair of the Management Board (Workers)
Ms Kauffmann	Deputy Chair of the Management Board (European Commission)
Mr Tagger	Member of the Executive Board (European Commission)
Mr Ciechański	Member of the Management Board (Coordinator, Governments)
Ms Smith	Employers (Coordinator)
Mr Scherrer	Workers (Coordinator)
Ms Hoffmann	Workers (Deputy Coordinator)
Ms Skrebiskiene	Member of the Management Board (Governments)
Mr Essemyr	Member of the Management Board (Workers)
Ms Roelen	European Commission
Mr Menéndez-Valdés	Executive Director
Ms Mezger	Deputy Director
Mr Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Management Board
Mr Storrie	Eurofound
Mr Blomsma	Eurofound
Mr Baussand	Eurofound

Day 1, Thursday 16 May 2019

1. Draft Agenda (EB 2/1)

The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting, noting that Mr Ciechański and Mr Scherrer were delayed trying to reach Brussels.

2. Adoption of Draft minutes of Executive Board meeting of 8 March (EB 2/2)

Draft minutes of Executive Board meeting of 8 March were adopted without amendment.

3. First Draft Programming Document 2021-2024 (EB 2/3)

- 3.1 The **Executive Director** briefly introduced the document. The General Context section of the Programming Document was provisional and would be adjusted once the new European Commission and Parliament were in place. Members were invited to send comments in writing but not to focus too much on this section, at this point.

In relation to the content of the programme, there was continuity with the previous four-year programme. Alongside the main heading 'Monitoring living and working conditions in Europe' that included the various monitoring tools and surveys, Eurofound had identified two main thematic approaches – 'Cohesion/convergence' and 'The changing world of work' – on which there had appeared to be consensus in the brainstorming meeting on the programme in March.

As resources had not yet been assigned, it was not clear whether all proposals in the draft would be possible.

In the area of surveys, there was a proposal to use the slot reserved for the European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS) to run a different exercise, in order to assess whether it would be possible to combine the EQLS and EWCS surveys, as had been presented to the Bureau in January. The proposal might provide cost savings in the long run, but not immediately. If it proved successful in retaining the trends in working conditions and the dimensions of job quality, then there would be implications for decisions in relation to the next phase of the EWCS.

A proposal for the next wave of the European Company Survey (ECS) was included in the Programming Document (PD) subject to an agreement with Cedefop to collaborate on the project.

It was important to avoid any overlaps with the new European Labour Authority (ELA) on the topic of mobility, so there were minimal references to the ELA in the document, although agreements with the new body would be sought later. Similarly, there would be scope later in the annual programmes to include collaboration with other institutions and bodies such as the European Commission, the European Social Fund, and the European Globalisation Fund (in the area of restructuring).

Parallel discussions on the programme were taking place internally and the next draft would include comments of the Executive Board and a first draft 2021 work programme.

- 3.2 The **Chairperson** underlined that discussions on the programme must remain open to the new Management Board which would meet in June 2019.

She invited comments on the general context of the programme before discussing the content proposals.

- 3.3 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** made the following comments:

- This section did not take into account the need for the European social model to be sustainable and to respond to the needs of workers and citizens in Europe for growth and competitiveness.
- The reflection on the uncertainties or discontent of citizens was rather philosophical and not relevant to the mandate of Eurofound which was to provide analysis of findings.
- The paper should elaborate more on the contribution of the Social Partners to social policy which entailed more than just implementing the European Pillar of Social Rights.
- The Group agreed with the three thematic areas chosen, as discussed in the brainstorming seminar in March. They supported the retention of the European Company Survey which provided information on what was changing at company-level. They stressed also the need to renew cooperation with Cedefop on the survey.
- The Group welcomed the experiment of a European Work and Life Survey.

- 3.4 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said that the Group were disappointed with the document in which it seemed that the topics of Social Dialogue and Industrial Relations were largely absent.

- Whilst a focus on just three thematic areas was a good idea, the themes were rather unambitious. In the monitoring and observatory activities it was not clear what Eurofound would be doing and how Eurofound's expertise would be moving the issues forward.
- Line 257 — what was meant by the sentence 'The wide range and depth of analysis required will entail an increased use of research conducted outside of Eurofound'.
- The Group were profoundly against the idea of combining the two surveys, as the European Working Conditions Survey was unique, providing reliable and comparative data for a variety of researchers and for policy makers. How would it

work in terms of sample size for example? As pointed out previously by the Group, there were other sources for data on quality of life, against which a combined survey would find it difficult to compete. Why not stick with a successful working conditions survey?

3.5 **Ms Skrebiškienė (Governments)** said that the Group also had some general doubts about the combined survey as the EWCS was considered the unique heritage of Eurofound.

Nevertheless, she found that the programme was balanced and not written in a predictable way. The multiannual part left a lot of space to introduce more precise definitions of future projects.

3.6 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that bearing in mind the potential of the interesting seminar in March she had found this draft somewhat disappointing.

- The structure and the priority areas were not convincing. The programme title 'Monitoring' did not seem very strategic, and indeed the first two priorities seemed to overlap. She too noted that 'Industrial Relations' seemed to be missing in the programme.
- Although it would be necessary to wait for the appointment of the new European Commission, the recent Sibiu Declaration of the Council in May 2019 had introduced the concept of a protective, competitive and fair Europe, and words like 'fairness' should make it into the text in the context of inequality.

3.7 **The Executive Director** briefly responded to some of the comments.

- It was always difficult to achieve the right balance in the tone and language of the document but effort would be made to be more ambitious in the formulation.
- In relation to the exploration of the feasibility of a combined survey, this proposal had been outlined in a presentation to the Bureau in January 2019 where it was understood it had been well received. It would need to be tested first, and this would initially be more expensive. There was assurance that key issues like monitoring of dimensions of job quality in the EWCS would not be put at risk in this process, as the EWCS was not involved in this year. The combined survey would not in any way pre-empt a discussion on the future of the EWCS. If the Groups were clear that the proposal was not acceptable, they should indicate so.
- The priority thematic areas included concrete descriptions of what research was planned but were not too detailed at this stage.
- Responding to Ms Hoffmann's question, in [Line 257](#) it was proposed to produce intelligent, digestible summaries of already existing research for policy makers (i.e. with none of the costs associated in producing new original research).
- The proposed structure of the Programming Document addressed Industrial Relations both in a horizontal way and in the priority area 'Monitoring'. This area especially covered the Industrial Relations priorities of the European Commission.

3.8 **The Chairperson** added that the Governments' Group accepted the definitions of the three priority areas, but felt that the descriptions could be more open, rather than discussing simply at the level of the tools.

The surveys were a priority for the Group, and there was concern at the idea of merging the two surveys, and even more on the possible discontinuation of the European Company Survey. She asked that the report on the surveys, presented to the Bureau

in January, be circulated to the Management Board in advance of the meeting in June in order to facilitate discussions. Eurofound should also explain that this was an experiment, that did not in any way prevent the continuation of the individual surveys.

If necessary, the Executive Board could take up the question of the joint European Company Survey with the Executive Board of Cedefop.

She invited the Groups to discuss the issue of gaps in the Programming Document in relation to Industrial Relations.

- 3.9 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said she understood that it was a matter of presentation but that certain key words were not mentioned at all in the document. In so far as Industrial Relations or Social Dialogue themes were mentioned at all they were very much 'tool-driven'.

There was a potential for more interesting research here. It was not the headings of the priority areas that were important but the content beneath them, which in this case was not adequate. Parts of the Programming Document differed in the level of detail, and certain issues seemed to be missing.

Regarding the combined survey, the preconditions of the experiment were unclear and should be clarified and defined first, otherwise there was a risk that something would disappear. What would be the main lines of enquiry, how would a longitudinal analysis be ranked, what would be retained, she asked.

- 3.10 **Ms Rossi (Employers)** added that Industrial Relations were of concern not only to the Social Partners but to the Governments and the European Institutions also, especially with the ongoing changes in collective bargaining. It was important that there was a shared interest in really monitoring this.

Ms Smith added that the Group had no issue with the proposals in relation to Industrial Relations and Social Dialogue in the priority area 'Monitoring', as the tools and actions described were correct. What was missing in the document however, was a red thread through the document, looking at the Social Partners in every sector e.g. in their reform agenda etc. There were concerns that some elements currently in the programme, such as the capacity building of Social Partners was missing. Some things were implied but not visible in the text, so she hoped that the next draft would be more concrete.

- 3.11 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that the structure of the Programming Document was driven by the various monitoring tools and was not sufficiently strategic. It was not easy to identify the priorities.

She agreed that the Industrial Relations area was an important one for Eurofound and should be more visible in the document.

The description on the Representativeness Studies could be strengthened. Some content could be added in relation to how collective rights were impacted by new forms of work, and how the self-employed were impacted. It was important to take note of the OECD research in the area of collective bargaining and to avoid any duplication.

- 3.12 **Mr Essemyr (Workers)** referring to the text on the need to preserve competitiveness and employment with structural changes on work and life ([line 163](#)) said that it was assumed that structural change should increase productivity and employment quality and the number of jobs, and the question was rather how Eurofound's work could support the increase. Eurofound should aim to analyse in order to achieve a deeper understanding of this structural change.

The text from page 8 onwards on the implications of change on work and life made little reference to climate change and its impact on Europe.

3.13 **The Executive Director** thanked the members for their feedback.

- There were budgetary constraints and in the absence of collaboration with Cedefop he doubted it would be possible to run the European Company Survey.
- There were various options for the structure of the Programming Document including the one chosen for the 2017-2020 programme. However, all approaches had inconsistencies and disadvantages. He was happy to accept any possible option with the clear support of the Executive Board.
- The text on monitoring was quite tool-drive, as so much of Eurofound's monitoring was descriptive. Analysis is done also in other areas.
- Budget expenditure in the area of Industrial Relations in recent years was substantial. In the Programming Document, all text between lines 217 and 232 related to Industrial Relations.
- It was correct that capacity building had not been included in the multiannual part of the Programming Document, though this might change in the annual parts later, as Eurofound awaited feedback from the European Commission before proposing something here. Due to budgetary constraints it would be necessary to seek collaboration in this area with the Commission, the social partners or other bodies, by making Eurofound available to organise actions within their programmes.

3.14 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that Eurofound should consider how the various tools could address the priorities identified during the March brainstorming seminar.

3.15 **The Chairperson** raised the point that the Programming Document should reflect the innovations in the new Founding Regulation. For example, she said, the word 'employment' was now explicitly mentioned in the regulation and should feature more often in the text.

Surveys, explicitly mentioned in the regulation, could be better highlighted in the document. In line with this, one might consider changing the title of the priority area on 'Monitoring'.

Regarding the text at lines 133-142 it would be preferable to follow the wording of the regulation when discussing relations with other EU Agencies or international organisations, with regard for example to 'cooperation' and 'close dialogue'. The text should be written in a way that would be understandable to readers a few years hence, also.

She asked the Executive Director whether in light of comments made that the text under the third priority in relation to trust was too philosophical and not consistent with Eurofound's mandate, some of the resources associated with this priority area might be reallocated to surveys.

3.16 **The Executive Director** did not feel that the content in this part of the document was inconsistent with Eurofound's mandate and said that the questions raised such as trust and tensions in society were core to the EQLS.

The combined survey would need to preserve the seven dimensions of job quality measured in the EWCS as well as the most unique dimensions of quality of life and

society of the EQLS. It would be the task of the researchers to check the feasibility and ensure this is done.

At a later stage, the Programming Document would include a revised paragraph on international collaboration, applying the correct wording of the Founding Regulation.

He reiterated that that financial contribution of collaborating partners was of great importance in light of Eurofound's reduced budget.

- 3.17 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that the Programming Document should reflect the text in the Founding Regulation on Industrial Relations. It should appear at a higher level in the document, as a heading.

The previous programme had been more explicit also in relation to employment with the inclusion of a strategic area for opportunities and challenges for work and employment.

- 3.18 **Ms Skrebiškienė (Governments)** asked whether there was scope to address the topic of 'youth' as well as the ageing population in the priority area 'Change'.

Convergence and cohesion in the European Union was an important area of the programme. The working poor topic could be moved to this area and it could be elaborated on, with more emphasis on social policy, encouraging Member States to increase their social expenditure.

Line 346 — the word 'employment' should be removed.

- 3.19 There was a short discussion on the structure of the document, with some members favouring the reinstatement of the structure of the current Programming Document that was based around the four areas of interest, with two transversal ones of digitalisation and convergence. There was a general feeling that the document was not very ambitious.

- 3.20 **Ms Smith (Employers)** led with comments of the Employers on the content section.

- *2.1.2 Implications of change for working life* — line 245 there were implications for employers and businesses, not only workers and citizens.
- In the 'Change' priority area the Group would like to see more on the employment opportunities driven by digitalisation, and the possibilities it provided for diverse work organisation, autonomy, distance working, work-life balance.
- Line 266 — the meaning was not clear. It seemed that the current debate was more about robot/human interface rather than replacement of workers by robots.
- Line 272 — it was not clear that third-country nationals were the largest potential resource, there were probably untapped resources in persons currently not working or unemployed.

Ms Rossi had the following comments and questions:

- Line 270 — what was meant by a diversified workforce?
- Line 284 — was missing a reference to the positive employment impact of platform work.
- Line 361 — what was meant by 'insecurity of employment'?

3.21 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** made the following comments on behalf of the Workers.

- Line 254 — she asked for more specific information about the further approaches, and the methodology proposed. Was it the same methodology used in the European Restructuring Monitor (ERM)?
- Line 281 — the sentence was rather dismissive of climate concerns and might be reviewed.
- Lines 288-290 — what was the meaning of the sentence, what was meant by ‘voting electorate’?
- Line 327 — the text was not easy to understand and not very convincing. What was meant by the material impact on discontent?

3.22 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** made the following comments on behalf of the European Commission.

- He said that the ‘Monitoring’ priority was concerned with the instruments and tools but had surprisingly little information on future research themes.
- Regarding the merging of the surveys, in the presentation at the meeting in January it had been indicated that only a selection of questions from each of the surveys could be included, leading to the question of which would be retained to allow for a comparison over time. Also, what would be the frequency of the surveys in order to take into account the pilot?
- In the Industrial Relations area, the impact of digitalisation and climate change were important issues, but the proposals were quite broad and lacking in focus, and there was insufficient emphasis on climate change. Regarding climate change, the idea of a fair transition to a sustainable Europe should be included. Eurofound should look also at the social and distributional impact of climate change.
- Convergence was an important area and linked to the idea of fairness, which was now included in the Sibiu Declaration of the Council.
- The Commission agreed that the ‘Future of work’ research should build on previous work, but they would recommend a stronger focus on inequality within and between regions and the driving forces behind it.
- In mind of the need to ensure synergies, he noted the recent joint publication on the middle classes by DG Employment and the OECD.
- The final section on communication seemed to be quite long compared to the more content-oriented section, but he assumed that would change in later drafts.

3.23 On behalf of the Governments, **Ms Skrebiškienė** made the following comments.

- Line 248 — work-life balance should be mentioned.
- Line 324 — in relation to territorial disparities she wondered whether regional aspects would be a more precise reference here.

The Chair continued:

- Line 233-241 — she suggested to move the labour market monitoring (European Jobs Monitor) to the second priority area and include less detail on the actual tool the European Restructuring Monitor, whose methodology was questioned by some.
- It was important to understand how digitalisation and artificial intelligence impacted on the content of jobs, and on the provision of providing and developing skills, which was why cooperation with Cedefop was so important.
- She supported the Commission's call for a focus on inequality, which had been emphasised during the brainstorming in March.
- Line 318-319 — stereotyped descriptions in the document of north, south etc should be avoided, and should instead speak about regions.
- The Group also supported reducing the section on disenchantment and the role of social media, which was too narrative.
- She suggested that mobility might be included in the area of structural change.

3.24 **The Director** noted the comments and made some immediate responses.

- The European Company Survey without a partner like Cedefop was possibly not viable for budgetary reasons alongside the experiment of a new European Working and Living Conditions Survey.
- The new Working and Living Conditions Survey would retain the measurements of job quality as a pre-condition. The situation was similar for the European Quality of Life Survey.
- In the area of change, it was proposed to build on approaches used already in the EMCC and FOME project, but exactly how to do that was not yet clear.
- He noted that the ERM data came from a variety of sources. In its reporting on restructuring there were no better tools at the moment. If the Management Board decided it no longer supported retention of the tool, it could decide to discontinue it, but he clarified that it would not have any substantial budgetary impact, no better information exists on the subject, and there will be more restructuring cases if there is a change in the economic cycle.
- Line 361 — 'insecurity in employment' referred to job insecurity he explained.
- 'Accommodation of workplaces' referred to adjustments needed to make it easier for some groups or persons to participate in the workplace.
- He concluded that it appeared the structure of the Programming Document still lacked broad support, and this should be taken into account.
- Regarding the European Company Survey, three Groups still wanted to keep it, irrespective of the presence of a paying partner.
- A majority of members supported the experiment to combine the EWCS and the EQLS in a pilot.
- Climate change would be included in the 'Change' priority area, but in light of Eurofound's limited resources there would be a stronger emphasis on

digitalisation. This reflected the fact that it was not possible to cover everything, although the reasons should be documented.

3.25 **The Chair** said that it would be a challenging task for Eurofound to formulate draft 2 of the Programming Document along with the first annual programme (for 2021).

She advised the Executive Director to inform the Management Board about the budgetary problems of the Agency at the meeting in June.

The meeting concluded and resumed the following day (Friday, 17 May).

Day 2, Friday 17 May 2019

3.26 **Mr Ciechański (Governments)** who could not attend the meeting on the previous day due to travel delays made the following comments on the Programming Document.

- The first draft lacked bite. The reader should have more specifics on the policy dilemmas and the key problems.
- There were more triggers of change than the three mentioned, namely that the EU was no longer the world centre of innovation which would have long term effects on the welfare state, demographics would not only concern ageing, but also a continuous migration pressure.
- Cohesion/convergence was a structural problem.
- The budgetary problems facing Eurofound needed to be highlighted in the Programming Document as they posed a significant risk.

4. Rules of Procedure Management Board and Executive Board (EB 2/6.1)

4.1 **The Chair** said that discussion on the rules would be technical discussion but an important one and so there would be some detail.

4.2 **The Executive Director** noted that the Founding Regulations and their implications for the rules of procedure had been considered at an earlier meeting between the Commission and the tripartite agencies and that the draft rules reflected that.

4.3 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** made the following comments.

- Rules of procedure should be normative instruments to ensure the functioning of the Management Board and Executive Board.
- Page 4 — as an EU Agency it was not appropriate to cite OECD guidelines and the footnote should be removed.
- Article 8, paragraph 3 — the Founding Regulation defined the composition of the Executive Board. The provision to allow additional participants as observers might be placed in Article 13 instead, before paragraph 7.
- Article 10, paragraph 2 — regarding the powers of the Appointing Authority, when the powers were taken away from the Executive Director they fell not to the Chair as was stated in the text, but to the Management Board.
- Article 11, paragraph 4 — the Founding Regulation stated that the Executive Board met three times a year, not 'at least' three times as was proposed.

- Article 18, paragraph 5 — he wondered if it was appropriate to make provisions for a secret vote which risked upsetting the dynamic of the Management Board which was usually very open.
 - Article 12, paragraph 2 — it was welcomed that documents would be distributed 10 days before a meeting and that minutes would be a summary and not a verbatim account.
- 4.4 **Mr Gran (Workers)** asked the following questions.
- Article 11 —why was there a specific mention of the Commission with regard to requesting the Chair to convene a meeting?
 - Article 17 — on what basis could the Groups reject a proposal for a written procedure and request that a meeting of the Board be convened instead.
- 4.5 **Ms Skrebiškienė (Governments)** asked about participation in the Executive Board by alternates (Article 8, paragraph 3).
- 4.6 **Ms Smith (Employers)** as a relative newcomer wondered about the basis for the rule that the Chair was held usually by one of the Groups, but not the Commission.
- 4.7 **The Chair** said that with regard to Article 4, paragraph 2 — there was no need to include a declaration of commitment to fulfil their duties as members of the Management Board which went too far, unlike the declaration of any potential conflicts of interest which was a legal requirement. It should also be removed from the rules for the Committee on Staff Matters.
- 4.8 **The Executive Director and Mr Grimmeisen** responded to some of the points.
- Article 10, paragraph 2 – changes would be made to reflect that it was the Management Board who decided on Appointing Authority powers, not the Chair subject to clarification by the Commission.
 - Article 18, paragraph 5 — the text was taken directly from the Founding Regulation.
 - Article 11, the text was taken directly from the Founding Regulation.
 - Article 17, there were a number of decisions to be taken during a year, and impossible to avoid approving them by a written procedure. Decisions of the Board were always discussed in the Executive Board first.
 - Article 8, paragraph 3 – it was a decision of the Board whether to appoint alternates to the Executive Board and this could be done during the plenary meeting.
 - It was an unwritten agreement that the position of Chair rotated between the Governments, Employers and Workers Groups only.
 - The requirement for a Declaration on commitments by Board members could be deleted.
 - Articles 26 and 27 — the Executive Director suggested that the two articles on decisions and communication of decisions be merged and simplified.
 - Written procedures would be open for ten working days. In exceptional circumstances this would be reduced to five working days. Members should be

aware however, that there were a number of procedures that would regularly be reduced to five working days.

5. Draft rules of procedure for the Committee on Staff Matters (EB 2/6.2)

5.1 The **Executive Director** highlighted some points to consider in the draft rules for the Committee.

- There was an open question as to whether Ms Smith (Employers) who according to the Founding Regulation was not a ‘full’ member of the Board with eligibility to vote, should be a member of the Committee on Staff Matters which effectively took decisions on behalf of the Board. This would be verified with the European Commission.
- The procedure should be amended so that the Chair of the Committee would consult with the secretary of the committee — who was Eurofound’s HR manager — rather than the Executive Director, particularly as many cases would concern appeals against decisions of the Executive Director.
- It was proposed that Article 13 would be further re-drafted to reflect that the proceedings of the Committee would be private, with the Committee deciding what aspects of its work should be confidential.
- Article 9 — it was important to ensure that there was agreement within the Committee, but there was a question as to whether it would be practicable to refer decisions back to the Management Board where agreement could not be found. Some other solution should be found here.

5.2 There was a short discussion of the draft rules and issues relating to the workings of the Committee.

Mr Gran (Workers) agreed that it was necessary to reflect on the participation of the Executive Director in the Committee in light of the fact that its work would include appeals by staff members against decisions of the Executive Director.

Article 10 – he said that care should also be taken to ensure the confidentiality of communications of the Committee in relation to written procedures. **Mr Tagger (Commission)** agreed that a higher standard of confidentiality was required in the manner in which the Committee communicated.

In relation to the question of who might participate in the meetings, there was a clarification by Eurofound that much of the work of the Committee would consist in reviewing files relating to appeals regarding promotion and reclassification, or the appraisal of the Accounting Officer. The Committee was not foreseen as a kind of tribunal.

More information on the appeals process and the anticipated work of the Committee would be provided to the members at the first meeting which would take place on the following week.

The Chair proposed to delete provision in Article 2 that members should have legal or HR competencies and in Article 5, paragraph 4, provisions in relation to the independence of the Chair which did not seem to be appropriate.

It was recommended that the deadlines in the rules should reflect those in the rules of procedure for the Management Board and Executive Board.

Regarding decisions of the Committee, it was felt by Eurofound that the Management Board should decide whether decisions were by simple majority, or whether the Chair would have a qualifying vote. It was hoped that decisions would always be by consensus.

Mr Tagger (European Commission) noted that he was consulting with DG HR within the Commission in order to find additional wording for Article 13, paragraph 4 as the Commission and Eurofound staff members were obliged by their own rules on conflicts of interest, and it was not the role of the Committee to decide in that matter.

Ms Hoffmann (Workers) said that the Committee should review and give an opinion on the rules, which nevertheless would be adopted by the Board.

The Chair said that the Board and Executive Board would evaluate the workings of the Committee at a later date.

6. Draft rules of procedure for the Advisory Committees (EB 1/6.3)

The rules were not discussed as they were largely in line with previous rules of procedure for the Advisory Committees, but the Chair asked for any comments to be forwarded to Eurofound in writing.

7. Draft decision on delegation of power to make non-substantial amendments to the work programme (EB 2/6.4)

7.1 **Mr Grimmeisen** introduced the draft decision using a number of slides, as it was quite a technical discussion.

- A new provision in the Founding Regulation (Article 6, paragraph 5) stated that the Board should amend the work programme where a new activity was assigned to Eurofound. It was important therefore to understand what was meant by a new activity.
- It further stated that the Management Board might delegate the power to make non-substantial amendments to the work programme, to the Executive Director. It was necessary to define what was a non-substantial amendment.
- He referred to the 2015 Commission circular on the *Financing Decision and Work Programme for Operational Expenditure* — circulated to the Executive Board beforehand — in which the approach was a flexible one, providing for delegation to the Commission's Authorising Officers by Delegation, analogous in Eurofound's case to the Executive Director.
- The circular spoke about two possible aspects of non-substantial decisions — qualitative and quantitative — where a decision significantly changed the nature of an action or the objective of the work programme. It also included two thresholds: a maximum 20% between actions within the envelope of the Financial Decision; or an increase in the total Financial Decision of a maximum of 20%.
- In the EU Agencies the Financing Decision was equivalent to the Programming Document that included all the activities and the procurement plan.
- Discussions to date within the Executive Board suggested that:
 - a substantial change was one that would 'change the objective' of the work programme;

- a 20% threshold was too high and one of 10% might be more appropriate;
- a double threshold of a percentage but also an amount, would be preferable;
- there should be a clear description of how the changes would be communicated, and that the Management Board should have a right of veto on the changes i.e. to effectively reverse the decision of the Executive Director.

Eurofound had incorporated these suggestions in the draft decision. The document was also closely aligned with rules adopted already by Cedefop.

- Eurofound considered that an ‘activity’ was a high-level strategic activity (like the Strategic Areas of Intervention in the current Programming Document) not an activity at the level of a project.
 - Eurofound felt that a threshold of 10% was too low. The financing decision paper of the Commission in Eurofound’s case concerned Title 3 (research) expenditure and it could be seen that the 10% threshold would be easily exceeded, with all kinds of knock-on effects on the transfers that were often required in the latter parts of the year, when budgets were moved from other titles into Title 3 in order to maximise the research budget (as for example in order to frontload costs for the surveys). A threshold that was too low would have implications for the ability to adopt financing decisions in good time, with a risk that full utilisation of the budget would not be realised and monies would have to be returned, which in turn had implications for the budget year-on-year.
- 7.2 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** said that a preliminary check with the Commission services raised questions as to whether in Article 3, paragraph 3, the 20% figure also included procurements within Title 3.

It was suggested that it might be useful to further define ‘substantial changes’ in Article 3, paragraph 2. He noted that a consultation with DG Human Resources on the issue was ongoing.

- 7.3 **The Chair** agreed that there was a need to have some flexibility but that there was also a need to regularise the issue. She thought that Eurofound’s proposal on the Financing Decision was not in line with the Commission’s circular which concerned the operational budget only.

It was necessary to make further enquiries with the European Commission and to provide definitions of ‘non-substantial amendments’ and the ‘financing decision’.

The text of the decision required further discussion by the Executive Board which could take place by email.

8. Progress Report of the Executive Director (EB 2/4)

The Executive Director updated the members on ongoing research, events and publications since the previous Executive Board meeting in March.

- 6 May 2019, he highlighted the launch of the joint report with the ILO on *Working conditions in a global perspective* in Geneva. The report covered 41 countries and 1.2 billion workers, with results of comparative working conditions surveys organised around the EWCS, to provide the first comparative analysis on job quality alongside Eurofound’s seven dimensions of job quality.

- The Industrial Action Monitor pilot had been evaluated positively in an Advisory Committee in March. This new tool was based on a similar methodology to the European Restructuring Monitor (ERM).
 - The European Company Survey fieldwork had encountered difficulties in some Member States with the availability of respondents in reaching the target sample of 250 cases. A preliminary outline of the overview report had been discussed both in-house and with Cedefop, with whom the survey was jointly undertaken.
 - Eurofound's web repository on platform work was now established and was an excellent source of information for researchers.
 - Progress was good in the new strategic area 'Convergence' and he mentioned Eurofound's participation in the European Commission's Directorate General for Economic and Social Affairs (ECFIN) conference '15 years anniversary of Enlargement in April 2019 in Bratislava', which was a positive development as ECFIN did not usually request information on social issues.
 - Another highlight was the final event for the Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME) project on 11 April 2019, in Brussels.
 - He updated the members on budget, staff issues.
 - He reported that on his suggestion, Eurofound had prepared a background paper for the Advisory Committee of the new European Labour Authority (ELA) on how evidence taken in joint cross-border inspections was applied in the Member States.
 - He called for proposals for ad hoc research in 2019 and relayed some suggestions from Eurofound's own researchers (growth of self-employment, wage convergence in groups, some positive aspects on discrimination and gender and platform work, and the economy of wellbeing).
 - The Workers and Employers supported research on self-employment, the Workers were less keen on the platform work proposal.
 - The Commission would make a proposal in relation to their own report scheduled for the end of 2020 on the role of the Social Partners in tackling discrimination at work.
 - It should be noted that the Social Protection Committee of the Council had already started work on monitoring and improving access to social protection for platform workers and self-employed.
 - The Director said that proposals would be circulated in writing.
9. Staff Working Document on Evaluation of the Agencies – Eurofound specific recommendations
- 9.1 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** said that the document was published online and he invited the members to read it as it would provide an interesting background to the evaluation.
- The evaluation gave an overall positive picture of the three tripartite agencies, in terms of fulfilling the tasks of their mandates, and their overall value for money.

- It identified some areas for improvement both specific to Eurofound and across the Agencies. The Agencies were now invited to develop action plans within six months, a task which Eurofound had already begun.
 - There were recommendations for all Agencies to improve their effectiveness and impact, to improve efficiencies through innovation, the need for cooperation between the Agencies, for a reinforcement of their policy support activities for the European Union and the Member States.
 - Specific recommendations for Eurofound were to have an increased emphasis on the added value of its research and budget flexibility in light of budgetary constraints. There was a call to reduce the time between the collection of data and the publication of the research, and to further consider ways to improve the quality of outputs from some of the national correspondents.
- 9.2 **The Chair** thought that the Commission's recommendations could be implemented and said that the Executive Board would follow up on that.
10. Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR) 2018 (EB 2/5)
- The Chair** proposed small amendments to the text of the Management Board's opinion on the CAAR.
- The decision to adopt an opinion on the CAAR would be sent forward to the Management Board meeting in June.
11. National Correspondents' contacts with Board members (EB 2/7)
- 11 The paper presented the annual feedback on the contacts with the Board members.
- Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** wished to understand the obligations regarding the Board members in relation to the Correspondents and said that this should be discussed in the upcoming Group meetings.
- 11.2 **The Deputy Director** said that there was no longer the obligation of a face-to-face meeting between the correspondent and the national board members, but there should be contact. The proactive involvement of the Board members was required in the evaluation of reports, like the Representativeness Studies
12. Draft agenda for 1st Meeting of the Management Board (EB 2/9)
- Mr Tagger (Commission)** proposed that the rules of procedure be adopted before there was any discussion of content and it was agreed.
- It was decided that a short informal meeting of the Executive Board would be necessary and should take place on the morning of the 1st Management Board meeting which would start at the later time of 10h00.
- The agenda and schedule for the Groups and Management Board meeting were revised accordingly.**
13. AOB
- The Chair** informed that she had been contacted by the Internal Audit Service of the Commission in relation to their Strategic Audit Plan which would look at ethics in Human Resources and Procurement. She said that she had informed the IAS that the Executive Board considered that the budgetary situation in Eurofound was a real risk.

14. The next meeting of the Executive Board (EB/3) would be held on **Friday, 13 September 2019 in Brussels.**

[A. Bulgarelli]

[J. Menéndez-Valdés]

Chairperson

Executive Director

**DRAFT AGENDA
FIRST MEETING OF THE MANAGEMENT BOARD OF EUROFOUND**

Friday, 28 June 2019 10.00-13.00

Raymond Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound, Dublin

Item	Agenda item	Ref. no	Presented by	Time
1.	Welcome and Draft Agenda, <i>For Adoption</i>	MB 1/1	Chair	10.00-10.05
2.	Draft Minutes of the 92 nd Governing Board meeting of 17 November 2018, <i>For Adoption</i>	MB 1/2	Chair	10.05-10.10
3.	Presentation to the new Management Board by the Executive Director		Executive Director	10.10-10.30
4.	Draft Rules of Procedure for Management Board and Executive Board, <i>For Adoption</i>	MB 1/4	Executive Director	10.30-11.00
	Break and <i>photo de famille</i>			11.00-11.15
5.	Programming Document 2021–2024 (PD): Draft 2, <i>For Discussion</i>	MB 1/5	Executive Director	11.15-12.00
6.	Draft Rules of Procedure for Committee on Staff Matters, <i>For Adoption</i>	MB 1/6	Executive Director	12.00-12.10
7.	Draft Rules of Procedure for Advisory Committees, <i>For Adoption</i>	MB 1/7	Executive Director	12.10-12.20
8.	2018 Final Accounts, <i>For Adoption</i>	MB 1/8	Accounting Officer	12.20-12.35
9.	Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2018, <i>For Adoption</i>	MB 1/9	Executive Director	12.35-12.50
10.	New Financial Regulation	MB 1/10		
11.	<i>Appointment of Reporting Officers for Appraisal of the Executive Director and Deputy Director, For Adoption</i>	MB 1/11	Chair	12.50-12.55
12.	Administrative questions - Report from the Committee on Staff matters <i>For Information</i>		Chair of the Committee	12.55-13.00
13.	AOB			

Date and venue of **next Management Board meeting:**

Thursday, 7 November (Group meetings) Friday, 8 November 2019, Eurofound, Dublin

DRAFT MINUTES
FIRST MEETING OF THE MANAGEMENT BOARD OF EUROFOUND

Friday, 28 June 2019 10.00-13.00

Raymond-Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound, Dublin

1.	<p>Welcome and adoption of revised agenda (MB 1/1)</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the members to the first meeting of the Management Board as constituted in the new Founding Regulation.</p> <p>She proposed the following changes to the agenda. The item on Eurofound’s new Financial Regulation (MB 1/ 10) would be submitted to the Board for approval by a written procedure later.</p> <p>An additional item (MB 1/11) concerned the appointment of Reporting Officers for the appraisal procedure for the Executive Director and Deputy Director.</p> <p>The revised agenda was adopted.</p>
2.	<p>Adoption of minutes of Governing Board, 17 November 2018 (MB 1/2)</p> <p>The minutes were adopted.</p>
3.	<p>Presentation to the new Management Board by the Executive Director</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The New Founding Regulation had come about as a result of a Common Approach to the EU decentralised Agencies adopted by the EU Institutions in 2012. • It was important to bear in mind that discussions on the future strategic work programme (2021-2024) would take place in the changing context of a new European Parliament and Commission, and the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) of the European Union. • The main task of the Management Board at this meeting was to adopt its own rules of procedure and those of its various committees, and to adopt an opinion on the 2018 Annual Accounts and Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR). • Eurofound utilised a Performance Management System (EPMS) and he outlined some of the results which concerned the number of references to Eurofound research in EU policy documents, contributions to events, publication downloads from the website and citations in academic journals, as well as rates for budget implementation, staff capacity and programme delivery. • Recent highlights included the fieldwork for the 4th European Company Survey (ECS) which was almost complete. For the first time the survey was being undertaken jointly with Eurofound’s sister agency Cedefop. • Preparations were ongoing for the 7th European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) in 2020. • The first of the new flagship reports on ‘Quality of Life and Public Services’ would be published in the autumn, having been positively evaluated in the Advisory Committee in March. • The ad hoc report on ‘Improving monitoring of posted workers in the EU’ was currently being evaluated. Provision was made in the programme planning for ad hoc research requests from the stakeholders. • Five Representativeness Studies had been evaluated in March and June. These studies were designed to provide basic information needed for the setting up and functioning of

	<p>sectoral and cross-sectoral social dialogue committees, the mechanism used by the Commission to consult management and labour under article 154 TFEU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A valuable resource for members which he wished to highlight was the new web repository on the Platform Economy where members would find Eurofound’s research on digitalisation, actions taken by social partners, legislation and other reports. Similar resources on the topic of convergence were also being developed, so he encouraged the members to consult Eurofound’s website. • He noted the recent joint Eurofound/ILO report <i>Working conditions in a global perspective</i> which had been linked to the ILO centenary celebrations. He was pleased to report that the ILO had indicated that they would commit to a similar exercise in the next wave of the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS). • He highlighted some recent publications that included secondary analyses of the European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS), reports on the involvement of the Social Partners in national policy, minimum wage, cooperatives and social enterprises and the role of public services in integrating refugees and asylum seekers which was the last in a series of works. • He referred also to a number of recent events including the annual meeting of the Network of Eurofound Correspondents (NEC). These national correspondents provided information and research services to Eurofound.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding events he reported that Eurofound had recently commenced a series of webinars. The results were positive, and the webinars allowed Eurofound to reach a broader audience.
3.2	<p>The Chair thanked the Director for his presentation. To the new members, she said that the indicators on references to Eurofound research in policy documents and scientific journals were important, allowing Eurofound to measure its performance against its objectives to provide high-level, high-quality knowledge to policymakers. These indicators showed that year-on-year there had been improvement.</p> <p>Similarly, events and publications reported on by the Executive Director — for example the joint ILO report on Global Working Conditions, tackling the minimum wage, cooperatives and social enterprises — had been decided a number of years ago and showed that the Management Board had the capacity for foresight in its programme planning.</p>
3.3	<p>Ms Kauffmann (Commission) congratulated the Executive Director and his staff on the excellent work that had been done, which was clear also from the quality of the research presented today. The European Commission were primary users of the data and for example, its upcoming report Employment and Social Developments in Europe (ESDE) frequently quoted Eurofound studies. The Commission wished to acknowledge that on the record.</p>
4.	<p>Adoption of rules of procedure for Management Board and Executive Board (MB 1/4)</p>
4.1	<p>The Chair said that it was crucial that the Management Board had a clear legal and procedural basis upon which to act. The Executive Board had discussed the rules and the Groups had subsequently considered them during their meetings.</p> <p>She invited Eurofound to present the rules with the comments and amendments received from the Groups.</p>
4.2	<p>Mr Grimmeisen said that comments had been received during the meetings of the Groups and the Executive Board. Eurofound had reviewed the changes from a legal point of view, and it was proposed now to adopt the rules.</p> <p>He read out the proposed changes. <i>[The amendments were distributed in writing to all the members during the meeting]</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion – Article 2 paragraph 5: ‘In the case of the members of the Board representing the Commission, their Appointing Authority shall decide on the appropriate measures to be applied to give effect to the provisions of this Article in line with Articles 11 and 11a of the Staff Regulations.’ <p>This deletion was at the request of the European Commission as the rules applied to all members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insertion – Article 12 paragraph 1: ‘With the exception of the decisions mentioned in Article 6 <i>and unless otherwise stated in Eurofound’s Founding Regulation</i>, decisions of the Management Board shall be adopted by a majority of its members entitled to vote.’ <p>This was a suggestion from the Governments — with which Eurofound agreed — to cover the cases such as the appointment of the Executive Director or other decisions in relation to the Executive Director, but also for example the majority rules for the adoption of the programming document and the budget, which required a two-thirds majority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendment – Article 12 paragraph 3: ‘The Chairperson shall take part in the voting. In case of a tie or deadlock, the proposed decision shall be rejected’. <p>This suggestion had come from various groups in consideration of the fact that the Founding Regulation stated that decisions required a majority.</p>
4.3	The amended rules of procedure for the Management Board and the Executive Board (Decision No. 6 of the Management Board) were adopted.
5.	Adoption of Rules of Procedure for the Committee on Staff Matters (MB 1/6)
5.1	The Chair introduced the paper noting that the Members had approved by a written procedure the delegation of the Appointing Authority powers from the Management Board to the Executive Director, except in certain cases where it could not be delegated such as for example in the case of complaints by staff members, where a staff member wished to appeal a decision taken by the Executive Director. A Committee on Staff Matters had been set up on 3 May 2019.
5.2	<p>Mr Grimmeisen presented the rules which had been discussed already by the Executive Board and the Committee itself during its first meeting. Discussions in the Groups had yielded several amendments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion – Article 4 paragraph 6: ‘In the case of the members of the Committee representing the Commission, their Appointing Authority shall decide on the appropriate measures to be applied to give effect to the provisions of this Article in line with Articles 11 and 11a of the Staff Regulations.’ <p>As with the rules for the Board and Executive Board this paragraph was deleted as the rules applied in the same way to representatives of the Commission in the Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendment – Article 11 paragraphs 3 and 4: ‘3. The Executive Director <i>Chairperson of the Committee</i> shall inform the members of the Management Board of the decisions taken by the Committee during each meeting of the Management Board. In case of any subsequent or follow-up action required from the Management Board, its members will be informed without undue delay. <p>4. The information provided by the Executive Director <i>Chairperson of the Committee</i> in accordance with paragraph 3 shall be limited to the number of meetings held or written procedures launched, the number of the decisions adopted by the Committee and the topic covered by each of them. Information on decisions adopted by the Committee in response to complaints submitted under Article 90(2) of the Staff Regulations or other staff matters of a similar nature shall not contain personal data related to staff or any information on the substance of the cases handled by the Committee.’</p>

	<p>It was felt to be more appropriate that the task should be done by the Chair of the Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition – Article 14 paragraph 4: <i>The members of the Secretariat of the Committee shall be bound by the duty of confidentiality in accordance with Article 17 of the Staff Regulations.</i> <p>The secretariat was composed of Eurofound staff members and this article reinforced the obligations in the Staff Regulations, but also underlined the need to retain confidentiality vis-a-vis the Directorate.</p>
5.3	<p>The amended rules of procedure for the Committee on Staff Matters (Decision No. 7 of the Management Board) were adopted.</p>
6.	<p>Adoption of rules of procedure for Advisory Committees (MB 1/7)</p>
6.1	<p>The Chair noted that it was positive that the Advisory Committees had been included in the new Founding Regulation, having previously been an informal way for the Management Board members to be involved in the details of the research. The new rules reflected the previous rules of procedure.</p>
6.2	<p>Mr Grimmeisen introduced minor changes that referred to ‘sending’ documents rather than publishing them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amended – Article 13 paragraph 3: ‘Meeting documents will be published on Eurofound’s extranet no later than two (2) weeks before the meeting. Where documents include lengthy research reports, these should, where possible, be published <i>sent</i> three (3) weeks before the meeting to allow members to prepare for the meeting. Where it is not possible to publish <i>send</i> such documents three (3) weeks beforehand, members should be informed about when they can expect to receive the document. <p>He invited the coordinator of the Governments’ Group to introduce a second amendment which had been proposed following discussions in the Groups.</p>
6.3	<p>Mr Ciechański (Governments) made an additional proposal in relation to Article 6 on the provisions for experts, to avoid confusion that the experts were appointed by the coordinators in the same way as the members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were discussions on the wording of the proposal, with members requiring changes to indicate that experts were invited by Eurofound, clarifications that experts were not members of the Advisory Committees, and that they held their positions for the duration of the four-year programme. • The following proposal was made to amend the title of Article 6, and text in paragraph 1: ‘Article 6 – Appointed <i>External experts</i> 1. Eurofound may nominate <i>invite additional external</i> experts to join the meetings of an Advisory Committee on a permanent basis <i>to provide independent scientific advice.’</i>
	<p>The amended rules of procedure for the Advisory Committees (Decision No. 8 of the Management Board) were adopted.</p>
7.	<p>Programming Document 2021-2024 – Draft 2 (MB 1/5)</p>
7.1	<p>The Chair noted that the preparation of a programming document for a four-year period was a challenge and she thanked the Executive Director and his staff for the good work on this draft. There had been lively discussion in the Group meetings and in the Executive Board meeting that morning, but it would be possible to come to some conclusions on this draft during the meeting.</p> <p>She invited the coordinators to present the comments of their Groups.</p>
7.2	<p>Mr Ciechański (Governments) made the following comments on behalf of the Governments:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group preferred the structure of the first draft but would accept that the majority favoured the current structure. • There was a need to have more coherence between the four traditional Strategic Areas of Intervention and the two transversal ones. • He noted that there had been discussions within the Group on whether climate change and transition to a low carbon economy was a driver for change, and whether it would have an immediate impact on working conditions that would be visible during the period of the programme. • The text on platform work should be developed, as it was important for the issues of reconciliation of work-life balance and technological change, demographic change, skills and reskilling. • The issue of mobility should be worked on in collaboration with the new European Labour Authority (ELA) once it was established. This intention should be reflected in the Programming Document. • The financial constraints under which Eurofound operated should be flagged early in the document. Economies and savings in Title 1 (staff expenditure) should also be considered. • Surveys were specifically mentioned in the Founding Regulation as a task of Eurofound and if economies were necessary then Eurofound might consider looking elsewhere, such as the European Restructuring Monitor (ERM) or the Industrial Action Monitor, which some members suggested were not particularly useful, and the Representativeness Studies. • The Group agreed that it was necessary to respond to the budgetary challenges facing the surveys and they were not against changes in the design and implementation of the surveys, however at that moment they did not have adequate information to be able to pronounce themselves in favour of merging the EWCS and the EQLS. Any discussion about a merger of surveys should start from the fact that Eurofound activities covered three surveys. The EWCS was a key brand for Eurofound and considered a priority, and there were concerns that merging the two surveys could really mean discontinuing the EQLS. Whilst three scenarios had been presented to the Bureau in January 2019, it seemed that only Option B (the merger) was being followed up on, whilst the others, which had also been interesting, had been rejected. More emphasis was being placed on the benefits rather than the risks of the proposed approach. There were doubts as to whether any decision taken would be reversible. It was hoped that between the Groups it would be possible to reach a consensus as to how to proceed.
7.3	<p>Ms Hoffmann (Workers) gave the comments of the Workers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group thanked Eurofound for changes in the text so that the concrete and useful work done by Eurofound was more evident. • The transversal themes (5. Anticipating and managing the impact of change and 6. Promoting upward convergence and social cohesion) should be highlighted more in the introduction and the context because it was felt that these were significant and would be so during the next programming period. However, effort should be made to interweave the four core areas with the transversal ones. • More explanation was needed about the new follow-up questionnaire to the European Company Survey (ECS). Was this a panel? If so, where were the resources for developing it?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group were not convinced by the arguments put forward in relation to the surveys and considered there were risks to the successful EWCS. Problems and reservations in the first working paper presented in January had not been addressed. The focus had switched to Option B without clarifying how options A and C had been jettisoned. • Nevertheless, the Group were interested in the possibilities to delve deeper into the nexus between job quality and the living situation of those workers. However, they did not consider that the merger of the surveys as proposed would cover that. • The planning seemed unrealistic, with a risk that all resources would be directed at the merger, with nothing left to carry on with the old approach. The priority for the Group was to have the EWCS continued unchanged, as it was a good product and a flagship of Eurofound. • Even though changes to the surveys had been discussed internally for ten years or so, the Group still did not feel that they had the right information to make an informed decision. More information was necessary in order to have a thorough understanding of what we want to achieve, the costs and the risks. • A way should be found to resolve this issue, because the Group were supportive of innovation and not against finding new ways to do things. It was important to make the surveys future-proof, but the Group were not convinced that the merger as proposed was the way to go.
7.4	<p>Ms Rossi (Employers) made the following comments on behalf of the Employers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group welcomed the revised structure but similarly to the Workers' Group would like to see a clearer focus in the document and a highlighting of the transversal themes. • The document should be written now in a way that would have meaning in 2024. • It was not only the European Commission and the Governments who were shaping policy in social Europe. The role of the Social Partners should be presented in a more balanced way in the introduction to the programme. • The challenge remained to support sustainable growth and fairness in society, and growth and competitiveness were prerequisites to sustainable social models in the future. This should be reflected in the document. • The programme should have more on the issue of skills, in particular in relation to labour shortages, linked to the issue of mobility. • The Group would support more research on the sustainability of welfare, regarding labour transitions. • The presentation on the results of the Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME) project on the previous day had been interesting, and the Group would support further analysis of the results of the project. • The Group were interested in employment creation and thought that the European Jobs Monitor and European Restructuring Monitor could be adapted and improved from a qualitative point of view. The Group would welcome more analysis and research on barriers to employment creation in Europe which was a great challenge. • In relation to the modernisation of labour markets and job creation in labour markets it was felt that there was too much focus on platform work. • It was clear that a decision on the future of surveys was required and there was an awareness that changes were necessary to make them sustainable, not only financially but also considering changes in the labour market. <p>In the informal Executive Board meeting that morning, the Chair and the coordinator for the Workers' Group had made interesting proposals on dealing with the survey topic</p>

	<p>through synergies. The Group were willing to work with Eurofound to consider the issue from different aspects and different perspectives.</p>
7.5	<p>Ms Kauffmann (Commission) welcomed the changes in this draft such as the inclusion of text on climate change, which was a key priority for citizens and policymakers. The key priorities for Eurofound including Industrial Relations were better highlighted in this version.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The European Council had now adopted its strategic agenda for 2019-2024 to protect citizens and freedoms, develop a strong and vibrant economic base, build a climate-neutral, green, fair and social Europe and promote European interests and values on the global stage. It was broadly in line with the Sibiu declaration of the Council in May 2019, but it would be necessary to wait to see what would happen when the new Commission was in place. The Commission would take the strategic agenda and see how it could be transmitted to more concrete proposals and deliverables. • References in the document could be stronger on the European Pillar of Social Rights and Eurofound's role in relation to it. The pillar was a framework for the European Commission to promote social convergence. • In the Industrial Relations section of the Programming Document, references to collective bargaining were in the context of the work with the OECD, which demonstrated that care was taken to avoid duplication and to promote synergies with other organisations. • It was good that the Representativeness Studies – which were key deliverables – were highlighted but there should be more mention of the role of the Social Partners in policymaking and the European Semester. • She agreed with comments by the Employers that there should be a bit more mention in the text of skills. Eurofound could start discussion with Cedefop on what could be done here. And of course, any research on mobility should be subject to cooperation with the new European Labour Authority. There should be no duplication of work in this area. • It was important to consider the sustainability of the surveys and be open-minded to innovations. However, continuity of the EWCS was essential for the Commission as it was unique, whereas elements of the EQLS could be found in the EU SILC survey. • The possibility of a combined survey linking living and working conditions was a very attractive proposal. The Commission would be open to exploring this novelty, but not at the cost of losing European Working Conditions Survey information.
7.6	<p>The Executive Director asked the Groups to send their comments in writing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although it was not the preferred option of Eurofound, it appeared that the current approach to the structure of the Programming Document was supported by the stakeholders and of course he could accept that. Effort would be made to emphasise the relations between the various strategic areas without too much cross-referencing between the various sections. • He understood that the main building blocks of the multiannual part of the programme were also supported by the Groups. • In relation to skills and mobility it was clear that any overlaps or duplications with the work of Cedefop and the ELA would be avoided. • The text on 'General Context' would be reviewed at a later stage, probably not before 2020. • On the surveys, Eurofound and its stakeholders all wanted the surveys to be central and to preserve the key elements of the information they provided. • Maybe the background note on 'Future of Surveys' sent to the Management Board had caused some misunderstanding. The text was for information only and was not for

	<p>discussion. It had already been presented and discussed in the Bureau meeting of January 2019 and since then Eurofound had moved on to the proposal of a survey merger, thereby also integrating elements of the two other scenarios.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new draft of the Programming Document could clarify the proposal more, but many of the questions raised by the members would only be addressed in the feasibility study. The plan was to do a proper feasibility study and a pilot which could lead to changes before the new merger survey was started. If Eurofound went this way, the Board would receive more information during the various steps of the process and decisions could be taken at each step. • It was important that a choice was made. Either there would be some experimentation possibly leading to a new survey, or Eurofound would continue a traditional approach, which was three surveys with a six-year cycle. • According to a traditional approach, Eurofound should run the European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS) in 2022 and the European Company Survey (ECS) in 2024 (the EWCS would be in 2026, beyond the period of the next programming document). The main risk therefore – if Eurofound tried to go ahead with the combined survey – would be to the EQLS in 2022 as Eurofound would certainly not have the same information for quality of life as before. A clear prerequisite of the proposal to combine the surveys was that the seven key dimensions of job quality which the EWCS informed on had to be preserved in any combined survey. Eurofound proposed to see if this could be done in a feasibility study. This implied that Eurofound also needed more time to see the results in order to answer some of the questions and concerns of members. <p>Having said that, there was no threat to the EWCS survey as this survey was not scheduled in 2022. Eurofound could make it more explicit that final decisions on the longer term would be taken once more information was available, and that preparatory work was planned for the EWCS if needed, although fieldwork would be in 2026 during the next multiannual period. The Management Board would receive information regularly and nothing was written in stone at this stage, he said.</p> <p>Regardless of any decision on possible combinations or merging of surveys, it was necessary to take some action in relation to the future of the surveys.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In response to the question from Ms Hoffmann, the follow up interviews in the ECS did not refer to a panel but would allow Eurofound to come back to some respondents on a small number of questions. This would be clarified in the text. He added however, that Eurofound would be happy to explore at a future date the idea of a joint company panel that could be shared between different EU Agencies and the EU Institutions, as mentioned in the 2019 Staff Working Document on the cross-agency evaluation of the European Commission.
<p>7.7</p>	<p>The Chair summarised some of the points raised in the discussions on draft 2 of the Programming Document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was consensus that the bridging between the four strategic areas and the transversal areas should be clearer. • Clearly highlighted also was the relevance of work on skills and mobility, obviously without overlapping with Cedefop and the ELA, which could be done through agreements and Memorandums of Understanding. • The work on labour shortages was appreciated by the Groups, important also when considering mobility.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several interesting ideas had been proposed by the Groups and she asked Eurofound to take these into account in the next draft. • In relation to the surveys, the common position was that all surveys were important but that the preservation of the knowledge provided by the European Working Conditions Survey was a priority. On the other hand, there was interest in the proposal for a combined survey linking living and working conditions. The risk of the negative impact on the analysis of trends and on the content of the EWCS was highlighted by everyone. How could Eurofound have a very strong EWCS but also experiment in the direction of a survey that combined living and working conditions? <p>One possibility was to clearly highlight in the Programming Document that preparations for the EWCS would go ahead (i.e. in good time for 2026) while also trying an experiment with a new merger survey, which would answer new questions, would experiment with new modes of delivery, and which could also be important for economic reasons in the long term.</p> <p>A feasibility study, followed by a pilot and possibly, implementation, might at the very least form a basis for innovation in terms of future-proofing of surveys, and a new formulation of the EQLS or a way to combine the surveys. Today was not the moment to decide on a merger of surveys. This moment might come at a later stage when more was known.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Groups were requested to forward their comments on draft 2 of the Programming Document 2021-2024 in writing • Following discussions in the Groups and the Executive Board it was agreed that Eurofound would propose to proceed with a feasibility study on a combined Living and Working Conditions Survey. Once the outcome of the study is available the Management Board will take a decision on the next steps.
8.	<p>Presentation of 2018 Accounts by the Accounting Officer (MB 1/8)</p> <p>The Accounting Officer, Mr Maddocks presented the final 2018 accounts focusing on the statement of financial performance, the balance sheet and the budget outturn. The opinion of the Court of Auditors, received on 21 May 2019, had concluded that ‘the accounts presented fairly in all material respects the financial position of Eurofound at 31 December 2018 the result of its operations, cash flows and changes in net assets for the year ended in accordance with its financial regulation and with accounting rules adopted by the Commission’s accounting officer’.</p> <p>Once the Management Board had adopted an opinion on the accounts, they would be sent to the budgetary authorities by the 1 July as required in the Financial Regulation.</p> <p>An opinion on the final accounts for 2018 was adopted (Decision No. 9 of the Management Board).</p>
9.	<p>Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2018 (MB 1/9)</p> <p>The Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2018 together with an assessment of Eurofound’s activity (Decision No. 10 of the Management Board) were adopted.</p>
10.	<p>Appointment of Reporting Officers for the Executive Director and Deputy Director (MB 1/11)</p> <p>The following members of the Management Board were Appointed Reporting Officers in the appraisal procedure for the Executive Director:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barbara Kauffmann, Commission (Chair) • Harald Fugger Governments • Stefania Rossi, Employers

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Esther Lynch, Employees <p>The following members of the Management Board are appointed Reporting Officers in the appraisal procedure for the Deputy Director:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jörg Tagger, Commission (Chair) • Domingo Jimenez Valladolid, Governments • Rebekah Smith, Employers • Stefan Gran Employees
11.	Report from the Committee on Staff Matters
11.1	<p>Ms Kauffmann (Commission) Chair of the Committee made an oral report to the members on the first meeting of the committee which had taken place in May 2019.</p> <p>The Committee had taken a decision to reject a complaint submitted by a staff member under Article 90.2 of the Staff Regulations, appealing a decision of the Executive Director.</p>
12.	<p>The Chair thanked the members and informed them that the next meeting of the Management Board would take place on 7-8 November 2019, in Dublin.</p>

A. Bulgarelli

Chairperson

J. Menéndez-Valdés

Executive Director

**DECISIONS OF THE MANAGEMENT BOARD
TAKEN AT THE 1ST MEETING ON 28 JUNE 2019**

1. Adopted a revised Agenda (MB 1/1)
2. Adopted minutes of the Governing Board, 17 November 2018 (MB 1/2)
3. Decision No. 6 Adopted Rules of Procedure of the Management Board and Executive Board (MB 1/4)
4. Decision No. 7 – Adopted Rules of Procedure for the Committee on Staff Matters (MB 1/6)
5. Decision No. 8 – Adopted Rules of Procedure for the Advisory Committees (MB 1/7)
6. Decision No. 9 – Adopted an opinion on 2018 Final Accounts (MB 1/8)
7. Decision No. 10– Adopted the Consolidated Annual Activity Report 2018 together with an assessment of Eurofound’s activities, as well as its submission to the European Parliament, the Council and the Court of Auditors. (MB 1/9)
8. Decision No. 11 – Appointed Reporting Officers for the appraisal of the Executive Director and Deputy Director. (MB 1/11)

**1ST MEETING OF THE MANAGEMENT BOARD 28 JUNE 2019
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS¹**

	First Name	Last Name	Group	Member/Alternate	Member State
	Severin	Gruber	Employers	Member	Austria
	Harald	Fugger	Governments	Member	Austria
	Dinah	Djalinous-Glatz	Workers	Member	Austria
	Koen	Cabooter	Employers	Alternate	Belgium
	Kris	De Meester	Employers	Member	Belgium
	Guy	Van Gyes	Governments	Member	Belgium
	Dimiter	Brankov	Employers	Member	Bulgaria
	Iskren	Angelov	Governments	Alternate	Bulgaria
	Teodora	Todorova	Governments	Member	Bulgaria
	Ivan	Kokalov	Workers	Member	Bulgaria
	Orestis	Messios	Governments	Alternate	Cyprus
	Vladimíra	Drbalová	Employers	Member	Czechia
	Matěj	Gregárek	Governments	Alternate	Czechia
	Thomas	Mølsted Jørgensen	Government	Member	Denmark
	Peter	Waldorff	Workers	Member	Denmark
	Thorfrid	Hansen	Governments	Member	EEA/Norway
	Raul	Eamets	Employers	Alternate	Estonia
	Heleene	Suija	Governments	Member	Estonia
	Aline	Hoffmann	Workers (Deputy Coordinator)	N/A	European Union (ETUC)

¹ Members with voting rights shaded in blue

	First Name	Last Name	Group	Member/Alternate	Member State
	Brenda	O'Brien	EU-OSHA	N/A	EU Agency
	Barbara	Kauffmann	European Commission	Member (Deputy Chair)	European Union
	Rebekah	Smith	Employers (Coordinator)	Member	European Union (BusinessEurope)
	Sven	Matzke	European Commission	Member	European Union
	Joerg	Tagger	European Commission	Member	European Union
	Katja	Miettinen	Employers	Member	Finland
	Hanna	Hämäläinen	Governments	Alternate	Finland
	Maija	Lyly-Yrjänäinen	Governments	Member	Finland
	Sebastien	Darrigrand	Employers	Member	France
	Régis	Bac	Governments	Member	France
	Sebastien	Hopfner	Employers	Member	Germany
	Thomas	Voigtländer	Governments	Member	Germany
	Stefan	Gran (Deputy Chair)	Workers	Member	Germany
	Christos	Ioannou	Employers	Member	Greece
	Triantafyllia	Totou	Governments	Alternate	Greece
	Georgios	Gourzoulidis	Governments	Member	Greece
	Ioannis	Poupkos	Workers	Member	Greece
	Adrienn	Bálint	Employers	Member	Hungary
	Katalin	Kissne-Bence	Governments	Member	Hungary
	Pauline	O'Hare	Employers	Alternate	Ireland
	Dearbháil	Nic Giolla Mhicíl	Governments	Member	Ireland
	Stefania	Rossi (Deputy Chair)	Employers	Member	Italy

	First Name	Last Name	Group	Member/Alternate	Member State
	Aviana	Bulgarelli (Chair)	Governments	Member	Italy
	Ilona	Kiukucāne	Employers	Member	Latvia
	Linda	Romele	Workers	Alternate	Latvia
	Danukas	Arlauskas	Employers	Member	Lithuania
	Rita	Skrebiskiėne	Governments	Member	Lithuania
	Kristina	Krupaviciėne	Workers	Member	Lithuania
	Mario	van Mierlo	Employers	Member	Netherlands
	Dirk	Scheele	Governments	Alternate	Netherlands
	Roel	Gans	Governments	Member	Netherlands
	Jan	Kouwenberg	Workers	Member	Netherlands
	Katarzyna	Siemienkiewicz	Employers	Alternate	Poland
	Andrzej	Rudka	Employers	Member	Poland
	Jerzy	Ciechański	Governments	Member	Poland
	Bogdan	Olszewski	Workers	Member	Poland
	Manuel Marcelino	Pena Costa	Employers	Member	Portugal
	Fernando	Catarino José	Governments	Alternate	Portugal
	Nelson	Ferreira	Governments	Member	Portugal
	Silvia	Gregorcova	Governments	Member	Slovakia
	Vladka	Komel	Governments	Member	Slovenia
	Maja	Konjar	Workers	Member	Slovenia
	Miquel	Canales- Gutierrez	Employers	Member	Spain
	Domingo Jesus	Jimenez- Valladolid	Governments	Member	Spain

	First Name	Last Name	Group	Member/Alternate	Member State
	Fernando	Rocha	Workers	Member	Spain
	Jonna	Jonsson	Governments	Member	Sweden
	Mats	Essemyr	Workers	Member	Sweden
	Paul	Sellers	Workers	Member	United Kingdom

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Juan	Menéndez-Valdés	Director
Erika	Mezger	Deputy Director
Markus	Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Management Board
Jorge	Cabrita	Staff Committee
Franz	Eiffe	Staff Committee

REGRETS RECEIVED

Member State	Group	Member/Alternate
ETUC	Workers (Coordinator)	Ms Lynch
Croatia	Employers	Mr Jakelić Mr Sarić
Czechia	Workers	Ms Studnicna Mr Pavelka
France	Workers	Mr Loreal Mr Lasserre
Malta	Governments	Ms Muscat
Malta	Workers	Mr Bugeja
Romania	Employers	Ms Pasat
Slovenia	Employers	Mr Antaeur

DRAFT AGENDA
3rd MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF EUROFOUND

Conseil Central de l'Économie (CCE), **room 6**, 20 avenue d'Auderghem, 1040 Brussels
Friday, 13 September 2019, **9h30-13h00**

Item	Agenda item	Ref no.	Time	Presenting
1.	Draft Agenda, <i>For Adoption</i>	EB 3/1	9.30-9.35	Chair
2.	Draft Minutes of the 2 nd Executive Board Meeting of 16-17 May 2019, <i>For Adoption</i>	EB 3/2	9.35-9.45	Chair
3.	Progress Report of the Director, <i>For Information</i> - Projects Publications & Events	EB 3/3	9.45-10.15	Director
4.	Programming Document 2020– State of play, <i>For Information</i>	EB 3/4	10.15-10.30	Director
5.	Programming Document 2021-2024 Draft 3, <i>For discussion</i>	EB 3/5	10.30-12.00 (incl. break)	Director
6.	Recruitment of the Director, <i>For Information</i>	EB 3/6	12.00-12.15	European Commission
7.	Update from the Committee on Staff matters, <i>For Information</i>	EB 3/7	12.15-12.25	Chair of Committee
8.	Draft decision on delegation of power to make non-substantial amendments to the work programme, <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 3/8	12.25-12.45	Director
9.	Dates of Board and Executive Board meetings in 2020, <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 3/9	12:45-12:50	Director
10.	Schedule of November Board and Group meetings 7-8 November 2019, <i>For Discussion</i>	EB 3/10	12.50-12.55	Director
11.	AOB		12.55-13.00	

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

17 January 2020, 9.30-13.00 (tbc)

Eurofound's Brussels Liaison Office, room 6,

Conseil Central de l'Économie, 20 avenue d'Auderghem, Brussels

FINAL MINUTES

3ND MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

9.00-13.00 Friday, 13 September 2019

Ms Bulgarelli	Chair of the Management Board (Governments)
Ms Kauffmann	Deputy Chair of the Management Board (European Commission)
Mr Tagger	Member of the Executive Board (European Commission)
Mr Ciechański	Member of the Management Board (Governments, Coordinator)
Ms Smith	Employers (Coordinator)
Ms Lynch	Workers (Coordinator)
Ms Hoffmann	Workers (Deputy Coordinator)
Mr Matzke	European Commission
Mr Rieff	European Commission
Mr Menéndez-Valdés	Executive Director
Ms Jepsen	Deputy Director (from 1 November)
Mr Grimmeisen	Secretary to the Management Board
Mr Storrie	Eurofound
Mr Blomsma	Eurofound
Mr Baussand	Eurofound

1. Adoption of Agenda (EB 3/1)

Ms Kauffmann (Commission) chaired part of the meeting as Ms Bulgarelli was delayed.

She welcomed Ms Jepsen, who would take up her post as Deputy Director in Eurofound on 1 November.

She also welcomed Ms Lynch, newly appointed coordinator for the Workers' Group.
2. Adoption of Minutes of Executive Board meeting, 16-17 May 2019 (EB 3/2)

The **minutes were adopted** with minor amendments at 3.25 and 5.2.

Mr Tagger (Commission) restated that the minutes should be more concise and operational.
3. Progress Report of the Director (EB 3/3)
 - 3.1 The **Executive Director** reported on activities since the previous meeting in May. Highlights included participation in a regional WHO high-level conference on *Health Equity – accelerating progress towards healthy and prosperous lives for all* in Ljubljana in June, which quite intensively utilised data from the European Quality of Life Survey.
 - A European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) seminar on the gender pay gap was held in Eurofound in June and was an example of collaboration between the EU Agencies.
 - He highlighted some recent publications including the *Annual review on Minimum Wage* which was currently a hot topic.

Status of the research projects was included in the usual progress report. Of note was that the pilot for the *7th European Working Conditions Survey* (2020) would take place in September 2019.

Analysing multi-level forms of social dialogue at company level – this project was behind schedule as it was proving problematic to get replies from multinationals. An expert meeting was planned for September which would review the issues.

The *Industrial Action Monitor* pilot was ongoing, with quality control measures currently being checked with the correspondents. The Executive Board should be in contact with colleagues in the Advisory Committees who were fully informed, as a decision would be required in the future as to whether to continue the monitor.

4th European Company Survey — he noted that the fieldwork was now complete but with lower-than-planned sample sizes. The collection mode for the survey (Computer-Assisted Telephone Mode CATI) had been changed to Push to Web and this required careful analysis to identify any bias and correct for that. Detailed information had been provided to the Steering Group.

He informed the Executive Board that he would be presenting the Agency to the Employment Committee of the new European Parliament on 24 September along with the other four agencies in the social and employment area.

Regarding the European Company Survey which was being jointly undertaken with Cedefop, he was considering applying Cedefop's practice of launching a call for research organisations to be provided early access to the data, in order to maximise use of the data and to publish it within a shorter timeframe.

In the area of convergence, he wished to highlight a technical tool on Eurofound's website where it was possible to query Eurostat data and display graphs of convergence around a selected indicator. He highlighted an upcoming webinar on convergence with DG ECFIN.

He reported that budget execution was in line with forecasts.

The Internal Audit Service (IAS) had announced the audit topics for 2020-2022: *Human resources and ethics, Procurement and Contract management. Quality Management* was held as a reserve topic and *Implementation of cloud services* was proposed as a horizontal audit across the agencies. The IAS had stated that Eurofound was considered a low-risk agency.

3.2 **Ms Lynch (Workers)** asked if there were any concerns raised by the fact that the IAS were looking at ethics and procurement and contract management.

3.3 The **Executive Director** replied that these were very common topics of audits, and there was no need for concern.

He updated the members on a legal case that had been taken by a staff member that related to a data breach in 2018.

In response to a question from Ms Lynch (Workers) he stated that the data security issues identified in the breach had been immediately resolved.

He noted that two *ad hoc* research proposals had been received and would be presented to the Executive Board today.

3.4 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** noted that there were a number of topics in the progress report which would gain importance in the new Commission such as minimum wage and the gender pay gap.

The option of making the survey data available to researchers in advance was an interesting one and she would welcome further explanation perhaps in a paper from Eurofound.

- 3.5 **The Executive Director** outlined that currently early access to survey data was provided on a case by case basis, on the condition that it was not published before Eurofound published its report. This had the impact of maximising the research outputs from the data at an earlier time. In the case of the EQLS much of the secondary analysis was done in parallel in order to complete most of the reports within a two-year window.
- It would not be necessary to draft a paper on the matter as this was already the practice in some form in Eurofound, but he thought it might be considered by the Steering Group of the European Company Survey.
- In response to a question from Ms Hoffmann (Workers) as to whether the multi-level social dialogue project could be further extended, he said that it was necessary to complete the research this year as the funds could not be re-committed.
- 3.6 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** presented a proposal from colleagues in DG Justice and Consumers on pay transparency, whose objective was to gather information on the cost for businesses and national administrations who already had pay transparency measures in place. The network of correspondents would be useful for looking at a group of selected countries. It was felt that Eurofound would be well placed to source the information.
- 3.7 **The Executive Director** said that Eurofound had published a report two years previously on the implementation of pay transparency in different Member States, so it was possible that the correspondents could carry out the interviews, although similar problems to those encountered in the multi-level social dialogue project (i.e. lack of response) could not be ruled out, and the limited time frame would also be a challenge. He would have to check with the researchers.
- 3.8 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that it was felt that it was feasible to ask Eurofound to undertake some limited work in this area in light of the work already completed by it. Also, it was desirable that Eurofound should contribute to any major initiatives of the Commission.
- 3.9 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** in relation to the pay transparency proposal, encouraged Eurofound to look carefully at the methodology behind calculating the incurred costs. The proposal was rather challenging and to achieve it in such a short time frame would be additionally difficult.
- 3.10 **Ms Lynch (Workers)** thought that it was a valuable request from the Commission considering the work already done in the area, and one that would be helpful to decision-makers.
- In relation to the other *ad hoc* proposals, with regard to the question of tackling discrimination, she referenced the EU position on the importance of implementing the ILO conventions, and she thought that the research should also look at the grounds for discrimination in convention C111, that included discrimination on the grounds of social origin. A number of EU Member States already provided protection on that ground.
- In relation to the proposal on long-term care it would be important also to look at the health professionals providing care, not only the care workers.
- 3.11 **Mr Ciechański (Governments)** shared the concerns of the colleagues about the pay transparency project and thought that in light of the time and resource constraints the research would be quite anecdotal, and he recommended the inclusion of a statement to that effect by Eurofound.

- 3.12 **The Executive Director** reminded the members of the inherent constraints of ad hoc research. The research staff would assess what was feasible.
- 3.13 **The Chair** concluded that Eurofound would do what was feasible in the research on pay transparency, and the members would see if they could somehow encourage responses on the multi-level forms of social dialogue at company level.
4. Programming document 2020 – state of play (EB 3/5)
- 4.1 The document had been sent to the Commission in January, but due to new internal procedures their comments had not yet been received.
The comments would be available shortly and the programme would be submitted for final adoption at the Board meeting in November.
5. Programming Document 2021-2024 (EB 3/5)
- 5.1 **The Executive Director** briefly explained the revised structure of the document which now combined the annual and multiannual parts in a way that would avoid repetition.
Budget figures though provisional at this stage indicated a deficit of EUR 400,000 so that cuts would be necessary.
Rather than preparing a table detailing the uptake of comments by the Groups in this latest draft, he was available to discuss the changes during the meeting or at any time on a one-to-one basis.
The document reflected the conclusions of the Management Board in June on the development of surveys i.e. that a study would assess the feasibility of a combined living and working conditions survey, that any decisions in that area would not be irreversible, that the Management Board should be involved in that decision and that all options should be kept on the table for the moment.
To that end, it was proposed to establish a Steering Group to accompany the process (the pilot and ex post evaluation) in order to be as transparent as possible and to secure the best outcome.
The feasibility study would look at possible areas of interaction between working life and poverty, gender balance, impact of certain working conditions on satisfaction in life, and whether that could be exploited in a combined survey.
It was planned that the feasibility study would be discussed in a workshop in April 2020 linked to the Executive Board meeting in Dublin (proposed for 3 April).
- 5.2 **The Chairperson** thanked the Executive Director and opened the discussion noting that it was important to retain flexibility in the programme to adapt to the new strategic priorities of the Council, Parliament and the Commission.
- 5.3 **Mr Ciechański (Governments)** said that the comments of the Group would be sent in writing, noting that there had been strong concerns about the proposals on the surveys. He said that there had been lengthy discussions on the topic of combining the surveys in a recent Advisory Committee meeting where external experts had indicated that it would be possible to do so. To that end, he thought that some text should be inserted on the methodological issues relating to the survey proposals, assuaging the fears of some members that the Quality of Life questions might disappear in a combined survey.
He said that the structural financial problems facing the agency should be highlighted in the document. It should be stated quite clearly that innovation in the surveys would require higher investment initially, but that savings would be achieved in the long term.

He noted that the topic of the middle class had largely disappeared in this programme, but thought it was still of importance in relation to social cohesion. In considering upward convergence, it would be good for Eurofound to look at the integration of migrants and whether policies in this area were working.

Some in the Group felt that the topic of climate change should be more closely linked to living and working conditions.

- 5.4 **Ms Smith (Employers)** said that the overall structure was clearer now. The Group were glad to see that as well as job quality, competitiveness and growth were also mentioned.

The role of the Social Partners could be more prominent vis-à-vis the Commission, and also their scope of activities was broader than simply implementing the European Pillar of Social Rights she felt.

There was too much emphasis in the document on self-employment, and there should be efforts to look also at the opportunities it provided, a comment made previously by the Group but not yet taken up strongly in the document.

The Group welcomed the follow-on to the *Future of Manufacturing in Europe* (FOME) project, and also that the Employers' suggestions in relation to somehow rationalising the European Restructuring Monitor and European Jobs Monitor had been taken up (i.e. to look at what measures work in returning people to the labour market when working in a company that has been restructured).

In contrast to the Governments, the Group wondered if there was a need to return to the subject of the middle classes.

Something that was missing in the narrative of the programme was the role of the European Semester process in the cohesion/convergence debate.

In relation to the structure, it was sometimes the case that the longer description did not quite fit with the shorter description in the outputs.

- 5.5 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** agreed that the new structure was clearer. It was difficult to consider where cuts were possible however, without information about costings.

Many in the Group felt that the document now went too far in its mention of competitiveness and growth. In national debates it was said that to focus on competitiveness without looking at labour productivity undermined competitiveness from the point of view of the worker.

Line 306 – a focus on older workers struck the Group as a kind of regression in that to date Eurofound had focused its research on sustainable work on change for all workers, so that they could work longer and with better quality.

Line 410 – why had comments by the Workers that Social Partner activity on managing change was not limited to the company level not been taken up here?

Line 490 – why focus in the European Jobs Monitor only on jobs employing a large number of workers or those growing fastest only?

Line 510 – further to earlier comments by the Group there should be more emphasis on work organisation, training and upgrading skills rather than only looking at labour markets that lack geographical mobility.

Line 666 – this still missed the impact on contractual relations of employment.

Line 771 – there should also be a focus on wage as a driver of convergence.

Line 861 – the text currently in the margin notes should be included in the main document as it clearly set out the timeline and actions for the feasibility study and further actions. This would have been helpful in dealing with the questions raised during discussions in the Group meetings.

The concern was that if it were decided in 2020 to continue with the experimental combined survey and that experiment was subsequently evaluated negatively,

would it still be possible to continue with the EWCS and EQLS as currently planned. It did not seem possible.

Further comments on the programme would be provided in writing.

- 5.6 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** said that the document was much improved in terms of substance and clarity. He noted that the document was necessarily a work in progress until the new Commission was in place.

Working Conditions and sustainable work were of high importance to the Commission and it was hoped that Eurofound would continue to support the Commission's work in the labour law field. But he noted only one report on self-employment and wondered if there were other reports on non-standard work planned.

Line 375 - what was the value of adding social dialogue to this title? The initiative that capacity building included identification of the concrete needs of national social partners in the relevant countries was included in the 2021 programme but not yet in the general one.

Line 633 - the impact of new business models and organisation of work was an interesting objective, but it would be interesting to look at the impact of working conditions on job quality beyond platform work, and possibly to take a more generic approach looking at fragmentation, outsourcing and subcontracting, to make it a little bit more open and to open it for possible wider research tools. The impact of business models and work organisation was not yet included in the themes for 2021.

In relation to resources, Eurofound should look also at the possibility of savings in Title 1 (staff).

- 5.7 **The Chair** concluded that it seemed there was a general consensus that the draft was in a good direction.

It reflected quite well the discussions on the surveys which was a crucial point for the next programming period. She suggested that the document should clearly state that any decision on the surveys would be taken by the Management Board.

She thought that any feasibility study should consider all options presented to the Bureau in January as the objective was to future-proof the surveys.

- 5.8 **The Executive Director** thanked the members for their comments and noted that he was open to provide any clarifications on the uptake of comments directly with the members. He responded to some of the comments.

He agreed that it was important to be transparent in any discussions on the future of surveys and proposed therefore to establish a Steering Group to steer the project.

On the issue of training and skills it was necessary not to overlap with the work of Cedefop in this area.

In relation to comments by the Workers' Group on the restructuring projects, he said that social plans happened at company level and that was where social dialogue happened.

The project on working conditions and sustainable work aimed to look at what kind of quality working conditions could help people to work longer and better.

Regarding comments made on the General Context part of the programme, he said that the role of the Social Partners was of equal importance to that of the Commission and he welcomed any proposals for a text that the Social Partners felt would adjust the balance. It was of relevance however that the Commission had a right of initiative in legislation and were the primary users of Eurofound's research.

- 5.9 **Ms Lynch (Workers)** said that the programme indicated that the Management Board would take a decision on the basis of the feasibility study and it was important to be clear on this point.
She did not think that the impact of Brexit was reflected in the document.
- 5.10 **The Executive Director** said that it would be a two-phase process, a feasibility study with a Steering Group composed of Board members. And the adoption of the next steps by the Board after that.
He noted that by the time it was necessary to adopt the 2021 programme, more would be known about the impacts of Brexit.
Ms Kauffmann (Commission) confirmed that the current budget foreseen in the medium-term financial framework assumed no contribution from the United Kingdom.
- 5.11 **The Chair** closed discussion on the item and asked that comments be forwarded to Eurofound in writing.
6. Recruitment of Executive Director (EB 3/6)
- 6.1 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** outlined the new procedure for recruitment which was that the Management Board would appoint from a short list submitted by the Commission.
A draft vacancy notice had been circulated. She noted that it stated that the working language of the agency was English. The description of tasks was taken from Article 11 of the new Founding Regulation.
It was hoped to issue the recruitment notice in late October with a view to completing the pre-selection process in time for June 2020, at which time a Management Board meeting could discuss the appointment.
- 6.2 The Chair thanked the Commission for this information and further to a request from the members, agreed that information on the stages in the recruitment procedure (e.g. publication deadline, the selection committee etc) would be provided to the members.
7. Update from the Committee on Staff Matters
- 7.1 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** Chair of the committee updated the members on two technical decisions adopted on 11 September on 'Types of posts in Eurofound' and 'Sub-delegation of powers by the appointing authority to the Paymaster's office of the European Commission (PMO), which was linked to the deployment of the Commission's HR system (SYSPER) in Eurofound and would allow the Director of the PMO to exercise some appointing authority powers in relation for instance to rights of entry and service or pay allowances.
8. Draft decision on delegation of power to make non-substantial amendments to the work programme (EB 3/8)
- 8.1 **Mr Grimmeisen** presented the draft which reflected the rules adopted by Eurofound's sister agency Cedefop that had been approved by the Commission.
Important elements were the regular communication to the Management and Executive Boards on all substantial and non-substantial amendments. Substantial amendments would require formal approval by the Board.
Some footnotes had been included for clarification purposes.
A threshold of 20% for substantial amendments was similar to provisions in Cedefop. The qualitative assessment of what constituted a substantial amendment remained the same (i.e. adding an activity, deleting an activity, changing the

direction of the work programme were also considered substantial independent of the financial consequences).

- 8.2 **Mr Tagger (Commission)** said the Commission favoured a uniform approach to non-substantial amendments in the three tripartite agencies and confirmed that the draft proposal was in line with what was expected in an agency. It concerned the transfer of monies from Title 1 (Staff) and Title 2 (Administration) to Title 3 (Operational) and not the other way around, which was an important clarification.
- 8.3 **Ms Lynch (Workers)** did not think that the document was clear, or in line with the explanation in the accompanying slides.
- 8.4 Following a short discussion, it was suggested to clarify the text in the recitals without changing the articles in the draft document. The rules would be checked once again with the Executive Board before submitting them for adoption by a written procedure.
9. Dates of Board and Executive Board meetings in 2020 (EB 3/9)
- 9.1 The members agreed that there would be just three meetings of the Executive Board in January, April and September 2020. Any other meetings would be informal.
- The Executive Board meeting in Dublin in April would be preceded by a workshop on the feasibility study for development of the surveys.
- It was decided that an additional Management Board meeting would be required to appoint a new Executive Director and it was agreed that Groups and Board meetings would be held on 2-3 July 2020.
- The revised document with the proposed dates would be put forward for adoption at the Board meeting in November.
10. The schedule of the Board and Group meetings on 7-8 November 2019 was agreed.
11. The next meeting of the Executive Board would be an informal meeting on 7 November 2020 in Dublin, prior to the Management Board meeting.

[A.Bulgarelli]

[J. Menéndez-Valdés]

Chairperson

Executive Director

3rd Meeting of Executive Board — Conclusions and Actions

1. Adopted minutes of Executive Board of 16-17 May 2019 with minor amendments.
2. Discussed a new ad hoc proposal from the Commission on *Pay transparency*, and two previously submitted proposals from them on the *Long-term care workforce* and the *Role of the social partners in combating workplace discrimination*. It was agreed to assess the feasibility of the proposals with Eurofound's research staff.
3. Discussed Draft 3 of Programming document 2021-2024 and agreed to send comments in writing to Eurofound, for preparation of a final draft to be approved by the Management Board in November 2019.
4. Took note of the vacancy notice of the Commission for post of Executive Director. Agreed that an outline of the steps in the process would be circulated to the Executive Board.
5. Took note of two technical decisions of the Committee on Staff Matters in relation to 1) Titles of posts and 2) sub-delegation of powers of the Authorising Officer to the Paymaster's office (PMO) in Luxembourg.
6. Discussed a draft decision on 'Delegation of powers to make non-substantial amendments to the work programme'. Decided that there should be clarifications made in the recitals of the document, which would then be submitted to the Board for approval.
7. Agreed the dates for meetings of the Board and Executive Board in 2020. The dates would be formally adopted by the Management Board in November.
8. Agreed the schedule for the Groups and Board meetings in Dublin on 7-8 November.

DRAFT AGENDA
SECOND MEETING OF THE MANAGEMENT BOARD OF THE
EUROPEAN FOUNDATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF
LIVING AND WORKING CONDITIONS

9:00-13:00 hrs, Friday, 8 November 2019
Raymond-Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound, Dublin

Item	Agenda item	Doc. no.	Presented by
1.	Opening of meeting and examination of Draft Agenda (EN, FR, DE) & Final minutes of 1st Meeting of the Governing Board, 28 June 2019 (EN, FR, DE) (<i>For Information only - approved in October 2019</i>)	MB 2/1 MB 2/2	Chair
2.	Welcome by the Executive Director and introduction to the new Deputy Director		Executive/ Deputy Director
3.	Presentation by the Director General of DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, Joost Korte: <i>Priorities of the new Commission</i>	MB 2/3	Mr Korte, European Commission
4.	Progress Report of the Executive Director on the activities of Eurofound, <i>For Information</i>	MB 2/4	Executive Director
5.	Programming Document 2020 (EN, FR, DE), <i>For Decision</i>	MB 2/5	Executive Director
	<i>COFFEE BREAK (with photo de famille)</i>	<i>10.50 - 11.10</i>	
6.	Programming Document 2021-2024 (EN only), <i>For final Discussion</i>	MB 2/6	Executive Director
7.	Election of Chair and Deputy Chairs of the Management Board, <i>For Decision</i>	MB 2/7	Chair
8.	Schedule of Meetings 2020 of the Management Board, Executive Board and Groups, <i>For Decision</i>	MB 2/8	Chair
9.	Advisory Bodies - 9.1 Advisory Committees – Composition and meeting dates 2020, <i>For Information</i> - 9.2 Steering Committee Survey Development, <i>For Decision</i>	MB 2/9	Chair
10.	Draft Implementing rules for application of regulation (EU) 2018/1725 on Data Protection (EN only), <i>For Discussion</i>	MB 2/10	Executive Director
11.	Implementing rules for application of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 on Public Access to Documents (EN only), <i>For Decision</i>	MB 2/11	Executive Director

Item	Agenda item	Doc. no.	Presented by
12.	Draft Policy on Conflicts of Interest (EN only), <i>For Discussion</i>	MB 2/12	Executive Director
13.	Action plan cross-agencies evaluation (EN only), <i>For Information</i>	MB 2/13	Executive Director
14.	Recruitment of Executive Director – state of play, <i>For Information</i>	MB 2/14	European Commission
15.	Report from the Committee on Staff Matters, <i>For Information</i>	MB 2/ 15	Chair of the Committee
16.	AOB		

FINAL MINUTES SECOND MEETING OF THE MANAGEMENT BOARD OF EUROFOUND

9.00-13.00, Friday, 8 November 2019,
Raymond-Pierre Bodin Conference Centre, Eurofound, Dublin

1. **The Chairperson**, Ms Bulgarelli opened the meeting and welcomed Mr Joost Korte, Director General of DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion who would address the Management Board on the priorities of the new Commission.

Presentation by Mr Korte, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion

2. **Mr Korte** said that his first visit to Eurofound came at a crucial moment for Brussels, and for the Agency as it adopted its multiannual work programme. He would make a short presentation to allow for questions and discussions with Board members. After that he would meet with the staff of Eurofound.

He said that the European Commission valued the good cooperation with Eurofound and that it benefitted from the high-quality input provided by the Agency. Speaking about the new founding regulation he said that the process had been driven by a need to ensure that the agencies were efficient and fully adapted to the requirements of the present times. A period of stability should now follow what had been a period of change and upheaval.

The Juncker Commission had made great progress on the Social Europe agenda with the adoption of 24 legislative proposals, one on social security coordination still under discussion, and proposals on the European Social Fund (ESF) and the new European Globalisation Fund (EGF) regulation, linked to discussions on the next EU Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF).

Ms von der Leyen's Commission would be in place by 1 December subject to the approval of the appointment of the final Commissioners.

Her priorities were apparent already in her speech to the European Parliament and included the importance of the social dimension in the European integration project. It was an important message for European citizens to hear, particularly when there was great anxiety in the general population within the Member States about their lives and expectations.

A priority in the Commissioner's political guidelines was for 'An economy that works for the people' and this was underpinned by seven concrete proposals. It was stated also that 'Social Dialogue' was the essence of our European welfare states that should be cherished, protected and promoted.

The new Commission would propose an action plan to implement the European Pillar of Social Rights and would ask Member States, the Social Partners, regions and all other stakeholders to implement the Social Pillar.

The strategic agenda 2019-2024 of the Council, adopted in June 2019, was an important document that he urged everyone to read. It also included a strong commitment to implementing the social pillar. It was likely that 2020 would be taken up with consultations and conferences with a view to coming forward with an action plan most likely in early 2021.

The initiative on the minimum wage which Ms von der Leyen wished to bring forward as soon as possible, would look at defining a framework within which each Member State, in accordance with its own rules and traditions, could fix its own minimum wage. It was clear however that there were strong constraints on the scope for action in view of the limited competence of the EU to legislate in this area.

Ms von der Leyen was also committed to the creation of a European unemployment benefit reinsurance scheme whereby if a Member State got into difficulties because of a crisis and could no longer pay, or had to reduce, its unemployment benefits, then there would be solidarity from the EU through a fund or through loans whereby the level of unemployment benefit could be maintained.

One initiative on which the continued assistance of Eurofound would be important was in relation to the working conditions of platform workers. The incoming Commissioner for Employment and Social Affairs, Mr Schmit when questioned about plans in relation to the digital platform economy had said that changes were moving fast in the area, and that what was needed was an inventory to know what was really happening and where the problems were. Whilst it was important not to be only negative about the platform economy it was necessary to keep an eye on the minimum protection that everybody in Europe deserved. It was suggested that a conference on the subject would take place in the second half of 2020. There was also a need to look at the growth of self-employment or independent workers and the impact on social benefits and protections for workers. The possibility of collective bargaining rights for the truly self-employed would also be investigated, particularly for those at the bottom of the market.

The European Commission were looking to modernise the already existing Youth Guarantee which had been a successful instrument during the crisis, and to come forward with a new recommendation in the area with monies made available through the European Social Fund.

A European Child Guarantee had been proposed by the European Parliament in response to the estimates that 25 million children within the EU were at risk of poverty and there were ongoing serious reflections on how to make such an instrument useful.

The European Gender Strategy and the question of equal pay were also of importance to Eurofound. Though not strictly speaking within the remit of DG Employment, staff members would be involved in the task force to bring forward proposals in this regard.

He mentioned also the Skills Agenda noting that the modernisation of skills was a topic of relevance to Eurofound.

In the coming five years the key theme would be transition and the two issues of digital developments and the move to a climate neutral economy in 2050 represented huge changes that would need to take place in a way that was acceptable to European societies. A key issue of debate therefore was how to ensure that this was carried out in the Member States in a socially acceptable manner.

Finally, with regard to the budgetary outlook he outlined how the normally complex MFF negotiations were being further complicated by the ongoing uncertainties around Brexit. He suggested that the best potential scenario would be a stable budget, which nevertheless would imply some staff reductions within the EU Institutions and Agencies.

- 2.2 **The Chair** thanked Mr Korte for his presentation. She said that the value of Eurofound's tripartite structures alongside the participation of the Commission increased the possibility of Eurofound's research being relevant to EU policymakers, and she was pleased to note that the proposals in the next programming period were clearly aligned with the priorities of the Commission.
- 2.3 The members had an opportunity to put any points or questions to the Director General to which he responded.

- There was as yet no clear decision on a possible successor to the Lisbon Strategy and the European Semester. It would be important that such a strategy should have targets and instruments to measure progress in the social area. The action plan for the social pillar was something that might be useful in this regard, for example in measuring what Member States were doing in relation to the different principles, perhaps through annual reporting.
- There was no timeframe for the introduction of the European Reinsurance Scheme as many factors were at play, including whether a new proposal should replace the 2017 one and questions around how the scheme should be funded. It was a complicated issue and was led by DG ECFIN in the Commission. Any decisions would likely be made in the course of 2020.
- He agreed with comments by the Chair of the Workers' Group that there should be proper funding of social dialogue and capacity building for Social Partners and felt that there were possibilities within the European Social Fund to do so. As regards funding of the Green New Deal, the Commission would propose a new fund known as the Just Transition Fund.
- He agreed with the statement by the coordinator for the Employers' Group that with regard to any action in relation to self-employment, digitalisation of the economy or platform work, account should be taken of the diversity of national situations. He also agreed that the competitiveness of industry and the international dimension of the European economy should not be undermined. The area of self-employment was a complicated one for Member States and the Treaties did not provide a role for the Commission in this area, so it was not obvious that any new initiatives would be brought forward at this time.
- He said that in relation to bringing forward proposals on Social Dialogue it was not clear in what form that would be, whether a Directive or a Recommendation. There were obviously challenges in bringing these proposals forward in line with the announced timetable, but he noted the concerns of the Employers' representative in this regard.
- With regard to relations with the European Labour Authority (ELA) it should be stated that the ELA was very different to Eurofound and the other EU Agencies. It was an operational agency to help the Member States work better together. It did not pose any risk to the Agencies under the remit of DG Employment and Social Affairs.
- Regarding the Skills Agenda there was unanimity that skills were the main challenge or weakness of the European economy. Action was foreseen both in the European Social Fund and the InvestEU Programme (2021-2027) which was the successor to the Juncker Programme.

The Chair thanked Mr Korte for a very interesting conversation that was also important for discussions on the work programme.

Adoption of agenda and minutes of Management Board meeting 28 June 2019 (MB 2/1 & MB 2/2)

3. **The Chair** welcomed Ms Jepsen, the new Deputy Director who had introduced herself to the members on the previous day.
She also welcomed Ms Lope Fontagné the independent expert appointed by the European Parliament, which was a new provision in the founding regulation.

The agenda and minutes were ADOPTED.

Progress Report of the Director (MB 2/4)

- 4.1 **The Executive Director** in his slide presentation, outlined some areas of progress in the year highlighting Eurofound's contributions to the policy debate through use of its findings in key reports and collaborations with international organisations, such as the joint ILO report *Working conditions in a global perspective* which carried out an analysis through the prism of 'job quality' in 41 countries with 1.2 billion workers. Eurofound's report *Annual review on minimum wages in 2019* had focused on recent developments as well as how taxation and social contributions impacted on net minimum wage. As touched upon earlier this area was one of the priorities of President-elect von der Leyen. It had been mentioned in the Employment Committee of the European Parliament as a potential pilot project (similar to the Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME) project that had concluded in Eurofound earlier in the year).
- Eurofound continued its work on Representativeness Studies, had made contributions to the European Semester, and had organised two seminars on Capacity Building around a Eurofound Working Paper.
- He reported on the *ad hoc* research requests in 2019. Three had been significant in terms of resources: *Long-term care workforce*; *Mapping of Social Partner initiatives to combat discrimination in the workforce*; *Pay transparency in the EU* — all requested by the European Commission.
- One request was less significant in terms of resources: *Summary information on minimum wages* (also from the Commission).
- He presented results of the various performance indicators used by Eurofound to monitor its effectiveness and efficiency.
- 4.2 **The Chair** thanked the Director for his report and the staff for their excellent work. She invited the members to make any questions or comments.
- 4.3 **Ms Smith (Employers)** informed that the Group were proposing a small *ad hoc* research request to gather information on existing European Works Council (EWC) practices, comprising mainly desk research with possibly some interviews with management or worker representatives. The aim was to look at the practical use of the Directive, at the changes for those who were in EWCs, in order to have examples of solutions found, and to have a view of the benefits from the perspective of Employers and Workers, with the objective of promoting the uptake of EWCs.
- 4.4 **The Executive Director** noted that the request would be reviewed and considered by the researchers.
- Mr Gran (Workers)** said that although he had not seen the proposal in principle the Group could support it, but they would like to see the questions beforehand, because the European Parliament were launching an own-initiative report on the EWCs and it could support their work.
- 4.5 **Ms Lope Fontagné (European Parliament)** thanked the Executive Director for his report, and the staff and members for their welcome thus far.
- She was already familiar with the work of Eurofound and looked forward to supporting a good collaboration between the Parliament and the Agency.

Adoption of Final Programming Document 2020 (MB 2/5)

- 5.1 The **Executive Director** introduced the document, explaining that the 2020 programme had been approved by the Board in January 2019. The document had been amended only where necessary to include more detailed planning or to

incorporate the official opinion of the European Commission. Some of the parts setting the policy context had also been updated where necessary.

- 5.2 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** said that the Workers' Group had reflected on the way in which the new programming method affected the way they worked. On a positive note it was possible now to see the progression in the projects. They regretted however that there was less detail about the research and less understanding of what would happen in 2020, which risked diminishing the members' engagement.
- 5.3 **Mr Ciechański (Governments)** proposed to insert the following text on the outcome of the feasibility study on the surveys.
- Page 54, insert at end of third bullet 'pending the decision of the Management Board taken after the results of the feasibility study are made available.'
 - Page 55, to add the same sentence under 'Objectives', at the end of the fourth bullet point.
 - Page 22, 24, in relation to the project in the Programming Document 2021 *Distributional impacts of climate change policies*, the study should be ready before the Just Transition Fund would be established. It was proposed to make use of the *ad hoc* budget to carry out the work in 2020 instead, or to amend the Programming Document 2021 text by adding to this proposal that it would be delivered 'as early as possible'.
 - Were savings possible in relation to costs in the area of corporate communication?
- 5.4 **The Employers and European Commission** said that they could adopt the 2020 programme with no further comments.
- 5.5 **The Executive Director** acknowledged that there was less information at project level in the Programming Document than in the past, as the document had moved from 'projects' to 'activities'. This had already been the case in the current multiannual programme 2017-2020. More information was provided in different ways.
- The Programming Document was a regular item on the agenda of the Advisory Committee meetings and included more detailed presentations on the projects.
 - In the 2021 programme more detail was provided in a table with projects, outputs and timing.
 - The changes requested by the Governments would be introduced.
 - He suggested to use the *ad hoc* budget in 2020 for the proposed project on climate change policies. Eurofound would make a proposal.
 - The costs in relation to corporate communications also included databases, and costs relating to the website that could be considered research outputs. It also included translations that were expected by the Board. The budget for communications had been substantially cut in the last few years.
- 5.6 **The Chair** said that when considering budget reductions, it was usually the surveys that were considered by Eurofound but there needed to be a more balanced approach. The budget for communication was almost a quarter of the overall budget and should also be included in budget reductions.

The Programming Document 2020 was adopted with the amendments.

Adoption of Programming Document 2021 (MB 2/6)

6. The Chair opened the floor for comments on the 2021 programme.

- 6.1 **Mr Ciechański (Governments)** gave the comments of the Governments' Group.
- Overall the impression of the evolution of the programme was a positive one.
 - *2.6 Promoting social cohesion and convergence*, in view of the plans of the new European Commission and EU Presidencies in areas like the minimum wage, and the unemployment reinsurance guarantee perhaps they should be analysed from the point of view of their impact on convergence.
 - In general, Eurofound should more widely take account of relevant studies by other international organisations. They should also more directly reflect in their conclusions how megatrends (demography, technology, globalisation, climate change) had impacted on the particular aspect of living and working conditions under consideration.
 - In relation to the surveys, the Group were unconvinced that a merger of the EWCS and EQLS was the best solution. The quality of these surveys had not been questioned and the savings might not be very substantial given the limited competition in the market. The Group however would not oppose a feasibility study and consequently supported the creation of a Steering Group that would oversee the development of the future of the surveys. The feasibility study would be an element of any future decisions. All options however should remain on the table.
 - He proposed a number of changes that might be included in the document.

- 6.2 **Mr Gran (Workers)** said that the Group agreed with the proposals made by the Governments in relation to the surveys. They were by and large pleased with how their previous comments had been taken up in this draft.

In relation to the possibility of combining the surveys, the Group were to date unconvinced by the information put forward by Eurofound.

However, they looked forward to the results of the feasibility study and if the arguments were compelling would be open to change. It was important however that in July there would be a final decision on the matter.

- 6.3 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** provided more detailed comments of the Workers' Group.
- One element that was missing in the document was the mention of the results of the European Company Survey (ECS), which would fall between the end of one programming cycle and the beginning of another. The results were of a transversal nature and there was potential to use some of the results in later work (whether on digitalisation, job content or industrial relations). There should be reminders here and there in the text that the work of the ECS might shed light on a topic. That could be a starting point for using these results in later years.
 - The Group could not adopt the rules for the Steering Group in their current form because of a certain mismatch between the composition of the Group and its very technical brief.
 - The feasibility study needed to look at the methodological and technical and chronological feasibility of a pilot study and a possible merger, but it also needed to specifically cover the desirability of this merger (i.e. not only whether it was doable but whether it was desirable, what were the risks, what was the cost/benefit analysis, was it worth the risk, what data would be irretrievably lost, and what could be done to address that). There should be a stocktaking of who used what data, of whether there was data that was not used. Was there any linchpin data that would cause specific concepts of Eurofound to crumble she wondered.
 - It was both technical and political work. The Group saw a need to have more evidence and information upon which the Management Board could base its

decision.

There should be a division of roles, with an expert performing the feasibility study. Where did Eurofound staff who had a lot to say on the matter, come in to the process?

- The Steering Group for the Joint European Company Survey had worked well and might be used as a model for the new Group. The Advisory Committees should also be involved in some way, and the Group suggested planning back-to-back meetings of the relevant committees.
- The Group underlined the need to have a clear roadmap for the future. They wished to see in the Programming Document text that preparations for the eighth round of the EWCS remained as normal (whether or not there was a pilot). All milestones should be included in the multiannual part of the document in order to prevent a situation whereby a point of no return would be passed, without noticing it.
- She would forward minor comments from the Group in writing.

6.4 **Ms Smith (Employers)** provided comments from the Employers.

- The Group did see potential benefits in merging the surveys in terms of looking at issues such as in-work poverty or work-life balance, however it was essential that important data was not lost, in particular in the ECS and EWCS. They therefore supported the suggestions made by the other Groups and were in favour of having external experts in the Steering Group who could speak on the methodological issues, as well as Board members who could speak on the rationale or desirability of merging the surveys. They would nominate members for the Steering Group at a later date.
- They were happy that a number of their comments had been taken on board in the Programming Document, in particular the focus on labour shortages which should of course be done in the most appropriate way with Cedefop without duplicating the work. They supported the efforts to build on the FOME research. They also welcomed the link between convergence and structural reforms and the European Semester process. The boosting of the research on capacity building of social dialogue was also welcomed.
- Line 158, in what was an issue of presentation it was felt that the role of the Social Partners came too late in this part of the document.
- Line 207 and 238, the Group would propose to refer not only to 'labour productivity' but also to 'competitiveness'
- Lines 282-283, they were concerned that self-employment in its entirety was referred to as 'non-standard employment' and they proposed some amendments to the text in order to take into account the diverse national situations.
- Line 452, Eurofound should build further on the work of the two successful seminars on Capacity Building and suggested the following text 'Building on the recommendations made in the Eurofound report on capacity building, Eurofound will explore further efforts in this area.'
- She thanked the colleagues from Eurofound who had explained why it was difficult to merge the European Jobs Monitor (EJM) and the European Restructuring Monitor (ERM). However, it was felt that the results of the monitoring tools should be presented in a more integrated way to provide an overview of the structural changes in the labour market.
- In the area of the Platform Economy it was felt that Eurofound should try to gather some quantitative data on the phenomenon, as it was well-placed to do so.

- Line 1009, the Agency should try to get access to national-level administrative registers and databases and statements to that effect should be inserted in two places in the document.

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

- Line 482, the text might need to be adjusted to deal with the timing issue whereby the proposal for a legal instrument on minimum wage would already be on the table in 2021.
- Line 734, the overview should refer to the 'distributional impacts' of a low carbon economy.
- The Commission supported the proposal by the Employers to build on the success of the two capacity building seminars held by Eurofound.
- They noted a tension between text on staff development on pages 38 and 39.
- They agreed that Eurofound should proceed with the feasibility study on the future of surveys and that the Steering Group should include experts, but they were neither for nor against the merging of the surveys. It was important to keep an open mind.

There were overlaps between the surveys and merging them would make it possible to address some new issues and questions. However, it was particularly important to preserve the EWCS and there were some concerns about losing data. There were overlaps between the EQLS and the EU-SILC and that was a potential area where savings could be made. It made sense that Eurofound should look to the future to see what possibilities there were to optimise the surveys, without losing what was important and cherished by everyone.

6.6 **The Executive Director** thanked the members for their comments which would be taken in consideration in the revised programme.

He thanked the Board for supporting the feasibility study. He said that Eurofound shared the same concerns and objectives in the centrality of the surveys, keeping trends and not losing key elements. He said that Ms Jepsen, the Deputy Director would primarily chair the Steering Group. This would ensure continuity over the four years of its existence and had the additional benefit of bringing fresh eyes to the matter. All the usual planning for the surveys remained in place, not pre-empting any decision.

Eurofound might try to do something further on Capacity Building but the question was how to fund that activity.

He could agree to the Employers' suggestion to present the findings of the EJM and the ERM in a more integrated way. Eurofound would consider this.

On Platform work, other organisations were already carrying out quantitative research (e.g. the Joint Research Centre with whom the agency was in close contact). Eurofound did not have the resources to undertake this kind of activity but would continue to engage with those doing this work and would include this information.

He could agree to including a sentence on the need to utilise administrative data at national level but would suggest including that in the section on methodological tools.

He invited the members to send their detailed comments in writing within one week.

6.7 **The Chair** thanked the Executive Director for his willingness to take the comments of the stakeholders on board.

With regard to the future of the surveys, there was a need to be ready if the merger of surveys did not go ahead. The next cycle of the EQLS needed to be considered

asap. A clear roadmap for the EWCS was required as preparations could need to start in 2024.

Regarding the risk assessment (Annex VIII) the risks to the organisation in the coming years she said were the overall budgetary situation and not only the sustainability of the surveys. The risk table in the Programming Document should outline the risks in the more global sense.

Decision on Chair and Deputy Chairs (MB 2/7)

7. **The Chair and Vice-Chairs were re-elected as follows:**

Chairperson	Ms Bulgarelli	Governments' Group chairing since 2018)
Deputy Chairperson	Ms Rossi	(Employers' Group chairing 2016-2018)
Deputy Chairperson	Mr Gran	(Workers' Group chairing 2014-2016)
Deputy Chairperson	Ms Kauffmann	European Commission

Schedule of meetings for Management and Executive Board in 2020 (MB 2/8)

8. It was proposed to seek alternative dates for the Management Board meeting in November 2020 and to approve the dates later by written procedure.

Advisory Committees (MB 2/9.1)

9. The Governments and Workers informed of changes in the composition in two Advisory Committees.

Steering Group for Surveys development (MB 2/9.2)

10. The Governments' Group said that they could adopt the proposal for the Steering Group and could already nominate Mr Voigtländer (DE) and Mr Scheele (NL) to represent the Group, with Mr van Gyes (BE) and Mr Fugger (AT) as alternates.

The Workers' Group however would not adopt the text at this time and would wait for clarification in the coming weeks of the role and tasks of the Group, at which point they would nominate their members.

Both the Employers and the Commission said that they would support the proposal of the Workers for a further clarification of the role and tasks.

The Executive Director asked the members to outline their points of concern in writing in order to have a new proposal to be submitted for adoption by a written procedure of the Board as soon as possible.

Draft implementing rules for application of regulation (EU)2018/1725 on Data Protection (MB 2/10)

11. Following comments from the Commission that the rules diverged slightly from those already adopted by Cedefop, the Chair proposed that Eurofound and the Commission liaise on the matter prior to submitting the rules for approval by a written procedure.

Implementing rules for application of Regulation (EC) 1049/2001 on Public Access to Documents (MB 2/11)

12. **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** suggested some small changes to the document. **The Chair** proposed that the rules be adopted with this amendment.

Draft policy on conflict of interests (MB 2/12)

13. In response to comments that the rules were rather complicated Mr Grimmeisen assured that they were aligned with the policies of Cedefop and EU OSHA. He said that a revised version of the policy incorporating the recently received comments of the Commission, would be submitted for adoption by a written procedure.

The Chair agreed with this approach and noted that Eurofound was not a regulatory agency and the risks were therefore lower. She trusted in the Commission's opinion on the matter.

Action plan cross-agencies evaluation (MB 2/13)

14. **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that it was important that the action plan fitted well with Eurofound's decision-making process. The Board would like to be informed regularly and in order to follow the development of the plan, there should be more concrete milestones and final deadlines for the implementation of each proposed action. Other Agencies had organised dedicated workshops and she wondered if Eurofound was planning something along these lines.

The Founding Regulation provided for the Agency to explore synergies, so she would remove the reference in the document to this role being the responsibility of the Commission. She said that comments would be forwarded in writing.

Recruitment of Executive Director (MB 2/14)

15. **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that the vacancy notice for the post of Executive Director was based on a standard model established by DG HR for the Agencies. The description of tasks was taken from Article 11 of the Founding Regulation.

Screening of candidates would commence in January 2020 and a consultative committee organised by DG HR would conduct initial interviews, followed by interviews with the Commissioner. It was anticipated that the Management Board would discuss the appointment in June 2020.

The members stressed that the shortlisted candidates should have strong experience in social partnership.

Following a short exchange on the matter, it was agreed that there should be some reflection on the format for the presentation of the shortlisted candidates to the Management Board.

Report from the Committee on Staff Matters (MB 2/15) (no document)

16. **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** who chaired the Committee on Staff Matters reported on its work since the last Board meeting, including a review of two technical HR decisions (implementing rules to the Staff Regulations on types of posts in Eurofound and the sub-delegation of the Appointing Authority powers to the Paymaster Office as part of the move to a new HR system) both of which had been approved subsequently by written procedures.

17. AOB

Ms Smith (Employers) said that the Group wished to appoint Mr van Mierlo (NL) in place of Ms Rossi as Reporting Officer for the appraisal of the Executive Director. A decision to appoint Mr van Mierlo was adopted.

18. **The Chair** thanked Eurofound and the members for their participation and closed the meeting. The next meeting of the Management Board would take place on **2-3 July 2020** in **Dublin**.

[A.Bulgarelli]
Chairperson

[J. Menéndez-Valdés]
Executive Director

DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE MANAGEMENT BOARD DURING ITS MEETING ON 8 NOVEMBER 2019

Decision	Reference
1. Adopted the draft agenda for the meeting & minutes of the previous meeting (28 June 2019)	MB 2/1 & 2
2. Adopted the Programming Document 2020 with minor revisions	MB 2/5
3. Discussed the final draft Programming Document 2021-2024 – proposed a number of amendments to be considered in a final draft for review by Executive board in January 2020	MB 2/6
4. Elected the Chair and Deputy Chairs	MB 2/7
5. Decided to review the dates of meetings of the Board in 2020 and resubmit for adoption by a written procedure	MB 2/8
6. Decided to review the composition and tasks outlined in the document 'Steering Group on development of Surveys' and to resubmit for approval by a written procedure	MB 2/9.2
7. Adopted rules for implementing Regulation (EC) No. 1049/2001 on Access to Documents with minor amendments	MB 2/10
8. Adopted a decision appointing Mr van Mierlo as Reporting Officer for the Employers' Group in the appraisal of the Executive Director in place of Ms Rossi	AOB

List of Participants
2nd Meeting of Eurofound Management Board - Friday, 8 November 2019

	Title	First Name	Last Name	Group	Member State	Status
1.	Mr	Carlos	Alves	Workers	Portugal	Alternate
2.	Mr	Juha	Antila	Workers	Finland	Member
3.	<i>Ms</i>	<i>Viktoria</i>	<i>Bergström</i>	<i>Governments</i>	<i>Sweden</i>	<i>Member</i>
4.	Mr	Javier	Blasco de Luna	Employers	Spain	Alternate
5.	Mr	Dimiter	Brankov	Employers	Bulgaria	Member
6.	Ms	Aviana	Bulgarelli	Governments	Italy	Member
7.	Mr	Koen	Cabooter	Employers	Belgium	Alternate
8.	<i>Ms</i>	<i>Lucile</i>	<i>Castex-Chauve</i>	<i>Governments</i>	<i>France</i>	<i>Alternate</i>
9.	Mr	Jerzy	Ciechański	Governments	Poland	Member
10.	Mr	Sébastien	Darrigrand	Employers	France	Member
11.	Ms	Vladimíra	Drbalova	Employers	Czechia	Member
12.	Mr	Raul	Eamets	Employers	Estonia	Alternate
13.	Mr	Mats	Essemyr	Workers	Sweden	Member
14.	Mr	Joseph	Farrugia	Employers	Malta	Member
15.	Mr	Nelson	Ferreira	Governments	Portugal	Member
16.	Mr	Harald	Fugger	Governments	Austria	Member
17.	Mr	Roel	Gans	Governments	Netherlands	Member
18.	Mr	Ger	Gibbons	Workers	Ireland	Alternate
19.	Mr	Georgios	Gourzoulidis	Governments	Greece	Member
20.	Mr	Stefan	Gran	Workers	Germany	Member

	Title	First Name	Last Name	Group	Member State	Status
21.	Mr	Matej	Gregarek	Governments	Czechia	Alternate
22.	Ms	Silvia	Gregorcova	Governments	Slovenia	Member
23.	Mr	Severin	Gruber	Employers	Austria	Member
24.	Mr	Stijn	Gryp	Workers	Belgium	Member
25.	Ms	Hanna	Hämäläinen	Governments	Finland	Alternate
26.	Ms	Aline	Hoffmann	Workers	ETUC	Coordinator
27.	Mr	Sebastian	Hopfner	Employers	Germany	Member
28.	Mr	Christos	Ioannou	Employers	Greece	Member
29.	Mr	Domingo Jesús	Jiménez-Valladolid de L'Hotellerie-Fallois	Governments	Spain	Member
30.	Mr	Thomas Mølsted	Jørgensen	Governments	Denmark	Member
31.	Mr	Patrik	Karlsson	Employers	Sweden	Member
32.	Ms	Barbara	Kauffmann	Commission	Commission	Member
33.	Mr	Ivan	Kokalov	Workers	Bulgaria	Member
34.	Ms	Vladka	Komel	Governments	Slovenia	Member
35.	Mr	Panagiotis	Kordatos	Workers	Greece	Alternate
36.	Ms	Veronica	Lope Fontagné	Expert appointed by European Parliament		
37.	Mr	Pierre-Gaël	Loreal	Workers	France	Member
38.	Mr	Orestis	Messios	Governments	Cyprus	Alternate
39.	Ms	Katja	Miettinen	Employers	Finland	Member
40.	Mr	Christiane	Misslbeck-Winberg	Employers	Denmark	Member

	Title	First Name	Last Name	Group	Member State	Status
41.	Mr	Andrea	Mone	Workers	Italy	Member
42.	Ms	Dearbhail	Nic Giolla Mhicil	Governments	Ireland	Member
43.	Mr	Bogdan	Olszewski	Workers	Poland	Member
44.	Ms	Diane	Pasat	Employers	Romania	Member
45.	Mr	Peep	Peterson	Workers	Estonia	Member
46.	Mr	Ioan Cristinel	Raileanu	Governments	Romania	Member
47.	Ms	Linda	Romele	Workers	Latvia	Member
48.	Mr	Jose Domingo	Rosello	Workers	Spain	Alternate
49.	Mr	Ričardas	Sartatavičius	Employers	Lithuania	Alternate
50.	Mr	Dirk	Scheele	Governments	Netherlands	Alternate
51.	Ms	Rita	Skrebiskiene	Governments	Lithuania	Member
52.	Ms	Rebekah	Smith	Employers	BusinessEurope	
53.	Ms	Lucie	Studničná	Workers	Czechia	Member
54.	Mr	Vatroslav	Subotić	Governments	Croatia	Member
55.	Mr	Joerg	Tagger	Commission		Alternate
56.	Ms	Ineta	Tare	Governments	Latvia	Member
57.	Mr	Guy	Van Gyes	Governments	Belgium	Member
58.	Mr	Mario	van Mierlo	Employers	Netherlands	Member
59.	Ms	<i>Diane</i>	<i>Vella Muscat</i>	<i>Governments</i>	<i>Malta</i>	<i>Member</i>
60.	Mr	Thomas	Voigtländer	Governments	Germany	Member
61.	Mr	Peter	Waldorff	Workers	Denmark	Member

Also in Attendance

Mr	Menéndez-Valdés,	Juan	Executive Director, Eurofound
Ms	Jepsen	Maria	Deputy Director, Eurofound
Mr	Grimmeisen	Markus	Secretary, Eurofound
Mr	Korte	Joost	Director General, DG Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion
Mr	Tagger	Joerg	DG Employment
Mr	Cabrita	Jorge	Staff Committee, Eurofound
Mr	Eiffe	Franz	Staff Committee, Eurofound

Proxy Votes were received as follows

	Last name	First name	Group (Member State)	Proxy
1.	Pena Costa	Marcelino	Employers (PT)	Farrugia, Joseph - Employers (MT)
2.	Balint	Adrienn	Employers (HU)	Drbalova, Vladimíra – Employers (CZ)
3.	Sellers	Paul	Workers (UK)	Hoffmann, Aline Coordinator