

Meeting:	MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
Date:	30 September 2010
Time:	14.00 h – 18.00 h
Place:	Gran Vía 35, INBISA Building, 7th floor, Meeting Room A, Bilbao

MINUTES

1. *Adoption of the draft agenda (B/10/A3) – for adoption*

Ms Schweng welcomed all members to the meeting and suggested moving item 6 of the Agenda to the last point. This would allow those Bureau members who did not signed the declaration of absence of conflict of interest in relation with the appointment of the new Director to leave the meeting. **Ms Schweng** also informed that a dinner had been organised for that night and kindly asked to confirm attendance.

Ms Schweng took the opportunity to remind the Bureau members about the need to confirm attendance as soon as possible, in order to better organise and assure good management of the resources, bearing in mind that the simultaneous interpretation service is hired for Bureau meetings. The Agency should put a deadline for informing about attendance in its invitations.

CONCLUSION: The agenda was adopted.

2. *Draft minutes of the last meeting of 14 June 2010 (B/10/M2) – for approval*

Mr Kahr pointed out that the presence list needed correction.

CONCLUSION: The minutes of the last meeting were approved without any comments.

3. *Status report: Progress on implementation of the 2010 management plan (B/10/05) – for information*

Mr Takala introduced the item, covering the following main issues:

- New EEA funds to be used to finance the establishment of two contract agent posts to support OiRA project
- Internal reorganisation within EU-OSHA with merging of European Risk Observatory and Working Environment Information Unit. The reorganisation allows a better link from the work on new and emerging risks to the good practice information. There are also efficiency gains allowing to identify resources for OiRA
- Preparation of an amending budget for Board's approval to include EEA funds in budget. This cannot wait until the Board meeting as it would make it impossible to implement the budget.
- Update on seat agreement
- The 2011 budget situation is difficult. Council has suggested a reduction of the budget for agencies
- Representatives from EEA countries to attend next Board meetings as observers
- Possibility for EU-OSHA to get involved in the work of the International Panel on Working Life with some kind of secretarial support from EU-OSHA
- Update on Coordination of Agencies work, with EU-OSHA as Chair of the network. Efforts continue to make the agencies' voice heard in the Inter-institutional Working Group on the future of Agencies.
- Written procedure launched to get minutes from March Board meeting adopted. Bureau is strongly invited to encourage their groups to answer when written procedures are launched.

Regarding the written procedures:

The Workers group stated that they had discussed about written procedures and the possibility to change the procedure to address directly the interest groups.

The Governments group asked about the legal possibility of delegating the vote to the Bureau.

The Employers group asked if the vote of all members were needed. Otherwise it would be an option if only the coordinator would give the common opinion of the group.

Mr Bejer noted that the rules for written procedures are defined in the rules of procedure. The Commission legal service did not answer yet to the Agency's question about the possibility of delegating competencies to the Bureau. Mr Bejer promised that EU-OSHA would remind the Commission about the consultation.

Regarding the Wikipedia:

Mr De Meester asked for information about the registration of the EU-OSHA, the target audience and the validation of the content. **Mr Rial González** answered that EU-OSHA would start generating content through the Topic Centre and then, once a critical mass of information is available, access would be opened up to official institutes and professional or scientific bodies (including those nominated by the FOPs at national level). The OSHwiki will be readable by anyone, but editing rights for 'approved authors' (to create, modify or translate content) will be administered by the Agency in order to maintain quality assurance. The Agency will also mobilise its networks to publicise the existence of this resource and encourage them to become 'approved authors'. This will also support the peer-review quality assurance that operates in other scientific fora. He also said that the target audience should not be merely the scientific community, but anyone who requires basic knowledge about different aspects of OSH. The wiki format also allows the Agency to use voluntary resources to translate its materials –something which is impossible with static text, and PDFs online. He also underlined that any information or assertion should be supported by references to the original sources, just as in Wikipedia.org.

Regarding the International Panel of Working Life:

The groups enquired about the composition and role of the Panel, and Mr Takala offered an overview of the different institutions being part of the panel (Finish Institute, NIOSH, etc.) and the role of the Agency in this panel, which would be mainly in the communication area.

Regarding the Progress Report:

Mr György asked to include an index with page numbers.

Mr Riese expressed the following comments:

- On page 10, what is the weight given to work on taxi drivers?
- The approach to managing expert groups and working groups should be strengthened. For example, members of groups no longer active should be informed. There is a need for an overview of all groups and their members
- In page 32, translation data is ok, but it should include a quality assessment

Ms Breindl asked if there would be a second phase of the occupational health promotion project. She also suggested that issues such as work life balance, family conciliation etc. should have strong links to OSH matters, in order to avoid overlapping with DG Sanco.

Ms Schweng asked for more concretion on page 2 regarding the project of drivers of technological innovation in the green sector. She also asked why ROU had committed only 50% of the budget. **Mr Rial-González** explained that by the end of the year 98% of the budget would be spent.

CONCLUSION: The Bureau noted the Progress Report with the above mentioned amendments.

4. Agency governance statement (B/10/06) – for discussion

Mr Bejer introduced the item [\[see presentation\]](#), informing that the word "statement" would be removed from the final version. He invited comments from the Bureau before submitting the paper to the Board.

Mr György and **Mr De Meester** agreed that more emphasis should be made on tripartite nature of EU-OSHA. **Mr Frederiksen** noted that the active involvement of the Advisory Groups in the AMP process should be stressed as well as the national networks.

Mr Riese suggested adding information on who appoints Board members and in general to stress what is unique about EU-OSHA.

Ms Schweng remarked that it is the focal point networks which are tripartite, not the focal points. She also suggested that the definition of "stakeholders" should be integrated in the document, as well as the role of the coordinators in the Board.

CONCLUSION: The amended version of the document will be adopted at the Governing Board meeting in November.

5. Impact assessment of OiRA (B/10/07) – for discussion

Mr Bejer introduced the item [\[see presentation\]](#) and invited comments from the Bureau.

Mr de Meester suggested leaving the focus on sectors more open. In different countries the focus may be different.

CONCLUSION: The Bureau agreed to send their comments to EU-OSHA by the end of the following week (8 October), so that EU-OSHA has enough time to finalise the AMP 2011.

7. Update on IAS (Internal Audit System) (B/10/09) – for information

Ms Murillo introduced the item. **Mr Alvarez** stated that the report reflected the improvements done by EU-OSHA and that the Commission supported the implementation of the Action Plan to comply with all the recommendations.

CONCLUSION: The Bureau noted information.

8. Update on ECA (European Court of Auditors (B/10/08) – for information

Ms Murillo introduced the item. **Mr Alvarez** encouraged EU-OSHA to take into account all the comments by the Court of Auditors, emphasising that showing a good and sound financial management is very important for small agencies. **Ms Schweng** remarked the good job carried out by EU-OSHA. All Bureau members agreed that the report was very positive.

CONCLUSION: The Bureau noted the Report.

9. Advance notice on action requiring the Governing Board's approval in the coming months – for information

Ms Murillo introduced the item and informed that the next actions requiring Board's approval are:

- Amending Budget II 2010
- Implementing Rules for Staff Committee pending notification of Commission approval
- Financial Implementing Rules

Ms Murillo acknowledged the difficulty in following up all EU-OSHA emails but remarked the need to get an answer for written procedures. In this sense, **Ms Murillo** offered to draft some explanatory notes for the interest groups.

Ms Schweng asked if n° 3 could be approved at next Board meeting in November as this issue may require some explanation.

CONCLUSION: EU-OSHA to draft explanatory notes about the next actions requiring written procedures and EU-OSHA to send the notes to the coordinators.

10. Decision on theme for Campaign 2014-15 (B/10/10) – for decision

Mr Takala introduced the item [\[see presentation\]](#). **Mr Takala** stressed that it was important to ensure an adequate process for deciding on the next theme. Sufficient evidence must be in place for this decision which is about the major Agency activity. This helps ensure that the Agency makes the best use of the resources available and guides the Agency in implementing the decision.

The Workers group would appreciate the opportunity to involve their group members in the decision on the short-list.

The Governments group commented that the following criteria should be taken into account:

- Do we have enough knowledge about the suggested theme?
- Is the theme suitable for a campaign?

The Employers suggested that EU-OSHA prepare a shortlist which could be discussed at the Bureau meeting. In their opinion, the eventual discussion is if any specific topic is acceptable for all groups. Therefore, they suggested we should not be very strict with the criteria.

The Commission appreciated the comments from the groups. **Mr Alvarez** remarked the good strategic approach to establish objective criteria and recommended to keep it as it is a sensible process, combining imagination and creativity with realism and pragmatism. Mr Alvarez reminded that EU-OSHA should also take

into account all the aspects of a campaign and carry out the process bearing in mind the spirit of reaching the highest consensus. **Mr Alvarez** fully supported the preliminary proposal.

Mr Smith asked the Bureau members which type of campaign they would like (prevention, management of risk assessment or sectoral approach). All Bureau members agreed that at this early stage EU-OSHA should not exclude any possibility. **Mr Takala** reminded that the EU Strategy should be taken into account.

Mr De Meester suggested the electromagnetic fields radiation as a possible theme. **Ms Breindl** suggested a focus on SMEs.

CONCLUSION: The Bureau agreed the proposed process with the comments regarding criteria.

11. Any other business

Mr Alvarez informed about the new Directive on prevention of injuries in Hospitals. In this sense, **Mr Alvarez** said that Commission would like EU-OSHA to help disseminate the content of the Directive, and contribute to its implementation.

Mr De Meester asked about the resources and financial support envisaged by the Commission so that EU-OSHA can develop this activity.

Mr Alvarez replied that the remark was relevant but there was no information at that stage about that. However, he considered that the necessary resources would be symbolic (e.g. links on EU-OSHA website, etc.) at this stage. If EU-OSHA would envisage more ambitious actions the Commission would be ready to discuss the issue of the necessary resources.

Mr György suggested involving the social partners of the sector.

Mr Rial-González said that EU-OSHA would try to disseminate the information while not duplicating what is being done elsewhere. He considered that it was easier for other bodies to develop the contents and for EU-OSHA to disseminate it, which requires fewer resources. He also suggested making use of the OSHwiki. **Mr Smith** noted that the translation into all EU languages could be an issue.

6. Update on Director's recruitment process (including budget) and selection of Bureau's representative in the process of selection for the new Director – for information and decision

The Chair asked those present who did not sign the declaration of absence of conflict of interest to kindly leave the room.

Mr Alvarez started by thanking EU-OSHA for the support and collaboration, and acknowledged that the process had been launched very late. He expected that the publication of the vacancy notice would probably be in November.

Mr Alvarez announced that there was a new obligation for the Agency: ensure the publication of the vacancy notice in the main EU newspapers. EU-OSHA would cover this cost. **Mr Alvarez** would provide the framework contract in place in the Commission for this matter.

Mr Alvarez detailed the next steps including the deadline for applicants (4 weeks), the Pre-selection Committee (from register of applications to interviews of pre-selected candidates) (8 weeks), consultation period (4 – 8 weeks), interview of short-listed by the Commissioners and establish a short-list for Governing Board (8 weeks). These deadlines are indicative only. He acknowledged that the objective to have a final nomination in March was very unlikely.

Mr Takala asked if EU-OSHA would need to organise an additional Board meeting, and in this case who was going to assume the cost (EU-OSHA or Commission). **Mr Alvarez** replied that he did not have this information at that moment.

Mr Riese expressed his disappointment about the process and his disbelief that there would be a decision before summer.

CONCLUSION:

Ms Schweng volunteered to be the Bureau's representative as observer, and **Mr György** and **Mr Riese** also did as alternates. The Bureau agreed on the principle that **Ms Schweng** would attend the meetings as a representative of the Bureau, and the two alternates would replace her in case she could not attend. If nor the representative nor any of the alternates could attend, there would be no Bureau representation.

EU-OSHA would send a letter to Mr Verrue, from DG Empl, (with copy to DG HR) notifying the nominations of **Ms Schweng**, **Mr György** and **Mr Riese**.

--- & ---

The Chairperson reminded that the next meeting would be on 29th November in Luxembourg, before the Board meeting. The Chairperson closed the meeting.

Actions points	Responsible	Due
Adoption of amended version of the document "Agency governance"	Governing Board	Next Board meeting on 30 November
Send comments on OiRA impact assessment to EU-OSHA	Bureau members	By 8 October
Provide overview to Bureau of working and expert groups	EU-OSHA	Bureau meeting November
EU-OSHA to draft explanatory notes about the next actions requiring written procedures and send the notes to the interest groups	EU-OSHA	ASAP
Send letter to Mr Verrue, from DG Empl, (with copy to DG HR) notifying the nominations of Ms Schweng, Mr György and Mr Riese as representative and alternates for the process of selection of new EU-OSHA director	EU-OSHA	ASAP

Present:

Chairperson: Christa SCHWENG (Employers representative)

Commission: F. Jesús ÁLVAREZ (European Commission representative)

Workers: Károly GYÖRGY (Workers representative)
Jan Kahr FREDERIKSEN (Workers representative)

Governments: Ulrich RIESE (Government representative)
Tatjana PETRICEK (Government representative)
Gertrud BREINDL (Government representative)

Employers: Kris DE MEESTER (Employers representative) - except for item 6

EU-OSHA: Jukka Takala, Jesper Bejer, Terry Taylor, Andrew Smith – except for item 6,
Eusebio Rial González, Françoise Murillo, Marta de Prado