



June 2013
B/13/M2

FINAL MINUTES

Meeting:	MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
Date:	Thursday, 13 June 2013
Time:	09.00 h – 17.00 h
Venue:	EU-OSHA, Inbisa meeting room A Gran Via 35, E - 48009 Bilbao

1. Draft Agenda (B/13/A2)

The following items were requested to be treated under Any Other Business:

- New EU OSH strategy
- Appraisal of the Director

The Draft Agenda was adopted.

2. Draft minutes of last Bureau meeting 21 March 2013 (B/13/M3)

The Draft Minutes were adopted without any comments.

3. Director's Progress Report, including feedback from the last FOP meeting 11-12 June (B/13/02)

In addition to the Progress Report, the Director briefed the Bureau on the following issues:

- Seat agreement: progressing well, the expectation is to get the agreement signed by the end of the year.
- Building: the lease contract for the 2 current buildings in Gran Via will expire on 31 December 2013, therefore a prospection notice was published. Two offers were considered as meeting best the criteria (saving money–lower rent and improving working conditions of staff). At present negotiations are on-going. The Bureau will be fully informed as soon as the procedure is closed.
- Staff seminar: a staff seminar focused on “working together” was organised on 6-7 June for all the agency staff, in order to prepare for the upcoming changes due to the new Strategy, the new way of working based on portfolio approach, activity based management and activity based budget, and also to improve our processes, in the direction of a quality management.
- Budget: The Commission has announced that a 4% penalty will be applied to the Agency for implementation of the budget 2012 below 95% and cancellation of credit above 5%. The Agency has prepared a letter to DG BUDG explaining the reasons for this (lack of rappel for 2011 and 2012, in particular) and calling for proportionality. Mr Koos Richelle, DG EMPI, showed his support to the Agency with regards to this issue.
- OiRA: on 12 June Commissioner Andor requested the Agency for an update on the OiRA project, to provide feedback to the high level group on the reduction of



administrative burdens on SMEs. At least 20 countries and 4 committees are involved and actually working on tools.

- Update on on-going recruitment procedures: recruitment for 2 temporary agents and 3 contract agents are currently on-going.
- Visit to Lithuania: the Director had the opportunity to meet the Lithuanian Focal Point to discuss about the upcoming presidency and invite the Ministry to the Campaign Closing Event in Bilbao.
- Campaign Benchmarking Event in Brussels: on request of the campaign partners, the agency organised a Benchmarking Event on 5 & 6 June to try to make the campaign more sustainable and build a network between official campaign partners. A short report will be published shortly and a full report with all the rapporteurs' input will come later. 60 people attended the event, with lively discussions and high interest, in which Commissioner Andor gave a speech in favour of the Agency and the campaign, and participated in the handing over of the certificates.
- FOP meeting 11-12 June: the main objective was discussing with the focal points the 'portfolio approach', presenting their projects, planning, deliverables for 2014 and beyond. The next step will be sending a formal request to the FOPs for consultation with social partners, in order to get their feedback at national level by the end of August, so that we can start with the detailed planning for 2014. This will be done bearing in mind the information from the Commission on the resources available, to finally be able to prepare a detailed final draft AMP 2014 for the Board's approval at the November meeting.

COMMENTS BY THE GROUPS:

The **Workers** and **Employers** claimed that the end of August was not a good timing for the Focal Points to provide feedback, due to the summer holiday period, which makes it very difficult to gather the social partners for a meeting, and suggested extending the deadline to mid-September.

Mr Bejer proposed to postpone the deadline until beginning of September, as there is a need of some time also to prepare the Work Programme for the November Board meeting.

Ms Böhm and **Mr Kempa** commented on the Director's Progress Report:

OiRA project: what is the interest of the different member states in the OiRA project? Western and Northern European countries signed no memorandum. It would be useful to have an overview of the different systems existing in the various countries.

Offline tool for SMEs: what is the reason for an offline tool in means of accessibility?

ESENER II: suggested changing the methodology used in ESENER I with regards to the contact person.

Migrant workers: re. page 3, *"The Agency has been invited to be part of an expert group set up by the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) on Severe forms of Labour Exploitation (SELEX)"* very pleased to know about this, as it is a huge problem.

Ms Breindl replied Ms Böhm about the OiRA project, explaining that in general the countries not signing the memorandum are those with already established national online tools. The **Director** added that the EU-OSHA has an agreement with existing groups who have developed risk assessment tools, and it is important that now an OiRA community exists to exchange information and experience, especially taking into account the limited resources available.

Mr Cockburn replied to the workers' questions:



Offline psychosocial risks tool: the idea is to disseminate a tool that will not depend on internet to work, although there is always the opportunity to connect to the internet.

ESENER II: A new respondent definition will be used to avoid the problems encountered in some countries with differentiation between management and employee representative respondents and to adapt the survey to the smallest size class (5+) that will be covered this time. In addition the agriculture sector, which is very challenging, will be covered in ESENER II. In any set of results where these challenges imply a decrease in reliability, the limitations will be clearly stated.

Cooperation with FRA: it is good to know that the Bureau supports the cooperation with FRA. EU-OSHA has also been asked to collaborate with EMSA on a feasibility study on protection of workers responding to emergencies at sea, shoreline and coast, together with DG ECHO, DG EMPL and the Focal Points. EU-OSHA will consult with DG EMPL and present a proposal to the Governing Board in November. In 2014 an expert group would be set up, while the main work should be done in 2015. In any case, it was clear that the work should be focused on OSH.

Ms Schweng posed the following questions about the Director's Progress Report:

- ERO Specific objective 1: *"The summary report is being translated into German, Spanish, French, Italian and Polish"*: when will this summary be ready?
- ERO Specific objective 3 *"A seminar will be organised before the end of 2013"*: who will participate?

Mr Smith informed that the summary was available on line in all the languages except for the French version. As for the "cost of non-OSH" workshop, **Mr Cockburn** informed that a number of experts in economic analysis, representatives from stakeholders, etc. would be invited but the rest of the participants were not decided at that stage.

OSHWiki:

Ms Petriček asked for more information about the development of the OSH wiki, when it will be operative and how the quality control is managed.

Ms Schweng asked in which language it was being developed and if it would be possible to have the access keys.

Mr Cockburn informed that the OSHwiki was currently finalising the content development stage in which the Topic Centre had delivered a large number of articles since 2010. A final set of articles is to be commissioned in June 2013, which was considered to be sufficient to provide a critical mass to pre-launch the OSHwiki. The pre-launch was conceived as a functional test to check how it technically works, it will be held in November at the Closing Event to profit from the event audience. The Bureau members will be provided with the keys and access rights to the OSHwiki as it is at present. The official launch of the OSHwiki is foreseen at the World Congress to be held in Frankfurt in August 2014. For the moment the tool is available in English only, with the idea that the stakeholders use this material to adapt to their national languages.

Endocrine disruptors:

Ms Böhm drew the attention to the big interest in endocrine disruptors shown by all the countries at the last ETUI seminar Conference on the European Health and Safety Strategy 2013-2020.

Ms Schneider informed that EU-OSHA had commissioned a report on reproductive risks at work, where endocrine disruptors were addressed, and will be ready for publication towards end 2013. A member of the Topic centre also participated on behalf of the Agency at a conference organised by DG Environment in June last year "Endocrine Disruptors: Current challenges in science and policy", where the European policy actions on endocrine disruptors were discussed. Awareness of endocrine disruptors is more in the environmental



field than in occupational health, this is why EU-OSHA included this into its research. Finally, EU-OSHA will organise a seminar in autumn 2013 and will inform and involve the interested members of the Bureau.

4 Agencies meeting:

Ms O'Brien informed that the second "4 Agencies Event" (EU-OSHA, Eurofound, CEDEFOP and ETF) will be held in the European Parliament on 25 September, under the mentorship of Ms Pervenche Beres with the objective of showing how these four agencies cooperate and create synergies. The topic of the event will be "The European social model, a driver for competitiveness". Commissioner Andor and the Commissioner for Education have been invited. Sectorial social partners, academics, experts, etc. have also confirmed attendance. The Bureau, Belgium Focal Point and its network, official campaign partners, colleagues from Unit B3 in Luxembourg, will also be invited in the following weeks.

Ms O'Brien apologised for the late information due to the fact that Ms Beres confirmed her attendance only a few weeks ago. **Ms O'Brien** noted also that this presented a serious clash of dates among the several meetings scheduled for that week in September: Commission's strategy working party on the 24 and 25, the "4 Agencies' Event" on the 25, and OIRA steering committee on 26 and 27. And asked **Mr Alvarez** to kindly raise the issue in his unit.

Mr Alvarez stated that the "4 Agencies Event" was an excellent idea and kindly offered to try changing the strategy working party meeting date. The **Director** suggested organising the Bureau meeting on 24 September in Brussels, instead of Bilbao, in order to make it easier for the Bureau members to attend.

CONCLUSION: The Bureau noted the Director Progress Report. The third Bureau meeting of the year will take place on 24 September in the EU-OSHA's Liaison Office in Brussels.

4. Feedback from the Meeting of Chairs of Boards of Agencies, by C. Schweng

Ms Schweng updated the Bureau about the outcome of the meeting of Chairs of Boards of decentralised Agencies, held on 14 May in Brussels, with 29 Agencies present.

Main messages from the Commission:

1. Founding acts of Agencies will only be amended if other necessities of reform occur.
2. Revision of horizontal acts affecting Agencies (staff regulations, financial regulations, etc.) is already on-going.

The priorities for the Commission include: guidelines and templates for Agencies' overall evaluations, template on a multiannual work programme, guidelines for ABB and ABM, guidelines with standard provisions on headquarters provisions and guidelines on prevention and management of conflicts of interest.

The Commission expects from Agencies to follow up on the roadmap, as EU-OSHA is already doing. Agencies should also contribute to the rationalization process.

Other issues treated related to the Governing Boards were:

- Executive Boards should be more closely involved in supervising and monitoring the Agencies' activities.
- "Alert warning system": should the Management Board detects irregularities within the Agency, the Commission should be alerted.
- Management Boards should become appointing authorities (change in legal act required).
- Discrepancy arose about Governing Boards deciding on the approach of international activities.



- Some members of the Governing Boards should have administrative and managerial skills. How to ensure this was unclear.
- Eurofound and Cedefop expressed their concerns about reducing the size of the Governing Boards. The Commission assured that they were closely collaborating with the Boards' representatives of the Commission on this issue. There was no information yet on how this would be done.
- Stakeholders should be involved in the formulation of the Multi Annual Strategy and Annual Management Plan, in order to ensure their ownership and commitment.
- Strong involvement of Agencies in the implementation of roadmap should be assured.
- As for the template for multiannual planning, the wide variety of tasks and diversity of the different Agencies should be taken into account.

COMMENTS FROM THE GROUPS AND EU-OSHA:

Commission:

Mr Alvarez updated the Bureau with the latest news since 14 May:

- “Amending of founding acts”: it is the intention of the Commission to present proposals for amendments of the founding regulations of several Agencies - including EU-OSHA- in 2014, in line with the common approach and the Inter-institutional Joint Statement, and present them all at the same time.

When amending the founding acts there will be two main blocks:

1. Horizontal changes common to all agencies, for which the Commission is preparing a set of horizontal prescriptions to be included in the founding regulations of all the Agencies.
 2. Specific changes, case by case analysis of the different situations (e.g. the size of the Boards for tripartite Agencies).
- Substantial reduction in the size of the Governing Boards is envisaged in order to improve efficiency, while maintaining the tripartite nature of EU-OSHA and the key role of social partners in the decision-making process of the Agency. This is precisely the challenge. The Commission is considering several options, e.g. participation of social partners in a Bureau.
 - The Commission wants to discuss this issue with the representatives of EU social partners, and a meeting will be convened probably in September.

Workers:

Mr György wanted to know how the discussion with social partners would be done and reminded that EU social partners do not necessarily coincide with national social partners; a significant number of national social partners are not covered by the EU social partners.

Mr Kempa said that so many agencies with different resources, missions, etc. pose a big challenge to make horizontal changes, and asked how many people was working at the Commission on this issue.

Ms Böhm stated that the European Union is a union of member states and not a union of social partners or institutions; therefore it should be a mistake to assume that the EU social partners will represent all national social partners. **Ms Böhm** proposed that a sort of regular meetings with national social partners would be organised, so that all their feedback is not lost.



Ms Böhm also asked the Commission to specify the relevant managerial skills that the Board members should have, and suggested getting appropriate training on these.

Employers:

Mr Nygaard invited the Commission to consider, on top of the tripartism and the efficiency, what the added value of the social partners was in the process of communicating and efficiently disseminating the Agency's activities, and the importance and significance of EU-OSHA's message in the OSH domain. **Mr Nygaard** insisted on the possibility that the dissemination of EU-OSHA activities could be in danger. **Mr György** said that the Workers' group totally agreed with this statement and asked Mr Alvarez to transmit this message to the Commission.

Mr Alvarez replied to the questions:

- Nothing has been decided yet about the process of the consultation with social partners. The groups' concerns about the participation of social partners, was acknowledge and would be transmitted to the Commission.
- The principle of tripartite participation would not change, although the size of the Board would be reduced.
- Regarding the managerial skills of the Board members, **Mr Alvarez** reminded that this was a general principle and that the inter-institutional approach was not legal binding, therefore its mission was to inspire the nomination of the Board members. **Mr Alvarez** considered that the idea of the training for Board members was very interesting.
- Regarding the significance and added value of the tripartism in disseminating the activities of EU-OSHA, **Mr Alvarez** agreed that it was a very pertinent comment. Nevertheless the inter-institutional working group considered that having a very big Governing Board is not efficient or operational, and urged to rationalise the size of the Boards accordingly.
- In reply to Mr Kempa's question, **Mr Alvarez** informed that the exercise was being coordinated in the Commission by the Secretariat General, via a specific unit in close contact with the Commission's services responsible for this Agency.
- **Mr Alvarez** encouraged the interest groups' representatives forward him the exact message and specific expressions that they wanted to transmit to the Commission, and he would kindly transmit literally the message in order to avoid any misunderstanding or misinterpretation.

CONCLUSION: This item was for information only.

5. Overview of the IWG roadmap and situation at EU-OSHA (B/13/03)

In line with what discussed in the previous item, the **Director** proposed to have a yearly meeting or conference of social partners at national level, to compensate a potential reduced representation in the Board.

The feedback from Focal Points is very important so it is essential to find a way of involving the national social partners.

The **Director** informed that, following the recommendations from the roadmap, a table had been prepared, to follow up on the implementation and implications for EU-OSHA.

The **Director** informed that a quality management area, led by Mr Bejer -in charge of the "Performance Working Group"-, was going to be established, dealing with aspects related with good governance, among others.

This template will be frequently updated and will constitute a standing item in Bureau and Governing Board meetings.



Ms Schweng considered that the table was a very useful tool, answering what was required by the Commission and that it was exactly what needed to be done.

CONCLUSION: The Bureau noted the update on the implementation of the IWG roadmap within EU-OSHA.

6. Board and Bureau meetings: Financial aspects (B/13/04)

The **Director** explained that EU-OSHA was expecting upcoming cuts in budget, and therefore one of her interests was to save money. In order to do this, some issues could be reviewed and the cost of Board meetings was one of them. The **Director** wanted to draw the Bureau members' attention specifically to the significant difference in cost of Board meetings depending on whether they were held in Bilbao or in Luxembourg. The **Director** invited the Bureau members to check the document G/13/04, showing the detailed breakdown of the expenses of the last Bureau and Board meetings in 2011 and 2012 and to comment on it.

COMMENTS FROM THE GROUPS:

Governments:

Ms Breindl asked about the difference in price between the different venues in Bilbao (Euskalduna Congress Centre, Melia Hotel, Carlton Hotel...). On the other hand, she considered that having the Board meeting in connection with the Closing Event would imply lower travel cost of the Board members, therefore she could not see the difference between holding the meeting in Bilbao or Luxembourg.

Workers:

Mr Kempa considered that the data was not comparable, as each of the meetings may have had different purposes, participants, activities, etc. and considered that the tables were not relevant; he would need a table with a 'standard meeting' comparison, including cost per person.

Mr György highlighted that the extraordinary meeting on June 2011 was due to the Commission's delay, and asked for more information about the cost in Hotel Melia versus Hotel Carlton. **Mr György** also asked to reconsider what was really necessary and what was not, regarding translations, and bear in mind the future of the Board's composition.

Commission:

Mr Alvarez welcomed the Director's initiative of proposing options to the Bureau to reduce the costs of the governance meetings. For instance, holding the September Bureau meeting in Brussels is a step in the way of start reducing costs. On the other hand, regarding the extraordinary Board meeting in 2011, **Mr Alvarez** remarked that the Commission complied with its duties and that the meeting was necessary and was held at a relatively low cost.

EU-OSHA:

Mr Bejer replied to the different questions:

Cost of different venues: the Agency is using a framework contract for hiring meeting rooms, interpretation, catering and technical equipment and assistance, therefore the cost is the one stated in the framework contract, regardless of the place of the meeting. I.e. there is no difference in price between Hotel Carlton or Euskalduna Congress Centre.

Board meeting in connection with CLEV: it is true that the travel cost for some Board members will be relatively low, as the Agency would only pay once for the two meetings. However, all the fix costs associated to Board meetings (meeting room hiring, catering, interpretation, technical equipment...) remain and still need to be covered if the meeting is held in Bilbao. However, when the meeting is held in Luxembourg –in connection with the



ACSH-, the travel costs are even lower, as they are shared with the Commission, and EU-OSHA saves an important amount of money, not having to pay for venue, interpretation, technical equipment, etc.

Cost per person: this does not determine the final cost, as the fixed costs remain the same no matter how many attendees (meeting rooms hiring, interpretation, technical equipment and assistance, etc.). Travel costs and allowances are the only variable costs, but they represent a low percentage of the final total cost and the number of attendees tends to be relatively constant.

The **Director** informed that, by the second part of the year she would be able to offer more information based on the outcome of the negotiations for the new building.

CONCLUSION: The Bureau noted the proposals for optimising financial resources and saving money in the area of Governance of EU-OSHA. This issue will be followed up at next Board meeting, in November, when more information on the new building will be available.

7. Status of the implementation of the portfolio approach (B/13/05)

The **Director** introduced the issue of the implementation of the portfolio approach in EU-OSHA, being 2014 the first year that it will be in place. [A presentation is available](#). The objective is to ensure that good practice information matches the needs in the different member states.

The process foreseen is that the detailed information is made available to the Focal Points in June. Focal Points will consult with their national social partners and provide feedback to EU-OSHA, by end-August. EU-OSHA will then take the decision on the portfolio tasks in October. This decision will be included in the final draft of the Annual Management Plan to be presented to the Board in November.

As the groups agreed on the fact that the timetable seemed to be not the best (with the holiday period of July/August and a very short delay) for the Focal Points to consult national networks and provide feedback, the **Director** suggested postponing the deadline for Focal Points to provide their input to mid-September, bearing in mind that the input was needed for the financial management plan.

The Director invited the Bureau to comment.

COMMENTS FROM THE GROUPS:

- 1) **Ms Petriček** asked for clarification about the sentence “[...] *provide binding feedback*”. She also wanted to know if it was necessary to have a contractor, which should be more expensive.
- 2) **Mr Kempa** asked for more information about the concrete topic requested to Focal Points at the June meeting.
- 3) **Ms Böhm** asked for clarification about the difference between the ECAP approach and the portfolio approach.

Regarding point 1, the **Director** explained that “*binding*” relates to a decision made at national level as it would be very difficult for EU-OSHA to get new demands from member states after approval of the final management plan. As for the contractor, **Mr Smith** explained that EU-OSHA needs (according to its regulation) external contractors to carry out its activities, with which fixed prices are set –depending on the country. A new call for tender has been recently launched to replace the current contract, about to expire.

Regarding points 2 and 3, the **Director** informed that there were different options and offers at national level, for example, the offer of translation of executive summaries of reports, organisation of seminars, etc. a final estimation will be ready in September so that the Annual Management Plan can be finalised for November.

Mr Cockburn gave some examples of the portfolio approach:



- Offer to participate in an activity, like OIRA
- ESENER: some member states want to boost the size of the sample in their country and assume the increase in cost themselves
- Dissemination: refinement in translation policy. Identify the particularly interesting material for each member state to be translated, etc.

All these require a lot of resources from EU-OSHA staff, but if it can be programmed ahead, dedicating the resources to what and when they are more needed, a better overall impact will be achieved. The Campaign is another long running portfolio based activity.

On Mr Kempa's demand, **Mr Cockburn** and the **Director** quoted some concrete examples: a group of Focal Points intended to run a seminar on economic cost of non-OSH, the Slovenian Focal Point will have a joint seminar with other Focal Points, Switzerland, Austria and Germany are discussion about an event on psychosocial risks... etc. The **Director** said that there were already concrete activities and good ideas but they still needed to be discussed at national level.

Regarding the resources allocation, **Mr Smith** explained that in order to maximise the budget and better meet the different national levels of enthusiasm, the approach has changed. Instead of applying the ECAP approach (big countries get more money), all the member states –no matter their size- will receive the same resources and the final reallocation will be done according to the level of commitment and engagement of the different member states with a second level of priorities.

Ms Böhm considered that that was a good and sensible approach. **Ms Schweng** agreed that that approach created a sense of ownership and was therefore very good.

CONCLUSION: The Bureau noted the update on the implementation of the portfolio approach. EU-OSHA will grant a two-week extension of the deadline for Focal Points to consult their national networks and provide their feedback to EU-OSHA.

8. Update on ESENER-2, particularly as regards the state of negotiations for larger sample sizes with some MS

Mr Irastorza offered an update on the situation of the ESENER-2 and the possibility offered to the member states to boost the sample sizes, and invited the Bureau members to comment. [A presentation is available.](#)

COMMENTS FROM THE BUREAU MEMBERS:

Mr Nygaard noticed a fundamental change in the approach concerning the risks covered, not focused so much on emerging risks rather than in existing risks. **Mr Nygaard** asked if there had been any professional contact with Eurofound, in order to learn about methodology, etc.

Ms Schweng noticed that the sampling was different this time, and considered that this would be an issue with the smaller companies.

Mr Kempa raised the issue of the need for subcontracting a lot of contractors (for the different member states) and asked if any means of control or supervision were foreseen.

Ms Böhm complimented EU-OSHA for such a good piece of research, and suggested that a "control question" should be included, as there was a big difference between the feedback received from an OSH management officer, and the one received from workers, who had a totally different perception.

Mr Alvarez considered that it was very positive to extend the coverage to micro companies, for policy purposes. This way, the limitations of the 1st ESENER were well covered.



Ms Breindl also complimented the Agency staff for the ESENER 2, and asked if the Agency's expert groups would be involved in the "advice and consultation" phase.

Mr Irastorza replied to the questions:

Emerging risks: **Mr Irastorza** explained that there was one area concerning general OSH management, MSDs, drivers and barriers for OSH management and workers' participation that the Agency wanted to keep, and the emerging risks would constitute a second area. The 3rd plan will probably include psychosocial risks.

Cooperation with Eurofound, **Mr Irastorza** emphasised the importance of the cooperation between Eurofound and EU-OSHA (i.e. being part of their Advisory Committee, EU-OSHA involvement in the questionnaire development of the "working conditions" survey on OSH matters, sharing methodology development...). **Mr Nygaard** asked the Commission to note the excellent and intense cooperation with Eurofound.

Sampling: **Mr Irastorza** agreed that the challenge was, precisely, the quality of the business registers in smaller companies, and the need to get relevant samples. It is an issue in some member states, and this is going to make the process lengthier, but the contractor has taken this issue into account.

Supervision of subcontracting: **Mr Irastorza** explained that there was the possibility of country visits, and other tools aimed at motivating rather than controlling, apart from other tools used to check the development of the field work (regular reports, etc.).

Consultation with expert groups: **Mr Cockburn** explained that the Agency's expert groups mandates were under revision to make them more tailored to the actual matters of the work programme. **Mr Cockburn** said that and the expertise from several member states with similar surveys (Spain, Denmark, UK) would be used and that the Bureau and Focal Points would be contacted in case any volunteering experts would be needed.

CONCLUSION: This item was for information only.

9. Update on Older workers' EP pilot project (B/13/06)

Ms Copsey offered a briefing on the pilot project on Older Workers, including the state of play and next steps. [A presentation is available](#). The **Chair** congratulated EU-OSHA staff for the important piece of work done in such a relevant project commanded by the European Parliament.

COMMENTS FROM THE BUREAU MEMBERS:

Mr Nygaard asked how the issue of the different OSH management or OSH regulation in the various member states would be coped with, and also if the Senior Labour Inspectors Committee (SLIC) had been involved in any activity.

Mr Alvarez said that the commission approved the commented approach and actions, and considered it was very important to involve the same actors that carried out the evaluation of the previous strategy. **Mr Alvarez** wished all the best and his support to the Agency and the project managers involved in the project.

Ms Copsey and **Mr Cockburn** replied to the questions:

- The necessary holistic approach has been reflected in the specifications, and it also appears in the offers received, how the different systems are operating in practice.
- SLIC is not directly involved, but the contractor has been instructed to investigate how labour inspectors are operating and incorporate diversity; this message could be reinforced to the contractor.



Ms Copsey informed that the country profiles would be done mainly 2013 but the project would not finalise until 2014, and aiming at having a report as updated as possible, **Ms Copsey** asked the Bureau members to kindly inform the Agency of any activity, campaign, action or significant programme that they would carry out. The **Bureau** committed to do so.

CONCLUSION: This item was for information only.

10. Briefing on the Foresight on Green Jobs

Ms Brun offered a briefing on the Foresight on Green Jobs, and invited the Bureau members to comment. [A presentation is available.](#)

Ms Schweng and **Mr Nygaard** considered that the scenario approach was very interesting. **Mr Nygaard** asked if there had been any contact with the European Environment Agency (EEA) in Denmark.

Regarding the Focal Point workshop in November, **Ms Breindl** draw the attention to the fact the Focal Points are not experts in this field, and this should be taken into account when preparing the workshop.

Ms Brun replied to the questions:

Cooperation: **Ms Brun** remarked the value of the project in bringing people together, as there had been contact and cooperation with the EEA, with some national Ministries of Environment, with the European waste management federation participating in some workshops, etc.

Workshop with Focal Points: the purpose of the workshop is to show how the scenario building methodology works, and more generally how Focal Points can use the scenario building methodology for policy making in general.

CONCLUSION: This item was for information only.

11. Any other business

2020 Strategy: update by Commission

Mr Alvarez updated on the situation of the new EU OSH Strategy 2020:

A public consultation has been launched, and will be open until 26 August. It consists on as a set of questions in all languages, in order to allow participation and transparency. The feedback will be carefully analysed, translated, etc. The Commission considers that it will be a very useful exercise.

Ms Schweng considered that at least a summary of the evaluation should have been translated into all languages (only available in English), and considered that this was a big mistake.

Ms Böhm asked whether all the answers would be translated and be taken into account.

Mr Kempa asked if there was any approximate timetable for the rest of the exercise.

Ms Skjoldager asked for the reason of changing the name from “strategy” to “policy”. **Mr Nygaard** considered that it was very important to distinguish between “policy” and “strategy”, which have very different meanings.

Ms Petříček wanted to know how the Commission saw the outcome of the Policy Framework in relation of the national policies. Would European policy have influence in national policies?



Ms Breindl said there was nothing to be afraid of strategic thinking in OSH matters, and reminded that in the Copenhagen Conference, Commissioner Andor said that there would be a strategy.

Mr Alvarez replied to the questions:

- In principle, all the answers will be translated and taken into account.
- There is no fixed timetable for the development and follow up of the consultation, it would depend on the number of answers, therefore it is difficult to know, but at least 2-3 months are foreseen.
- The areas of a possible new strategy have not been decided yet.
- Agreed that the translation of at least the summary of the evaluation would have been very useful, but impossible for practical reasons.
- The use of the word “policy” was preferred, in order not to pre-judge the results of the exercise, as one of the possible outcomes is that there is finally no strategy.
- This exercise is based on the evaluation of the previous strategy, and one of the conclusions of it was that it had had an important influence on the national policies.

Appraisal of the Director:

The Director will prepare a self-assessment as a basis for discussion. A reminder to the Groups coordinators will be sent in the following days.

Working Groups structure:

One of the outcomes of the last seminar was that the structure of the expert groups needed revising. The **Director** informed that the working groups would be defined according to the different areas, once the new Strategy will be approved. **Ms Schweng** considered that that was a wise approach.

...  ...

The Chair thanked the participants and closed the meeting.



Action points:

N°	Action	Resp.	Due
1.	<u>OSH wiki</u> : Made available the OSHwiki access data to Bureau members	PRU	-
2.	<u>Director's appraisal</u> : Send a reminder to the Interest Groups Coordinators, to nominate rapporteurs for the process of the Director's appraisal	NET.SEC	Asap
3.	<u>Director's appraisal</u> : the Director will prepare a self-assessment	Director	Once the IR are ready
4.	<u>Bureau meeting in September</u> : inform the Bureau members about the date and venue of the next Bureau meeting (Brussels, 24 Sept.)	NET.SEC	Asap
5.	<u>FOPs request for opt-up options</u> : send the request, copying the social partners, offering them an extension of the deadline of around 15 extra days (approx. mid-September)	NET.SEC	Asap
6.	<u>OiRA</u> : Prepare a table showing which tools are available in the different member states, and which countries are interested	PRU	-
7.	<u>EMSA project</u> : present the proposal of cooperation with EMSA to the Governing Board at November meeting	PRU	12/13 Nov.
8.	Invite the Bureau to the " <u>4 Agencies Event</u> " in the European Parliament on 25 September	EU-OSHA	-
9.	<u>Training needs on financial issues for Board members</u> : to include these issues in the "Introductory session for Board members" which is being organised prior to the March meeting during the last years	NET.SEC	March 2014
10.	<u>Financial cost of Governance meetings</u> : include this item in the draft Agenda of the Governing Board meeting in November	EU-OSHA	November 2013



List of attendees:

	Name	Representing	Organization
1	ALVAREZ Jesús	European Commission	European Commission
2	BÖHM Lučka	Workers	Confederation of Free Trade Unions of Slovenia
3	BREINDL Gertrud	Government	Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection
4	GYÖRGY Károly	Workers	National Confederation of Hungarian Trade Unions
5	KEMPA Viktor	Workers	European Trade Union Confederation
6	NYGAARD Sven-Peter	Employers	Confederation of Danish Employers
7	PETRICEK Tatjana	Government	Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs
8	SCHWENG Christa	Employers	Austrian Federal Economic Chamber
9	SKJOLDAGER Charlotte	Government	National Working Environment Authority
10	SEDLATSCHEK Christa	EU-OSHA	
11	BEJER Jesper	EU-OSHA	
12	BRUN Emmanuelle	EU-OSHA	
13	COCKBURN William	EU-OSHA	
14	COPSEY Sarah	EU-OSHA	
15	DE PRADO Marta	EU-OSHA	
16	IRASTORZA Xabier	EU-OSHA	
17	MURILLO Françoise	EU-OSHA	
18	O'BRIEN Brenda	EU-OSHA	
19	SMITH Andrew	EU-OSHA	