

Meeting: 35th MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

Date: 20 March 2012

Time: 09.00 h – 16.30 h

Venue: E, B1 and B-Terraza meeting rooms
Palacio Euskalduna
Avda. Abandoibarra 4, E-48011 Bilbao

MINUTES

The **Chairperson** (Mr György) welcomed those present and informed that there would be interpretation facilities in English, French, Spanish, German and Italian during the session. The **Chairperson** also informed about the papers tabled and the timetable for the day.

1. Adoption of the draft agenda (G/12/A1)

It was agreed to postpone item 3 to the end of the meeting to allow for preparation and distribution of copies of the document agreed in the Bureau meeting the day before.

CONCLUSION: With this amendment, the draft Agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of Draft Minutes from November 2011 Board meeting (G/11/M3)

CONCLUSION: The draft Minutes of the last Board meeting were adopted without any comments.

3. Conclusions from Pre-Board seminar (G/12/01)

The **Chair** informed about the discussions carried out in the Bureau meeting on 19 March and the paper with the Bureau's proposal for the mission, vision and values was circulated. A discussion followed where Board members were invited to provide their opinions and views.

The following changes were made to the Bureau proposal as regards the vision statement:

- "the leader" was replaced with "a leader"
- "risk prevention culture" replaced "prevention culture"
- "development" replaced "creation".

CONCLUSION: The Board agreed by consensus on the following text:

MISSION:

We develop, gather and provide reliable and relevant information, analysis and tools to advance knowledge, raise awareness and exchange occupational safety and health (OSH) information and good practice which will serve the needs of those involved in OSH

VISION:

To be a recognised leader promoting healthy and safe workplaces in Europe based on tripartism, participation and the development of an OSH risk prevention culture, to ensure a smart, sustainable, productive and inclusive economy

VALUES:

Pan-European

We create European added value by bringing together actors from across Europe and by providing the tools to create a common approach to occupational safety and health while respecting national specificities

Relevant

We ensure that our activities are relevant to the most pressing OSH needs in Europe and contribute to the realisation of wider EU policy objectives

Tripartite

We work on the basis of, and promote, tripartism as the cornerstone of our work

Partnership and network-based

We participate in and connect networks and build communities to create European added value

Reliable

We see the quality assurance of our work as a key condition for success

Responsive and innovative

We are responsive to new OSH developments and innovative in addressing them

Good governance

We place great importance on accountability and transparency towards our stakeholders and efficiency in the use of our human and financial resources

CONCLUSION: The Board mandates the Bureau to oversee the preparation of the strategy document for the December Board meeting.

4. Analysis and assessment of the Agency's 2011 Annual Activity Report (G/12/02)

The **Director** introduced the item 4 together with item 5, as they were related in content [[presentation available here](#)] and informed about the main highlights from 2011. These included:

- OiRA project
- ESENER secondary analysis
- Foresight of risks in green jobs
- Safe Maintenance Campaign
- Selected performance indicators

The **Director** also gave an overview on the Inter-institutional Working Group and the status of the discharge process for the 2010 budget.

Ms Schweng asked for more information on SLAs as mentioned in the IAS report. **Ms Murillo** clarified that SLAs (Service Level Agreements) are concluded on the basis of a contract with a provider and that the SLAs provide details on how the contractor will provide the service contracted.

Mr Silva commented on the difference between the level of consumption of budgetary credits and the level of execution. **Ms Murillo** explained that "budget implementation" is the percentage of budgetary appropriations committed at year end. "Budget execution" is the percentage of budgetary appropriation actually paid at year end.

Following a request for information on the seat agreement, the **Director** explained that although the Basque government had offered the Agency a building, it had not been feasible for the Agency to accept the building as the Agency would have to undertake comprehensive maintenance work before being able to use the building. Discussions with the new Spanish government were yet to start.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GROUPS AND THE COMMISSION:**Governments:**

- Requested the seat agreement issue to be a permanent item on the Agenda
- Requested that the Board be informed on a regular basis on the new products before they are launched
- Requested that the Board be granted access to the Bureau and Advisory Groups minutes through the extranet

- Requested that the Board be informed on a regular basis about the main activities in which the Board and Focal Points are not involved
- Requested that the Board be sent the list of official campaign partners
- Considered that there was a need for a set of criteria to select the official campaign partners
- Requested Agency to provide a business case for the OSHwiki activity

Employers:

- Were not convinced about the methodology of the “foresight of risks for green jobs” used during a workshop and considered that this activity should be reconsidered.
- Requested Agency to inform the Board on a regular basis on the new products before they were launched.
- Regarding impact indicators, Agency is requested to provide information on the time visitors spend on the EU-OSHA website.
- Request Agency to attach information about the indicators defined in the EU-OSHA strategy 2009-2013 to the Annual Report and the Annual Activity Report.

Workers:

- The report was accepted and supported and they valued the active participation of project partners in the activities.
- Expressed their concern about the discussions in the Inter-institutional Working Group and stressed that any future tripartite structure must be really tripartite.
- Deplored that the existing agencies’ resources were decreased
- Products developed are good but they have to be relevant and acceptable by the end users

Commission:

- Considered the report was well structured, however
- Requested Agency to better explain the budget implementation figures (commitments/payments)

The **Director** informed that the website was being further developed and that the launch of the new website was expected by the end of 2013.

CONCLUSION: The Board adopted the analysis and assessment of the Annual Activity Report 2011 and the Annual Report 2011 with the above mentioned comments/amendments.

5. Agency’s 2011 Annual Report (G/12/03)

This item was treated together with the previous one.

6. Draft Annual Management plan 2013 (G/12/04)

The **Director** introduced the item [[presentation available here](#)], explaining that it was based on the expectation of reduced resources and that a certain amount of flexibility would be needed in view that the next EU-OSHA and EU strategies are still in preparation. Therefore the final version to be presented to the Board in December would be adapted in order to be in line with the new strategy. The **Director** highlighted the importance of networking and better and more regular communication with Board and Focal Points.

Mr Rial-González and **Mr Smith** informed about the main tasks of their respective areas of work: European Risk Observatory, Working Environment Information and Campaigning, Communication and Promotion [[presentation available here](#)].

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GROUPS AND THE COMMISSION

Employers:

- Regarding the possible additional funding for the Working Environment project on health and safety for older workers, the Employers requested the Bureau's involvement.

Governments:

- For major projects, the Governments reminded that a Board decision is necessary and for this a business case should be presented. Focal point engagement should be reflected in the Annual Management Plan, in order to plan resources at national level.
- The link between the new EU-OSHA Strategy and the management plan must be clearer.
- In page 11, objective 3: The indicator on reliability of information is unclear.
- In page 16, objective 4: Targets are not defined; when will the targets be defined and does EU-OSHA need any help from the Board in defining these targets?
- Page 25: "Budget implementation" target should define a minimum value.
- Page 25: "Number of training days" - it would be more relevant to define a range.
- Page 26: "Impact on awareness" indicators with decimals (rating of web-site), how does EU-OSHA reach these figures?

Workers:

- Regarding "Active ageing", the workers stressed that this is controversial and that OSH in this context should not be reduced to OSH for older workers but for OSH for the full working life.
- Regarding the issue of the performance of focal points, EU-OSHA should identify the focal points which underperform and take direct contact to these and the national social partners.
- Data on indicators: considered that there was a need for reliable, qualitative data.
- Stressed the importance of good cooperation between EUROFOUND and EU-OSHA. Both agencies are necessary and complementary.
- Expressed their interest in getting involved and active in the campaign starting the following month.
- Stated that ETUC's priority for the year was to have more safety representatives and that a survey on workers' representative representation would be carried out.
- Considered that the co-branded products were an interesting exercise and it would be necessary to assess their success when implemented at national level

Commission:

- Informed that the Annual Management Plan was at that moment within the process of internal consultation and that the general opinion on the draft was positive. The Commission had an interest in having good synergies between EU-OSHA's activities and Commission's activities in 2013.
- Page 16 specific objective no. 4 "risk assessments in micro and small enterprises" and page 14 specific objective no. 2 "Healthier and longer working lives": stressed that these were issues of increasing importance for the Commission and it would welcome the focus on these priorities in the Annual Management Plan.
- Informed about the first evaluation on health and safety policies and directives that would kick off in 2013 and the results expected by 2015; the Annual Management Plan should also take this priority into account.
- Expressed a positive opinion on the Annual Management Plan, with the reservation for future remarks after conclusion of the consultation process.

EU-OSHA:

- The **Director** informed that Mr William Cockburn and Ms Elke Schneider had been nominated for the working group evaluation of OSH directives
- Page 25 - days of training: EU-OSHA explained that the training plan was discussed and agreed with the staff committee before the budget was approved. The training days are fixed according to the needs of staff and the budget available.
- Regarding budget implementation: the **Director** agreed that it would be more relevant to establish a minimum value
- Regarding the 2 Million Euro for a targeted activity on older workers and involvement of the Bureau, **Mr Smith** informed that the agency would find a way to inform the Bureau.

- **Mr Rial-González** informed that, regarding the business case approach, ex-ante assessments were being carried out
- Regarding the definition of targets for OiRA, any guidance from the Board would be welcome. Ex-ante assessment was also carried out to define targets, beneficiaries, indicators, etc.
- Regarding comment in page 11 “increase of reliable information”: a survey would be repeated among the OSH mail subscribers, as in 2009.
- Informed that EU-OSHA would update about the coordination Eurofound/EU-OSHA regarding activities and the cooperation existing for instance with the ESENER survey.
- Regarding the question by the Governments on the evaluation of some sections of the website, the explanation of the figures was that the rating ranged from 1 to 5 and the average was calculated.

CONCLUSION: The Board adopted the draft Annual Management Plan 2013

7. Draft budget and establishment plan 2013, including staff policy plan (G/12/05)

The **Director** invited Ms Murillo to introduce the item [\[presentation available here\]](#). Ms Murillo presented the draft budget and establishment plan for 2013 including the staff policy plan, inviting the Governing Board to adopt it at that moment, bearing in mind that the documents would be sent to the Commission services together with the Draft Annual Management Plan 2013 and some amendments might be requested by the Commission. The final budget and establishment plan would be submitted for approval in December.

Mr Silva explained that the reason for the budgetary constraints for EU-OSHA in the current situation of economic crisis was the decision of freezing the budget of the “consolidated” agencies to the level of 2012 to compensate the increase for the “new agencies”. That was part of the Commission’s proposal to be submitted to the budgetary authorities. **Mr Silva** also remarked that the Commission considered that the budget presented by EU-OSHA was in line with its recommendations, and this was very much appreciated by the Commission. It was finally stressed that it is important to remember that 2013 is the last year of the current multi-annual financial framework. From 2014 on the budget will have to be formulated within a new multi-annual financial framework which may bring even stronger austerity measures.

Mr Silva explained that a reduction of five per cent in staff was proposed for the next five years. To be able to deliver the same output, the reduction in staff would be compensated by an increase in working time. The final decision on this proposal is to be taken by the Council and European Parliament.

Finally, **Mr Silva** requested that the figure for the reduction in the budget be changed to 0.7 (instead of 3%) to correct a clerical error.

Ms Koradecka expressed her concerns about the budgetary constraints and the negative repercussions on the health and safety of the workers.

Ms Böhm expressed her concern about the impact of the staff policy plan and asked how the Agency was handling this with the staff representatives. The **Director** assured that consultations and discussions with the staff committee had been carried out to assure the process was as smooth as possible. The Director also informed that the Agency had undertaken its 4th stress survey in 2011 and as a result developed a stress prevention action plan in consultation with staff representatives.

Mr Seitz pointed out that the reduction in staff combined with an increase in working time would require a prior assessment of the health impact on the remaining staff.

Mr Schäfer remarked that as the 2013 budget proposal from the Commission was not known yet, the German government would have to abstain on this item.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GROUPS AND THE COMMISSION:

Workers:

- The workers had strong reservations regarding the decrease in the total budget, but they had no specific comments on the distribution of the budget.

Governments:

- Requested to correct the clerical mistake re the decrease in budget (0,7% instead of 3%) as remarked by Mr Silva
- In page 7, budget title no. 4, remarked a significant decrease from 2011 to 2012 and requested an explanation

Commission

- Remarked that the budget was in accordance with the directions given

EU-OSHA:

- As regards chapter 4: For the IPA funds, a large amount is paid at the beginning of the programme as the Agency needs funds to initiate projects. Later in the project, fewer new resources are needed. This is according to the agreement signed with the Commission.

CONCLUSION: The Board adopted the draft Budget and establishment plan 2013, with the corrected figures of 0.7 % instead of 3 %.

8. Amendment of Budget 2012 (G/12/06)

Ms Murillo introduced the item. The Governing Board approved the budget 2012 in November 2011 based on the income and expenditure estimated at the time. After that, the final decision on the general budget of the European Community in early December 2011 implied that the subsidy for most agencies was decreased by 1%. This needs to be reflected in the Agency's budget 2012 as well as the exact available appropriations for the IPA III programme agreed with the Commission. Therefore, the Governing Board was invited to adopt the amending budget for 2012 and the establishment plan.

A question was raised about the impact that the decrease in the budget available for translations may have in the quality of the products. The **Director** and **Mr Smith** explained that there would not be reduction of the quality of the products, but a better use of the resources available, by means of a different policy for translations aimed at developing a more sustainable solution. An example of this more sustainable approach to translations was the OiRA project, where the interested member states feed the tool and translate into their own languages on their demand. This approach helps managing the amount of work for Focal Points, and decreasing the time devoted to translations management and checking, thus allowing both Focal Points and Agency staff to devote more time to other activities, such as networking, campaigning, etc.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GROUPS AND THE COMMISSION

Employers and Commission:

- No comments

Workers:

- Expressed their concern about the decrease of the budget and the impact on the activities and asked if externalising staff would be the most efficient way of facing it.

Governments:

- Requested information on what was the real impact of the decrease of resources for translations.

EU-OSHA:

- Informed that there would be less translations (see also above) and that there was a need to evaluate, and prioritise concerning translations. In this sense the portfolio approach would be very useful.

- Informed that the biggest activity for the translation was linked to the campaign and in 2012 there would be less need for translation compared with the previous year as most campaign products are already translated. The future policy for translation would be linked to the future strategy of the agency.

CONCLUSION: The Board adopted the Amendment of Budget 2012

9. Amendment Annual Management Plan 2012 (G/12/07)

Ms Murillo introduced the item. Following approval of the amending Budget 2012, the Governing Board is invited to approve the revised version of the Annual Management Plan which needed to be amended as well to reflect the adjustments in the financial resources available for the different activities.

The workers' group stressed the importance of continued involvement of the Agency's staff representatives in dealing with the impact of the austerity measures.

There were no further comments by the groups.

CONCLUSION: The Board adopted the Amended Annual Management Plan 2012.

10. Code of Good Administrative Behaviour at EU-OSHA (G/12/08)

The **Director** introduced the item. The Governing Board was required to adopt a new Code of Good Administrative Behaviour replacing the actual one which was not fully in line with the EU standards. There were no comments by the groups.

CONCLUSION: The Code of Good Administrative Behaviour is adopted.

11. 2011/2012 pan-European opinion poll of public attitudes to OSH (G/12/09)

Mr Smith introduced the item [[presentation available here](#)]. As agreed, EU-OSHA introduced this item in order to try to give the Board and the focal points as much advance notice as possible of the results before they were published.

COMMENTS FROM THE GROUPS AND THE COMMISSION

Employers:

- Requested clarification on how the cooperation between EU-OSHA and focal points would be enhanced.
- Requested for information on how the results would be used and on the press releases
- Questioned the sample of interviewed people (including pensioners, unemployed, etc.).
- Considered that when publishing the results concerning stress, it should be clearly stated that the poll referred to "perceptions and opinions".

Commission:

- Considered that some of the results might be interesting and useful for EU policies, for instance how well-informed people perceive they are
- Agreed that the stress is a complex issue and the elements of the poll are subjective.
- Requested that the Agency keeps the Commission spokesperson informed about the publication

EU-OSHA:

- Informed that focal points had reported that the previous exercise had been extremely useful for them at national level in order to stimulate debate and discussion about OSH in their member state; therefore EU-OSHA supports and cooperates with focal points by providing them with relevant information that they can use to discuss occupational safety and health and regard their own situation with regards to other European member states.

- Informed that the methodology used was similar to the Eurobarometer, being a representative of the population aged +18, including retired, students, unemployed, etc., but when the results are presented it is made clear which sample is included.
- Remarked that the results would not be presented in a negative way but aiming to stimulate debate.

CONCLUSION: This item was for information only.

12. Election of chair, vice-chairs and other Bureau members (G/12/10)

CHAIR Ms Gertrud Breindl	
VICE-CHAIRS	Workers' group Mr Károly György (workers' group)
	Commission Mr F. Jesús Álvarez (Commission)
	Employers' group Ms Christa Schweng (employers' group)
COORDINATORS	Governments' group Ms Tatjana Petriček
	Workers' group Ms Judith Kirton-Darling
	Employers' group Ms Rebekah Smith

BUREAU REPRESENTATIVES AND ALTERNATES

Governments' group

Member of Bureau	Mr Renārs Lūsis
Alternate	Mr Mario Grau-Rios
Alternate	Ms Danuta Koradecka
Alternate	Ms Charlotte Skjoldager

Workers' group

Member of Bureau	Ms Lučka Böhm
Alternate	Mr Jan Kahr Frederiksen
Alternate	Mr Viktor Kempa
Alternate	Mr Gilles Seitz

Employers' group

Member of Bureau	Mr Kris de Meester
Alternate	Ms Nathalie Buet ¹
Alternate	Mr François Engels
Alternate	Mr Eckhard Metze

Commission

Member of Bureau	Mr Costas Constantinou
Alternate	Ms Malgorzata Stadnik

Any further changes to these above would be communicated to EU-OSHA in writing.

13. Any other business

The **Director** thanked Mr György for his work as Chair for the year 2011-12 and welcomed Ms Breindl as new Chair of the Board for 2012.

The **Chair** informed that the next Board meeting would be held on 3 December in Luxembourg and reminded that the preparation of the draft EU-OSHA Strategy required the active participation of the Board.

The **Chair** reminded the Board that new Board members were invited to an "introduction to EU-OSHA" session in the Agency premises on the following day.

The **Chair** thanked the Director and Agency staff for the organisation of the meeting, as well as the interpreters and closed the meeting.

¹ Ms Nathalie Buet was replaced by Mr Sven-Peter Nygaard, as from 16 April 2012

List of participants:

	NAME	INTEREST GROUP	REPRESENTING
1	ADAMAKIS Ioannis	Workers	GREECE
2	ALVAREZ HIDALGO Francisco Jesús	European Commission	
3	ANDERSON Cecilia	Employers	SWEDEN
4	ANDREOU Nicos	Workers	CYPRUS
5	ANTAPSONS Ziedonis	Workers	LATVIA
6	ANTAUER Igor	Employers	SLOVENIA
7	BATEN Jan	Government	BELGIUM
8	BÖHM Lučka	Workers	SLOVENIA
9	BOMBERA Géza	Employers	HUNGARY
10	BREINDL Gertrud	Government	AUSTRIA
11	CASTRILLO NÚÑEZ Laura	Employers	SPAIN
12	CHRISTODOULOU Antonios	Government	GREECE
13	COJOCARU Adrian	Workers	ROMANIA
14	CRONIN Sylvester	Workers	IRELAND
15	DE MEESTER Kris	Employers	BELGIUM
16	DORGAN Mary	Government	IRELAND
17	ENGELS Francois	Employers	LUXEMBOURG
18	FLEMING Clive	Government	UNITED KINGDOM
19	FONCK Herman	Workers	BELGIUM
20	GANS Roel	Government	NETHERLANDS
21	GOMES Fernando	Workers	PORTUGAL
22	GYÖRGY Károly	Workers	HUNGARY
23	HEIDER Alexander	Workers	AUSTRIA
24	JANCUROVA Laurencia	Government	SLOVAKIA
25	JÄRNSTEDT Christina	Workers	SWEDEN
26	KIRTON-DARLING Judith	Workers	BELGIUM
27	KOLCHAKOV Atanas	Government	BULGARIA
28	KORADECKA Danuta	Government	POLAND
29	KUBICKOVA Daniela	Government	CZECH REPUBLIC
30	LEPORE Michele	Government	ITALY
31	LEUZZI Fabiola	Employers	ITALY
32	LEVICKIS Vaidotas	Employers	LITHUANIA
33	LEVY Patrick	Employers	FRANCE
34	LUSIS Renars	Government	LATVIA
35	MEITNER Róbert	Employers	SLOVAKIA

36	METZE Eckhard	Employers	GERMANY
37	MEUNIER Olivier	Government	FRANCE
38	MILLER Jean-Michel	Eurofound (Observer)	
39	NICOLAIDES Leandros	Government	CYPRUS
40	NICOLESCU Ovidiu	Employers	ROMANIA
41	NYGAARD Sven-Peter	Employers	DENMARK
42	PÁLSSON Jón R.	Employers	ICELAND
43	PASCUAL LIZANA Concepción	Government	SPAIN
44	PERIMÄKI Raili	Workers	FINLAND
45	PETRICEK Tatjana	Government	SLOVENIA
46	PLANGI Kristel	Government	ESTONIA
47	SÆMUNDSSON Eyjólfur	Government	ICELAND
48	SABAITIENE Aldona	Government	LITHUANIA
49	SCHÄFER Kai	Government	GERMANY
50	SCHRÖDER Marina	Workers	GERMANY
51	SCHWENG Christa	Employers	AUSTRIA
52	SIGURJÓNSSON Björn Ágúst	Workers	ICELAND
53	SILVA Armindo	European Commission	
54	SJÖBERG Mikael	Government	SWEDEN
55	SKJOLDAGER Charlotte	Government	DENMARK
56	SMITH Rebekah	Employers	BELGIUM
57	SOON Argo	Workers	ESTONIA
58	STOEV Georgi	Employers	BULGARIA
59	TĂNASE Marian	Government	ROMANIA
60	VAN STEENBERGEN Rik	Workers	NETHERLANDS
61	ZAGOROV Aleksandar	Workers	BULGARIA
62	Christa SEDLATSCHKE	EU-OSHA	
63	Jesper BEJER	EU-OSHA	
64	Marta DE PRADO	EU-OSHA	
65	Françoise MURILLO	EU-OSHA	
66	Eusebio RIAL GONZALEZ	EU-OSHA	
67	Andrew SMITH	EU-OSHA	
68	Brenda O'BRIEN	EU-OSHA	
69	Kate PALMER	EU-OSHA	
70	KEMPA Viktor	Workers	
71	SEITZ Gilles	Workers	FRANCE
72	FREDERIKSEN Jan Kahr	Workers	DENMARK
73	VAN MIERLO Mario	Employers	NETHERLANDS