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1. Welcome to meeting and adoption of agenda (B 260/1)

Mr Fonck (Workers) chaired the meeting in the absence of the Chairperson, Ms Rossi. Regrets were received from Mr Mühl who was replaced at the meeting by Ms Andersen.

The Chairperson proposed the following additions to the agenda: the role of academic experts in the Advisory Committees; nominations for Reporting Officers for the Director; and the location of the Bureau meeting in March.

2. Adoption of minutes of Bureau meetings

2.1. Minutes of the Bureau meeting, 9 December 2016 (B 261/2a)

2.1.1 4.7 The Chairperson asked for the following changes to be inserted in the text after ‘evaluation criteria ‘The Workers’ Group voiced in the Bureau of May 2014 their strong disappointment about the way Eurofound had transposed the joint concerns of the Bureau to attach very strong importance to the criterion of excellent expert knowledge of the national industrial relations system and social partners in the selection procedure. The report and justification given to the bureau after the selection showed that in some cases the score awarded to rather administrative criteria (e.g. the description of a mechanism to keep deadlines) was three times more important in the weighting of scores then the criterion on the strategy to access and maintain the connection with relevant social partners, policymakers and other practitioners. He insisted that the design and weighting of the criteria be adapted in order to capture better the concerns of the Bureau to select centers with expert knowledge of the national industrial relations systems.

The Director wished to state for the minutes that in procurement procedures there was
a distinction between Selection and Award criteria, whereby applicants had to pass the selection criteria and score above 70% in a range criteria before progressing to be evaluated on distinct Award criteria. This explained why it might appear that certain criteria were ranked as less important. In any case, concerns of the groups were noted.

2.1.2 Ms Welter (Governments) made the following comments.

Point 2.12 She noted minor editorial changes at 2.12.

Point 4.9 Contrary to the statement in the minutes that Eurofound did not wish to restrict meetings between the national correspondents and stakeholders to face to face meetings only, she said that in some member states face to face meetings were not more costly but were more effective.

Point 5. The final sentence should be deleted as the Bureau needed more information before deciding whether to accept or refuse the Director’s request regarding participation in Bureau meetings.

The amended minutes were adopted and the Director’s statement was recorded.

2.2 Adoption of minutes of Bureau meeting, 16 September 2016 (B 261/2b)

2.2.1 These minutes had not been submitted in November due to the shorter Bureau meeting which discussed only the work programme.

- Mr Maes (Commission) had submitted a number of changes in writing.
- 3.8 The Director corrected that it should read ‘European Commission’ and not ETUC.

The minutes were adopted subject to the Commission’s changes.

3. Progress report of the Director (B 261/3)

3.1 The Director outlined activities in Eurofound since his last progress report in November.

- A highlight of the period had been the launch of the 6th European Working Conditions Survey (6EWCS) overview report in the European Parliament on 17 November. A number of Board members had participated and the experience of the event was a positive one.
- The national cluster seminar was held in Berlin on 28-29 November and had focused on the labour market integration of migrants and refugees.
- The second regional seminar of the pilot project on the Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME) was held in San Sebastian, also on that date.
- On 7 December the Coordination of the Agencies had organised an Agencies’ Forum in the European Parliament. Eurofound was a member of the coordinating body until the end of February. The forum was an opportunity to present the work of the EU Agencies to key stakeholders.
- On 13 January Eurofound had welcomed Mr Calvet Chambon, rapporteur on revision of the Eurofound’s new founding regulation in the European Parliament.
- There were good preliminary results for Eurofound’s key performance indicators in 2016, including programme delivery with the target overachieved, correcting the situation of previous year.
- He informed the Bureau on the results of the annual user satisfaction survey which were positive.
- He highlighted recent publications including a new type that featured the contributions of participants in Eurofound’s recent Foundation Seminar Series which looked at the digitalisation of work. This was a good way to realise added
value from what was a costly exercise relative to the number of participants.

- Cooperation with the ILO was ongoing in relation to the EWCS report and the production of global guidelines for developing national contributions. The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences had ultimately decided to reduce the number of questions they used from Eurofound’s questionnaire, so the results would be less ambitious than originally intended but interesting nevertheless.

- Within the EurWORK observatory a number of longer topical updates would be published on Capacity building initiatives for social dialogue and Social Dialogue in the context of digital challenge. The Annual update on pay/minimum wages was due.

- The further analysis of the European Company Survey (ECS) on Reported changes in European Companies promised to be an interesting report.

- Following the Comparative Analytical Report (CAR) exploring fraudulent forms of contracting work and self-employment in the EU, further in-depth analysis on five forms of fraudulent forms of contracting, including some in-depth interviews, would be published at a later date.

- He outlined the different Representativeness Studies which had been published or were in the pipeline including: Personal services (hair and beauty sector); Postal and courier activities; Railways and public urban transport; sugar; shipbuilding; Tanning and leather; Footwear; Metal; and Steel. Discussions with DG Employment on Sector studies would start in 2017 subject to NACE code clarification.

- The feasibility study on the European Social Dialogue Database development had been finalised and would inform further work on the Representativeness Studies and presentation of data in 2017.

- The fieldwork of the 4th European Quality of Life Survey had been extended to the end of January, possibly in one case to February. There was however no change to the scheduled date for publication of the overview report.

- He presented a slide with an update on the Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME) project including developments with the test site for the planned re-shoring monitor. He would be happy to take any questions on the project.

- He presented provisional year-end financial figures that in comparison to 2015 included a higher level of unplanned carryovers, though they were still at a reasonable level (at 5.2% of the overall). The overall budget execution remained high.

- He outlined the transfers between budget lines in the final amended budget, noting that he was obliged to report this to the Bureau. He informed of upcoming written procedures to approve the Programming Document and the 2018 work programme, as well as the approval of carryovers.

- The report of the Court of Auditors had established a preliminary finding in relation to an error in the salaries of staff in place during the time of transition to the new staff regulations in 2005. An error in the so-called multiplication factor applied to the salaries resulting in under payments and overpayments to several staff. The underpayments had been regularised in November 2016. The overpayments would not be recovered, in line with Article 85 of the staff regulation (confirmed by DG HR) corresponding to the fact that the staff members could not have been aware of the error. As a further consequence Eurofound would carry out an external evaluation of its salary function.

- The audit of the 2016 accounts would be carried out in March 2017 by Mazars.
• The Internal Audit Service (IAS) had carried out an audit to ensure that project management procedures supported the achievement of Eurofound’s business objectives. The report, which was available on the extranet, made four recommendations. They concerned project governance (clarification of roles and guidelines), project monitoring and reporting (addition of data on human resources in projects), recommendations in relation to workload allocation and deadlines planning, and data quality checks in the project management information system. Eurofound would be addressing the recommendations. There would be scope for more detailed discussion of the audit reports in the Bureau meeting in March, as usual. It was required to submit the action plan to the IAS by 30 January 2017.

3.2 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that it would have been good to discuss the action plan in the Bureau.

3.3 The **Deputy Director** responding to concerns that the Bureau had not been duly informed about the Internal Audit Service report, explained that it had been received quite late in the year on 23 December. It had been published on the extranet for the Governing Board on 4 January.

It is normal procedure that Eurofound would develop an action plan in response to an audit’s findings, and would then inform the Governing Board and Bureau about the plan.

3.4 The **Chairperson** said that he had seen the report having received it by mistake instead of the new Chairperson Ms Rossi.

The recommendations did seem quite serious and he felt that as a matter of transparency the Governing Board should have been better informed.

3.5 **Mr Grimmeisen** said that follow up of internal audit reports were usually an internal matter, whereby Eurofound would have to develop actions in relation to the findings that the IAS would come back again on Eurofound’s response and would also follow up on the implementation of the action plan. It was routine that the Governing Board was informed throughout the process but it was not usually involved in it.

3.6 The **Director** agreed that there could have been more information to the Board, but for a number of reasons Eurofound had not wanted to send a mail to the new Board members before they had received information about their role and details of how to login to the extranet, where the documents were published.

He did not agree with all of the comments in the report and there had been a number of exchanges with the IAS. However in spite of that, Eurofound preferred to concentrate on recommendations and he did consider that a number of valid points had been raised and that the actions in response were reasonable and would be helpful.

3.7 • **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** thanked the Director for his progress report. She said that the presentation of the 6th European Working Conditions Survey report in the European Parliament had been an excellent event.

• Regarding the matter of academic experts on Advisory Committees, she urged Eurofound to launch a call for such experts, not only to ensure transparency but also to allow more people to come forward and propose themselves.

• The FOME project was interesting and she wondered if any research results were available to be shared.

• In relation to the IAS report, although she had not yet had time to read the report, it
should be emphasised that there were no critical findings. If the Director had disagreements about some of the material findings it was important to point that out. However she felt that the activity based budgetary approach was an opportunity to understand how the resources of the research project managers were utilised, particularly with regard to missions and travel.

3.8 **The Director** replied that Eurofound was in the process of preparing a call for interest similar to that described by Ms Bulgarelli. The work of the FOME project was still at a preliminary stage, restricted to workshops and conferences on a regional level.

3.9 **The Chairperson** asked that all Board members receive the IAS report as soon as possible. There were strong sentences about weaknesses in project management at Eurofound and important recommendations.

3.10 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** agreed that it was important to distribute the report to the Governing Board. In relation to the reports of the Internal Audit Service she added that Eurofound should be precise in relation to any points in the IAS report with which it did not agree. It was important to correct any misunderstandings both for the record and in terms of accountability.

She added that she also found the seminar launching the Sixth European Working Conditions Survey to be an excellent event.

3.11 **The Director** agreed to focus mainly on recommendations and outlined areas where Eurofound had engaged with certain statements in the report. The action plan would be presented to the Bureau in March.

3.12 **The Director** concluded his progress report.

- He updated the Bureau on HR matters, including recruitment activity, a follow up to the staff engagement survey and the organisational development which had been undertaken in line with the new Programming Document.
- An *ad hoc* information request had been received from the European Commission in the context of the follow-up to the European Pillar on Social Rights. It would concern a customised report ‘Recent evidence on the labour situation of workers in new types of employment, temporary employment and the self-employed’

4. Update by the Commission on the revision of the Founding regulation and the evaluation exercise (B 261/4)

4.1 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** informed the Bureau that the Commission’s proposal had passed through the Council and was now with the European Parliament. It still included elements such as suppression of the Deputy Director’s post, and that the Governing Board was the Appointing Authority. The Employment Committee of the Parliament were in charge of the procedure with voting expected in June 2017.

With regard to the cross-cutting evaluation of the tripartite agencies in 2017, a contract had been awarded to Ecorys UK and the terms of reference had been sent to the Director and the Bureau earlier in the week. It would be completed by December 2017 and an internal Commission working paper with the key results of the evaluation was foreseen in 2018. As mentioned by the Director in the Governing Board meeting, members of the Board if approached should treat the evaluation seriously, as it was an important matter the outcome of which was not certain.

**Ms Scanferla** added that following adoption of the report in June there would likely be further meetings between the Council, Parliament and the Commission. The duration
of this phase depended on whether it was considered a technical or political decision. The role of the Commission in that phase was usually to explain and sometimes defend its position.

4.2 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** regarding the cross-cutting evaluation noted that the terms of reference made provision for an inception report and that it was not foreseen to consult the agencies in order to confirm or check the facts and figures.

4.3 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** replied that a Commission inter-service Group had been set up, which would be responsible for the evaluation. The agency would be informed about the developments but it was not foreseen that it would be involved in steering the evaluation.

4.4 **The Director** said that the Agency would be willing to assist the evaluation process, for example by informing the Governing Board members about the process and also by providing up-to-date and correct facts or figures to the evaluators.

5. Final Draft Programming Document 2017-2020- version 2018 (B 261/5)

5.1 **The Director** briefly introduced the programme, noting that this final draft included clearly marked areas where clarification from the members was required.

5.2 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** made the following remarks:

- In the context of discussions on negative priorities, she had consulted with colleagues in the Platform on Undeclared Work who were currently setting the priorities of the platform. Following discussions with them, her suggestion was that Eurofound should proactively provide an input of its own data on undeclared work to the platform. It would be an opportunity to demonstrate Eurofound’s valuable tripartite approach to the issue. It was misleading to include it in the negative priorities and it should be deleted.
- She welcomed the information provided by the Commission on research carried out by them on the integration of third-country nationals. Based on this list, it would appear that there was scope for discussion between the Commission and Eurofound on additional work that was possible in the future in the area of migrants.
- Line 983-984 the sentence Eurofound is not among the Agencies that have been given additional resources to deal with the situation should be deleted, as the situations in the different EU Agencies were not comparable.
- Similarly Line 985-989 should be reworked. Eurofound had a good deal of expertise in the area of undeclared work, and the paragraph should be more general such as ‘Eurofound will cooperate with the Platform’. At line 1145 the description of the project on undeclared work would also have to be amended.
- The Group reiterated their call to increase the time spent by Eurofound’s research managers on research, by reducing the time spent travelling.
- She outlined a proposal by the Governments for an event in which Eurofound would invite papers from organisations and researchers using its data. It would be an excellent way to disseminate its information further, and to capitalise on its data through collaborating in this way. Such an event need not be expensive.
- She made a number of points in relation to the budget, asked what exactly was meant by ‘external services’ with a foreseen increase of EUR 120,000 and commented on the risk table.

5.3 **Ms Bober (Employers)** made the following remarks on behalf of her Group.
• The programme was quite overloaded and the Group would not therefore be requesting additional projects, although they understood the points made by the Governments on the theme of undeclared work.

• On the other hand, they would foresee deleting a project in which it did not seem there was great interest, and over which there had been a difference of opinion, namely the Social Dialogue project investigating the articulation and level-linkages between the European social dialogue and social dialogue at national level, with a particular focus on the company level (line 1164-1171). The Group could support the insertion of the project on undeclared work if this project were deleted.

• There had been discussions with ETUC on the capacity building project however they were not at a point where a joint proposal was possible. This was an important topic and along with the other partners the Employers had signed a declaration about social dialogue that included commitments to capacity building. A subgroup had been created in the Social Dialogue Committee to look at capacity building. The Commission had also published a report on social developments in Europe with a chapter on capacity building. Eurofound’s contribution would have to be seen within the context of all of these activities, so the Group would need more time to reflect on what that might be. They would be ready with a proposal by 2019. Without a mandate to propose something however what was proposed by Eurofound was a good preparatory base and so the Group could agree to that.

5.4 Ms Hoffmann (Workers) made the following comments:

• The Group appreciated that some of the uncertainties around the European Working Conditions Survey had been removed but noted that line 1805 again picked up on ‘cost-saving scenarios and their quality implications’.

• Line 1106 in relation to the survey, said that the approach for sectoral and occupational comparisons in job quality from the EWCS data would be decided in 2019 i.e. three years after the data had been collected. She wondered if it could be done sooner.

• She reiterated the interest of the Group in the subject of articulation and made some fresh arguments in favour of the research. It was, she said, becoming clear in the reports on the recast European Works Councils Directive that the gap in the knowledge was in relation to how EWC or transnational company level social dialogue translated into actually Europeanising a multilevel system. The Group felt that Eurofound was well placed to do this study, because of its expertise and experience on the European Works Councils worked in practice.

• She agreed with the Employers’ comments on capacity building. The Group had the idea that Eurofound could build on its database work have a biannual or annual report on the state of play of social dialogue, in terms of the agreements, what had been signed or implemented, and what to cover. It would be good if Eurofound could provide an overview. The analysis would be done by the social partners, but such an overview would be enormously helpful.

• Line 1292 it was not clear that the Workers’ comments on the link between employment protection and segmentation had been answered in the changes. Some clarification was required.

• Line 1386 it would be useful to be more explicit about how the outputs here covered the issue of migrants and refugees.

5.5 The Chairperson reiterated that lines 1805-1808 which appeared to put in doubt the future of the survey should be deleted.
5.6 Ms Kauffmann (Commission) made the following comments:

- In the document currently the staff table on page 27 did not include the figure of 91 posts in 2018 which the agency was obliged to achieve as part of the 10% reduction. If this was not achieved the Commission would have to reserve its opinion on the written procedure for approving the programme.

- The proposals made today on the platform of undeclared work sounded feasible, and as they did not represent additional work but were more a gathering of existing material, it did seem that the topic should stay in the area of negative priorities with a slightly different formulation, as requested.

- On the capacity building, the understanding had been that the Employers and Workers could bring a clear proposal by 10 January so it was disappointing that this had not been possible. The Commission attached great importance to this work. The proposal of the Workers’ Group in relation to a database of agreements did not reflect what was proposed in the document. She looked forward to a more concrete proposal at a later date.

- The project on articulation was important, and she supported its inclusion in the programme.

5.7 The Director responded to some of the comments.

- He outlined Eurofound’s interaction to date with the Platform on Undeclared Work that included undertaking a feasibility study for transforming the database into a knowledge bank. Eurofound had presented information at the European Parliament and had offered to present information to the first meeting of the Platform, an offer which had been declined at the time. Eurofound had made available the results of the work on fraudulent forms of work there. Given the budgetary constraints however, Eurofound was not in a position to do more at this stage and hence this was included in the area of negative priorities, pending on decisions of the work programme of the Platform.

- It was in his opinion justified to reflect in the document that EU Agencies (e.g. FRA) had been given additional resources by the Budgetary Authority to deal with the migrant and refugees issue whereas Eurofound had not received additional resources. He would concur with the Bureau’s wishes that the sentence should be deleted but he wanted to state the point.

- He noted and would further explore the suggestion about an event with organisations and researchers using Eurofound data. He added that Eurofound released its data as soon as possible to select organisations such as the OECD for their job strain index.

5.8 The Deputy Director in relation to this proposal said that she did not see the need for additional parallel activities, because the kind of collaboration described was already underway in Social Science networks like the InGRID project organised by DG Research and Innovation at the European Commission.

5.9 However, the Chairperson proposed that the idea of an event with organisations using Eurofound data be taken up in a later meeting of the Bureau.

5.10 The Director noted that the missions budget covered all staff participating in meetings where there was a cost.

Once again he assured the Bureau members that the European Working Conditions Survey would go ahead as planned in 2020. He said that it was important that the Bureau and in particular the representatives of the Workers trusted his assurances in
this regard. However as he had stated on many occasions it was also necessary to undertake to review all the surveys, in relation to timing, cycle, exploration costs, quality implications, parameters.

5.11 **The Deputy Director** referred to the new strategic activity in the work programme on the development of surveys. It was necessary to explore in terms of methodology and collaboration. The Governing Board of course would be informed and would ultimately decide about any changes.

5.12 **Ms Bober** and **Ms Andersen (Employers)** agreed that it was necessary to have this long term strategic approach.

5.13 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** also agreed that it was important to reflect on these issues and to reflect broadly, so that no one survey was excluded from discussion.

5.14 Further to questions from the Governments’ Group, **Mr Grimmeisen** explained that the budget line for external services was mainly composed of fees for Service Level Agreements with the Commission for software, as well as the cost of trainees. The increase in this figure was due to the fact that Eurofound was expected to take up the Commission’s HR system (SYSPER) and had restored the trainee budget to normal levels, following the budgetary pressures in the previous year.

Concerning the types of procurement indicated in the table in Annex IX, he said that subject to the financial rules there was scope for selecting heavier open tender procedures or negotiated procedures where applicants were invited to tender. An explanatory footnote would be inserted in the programme to outline the different procedures.

5.15 **The Chairperson** summarised the textual amendments required in relation to the assurances about the EWCS, and noted that there remained a difference of opinion over the project on articulation of social dialogue and a requirement for clarification on the capacity building.

5.16 **The Director** proposed that the Employers and Workers come together with a joint text on the two research projects on articulation of social dialogue and capacity building. He said that on the capacity building project, they should consult with the Commission who also had an interest in this area.

The project on articulation followed a request of the European Parliament in 2016 that ‘Eurofound takes account in its 2018 work programme studies examining cooperation between European Works Councils and European Framework Agreements’.

5.17 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** did not wish to link the two projects so that one might be deleted in order to undertake the other.

5.18 **Ms Bober (Employers)** said that the Group could agree to the text on capacity building as it was on the basis that discussions with ETUC would continue and that it might be possible to add to the text at a later stage.

However the Group did not support the text as it stood on the articulation between the EU and national levels of social dialogue, as they had never received a satisfactory explanation of the reasons behind the project.

5.19 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** putting it in the larger context of years of work done by Eurofound on European Works Councils, on information consultation, on social dialogue at work this was the only item in the work programme focusing in particular on articulation.
5.20 Ms Bober (Employers) said that the Directive was very clear on what was meant by articulation and whilst it was sometimes difficult to apply it was working. The Group did not understand the reasoning behind this project and did not support the focus on articulation.

5.21 The Chairperson indicated that it was necessary to reach a compromise on the issue in order to adopt the programme. There followed a protracted discussion between the Employers and Workers on the research.

It was not appropriate to delete the project as it was linked to a direct request from the Parliament.

The Groups agreed to delegate the task to Eurofound of finding a text that was acceptable to all the Groups in order to submit the work programme for approval by written procedure. A joint proposal on capacity building could be suggested at a later stage for the final programming document.

Discussion on the final draft 2018 work programme concluded and the Groups agreed that the document with the amendments could be sent for approval by a written procedure.

6. The Bureau decided that the next meeting would be held in Dublin on 10 March 2017.

7. The Director said that the Foundation Forum (B 261/6) would consider upward convergence in living and working conditions, including employment, a theme that was in line with the strategic objectives of the Four-Year Programme. Any ideas about the kinds of sessions that could be held should be sent to Eurofound. He reminded the members that the Forum was a high level event, that invitations would be issued at the highest level in the organisation, and he asked the members to alert the people within their own organisations.

In relation to figures in the budget table for 2018 he noted that in order to avoid disruption to the business he would be appealing to the Commission for a margin of manoeuvre in the non-compliance with the required staff reductions (he mentioned a period of three months).

He informed the Bureau that the notice of the tender for the Network of European Correspondents would be sent to the Official Journal of the EU on 10 February 2017.

8. The date of the next meeting would be Friday, 10 March 2017 in Dublin.
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Brussels, Conseil Central de l’Economie (Eurofound’s Brussels Office)
1. Welcome to the meeting and adoption of Draft Agenda (B 262/1)

Apologies were received from Ms Bulgarelli (Governments) and Ms Bober (Employers).

The draft agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of draft minutes of Bureau meeting 20 January 2017 (B 262/2)

2.1 Ms Kauffmann (Commission) requested the following changes to the minutes.

- 3.7 At this point, Eurofound may wish to include for the record that she had stated that she also found the presentation of the Sixth European Working Conditions in the European Parliament to have been an excellent event.
- 3.10 The last sentence should be amended: It was important to correct any misunderstandings both for the record and in terms of accountability.
- 4.1 As mentioned by the Director in the Governing Board meeting, members of the Board if approached should treat the evaluation seriously, as it was an important matter, the outcome of which was not certain.
- 4.3 Ms Kauffmann replied that a Commission inter-service group had been set up and would be responsible for the evaluation. It was not foreseen that it would be involved in steering the evaluation.
- 5.8 It was not Ms Kauffmann, but rather the Deputy Director who had intervened at this point.

2.2 Mr Scherrer (Workers) said that he was included in the list of participants but had not attended the meeting.
2.3 Ms Welter following up from the minutes (which she felt did not reflect the richness of the discussion) asked whether a decision had been taken on whether to prepare a resumé of existing Eurofound research in the area, in order to submit it to the Platform on Undeclared Work.

The Director replied that Ms Gerstenberger had presented the preliminary results of the report on *Self Employment* to the Platform on 9 March 2017 and he had asked her to also present a short overview of Eurofound’s work in the area to date.

2.3 With the above amendments the minutes were adopted.

3. Director’s progress report (B 262/3)

3.1 The Director highlighted some of the activities since the last Bureau meeting on 20 January, which were outlined in greater detail in the progress reports submitted.

- Implementation of the new 2017-2020 programming document had begun, with Eurofound presenting the new activities in the usual meetings in the European Parliament and the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC). The EESC had provided a longer slot on the day as it was also presenting its opinion on the new Founding Regulation for Eurofound.

- He noted that the Social Partners had not yet submitted an alternative joint proposal for the project on capacity building. The draft programme sent to the Commission in late January, contained the original research proposal. Mr Scherrer responded, informing the Bureau that a meeting had been held in recent days between the social partners and the Commission. He said that capacity building was considered an important topic for the stakeholders and that written exchanges were ongoing in order to prepare a joint submission. Eurofound should expect a proposal in the near future.

- The Director alerted the Bureau to the upcoming discussions on the rolling work programme which would include planning for the period to 2021, while this goes beyond the current Multiannual Financial Framework. It was clear that by that time, the implications of the UK’s departure from the union would affect all EU budget lines. The rolling part of the Programming Document would remain unchanged but it would be necessary to present a brief outline for 2021, considering the budgetary pressures in the future. For example although a cycle of the EQLS was due in 2021 it would not be feasible in that year.

- The European Parliament’s discharge procedure was almost complete and it looked as though the budget would be discharged without difficulty for all EU Agencies, including Eurofound.

- EQLS fieldwork in 28 countries was now complete and the recent delays were not expected to have a major impact on the schedule publication of the report.

- Regarding the Sixth European Working Conditions Survey (6 EWCS), he informed the Bureau that a weighting error had been discovered in relation to the data for Spain. The analysis remained valid but there were slight changes in the EU figures. The database and Survey Mapping Tool had been corrected. Further actions were ongoing that included correcting the dataset deposited in the UK Data Archive and in the related publications, and notifying anyone who had worked with the dataset to date.

- A number of meetings had been held with colleagues in the European Commission in order to further improve communications with the agency, and to introduce Mr Baussaud the recently appointed head of Eurofound’s Brussels office.
• The tender for the Network of European Correspondents had been published on 28 February 2017.
• Planning was underway for the Foundation Forum in November 2017 and an early draft programme had been circulated to the Bureau and would be discussed later during the meeting.
• Eurofound’s action plan to address the Internal Audit Service (IAS) recommendations on its audit of project management in Eurofound, had been accepted by the IAS.
• He highlighted a number of publications including the 2016 European Restructuring Monitor (ERM) report which would focus on offshoring and reshoring in Europe. It was this kind of qualitative assessment that demonstrated the greatest value of the ERM.
• At the request of a number of MEPs, Eurofound had hosted a visit by members of the European Parliament on a cross-party basis which included Eurosceptic groups. It was felt that the visit had been successful, with a good level of interest shown by the visitors in the programme that was presented.
• A joint report with the ILO Working anytime, anywhere: the effects on the world of work had proven to be an interesting way to extend Eurofound’s reach, providing a higher visibility than usual. Eurofound had used data of the EWCS and a Comparative Analytical Report (CAR) and had covered a number of European countries, whilst the ILO had covered non-European countries. There was press coverage beyond Europe.
• In his slides he outlined the list of 2017 projects grouped by activity and said that more detailed information on the status of each project was available in the update report.
• He highlighted the project on Casual work – characteristics and implications which would complete the earlier work on new forms of employment that had mapped nine new forms of work (the research on new forms of work in ICT and Job Sharing had been completed – new forms of casual work and crowd employment would be tackled in this phase).
• He informed the Bureau that preparations had started for the 7th EWCS, planned for 2020.
• Work was ongoing on preparations for the joint European Company Survey with Cedefop. A steering group composed of members of the two Governing Boards would meet on 11 May 2017 in Brussels.

The feasibility of using a web-based survey mode had been investigated (whilst Eurofound’s other surveys were conducted face-to-face, the ECS was conducted by telephone interview). However although the technological future of surveys might be in this direction, it appeared that it would not yield many cost savings. There were some difficulties with the coordination of the procurement with Cedefop. In this sense the joint procedure was more labour intensive and took longer than usual.
• He mentioned the upcoming joint OECD event on Social Mobility and Equal Opportunity on 4 May in Paris. Whilst it had originally been planned to launch Eurofound’s report on Social Mobility in EU Countries at this event, the OECD whose own report in the area was due for publication only after the event, did not support this idea. Therefore, Eurofound would launch its own report in April. This kind of joint event provided an excellent opportunity for greater public visibility.
• In a slide he updated the Bureau on the Future of Manufacturing in Europe.
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(FOME) project, which was a project funded by the European Parliament. The European Reshoring Monitor on the website was now fully operational. Meetings had been held on 2 March 2017 with potential contractors for preparation of Manufacturing Employment Scenarios, and explorations were underway with the inter-service steering group on relevant and feasible scenarios such as Trade, Energy, Investment, Technology and Growth.

- The tender for the Network of European Correspondents had been published and he outlined how the concerns of the Bureau and Board had been taken on board in both the selection and award criteria. He encouraged the members to disseminate the tender within their own networks. The Deputy Director added that the Governing Board members would soon receive a letter asking them to make a quality assessment of their collaboration with the networks in the previous year.
- Regarding the Foundation Forum, he noted that the programme was a very early draft and included the names of persons who had not yet been contacted, so members should not distribute it further. He encouraged the members of the Bureau to ensure participation at the highest level within their organisation. There was a short exchange on the Forum with members offering advice based on their own experiences.
- He informed the members of upcoming written procedures of the Governing Board, on the appointment of Reporting Officers for the Director and Deputy Director, and certain implementing rules regarding the staff regulations.
- Mr Grimmeisen reported that in discussions on the upcoming revised general financial regulations, the Court of Auditors had indicated that it would in the future externalise the audit process fully so that the first visit of the auditors every year in November (which looked into procurement and recruitment) would also be carried out by a private audit firm. This was not the preferred outcome for the EU Agencies, as in the past a pilot project had revealed certain difficulties as the private-firm auditors were not experienced in the EU Staff Regulations or the Financial Regulation. There would also be cost implications.
- The Director informed the Bureau about the Sysper2 project, a significant ICT project whereby the agencies would implement the Commission’s software for managing human resources.
- Eurofound had received two ad hoc research requests. One from the European Commission concerned the labour market situation of workers in new forms of employment, temporary employment and self-employment (a customised report of existing findings) and was required before May 2017. The other on work-life balance (a Comparative Analytical Report (CAR)) had been requested by the member for the Austrian governments.

3.2 Ms Kauffmann (Commission) said that there were serious doubts about the request in relation to the CAR, as the Commission’s own proposal on work-life balance was due for publication on 26 April 2017, with an impact assessment and a report to follow. It seemed that there was a high risk of duplication of effort.

3.3 There followed a discussion on procedures for ad hoc research requests and the role of the Bureau in the process.

The Chairperson summarised that the procedure was such that these requests were managed by Eurofound although the Bureau was informed about them in a transparent way. Whilst it was not necessary to have tripartite agreement beforehand it was important that a request was generally supported.
As it appeared that there were concerns that in this case the request would duplicate work done elsewhere, no further action would be taken in relation to the CAR until the Commission had reported from its own impact assessment after April.

It was noted that Eurofound had published a CAR on promoting the uptake of parental and paternity leave amongst fathers in the European Union in 2014, which in some ways addressed the request.

Mr Storrie added that there was provision in the budget in 2017 for addressing ad hoc requests, with resources assigned that were equivalent to a full CAR.

3.4 Ms Welter (Governments) said that in the list of events in the progress report, it was the case that some countries were not represented at all and she wondered why.

In relation to the tender for the correspondents, one member from her Group was curious to know if the tender included provision for input to CARs, as the evaluation of the network had indicated some declining use of this aspect of the national correspondent’s activities.

In relation to the Foundation Forum it was the felt that the Governing Board members were noticeably absent from the programme.

3.5 There followed a short discussion on the Foundation Forum, touching on the concept of the event, the profile of the speakers and the involvement of members of the Governing Board.

- The Director explained that the Forum had a more external orientation but the involvement of some Board members was foreseen, in relation to Chairing roles etc.
- The Chairperson said that the Forum presented an opportunity for Eurofound to reach out to other people within the stakeholder organisations, beyond the usual Governing Board members.
- Mr Scherrer (Workers) encouraged Eurofound to strive to be innovative in the Forum, to avoid that the event would be a high level event with lofty declarations but without subsequent actions.

3.6 Responding to Ms Welter, the Director replied that the correspondent’s contract mainly concerned regular reporting such as articles, quarterly reports and mini-CARs. The number of CARs had been reduced. A good part of the work of the correspondents was of course concerned with producing the Representativeness Studies.

The geographical split of events would be covered in the presentation by the Head of Information and Communication later.

3.6 The Chairperson thanked the Director for his progress report.

4. Revision of Founding Regulations – update by the Commission

4.1 Ms Kauffmann (Commission) said that the Commission had presented its proposal to the Employment Committee of the Parliament on 28 February 2017.

Discussion within the various Parliamentary committees was due on 22-23 March 2017, with the reports of the three rapporteurs due after that, with adoption in the Employment Committee in June and vote in the plenary at the latest in September, followed after that by a trilogue between the three institutions.

The latest information was that the rapporteur for Eurofound was proposing the following: a reduced Governing Board of nine members representing the three
Groups; retention of the post of Deputy Director; representation of the European Parliament in the Management Board and on the Executive Board; and the introduction of a reference indicating that in the future agencies could be merged following an evaluation; proposals were also included aimed at improving working relations between the Commission and Eurofound in order to avoid overlaps.

It was not clear that these proposals were supported in full by the other rapporteurs, and the final proposal would be voted on by the Committees. Some elements of the proposal were interesting but it would remain to be seen what the final text would be.

The Chairperson invited any questions from the Bureau.

4.2 Mr Fonck (Workers) wondered about the origin of the proposal to reduce the size of the Management Board, whether it originated from the rapporteur himself or reflected the views of the Committee. Ms Hoffmann (Workers) asked why the three agencies had been discussed separately in the Parliament.

4.3 Mr Maes (Commission) said that the European Commission had dealt with the agencies as a package, as had the Council but the Parliament had not. The Parliament committees were aware that the proposals were almost identical so that they would not have a strong negotiation position in the trilogue if they had diverging proposals. However in the Parliament, it was the beginning of a process whereby there might be amendments from other MEPs in the Committees, and further amendments in the plenary.

The idea of a reduced Management Board was not included in the proposals of the other rapporteurs so it could be assumed to have come from the rapporteur himself. However it was expected that the various rapporteurs would converge in their opinions.

4.4 In relation to the cross-agency evaluation being undertaken by the Commission, the Director asked about the schedule of interviews and offered once again to provide up-to-date fact sheets about the agency to the evaluation team. He said that Eurofound would circulate a short information note to the Governing Board members, with relevant figures and performance data.

4.5 Ms Kauffmann (Commission) said that the factual information offered by the Director would be very welcome and would be shared with the contractor.

Mr Maes added that the evaluators were setting dates for interviews, with the first interviews scheduled in Brussels. Ms de Boer had been identified as contact person in Eurofound. With such a large number of interviews scheduled in the evaluation of four agencies, he said that any issues that might arise should be immediately reported to the Commission in order to be fed back to the evaluators.

The interviews would be targeted, and would include Bureau members, Governing Board members, Eurofound staff and stakeholders. There would also be a public consultation on the four agencies in the first week of April. He would inform Eurofound once this had been launched.

In response to a question from the Chairperson he said that it would also be possible for the social partners to participate in that public consultation through their organisations.

In response to a question from the Deputy Director he said that the inception report scheduled for the end of January would be used by the Steering Group and would therefore remain within the Commission. However there would be a workshop
towards the end of the evaluation exercise during which Bureau and Governing Board members as well as senior staff of the agency would be able to verify the findings of the evaluation and also to have a look at the draft recommendations emerging from this process.

He reiterated that any requests for information should be sent to the Commission. For the moment the terms of reference and the roadmap for the evaluation were the only documents that could be shared.

5. Update on Information and Communication activities (B 262/5)

5.1 Ms McCaughey presented an overview of communication activities with a focus on the strategy in relation to events.

The overall objective of activities was to communicate Eurofound’s research in such a way as to have an impact and influence on policymakers. Target groups identified included stakeholders (the Governing Board) and primary target groups (the EU Institutions, the Social Partners etc.) as well as intermediary target groups such as research organisations, universities, media and various multipliers i.e. channels that could be used for further dissemination. The general public was not a core group for Eurofound’s communication strategy, but was an audience that could be reached through social media and similar channels.

She presented the national picture of events in the period 2013-2016, a period during which the communications budget had suffered reductions. Following a decision the number of publications had been reduced from 172 per annum in 2013 to 105 in 2016. Downloads from the website had increased, following a drop in 2015 after a difficult transition to the new website. This increase was attributable also to improved social media campaigning which encouraged click-through to the website.

Eurofound’s contact management system (known as the CRM) had been further developed, with greater ability for users to subscribe to areas of interest and with regular targeted dissemination made possible.

12,500 publications had been disseminated in 2016 using the Service Level Agreement with the Official Publications Office of the EU. The development of targeted marketing lists had made it possible to reduce the costs in this contract.

In parallel email marketing had improved, with CRM contacts receiving notification of publications with a link to a download, as for example with the recent tender for the Network of European Correspondents. In the CRM it was possible to analyse how users interacted with the content, if for example they had downloaded the information, and it was also much easier to manage user subscriptions.

Press activity had to be seen in the context of a much more diverse media field, where press releases were no longer as relevant and where activities could be virtualised, or could be formed by outreach to a group or media. An issue that Eurofound was encountering in trying to assess its media impact was the problem of accessing media behind paywalls. It would appear that the EU Agencies were now able to participate in a framework tender of the European Commission for media monitoring, but how that might be facilitated in terms of costs etc. was not yet clear.

The national cluster events had been organised to ensure a broad coverage of the Member States. With regards to national-level communication there was obviously a greater focus on Belgium (in reality Brussels) but dissemination activities were generally across the Member States from the perspective of translation, and events, particularly linked to the EU Presidency events.
She presented a list of the most downloaded publications, noting that the most popular continued to be reports of the European Working Conditions Survey and its secondary analyses, as well as the Eurofound Yearbook and the report on the NEETs.

She noted that the design of the Sixth European Working Conditions Survey overview report had been updated, with new styles, new graphs and more correlation with the Survey Mapping Tool. Further to the information provided by the Director earlier about the error in the data for Spain, she informed that an updated version of the report with updated tables and figures should be available in April 2017 provided that no additional issues are identified.

Other highlights included contributions to the informal Council meetings (Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs (EPSCO) Employment Committee (EMCO) and Social Protection Committee (SPC)), which allowed Eurofound to target national players represented at those committees.

Eurofound monitored its performance in three KPIs: uptake of Eurofound’s knowledge through its website (i.e. downloads), Use of Eurofound’s expertise in key EU policy documents, and contribution to policy development through events. In the last year, Eurofound had made 13 contributions to EPSCO and EU Presidency events, four to EMCO meetings, two to SPC meetings, 13 to European Parliament debates, 47 to European Commission events and 18 to the EU level social and seven to EESC events.

She presented a chart detailing the internal impact tracking of references to Eurofound research in EU policy documents of the target groups that charted the references between 2013 and 2016.

She briefly outlined the communications approach linked to the new programme, and the reduced resources for communication activities.

Information on the website was presented through portals (see for example EurWORK, EMCC and EurLife).

The publication strategy had been renewed and a number of new publication types developed. In future the strategy would incorporate:

- One flagship report for each of the strategic areas during the four years plus a spotlight for each strategic area on the website,
- A maximum of two policy paper series (these were adaptations of the Foundation Findings series) per strategic area each year,
- A maximum number of reports per strategic area and the introduction of blogs.

She presented the website which had been reviewed and updated with new features. A number of audits had been carried out (online communications, search engine optimisation and usability), the findings of which were now being addressed.

Eurofound’s new corporate branding had been applied across the range of outputs.

An annual user satisfaction survey had been conducted and the results implied that the target audiences were being reached, and their information needs were being met.

She then presented in more detail on Eurofound’s events strategy focusing in detailed slides on how resources were allocated and utilised in this area.

Eurofound tended to have three types of events: own events (e.g. the Foundation Forum), joint events (including Presidency events) and events where Eurofound made contributions only. Joint events presented a better return on investment for a small agency like Eurofound, and the unwritten policy in the last few years had been to focus on these kinds of events.
The cost of Eurofound’s contributions to events was covered under the Missions budget. There was an internal policy to prioritise high impact missions and therefore specific criteria were applied in the internal approval processes. As indicated in the presentation there was an overall downward trend in the costs of missions.

5.2 On behalf of the Group which had raised the issue Mr Närhinen (Governments) said that they were pleased to see that there was consideration of the added value of a mission.

They also welcomed the information on the events at national level, the reasons why some countries did not appear in the list, and the reassurance that they were served by other activities, as described by Ms McCaughey.

5.3 Mr Kokalov (Workers) agreed and noted that Eurofound’s presentations to the Labour Market Section of the European Economic and Social Committee had been an excellent example of disseminating information to its target audiences.

5.4 The Chairperson thanked Ms McCaughey for a very thorough presentation of events. The Bureau would continue to monitor the activities in this important area of activity.

6. Functioning of Advisory Committees and Academic Experts (B 262/6)

6.1 The Bureau discussed this topic which had been deferred from the meeting in January.

6.2 Mr Fonck (Workers) outlined the motivation of the Group for introducing this topic which was based on comments received from colleagues on the differing experiences in the committees, and in particular where it was felt that improvements could be made. The comments in general had concerned the late delivery of documents, a lack of time for discussion of reports and the lack of flexibility around the dates of the back to back meetings.

The Group were satisfied by the answers provided in the Bureau paper but he would urge Eurofound to try to be more flexible when dates were difficult for some members.

The Workers thought that it would be useful to involve the committees in discussion at a very early stage of the work programme development, in order to bring in ideas.

6.3 The Director agreed that the concerns raised were valid and that it was important that documents were available in time, in accordance with the rules and procedures for the committees. The staff had recently held discussions to ensure that procedures in the various advisory committees were standardised.

Regarding the experts there would be an open call for experts, but he noted that at any point it was possible for the Groups to bring experts to the meetings, but that other members would not be able to attend, as it was not possible to exceed the total number of participants allowed per Group.

6.4 Mr Närhinen (Governments) conveyed the comments of Ms Bulgarelli, that experts should be nominated on a renewable rather than a permanent basis.

He also wondered what the interest would be for a scientific expert in participating in an Advisory Committee.

As a member of the Advisory Committee for Working Conditions he considered that it might be useful to reduce the number of reports for discussion, in order to allow time for discussion, and suggested that only those researchers responsible for research under discussion should be present, in order to reduce costs and to improve discussion.

6.5 Mr Mühl (Employers) said that he did not think that the Advisory Committees
should have any formal role in the development of the work programme, the adoption of which was already quite a complex process.

It seemed that the solution to the problem of meetings that were too long was to focus on only the most important reports, and to remember that an Advisory Committee was not a place for negotiation but rather a forum for an exchange of views.

He was not sure that the suggestion to have shorter terms for experts was feasible, as it usually took more than two years to become familiar with the way the committees and Eurofound worked.

6.6 **Ms Hoffmann (Workers)** clarified that the Group did not think that the work programme should be discussed in the committees as part of the formal adoption procedure, but rather the committees were an environment for a more qualitative discussion of the programme and therefore a means of providing a different more focused input, an early view into the programme to identify parallels, things that were missing or duplicated.

The Group understood that the organisation of back-to-back meetings of the Industrial relations and Working conditions committees was in order to take account of members who had interests in projects dealt with by both committees, and perhaps the new Strategic Areas programming would allow an opportunity to review which committee dealt with which topic.

She said that at least in her field, the role as expert in an Advisory Committee was an attractive one. It was an excellent opportunity to gain some European knowledge and to have an input into the debate, as well as providing excellent opportunities for building research networks.

6.7 **Ms Kauffmann (Commission)** said that the two days of the back-to-back meetings seemed too long. She did not think that the committees should have any formal role in the approval of the work programme. In relation to experts, it was important that there was foreseen to have the possibility of a mid-term evaluation of experts as a way to ensure the ongoing quality of experts on the committees.

6.8 **The Director** thanked the members for their comments.

- He agreed that continuity of expertise was important but that there should also be a mechanism to replace experts if they were not suitable.
- Any potential conflicts of interests were actively managed, and it was clear that experts should not be directly involved in Eurofound tenders.
- He agreed that it was important to have more focused discussion in the Advisory Committees (maybe with less points in the Agenda) and the research colleagues were discussing how to achieve this.
- In relation to the timing, the meetings were usually in March and September/October in order to facilitate feedback on the implementation of the work programme, and on the discussion of the new programming document before its approval. The back-to-back meetings were a compromise arrangement to facilitate the interest in overlapping projects on working conditions and industrial relations, and also to facilitate attendance of members of both committees. It had been discussed in various occasions with same outcome, and it should not be necessary to take the point up repeatedly in Bureau meetings.
- He added that the opinions of the Advisory Committees on the work programme were welcomed and could be taken into consideration, while not part of the adoption procedure.
6.9 The Chairperson concluded the discussion on this item.

7. IAS Audit Report on Project Management (B 262/7)

7.1 The Deputy Director said that the action plan in response to recommendations of the Internal Audit Service (IAS) had now been agreed and Eurofound would respond to the recommendations on the roles and responsibilities in relation to projects, and the monitoring and reporting on projects.

She reassured the Bureau that all actions would be implemented and the Bureau would be informed on a regular basis, as usual.

7.2 Mr Närhinne (Governments) said that the document should state clearly who was responsible for the overall coordination of the action plan.

7.3 The Deputy Director said that she was responsible and this would be made clear in the document.

7.4 Ms Kauffmann (Commission) said that it was not clear if in relation to recommendation no. 4 of the report, Eurofound would now be modifying its KPI no. 4 in order to reflect progress against deliverables throughout the year, rather than at the end of the year only.

She asked how the role of the Head of Unit in relation to quality control and delivery in project management would be reinforced.

In response to recommendation no. 3 which called for more time to be allocated for approval of project deliverables by Advisory Committees, the action plan stated that this was being done in 2017 and she asked for further information about that.

7.5 The Director replied to the comments.

KPI no. 4 referred to deliverables at the end of the programme year. Progress on the deliverables during the year was reported on at the Bureau and Board meeting with a very detail report. Eurofound would be retaining the current procedure. Deliverables that ran into a subsequent year would be reported on with the KPIs at the end of that year.

The suggestion in relation to the Advisory Committees was to allow some contingency in terms of time, for discussion or disagreements in the committees and this would be factored in to the revision of the guidelines for project management.

The issue of quality control would be addressed systematically in the guidelines.

8. AOB

8.1 Mr Grimmeisen informed that a written procedure for appointing the Reporting officers for the Director and Deputy Director would be launched shortly.

The next meeting of the Bureau would be held on Friday, 12 May 2017 in Brussels.

[Signed H.Fonck] [Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]
Chairperson Director
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Date and venue of **next Bureau meeting:**

**Friday, 15 September 2017 at 9:30 hrs**

Brussels, Conseil Central de l’Economie (Eurofound’s Brussels Office)
1. Adoption of draft agenda (B 263/1)

The agenda was adopted. As the Chairperson was delayed the meeting was chaired initially by Ms Bulgarelli (Governments).

The draft agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of minutes of Bureau 10 March 2017 (B 264/2)

2.1 6.8 Mr Fonck (Workers) said that the summary conclusion of discussions did not reflect that the Group had suggested contacting the current experts on the Advisory Committees with regard to suggestions they might have for improving their role and functioning in the committees.

The Director confirmed that Eurofound would follow up.

2.2 3.4 Ms Welter (Governments) said that the minutes and the draft programme circulated with agenda item 3 did not fully reflect the discussion and the Group’s position that Board members should be more visible in the programme of the Foundation Forum, and that at least the Chairperson should have a more visible role there.

2.3 4.1 Ms Kauffmann (Commission) requested an addition to the text as follows:

‘Discussion within the various Parliamentary committees was due on 22-23 March 2017, with the reports of the three rapporteurs due after that, with adoption in the
Employment Committee in June and vote in the plenary at the latest in September, followed after that by a trilogue between the three institutions.

6.7 She had stated that it was important to foresee the possibility to have a mid-term evaluation of experts as a way to ensure ongoing quality.

The Director said that this would be discussed under item 3 but noted that the minutes tried to reflect discussions, and recorded conclusions only where formal decisions were required. When an item was not indicated for action it did not mean that the opinion of the Bureau members was not taken into consideration.

The draft minutes were adopted with amendments.

3. Director’s Progress Report (B 263/3)

3.1 The Director highlighted some of the activities in the detailed progress reports provided.

- *Sixth European Working Conditions Surveys (EWCS)* the correction of the weighting errors had been completed (a problem had been identified with the weighting of the data for Spain due to the top-up sample); the Survey Mapping Tool had been corrected. As a result he had requested a more thorough check, resulting in updates to the EWCS data files. The report was being revised accordingly; further minor changes were being made to the Survey Mapping Tool and to the EWCS dataset deposited with the UK Data Archive at the University of Essex.

- *Fourth European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS)* the field work was complete. The data was currently being cleaned and work on the dataset would commence shortly, with the ambitious intention to produce the overview report by the end of the year.

- *Fourth European Company Survey (ECS).* The agreement on the joint survey with Cedefop had now been signed and the tender procedure launched on 10 May 2017. The Steering Group for the survey including members of the Governing Boards of both Agencies had met on 11 May, with rather intense discussion on the content of the survey questionnaire.

Ms Bober (Employers) said that representatives of the Employers’ Group who had participated in the meeting had expressed concern regarding the content of the survey questionnaire. The Group were keen that the survey would focus on company skills needs and skills strategies, but in the meeting there were indications that the scope would be shifted more towards the social relationship at work and the role of social partnership in the provision of training. The Employers wanted to focus on the company skills needs, and for that it was necessary to focus on the management’s assessment of that. It should be noted that in the previous year Cedefop had published research on the topic of skills mismatch from the point of view of the Workers. The EWCS also focused on the training participation of workers, and the information and consultation of workers, so the Employers’ Group were keen to retain in the ECS an emphasis on skills from a management perspective.

The Director noted that the previous ECS had covered work organisation, HR Management practices, direct participation or direct involvement of staff, and formal social dialogue. Two additional topics had been added to the questionnaire (Skills use and skills strategy and Digitalisation) and in order not to extend the questionnaire, it would be necessary to reduce some of the other parts.
In relation to the questionnaire, he added that the OECD was also interested in questions that could be related to their own Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) and the Programme for international Student Assessment (PISA). He reminded the Bureau that the steering group would be consulted on the questionnaire for the survey but it was not the case that the questionnaire had to be adopted by consensus.

Ms Bulgarelli (Governments) who had attended the meeting said that the crucial moment for discussion would be when the questionnaire was available. She wished to highlight that the joint survey was highly relevant in facilitating cooperation with Cedefop and bringing added value to knowledge at EU level, combining skills and work organisation, human resource practice and social dialogue.

She was co-chair of the OECD Board of participating countries and the request to link the surveys with the PIAAC came from that Group, on the basis that to make the ECS comparable with the PIAAC would introduce a global element to the company survey.

- The Director continued. He highlighted the reports *Working Time Patterns and Sustainable Work* and *Exploring self-employment in Europe* noting that much of the working time report concerned work life balance which was quite relevant for the Commission’s initiative in the area. The Advisory Committee had facilitated a first input from the Commission’s services to the report.

- The report on *Social Mobility in Europe* had been published in April. This was also the subject of Eurofound’s first joint event with the OECD in Paris on 4 May 2017. The OECD were pleased with the collaborative meeting, and responded positively to suggestions to draw up a framework cooperation agreement similar to that of Eurofound’s with the ILO, around the areas in Eurofound’s work programme that were priorities for them namely the data in Eurofound’s surveys (the EWCS had been used by the OECD in its job quality framework to measure what was termed the ‘workplace environment’). Further discussions would take place, which would then be pre-cleared with the Commission as usual.

- Ms Kauffmann (Commission) said that she had participated in the meeting and found the discussion very interesting, with the participants coming from a research background. The publication of the European Pillar of Social Rights on the previous day had slightly dominated the discussions. She also noted that the Employment Committee (EMCO) meeting in Malta, titled *Making Work Pay* had also been very interesting.

- The Director highlighted the report *Income inequalities and employment patterns in Europe before and after the Great Recession* where the work done on wages distribution in Europe had been replicated. This formed part of the basis of an intervention in the informal Employment and Social Affairs Council (EPSCO) meeting in Malta in April, with an update on wages as well.

- Eurofound had been in close contact with the ILO in relation to their tripartite national debates on the future of work. The Director had participated in their meeting in Spain, and had collaborated on their meeting in Ireland too.

- Eurofound had participated in the informal EPSCO meeting as well as the EMCO meeting of the Maltese Presidency, which was one of the most relevant for Eurofound, in particular in relation to coordination with the Commission.

- Eurofound had hosted a visit by Hugh Fraser, coordinator of the European Social Policy Network (ESPN).
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- Due to recently announced staff departures, Eurofound would meet the target of a 10% reduction in staff as requested by the Commission. He referenced future challenges in Eurofound due to the EU budget.

Ms Bulgarelli (Governments) in the chair acknowledged the concerns of the Bureau vis-à-vis budget and staff and suggested that the matter might be taken up in discussions on the work programme.

- The Director continued that in the absence of any volunteers stepping forward to join the troika on the coordination of the EU Agencies, Eurofound would remain a member of the EU Agency Network (EUAN) along with EFSA and EIOPA, both large Agencies, until March 2018.

Implementation of the Work Programme

He highlighted some of the projects detailed in his presentation:

- *Measuring Working Conditions in a Global Perspective* was a joint report with the OECD and would include chapters on the US, South Korea, Turkey and a selection of Chinese cities as well as a chapter for other surveys. The research had been discussed at a meeting at the ILO offices in Geneva on 28-29 March 2017.

- To the Commission, he said that researchers in Chile, supported by the OECD, had been in contact with DG DEVCO and would be making a proposal for a working conditions survey in Latin America, based on the EWCS. In parallel, colleagues in DG DEVCO had expressed an interest in availing of Eurofound’s technical advice in EUROsociAL, the Commission’s programme for cooperation between Europe and Latin America. He had asked them to channel their request through DG Employment.

- He was pleased to report a high rate of Representativeness Studies completed.

- In relation to the EurWORK portal on collective bargaining, he informed that following discussions in the Advisory Committee on synergies with relevant institutions reporting on collective bargaining in Europe (e.g. ILO, OECD etc), Eurofound would launch an online survey asking what information the members wished to be included in that portal and he said it was important that the members identify their preferences. A feasibility study would be carried out examining the implications of the different options.

- In the new transversal research area the Digital Age, the report *Conditions of work and employment in ICT-based mobile work* was a continuation of the joint report with the ILO, and represented further use of the EWCS data plus other elements.

- He presented a slide with updated information on the *Future of Manufacturing in Europe (FOME)* project funded by the European Parliament.

- He provided background information on Eurofound’s performance indicator measurements which remained on target, despite reduced resources. The score for the ‘Recognition of Scientific quality of Eurofound’s Research’ was the highest to date. He presented indicators for contributions to policy development in 2016, Key EU documents, citations in key EU documents, as well as the results of the 2016 User Satisfaction survey. He reported that the topics addressed the most in EU policy documents quoting Eurofound were: employment, working conditions, labour market, youth and social inclusion.

- The programme for the *Foundation Forum* was still provisional. Although the Governing Board members would not be participating as speakers, they would...
play a role by for example chairing or concluding sessions. These details would be included in the programme at a later stage.

- He informed the Bureau of upcoming written procedures on implementing rules to the staff regulations, on adoption of the annual report and the accounts, which would be launched earlier this year by request of the Commission.

- The external audit, this time by a private audit company on behalf of the Court of Auditors had taken place satisfactorily. The preliminary observations of the Court on the accounts had been received on 10 May 2017. Disappointingly, the report once again made reference to the high level of carryovers, this despite the large amount of work done by Eurofound in recent years, also as part of the network of agencies, to inform the Court and the Parliament about the unavoidable nature of these carryovers in a multiannual programming environment.

Unusually, the Court was suggesting utilising ‘differentiated appropriations’, a tool used by the European Commission for its own multiannual activities, which historically had not been considered appropriate for the EU Agencies.

- The report Some aspects of non-standard employment in Europe, which had been a stakeholder request from the European Commission, was almost complete. It combined information collected from the self-employment reports provided by the correspondents. In response to questions from the Bureau he said that the table of contents would be circulated to indicate what was covered there.

- He also informed the Bureau of a new stakeholder request from the Commission in relation to regular updates on European developments of the social partners in the European Semester.

He asked the Commission to forward details of the requirements as soon as possible, or the timeline for completion by October could not be achieved. As this was a new request in his opinion it should be considered by the Bureau under the provisions for ad hoc requests, as it had not been included in the work programme planning.

- Mr Närhinen (Governments) asked for clarification on this request. The National Reform Programme reports of the Member States were similar, so he wondered whether it risked duplicating that work.

- Ms Kauffmann (Commission) said that the reports referred to by Mr Närhinen tended to be drafted by Governments, sometimes, but not always, with the involvement of the Social Partners, and tended therefore to reflect the Government’s position on social dialogue in a Member State. The Commission wanted a more comprehensive picture. For instance, in October the Commission had held an exercise whereby for the first time the Employment Committee EMCO (representing the Governments) had been supplemented with representatives from the national Social Partners to discuss how social dialogue worked within the context of the European Semester. The exercise was judged to have been very successful. Although it was not planned to make it an annual exercise, it might take place on a more focused level with a reduced number of Member States. The idea was to sustain the monitoring element and encourage the involvement of Social Partners in the formulation of policy and strategy. The Commission considered it to be an important element of the European Semester and the input of Eurofound was considered important for the discussion and for the monitoring elements. Eurofound had presented at the meeting, but it was hoped to facilitate an earlier input to the discussions next time.
Mr Maes (Commission) indicated that the matter had been discussed already with the research units in Eurofound, whereby it had been said that it would be useful to have the outputs from the collaboration in the Employment committee in the European Semester included. It would be good and beneficial for Eurofound to present some more updated information on the involvement of the social partners in the Semester when they would be invited to EMCO to present their findings. In the October meeting there would be a selection of around ten Member States and the Commission would welcome the expertise of Eurofound on involvement of the Social Partners in the European Semester to also feed into that more specific discussion that would take place in the Employment Committee. The research was a request from the Commission but was in the interests of all the Groups and Eurofound to be in a position to present up-to-date information at the next meeting in October.

Mr Scherrer (Workers) had participated in the EMCO meeting on behalf of ETUC and could report that the Workers Group had found the report on the participation of Social Partners in the Semester to be quite contentious in that they did not reflect the situation on the ground, as they saw it. It would be good to avoid such a situation by ensuring the participation of the Social Partners.

The Director clarified that Eurofound was very interested in participating, but to date Eurofound had received no information from the Commission about which Member States would be involved in the process this year, and which details were required. He was highlighting the matter to the Bureau because it qualified as an ad hoc request in the 2017 and the 2018 programmes, and the question was therefore if the Bureau wished to allocate the ad hoc resource to the work.

Mr Fonck (Workers) asked if it would be possible to have a short paper on the proposal as it was difficult to make a decision based on such little information.

Ms Bulgarelli (Governments) referred to the discussions in the previous Bureau on the subject of ad hoc reports, the conclusions of which had not been clear from the minutes. As a quadripartite body, requests would come from every Group, and it was certainly easier for the Commission to make proposals as it did not have to consult with 28 Member States. It should be dealt with as an ad hoc request as it was not included in the work programme. She wondered what would be the process for dealing with this in the fairest way.

The Director did not wish to repeat discussions from the previous meeting but explained that in a situation where it was necessary to plan two years in advance, more resources had been allocated to the ad hoc research capacity. In the past Eurofound had provided a Stakeholder Inquiry Service and Customised Reports service, without any issues. The criteria for agreeing to a request were usually that funds were available and that the request was one that made sense in light of the work programme. There was no formal approval process. For example he said, in the previous Bureau meeting it had been decided not to proceed with a research request because it became apparent that it would duplicate research being undertaken by the Commission. He reiterated that there had been no problems with ad hoc research requests to date.

CONCLUSIONS:

- The Bureau noted the contents of the Director’s progress report.
- Following a discussion on the way in which ad hoc research requests were approved, the Bureau members said that they would welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter at a later date as it was felt that more
formal requests by stakeholders should be approved by the Bureau.

4. Revision of the Founding Regulation – update from the Commission (B 263/4)

4.1 Mr Maes (Commission) provided a short update.

- The Employment Committee of the European Parliament was still working on the three proposals for the three decentralised agencies, with over 200 amendments to the Commission’s original proposal.
- There seemed to be support for a number of the proposed amendments.
- Alternative proposals had been made in relation to the Appointing Authority powers for staff matters.
- There was clear support for having a member designated by the European Parliament and Mr Chambon, Rapporteur for Eurofound’s regulation, was proposing also that the European Parliament should have representatives on the Bureau too, although some MEPs had raised doubts about this, particularly considering the Parliament’s role in relation to the budget and whether there was a desire to be involved in the Agencies at such a detailed level. Some proposed two, others three members of the Parliament, but the Common Approach foresaw only one.
- The MEPs had heard the concerns of some of the Agencies in relation to the translation Centre, and a number of amendments foresaw the possibility of outsourcing translations.
- Differently to the other rapporteurs, Mr Chambon maintained his proposal to reduce the size of the Governing Boards to nine for each Group. He also included a specific amendment which would require all the EU Institutions to first consult with Eurofound before outsourcing anything that would be within the field of expertise of Eurofound. This in the Commission’s view went too far. All rapporteurs however emphasised the need for the agencies to coordinate among each other also with the Commission and in order to enhance the coordination with the other agencies they all foresaw an observer status for the other agencies in each other’s Governing Boards.
- Mr Chambon also proposed the retention of the Deputy Director post in Eurofound. A number of proposals in relation to Cedefop indicated that the management board should still have a possibility to appoint a Deputy Director although the Deputy Director role was not currently included in Cedefop’s founding regulation.
- The next step in the process was a vote on the amendments with probably a number of compromise amendments in June. If so, the vote and plenary could take place in July or directly after the summer break. The Estonian Presidency was preparing to start the trilogues directly after the summer.

4.2 Mr Scherrer (Workers) asked whether the proposal to reduce the Board was widely supported.

Ms Hoffmann (Workers) asked about the mechanisms for coordinating the debate on the three proposals, for example by debating them together in June. What was the role of the report by the European Economic and Social Committee (ECOSOC) in the procedure?

The Director noted that in some areas of the proposal there was a need for a more technical consultation to clarify the wording and align it with procedures.

4.3 Mr Maes (Commission) said that there did not appear to be support for the proposal
to reduce the size of the Board.

- Although there was a willingness to align discussion on the three proposals as much as possible, it could be seen that the process was quite complex and in the end there was a tendency to discuss them separately. He understood that at present about thirty people were discussing the amendments and trying to agree on some compromise amendments.
- He said that the technical clarifications would be dealt with at a later stage.
- The purpose of the ECOSOC report was to provide an input to the discussion.

CONCLUSION:
The Commission provided its regular update on the revision of Eurofound’s Founding regulation.

5. Draft Programming Document – Revision of ‘General Context’ and multiannual part (B 263/5)

5.1 The Director introduced the document which updated the multiannual part of the Programming Document 2017-2020.

- In the new programming document it was a requirement to update the budget and staff details in the programme on a rolling basis. In the context of planning for the 2019 work programme (for which there was as yet no text) there was the difficulty that the EU financial framework for 2021 was not yet available.
- The budget for Title 1 (Staff) had been adjusted to take into account the rising costs of the so-called country coefficient for Ireland and he warned the members that this issue would also necessitate changes to the 2018 programme, submitted to the Commission in January to be finally approved by the Board in November 2017.
- He alerted the members to the statement in the document (p.14, line 699) that it would not be possible to carry out the EQLS in 2021 i.e. in accordance with the normal cycle, for budgetary reasons. Having just completed the EWCS in 2020 it would not be possible to run two surveys in consecutive years. The suggestion was therefore to extend the cycle of the survey to every five years. This however went beyond the budgeting period of this programme (2017-2020).
- As the budget for Title 3 (Research) was reducing each year it would be necessary to consider the research very carefully in the future.

5.2 Ms Bulgarelli (Governments) said that the Surveys were Eurofound’s key and unique research outputs and the text should not indicate that it was not possible to run the EQLS in 2021. In relation to the suggestion that it might not be possible to run the surveys in consecutive years, she countered that it should be possible to adjust the budget, to cut in other areas, in order to retain the current cycle of the surveys. This was a decision that risked damaging Eurofound.

5.3 The Workers Group made the following comments:

- Ms Hoffmann (Workers) said that the document was rather confusing with the various deletions and comments, and she thanked the Director for his explanations. Lines 93-95 said that Eurofound’s research showed that there were signs of a return to convergence in wages though not yet in income, and she wondered what was meant by that.
  It was not clear why in parts of the document text had been deleted when it appeared that the content was still relevant. There were no references to the European Pillar of Social Rights and she wondered how reflections on what
might be needed for the pillar would be incorporated in the text.

- **Mr Kokalov (Workers)** asked why the reference to mapping the situation of social dialogue and the social partners had been deleted at line 537.
- **Mr Fonck (Workers)** requested further explanation of the staff tables indicating the posts suppressed in line with the 10% reduction of staff (line 1339).

5.3 **Mr Maes (Commission)** noted that the first draft 2019 programme would be discussed during the Group meetings in June, but the Commission did not attend those meetings. As a matter of principle he said, the first draft of the programme should be discussed by the Bureau. The role of the Bureau should be respected.

- Lines 86-101 could be improved and streamlined. The Commission in its own *Employment and Social Development in Europe 2016* report, to which Eurofound had contributed, had a certain narrative development in terms of the overall economic situation, but also in terms of the employment and social situation and he would propose to make this section of the document more coherent with that.
- He noted that the official wording around the United Kingdom’s triggering of the procedure foreseen by Article 50 of the Treaty should be used.
- Lines 240-245, the Commission would propose some text here.
- Lines 537-538, similar to the Workers’ Group he wondered why the text in relation to mapping social dialogue had been replaced.
- Lines 536-537, he asked for an explanation of the statement that the volume of Representativeness studies might be revised in the context of the available budget. He reiterated that this was a crucial element in the support of social dialogue at EU level, by identifying social partners that were covered by the Articles 154 and 155 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU. Cost savings might be sought in other areas of the work programme, such as the European Restructuring Monitor. It was not clear why only the Representativeness Studies were spoken about in this regard. The Commission were surprised that in the tender for the Network of Correspondents, the budget allocated to this aspect of the correspondents’ work had not been increased.

5.4 **The Employers Group** could accept the document. In relation to the comments by the Governments’ Group on the survey, perhaps a sentence could be added underlining the importance of the surveys.

5.5 **The Director** responded to the comments.

- He reiterated that Eurofound defended the surveys, whilst looking for ways to manage the costs associated with them, as for example in the joint ECS survey with Cedefop. The issue concerned the timing of the surveys and the problem of having projects which each consumed over half the research budget in consecutive years. The Bureau should be aware of the issue. He did not think that it was financially sustainable in the long term. He confirmed that the EWCS would be undertaken in 2020.
- Some of the comments should not have been included in this version as they related to previous versions, so the members could disregard them.
- The purpose of the policy context in the document was to introduce the work programme and the changes were intended simply to update the document. The references to the EQLS had been deleted as they were considered to be outdated.
- The project on convergence of wages but not incomes concerned the recently published income inequalities report and an update of the previous report on
wage distribution. What had emerged was that since 2013 there was a process of catching up in terms of wages in Europe, mainly in the central and eastern European countries, whilst the top earners remained frozen, but that this was not the case if one looked at income, largely due to unemployment and, to a degree, welfare payments. The research presented at the Maltese Presidency conference indicated that whilst the single market might be helping upward convergence in wages, this was not the case for income, the message for policymakers being that additional tools were required to address income inequalities.

- The European Pillar of Social Rights had just been launched and it had been decided not to go into detail about it in this document, instead linking here to the website of the European Commission. It could be supplemented in the future with a short paragraph of text.

- In relation to the deletion of the sentence on the mapping of social dialogue, this was a problem of writing a document up to three years in advance. At national level, Eurofound would continue to map the situation of social dialogue and the Social Partners, within the framework of the research on key dimensions of social dialogue. By the time the programming document would be adopted the mapping framework would be complete, though Eurofound would continue to base its work on this mapping exercise. He reminded that Eurofound was still waiting for the joint proposal of the Employers and Workers on capacity building, for the 2018 work programme.

The members confirmed that a joint proposal would be sent to Eurofound shortly.

- He explained the figures for the staff reductions between 2013 and 2018, which were due to departures, retirements and in some cases the non-renewal of contracts.

- He acknowledged that the Bureau should have an opportunity to react on the work programme before the Group meetings at the end of June 2017. Most of the 2019 projects would be continuations of those of 2018, being the third year of the four-year programme and he imagined therefore that the level of information would be similar to last year’s.

- The new programming cycle provided new challenges and new opportunities, and he suggested that in light of the changes in the programming cycle, the Groups might learn to provide a different feedback on the work programme, that rather than providing feedback on the details of a particular project they might look at the expected outcome of a particular research area or activity in a broader way. More information would come later in the process, allowing for richer discussion perhaps in the Advisory Committees.

- In response to the Commission’s points about the Representativeness Studies he reiterated that the budget in Title 3 was under pressure and it was necessary to adjust the research accordingly and it would be difficult to retain the current rate of Representativeness Studies. It was not valid to compare the costs of the ERM with that of the Network of Correspondents and the Representativeness Studies. It was not that Eurofound wished to reduce the number of Representativeness Studies it was rather that it might be necessary. As this work was important for the Commission it might be opportune to request that more resource from the EU Budget be allocated to it. However the text in this part of the programme would be reviewed.
5.6 **The Bureau** discussed how to ensure the best consultation leading to discussion of the 2019 programme in the Group meetings in June. An opportunity would be found to have a web consultation,

**CONCLUSIONS:**

- The Bureau agreed that a video conference would be held prior to the Group meetings to allow the Bureau (including the Commission) to discuss the first draft of Work Programme 2019.
- The Employers and Workers would forward to Eurofound a joint proposal in relation to the capacity building project in 2018.

6. The 2016 Consolidated Annual Activity Report (B 263/6)

6.1 The **Deputy Director** introduced the report and indicated that it would be sent to the budgetary authorities by 15 June having been approved by the Governing Board by a written procedure. It set out the policy achievements, the management situation, evaluation, internal control systems and management assurance.

6.2 **Ms Bulgarelli (Governments)** said that the report demonstrated efficiency with accountability and she congratulated the Director and Deputy Director and their team.

6.3 **Mr Maes (Commission)** echoed that and noted the improved performance in relation to the Key Performance Indicators. The Commission pointed to the need to follow up on the Internal Audit Service recommendations in relation to resource allocation in project management. However, he congratulated Eurofound on the contents of the report.

**CONCLUSION:**
The Bureau noted the content of the report which would be submitted to the Governing Board for approval by written procedure by 15 June.

7. Network of European Correspondents (update) B 253/7

7.1 The **Deputy Director** presented the results of the annual feedback from Governing Board members’ on their contacts with the correspondents. Feedback had been received from 22 countries (excluding Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and the UK) with 36 members responding out of a potential 84.

Issues were identified in some countries but in general the contacts were working well, topics usually covered in meetings included communication, dissemination but also contributions to reports beyond the usual things, such as Representativeness and case studies.

A theme emerging and something that would be addressed in the new website was improving the visibility of the correspondents at national level.

This kind of internal assurance was very valuable as part of the overall quality assurance of the network.

She also presented information on the tender procedure for the new correspondents which was currently being evaluated. 40 applications had been received for 28 Member States. For 18 countries only one applicant, 8 countries with 2 applicants and 2 countries with 3 applicants.

It was intended to conclude the evaluation and sign contracts by latest October/November in order for the new contracts to commence on 1 March 2018.
7.2 The Chairperson thanked Eurofound and in particular the Deputy Director for coordinating this work. She welcomed the improvements in the process and said that it had been very transparent and that the Bureau had been regularly informed.

CONCLUSION:
The Bureau were informed about the feedback received from Board members in relation to the current correspondents and updated on the recently concluded tender procedure to renew the Network.

8. AOB

8.1 Ms Hoffmann (Workers) reported that in relation to the cross-cutting evaluation of the four agencies, the Group had forwarded the public consultation survey to its own contacts.

8.2 Mr Maes (Commission) explained that there were several surveys targeting different audiences, including the public consultation survey which was open until 5 July and available in all EU official languages. This public consultation was a requirement of all Commission evaluation procedures. There was also a stakeholder survey and a survey of the staff of the Agencies concerned.

Any concerns or questions about the evaluation should be directed to the Commission. A contact person within Eurofound had also been identified in case of need.

9. The Chairperson thanked the Bureau and concluded the meeting. The next Bureau meeting would be held on Friday, 15 September 2017.

[Signed H.Fonck] [Signed J.Menéndez-Valdés]
Chairperson Director
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