

Pay inequalities experienced by posted workers: Challenges to the 'equal treatment' principle

Contents

Introduction	1
Redefining ‘minimum rates of pay’	1
Reactions from Member States	3
European-level social partners: Opposing views.....	4
Trade union perspectives.....	4
Employer organisation perspectives.....	4
Variety of national stakeholders’ positions on revision	5
Shared positions	5
Mixed positions	5
No stated positions	5
National union–employer divide on equal pay principle.....	7
Trade union support for targeted revision	7
Concerns regarding content of ‘remuneration’	7
Concerns regarding role of trade unions and social partners.....	7
Employer organisation positions	7
Supporting BusinessEurope’s position.....	7
Concerns regarding remuneration	8
Exceptions on employers’ side.....	8
Concluding remarks	9
National correspondents	10

When citing this report, please use the following wording: Eurofound (2017), *Pay inequalities experienced by posted workers: Challenges to the ‘equal treatment’ principle*, Eurofound, Dublin.
Authors: Isabella Biletta and Christine Aumayr-Pintar, Eurofound

© European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2017

The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound) is a tripartite European Union Agency, whose role is to provide knowledge in the area of social, employment and work-related policies. Eurofound was established in 1975 by Council Regulation (EEC) No. 1365/75 to contribute to the planning and design of better living and working conditions in Europe.

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

Telephone: (+353 1) 204 31 00

Email: information@eurofound.europa.eu

Web: www.eurofound.europa.eu

Introduction

This EurWORK topical update summarises the views of European and national-level stakeholders on recent debates on implementing the principle of 'equal pay' for posted workers. Directive 96/71/EC foresees that posted workers must be granted the minimum standards of employment conditions applicable in the host country, including the minimum rates of pay. Given the variety of interpretations of this concept and various cases of social dumping, concerns have been raised, resulting in the need for clarification. In March 2016, the European Commission presented a targeted revision of the rules regarding the posting of workers, which addressed the issue of posted workers' pay and the implementation of the principle of equal pay for equal work. Stakeholders at European and national levels are divided on these issues.

A [posted worker](#) is 'a person who, for a limited period of time, carries out his or her work in the territory of an EU Member State other than the state in which he or she normally works' ([Council Directive 96/71/EC](#)).

One key consideration since the very beginning of the posting of workers' regulation has been simultaneously guaranteeing freedom for businesses to offer services across the European Member States while ensuring standard working conditions for posted workers. Businesses should have a level playing field of competition, while it is expected that the principle of equal treatment for workers be implemented. Indeed, the Posting of Workers Directive 96/71/EC states that posted workers must be granted the 'minimum standards of employment conditions' that apply in the host country. One key element of the equal treatment principle – pay – has been extensively discussed.

The minimum rates of pay to which posted workers are entitled have been interpreted in very different ways by Member States and businesses. Concerns raised include the following:

- cases of social dumping due to unscrupulous employers
- posted workers being paid – on paper – according to the minimum standard while, in practice, fees are levied for accommodation, food and necessary work equipment
- stripping posted workers of wages owed to them.

The overall discussions taking place in 2016 at European and national levels highlight some key challenges in implementing the principle of equal treatment – especially the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' – in the context of cross-border posting of workers.

Redefining 'minimum rates of pay'

It has been argued – given its existence for over 20 years – that the Posting of Workers Directive needs to be revised and clarified, especially in terms of the issue of pay. The directive (1996) states that Member States shall ensure that workers posted to their territory enjoy 'the host country's terms and conditions of employment regarding minimum rates of pay' (Article 3, paragraph 1 (c)), including overtime rates. Precisely how this is implemented depends on national law and/or the practices of the host country. Some flexibility in the application of this provision is allowed, and the directive states that nothing should prevent terms and conditions of employment that are more favourable to workers being applied. Further specifications are limited to:

Allowances specific to the posting shall be considered to be part of the minimum wage, unless they are paid in reimbursement of expenditure actually incurred on account of the posting, such as expenditure on travel, board and lodging (Article 3, paragraph 7).

This issue has been hotly debated, especially in the wake of several rulings from the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), particularly the [Viking ruling \(PDF\)](#) and [Laval ruling \(PDF\)](#), questioning what should be included in the minimum rate of pay.

Addressing the issue of social dumping, the more recent [Enforcement Directive \(2014/67/EU\)](#) highlights the need to ensure that posted workers are paid their rightful wages and to empower social partners in communicating with and informing workers about relevant minimum pay rates. The directive indicates what can be considered part of this minimum:

For the purpose of ensuring that a posted worker receives the correct pay and provided that allowances specific to posting can be considered part of minimum rates of pay, such allowances should only be deducted from wages if national law, collective agreements and/or practice of the host Member State provide for this. (Entry 35)

This minimum is also discussed in the case of subcontracting liability:

Such measures may include the introduction on a voluntary basis, after consulting the relevant social partners, of a mechanism of direct subcontracting liability, in addition to or in place of the liability of the employer, in respect of any outstanding net remuneration corresponding to the minimum rates of pay and/or contributions due to common funds or institutions of social partners regulated by law or collective agreement in so far as these are covered by Article 3(1) of Directive 96/71/EC. (Entry 36)

In 2016, while most Member States were still [in the process of transposing the Enforcement Directive](#), the European Commission issued a [proposal to revise Directive 96/71/EC \(PDF\)](#) on the posting of workers.¹

This targeted proposal was motivated by the observation that posted workers might earn up to more than 50% less than their local colleagues – particularly in high-wage countries. The proposal clearly stated that posted workers shall generally benefit from the same rules governing pay and working conditions as local workers. It also stated that the principle of 'equal pay' should apply:

The principle of equal pay has been implemented through secondary law not only between women and men, but also between employees with fix term contracts and comparable permanent workers, between part-time and full-time workers or between temporary agency workers and comparable workers of the user undertaking. (Entry 5)

The new text proposed replaces the reference to 'minimum rates of pay' by a reference to 'remuneration' stressing that it includes:

all the elements of remuneration rendered mandatory by national law, regulation or administrative provision, collective agreements or arbitration awards which have been declared universally applicable and/or, in the absence of a system for declaring collective agreements or arbitration awards to be of universal application... (Article 1 paragraph 2 (a))

More detailed features have also been specified by the European Commission:

Remuneration will not only include the minimum rates of pay, but also other elements such as bonuses or allowances where applicable. Member States will be required to specify in a transparent way the different elements of how remuneration is composed on their territory. Rules set by law or universally applicable collective agreements become mandatory for posted workers in all economic sectors. The proposal also gives the possibility to Member States to provide that subcontractors need to grant their workers the same pay as the main contractor. Nevertheless this can only be done in a non-discriminatory way: the same rule must apply to national and cross-border subcontractors. ([European Commission press release](#), 8 March 2016)

¹ This was done [without adequate consultation with the social partners \(PDF\)](#), according to a joint letter from ETUC, Business Europe, Ceep and UEAPME to President Juncker from 2 March 2016.

Reactions from Member States

In the discussions on a potential revision of the Posting of Workers Directive, Member States have been split over the principle of equal pay for equal work, on either side of a line drawn largely between continental European countries on one side, and central and eastern European countries and Baltic countries on the other.

As indicated in the European Commission targeted proposal, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Sweden stated in a joint letter their support for a modernisation of the directive that would establish the principle of equal pay for equal work in the same place. These countries suggested that the provisions regarding working and social conditions applicable to posted workers (most notably those regarding remuneration) should be amended and widened.

In contrast, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Slovakia and Romania argued that a review of the 1996 Directive is premature and should be postponed until after the deadline for the transposition of the Enforcement Directive has elapsed and its effects are evaluated and assessed.² Moreover, these Member States express 'the concern that the principle of equal pay for equal work in the same place may be incompatible with the single market', since differences in rates of pay constitute one 'legitimate element of competitive advantage' for service providers. Furthermore, their letter continues

Posted workers should remain under the legislation of the sending Member State for social security purposes, and no measure should thus be taken to revise the linkages between the posting of workers and the social security coordination in this sense.

Following the European Commission's announcement of 8 March 2016, parliaments from 11 Member States³ submitted a reasoned opinion opposing the proposed reform; [this triggered the yellow card procedure](#), a subsidiarity control mechanism that requires the Commission to review these opinions.

In individual response letters to each government,⁴ the Commission stressed the importance attached to 'its relationship with national Parliaments, notably when it comes to the principle of subsidiarity' (subsidiarity being the reason the 11 countries in question launched the yellow card procedure). Moreover, in the letter, the Commission explained the rationale for the targeted revision proposal, restating the following points.

- The objective is not to align wages across Member States: the proposal does not aim to address the difference between wage levels in the home and the host Member State.
- The objective is to ensure that work carried out within a Member State is remunerated according to the same rules, irrespective of whether that work is carried out by a local worker or by a posted worker.
- The proposal does not equalise pay between local and posted workers: it therefore strictly avoids any discrimination against cross-border service providers and ensures a more level playing field in the provision of services.
- The proposal does not in any way interfere with the social partners' competence to engage and eventually agree on a collective agreement or with the national government's competence to make such a collective agreement universally applicable or not.

² The 18 June 2016 was the deadline for transposition of the Enforcement Directive (2014/67/EU)

³ The nine Member States mentioned above, together with Croatia and Denmark.

⁴ See, for example, the response to the Polish Parliament at http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/reactions/reactions_other/npa/docs/poland/2016/com20160128/com20160128_sejm_reply_en.pdf

On 20 July 2016, the Commission adopted a [Communication \(COM\(2016\) 505 final\) \(PDF\)](#) re-examining its proposal for a revision of the Posting of Workers Directive. In the communication, Commission set out its position:

- considers both the 2014 Enforcement Directive and the targeted revision as being both complementary and mutually reinforcing
- states that the objectives of the proposal can be better achieved at European than at national level
- reconfirms that it is within Member States' competence to set rules on remuneration in accordance with their law and practice
- stresses that the proposal leaves intact the competence of Member States to set rules for temporary work agencies
- concludes that it will maintain its proposal for a revised directive.

European-level social partners: Opposing views

The two sides of industry expressed largely opposing views, with some nuances.

Trade union perspectives

From the workers' perspective, the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) and the European Federation of Building and Woodworkers (EFBWW) expressed clear support for a revision to ensure the principle of equal treatment.

In this context, however, ETUC called upon the Commission to respect the principle of autonomy of the social partners to negotiate wages and the plurality of national industrial relation systems, by establishing provisions on the constituent elements of pay having the effect of favouring company-level over sector-level collective agreements. ETUC recommended that the Commission:

- propose measures regarding the requirement of a previous period of employment in the country of origin to be applied in particular to posted temporary agency workers
- put in place new rules on combatting bogus self-employment
- implement better enforcement measures – in particular inspections and more reliable social security forms.

(For more on these, see the [ETUC orientation paper \(PDF\)](#) from 13 April 2016; also positions against the yellow card from [13 May 2016](#) and [20 July 2016](#)).

Employer organisation perspectives

In contrast with trade unions' positions, employer organisations at European level stated that there was, in general, no need to reopen the 1996 Directive; nevertheless, some subtle differences between the positions of the various organisations have emerged. Both BusinessEurope and UAPME stated that priority should be given to the full transposition of the Enforcement Directive and an evaluation of its effects. BusinessEurope also suggested that reopening the Directive may reduce posting activities because of the uncertainty the negotiation would create among companies. On 17 May 2016, BusinessEurope published its position, in which it [outlined its objection to the targeted revision](#).

The divide is bigger when it comes to the principle of equal pay. BusinessEurope, the Council of European Employers of the Metal, Engineering and Technology-Based Industries (CEEMET) and the Confederation of European Managers (CEC) share the view that 'the principle of equal pay for equal work would create an undue interference of the EU in the free determination of wage levels by the social partners'. (Text from the [explanatory memorandum](#))

However, two European sectoral employer organisations expressed clear support for how the revision sought to implement the equal pay principle. The World Employment Confederation Europe (Eurociett), representing the temporary work agency industry, supported the principle of equal pay for equal work for posted agency workers and the application of the full set of rules provided for by the

Temporary Agency Work Directive to posted agency workers. Similarly, the European Builders Confederation (EBC), representing small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in the construction sector, has expressed support for the reopening of the 1996 Directive in line with the principle of equal pay for equal work in the same place.

Variety of national stakeholders' positions on revision

The targeted revision of the posted workers directive stirred up debate and triggered reactions from social partners and governments in many EU Member States in 2016.⁵

Shared positions

In a handful of countries, all tripartite stakeholders took the same position regarding the targeted revision proposal. In Italy and Luxembourg, all three openly supported the targeted revision. This was also reported by the Slovenian correspondent, though official positions were not expressed by some parties.

In contrast, in Denmark and Hungary, all three stakeholders opposed the revision – albeit for different reasons. The common concern in Denmark was about interference with national practices of wage setting, while the Hungarian position expressed strong opposition both to procedure and the content. According to the official standpoint of the Hungarian government, the proposal

violates the principle of subsidiarity and proportionality; limits the free movement of services and would distort the current playing field ... limits the possibility to implement differentiated treatment justified by the different employment status of domestic and posted workers; curtails the right of the sending country to determine freely the wages for their citizens i.e. their workers posted to another Member State.

And in particular the Hungarian government contested the 'equal pay' principle, considering that it 'would [push Eastern and Central European workers out of the internal market](#), bankrupt companies and give rise to the black market'.

It is worth noting that the Italian and Danish stakeholders expressed similar concerns regarding their specific wage-setting mechanisms, while adopting opposing positions. Both countries have no statutory minimum wage and no universally applicable collective agreements.

Mixed positions

In another, much larger group of countries – comprising almost half the Member States – positions were mixed, depending on the stakeholder organisation. In the first subgroup, employer organisations were the only party opposed to the revision, trade unions and governments/parliaments supporting it. This group comprises Austria, Finland, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal and Sweden.

In the second sub-group, only trade unions supported the revision. In most countries where parliaments supported the yellow card procedure, governments and employers alike were opposed to the revision of the directive. This group comprises Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovakia.

No stated positions

In the remaining countries, the targeted revision did not seem to be such a hot topic: correspondents from Cyprus, Ireland and Malta reported that none of the three parties had issued any statements or positions, while in Belgium, Bulgaria, Greece, Spain and the United Kingdom no official positions were found for two of the three parties. It is notable in this context that this set of countries includes

⁵ In the course of the compilation of the national contributions to the annual review of working life 2016, Eurofound's correspondents were asked to report any related debates and positions from the social partners and governments – in particular, so far as they concern the point on equal remuneration of posted workers. Table 1 Table 1 is an attempt to summarise the reported views (more details can be found in the national contributions, forthcoming as part of EurWORK's annual review of working life 2016).




some of those in which fiscal adjustment programs had been implemented (Ireland, Greece, Cyprus), resulting in a deficit of social dialogue practices. In Greece, for instance, a qualitative and quantitative downgrading of social dialogue has meant that procedures for transposing European directives into national law usually do not follow participation and involvement of social partners, resulting in the absence of comments from their side.

Table 1: Overview of positions regarding targeted revision of Posting of Workers Directive

		Trade unions	Employers	Governments
All three sides				
Supportive	Italy , Luxembourg Slovenia (the position of employers is available from only one organisation)			
Opposed	Denmark*, Hungary*			
Mixed between stakeholders				
Employers opposed	Austria, Germany, Finland, France , Netherlands, Portugal , Sweden			
Trade unions in principle supportive / employers and governments/parliaments opposed	Czech Republic*, Estonia* (government is supportive, but parliament is opposed), Croatia*, Romania*, Latvia*, Lithuania*, Poland*, Slovakia*			
Missing positions				
	Norway			
	Belgium, Greece			
	Spain , Bulgaria*, UK (one employer organisation expressed concerns)			
No debate/positions reported	Cyprus, Ireland, Malta			

*Note: *Countries in which national parliaments supported the yellow card procedure.*

Countries in bold: national parliaments sent supporting opinions of the targeted revision to the European Commission and considered the proposal to be in line with the 'subsidiarity principle'.

	<i>Supportive</i>
	<i>Opposed</i>
	<i>Missing</i>

The positions of the national governments (in so far as they were made publicly available) were in line with the parliaments' positions; they are summarised in the [Commission Communication \(COM\(2016\) 505 final\)](#).

In only one Member State – [Estonia](#) – [did the government reportedly take a different view](#) from its Parliament.

National union–employer divide on equal pay principle

Trade union support for targeted revision

Most trade unions across Europe are – in principle – in favour of the targeted revision, and joined ETUC in their support for the move. For instance, the Dutch Trade Union Confederation (FNV), the Estonian Trade Union Confederation and the Council of Nordic Trade Unions are in favour of revising the directive.

Some trade unions, while being supportive of the proposal, voiced that it could have gone further – in particular, as regards a further reduction of the posting period to less than 24 months, or for tighter rules to avoid abuse and the bogus posting of workers.

In relation to the equal pay principle specified in the directive, some unions highlighted concerns regarding the content of remuneration and the role of trade unions and social partners.

Concerns regarding content of 'remuneration'

The Austrian Trade Union Federation (ÖGB), its member unions and the Austrian Chamber of Labour (AK) criticised that the revision did not go far enough and stressed that they would like all relevant components of pay to be considered in the directive, including differences in social security contributions and wage supplements, as well as employers' obligations to cover costs for travel, accommodation and food.

In France, Force Ouvrière (FO) believes that the European Commission proposal could go further by explicitly taking into account remuneration that is foreseen in company-level agreements – hence, not just the legal minimum wage, the minimum wage and other wages fixed in an extended branch collective agreement.

Concerns regarding role of trade unions and social partners

The German confederation DGB [proposes an amendment to allow the covering of posted workers](#) by representative sectoral and company agreements. German legislation provides for the coverage of posted workers by extended collective agreements only; DGB proposes the introduction of the category of representative agreements into the directive as well as into the German legislation so as to extend the rate of coverage of posted workers.

The Italian General Confederation of Labour (CGIL), the Italian Confederation of Workers' Unions (CISL) and the Union of Italian Workers (Uil) remarked that the concept of universally applicable rules on remuneration may clash with the non-binding nature of collective agreements in Italy and of the wage levels they set.

In Poland, NSZZ Solidarność expressed its wish that the proposal had secured trade unions' right to negotiate on behalf of posted workers and to determine joint responsibility of the main contractor and subcontractors for employment conditions.

The Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees (TCO) and the Swedish Trade Union Confederation (LO) want a clarification of the Member States' exclusive competence when it comes to remuneration levels; they also want greater transparency with respect to the autonomy of the social partners.

Opposing positions can also be seen across Member States – for instance, regarding the implementation of the posting of workers rules to temporary agency workers. The Dutch trade unions are opposed to this application, while the Italian organisations state that it already applies.

Employer organisation positions

Supporting BusinessEurope's position

BusinessEurope's position has been echoed by many employer organisations in the Member States; however, their focus differs, depending on various features, such as whether the country largely sends or receives workers, or whether it is a high- or low-wage country.

Employer organisations in some high-wage countries – BDA in Germany, and WKO in Austria – criticised the timing of the revisions, arguing that the implementation of the Enforcement Directive was still pending, and better enforcement (including better administrative cooperation between Member States and an improved cross-border enforcement of sanctions) would be the crucial issue for the near future.

Interestingly, in a similar stance, some employer organisations from both high- and low-wage countries mention the fear of job loss due to the inability of companies to provide services across borders and/or loss of competitiveness for sending companies, as the cost of posting workers is deemed to be high. This was voiced by the following employer organisations:

- Confederation of Hungarian Employers and Industrialists (MGYOSZ)
- Movement of French Enterprises (MEDEF)
- Latvian Confederation of Employers (LDDK)
- Confederation of Lithuanian Industrialists (LPK)
- the Confederation of Industry of the Czech Republic (SP ČR)
- Estonian Employers' Confederation (ETKL)
- Croatian Employers Association (CEA)
- in Poland, Confederation Lewiatan and Employers' of Poland (Pracodawcy RP) jointly with Business Center Club (BCC)
- Employers Association of the Slovak Republic (AZZZ SR).

However, in some countries, employer organisations voiced the fear that the revision could shut out urgently needed labour from other countries. According to the Swedish Confederation of Enterprise (Svenskt Näringsliv), this happens in the construction sector, [in the context of a shortfall of housing](#) and a lack of domestic workers. The Dutch General Employers' Association (AWVN) feels that applying the principle of the 'country of employment' to establish labour conditions and social security coverage of posted workers would be a 'degeneration in terms of the European internal market' and therefore [certain amendments would only lead to legal confusion](#).

Concerns regarding remuneration

Some organisations specifically commented on the proposal's new point regarding ensuring equal remuneration, or highlighted practical difficulties in its implementation. The Bavarian Industry Association (vbw) stated that – rather than stipulate that posted workers receive 'minimum wages including pay for overtime' – the Commission proposal should only state that posted workers receive 'wages including pay for overtime' (excluding occupational pension). Such a clause should also only hold if a collective wage agreement exists that was declared generally binding. The Confederation of Finnish Industries (EK) fears that the [changes will interfere with pay setting mechanisms](#), hinder cost competition in the internal market and increase administrative burden for employers. The posting company may also be placed in a less favourable position than that of companies in the host country; this would reduce the posting company's activity, slowing down the development of the internal market.

And the Confederation of Netherlands Industry and Employers (VNO-NCW) feels that the [principle of equal pay for equal work is not legally or practically workable](#), a view echoed by the Royal Association of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises in the Netherlands (MKB-Nederland).

Finally, it should be noted that some sectoral organisations presented a joint voice at European level regarding the targeted revision. The Confederation of Industry of the Czech Republic and the industry associations of Finland, Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden – in a joint letter – expressed concerns about introducing the principle of equal pay for equal work in the Posting of Workers Directive.

Exceptions on employers' side

Exceptions on the employers' side were found in Italy and Slovenia. Italian employer organisation Confindustria admitted [not to dislike the proposal \(PDF\)](#), citing the likely positive impact on

international competitiveness and the mitigating expected effect of the equal treatment principle implemented at European level, on what it considers a very rigid Italian equal treatment principle. Rete Imprese Italia [praised the enlargement of the notion of minimum rates of pay \(PDF\)](#), arguing in favour of the principle of equal pay for equal work. However, the organisation also deemed the 24-month limit to be too long, suggesting instead that European social partners be empowered to adjust it at sectoral level.

In Slovenia, only the Association of Employers of Slovenia (ZDS) published an official stance. The association supports the principle of equal pay for posted workers, but finds the principle of secondary liability excessive; it also regards as burdensome the condition that undertaking performs substantial activities in the country from which it posts the workers. ZDS warned that any stricter determination of conditions, as provided for by the directive itself, could have a negative impact on the operations of those employers who supply their services abroad and of international corporations.

Concluding remarks

The discussion regarding posting of workers continues to highlight the challenge of implementing the key European principle of equal treatment of workers (independently of employment status) across a wide range of institutional settings and wage negotiation mechanisms. Moreover, the discussions seem to have crystallised national positions on the principle of equal pay along an east–west divide. The main challenge is to address this split between Member States, stakeholders and even at times, within organisations.

At EU level, the co-legislators discussed the Commission's proposal. In the Council, the Social Questions Working Party (SQWP) discussed the proposal on five occasions under the Dutch Presidency – see [the progress report \(PDF\)](#). Since the beginning of the discussions, a group of Member States have opposed the Commission proposal, considering it premature at the stage of implementing the Enforcement Directive. In contrast, another group of Member States has welcomed the initiative as a solid basis for improving current outdated rules on posting. A third group has not yet reached a position at national level. On the basis of the exploratory work of the Dutch Presidency – and building on the five main issues identified – the SQWP continued discussing the file under the Slovakian Presidency see [the progress report \(PDF\)](#). Under the Maltese Presidency, the Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council (EPSCO) ministers' meeting on 16 June 2017 discussed and sought to agree on a [general approach](#).

In the European Parliament, the co-rapporteurs on posted workers – MEP Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (EPP, France) and MEP Agnes Jongerius (S&D, Netherlands) – presented their [draft report on posted workers \(PDF\)](#) on 16 February 2017. Among other elements, the report seeks 'to protect the notion of remuneration', allowing for supplementary pay elements for both posted and national workers. The report also proposes adding accommodation conditions to the core social rights and envisages the possibility for Member States to apply conditions in regional and sectoral collective agreements to posted workers.

The next milestone at the European Parliament is foreseen for July 2017, when the Employment and Social Affairs Committee (EMPL) will vote on the report, and on the mandate to negotiate with the Council.

National correspondents

The national part of this topical update is based on contributions from Eurofound's network of European correspondents.

Austria Bernadette Allinger, (Austria)

Belgium Dries Van Herreweghe | Maarten Hermans | Guy Van Gyes

Bulgaria Ekaterina Markova

Croatia Predrag Bejakovic | Irena Klemencic

Cyprus Pavlos Kalosinatos | Loucas Antoniou

Czech Republic Renáta Kyzlinková | Soňa Veverková | Aleš Kroupa

Denmark Carsten Jørgensen | Tobias Buring

Estonia Ingel Kadarik | Märt Masso

Finland Anna Savolainen

France Frédéric Turlan

Germany Sandra Vogel | Birgit Kraemer

Greece Elena Kousta

Hungary Ambrus Kiss | Károly György | Annamária Kunert | Pál Belyó

Ireland Roisin Farrelly

Italy Anna Arca Sedda | Feliciano Iudicone

Latvia Raita Karnite

Lithuania Inga Blaziene | Sandra Krutuliene

Luxembourg Frédéric Turlan | Roland Maas | Adrien Thomas

Malta Saviour Rizzo

Netherlands Noëlle Payton

Norway Kristin Alsos

Poland Jan Czarzasty | Barbara Surdykowska

Portugal Heloísa Perista | Paula Carrilho | Maria da Paz Lima

Romania Victoria Stoiciu

Slovakia Ludovit Cziria | Rastislav Bednarik

Slovenia Barbara Lužar

Sweden Anna-Karin Gustafsson | Michaela Danielsson

Spain Jessica Durán | Iñigo Isusi

UK Claire Evans