



Forum Court  
83 Copers Cope Road  
Beckenham  
Kent BR3 1NR  
United Kingdom

Tel: + 44 20 8663 0948  
Fax: + 44 20 8663 0949

## EUROPEAN FEDERATION OF FOUNDATION CONTRACTORS

---

### Minutes of a Meeting of the EFFC Executive Committee held at VÖBU Offices, Wolfengasse 4/8, 1010 Vienna, Austria on Friday 11 April 2014 at 09:00

#### PRESENT:

In the Chair	Chris Primett	President (UK)
Other Officers	Stefano Trevisani	Immediate Past President (Italy)
	Hans-Joachim Bliss	Junior Vice President (Germany)
	Eddie Falk	Treasurer (Austria)
	José Candela	Spain
WG Chairmen	Reto Stump	Health and Safety WG (Switzerland)
	Bartho Admiraal	Technical WG (Netherlands)
Members	Maurice Bottiau	Belgium
	Philippe Liausu	France
	Balzas Gombos	Hungary
	Henk de Koning	Netherlands
	Carlos Vazquez	Romania
	Par Land	Sweden
	Lars Rand	Denmark
In Attendance:	Ciaran Jennings	Secretariat

Thomas Pirkner of VÖBU welcomed everyone to Vienna.

Chris Primett formally thanked Thomas and the Austrian Federation on behalf of the EFFC for hosting the meeting and for their hospitality the previous evening.

He informed the meeting that Dianne Jennings is intending to step back from the day-to-day running the EFFC. Dianne has been the Secretary to the EFFC since its formation in 1989 through her company Forum Court Associates (FCA). The EFFC is contracted to FCA and Ciaran Jennings is stepping forward to take on these duties in her place. Members were asked to submit any ideas on how we can mark the occasion of Dianne stepping down at the AGM in October.

#### 01/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Frank Haehnig (Germany), Ivo Rosa (Portugal), Marco Ziller (Italy), Didier Verrouil (France), Marine Lasne (France), Chris Harnan (UK), Peter Vroom (Netherlands), Claire Symes (European Foundations), Dianne Jennings (Secretary)

#### 02/14 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting held on 26 April 2013 (Czech Republic) were approved. Henk de Koning commented that the Minutes stated that the Executive Meeting was expected to meet over two days, however this has not been necessary in

practice.

The Minutes of the Council Meeting and AGM held on 18 October 2014 (Windsor) were noted and would be submitted for approval at the next Council Meeting and AGM.

### 03/14 MATTERS ARISING

None.

### 04/13 REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUPS

a) **Technical WG** Bartho Admiraal reported.

The Working Group has not met since the last report in October. It has an on-going brief to look at the European Execution Codes. It was requested that the Working Group put forward a timetable that planned its activity against the dates from CEN on the voting of standards for revision or acceptance. Wolf Linder used to do this.

Bartho Admiraal suggested that the EN 12716 Jet Grouting standard that is due for review in 2016 is in need of revision. However there is an issue with who could fund a rewrite.

Eddie Falk reported that in Austria and Germany the standards bodies lacked funds to revise these sorts of projects and look to contractors to pay for the revision and buy the completed standard. This was preventing work being undertaken on standards.

Par Land reported this was also the case in Sweden.

Chris Primett said that for the EFFC best practice was to review the standards and look to influence the Execution Codes where possible.

#### **Concrete Task group**

A Concrete Task Group has been formed to address failures in the use of concrete in foundation works. The group has met twice, in January and also on the 10<sup>th</sup> April and is being led by Karsten Beckhaus of Bauer who has worked on concrete standards in Australia.

The Group is composed of fourteen people, including four consultants, Michael Löffler, Christian Gilbert, Duncan Nicholson and Michel Boutz. It is looking at how to manage the quality of concrete on site. They are sharing information including

- Research from universities,
- Content of the national standards
- Problems faced by contractors
- Papers from national federations
- Proposals for the design and use of concrete in foundations

The view of the Group is the majority of problems result from the concrete mix. This is not something contractors control. The Group is therefore working to determine what quality assurance tests can be conducted before, during and after the pouring of concrete to reduce risk of failure. This will give members a means to check on the quality of concrete without having to take responsibility for specifying the mix of concrete.

The intention is to draft a practical guidance document, with different members of the Group taking responsibility for different chapters. It is intended this is completed next year.

It was asked what guidance the document will give. Bartho Admiraal said it would inform on the use of concrete in deep foundations such as piles. Specifically it would add new requirements to the current minimum requirements on the cement mix and flow rate. These will include elements such as testing on site and special additives that should not be used in the mix. The guidance should augment the Eurocodes on concrete.

Jose Candela commented that Spain has produced a strong guidance document but that

B Admiraal

generally this was an area where the industry lacked good guidance.

It was hoped the guidance would influence the CEN standard but that the national standards bodies may have some regional variation. It was felt adoption of the EFFC guidance by Members as best practice would be key to addressing this issue.

The Group was asked to set a timeframe for the project. Bartho Admiraal said this was intended for 2015 and a more specific timeframe would be set later in the year when the Group meet in May and September.

The group was being driven well by Chris Harnan and Bartho Admiraal. It was felt to be very positive that external consultants such as Duncan Nicholson from Arup were involved in the Group and asked for more to be added. Bartho Admiraal suggested this could be achieved later in the process and representatives of the concrete industry should be involved.

Philippe Liausu reported there were currently two studies being worked on in France. He suggested that a paper be produced to present to consultants. Par Land and Stefano Trevisani offered to work with Bartho Admiraal to approach consultants in Sweden and Italy.

**b) Health and Safety WG** Reto Stump reported.

The last meeting was in Geneva on 28 March and was attended by Domenico Campogrande from FIEC and Nicole Loichat from the Swiss Federation for Construction.

The WG has a work programme that consists of short and longer term items.

Single use slings: The Group has produced a position paper on the risks of reusing single use slings. This is widespread throughout the construction industry and is putting people at risk from heavy loads falling from height. The position paper is ready for translation and will be published on the website. The issue has also been raised with FIEC to build greater awareness and action to stop this practice.

Client responsibility for safety co-ordination: There is an on-going challenge for clients and companies to co-ordinate safety on sites. It was reported that across Europe there is a lot of variation in the standards and approach to managing safety generally but also between different companies working in the same location.

The Group had visited the CEVA site in Geneva that was felt to be an excellent example of a consortium taking a strategic approach to site safety. However, even on this site standards were inconsistent. In the area where work was well advanced it was found safety was very well managed. The second part of the site had much poorer safety standards and the group witnessed an incident where a worker slipped over and no immediate action was taken to make the site safer.

To address the issue the Group will co-ordinate their activity with the Contracts WG and have asked FIEC to publicise it to the industry at large.

Breaking down of piles: Bob Speakman has drafted a strong document that sets out the safety aspects of different techniques. It is careful not to give advice on which technique to use so as to avoid issues of potential liability.

Engagement with FIEC: The Group is seeking to become more involved in working with FIEC and will be assigning to members of the Group specific themes to monitor. Martin Sonnberger attends their SOC 2 meetings and reports back to the Group.

Machinery Safety – Amalgamation of EN 791 and EN 996 (EN 16228-2014): The new standard is finished and will be formally adopted by the EFFC in October at the AGM. It represents an important investment of time, effort, and expertise from the EFFC and we need to recognise the contribution of Walter Ensinger in producing the new standard.

Chris Primett noted that the work was excellent, but had been a significant drain on EFFC finances over the years and we need to look at how these sorts of projects are funded in the future.

Stefano Trevisani said collectively the members need to give us much publicity to this achievement and the new standard across Europe.

Mutual recognition of driver qualifications: The focus for the WG is not to harmonise training – this is too big and complex a task. Instead we are looking for mutual recognition that a minimal standard has been achieved to drive a rig, crane etc.

It was asked whether we could complain through FIEC to the EU that the non-recognition of other countries' qualifications is a restraint of trade issue. Maurice Bottiau indicated there was a conflict within the industry on this issue. This is because large companies want to be able to move their employees across borders and smaller companies operating in their local market want to protect their business.

Reto Stump reported that the issue had been raised with FIEC. However, the expectation is that an agreement and scheme would need to happen at country level first. Other countries will then start to copy the scheme. He said that a group called the Alpine Kolloquium is looking at this issue. This is formed of contractors and insurers from Austria, Northern Italy, Switzerland and Germany. The largest health and safety insurer in Switzerland is attending and if they recognise different qualifications it will become standard throughout the country.

Online Accident and Incident Reports: ([www.effcaccidentreports.org](http://www.effcaccidentreports.org)) Some amendments are being made to the site to make it clearer for users. The site needs more data from members to fulfil its potential.

It was asked how much the site was being used by member Federations and companies. Ciaran Jennings reported that it varied from country to country. Some organisations such as Bauer are very active across different countries, but it is inconsistent on a country-by-country basis.

The ideal situation is for the national federations to collect accident data centrally and input it on the site. This is the case for the FPS in the UK where one of the membership rules is to submit data. However it is recognised that this is not easy to do where a Federation has a large number of members.

Ciaran Jennings was asked to report on who is using the site to help drive its use

Everyone was asked to ensure their members were aware of and using the site.

**c) Contracts WG** Chris Harnan had given his apologies and Henk de Koning reported.

The last meeting took place in January in Amsterdam with twelve attendees from eight countries.

Site investigation: The WG is developing guidance on the issue of poor site investigation information. The guidance is to use the three EC7 levels to give basic guidance to clients, more extensive guidance to non-specialists and detailed guidance to specialists. The Group considers this issue is not only a technical issue, but also involves commercial risk. It had been referred to the Technical WG for input, but their work programme is full, therefore the Contracts WG will be reviewing the document at the next meeting in May. The intention is to refine the document and publish it.

Concrete Task Group: As per above.

FIEC Sustainability vision and manifesto: The Chairman had been optimistic that the EFFC policy of collaborative contracts would be included in FIEC's 'Sustainability Vision' and that the EFFC Carbon Calculator would be an Appendix in the FIEC document. However, because of the forthcoming European Parliamentary Elections, FIEC has abandoned the 'Sustainability Vision' in favour of a 2 page election manifesto. This has ten headings:

- Investment for growth and jobs
- Financing investment

C Jennings

Everyone

- Infrastructure investment
- Fair competition at all levels
- Build a sustainable/efficient Europe
- Prompt payment
- Well functioning labour market
- Unrestricted innovation
- Smart cities
- Reduction of bureaucracy

A response to this manifesto was drafted and sent to FIEC complaining about the lack of sustainability within the manifesto. Chris Harnan has complained to TEC-PLEN about the lack of planning in the Steering Committee.

Public Procurement Directive: A new Directive has been published that allows the use of e-auctions. The Directive does indicate that e-auctions may not be suitable for complex works. It does not deal with the issue of abnormally low tenders (ALT).

Geotechnical Risk Management: Contact has been made with Martin van Staveren of the ISSMGE (International Society of Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering). ISSMGE has agreed to collaborate with the EFFC but no action plan has been discussed. An EFFC Position Paper "Managing Geotechnical Risk by Collaborative Working" is to be developed.

Carbon Calculator: See below.

Safety Co-ordination on site: In addition to the Health & Safety WG's position paper the Group is looking at the Mobile Site Directive. Currently there is a lot of variation in how the Directive is applied. Ideally this issue should be discussed at the contractual stage of a project. Henk de Koning is reviewing what responsibilities the Directive 92/57/EEC places on the contractor and client. The intention is to draft some standard clauses for insertion into all tenders.

A presentation has been given to the Contracts WG on the UK's working platform initiative. This initiative places a responsibility on the main contractor/client to ensure a properly designed, built and maintained working platform is provided. This has been used in the UK to address the problem of rigs overturning owing to poor quality platforms or ground conditions. Chris Primett said this is a powerful initiative in the UK and had come from a collaboration with the UK Government's Health and Safety Executive.

It was also reported that the Group are reviewing the EFFC's Level 3 working conditions. These are a list of the contractual requirements member companies can ask for to ensure they have the right conditions to work safely and effectively.

**d) EFFC-DFI Geotechnical Carbon Calculator** Chris Primett informed the group that Marine Lasne had stepped down from running the Sustainability Group. This was owing to her moving to a new role at Entrepose Contracting that would no longer permit her to continue this work.

He reported that the Calculator had been completed and was now available and being used. A group of national champions had been convened in November of 2013. They are now training and promoting the tool in their countries.

The Calculator had also been shortlisted for the Ground Engineering Awards in the UK in the sustainability category. These awards are organised annually by *Ground Engineering Magazine*, which is the parent title to the *European Foundations* magazine owned by EMAP. Marine Lasne has been invited to attend these awards as recognition for her work on leading this project.

The next stage for the project is to drive utilisation of the tool. Chris Primett invited the group for suggestions for a new chairman of the Sustainability Group to drive this forward. Marine Lasne had suggested Inge van Baardwick, but she was unavailable to do this. The group

Everyone

members would be contacted to ask for a volunteer.

Maurice Bottiau asked who was going to present the Carbon Calculator at the EFFC/DFI Conference in Stockholm in Marine Lasne's place. Ciaran Jennings said he would approach Martin Stanley who is part of the Sustainability Group and is due to be presenting at the conference on the same day.

**Secretary**

**05/14 FINANCE**

Eddie Falk reported on the 2013 accounts and 2014 budget. The EFFC does not have a large amount of funds and in 2013 income had slightly decreased. This year's budget was not reflecting any major changes from the year before.

He raised the question of how the EFFC could raise more funds in the future and asked what our approach towards special projects should be. He also asked how the EFFC could reach the smaller Federations and members who do not currently contribute to our work.

Chris Primett commented that finance was a major issue for the EFFC and is a topic Hans-Joachim Bliss will raise in his presentation on future strategy.

Maurice Bottiau said there may be a contribution to the EFFC from the Stockholm Conference resulting from the profit-share arrangement in place with the DFI.

**06/14 EFFC/DFI CONFERENCE, STOCKHOLM**

Maurice Bottiau reported on the upcoming conference in May. Currently they had approximately 200 registrations to date and were targeting 300+. He asked all attendees to register if they had not already.

**Everyone**

Special rates were being given to young engineers (35 and under) and students. This was intended to allow companies to send the rising generation of talent to help them improve their knowledge and network.

It is also planned that presentations will be webcast before, during and after the event to have them seen as widely as possible. Members were asked to send video presentations so that they could be screened at the event. Maurice Bottiau said that these did not need to have high production values and could be as simple as a person speaking into a handheld camera. Electronic posters were being supplied in kiosks within the conference venue where these presentations will be screened.

**Everyone**

Stefano Trevisani queried why there was not a bigger representation from the US. The bookings to date showed the US numbers were reported to be 25%. This is less than the 33% that would usually attend. Stefano Trevisani commented that in the last conference the US had been in recession, but this was no longer the case so the US attendance should now be higher. Maurice Bottiau said that we cannot look to the US to make the Conference work commercially, but to ourselves.

Chris Primett asked what more the Executive could do to make the conference a success.

Maurice Bottiau asked that the Executive promote the Conference to their contacts. It was also requested that members send in project images to Ciaran Jennings so that they can be made into a slideshow for the EFFC stand.

**Everyone**

It was agreed that the Officers would take turns during the event to man the stand in addition to Ciaran Jennings who would be attending from the Secretariat. All the Officers should have 50-100 business cards produced to hand out at the event.

**Secretary**

2018 Conference

Chris Primett asked all to consider what the EFFC wanted from the conference in 2018. A wide ranging discussion ensued with the following themes and considerations:

- Should the EFFC be the main organiser of the conference?

- Our current model gives us influence over the programme and no financial risk
- The DFI are a networking business whose organisation is built to deliver these sorts of events, the EFFC is different as an organisation with different aims
- Wholly owning the event would give the EFFC more financial reward but would bring the EFFC into competition with the DFI and other commercial organisations
- The EFFC does not have the people and financial resources to run the conference in the way the DFI does, a dedicated resource would be needed
- An alternative model to run the conference might be to work with a National Federation and a locally based conference company – e.g. the London Conference was organised using EMAP and strongly driven by David Sherwood.
- What should the EFFC's strategy be for the 2018 Conference
  - Hans-Joachim Bliss - Driving revenue, building our network and attracting new clients through showcasing our capabilities and solving their problems
  - Eddie Falk – A conference of practitioners focused on real application of techniques (Maurice Bottiau said this is the focus of the 2014 conference)
  - Stefano Trevisani – Attracting main contractors is too difficult, the focus should be on attracting in the wider contractor community to what is new, as European companies are the reference point for this globally.
- What involvement do the EFFC want with the DFI?
  - The DFI are targeting Turkey and Poland as areas to expand – it was felt Europe/UK delegates are unlikely to attend an event in Istanbul
  - Our role should be to support and influence the DFI as much as possible for the events that are relevant to our Members.

In summary Chris Primett concluded that there was not an appetite, finance or resource to change how we approach the conference currently. Our focus is to be an equal partner when the DFI want to run an event in Europe.

## 07/14 REPORT OF THE OFFICERS

### Subscriptions:

Chris Primett reported that the subscriptions would be agreed later in the year but that special rates had been set for Spain and Poland to reflect the economic issues facing those countries.

### Bored Pile Seminars

As part of the Stockholm Conference the DFI had proposed running a bored pile seminar. The EFFC had decided not to support this directly, but some of the member companies within the EFFC were contributing to the event.

### Finance

There were a number of outstanding subscriptions from some members. Chris Primett said it was unfair for members not to pay their subscriptions and asked those outstanding to please pay all outstanding invoices.

## 08/14 MARKET REPORTS

UK – There has been an increase in the housing market in the UK. This has been helped by the government's 'Help to Buy' scheme. There are also signs of recovery from the commercial market. Contractors in the UK are seeing delays in projects starting because they are taking time to gain financial approval. This is due to projects having been priced during the downturn and costs having subsequently increased in the time it has taken for the market to improve.

Italy – Stefano Trevisani reported this was the worst period in the last ten years.

France – There has been a 6% market decrease within the country for 2013 and a small increase for those companies working outside France. The public market is difficult.

Sweden – The market is seeing a lot infrastructure projects, with two to three large scale projects. The housing market is increasing but the commercial market is not recovering yet.

Netherlands – The housing construction market is down 40-50% but is beginning to stabilise. The public market for infrastructure projects is reasonable, but the government is cutting costs, which is expected to have an impact.

Hungary – 2013 was the first year of growth since 2006. This has largely been due to infrastructure projects, but there is uncertainty over how long these projects will last. The rate of private investment is very low so the commercial market is not good.

Spain – The macro economic picture is changing and the view is that the economy has reached the bottom of the recession. It is unclear how long this will last. The banks and real estate companies are not selling houses when they have 600k to sell. The unemployment rate currently stands at 26%. The tourism industry is being look to, to help lead the recovery.

Romania – There has been a small increase in the market with €35m covered by 12 companies. Seven businesses are insolvent this is largely owing to main contractors using the downturn to create poor contract conditions. In 2013 no new tenders were issued, this is expected to create an impact in two years time. Commercial activity remains low.

Belgium – The volume of activity in the market is stable compared to last year. There is more competition coming from the Netherlands and price levels are very low. Contractual conditions are very poor with low price and high levels of risk being taken on.

Austria – Austria has the highest concentration of resources in Europe. However, the eastern European markets have broken down as companies are fighting for survival. The insolvency of main contractors has created problems as two very aggressive companies made it a difficult market by driving the price down.

Germany – Order books are full for the year with the private sector and housing sector active and continuing. There is also significant investment from the government into infrastructure. However there is a degree of fear these projects will not start as local opposition to projects has delayed them in the past.

Denmark – Infrastructure work is strong with large scale metro works being undertaken in Copenhagen. There is also a new rail connection with Germany with a €6bn budget and further €4bn investment in the rail network due to come. The private market is very low as many businesses are taking their production out of the country. Main contractors are struggling, one major contractor has become bankrupt and another is starting to make a loss.

Switzerland – 2012 was a very bad year and 2013 was very good. This was largely due to a lot of government infrastructure projects. Private work has been dropping owing to restrictions on construction work. It is now not permitted to build on greenfield sites in the country. Contractors are increasingly working within cities and the trend is to build upwards to maximise the use of land.

## **09/14 WEBSITES AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Ciaran Jennings presented a proposed strategy for developing rebuilding the EFFC website (see attached).

This suggested the website be refocused to deliver on three objectives

- Promoting the foundations industry to clients
- Building interaction with EFFC members
- Providing information to industry stakeholders such as FIEC.

The presentation set out a number of new elements that were recommended to increase the visibility of the EFFC Executive and its Working Groups. It also included recommendations to help support Member companies and give them a platform to share their issues and views.

It was proposed the website be built using the WordPress content management system. This

is widely used by the web development community and will not bind the EFFC to using one company in the future. It will also allow the site to be easily updated and will integrate with social media platforms such as Twitter, LinkedIn and Facebook. This would allow Member Federations and visitors to the site to share the articles, project information and guidance content more widely.

It was suggested that Member Federations would need to provide three articles each throughout the year. This will ensure there is enough new information to attract users back to the website and make it more attractive to search engines such as Google. This activity ideally would need to be supported by an EFFC Twitter presence.

It was proposed the website be launched in January. Members would need to be asked to provide content from October to support this. There is €5,000 in the 2014 budget to rebuild the website. The website will depend on Members providing content to keep it up to date and relevant to members. It will be necessary for a person to manage and co-ordinate the production and uploading of content from Members. This would involve communicating with members, editing material and posting it on to the website regularly. Two cost options were proposed for maintaining the content on the site and the EFFC social media presence. These ranged from €14-31k depending on the number of articles supplied by the Members.

Henk de Koning approved of the ideas in the presentation. He pointed out that the existing site only showcased the big projects of the Members and did not represent the smaller companies or the work they do. It was suggested that members could provide examples of typical projects, not just the ones that were high profile.

It was felt this issue reflected the wider challenge of getting Members to interact with the EFFC. It was reported the editor for European Foundations magazine often struggled to get response from the Members. This was due to the EFFC representing the Member Federations first and foremost. The Member Federations tended to have lots of small companies who can be inward looking. This makes it difficult to gain more interaction with the members.

It was felt the website needed a fresh and strong corporate image and it needed to work with social media as this had changed how the world communicates. It was also felt the website needs to present a positive image of the industry for Members' clients.

On the issue of funding the website the example of European Foundations Magazine was raised. This is the magazine of the EFFC but carries no cost and no financial risk, but with limited involvement from Members. It was clarified that the magazine was owned by EMAP and that the editor sought more involvement from the EFFC but that it was dependent on *Ground Engineering* magazine to support it financially.

The Executive asked Ciaran Jennings to report to the Officers on ways the website could be made commercially self-funding.

Ciaran  
Jennings

## 10/14 FUTURE STRATEGY OF THE EFFC

Hans-Joachim Bliss gave a presentation (see attached) on the state of the EFFC today and its mission and objectives for the future. He asked members to consider what changes the organisation could make by 2025.

A mission statement and series of objectives were presented, these are summarised as:

### **Mission:**

Create an effective federation, which is appreciated by its members and which is recognised by authorities and other federations

### **Objectives:**

- Improve the standards of workmanship
- Maintain high standards of technical competence, safety and innovation
- To express the point of view of our members

These were agreed in principle as the organisational aims.

A number of challenges were put forward as issues that the EFFC should look to address. These were

- How can the EFFC as a federation of federations have more interaction, communication and acceptance with the member companies?
- How can we address the lack of funding in the EFFC and achieve a budget of €250k?
- Our constrained finances mean we lack a large headquarters team.

Hans-Joachim Bliss said it was important to find out from the National Federations what their expectations are of the EFFC and what they would be willing to contribute in activity and funds. He suggested that the Officers could lead by example by each taking a theme to own such as securing funds from the EU for a project. He also wanted to see National Federations providing a more active EFFC Liaison Person

It was said the ability for National Federations to contribute to the EFFC should not be overestimated. In many cases they are not in a position to contribute more, but the work of the EFFC was still relevant to them. It was suggested the issue was whether they would pay more for membership and what activity they are actually able to contribute.

It was also felt the issue at the Member company level was that there was a lack of awareness of the impact of the EFFC on their daily work. Philippe Liausu later commented that smaller companies in France were interested in the work of the EFFC, but did not have the time or people to be able to contribute directly.

The structure of the EFFC was raised as an issue that needed to be thought about as the representatives on the Executive Committee are from companies with a vested interest in the work of the EFFC. Many Executive members are entrepreneurs and company representatives and their interests are not the same as the National Federations' interests. It was suggested National Co-ordinators and Federation representatives should attend the AGM to increase awareness and involvement.

There was a perception the EFFC represents the big companies and does not offer much of a networking opportunity for smaller companies.

Hans-Joachim Bliss made the point that it was important to bridge the gap between what we do and the activity to create the output. He said the need was to demonstrate how our work affected member companies and Federations.

From the discussion it was agreed that the National Federations would be asked four questions to help establish what they want from the EFFC and what they are prepared to contribute. It would be requested that the answers would be fed back by the end of September in time for consideration at the AGM.

**Secretary**

**11/14 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**None**

**12/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS**

Thursday 9 October to Sunday 12 October – Bucharest, UK (AGM & Council)