



Forum Court,  
Devonshire House Business Centre,  
29-31 Elmfield Road,  
Bromley,  
Kent, BR1 1LT  
United Kingdom

Tel: + 44 20 8663 0948  
Website: www.effc.org

EUROPEAN FEDERATION OF FOUNDATION CONTRACTORS

## MINUTES OF AN EFFC ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

**DATE:** Friday 25 September 2015

**TIME:** 09:00

**LOCATION:** German Federation HDB, Kurfürstenstraße 129, Berlin, Germany

### PRESENT

In the Chair:	Chris Primett	President (UK)
Other Officers:	Hans-Joachim Bliss Jose Candela Eduard Falk Olivier Peter Stefano Trevisani	Senior Vice President (Germany) Junior Vice President (Spain) Treasurer (Austria) Officer (France) Immediate Past President (Italy)
WG Chairman	Chris Harnan Bartho Admiraal Reto Stump Luca Bruni Karsten Beckhaus	Contracts WG (UK) Technical WG (The Netherlands) Health and Safety WG (Switzerland) Carbon Calculator (Italy) Concrete TG (Germany)
Members	Thomas Pirkner Kurt Kogler Wim Claesen Luc Van Hecke Jindrich Ricica Philippe Liausu Dirk Siewert Horst Leisering Gebhard Dausch Uwe Hinzman Balázs Gombos Przemyslaw Nowak Wojceich Szwejkowski Par Land Dejan Lukic Henk de Koning Peter Vroom Jim De Waele	Austria Austria Belgium Belgium Czech Republic France Germany Germany Germany Germany Hungary Poland Poland Sweden Switzerland The Netherlands The Netherlands UK
Past Presidents	Peter de Kort	The Netherlands
In Attendance:	Ciaran Jennings Caroline Kratz	Secretariat Secretariat

No	TOPIC	ACTION
	Hans Bliss welcomed everyone to the German Federation and introduced Professor Thomas Bauer, President of the German Construction Industry Federation, CEO Bauer Group.	

	<p>Professor Bauer formally welcomed everyone to Berlin. He explained that as a specialist contractor himself the world of the EFFC is his world. He stated that Bauer Group saw the EFFC as very important and they had participated since it was founded in 1989 as one of its 'founding fathers'.</p> <p>He said that the complex issues and future challenges of the industry cannot be solved at national level alone. Contractors involved in cross border activities require a transparent framework. The EFFC provides a solid network with strong contact with both FIEC and the DFI. Collectively the EFFC can address the major challenges of the industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diverging economic strengths in the EU</li> <li>• Backlog of projects needing funding</li> <li>• Shortage of skilled labour</li> <li>• Young unemployment and big demographic change</li> <li>• Environmental and occupational safety legislation becoming tighter.</li> </ul> <p>He said that meeting these challenges required the work of the managers and individuals within the EFFC. Only with their effort can we have a successful future in Europe.</p> <p>In conclusion he stated that the construction industry's markets are not easy. They are very competitive and difficult to make good margins in. Members' businesses are seeking to sell services to do a specialised type of work and compete on comparing the ability to do the work. Legislation should help us all to do more work and with good profits, this is not understood by governments.</p> <p>He believed that everyone should have the mind-set that we all want everyone to make profit. To this end we need to help everyone be successful.</p> <p>Finally he said he was pleased that Hans-Joachim Bliss was taking on the Presidency and would like to wish him every success. He believed Hans would work very hard to push the success of the EFFC as had Peter Arz and Manfred Stocker during their times as President.</p> <p>He wished everyone a successful meeting and prosperous future.</p>	
<b>1.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
	<p>Peter Arz (Germany), Peter Thornton (UK), Wolf Linder (Germany), Lars Rande (Denmark), Miguel Para (Spain), Mary Ellen Large (DFI), Michael Jones (Germany), Maurice Bottiau (Belgium), Frederico Trevisani (Italy), Marco Ziller (Italy), Carlos Vasquez (Romania), Leena Haabma (Sweden).</p>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING</b>	
<b>a)</b>	<p><b>AGM Meeting</b> The Minutes of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2014 in Romania were agreed.</p>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Report of the President</b>	
	<p>Chris Primett thanked Thomas Bauer, the German Federation and all of the sponsors of the AGM programme for their support.</p> <p>He said that the past two years as President had passed very quickly. Although the EFFC does not meet very frequently it does a lot of very good work between meetings. He reported that the representative from Huesker, who presented to the EFFC on the previous day, had been impressed that Member companies who are normally competitors can work together.</p> <p>Chris said that his mission as President was to help reinvigorate the Federation and seek more participation. A survey had been conducted of the Members that the</p>	

	<p>Officers had reviewed to shape the strategy for the future. In the past two years a closer relationship with FIEC had been formed to help push the EFFC's ideas and wishes. He also said that the Officers were looking for the next generation to take on the leadership of the industry and he was pleased to see younger people around the room.</p> <p>He thanked the Working Group Chairmen and summarised the issues they were addressing:</p> <p>The Health &amp; Safety Group had a long-term project in seeking to achieve mutual recognition across borders of rig drivers' qualifications. It was continuing to gather statistics on accidents to help inform best practice. The Working Platform Certificate initiative is being discussed – but had become the norm in the UK and saved lives. The Group had successfully created the new rig standard to ensure much better safety requirements on rigs built in Europe.</p> <p>The Technical Group provide invaluable work on European standards. This is an ongoing, never ending task. Collectively the group are able to form a European perspective on the standards that can be fed back to the national standards bodies and into CEN. They are also a useful single point of reference to understand which standards are being reviewed.</p> <p>The Contracts Working Group – The President commented that Chris Harnan's group tends to be given all the other subjects to manage such as the Carbon Calculator and issues of sustainability. It has worked to build the relationship with FIEC and develop an understanding how Building Information Modelling/Management will impact the industry. The Group is working on a position paper and tools to support collaborative working.</p> <p>The Concrete Task Group – this group had seen a lot of hard work from Karsten Beckhaus and Chris Harnan with a lot of debate to develop an acceptable document.</p> <p>In addition a lot of work had gone into the development of the new EFFC website and consideration was being given to introducing affiliate membership.</p> <p>He concluded by saying that the Federation had many good ideas. These ideas require funding. The Concrete TG project had shown that we can raise funds on specific issues and this was a good model. He commented that the subscriptions being paid currently were very low when considered in relation to the size of the special foundations markets across the EU. It was therefore important that we all talk to our National Federations to understand what the EFFC can bring to them in order for them to invest more in the EFFC.</p>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUPS</b>	
<b>a)</b>	<p><b>Technical Working Group (see attached presentation)</b></p> <p>Bartho Admiraal gave an update on the status of the European standards related to geotechnical works. The Group had been reviewing the standard for testing Ground Anchors. It also discussed EN10902-2 that requires CE marking for the execution of steel structures such as steel piles and rebar cages. It had been identified that this standard only required CE marking where the structure was built off-site. This means that assembling steel structures on site does not require CE marking.</p> <p>The Group received a presentation from David Hard on the Working Platform Certificate to understand how working platforms are designed under the initiative.</p> <p>The Group had looked at the guidance produced for unexploded ordnance in Germany and new Polish research on noise and vibration in urban areas.</p> <p>Bartho explained that the main work of the Working Group is the review of the CEN standards. In 2016 the standards that will be reviewed according to the CEN process</p>	

	<p>are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revision of EN 12716 – jet grouting (TC288 WG17)</li> <li>• Revision of EN 12715; grouting (TC288 WG18)</li> <li>• Revision of EN12063 – sheet piles (TC288 WG19 – CEN are calling for a conveyor, secretary and national experts to prepare the revision.)</li> </ul> <p>He reported the issue of concrete cover in tremie operations has also been raised at TC288 as there is a conflict between the execution and design rules in Eurocode 2. This issue is being explored by the Concrete Task Group.</p> <p><b>b) Health &amp; Safety Working Group (see attached presentation)</b></p> <p>Reto reported the group is working to promote a number of short term and long term issues. In the short term the Group are looking to achieve the following:</p> <p><b>Establish an expert platform:</b> Reto said that the intention of the Group is to use its experts to create guidance documents on specialised subjects. The Group would seek endorsement of these guidance documents by official organisations and experts within Member countries. A number of subjects will be proposed and prioritised. The first of these will be on the subject of “How to investigate an accident”. It is anticipated this may become an EFFC training course or seminar that could be promoted to the wider industry.</p> <p>The delegates were asked whether they were supportive of the idea of establishing a training event or course on accident investigation. It was agreed this was a good idea and a proposed budget will be prepared for consideration</p> <p><b>LinkedIn Group:</b> The current LinkedIn group is not regularly used by the group at present. It is therefore proposed that the group is opened up to HSE managers within the EFFC Membership. It is hoped the LinkedIn group could become a place to promote EFFC guidance documents and raise questions that need an expert opinion from the Working Group.</p> <p><b>Delegation to SOC2:</b> Martin Sonnberger currently attends the SOC 2 meetings of FIEC’s Social Commission’s as a representative of Porr and Voebu. It was requested that he is approved as the official EFFC representative on SOC 2. This was agreed and the Secretary will inform FIEC.</p> <p>The long term projects the Group are working on were summarised as follows:</p> <p><b>Safety co-ordination on site:</b> The Group continue to see many instances where clients and main contractors do not take responsibility for co-ordinating safety on site. The WG intend to investigate whether a safety standard can be introduced into projects using Building Information Modelling (BIM) methods. It is thought that BIM’s ability to detect clashes over the course of the project could help project clients and contractors to take on their responsibilities under the Mobile Site Safety Directive.</p> <p>Chris Harnan commented that the Contracts Working Group is also looking at this issue. They are amending the Level 3 contract conditions to ensure that the safety co-ordination is explicitly addressed. In addition FIEC have invited the EFFC to present at their ECOPLN meeting on BIM. The Contracts WG are sending a delegation to this meeting and want to raise this issue within the context of BIM.</p> <p>It was agreed that the H&amp;S and Contracts Working Groups should co-ordinate their activity.</p> <p><b>Rig stability</b> – See item 7 Working Platform Certificate Initiative.</p> <p><b>Mutual Recognition of Rig Driver Qualifications</b> – See item 8 Mutual Recognition of Rig Driver Qualifications</p> <p><b>Machine Safety</b> – This item has been added to the Group’s agenda to see how the new rig standard is being implemented and identify other issues related to the safety of plant.</p>	<p><b>H&amp;S WG</b></p> <p><b>Secretary</b></p>
--	--	--

c)	<p><b>Accident statistics</b> – These continue to be collected via the EFFC Incident Reports website. However the amount of data submitted to the site remains very low. All accidents need to be reported across the EFFC, including the participation of all Members in order to make this more useful.</p> <p>Finally, Reto Stump introduced Luc Van Hecke, who is taking over as the Chairman of the Working Group. Reto said he will support Luc in the role to ensure there is continuity. It is anticipated that after two years Martin Sonnberger will take over from Luc.</p> <p><b>Contracts Working Group (See attached presentation)</b></p> <p>Chris Harnan reported that the Group had met three times this year and that the attendance had been poor during the May meeting with FIEC. He therefore was going to reintegrate the meetings with the Executive and AGM as it led to better attendance.</p> <p>He reported on the issues that the group is currently addressing:</p> <p><b>Mutual recognition of rig driver standards</b> - See item 8.</p> <p><b>End of waste criteria</b> – This issue relates to earth excavated on site being legally defined as waste under the EU directive. Chris reported that there is no real activity on this issue currently within the EU and group will maintain a watching brief.</p> <p><b>Circular Economy</b> – This initiative has two objectives at EU level. The first is to reduce dependency on the supply of energy and resources from outside the EU as this exposes the EU to significant economic and political risk. The second is to reuse resources wherever possible in order to make construction more sustainable. However, in FIEC’s TEC3 Commission binding targets on reusing resource have been rejected.</p> <p><b>BIM</b> – Chris said he felt this was a critical issue for the next 10 years. He believed foundation contractors will fail if they do not become BIM compliant. BAM Ritchies from the UK had provided a presentation on it to show how it worked for a geotechnical contractor. The UK Federation’s guidance notes on BIM are being considered for adoption as EFFC documents.</p> <p>Stefano Trevisani commented that the US is ahead of Europe on this issue and may have experiences to share of how BIM can be applied to foundations. Chris Harnan commented that it was important the foundations industry did not lag behind as it would mean BIM was imposed upon contractors.</p> <p>Uwe Hinzman asked what the benefit of BIM was. Chris Harnan reported that clash detection and efficiency in the how the project is managed take cost out of the process. Chris Primett commented that BAM Ritchies use is as a management tool and see a benefit in using it on jobs where a main contractor is not insisting on using BIM.</p> <p>Olivier Peter commented that he believed it was suitable for big projects and there was a need to identify where it is beneficial and on which types of projects. Jim de Waele commented that it could be used on small projects as well, as Keller has used it with a house builder in the UK on a £50k project.</p> <p><b>Collaborative working</b> – The Group have produced a strong paper on this topic. As reported above, ECOPLN have invited the EFFC to present on this topic and the intention is to introduce this topic through this presentation.</p> <p><b>Promoting better standards of Ground Investigation (GI)</b> – The Group wants to encourage insurers to add conditions to their insurance policies for better GI. It attempted to approach the Association of British Insurers but they were unable to help. The British Tunnelling Society is being approached as they have included contractual terms into their standard form of contract on this issue.</p>	
----	--	--

	<p><b>Mobile Site Safety Directive</b> – As reported above the Group has developed some Level 3 conditions that address the requirements on clients, designers and main contractors. These will be finalised at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b> – FIEC’s Sustainability Vision document that had been written by the Group is currently dormant. FIEC’s Climate Conference may offer an opportunity to promote this document. The Group are looking at Key Performance Indicators and practical targets that could be adopted by the EFFC members to help manage and reduce the environmental impact of foundation works.</p> <p>Hans-Joachim Bliss commented that in Germany large companies all have reporting on sustainability but small companies do not see the point. He believed that to keep the issue alive we need to create a simple agenda concentrating on three to four major issues and encouraging the small and medium enterprises to start reporting more formally on the action they are already taking. A sample shall follow through the future newsletter.</p> <p><b>d) Carbon Calculator Task Group (see attached presentation)</b></p> <p>Luca Bruni reported that the Task Group has restarted activity. The Group has a good mix of people and is open for more to join to contribute ideas and data samples.</p> <p>To date 545 people have downloaded the carbon calculator and all are encouraged to promote and use it within their companies. The software is continuing to be maintained by Carbone 4.</p> <p>Currently the Group is collecting more data samples for each technique to refine the accuracy of the tool on the primary and secondary sources of emissions.</p> <p>It was reported that the Carbon Calculator had been presented at a conference in Sao Paulo, Brazil. A paper on the tool had also been submitted to a political conference in Italy where the Italian Prime Minister was attending.</p> <p><b>Future strategy</b> – Luca reported that the DFI’s representative was keen to introduce benchmarking of each technique using functional units as appropriate – e.g. carbon per m<sup>3</sup> of diaphragm wall. He asked the Group for their view on whether benchmarking was desirable. In discussion it was felt that the main contributor to emissions in foundations works is the quantity of materials rather than other factors that foundations contractors had control over. It was felt that benchmarking was not necessary at this point.</p> <p>Luca said it was important to disseminate the tool more widely and drive adoption within EFFC member countries. It was agreed this was the right approach.</p> <p>The group is seeking recognition of the tool with national authorities and bodies such as BREEAM, TÜV, Atkins, HS2 (a UK infrastructure project) and universities.</p> <p>Hans Bliss commented that he had raised the use of the carbon calculator within the German Federation. German companies were not being asked for carbon calculations so were not being proactive in offering them. His view was that main contractors need to be shown that it is possible to assess the carbon impact of different project designs. He was encouraging German companies to submit carbon calculations with their tenders as a first step.</p> <p>It was asked whether there was a presentation available for Members to use to promote the tool. It was confirmed that there was a presentation available. It was agreed this should be made available in the Member’s section of the new website once it is launched.</p> <p><b>e) Concrete Task Group (see attached presentation)</b></p>	<p><b>Secretary</b></p>
--	--	-------------------------

*Please note this item was moved to the end of the session to facilitate the debate on the content of the guide.*

Karsten Beckhaus summarised the work of the Group. He reminded everyone that the purpose of the Group was to create a Guide to Tremie concrete with a view to solving the problems contractors had encountered. This project had attracted significant sponsorship from contractors, concrete suppliers and consultants. It was also now a joint project with the DFI in the US who were also contributing financially and with experts.

The original intention was to publish the first edition of the guide in May 2015 in order to provide guidance on placement and on-site tests to assess the acceptability of supplied concrete. The first edition would have theoretical values for the tests for what should be considered acceptable. A series of field research tests has been commissioned to provide actual values and published in a second edition in 2016/17. These tests will be carried out by the Technical University of Munich in Europe and Missouri University in the US. Karsten reported that the timing of publication for the first edition had slipped to October 2015 as a number of issues had required extensive discussion in order to reach agreement.

Karsten reported that a meeting had been held on the previous day to debate and agree the first edition. This had been attended by Peter Faust of the DFI, Christian Gilbert of TC288 and Bartho Admiraal for the EFFC. Agreement had been achieved on all outstanding points except for two relating to execution. Karsten asked the Council to consider these issues and provide a clear direction on what was acceptable. They related to section 6.2 "Prior to Concreting":

First issue – This related to the amount of permissible debris at the bottom of diaphragm wall excavation or pile. The US standard set this at 75mm, which was acceptable to the DFI. However to some European contractors setting a limit was felt to be contractually dangerous.

Second issue – The Guide currently requires that sand content is less than 4%, which is in line with the Eurocodes, and that best practice is to have sand content at not greater than 2%. This was also unacceptable to some European contractors.

There was a discussion in the meeting where the following points were raised:

- SOFFON's view was that there was a danger the document could become treated as a standard that put the responsibility on the foundations contractor and the document should be delayed until the research data was collected. Their understanding was that the Guide would be explaining the issues with the concrete being supplied, rather than how the execution is carried out. This was a present issue for one contractor who was facing compensation claims where concrete quality issues were being presented as an issue with workmanship.
- It was not realistic to measure and verify the sand content or amount of debris in the excavation. Although it was acknowledged that the US have techniques in this area that might be adopted in time.
- It was recognised that many Members had stricter standards on these issues than were included in the Guide. However, the Guide should not be placing greater burdens upon the foundation contractor.
- The research would not clarify the two outstanding issues and there was a lot of content within the document that covered the issues with the concrete mix itself.
- Delaying publication was likely to lead to 2-4 years of delay before the practical tests and quality procedures in execution were adopted by the industry.
- The EFFC had committed contractually with the sponsors to publish a first edition and then a subsequent updated edition with the test data. This meant it was not feasible to delay publication until the test data had been collected.

In conclusion it was formally agreed that the requirement for 2% sand content and 75mm limit to debris should both be removed from the document. With these amends the document was approved for publication.

**K Beckhaus**

	The final version will be sent to the Officers to verify that the 2 items have been removed from the document.	<b>Officers</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>EFFC Website</b>	
	See item 11. New President Introduction.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>EFFC/DFI Conference 2018</b>	
	<p>The President invited Henk de Koning to provide an update on the progress of the conference.</p> <p>Henk summarised that there had been a conference call at the beginning of the year between DFI Europe and the EFFC. Rome had been suggested as the venue for the next conference and the DFI had received had received and offer from Professor Massimo Grissola to organise the content of the programme.</p> <p>A key lesson from last year's conference was that local support and participation was very important for the event to be successful. The DFI in the US were willing to support the organisation of the conference, but an Italian organiser would be necessary on the ground.</p> <p>A meeting has been organised in Rome for the 5<sup>th</sup> October to start the planning for the conference.</p> <p>Stefano Trevisani said that the decision to choose Rome as the venue for the conference had been taken without consulting the AIF. He reminded everyone that the Italian industry was suffering badly with 12,000 companies having closed down since 2007. Despite this, the Italian Federation had discussed the possibility and needed to know what support means, and the resources required. He agreed that the AIF Secretary would be asked to attend the meeting in order to find out more about what is required of the Federation.</p> <p>Chris Primett asked the group to consider what risk and involvement the EFFC should take in the conference. In discussion it was determined that the conference should not be academic in nature, but focus on practical subjects that were relevant to clients and contractors. It was recognised that a local specialist conference organiser company was likely to be needed. The format of the conference needs to be reviewed as three days was felt to be too long and did not represent value.</p> <p>In conclusion it was agreed that the EFFC should proceed on the same model as for the conference in 2014. This would mean having input into the content but not taking any financial risk.</p> <p>It was requested that Henk de Koning report on the outcome of the planning meeting on the 5 October.</p>	<p><b>S Trevisani</b></p> <p><b>Henk de Koning</b></p>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Working Platform Certificate Initiative</b>	
	<p>The proposal to create a Working Platform Certificate scheme that could be adopted by EFFC Members was discussed. Under the scheme main contractors have to take responsibility for providing a clean, safe and properly built working platform.</p> <p>Chris Primett said that the scheme had been successful in the UK at reducing the number of rig overturns. He explained that adoption of the scheme at national level is not easy as it requires foundation contractors in the country to act together by refusing to work on site without a signed WPC. This would require the National Federations to gather the support of their members.</p> <p>Chris said that it was very helpful to gain recognition by the national government and the health and safety authorities. In the UK the scheme is supported by the Health &amp; Safety Executive which gives it a legal basis that main contractors respect.</p>	

	<p>The issue of cost was discussed. This was seen as a difficulty with the scheme as main contractors would need to pay for the scheme. However it was also an opportunity for the main contractor, who can pass on the charge to their client for providing the platform.</p> <p>Hans Bliss commented that this was not purely a cost issue but an issue of safety and risk.</p> <p>It was agreed that a framework should be developed based on the proposal to help Member Federations to adapt the scheme for its own national situation. The Working Group Chairmen will co-ordinate activity to develop guideline and recommended approach to adopting the WPC scheme.</p>	<b>WG Chairs &amp; Secretary</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Mutual Recognition of Rig Operator Qualifications</b>	
	<p>Reto Stump reported that a delegation from the Health &amp; Safety WG had met with Domenico Campogrande of FIEC to determine a way forward on this issue. The intention is to define a basic standard that can be recognised in each country. The intention is not to harmonise standards as this task is too great to achieve.</p> <p>Reto proposed the following strategy is adopted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A survey of Member Federations is carried out to determine the scale of the problem including case studies for evidence</li> <li>2. A minimum standard is developed with the input of Federations, manufacturers and experts within the EFFC – an initial proposal is being developed by the Alpine Kolloquium with the input of members of the H&amp;S WG.</li> <li>3. A project is formed with FIEC to explore the different routes to implementation. This is would be funded and backed by the EU commission, with a potential budget of €300k.</li> </ol> <p>It was recognised that this was a very complex and difficult issue to address and was likely to take two or more years to solve. It was agreed that a proposal should be formed with a view to gaining funding to undertake the Survey and further steps.</p>	<b>H&amp;S WG</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Finance</b>	
<p><b>a)</b></p> <p><b>b)</b></p> <p><b>c)</b></p>	<p><b>Adoption of the 2014 accounts</b> 1.Resolution: The resolution was passed that the 2014 accounts should be adopted.</p> <p><b>Appointment of auditor</b> 1.Resolution: The resolution was passed that Crane and Partners be reappointed as auditors of the EFFC accounts.</p> <p><b>Budget and subscriptions</b> – Eduard Falk presented the budget for 2016. Eduard explained that the budget was divided between standing activities to run the Federation and special projects. The income to the Federation remained very low compared to the size of the market that the National Federations operate in.</p> <p>He commented that Secretariat fee had increased to reflect that pound was currently strong against the Euro. The increase reflected the quality of service provided by Forum Court and the loyalty they have shown to the EFFC.</p> <p>There had also been an increase in the meetings and travel budget from the previous year to take account of WG activities. No provision had been made for website sponsorship income as the website was being rebuilt. There was a decrease in the cost for the website handling in future, now that new website was being built.</p> <p>Stefano Trevisani asked whether sponsorship income is planned immediately. Hans</p>	

	<p>Bliss answered that it is not immediately because of the hesitation expressed by some members in the last meeting, but he suggested it might be considered for the newsletter.</p> <p>He explained that the subscriptions income and resulting subscriptions were maintained at the 2015 levels. It is recognised that some Federations are continuing to pay a reduced subscription fee owing to the poor economic climate and market in those countries. The exception to this was the Polish Federation which had its subscription increased by €1000. This reflected that the Polish market had improved significantly and the principle that the eventual aim is that all Members pay a full subscription.</p> <p>Przemyslaw Nowak commented that the Polish Federation feel uncomfortable with the current population based system for calculating subscriptions as it did not reflect the size of the market. He believed they would think that the subscription amount €4.5k would be seen as too high.</p> <p>Hans Bliss responded that the models had been looked at by the Officers and Executive earlier in the year and it had been determined to keep the system as it currently stands. This was due to there not being accurate market information available for geotechnical works in each country. It was recognised that none of the discussed systems would provide a perfect solution.</p> <p>Przemyslaw said, although he supported the increase, he would be meeting with the Polish Federation in two week's time and they may not support the increase. Hans invited Przemyslaw to feedback on this issue to the Officers if there was an issue.</p> <p>The budget for 2016 was agreed.</p>	
<b>10.</b>	<b>Membership Matters</b>	
	<p><b>Confirmation of the Officers</b>  Jim De Waele Proposed the Officers and succession should be confirmed as follows:</p> <p><b>President</b> – Hans Joachim Bliss (Germany)  <b>Senior Vice President</b> – José Candela (Spain)  <b>Treasurer and Junior Vice President</b> – Eduard Falk (Austria)  <b>Immediate Past President</b> – Chris Primett (UK)  <b>Additional Officers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oliver Peter (France)</li> <li>• Stefano Trevisani (Italy)</li> </ul> <p>This was seconded by Stefano Tevisani.</p> <p>The Presidency was formally passed from Chris Primett to Hans Joachim Bliss.</p>	
<b>11.</b>	<b>New President introduction (incorporating the EFFC website)</b>	
	<p>Hans Joachim Bliss addressed the meeting as the new EFFC President:</p> <p>He warmly thanked Chris Primett for the work Chris had put into being the President. Hans said he had learned from Chris that the President has to lead a Federation and not a company, which requires a different approach. He felt it is an honour and a privilege to take on the responsibility to take on this role and that he would put his energy into some specific goals. It was his intention not to bring new changes but to build on the strengths and achievements of the EFFC.</p> <p>He stated his mission was to promote the industry within the European community and to support the quality of work so that all charge a price to reflect this. Specifically he wanted to increase the networking both within and outside the EFFC.</p> <p>He set out a number of personal objectives for the next two years</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To provide to Members what they have asked for in the survey carried out in</li> </ol>	

	<p>2014. This included lobbying, collaborative working, making clients aware of the organisation and its Members and working with individual Members.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Encourage networking – between Federations, Working Group Members and the people in Member companies.</li> <li>3. Make the website an attractive networking tool.</li> <li>4. Recruit one new member Federation to the EFFC.</li> </ol> <p>In accordance with these objectives Hans Joachim introduced the proposed design for the EFFC website. This design reflected the direction from the Executive meeting to focus the website on the needs of Members and driving interaction between them.</p> <p>The new design was designed to scroll so that it would work well on mobiles and tablets. He explained that the intention was to launch the site at the end of October or beginning of November assuming there were no objections.</p> <p><i>Please refer to the attached designs for the website.</i></p> <p>Hans introduced a number of new initiatives and sections that are being introduced into the site:</p> <p><i>Statement from the President</i> – this will provide a regular update on the issues that are being worked on by the Officers and WGs</p> <p><i>Europe corner</i> – this will provide insight into how the EU functions and what is happening that may be important to Members</p> <p><i>View of the National Federation</i> – This is to be a monthly column where National Federations will be asked to provide 300 words on what are the issues that are affecting their members. Austria had volunteered to be the first to participate and it was expected this would progress alphabetically through the National Federations.</p> <p>Hans reported that the European Foundations magazine was likely to cease publication at the end of 2016. However it was intended that much of the contribution of the Members would now appear in the news section of the website. Everyone was asked to provide project reports to the Secretariat for inclusion.</p> <p><i>Members' section</i> – Hans asked that all Members provide the details of their National Federation and all the companies within their Membership so that we they can be introduced into the map.</p> <p><i>Guidance and resources</i> – This section will give access to position papers tools and links of interest to members. Hans suggested that the Carbon Calculator needed a logo identity that could be used on the website and in all marketing of the tool. Luca Bruni agreed to take this issue back to the Carbon Calculator TG</p> <p><i>Young Professionals</i> – This section would initially host a survey for young geotechnical engineers to tell the EFFC how they would like to engage with the EFFC and the industry. This will inform the development of the website so that we can respond to these ideas.</p> <p><i>Executive Council</i> – This section of the site requires that the correct information is presented. All Federations were asked to confirm the name of their representative and ensure that they have the formal authority to vote on behalf of their Federation at EFFC meetings.</p> <p>A number of comments were made in response to the website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested the EFFC logo should appear at the top of the website.</li> <li>• The map in the <i>Members' section</i> needed to reflect current European borders.</li> <li>• In the tablet view of the page the images appeared to be too large</li> </ul> <p>These changes would be fed back to the developer.</p> <p>Hans also indicated that he planned to produce a newsletter three times a year that would provide detailed information that did not appear on the website.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>All</p> <p>All</p> <p>L Bruni</p> <p>All</p> <p>Secretariat</p>
--	---	---

	Finally Hans said he offers to participate in the meetings of the National Federations to help raise the profile of the EFFC and help the Members get more value from the organisation.	
<b>12.</b>	<b>Officers – Areas of responsibility</b>	
	No discussion	
<b>13.</b>	<b>Affiliate Membership Scheme (see attached presentation)</b>	
	<p>Eduard Falk gave a presentation on the Austrian Federation, VÖBU and how it works to create value within their national industry. He explained that he wanted to share their approach with a view to thinking about how deeper links with the industry partners could help to extend the EFFC's influence and provide a strong income. VÖBU has 41 Executive Members (Foundation Companies) and 92 Supporting Members (other companies).</p> <p>He explained that VÖBU worked to ensure there was a well structured market. This involved developing rules, standards and recommendations to members. Members paid their fees because the Federation provided training courses, seminars and useful publications.</p> <p>Eduard said that the EFFC represented as a collective of companies a €3b buying force. If it provided a community position it could work to influence the supply chain and wider businesses and gain significant income. He set out the following suggested model to show how many affiliated member companies could contribute more significant funding:</p> <p>Companies of €1m turnover – pay €1000 x50  Companies of €1-10m turnover – pay €2000 x 50  Companies of €10m+ – pay €5000 x 30</p> <p>This would contribute €300k to the EFFC.</p> <p>It was agreed a formal proposal should be produced for the Executive meeting to consider this further.</p>	<b>Officers</b>
<b>14.</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	<p>Przemyslaw Nowak introduced Wojceich Szwejkowski who is the new President of the Polish Federation. Wojceich was welcomed by the Council.</p> <p>Dejan Lukic asked whether consideration could be given to co-ordinating the dates and locations of the Working Group meetings to save on travel costs for those members who attended more than one group. Hans Joachim Bliss commented that this could be looked at together with how we co-ordinate the activity of the groups on common subjects.</p>	
<b>15.</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>	
	<p>Executive Meeting – Warsaw, Poland, 18-19 May 2016  AGM – Florence (TBC) Italy – 20-21 October 2016</p> <p>Oliver Peter kindly volunteered that France could host the Executive meeting in 2017.</p>	

## SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Issue/Project	Task	Responsibility	When
EFFC training event on Accident investigation	Provide a proposal and budget for consideration	L v Hecke H&S WG	Executive meeting
EFFC representation at FIEC SOC 2	Inform FIEC that Martin Sonnberger is the official EFFC representative.	Secretary	Complete
Carbon Calculator	Make the Carbon Calculator Presentation available to Members via the new EFFC website.	Secretary	At launch of new website
Concrete Tremie Guide	Finalise the document incorporating the two agreed amendments. Pass to the Officers for final approval	K Beckhaus & Officers	ASAP
EFFC/DFI Conference 2018	Italian Federation to be asked to send a representative to attend the planning meeting on 5 October 2015 in Rome.	S Trevisani	Complete
EFFC/DFI Conference 2018	Report on the planning meeting to be fed back to the Secretary and Officers	H de Koning	31 October
Working Platform Certificate initiative	Develop a framework for the WPC to aid National Federations to adapt the scheme for their own country.	WG Chairs/ Secretary	Update for Executive meeting
Mutual Recognition of Rig Operative training	Develop a project proposal and budget to gather financial support for the project.	L v Hecke H&S WG	Executive meeting
EFFC website	All members to provide an article when requested on what issues are being addressed by their Federation. This will be published on the website.	All	When requested
EFFC website	Provide Project reports for publication on the website	All,	When requested
EFFC website	All members to provide contact details of their Federation and Member companies for publication on the website	All,	When requested
EFFC website	All members to confirm their representative on the EFFC Executive for publication on the website.	All,	Immediately
Carbon Calculator	Consideration to be given to developing a logo for the scheme that can be used in EFFC marketing.	L Bruni	Next CCTG meeting
Affiliate/Associate Membership scheme	Proposal to be developed for how an affiliate membership scheme for industry partners might work.	Officers	Executive meeting