



**Minutes from the EFFC Executive meeting held on Thursday 14th May –
10am-13.00pm UK – 11am – 14.00pm CET via WebEx Conference Call**

In Attendance:

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Serge Borel | France |
| Maurice Bottiau | Belgium |
| Rasin Düzceer | Turkey |
| Jaap Estié | Netherlands |
| José Candela | Spain |
| Frank Haehnig | Germany |
| David Hard | UK |
| Chris Harnan | UK |
| Uwe Hinzmann | Germany |
| Tamás Kaltenbacher | Hungary |
| Andreas Körbler (President) | Austria |
| Boris von Luebtow | Germany |
| Fabrizio Leoni | Italy |
| Dejan Lukic | Switzerland |
| Przemyslaw Nowak | Poland |
| Cyril Plomteux | France |
| Bob Thompson (Treasurer) | UK |
| Federico Trevisani | Italy |
| Peter Vroom | Netherlands |
| Stig Weis | Denmark |

Present:

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|----|
| Ciaran Jennings | EFFC Secretary | UK |
| Isabel Jennings | EFFC Secretariat | UK |

| | Minutes | Actions |
|----------|---|----------------|
| | <p>Welcome & Legal Compliance Statement</p> <p>Andreas Körbler invited members to the first virtual EFFC Executive meeting.</p> <p>A legal compliance statement was made: the purpose of the meeting is to discuss collaboration to address industry issues and not to, in any way, engage in fixing of markets or project pricing.</p> | |
| 1 | <p>Apologies</p> <p>Marc Lacazedieu (France), Wojciech Szwejkowski (Poland), Goran Svensson (Sweden), Dirk Siewert (Germany), Didier Jacquet, Roberto Carlos Vazquez (Romania)</p> | |
| 2 | <p>Minutes of the last meeting</p> <p>a. Executive minutes (14-06-2019) - attached for approval b. AGM minutes (18-10-19) - attached for information c. AGM formal minutes (17-10-19) - attached for information</p> <p>Minutes of previous meeting were approved by Bob Thompson and seconded by Andreas Körbler.</p> | |



| | | |
|----------|---|------------------------------|
| <p>3</p> | <p>COVID-19 (C-19)</p> <p>a) FIEC activity and EU response</p> <p>The Secretary started by providing feedback from a recent FIEC meeting. It was discussed that disruption has been widely felt across Europe but most large infrastructure projects have avoided closures. Ciaran reported that FIEC are meeting with the European Commission every week to determine what proportion of the C-19 recovery fund should go to the construction industry. He stated that FIEC have asked if there are any issues the EFFC want them to lobby to the EU. Ciaran noted that this leads to the question of whether the EFFC should create a C-19 statement.</p> <p>Chris Harnan noted that FIEC sent a statement to the EU commission in early April which asked for free movement of workers to be maintained. He expressed concern that it may have affirmed doubts from the EU commission about FIEC as this request was completely at odds with the public health priority of all EU states during the C-19 crisis. Bob Thompson said that he had not heard of this document but agreed with Chris that it was a naïve response to the situation. It was agreed by members that the EFFC should distance themselves from this statement.</p> <p>b) EFFC position and action to help members</p> <p>The President asked members what they thought should be in the EFFC C-19 statement. Serge Borel started discussion by stressing that the statement should be applicable to the whole construction industry. Maurice Bottiau commented that it would be difficult to create a global statement. Chris Harnan stressed that covering government guidelines (such as handwashing) is not necessary at EFFC level. Chris continued by saying the statement should ask that the EU try and provide financial stability – e.g. by asking clients to provide proper project extensions etc. Bob agreed with Chris but stated that the statement should still start with a general statement about safety of employees before outlining government and client responsibilities. Ciaran added that FIEC have been pushing for the EU Commission to view C-19 as a force majeure event for contractual purposes. Maurice advised to err on the side of caution with this request as it can mean that clients do not have to recognise costs. Adding to Bob’s comments, Maurice said that asking governments to solve issues quickly for public clients will help the industry financially. Frank Haehnig added that speeding up the timeline of future public infrastructure projects would also help. Fabrizio Leoni stressed that, whilst distancing from the FIEC statement was fair, movement of workers is still an important issue to mention. Chris and Bob both agreed it should be included if the request is still within the capacity of governments. It was agreed to ask for effective testing and travel precautions – which sets the statement apart from the FIEC statement.</p> <p>Andreas actioned the EFFC Secretary to draft the response for approval.</p> <p>(Please find published EFFC C-19 Statement here)</p> | <p>EFFC Secretary</p> |
| <p>4</p> | <p><u>EFFC Driver’s License</u></p> <p>The Secretary started discussion by recapping that the objective of the project is to create the equivalent of an EU driver’s license for rig-operators. Previously the</p> | |



project tried to gain mutual recognition for licenses but practically this was too difficult.

Ciaran explained the new proposal is to pursue a harmonised approach (integrating with existing national schemes) which aims to establish a common basic standard for qualification. Ciaran noted that, to instil confidence in the project, it must stay under the control of the EFFC as contractors should determine the competencies for qualification.

a) Proposal for how EFFC shall run the scheme

Ciaran explained that market research has found substantial similarities across European qualification schemes. This should mean that relatively few additional questions/requirements will be needed at national level in order to harmonise with the EFFC license. Ciaran noted that a question-set is being tested by ZUMbau (in Germany) to see whether the questions disrupt the training scheme.

Ciaran went on to explain that to control the quality of the testing regime a 'notified body' would need to be set up. A "notified body" is one that is recognised by national governments as one qualified to assess conformity across the EU – i.e. to check that a training standard is being applied in the same way in different countries. This notified body would formally assess the conformity of national qualifications to the EFFC standard. Ciaran suggested that this notified body could then issue the EFFC license but that the details have not been confirmed yet.

Ciaran explained an EFFC management committee would need to be set-up to manage the whole project. This committee would feedback to the Executive Committee and liaise with FIEC and their SOC 1 commission. They would also manage the notified bodies by setting standard and audit regulations and manage the contract with them. The notified bodies would in turn meet with the national qualification bodies and assessment centres.

Ciaran then asked if members had any questions.

Maurice asked for further explanation on the difference between the notified body and the national qualification bodies. Ciaran explained that the notified body is an independent auditing organisation whereas the national qualification bodies (e.g. ZUMbau in Germany & CPCS in the UK) run their licensing schemes depending on national requirements. The notified bodies would go to the national qualification bodies to audit them – to make sure they were meeting the EFFC qualification standards. Maurice noted that he thought it would be difficult to get cooperation from the national qualification bodies as they are not linked with the industry. Ciaran agreed with this stating that hopefully the harmonisation approach might weaken political objections.

Bob noted that the CPCS etc. are testing bodies not training bodies. This might mean that the notified bodies are not necessary. Ciaran said that the notified body would be necessary for the EU to accept it as an official standard. Ciaran also noted that if the EFFC were to set up the project without the notified body it would require taking on direct administrative responsibilities. Therefore, going to a body like DNV might be better for this.

Chris asked whether it was worth involving UK bodies such as CPCS considering Brexit. Ciaran noted that CPCS and the FPS are already looking into



| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | <p>ways to counter the rig-operator shortage HS2 will create. Both have agreed an EFFC license could be an easier way of getting international workers involved.</p> <p>Chris then suggested that the project could get EU funding which would allow for the project timeline to progress faster. Ciaran noted that Martin has been talking to FIEC extensively about the project and that he may have spoken to them about funding. Andreas agreed to talk to Martin about the issue of EU funding.</p> <p>Jaap commented that he, Martin and Domenico Campogrande had approached the EU about funding. Jaap expressed his concern that they seemed disinterested in funding due to the size of the industry. Nonetheless they did agree to investigate the possibilities and feedback to Domenico. Ciaran agreed to contact Domenico to pursue this line of enquiry.</p> <p>Jaap stated that the contact within the EU Commission advised against interfering with training bodies as it is an extremely difficult option for pushing change. Instead she recommended that the EFFC regulate the level of examination.</p> <p>Chris asked if there has been discussion about rolling the license out to crane operators as well – as a way of increasing EU interest. Jaap noted that there are initiatives for this but because they deal with training, they have not been approved at an EU level.</p> <p>Bob and Jaap concluded that following the path of auditing the testing process would be the favourable option for this project. It was agreed to come back to this topic at the next EFFC Officers meeting.</p> <p>b) What we need from Members</p> <p>Ciaran noted that he had circulated a request for information. This request fell into two categories.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A detailed narrative on the current national qualification process - what is required, who runs them, what other stakeholders are involved. 2) Nominate a national champion to drive the adoption of the scheme in your country <p>Andreas asked what the timeline for this information was. Ciaran noted that having the narrative by the end of May 2020 would be ideal. It was agreed that it may take longer to decide a national champion. Ciaran agreed to circulate this deadline after the meeting.</p> | <p>A Körbler</p> <p>EFFC Secretary</p> <p>EFFC Secretary</p> <p>EFFC Secretary</p> |
| <p>5</p> | <p>Updates from WGs (max 5 slides from each)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability WG (SWG) <p>Chris Harnan started the SWG presentation by saying the group are currently very active – meeting every 6 weeks or so – due to the virtualisation of meetings. Chris then outlined current SWG projects:</p> <p>Influencing FIEC’s Circular Economy Action Plan (CEAP)</p> <p>Chris explained that CEAP’s were first mentioned at European level 5 years ago but that it fell off the radar. Chris noted that he thinks it will now be a permanent</p> | |



feature of discussion due to European green initiatives. Chris mentioned that the SWG's feedback to Sue Arundale (at FIEC) on their CEAP has been well received. Chris commented that the reference to "deep foundations" is a direct output from the SWG's feedback.

Low Carbon Cement Task Group

Chris noted that low carbon cement is currently a big topic in Europe but that it is not openly spoken about. Therefore, the task group is investigating different European projects. The group is also producing a market survey on existing low-carbon cement.

A roadmap to sustainability

Chris noted that this is a development on the materiality matrix documents which was shared to the Executive previously. Chris explained the purpose of this document will be to highlight sustainability measures and plot them on a timeline to provide an overall goal for sustainability.

An EFFC Sustainability 12-month action plan

This plan will include a list of achievable sustainability targets for EFFC members. Chris noted that the SWG have spoken about introducing an EFFC sustainability audit to ensure members actively adopt sustainable practices. Chris concluded that this would need a lot more discussion before being implemented. Chris suggested that a 'soft audit' like the FPS 3-yearly audit would be beneficial.

Andreas asked the timeline on producing the 12-month action plan. Chris said that the group are aiming to produce the action-plan draft, for comment, within the next 6 months. Lorenzo Alessi asked if there would be a section on greenhouse gas emissions as this seems like an important step to increase sustainability. Ciaran agreed with Lorenzo, noting that greenhouse gases will be included in the plan. Ciaran also noted the carbon calculator has provided valuable data on on-site emissions.

Chris noted that that FIEC have started their own Sustainability group separate to TEC-3. The EFFC have put forward members for this and they are currently being integrated into the FIEC intranet.

- [Contracts WG \(CWG\)](#)

Federico Trevisani started his presentation by saying that the CWG have decided to implement a new organisational structure. Federico explained the new approach includes splitting off into three different task groups and then reporting back to the general committee a couple of times a year. This should increase WG productivity and ensure that members are working on topics they are interested in. Federico then outlined the task group work:

Collaborative Working and Digitisation.

Federico stated that collaborative working has previously been worked on by Chris, Dejan and himself. The plan for this group is to update the previous paper taking digitisation (e.g. BIM) into account as this will change the way stakeholders collaborate.



Cash Retention

Federico explained that the WG conducted a cash retention survey last year. The aim of this group will be to use this as a stepping-stone to create an EFFC position on cash retention fair practices. Federico noted that this would have to be approached delicately due to “anti-competition” clauses.

General Contract Conditions

Federico explained that creating an EFFC Contract would be impractical so instead this group will create a document outlining fair contractual practises.

Institutional Presentations

Federico explained the purpose of these presentations will be to inform national federations on the aims and work (past and present) of the WG.

Federico finished his presentation by stating that the task groups have been set-up and that they are currently deciding when to hold initial task group meetings.

Andreas asked whether there would be a leader of each task group. Federico said that each group will nominate their leader in the first meetings. Andreas asked whether the group needs any other support and whether he would be welcome to join the next general committee meeting. Federico welcomed Andreas to the next meeting and invited any others interested to join. Maurice noted that he would nominate a replacement for Wim.

- [Health & Safety WG](#)

Lorenzo started his presentation by stating that the H&S WG had their first meeting of the year on 13/05. They are currently working on the following projects:

Covid-19 best practices

In the members area of the EFFC website ([HERE](#)) the H&S WG has collated a range of documents to help with working during C-19. This will be updated frequently.

Safety Seminars

Lorenzo explained that the group hopes to finalise and be ready to deploy safety seminars to stakeholders by September 2020.

Incident Investigation Training

This initiative sees the WG conduct training for local businesses/members in the location the WG meeting takes place e.g. Madrid in September.

Lifting Operations good practices

Document should be ready to publish in July.

**EFFC
Secretary**

M Bottiau



EFFC golden rules

A simple document to provide best guidance practises to members. Should be ready to publish in July.

There was a lot of discussion about safety statistics and whether it would be beneficial for the EFFC to collect them. Lorenzo felt that collecting statistics would not be beneficial to the group as 'overall safety' and 'accident rates' are different problems. Lorenzo concluded the EFFC should instead focus on reporting safety alerts, HiPOS etc. Ciaran noted that the EFFC used to collect safety stats but only the UK was able to collect these centrally – which led to unrepresentative data. He stressed that it had proved impossible to gain a whole EU commitment to collecting accident data as some Members did not collect it centrally at all and others did not necessarily use the same types of data. Frank, Andreas, and Bob felt that statistics would be beneficial to see the progress that documents (such as the lifting operations good practises) were having in the industry. Chris and Ciaran noted that if FPS members are the only National Federation required by contract to collect safety stats it would be very difficult to administer. Bob and Lorenzo concluded that reporting near misses and lessons learnt would be the best practice for the moment.

- [Technical WG](#)

David started his presentation by noting that the TWG meet once a year. The meeting has been postponed until Autumn as the group did not want to meet virtually. Nonetheless projects have been ongoing:

Eurocode 7

Ongoing subject which is going through a comprehensive rewrite. The groups drafting these documents are finalising now. Clearly still some fundamental disagreements between countries which need to be worked through. The chair is hoping for consensus before publication. Probably 2-3 years away from publication.

Execution standards

Deep mixing and Ground Treatment by deep vibration up for review.

Water tightness documents

The diaphragm document was published and circulated for review. Two members responded - one in detail another more generic. This group will need to be reconvened to review feedback and implement changes before the secant wall document can be written.

Frank asked if new members could be involved in this group and when the next meeting is scheduled. David noted that new members were welcome and that the next meeting has not been set yet.

EN206

Currently in early stages of lobbying to align Appendix D of EN206 with the Tremie Guide. This could be achieved through membership of TC288.



| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on R&D Support Fluids Project <p>Support Fluids</p> <p>Chris noted there is little to report due to C-19 restrictions. He said 5 sites have been tested: 2 in America (LA & Texas) and 3 in Europe (Denmark, Belgium & London). All the equipment has been purchased/borrowed and is ready to use. The budget is in line with estimated costs and income.</p> <p>Chris noted his concern that the Tremie guide is not being distributed effectively within EFFC member organisations and that it should be circulated properly. This is especially true considering it has been adopted successfully by the US core of engineers.</p> <p>The Federal Highways Authority (FHWA)</p> <p>Karsten Beckhaus explained that the EFFC were approached via the DFI to review a draft report for cast-in-place concrete for below ground application. EFFC tasks groups have provided feedback on this document in line with the understanding in the Tremie Guide. Chris noted that the FHWA approaching the EFFC for feedback shows their respect for the Tremie Guide. Reiterating the importance of implementing it within the EFFC.</p> <p>Andreas agreed that EFFC papers should be advertised in a more efficient way. Chris mentioned that maybe the Tremie Guide could be promoted via seminars to the National Federations. Andreas agreed to ask the Austrian federation if they are interested in this.</p> <p>R&D Additional Skin Friction Project</p> <p>Chris explained that two German universities are researching the effects of support fluids on shaft friction elements. Chris explained that Karsten has gained sponsors for the project (75,000EUR) so there will be zero cost to the EFFC but everyone is happy for it to be conducted under the DFI/EFFC umbrella. The contracts are ready and now all that is needed is executive approval.</p> <p>The EFFC Secretary agreed to circulate the project proposal. Members agreed that, if no objections/responses were returned, the project be granted implicit approval.</p> | <p>A Körbler</p> <p>EFFC Secretary</p> |
| 6 | <p>Financial Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial round-up from 2019 <p><u>General Income and Expenses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budgeted for surplus of €250 but ran into a deficit of €804 - Additional costs came from slightly higher audit fees and increased meeting costs (partly to do with the creation of the SWG) - These figures reflect that the federation is still running at a higher rate of expenditure than income – one of the reasons that AM's were introduced <p><u>Special Projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall surplus meant to be €200 but instead was €5,912 - Some budgets went over (e.g. TC151 WG3) | |



| | | |
|----------|---|---------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rig Safety standard budget will need to be revised as more works are needed than first thought - Overall cost in line with expectations <p>Overall the EFFC had a €5,108 surplus for 2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial report for 2020 <p><u>Subscriptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For 2020 the financial forecast is not clear yet due to C-19 - Still waiting for second half of 2020 subscriptions to come through but current revenue from subscriptions is in line with expectations - A few 'aged' subscriptions invoices from previous years are being chased and should be balanced by the end of June <p>Chris stated that he felt it was important to keep the Associate Member's updated/advised to make them feel they are part of the EFFC. Chris noted that Optimise had expressed some concerns to him about the value of their membership. Ciaran agreed that it is important to maintain relationships with all members. Ciaran then mentioned that he has been in direct contact with Optimise both last year when the concerns were originally raised and more recently about a proposal for EFFC members and setting up a digital WG to look at creating a data standard for contractors in Europe.</p> <p>Chris suggested that a bi-monthly newsletter might be a good way of tackling this. The EFFC secretary agreed to investigate this and put membership relations on the agenda for the next Officers meeting.</p> | EFFC Secretary |
| 7 | <p>AOB</p> <p>Hold the date for the EFFC DFI Conference in Berlin 18-21 May 2022. It was agreed that after a committee meeting later in the year a request for volunteers will be issued.</p> <p>Jaap noted that if the Executive wants to hold a meeting in October the NVAF would be able to host the meeting. Both the President and Secretary thanked Jaap and the NVAF for agreeing to host the AGM should it be possible to hold it as a physical event.</p> | All |
| | <p>Date of next meeting:</p> <p>8-9th October, 2020 (TBC)</p> | |