



**A Meeting of the EFFC Council held virtually (via Cisco Webex) on Thursday
8th October 2020, between 09:00-13:30 (BST)/10:00-14:30 (CET).**

President: Andreas Körbler	Austria
Senior Vice President: Serge Borel	France
Immediate Past President: José Candela	Spain

Officers:

Bob Thompson	UK
Boris Von Luebtow	Germany
Fabrizio Leoni	Italy

Working Group Chairs:

Federico Trevisani (Contracts)	Italy
Lorenzo Alessi (Health & Safety)	France
Chris Harnan (Sustainability)	UK

Members:

Maurice Bottiau	Belgium
Luke Deamer	UK
Rasin Duzceer	Turkey
Jaap Estié	Netherlands
Frank Haehnig	Germany
Dejan Lukic	Switzerland
Tamás Kaltenbacher	Hungary
Stefan Lahme	Germany
David Major	UK
Przemysław Nowak	Poland
Thomas Pirkner	Austria
Jindrich Ricia	Czech Republic
Jim De Waele	UK
Stig Weis	Denmark

In attendance:

Peter Arz	Past President EFFC
Ciaran Jennings	EFFC Secretary
Isabel Jennings	EFFC Secretariat

Owners	Actions
J Estié	Create an outline of the Rig-Operator goals
C Jennings	Set up meeting with Andreas and Jaap to compile formal budget & business case
All	Nominate representatives from their National Federation who would be interested in joining an ECG committee
C Jennings	Co-ordinate ECG volunteers
C Jennings F Trevisani	Speak with contracts WG regards – COVID-19 best practices
D Lukic	Translate Swiss sustainability standard for sustainability working group
I Jennings	Circulate safety seminar information to executive council
C Jennings L Alessi	Discuss H&S WG webinar
C Jennings	Ask David Hard and Marc Verlinden to collate a list of intentions re the TWG work on corrosion and splicing cages
C Jennings C Harnan	Discuss Tremie Guide webinar

Minutes	
1.	<p>Welcome & Legal Compliance statement</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 to engage in fixing markets or project pricing.</p>
2.	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>David Hard (UK), Carlos Vazquez (Romania), Peter Vroom (Netherlands), Marc Verlinden (Belgium), Göran Svensson (Sweden), Wojciech Szejkowski (Poland), Marc Lacazedieu (France), Dirk Siewert (Germany).</p>
3.	<p>Minutes of the last meeting</p> <p>a) Executive Minutes (May 14th 2020, Virtual) – for information b) AGM Minutes (October 17th-18th 2019, Vienna) – for approval</p> <p>The minutes of the last AGM were proposed by Bob Thompson and seconded by Federico Trevisani and approved.</p>

<p>4.</p>	<p>Report of the President</p> <p>Andreas Körbler started his address by stating that we are currently living in unprecedented times. Andreas noted that holding the EFFC AGM virtually is a first and that, although it does not substitute a physical meeting, this was the best option in these difficult times. Andreas stressed that, despite the circumstances, the group should continue share information as best they can.</p> <p>Andreas noted that the condensed AGM would be a two, two-hour, session with a 30-minute break in between. Andreas explained that the focus of the first session would be on the: work of the Working Groups, the creation of an Early Careers Group, and the next steps for the Rig-Operator License project. He continued to note that the second session would focus on how the EFFC can help the National Federations.</p> <p>Andreas closed his opening statement by thanking everyone for attending and expressed his hope that the group meet in person next October.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Issues requiring a decision</p> <p>The Secretary noted that a set of comprehensive notes (here) on the financial statement and 2021 budget was circulated ahead of the AGM – which has been taken as read. This was done to help utilise the time during the virtual AGM. He noted that this is not an ideal situation and that if anyone has any questions they should email him (at effc@effc.org) and he will set-up a meeting to discuss.</p> <p>a) Finance</p> <p>1. Adoption of the 2019 Accounts</p> <p>i. Resolution: That the 2019 Accounts should be adopted</p> <p>Maurice Bottiau proposed the EFFC 2019 accounts. Federico Trevisani seconded this.</p> <p>2. Appointment of Auditor</p> <p>i. Resolution: that Crane & Partners be reappointed as auditors of the EFFC accounts.</p> <p>Frank Haehnig proposed the appointment of Crane & Partners as auditors of the EFFC accounts. Federico Trevisani seconded this.</p> <p>3. Financial Statement to Aug 2020</p> <p>The top line summary of the financial statement is that, owing to COVID-19, the EFFC is currently projecting a €23,000 surplus in the general fund. This reduces the overall deficit in the general fund.</p> <p>4. 2021 Budget and Subscriptions</p> <p>Ciaran noted that the biggest investment for 2021 will be the Rig-Operator Driving License (see section 6). It was noted that travel and meeting expenses have been reduced due to C-19.</p> <p>b) Confirmation of the Officers</p> <p>1. President – Andreas Körbler (Austria - Keller)</p> <p>2. Senior Vice President – Serge Borel (France - Soletanche Bachy)</p>	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Officer – Bob Thompson (UK - Keller) 4. Officer – Boris Von Luebtow (Germany - Züblin) 5. Officer – Fabrizio Leoni (Italy - Trevi Spa) 6. Immediate Past President – José Candela (Spain - Terratest) <p>Frank Haehnig proposed. Federico Trevisani seconded this.</p> <p>Dejan asked, for transparency reasons, whether the company names of the Officers could be highlighted in the minutes. Andreas noted that whilst acting as an Officer they represent the countries not companies, but that he was happy to disclose the information (see above).</p>	
6.	<p>EFFC Rig-Operator License Scheme</p> <p>The President stated that the EFFC has been talking about this project for many years without much progress. To try and move this project forward Andreas explained that he has approached Jaap Estié to champion the project on behalf of the EFFC. This was due to Jaap’s ongoing involvement in creating a bilateral approach to recognition of rig operator qualifications between the Netherlands and Belgium, his familiarity with the EFFC question set and the project to date as well as his ability to liaise with FIEC and the EU.</p> <p>Andreas invited Jaap to present to the group – (presentation here)</p> <p>a) Proposal & discussion of member involvement</p> <p>To start his presentation Jaap did a quick overview of the status of the project. Jaap noted that, since the last AGM, there has been little progress but that the exams are nearly finished and will soon need to be proofread and finalised. Jaap explained that, earlier in the year, the National Federations were asked to appoint a ‘national champion’ to help the project. Jaap noted that there are still some federations which need to appoint a champion. Jaap explained that by the end of Q4 2020 all national champions need to have been nominated as he plans to set-up meetings between the national champions, FIEC and the EU Commission. Jaap proposed that the national champions should meet at least 6 times a year to maintain project momentum. Jaap remarked that these meetings will hopefully be a mix of virtual and physical meetings to help build a strong working relationship.</p> <p>Jaap noted that he, Martin Sonneberger and a FIEC representative had a meeting with Tina Heremans (at the EU commission) in January 2020. Jaap explained that the aim of the meeting was to assess funding possibilities, but they have not heard back from Tina yet. Jaap noted that they would have to approach the EU again in 2021 (via FIEC) to see if they can get funding. Jaap rationalised that this is an important step for the project to succeed as it is the fastest way of getting the license recognised in each country.</p> <p>Jaap explained that other next steps include finding a notified body to compare prices and quality – it was mentioned that the group already has some contacts within DNV. Also, as decided at the last executive meeting, a management committee needs to be formed to help oversee the project. Jaap commented that this committee needs to coordinate with other FIEC committees.</p> <p>To conclude Jaap commented that this project will take time and commitment to succeed but that he is positive that the group can make it work.</p>	

b) Member's approval of the scheme

Andreas thanked Jaap and noted that the group needs to get access to the right people within FIEC to obtain project funding. Jaap advised he will continue to contact Sue Arundale and Domenico Campogrande for updates from the EU.

Maurice stated that he thinks it would be beneficial for the group to pursue mutual recognition as well as EU funding. Jaap agreed, saying that previous work has proven there are many similarities between adjacent countries e.g. between Belgium/Netherlands/Germany. Maurice stated that, considering these similarities, it has been very difficult to obtain mutual recognition. Maurice suggested the EFFC should aim to help in any way we can.

Frank Haehnig advised that going via FIEC would take another 5 years and suggested the EFFC group should continue finalising the exams, approve them as an EFFC standard, and then get member companies to adopt them. Frank acknowledged that it could be difficult to find a certified body (in each country) for this route. Jaap agreed that this could be a potential route forward – as the national champions will have the relevant contacts in each country. Jaap noted that he and Martin have held meetings with certified bodies and that the quote for certification is small (€85/certificate). Jaap noted that if the certification company can also do the audit (quoted at ~€1300-1400/day) this would keep the cost for the project low. Both Jaap and Frank concluded that an EFFC scheme, with EFFC exams, upholding a general EFFC standard, should be accepted across borders.

Maurice and Frank expressed surprise that the group had only received 8 responses to the call for national champions. Frank was curious if this indicates a lack of enthusiasm from the EFFC member countries. Serge explained that, in France, it is difficult to raise the license as an issue as there is no clear structure or end goal. Serge suggested that, now a small core-group has been formed, a short document outlining the project goals should be compiled and circulated to the National Federations. Jaap agreed to get the group of national champions to pull this document together. Dejan suggested that the national champions (or “co-ordinators”) should be from training centres to harmonise thinking.

Dejan noted that the EFFC have not had any formal voting on the content of the rig-operator license. Dejan suggested that the National Federation's should have a 1-2 month period to accept or reject the project. Then the EFFC would have a clear mandate. Frank stated that this would only act as a way of slowing down the project. Frank continued to explain that the working group has approved all meeting minutes, and therefore the decision made within them, so the group can assume a mandate from them.

Chris asked whether a formal budget has been published for this project. Ciaran noted that a place holder of €20,000 has been allocated from the special project fund and that the next step is for Jaap to formalise the budget/milestones. Chris explained that, to formally approve the budget allocation, the group needs to have a detailed understanding of the budget commitments. Fabrizio agreed that it would be best to define the targets for 2021 onwards and then hold a vote on the budget. Andreas commented that the real question is whether the council agrees that the EFFC should invest in this project – even if the amount is still being decided. Maurice suggested the group could raise their hand to show support but was disappointed that the council are having this discussion again after years of work on this project. Chris

J Estié

	<p>noted that these are two separate issues. Chris explained that the project and its principles are approved but that the specific funding commitments need to be approved separately. Ciaran suggested that the group temporarily remove the budget allocation of €20,000 whilst he, Andreas and Jaap go away and compile a budget/business case.</p> <p>The group agreed that, once a business case has been formalised, the group would look to vote on its approval. In the meantime, Frank asked for the exam finalisation to continue – as this will not need money from the budget.</p>	<p>J Estié A Körbler C Jennings</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Early Careers Group Presentation</p> <p>Ciaran explained that the Federation of Piling Specialist (in the UK) have recently established an Early Careers Group (ECG) which has been transformative for the federation. Ciaran noted that he has invited the leader of this group, David Major, to present on the work of the group to see whether the EFFC would be interested in creating their own ECG.</p> <p>Ciaran invited David to present to the group – (presentation here)</p> <p>a) Presentation from FPS Early Careers Group leader</p> <p>David started by thanking the group for letting him come and present.</p> <p>David explained that the group was formed as he, and many of his peers, found that their voice was not being heard within the industry. David continued to explain that the aim of the group is to help young professionals progress their careers and share valuable information with one another. Over the past few months, the ECG has developed webinars, meetings and podcasts to help young professionals get involved in the industry.</p> <p>b) Discussion – should the EFFC start an ECG?</p> <p>Andreas thanked David for his presentation and welcomed the idea of an EFFC ECG. Serge seconded this, calling it a great initiative. Serge continued by asking David how the group attracted members and whether it was open to any young professional. David stated that, to start, members had been hand-picked from companies but that more had now joined. David noted that all members have had endorsement from their companies – as it takes a lot of time to go forward and interact with the group properly.</p> <p>Chris Harnan commented that an ECG could be a brilliant way of disseminating information throughout the industry. David agreed with Chris – noting that the FPS group shares EFFC/FPS guidance amongst its members.</p> <p>Bob Thompson noted that a big part of the group’s success is that David has been a highly motivated leader and organiser. Bob suggested that maybe a couple of EFFC young professionals could get involved with the FPS group for inspiration. Maurice agreed that this could be incredibly beneficial but advised that language might be a barrier to the group. Maurice stressed that the group should be <i>European</i> and not <i>too British</i>. David agreed and suggested that he would be in favour of getting an information flow between the FPS ECG and an EFFC ECG or other similar groups in Member countries.</p> <p>Jaap noted that, in the Netherlands, they have a similar group for young professionals. The group meets up to 3 times a year and has an age limit of 40</p>	

	<p>years old. David noted that the FPS ECG request >15 years' experience. Jaap noted it might be beneficial for these two groups to unite to produce information. Dejan also noted that they have a similar group in Switzerland who approach universities and offer a week work experience on site. Serge explained that, in France, they have a young professional's group but that this is primarily for young designers and science/technical professionals. Serge praised David for approaching the business side of the career path. David thanked Serge and noted that this approach to developing the business skills of the ECG members was a key driver in the ECG.</p> <p>Maurice and Federico noted that it would be good for each National Federations to have their own ECG which come together to share at the <i>umbrella</i> EFFC group. Federico continued to say that this would be beneficial as would help young professionals focus on the issue of cross-border working.</p> <p>The group agreed to go away and Nominate representatives from their National Federation who would be interested in joining an ECG committee</p>	All
8.	<p>Working Group Presentations</p> <p>a) Contracts</p> <p>Andreas invited Federico to present to the group – (presentation here)</p> <p>Federico explained that, since the last AGM, the Contracts WG has re-organised its structure and has split into three task groups – Cash Retentions, Collaborative Working & Digitisation, and General Contract Conditions. These groups have been focused on producing new EFFC guidance.</p> <p>Federico explained that the Cash Retentions group is looking to define a position paper to share with FIEC. Federico noted that ideally, they would like to lobby for the complete removal of cash retentions in the industry.</p> <p>Federico stated that the Collaborative Working & Digitisation group is looking to improve understanding of digitisation and BIM. Federico noted the group has been struggling to define the best way to approach this – should they try and influence via FIEC and Building Smart International, or aim to educate the National Federations?</p> <p>Federico explained that the General Contract Conditions group is looking to compile a best practise document for National Federation's to use as a template for contract conditions.</p> <p>Federico stated that it would be useful to have the National Federation's answer his questions - on the last slide of his presentation. Isabel Jennings agreed to circulate these for response after the meeting.</p> <p>Fabrizio mentioned that the Officers had been discussing whether it would be beneficial for the Contracts WG to address the contractual issues arising from COVID-19. Fabrizio commented that the aim of the guidance would be to help smaller companies without dedicated law departments. Fabrizio noted that Federico had done a similar task from Trevi SPA, in Italy, and might be best placed to do this for the EFFC. Federico noted that they had discussed this at the Contract WG meeting in May but that the group had agreed it would be too difficult to produce – due to varying regulations and government guidelines. Bob, Fabrizio, and Andreas agreed that it would be difficult but, as these</p>	I Jennings

circumstances are no longer a force majeure event, it would be beneficial to have an EFFC best practice document. Bob suggested that a short paper reviewing best/worst practice might be the simplest way to approach it. Andreas asked Federico to consider the possibilities for providing this guidance. It was agreed that Ciaran and Federico would pick this up outside of the meeting.

b) Sustainability

Andreas invited Chris to present to the group – ([presentation here](#))

Chris started his presentation by noting that the Sustainability Working Group currently has 10-12 very active members, have been holding video calls every 2 months and have recently had big successes when it comes to influencing FIEC. Chris noted that the group has representatives on TEC-3 and FIEC's new sustainability working group.

Chris advised that the European Green Deal is quickly making sustainability an unavoidable issue for the industry. This is increased by Arup and others (e.g. the HS2 project in the UK) starting to actively propose carbon pre-qualifications. Chris warned that the option is to adapt or disappear. Chris welcomed Luke (one of the most active members of the working group) to present his recent "what is sustainability" presentation from an FPS webinar on the EFFC Carbon Calculator (the full webinar can be found [here](#)).

Luke thanked Chris for his introduction. Luke stressed that sustainability needs to be viewed holistically – including environmental, social, and economic criteria. Luke overviewed the European legislation and the growing importance of sustainability for procurement. Luke also noted that sustainability is a big issue for young professionals and that greater sustainability might attract more young professionals into the new EFFC ECG.

Chris continued his presentation by confronting the Executive council, saying they were more interested in *business as usual* than accepting sustainable change. Chris commented that only four National Federation's quoted sustainability as a key issue. Chris expressed his annoyance at the *business as usual* stance of the Officers whilst discussing the working group's suggestion of creating a sustainability audit. Chris concluded that, without a full re-commitment to achieving sustainability, he was no longer willing to chair the working group.

Andreas asked Chris what he wants the EFFC council to do in this regard. Chris explained that he wants reasonable, considered, responses to any working group proposals. Chris commented that it was unfair for people to invest time into creating new guidance if this is not then promoted and adopted by the EFFC.

Dejan voiced his support for the sustainability working group, noting that many companies are guilty of *green washing*. Dejan noted that changing procurement requirements will require companies to adapt. Bob also stated his support of Chris, suggesting that it might be worth deciding what the EFFC wants to measure – with regards a "sustainability audit". Chris noted that the working group are already discussing different measurement criteria and that what he really needs is a commitment from the executive to adopt if reasonable.

Serge thanked Chris for being so direct with the Council. Serge commented that companies have varying levels of sustainability but that most are starting to

C Jennings
F Trevisani

	<p>investigate sustainable working. Serge noted that he thought collecting KPI data would be difficult.</p> <p>Lorenzo advised that the EFFC needs to create a culture of sustainability and not only focus on data collection. Lorenzo suggested that the group should start with the basics e.g. explaining sustainability, cement composition etc. Lorenzo also suggested the EFFC run an environmental award which aims to promote new, simple, and practical steps to enhance sustainability. Bob suggested that this award be framed as a “sustainable alternative solution” as responses could then be used as an educational resource and to promote expertise. Andreas agreed that this would be a good bottom-up exercise.</p> <p>Dejan noted that, in Switzerland, they have created an open network of sustainability which includes clients and contractors. This group has come together to create a standard for sustainability. Dejan noted that this is currently written only in German but that he would translate and present to the sustainability working group.</p> <p>Luke noted that an easy way to collect this data is by using the scope 1+2 emissions data – as all large companies are required (by European Law) to declare these annually. Serge agreed it would be easier to monitor these but asked how this would be compared – e.g. hours worked, concrete used etc. Luke noted that either of these would work. Serge commented that people would be unwilling to engage with the mathematical requirements of this. Ciaran noted that the carbon calculator functionality could be used as a way of benchmarking sustainability.</p> <p>Chris accepted that it might be difficult to get data from everyone but that the act of recording/calculating should encourage companies to start reducing carbon consumption. Chris asked the group whether they would submit data if the working group devised a reasonable data request. Chris noted that any data collected could be anonymised and would not be used to name and shame. Stig noted that Denmark would be happy to submit data – as they have been recording for many years. Stig continued to say that you need to see the figures before you know what you are tackling – it can be as simple as education of drivers to turn off machines when not in use.</p> <p>Lorenzo noted that this collection could be produced at a company level but asked how this would work at National Federation level. Chris acknowledged that that, realistically, this would only work on a company level.</p> <p>Chris asked the group whether anyone had objections to providing this information when the sustainability working group asks for it. Bob noted that he could not commit from a national federation stance but could from a company perspective. Dejan noted that, as a representative of a National Federation, he would try but could not promise. Overall, there were no objections from the council.</p> <p>Andreas thanked Chris for challenging the group to commit to sustainability.</p> <p>c) Technical</p> <p>Ciaran noted that neither David Hard nor Marc Verlinden were able to attend and present on behalf of the Technical WG.</p>	<p>D Lukic</p>
--	--	----------------

	<p>f) Health & Safety</p> <p>Andreas invited Lorenzo to present to the group – (presentation here)</p> <p>Lorenzo explained that his presentation covers the H&S Working Groups main points of interest.</p> <p>Lorenzo explained that the group have compiled a one-hour <i>Health and Safety Seminar</i> which they hope to present at universities. This seminar aims to embed a good health and safety culture within young professionals. Lorenzo noted that COVID-19 has caused a delay in deploying the material. Lorenzo explained that, in the meantime, the group is looking to promote a slightly shorter presentation as a working group webinar. Lorenzo stated that their <i>accident investigation training</i> has been paused due to COVID-19 but could also be conducted as a webinar/virtual series. Lorenzo concluded that this would not have the same impact but could still be beneficial.</p> <p>Lorenzo commented that, at the last Executive meeting, it was agreed collecting safety alerts would be a beneficial way to disperse information about high potential incidents. The group has created a template for these and are now being uploaded (monthly) to the EFFC Members Area.</p> <p>Lorenzo explained that the group are looking to produce 10 golden rules of health and safety. The aim of this work will be to help smaller companies improve their safety standards.</p> <p>Lorenzo closed his presentation by stating that the activity of the working group members is poor. Lorenzo suggested that the group be made smaller and that only committed members should be invited to join.</p> <p>Andreas asked whether the working group could circulate the seminar information to the EFFC before presenting. Lorenzo agreed but noted that the presentation material has already been reviewed twice and that he would prefer no more changes to be made. Andreas also asked whether this information could be distributed to the wider membership. Lorenzo noted that this material is intended to be a presentation and not a standalone guidance. Lorenzo explained that each member of the working group will be trained to present this material, then they will go back to the National Federations. Lorenzo suggested that it might be beneficial for this presentation to be made to the new EFFC ECG.</p> <p>Maurice noted it would be good to try and get this information outside the membership – as it would benefit the whole sector. Lorenzo agreed, noting that the presentation is meant to be accessible/simple for the general public to understand. Ciaran noted that other Forum Court webinars had gained a wide international audience, so would expect a similar outcome if this were presented as a webinar.</p>	
9.	30 MINUTE BREAK	

10. National Federations

a) Round-table discussion of key issues

Ciaran provided a quick overview of the collated National Federation issues ([here](#)). He noted that a lot of the issues were country specific but that there were 3 points which were overarching:

1. Cross-border working
2. Helping smaller companies benefit from information from the EFFC
3. Knowledge transfer between National Federations

Andreas asked the group whether there were any further comments:

Austria – Andreas noted he had no further comment.

Belgium – Maurice noted that all major topics have been covered. Maurice also noted that the federation is currently trying to raise “proudness” of the sector.

Czech Republic – Jindrich had microphone trouble and was unable to comment.

Denmark – Stig noted he had no further comment.

France – Serge commented that maintaining activities and creating a COVID-19 recovery plan are currently SOFFONS key issues.

Germany – Boris noted that conducting a Carbon Calculator webinar may be useful to promote its use.

Hungary – Tamás noted that they are currently internally re-organising the federation. Hopeful that this will help re-invigorate the federation and its work.

Italy – Federico noted he had no further comment.

Netherlands – Jaap noted he had no further comment.

Poland – Przemysław noted that they have been working on improving working platforms. He noted that they expect effective changes will be enforced shortly.

Romania – José commented (on behalf of Romania) that they are currently working on making the federation sustainable as organisation by getting the members to collaborate more fully.

Spain – José noted they primarily worried about the impact of COVID-19 on activity.

Sweden – No representative to report.

Switzerland – Dejan noted that main issues are around procurement changes and sustainability.

Turkey – Have just finished creating a Turkish federation and are looking to join the EFFC as a full member in 2021.

	<p>UK – Bob noted that they are finding issues with workforce due to COVID-19 “association” – opposed to themselves contracting the virus.</p> <p>b) Questions</p> <p>Members had no questions to report.</p>	
11.	<p>Questions from Associate Members</p> <p>Ciaran stated that Optimise would like to offer EFFC members a free 120-day trial of their software platform – Kapiro Cloud. Ciaran noted that he is still in discussion with Optimise about this and would circulate for approval once a decision had been made. It was mentioned that Optimise could conduct a webinar on how to use the software in collaboration with the contracts working group digitisation task group.</p> <p>Ciaran also noted that (in the light of COVID-19) he is working with the Officers on making associate membership more valuable for current members.</p>	
12.	<p>DFI-EFFC Conference (Berlin 2022)</p> <p>Ciaran explained that the conference now has a working title - “Smart Geotechnical Solutions”. This was chosen as it allows for a wide spectrum of topics to be covered – e.g. sustainability, digitalisation, collaborative working, design, and build. This should help increase client and contractor involvement. It was noted that specific session chairs/topics have not been confirmed yet.</p>	
13.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>It was agreed that the group should assume that the next EFFC Executive meeting will be virtual, but that the AGM will be a physical meeting. Andreas noted that if the AGM is held physically it would be in France.</p> <p>José warmly thanked Peter for his attendance. Peter commented that he was very happy to have been able to join the AGM virtually and that he was interested to hear the current work of the federation.</p>	
14.	<p>Date of the next meeting</p> <p>a) Executive: 22nd April 2021 – Virtual</p> <p>b) AGM: 7th- 8th October 2021 – France TBC</p>	