



A Meeting of the EFFC Executive Committee held on Thursday 22nd April 2021 from 09:00-12:00 (BST) / 10:00-13:00 (CET) via Cisco WebEx.

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

Officers:

Bob Thompson	UK
Fabrizio Leoni	Italy

Working Group Chairs:

Federico Trevisani (Contracts)	Italy
David Major (Early Careers)	UK
Lorenzo Alessi (Health & Safety)	France
Chris Harnan (Sustainability)	UK
David Hard (Technical)	UK

Members:

Björn Böhle	Germany
Maurice Bottiau	Belgium
Rasin Duzceer	Turkey
Jaap Estié	Netherlands
Dejan Lukic	Switzerland
Tamás Kaltenbacher	Hungary
David Major	UK
Gábor Makkos	Hungary
Joao Pina	Portugal
Thomas Pirkner	Austria
Cyril Plomteux	France

In attendance:

Ciaran Jennings	EFFC Secretary
Isabel Jennings	EFFC Secretariat

Owner	Actions	Date
Jaap Estié EFFC Secretariat	Organise a meeting between the leaders of the EFFC Rig Operator Licence project and the EFFC Officers	ASAP
EFFC Secretariat	Schedule an EFFC Officers meeting so that the new structure of quarterly Executive meetings can be finalised	ASAP
Chris Harnan	Present to the DFI SWG and see whether a joint sustainability group would be beneficial	30 th April
Chris Harnan EFFC Secretariat	Confirm that all the National Federation's SWG's are represented at the EFFC SWG	ASAP
All Executive Committee	Review the EFFC Strategy document and provide feedback for the next Executive meeting	Next Meeting

MINUTES		
	<p>Welcome & Legal Compliance Statement</p> <p>Andreas Körbler invited members to the 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>Jindřich ŘIČICA (Czech Republic); Stig Weis (Denmark); Boris von Luebtow (Germany); Frank Haehnig (Germany); Wojciech Szwejkowski (Poland); Przemysław Nowak (Poland)</p>	
2.	<p>Approval of Minutes of the previous meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were approved.</p>	
3.	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) EFFC Rig Operator License</p> <p>Jaap noted that last December the theoretical and practical examinations were finalised.</p> <p>Jaap stated that in February he and Martin Sonneberger presented the project to the FIEC SOC-1 committee. Following this presentation, it was agreed to form two task groups, one for employers and one for the trade unions, to review the project. Jaap noted that they have met some resistance from the trade unions as they are worried about the impact of the license on cross-border working. It was noted that FIEC are still in the process of organising the task group meetings.</p> <p>Jaap noted that on the 11-12th of May they plan to meet at the Bauer training centre to sit the practical exam. Jaap explained that the primary aim of this meeting was to 'train the trainer'. Jaap noted, after this, he then plans to have a meeting with all the national co-ordinators to share the project's progress.</p> <p>Andreas asked whether Jaap and Martin would still like to meet with the Officers to review the presentation for the trade unions. Jaap explained that it would be good to meet with the Officer ASAP so they can overcome the trade union hurdle.</p> <p>Jaap agreed to contact the EFFC Secretariat to confirm when the trade union presentation will be. The EFFC Secretariat agreed to set up a meeting with the Officers before this date.</p>	<p>J Estié EFFC Secretariat</p>

b) Working Platform Guide

Ciaran explained that the joint EFFC-DFI group is continuing with further research, following the publication of the [first edition of the guide](#). Ciaran noted that Jim De Waele will feedback any progress at the EFFC AGM in October.

c) DFI-EFFC Conference Berlin 2022

Andreas commented that the organising committee are meeting monthly to plan the conference. Ciaran noted that this conference will be produced in a similar format to Rome (2018) with the shared commercial risk/reward being 25% EFFC - 75% DFI. Ciaran also noted that the budget has not been confirmed yet, due to C-19, but the intention is to make this a hybrid-event with the same cost for virtual/physical attendance. Maurice and Andreas stressed the importance of virtual attendance in the wake of C-19.

It was noted that 106 abstracts have been submitted so far. Andreas explained that the next step is to appoint 9-12 session chairs to review the papers.

Ciaran commented that the group would like to encourage involvement from young professionals and explained that David Major is helping with the Early Careers Group involvement. Maurice commented that it would be good to have a separate young professionals' session as this was an extremely successful feature of the Rome conference.

Maurice commented that the most successful conferences are those which had great support from the local National Federation (NF). Maurice noted that, so far, the HDB support has been good.

d) EFFC Officers term extension

Jaap noted that the success of the EFFC is primarily driven by physical meetings where members come together to collaborate. The group acknowledged that this has not been possible for the past year. Jaap therefore proposed that the current Officers have their terms extended by 1-year to allow them to have continuity as the industry comes out of the pandemic and allow the President to have a three year term so that his term is not completely consumed by running the EFFC virtually without proper interaction with the members.

Ciaran asked Jaap whether he felt the extension should be permanent, or just a temporary measure. Jaap expressed his view that a fixed 3-year term would allow for Presidents to better adjust to the role and impact change. It was noted that the term length is within the jurisdiction of the EFFC Executive so was opened for discussion.

	<p>Maurice acknowledged the 2-year presidency does feel short when you are president. However, the continuity of the federation’s work lies predominantly with the Secretariat and the Executive as opposed to the President/Officers. Maurice noted that the 2-year term is a long time to juggle other business obligations.</p> <p>Chris commented that he would be happy for the current Officers team to extend their term by 1-year. Chris agreed with Maurice that 2-years is more than enough and that anything longer may put people off volunteering. Bob suggested that the group continue to have 2-year terms with the option to extend by 1-year if the Executive committee approve.</p> <p>Chris also warned that C-19 has slowed the work of the federation and damaged communication. Chris suggested that, instead of two 3-hour video conferences a year, the group meet more frequently (maybe monthly/quarterly) for a maximum of 90 minutes. Chris noted that this would allow for work to continue at a good pace. Andreas commented that the Officers meet frequently so can understand the appetite of the Executive to meet more often.</p> <p>Andreas asked whether the group would like to commit to quarterly meetings. The group agreed. It was agreed the Officers would meet after the Executive meeting and discuss the meeting programme and when they should be held.</p> <p>Bob suggested that the Associate Members should also be invited to ‘every other’ meeting to share their initiatives. The EFFC Secretariat agreed to schedule an Officers meeting in May to discuss the executive programme. Another executive meeting would then be scheduled for June/July.</p>	<p>EFFC Secretariat</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Sustainability</p> <p>a) Presentation – available here.</p> <p>a. EU Taxonomy</p> <p>Chris started his presentation by explaining that sustainability and finance are now heavily intertwined. Chris noted that in the EU budget €500 billion has been put aside for sustainable expenditure.</p> <p>Chris commented that a Harvard Business School review has shown that Environmental, Social, and Corporate Governance (ESG) funds are growing exponentially.</p> <p>Chris noted that EU taxonomy is aiming to provide a unified classification for ‘green’ and ‘sustainable’ funds. This will likely pressure other funds (e.g., in the UK, USA etc.) to conform to this framework and will hopefully stop the ‘greenwashing’ of businesses.</p>	

Chris explained that the EU taxonomy legislation requires larger companies to report more detailed sustainability metrics. These will then be reviewed by investment managers to show their investors the complete impact generated by their investment. This legislation will also require each financial product to state which environmental objective ([of which there are 6](#)) it is 'contributing substantially' to, and for the project to 'do no significant harm' (DNSH) to any of the other 5. Chris commented that there are also plans to include minimum social safeguards but that these are not currently included.

Chris explained that all financial institutions are likely to conform to this framework. This is because the EIB and all green fund banks and suppliers will insist you meet taxonomy requirements to access finance, which is likely to be at a lower interest rate than non-sustainable finance. Bob asked who makes the decisions on what a sustainable company is. Chris explained that this will be based on the metrics – including a company's Scope 1-3 emissions. Chris stressed that SME's will not be exempt from this as the reporting of Scope 3 emissions will directly impact the supply-chain and therefore SME work.

Chris noted that FIEC is heavily involved with the Sustainable Finance Platform who have a big part to play in setting up EU taxonomy. Chris stated that he can circulate more detailed information on EU taxonomy to those who want it.

b. EFFC Sustainability Roadmap

It was noted that the Sustainability WG (SWG) are meeting every 1-2 months. Chris explained that the group are working on an EFFC sustainability roadmap following the commitment from the Executive to collecting KPI data where sensible. This roadmap will include a series of 'how to' guides to help companies make progress.

Chris explained that the group is using the [17 UN Sustainable Development Goals \(SDGs\)](#) to frame the EFFC Sustainability Roadmap. It was explained that the group have prioritised 5 initial SDGs but that they would like the order to be reviewed yearly at the EFFC AGM. It was suggested that this section of the AGM could also be used to track action.

Chris explained that the current framework of the roadmap is What → Why → How → Measure approach.

“What” is this area sustainability? “Why” should I improve? “How” do I improve? And what should be used to “measure” this improvement?”

Chris outlined SDG 13 (climate action) as an example of the suggested KPI collection requirements. Chris noted that initially EFFC

member companies will be required to report their scope 1 and 2 emissions per €million revenue and per thousand hours worked. These metrics are already reported by many companies under EU transparency directive requirements. Then, in 3-5 years' time, EFFC member companies will be asked to also provide carbon calculations using the EFFC carbon calculator as well as scope 3 emissions.

Chris noted that the group are [planning a webinar](#) on the 18th May focusing on the [EFFC Sustainability Overview](#). After this the group plans to create short webinars detailing the importance of each SDG to geotechnical companies.

Chris noted that, before doing any further work, the group need executive approval for/commitment to the following:

- The roadmap and the 'how-to' guides
- Collaboration & sharing of best practices
- Reporting to the KPIs and targets
- The dashboard at National Federation and EFFC level

Finally, Chris noted that the DFI's sustainability work group has come back to life following Biden's election win. Chris explained that he has been contacted by Gerald Verbeek with the intention to either collaborate or create a joint group. Chris noted that he plans to present the same slides to the DFI SWG but that he has not committed to any ongoing collaboration yet. Chris asked group whether they would like the two groups to collaborate or continue the current course.

b) Group Discussion

Bob started discussion by noting that he did not see any harm in working alongside the DFI if the collaboration does not negatively impact the EFFC's progress/ambition. Bob noted that this is especially true if the EU legislation is very focused. Maurice suggested that the EFFC SWG could collaborate with the DFI Europe SWG if the differences in legislation was a problem.

It was noted that the prominence and relevance of the carbon calculator has been increasing. Chris noted that the DFI have not helped to fund the maintenance of the carbon calculator and that this issue has been raised with them. Maurice noted that the benefit of DFI collaboration/funding for the calculator was clear, so further collaboration may help to progress the roadmap work.

Dejan commented that sustainability is more than just environmental issues and is glad the UN SDGs are being used to frame a holistic approach. Dejan commented that he is 100% on board with the roadmap and that sharing best practices is a great way to progress.

	<p>Bob noted that he is worried that clients will continue to focus on price, opposed to sustainability, and will not consider the impacts this could have on a company’s sustainability credentials. Chris agreed with Bob’s fears and commented that EU taxonomy is a chicken and egg transition. Chris continued to say that HS2 is a good example of price not being the only determining factor in procurement.</p> <p>Bob commented that the EFFC, via FIEC, should be looking to influence the big-ticket items for the industry to ensure a suitable framework is implemented. Chris agreed, noting that the EFFC has 4 representatives on the FIEC SWG and representatives on the FIEC taxonomy group. Bob stressed that creating a level playing field with clients will be necessary to make these sustainable initiatives work. Chris agreed, commenting that this will likely be top-down change.</p> <p>Andreas commented that all our companies will want to be involved in the investment packages so we will need to adapt. Andreas noted that he is in full support of the SWG’s plans.</p> <p>The Executive committee gave their commitment to the EFFC sustainability roadmap and the sustainability reporting scheme.</p> <p>Chris confirmed that he would discuss an informal collaboration between the EFFC and DFI on sustainability and would only enter a joint project if there were no negative consequences on the EFFC’s progress. Chris noted that he would consult with the executive committee before any formal steps are taken.</p> <p>Finally, David M asked Chris whether the EFFC SWG has representation from rig manufacturers. David explained that their collaboration is important to align goals – especially if we are considering scope 1-3 emissions as a KPI. Chris conceded that the group are mostly sustainability professionals and agreed it is necessary to invite more contractors. David M also asked whether the SWG has members from each National Federation. Chris noted that he did not know but that he will work with the EFFC Secretariat to check that each are represented at the EFFC group.</p>	<p>C Harnan</p> <p>C Harnan EFFC Secretariat</p>
	15-minute break	
5.	<p>EFFC 5-year Strategy</p> <p>a) Presentation</p> <p>Ciaran explained that the EFFC needs to outline a new 5-year strategy plan as the previous, championed by Hans Bliss, has now expired.</p> <p>Ciaran noted that he and the Officers have been working on a suggested strategy framework. Ciaran stressed that this is a working</p>	

	<p>document which is open for comment. It was also noted that the working groups have not fed their priorities into it yet.</p> <p>Ciaran stated that he would present a quick overview today (here) but that the Executive will need to review and feedback on the full version (here) at the next meeting.</p> <p>b) Group Discussion</p> <p>Dejan commented that he understands the EFFC's wish to get more visibility but warned that there will be a language barrier when it comes to pushing English guidance, webinars etc.</p> <p>Dejan also commented that it would be great to align the sustainability drive with all the National Federations. It was commented that having an active member from each National Federation would be great for the SWG. Chris agreed and noted that David M was correct to make this challenge earlier. Chris noted that the EFFC SWG would be more than happy to help setting up other National Federation SWG's.</p>	All
6.	<p>Working Group Updates</p> <p>a) Contracts WG</p> <p>Federico commented that the CWG are still looking to engage more active participants.</p> <p>Federico commented that the Cash Retentions and General Contract Conditions TGs are both ready to present their position papers to the Executive committee for a final review. It was noted they would like to formally publish the papers before the AGM in October.</p> <p>Federico noted that the Collaborative Working and Digitalisation TG recently conducted a survey of the EFFC. Federico explained that the survey results show that the industry's knowledge of digitalisation is small and needs to improve. Federico noted that the group are planning to host a webinar to help contractors understand the power of digitalisation and BIM.</p> <p>Finally, Federico commented that the group are looking to prepare a C-19 document, as requested at the last AGM. Federico noted that the group will initially review the Swiss guidelines and then adapt accordingly.</p> <p>Dejan commented that, in Switzerland, they have just formed two working groups on digitalisation. One of these groups is focusing on BIM and the other on digitalisation of company processes. Dejan suggested the EFFC should consider similar working groups. Andreas commented that this would be good and that it is important to treat BIM and digitalisation as mutually exclusive processes.</p>	

b) Early Careers Group

David M commented that he and Isabel are currently assessing whether National Federations have ECG's or whether they have an interest in starting one. It was noted that a EFFC recent survey had shown that some National Federations are not interested in setting up ECG's. David commented that he and Isabel would be contacting these federations to understand why this is.

David noted that the aim for group is to be a formal working group opposed to a social group. This means they would like to be tasked with helping achieve the EFFC's strategic priorities and to work alongside the other working groups.

Finally, David noted that the ECG plans to present at the DFI-EFFC Berlin Conference 2022.

c) Health and Safety WG - [presentation](#)

Lorenzo noted that the group ran its [first webinar](#) earlier in the week and that the feedback has been really positive. Lorenzo commented that he wishes to run the webinar again in different languages – including French, Spanish, and German. José noted that he attended the webinar and thought that it was brilliant. José recommended that all the working groups start webinar series.

Lorenzo explained that the group recently launched an EFFC Health and Safety Talks initiative which will run short webinars on specific H&S topics. It was noted that an initial survey has provided them with a variety of different issues to tackle. Lorenzo commented that they plan to have the first of these webinars published by the end of the summer.

Lorenzo also noted that the EFFC Golden Rules document is in its final stages of review and should be published shortly.

Lorenzo commented that the group has continuously spoken about the need to share near misses and high potential incidents. Lorenzo commented that the group has created a safety alert template so that National Federations can feedback anonymously to the EFFC. Lorenzo noted that most companies are still not submitting their safety alerts which is disappointing. Lorenzo urged that this is important as it helps to create a safety culture. Lorenzo asked companies to provide alerts whether they are new or old incidents – [template available here](#).

Finally, Lorenzo commented that the group has a lot of inactive members and suggested that the group either push participation or

	<p>reduce its numbers. Andreas commented that the group should push for more collaboration and participation.</p> <p>d) Technical WG - presentation</p> <p>David H commented that the TWG have two meetings lined up, in June and September. David H noted that the group hope to meet physically in September. David noted that there has not been much progress in the past year.</p> <p>David noted that there are two key standards coming up for review for the first time since 2015 - EN1536 (bored piles) and EN1538 (diaphragm walls).</p> <p>David commented that the Tremie Guide testing procedures and parameters have been adopted by CEN/TC288 and that the EFC has representatives working in this working group.</p> <p>David noted that other current activities include working on the revision of the working platform guide and the watertightness of retaining walls. David commented that the watertightness document should be published soon.</p> <p>David noted that the issue of cage splicing was raised with the TWG by the DFI. David commented that the TWG have not looked into this yet but are considering it. David commented that integrity testing is another potential issue but that he felt this was wider than just the TWG.</p> <p>e) Support Fluids TG</p> <p>Chris noted that the project has been on pause due to C-19. He noted that he is planning to test an HS2 polymer project next week. Chris noted that European project testing would not happen until covid restrictions ease, and the situation improves.</p>	
7.	<p>Financial Update</p> <p>Please click here for the financial update.</p>	
8.	<p>AOB</p> <p>Nothing to be discussed.</p>	
9.	<p>Next meeting date: TBC (Virtual)</p> <p>AGM - 8-9th October 2021 (Virtual or Physical, TBC)</p>	