

SSDC Rail Steering Committee

Brussels, 28 June 2016

9.00 – 16.00

MINUTES

1. Approval minutes last SSDC Working Groups (23/02/2016) and Steering Committee (29/04/2016), and draft agenda

Barbara Grau (SNCF, CER) asked to delete the reference to France in the minutes of WG II meeting of 23/02/2016, p. 4, as that information had already been clarified during the meeting.

Both sides agreed to prepare a shorter version of the minutes of the meeting in April for the official publication on the Commission's website.

CER noted that ETF had circulated their changes to the draft minutes only the evening before, and reiterated the request that all meeting documents and related amendments/comments are provided at least two weeks in advance of the meeting (with the exception of presentations: only one week in advance). ETF recalled the high work load associated with the drafting and submitting of the joint project application "Rail Mobile Workers".

2. Recap after SSD Steering Committee kick-off meeting

Matthias Rohrmann (AgvMoVe/DB, CER), speaking on behalf of CER, and Guy Greivelding (FNCTTFEL, ETF), ETF's spokesperson, recalled the main conclusions of the previous discussions (Vienna, 29 April).

ETF invited to discuss about the contents before addressing the structure. They noted that some aspects of the structure were not yet fully clear (e.g. working groups) and this should be addressed under item 4.

Eventually, agenda items 3 and 4 were addressed jointly.

3. SSDC Rail work programme: discussion about priority topics (continued)

4. SSDC Rail new structure and future functioning (continued)

CER listed the main issues they would like to address in the work programme: the evaluation/revision of the Train Drivers Directive, the Rail Mobile Workers project; the development of

recommendations from the 'Employment in Rail' project; and the topic 'women in rail' as linked to the one on 'attractiveness'.

ETF listed their priorities: (1) guaranteeing safety in the railways by addressing application and compliance with driving and rest time, certification of drivers and other safety relevant professions and the regulation of contract/temporary agency workers – all topics to be addressed in an ad-hoc working group (WG) (possible WG title: 'Ensuring rail safety in an open and competitive railway market'); (2) the transposition of social partners' recommendations (JR) into binding social partner agreements – also in the context of a specific WG; (3) the application of the agreement on mobile workers (theme of the upcoming joint project).

ETF added that the current structure with two WGs and the respective Chairpersons can remain, but they would like to have each WG focus on one single topic, for which tangible results are identified and a timetable set. In addition, current 'WG rapporteurs' should report to the Steering Committee (SC), and not to the WG, since WG participants are in general already aware about the latest developments. For ETF it is very important to address 'safety' in the context of the SSD.

CER noted that the aspects of structure and content appear to be closely linked. CER suggested that the envisaged WG on safety issues could be the same as the one dealing with the upcoming project.

With regard to the last project on 'attractiveness', ETF argued that the already existing sets of social partners' recommendations can be considered as elements also contributing to the attractiveness of the sector, and the recommendations on psycho-social risk were presented as an example of this fact. This is also the reason why ETF would like to take recommendations as a basis for future negotiations. A WG should be in charge of preparing the proposals to be submitted to the SSD decision-making bodies.

CER expressed support to the proposal to work on previous joint recommendations, but starting with the preparation of the ones stemming from the 'attractiveness' project. The proposal on the latter can be prepared for adoption during the upcoming plenary meeting (in October).

With regard to ETF's 4 points listed under the topic on safety, CER enquired about how ETF is envisaging to include it in the current WG structure, without overloading WG I.

As regards the existing JR, ETF insisted that the process should lead to the adoption of binding agreements. As a first step, CER and ETF should identify the first set of recommendations to address. ETF clarified that, when entering into negotiations, new ad-hoc structures would be created and a different funding would apply. The negotiating scope would be prepared in the WGs and SC, the mandate by each social partner organisation.

CER stressed that the SC should be the key group in the structure, with a supervisory role.

Asked about their view on the use of the 'proxy' rule, ETF insisted on their request to have Human Resources Directors (HRDs) attending, so that they can commit immediately to the decisions taken during meetings. CER argued that it is important that HRDs (or attending decision makers who have the mandate of the HRDs) would have to receive the backing from their company (CEO) as well, and that they would also expect the same level of representation among their ETF counterparts. ETF replied that they can commit to sending national representatives at Secretary-General level to the plenaries, with a view to having a high-level meeting and attract the HRDs.

A long exchange followed about the composition of the Steering Committee, and the 'level' of representation on both sides:

CER would like to see a better correspondence in the level of the national counterparts represented in the Steering Committee, i.e. the participation of the Presidents of the German and Austrian railway unions . Namely, CER expressed their concerns about the potential lack of support from trade union Presidents that are not taking part in the SC.

ETF explained their representation through the elected Steering Committee of the ETF Railway Section. Such body has a European dimension rather than a national one and it receives its mandate from the Railway Section. It is to be considered the 'high-level' of the Railway Section.

CER and ETF took note of the existing misunderstandings and diverging interpretations and recollections from past discussions.

In order to clear these issues and move on with the relaunch process, CER proposed to have a meeting right after the summer break involving those who had been the initiators of the relaunch and who could help finding a definitive consensus on the outstanding issues. . The group should include those Trade Union Presidents that have been supporting the relaunch process since the beginning (the Presidents of the German and Austrian railway unions). ETF could not fully agree with this suggestion and asked to adopt an – in their view - more democratic process.

The meeting ended with no decision on this specific point. CER and ETF would both reflect on the day's discussions in order to find a way out of the deadlock.

The commitment to organise the plenary in October was maintained.

List of participants

CER (9)		
Matthias Rohrmann	AgvMoVe / DB	Germany
Peter Pirkner	ÖBB	Austria
Claudia Kürzl	ÖBB	Austria
Yves Baden	CFL	Luxembourg
Tomas Wallin	ALMEGA / ASTOC	Sweden
Barbara Grau	SNCF	France
Seraina Lang	SBB	Switzerland
Libor Lochman	CER	/
Ester Caldana	CER	/

ETF (7)		
Guy Greivelding	FNCTTFEL	Luxembourg
Maria Cristina Marzola	FILT-CGIL	Italy
Christian Tschigg	FIT-CISL	Italy
Marion Carstens	EVG	Germany
Daniela Zlatkova	FTTUB	Bulgaria
Sabine Trier	ETF	/
Andrea Albertazzi	ETF	/

European Commission		
Sigfried Caspar	DG EMPL	/