

Minutes

Meeting of Directors General for Industrial Relations

Madrid, 31 May 2023

1. WELCOME AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Stefan OLSSON (Chair, Deputy Director-General for Jobs, Skills and Social Policies in DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, European Commission), opened the meeting and warmly thanked the Spanish hosts, including for the visit in the Prado museum.

He introduced himself, in his new function of Deputy Director-General, and welcomed participants, in particular new members, Mr. G. Petursson from Iceland, Mrs K. Gey from Lichtenstein, Mr T. Meyer and Langenbrick from Luxembourg (in the absence of Mr Meyer at the present meeting, M. A. Skrozic is also representing Luxembourg) and for the first time in person, Mr. P. Vansintjan from Belgium and Mr K. Agrapidis from Greece.

Members also honoured the memory of Ms T. Kröger, a long-standing Finnish member of the DGIR who passed away early May.

The draft agenda was adopted with no changes.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DIRECTORS GENERAL HELD ON 13 DECEMBER 2022 IN STOCKHOLM

The summary minutes of the December 2022 DGIR were adopted without amendment.

3. PRESENTATION OF THE SPANISH PRESIDENCY'S PRIORITIES IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS

Mr Joaquín PÉREZ REY (Secretary of State for Employment and Social Economy, Ministry of Labour and Social Economy, Spain) welcomed the participants and introduced the priorities of the Spanish Presidency.

Social dialogue

Social dialogue would be a key thread in the Presidency's agenda for a Social Europe, with plans to further promote information and consultation mechanisms and the active participation of workers in decision-making processes.

The Presidency welcomes European social partners' negotiations on remote work and the right to disconnect, as these two elements will be decisive in future labour relations. Making headways on both would be important, including translating a social partners' agreement into an EU Directive.

He referred to the planned summit in Santiago de Compostella in September, on social dialogue. Social Dialogue is intertwined with the debate on democracy at the workplace, a topic central to the Presidency's agenda. Council conclusions on this topic will be prepared with a view to enhancing participation of workers at the workplace beneficial for the companies and management alike. This would also cover the need to connect social dialogue and industrial relations with the green and

digital transition and how industrial relations and collective bargaining could support a just transition.

Decent work

As regards decent work, the Presidency is committed to promote safe and healthy workplaces. In particular, the Presidency wishes to progress in the discussions relating to the Directive on improving working conditions in platform work, as a key topic to reconcile the defence of labour rights and the rise of digital technologies. Efforts have also to be made as regards the proposals on asbestos and on the limit values for lead and diisocyanates. The Presidency will also push for the adoption of Council Conclusions on mental health and precarious work, and a Declaration with European social partners on the 2023 European Year of Skills.

Social economy

Another priority would be the social economy, a flagship of Europe. Mr PÉREZ REY underlined that social economy carried a lot of weight in Spain, approximately 20% of Spanish GDP. From a labour law point of view, social economy represents a very good model to make labour relations democratic.

The Spanish Presidency would advance on the actions in the Social Economy Action Plan and promote that Member States adopt the proposal for a Council Recommendation on developing social economy framework conditions.

4. OVERALL UPDATE BY THE COMMISSION ON RECENT AND UPCOMING INITIATIVES AND ACTIVITIES.

Stefan OLSSON presented the most important recent developments, notably in the area of social dialogue, as well as current or future legislative initiatives.

Social Dialogue

An important [package on social dialogue](#) was adopted on 25 January 2023, and consists of a draft Recommendation and a Communication. Stefan OLSSON highlighted that the next important step was to ensure the implementation of the Recommendation in a meaningful way, and the informal Council in July would be an important first step in this regard.

There has been a lot of engagement from social partners and an important next step would be a success in the negotiations on the Right to Disconnect and on Telework and, if concluded, to submit it to the Commission as an agreement to be proposed as EU law.

Revision of the 2009 recast Directive on European Works Councils

The Commission has been actively following up to the European Parliament's own-initiative legislative report on the revision of the European Works Council Directive (Recast Directive 2009/38/EC), as adopted in February. Mr OLSSON informed the audience that the first stage of Social Partners' consultation was now completed and it was not clear whether there was an interest from the parties to possibly negotiate on the topic. The second stage of the consultation should follow soon.

Referring to the EWC file, he mentioned on a more general note the implications of the own-initiative legislative reports of the European Parliament. The EC had taken a commitment to look seriously into these legislative reports. Since the start of the current legislature, there have been a number of reports in the area of employment and social affairs, in particular:

- The report on the Right to Disconnect, which immediately led to the ongoing social partners negotiations;
- The report on asbestos, after which the EC rapidly presented, as already planned, an update of the limit value on asbestos. The EP added additional issues in their report and set an ambitious limit value. The dialogues on this file are expected to be concluded before the summer;
- The so-called "Radke Report" on European Works Councils mentioned above;
- The report on traineeships with a view to banning unpaid traineeships (report still to be finalised), which may raise legal questions (e.g. limitations of the relevant legal basis).

The EP reports create a new dynamic at EU level that impacts the work of the EC. This issue would be important for the next legislature as well.

Current and future legislative items

An important issue underlined by President von der Leyen at the ETUC congress in May would be the potential need for further regulation on AI in the field of employment area beyond platform work.

Concerning Health and Safety at work, Mr. OLSSON recalled the Health Safety at Work Summit in May in Sweden where an important debate on psycho-social risks at work took place.

In addition, he mentioned the updates of the carcinogens, mutagens, and reprotoxic substances Directive (so called "CMRD" Directive) conducted through co-decision, which represents a solid but also lengthy process. There are ideas about simplification, bringing at the same time political considerations. Referring to the asbestos dialogues, he referred to the issue of how to deal with complex scientific issues in co-decision. This could come up as a question for discussion in the future.

As regards social economy, and with reference to the intervention of the Spanish Secretary of State, he reminded that Commissioner Schmit made it a key issue, and it was now for the Spanish and Belgian Presidencies to take it further.

In terms of upcoming initiatives planned on the EC agenda, he mentioned that the initiative on the European Disability Card was scheduled early September, under the competence of Commissioner Dalli; it represents an important work in DG EMPL.

The upcoming communication on digitalisation in social security coordination will not include a legislative proposal but rather follow up to the intensive work on the ongoing pilot project on digitalisation with a view to set a long-term perspective.

About the European Year of Skills launched on 9 May, Mr OLSSON mentioned that related events are to take place almost every day, and he thanked in advance the Spanish and Belgian Presidencies for investing a lot in this issue. The initiative is complementary to the very ambitious Skills Agenda.

He underlined that existing skills gaps and labour shortages have an impact on the economy, the quality of jobs and individual development. The shift to adult VET remains the biggest challenge. EU efforts on skills drew international attention, e.g. US high level officials learn from what the EU is developing on skills policy. The 'mindset on skills' is a major element in managing the future, notably the green and digital transitions.

Ms HEINONEN (Finland) inquired if the renewing of the ELA (European Labour Authority) decision was planned in order to include labour mobility of 3rd country nationals in ELA cooperation.

Mr OLSSON replied that there was no decision on this. He reminded that in relation to the activation of the temporary protection directive regarding Ukraine, it was considered that EURES and PES could support Ukrainian refugees, while in respect of 3rd country nationals, a revision of the EURES

legal basis, and possibly of the ELA Regulation, would be necessary. He informed that DG HOME was preparing a “talent pool” proposal to bring in 3rd country nationals.

In the context of the preparations of EP on-initiative legislative report on traineeships, Ms SALUMAA (Estonia), inquired about the potential form of the new legislation: would it be a new directive or review the current recommendation? She also underlined that the EP’s numerous requests in the dialogues on asbestos go beyond the EC proposal. While some may have merit, they pose a problem by making it difficult for Member States to react without any further impact assessment. It would be much better to have an impact assessment to rely on.

Mr AARDEN (The Netherlands) agreed that OSH processes were lengthy and suggested using scientific evidence available at national level and inquired if the DGIR group could help in the process or if it was the prerogative of only OSH experts. Mr. AARDEN echoed the Finnish representative on the question on 3rd country national and ELA, and wondered if the DGIR group could play a role in the reflection on the matter.

Mr OLSSON replied as follows:

- on the nature of the forthcoming traineeships initiative, he recalled potential limits and issues as to the appropriate legal basis.
- Regarding the complexity of dealing in dialogues with proposed amendments beyond the EC proposal in the OSH area, he acknowledged this was a challenge. Some Member States may have more resources to look at EP proposals, with the support of strong health and safety authorities, but the Commission lacks those resources. The Commission’s role is to bridge the two sides, and the Council would need to invest in effective ways to deal with new EP requests.
- In reply to the Dutch representative, Mr. Olsson expressed his appreciation for the work conducted on Health and Safety and underlined the importance of having the right assessments and the role of tripartite dialogue. Without such tripartite dialogue, there is a risk of lack of implementation. Therefore, the Tripartite Advisory Committee is a valuable place and tool to better grasp some of the issues. He mentioned the example of discussions on lead, which touch on complex issues in the context of the green transition and the production of batteries. In addition, it raises the question of comitology versus co-decision to update the OSH acquis which has to be discussed with the EP. Health and Safety at work is actually more than chemicals. It is about e.g. psycho-social risks, musculoskeletal disorders, AI and robotisation. He underlined the limited resources in the EC to work on all these topics. So there is also a choice either to concentrate on chemicals, possibly simplify that or to expand the work. He suggested preparing for a discussion on comitology, as an interesting way to speed things up. As regards sources of scientific evidence, he cautioned that a serious expert debate on the consequences nevertheless would be necessary and would take some time.

Mr BÖTTCHER (Germany) raised the topic of ‘just mobility’ namely how to implement the rights of employees who work in several countries. He considered that one needs to help ensure that these workers know about their rights in other countries. He inquired whether there was any EP initiative to foster this kind of support e.g. with the help of trade unions.

Mr OLSSON agreed that EU level support would be necessary for these workers, so as to provide more information to them. Overall, the Commission is supportive, more concretely via implementing pilot actions put forward by the EP with the Commission’s financing. This issue would stay on the agenda of the future Commission.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF EU LABOUR LAW AND THE ROLE OF DGIR

Stefan OLSSON recalled that discussions on the role of the group were launched at the December 2022 meeting, in Stockholm, with Joost KORTE (Director-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, European Commission). There is a general willingness to use the Commission's various fora in the most effective way possible, and recognition that the DGIR group has clear added value.

He mentioned that while other DGs establish specific working groups to discuss issues pertaining to the internal market (e.g. SMET), and EMPL also had specific transposition expert groups (e.g. regarding minimum wage directive), the DGIR had a specific, twofold role: it is a forum to discuss at the same time ways to implement and transpose EU labour law Directives and labour law developments both at EU and national level.

He underlined that this role should remain as such while we could consider introducing new working methods such as a longer-term pre-defined work plan or choosing to discuss topical issues from both national and European levels. He appreciated the role of the Sub-group on Working Time as a valuable format to discuss specific files and invited the group to express their views on these points.

Mr RODRÍGUEZ GARCÍA (Spain) started by confirmed the value of the work of the DGIR. He raised the issue of the impact of transposition of EU law in terms of additional resources and administrative burden, as well as coordination among different ministries or authorities. It can also be complex to identify the services most affected by certain pieces of EU law. To this end, ES would welcome discussions on administrative and practical arrangements from other MSs including first-hand experience on the various implementation tools.

Mr DE CAMILLIS (Italy) reiterated the usefulness of the discussions on the different legislative files and suggested that Commission provides regular updates on the development of other Directives (platform work) or files (e.g. social dialogue, social protection) as well as latest EU level events and developments (e.g. debates in various Council formations) which may be relevant to the DGIR members.

Mr AARDEN (The Netherlands) echoed the Spanish intervention about implementation and transposition challenges which are often common to many Member States (e.g. intensive consultation processes at national level), and supported the Italian member on keeping the group abreast of EU level developments that may play a role in the national transposition and/or application process. Underlining the need for sufficient time to implementing directives, he recalled the importance of having appropriate transposition periods for transposing new Directives (i.e. at least 24 months) and welcomed the work of dedicated transposition expert groups. In terms of the role of the group he suggested holding an in-depth discussion on a specific topic, i.e. the posting of third-country nationals.

Mr SALCHEV (Bulgaria) welcomed the work of the sub-group on the working time directive. He also welcomed discussions on upcoming issues or developments at EU level as these trigger discussions and responses of national social partners. Finally, a common repository of the subgroup's documents (e.g. those of the Working Time sub-group) would be useful.

Mr BADOVSKIS (Latvia) reiterated the obstacles of implementation, echoed the Dutch intervention and underlined that respecting the transposition periods can be challenging due to lack of resources, budget and administrative structures – especially within smaller administrations. He also said that while the transposition expert groups meetings are very useful; some general misunderstanding may however persist on certain specific aspects, and there the DGIR could help (e.g. when a large group

of Member States receive administrative or infringement letters on the same matter). The DGIR group could add value to these discussions and setting up ad hoc meetings (online) on specific issues e.g. on Working time/weekly resting time would be welcome.

Mr AGRAPIDAS (Greece) mentioned the gaps between EU level and national legislation and suggested the setting up of a broad and common database with judgements, national legislation, and transposition practices as an effective implementation support tool.

Ms SALUMAA (Estonia) also recalled the administrative, budgetary and resource obstacles in implementing legislation, and drew attention to the importance of having a common understanding/interpretation of the legal texts of directives. Its lack leads to infringements, sometimes involving several Member States, and these issues should be discussed. What matters is for DGIR is probably to develop a capacity to discuss and tackle topical issues (via subgroups or ad-hoc meetings).

Ms SZOSTAK (Poland) agreed with the challenges mentioned. She also welcomed the availability of the Commission services for bilateral assistance in transposing some recent instruments.

Ms CASTEX-CHAUVE (France) added that some implementation issues were at times difficult to address in relation to the Commission as a whole, due to the different approaches from DGs and work in different expert groups (e.g. posting of workers), while this could actually affect more than one Member State.

Mr OLSSON came back on challenges linked to transposition of EU law, but also beyond (e.g. CJUE interpretation). Should we enlarge the existing sub-group on working time to other important instruments? Would we rather have new, specific sub-groups? He concluded that one could develop a more flexible approach, and, for that, ad-hoc meetings could better fit the needs of the group. He welcomed indeed the idea about the organisation of topical, ad-hoc DGIR meetings where there would be a need to discuss a specific, common issue. For him, dialogue and pro-activity is key in anticipating implementation issues or infringements. One idea to bring back could be to have specific meetings of technical nature, when needed, to be opened to interested Member States. Such meetings would have to follow clear rules, without political consideration or judgements. He added that duplication of the work of existing groups (e.g. on posting or mobility of workers) should be avoided. For the time being, the cross-border dimension is indeed dealt with in separate groups or channels.

He found also interesting to explore more modern ways of exchanging and communicating, if suitable for all.

He finally seized the opportunity of the meeting to mention EC efforts in reducing reporting obligations, and called on Member States to flag areas where cumbersome reporting obligations exist and thus could be removed.

6. THE WORKING TIME DIRECTIVE: IMPLEMENTATION REPORT AND INTERPRETATIVE COMMUNICATION PRESENTED BY THE COMMISSION ON 15 MARCH 2023

Mr Bertrand MULLER-SCHLEIDEN (European Commission, Team Leader, EMPL.C.1 “Labour law”) presented the “working time package” adopted by the Commission on 15 March 2023, which updates the previous package from 2017. It consists in a Commission report on the implementation of the Directive by Member States; a more detailed Commission Staff Working Document; and an update of the 2017 interpretative communication on the Directive, which was published in the Official Journal of the EU in the form of a corrigendum on 26 April 2023.

Mr MULLER-SCHLEIDEN explained that the implementation report is a five-yearly exercise based on Article 24 of the Directive. The report provides a factual overview of how Member States have implemented the Directive, highlighting key issues and problems. Both report and Commission Staff Working Document pursue the same purpose and follow overall the same article-by-article structure as in 2017. They also include a section on the social partners' evaluation of the implementation of the Directive as well as the assessment of the Directive by Member States, and briefly present Covid-related measures in the field of working time.

The report concludes that a large majority of workers in the EU are subject to working time rules that respect the Directive or are more protective. While rules on breaks, daily and weekly rest as well as annual leave are generally satisfactorily transposed, compliance issues do remain, including on derogations from daily and weekly rest and on compensatory rest; on lack of definition or inappropriate application of on-call time; on maximum weekly working time limits in certain sectors such as health and armed forces; and on annual leave during the first year of employment and its overlap with sick leave. The number of Member States applying the individual opt-out has decreased since 2017.

In its analysis of the national implementation of the Directive, the report takes into consideration significant recent developments in the case-law of the Court of Justice, notably on the following topics: the concept of working time in relation to on-call and stand-by time, following the 2018 *Matzak* judgment^[1] and several rulings^[2] following up on it; the obligation to record all working time, in line with the *CCOO* judgment^[3] of 2019; and the application of the Directive per worker in case of multiple employment contracts with the same employer, as required by a judgment^[4] of 2021.

Concerning the EU social partners' assessment, Mr MULLER-SCHLEIDEN indicated that worker organisations consider that the practical application of the Directive does not sufficiently protect and improve workers' health and safety. For their part, employer organisations are of the view that the Directive does not provide the necessary flexibility to adapt working time arrangements to the needs of employers and workers in a globalised and digitalised world. As for Member States, most of them reported that the Directive continues to meet its objectives by providing an adequate and solid framework for taking action on occupational health and safety; they nevertheless mentioned a number of remaining challenges.

Mr MULLER-SCHLEIDEN explained that the update of the interpretative communication is justified by the high amount of judgments of the Court of Justice interpreting the Working Time Directive, with 32 rulings since 2017. As the previous one, the new version, up-to-date as of September 2022, summarizes the case-law of the Court on working time in an objective and neutral way; although not binding, it aims at bringing legal clarity and certainty to stakeholders. The main topics covered by the Court's case-law on working time since 2017, excluding those already mentioned earlier in the presentation, notably include the scope of the Directive; the derogation for autonomous workers; and the right to paid annual leave, as regards both the employer's obligation to enable the worker to exercise it, and the recognition of that right for workers reinstated after an unlawful dismissal.

Ms SZOSTAK (Poland) said the package was useful, in particular the interpretative communication when it comes to interpreting the Court's case-law, and encouraged the Commission to draw up comparable documents in other fields.

Mr SALCHEV (Bulgaria) suggested to discuss the challenges posed by new forms of work in relation to the Fixed-Term Work Directive.

^[1] Judgment of 21 February 2018 in case C-518/15, *Matzak*, ECLI:EU:C:2018:82.

^[2] Judgment of 9 March 2021 in case C-344/19, *Radiotelevizija Slovenija*, ECLI:EU:C:2021:182; judgment of 9 March 2021 in case C-580/19, *Stadt Offenbach am Main*, ECLI:EU:C:2021:183; judgment of 11 November 2021 in case C-214/20, *Dublin City Council*, ECLI:EU:C:2021:909.

^[3] Judgment of 14 May 2019 in case C-55/18, *CCOO*, ECLI:EU:C:2019:402.

^[4] Judgment of 17 March 2021 in case C-585/19, *Academia de Studii Economice din București*, ECLI:EU:C:2021:210.

7. PRESENTATIONS AND INFORMATION BY DELEGATIONS ON THE RECENT DEVELOPMENTS REGARDING LABOUR LAW AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN THE MEMBER STATES

7.1 Main changes brought to social dialogue legislation and their impact for companies and employees

Ms Angelica SABIESCU (Counselor, Ministry of Labour and Social Solidarity, Romania) presented the significant changes introduced by Law No. 367/2022 on social dialogue. The previous law in this field dated back to 2011; while the Government negotiated with social partner organisations without success in the following years, Romania benefitted from the technical assistance of the ILO. Moreover, Romania's National recovery and resilience plan included a milestone about the improvement of social dialogue, which had to be reached by December 2022.

The reform concerns every aspect of social dialogue. It aims in particular at guaranteeing the exercise of trade union rights, including in information and consultation processes, and at facilitating collective bargaining, notably at company and sectoral levels. It opens up the possibility of ensuring universal application of sectoral-level collective labour agreements via an extension procedure. The new law also reinforces the role of the Tripartite National Council for Social Dialogue. The reform should enhance the involvement of trade union and employee representatives in decision-making, with a positive impact on social peace. In May 2023 the 2022 law was amended and supplemented on several points by Government Emergency Ordinance No. 42/2023, which notably redefined collective bargaining sectors and corrected material errors.

Ms SALUMAA (Estonia) enquired whether Romania uses indicators to measure the improvements in social dialogue brought by the reform. Ms SABIESCU stated that a significant indicator would be the development of collective bargaining; Romania is trying to develop new tools in order to create indicators in consultation with the social partners.

7.2 Social dialogue in the sector of industry

Mr Christophe LANGENBRINK (Chargé of International Relations & ESF Managing Authority, Ministry of Labour, Employment, Social and Solidarity Economy, Luxembourg) presented the functioning of social dialogue, which is a cornerstone of Luxembourg's social model, in the industrial sector.

Mr LANGENBRINK explained that in Luxembourg an employer who intends to dismiss, for reasons unrelated to the employee's person, at least 7 employees over 30 days or 15 employees over 90 days must apply a collective redundancy procedure. He presented the "redundancy plan", whose negotiation is a major element of the procedure. Besides, the "job protection plan", a more preventive procedure aimed at avoiding redundancy plans and finding alternative solutions for the employees affected, was introduced in 2006. The setting-up of a job protection plan involves discussions between the social partners, primarily on job protection instruments within the company (e.g. short-time working, voluntary career breaks), instruments for internal or intra-group restructuring (e.g. reduction in the number of fixed-term employment contracts, temporary loan of labour), and external reassignment (e.g. personalised support for career changes). Job protection plans are assessed by the Economic Committee, a tripartite body established in 1975, and require approval by the minister responsible for labour and employment, as they usually include measures involving State subsidies.

In conclusion, Mr LANGENBRINK underlined the national culture of tripartite social dialogue and consensus-building. However, the smooth functioning of social dialogue has been challenged since the 1980s by a significant influx of foreign companies as well as foreign and cross-border workers and, more recently, by globalisation.

7.3 Spanish Labour Reform

Ms Verónica MARTÍNEZ BARBERO, Director General of Labour, Ministry of Labour and Social Economy, Spain, presented the reform of national labour law adopted at the end of 2021 after about 9 months of negotiations between the Government and the social partners. In her presentation she focused on collective bargaining and hiring.

As regards collective bargaining, a major element of the reform is the application to subcontractors of the collective agreement corresponding to the activity they carry out under the subcontract. Moreover, as a result of the reform sectorial collective agreements take precedence over company agreements when it comes to issues such as wages, working time and flexibility arrangements; also, when a collective agreement expires, it will remain in force until it is substituted by another agreement.

Concerning hiring, the different types of contracts of employment now existing in Spain are: the permanent, open-ended contract; the part-time contract; the formative contract; the fixed-term contract; and the seasonal contract. Ms MARTÍNEZ BARBERO explained that the reform transformed the way of hiring in Spain. While an average of 2 million open-ended contracts were concluded annually before the reform, in 2022 the figure exceeded 7 million. The proportion of fixed-term contracts in the private sector has decreased from around 24% in the fourth quarter of 2021 to 13,7%, i.e. close to the EU average, after the reform. This trend has particularly benefited workers under the age of 30, 76% of whom had an open-ended contract in December 2022 while the figure was 46% one year earlier, and the number of women in employment, which exceeds 9,5 million, has never been as high as it is today.

8. PRESENTATION BY THE COMMISSION ON EU ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELDS OF SOCIAL DIALOGUE (INTERPROFESSIONAL AND SECTORAL) AND LABOUR LAW (INCLUDING RECENT RULINGS OF THE EU COURT OF JUSTICE)

Complementing the intervention of Mr OLSSON in the morning, Ms Marie LAGARRIGUE (European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion; Deputy Head of Unit EMPL C.1 ‘Labour law’) came back briefly on the following items:

- The main elements of the Communication on Social Dialogue put forward in January, e.g. an increased use of tripartite dialogue (e.g. in EMCO, SPC); a process towards a modernised sectoral social dialogue; more active support to social partners’ agreements (during negotiations, upon demand, as well as regards possible courses of implementation, including proposals for a Council Directive); mainstreaming of social dialogue in other policies and activities; improved consultation of cross-industry social partners on general policy priorities and developments (e.g. Commission work programme).
- Various specific consultations of social partners (including on CMRD Directive revision; EWC directive revision).
- The conclusion by Central Government Administration (CGA) social partners of a sectoral agreement on digitalization (October 2022), then submitted to the Commission for implementation in EU law; the Commission will assess this agreement when the related cross-industry negotiations on telework and right to disconnect are concluded.
- The set up of a new Sectoral Social Dialogue Committee on social services.
- Prospects for sectoral negotiations in the gas sector (to be conducted from summer 2023 till early 2024).

She also informed the DGIR that the next meeting of the Working Time DGIR subgroup will be held on 5 December. An agenda will follow in due course . By 15 September, Member States should let

the Commission know if they would like to put any specific topic on the agenda (the interest to discuss the MAV-START judgement has been duly noted).

She finally reported, together with Bertrand MULLER-SCHLEIDEN, on recent rulings of the EU Court of Justice on the Working Time Directive, the Fixed-Term Work Directive, the Part-Time Work Directive, the Temporary Agency Work Directive, the Employer Insolvency Directive and the Transfer of Undertakings Directive. Details can be found in the annex (English only).

9. INVITATION BY THE SPANISH DELEGATION TO THE NEXT MEETING IN MAY 2023

Mr Peter VANSINTJAN (Director-general for Collective Labour Relations, Belgium) announced that the next meeting would take place on 14 November in Brussels, with a social event to be organised on the eve of the meeting.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

N.A.