

MINUTES

Liaison Committee

Online, 15 January 2026

Final Minutes

Delphine Rudelli welcomed the participants: Lucile Uhring (UIMM), Richard Rumbelow (Make UK), Anton Wemander Graham (Teknikföretagen), Stefan Solle (Gesamtmetall), Yolanda Sanz Martin (Confemetal) and Viktorya Muradyan (Ceemet)/Pauline Dubois Graffin (Ceemet).

ITEM 1 - CEEMET EVENTS FOR 2026

Incl. proposals to better involve companies

Delphine Rudelli introduced the item, stressing the need to increase Ceemet's visibility and recognition among Brussels-based companies, particularly through events. As a first step, she proposed organising an after-work event for the network, to establish a first contact, introduce them to what Ceemet does and how impactful social topics are for their work. She then gave a word to Viktorya.

Viktorya Muradyan noted that policymakers tend to show greater interest when companies are involved in events and can provide concrete examples. She mentioned the breakfast event on AI held in September in the European Parliament as a success story, showing that the involvement of member companies does get traction and interest. Viktorya also added that if Ceemet wants external stakeholders and institutions to show up to our events, we need to offer them either an interesting audience or some insights or contacts that they cannot find elsewhere.

Yolanda Sanz Martin agreed on the intention of raising awareness about Ceemet but highlighted a structural challenge, as many federations have members that are themselves federations rather than companies. This makes it more difficult to build direct links with companies. She also noted that social issues are mainly addressed at national level for most members.

Delphine responded that companies are ultimately members of national federations, even where regional federations act as intermediaries. She underlined that all organisations represent the same companies and that it is important for companies to understand who is doing what on their behalf.

Stefan Solle noted that this challenge is shared, as in Germany, much like in Spain, companies are not direct members of Gesamtmetall. He explained that having a Brussels presence makes it easier to establish contacts with companies locally. He agreed that social issues are not well communicated. However, he noticed that sometimes when social topics are overlapping with

industrial topics, companies do get interested, as it has been the case with the recent files. He stressed the importance of demonstrating coordination and added value, noting that engagement remains low despite long-standing efforts to involve companies.

Richard Rumbelow explained that his organisation has a different structure, with members having offices in Brussels and being involved in several EU organisations. He supported closer coordination on events, while respecting the role of each organisation. He noted that social issues are a significant matter in the UK, both from a policy and a commercial (health and safety services) perspective, and saw value in reaching individual members to complement the association's work. He expressed support for the initiative.

Anton Wemander Graham expressed support for the initiative, noting that his organisation has company members at the EU level. He identified a challenge in that policy advisers are not always focused on social policies and saw value in strengthening this dimension. He also mentioned the potential involvement of HR professionals, including company representatives travelling from national capitals to Brussels. Anton mentioned that they would appreciate having the choice of which companies to engage and generally being kept in the loop.

Lucile Ulhring explained that her organisation has a similar structure to those in Germany and Spain. She observed that initiatives have greater impact when companies, rather than the associations themselves, speak on topics. Lucile also mentioned that UIMM is making efforts to increase the involvement of presidents of local associations at the European level. She supported the initiative of Ceemet to engage more with Brussels-based companies. While acknowledging ongoing difficulties in engaging companies on social topics, she suggested that clearer communication on areas of work could help members identify and connect relevant experts. She also noted gradual improvements in communication with local chapters and growing interest in European issues.

➤ **Delphine** presented the following ideas for organising an event: each member could invite three companies and the meeting will be structured around two topics. The idea is to keep the effort small and organized, to have an opportunity to interact with all the guests. Members will be involved in all stages of the “step-by step” process, without putting a lot of work on them.

➤ Richard, Lucile, Anton and Stefan expressed their support for this format.

Richard considered that starting with the existing Brussels network and adopting a gradual approach was the most effective way forward. **Anton** agreed and suggested that HR professionals should be given the choice to participate directly or to be represented by their Brussels-based colleagues. **Delphine** noted that a list of companies with a presence in Brussels is already available (although not final), and that Ceemet members could give three companies names to Ceemet. **Viktorya** added that the initiative could have a “snowball effect” over the long term, contributing to the development of stronger and more sustainable relationships of stakeholders presenting the interests of the MET sector.

Incl. event with EIT Manufacturing

Viktorya presented EIT Manufacturing, what the organisation does and around which topics the MoU with them is structured. She mentioned that skills are central to what both Ceemet and EIT Manufacturing do, and invited members to suggest topics of interest for a potential event to be co-organised by both in Q1 2026.

Richard suggested supply chains as a possible topic and proposed organising a presentation at Board or General Assembly level to explain EIT Manufacturing's role and highlight a specific theme. He also noted the need to verify the possible involvement of UK stakeholders.

Viktorya indicated that it would be preferable to organise an event before April while the event scene is not overcrowded.

- It was agreed that the Secretariat would shortlist some topics and get back to members for input.

Viktorya also suggested looking ahead and **planning for late 2026**, the possibility of organising an event with the European Parliament or in connection with the **next EU Presidency (Ireland)**.

Stefan highlighted Gesamtmetall's positive experience working with the EPP SME Group through breakfast meetings and recommended that Ceemet consider a similar format.

Richard added that the UK Mission in Brussels could potentially support an event together with Ireland, noting that IBEC is in contact with Make UK. He suggested that such an event could focus on the social policy program of the next EU Presidency.

- Ceemet will inquire about participating in the EPP breakfast meeting.
- Ceemet will organise an event with the Irish presidency during the year.

ITEM 2 -HOW TO INCREASE THE SHARING OF BEST PRACTICES?

Pauline Dubois-Graffin introduced the topic explaining that politicians are increasingly pushing for concrete examples from the field. She explains that Ceemet was able to suggest adding examples when drafting the position paper. However, Ceemet very often ends up using the same examples in multiple papers, which can seem a bit repetitive. She asks members to suggest processes or ways to facilitate the reporting of examples by national federations.

Lucile stated that she did not have new ideas to propose, noting that it is generally difficult to identify topics due to the lack of direct access to companies. She explained that sector-specific examples are easier to provide, as they are linked to sectoral provisions and legislation. She also highlighted that relevance depends on the topic, mentioning that in France there is limited input on skills portability. Lucile added that it could be useful to keep flexibility regarding the choice of topics during Ceemet's committees.

Yolanda expressed full support for Ceemet’s objective of further enriching position papers, while stressing the importance of including illustrative examples rather than referring to “best practices.”

- Ceemet will try to find a way to track and compile relevant practices.
- Ceemet will add a standing agenda item in committees to invite members to come prepared with examples.
- Ceemet will pay attention to mention only the terms “examples” or “practices” and avoid the terms “best practices”.

ITEM 3 - WG ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE - WHICH DIRECTION?

Delphine Rudelli introduced the item, explaining that its objective was to identify members’ needs and expectations for the AI committee. **Pauline** added that previous meetings had shown that information mainly flowed from Ceemet, with limited input from members, reflecting a diverse level of expertise within the group. She suggested encouraging members to share national examples and inviting external speakers. She also asked members if Ceemet should organise AI committee with other committees. **Delphine** suggested that we can also consider if it’s still interest to have this committee.

Lucile Uhring stated that expectations include a better understanding of the legal framework and how companies are implementing AI in practice. She noted that the previous meeting generated limited feedback, partly due to a lack of internal coordination on the topic. She added that there are currently few questions on the use of AI at work, as the legislative framework is already in place, and suggested addressing AI-related issues through another committee (e.g. IER) or via ad hoc meetings to feed into EEI discussions.

Richard Rumbelow underlined the relevance of the topic, highlighting the increasing pressure on employees and the need for greater investment in AI. He stressed the implications for employment and the business services sector, including reskilling needs, and emphasised that AI is a key component of digitalisation that raises multiple challenges to be addressed.

Yolanda Sanz Martin agreed that AI will be a major issue but noted that it is not currently being sufficiently monitored, particularly regarding developments within companies.

Richard recalled that the initial rationale for the group had been enabling a coordinated discussion and responding to trade union positions on AI. He noted that the underlying challenges remain unchanged, and therefore the group remains relevant.

Stefan Solle referred to an upcoming four-week special summit on competitiveness and suggested exploring new initiatives in cooperation with other organisations.

- Ceemet will invite a speaker for the next meeting of AI Working Group.
- Ceemet will consider the possibility for the AI committee to work with the EEI.

ITEM 4 - AOB

No other topics were discussed.