

50th Health & Safety Committee

Meeting Participants		
AUSTRIA	WKO	Mr Clemens ROSENMAYR
BELGIUM	AGORIA	Mr Geert DE PREZ
FINLAND	TIF	Mr Sauli HOLAPPA
FRANCE	UIMM	Mr Franck GAMBELLI
ITALY	ASSOLOMBARDA	Mr Lorenzo DELL'ACQUA
NORWAY	NORSK INDUSTRI	Ms Berit SØRSET
UNITED KINGDOM	MAKE UK	Mr Jamie CATER
	CEEMET	Mr John HARKIN
Action points from 50 th Ceemet H&S Committee		Deadline
ITEM 3 – Debrief from EU-OSHA first day meeting		
Secretariat to investigate where EU-OSHA get their data.		July 2024
Secretariat to invite the chemicals representatives from EU-OSHA and the employer representatives from Eurofound to visit a company (only EU-OSHA) or to our upcoming meetings.		Next meetings or as appropriate.
ITEM 4 – ACSH Working Parties on DSE and Workplaces directives		
Secretariat to investigate the possibility of circulating material from the ACSH to the members.		July 2024
Secretariat to circulate the information on the people who need to be replaced in the ACSH working parties.		To be found in the minutes of this item.
Secretariat to invite relevant persons from the ACSH working parties to upcoming Ceemet H&S committees.		Next meetings.
ITEM 7 – EU maximum working temperatures		
Secretariat to circulate the Italian decalogue for the prevention of heat-related diseases and exposure to solar radiation in the workplace.		June 2024

ITEM 8 – EFRAG		
Secretariat to circulate the latest versions of the EFRAG documents, members could react to those drafts.		June 2024
Minutes of Meeting		
ITEM 1	Agreement of 5 October meeting minutes	
	Minutes already approved by written procedure, were approved for the record.	
ITEM 2	Actions from 5 October meeting	
	The actions from the previous meeting were discussed by the Secretariat, a full list of actions and outcomes is available in the document agenda, participants and actions sent with circular 140/24.	
ITEM 3	Debrief from EU-OSHA first day meeting	
	A roundtable was held with members highlighting some of the insights gathered and the key takeaways from the first day of the meeting at EU-OSHA. A summary of members comments is to be found below: • All members agreed that it was a very good meeting with high level people from the EU agency. • Some members pointed out that the agency have a better view of industry issues than some policymakers. • Many members pointed out that they wondered where EU-OSHA got their data from, and this was something that they would like further investigation into. Furthermore, members pointed out that the data which was gathered depends on the questions asked and that answers to questions can be subjective. • Many members highlighted the fact that there was no definition for psychosocial risks within the agency, and this is something which would need to be created. • Members also pointed out that data about accidents and illnesses are different in different countries and therefore this data is not comparable. • Some members asked if we could invite some of the experts, particularly the chemicals experts, to visit a company or to attend our next committee meetings. This was qualified by other members saying that we should invite employer representatives from Eurofound to our next committee meeting.	
ACTION 1	Secretariat to investigate where EU-OSHA get their data.	
ACTION 2	Secretariat to invite the chemicals representatives from EU-OSHA and the employer representatives from Eurofound to visit a company (only EU-OSHA) or to our upcoming meetings.	
ITEM 4	ACSH Working Parties on DSE and Workplaces directives	
	Update by the Secretariat	
	The Secretariat gave an update on the working parties in the Advisory Committee on Safety and Health (ACSH) on the DSE and workplaces directives. The Secretariat	

	pointed out that following the failed Social Partner negotiations on Telework and the right to disconnect, the work in these working groups has started again. We should see a report on both directives in the November ACSH plenary meeting. On the Workplace Directive, the Secretariat said that the broadening of the definition is the biggest issue for employers, essentially the inclusion of telework and the obligations around it. Furthermore, the inclusion of psychosocial risks has been proposed and that is not something that the employers support. Exemptions on obligations for employers are also being discussed, as to whether they should be kept or not. Employers are of the opinion that we should stick to the risk-based approach. On the DSE Directive, the Secretariat said that what qualifies as a DSE worker is problematic in the discussions. The inclusion of psychosocial risks is also an issue in the review of this directive and who has responsibility at the home, the employer or employee. Excessive cognitive demands are a challenging issue for employers. Members suggested that there will be a meeting on 18 June 2024 on these directives and that there are drafts already. Some members said they are old directives and need to be updated. Other members said that just because they are old, doesn't mean they are to be changed. Members said we need to follow-up on what the Commission Directorates are doing on reducing obligations, legislation and administrative burdens. The question was raised by some members whether we get enough information from the ACSH. Members involved in the discussions in the ACSH suggested that Ceemet could circulate the information to the members of the committee and that this should be investigated. It was agreed that this could begin by the Secretariat circulating the information on the people who need to be replaced in the ACSH working parties. It was also suggested that we could invite the people relevant to our committee, such as Martin Wieske, from the working parties. The following working parties need replacement persons: • WP Strategy: one full member and one alternate member • WP DSE: one alternate member • WP Workplace: one alternate member • WP Climate change and OSH: one full member • WP Standardisation: one full member
ACTION 3	Secretariat to investigate the possibility of circulating material from the ACSH to the members.
ACTION 4	Secretariat to circulate the information on the people who need to be replaced in the ACSH working parties.
ACTION 5	Secretariat to invite relevant persons from the ACSH working parties to upcoming Ceemet H&S committees.
ITEM 5	Chemicals at the workplace
	Carcinogens, Mutagens or Reprotoxic substances at work Directive
	The Secretariat began by saying that the ACSH currently have a report on the need to set limit values under both the Carcinogens, Mutagens or Reprotoxic Substances Directive (CMRD) or the Chemical Agents Directive (CAD). The report says that

	justifying new BOELVs under the CMRD is challenging. The Working Party Chemicals (WPC) assumes minimal impact for CMR substances with low annual volumes, minimal workforce exposure, and controlled usage conditions. The number of CMR substances to be addressed in the near future is expected to decrease. Adverse health effects from CAD substances are more common than from CMR substances. The ACSH notes the need to review some CMR substances with existing BOELVs due to amendment requests or high residual risks. The report concludes by saying that limit values should be set for both CAD and CMR substances based on the most urgent need for action. • Welding fumes, Cobalt, PAHs, 1,4 dioxane & Isoprene The Secretariat stated that Ceemet participated in the Commission's two consultations of social partners on the five above substances. We now await the European Commission proposal on this topic which is expected to be released in September 2024. This will be a priority of the Hungarian Presidency of the EU Council, which takes over on 1 July 2024. They have already allocated three social questions working party meetings to discuss the topic, plus the COREPER meetings which are needed to adopt a general approach. Members made broad points on the time allowed for consultation and the level of information from this wave of substances. All members agreed this is a priority for the committee. • Member States letter on setting OELs On 5 March 2024, 14 Member States sent a letter to Commissioner Schmit urging the Commission to accelerate the process of setting OELs. The letter requested the Commission to do so by increasing the capacity of preparing scientific opinions for chemicals and acting on the priority list of chemicals both in the CAD and CMRD. It is unclear what are the implications of this letter to policy making in the area of chemicals legislation, however there would need to be a response from the Commission to such a letter. • Lead & Di-isocyanates The Secretariat stated that on 13 March 2024, Directive (EU) 2024/869 amending Directive 2004/37/EC and Directive 98/24/EC as regards the limit values for lead and its inorganic compounds and for diisocyanates was published in the official journal. Clemens from WKO took the floor to speak about the new priority list on chemicals and some of the pertinent substances for Ceemet. Lithium is on this list and the question is whether it is better in the REACH or OSH regulation. There is currently a scoping study for poorly soluble particulates, such as aluminium and graphite.
ITEM 6	Workplace Mental Health
	Update on latest developments
	The Secretariat gave an overview of the situation saying that after much discussion we developed our Ceemet position paper on this topic. The Secretariat also gave an overview of the advocacy activities which have been undertaken subsequent to that, including meetings with the European Commission and Parliament. The chair of the committee, having attended the meeting with the European Commission, stated that this is the first time we will regulate people, the inclusion of KPIs will be crucial and that in Belgium, the rules are challenging in this context.

	Members made some broad points around the fact that we must not see an EU Directive and we must promote good mental health at the workplace. Statistics in this regard are subjective as people feel work is stressful, this is normal. Mental health is a personal issue, risk assessment is the way to deal with this.
ITEM 7	EU maximum working temperatures
	The Secretariat began by saying this is an issue which continues to gain importance at an EU level. There is a new ACSH working party on the impact of climate change on OSH, which has the objective to develop an opinion on working temperatures in the EU. EU-OSHA are also developing a number of projects in this field, this appears to be one of their flagship initiatives for the coming years. In this context, the Secretariat requested members to come forward with any work they are undertaking at a national level and the following is what was said. • In France, UIMM have a checklist, to evaluate all of the consequences, not just for workers. • In Finland, there is no legislation about temperature, but they have mandatory guidelines. If it is over 28 degrees, employers must lower the temperature, if possible, if not, they must give enough breaks. • In the UK, there is no legal maximum working temperature, there is guidance from the HSE (16 degrees minimum), however it is not really a significant issue. • In Norway there is no maximum or minimum temperature regulations but there are recommendations from the OSH authority, not below 19 degrees or above 26 degrees. • In Italy, there is no maximum or minimum temperature regulations, however they need to think about this in the context of workplace scenarios. The Italian government has finalised a paper on this, Lorenzo will share it and the Secretariat will circulate it. • In Austria, inside companies it should be minimum 12 degrees with a high of 18 degrees for highly physical work and 19 degrees to 25 degrees for low physical work. There is no maximum temperature for outside. • In Belgium, maximum or minimum temperatures are measured in the BTB index, if the work is heavy the temperature should be lower, if not, it can be higher. There must be organised breaks.
ACTION 6	Secretariat to circulate the Italian decalogue for the prevention of heat-related diseases and exposure to solar radiation in the workplace.
ITEM 8	EFRAG
	Under this point, Franck from UIMM gave an update to the committee on the OSH issues which are linked to the work of the European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (EFRAG). Franck stated that he asked the question to EU-OSHA during our meetings, and it seemed to be important for them. For larger companies, this will be problematic, the information they are being asked to provide is difficult and comes from multiple departments of the company. Also, the comparison isn't straight forward, companies from countries which are traditionally good performers are doing worse than those who are not. Is this an issue of

	underreporting? Comparing the reports of companies in Europe to other European companies is useful, if we move outside of continents, it becomes more difficult. Frank proposed to circulate the latest versions of the EFRAG documents, and members could react to those drafts. Members reacted saying that SMEs will possibly be exempted but will be under pressure from big companies to comply. Some members said it would be implemented by the Finance Ministry in their countries.
ACTION 7	Secretariat to circulate the latest versions of the EFRAG documents, members could react to those drafts.
ITEM 9	Miscellaneous
	1. Sauli Holappa's presentation on the use of criminal sanctions in Finland Following discussions during the adoption of our position paper on workplace mental health, Sauli from TIF gave a short presentation on the use of criminal sanctions in Finland. He suggested that following a study made by the relevant ministry, Finnish criminal sanctions are stricter than more or less anywhere else in Europe. The ideal scenario would be to level out the playing field for companies. The difference between hazard and accident was highlighted by Sauli. He also stated that in Sweden sanctions require an accident but not in Finland. Furthermore, in Finland, sanctions are personal which creates a massive number of problems. Some members said the same could happen in their countries, particularly in Italy. Other members suggested that in their countries it was a sliding scale of sanctions, based on the breach. 2. Date and Place of next meeting Date to be decided by Doodle Poll with the meeting to be hosted in Brussels. 3. AOB N/A