

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

# Working Documents

1983-1984

---

28 September 1983

DOCUMENT 1-760/83

REPORT

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public  
Health and Consumer Protection

on the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and  
Working Conditions

Rapporteur: Mr Doeke EISMA

PE 84.082/fin.



At its sitting of 15 November 1982, the European Parliament referred the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Muntingh (Doc. 1-787/82) pursuant to rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgetary Control and the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment for an opinion.

At its meeting of 25 November 1982 the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection decided to draw up a report and appointed Mr EISMA rapporteur.

The Committee considered the draft report at its meetings of 16 June and 21 September 1983. At the last meeting it adopted the motion for a resolution as a whole by 5 votes for with 4 abstentions.

The following took part in the vote: Mr Ryan, acting-chairman; Mr Eisma, rapporteur; Mr Alber, Mr Forth, Mr Ghergo, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mr Mertens (deputizing for Mr Del Duca), Mrs Schleicher and Mrs Seibel-Emmerling.

The opinion of the Committee on Budgetary Control is attached.

The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment decided not to deliver an opinion in view of the fact that an opinion had already been delivered to the Committee on Budgets on proposals for four regulations concerning among other things the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (PE 82.309/fin.). This opinion is attached for information.

The report was submitted on 26 September 1983.

## C O N T E N T S

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION .....   | 5           |
| B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....   | 8           |
| <br>   |             |
| ANNEX I : Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-787/82) .....                        | 19          |
| ANNEX II : Opinion of the Committee on Budgetary Control ....                  | 21          |
| ANNEX III : Opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs<br>and employment ..... | 27          |

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution together with explanatory statement

Motion for a Resolution

on the European Foundation for the Improvement  
of Living and Working Conditions

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Muntingh and others in accordance with Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure (Doc. 1-787/82),
  - having regard to its opinions on the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions,
  - having regard to the reports of the Court of Auditors for 1978 and 1980,
  - having regard to the annual reports of the Foundation for 1980 and 1981,
  - having noted the programmes of work and the rolling programmes,
  - recalling the first programme of action of the Community on the environment (1973),
  - recalling the establishing Regulation of the Foundation (No. 1365/75),
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and the opinion of the Committee on Budgetary Control (Doc. 1-760/83),
- A. Considering that the environmental programme proposes the establishment of a European Foundation the activities of which should include the promotion of research into the natural environment,
- B. Considering that the Regulation establishing the European Foundation refers explicitly to the promotion of research on the natural environment,
- C. Noting that in its work since being established, the Foundation has devoted practically no attention to the environmental component of its activities,

- D. Noting that the Foundation has given inadequate follow-up to the opinions of the European Parliament on this matter,
1. Notes that the Foundation is not operating in conformity with the duties set out in the Regulation establishing it;
  2. Considers it necessary that in the activities of the Foundation, sufficient attention be paid to matters relating to the improvement of the natural environment and living conditions and that in so doing connections be established with the social and psychological environment;
  3. Also considers it necessary for the European Parliament - pursuant to Article 12 of the establishing Regulation - to be more closely involved in the management of the Foundation;
  4. Considers that the Administrative Board should be reconstituted as follows:
    - 5 representatives nominated by employees
    - 5 representatives nominated by employers
    - 5 government nominated representatives experienced in environmental protection and improvement
    - 5 government nominated representatives experienced in problems affecting working conditions
    - 3 representatives of the Commission
    - 1 representative of the Parliamentary Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection
    - 1 representative of the Parliamentary Committee on Social Affairs and Employment;
  5. Considers that membership of the Committee of Experts should be brought into line with the new membership of the Administrative Board;
  6. Considers that one of the two coordinators in the Foundation should be exclusively engaged in environmental matters;

7. Requests the Commission to play an initiating and coordinating role on the Administrative Board, and to make optimum use of the research potential of the Foundation even for Community initiatives to be implemented in the short term;
8. Recommends that budgetary appropriations to the Foundation should be divided into separate allocations concerned with (a) living conditions and (b) working conditions and that the Foundation be debarred from expending such monies on projects which are not within the respective headings;
9. Requests that the Commission report back to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on the possibility of transferring to the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training at Berlin all work in relation to working conditions in order that all the resources of the Dublin Foundation may be devoted to the improvement of living conditions;
10. Hopes that the relevant committees of the European Parliament will, pending a formal arrangement, be associated with the implementation of the forthcoming programme of the Foundation;
11. Requests the Commission to submit short-term proposals taking due account of the wishes of the European Parliament;
12. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council the Commission and to the Foundation.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTFirst environmental action programme 1973

1. In the first programme of action of the European Communities on the environment, adopted by the Council on 22 November 1973 (OJ No. C 112, 20 December 1973), it is proposed that a European Foundation on the improvement of working and living conditions should be established. The action programme states that 'the Community Institutions should set up a body capable of scanning those elements which, through their combined effects, affect living and working conditions, and of carrying out a long-term forward study of those factors which may endanger the conditions of existence and those which are capable of improving them' (OJ C 112, p. 45).
  
2. As this fundamental objective indicates, the original intention was that the Foundation should concern itself not only with matters of working conditions and immediate living conditions, but also with the natural environment in the wider sense. This also emerges from the list of topics on which the Foundation could encourage research, which are included in the action programme by way of example (OJ C 112, p. 45).
  
3. Under the heading 'Improvement of working conditions' the following research fields are listed:
  - (1) Changes in industrial practices with a view to eliminating tasks of a physically or psychologically arduous nature,
  - (2) Improvement of working relationships,
  - (3) Working hours.
  
4. Under 'Improvement of living conditions' the following areas are listed:
  - (1) Living space in towns:
    - different types of dwelling,
    - optimum utilization of available territory,
    - preservation and renovation of old quarters and town centres, new towns, optimum size of towns,

- (2) The development of transport,
- (3) The development of communications and the data processing revolution, the 'push-button' society, political and cultural implications,
- (4) Social integration of immigrants, notably from non-member states.

5. It will be clear that these two categories of subjects comprise both items having a direct bearing on human living conditions, and items relating to the environment in the wider sense.

#### Establishment and functions of the Foundation

6. One consequence of the action programme on the environment and of the 1974 social action programme was Regulation (EEC) 1365/75 of the Council of 26 May 1975 on the creation of a European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions (OJ No. L 139, 30 May 1975).

7. Article 2 of this regulation states that the aim of the Foundation 'shall be to contribute to the planning and establishment of better living and working conditions through action designed to increase and disseminate knowledge likely to assist this development'. Article 2(2) gives one task of the Foundation as being 'to develop and to pursue ideas on a medium- and long-term improvement of living and working conditions in the light of practical experience and to identify factors leading to change'. Article 2(3) then goes on to list issues with which the Foundation should deal more specifically on the basis of this task. These are:

- (1) Man at work,
- (2) Organization of work and particularly job design,
- (3) Problems peculiar to certain categories of workers,
- (4) Long-term aspects of improvement of the environment,
- (5) Distribution of human activities in space and in time.

8. It will be evident that the first three issues have a direct bearing on the labour process and immediate living conditions, with the stress on the labour process. The fourth issue, however, relates to living conditions in the wider, i.e. environmental, sense. In the fifth issue

we find a combination of working conditions, immediate living conditions and environmental matters. The essential point here is that the emphasis is on the distribution of human activities in time and in space, whereas the environmental action programme was concerned with distribution of work over time. There has thus been a clear displacement here such that in addition to aspects concerning work, environmental aspects can also be considered under this heading. From an environmental point of view therefore, the main interest lies with the fourth and fifth items and with the general objective of carrying out a forward study of factors that might endanger or improve the conditions of existence (3rd recital of the Regulation and Chapter 5(A) of the 1973 environmental action programme).

### Priorities

9. Both the 1973 first environmental action programme and the Regulation on the establishment of the Foundation refer to the need to establish priorities for the Foundation as regards the subject matter of research. The priorities to be established are to be set out in the annual programme of work of the Foundation as part of a four-year rolling programme. Article 12(1) of the Regulation.

10. In the first four-year rolling programme (1977-1980) clear priority is allocated to working conditions and immediate living conditions, having regard to the limited financial and staffing resources of the Foundation. This means that the environmental aspect of the Foundation's activities has been deliberately neglected, not to say ignored. In the list of research subjects, there is not a single environmental item. Where the environmental element is present in the description of a research subject, it has no place whatsoever on the side of implementation of the study or publication. Moreover, the Foundation shows every sign of placing a narrow interpretation on the concept of 'living conditions', which at best refers to people's immediate living conditions and not to living conditions in the wider, environmental sense, as expressly indicated in the list of duties of the Foundation.

11. The second four-year rolling programme (1981-1984) has the impact of technological development as its main subject. This is defined as comprising aspects of both continuity and innovation (Annual Report 1980, estimates for 1983 financial year). The innovation aspect is represented as resulting primarily from the fact that the 1981-1984 programme now also includes a section on the improvement of living conditions and the environment. This, however, is hardly a guarantee that these items will in fact be taken seriously. This applies in particular to the environmental aspect. When the content of the 1981-1984 rolling programmes and the programmes of work for 1981, 1982 and 1983 are compared with actual performance on environment-related research activities, the result is disappointing.

12. While the second four-year rolling programme (1981-1984), which is substantially a continuation of the first rolling programme, announces that more attention will be paid to improving living conditions, it is clear from the priorities listed in this programme that only two items relating to living conditions have been given any priority. Studies on the changing relationship between working time and leisure time are supposed to include the investigation of the impact on living conditions, the quality of life, the environment, leisure time etc. The Foundation also intends to include the environmental aspects in studies on transport problems. It is therefore clear from the rolling programme that matters of living conditions still play a more or less subordinate role in the work of the Foundation. Where reference is made to the improvement of living conditions, what is usually meant is people's immediate living conditions rather than living conditions in the wider, environmental sense.

13. This impression is further confirmed when the programme of activities for 1981 is considered. In the outline of the subject matter of research undertaken by the Foundation the environmental aspect is even less in evidence than in the preview set out in the rolling programme. Only under the heading 'transport' does one of ten subheadings refer to the energy aspect (e.g. the impact on the environment of noise and air pollution, etc) . Where 'living conditions' are referred to, the emphasis is overwhelmingly in relation to work. In the list of seminars and colloquia, the environmental aspect is totally absent, surprisingly so in view of the content of the research carried out.

14. The programme of activities for 1982 is no better in this respect. Here too, living conditions are considered virtually exclusively in terms of work, and the single item in which the environment is allowed to play a role is directly related to working conditions, namely the consequences for health of pollution associated with intensive commuter traffic.
15. In the estimates of revenue and expenditure for the 1983 financial year the provisional programme of activities for 1983, on which the budget for the financial year 1983 is based, is reproduced. Chapter 3, Article 303, outlines the studies undertaken (operational expenditure). In this case it is rather difficult to determine how much effort will in fact be devoted to aspects of human living conditions not directly connected with work and environmental matters. In a number of cases, the term 'environment' is used in describing a research item in one place, but is missing when the same item is referred to elsewhere. Thus item 3034 is described in the estimates as studies on the impact of the changing relationship between working time and leisure time on the quality of life and the environment, while the description of the same item in the explanatory statement to Chapter 3, operational expenditure, refers to appropriations for the conclusion of research contracts and the carrying out of special projects as contributions to the implementation of the programme of work of the foundation in new research fields under the 1981 programme of work (it means 83), in particular research into working hours in relation to life expectancy.
16. In the research actually carried out there is in general scarcely any reference to matters concerning the environment. It is impossible to avoid the impression that the Foundation has indeed taken the environmental aspect into account in the descriptions of the various research projects over the years, but that the environmental aspect has been missing in the practical implementation of these projects. The same impression is given in the list of the Foundation's obligations. There has hitherto not been a single publication with (any aspect of) living conditions as its subject. In the near future one publication is expected to be devoted to immediate living conditions, but only in direct connection with the working situation (work time/leisure time relationship). Not a single publication on environmental matters in the wider sense is projected for the near future, with the possible exception of a publication on transport policy where the energy aspect might possibly be featured as a minor sub-division.

## Involvement of Community Institutions/criticism by the Committee on the Environment and the European Parliament

17. The involvement of the Community Institutions in the activities of the Foundation is provided for in Article 12 of the Implementing Regulation which states that the director of the Foundation shall in drawing up the programme of work, take account of the opinions of the Committee of Experts (see above) and those of the Community Institutions and the ESC. The programme of work is then to be forwarded to the Administrative Board for approval.

18. In the past, the European Parliament, in particular its Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, has repeatedly criticized the policy and activities of the Foundation. In for example the resolution on the discharge for the financial year 1979 (OJ No. L 342/6, 28 November 1980) it is stated that the Foundation should be more closely involved in Community policy-making in the social and environmental fields, and improvements are urged in relations between the Foundation and the relevant committees of Parliament.

19. Subsequent criticism by the Committee on the Environment was aimed in particular at the absence of environmental projects in the programme of the Foundation, and this in turn led, during consultations on the 1983 budget - in the first reading in October 1982 - to the tabling by the committee of an amendment to Article 641 (subsidy to the Foundation) proposing that the appropriations from the preliminary draft which had been reduced by the Council should be reinstated but transferred to Chapter 100 and reduced by one unit of account as a symbolic warning (justification for Amendment 184), until such time as due account had been taken of the committee's criticisms. Finally, the absence of forward-projected environmental research in the work of the Foundation led to the tabling of the motion for a resolution by Mr Muntingh, following which the Committee on the environment decided to draw up this report.

## The structure of the Foundation

20. The implementing Regulation states that the Foundation shall comprise an Administrative Board, a director and deputy director and a Committee of Experts. The Administrative Board is to consist of representatives of the Member States, of employers' organizations and employees' organizations

appointed by the Council on the basis of one Member for each Member State and for each of these categories, plus three members appointed by the Commission to represent it. Although not provided for in the statutes of the Foundation, two non voting coordinators from employers' and employees' organizations (UNICE and ECFTU) are present. Substitute members are also appointed on the same basis.

21. This Administrative Board determines the policy of the Foundation following the opinions of the Committee of Experts. The Administrative Board also draws up the programme of work on the basis of a report submitted by the director. Pursuant to Article 7 (1) of the implementing regulation, the Administrative Board does this following consultation with the Commission. Any criticism of the content of these annual programmes therefore applies to the director and the Administrative Board of the Foundation, and also to the Commission. The Administrative Board is also responsible for the budget of the Foundation.

22. The director and the deputy director are appointed by the Commission on a proposal from the Administrative Board. The director is responsible for running the Foundation and has authority over its staff. He thus fulfils a management function. He is accountable to the Administrative Board. The duties of the director include drawing up the annual programme of work and the annual reports, both of which must be approved by the Administrative Board.

23. The Committee of Experts consists of twelve members appointed by the Council on a proposal by the Commission and drawn from scientific and other circles concerned in the activities of the Foundation (Article 10 of the regulation) Article 10 also stipulates that the Commission will take into account when drawing up its proposal:

- the need to maintain a balance between the two complementary aspects of the foundation - i.e. living conditions and working conditions;
- the need for the best possible scientific and technical consultation;
- the need for at least one national from each Member State to be appointed.

24. In practice, and having regard to the membership of the Committee of Experts, the Commission would appear to have made inadequate provision for balanced representation. The duties of the Committee consist in

providing solicited or unsolicited advisory services to the other bodies of the Foundation, in particular in drawing up the annual programmes of work. The Committee thus acts as a guarantee of a balanced relationship between the two aspects of the Foundation's work. Any criticisms in respect of the latter thus applies also to the Committee of Experts.

25. The operational apparatus of the Foundation consists of five departments, among which the department for research promotion is the most significant in this connection. This department comprises six project managers, with administrative backup, who are responsible for overseeing the different research projects. The research itself is farmed out by the Foundation to research institutes in the Member States on the basis of research contracts.

#### Proposals on the strengthening of European environmental research

26. It is therefore justified to conclude that there is an imbalanced relationship between research on the improvement of working conditions and research on the improvement of living conditions, in particular, the environment. Research has been almost exclusively aimed at the working and not at the ecological environment. This is due both to the structure of the Foundation itself and to a failure of the Community Institutions to make their influence felt. In the latter category, it would appear that the Commission has failed, or failed adequately, to make use of available possibilities, while in the case of the European Parliament, it is a matter of its repeated calls for improvement of this imbalanced situation being effectively ignored by the departments of the Foundation.

27. The latter factor may well be due to the structure of the Foundation, but the lack of more direct possibilities for Parliament to exert its influence may well play a role here, though such possibilities are certainly open to the Commission in as much as it is associated with the adoption of the programme of work (Article 7(1)). Of the different possibilities that exist for strengthening environmental research in the European context, two possible solutions are proposed below which perhaps can best be described in the given circumstances, as the most expensive and the cheapest respectively;

1. The transfer to CEDEFOP in Berlin of all work in relation to working conditions

This would leave the Dublin in Foundation with a specific mandate to report on all factors the combined effect of which has an impact on the environment in the wider sense, and to conduct a forward study of factors liable to jeopardize or to improve living conditions.

Research topics to which the Foundation might well give an impetus could include:

- the long-term aspects of environmental improvement
- distribution of human activities by time and place

The Administrative Board of the Foundation would, in addition to representatives of the Member States and the Commission, need to comprise representatives of employers' and employee's organizations. The European Parliament should also be represented on the Administrative Board through its Committee on the Environment. The title of the Foundation might be 'European Foundation for the Improvement of Living Conditions'. The Committee calls on the Commission to examine this proposal and to report back to it. In the meantime a second possibility could be envisaged which would involve changing the structure of the existing Foundation.

2. Changing the structure of the Dublin Foundation so as to ensure that due regard is paid in the activities of the Foundation to the hitherto neglected environmental component of its duties. This will mean changes in the membership of the Administrative Board, requiring it to be expanded to include representatives of environmental organizations from the Member States. The European Parliament - through (a) its Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and

(b) the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment should also be represented on the Administrative Board. Representation of the European Parliament through the appropriate Committees should also be arranged in respect of other existing or projected similar European institutions. The obvious advantage of this 'internal' solution is that use can be made of existing infrastructures and staff, so that no additional cost need be incurred in this connection.

A possible disadvantage of this solution would be that the number of the Foundation's research projects devoted to labour matters would have to be reduced, thus provoking resistance to this approach. Increasing resources so that the volume of labour projects would not be affected would be a possible solution.

If increasing the Administrative Board is regarded as utterly unacceptable, consultations should be held on balanced reductions in the numbers of representatives of Government, employer, employee and environment organizations. A possible approach would also be for Government representatives to be represented exclusively on the Committee of Experts.

Membership of the Committee of Experts should be by analogy with that of the Administrative Board.

#### Other considerations

28. The European Parliament should, pending a Council decision amending the Statute, be more closely associated with the programme of work of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Working and Living Conditions and of the European Centre for the Development of Occupational Training

and this arrangement should also apply to all existing and projected institutions. Responsible authorities of both institutions should request the relevant Parliamentary committees for the research they require in good time, so that this can be taken into account in the initial stages of decision-making. Reports should then be drawn up for the Parliamentary Committees on the initial results in the Administrative Board, so that the reactions of the European Parliament can be taken into account in the final decision-making procedure.

29. The rapporteur would mention that on 20 June 1983 the Committee sent a letter to the Administrative Board of the Foundation, setting out a number of suggested topics which they would have liked to see incorporated into the programme, but no response has yet been received. The Committee considers this to be most unsatisfactory.

30. The representatives of the European Commission should give an active impetus to programme preparation. This initiating function would need to be closely bound up with the Environmental Action Programme, in particular with the research and development programme in the field of environment protection. So as to increase the relevance of research to policy, a so-called free margin should be maintained in programming in order to create conditions favourable to research support for short-term reports by the Commission.

Discussion in committee

31. The opinion of the Committee on Budgetary Control was taken into account by the committee during the discussion of the report. An amendment inserting a new paragraph 9 requesting the Commission to report back to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on the possibility of transferring to the Berlin Foundation research connected with working conditions was adopted. This amendment takes into account the main preoccupations of the Committee on Budgetary Control.

Motion for a Resolution (Doc. 1-787/82)

tabled by Mr Huntingh pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure  
on the Dublin Foundation

The European Parliament,

- A having regard to the opinions of the European Parliament on the creation of this Foundation<sup>1</sup>,
- B having regard to the reports of the Court of Auditors on the 1978<sup>2</sup> and 1980<sup>3</sup> financial years,
1. Recalls that the European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions was established in application of the first environmental action programme<sup>4</sup> and the social action programme<sup>5</sup>;
  2. Points out that this Foundation was intended as 'a body capable of scanning those elements which, through their combined effects, affect living and working conditions, and of carrying out a long-term forward study of those factors which may endanger the conditions of existence and those which are capable of improving them';
  3. Stresses above all the fact that the Foundation, when drawing up its annual programme of work, is required to take account of the opinions of the European Parliament, as laid down in Article 12 of the Regulation establishing the Foundation<sup>6</sup>;
  4. Regrets deeply that this Foundation, despite repeated critical comment from the European Parliament and the Court of Auditors, has remained unable to carry out half of the tasks conferred on it in the above Regulation;

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 76 of 3.7.74, pp. 33 and 36

<sup>2</sup> OJ C 326 of 31.12.79, p. 156

<sup>3</sup> OJ C 344 of 31.12.81, p. 136

<sup>4</sup> OJ C 112 of 20.12.73, p. 45

<sup>5</sup> OJ C 13 of 12.2.74, p. 1

<sup>6</sup> OJ L 139 of 30.5.75, p. 1

5. Stresses therefore that this Foundation
  - (a) must constitute a genuine source of assistance for the Commission
  - (b) must devote at least half of its activities to the improvement of living conditions and the natural environment
  - (c) must take proper account of the suggestions of the European Parliament;
6. Instructs its committee responsible, given that the opinions of the European Parliament have been heeded only in part, to subject the aims, activities, structure and policy of this Foundation to close scrutiny and to report on their findings at an early date.

OPINION

of the Committee on Budgetary Control

Draftsman : Mr. Edward KELLETT-BOWMAN

On 14 June 1983 the Committee on Budgetary Control appointed Mr. Kellett-Bowman draftsman.

It considered and adopted the draft opinion at its meeting of 13 July 1983 unanimously.

Present: Mr. Aigner, chairman; Mr. Treacy, vice-chairman;  
Mr. Kellett-Bowman, rapporteur; Mr. Gabert; Mr. Gouthier; Mr. Irmer;  
Mr. Jürgens; Mr. Key; Mr. Mart; Mr. Orlandi; Mr. Saby.

## Introduction

1. The Committee on Budgetary Control has been charged with the responsibility for presenting to Parliament each year, in plenary session, a report on the discharge in respect of the accounts of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.<sup>1</sup> The Committee has considered the accounts from legality, regularity, timing and effectiveness viewpoints, when preparing its annual report. Also, it has drawn on the relevant material contained in the Court of Auditors' annual report.

2. The Committee on Budgetary Control has not, on any occasion, found fundamental problems in the course of its examination of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Financial management was sound and the Committee has been able, each year, to recommend that discharge be granted; this recommendation was followed by Parliament.

## Problems of an accounting nature

3. A number of relatively technical problems, primarily of an accounting nature, came to light in the past. These concerned annuality, the scale of carry forwards of appropriations, the procedure for the approval of transfers, the rate of spend of available appropriations, the enhancing of the income from lettings, charge for publications, accounts in respect of construction projects, and certain other minor matters. These have been resolved to the satisfaction of the Committee.

## Points of political control significance

4. The Committee stressed the need for ensuring that discharge was given by Parliament to the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, because this would be in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of 22 July 1975 and with the general financial regulation. This has been accepted. Amendment of the relevant financial provisions has been deferred, however, until the main financial regulation has been amended.

-----  
<sup>1</sup> See Docs. 1-726/79, 1-251/81 and 1-33/82

5. The Committee also made recommendations for changes in the social security system applicable to the staff of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. The recommendations put forward by the Committee were adopted by the Council and a new system is now in operation.

#### Weaknesses resulting from the 'unanimity rule'

6. The Committee noted that extensive delays resulted from the apparent requirement that the publication of expensive studies required unanimity. The Committee felt that the system of majority voting should apply, as envisaged at Article 6(b) of the founding regulation<sup>1</sup>, with the publication of supplementary reports setting out minority views, where necessary.

#### Closer involvement in the formulation of EC policy

7. The Committee noted that the founding regulation envisaged that the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions should be involved in the formulation of EC policy in the social sphere. Such active participation did not appear to have taken place and the Committee urged the Council and the Commission to ensure, in future, fuller involvement of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions in the formulation of EC social and environmental policy.

#### Other aspects

8. The Committee noted the economies that resulted from the fact that the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions had recourse to outside services for translation and printing work thereby **finding** solutions that could be emulated by other EC satellites and institutions. It also approved of the way in which the conference centre was managed and the alacrity with which the Foundation responded to suggestions regarding accounting matters.

#### Scope of the Foundation's work

9. Attention was drawn by the Court of Auditors and by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection to the apparent concentration of the Foundation on the study of ways to improve working

-----  
<sup>1</sup> OJ no. L 139, 30.5.1975, page

conditions without investigating how living conditions could be improved. The representatives of the Foundation gave assurances that the comprehensive mandate would be respected. The Committee indicated <sup>1</sup> that it expected 'that a substantial output of pertinent material will begin to flow from the Foundation in the near future which will vindicate the extensive Community investment involved.'

Need to look at the Foundation jointly with CEDEFOP

10. The Committee considers that it is important that the Foundation be considered jointly with CEDEFOP, the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training based in Berlin. Both satellites are similar in several respects and the time may be ripe for restructuring both simultaneously.

11. It could be envisaged that the Centre could take charge of the social conditions aspect of the work of the Foundation - which would fit in well with the vocational training aspect of the work of the Centre.

12. On the other hand, the Foundation was set up by Council regulation no. 1365/75<sup>2</sup> and came under the environment programme which provided expressly for its establishment. Because it has concentrated on working conditions - rather than living conditions - it has disappointed those who are perturbed by the enormous environmental problems that face the industrialised world. The response of the Foundation that study of working conditions must perforce involve living conditions does not effectively counter the point made by those who are concerned about the world around us.

13. Adjustments to the Foundation's regulation that would give it a clear mandate in relation to the environment - whilst enabling it to shed its other responsibilities to the Centre should be feasible. Work of an environmental nature - on urban surroundings, acid rain, the pollution of the rivers, lakes and seas of Europe, the impact of changes in the natural environment on the quality of life, etc. - would constitute a substantial and eminently desirable task for a revamped Foundation.

14. The Committee has observed in discharge reports that the Council and the Commission have failed to realise the full potential of the two satellites. The Committee has further observed, in the past, that both the Foundation and the Centre have been starved of operational funds to the point that the ratio of

-----  
<sup>1</sup> Doc. 1-726/79 page 9, para. 9

<sup>2</sup> OJ no. L 139, 29.5.1975, page 1

management costs to the operational budgets has been unrealistic. From these two observations, it is clear that an urgent review is necessary.

#### Suggested reforms

15. At this point, the Committee stresses the importance of the work done by the Foundation in the sphere of working conditions which has improved the 'human visage' of the EC. The present suggestion is made so as to enable consideration to be given to providing a more efficient working of both satellites and to improving transparency.

16. A further reform could be the reduction in the size of the Administrative Board which, with 33 members and 33 alternates, is unwieldy for so small a satellite. A similar reduction in the case of the Management Board of the Centre is suggested. When the proposal for the setting up of the Centre was first made, it is noteworthy that the Commission suggested 15 members for the Management Board (Com(74)353 final of 27 March 1973).

17. These two reforms:-

- I the transfer to the Berlin Centre of the social enquiry work of the Foundation in Dublin; and
- II the establishment of the Dublin Foundation for Environmental Research;

are suggested to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for consideration.

18. If carried through, these reforms would ensure greater transparency of the rôles of the two satellites, would tend to improve their effectiveness and would remove what has been a continuing source of concern for many members of Parliament - the need for assurance that environmental aspects of the EC are being taken care of adequately.

19. As satisfactory basic structures exist in the two satellites, the re-arranging of rôles, which is proposed on the grounds of enhanced transparency and cost effectiveness, could be carried out fairly speedily by way of amendments to the existing regulations.

## Conclusions

20. After several years' work, both satellites must have completed some of the tasks set for them initially. Therefore, the restructuring proposed is an alternative to a possible reduction in their organigrams - especially in view of the comments at paragraph 14 above.

Indeed, the occasion could, perhaps, be availed of by both satellites to exchange staff with the Commission, with each other and with other research institutes - so as to introduce new blood - as previously suggested by the Committee on Budgetary Control.

With a lighter administrative structure and clearer and more comprehensive roles, both the Dublin Foundation for Environmental Research and the Berlin Centre would be able to cope with their better-defined tasks.

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT

for the Committee on Budgets

on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council  
for

- I. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No. 337/75 on the creation of a European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training
- II. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No. 1365/75 on the creation of a European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions
- III. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No. 1416/76 on the financial provisions applying to the European Centre for the Development of Vocational training
- IV. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No. 1417/76 on the financial provisions applying to the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

(Doc. 1-991/81)

Draftsman: Mrs H. SALISCH

On 26 February 1982 the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment appointed Mrs H. SALISCH draftsman of an opinion.

At its meetings of 16 and 25 February 1983 it considered the draft opinion and adopted it unanimously at the latter meeting.

The following took part in the vote: Mr Papaefstratiou (chairman), Mr Pattison (2nd vice-chairman), Mrs Salisch (draftsman), Mr Boyes, Mr Ceravolo, Mr Chanterie, Ms. Clwyd, Mrs Duport, Mr Eisma, Mr Estgen, Mr Ghergo, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Patterson and Mr Tuckman.

The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment requests the Committee on Budgets to take into account the following conclusions in its motion for a resolution:

1. Is pleased to note that the above-mentioned regulation enables a direct budgetary link to be made between the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training and the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions on the one hand and the European Parliament on the other;
2. Emphasizes that both the Berlin Institute and the Dublin Institute can perform supportive academic functions in the formulation and programming of appropriate Community measures;
3. Points out that in the near future there must be an in-depth discussion of (a) the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training in Berlin and (b) the Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions in Dublin on the basis of the EISMA report on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection;
4. Regrets that the Commission has not made sufficient use of the reports drawn up inter alia by CEDEFOP, Berlin;
5. Further regrets that the budgets of these European establishments reveal an imbalance between the staff complement and the budget appropriations for operating expenditure;
6. Expressly approves the main points of inquiry, research and documentation formulated by CEDEFOP and the Dublin Foundation but takes the view that there must be an improvement in consultations both between the institutes and with the other Community bodies concerned;
7. Requests in this connection that the European Parliament should be represented on the supervisory bodies of the institutes, which have hitherto had sole responsibility for drawing up the programmes of work, since Parliament's opinions, which must, according to Article 12 of the basic regulation, be included in the programmes of work, have so far not been taken into account in a fully satisfactory manner;

8. Supports the view of its Committee on the Environment that the Dublin Foundation for the Improvement of Living Conditions must carry out long-term, prospective investigations into factors determining the living conditions of Community citizens and factors which might improve these conditions;
9. Takes the view that if the terms of reference of the institutes are extended, budgetary resources will have to be reallocated accordingly; any additional appropriations must be for operational purposes only and must in no event be used to increase staff costs.