ECO/ESG

Brussels, 20 February 2025

To the members of the
European Semester Group

The secretary-general of the European Economic and Social Committee is pleased to enclose the

MINUTES

of the 34th meeting
of the
European Semester Group,
held at the Committee building in Brussels
on
20 February 2025

The European Semester Group (ESG) held its 34th meeting at the Committee building in Brussels, from **09:30 to 13:00 on Thursday, 20 February 2025**. It was a hybrid meeting, with some members connecting remotely via the Interactio videoconferencing system and others attending in person. The meeting was chaired by the ESG president, **Luca Jahier.**

1. Adoption of the draft agenda

The draft agenda was **adopted**.

2. Approval of the minutes of the 33rd European Semester Group meeting held on 9 December 2024 (EESC-2025-00202-00-00-PV-REF)

The minutes were approved.

3. Introduction by the president of the group, **Luca Jahier**.

- The president welcomed the **increased involvement and high-quality work** of those contributing to the European Semester Group's consultation in the framework of the **ECO/651** information report and **ECO/652** opinion on the reform and investment proposals formulated as part of the 2024-2025 European Semester cycle.
- Following the decision not to publish the Annual Sustainable Growth Survey 2025, the European Commission has also withdrawn the Winter Forecast, resulting in unstructured changes to the European Semester's framework.
- The Competitiveness Compass mentions the **connection between the Competitiveness Coordination Tool and the European Semester**. However, a clear framework defining how this interconnection will operate is necessary.
- **The EESC raised concerns about excluding key expenditures in green, digital and defence from EU deficit and debt calculations**. These concerns were not considered in fiscal and economic policy reforms.
- Ursula von der Leyen addressed plans to activate the escape clause in order to exclude defence expenditures. This escape clause should be framed in the context of financing EU defence projects.

The ESG president, **Mr Jahier**, opened the floor for questions/comments. **Mr O'Connor**, **Mr Doz Orrit**, **Ms Vorbach**, **Mr Sipko**, **Mr Gobiņš** and **Mr Morkis** made the following comments:

- EU defence capacity must be considered alongside the **development of a political and legal framework**. It is important to note that the EU is not a single country or a federation of countries. The EU has a unique history, and the Member States hold differing views on defence policy.
- As the EU currently lacks a defence structure, there is **a significant gap** regarding defence that needs to be addressed. Given the geopolitical situation**, a resolution from the Committee is necessary**. Regarding the escape clause, it is also important to assess the impact on social expenditures and ensure that they are not reduced as a result.
- The EESC should quickly **react with a solution, pointing out the risks and advantages** related to current debates on defence expenditure and security.
- While academic studies show that spending on military structures is counterproductive, civil society must encourage global security leaders to **prioritise peace-building efforts**. Questions remain about how long the escape clause will remain active and how it will impact already

unsustainable public debt levels in some Member States. The EU must mobilise revenue through **corporate taxation while combating corruption and shadow economies**.

- Defence investments are essential if Europe wishes to maintain its Eastern territories and its influence in global decision-making processes.
- Defence expenditures cannot be excluded from discussions within the European Semester as defence has become a major concern for all Member States.

4. **State of play of the consultation** in the framework of the **ECO/651** information report and **ECO/652** opinion on the reform and investment proposals formulated as part of the 2024-2025 European Semester cycle: questionnaire and round tables (presentation of the reports).

Ms Colombe Gregoire, ESG secretariat, stressed the following:

- **The consultations in the Member States have been finalised** with the last round table in Malta on 7 February. The annex contains already 24 national contributions, whereas the information report ECO/651 contains 20.
- The second study group meetings for **ECO/651 and ECO/652** are scheduled for 4 and 14 March and are e**xpected to be adopted as a package on 15 April at the ECO section and on 29-30 April at the plenary session**.

Mr Philip Von Brockdorff presented the round table in Malta, which took place on 07/02/2025:

- The overall outcome of the round table in Malta was very positive, with structured, effective and active participation of social partners. The trade union representatives at MCESD were active and raised relevant comments.
- The social partners were particularly interested in finding out more about the Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF), Malta's role in it, and the involvement of social partners.

Mr András Edelényi presented the round table in Hungary, which took place on 06/12/2024:

- The overall awareness of the topics discussed was comparatively low. Nevertheless, the contribution by the participants was strong, particularly on the topic of civil society involvement.
- Hungary is behind in performing on the country-specific recommendations (CSRs). On the one hand, the government tends to implement those recommendations in a selective way and on the other hand, some recommendations need a long lead-time to be performed.
- The ex-post reviews reveal that flexibility is necessary to reallocate the available funds according to the needs identified in the analysis.
- The inclusion of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) was positively highlighted.
- Particularly for employee organisations, the value and role of human resources regarding competitive productivity and the fight against brain-drain and emigration is crucial.
- The awareness concerning the fiscal structural plans was below average. However, the general feeling of the participants was that it was a good initiative to put a stronger focus on the 60% debt level instead of the 3% annual deficit. The planning structure was perceived as too complicated and especially the expenditure trajectory. The social partners expressed doubts and fears on the just split of transition costs.
- With regard to the RRF, the social partners were doubtful whether the outlined goals will be met. The majority stated that whenever such funds are available Hungary should strive to make better use of these resources.

Ms Justyna Ochędzan talked about the round table in Poland, which took place on 13/12/2024:

- The representation was very balanced at the round table which included, among others, social partners, NGO's and representatives of the European Commission.
  The representatives of civil society had a positive view regarding the situation in Poland and engaged in discussions about the need for investments, as well as the Draghi Report, the effectiveness of these actions and the resilience of society.
- The RRF was discussed, and the role of the different criteria used, the needs of society and the quality and pace of the implemented reforms. The funds disbursed to Poland were not always used as they should have been.
- Regarding public expenditures, an excessive deficit procedure was opened for Poland.
- There were also discussions regarding medium-term plans and expenses on social issues and whether they were taken into account into the debt calculation.
- The entrepreneurs were particularly concerned about regulation and overregulation, as well as about the burden resulting from EU legislation and what effect this has on international competitivity.

Ms Cinzia del Rio presented the round table in Italy, which took place on 13/12/2024:

- The Recovery Resilience Plan (RRP), the CSRs and the medium-term fiscal-structural plans (MTFSPs) were discussed. All stakeholders had impressive knowledge regarding the topics, which fostered a fruitful discussion on these topics, the challenges and their impact.
- It was highlighted that there is an imbalanced impact at the local territorial level. All policies are centralised, which is detrimental to local development. Furthermore, a weakness in the spending capacity of the Recovery Plan at the local level was also stated.
- All participants pointed out the problems of cohesion policy in the context of the MFF's negotiations, as well as the future of the cohesion funds on which Italy heavily relies.
- Regarding the fiscal structural plan there was a general agreement to achieve microeconomic stability; however, this must be paired with greater attention to the social dimension of investments. Therefore, the stakeholders expressed concerns about the risk of limiting expensive economic policies due to the new economic governance rules.
- The participation and involvement of stakeholders is fragmented and weak and all participants underlined the need for structured, coordinated and formalised involvement.
- Concerns about the future of social investments were also expressed, especially due to reduced public spending capacity. There is a risk of less investment in public services at a territorial level, especially in the health and education sectors.
- While the employment rate in Italy has increased, it is mainly linked to the creation of poor-quality jobs, impacting welfare, youth, women, etc.
- The fragmented use of EU funds was mentioned and the lack of a medium and long-term vision.
- The tax wage and the need for reforms to help low-income families were also mentioned, while enterprise representatives highlighted the need for measures to address high energy prices and criticised the lack of a common policy at EU level.
- Furthermore, the need for comparable, accessible and transparent data, as well as for simplifying procedures, was highlighted.
- The importance of good local governance was also discussed, as was the lack of qualified staff in public administration, which affects the planning and implementation of projects.

Mr Jack O'Connor talked about the round table in Ireland, which took place on 16/01/2025:

- In Ireland, the general interest in the RRF and the cohesion fund is less pronounced compared to other countries.
- There was considerable agreement on various issues, particularly on the lack of awareness of the CSRs and the SDGs. There was also criticism regarding engagement, especially from GIII and GII and less from GI.
- The participants agreed on the need for structural engagement that was not identified in the CSRs and they agreed with the CSRs' focus on infrastructural deficits, such as for water and energy; however, they criticised the missing focus on housing issues.
- The participants put an emphasis on the social dimension, as well as on the sustainability of public finances. Due to heavy reliance on corporate tax in Ireland, the need for a sustainable tax system in the long-term was also emphasised.
- The employers' group put more emphasis on competitiveness and on reducing regulation, which is an issue for some EU countries. However, in Ireland we may need more regulation in a number of areas.

Mr Andris Gobiņš highlighted the following on the Latvian round table, which took place on 20/01/2025:

- The discussion was very intense and included a wide variety of stakeholders, e.g., environmental organisations, farmers, regional development organisations, think tanks, energy sector trade unions, and the Chamber of Commerce. However, no participant represented the employers' side.
- The participants mentioned that the key problem of the different types of funding - the RRF, the structural funds, the national budget – was the lack of coordination between them.
- While an observation monitoring system exists for the structural funds, this is not the case for the RRF.
- The European Commission should consider applying greater flexibility regarding the 2026 deadline.
- There was almost no participation in the mid-term structural plans, and the participants neither knew about it nor were they involved.
- The participants suggested including a separate point on resilience, not only for the institutions but also for civil society and democracy.
- Uncertainties are growing in Latvia regarding the importance of the Green Deal and climate goals. There is a shift from climate mitigation towards adapting to climate change instead.
- Other problems raised included issues regarding financing and securing energy availability, insufficient education in STEM subjects in schools, and the high costs for EU agricultural policy.
- Social questions, such as the widening gap between wealthy and non-wealthy people in Latvia, have still not been successfully tackled, even though this issue has always been in the recommendations of the Commission and the RRF.
- The participants argued that there is a major problem in representation and participation regarding who gets which types of funds (RRF, mid-term review of the MFF), as the decision lies solely with the Ministries.

Mr Javier Doz Orrit outlined the results of the round table in Spain, which took place on 28/01/2025:

- The participants generally agreed on the recommendations, even though some sectors saw certain shortcomings, particularly in the fields of water management, which is an important issue for Spain, as well as on the topics of poverty and inequality reduction and housing, which are also main concerns in Spain, as highlighted by the Workers' and Civil Society Group. The Employers' Group stated that there is not enough attention on creating work for smaller enterprises.
- Criticism was expressed about the lack of participation regarding CSRs, the structural fiscal plans and the RRF.
- In terms of the fiscal structural plan, some participants stressed the need to increase fiscal expenditure as there is room for manoeuvre.
- Group II and III were in favour of the fiscal reforms connected to the RRP; however, it was expressed that applying these reforms at a parliamentary level could become difficult.
- The participants jointly agreed that the possibility of approving investments and reforms should be extended until 2028, thus into the new MFF period.

Mr Vertti Kiukas presented the results of the round table in Finland, which took place on 28/11/2024:

- During the debate, NATO Secretary Mark Rutte's comment on cutting social expenditure to finance defence expenditure was discussed, as it is a topic that hugely divides Finnish society.
- The participants also talked about the country's public deficit, which is already at a high level and rising, as well as about the Finnish debt rate, which is growing at the highest pace in the EU.
- Furthermore, other issues discussed were the social and health reform introduced by the Finnish government three years ago and which the Finnish government must now manage to finance. Social and health service expenditure now represents one third of the state budget.
- The financial resources necessary for this reform, combined with increasing costs of social and health services and an ageing population, are already a major challenge for the country. As a result of substantial additional defence investments to protect the border with Russia, the national budget deficit is growing, leading to cuts in social security and service systems.

5. **Winter Economic Forecast of the European Commission.** Presentation by a representative of DG ECFIN, European Commission.

Agenda point dismissed following notification by the European Commission that the Winter Forecast would not be published this year.

6. **Competitiveness Compass: how it will be taken into account in the European Semester and discussion about the future of Annual Sustainable Growth Survey.** Presentation by **Arnold De Boer**, SG REFORM, European Commission.

- It was explained that the Commission introduced the Summer and Winter forecast in 2021 in response to the crisis, enabling quicker reactions to a rapidly changing environment that made quarterly updates necessary for greater economic responsiveness. However, the production of interim forecasts has been discontinued. **As of now, the Commission will go back to its usual approach and publish two fully-fledged forecasts each year, in Spring and in Autumn**.
- The Competitiveness Compass was presented and the link with the European Semester was explained. Competitiveness is a core issue of the EU policy agenda **and a primary concern of**

citizens and businesses. The Compass is the **first major initiative of the new Commission's mandate**, offering a roadmap of concrete policy actions to restore the EU's competitiveness.

- **The Draghi Report forms the basis for the work on the Compass with 176 recommendations on restoring European competitiveness**, with many focusing on digitalisation and others calling for greater ambition.
- The Compass highlights the EU's numerous assets for excelling in global economic competition. The EU suffers from **long-standing weaknesses and structural barriers** and it has been in a divergent economic trajectory for two decades vis- à-vis competitors.
- The GDP gap between the EU and the US has doubled, and China has overtaken Europe in terms of GDP. The EU is falling behind, with the Compass highlighting sluggish productivity growth as a root cause.
- **Productivity growth is the result of three factors**:
  New young start-ups investing in breakthrough innovation, innovation among large leading firms, and efficiency gains in mature firms adapting these innovations. The EU falls short in all three areas.
  The Draghi report highlights two additional factors affecting the EU's competitiveness. First, the trajectory of the **clean energy transition and the cost of energy**. Second, the **risks for security that comes from an unstable neighbourhood and excessive dependencies and vulnerabilities** arising from long global supply chains.
- The Compass aims to **address these weaknesses by proposing a series of policy shifts or accelerations** and by suggesting different ways of working together.
- Following the Draghi report, the Compass focuses on **three transformational imperatives** to restore the EU's productivity dynamics:
  - First, **closing the innovation gap**, particularly for the tech and digital sector.
  - Second, developing **a joint roadmap for decarbonisation and competitiveness**.
  - Third, **reducing excessive dependencies** that can become vulnerabilities **and increasing security**.
- In addition, the Compass also presents **five key horizontal enablers:**
  - Simplification of the regulatory environment (the primary request from stakeholders and governments).
  - Fully exploiting the benefits of the Single Market.
  - Financing through a Savings and Investment Union and a refocused EU Budget.
  - Promoting skills and quality jobs while ensuring social fairness.
  - Better coordination of policies at EU and national levels. The Compass proposes a Competitiveness Coordination Tool backed by a competitiveness fund aiming to align EU and Member States priorities for action, investment and reforms in key selected areas.
- Regarding the **relationship between the Competitiveness Compass and the European Semester Cycle,** the following points were highlighted:
  - The **European Semester (ES) will continue to identify socio-economic challenges** and provide guidance to Member States on the policy action needed to address them on an annual basis.
  - It will **move away from the parsimonious approach of CSRs** and be built on a stronger analytical basis.

- There will be stronger ownership through better use of structured dialogue with the Member States and other stakeholders on concrete policy actions, including on past CSR implementation.
- In the context of the Semester, we should **identify key bottlenecks** in the absorption of all types of funding and determine short and medium-term actions.
- The **Spring Package** of the European Semester will provide CSRs based on the identification of the main country-specific challenges in the Country Reports.
- While the Semester is an annual process focusing on economic policy coordination, **the Compass takes an EU-wide approach to competitiveness**, identifying key areas and policies that go beyond national borders. It looks at competitiveness from a cross-border level, encouraging Member States to work together and address needs as one.
- The form of the Compass is still being discussed. Pilot areas may include energy and transport infrastructure, digital and AI infrastructure, biotechnology, and key manufacturing capacities. Policy priorities, shortcomings and responsibilities must be agreed upon.
- The focus is on **cross-border EU added value**, avoiding overlap.
- The Semester continues to examine needs at the Member State level linked also to competitiveness. It maintains a broader focus on the coordination of economic and social policies.
- The Semester and the Competitiveness Compass **complement** each other by providing a structured approach for Member States to improve their economic resilience and performance.

The ESG President, Mr Jahier, opened the floor for questions/comments. **Mr Gobiņš**, **Ms Vorbach**, **Mr Doz Orrit**, **Ms Del Rio**, **Mr Andersson, Mr Schmidt**, **Ms Calistru**, **Mr Dandea**, **Mr Palmieri**, **Mr Schlüter**, **Ms Grégoire** and the ESG President **Mr Jahier** took the floor:

- *How does the Commission ensure that competitiveness is in line with the EU's key goal of cohesion?*
- The primary focus should be on safeguarding people's standard of living and fostering social cohesion, rather than pursuing competitiveness as an end in itself. Regarding the Compass, there appears to be more emphasis on simplification and less focus on investments, infrastructure and finance. Concerns have also been raised about potential pressure on social and environmental standards. For example, the EU Taxonomy reflects the complexities of the environment we live in, even if it results in additional bureaucracy. In its communication for the next MFF, the Commission asks the Council to focus on own resources, which could be key to addressing the financing challenges.
- The Compass lacks a clear focus on financing and funding. It does not include information on how to address issues regarding investments and we have an annual investment deficit of approximately €18 billion. *Should this financing come from public or private sources? Should it be handled at the Member State level or at the European level? Should we rely on capital markets or private savings?* Furthermore, there is no timeline for completing the Capital Markets Union, leaving this issue unresolved.
- Social issues appear to have been ignored in the Compass. However, during the Belgian Presidency, social matters were a key focus, and some opinions were developed on this topic. Social affairs should not only be considered important in their own right but also as factors that influence growth and productivity. A strong EU social model could drive both investment and economic growth.

- Governance is mentioned in the Compass but it is unclear how it will function in practice. While there is recognition of the need for an industrial policy, key questions remain: *How will access to critical raw materials be ensured?* There is a pressing need to closely coordinate trade policy with industrial policy to address modern challenges effectively.
- Simplification can be beneficial if it helps companies grow, but it should not lead to deregulation of national labour markets, which would be undesirable. A critical issue here is artificial intelligence (AI). The EU cannot afford to fall behind due to inadequate regulations. Unlike in the United States, Europe must develop robust and effective AI regulations.
- The trade unions are disappointed because the social dimension has disappeared from this competitiveness agenda and is left entirely to national policies. *How can we use national spending capacity to address the social agenda?* While the Social Convergence Framework may not be binding, it remains an instrument that should be considered. *Does the European Commission think that the European social model is part of the EU's competitiveness or that we should mimic the competitiveness goals of China or the US, and risk abandoning the EU social model?*
- *What common financial tools are available at the European level?* You mentioned that the Semester allows for ownership of projects, but there is no structured participation of stakeholders in the dialogue. Despite repeated requests, the Commission has not provided binding guidelines on consulting all stakeholders at the national level, leaving only fragmented involvement. The Semester's participation processes are insufficient. *What kind of social stability can we guarantee for Member States?*
- The Compass is also concerned with social policy, as it is about sharing prosperity, not poverty. However, funding and the need for own resources are critical issues. Member States' budgets will be under significant pressure, especially with their social, infrastructure decarbonisation and defence agendas. Customs duties and tariffs should not become tools for increasing own resources.
- *Concerning the €37.5 billion target, what is expected to be achieved through reducing administrative and regulatory burdens by 25% and 35% for SMEs? Will the Commission now assess how much each proposal adds to or subtracts from this €37.5 billion target?* Additionally, impact assessments need reviewing - especially in areas like taxation.
- Competitiveness is not a religion, and we should question its broader purpose. *The question is for what do we need a competitive economy? How we plan to finance all the challenges we face, whether in defence or the green transition?* The Compass also lacks focus on sustainable development and neglects rural development and agriculture, where investment is declining.
- Strategic autonomy in Europe means we can no longer rely on the US. We must redefine this concept for ourselves, including sustainable development and funding sources. While national budgets may be squeezed, this is not due to social spending or decarbonisation but to poor distribution systems that widen inequality. There seems to be a belief that markets will provide all necessary financing but this will not happen without proper direction. *What role will trade agreements play?*
- As we approach the next MFF, it is clear that aligning resources with policies, strategies and budgets will be central. However, instead of streamlining the Semester, a new coordination tool - the EU Competitiveness Coordination Tool - has been added on top. *Why could this not have been integrated into existing processes?*
- Regarding resources, while the Compass aims to provide a more practical vision for implementing The Draghi report, current financial capabilities - such as redirecting funds from the 2021–2027 MFF or using the announced competitiveness fund - represent only a low-cost version of Draghi's

priorities. *How will financing be structured?* So far, it feels like a reiteration of STEP, which was insufficient. *How exactly will this new coordination tool work? Will it involve a new chapter in the Semester or something specific for R&D?*
- The main factor behind the gap between the EU and the US is the digital sector. *While the EU is effective at regulating social platforms and AI, when will it focus on producing digital tools?* This could enhance competitiveness across many sectors in the EU. *Is the Commission committed to building a European cloud company to help close the digitalisation gap?*
- The Compass seems to have lost its social and environmental dimensions, even though Europe's social market economy, with its high standards, is a strength, not a weakness. *Why focus on a 25% reduction in regulations instead of aiming at rationalising them more broadly for enterprises and SMEs?* The European Single Market relies on strong regulation to uphold high social standards.
- EU competitiveness is fragmented across Member States and territorial competitiveness is overlooked. Regions caught in development traps need cohesion policies and investments tailored to their specific local characteristics to improve overall competitiveness.
- Regulation is essential for democracy, the rule of law, markets and competitiveness and should not be confused with excessive bureaucracy. Competitiveness is discussed mainly in international terms, but there are also problems within the EU—between regions, small businesses and large corporations. We need consistent policies that promote fair competition both inside and outside the Single Market. The goal should not be monopolies or market centralisation but fair, free markets.
- *The slides mention moving away from the CSR approach and building a stronger analytical basis. What exactly does that mean?*
- In 2000, the Lisbon Strategy aimed to address low productivity and stagnating growth to make the EU the most competitive economy by 2010. It failed, leading to Europe 2020, which also fell short. *Now we have the Compass - why should this strategy succeed where others did not?*
- The first step in implementing the Compass is the Commission's 2025 work programme with 45 initiatives (16 legislative), mostly revisions of recent legislation. While boldness is evident, simplicity and speed are lacking.
- Regarding funding, you propose supporting the Compass through a Competitiveness Fund as part of the next MFF starting in summer 2028. *A communication on the Capital Markets Union (CMU) is expected, but should we abandon the 2020 Commission Action Plan that listed legislative acts for completing CMU?*

Mr De Boer replied to the comments and questions as follows:
- The Compass marks the need for a paradigm shift, which requires also the support of the Member States and stakeholders. The Compass outlines future strategies and actions, and we have to act quickly.
- Increasing productivity and competitiveness is crucial, but this does not mean that social and cohesion aspects have been overlooked - on the contrary, **the Communication highlights the importance of preserving the European social model**. Cohesion remains central to the European approach. **This Communication**, which replaces the Annual Sustainable Growth Survey in 2024, **focuses on productivity and competitiveness. However, other initiatives, such as the Skills Union, are directly linked to social cohesion**. The **European Semester** also continues to monitor economic **and social policies** in the Member States.
- **Regarding financing,** the co-legislators, including the Member States, will need to decide how much they are willing to spend. The proposal for the **next MFF will address funding aspects**. **The**

Social Convergence Framework remains part of the Semester and is still relevant for helping Member States catch up on cohesion. While the Semester focuses on national-level issues, the Coordination Tool targets EU-level priorities. The Coordination Tool targets specific sectors and offers tailored recommendations for specific Member States in areas of cross-border relevance, whereas the Semester addresses broader national challenges.

- **On simplification and maintaining social standards,** each proposal must be discussed in the context of individual proposals. **Social standards are not negotiable and must be upheld within the context of competitiveness and sustainable prosperity**.
- **The Savings and Investments Union is lagging behind**, and urgent action is needed. The aim is that the focus on competitiveness will help accelerate progress in this area as well.
- **Concerning the ownership of Member States and stakeholders within the Semester framework**, this remains a challenge. It will undoubtedly be part of discussions in the context of the MFF, also to strike a balance regarding **avoiding excessive centralisation and ensuring appropriate stakeholder involvement at local and regional levels**.
- Regarding country-specific recommendations: In recent years, **challenges covered by RRPs were often excluded from CSRs**. However, we are now moving away from this parsimonious approach to **prepare for the next MFF with a broader, targeted set of CSRs**. These will also consider what Member States can realistically achieve in the next 12 to 18 months.

The ESG president, **Mr Jahier**, concluded the debate and highlighted the following:

- The European Semester will be strengthened by the Competitiveness Compass, but we need to understand how it will evolve and be applied in practice.
- At our next meeting, Professor **Enrico Giovannini** will present the topic of "**Measuring sustainable and inclusive well-being: a multidimensional dashboard approach" and** a JRC publication.

7. **Date of the next meeting: Tuesday 24 June 2025** (morning session - Annual conference, afternoon session - 36th ESG meeting).

*

*   *

ATTENDANCE LIST

List of members				
Mr/Ms	**Present**	**Remotely**	**Absent**	**Apologies**
ANDERSSON, Krister		X		
ANTONIOU, Michalis (replaced by Eleni PANAYIOTOU)		X		
ATS, Kerli	X			
BOLLON, Pierre		X		
CABRA DE LUNA, Miguel Ángel		X		
CALISTRU, Elena-Alexandra	X			
DANDEA, Petru Sorin	X			
DEBAY Pascal	X			
DEL RIO, Cinzia	X			
DOZ ORRIT, Javier	X			
EDELÉNYI, András		X		
GOBIŅŠ, Andris	X			
IOANNIDIS, Athanasios	X			
JAHIER, Luca	X			
KINDBERG, Mette	X			
KIUKAS, Vertti		X		
LIBAERT, Thierry (replaced by John COMER)	X			
LOBO XAVIER, Gonçalo	X			
MANOLOV, Dimitar			X	
MARTINOVIĆ DŽAMONJA, Dragica		X		
MORKIS, Gintaras	X			
O'CONNOR, Jack	X			
OCHĘDZAN, Justyna Kalina		X		
OSTROWSKI, Krzysztof		X		
PALMIERI, Stefano	X		X	
PLAT, Jacob	X			
POČIVAVŠEK, Jakob Krištof			X	
REALE, Maurizio		X		
ROBYNS DE SCHNEIDAUER, Wautier	X			
SALAFRANCA SANCHEZ-NEYRA, José Ignacio	X			
SCHLÜTER, Bernd		X		
SCHMIDT, Peter	X			
SIPKO, Juraj	X			
SVENTEK, David	X			
VARDAKASTANIS, Ioannis	X			
VON BROCKDORFF, Philip	X			
VORBACH, Judith	X			
WAGENER, Marco		X		
ZARIŅA, Katrīna				X

____