



ECO/ESG

Brussels, 9 December 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 38th meeting
of the
European Semester Group,
held at the Committee building in Brussels
on
9 December 2025

The European Semester Group (ESG) held its 38th meeting at the VMA building in Brussels, from **14:30 to 17:30 on Tuesday 9 December 2025**. It was a hybrid meeting. The meeting was chaired by the ESG president, **Gonçalo Lobo Xavier**.

1. Adoption of the draft agenda
The draft agenda was adopted.
2. Approval of the minutes of the 37th European Semester Group meeting held on 11 September 2025 (EESC-2025-03348-00-00-PV-REF)
The minutes were approved.
3. **Introduction and welcome to the new members of the group by the new president of the group, Mr Lobo Xavier, and the new ECO section president, Elena-Alexandra Calistru.**

Introduction by the ESG president

- **The ESG presidency** is composed of its president, Mr Lobo Xavier, and vice-presidents, Judith Vorbach and Luca Jahier.
- **The European Semester is an annual exercise that coordinated Member States' economic, fiscal, employment and social policies across the EU.** The cycle begins in the autumn with the European Commission's presentation of economic and social priorities, and concludes in October of the following year, when Member States submit their draft budgetary plans.
- **The main objectives of the European Semester** are as follows: providing a coordination framework; fostering economic growth, ensuring sound public finances, convergence and stability in the EU; preventing macroeconomic imbalances; coordinating and monitoring employment and social policies; and monitoring the implementation of national medium-term fiscal-structural plans (MTFSPs) and national recovery and resilience plans (RRPs).
- **The EESC's ESG** has been established in 2017 in response to the growing importance of the European Semester. The ESG is a horizontal body of 34 members that supports and strengthens the work carried out in the EESC sections. **Its role is to examine and to channel proposals from organised civil society on economic, fiscal, employment and social policies**, ensuring a continuous EESC contribution to the annual European Semester cycle.
- The **ESG mission** was presented: to amplify the voice of European organised civil society and ensure that civil society's concerns, requests and proposals were relayed and effectively communicated to the European institutions; develop meaningful policy recommendations; maintain close relations with EU institutions and national economic and social councils; intensify exchanges between EESC members and representatives of organised civil society in the Member States; and to foster cooperation with EESC sections, the Consultative Commission on Industrial Change (CCMI) and the Liaison Group.
- The **main activities** of the ESG include: ensuring the production of opinions and information reports at key moments of the European Semester cycle; organising a broad consultation of organised civil society in the Member States through country visits and a questionnaire; holding four ESG meetings per year; and organising an annual ESG conference dedicated to discussing key policy issues related to the European Semester.

Introduction by the **ECO president**

- Ms Calstru reaffirmed the ECO section's strong support for the ESG – a group carrying out the important role of collecting, channelling and promoting the policy views of organised civil society.
- The European Semester is no longer solely focused on economic policies (although this remained its central dimension), but now also encompasses social and regional dimensions. In this context, cooperation between the ESG and other EESC sections and the CCMI is considered essential.
- The ECO section's work currently places a strong focus on the new multiannual financial framework (MFF), which will shape the EU's resources and priorities in the coming years. In this regard, the European Semester is likely to become an even stronger instrument, with the national and regional partnership plans (NRPPs) expected to build on the work already carried out within the European Semester. Systematic engagement with organised civil society in all Member States, as carried out by the ESG, will help ensure that the new MFF reflected the genuine concerns of pan-European civil society, rather than solely Brussels-centric perspectives.
- Finally, Ms Calstru pointed out that the Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF) was due to come to an end in 2026. An evaluation of this instrument is expected, which could further provide valuable lessons for the new NRPPs and for civil society engagement in the next financial cycle.

4. Interinstitutional debate on the 2026 European Semester Autumn Package

Opening speech by the **EESC president, Séamus Boland**

- Mr Boland spoke of his vision for his term of office, emphasising that the EESC could and must play a central role as a catalyst for meaningful civil society participation. He also underlined the responsibility of the EESC to provide a forum for listening to, debating, reacting to and influencing EU policymaking, while at the same time remaining closely engaged with and relevant to wider European civil society.
- The European Semester must focus on fostering convergence and reducing regional disparities, while supporting a resilient, competitive and sustainable EU agricultural and fisheries sector, investing in people, and delivering on the European Pillar of Social Rights. These objectives were central to the next EU long-term budget, the MFF, that would be implemented through NRPPs, which must address all or a substantial subset of the challenges identified in the European Semester, including the country-specific recommendations (CSRs).
- The work of the economic and social councils should be reinvigorated and more widely recognised, acknowledging the significant value of their contributions.
- He also stressed the EESC's commitment to ensuring that organised civil society played an active role in shaping and supporting reforms and investments that responded to current and future challenges, highlighting the fact that organised civil society was a key driving force that helped ensure that priorities reflected real needs and remained democratically grounded at all levels of governance.

Presentation of the 2026 European Semester Autumn Package and interinstitutional debate with: **Heinrich Wollny**, head of unit, European Semester, Access to Finance (SG REFORM), European Commission

- The 2025 European Semester cycle was built around the Competitiveness Compass, aiming to close the innovation gap, decarbonise the economy and reduce strategic dependencies. These objectives were facilitated by key horizontal enablers such as simplification, the single market strategy, the Savings and Investments Union, skills and quality jobs and better coordinated policies at EU and national levels.
- Significantly higher investment, productivity and innovation were essential for safeguarding the EU's competitiveness and social model in a challenging geopolitical context, requiring urgent action at EU, national and regional levels. In this regard, the European Semester played a central role in supporting structural reforms across economic, social, labour, fiscal, industrial, climate and energy policies.
- The main elements of the 2026 European Semester Autumn Package were outlined. The euro area recommendation this year sought to ensure fiscal sustainability while creating space for strategic investments, notably in defence, competitiveness, research and innovation, decarbonisation, clean energy, the digital transition, economic security and in reducing dependencies. It was also important to tackle defence industry bottlenecks; promote joint procurement; strengthen education and training policies, the single market and the international role of the euro; make progress on the digital euro; and monitor financial stability.
- Turning to the fiscal elements of the autumn package, it was mentioned that the EU economy had shown resilience. By 2024 the EU's real GDP per capita had been 4.1% higher than in 2019, with moderate growth expected to continue in the medium term. The GDP growth was forecast to reach 1.4% this year and in 2026, and increase slightly to 1.5% in 2027. However, growth remained modest, with euro area debt beginning to rise again, requiring vigilance. All Member States had submitted their MTFSPs, and overall compliance with recommended net expenditure paths had been assessed positively, offering flexibility for defence spending. Some euro area and non-euro area Member States had nevertheless been identified as being at risk of non-compliance, with the Commission inviting those concerned to take corrective measures. The Commission had also prepared the report under Article 126(3) of the Treaty, noting an excessive deficit procedure had been warranted for Finland.
- On labour, social development and skills, the proposal for EU-27 Council recommendations on human capital was highlighted as a key novelty of the Autumn Package. Despite strong labour market performance, major challenges persisted, including skills shortages, low participation in adult learning, digital skills gaps and declining basic competences among young people. There was an urgent need to prioritise education and upskilling, particularly in STEM fields, and supporting these efforts through stronger public-private partnerships. To improve anticipation of skills needs, the Commission would establish a skills observatory.
- On the Joint Employment Report, the situation of the labour market was noted as stable, but there were still structural weaknesses, including stagnating labour productivity, job quality concerns, high numbers of inactive people and diverging social trends. In-depth social convergence reviews would be conducted for several Member States, while others would exit reinforced monitoring.
- **The adoption of the Spring Package was announced for 3 June 2026** - a time at which a significant part of the next MFF was expected to be channelled through NRPPs and to address

identified challenges linked to the European Semester and CSRs, therefore acting as a bridge to the next MFF. The importance of stronger implementation was stressed, as well as a deeper analysis in priority areas such as innovation, access to finance, the business environment, the single market, public procurement, skills and housing and enhanced dialogue with social partners and organised civil society to ensure national ownership of reforms.

Damian Boeselager, vice-chair of the ECON Committee, European Parliament

- Mr Boeselager outlined the challenging EU context marked by intensifying global competition, a shift away from cheap Russian energy, US tariffs and ageing societies. He noted that most Member States relied on income taxation or social contributions to finance pensions and healthcare, while often continuing to support old companies through subsidies or equity participation. He expressed concern about the lack of urgency and political willingness to make the difficult decisions required to reverse the EU's current economic and social trajectory.
- Drawing on his experience in negotiating the Regulation establishing the RRF and NRRPs, he stressed the need for a European economic and social governance framework that functioned effectively. He recalled lengthy debates in the European Parliament on whether national plans should address all or a significant subset of the CSRs, noting that this formulation had subsequently been interpreted very broadly by both the Commission and Member States.
- He argued that the EU had an opportunity to improve its approach in the next cycle, particularly by using the CSRs more effectively in the context of the forthcoming MFF, and expressed the hope that past shortcomings would not be repeated. In this regard, he identified a concentration of decision-making powers between the European Commission and individual Member States, and pointed out the European Parliament's long-standing request for greater involvement in the development of CSRs and, more broadly, in the European Semester process.
- He therefore suggested that the European Parliament be involved in the process and granted a role in approving the national plans, possibly through a collective vote following the Commission's evaluation. Such an approach would allow for more effective scrutiny of whether CSRs, as well as green and digital transition objectives and other relevant policy frameworks, were genuinely reflected in the national plans submitted for approval. He concluded by calling for greater urgency and for a clearer, more transparent and more democratically accountable European Semester process.

Naim Cordemans, senior economist, European Central Bank (ECB)

- The ECB's latest monetary policy statement of 30 October 2025 summarised the Governing Council's views on euro area policy priorities. These included the need for fiscal and structural policies to boost productivity, competitiveness and resilience; the swift implementation of the European Commission's competitiveness roadmap; and governments' efforts to prioritise growth-enhancing structural reforms and strategic investment, while ensuring sustainable public finances.
- The EU was facing unprecedented challenges, including the green and digital transitions, demographic ageing, economic security concerns, competitiveness pressures and increased defence investment needs. At the same time, fiscal conditions remained constrained, with high debt levels and limited fiscal space in several Member States. While the euro area's overall fiscal position had recently improved, it continued to be under pressure.
- Against this background, he raised the question of how to reconcile fiscal sustainability with the need to respond effectively to these challenges. It was important to recognise and to build on

Europe's strengths. The EU economy had proved more resilient than expected, with a strong labour market and inflation under control. Europe's highly educated workforce, world-class research institutions, diversified production structure, strong institutions, predictable legal environment, high savings and robust financial sector were strengths that must be leveraged more effectively.

- Three key avenues through which Europe could better reconcile fiscal sustainability with its current and future challenges were mentioned.
 - **Tapping remaining reserves of growth and higher productivity** by building a genuine savings and investment union, mobilising private capital and removing remaining single market barriers.
 - **Adopting a more sustainable and growth-friendly fiscal policy** by shifting towards taxes that were less harmful to growth and that supported the green transition in a fair way, using the flexibility of the new EU fiscal rules to prioritise productive public investment (R&D and education) and supporting structural reforms. It was also important to ensure that fiscal consolidation did not undermine future prosperity, as Europe needed investment to generate the productivity gains that could sustain its social model and ageing population.
 - **Deploying collective resources more efficiently** to meet the EU's large investment needs for the green, digital and defence transitions, notably by exploring ways to pool national resources in high-multiplier, cross-border areas, and through stronger mobilisation of private capital.

Follow-up discussion with ESG members and representatives of national economic and social councils (NESC)

The ESG president opened the floor for questions and comments. From among the ESG members, **Krister Andersson**, **Philip Von Brockdorff**, **Grzegorz Trefon** and **Judith Vorbach** took the floor, and from among the NESC, **Dimitris Bimpas** (EL ESC), **Benoît Bayenet** (BE ESC), **Silviya Todorova** (BU ESC), **Sterica Fudulea** (RO ESC), **Zwiers Roland** (NL ESC), **Gusztav Bager** (HU ESC), **Luca Trifone** (IT ESC), **Pilar Lopez** (ES ESC) and **Daniel Becker** (LU ESC) took the floor.

- In Europe, VAT covered only around 50% of consumption, whereas in countries such as Australia and New Zealand, it accounted for approximately 90-95% of private consumption. Would the ECB consider broadening VAT as a growth-enhancing measure that could be considered by policymakers, potentially allowing for a reduction in income taxes or other distortive forms of taxation, including certain wealth taxes?
- The analysis was largely based on macroeconomic data, but there was an increasing need to place greater emphasis on microeconomic analysis at company and household level in order to identify the real challenges faced on the ground. The EU was not yet doing enough to systematically incorporate micro-level analyses in order to better understand and address issues that may not be fully captured at the macroeconomic level.
- Despite the Commission's strong emphasis on protecting the social model, on decarbonisation, the future MFF and the NRPPs, certain gaps remained, notably regarding workers' training programmes, support and funds for regions in transition and structured partnerships with social partners. A transition lacking a strong social justice dimension risked becoming unjust. In this context, the European Semester should be more closely aligned with the objectives of the just transition and social progress, with national plans linked more clearly to recovery goals that

would strengthen social cohesion and reduce inequalities. How could these aspects be better integrated in future documents and more related to the just transition?

- The EU was attempting to pursue the green, digital and defence transitions simultaneously, creating a risk that key elements would be insufficiently addressed. In particular, progress on the green transition appeared to be slowing, while defence expenditure was increasing. Although some flexibility had been introduced for defence spending, similar budgetary flexibility did not appear to apply to other strategic investments, such as education, research and innovation. Against this background, should priorities be rebalanced at national level, and should social dialogue and consultation be strengthened?
- Did the Commission intend to further adapt the DSA methodology to better reflect economic realities and avoid imposing additional adjustment requirements on Member States in cases of misestimated potential growth? In addition, in light of the current geopolitical context, would it be appropriate to extend the escape clause for defence expenditure beyond the current timeframe? A longer period could allow Member States to better adapt their fiscal policies to sustain defence spending needs and to avoid abrupt fiscal adjustments.
- In the case of Bulgaria, the European Semester was less about managing moderate growth and more about addressing instability, particularly in view of the country's objective to join the euro area on 1 January 2026. At national level, social partners were often only formally consulted and not sufficiently involved in the implementation of the Semester. This top-down approach to policymaking was seen as limiting ownership and weakening the effective implementation of reforms.
- Romania had received a positive assessment in the European Semester Autumn Package, with the Commission freezing the procedure that could have led to a suspension of EU funds, although a new review was expected for spring 2026. Despite remaining under the EDP, Romania would retain full access to EU funding. This would offer partial relief amid earlier concerns, as the country had recorded the EU's highest budget deficit in 2024 and weak growth, with GDP rising by only 0.8% in the first nine months of 2025. The recent government measures, including higher VAT, dividend and property taxes, had contributed to the improved assessment. However, the balance between austerity and positive socio-economic outcomes remained fragile. While the Autumn Package urged greater investment in education and skills for strategic sectors, some fiscal measures risked limiting education funding. Regional disparities also persisted, particularly in south-eastern and northern border regions most affected by war in the area. Socioeconomic coordination was especially difficult in times of crisis, making the involvement of social partners and civil society essential. Strong social dialogue and cooperation across national, European and regional levels were key for effective policymaking. In this context, a joint Romanian-Bulgarian proposal for targeted policies to strengthen the socio-economic resilience of the Black Sea and EU border regions was considered urgent.
- The Netherlands had traditionally maintained strong involvement of social partners in the European Semester. However, social partners were no longer consulted during the preparation of the first structural budgetary plan. Once this omission had been identified, the matter had been raised within the Dutch Committee on European Affairs. This had led to the Dutch government once again vowing to involve social partners in the Semester process.
- We needed to enrich macroeconomic analysis with sustainability perspectives, and adopt a convergence strategy centred on sustainability, going beyond traditional GDP metrics. The UN High-Level Expert Group was developing a set of such indicators, while the OECD was

promoting similar measures. In addition, the Central Bank of Hungary had published their Composite Sustainable Growth Index in 2024, encompassing 64 indicators across economic, financial, social and environmental dimensions. The index highlighted the gap between traditional GDP per capita and GDP adjusted for sustainability, and identified the sources of these differences.

- The Italian CNEL welcomed the 2026 Autumn Package's focus on social issues and its relevance for human capital development in the EU, but had also identified three main challenges. The first concerned policies for youth. There was a need to make the Union more attractive for young people and to prevent the loss of human capital. Measures to this effect should include efforts to improve work-life balance; enhance public services for families in areas such as education, childcare and local transport; and to adapt policies to current family models. Investment in young people was essential for demonstrating that the EU supported their future. The second challenge was housing, which affected various social groups, including young people, older people and low-income families. Public debt and fiscal policies should consider the long-term social returns of housing investment, and implement financial instruments to stimulate private investment. The third challenge was artificial intelligence. While AI could transform organisations, it also risked creating uneven opportunities and competition, and social exclusion. There was a need for sustained dialogue among institutions, the public and civil society, and for targeted training to support technical skills and adaptation to AI. Inclusive legislative measures, including in competition policy, were essential for ensuring fair access to AI benefits.
- In Spain, housing had become a major concern for both the population and the government. Rising rents (an increase of EUR 380 in a short period) contrasted with a basic salary of EUR 1 000 per month, were creating significant social strain. In response, the Economic and Social Council had begun preparing a report on housing, with work underway on a report regarding governance.
- In Luxembourg, the European semester had been addressed outside the ESC, through the social partners. In its 2026 budget, Luxembourg had introduced six well-being indicators to complement GDP and better integrate social and environmental aspects. This accounted for nearly 5% of national GDP.

Mr Cordemans replied the following.

- VAT was generally considered less distortive to economic activity than taxes on labour or corporate income. At the same time, VAT was a regressive tax – a factor that must be taken into account in policy design. Taxes which were less impactful to economic activity while being less regressive typically included taxes on immobile and productive assets, notably real estate.
- Financial stability was extremely important. Currently, no immediate risks were identified, and as long as both public and private debt remained sustainable, there was no cause for concern. While vigilance was necessary, the current debate on fostering investment needs was not constrained by concerns over financial stability.
- EU institutions should place greater emphasis on beyond-GDP metrics and the broader dimensions of prosperity, given that this issue had received less attention in recent years.

Mr Boeselager replied the following.

- At household level, higher energy costs were increasingly affecting individuals and companies. This was compounded by structural weaknesses in the way public finances were organised, particularly in view of rising pension costs. A reassessment of state financing, including a greater role for VAT, was therefore considered necessary. At company level, European firms faced growing operational difficulties. While simplification efforts were welcomed, the need for a more urgent and ambitious approach to completing the single market was emphasised, as current proposals were seen as positive but insufficient to unlock its full potential.
- Regarding the RRF, its success should not be measured by the volume of funds spent, but by its performance-based nature. In this view, unspent funds reflected the fact that reforms and investments had not always been delivered, and this should not be seen as a failure. Lowering standards to increase absorption could undermine the credibility and fiscal stability created by the RRF's design.
- On the green, digital and defence transitions, the political context had become more challenging, with growing resistance to ambitious climate legislation by the far-right parties within the European Parliament. Thus, simplification was important, but should not come by lowering standards without significantly reducing regulatory burdens.
- Finally, the effectiveness of fiscal rules depended on addressing difficult national-level decisions that had long been postponed. In particular, reforms of pension systems would be unavoidable if Member States wished to free up resources for priorities such as education, research and social welfare, rather than continuing with unsustainable spending structures.

Mr Wollny replied the following.

- The specific and general objectives of the NRPP proposal included social cohesion and support for workers in the just transition. Incorporating the CSRs into the NRPPs and linking EU funding to concrete recommendations reflected EU policy priorities and created, for the first time, a coherent framework to ensure that EU funds were spent on shared European priorities.
- In the long run, investing and saving in capital markets and providing people with proper financial literacy could be recommended and make no difference to financial stability if people saved through capital markets or through banks, but of course it had to be monitored.
- Fiscal consolidation, fiscal sustainability and the necessary adjustments were essential for ensuring economic stability for future generations.

Mr Philipponnet, deputy head of unit, policy coordination, DG ECFIN, replied the following.

- The economic impact of the RRF should be assessed over the long term. While the economic impact of investment may materialise relatively quickly, one of the key innovations of the RRF lay in its strong link to reforms, the impacts of which could only be expected to emerge over a longer timeframe.
- Regarding the DSA methodology, the Commission continuously worked to ensure a robust and credible technical framework. While methodological improvements were regularly considered, a balance must be struck between the technical aspect and the need for stability, predictability and a common understanding among Member States. Any changes to the methodology must therefore be agreed in an orderly manner and should not have disruptive effects on public finances. Methodological developments were not intended to create additional fiscal space, but rather to ensure an unbiased and accurate assessment of risks to debt sustainability.

- Concerning the national escape clause for defence expenditure, the Commission did not determine national budgetary priorities, but rather set overall fiscal guardrails. The escape clause had been introduced as a temporary measure to allow a rapid increase in defence spending in response to the current geopolitical situation. Its temporary nature reflected the expectation that, over the medium term, higher defence expenditure would become part of regular government spending and would therefore need to be financed within normal budgetary frameworks. In the short term, debt financing was considered appropriate, while in the longer term, national authorities would need to make choices on revenue and expenditure to ensure debt sustainability. This approach did not constitute a permanent ‘golden rule’ for defence, but a temporary deviation to allow budgetary structures to adapt to exceptional circumstances.

5. **Presentation of the draft work programme of the European Semester Group** for the new term of office.

The ESG president opened the floor for questions and comments. **Adelina Dabu, Luca Jahier, Andris Gobiņš** and **Marco Wagener** took the floor.

- Attention was drawn to the growing complexity of reforms, ranging from taxation to labour market policies, and to the increasing challenges related to their effective implementation. While capacity building at Member State level was generally addressed separately by the Commission, questions had been raised about how this complexity could be better managed, how efforts could be streamlined, and how Member States’ capacity to operate coherently across national and European levels could be strengthened.
- During earlier work on the reform of the EU fiscal framework, the EESC had already called for a thorough review of the European Semester, with consideration given to shifting from an annual cycle to a multi-year framework based on the DSA. The EESC had been the first institution to question the DSA approach, leading the European Parliament to require an ongoing joint review by the Commission and Member States. The structural link between the European Semester, the CSRs and the future MFF should be at the core of the ESG’s future analysis and Member State consultations. In addition, a key topic was the effective involvement of social partners and civil society in negotiating the MTFSPs.
- A proposal had been put forth to complement national-level engagement with structured exchanges with EU-level networks to better understand their perspectives on the growing role of the European Semester. At national level, closer links could be developed between the ESG process and existing monitoring or supervisory bodies, and involving social partners and civil society. Finally, a priority for the first year should be to establish effective structures to ensure meaningful and efficient participation of organised civil society.
- Closer interaction with other EESC sections could better reflect the complexity of the European Semester and generate more practical input, especially on social issues. Concern was expressed that, despite repeated calls for a stronger social dimension in the Semester, there was a real risk of social spending cuts to accommodate increased defence expenditure. The need to reinforce the social emphasis within the European Semester was therefore strongly underlined.

6. **The forthcoming consultation of organised civil society in Member States** on the reform and investment proposals formulated as part of the 2025-2026 European Semester cycle: organisation and preparation. Mr Lobo Xavier and Ms Grégoire, EESC policy officer, explained the following.

- The consultation would be conducted in the context of the Information Report ECO/691, which presented the views of organised civil society in the EU Member States. In parallel, the

Resolution ECO/692 would present the EESC's policy recommendations based on this consultation. This year's consultation focused on reform and investment measures, based on the 2025 CSRs and their implementation, the completion of the RRP, the implementation and monitoring of the MTFSPs, and the inclusion of the CSRs in the future NRPPs.

- For each Member State, a three-member ESG delegation had been established to carry out the consultation. Contributions may be provided either through a joint response to the questionnaire or by organising a country visit. There were 22 national delegations expected to contribute by submitting a joint response to a questionnaire consisting of 10 questions. Responses would be drafted by each delegation, either on the basis of their own knowledge or following consultations with national stakeholders. For the remaining five delegations, contributions would be gathered by organising national roundtables in Austria, Cyprus, Estonia, France and Romania. The resulting report would constitute the delegation's contribution.
- Both the joint questionnaire responses and the roundtable reports would be analysed, with key findings compiled in tables and graphs annexed to the information report. The report itself would present recommendations from organised civil society, as well as general trends and Member-State-specific features. The consultation would take place between January and early March 2026. The information report and the resolution were scheduled for adoption at the ECO section on 4 June and at the plenary session on 17-18 June 2026.

7. Confirmation of the date of the next (39th) meeting: **12 March 2026 (9:30-13:00)**.

*

* *

ANNEX

ATTENDANCE LIST

List of members				
Mr/Ms	Present	Remotely	Absent	Apologies
ANDERSSON, Krister	X			
ANTONIOU, Michalis (replaced by ROBYNS, Wautier)		X		
BARRERA CHAMORRO, Maria del Carmen		X		
BIEGON, Dominika		X		
BOGDAN, Luka	X			
BOLAND, Séamus	X			
CALISTRU, Elena-Alexandra	X			
COHEUR, Alain	X			
DABU, Adelina	X			
DEL RIO, Cinzia			X	
GOBIŇŠ, Andris	X			
HAKEN, Roman	X			
HIDVÉGHINÉ PULAY, Brigitta	X			
IOANNIDIS, Athanasios (replaced by VARDAKASTANIS, Ioannis)	X			
JAHIER, Luca	X			
KRUPAVIČIENĖ, Kristina		X		
LOBO XAVIER, Gonçalo	X			
MARKKULA-KIVISILTA, Hanna		X		
MÁRQUEZ DE LA CALLEJA, María Lourdes	X			
MEDINA, Felipe (replaced by PEIRONCELY ARBIDE, Alberto)		X		
MISSLBECK-WINBERG, Christiane			X	
NOWACKI, Marcin		X		
PALMIERI, Stefano	X			
POČIVAVŠEK, Jakob Krištof		X		
PROUZET, Emilie		X		
REHSE, Sebastian	X			
SIPKO, Juraj			X	
TCHOUKANOV, Stoyan	X			
TIMMERMANS, Theo			X	
TREFON, Grzegorz	X			
VASK, Kaia		X		
VON BROCKDORFF, Philip	X			
VORBACH, Judith		X		
WAGENER, Marco	X			
WALKER, Neil		X		