



ESCO (2013) MAI 002 FINAL

Creation Date: 22/02/2013

Last update: 29/03/2013

DRAFT MINUTES

## **7th meeting of the ESCO Maintenance Committee**

**20-21 February 2013**

**Hotel Marriot, Brussels**

### **1. Opening of the meeting**

Mr Tony BIRD chaired the meeting.

The minutes of the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MAI were adopted unanimously.

The agenda for the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MAI was approved unanimously.

### **2. Thematic bloc 1&2: review of the work results of the Sectoral Reference Groups (SREF) and input for the ESCO Guidelines**

In the draft agenda bloc 1 (review of the work results of the SREF) and bloc 2 (open questions on the ESCO Guidelines) are distinct items. But, as they are strictly related, the MAI decided to merge the two.

Ms Katrien Vander Kuylen presented the results that the SREF have achieved so far. The aim of the discussion was to provide feedback for the SREF and improve the ESCO Guidelines by developing new information and clarifying open issues.

While detailed and specific feedback will be provided to each SREF, this chapter focuses on the principles stemming from the discussions. These should be made available to all the SREF through their inclusion in the ESCO Guidelines.



### 2.1. Dealing with specialisms and regulated professions

The MAI discussed how to address the issue of specialisms. This topic highlighted the need to make clear to the SREF that they should include occupations (OCC), not jobs. The MAI agreed on the principle that specialisms should be included only if they have employment market relevance.

This topic is especially related to regulated professions. The MAI agreed that the directive on regulated professions should be respected. However, it should not be the guiding principle for developing the classification. Labour market relevance should always be the main concern. In a second stage a cross-check with the directive should be made in order to make sure that the classification complies with its regulations.

The MAI also recognised that the inclusion of the qualifications (Q) pillar will make the legal relationships clearer.

The MAI underlined that specialisms are important for job matching, especially in some sectors; therefore it is crucial to include them.

### 2.2. Alternative medicines

The MAI discussed the issue raised by the "Human health and social work activities" SREF about how to deal with alternative medicines.

The MAI stated that if the subgroup covering an alternative medicine discipline is a labour market reality and there are sufficient sources to validate the data, then it should be included. The MAI adopted a practical approach and decided to add the subgroup "non-regulated medical professions".

### 2.3. Levelling

The MAI discussed instances where elements of levelling appeared in the OCC titles (e.g. specialist, assistant, advanced).

The MAI members agreed that this practice should be avoided as much as possible, unless there is a clear objective need for it in the labour market. The SREF should use the reporting mechanism to explain why they included levelling in the OCC title. Their argument should be supported by relevant sources.

The MAI also recommended not using EQF levels at this point in time with regard to OCC.



### 2.4. Presentation of the data

The MAI recommended that the SREF present their outputs in a consistent way. The different elements of their classification should be clear and stand out (sectoral breakdown, occupations, specialisations, skills/competences).

Terms should be formulated according to the terminological guidelines. The formulation of the preferred term (PT) should be made in layman's language. Only if this is not possible alternative terms can be added as non-preferred terms (NPT). Moreover, terms can include a contextualisation in brackets, but should not include other data (e.g. the sources).

### 2.5. Occupations overlaps

The MAI agreed that relations between OCCs will need to be discussed in the future, as these will support job mobility. However, at this stage SREF should focus on identifying the overlaps and cooperate with each other to address them.

The MAI suggested that each OCC should have a unique name. SREF should make sure that this principle is applied consistently.

The MAI stated that the principle for differentiating two OCC is that their skillset be different enough. This judgment call lies in the expertise of the SREF.

If an OCC has a clear cross-sectoral nature, the SREF should contact the relevant SREF and follow the approach for dealing with the sectoral overlaps. For instance, design-related OCC will be dealt with by the appropriate SREF. The same applies to OCC like "electricians", "engineers", "technicians" and "operators".

The SEC suggested that cross-sectoral OCC (like secretary or accounting) and transversal fields of economic activity (design/development/quality control) could be included in the sectoral breakdown. But while they could be helpful to identify cross-sectoral OCCs they should not be displayed in the classification available for the users. Indeed, design-related OCC will be clustered in the appropriate OCC G.

In a second phase the MAI will perform the technical control to verify whether the skills set of the OCC shows an overlap with OCC in other sectors. In practice, at the end of step 4 a technical control needs to take place in order to verify whether the skills set of an OCC shows an overlap with the skills set an OCC in another sector. After 4 or 5 SREF have finished step 4 this task will be started. At that moment, each time a SREF has finished step 4, this technical control will be implemented. The taxonomy expert group (TEG) will be in the best position to perform this work, as it is not made of sectoral experts.



This technical check should be combined with mapping OCC to ISCO unit levels. The process will have to be described in detail in the ESCO Guidelines.

Additionally, the MAI specified that two OCC should not be merged if the formulation of the PT clearly spells two different OCC concepts (e.g. term1&term2).

### 2.6. Level of detail

The MAI agreed that SREF should be as detailed as possible, provided that OCC have market relevance. Additionally SREF should identify and mark relationships between OCC with the same generic basis for the purpose of supporting occupational mobility.

The level of detail of the OCC pillar should however not lead to develop job titles. The SREF should take into account that the more detailed the classification, the more difficult it will be for a non-expert to find concepts at the lower levels. In a second stage, based on MAI feedback and on cooperation with other SREF and the CSREF, a decision will be taken whether there is a need to regroup proposed OCC.

The same principle stands for the skills/competences (SC) pillar. However, if SREF provide additional information on SC or further data on tasks, this could be included in scope notes and/or definitions and kept for future reference.

As a point of information for the SREF, the SEC addressed the concern of some of them about including sensitive information related to the production process. The SEC suggested that SREF do not need to disclose more information than they would display in a public vacancy.

### 2.7. Access to national sources and their use

The MAI expressed the need to establish clearer criteria for the use of national sources. Indeed this is one of the reality checks that the MAI will monitor in the future.

The MAI recommended that the SEC prepare an approach for the use of national sources and that some of them are provided to the SREF in their welcome package.

#### **Actions to be taken:**

- The SEC to prepare an overview of standard sources explaining their content and how they can be accessed. This list will become part of a "welcome package" for new SREF members.

### 2.8. "Design"-related OCC

The MAI discussed whether *design and product development* should be included in each relevant sector or be considered as a sector on its own. While job mobility in "design"-related OCC is possible, in some areas the design and software used is very job- and or sector specific. The MAI agreed that at this stage design OCCs should be included within each sector breakdown (where relevant). In a second phase a quality check and a cross-check of the different sets of SC will reveal similarities and differences. At that point a decision will be taken on a case-by-case basis.

### 2.9. Time constraints

The MAI discussed about the concern of some SREF that results could be difficult to deliver within the agreed timeline. The MAI agreed that, while it is important to follow the timeline, this should not be considered too rigid. Time concerns are therefore not an acceptable reason not to include the labour market relevant occupations.

### 2.10. 5 steps approach

The MAI recommended that the SREF follow carefully the 5 steps approach for the development of ESCO v1 as described in the ESCO Guidelines. This implies that the SREF should proceed towards a milestone only once the previous milestone has been achieved. This process will be more structured once the reporting mechanism will be in place.

### 2.11. Generic occupations

The MAI advised that generic occupation titles (worker, labourer, technician, etc.) should be avoided as much as possible. They should be reformulated to make them more clearly sector-specific. A double check should be performed on the labour market relevance of such concepts before including them in ESCO.

### 2.12. Formulation of occupation concepts

The MAI further recommended that OCC Preferred Terms (PTs) be formulated in layman's language. More technical/context-specific terms can be used as Non-Preferred Terms (NPTs).

The MAI also remarked that each OCC title should refer only to one concept. Ambiguity should be avoided as much as possible.

### 2.13. Templates

The MAI invited the SEC to develop more differentiated templates for the SREF so that they can submit their work results to the MAI in a consistent way.

The SEC announced that in the longer term a Taxonomy Collaboration Tool will be available for this purpose. This tool will also help the SREF to display their classification and cooperate with other SREF and the CSREF.

### **Actions to be taken:**

- The SEC to update the ESCO Guidelines based on the discussions.
- The SEC to create a discussion thread within the MAI community on Sinapse to further discuss the feedback that should be delivered to the SREF. For this purpose, the SEC will upload the feedback developed during the meeting. The MAI will be invited to comment. The SEC will integrate such comments into one document per SREF and submit it to the MAI for endorsement via written procedure. The document will then be shared with the SREF.
- The SEC and MAI to develop a more structured approach for monitoring the work results of the SREF (including templates for the SREF).

### **3. Thematic bloc 3: review of the work results of the CSREF and methodology**

Ms Karin Van Der Sanden introduced the work results of the CSREF.

The MAI welcomed the changes made to the conceptual model and the thesaurus.

The MAI suggested deleting the arrow in figure 1.1 at page 5 of the document "Refining the draft of ESCO's cross-sectoral skills & competences list". The MAI pointed out that the category "attitudes and values at work" is not only important in the external dimension (towards the others), but also in its internal dimension (in the pursuit of one's own goals).

The MAI approved of the structure and the draft Thesaurus. These can now be presented to SREF for feedback and be used for the data structure of ESCOv0.

### **Actions to be taken:**

- The CSREF to delete the arrow in the figure
- The CSREF to introduce the model to the SREF and collect the feedback for improvement
- The SEC to import to use the structure and thesaurus for ESCOv0



#### 4. Thematic bloc 4: towards the release of ESCO v0: development of the qualifications pillar

Mr Jens Bjørnåvold presented the approach for testing the qualifications pillar for inclusion in ESCO v0.

Mr Bjørnåvold stated that the results should be available by the end of March.

Mr John O'Connor presented the Irish approach to quality assurance in recognising bodies awarding qualifications.

The MAI agreed that ESCO should not establish a parallel system of accreditation. The primary criterion for recognising awarding bodies is the labour market relevance of their qualifications. The SREF are best placed to decide what qualifications are labour market relevant..

##### **Actions to be taken:**

- The SEC will inform the MAI on the outcome of listing sample international qualifications and certificates and of the testing of the data model for the Q pillar.

#### 5. Thematic bloc 5: organising future activities

Ms Gerd Goetschalckx presented a proposal to move forward with the development of an interoperability test scenario together with the PES.

Mr Vito Spinelli introduced the discussion on developing a mandate for the ESCO user group.

In conclusion of the meeting the SEC informed the MAI on the timeline for establishing the next 5 SREF. The MAI agreed that Mr Bird and Ms Goetschalckx will take part in the next Introductory meeting on 24-25 April to present the activities of the MAI to the new SREF.

The MAI discussed the work programme 2013. Some changes were made to the initial list provided by the SEC.

##### **Actions to be taken:**

- The SEC will upload the updated work programme 2013.



## ESCO - European Skills/Competences, qualifications and Occupations

The next MAI meeting is scheduled on 19-20 June. The possibility of a telekit in between will be considered.





\*\*\*\*\*

## Participants

### ESCO Maintenance Committee Members

Heathwood, Cathy	Council for Curriculum Examinations and Assessment (CCEA), Principal Officer Qualifications and Skills Accreditation
Goetschalckx, Gerd	VDAB, Co-ordinator R&D
O'Connor, John	National Qualifications Authority of Ireland, Development officer
Goulet, Valerie	Pôle emploi, Pole ROME Adviser
Bird, Tony	Lantra Sector Skills Council, Head of Business Development
Rita Bergenhill	PES Sweden
De Ruijter, Judith	AO Consult, Senior researcher/advisor
Nordhaus, Hans Ulrich	DGB, Member of the Executive Board

### Permanent observers to the ESCO Maintenance Committee:

Franco Lopes, Ana	EC/ESTAT, Head of section, European Commission
-------------------	--

### ESCO Secretariat

Le Vrang, Martin	ESCO Secretariat (DG EMPL)
Niedra, Ginta	ESCO Secretariat (TenForce)
Vander Kuylen, Katrien	ESCO Secretariat (TenForce)
Spinelli, Vito	ESCO Secretariat (Tenforce)
Nomden, Koen	ESCO Secretariat (DG EAC)
Bjornavold, Jens	ESCO Secretariat (Cedefop)
Van Der Sanden, Karin	ESCO Secretariat (DG EAC)
Perera Orcastegui, Cristina	ESCO Secretariat (Tenforce)

### Excused

Ekeland, Anders	Statistics Norway, Senior Adviser
Wechsler, Dietmar	BW Bildung und Wissen Verlag, Service provider and information expert in the fields of education, training, occupations and careers
Šlekýtė, Donata	Lithuanian Labour Exchange at the Ministry of Social Security and Labour, Deputy Head of Labour Resources Division
Diekmann, Knut	Association of German Chambers of Industry and Commerce, Director Principals of Further Vocational Education Policy
Mijangos, Garbine	EC/DGT, Lead translator for the ESCO project, European Commission
Blažíčková, Jolana	TREXIMA, Head of HRD and Labour Market Department