



Annex II: Written comments of the ESCO Maintenance Committee on the proposed version 1.1 concepts

MSWG 13-02

During the 34th meeting of the ESCO Maintenance Committee (MAI) of 22 October 2020, the Commission presented the objectives of ESCO version 1.1, the process for updating the classification and the proposed timeline. The MAI discussed on the approach used to create new content and review the quality of existing occupations and skills and provided detailed feedback and input on the draft content. As a follow up to the discussion, the Commission invited the MAI to provide written comments on the proposed concepts (occupations, skills and knowledge). The feedback received is listed below:

Feedback related to prior learning

1. Validation of prior learning and related skills headings: alternative titles for this process are "*recognition of prior learning*" or "*recognition of prior experience and learning*". A distinction is sometimes made between recognition of non-formal and informal learning and recognition of prior certificated learning.

Reaction: this feedback will be implemented.

2. The occupation "*Assessor of prior learning*" does not exist in Slovenia.
3. The knowledge "*validation of prior learning*" and the skill "*assess prior learning*" refer to the same concept and represent duplication.
4. The new skill concept "*use questioning techniques for assessment*" is similar the concept "*use questioning techniques*".

Reaction: feedback under points 2-4 will be investigated.

Feedback related to the Agri-food ecosystem

5. The scope of the skill "*develop food scanner devices*" should be extended to include crops for nutrients, pests and diseases.
6. The scope of the knowledge "*e-agriculture*" should be extended to include horticulture and viniculture.
7. The description of knowledge "*mobile agriculture*" should be more specific.
8. Add the wording "*appropriate application windows*" in the description of the skill "*recycle livestock manure*".
9. The scope of the skill "*use agronomic modelling*" should be extended to include crop protection, irrigation.
10. Aeroponics should also be taken into consideration for the update of ESCO.
11. The word "*principles*" should be removed from the description of the concept "*sustainable agriculture production*".

Reaction: all of the above feedback (points 5-11) will be implemented.

12. The description of the skill "*use mobile agriculture solutions*" is too generic and should be improved.

Reaction: this feedback will be investigated.

13. The skill "*operate drones in civil engineering*" should not be limited to this domain as drones are used also in other sectors such as agriculture or arts.

Reaction: this feedback will be investigated and further skill concepts could be created.

Feedback related to the Health ecosystem

14. The concept "*provide protective equipment against infectious diseases*" should take into account the need for protective equipment in a COVID 19 environment.

Reaction: this feedback will be implemented. The expression "*infectious diseases*" covers already COVID 19 and a specific non-preferred term will be added to the list.

15. The occupations of "*coronavirus tester*", "*temperature screener*" and "*contact tracer*" could become obsolete if a COVID-19 vaccine becomes widely available by the middle of 2021.

16. The word "*COVID-19*" and "*coronavirus*" should be removed in order to make these concepts reusable in case of other pandemics/health crises.

Reaction: the above feedback (points 15-16) will be investigated. Defining these occupations and their related skills could be still useful in job matching services and for reflecting prior experience in CVs.

Feedback related to procurement, distribution and supply occupations and the Public sector

17. The functions and skills described in the occupations of "*standalone public buyer*" and "*public procurement specialist*" seem to be covered adequately by the existing occupation "*purchaser*", although the ESCO description of this occupation could be improved. The proposed preferred term could simply be listed as an alternative label.

18. The profile of "*procurement category specialist*" overlaps with some of the occupations listed as narrower than 3323.2, without specifying the categories or areas of specialisation. It should be listed as an alternative label for 3323.2.

19. The formulation of the knowledge concept "*certification*" is too broad.

20. The new skill concepts "*promote sustainable procurement*" and "*innovate in procurement*" are too specific. Contextualisation for public procurement is not needed in these cases.

21. The sentence "*in order to identify the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT)*" is too specific and should be deleted from the skill "*evaluate tender*".

22. The alternative labels listed for the occupation "*purchaser*" include several job titles related to management occupations. These labels should be removed and included in the list for the occupation "*purchasing manager*".

23. The need for a different profile for the "*procurement department manager*" does not seem to be justified. "*Procurement department manager*" should be listed as an alternative label for "*purchasing manager*" and the description of "*purchasing manager*" should be modified to include public sector managers and reflect oversight of staff.

Reaction: all of the above feedback (points 17-23) will be investigated. As already mentioned, public procurement profiles have been created following the recently adopted European Competence Framework for Public Procurement Professionals and

the Commission believes it is important to reflect such competence framework in the ESCO classification. Non-preferred terms for the concept 3323.2 will be assigned as suggested.

24. "*Purchasing manager*" also overlaps with the occupation of purchaser, as some of the same job titles appear as alternative labels for both occupations. These labels should be removed from the list for purchasing manager.
25. The hierarchy of occupations specified as narrower occupations than the occupation "*logistics and distribution manager*" is too deep. In particular, "*supply chain manager*" should be listed at the same level as "*logistics and distribution manager*".
26. The occupation "*transportation manager*" as described seems similar to the profile of distribution manager and could be confused with other occupations such as the "*road operations manager*".

Reaction: the feedback under points 24-25 will be implemented. The feedback under point 26 will be investigated.

Feedback related to development cooperation

27. The occupation "*international aid worker*" should not be included in the classification as the different functions described in this profile belong to a wider range of existing occupations and are rarely found in a single profile.
28. The knowledge concept "*sustainable development goals*" is too specific and should be deleted.
29. The preferred term "use systemic design" is not informative and it is hard to understand it without description.

Reaction: this feedback will be investigated.

Feedback related to data collection skills

30. A new knowledge concept for "*qualitative techniques for data collection*" is not needed as the skill concept "*conduct qualitative research*" already covers the use of qualitative techniques for data collection.
31. A new concept for "*quantitative techniques for data collection*" is not needed as the skill concept "*conduct quantitative research*" already covers the use of statistical, mathematical or computational techniques. The word "*observation*" should be removed from the description of the concept.

Reaction: the feedback under points 30-31 will be investigated.

More general feedback

32. It is important to ensure that the newly proposed ESCO occupations are correctly mapped to ISCO-08 in consultation with ILO, using a similar process with the one for ESCO v1.0.

Reaction: this feedback will be implemented. The Commission has already established contacts with the ILO and this work will take place in the first part of 2021.

33. There is a need to systematically check the lists of alternative labels in related occupations to remove duplicates. The same alternative label should be included in the lists for different occupations, if the term genuinely has different meanings in differing contexts, such as "*project manager*".

34. Several of the preferred terms used for occupation, skill and knowledge concepts are not sufficiently specific and/or are not consistent with the name given at the beginning of the text in the column for additional information. For example "*Offshore engineer*" should be changed to "*Offshore renewable energy engineer*" in order to differentiate it from engineers working on offshore installations that are not concerned with renewable energy (e.g. offshore oil rigs).

35. The preferred term of some very occupationally specific skills (for example "*perform image guidance*") are similarly not sufficiently contextualized. In other cases (for example the skill "*perform cannulation*") the preferred term is broader than the description of the concept and the description should therefore be de-contextualised to cover venous cannulation in health care generally but provide a little more detail as to what this skill involves.

36. **Reaction:** the feedback under points 33 –35 will be implemented.

37. It is not recommended to establish a new classification termed "Ecosystem". This is effectively a new classification of economic sectors, which is likely to cause confusion with established classification systems such as NACE. It also confuses concepts of type of economic activity with institutional sector. This results in overlap between the public sector and other sectors specified.

Reaction: the mapping of ESCO occupation under different sectors and the use of the word "ecosystem" to refer to these sectors does not imply the establishment of a new classification. These ecosystems will be used only for the purpose of this exercise and will not be part of the ESCO structure.

38. The new content should be reviewed by experts in occupational information and classifications once the documentation has been fully developed. The inputs from sectoral experts need to be complemented by inputs from occupational experts who have a view of the whole labour market and not just individual sectors. It is not sufficient to rely only

on comments made by MAI members as this does not allow sufficient time for comprehensive review.

Reaction: this feedback will be investigated.