

Mr. Pascal Lamy
Member of the European Commission
Trade Commissioner
Rue de la Loi, 170
B – 1049 – Brussels

Brussels, 8 November 2000

Subject : Second ESF Position Paper on The Temporary Movement of Key Business Personnel

Dear Mr Lamy,

Please find enclosed the second ESF Position Paper on The Temporary Movement of Key Business Personnel.

In our first Paper dated 19 October 1999, the ESF articulated a number of views that remain valid.

This second Paper reflects additional thinking by members of the ESF on this important issue for the European exporting services industry. It provides information to build up a business case on the concrete needs of European companies and makes some recommendations to the European Commission and to the EU Member States as part of the GATS 2000 negotiations.

The ESF believes that the effort needed to improve the existing GATS framework to provide clarity and consistency of treatment on the matter of mobility of personnel would be minimal compared with the benefits of liberalisation in terms of improving the ability to move business people to locations where they can be most productive for a specific period. We believe that mobility of key business personnel encourages knowledge share and development, stimulates innovation and enhances efficiency and international competitiveness.

The ESF does not underestimate the difficulties of liberalising barriers to the movement of persons under the GATS. The understandably defensive interests of WTO Member Countries' immigration and labour market development officials, coupled with the complexity and opacity of the GATS itself, however, need to be balanced against the needs of a global market place which requires an internationally mobile workforce. These developments call for an internationally co-ordinated response from governments.

The ESF considers that the EU should urgently raise these matters with the WTO Committee on Specific Commitments in order to focus attention on the movement of natural persons and to

consider possible improvements that could be made under the GATS. The Committee could take into account whether, and to what extent, related questions such as scheduling, classification and domestic regulation need to be examined in liberalising barriers to the movement of people. The Committee could also consider arrangements which could be introduced to monitor and track the operation of any revised schemes.

The list of ESF Members supporting the Position paper is attached.

A similar letter has been sent to Mr. François Huwart, as Chair of the Council of the European Union.

Yours sincerely,

Pascal KERNEIS
Managing Director

Enclosure: 1 (9 pages)

Cc: Mr. P. Carl, Director General, DG Trade; Mr. H. Jouanjean, Director, DG Trade;
Mr. Servoz, DG Trade/D/2 (Services)

The Temporary Movement of Key Business Personnel: Second Position Paper

24 October 2000

Introduction

1 The European Services Forum (ESF) issued its preliminary views on the temporary movement of specialist, technical or managerial personnel - "key business personnel"¹ - in a position paper that was submitted to the European Commission on 19 October 1999. That paper recommended that the issue of international mobility of personnel should be discussed, as a matter of priority, by WTO Member Countries as part of the services negotiations that have now been launched under Article XIV of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS).

2 With the objective of reducing government measures which impede or restrict the temporary movement of key business personnel between WTO Member Countries, the paper recommended that agreement should be sought on 5 main matters:

1) common definitions of key business personnel – to remove from scheduled commitments uncertain and inconsistent terms thereby reducing the scope for arbitrary and discriminatory application of the rules and procedures operated by relevant authorities

2) transparent procedures – to facilitate compliance with necessary requirements for obtaining permission for entry

3) common terms for intra-company transfers – to remove uncertainty and arbitrary restrictions on the movement of categories of personnel under intra-company transfers

4) provision of expedited procedures for short-term movement of personnel – to reduce the delays (and costs) involved in arranging visits to or assignments in host countries of less than 12 months

5) co-ordinated treatment of modes 1, 3 and 4²

3 In its response of 25 November 1999 to the ESF's first position paper, DG Trade accepted the ESF's analysis of the problems which barriers to the movement of personnel cause. The Commission invited the ESF to provide examples of the problems encountered by services providers and encouraged the forum to develop its recommendations. Representatives of ESF have since met with officials from DG Trade and presented the issue of mobility to Member State officials at a meeting of the 133 Committee in Brussels on 20 June 2000, with a view to raising awareness of the issue and beginning a process of information exchange and debate.

4 Having regard to the collapse of the WTO Ministerial Conference in Seattle last year and the wishes of a number of the least developed countries to increase their participation in services trade by seeking improved mode 4 commitments from OECD countries, the ESF urges the Commission and Member States to take active steps to remove barriers to the international mobility of personnel between WTO Member Countries.

5 The ESF re-emphasises that the focus of its attention is on the *temporary* movement of key business personnel. It accepts that the GATS does not apply to measures affecting immigration or employment on a permanent basis.³ The movements of personnel with which this paper is concerned are "temporary" in the sense that they are for a limited duration only (ie they do not involve permanent transfer but are for short-term periods at the end of which the person concerned

¹ A term that covered a broader range of personnel than the EU's 1999 GATS offer which was limited to: "contractual services supplier, sales negotiator of a service, key personnel responsible for setting up a commercial presence, intra-corporate transferee (either a person working in a senior position or a person with an uncommon knowledge)".

² I.e. the modes specified in GATS Art I, para 2 namely cross-border supply, commercial presence abroad and delivery of services by natural persons abroad.

³ See GATS Annex on Movement of Natural Persons Supplying Services under the Agreement, para 2. For this reason, the ESF accepts that the GATS is not an appropriate mechanism for addressing restrictions on family members (which is often a significant barrier in practice to the movement of personnel in relation to longer-term transfers, assignments or secondments) and which is likely to be considered more fruitfully on a bi-lateral basis.

returns to his or her country of origin), the actual duration depending on the type of movement. In some cases (for example, consulting assignments, involving the movement of a person with specialist knowledge or skills to work in a non-EU country in which a client has operations) the duration may be for a period of a few weeks or, less commonly, up to 12 months. In the case of an intra-corporate transfer, whereby a company employee is transferred to a subsidiary, branch or affiliate of the company in another country, the duration may be for a period of up to 2 years in many cases; in some cases (in the banking and transport sectors, for example) the movement of key business personnel may be for a period of between 2 and 4 years.

6 The remainder of this paper:

- ?? underlines the need to make progress on this issue (paragraphs 8 - 12)
- ?? provides examples of the problems to which current barriers to the movement of personnel give rise across a number of services sectors (paragraphs 13 - 20)
- ?? makes further recommendations to achieve more predictable, harmonised and transparent arrangements for the movement of key business personnel (paragraphs 21 - 25)

7 This paper does not deal with barriers to the mobility of personnel that may be caused by domestic regulation. For example, local licensing requirements that discriminate between foreigners or between foreigners and nationals⁴ and the absence of agreements between countries for the mutual recognition of qualifications may have significant practical effects on the cross-border movement of certain services providers (notably providers of professional services). The ESF is developing a separate paper on domestic regulation which will focus on improving the effectiveness of the basic principles of domestic regulation (in particular transparency and necessity) as set out in Article VI of the GATS.

Growing significance of international mobility

8 A recent survey by PricewaterhouseCoopers⁵ of 271 leading, cross-sector organisations⁶ (including a number of ESF members), drawn from 24 European countries, reveals that conducting business on a global basis requires an increasingly mobile workforce. Between them these organisations employed a remarkable 65,000 expatriate executives. The 1999 survey disclosed that the size of participants' expatriate populations varies considerably, from 1 to 4,000. One member of the ESF, operating in the professional services sector, estimates that at any one time there are 5,000 of its own key business personnel working outside their country of origin, on secondment or (more commonly) on assignments in 76 countries around the world – an increase on 50 countries in 1997.

9 The PricewaterhouseCoopers 1999 survey shows that more than 54% of participants had experienced an increase in the use of short-term assignments. The changing patterns of international labour mobility across a wide range of sectors are being driven by:

- ?? an increase in internationally mobile executives working in global business networks
- ?? changing technology leading to different work patterns and the ability to work from remote locations
- ?? increasing difficulty in attracting employees to accept lengthy periods outside the home country
- ?? the need to develop a more internationally experienced workforce at a lower transaction cost to the business

⁴ For example under Thai law certain valuations require surveying firms to be stock market or central bank approved. The Thai Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) welcomes all professional valuers but asks that the Valuers' Association of Thailand (whose members must be Thai nationals) check valuers' credentials. As the valuers' association will only approve its own members, this effectively prevents foreigners from performing valuations for SEC purposes. In addition surveyors are prevented from undertaking agency work (buying, selling or managing property) under Thailand's Alien Business Law, which is a reserved profession for Thais.

⁵ *International Assignments: European Policy and Practice 1999/2000* (1999).

⁶ The majority employ over 10,000 employees world-wide, with an average expatriate population of 250. They covered the following industry groups: Tobacco, food, beverage and retail; Banking; Legal, finance and insurance; Pharmaceuticals, chemicals, personal products and health care; Telecommunications; Electronics, computers, software and semiconductors; Oil, gas and mining; Engineering, construction and aeronautics/aerospace; and Manufacturing, metals and textiles.

Ability to perform contract work for clients abroad

10 It is also necessary to address barriers associated with the temporary entry of key business personnel who are fulfilling a contract between two businesses that does not involve intra-corporate movement of personnel. This is to cover the situation, for example, of a business in developing country A that has won a contract to provide services to another business in country B where the former does not have a commercial presence. The same issues of transparency and timeliness are at stake in these situations where, in too many instances, the process of granting work permits and visas is so slow as to make it impossible to complete work within prescribed periods.

Benefits of greater international mobility of personnel for developing countries

11 The benefits that can be obtained from greater mobility of personnel are not confined to developed countries. Depending on various factors (including the regulatory frameworks of home and recipient countries), the transfer of specialist knowledge, expertise and skills that typically accompanies the movement of key business personnel can bring important benefits for developing countries (as well as countries whose economies are in transition). Indeed the GATS explicitly states⁷ that increased participation of developing country Members in world trade should be facilitated through the negotiation of specific commitments relating, amongst other things, to the liberalisation of market access in sectors and modes of supply of export interest to them. The temporary movement of key business personnel is one of the main areas in which developing countries can exploit their comparative advantage, for example for qualified professionals such as doctors and software programmers working on temporary contracts in developed countries. For developing countries, despite the temporary loss of skilled resources, offsetting gains can be expected to accrue from the enhanced experience and skills obtained while working temporarily abroad. In addition there are opportunities for home countries to promote specialisation and develop economies of scale and scope of services.

12 In addition to net labour-related inflows to developing countries (from income earned abroad and remitted to the home country), the transfer of knowledge and skills back to the home country after a period of temporary work abroad can have huge economy-wide implications. Better quality, more competitively priced business services such as accounting and legal services, for example, can reduce costs in developing countries; enhanced knowledge and experience in software development acquired in developed countries can provide the necessary underpinning for spreading the information-based economy and infrastructure improvement to less developed countries.

Barriers to the movement of people

13 The need for an increasingly mobile workforce is presenting businesses (increasingly operating to new models, involving cross-border joint ventures and strategic alliances) as well as governments with growing challenges. While commercial activity operates in an environment that is becoming borderless, government measures that regulate the movement of business personnel across borders are failing to keep pace with the international market dynamic. Whether facilitating a business visit, an international assignment or an intra-company transfer, businesses face a variety of hurdles that act as significant non-tariff barriers to efficiency and competitiveness. These include:

- ?? complex, cumbersome and time-consuming procedures to obtain work permits and visas
- ?? quantitative and qualitative restrictions, such as Economic Needs Tests (ENTs) and local market tests, the criteria for which may be unclear and subject to arbitrary interpretation; such restrictions (like the cap on H-1B visas in the US) frequently apply the same set of rules and procedures to permanent as well as temporary transfers
- ?? restrictions on the movement of foreign workers once in a recipient country (for example, restricting movement between States within the US or between client sites in different Swiss cantons and restrictions on extensions of stay)

Impact of barriers to the movement of people

⁷ Article IV.

14 As the European Commission is aware,⁸ barriers to the movement of persons (which are often linked to onerous local regulatory and licensing requirements as well as the recognition of qualifications) can affect the supply of services in a wide range of services sectors. Some examples of particular problems are given below:

?? **Business advisory and professional services:** Multi-national firms of *accountants, management* and *IT consultants* and *lawyers* increasingly need to deploy professional staff (at executive or technical levels) to work away from their home country on short-term secondments or assignments (often at short notice) to meet client demands for seamless, high quality services around the world.⁹

A professional services firm, with operations in 150 countries, had to assemble a team of 70 consultants to help a client implement a systems integration project in 63 territories but obtaining necessary work permits took several months in some cases.

Surveyors (who provide expert valuations to businesses for accounting, taxation or investment purposes) also encounter problems with the movement of personnel. In South Africa, surveyors have encountered problems because visa requirements change frequently but are not published. Some requirements are cumbersome and time-consuming (for example, the need to obtain a police report confirming that an applicant does not have a criminal record). In Korea a single entry visa will be issued to UK workers but to renew the visa or obtain a multiple entry visa, workers have to return to the UK to apply.

?? **Communications services:** Firms in this sector have reported problems moving personnel overseas, a drawback that impedes international team-working; a large telecoms operator cites problems moving key business personnel on a temporary basis into the US.

?? **Construction services:** *Engineers*, for example, encounter problems obtaining visas to work in Malaysia. Most people enter Malaysia on a business or visitors' visa but a foreign engineer who wishes to work in Malaysia may only do so as an employee on an annually renewable temporary registration basis and provided that he has 10 years' experience and been in Malaysia for not less than 6 months in one calendar year.

?? **Environmental services:** Firms providing environmental services have reported difficulties moving personnel to developing countries to augment or establish a commercial presence abroad with a view to helping local staff implement business plans and training them up to take over management functions at a later date.

?? **Financial services:** Businesses in this sector are unable to rely exclusively on local personnel to run their operations and look for the removal of restrictions on the movement of personnel.¹⁰ The extent to which they need to move executive or professional staff from one country to another depends on the availability of suitably qualified local personnel and local regulatory requirements (such as licensing, which may be restrictive).

In the *insurance sector* restrictions on the movement of people are encountered in countries including Bahrain, Canada, China (seeking WTO accession), Korea, Malaysia, Philippines, Saudia Arabia (seeking WTO accession), Singapore, South Africa and United States (certain States).

⁸ See *Report relating to the Industry Consultation in the Context of Preparatory Work for GATS 2000 via the SIS* by Deloitte & Touche (1999) in addition to representations that have been made to DG Trade by a number of services sectors.

⁹ See evidence submitted by the Management Consultancies Association (representing the leading consulting firms in the UK, employing over 17,000 people and generating £3 billion in fees) to the House of Lords Select Committee on the European Union review *The World Trade Organisation: The EU Mandate after Seattle* (HL 76, 2000) Vol II at p 263. See also the evidence submitted by PricewaterhouseCoopers, *ibid.*, at p 273. The report was debated in the House of Lords on 14 July 2000 during which the problems caused by barriers to the mobility of personnel were recognised by several contributors: see *Official Report* (HL, 14 July 2000) at cols. 472-474 (Lord Freeman), col. 484 (Lord Sharman) and col. 494 (Baroness Williams). The UK Government's response to the select committee's report is expected in the Autumn 2000.

¹⁰ See, for example, the evidence supplied on behalf of the UK-based financial services industry to the House of Lords European Union Committee by British Invisibles: HL 76, Vol II Evidence 115, 119.

In the *banking sector* barriers to the movement of people are encountered in Brazil (which has not made any commitments on the movement of personnel), the Czech Republic (which limits the entry of executives, managers and specialists) and Poland (which has not made any commitments on the movement of personnel and which applies a nationality requirement for senior executive personnel of foreign banks established in Poland)

?? **Tourism services:** In some cases restrictions on the movement of persons have been cited as the most significant restriction on the development of these services. The European tourism sector encounters problems, for example, with restrictions in the US on the employment of foreign personnel needed by investors to establish a commercial presence. Problems are also caused by conditions concerning the distribution of work permits in Turkey, Cyprus and Tunisia (except, in the case of the latter, for managing directors). Difficulties are encountered with the temporary movement of tour guides between Mauritius and Morocco and between Morocco and Algeria. Restrictions faced by this sector operate to the detriment of less well developed countries which apply licensing requirements that discriminate against foreign guides. Restrictions on foreign guides also apply in developed countries, such as Austria, France, Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal.

?? **Transport services:** Although in the air transport sector provision is normally made in bilateral international agreements for the movement of specialist personnel such as "station managers", in the maritime sector bilateral agreements only cover the transfer, assistance and shore visits of ships' crews.

15 The problems of mobility of personnel have been highlighted by the current world wide shortage of IT workers. Estimated at 850,000 in the US market and 600,000 in Western Europe alone, this shortage is focusing attention on the need for developed countries like the US, the UK, Ireland, Germany, Singapore, South Korea and Japan to be able to access skilled workers from such countries as India, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and South Africa with the minimum of restriction to meet specific, time-limited economic needs.

16 One member of the ESF, representing a leading IT services company, expressed his company's concern as follows:

"Our customers want seamless solutions across borders, and we have to be there to support them. You cannot build a full set of global competencies from individual territories so you have to pull together teams from different countries. If your customer is a government installing a new social security system, speed is critical. You cannot wait months for entry clearances to be obtained. Unless we remove unnecessary restrictions on non-EU nationals seeking temporary movement into the EU, the skills we need will simply by-pass Europe."

17 In response, a number of governments have made adjustments in immigration and labour market policy to facilitate the movement of key business personnel. For example, in the US Congress has recently approved legislation¹¹ to raise the cap on H1-B visas (temporary admission of foreign nationals with specialised skills) for the years 2001-2003. In the EU the European Parliament approved the EU Services Card Directive¹² in May 2000 which will allow third country nationals who are legally resident in a Member State the freedom to provide services in other Member States. A common position is expected to be adopted by the Internal Market Council of Ministers later this year. In addition in some (but only some) Member States there have been some helpful initiatives to improve the mobility of key business personnel. In Germany an accelerated work visa programme has been introduced for highly skilled technical workers (as well as their spouses) for non-EU nationals for a period of 5 years. In the UK (where there is no cap on highly skilled professionals) the Government announced in March 2000 measures to streamline the grant and renewal of work permits for overseas workers seeking entry to the UK,¹³ and further reforms may follow.¹⁴

¹¹ S.2045, The American Competitiveness in the Twenty-first Century Act.

¹² COM [2000] 271 final.

¹³ A scheme to allow multinational employers to self certify rather than apply for a work permit for employees on intra-company transfers is being piloted in the UK: see the announcement by Employment Minister Margaret Hodge MP on 28 September 2000.

¹⁴ See the speech by UK Home Office Minister, Barbara Roche MP on 11 September 2000 (www.homeoffice.gov.uk/new.htm)

Mobility of persons and the GATS: limited progress to date

18 Despite these welcome initiatives, efforts to reduce barriers to the mobility of people on a multilateral basis under the GATS have proceeded very slowly. Following the extended negotiations in this area that were completed in June 1995, only a relatively small number of Member Countries made commitments regarding the movement of persons under Mode 4 with regard to Market Access (Article XVI), National Treatment (Article XII) or for additional reasons (Article XVIII). Liberalisation commitments made to date, by both developed and developing countries, have been:

- ?? uneven in coverage by sector (many countries have not scheduled accounting, legal or health services)
- ?? subject to conditional limitations (usually relating to functional or hierarchical criteria, length of stay, labour market and ENTs), with unclear or inconsistent criteria, and often not related to *temporary* movement
- ?? expressed in terms that are neither clear nor consistent (despite scheduling guidelines, there is no uniformity of definition types and categories of personnel), leading to arbitrary and discriminatory treatment by immigration and consular officials)

19 A fundamental problem is that under the existing schedules of commitments by Member Countries no distinction is made between temporary and permanent labour even though the GATS is meant to cover only temporary movement.¹⁵ Analysis of scheduled commitments regarding the movement of natural persons shows that most of the conditions relate to immigration and labour market regulation, which also affect permanent movement of workers.

20 In short there is a need to introduce clarity, objectivity and transparency into the GATS commitments regarding the movement of personnel.

How to improve the mobility of personnel under the GATS

21 The ESF believes that, in order to improve the effectiveness of *existing* commitments and provide a stimulus for further liberalisation, the Commission and Member States should support:

- ?? ***The development of a minimum set of Mode 4 requirements which could be applied both horizontally and sectorally.*** These requirements could be specified in a model template schedule containing market access commitments and international trade principles with reference to existing GATS provisions concerning necessity and equivalence related to the *temporary* movement of natural persons. The principles would govern such matters as minimum durations of stay and circumstances in which ENTs could be justified. The model schedule would need to be formulated in sufficiently broad terms to avoid being overtaken by the dynamics of labour markets. A core set of Mode 4 requirements of the kind envisaged could help WTO Member Countries to undertake comparative assessments of regulatory responses to the movement of persons assessed against the needs of international trade (and thereby reduce the scope for politically charged debates on a domestic level).
- ?? ***The creation of Mode 4 horizontal commitments to align with agreed principles.*** Existing horizontal commitments should be reviewed to determine whether they are sufficiently detailed and specific; and reformulated as appropriate to align with the model template.
 - To facilitate the *temporary* movement of defined categories of personnel, ***an expedited procedure - a "GATS Permit" - should be developed for intra-corporate transfers*** wishing to move such personnel to another country for less than 12 months. A system whereby companies are certified by the immigration authorities to allow them to self-administer transfers that satisfied appropriate criteria could be developed. Such a procedure could significantly improve the efficiency and

¹⁵ "The Agreement shall *not* [emphasis supplied] apply to measures affecting natural persons seeking access to the employment market of a Member, nor shall it apply to measures regarding citizenship, residence or employment on a permanent basis" (Annex on Movement of Natural Persons Supplying Services under the Agreement, para. 2).

effectiveness of arrangements regulating short-term movements of defined categories of personnel. Issue of GATS Permits should be subject to strict conditions relating, for example, to the method of application (including information necessary to support the application, proof of employment with current employer for a defined period and coupled with a declaration of an intention not to establish a permanent residence in the recipient country). Terms would need to be provided for renewal and transfer of applications and for appeals against the refusal to grant entry permission. To facilitate compliance and minimise opportunities for abuse, the expedited procedure could be backed up by a standing bond, made between the applicant business on behalf of their transferred employees and the local embassy or consulate of the recipient country.

- There should be a similar undertaking for allowing commitments to be made for the temporary **movement of key business personnel who are fulfilling a contract of services between two businesses** not involving the intra-corporate movement of personnel, to enable them to fulfil a contractual obligation.¹⁶
- A new category of **“intra-corporate transfer for training and career development”** should be created to facilitate the temporary movement of *potential* key business personnel; this would offer additional flexibility to EU Member States to benefit least developed countries by increasing the knowledge, skills and experience of the key business personnel of the future.

Conclusion and recommendations

22 The ESF believes that the effort needed to improve the existing GATS framework to provide clarity and consistency of treatment would be minimal compared with the benefits of liberalisation in terms of improving the ability to move business people to locations where they can be most productive for a specific period, encouraging knowledge share and development, stimulating innovation and enhancing efficiency and international competitiveness.

23 The ESF does not underestimate the difficulties of liberalising barriers to the movement of persons under the GATS. The understandably defensive interests of WTO Member Countries' immigration and labour market development officials, coupled with the complexity and opacity of the GATS itself, however, need to be balanced against the needs of a global market place which requires an internationally mobile workforce. These developments call for an internationally co-ordinated response from governments.

24 The ESF considers that the EU should raise these matters, as a matter of urgency, with the Committee on Specific Commitments in order to focus attention on the movement of natural persons and to consider possible improvements that could be made under the GATS. The Committee could take into account whether and to what extent related questions such as scheduling, classification and domestic regulation need to be examined in liberalising barriers to the movement of people. The Committee could also consider arrangements which could be introduced to monitor and track the operation of any revised schemes.

25 Accordingly, the ESF:

?? Notes the Commission's initial support for its earlier recommendations (summarised in paragraph 2, above) - namely for common definitions of “key business personnel”, transparent procedures, common terms for intra-corporate transfers, the provision of expedited entry clearance and co-ordinated treatment of the movement of personnel under the different modes of supply – and **Recommends** that the Commission seek to obtain broader support from the Member States to progress those recommendations in the formulation of a revised EU GATS offer and negotiations under Article XIX

?? **Recommends** that the Commission, together with the Member States, should consider the approach summarised in paragraph 21 above to achieve greater liberalisation of the barriers to the movement of natural persons

¹⁶ To deal with the situation described in para 10, above.

?? **Recommends** that the Commission, together with the Member States, should call for the Committee on Special Commitments to provide more detailed consideration of the issues in a multilateral context involving the developed as well as developing Member Countries of the WTO (paragraph 24, above)

Contacts :

Roger Davis, Partner

PricewaterhouseCoopers

Tel: +44 (171) 583 5000 – Fax: +44 (171) 8224 4652 –

Email: roger.o.davis@uk.pwcglobal.com or mark.hatcher@uk.pwcglobal.com

Pascal KERNEIS, Director

European Services Forum (ESF)

Tel: +322 230.75.14 - Fax: +322 230.61.68 - Email: esf@esf.be

**List of ESF Members Supporting
The Second Paper on The Temporary Movement of Key Business Personnel**

<p>INSURANCE ?? Allianz AG ?? AXA Group ?? UNIQA Versicherungen AG ?? CGNU (Norwich Union) ?? Comité Européen des Assurances - CEA ?? Bureau International des Producteurs d'Assurances & de Réassurances – BIPAR</p> <p>FINANCIAL SERVICES ?? ABN AMRO ?? Barclays PLC ?? Commerzbank AG ?? DIT Deutscher Investment-Trust ?? National Bank of Greece ?? Fédération Bancaire de l'Union européenne – FBE ?? European Savings Banks Group – ESBG ?? European Association of Cooperative Banks - EACB ?? European Federation of Investment Funds and Companies - FEFSI</p> <p>TELECOMMUNICATIONS ?? British Telecommunications plc ?? Deutsche Telekom AG ?? France Telecom ?? Telefónica ?? European Public Telecommunication Network Operators' Association - ETNO</p> <p>POSTAL & EXPRESS DELIVERY SERVICES ?? Deutsche Post AG ?? DHL Worldwide Network SA ?? Sweden Post ?? TPG (TNT Post Group) ?? La Poste ?? European Express Association – EEA</p> <p>AVIATION ?? Association of European Airlines – AEA ?? European Community's Independent Airlines Association – IACA/ACE</p> <p>SHIPPING ?? AP Møller ?? European Community Shipowners' Association – ECSA</p> <p>TOURISM ?? Sol Melia Hotels ?? Touristik Union International GmbH/Preussag ?? Confédération des Associations Nationales de l'Hôtellerie et de la Restauration de la CE - HOTREC ?? Groupement des Unions Nationales des Agences et Organisateurs de Voyages de l'UE – ECTAA</p> <p>DISTRIBUTION/RETAIL ?? Marks & Spencer plc ?? Metro AG ?? Royal Ahold NV ?? EuroCommerce</p> <p>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES - LAWYERS ?? Clifford Chance ?? Thomas / Deloitte ?? Pohl & Bauer Rechanwälte</p>	<p>?? Council of the Bars and Law Societies of the EU - CCBE</p> <p>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES – MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS ?? Andersen Consulting ?? Federation of European Consultancies Associations - FEACO</p> <p>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES – ACCOUNTANTS ?? Arthur Andersen ?? PricewaterhouseCoopers - PwC ?? Fédération des Experts Comptables Européens – FEE</p> <p>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES - SURVEYORS ?? The European Society of Chartered Surveyors ?? Comité de Liaison des Géomètres Européens – CLGE</p> <p>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES - ARCHITECTS ?? JDR Asociados ?? Architect von Lom ?? Architects' Council of Europe – ACE</p> <p>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES - OTHERS ?? European Council of the Liberal Professions – CEPLIS</p> <p>ENGINEERING & CONSTRUCTION ?? BESIX SA ?? Ove Arup & Partners ?? European Federation of Engineering Consultancy Associations - EFCA ?? European International Contractors - EIC ?? Fédération de l'Industrie Européenne de la Construction – FIEC</p> <p>COMPUTER & IT SERVICES ?? Sema Group plc ?? IBM Europe, Middle East & Africa</p> <p>AUDIO VISUAL ?? Association of Commercial Televisions - ACT ?? ARD ?? EMI Europe ?? UGC ?? Association of Commercial Televisions in Europe -ACTE ?? Eurocinéma ?? European Broadcasting Union – EBU ?? Federation Européenne des Réalisateur de l'Audiovisuel – FERA ?? International Federation of the phonographic industry – IFPI ?? Société des Auteurs et Compositeurs Dramatiques – SACD</p> <p>PUBLISHING, INCLUDING MUSIC PUBLISHING ?? Bertelsmann ?? European Publishers Council</p> <p>ADVERTISING & MARKETING ?? European Advertising Tripartite - EAT</p> <p>ENERGY SERVICES ?? Fortum Corporation ?? Eurelectric</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES / UTILITIES ?? Suez-Lyonnaise des Eaux ?? Vivendi</p> <p>GENERAL ?? Daimler-Chrysler Services (DEBIS) ?? UNICE</p>
--	--