



# Implementation of the European code of conduct on partnership

Findings of a survey by ETUC, BUSINESSEUROPE,  
UEAPME

ESF capacity building seminar, 30 March 2015

# Structure

- Methodology
- Findings
  - Process
  - Involvement of partners
  - Content and outcomes
  - Joint recommendations

# Methodology

- Structured according to main elements of the code of conduct on partnership – NPAs and Ops
- Does not cover capacity building support measures or access to funding
- Survey findings from 28 members in 22 countries – mainly on NPAs. Not all responses cover all questions
- NB: some divergent views between experiences of trade unions & employers and between employers organisations within same country

# Findings: Process - NPAs(1)

## Consultation

- Members assessed extent of general participation in NPAs on a scale of 1 (bad) to 5 (excellent)
- Majority of responses fell between 2 and 4
- Positive experience of involvement via initial public consultation in 12 countries
- But in 7 Member States social partners ranked their participation as 1 or 2 (3 as 1 and 4 as 2)

# Findings: Process - NPAs(2)

## Drafting

- Negative experience of involvement in drafting in 12 countries. Partial involvement in a further 3
- Only in 3 countries did social partners have full positive experiences (Germany, Netherlands, Slovenia)
- NB: BE Spanish member positive about involvement in drafting – UEAPME and ETUC negative

# Findings: Process - NPAs(3)

## Timing

- Mainly partial or negative level of satisfaction on timetable for consultation and timing of involvement at different stages.

## Findings: Process - OPs (4)

- Mixed picture between national and regional level.
- Involvement in national OPs broadly follows same direction as for NPAs
- Tends to be less involvement of social partners at regional level. Portugal a good eg - BE member ranked involvement as 4 out of 5
- Constant feature: Differences between regions within same country

# Findings: Process (5)

## Main Messages

- Initial level of consultation broadly satisfactory - good with opportunity to express views
- BUT, difficult to reach the responsible people outside of consultation meetings = lack of permanent involvement and of concrete influence on the decision-making process.
- Public consultations not always seen as enough/satisfactory.
- Social partners often only formally consulted, together with several other subjects.



# Findings: Involvement (1)

- Positive involvement of relevant social and economic partners in 12 countries.
- Negative responses from Hungary, Ireland, Poland
- Positive experience in Spain for BE and ETUC members, negative for UEAPME. Positive experience for Italian members across the 3 organisations
- No balanced representation of large, medium, small companies in several countries

## Findings: Involvement (2)

- Participation confirmed in national monitoring committees in 10 countries
- 10 Members unable to answer at this stage

# Findings: Involvement (3)

## Main Messages

- Half of the countries positive on involvement of relevant social and economic actors, but more obvious for ESF than for other funds such as ERDF
- Where this was not the case a strategic approach to the involvement of these actors needs to be implemented.

# Findings: Content/outcomes (1)

- Positive experience of participating in selecting thematic objectives in just 8 countries, negative in 11
- NB (1): Partial involvement of UEAPME and ETUC members in Italy, but good of involvement of BE member
- NB (2): Process in Slovenia is positive for UEAPME member, negative for ETUC's

## Findings: Content/outcomes (2)

- Social partner views fully taken into account in just 3 countries (Germany, Romania, Italy (except UEAPME))
- Partial inclusion of social partner views in 8 countries and no consideration of views in a further 7 (Croatia, Hungary, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Greece)
- In some countries there are diverging assessments between social partner members

# Findings: Content/outcomes – OPs

## (3)

- Limited involvement of social partners in selection of priorities
- In Poland better involvement and effectiveness of social partners in preparation of national OP than NPA
- Could be more feedback explaining which priorities have been taken into account and why others haven't

# Findings: Content/outcomes (4)

## Main Messages

- Lack of proper involvement throughout process shown by limited social partner input on thematic objectives and uptake of views
- Reflects that in some countries consultations merely formal exercises (& limited to public consultation involving several stakeholders), not a real exchange
- = reduced added value of ESF in key policy areas that social partners contribute to, such as work-based and workplace learning, or the implementation of the YG/YEI and the EU Alliance for Apprenticeship

# Joint recommendations

## **Joint EU social partners' requests towards the EU Commission**

- To conduct a more in depth analysis on the full implementation of the partnership principle and of article 5, as well as of the specific provisions of the Code of Conduct for Partnership
- To give serious considerations to the application of partnership principle in the analysis of ex-ante conditionalities for OPs
- To recommend the MS to proceed towards better implementation of such tools



# Contacts

ETUC: Luca Visentini  
[l.visentini@ETUC.org](mailto:l.visentini@ETUC.org)



BUSINESSEUROPE: Robert Plummer  
[r.plummer@businessseurope.eu](mailto:r.plummer@businessseurope.eu)



UEAPME: Liliane Volozinskis  
[l.volozinskis@ueapme.com](mailto:l.volozinskis@ueapme.com)

