

# ARITAKE-WILD

Joint Project of the European Social Partner Organisations;

"CEEC Social Partners' Participation in the European Social Dialogue:

*..... what are the social partners needs? "*

Report of the Czech National Seminar  
Praha  
Czech Republic  
9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> March 2004

Prepared by ARITAKE-WILD  
March 2004

Joint Project of the European Social Partner Organisations:

# ARITAKE-WILD

“CEEC Social Partners’ Participation in European Social Dialogue:  
..... what are the social partners needs?”

Praha  
Czech Republic  
9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> March 2004

---

The third in a series of five national seminars designed to identify the organisational and individual characteristics that will enable the participants to participate effectively in the European Social Dialogue was held in the Czech Republic on 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> March 2004. The objectives for the Czech social partners during the two-day event were;

- To identify the characteristics of organisations and individuals that will contribute most effectively to the European Social Dialogue;
- To develop individual social partner organisation and joint action plans to prepare for their full participation in the European Social Dialogue process after accession on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2004.

The seminar was attended by representatives of Czech employers' organisations and trade unions; representatives from the European social partners UNICE, UEAPME, CEEP and ETUC; and experts. The full attendance list for the seminar is attached as appendix one.

The seminar methodology was designed to assure maximum participation of the Czech trade unions and employers with “added value” input from the participants from the European social partner organisations and the experts. Most of the event involved discussions in small working groups with regular plenary feedback forums and consensus building sessions. To further facilitate the generation and development of ideas and strategies, the working groups were conducted in the Czech language with “subtle” interpretation available to the European social partner participants and experts. Full interpretation was provided in the plenary sessions.

Additionally, and in order to maximise bipartite discussion, agreement and action planning, where discussions took place in working groups, three groups were used: One contained exclusively trade union representatives; a second contained exclusively employers’ organisation representatives and the third group was of “mixed” composition. The outputs of all three groups were presented and discussed in plenary.

## ARITAKE-WILD

Day one of the seminar was devoted to identifying the most important characteristics, actions and behaviours that will lead to a successful entry into the European Social Dialogue for the Czech social partners. Through successive combinations of working groups, feedback forums, expert input and consensus building sessions, the participants were encouraged to develop a short list of key issues that they believed would have to be addressed. Day two was devoted to the development of individual social partner and joint action plans for each priority issue that will speed the transition and maximise the effectiveness of the Czech social partners in the European Social Dialogue.

This report follows the format of the seminar agenda, providing an overview report of each of the eight working sessions, and culminating in the agreed action plan that was the outcome of the final working session. The detailed agenda for the meeting is included as appendix two but the eight working sessions making up the seminar can be summarised as follows;

Outline session content		Nature of the session
Session one	"Explaining the European Social Dialogue".	Expert input - plenary
Session two	"Building successful organisations and individuals for European Social Dialogue".	Working groups
Session three	Working group feedback. "Building successful organisations and individuals for European Social Dialogue".	Plenary presentations
Session four	"Successful social partners and successful meetings" – presentation of research findings.	Expert input – plenary
Session five	"The characteristics, actions and behaviours that contribute to successful engagement in social partnership".	Consensus building session – plenary.
Session six	"Action plan development on the agreed priority issues"	Working groups
Session seven	Working group feedback. "Action plan development on the agreed priority issues"	Plenary presentations
Session eight	Discussion and agreement on specific action plans	Consensus building session – plenary.

**DAY ONE (9<sup>th</sup> March)**

**Session one (Expert input)**

*Explaining the European Social Dialogue*

The history, evolution, participants, working rules, practices and priorities of the European Social Dialogue were summarised in formal presentations given by one of the seminar experts (Alan Wild) and the UNICE Director of Social Affairs (Thérèse de Liederkerke). These presentations are attached as appendices three and four respectively. Additionally, each of the representatives of the European social partners; Juliane Bir of ETUC; Lilliane Volozinskis of UEAPME; and Inge Reichert of CEEP commented briefly on the similarities and differences in the approaches of their respective organisations to the development of negotiating positions, the sign-off process for agreements and methods of communication and implementation.

At the end of session one, the Czech social partners were left with a series of specific questions for consideration during the course of the seminar;

- How will they organise member discussions and convey input to consultations?
- How will they prepare technical input for negotiating mandates?
- How will they get this mandate approved?
- How will they liaise with each other?
- How will they explain compromises to members?
- How will they organise follow up procedures?

**Session two (Working group activity)**

*"Building successful organisations and individuals for European Social Dialogue"*

The national representatives were divided into three working groups. Two thirds of the trade union representatives formed the "trade union group"; two thirds of the employers formed the "employers' organisation group" and the remaining one third of the total population formed the "joint group". The representatives from UNICE and UEAPME, together with one expert, joined the employers' organisation group; the representative from the ETUC together with one expert joined the trade union group; and the representative from CEEP together with one expert joined the "joint group". A

## ARITAKE-WILD

chairperson/rapporteur was designated for each group from the list of national participants.

The working groups were given two hours to consider the following questions;

- *What do we need to do to build successful social dialogue partner organisations at the national level that are capable of contributing effectively to the European Social Dialogue? (Trade union and employers' organisation groups)*
- *What are the actions and behaviours that will make our meetings together as successful as possible? (Joint group)*

### **Session three (Working group feedback)**

*"Building successful organisations and individuals for European Social Dialogue"*

The report back from the three groups covered the following issues;

#### **Trade Union Group**

Improvements are required in working relationships and practices between CMKOS and the employers' organisations; the European social partners; and the Czech government.

#### **CMKOS**

- Need to consider organisation structure changes, including at the regional level;
- Work to improve the representative character of the organisation by increasing membership and setting up more local company/grass root organisations of unions. The union sectoral structure is satisfactory;
- In human resources the unions need to recruit more qualified people who speak foreign languages. This will require a combination of language and professional courses so that our representatives are capable of more effective representation;
- In order to assure sound arrangements for the establishment of mandates for European level negotiations, the unions can make adjustments to the current national level mechanism.

## ARITAKE-WILD

### Employers

- It will be necessary to set up a bipartite dialogue mechanism similar to the existing tripartite one. We need to create a new platform to coordinate the approach between unions and employers vis a vis the European Social Dialogue. This mechanism will also be necessary to allow us to apply voluntary agreements made at the EU level;
- Employers' organisations also need to work to improve their representivity;
- It is necessary to understand further, and to work on a general level of resistance towards unions at the company level.

### European Social Partners and European Commission

- Foreign investors need to be persuaded to enter into the social dialogue in the Czech Republic to the same extent that they are involved in their own countries;
- Financial assistance will be necessary to develop the full involvement of Czech Social Partners in European Social Dialogue. (Projects of technical assistance, language training, etc.);
- Mechanisms need to be established that allow us to benefit from the experience of colleagues from abroad (Germany, Austria, etc)

### Czech Government

- Discussions need to be held with respect to the legislative provisions covering The Council for Social Understanding in the Czech Republic including plans to establish regional structures.

### **Employers' Organisation Group**

Improvements in Czech participation in the European Social Dialogue will be based on six key points:

- Ensuring social partner autonomy when discussing things related to the European Social Dialogue;
- Strengthening the position of the employers, particularly financially, so that they can change internal structures and benefit from expert advice;

## ARITAKE-WILD

- Become Involved more deeply in national institutional structures relating to EU membership and decision making;
- Improve the flow of communication between the EU and the domestic level and our fuller integration into appropriate umbrella organisations;
- Improve communication between employers' organisations and between employers' organisations and trade unions, particularly in the implementation of agreements, other commitments and joint projects;
- Further developing social dialogue in the public sector.

### Joint Group

- It is to be regretted that observation/participation in the European level social dialogue was not granted until just six months ago; as a result, the level of Czech preparation is not as fully developed as it could have been;
- The Czech Republic needs to introduce a mechanism of bipartite social dialogue in order to discuss and maximise consensus on EU issues between the social partners.

### Session four (Expert input)

*"Successful social partners and successful meetings" – presentation of research findings*

One of the seminar experts (Alan Wild) presented the findings from a small research project conducted specifically for this series of national seminars. Fourteen currently active members of the European Social Dialogue, eight trade union members and six employer members, from the "European 15" were asked the following questions relating to the organisational characteristics of "more" and "less" successful organisations and the actions and behaviours of "more" and "less" successful individuals.

*Could you tell me, in your experience, what are the characteristics of the successful social partner at the European level? Could you list three or four characteristics of successful social partner organisations?*

## ARITAKE-WILD

*Could you tell me, in your experience, what are the characteristics of the least successful social partners at the European level? Could you list three or four characteristics of the least successful social partner organisations?*

*Turning now to behaviours. Can you tell me what are the most important actions and behaviours that make **individuals** more or less successful in the European social dialogue?*

*Are there any behaviours or actions that make particular **national delegations** (employers and trade unions together) more or less successful?*

The purpose of this session was to allow the participants to review their own discussions and presentations from session three and four in the context of the knowledge and experience of individuals from different countries that had participated in the European Social Dialogue over a number of years. The full presentation is attached to this report as appendix five.

In summary, the following factors were identified in the research.

Characteristics of the "most successful" social partner organisations	Characteristics of "less successful" social partner organisations
✓ Social dialogue is taken seriously;	✗ Lack of priority or interest in the social dialogue;
✓ One or two individuals given clear responsibility for the social dialogue;	✗ Lack of clarity in who represents the organisation;
✓ Continuity of representation;	✗ Lack of delegation of authority – too many referrals to national HQ;
✓ Representatives are credible at the national level;	✗ Low credibility – nationally or at the European level;
✓ Strong links between national and international activities;	✗ Changes in representation from meeting to meeting;
✓ Clear process for mandate development;	✗ Lack of processes for producing a clear mandate, reporting back or implementation;
✓ Clear process for reporting back;	✗ Over-political organisations/stances – lack of independence, influence of "party politics";
✓ Processes for implementing agreements;	✗ Poor electronic communication media;
✓ Dedication of sufficient resources – admin, research and IT;	✗ Lack of visibility in Brussels.
✓ Permanent Brussels presence.	



Actions/Behaviours of the "most successful" individuals	Actions/Behaviors of "less successful" individuals
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Interested in and motivated by subject;</li> <li>✓ Preparedness to research and learn;</li> <li>✓ Patience!;</li> <li>✓ Language skills;</li> <li>✓ Good listening skills;</li> <li>✓ Working outside of the formal meetings – 10% inside, 90% outside;</li> <li>✓ Strong networker;</li> <li>✓ Cultural awareness and sensitivity;</li> <li>✓ Awareness of other country conditions;</li> <li>✓ Awareness of views of other national social partner;</li> <li>✓ Strong IT skills;</li> <li>✓ "European" thinking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✗ No experience in collective bargaining;</li> <li>✗ Lack of language skills;</li> <li>✗ Lack of interest;</li> <li>✗ Political operators;</li> <li>✗ Dishonesty;</li> <li>✗ Nationalistic approaches;</li> <li>✗ Speaking to get their names in the minutes;</li> <li>✗ Internet illiterate;</li> <li>✗ Poor networker;</li> <li>✗ Inability to work effectively outside formal meetings;</li> <li>✗ Lack of closeness to the other national social partner;</li> <li>✗ "9 to 5" workers.</li> </ul>

**Session five (Consensus building session)**

*The characteristics, actions and behaviours that contribute to successful engagement in social partnership.*

Each individual was asked to consider, in the light of sessions four and five, what they considered to be the most important issues to have emerged. During a "tour de table" exercise involving all of the national participants, each subject raised was noted and the following "long-list" of issues was the result. The list below is exactly that recorded in the meeting. It is not in any priority order and reflects only the order in which the subjects were mentioned. It does not reflect "multiple mentions" of issues.

- ❖ Find resources for technical support
- ❖ Two partners with a clearly cut out mandate
- ❖ Information network and feedback perhaps via email, etc
- ❖ Encourage European thinking among employers within organisations
- ❖ Set up adequate internal structures for membership and integration into European Social Dialogue
- ❖ Preparation of experts for European Social Dialogue, adequate mandate and qualifications
- ❖ Create effective mechanism of social partners for preparation and implementation of joint stands in relation to the EU, should be related to national tripartite dialogue
- ❖ Create expertise/background for an information system
- ❖ Assure financial support for the creation of this background either with EU help or help of own state

## ARITAKE-WILD

- ❖ Educational work necessary to fulfill our potential as members of higher level European institutions . The EU needs to be perceived the EU as a process, not something static (moving train)
- ❖ Training on what is happening in Europe, how do we convey this information
- ❖ Learning from best practices/success stories of member states in terms of monitoring labor/economic situation on how to do this (Dublin Foundation example)
- ❖ Decent employment, decent social programs, high competitiveness—accept and develop this culture
- ❖ Identify the financial and human resources necessary for effective participation in European Social Dialogue
- ❖ Clear communication pathways, public information
- ❖ Make more use of young experts who are more energetic, assertive and have better language skills
- ❖ Cooperation between Czech and European organisations
- ❖ Do not invent a special Czech way, stick to practical procedures that have been outlined, determine how to come close to that and implement it.
- ❖ Stress and disseminate the significance of social dialogue, many still do not appreciate it
- ❖ Improve communication at all levels between employers and trade unions because this is the basis of bipartite structures
- ❖ Clear rules of permanent bipartite cooperation are necessary to be capable of using the system (written rules, written agreements)
- ❖ Willingness of partners to agree and behavior necessary to master this during the negotiation, have people with the qualities to agree and find solutions. Sometimes there are personality problems that prevent positive things from happening.
- ❖ Clear identification of the mandate and the authorities, use experience of existing member states and apply our experience from sectoral level of negotiations
- ❖ Dissemination of information to the grass roots level
- ❖ Autonomy of social dialogue, defining the content of social dialogue, picking the topics, two parties of social dialogue have different priorities. Need to set up mechanism to define content of dialogue
- ❖ Quality of experts is particularly important, they should be the people that prescribe to life long learning
- ❖ Restructure not only employers' organisations, but also their individual members. Establishment of internal structures that would be directly involved in social dialogue because these specialised structures do not yet exist.
- ❖ Ensure the process is continuous
- ❖ European thinking, create links between national and international issues
- ❖ Development of bipartite social dialogue is very important, needs to be official, these negotiations enable us to learn a way of thinking of the other party and understand each other better
- ❖ Maintenance of social peace in own country and Europe through social dialogue
- ❖ Due to limited number of experts in employers' organisations, should select carefully the organisations to which we send our experts where we don't have sufficient numbers
- ❖ Need better quality information
- ❖ Need to improve reputation of unions
- ❖ Willingness of social partners to come to an agreement and once agreement is reached, to comply with the agreement and implement it
- ❖ Enable mobility of workforce, life long learning
- ❖ Current lack of financial resources for social partners should be discussed on platform of tripartite dialogue
- ❖ In bipartite dialogue we should start building the model to implement the agreements between the social partners. Implementation of collective bargaining agreements in the Czech Republic is not fully satisfactory.

## ARITAKE-WILD

- ❖ Translation issues with short time frame (technical issue)
- ❖ More effective use of union resources
- ❖ Excessive interference of the state into the relations between employers and employees.  
Lesser role of the state and a strengthening of bipartite dialogue
- ❖ Build trust among groups

Following the national participant “tour de table”, the experts were asked to give their views on what they considered to be the most important priorities for the Czech social partners. In this short session, the experts and European level social partners made the following points;

- The accession countries were joining a moving train. It was important that they move quickly to resolve the issues raised and prioritise those matters that would facilitate a rapid and smooth entry transition;
- Financial resources: The social partners should start by looking to their own resources. There are other financing options available but ways of increasing and better using current resources is crucial;
- By and large, the Czech social partners are well equipped to deal with the problems they face. The structure of the Czech economy is very similar to other EU countries, as is the maturity of approach of the Czech social partners. There is a long term challenge: As the structure of the economy changes and the service sector becomes more important, there will be new challenges for collective approaches. The social partners need to consider the way they will approach these issues.

Following this general discussion, each of the national participants was asked to select three issues from the above “long-list” that they wished to spend the following day working on. This more focused “tour de table” produced consensus on four broad areas;

<b>Financial Resources</b>	Where to find funding. Internal restructuring of finances and priorities within organisations need to be considered alongside funding sources outside of the organisations. Examples included increasing the membership base, developing other kinds of services, turning to other organisations that can help bridge the technical support gap.
<b>People Development</b>	Developing organisational competency through people that can assimilate info quickly and have a combination of good language and professional skills.

<b>An effective Bipartite Structure</b>	Bipartite dialogue needs to be developed but with an appropriate degree of connectivity between the bipartite and tripartite structures. There must be connectivity without loss of social partner autonomy. Both the will to make bipartite dialogue work, and the establishment of clear rules around its operation are equally important – whether these rules are formal or informal.
<b>European Thinking</b>	Further developing European thinking through improved communication, selling the European Social Dialogue and persuading the general population that “Europe is us”.

Overnight the four broad areas were converted into specific task descriptions and translated for the working groups.

### DAY TWO (10<sup>th</sup> March)

#### Session six (Working groups)

##### *Action plan development*

Three working groups; again one trade union group, one employers' group and one joint group, were given three hours to develop responses to the following questions;

*For your organisation (or jointly) develop a specific action plan to address each of the following issues;*

**Q1:** *How will your organisation assure that it devotes the necessary financial resources to support effective participation in the European Social Dialogue? Consider internal resource reallocation and the acquisition of additional resources.*

**Q2:** *How do you propose to establish an effective bipartite social dialogue? Suggest a specific and time phased action plan that will enable you to have at least a minimum process in place by 30 April 2004.*

**Q3:** *How will your organisation assure that it puts in place the human resource development initiatives that will maximise your impact in the European Social Dialogue process? Consider immediate actions associated with entry into the European Social Dialogue process on 1 May 2004 and the medium and long term actions that will further reinforce your performance.*

**Q4:** *What actions do you need to take to reinforce “European Thinking” in your organisation and your members? How will you reach those enterprises and workers that are not your members?*

## ARITAKE-WILD

For each group, a working group chairperson/rapporteur was appointed and the experts were divided amongst the groups in a similar manner to session three above.

### Session seven (Working group feedback)

#### *Action plan development*

The group rapporteurs presented the following feedback from their working sessions;

#### **Joint Group**

- By the 30<sup>th</sup> of April, representatives from both partners will develop an appropriate agreement on bipartite dialogue. At this meeting we will also discuss a pilot program using telework.
- The social partners will assess their financial resources and prepare proposals to attract additional funds from the EU for specific activities. These funds could be used for the construction of an information center, etc.
- Information on bipartite cooperation should be presented on the websites of the social partners.

#### **Employers' Group**

It was noted that the Czech employers' group is not a single entity. The different organisations work in different ways and face different issues and obstacles.

#### *Financial Resources*

Three areas require priority funding:

- Modifications to the internal structure of the organisations in the context of EU accession. *They will identify the specific person(s) dealing with European issues in each organisation;*
- Travel expenses incurred by experts relating to European Social Dialogue. *Expert attendance at meetings of ESD events are often reimbursed by the EU, but there are significant time delays. The organisations should set up a special fund so that money is always at hand for travel expenses, then the money would be returned when refunded.*

## ARITAKE-WILD

- Where possible employers' organisations should join forces in order to become more effective. *Networking and closer cooperation among the employers' organizations to use experts more effectively and harmonise employer positions on European issues.*

To address these issues we need to:

- Inform the management of our organisations about this discussion and proposals; discuss with financial directors how the traveling fund can be set up and agree on how to organise meetings required to start regular cooperation.
- Discuss these issues in each organisation by the 27<sup>th</sup> of April with the senior management and to see what can be practically achieved. The delegates here will meet on the 27<sup>th</sup> April to review the response.
- Determine how to obtain and make best use of EU and ILO resources. The deadline for this is autumn 2004.

### *People Development*

- All agreed that human resources development is necessary to improve effectiveness of European Social Dialogue.
- Each organisation will undertake a review to establish what experts we have and what kind of training is needed for these experts from the point of view of maximising our effectiveness in EU work.
- Organisations need to work on recruitment strategy for young people as well as experienced people. We need to develop a list of requirements specifying exactly what we are looking for.
- The deadline for this work is September of this year.

### *European Thinking/Information Sharing*

- Assure that European issues get adequate exposure in current channels for information provision e.g. websites, bulletins, journals, newspapers.
- Also need to publish our opinions on the different EU issues.
- As a one-time event, prior to the upcoming elections for European Parliament, each employers' organisation will develop a strategy to influence public perceptions of Europe and encourage participation in the elections.

## **Trade Union Group**

### *Financial Resources*

- Quantification of the probable expenditure necessary for preparation and continuation of European Social Dialogue with a deadline of March 2004 so it can be presented as an agenda item at the first meeting of the budgetary committee for 2005.
- Work with employers organisations to determine common goals for seminars and share the costs. Also in terms of co funding, work with ILO and European Commission on social dialogue projects
- Recruitment and membership fees as a means of financial resources.
- Use the ETUC seminar this week as a means of determining what budget lines are relevant to European Social Dialogue projects and develop skills on obtaining these funds (e.g. how to write a project proposal in terms of content and budget)

### *People Development*

- Language skills:
  - Follow ETUCO language courses
  - Revise personnel/recruitment criteria to emphasise language skills
- Exchange programs/internships/stagiaires: cooperation with neighboring country organisations/young people council/sojourns
- Internet/correspondence courses on language and communication skills
- Intranet network to facilitate communication between the confederations and the trade unions.
- Deadline: End of year 2004

### *European Thinking/Information Sharing*

- Attendance of ETUC events on EU enlargement, EU parliament elections, European Social Model, etc (for example, Action Day, beginning of April)
- Use media forums such as periodicals, journals, internet websites, etc to communicate positions on various topics and provide access to information on current events.

## ARITAKE-WILD

- Communicate with non-members by exploring opportunities to cooperate with employers organisations such as the SME association.
- Possibility of communicating through works councils in certain companies that do not have union representation. Labor code makes it possible to set up works councils but this has not yet been widely embraced.

### *Working Bipartite Dialogue*

- Establish a system of bipartite dialogue and test its robustness using telework as an example.
- It would be welcome if the employers organisations would establish one main group for discussion purposes.
- We could try to organise certain activities to help increase the quality of sectoral social dialogue.

## **Session eight (Consensus building session)**

### *Action plan development*

During the discussion of the working group reports in plenary session, it was agreed that action plans could be developed for the priority issues. These action plans should divide responsibility between the four groups present at the seminar; the trade unions; the employers' organisations; jointly by the national social partners and jointly by the European level social partner organisations.

It was agreed that the formal action plan emerging from the seminar should be both focused and achievable. It was noted that many of the ideas contained in the working materials above, but not specifically included in the action plan are worthy of follow-up and should not be lost.



## ARITAKE-WILD

There was agreement of all parties to the following actions;

<b>Financial Resources</b>			
<i>Trade unions</i>	<i>Employers' organisations</i>	<i>Joint action by national social partners</i>	<i>European level social partners</i>
<p>Quantification of the probable expenditure necessary for preparation and continuation of European Social Dialogue with a deadline of March 2004 so it can be presented as an agenda item at the first meeting of the budgetary committee for 2005.</p> <p>Work with employer organisations to determine common goals for joint activities and share the costs. Also in terms of co funding, work with ILO and EC on social dialogue projects.</p> <p>Use the ETUC seminar this week as a means of determine what EC budget lines are relevant to European Social Dialogue projects and develop skills on obtaining these funds (how to write a project proposal in terms of</p>	<p>Meet on 27 April to consider the result of internal management discussions on:</p> <p>The identification of key person(s) with responsibility for EU affairs, in particular, European social dialogue.</p> <p>The establishment of an "Expert Travel Fund" to reduce the cash flow problems caused by late payments of expenses by European Commission.</p> <p>Creating a network of employer representatives in EU meetings in order to coordinate the position of the Czech business community and assure report back.</p>		<p>Discuss with the European Commission ways of improving financial support to social partner organisations and request the European Commission to organise a clarification seminar on existing possibilities of financial support.</p>

## ARITAKE-WILD

content and budget)  Develop recruitment campaigns to increase available financial resources.	
---	--

<b>People Development</b>			
<i>Trade unions</i>	<i>Employers' organisations</i>	<i>Joint action by national social partners</i>	<i>European level social partners</i>
<p>Language skills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Follow ETUCO language courses</li> <li>- Revise personnel/recruitment criteria to ensure language skills</li> <li>- Revise teaching methods of language courses continuously organised and attended by union experts</li> </ul> <p>Use exchange programs/internships/stagieres in cooperation with the ETUC and neighboring country organisations.</p> <p>Deepen "EU dimension" of the Young Trade Unionists Council.</p> <p>Use the intranet network ("Regionet") to facilitate communication on EU issues between the confederation and all other levels of trade union structure.</p> <p>Deadline: End of year 2004</p>	<p>By the end of September, the Employers' organisations will:</p> <p>Conduct a strength and weakness assessment of their capacities in terms of technical and language skills to identify training needs.</p> <p>Ensure language skills criteria as a part of organisational recruitment strategy.</p>		

<b>European Thinking/Information Sharing</b>			
<i>Trade unions</i>	<i>Employers' organisations</i>	<i>Joint action by national social partners</i>	<i>European level social partners</i>
<p>Assure media coverage of ETUC events on EU enlargement, EU parliament elections, European Social Model, etc (for example, Action Days, beginning of April) to promote European thinking.</p> <p>Use media forums such as periodicals, journals, internet websites, etc to communicate positions on various EU topics and provide access to information on current events.</p> <p>Make best use of Internet/ and intranet correspondence courses to develop information/ communication and feedback on EU issues.</p> <p>Contact the Czech organisation of SMEs to judge optimal ways of addressing their employees on European integration process in case they do not have union representation.</p> <p>Use the mechanism and activities of European works councils as an example of European thinking culture.</p> <p>Promote European sectoral level dialogue as a means of promoting European thinking.</p>	<p>To make better use of existing information channels to publicise the relevance to the business community regarding EU initiatives.</p> <p>By the end of May, encourage participation in the forthcoming elections for the European Parliament and to increase the public understanding of the importance of Czech involvement in the EU.</p>		

<b>Working Bipartite Dialogue</b>			
<i>Trade unions</i>	<i>Employers' organisations</i>	<i>Joint action by national social partners</i>	<i>European level social partners</i>
		<p>By 30<sup>th</sup> April, complete agreement on bipartite cooperation, during these discussions things like themes telework and lifelong learning will be pilot programs for bipartite cooperation</p> <p>Disseminate information relating to bipartite cooperation on websites of social partners organisations.</p>	

The meeting ended with the general agreement that a lot had been accomplished in a very short period of time. Not only had a soundly thought through series of actions been agreed upon, but the meeting itself had helped cement positive relationships between the national social partners in a very constructive way. It was viewed that each seminar can only help improve the ability and define the needs, whether it be matters of financing, organisation, linguistic skills, etc.

Thanks were extended to the guests for their patience and help during the discussion. The hope was expressed that the bipartite social dialogues will develop within the Czech needs and that they may contribute something to the ESD.

Thanks were offered to all those involved in the preparation and conduct of the seminar.

## AGENDA

Joint Project of the European Social Partner Organisations:  
 "CEEC social partners' participation in the European social dialogue:  
*What are Social Partners' Needs? "*

National Seminar No. 3

Venue: Praha, hotel Pyramida, Belohorská 24, 169 00 Praha 6, Czech Republic

Date: 9 and 10 March 2004

DAY ONE

Tuesday, 9<sup>th</sup> March 2004

0900 - 0930	Registration		
0930 - 1000	Introductions and welcome	Plenary	
1000 - 1045	"Explaining the European Social Dialogue"	Plenary	Mr. Alan Wild
1045 - 1100	Coffee break		
1100 - 1300	Three concurrent work groups; Group 1 "What do we need to do to build successful social dialogue partner organisations at the national level that are capable of contributing effectively to the European social dialogue?" – trade union group.  Group 2 "What do we need to do to build successful social dialogue partner organisations at the national level that are capable of contributing effectively to the European social dialogue?" – employer group  Group 3 "What are the actions and behaviours that will make our meetings together as successful a possible?" - joint trade union and employer group.	Work Groups	
1300 - 1400	Lunch break		
1400 - 1500	Feedback from Groups 1,2 and 3	Plenary	
1500 - 1515	Coffee break		
1515 - 1600	Presentation of research; "Successful social partners and successful meetings – learning from experience"	Plenary	Mr. Alan Wild
1600 - 1800	General discussion and agreement on the characteristics, actions and behaviours that contribute to our successful engagement in social partnership	Plenary	

## ARITAKE-WILD

1800	Close and any announcements	Plenary	
	Evening Program in accordance with announcements		

### DAY TWO

Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2004

0900 – 1200 Coffee to be taken at 1030	<p>Three concurrent work groups;</p> <p>Group 4 "Based upon yesterday's conclusions – what are the issues we need to work on to make our organisations as effective as possible in the European level Social Dialogue? What specific actions do we need to take?" – trade union group.</p> <p>Group 5 "Based upon yesterday's conclusions – what are the issues we need to work on to make our organisations as effective as possible in the European level Social Dialogue? What specific actions do we need to take?" – employer group</p> <p>Group 6 "Based upon yesterday's conclusions - what are the issues we need to work on to make our involvement in the European Social Dialogue a success? What specific actions do we need to take?" - joint trade union and employer group.</p>	Work Groups	
1200 - 1300	Feedback from groups 4,5 and 6	Plenary	
1300 - 1400	Lunch		
1400 – 1630 Coffee to be taken at 1500	Discussion and agreement on the key issues and the specific actions to be taken by the trade unions and employers individually and jointly.	Plenary	
1630 - 1700	Closing remarks	Plenary	