

Social Partners' participation in the European social dialogue : what are the social partners needs?

“Summary of the main project findings & the key trends emerging from the 24 seminars”

ARITAKE-WILD

“Summary of the main project findings & the key trends emerging from the 24 seminars”

- The EU Social Partners' joint project;
- Findings and trends;
- Evaluation of the project's impact;
- Some thoughts going forward.

ARITAKE-WILD

Purpose of this presentation

- To introduce the themes and panel sessions of the conference;
- To interest you enough to make you want to read the full report.

ARITAKE-WILD

The EU Social Partners' joint project

- Five years (2004 – 2009);
- 12 countries;
- 24 seminars;
- ± 500 national social partner representatives;
- EU social partner engagement;
- 24 seminar reports;
- Four reviews and reports;
- A series of related European social partner initiatives.

ARITAKE-WILD

Related European social partner initiatives

- The employer and trade union resource centres;
- Training and mentoring programmes;
- Translation fund on EU social dialogue texts;
- Capacity assessment and development tool;
- EU social dialogue seminars "on demand";
- Practical assistance in securing external funds;
- Mini cases on social dialogue.



EMPLOYERS' RESOURCE CENTRE

ARITAKE-WILD

Findings and trends

- Similarities in the actions adopted in the initial seminar;
- Consistency in the areas where improvements were made ... and which remained constraints;
- Substantial differences in the nature, extent and mix of issues;
- Action plans need to reflect specific national circumstances.

... at the macro level: "are the 12 participating countries different from other EU member states?"

ARITAKE-WILD

Two distinct kinds of issue

The functioning and effectiveness of social dialogue in the country

Practical questions of resourcing and organising for success

ARITAKE-WILD

Two distinct kinds of issue

The functioning and effectiveness of social dialogue in the country

- Role of government;
- Influence of tripartism;
- Structural pluralism;
- Trust and respect;
- Representivity and the nature of collective bargaining

ARITAKE-WILD

Two distinct kinds of issue

The functioning and effectiveness of social dialogue in the country

- Role of government;
- Influence of tripartism;
- Structural pluralism;
- Trust and respect;
- Representivity and the nature of collective bargaining

Practical questions of resourcing and organising for success

- Financial & material resources;
- Quality & quantity of people;
- Communication & cooperation;
- Matching agendas;
- International cooperation

ARITAKE-WILD

Three key hypotheses

- A clear and direct correlation between the effectiveness of national social dialogue and European level impact;

ARITAKE-WILD

Three key hypotheses

- A clear and direct correlation between the effectiveness of national social dialogue and European level impact;
- Resourcing and organising issues are easier to approach than structural and relationship issues;

ARITAKE-WILD

Three key hypotheses

- A clear and direct correlation between the effectiveness of national social dialogue and European level impact;
- Resourcing and organising issues are easier to approach than structural and relationship issues;
- Where national social dialogue has structural or relationship based problems – actions to improve resourcing and organising will be much less effective

ARITAKE-WILD

Where the participating countries are ...

Bipartite effectiveness

Bulgaria
Croatia
Estonia
Latvia
Lithuania
Romania
Slovakia
Turkey

Resourcing and organising

The Czech Republic
Hungary
Poland
Slovenia

ARITAKE-WILD

Evaluation of the project's impact

The number of participating countries reporting an improvement in effectiveness between the initial and follow-up seminars							
The functioning of bipartite social dialogue and relationships between the social partners	SK	Improved coordination within the employers and trade union organisations		Technical capacities of staff improved		Language skill capacities improved	
	SV						
	PL						
	LT						
	LV		HU		SV		
	CZ		SV		PL		
	HU		SK		LV		
	HR		PL		LT		HU
	TK		CZ		CZ		SV
	RO		EE		RO		PL
BU	LT	HR	EE				

ARITAKE-WILD

Evaluation of the project's impact

The number of participating countries reporting an issue as a constraint on improved effectiveness												
<i>Poor coordination within trade union and employers' organisations</i>		<i>Negative attitude of government toward autonomous social dialogue</i>		<i>Reluctance of employers to engage in bipartite social dialogue</i>		<i>Lack of appropriately skilled staff</i>		<i>Financial constraints</i>		<i>Language skill constraints</i>		
	LV											
	SK											
	CZ											
	BU		SK									
	RO		EE		LT							
	HR		BU		EE				SV		SV	PL
	TK		TK		RO				TK		CZ	EE

ARITAKE-WILD

Evaluation of the project's impact

The number of countries reporting an area where future actions are needed													
<i>Better coordination within the trade union and employers groups</i>	BU	<i>Improvements in the system of bipartite social dialogue</i>		<i>Putting European issues further up the national agenda</i>		<i>Persuading government to create more space for social dialogue</i>		<i>Improving the skill base</i>		<i>Better communication on European issues with members and the general public</i>		<i>Increasing employer commitment to social dialogue</i>	
	HR												
	TK		BU										
	RO		HR										
	EE		TK										
	HU		RO										
	SK		HU		TK				HU				
	LT		SV		HR				PL		BU		LV
	PL		SK		SV				BU		HR		SK
	LV		PL		SK				HR		TK		RO
CZ	LT	EE		TK	RO	TK							

ARITAKE-WILD

Evaluation of the project's impact

- Integration into EU social dialogue improved for most countries;
- Delivery against specific actions – “a mixed bag”;
- Relationships between national social partners improved almost everywhere;
- The project has combined with other initiatives to improve the working of social partnership – particularly the access to funds;
- Creating the space and structure to “step back and reflect” in a practical way was useful.

ARITAKE-WILD

Some thoughts going forward

- Similarities and differences matter;
- Distinguish between issues of structure and resourcing and organising;
- Invest in getting structures right;
- Making a habit of working together – works;
- Getting used to living with limited resources;
- A “joined up approach” reinforces progress.

ARITAKE-WILD

The seminar agenda

- The ability and the capacity to influence the European social dialogue;
- The financial and economic crisis and social dialogue;
- The characteristics of effective social dialogue;
- The influence of public policy on social dialogue;
- Making the most of available financial support mechanisms

ARITAKE-WILD