

Evaluation of European Sectoral Social Dialogue in Public Services

Preliminary Results of the General Web Survey

Ramón Peña-Casas
European Social Observatory (OSE)

**EPSU's 2012 Conference on
Social Dialogue & Collective Bargaining
Brussels – 13 & 14 December 2012**



Content

1. The evaluation
2. The process of ESSD
 - A. *participation*
 - B. *information*
 - C. *languages*
 - D. *awareness of key SD developments*
3. General views on ESSD
 - A. *impact*
 - B. *relevance*
4. Priority issues for ESSD
5. Perspectives for ESSD

1. EVALUATION PROCESS

- **6 surveys: 1 on general evaluation of ESSD and 5 sectoral surveys on specific results**
- **Targeted Interviews**
- **SAMPLE OF GENERAL SURVEY:**
 - **Response rate : 51 answers on X**
 - **Unbalances:**
 - **GEO: 25 countries , but Eastern countries (EU & non-EU) represent nearly 2/3 of sample**
 - **SECTORAL: predominance of respondents from Public Utilities (35,3%) and Health & SS (31,4%) sectors**
 - **GEO/SECTOR: around 1/2 of Eastern respondents are from the Public utilities sector, as well as all respondents from Anglo-saxon countries**
 - **experimented respondents (average tenure of post: 9,1 y; 40% in EX COM)**

2. PROCESS – A. Participation

- **2 of 3 respondents/unions participate to a single committee, 20% to two committees and 12% to 3 committees**
- **70% are normal representatives in the Committees**
 - **90,9% feel to have enough support (expertise & experience) from their own union to deal with SD issues**
- **All those not taking part directly to the meetings declare to keep up-to-date with content of meetings**
- **90% respondents follow also ESSD working groups meetings**

2. PROCESS – B. information (1)

SOURCES

•EPSU's mailings (92%) and web site (86%) are main sources. Documents and meetings of Executive and Standing committees in a lower but still significant measure (55% & 63%)

APPROPRIATION by TU

- Majority pass it on internally within the union (78%), to members (53%) or shop stewards/activists (45%). Information is used to initiate internal policy debates by 59%.
- There is less diffusion outside the TU. Around one third transmit the information to other unions in the constituency or in the country or to works councils members. Only 1/4 transmit it for publication on TU website or journal.

2. PROCESS – B. information (2)

- **One in three respondents think that more should be done to inform affiliates about ESSD**
- **SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**
 - Translation into mother tongue (7)
 - Develop & improve channels of communications (website, NL,..) (4)
 - Training & seminars on ESSD issues (2)
 - Improving communication process through national affiliates themselves (2)
 - More timely information (2)
 - Shorter and more formalised documents to facilitate distribution (2)
 - Strengthen communication to employers (2)

2. PROCESS – C. Languages

- Only a small proportion of respondents can always use their own language in meetings, either for speaking (15%) or both speaking & hearing (12%)
 - One in two could never use their own language for speaking (47%) or both speaking and hearing (53%)
- English is by far the predominant other language known, either for participating (50%) or reading (52%)
- 42% declare that language does not at all hamper their participation in SD. But, for 28% it is an important limitation

2. PROCESS – D. Awareness

- **New SD committee for central gvt administrations in December 2010: 60% knew about it**
- **Agreement on hospital sector dialogue on dealing with sharps injuries that became EU legislation in 2010: 66,7% knew about it**
- **Those pertaining to the concerned committees are by definition the more aware. This is also the case of respondents participating to the Executive Committee too.**
- **Differences are observed concerning sectors on the awareness of these outcomes**
 - **Nearly 50% members of other committees do not know about the two outcomes**

3. VIEWS ON ESSD

A. IMPACT ON NATIONAL WC

- **Mitigated answer : 56% no, 44% yes**
 - **NO is predominant in national public administrations (72,7%) and Public Utilities (61,1%) / 50% of regional & local public administrations;**
 - **YES for a majority (60%) in Health & SS sector**

- ***Examples of positive impact:***
 - **Specific texts: Agreement on sharp injuries (4) ; Hospeem-EPSU Code of ethical recruitment; Energy Roadmap**
 - **Specific topics: working time, violence at the workplace, wage moderation**
 - **Improvement of collective bargaining at national level on WC**
- ***Reasons of limited impact:***
 - **Higher national standards (12 on 24 answers)**
 - **Absence or weakness of national SD (5) including absence of employers (3)**
 - **Topics not relevant for our TU (2)**
 - **Lack info on ESSD (2)**
 - **ESSD too soft instruments (2)**

3. VIEWS ON ESSD

B. IMPACT ON NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

- **No impact for 59,2% of respondents, yes for 40,8%**
 - **NO is predominant in National Public administrations (63,6%) & Health & SS (64,3%) but also around 50% in other sectoral committees**

- ***Examples of positive impact:***
 - observed improvement in national SD (3)
 - contribution to a better understanding and information about issues (3)
 - relative obligations on national stakeholders (2)
- ***Reasons of limited impact:***
 - Well established national SD (7 on 21 answers)
 - Weak national SD / lack involvement social partners (7)
 - Absence of bargaining or sectoral agreements (2)

3. VIEWS ON ESSD

C. RELEVANCE OF MAIN OBJECTIVES

- **The proposed main objectives of ESSD are considered as relevant by a large majority of respondents**
 - **Exchange of views and practices (84,3%)**
 - **Info/consultation on EU policies (82,4%)**
 - **Opportunity to influence EU policies (78,4%)**
 - **Joint responses to EU consultations (70,6%)**
- **No marked differences between sectors**

3. VIEWS ON ESSD

D. RELEVANCE FOR NATIONAL SD

- **63% find that issues dealt with in ESSD are relevant for national level**
 - **But differences between sectors:**
 - **Health & SS (78,6%) and National public administrations (66,7%) are the more positive, while answers are divided for Public utilities (52,9% yes) or Regional Administrations (50%)**

4. PRIORITY ISSUES FOR EESD

Index of priority takes into account selection of item and level of priority given

- **Top priority issues**: health & safety (67), Employment policies (61), pay (61);
- **High priority issues**: Economic/sectoral policies (49), Role and definition of public services at EU level (49), Outsourcing/marketization of public services (42);
- **Medium priority issues**: Gender equality (35), Demographic change (34), Skills (33), Working time (30), Restructuring (28);
- **Low priority issues**: Mobility/migration (25), Work-life balance (23), training (20);
- **low priority issues**: Non-discrimination (13), Atypical/precarious work (12).

PRIORITY ISSUES BY SECTORS

	<i>National public administrations</i>	<i>Regional & local public administrations</i>	<i>Health & social services</i>	<i>Public utilities</i>
<i>Health and safety</i>	11	5	26	25
<i>Employment policies</i>	14	2	7	38
<i>Pay</i>	15	3	13	30
<i>Economic/sectoral policies</i>	8	4	12	25
<i>Role and definition of public services at EU level</i>	12	1	16	20
<i>Outsourcing, marketization of public services</i>	9	1	10	22
<i>Gender equality</i>	3	4	14	14
<i>Demographic change</i>	4	4	9	17
<i>Skills</i>		4	9	20
<i>Working time</i>	1	2	12	15
<i>Restructuring</i>	3	4	4	17
<i>Mobility/migration</i>	1	2	16	6
<i>Work-life balance</i>	1	4	4	14
<i>(Professional) training</i>	5	1	7	7
<i>Non-discrimination</i>	2	4	0	7
<i>Atypical/precarious work</i>		4	0	8

6. PERSPECTIVES FOR THE EESD

A. Improving the ESSD

- a) Improve the follow-up, implementation and monitoring of ESSD agreements and other outputs (72,9%)
- b) Improve participation of national employer organisations (70,8%)
- c) Improve participation of national trade unions (54,2%)
- d) Improve the preparation and drafting of European social dialogue agreements and other outputs (35,4%)
- e) Set up employer organisations at national level (20,8%)
- *No marked sectoral differences excepted :*
 - a) less supported by Health (57,1%)
 - b) less for Public administrations (50%)
 - c) 100% of Local Administrations
 - d) more for Health (57,1%)

Suggestions:

- **increase participation and stability of participants in order to build and strenghten existing networks**
- **clearly outline added-value of ESSD (sectoral & European)**

6. PERSPECTIVES FOR THE EESD

B. Should EPSU continue the ESSD?

The answer is an unanimous **YES !**

Main reasons for answers:

- Importance of bargaining at/influencing EU level (10 on 31 answers)
- EPSU as a focal place of influence at EU level (5)
- EPSU as a focal platform of exchange at EU level (4)
- Positive influence of ESSD on national level (5)
- No alternative / SD is important for all (7)

NEXT STEPS

- Analysis of 5 sectoral surveys
- Interviews
- Cross-over