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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 ½ 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 ¼ 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%)
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

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

A. Improving the EESSD

a) Improve the follow-up, implementation and monitoring of EESSD 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 strengthen 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