

# ARITAKE-WILD

Joint Project of the European Social Partner Organisations;

“CEEC Social Partners’ Participation in the European Social Dialogue:

*..... what are the social partner’s needs? ”*

Report of the Estonian National Seminar

Hotel Sokos Viru, Tallinn  
Estonia

7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> February 2005

Prepared by ARITAKE-WILD  
February 2005

ARITAKE-WILD

Joint Project of the European Social Partner Organisations:

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

Hotel Sokos Viru, Tallinn  
Estonia  
7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> February 2005

---

The seventh in a series of national seminars<sup>1</sup> designed to identify the organisational and individual characteristics that will enable the attendees and their organisations to participate effectively in the European Social Dialogue was held in Estonia on 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> February 2005. The objectives for the Estonian 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 assure maximum effectiveness of their participation in the European Social Dialogue process following their accession to the European Union on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2004.

The seminar was attended by representatives of Estonian 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 Estonian 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 Estonian language with “non-intrusive” interpretation available to the European social partner participants and experts. Full simultaneous 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:

---

<sup>1</sup> The first five seminars belonged to a pilot project of 5 new Member States (Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland and Slovakia) which has since been expanded to further include Estonia, Latvia and Slovenia.

## ARITAKE-WILD

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.

Day one of the seminar was devoted to identifying the most important characteristics, actions and behaviours that will lead to more successful participation in the European Social Dialogue for the Estonian 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 Estonian 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 (7<sup>th</sup> February)

### 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 Jeanne Schmitt of UNICE Social Affairs. These presentations are attached as appendices three and four respectively. Additionally, each of the representatives of the European social partners; Juliane Bir of ETUC; Liliane Volozinskis of UEAPME; and Valeria Ronzitti 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 Estonian 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: A "trade union group"; an "employers' organisation group" and a "joint group" of trade union and employers' organisation participants. The representatives from UNICE and UEAPME joined the employers' organisation group; a representative from the ETUC together with one expert joined the trade union group; and representatives from ETUC and CEEP,

## ARITAKE-WILD

together with one expert, joined the “joint group”. A chairperson/rapporteur was selected by each group from amongst the national participants.

The working groups were given 90 minutes 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**

- ❖ Balance should be sought between EAKL and member involvement in EU related issues and in determining national/EU priorities;
- ❖ Strategies for coping with time constraints need to be found, for example delegating appropriately to committees who can also facilitate improved communication between EAKL and its members;
- ❖ Language skills must be developed. Currently more, and more rapid translation of documents into Estonian is required;
- ❖ Experts need to be identified and provided with training that allows them to cope with the broad range of issues that must be covered;
- ❖ Negotiators should be identified, this could be done by EAKL's board;
- ❖ EAKL and its members need to hold regular meetings to discuss EU matters;
- ❖ The interest of members in both national and EU social dialogue should be promoted;
- ❖ The possibilities for EU funding should be explored.

### **Employers' Organisation Group**

- ❖ Information flows within and between employers' organizations should be improved;
- ❖ Priorities must be identified;
- ❖ Any conflict of roles (between enterprise, branch, national and/or EU level) need to be resolved;
- ❖ Competencies should be mapped to identify experts;
- ❖ EU "hot topics" need to be identified to ensure early involvement of Estonian employers, this could be ETTK's responsibility.

### **Joint Group**

- ❖ The social partners need to be better aware of each others views and opinions;
- ❖ Communication between the social partners should take place at a very early stage before positions become too fixed, the first phases of communication should be of an informal nature;
- ❖ Areas of common interest should be identified and discussed, starting with easier topics initially and progressing later to the tougher issues;
- ❖ National issues currently have priority over EU issues, a reasonable balance between the two needs to be found;
- ❖ The Estonian social partners want to get to a position where they can exercise genuine influence at the EU level.

**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. 14 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?*

*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.

## ARITAKE-WILD

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Social dialogue is taken seriously;</li> <li>✓ One or two individuals given clear responsibility for the social dialogue;</li> <li>✓ Continuity of representation;</li> <li>✓ Representatives are credible at the national level;</li> <li>✓ Strong links between national and international activities;</li> <li>✓ Clear process for mandate development;</li> <li>✓ Clear process for reporting back;</li> <li>✓ Processes for implementing agreements;</li> <li>✓ Dedication of sufficient resources – admin, research and IT;</li> <li>✓ Permanent Brussels presence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✗ Lack of priority or interest in the social dialogue;</li> <li>✗ Lack of clarity in who represents the organisation;</li> <li>✗ Lack of delegation of authority – too many referrals to national HQ;</li> <li>✗ Low credibility – nationally or at the European level;</li> <li>✗ Changes in representation from meeting to meeting;</li> <li>✗ Lack of processes for producing a clear mandate, reporting back or implementation;</li> <li>✗ Over-political organisations/stances – lack of independence, influence of "party politics";</li> <li>✗ Poor electronic communication media;</li> <li>✗ Lack of visibility in Brussels.</li> </ul>
Actions/Behaviours of the "most successful" individuals	Actions/Behaviours 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 from the discussion. During a “tour de table” exercise involving the national participants and the following “long-list” of issues emerged. 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.

- ❖ Aim for proactive participation;
- ❖ Permanent presence in Brussels would be valuable;
- ❖ One proactive initiative should be taken all the way – as a kind of experiment;
- ❖ Have to identify the responsible people;
- ❖ Priorities must be determined;
- ❖ Aim for continuity of representation;
- ❖ Issues should be discussed at home with the relevant partners first;
- ❖ Contacts with partners abroad who have similar experiences should be used to avoid starting everything from scratch;
- ❖ Interest group(s) could be developed with partners who have similar needs and concerns;
- ❖ Openness and honesty are crucial;
- ❖ Language skills must be developed;
- ❖ Social partner presence in Brussels could be funded by the Estonian government;
- ❖ Estonian social partners need a mature relationship to ensure success at the EU level;
- ❖ The social partners could create a joint committee on EU issues;
- ❖ There are enterprises that are not members of ETTK or one of its affiliates and there are also branches that are weak in terms of social dialogue. A means must be found to hear their needs – seminars/meetings could be held to provide a forum and EU experts could also participate to raise awareness;
- ❖ Any time a social partner goes to Brussels opportunities for exchanging information on important topics should be maximised;
- ❖ There is a need to lobby more effectively;
- ❖ Working 9 to 5 is not conducive to being successful at EU level;
- ❖ Examine the economic impact of topics in order to have the facts;
- ❖ Permanent representation in Brussels would enable Estonian social partners to be more forward looking;
- ❖ The need for clear and fixed mandates in order to participate actively;
- ❖ In order to know how things work and integrate both informally and formally a representation in Brussels is needed, however as this is not yet possible for ETTK they should find partners and collaborate;
- ❖ More experts and analysts are needed;

- ❖ More human and financial resources are needed;
- ❖ There should be more consideration given to the Branch level;
- ❖ Estonian trade unions and employers need to be able to present a common message to Brussels;
- ❖ Linkages between national activities and what should be raised at EU level should be explored;
- ❖ The Estonian employer and trade union confederations should identify the issues to be raised at EU level and nominate people to represent their interests in Brussels;
- ❖ Issues at the national level need to be addressed before proceeding the EU level;
- ❖ Have to find a way to ensure that representatives in Brussels actually deliver on their mandate;
- ❖ National implementation of EU agreements has to be considered;
- ❖ Knowledge from the Branch level should be tapped into;
- ❖ The spiral created by the linkages between social dialogue, membership and financially strong social partners was noted, this spiral can generate either vicious or virtuous cycles – for example high levels of social dialogue involvement promotes higher membership levels which leads to financially stronger social partner organizations.

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 Estonian social partners. In this short session, the experts and European level social partners made the following points;

- A strong system of social dialogue and a membership convinced of its value is essential if strong social partner organisations are to be promoted. The key is to find a model of social dialogue that is sustainable for Estonia – while you can learn a lot from other countries, your own specific context must be taken into account.
- The issue of resources and how to get them is central. This is also true of mandates and how to set them in order to participate actively. One question you need to ask yourselves is how do we make our organisations attractive to members? Another important point is the need for discussion between the social partners at the national level. Although the employers and trade unions each have their respective channel to the EU level, even if there is no consensus, an exchange of views will be important in increasing effectiveness of participation.
- Cooperation, respect and trust are words that keep coming up, together with the necessity for strong partnerships. The need for social dialogue at both

## ARITAKE-WILD

national and EU level has been underscored so the question that remains is HOW?

- The ETUC can provide support. While funding for seminars or conferences cannot be provided, language courses at the ETUC training college are available for your participation. Keep in mind that if you want to participate effectively at the EU level you will have to invest, not necessarily financially but at least in terms of human resources.
- Moving from passive to proactive is an important step and it is the job of the European social partner organisations represented here to help you take that step. Information flow is crucial in this regard. You may wish to assign a group of handpicked people who go to Brussels regularly. In addition the EU organisations represented here today are at your disposal to keep you informed and are setting up employer and trade union resource centres to facilitate this process.
- A balance between national and EU priorities needs to be found. Improving informal discussion and structures of national dialogue will be crucial to your organisations when it comes to implementing agreements.
- An outsiders' suggestion for priorities would be to develop technical expertise and language. Joint collaboration on translations of common texts would be a good area for cooperation and a means to share costs. There are several fields of social dialogue that can be viewed together when determining priorities (the company level, branch level, the European Works Council, the national and the EU levels).
- With the support of the European Commission, the European level social partners have undertaken a series of actions that relate to some of the comments made. These include: a workshop on how to apply for funding for social dialogue related initiatives; a model of competency that is being developed which can be used as an audit model to evaluate your staff competencies. A letter has also been sent to the Commission referring to the urgent short-term need to provide facilities for the new member countries in Brussels. In response to the later point, ETUC and the European level employers' organisations jointly are in the process of setting up resource centres for trade unions and employers' organisations respectively.
- The resource centres are currently under construction. The centres will each develop access to website material which will include information on funding that your organisations would be eligible to apply for, important documents relating to social dialogue and details of important meetings. As the centres are under development any suggestions or ideas you have are welcome, we want

## ARITAKE-WILD

to make them as useful and appropriate for you as possible. Further details on the resource centres can be expected during the next month.

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. The participants felt that each issue should be considered in the context of moving Estonian participation from passive/reactive to being proactive and influencing the agenda:

<p><b>Identifying priorities and finding the human resources who can deliver</b></p>	<p>Priorities have to be identified as the same effort cannot be put into everything when the amount of work is so considerable. How do we identify our priorities? What human resources do we have? How do we best use those human resources to deliver on our priorities?</p>
<p><b>Identifying means of collaboration</b></p>	<p>How can Estonian social partners make themselves heard and have the greatest impact? There is a need to understand the views of other national social partners, but how do we help others to also understand our views? Who are our natural national social partner allies? Does this vary according to issues?</p>
<p><b>Development of mandates</b></p>	<p>How can effective mandates be developed? What processes need to be put in place?</p>
<p><b>Promoting national social dialogue</b></p>	<p>National dialogue especially in regard to EU issues needs to be promoted. How can this be done?</p>

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

**DAY TWO (8<sup>th</sup> February)**

**Session six (Working groups)**

*Action plan development*

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

*Trade Union and Employers' Organisation Groups*

*In the context of moving Estonian participation in the European social dialogue from the reactive to the proactive, discuss the following and come up with concrete actions:*

- 1. How can we develop collaborative relationships with other national social partners to maximise our impact?*
- 2. How can we establish our most important priorities and assure that we identify the human resources that will best represent us?*
- 3. What processes do we need to establish or improve to ensure we design and adopt clear mandates?*

*Joint Group*

- 1. How can we assure a positive exchange of views between social partners on Estonian issues and priorities relating to the European agenda?*

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:

**Employers' Group**

*How can we establish our most important priorities and assure that we identify the human resources that will best represent us?*

- ❖ Identify priorities at the EU level in liaison with the EU employers and work of the relevant EU bodies.
- ❖ Then identify what are the priorities of our members and get their views on these issues.
- ❖ To this end improve information flows from the EU level to ETTK and EVEA and from ETTK and EVEA to their members as well as vice versa.
- ❖ Identify experts who can form working groups to develop Estonian employers' opinions on these issues.
- ❖ The ETTK could coordinate the above.

*What processes do we need to establish or improve to ensure we design and adopt clear mandates?*

- ❖ Involve members and other employer organisations in the development of suitable processes.
- ❖ Motivate their participation by raising awareness of the consequences if we do not express opinions or prioritize issues.

*How can we develop collaborative relationships with other national social partners to maximise our impact?*

- ❖ Develop collaborations between organisations representing business in Estonia and having similar membership as employers' organizations in order to better share expertise/resources.
- ❖ Develop a common platform to voice our opinions at EU level.

### **Trade Union Group**

*The trade union group discussed the issues of collaboration with the Estonian employers, establishing priorities and maximising impact. They suggested the following actions:*

- ❖ A two level decision making process will be developed through creating a committee for EU issues which both EAKL and its members will participate in.
- ❖ A review will be made of what has taken place at the EU level to date.
- ❖ A suggestion to establish a bipartite briefing process will be made to the employers.
- ❖ ETUC will help with identifying issues for the committee to discuss.
- ❖ A proposal will be made to the Estonian government that it contributes to the costs of Estonian social partner representation in Brussels.

### **Joint Group**

*How can we assure a positive exchange of views between social partners on Estonian issues and priorities relating to the European agenda?*

The group noted that:

- The Estonian social partners need to engage in dialogue as partners looking for solutions to problems rather than as adversaries.
- If positive social dialogue is to be established it must be based on a common goal. The social partners share the objective of promoting the success of the Estonian economy. The social partners could identify common ground on specific issues by listing their priorities for discussion on European matters.
- Estonian opportunity for social dialogue is limited by the high levels of regulation that currently exist.

*And suggested the following actions:*

- ❖ Development of informal communication between the social partners.
- ❖ Improvement of communication with members of the national social partner umbrella organizations to explain the advantages of social dialogue.
- ❖ Specialists on EU issues should initiate informal discussions with their national social partner counterparts.

**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.

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 are worthy of follow-up and should not be lost.

There was agreement of all parties to the following actions:

<i>Employers' organisations</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Identify hot issues at EU level;</li><li>2. Identify Estonian employers' priorities;</li><li>3. Identify experts on specific issues on the European agenda and convene working groups appropriate to assure that high quality inputs can be made in a timely manner;</li><li>4. Improve information flows to and from member companies and organisations on social dialogue decisions and their impact;</li><li>5. Develop cooperative relationships with other organisations representing Estonian business interests in order to benefit from the full range of available expertise.</li></ol>

<i>Trade unions</i>
<p>Improve preparation for Estonian involvement in European social dialogue meetings by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Creating a two-tier decision making system in EAKL to improve branch involvement on European issues;</li><li>2. Improve information flows from the ETUC so that important issues can be addressed in a timely way;</li><li>3. Propose to the Employers that a briefing system be established to exchange views on European issues;</li><li>4. In the Autumn of 2005 undertake a review of the issues adopted in the European social dialogue;</li><li>5. Suggest to the Estonian government that they make a contribution to the costs of Estonian social partner representation in Brussels.</li></ol>

*Joint action by the national social partners*

1. Informal communication should be initiated between the social partners to identify common ground for dialogue;
2. Social partner specialists working on European issues should assure regular, informal exchanges of views with their counterparts;
3. The social partner organisations should improve member communication on European issues.

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 promote positive relationships between the national social partners in a very constructive way. Thanks were offered to all those involved in the preparation and conduct of the seminar.

## ARITAKE-WILD

### **List of Appendices**

Appendix one

Seminar agenda

Appendix two

Agreed action plan from the Estonian 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. 7

Venue: Hotel Sokos Viru, Tallinn, Estonia

Date: 07 and 08 February 2005

DAY ONE

Monday 7<sup>th</sup> February

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 Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> February

0900 – 0915	Review of day one	Plenary	
0915 – 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 and discussion of action plans	Plenary	
1300 - 1400	Lunch		
1400 – 1530  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	
1530 - 1600	Closing remarks	Plenary	

<i>Trade unions</i>	<i>Employers' organisations</i>	<i>Joint action by national social partners</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create a two-tier decision making system in EAKL to improve branch involvement on European issues;</li> <li>2. Improve information flows from the ETUC so that important issues can be addressed in a timely way;</li> <li>3. Propose to the Employers that a briefing system be established to exchange views on European issues;</li> <li>4. In the Autumn of 2005 undertake a review of the issues adopted in the European social dialogue;</li> <li>5. Suggest to the Estonian government that they make a contribution to the costs of Estonian social partner representation in Brussels.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify hot issues at EU level;</li> <li>2. Identify Estonian employers' priorities;</li> <li>3. Identify experts on specific issues on the European agenda and convene working groups appropriate to assure that high quality inputs can be made in a timely manner;</li> <li>4. Improve information flows to and from member companies and organisations on social dialogue decisions and their impact;</li> <li>5. Develop cooperative relationships with other organisations representing Estonian business interests in order to benefit from the full range of available expertise.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Informal communication should be initiated between the social partners to identify common ground for dialogue;</li> <li>2. Social partner specialists working on European issues should assure regular, informal exchanges of views with their counterpart;</li> <li>3. The social partner organisations should improve member communication on European issues.</li> </ol>