

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 Lithuanian National Seminar  
Vilnius  
Lithuania  
17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> February 2004

Prepared by ARITAKE-WILD  
February 2004

ARITAKE-WILD

Joint Project of the European Social Partner Organisations:  
“CEEC Social Partners’ Participation in European Social Dialogue:  
..... what are the social partners needs?”

Vilnius  
Lithuania  
17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> February 2004

---

The second of 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 Lithuania on 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> February 2004.

The objectives for the Lithuanian 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 Lithuanian 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 Lithuanian 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 Lithuanian 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:

## 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 a successful entry into the European Social Dialogue for the Lithuanian 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 Lithuanian 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;

	<b>Outline session content</b>	<b>Nature of the session</b>
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 (17<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 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; Walter Cerfeda 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 Lithuanian 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

## ARITAKE-WILD

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 chairperson/rapporteur was designated for each group from the list of 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**

- ❖ Enterprise and national level social dialogue work relatively well but sectoral dialogue almost does not exist;
- ❖ Employers' associations do not carry the authority to conclude sectoral agreements;
- ❖ Need to coordinate more closely the work of the three trade union centres;
- ❖ Trade union membership is low;
- ❖ Where agreements are reached, they are not always implemented;
- ❖ Training and education programmes need to be stepped up to improve the quality of representatives working at the European level;
- ❖ Need for joint seminars with employers' organisations to improve mutual understanding;
- ❖ Assistance of international organisations needs to be sought in order to improve social dialogue.

### **Employers' Organisation Group**

- ❖ Growth of the national economy and improving competitiveness should be top priority for both employers' organisations and trade unions;
- ❖ The two national employers' organisations do not always take same position;
- ❖ Employers' organisations are relatively weak – both in membership and financial terms;
- ❖ The representative organisations (employers and unions) need to be apolitical;
- ❖ Tendency towards populist approach, protectionism;
- ❖ Employers' organisation and trade union relationships are based too much on conflict;
- ❖ Although coordination of the views of two employers' organisations is sometimes difficult, it is better to have more than one organisation representing the employers;
- ❖ Ways need to be found to bring the parties together to find mutually beneficial ways to solve common problems and reach common goals.

### **Joint Group**

- ❖ Before negotiations start, the employer and trade union groups each need to agree a single mandate rather than agree against each other during negotiations;
- ❖ The parties have to learn to make compromise rather than failing to agree on issues due to intransigent positioning;
- ❖ Social partners are sometimes not competent enough and training is needed, particularly on European legal issues;
- ❖ The social partners need to put more to focus on informal relationships and meetings;
- ❖ Once agreements are reached, implementation is key, currently much falls by the wayside;
- ❖ Labour code and other legislation should do more to encourage agreement between the social partners;
- ❖ There is little motivation for employers to negotiate with the trade unions as the labour code is too prescriptive. Where employers negotiate with unions it is out of a sense of charity rather than mutual benefit;
- ❖ Both employers' organisations and trade unions need more members.

**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 ?*

*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. During a “tour de table” exercise involving the national participants, the following “long-list” of issues was the outcome. 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.

- AGREEMENTS BETWEEN TRADE UNIONS AND EMPLOYERS' ORGANISATIONS GENERALLY TAKE PLACE IN A TRIPARTITE SETTING. PROCEDURES FOR BIPARTITE ARRANGEMENTS HAVE TO BE PUT IN PLACE;
- TRADE UNIONS AND EMPLOYERS' ORGANISATIONS NEED TO DEFINE AREAS OF COMMON INTEREST;
- SALARY/EMPLOYMENT ISSUES ARE VERY IMPORTANT ISSUES FOR THE TRADE UNIONS, BUT IF CONCRETE RESULTS ARE DESIRED, EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION IS CRUCIAL;
- SOMETHING MUST BE DONE ABOUT THE SHADOW ECONOMY;
- EMPLOYERS' ORGANISATIONS SHOULD DEVOTE MORE ATTENTION TO SALARY AND WAGE ISSUES;
- BOTH WORKING PROCEDURES AND TRAINING NEED TO IMPROVE IF EU INVOLVEMENT IS TO BE EFFECTIVE;
- THE TRADE UNION IMAGE OF THE EMPLOYERS' ORGANISATIONS IS ALWAYS NEGATIVE;
- TRADE UNIONS AND EMPLOYERS' ORGANISATIONS NEED TO WORK HARDER TO FIND COMMON VIEWS;
- FOR MORE EFFECTIVE SOCIAL DIALOGUE, THERE NEEDS TO BE MORE GOODWILL AND MORE COMPETENT NEGOTIATORS;
- COLLECTIVE AGREEMENTS AT ALL LEVELS, NEED TO NOTE THE RIGHTS OF EACH SIDE;
- TRADE UNIONS DO NOT HAVE LAWYERS, CONSULTANTS, ETC TO HELP THEM IN THE SAME WAY THAT EMPLOYERS' ORGANISATIONS DO. THEY SHOULD NOT EXPLOIT THIS SITUATION;
- GOVERNMENT SOMETIMES DECIDES SOMETHING ALTOGETHER DIFFERENT TO THE AGREED VIEWS OF THE SOCIAL PARTNERS;
- BOTH SIDES NEED TO DO BETTER IN PUTTING THEMSELVES INTO THE SHOES OF THE OTHER SIDE;
- MOTIVATION AND EFFORT ON BOTH SIDES IS NEEDED, THUS FAR MOST IS COMING FROM THE TRADE UNIONS;
- NEED MORE INFORMAL MEETINGS TO BUILD TRUST AND CONFIDENCE;
- NEED TO WORK TOGETHER AND NOT SPEND SO MUCH TIME ACCUSING EACH OTHER;
- MUTUAL RESPECT ON BOTH SIDES IS NEEDED TO HAVE SUCCESSFUL SOCIAL DIALOGUE;
- NEED TO IDENTIFY MORE TOUCHPOINTS TO BRING THE SIDES TOGETHER RATHER THAN DRIVE THEM APART;

## ARITAKE-WILD

- NEED TO IMPROVE COOPERATION WITHIN EACH GROUP AND ACROSS BOTH SIDES;
- NEED TO TRY TO IMAGINE BEING IN THE SHOES OF THE OTHER PARTY;
- NEED TO PROPOSE WHAT CAN BE IMPLEMENTED IN REALITY;
- NEED TO REALISE THAT IN THE THREE LEVELS OF DISCUSSION (OPINIONS, DISCUSSION, DECISION MAKING) COMPROMISE IS NECESSARY;
- SOCIAL DIALOGUE AND SOCIAL PARTNERS ARE OBLIGATORY, THERE NEEDS TO BE CONTINUITY AND THE CURRENT SHORTAGE OF HUMAN RESOURCES SHOULD BE ADDRESSED;
- SOCIAL MODEL IS TO CREATE BETTER GOVERNANCE VIA SOCIAL DIALOGUE. WE SHOULD NOT FORGET THAT OTHER NATIONS WILL ALSO DEMAND THIS OF US;
- LOOK TO OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS ON DEALING WITH CERTAIN SUBJECTS, THIS EXPERIENCE MAY SETTLE SOME PROBLEMS AND AS A RESULT, LITHUANIA WILL BE BETTER REPRESENTED

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

- At the European level sometimes the social partners must “agree to disagree” on some issues. Instead of viewing disagreement as catastrophic, they should move forward on other joint issues;
- Communication is key, you cannot consult with your members too much;
- There is no one single way to develop a mandate. Agreed positions can be built at a national level; by using regional and sectoral committees; or through social affairs/policy committees;
- The credibility of the parties grows as consensus is reached. By strengthening the relationship between the two sides, the country will be more effectively and more positively represented at the EU.

The expert from the Republic of Ireland was asked to explain how successful dialogue had been built and sustained in his country;

- Lots of informal contact between groups, in a small country, partnerships should be easy;
- Formal meetings also occur, he cited the example of the National Economic Social Council that sets agendas;

## ARITAKE-WILD

- Government has an important role as an employer and an enabler of dialogue;
- Tax issues have also played a major role in the succession of national agreements that have been reached since 1987 between the social partners in Ireland. The government was prepared to reduce punitive levels of taxation (52%) for wage moderation and agreements to control public expenditure.

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 three areas;

<b>Relationship Building</b>	Define common vision, goals, mutual trust and respect
<b>Structural Definition</b>	Define regulated process/procedure/rules for working together
<b>Consensus Building</b>	Clear positions and clear mandates

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

**DAY TWO (18<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 three hours to develop responses to the following questions;

*"Goodwill backed up by good practice"*

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

- 1. What actions will we take, individually and jointly, to build an atmosphere of mutual respect and understanding?*
- 2. What processes and working practices will we establish to assure effective bipartite discussion and European Social Dialogue?*
- 3. Within our group (TU or EO), what processes will be established to build consensus around European level issues (e.g. mandate setting and implementation)?*

*For each issue, specify a time schedule for achievement of your goals*

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.

Each group was asked to deal with two questions only;

- The joint group dealt with issues "one" and "two";
- The employers' organisation and trade unions groups were each asked to consider questions "one" and "three".

**Session seven (Working group feedback)**

*Action plan development*

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

**Joint Group**

*Mutual Respect and Understanding*

- ❖ Need to create favourable human atmosphere through politeness, punctuality, all the little things that can create tension;
- ❖ Important to encourage young people to take an interest;
- ❖ Need to have more informal meetings;
- ❖ Important to recognise similarities between social partners;
- ❖ Improve understanding of what social partners are;
- ❖ Be prepared for what to expect once a member of the EU;
- ❖ Hold one or two day seminar before May 1<sup>st</sup> to hear experiences with other EU countries and to share the views of the Lithuanian social partners on the medium term action programme.

*Processes/Structures to assure European social dialogue*

- ❖ Build level of understanding of the conduct of negotiations – European and Lithuanian level;
- ❖ Improve negotiations by increasing access to important economic data/reports;
- ❖ Improve transparency of social dialogue process;
- ❖ Improve process for finding social partners at the sectoral level;
- ❖ Define processes for assuring representivity of the parties;
- ❖ Define a process for dealing with regional level issues;
- ❖ Improve consensus-building process for when groups come together.

**Employers' Group**

*Mutual Respect and Understanding*

- ❖ Social dialogue already exists in the EU, we must learn the rules of the game in order to play effectively;
- ❖ Must respect trade unions and find more touchpoints.

## ARITAKE-WILD

### *Processes/Structures for consensus building within the employers' group*

- ❖ Need to define mechanisms to improve discussion and working relationships to build employer consensus;
- ❖ Find competent experts, preferably businesspeople that have faced similar issues;
- ❖ Improve access to information;
- ❖ Set up working groups with representatives from international organisations to work on European level issues;
- ❖ Put consensus building and representation in Brussels on the agenda of next "Presidium meeting" for both confederations;
- ❖ Important to disseminate information to companies they represent – will be flooded with information upon accession

## **Trade Union Group**

### *Mutual Respect and Understanding*

- Use politeness, punctuality and respect when communicating within the organisations and with other social partners
- Understand how to communicate to promote understanding;
- Improve understanding of legal issues.

### *Processes/Structures for consensus building within the trade union group*

- Determine what measures and procedures are necessary within the trade unions concerning consensus building and dialogue;
- Improve knowledge about economic atmosphere of country;
- Development of skills, competencies, training for both social partners;
- Develop round table discussions between social partners meetings;
- Improve informal communication;
- Use compromises to make progress on all levels, local and national;
- Establish common goals and priorities;
- Try to develop mechanisms on how to communicate effectively;
- Collective actions: social partners should come to negotiations with informed opinions;
- Trade union centres should each appoint a coordinator charged with contact among themselves, information gathering and sharing—determine timeline for this;
- Define a process with timescales for maximising consensus in trade union centre opinions on European issues, and processes for dealing with issues where views differ;
- Define communication processes.

**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; and jointly by the national social partners. A number of important issues had been discussed during the meeting relating to issues of national interest only. These would be included in the report but would not form a part of the action plan.

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;

<b>Action Plan</b>		
<i>Trade unions</i>	<i>Employers' organisations</i>	<i>Joint action by national social partners</i>
<p>Establish a mechanism to bring together the views of the different trade union centres to aid in establishing common positions on European issues. It is envisioned that this process will involve the establishment of coordinators and the agreement of specific time schedules for review and approval.</p> <p>Provide training and development for representatives including on the economic development of Lithuania, the European legal acquis, positive cooperation and negotiation practices.</p>	<p>Propose at the March meetings of the Presidia of LPK and LVDK to establish a joint working group on European issues. Following the Presidia discussions the two organisations will meet and agree upon follow up items.</p> <p>LPK and LVDK will explore the possibility of establishing representatives in Brussels to facilitate their work on EU issues and their contacts with EU players (Commission, Parliament, UNICE, UEAPME, etc)</p>	<p>Establish more regular informal contact between formal meetings, on European issues.</p> <p>Arrange a joint seminar to review issues on the agenda of the European Social Dialogue with the attendance of ETUC, UNICE, UEAPME and CEEP.</p> <p>On an individual basis: Make personal efforts to improve the human atmosphere during discussions; to understand the views and perspectives of the other side; and to identify common points rather than focusing on the differences.</p>

## ARITAKE-WILD

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 begin to create more 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.

### **List of Appendices**

- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Appendix one | Seminar agenda                         |
| Appendix two | Lithuanian social partner action plan. |

## Appendix 1

## 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. 2

Venue: Hotel Radisson SAS Astorija, Didzioji str. 35/2, Vilnius, Lithuania

Date: 17 and 18 February 2004

## DAY ONE

Tuesday, 17<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	
1800	Close and any announcements	Plenary	
	Evening Program in accordance with announcements		

## ARITAKE-WILD

--	--	--	--

### DAY TWO

Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> February

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	

Lithuanian Social Partner Action Plan		
<i>Trade unions</i>	<i>Employers' organisations</i>	<i>Joint action by national social partners</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish a mechanism to bring together the views of the different trade union centres to aid in establishing common positions on European issues. It is envisioned that this process will involve the establishment of coordinators and the agreement of specific time schedules for review and approval.</li> <li>2. Provide training and development for representatives including on the economic development of Lithuania, the European legal acquis, positive cooperation and negotiation practices.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Propose at the March meetings of the Presidia of LPK and LVDK to establish a joint working group on European issues. Following the Presidia discussions the two organisations will meet and agree upon follow up items.</li> <li>2. LPK and LVDK will explore the possibility of establishing representatives in Brussels to facilitate their work on EU issues and their contacts with EU players (Commission, Parliament, UNICE, UEAPME, etc)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish more regular informal contact between formal meetings, on European issues.</li> <li>2. Arrange a joint seminar to review issues on the agenda of the European Social Dialogue with the attendance of ETUC, UNICE, UEAPME and CEEP.</li> <li>3. On an individual basis: Make personal efforts to improve the human atmosphere during discussions; to understand the views and perspectives of the other side; and to identify common points rather than focusing on the differences.</li> </ol>