

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 Polish National Seminar

Warsaw

Poland

20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> June 2004

Prepared by ARITAKE-WILD  
June 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?”

Warsaw  
Poland  
20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> June 2004

---

The last in 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 Poland on the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> of June 2004.

The objectives for the Polish 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 following their recent accession to the EU.

The seminar was attended by representatives of Polish 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 Polish 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 Polish 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: 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.

## ARITAKE-WILD

Day one of the seminar was devoted to identifying the most important characteristics, actions and behaviours that will lead to successful participation in the European Social Dialogue for the Polish 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 high priority 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 maximise the effectiveness of the Polish social partners in the European Social Dialogue in the shortest time possible.

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 (20<sup>th</sup> June)**

**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 Liedekerke). These presentations are attached as appendices three and four respectively. Additionally, representatives of the European social partners; Maria-Helena Andre 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 Polish 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; a representative from the ETUC together with one expert joined the trade union group; and the second representative from the ETUC, the representative from CEEP and one expert joined the

## ARITAKE-WILD

“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**

- There needs to be a willingness to organise and coordinate social partner action and to minimise fragmentation.
- Discussions need to focus on consensus building. The Polish approach today is more associated with ‘destroying’ the other side.
- Social partners need to work harder on acknowledging, respecting and recognising each other.
- The Government is a part of the bipartite process because the state remains a large employer. This can be difficult when the Government supports action or legislation for political reasons that do not reflect the views of the “genuine” social partners.
- The social partners need to engage in issues beyond social policy. Fiscal policies designed to attract foreign inward investment have important social effects and social partner views should be sought.

## ARITAKE-WILD

- The need for language training and translation will arise as EU documents and seminars are often in English and sometimes French.
- There is a lack of interest from the media and society on many topics relating to trade unions specifically and the social partners generally. By increasing the social partners' media visibility, public opinion could be improved.
- In order to combine business flexibility and efficiency with employee interests, ways need to be found to build consensus and find joint solutions.
- Trade unions have well trained people both at national and international level in terms of experts and activists. There is nonetheless a concern that there is a lack of public understanding of the efforts made by trade unions to save workplaces and secure better working conditions

### **Employers' Organisation Group**

- There is a need to improve information flows between employers' organisations on European issues.
- There is a lack of sufficient knowledge on EU matters that inhibits the level of employer participation.
- Most organisations do not have representation in Brussels; this is something that would significantly improve EU level participation and understanding.
- There is a lack of day-to-day procedures for facilitating meetings of employer representatives and a lack of access to experts in key technical areas.
- Although these issues do not apply to every employers' organisation, the majority have a need to improve in some or all of these areas.

### Joint Group

- There is a need to create a national platform for bilateral dialogue on EU issues.
- Further training and development of the people involved in social dialogue needs to be undertaken.
- The role of multinational companies at both the national and international level needs to be taken into account.
- Social partners need to identify common fields of interest in terms of horizontal issues (like social security) and sectoral level issues (like dealing with restructuring or rapid growth)
- The general awareness of the need for social dialogue needs to be raised.
- Unless the quality of bilateral national dialogue is improved, high quality participation at the EU level will be limited.

### 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*

## ARITAKE-WILD

*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.

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
✓ Social dialogue is taken seriously;	✗ Lack of priority or interest in the social dialogue;
✓ One or two individuals given clear responsibility for the social dialogue;	✗ Lack of clarity in who represents the organisation;
✓ Continuity of representation;	✗ Lack of delegation of authority – too many referrals to national HQ;
✓ Representatives are credible at the national level;	✗ Low credibility – nationally or at the European level;
✓ Strong links between national and international activities;	✗ Changes in representation from meeting to meeting;
✓ Clear process for mandate development;	✗ Lack of processes for producing a clear mandate, reporting back or implementation;
✓ Clear process for reporting back;	✗ Over-political organisations/stances – lack of independence, influence of "party politics";
✓ Processes for implementing agreements;	✗ Poor electronic communication media;
✓ Dedication of sufficient resources – admin, research and IT;	✗ Lack of visibility in Brussels.
✓ Permanent Brussels presence.	

## ARITAKE-WILD

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.

- Lack of knowledge on social dialogue in Europe - more education and training is needed.
- Lack of procedures for working out joint opinions for employers' organisations and perhaps the trade union side as well.
- The tradition of tripartite dialogue in Poland is very set. Bipartite dialogue is new to the Polish social partners.

## ARITAKE-WILD

- Lack of legal solutions .... Poland has not yet been able to implement fully all the EU solutions that promote effectiveness in social dialogue.
- The need to improve competency on both sides of social partner ... to make the shift from volunteers to professional people that have the skills necessary to be effective.
- The Polish tendency is to veto everything that is not the Polish way. The current focus is too often on how to block rather than how to build consensus.
- The need to speak with a Polish voice in a pan-European context and learn to translate a national problem into EU language.
- Procedures and principles for engaging in social dialogue need to be formalised. Legal provisions might be useful.
- If the social partners are to strengthen their position and have representation in Brussels more funds will be needed.
- The need to concentrate on bipartite, as opposed to tripartite, dialogue.
- Polish success in social dialogue in Europe depends on the effectiveness of national and sectoral social dialogue.
- Good flows of information are crucial. Without this it will be difficult to pursue Polish goals and interests and to improve communication with others.
- The need to learn about how Europe really works, e.g. what does it take to get things done within the EU institutions. Polish social partners need to improve their ability to form effective alliances and partnerships. This will help not only Poland but many countries within the EU.
- Polish people need to learn to trust their social partners. History of manipulation of people to political ends has built suspicion of ulterior motives of social partners. Winning at the cost of others has to be replaced by working together to find common solutions.
- All want to have effective social dialogue but that is where the similarity ends. The approaches are all different and partners are still very far from one another.

## ARITAKE-WILD

- One reason for the slow progress of the development of dialogue is because not all employers and owners of companies understand what trade unions are really about. Process of building goodwill will be a long, learning process.
- Overcoming stereotypes and believing in the good intention of the social partners is key.
- Knowledge, credibility and flexibility are key assets for social partners.
- The need to be able to identify common interest areas, have confidence in partners and communicate effectively.
- Success of Polish social partners depends on using learning from other country's models and determining what will work best for the Polish partners.
- It is important to widen scope of social dialogue to include, for example, the use of structural funds.
- The need to build interpersonal relationships.
- Dialogue of this kind has been absent in Poland for 40 years. With only ten years of new experience, a deeper understanding still needs to be achieved.
- Parties need to be willing to implement the results of social dialogue.
- The need to improve language skills.
- The social partners need to have a clearer strategic vision of what they want to achieve both in the short and the longer term.

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

- Partners need to focus on the more practical aspects of implementing social dialogue in Poland. By being overly ambitious and trying to find the ideal solution, partners may be blocking their own immediate term progress. No country has been able to find the ideal solution, and the process of European social dialogue itself is not perfect. Polish social partners must find what will work best in the context of current needs and this will get them to the next step.

## ARITAKE-WILD

- A specific national model will need to be built by the Polish social partners. There is no single country “off the shelf” model that will perfectly serve Poland.
- European social dialogue is a moving train, it will not stop and wait for Poland to get on, so Poland needs to make best use of the resources available in the immediate term.
- Poland already has a high level of awareness on social dialogue and the need to work together, find compromises and utilise resources to invest in education, knowledge and decision making processes. This is a firm foundation on which to build.
- It is generally wise to build on existing structures and procedures and determine if these can be modified to further serve the goals of Poland.

Following this general discussion, each of the national participants was asked to select key issues from the above “long-list” that they wished to spend the following day working on. Several topics such as funding, image building .... between the social partners and with the media, society and multinationals, as well as the ability to raise national issues in a European context were raised several times; however the topics most mentioned were the following:

1. What needs to be done to move Polish social partners from being “talented amateurs” to real professionals on the European stage?
2. What steps need to be taken to identify common ground and to build trust and consensus between the social partners. The Polish tendency to see winning only being achieved at the cost of another’s defeat has to be addressed?
3. How can a process for effective bipartite dialogue be built?
4. How can the social partner groups enhance their ability to work together to ensure coherent approaches and solutions?

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

**DAY TWO (21<sup>st</sup> June)**

**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:

*Produce specific and time phased action plans to address the following issues:*

- *The establishment of adequate systems for bipartite social dialogue that will link effectively with the existing European level structures. (Joint group)*
- *Put arrangements in place that assure the coordination of the activities of each of the social partner 'sides'. (Employers and trade unions to consider from the point of view of their own side)*
- *The short and medium term development of the range of personal and professional skills necessary to represent the Polish social partners in the European social dialogue.*
- *Identify and build upon areas of common ground that exist between the social partners both at a national and European level.*

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;

**Joint Group**

- Sectoral level dialogue: by the end of September there should be bilateral meetings for the sectors of construction, metallurgy and banking. Objectives should include promoting information flow, identifying what is common to the social partners and learning about what is happening in these sectors at the European level.

## ARITAKE-WILD

- Other sectors should be briefed on this initiative, what is happening at the European level, and sectoral best practice. This should take place before the end of September.
- There should be a meeting organised of the seminar participants before the end of September to work out a model of permanent bipartite cooperation. The proposed process and the proposed agenda for more frequent and regular meetings will need to be presented to the management boards of each participating organisation for approval.
- A project should be prepared to improve the skills and competencies of those involved in social dialogue: Phase 1: assessment of current skills; Phase 2: define and identify training needs; Phase 3: implementation of a training programme that would equip these people with these skills and qualifications.
- Such a joint project could be submitted for external funding, but if funding is not approved, each organisation could still benefit from undertaking the self evaluation process.
- Investment in training and human resource development in the context of economic restructuring is a horizontal issue that can bring the social partners together. Structural funds could be used to develop national and sectoral initiatives.

### **Trade Union Group**

- Cooperation based on trust between employers and employees will assist effective implementation of national social dialogue.
- Partners should establish a team that will represent the social partners in various national and European level issues in terms of lobbying, economic/funding discussions, information gathering and flow, formal and informal contacts with government, negotiations, etc. This team should be based upon trust and cooperation between both social partners.
- The national social dialogue team should be set up within three months.
- During the first meetings, the rules and regulations for teamwork should be defined.

## ARITAKE-WILD

- The terms of reference for this group should include “joint-interest” domestic issues as well as European level issues; this group can ask the organisations like ETUC, ILO, etc for help.
- The team should undertake consultations to determine the strategic priorities to be presented to the European Union or other international organisations (e.g. the ILO, etc).
- It should agree on principles of communication such as informal meetings, formal meetings, telephone conversations, etc between social partners.
- It should work towards getting a permanent representation in Brussels.
- It should develop structure and strategy to obtain funds for common projects presented, implementation and objectives.
- It should elaborate development programs for the Polish economy that will help to reduce unemployment and to create trust.
- Skills and knowledge need to be developed in the following areas: languages, negotiation techniques, social dialogue and bilateral relations, the functioning of international organisations, IT.
- Career paths need to be developed to attract, recruit and retain younger people. They should be given the opportunity to take part as an observer in these structures to indicate possible opportunities for promotion.
- The positive role of employers’ organisations and trade unions should be promoted to increase the membership of the social partner organisations.

### **Employers’ Organisations Group**

- Audit what areas employers are already present and build future plans from this base.
- Coordination needs to be encouraged between those responsible for European Social Dialogue in the various employers’ organisations. This should be made clear by the management boards of the organisations by the end of September.

## ARITAKE-WILD

- The description of successful social dialogue characteristics presented in the seminar is an exhaustive list to use as a basis to diagnose if people have those skills and if not, how to meet those needs.
- Steps need to be taken to develop teams that combine language and technical expertise

### **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 groups present at the seminar.

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;

## THE POLISH SOCIAL PARTNER ACTION PLAN

<b>Joint Social Partner Actions</b>	<p><b>Bipartite social dialogue</b></p> <p>A coordinating team comprising attendees from this workshop will meet before the end of September to implement the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ To arrange bilateral meetings in the metal, construction and banking sectors to discuss the scope of discussions and priorities for effective social dialogue in these sectors.</li><li>➤ To provide information on this activity to other sectors with the intention of promoting sectoral social dialogue.</li><li>➤ To develop a process of permanent national level cooperation between the social partners for presentation to the decision making boards of their respective organisations.</li><li>➤ To discuss and agree upon an agenda of 'common interest' issues relating both to national and European level issues where joint approaches will be of a mutual benefit.</li></ul> <p><b>Skill Development</b></p> <p>As a joint initiative, the social partners will develop a project to be submitted for external funding to evaluate existing skills, to identify training and development needs and to provide training and development programmes. This could be used as a model for other accession countries.</p>
-------------------------------------	---

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Trade Union Actions</b></p>	<p>In addition to the items identified above as 'joint', the trade unions undertook to take the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Using the capability profile presented at the seminar, the trade unions will undertake an evaluation of existing skills available to their organisations and develop action plans to meet the identified training needs. Particular attention will be paid to developing the skills of younger people by giving them technical experience through acting as observers.</li> <li>➤ To improve internal coordination between trade unions, in particular where the unions concerned are not members of European level social partner organisations.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Employers Organisations Actions</b></p>	<p>In addition to the items identified above as 'joint' the employers' organisations undertook to take the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Using the capability profile presented at the seminar, the employers' organisations will undertake an evaluation of existing skills available to their organisations and develop action plans to meet the identified needs.</li> <li>➤ To develop teamwork initiatives to better combine language and technical expertise.</li> <li>➤ Following the establishment of the process for national level social dialogue, the employers' organisations will develop practices to promote positive cooperation to maximise their effectiveness as an employer group both nationally and in their relationships with the European level social partners.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>European Social Partner Actions</b></p>	<p>The European social partner organisations agreed to support the creation of the skills development initiative proposed in the joint action programme.</p>

The meeting ended with a word of thanks to those that participated and for the hard work accomplished. The Poland seminar was considered to be one of the best of the

## ARITAKE-WILD

series due to the serious efforts put in by the social partners. Thanks were offered to all those involved in the preparation and conduct of the seminar.

### **List of Appendices**

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

## 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. 4

Venue: ???, Warszawa

Date: 21 and 22 June 2004

DAY ONE

Monday 21<sup>st</sup> June

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 22<sup>nd</sup> June

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	

<p><b>Joint Social Partner Actions</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>POLISH SOCIAL PARTNER ACTION PLAN</b></p> <p><b>Bipartite social dialogue</b></p> <p>A coordinating team comprising attendees from this workshop will meet before the end of September to implement the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To arrange bilateral meetings in the metal, construction and banking sectors to discuss the scope of discussions and priorities for effective social dialogue in these sectors.</li> <li>➤ To provide information on this activity to other sectors with the intention of promoting sectoral social dialogue.</li> <li>➤ To develop a process of permanent national level cooperation between the social partners for presentation to the decision making boards of their respective organisations.</li> <li>➤ To discuss and agree upon an agenda of 'common interest' issues relating both to national and European level issues where joint approaches will be of a mutual benefit.</li> </ul> <p><b>Skill Development</b></p> <p>As a joint initiative, the social partners will develop a project to be submitted for external funding to evaluate existing skills, to identify training and development needs and to provide training and development programmes. This could be used as a model for other accession countries.</p>
--	--

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>Trade Union Actions</b></p>	<p>In addition to the items identified above as 'joint', the trade unions undertook to take the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Using the capability profile presented at the seminar, the trade unions will undertake an evaluation of existing skills available to their organisations and develop action plans to meet the identified training needs. Particular attention will be paid to developing the skills of younger people by giving them technical experience through acting as observers.</li> <li>➤ To improve internal coordination between trade unions, in particular where the unions concerned are not members of European level social partner organisations.</li> </ul>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>Employers Organisations Actions</b></p>	<p>In addition to the items identified above as 'joint' the employers' organisations undertook to take the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Using the capability profile presented at the seminar, the employers' organisations will undertake an evaluation of existing skills available to their organisations and develop action plans to meet the identified needs.</li> <li>➤ To develop teamwork initiatives to better combine language and technical expertise.</li> <li>➤ Following the establishment of the process for national level social dialogue, the employers' organisations will develop practices to promote positive cooperation to maximise their effectiveness as an employer group both nationally and in their relationships with the European level social partners.</li> </ul>

<p><b>European Social Partner Actions</b></p>	<p>The European social partner organisations agreed to support the creation of the skills development initiative proposed in the joint action programme.</p>
---	--