

Project PESSIS +: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue

DRAFT

Final European Report 2019

May 2019

**Dr Jane Lethbridge
European Research Coordinator**

Final European Report

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1 Definitions	4
1.2 Methodologies	4
2. Nature and structure of the social services sector.....	7
2.1 Workforce profile and sectoral rate of growth	8
2.2 Structure of sector	10
3. Social dialogue in the social services sector.....	14
3.2 Representativity	20
3.3 Well defined social dialogue structures	21
3.4 Employer-employee dialogue	23
3.5 Newly established social dialogue structures (post 1990)	24
3.6 Recently reformed social dialogue structures	26
4. Collective bargaining in the social services sector.....	28
4.1 Types of issues covered	28
4.2 Coverage	29
4.3 Changes	29
4.4 Independence of partners	30
4.5 Role of state	30
4.6 Correlation of social dialogue & collective bargaining	34
4.7 Reactions to financial crisis	34
5. The case for EU level Social dialogue in the social services sector.....	35
5.1 Social dialogue and the European Union	35
5.2 The legal base for social dialogue	36
5.3 Arguments for EU level social dialogue in the social services sector	36
6. Conclusion and Recommendations.....	38
8. References.....	42
Appendix A: Trade union and employers organisations.....	46

1. Introduction

The aim of the research project '*Project PESSIS: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue*' was to provide a detailed understanding of how social dialogue is organised and structured (or not) in the social services sector in Europe. It aimed to identify barriers to increased cooperation among employers in the sector as well as highlighting examples of good practice. Eleven national studies contributed to an overall European perspective of social dialogue in the social services sector, which are included in this European Synthesis Report. The research project involved studies of social dialogue in the social services sector in Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, The Netherlands, Scotland, Slovenia and Spain.

The aims of '*Project PESSIS 2: Promoting Employers' social services in social dialogue*' was to build on the findings of *Project PESSIS* by extending the understanding of social dialogue in the social services to six more countries: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Italy, Lithuania, Poland and Sweden. *Project PESSIS 3: Promoting Employers' social services in social dialogue* further extended the national case studies to include Hungary, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and the United Kingdom. *Project PESSIS +: Promoting Employers' social services in social dialogue* further extended the national case studies to include Denmark, Latvia and Luxembourg.

The Final European Report of '*Project PESSIS + Promoting Employers' social services in social dialogue*' draws together the mapping of social dialogue in the social services sectors from each of the 25 national reports. Each national report presented a 'picture' of how social dialogue is organised at local, regional and national levels and addressed the following six research questions:

1. What is the size of the social services sector, both in terms of workforce and of employers in aggregated value?
2. How well represented is the sector in terms of number of employers and workers covered by collective agreements?
3. What are the types of social dialogue or collective agreements that exist?
4. How many employers of the sector are involved in social dialogue and at what level?
5. What are the key labour issues dealt with and at what level?
6. Are there any labour issues that could be dealt with at European Union (EU) level?

1.1 Definitions

There are several terms which have been used in this research project which are defined below.

1. The term social dialogue is defined as '*a dialogue between employers and employees*'.
2. The terms public, for-profit and not-for profit sectors are widely used across Europe. They are defined in this report as:

Public sector commissioners of social services - Government departments, public sector agencies or municipal authorities commission social services in many countries and contract for-profit and / or not-for profit providers to deliver social services.

Public sector funders of social services – public authorities (national, regional or local government) fund social services by providing money directly to individuals.

Public sector – In some countries, social services are still delivered by municipal or regional government authorities.

For-profit sector– Providers of social services which operate to make a profit. They may operate with shareholders or they may be private companies, owned by one or more individuals. In some countries, family businesses deliver social services. They may be large or small in size.

Not-for-profit sector– Providers of social services, which do not operate to make a profit. In some countries this sector may be called the voluntary or charitable sector. In some countries, volunteers deliver some of the services for the not-for-profit sector.

1.2 Methodologies

'*Project PESSIS: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue*' was an exploratory research project which aimed to gather data on a sector that is under-researched in terms of social dialogue. A research strategy, drawn up by the European Research Coordinator, was discussed with the project partners in January 2012. After the appointment of the 11 national researchers, the strategy was further clarified after discussions between the national researchers and the European Research Coordinator via Skype.

Each national study started by gathering research that had already been conducted on the social services sector in each country. There were four main sources of information: employer organisations, trade unions, government departments and academic research. Reports covered the numbers of workers in the social services sector, the structure of the sector, existing systems of social dialogue, collective bargaining arrangements, and

wider perspectives on employment relations in the social services sector. This information was used to map out the key elements of the social services sector.

As social dialogue in the social services sector is an under-researched topic, the main form of data collection took place either through a national workshop or through a series of key informant interviews. Workshop participants and key informants were sent a short briefing paper which outlined the initial mapping of the social services sector. The stakeholders included employer organisations, government (national, regional, provincial, municipal) departments, trade unions, not for profit sector, for-profit sector and worker associations. Stakeholders were asked about their experience of social dialogue, the structures that exist to support social dialogue, existing collective agreements and the resources that the stakeholders have available to develop social dialogue at EU level. This stage of data collection was also used to raise awareness of the PESSIS project among stakeholders in each of the eleven countries. It generated a wide range of views and insights into social dialogue in the social services sector. The research was written up as a series of eleven national reports, which were then translated into English, when required.

A further testing of the findings of the research was done through the second meeting of project partners in April 2012. Initial research findings were presented and discussed by national researchers. Their comments and recommendations have been incorporated into this report.

A conference held on 22 June 2012 presented the key findings of the PESSIS project to an audience drawn from European and national project partners, the European Commission and other stakeholders. The main points raised in the conference are included in Appendix 1 of this report. The research was written up as a series of eleven national reports, which were then translated into English, when required.

For PESSIS 2, six researchers were recruited by the University of Greenwich in January/ February 2014. The research strategy was further clarified after discussions between the national researchers and the European Research Coordinator via Skype in February 2014. Each national study adopted the same methodologies as used by the initial 11 case studies.

An initial testing of the findings of the six case studies was done through the mid-project meeting of PESSIS 2 project partners in June 2014. Initial research findings were presented and discussed by the European Research Coordinator with PESSIS 2 project partners and their comments and recommendations have been incorporated into this report.

A final conference held on 23 September 2014 presented the key findings of the PESSIS and PESSIS 2 project to an audience drawn from European and

national project partners and other stakeholders. The main points raised have been included in this report.

This Final European Report 2 uses material from the seventeen national reports to provide an analysis of social dialogue in the social services sector in seventeen European countries.

PESSIS 3 aimed to further extend the research into national social dialogue arrangements in the social services sector in a further five countries. Five researchers were recruited by the University of Greenwich in January/ February 2016. A research strategy was further clarified after discussions between the national researchers and the European Research Coordinator via Skype in February 2016. Each national study adopted the same methodologies used by the initial 11 case studies. A final conference for PESSIS 3 was held in October 2017 where the five new national case studies were presented and discussed.

PESSIS + aimed to continue the exploration of social dialogue in the social services sector at national and local levels. Three researchers were recruited by the University of Greenwich in 2017. A research strategy was further clarified after discussions between the national researchers and the European Research Coordinator via Skype in 2018. Each national study adopted the same methodologies used by the initial 11 case studies. A final conference for PESSIS + was held in June 2019 where the three new national case studies were presented and discussed.

Table 1: Country case studies of social dialogue in the social services sector

European region	Countries
Central/ Eastern Europe	Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Romania
Continental Europe	Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, The Netherlands
Nordic region	Denmark, Finland, Sweden
Southern Europe	Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain
UK and Ireland	Scotland, Ireland, United Kingdom

This report is structured in the following sections:

- Nature and structure of the social services sector;
- Social dialogue in the social services sector;
- Collective bargaining in the social services sector;
- Presenting the case for social dialogue in the social services sector at EU level;
- Conclusion & recommendations.

2. Nature and structure of the social services sector

In Europe, the term social services covers services for older people, people with disabilities and children as well as services to reach excluded and disadvantaged groups (CEC, 2010). The main focus of this Final European Report (2019) is on long-term care for older people; care and rehabilitation for people with disabilities; and child care. Other services covered by the term social services have only been included when they have particularly strong systems of social dialogue.

The historical development of these services varies from country to country but has been strongly influenced by the establishment of the welfare state and the role of the voluntary/ not-for-profit sector, including churches and community groups. In Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Slovakia and Slovenia entry to the European Union and access to funds led to the expansion of a not-for-profit social services sector. Social services are most often provided locally. In several countries, the social services sector, for example, Portugal, is called the social enterprise, social economy or social profit sector, terms which capture the social values that inform the delivery of services and its contribution to social inclusion and social capital.

In many countries, the sector is expanding because of a growing demand for social services. European countries have ageing populations with longer life expectancy and higher rates of disability and morbidity which increase the demand for care services (European Foundation, 2009). This is an important economic, social and political issue for the majority of European countries and governments are attempting to find ways of funding the growing demand for social services. At the moment, the funding of social services is mostly from the state, whether as provider of services or by providing funding for social services that are run by either for-profit/ not-for-profit providers or providing funding directly to individuals who then pay service providers. The extent to which individuals should pay for their own care directly is often determined by income and means testing in some countries. Austerity policies have impacted on the funding available for social services in many countries.

In recent decades, almost all countries have experienced an increase in private for-profit sector provision although it remains the smallest sector in the majority of countries in the study, except for the United Kingdom where it is the largest sector. There has also been a reduction in state provision in many countries. The growth of for-profit providers is often accompanied by competition within the sector which affects wages and the position of not-for-profit providers. For-profit provision can be seen most clearly in the provision of home care services. New providers also challenge existing systems of representativity for employer organisations.

2.1 Workforce profile and sectoral rate of growth

The social services sector is a labour intensive sector which is expanding rapidly in many countries. Table 2 shows the numbers of workers in the social services in the 25 countries examined by the PESSIS project. It is difficult to compare different countries because definitions of social services may vary from country to country. In many countries, social services are the responsibility of more than one government department but are found most often in the health, local government or social welfare departments. Health and social services workers are often grouped together in national statistics, which makes it difficult to define the precise number of social services workers. In some countries, social services only refer to a non-market sector providing care services to different groups. In other countries, there are three distinct sectors: public, for-profit and not-for-profit. The table below shows the 25 countries with population, social services sector employment and, when available, growth rates.

Table 2: Number of workers in social services and value/ growth of sector

Country	Population (million) (2014)	% population aged 65+ (2014)	Number of workers in social services	Value of sector/ growth rate
Austria	8.5	18.3	385,000	3.35% pa
Belgium	11.2	17.8	330,000	Value of sector €7.8million Non-market sector growth rates 5.00% p.a.
Bulgaria	7.2	19.6	30,000	n/a
Czech Republic	10.5	17.4.	100,000	0.7% GDP
Denmark	5.8	19.3	279,810	?
Finland	5.4	19.4	185,800	3.7% jobs growth
France	65.8	18.0	980,000	7% jobs growth rate 2000-2007
Germany	80.7	20.8	1,788,656 and 222,943 (without social insurance)	€1.5 billion Gross added value 6.7% 16.2% jobs growth and 8.1% jobs growth (without social insurance)
Greece	10.9	20.5	37,822	Lack of evidence
Hungary	9.8	17.5	93,174	n/a
Ireland	4.6	12.6	155,000	€4,509 million
Italy	60.7	21.4	480,634	Economic impact of not-for-profit sector estimated at 4.3 GDP
Latvia	1.9	20.1	?	n/a
Lithuania	2.9	18.4	14,900	n/a
Luxembourg	0.6	14.3	25,150 (2019)	Expansion of long term care insurance and government budget (22% GDP) has resulted in expansion of jobs The gross value added (GVA) indicates that the NACE branches 87 and 88 contribute to a GVA of 1,457.7 billion Euro in 2018 and its relative share has increased over the last two decades
The Netherlands	16.8	17.3	694,000	2004-9 Elderly 2.6% jobs growth Disabled 3.2% jobs growth Childcare 11.4% jobs growth

Poland	38.0	14.9	775,400 jobs in health and social services	775,400 jobs is 5.4% of workforce (161,300 FTE in social services = 1.2% workforce)
Portugal	38.0	19.9	100,000 in social assistance in social economy sector	Gross Value Added (GVA) of Social Economy Sector represents 2.8% of total national GVA – 50% social economy sector is social services
Romania	20.0	16.5	43,382 – public services 16,480 non-governmental sector	n/a
Scotland	5.2	17.0	198,600	n/a
Slovakia	5.4	13.5	24,865	n/a
Slovenia	2.0	17.5	9,508	n/a
Spain	46.5	18.1	568,000	€12,322 billion value added 1.17% of GDP (2010)
Sweden	9.6	19.4	416,100	n/a
United Kingdom	64.3	17.5	1,700,000	6% of total workforce Gross Value Added (GVA) for Residential Care & Social Work Activities was £24,561 million in 2012 and GVA for Human Health and Social Work in 2014 was £107,420 million

n/a = data not available Sources: Eurostat, National Statistics (Scotland) and PESSIS/ PESSIS 2/PESSIS 3/PESSIS + project country reports

Many countries reported that the social services sector is one of the fastest growing sectors in terms of value and employment expansion although there are often differences between services for older people, people with disabilities and childcare. In Germany, although both ordinary jobs and jobs without social insurance expanded, there was a significant increase in jobs without social insurance in social welfare. As a labour intensive sector, in a period of rising unemployment, the social services sector is making a significant contribution to employment provision as well as to value added activities, although there is yet to be a full recognition of the potential of the sector. There are signs that the austerity measures, adopted by some European governments, are beginning to impact on this expansion even though demand for social services will remain high because of the expanding percentage of the population aged 65+. Reductions in social services budgets are affecting the negotiation of wages and working conditions. This is making recruitment and retention more difficult because low wages are unable to compete with higher paying sectors.

The social services sector has a high proportion of women workers. In some countries over 90% of workers are women, many working part-time, e.g. Finland, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands and Poland. Many countries have problems with recruitment and retention of workers. In almost all countries volunteers make a significant contribution to overall social services provision. A large percentage of women workers are aged 40 or above in many countries. France is an exception to this trend, with a larger percentage of workers under 40. In several countries, a relatively high

proportion of social services workers are migrant workers, for example, Austria, Netherlands and the United Kingdom. In some Central and Eastern European countries, social services workers leave to work in other European countries in search of higher wages, which results in a 'care deficit'. Countries then have to recruit social services workers from other countries, e.g. Ukraine, Vietnam. These are not long-term solutions to the problems of recruitment and retention of social services workers.

This profile of social services workers has several implications for the future. The rapid growth rate of this sector will, in future, have to be met by an expansion in either a younger workforce or by drawing in more male workers or more migrant workers. It will require changes in the image of employment in the social services sector, which is current characterised as a low paid, part-time, female workforce, in order to attract a wider range of workers.

2.2 Structure of sector

Comparing national social services data to obtain a picture of the contribution of public, for-profit and not-for profit sectors make to overall social services provision is difficult because of the use of different terminology in each country. Table 3 shows the number or percentage of jobs in the public, for-profit and not-for-profit sectors for countries where there is available data.

Table 3: Percentage of social services jobs in public, for-profit and not-for-profit sectors

% jobs (non-bold); number of jobs (bold)

Country	Public	For-profit	Not-for-profit	Comments
Austria	n/a	n/a	50% jobs	Lack of data
Bulgaria	95.8%	5.2%		Recent expansion of for-profit/ not-for-profit sectors
Denmark	Education 9,176 Human Health & social work 14,702 Residential care activities 133,352 Social work activities without accomodation 122,580	3% (subject to competition)		Public sector is still dominant although some municipalities have introduced competition to social services
Finland	62% elderly 89.7% childcare 50% other social Services	18.6% elderly 5.8% childcare 15.3% other social Services	18.6% Elderly 4.6% Childcare 34.5% other social services	Expansion of for-profit & not-for profit
France	30% jobs	8% jobs	62% jobs	For-profit sector expanding. Not-for-profit includes 100% of disabled jobs and 37% childcare jobs)
Germany				
Hungary	45.7% local government	-	17.8% Ecclesiastical foundations	No for-profit sector data

	22% General Directorate of Social Affairs and Child Protection		14.5% Not for profit	
Italy	44%	10%	46%	
Latvia	66% Majority in public sector		33%	
Luxembourg	23.78% Public utility institutions	55.5% NGO associations 10.59% in cooperatives and mutuals	10.13 in private, for-profit social enterprises	Not for profit sector is majority sector
Poland	70%	30%		Total health and social care jobs
Portugal	Social economy sector employs 226,000 people – half work in social services/assistance			
Romania	43,382	16,480		
Scotland	33.9% jobs (focus on adoptions, adult placement & adult care)	39.9% jobs (focus on child-minding & adult care homes, school care accommodation & nursing agencies)	26.0% jobs (focus child care agencies, offender management)	Sectors have specialist focus
Slovenia	n/a	n/a	26.7% jobs	Limited data
Slovakia	24% facilities for older people 47% Facilities for people with disabilities 19% Services for children 9% Other facilities			
Sweden	Overall social services 75% but Personal assistants 22%	Overall social services 25% but Personal assistants 72%		
United Kingdom	27%	49%	24%	Majority privatised services

Sources: PESSIS/PESSIS 2/PESSIS 3/PESSIS + country reports

Although several countries, for example, Finland, Bulgaria, Lithuania, still have a large public sector provision, the contributions of not-for-profit and for-profit sectors are growing throughout the 25 study countries. In Italy, the not-for-profit sector provides 73% of social services. In Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovenia and Poland there has been some expansion of the not-for-profit sector. There is some evidence that the not-for-profit sector specialises in certain types of services, for example, for people with disabilities in France. Child-minding provision is most often found in the for-profit/ not-for-profit sectors. The local nature of social services has influenced the size of enterprise involved in the social services sector. Table 4 shows the percentages or number of enterprises in the public, for-profit and not-for-profit sectors.

Table 4: Percentage or number of enterprises in public, for profit and not for profit sectors

Country	Public	For-profit	Not-for-profit	Comments
Belgium			2,222 Elderly services 1,063 Disabled services 2,788 children/ young	Data on number of enterprises

			people	
Czech Republic	33% services provided	1.7% services provided	58.5% services provided	
Denmark	98% social services enterprises in public sector	25% of social services tested in the market (2017) mainly by more rightwing municipalities but only 3% nursing homes subject to competition following bankruptcies	? in decline	Although for-profit private sector tried to establish itself there has been a decline in for-profit organisations after bankruptcies
Germany	5% residential elderly 23.7% child/youth centres	40% residential elderly	55% residential elderly 76.3% child/ youth Centres	Over 100,000 enterprises with 90% not-for profit
Greece	68 day care homes 1,009 assistance-at-home 1,319 municipal crèches 52 disability centres	10,000 beds in care homes 1,200 crèches	270 elderly care homes	
Ireland	200 local disability centres 5,276 home helps (largest provider)	128 home care providers 3,000 play centres 000s child minders	800 local disability centres 41 home care providers	
Hungary	520 (13%) central government 1880 (47% local government	400 (10%) Other non-state (mainly long term residential for older people)	960 (24%) Ecclesiastical institutions 240 (6%) Not for profit	
Italy	11%	16%	73%	Breakdown of units of social services
Latvia	207 service providers provide long-term social care and social rehabilitation services 78 provide home care and 52 service providers provide social services in day care centres. Long-term social care providers dominate local government care institutions - 102 institutions for adults and 33 institutions for children while 15 institutions of the state and contracting organizations (2017)		33%	
Luxembourg				362 social services enterprises
The			Disability – 525 enterprises	Disability &

Netherlands			75% with fewer 10 employees <u>Elderly</u> – 125 nursing homes, 360 retirement homes, 1,150 home care enterprises <u>Childcare</u> – 2,800 75% with fewer 10 employees	childcare enterprises – small numbers of employees
Poland	Residential social assistance institutions (48%) Nursing homes (72.3%) Other residential social assistance institutions (20.6%)	Residential social assistance institutions (12.2% For profit) Residential social assistance institutions (39.6% - Not for profit NFP) Nursing homes (27.7% for-profit & NFP) Other residential social assistance institutions (79.4% For-profit & NFP)		
Portugal		30.5% for-profit organisations	69.5% not-for-profit organisations	Expansion of social public services done through extending role of for profit providers
Slovakia	300 Care for older people 487 Care for people with disabilities 165 care institutions for children			
Spain		5,534 enterprises	19,000 social action with 73% with less than 10 employees	
Sweden	Pre-schools 57% Municipal older care provision 84%	Pre-schools 33%	Pre-schools 10%	Combined Private / not for profit older care provision 14%
United Kingdom		40,450 care enterprises		Highly fragmented sector

Sources: PESSIS/ PESSIS 2/ PESSIS 3/PESSIS + country reports

Childcare centres, crèches and kindergartens are frequently small in size. In the Netherlands, three quarters of the 2,800 childcare enterprises employed less than 10 people. In Poland there is a mix of public and not-for-profit/ for-profit provision in nursing homes and different types of residential social assistance institutions. In Sweden, although municipal care for older people still dominates provision, for-profit and not-for-profit providers are expanding in pre-schools and long-term care.

Enterprises providing care or services for people at home have small numbers of employees, although in one or two countries, larger companies are becoming involved, for example, Sweden, United Kingdom. The small size of social services enterprises in the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors has implications for the representation of both workers and employers. Public provision of social services is most often focused on local authority/ municipal authorities with larger operating units.

Key points

- Social services sector is a rapidly growing sector contributing to social and economic value in many countries although this is not systematically measured in all European countries
- Social services are labour intensive activities and there is a growing demand for workers with problems of recruitment and retention
- The majority of workers are women and low paid, often working part-time
- Much of the labour force is aged 40+
- Social services sector is fragmented with a majority of small sized enterprises in for-profit and not-for-profit sectors
- Expansion of competition and entry of the for-profit sector
- Decline of public/ government provision in many countries

3. Social dialogue in the social services sector

3.1 Understanding of social dialogue

Although the 25 countries in the PESSIS/ PESSIS 2/ PESSIS 3/PESSIS + Projects show that there are national differences in the definitions and arrangements for social dialogue, there are also some strong similarities between countries in that there is some form of dialogue between employers and employees that affects the social services sector in each country. As a way of explaining the incidence of social dialogue in the social services sector, the analysis of social dialogue will draw on definitions and arrangements at a wider national level, which set the context for social dialogue in the social services sector. This analysis will deal with the 25 study countries in four groups:

1. Well established social dialogue structures - Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands
2. No formal social dialogue structures but existing employer/employee agreements - Finland, Italy, Scotland, Sweden, UK
3. Newly established social dialogue structures (post-1990) – Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia
4. Recently reformed social dialogue structures – Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain.

Before the discussion of collective bargaining arrangements in these three groups, the representativity of the employers and employees will be discussed in relation to these four groups of countries (Table 5, 6, 7, 8).

Table 5: Representativity in countries with well-developed social dialogue systems

Country	Employers' representative associations	Workers/ trade unions
Austria	<i>SozialwirtschaftOsterreich</i> (2012) largest professional association of employers Caritas, Diakonia & Red Cross and Vorarlberg employer association of social and health services and 10 other employer associations	Union of Public Services Union of Municipal Employers Trade union of private employees (GPA-DJP) Vida
Belgium	UNIPSO (<i>Union des entreprises à profit social: Wallonia</i>) UNISOC (<i>Union des entreprises à profit social: national level</i>) VERSO (<i>Vereniging voor Social Profit Ondernemingen: Flanders</i>) CBENM (<i>Confédération Bruxelloise des Entreprises Non Marchandes: Brussels</i>) Sectoral member federations of UNIPSO An organization representative of social profit sector employers may be appointed as an expert and mandated by the public authority... thereby 'qualifying' it to be part of its delegation. In this way, the organization representing employers fully partakes in the process of employer/worker consultation	Trade unions and government 'public purse' funder
Denmark	<i>Kommunernes Landsforening</i> (KL – Local Government Denmark) represents the municipalities, whereas the regions are represented by <i>Danske Regioner</i> .	<i>Børne- og Ungdomspædagogernes Landsorganisation (BUPL)</i> <i>Dansk Socialrådgiverforening</i> <i>FOA – Fag og Arbejde</i> <i>Socialpædagogerne</i> <i>Dansk Sygeplejeråd</i> Together these form <i>Forhandlingsfællesskabet</i> (the negotiation alliance) for collective bargaining negotiations
France	Social and health associate branch (BASS) A new confederation bringing together: FEHAP, UNICANCER, NEXEM (+ French Red Cross) <u>Care at home</u> USB Domicile	<u>Health, social and medico-social non-profit organisations (2017)</u> <u>- La Confédération française démocratique du travail (CFDT) ;</u> <u>- La Confédération générale du travail (CGT) ;</u> <u>- La Confédération générale du travail-Force ouvrière (CGT-FO) ;</u> <u>- L'Union syndicale Solidaires (SOLIDAIRES).</u> <u>Care of children at home</u>

		<p><u>Syndicat professionnel des assistants maternels et assistants familiaux (SPAMAF);</u> <u>Confédération des Syndicats d'Assistants Familiaux et d'Assistants Maternels (CSAFAM);</u> <u>L'Union nationale des syndicats autonomes (UNSA);</u> <u>Confédération générale du travail (CGT).</u></p> <p><u>Social and family services (not at home)</u> <u>Confédération française démocratique du travail (CFDT);</u> <u>Confédération générale du travail (CGT);</u> <u>Confédération générale du travail-Force ouvrière (CGT-FO);</u> <u>Confédération française des travailleurs chrétiens (CFTC).</u></p>
Germany	8 Employers - Caritas, Diakonia, ZWST, AWO, German Red Cross, DPWW, Public providers VKA, private providers bpa	Ver.di
Luxembourg	<p>Confederation of care and social services providers COPAS (<i>Confédération des organismes prestataires d'aides et de soins</i>), the largest organization in the sector, represents social services providers who deliver assistance and care services to the elderly, sick, mentally ill or disabled, whether at home or in institutions.</p> <p>FEDAS Luxembourg, formerly known as the "Agreement of Managers of Reception Centres" (EGCA), was created in 1977 by twelve NGOs (associations), operating in the sector</p> <p><i>L'Entente des Gestionnaires des Maisons de Jeunes</i> (EGMJ) (Youth House Managers Agreement) is the third organisation of employers' in the sector</p>	<p>The Health, Social and Educational Services Union of the OGBL is, at the national level, the largest organization of employees in the health sector, the aid and care sector and the social sector.</p> <p>The second federation is part of LCGB - Health, Care & Socio-Educational¹ (<i>Santé, Soins & Socio-éducatif</i>). The professional federation is made up of nurses, nursing aids, midwives, etc. and is committed to improving working conditions as well as fair remuneration</p>
The Netherlands	<p>Employers: Disabilities</p> <p>Dutch Association of Health care Providers for People with Disabilities (VGN) is the employer organisation 162 members Also a trade organisation called <i>MEE Nederland</i>. Based on membership, the VGN comprises 95.6 percent of the branch and <i>MEE Nederland</i>, 2.1 percent</p> <p>Employers: <u>Elderly</u></p> <p><i>ActiZ with 415 members</i>, which represents 73 percent of the nursing homes,</p>	<p>Trade unions</p> <p>Disabilities</p> <p><i>Abvakabo FNV, CNV PubliekeZaak, NU'91 and FBZ</i></p> <p><u>Elderly</u></p> <p><i>Abvakabo FNV, CNV PubliekeZaak, NU'91 and FBZ.</i></p>

¹ <https://lrgb.lu/structure/fachverbände-und-branchen/sante-soins-socio-educatif/news-gesundheit-pflege-sozioedukative-berufe/>

	<p>retirement homes and home-care providers and <i>BranchebelangThuiszorg (BTN)</i> (home-care branch advocacy group) is a smaller employer organisation for entrepreneurs in home care and postnatal care; it has 90 members. Employers: <u>Childcare</u> <i>BrancheorganisatieKinderopvang (Branch Organisation for Child Care)</i> is the only national employer organisation responsible for child care and has well over 1,100 members, representing 80 % total employment in the branch.</p>	<p><u>Childcare</u> <i>Abvakabo FNV, CNV PubliekeZaak and Vakbond de Unie</i></p>
--	--	---

Table 6: Representativity in countries with dialogue between employer and employees

Country	Employers representative associations	Workers/ trade unions
Finland	Employers – municipalities & communities of municipalities (public and private),	Union of Health & Social Care Services (Tehyry) and Finnish Union of Practical Nurses (Super ry)
Italy	Public sector - Social Policy Departments Forum NFP sector: <i>Federsolidarieta Confcooperativa; AGCI Solidarieta; Legacoop sociale</i>	Three main trade unions: CGIL, FP CGIL, FILCAMS CGIL; CISL, FISASCTA CISL; UIL, UIL FPL, UIL TUCS
Scotland	Coalition of Care & Support Providers (vol. sector employers – company level) Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) – involved in negotiations Scottish Care (independent providers) – not negotiate but on government consultation groups and Scottish Child-minding Association –not involved in negotiations	3 Trade unions: Unison, Unite, GMB
Sweden	Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions; KFO; <i>Almega Tjänsteföretagen; SKL (SALAR); Vårdföretagarna; Arbetsgivaralliansen; KFS; SKL/PACTA; the Cooperative Employers Association</i>	Swedish Municipal Workers Union; National Union of Teachers in Sweden; Kommunal, Vision and SSR
United Kingdom	Local Government Association in England, Wales and Northern Ireland; Convention of Scottish Authorities (COSLA) in Scotland. No employers organisations for for-profit or not-for-profit sectors	UNISON, Unite, GMB

Table 7: Representativity in countries with newly established social dialogue structures (post-1990)

Country	Employers	Employees
Bulgaria	No representative employers' organization	Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Governmental Organisations (FITUGO); Union of Administrative Employees (PK Admin); Federation of Trade Unions –Health Services (FTU-HS) Medical Federation "Podkrepa" (MF PODK)
Czech Republic	Union of Employers' Associations (38 Associations with 6 Social Services Associations) Organisations of social services providers: Czech Association of Social Home Care; Association of Advisory Places; Czech Council of Social Services; Czech Association streetwork; Union of Asylum Houses.	Trade Union in Health and Social Care
Hungary	General Directorate of Social and Child Protection (SZGYF) National Association of Local Government of Settlements (TOOSZ) Association of Towns with County Status (MJVSZ)	Democratic trade union of Nursery Workers (BDDSZ); Trade Union of Hungarian Civil Servants, Public Employees and Public Servants (MKKSZ); Teachers Union (PSZ)
Latvia	Union of Local Governments but no social dialogue in the social services sector in Latvia	Social services workers can join the following trade unions: Trade Union of Local Governments, Trade Union of Employees of State Institutions, Local governments and Finance Sector, the Latvian Health and Social Care Workers Trade Union or the Latvian Medical Treatment and Care Workers Union and others.
Lithuania	Association of Local Authorities, Association of Key Personnel and social care Institutions for Lithuanian Elderly and Disabled People and the Association of Lithuanian Child Care Institutions,	Lithuanian Trade Union (TU) for Social Institution Workers; Republican Consolidated TU, Lithuanian Union of Social Workers; Lithuanian Union of Civil Servants; Lithuanian TU of Education (Association of Child Care Homes TU); Lithuanian Federation of Public Services Unions; Lithuanian TU League; Lithuanian Union of Health Care Workers; Lithuanian Union of Nursing & Social Care Workers (Solidarumas).
Poland	Local Government Association of Social Welfare Centres (FORUM); National Association of County and Municipal Family Assistance Centres (CENTRUM); National Association of Municipal Social Welfare Centres (RAZEM)	NSZZ <i>Solidarnosc</i> (Solidarity) National Section of Social Assistance Workers; Health and Social A
Romania	National Confederation of Romanian Patronage; National Council of Romanian Patronage	Sanitas, FNS ProAsist, Federation of Personal Assistants of Persons with Disabilities, National Trade Union Confederation CARTEL ALFA, National Free Trade Union Confederation FRATIA
Slovakia	Higher Municipal Authority; Slovak Union of Town and Village Municipalities; Association of Slovak Higher Level Hospitals; Association of Slovak Public Hospitals	Confederation of Trade Unions of Slovak Republic (KOZ); Slovak Trade Union of Health and Human Services (SOZZaSS)

Slovenia	Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs (MOLFSA); Association of Social Institutions of Slovenia (not represented in social dialogue at national level)	The Confederation of Trade Unions of Slovenia PERGAM
----------	---	--

Table 8: Representativity in countries with recently reformed social dialogue structures

Country	Employers' associations	Trade unions
Greece	Main employers: the Hellenic Association of Private Kindergartens (PASIPS) and PEMFI (Hellenic Union of Nursing and Care Homes)	Trade unions - GSEE (General Confederation of Greek Workers); OIYE(Federation of Private Sector Employees of Greece); OSNIE (Federation of Hospital Institutions Associations of Greece); SKLE (Association of Social Workers of Greece); Association of Employees working in private kindergartens of Athens-Piraeus and suburbs
Ireland	Public employers, state authorities and IBEC – Irish Business and Employer Confederation National Federation of Voluntary Bodies -62 member organisations; Community Sector Employers Forum; Not-for-Profit Business Association; Disability Federation of Ireland represents disability issues and 127 members in civil society dialogue	SIPTU IMPACT Irish Nurses & Midwives Association UNITE facilitated by Labour Relations Commission
Portugal	Portuguese Union of Charities/ Misericordias (UMP) National Confederation of Solidarity Institutions (CNIS) Portuguese Union of Mutual Associations	General Confederation of Portuguese Workers –National Inter-Union and the General Union of Workers
Spain	Most representative employers organizations in the sector - Collective bargaining for social action: OEIS, AEEISSS and AESAP, with a representation percentage of 27.5% each; FAIS and APAES: with a 7% representation; AEFYME: with 3.5%. No social dialogue between social services employers/ employees but several organisations recently set up: Third Sector Platform, created in early 2012, made up by 7 large Third Sector organizations (Social Action and Intervention and People with Disabilities) - aims to talk directly to the government but does not have the legal status of an employers' organization; 'Dependency System Consulting Committee' set up, although the organizations(general/ national level); Disability Patronage (2012) State Council of Non-Governmental Social action Organizations	Most representative trade unions, e.g. Federation of Health Sectors and Socio-Sanitary Sectors of the Trade Union Confederation of Workers' Commissions (<i>Federación de Sanidad y Sectores Sociosanitarios</i> , FSSS-CCOO); Federation of Public Services of the General Workers' Confederation (<i>Federación de Servicios Públicos</i> , FSP-UGT)

3.2 Representativity

In countries where there is a strong system of social dialogue in the social services sector, there are several examples of well-established organisations representing employers. In the Netherlands, each branch dealing with people working with disabilities, older people and children has a single large organisation representing the majority of employers but smaller representative employers' organisations also exist alongside. In contrast, one of the main problems confronting the social services sector in Germany is the lack of a unifying organisation for not-for profit employers. This lack of employers' organisations is a problem facing many Central and Eastern European countries. Appendix A shows the main trade union and employers' organisations at national level for all the countries covered by the PESSIS project.

There have been recent changes in some representative organisations, which have often involved the merging of existing structures and the creation of a single new structure. In France, the process of drawing together larger employers to form a single agency started in the 1990s. In Austria, a single employer organisation, *SozialwirtschaftOsterreich* was created in 2012.

In the United Kingdom, the Local Government Association is the public sector employer for England, Wales and Northern Ireland and in Scotland, the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) acts as an employer organisation in collective agreement negotiations, which impact on the social services sector. In addition, there are several alliances of independent providers of elderly care and the child-minding Association which are consulted on government policies but do not take part in collective bargaining. In Spain, although there is no social dialogue in the social services sector but there are employers' organisations for related sectors, e.g. social action.

One of the main issues facing the development of social dialogue in the social services sector in Europe is the weakness of employers' organisations. In countries of Central and Eastern Europe, there is a lack of employers' organisations. In Bulgaria and Latvia, there is no single employers' organisation and in other countries this type of organisation is under-developed. In other countries employers are often fragmented. In Latvia, social dialogue does not exist in the social services sector. Table 9 shows the types of groupings that underpin employers' representativity in many European countries.

Table 9: Types of employers' organisations

Sector	Types of groupings
Public	Representing municipal authority providers; sub-sector, e.g. older people, people with disabilities, childcare
Not-for-profit	Voluntary organisations; faith-based organisations; sub-sector, e.g. child care; social enterprises
For-profit	Types of service e.g. associations of nursing homes, kindergartens; sub-

	sector, e.g. older care.
--	--------------------------

From a trade union perspective, several trade unions represent workers in almost all the social services sectors and so can appear fragmented. Trade union coverage varies from country to country. Although unionisation in public sector social services is high in Finland, Ireland, Sweden, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, it is much lower in the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors in almost all countries.

There are some organisational responses to the financial crisis which suggest that new structures may be evolving to address the specific problems of the social services sector. In France, sixteen organisations of professionals and users (Partnership of 16) have grouped together to raise awareness of situation. There is a new agreement between the Partnership of 16 and the Assembly of Deputies of France which aims to clarify contractual relationships between domestic aid associations and general councils and to implement new methods of setting tariffs. There is also a move towards a single health and social associative branch convention. In Spain, the national economic crisis has resulted in the creation of new organisations, for example the Third Sector Platform, which are bringing together not-for-profit organisations in the social services sector, initially to raise awareness and lobby for action.

3.3 Well defined social dialogue structures

Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands have well defined social dialogue structures, which have influenced their social and economic development over many decades. The main differences lie in the role of the state which varies from state as a key player in tri-partite arrangement to that of regulator and final arbiter.

Austria has a system of social partnership which is based '*on the belief that conflicts of interest can be solved through dialogue and that there can be a balancing of economic and social interests through compromise*' (Österreichische Gesellschaft für Umwelt und Technik, 2012). There is a system of works councils at company level for enterprises with more than five employees. Although social dialogue agreements are voluntary and informal, legislation determines which specific interest groups and professional organisations can actually negotiate agreements. There is a collective agreement which covers the whole of the health sector, social services, disability, child and youth welfare services and labour market services.

Belgium has a well defined social dialogue system that addresses key issues in each sector and reaches agreement in labour law. Representativeness is defined by law with different terms for employers' and workers' organisations. The social dialogue system is organised at national, regional, local and commune levels. Government plays a key role in representing the public authority that defines the terms of negotiations and funding. In the social profit sector, joint committees and sub-committees cover the following sectors: home help and elderly care services, enterprises and 'sheltered' workshops employing the disabled, social welfare, and the non-market sector.

Employers' organisations are formally recognised as representative by the national administration and are represented on these committees. As public authorities are funders of the social profit sector, negotiations are tri-partite. Most social profit companies/ enterprises are represented in these structures and non-market agreements have developed. Once these have been signed, committees negotiate collective labour agreements.

In Denmark, social dialogue builds on a 100 year-old tradition of collective bargaining. The system is essentially a voluntary one with little legislation. Social dialogue is part of the Danish labour market model. There is mutual recognition between the two social partners but there is no legislation determining representativity. Collective bargaining in relation to wages and working time are conducted at the sectoral and the company levels interlinked in a centralised decentralisation system. The *Medindflydelse* (MED) system of co-decision or involvement in decisions operates in workplaces and in occupational health and safety. Local flexibility and trust are two elements which contribute to a functioning social dialogue.

In France, the state plays a key role in defining and organising social dialogue and has recently tried to reform social dialogue with changes to systems of representation for workers. Social dialogue is negotiated between the state, employers' organisations and trade unions. Social services social dialogue is subject to the collective approval of conventions and agreements by the state. The social services sector is covered by three 'branches': social and health, domestic help and social and family. Although there is a recognised social dialogue structure for social services at branch levels, the social services social dialogue partners are not recognised in the national social dialogue plan.

In Germany, the social dialogue system is arranged by different economic sectors/ industries and employers and employees negotiate collective agreements, which determine working conditions and wages. Works committees represent worker interests at company level. The Ministry of the Economy declares wage agreements legally binding. In the social services sector, there is no overall representative organisation that draws together the six not-for profit providers, which results in uneven coverage of negotiations. As the funding of social services is partly from public funds, budget cuts are making pay negotiations difficult. In this sense the government plays a role in the negotiations as funder.

In Luxembourg, there is a highly developed social dialogue system operating in a country which has a well-funded social services system. 100% of employees are covered by collective bargaining and social dialogue. However, trade unions feel that there is an unresolved issue of work organization and working time arrangements, including on-call work. Another issue has been the difference in pay / terms and conditions between residential care home workers and hospital workers with hospital workers on higher pay rates. This has been resolved by paying care home workers the higher Hospital Collective Labour Agreement (CLA) rates until retirement.

In the Netherlands, the term social dialogue is used to cover more than negotiations between employers and employees and includes other forms of negotiation, consultation and information gathering. Other stakeholders, for example academics, may be involved in consultations. Social dialogue between social partners involved in the care of the disabled, the elderly and in child care takes place in the Netherlands on four different levels: national, by the health and welfare sector, at the branch level and within the facilities. The Dutch Collective Labour Agreement Act (1927) regulates the groups who are allowed to negotiate collective bargaining agreements and those who are bound to the agreements. There are three collective agreements that cover the social services sector, covering disability care, services for older people and childcare.

In these seven countries which have well established social dialogue systems, the social services sector has either specific arrangements or is covered by wider social dialogue or collective bargaining agreements. However, there are signs that even where there are well defined social dialogue arrangements there are difficulties in the social services sector which are the result of a lack of representation and reductions in the funding of services within the sector. France has been trying to reform social dialogue through changes to employee representation and although a social dialogue operates within the social services sector, the social services partners are not recognised in the national social dialogue plan. Germany faces difficulties because of a lack of representative not-for profit employers' organisations at federal level.

3.4 Employer-employee dialogue

Finland, Italy, Sweden and the United Kingdom all have structures that provide for some dialogue between employers and employees but there are some significant differences in the strength and effectiveness of these arrangements, especially in the light of recent financial crises. None of this group of countries use the term '*social dialogue*' but all countries have well developed collective bargaining arrangements for the public sector established through systems of industrial relations, supported by legislation. In Finland, negotiations between employers from public and for-profit sectors, trade unions and the government take place regularly with the government promising the '*common good*' for contracted parties. Public social services comply with municipal collective agreements. For-profit social services comply with collective agreements of the for-profit social services sector.

In Italy, in the early 2000s government and social partners signed the first National Collective Labour Agreement (CCNL), which is recognized as the main employment regulatory and negotiation tool between companies and workers. It is the regulatory act which defines all rules to be implemented within a sector for collective bargaining. However the NCLN is not valid for the organisations which are not represented at the negotiating table and this affects the social services sector. Social cooperatives are obliged to implement the CCNL. There are nine collective agreements in the social services charitable sector and 40 in social services sector.

In Scotland, the public sector has a well established system of industrial relations which draws public sector employers and trade unions together in negotiations. Although there are no nationally negotiated agreements for the social services sector, it is covered by collective agreements in the NHS (health service) and local authority sectors. There is a less well-established system of collective bargaining for the for-profit sector, which is voluntary and decentralised and operates at the company level. Small for-profit and not-for-profit organisations are considered '*not big enough for collective bargaining*'.

In Sweden, social dialogue is part of the 'Swedish model' with different collective agreements and is regulated by law. Social dialogue is considered to consist of three parts: the bargaining of collective agreements; influence on political decisions and; long term support of good dialogue between employers and employees. Collective agreements cover the conditions of employment as well as the general relationship between employer and employee.

In the United Kingdom, the term social dialogue is not used although there is a recognized system of collective bargaining between the local government/municipal sector and public sector trade unions, for example, UNISON, Unite and the GMB. However, as the majority of social services workers are employed in the for-profit or not-for-profit sector, a large part of the workforce is not covered by collective agreements.

3.5 Newly established social dialogue structures (post 1990)

Central and Eastern European countries set up formal social dialogue structures after 1990. In Bulgaria, a National Council for Tripartite Cooperation was set up in 1993. Social services social dialogue is discussed at national level by the National Council for Tripartite Cooperation and at the Sectoral Council for Tripartite Cooperation in health care, which discusses laws and regulations affecting facilities for social care for children, crèches and older people. At the Municipal Councils for Social Cooperation, labour market issues, social policy, social services and municipal budgets are discussed. Social dialogue in the Agency for Social Assistance (ASA) is institutionalised through a Council for Social Cooperation which has representatives of two trade union federations and the employer (Director of ASA).

In the Czech Republic, social dialogue is not legally defined because it seen as a constant process. The Council of Social and Economic Agreement is a voluntary and consultative body of trade unions, employers' organisations and the state and was set up in 1990. Social dialogue in the social services sector at national level is a tri-partite arrangement between the Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs, the Union of Employers' Associations and the Trade Union in health and social care. As a local level, there is social dialogue between the trade union and employer.

In Hungary in 1990 a new system of dialogue was set up with the creation of the National Council for the Reconciliation of Interests, which drew together

the main trade union federations, the employers' organisations and government in a tripartite system of dialogue. It set wages and defined annual wage increases. In 2011, the National Economic and Social Council (NGTT) was set up by the Orban government, with a wider range of stakeholders. The following year, in 2012, the Consultation Forum of the Competitive Sector was set up with a reduced trade union and employer presence and although it consults on aspects of government policy there is no right of consent. Although social dialogue in the wider economy has been reduced, in the public sector, social dialogue has survived through the use of the National Council for the Reconciliation of Interests but the number of agreements has declined.

Satversme - the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia (1922) - determines the right of everyone to form and join associations, political parties and other public organisations and the right of employed persons to a collective labour agreement. The Employers' Confederation of Latvia (founded in 1998), which represents employers, and the Free Trade Union Confederation of Latvia (founded in 1993), which represents employees, are the parties of the social dialogue in the National Tripartite Cooperation Council (founded in 1998). Employers' Confederation of Latvia (ECL) employs 44% of Latvian employees, bringing together 112 industry leaders – companies with more than 50 employees, 64 industry and regional business associations and federations, and over 5,000 companies, of which 3,036 are micro and small enterprises. Even with these national social dialogue structures, there are no social service employers or their associations among ECL members. Social services workers can join one of several trade unions but there is no social dialogue in the social services sector.

In Lithuania, the Tripartite Council of the Republic of Lithuania was set up in 1995 and covers government administrations, trade unions and employers' organisations. Although social services employers are organized into three main groups: e.g. Association of Local Authorities, Association of Key Personnel and social care Institutions for Lithuanian Elderly and Disabled People and the Association of Lithuanian Child Care Institutions, not all of these representatives take part in social dialogue at national level. In 2013, the government launched a 'Promotion of Social Dialogue' for the whole of the Lithuanian economy and of the six completed projects, one was orientated towards the social services sector.

Poland set up the Tripartite Commission for Social and Economic Affairs, similar to Bulgaria, Czech Republic and Lithuania, in 1994. It provided a forum for social dialogue between the government, employers and trade union organisations. In 2013, all three representative trade unions suspended their participation because of the government's changes to the Labour Code, which have introduced flexible working hours and had been made without adequate consultation. Social dialogue in the social services is weak because of the poor state of social dialogue in Poland, little interest in social policy, over-regulation, problems with the financing of social welfare institutions and low levels of unionization.

A social dialogue law was passed in Romania in 2011 (law no 62/2011). Social dialogue operates through a series of social dialogue committees at central and local government levels. Tripartite dialogue which includes the government takes place through the National Tripartite Council for Social Dialogue. The requirement for representativity, minimum 15 members employed by the same unit and 50% plus 1 from the employees of the same unit makes it difficult for trade unions to gain recognition because the majority of small / medium sized enterprises have between 5 and 26 employees.

Slovakia also has a form of tripartite dialogue with trade unions, employers and government working together. There are local, sectoral and national level social dialogue. The state operates as the employer in social dialogue negotiations and also has a regulatory function.

In Slovenia, there is a recognised system for social dialogue that operates at national level. Social partners cooperate at national level through the Economic and Social Council and discuss industrial relations, conditions of work, labour legislation as well as broader issues affecting workers; employers and government policy. However social services partners and not-for profit organisations are not directly involved in the Economic and Social Council and this affects the quality of dialogue in the social services sector. At the moment, this impacts on negotiations over pay for social services workers and the interests of users. The Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs (MOLPSA) represents both interests of users and workers but the interests of users dominate in negotiations. This problem is attributed to the lack of influence of social services employers at national level.

In countries of Eastern and Central Europe, new social dialogue arrangements were set up after 1990 but the functioning of these systems is still hindered by several factors. There is a lack of representativity of employers and employees in some countries. Even when there are social dialogue arrangements for the social services sector, social partners are not always represented in the national social dialogue structures. Governments play an important role in tri-partite social dialogue arrangements.

3.6 Recently reformed social dialogue structures

Ireland, Greece, Portugal and Spain have all undergone labour reforms as a result of their financial crises but each country exhibits some form of social dialogue. In Ireland, the term 'civil dialogue' is used rather than 'social dialogue' but the financial crisis led to the creation of the Public Services Agreement 2010-14 (The Croke Park Agreement) which was negotiated after extensive consultation with social partners, who included public employers, trade unions and state authorities. This was replaced by the Public Service Stability Agreement 2013-2016 (Haddington Road Agreement) between the Government and the public service unions, and sets some pay and productivity measures to be implemented in the public sector until 2016.

In Greece, there have been attempts to organise social dialogue at national level and within the social services sector. The Greek Economic and Social

Council (OKE) attempted to conduct an organized social dialogue. Both the public sector and the private sector unions of the social services sector have contributed to enhancing the social dialogue as well as other key NGOs. However recent labour legislation was passed without consultation with the social partners and has resulted in the destruction of an industrial relations system built up over the last 50 years.

In Spain, there are arrangements for social dialogue in several sectors between employers, trade unions and government or public administrations and the term is interpreted as being collective bargaining. Depending on the issues under discussion, these arrangements can be extended to associations, organizations or interest groups although they are not legally binding. There is no social dialogue between social sector employers, trade unions and government at the moment although there are collective agreements that cover workers in the elderly care sector in home care and institutional homes and for workers working with people disabilities in a wide range of services and activities. Workers with children are also covered by a collective agreement but are currently subject to a court action as to whether this should be part of a collective agreement covering Social Action and Intervention. There is a lack of private sector participation and a lack of representativity of employers which impedes negotiations for national collective agreements.

In Spain, although there are a set of collective agreements that cover the social services sector, recent labour reforms (Labour Market Law 2012) allow stakeholders/ social partners to withdraw from national collective agreements and negotiate agreements at company level. The impact of this law will be influenced by the actions of the individual companies and enterprises and the extent to which they abandon national level agreements.

In Portugal has legislation which sets out a series of agreements made between employers' associations and trade unions, which may be company agreements, sector and multi-employer agreements and sector and multi-employer contracts. The social services sector has recently agreed a company collective agreement, a collective and multi-employers agreement and a collective and multi-employer contract. These cover pay, working time and careers. Social economy organisations sign 'models of agreement' which provide some collective bargaining coverage.

This analysis of the 25 case study countries shows there is some evidence of social dialogue in the social services sector even if the systems are not well defined or different terms are used. What is common to all countries is some form of collective agreement, informed by a basic negotiation between employers and employees. In several countries, collective agreements are negotiated directly for all or part of the social services sector. In other countries, wider collective bargaining arrangements cover the sector. The next section will analyse the content of the existing collective bargaining agreements that apply to the social services sector.

Key points

- Social services sector often covered by a range of employers' organisations and more than one trade union
- Some form of dialogue between employers and employees in all countries, except Latvia
- Seven countries with well-developed social dialogue systems but differences in role played by state
- Five countries with some form of dialogue ranging from well developed collective bargaining based on legislation, to less well defined agreements covering fewer issues
- Eight countries with newly developed social dialogue systems provide some coverage but often limited coverage for social services
- Four countries has recently reformed social dialogue systems
- Evidence that some existing arrangements are threatened by lack of recognition of social services partners
- The role of the state is becoming increasingly significant in social dialogue in the social services sector in both positive and negative ways
- Budgets cuts are leading to new alliances

4. Collective bargaining in the social services sector

All of the 25 countries have some form of collective bargaining agreements covering all or part of the social services sector (Table 9). There are significant differences in terms of coverage of the workforce, coverage of different sectors and the range of labour issues included in each collective agreement. This is an important starting point for future negotiations between employers and employees and for the development of any future social dialogue.

4.1 Types of issues covered

The content of the collective agreements reflects, to some extent, the nature and quality of the negotiations that inform them. All of the collective agreements cover wages and many include working conditions but several only cover basic wage negotiations, for example, Greece. In contrast, several countries with well-developed collective agreements cover employer/employee relations, contracts, working hours, holidays and other absences, training, and trade union rights, for example, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden.

As well as analysing collective agreements in terms of the issues and terms covered, there are several other factors that need to be taken into account when assessing them. The age and maturity of the arrangements have an important influence on the process of negotiations. The collective bargaining arrangements of several countries, for example, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, are determined by legislation which is at least 40 years old. An established industrial relations system can inform the way in which relationships between employers and employees are managed. However,

industrial relations systems are not static arrangements and have been subject to change in recent decades.

4.2 Coverage

One of the factors that can influence the strength of an industrial relations system is the extent of the unionisation of the workforce and the inclusion of employers in the agreements. Coverage of a collective bargaining arrangement is one of the most important factors in assessing its value to the sector. Austria, Finland, Luxembourg and the Netherlands have some of the highest levels of coverage. Austria has 95% coverage or 90,000 workers. In Finland, 84.7% of municipal workers are unionised and municipal collective agreements cover public social services. Luxembourg, a much smaller country, has 100% coverage. In the Netherlands collective bargaining arrangements cover all workers in the sector.

Several other countries show a more limited coverage. In Germany, 32% of enterprises and 52% of employees are covered by industry wage agreements and 5% of enterprises and 11% of employees covered by house/company wage agreements. Perhaps more significantly 63% of enterprises and 37% of employees work without any involvement in collective agreements. In Italy, there are only 9 larger National Collective Labour Agreement which represent social health care and educational departments in public, private and not-for-profit organisations. In the United Kingdom, there are collective bargaining agreements that cover public sector/ local authority workers but there are few collective bargaining agreements that cover specifically social services workers.

Coverage in Central/ Eastern Europe is much lower with Bulgaria having 25% coverage and Czech Republic and Poland have coverage of less than 20%. In the Czech Republic, about 200 out of a total of 2,500 social services providers have a collective agreement. In Lithuania, there are 11 collective agreements which cover social care homes. In Romania, 46% of public social services employers have collective agreements, 22% do not have any collective agreements and about 20% are currently being negotiated. In Hungary most collective bargaining takes place at company level with a single employer. Coverage in Slovakia is affected by the poor financing of social services and the lack of any long-term financing arrangements because they undermine any collective bargaining for wages and working conditions. In the majority of countries, the coverage of workers in the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors is much less than in the public sector.

4.3 Changes

There have been some recent changes in the collective bargaining arrangements that cover part or all of part of the social services sector, reflecting some of the changes taking place in the sector.

In Austria, it took six years, from 1997-2003, to unify all the collective bargaining agreements for the health and social services sector and there are still problems in relation to wage systems. In the Netherlands, a merger of collective agreements in the nursing/ retirement homes and home care took

place between 2008 and 2010 but attempts to renegotiate the collective agreement covering child care workers have not been successful yet because of budget cuts.

In France, there have been negotiations over the past two years to revise 66 collective agreements for the social and health associate branch but these have been inconclusive. Also in France, a new collective agreement to cover workers providing services to the individual, was signed in January 2012 but immediately deemed inapplicable by the trade unions.

4.4 Independence of partners

The independence of partners in the negotiation processes has an influence on the effectiveness of collective agreements. In several countries there are carefully defined arrangements which determine which parties/ organisations can negotiate for employers and employees and these players have recognised bargaining power, for example Belgium, the Netherlands. The social partners are often recognised in legislation or have to be approved by government to take part in social dialogue and collective bargaining negotiations.

In other countries, such as France, the state plays a strong role in creating and influencing the social dialogue process and the collective bargaining process. In Central/ Eastern Europe, new systems of social dialogue were set up after 1990. Some of these new structures are not yet fully functioning with a lack of employer representation in Bulgaria and Latvia and fragmented trade unions in Latvia, Poland and Slovakia.

4.5 Role of state

In several countries the role of the state as a funder of social services has an influence on the collective bargaining process and in some cases negatively. In Finland, the government plays a role of looking after the '*common good*' through employment laws, social policy reforms and tax relief. In Belgium, the government, as the public authority funding social enterprises, is involved in the tri-partite negotiations with employers and employees. In Luxembourg the majority of funding for social services comes from the state with a continued expansion of the long-term care insurance budget.

In countries of Central/ Eastern Europe, the state is part of tripartite social dialogue negotiations at national level. The dominant role of government in the funding of social services also gives it a strong influence in the social services sector. With budget reductions, this has influenced collective bargaining negotiations. The Lithuanian government recently limited wage increases. The Slovak government is unable to solve the long term problems of funding the social services sector which weakens collective bargaining.

The use of public procurement processes in the social services sector is making collective bargaining more difficult. In Austria, as a result of the public procurement process and the role of the state in the payment of social

services, the state is only willing to pay for the cheapest wages. This restricts the capacity of the social partners (employers/ employees) to negotiate. In Scotland, the absence of a regulatory framework for public procurement, combined with cuts to budgets makes negotiations between public sector employers and trade unions problematic. In Bulgaria, Germany, Lithuania, Slovakia, budget cuts have made wage negotiations difficult.

Spain and Greece have reformed the existing collective bargaining structures, with the introduction of company/ firm level collective bargaining, which has created a fragmented system. A new government in Portugal is starting to encourage social dialogue but the social economy sector does not always fit into a single employer-worker relationship, with workers playing a dual role of employee and employer.

Table 9: Analysis of collective bargaining agreements

CA = Collective agreement; CLA = Collective labour agreement

Country	Collective agreements	Wages/ salaries / allowances	Working conditions/ arrangements / patterns	Annual leave & other types of leave	Training provision/ Supervision/ professional development	Contracts/ Terms of employment	Health & safety	Union recognition/ consultation
Austria	BAGS 2012	YES	YES		YES			
Belgium		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Bulgaria	CA in health sector; Municipal CA for crèche workers and social services workers ; branch CAs in Social Assistance Agency	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Czech Republic	Collective Bargaining Act	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
Denmark	Collective Bargaining at sectoral and local level – based on voluntarism	YES including equal pay	YES	YES	YES & new technology	YES	YES	
Finland	Municipal general CA, CA of private social services	YES	YES	YES				
France	National conventions – 1) disabilities 2) domestic aid 3) social/family, young children	YES	YES					
Germany	3 types settlement: wages; skeleton; single issue	YES (some minimum wages)	YES	YES				
Greece	PASIPS	YES		YES	YES			
	PEMFI	YES						
Hungary	Collective agreement company level	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES
Ireland	Public Service Agreement 2010-14 (Croke Park Agreement)	YES	YES					

4.6 Correlation of social dialogue & collective bargaining

In Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, there is a strong correlation between the system of social dialogue and the system of collective bargaining. In Denmark and the Netherlands, there is a long tradition of collective labour agreements as well as social dialogue. There is some evidence to show that legislation is important in establishing systems of social dialogue and collective bargaining but this has to be supported by a political commitment to widen collective bargaining coverage. The attempts to negotiate new collective agreements can be interpreted as a system that is attempting to deal with a changing situation within the social services sector.

In France, although there are recognised and functioning systems of social dialogue and collective bargaining, the social services employer organisations are not part of the national social dialogue plan. Similarly, in Slovenia, social services employers are not part of the national social dialogue structure. Germany has a recognised system of social dialogue and collective bargaining but the structure of the social services sector and lack of representative organisations for not-for-profit employers makes the system dysfunctional, although there are signs that this may be changing.

In Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Slovakia new social dialogue structures were set up after 1990 but often lack commitment and appropriate organisational structures to function effectively. Collective bargaining arrangements are dominated by the state which is an integral part of a tri-partite system of social dialogue at national level. For example, in Romania, most collective bargaining is done at company level. Collective bargaining agreements of the public social services, although covering rights and obligations of the employer and promoting fair labour relations, only set minimum standards on rights and obligations. Promises of free medical tests, for example HIV, can impose on the privacy of the workers. The trend towards company level collective bargaining results in a more fragmented and weaker collective bargaining coverage.

4.7 Reactions to financial crisis

The social services sector is directly affected by the austerity programmes that have been introduced in response to the financial crisis in Europe. In Germany and the Netherlands, budget cuts contribute to making negotiations about collective agreements difficult to resolve. In Ireland, social partners are disaffected with the existing collective agreement. In Spain, new labour reforms are threatening the existence of national collective bargaining agreements with a possible move towards company level collective bargaining. In Poland, there has been a breakdown of the social dialogue process because trade unions were unwilling to negotiate with government after changes in the Labour Code increased employment flexibility. In Portugal, the financial crisis affected the social services sector by blocking any increases in the national minimum wage, reducing wages in the private sector and cutting wages in the public sector. High levels of unemployment increased precarious working conditions.

Key points

- Basic collective agreements just cover wages and more comprehensive agreements cover a wider range of issues from pay, working hours/ conditions, contracts, consultation, absences and trade union rights
- Coverage by collective bargaining agreements is highest with public social services workers and lowest for private sector workers
- Legislation is important in securing social dialogue and collective bargaining arrangements combined with political will
- Recent changes in the social services have led to changes and mergers between collective agreements
- Important role of state with some tri-partite arrangements and others influenced by state as funder of social services
- In some countries with strong social dialogue arrangements, the collective bargaining agreements build on these relationships
- In countries where there is not a strong tradition of social dialogue, collective bargaining arrangements are often separate.

5. The case for EU level Social dialogue in the social services sector

5.1 Social dialogue and the European Union

Social dialogue at European Union level was officially launched in 1985 and it refers to discussions, consultations, negotiations and joint actions undertaken by social partner organisations (or social partners) which represent the two sides of industry: the trade unions and the employer organizations. The European social dialogue is one of the main instruments for employment and social policy at EU level apart from legislation, the open method of coordination and the European social fund. The role of the European Commission is to provide balanced support to both sides of industry and to chair most of the social dialogue meetings as an important mediator.

Social dialogue at sectoral level was set up in 1998 after the Commission decided to cover specific branches of the economy, for example, retail trade, construction, agriculture, transport, financial services. There are now over 36 sectoral dialogue committees. Organisations representing employers and workers at European level have to:

- Relate to specific sectors or categories;
- Be organized at European level;
- Consist of organisations which are integral and recognized part of member state social dialogue structures, having the capacity to negotiate agreements and being representative of several Member states;
- Have adequate structures to ensure their effective participation in the work of the committees.

There are two types of social dialogue:

- **Bi-partite** dialogue takes place between employers and trade unions. Bi-partite dialogue occurs in both cross-industry and within sectoral social dialogue committees
- **Tri-partite** dialogue involves employers, trade unions and public authorities, mostly at cross-industry level.

5.2 The legal base for social dialogue

The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Lisbon Treaty) states that the Union and its member states shall share competencies in the area of social policy, for the aspects defined in the Treaty. Articles 151, 152, 154 and 155 refer to specific processes that together constitute social dialogue.

Article 151 refers to '*fundamental social rights*' and recalls the objects of the Union and its Member States to promote employment, improve living and working conditions, proper social protection and '*dialogue between management and labour*'.

Article 152 refers to the facilitation of social dialogue by the EU. '*The Union recognizes and promotes the role of the social partners at its (EU) level, taking into account the diversity of national systems. It shall facilitate dialogue between social partners, respecting their autonomy*'. The Tripartite Social Summit for Growth and Employment, which meets annually, contributes to social dialogue by ensuring the effective participation of social partners in implementing EU social and economic policies.

Article 154 sets out the form of consultations between the EC and the social partners. The European Commission has a specific role in '*promoting the consultation of management and labour at EU level and shall take any relevant measures to facilitate their dialogue by ensuring balanced support for the parties*'. The EC '*shall consult management and labour on the possible direction of Union action, before submitting proposals in the social policy field*'. The EC may also '*consult management and labour on the content of the envisaged proposal*'

Article 155 outlines how negotiations between the social partners should be arranged, especially when social dialogue '*may lead to contractual relations, including agreements*'.

There is a clear legal basis for social dialogue, including sectoral social dialogue, at EU level. However, it is up to the social partners of the social services sector to initiate and create this dialogue within the legal framework.

5.3 Arguments for EU level social dialogue in the social services sector

- All European countries have an ageing population and growing demand for social services. Although the social services sector is expanding rapidly in terms of value and job creation, it also faces a common set of problems which are

threatening this expansion. Delivery of services will depend on establishing a sustainable workforce. Labour issues, such as maximum working hours, maternity/ paternity leave, and terms and conditions of workers in outsourced services, will be addressed most effectively at European level.

- EU level social dialogue will help to promote social partnership through structural involvement of social partners in decision making processes. EU level social dialogue would help to create agreement on a range of instruments, codes of conduct, guidelines, framework for action which could be adapted to social dialogue at national level. Social dialogue at EU level will have a 'lighthouse' effect on national social dialogue.
- EU level social dialogue will help to share successful models of good practice and solutions to problems facing the social services sector, e.g. recruitment and retention of workers, public procurement issues. Common problems exist across European countries and will be most effectively addressed at EU level.
- EU level social dialogue will contribute to strengthening the social services sector through providing exchanges of information at EU between social partners which would contribute to a better understanding of changes in the sector and how to safeguard the social value of social services.

Key points

- Legal basis for social dialogue at EU level
- Social dialogue at EU level will address problems of a rapidly expanding sector threatened by the lack of a sustainable workforce
- Social dialogue at EU level will strengthen social dialogue at national level
- Social dialogue at EU level will help share models of good practice and solutions to problems facing social services
- Social dialogue at EU level will facilitate sharing of information about how to safeguard the social value of social services

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The social services sector is a rapidly growing sector in terms of employment and value, as measured in both social and economic terms. This needs to be more widely recognised at national and European levels. More research is needed to present the detailed social and economic value of the sector by country. The employment growth of this sector, during a period of rising unemployment, has important implications for its place within national economies. However, the profile of the labour force shows that it is predominantly low paid, female, part-time and aged over 40 years old. This profile has implications for the future expansion of the sector.

The majority of EU countries have ageing populations with only some having rising fertility rates. A common set of problems face the social services sector which are challenging traditional forms of delivery. The growing emphasis on home care and personalised services raises questions about how social services can '*be of service to people*' in future. Delivery of services will depend on the future of the social services workforce, which needs to be sustainable. Solutions to the problems of recruitment and retention will have to involve improved pay and working conditions, more training and support for professionalisation. The growing cross-border mobility of social care workers requires wider recognition of qualifications and as well as greater provision of training by for-profit and not-for-profit providers. Labour issues, such as maximum working hours, maternity/ paternity leave, and terms and conditions of workers in outsourced services could be addressed at European level. The Agency Directive needs to be revised and improved.

The value of the not-for-profit sector should be more widely recognised with a broader interpretation of 'Services of General Interest'. The privatisation of services, the introduction of public procurement processes and the lack of regulatory frameworks in the social services sector are resulting in low pay and the deskilling of the workforce, which threaten the strong values that inform the delivery of social services. High quality social services require high quality, well-paid workers. EU procurement processes need to be modernised so that the labour intensive nature of the social services sector is recognised and contracts are awarded in terms of the quality of the service rather than the lowest cost. This would help to attract new workers to the sector.

There are several systems of representativity in the social services sector at national level but many countries lack strong employers' organisations, even where there is a tradition of social dialogue. In several countries, employers in the social services sector are not organised into any representative organisation. The public sector has stronger systems of representation, often required by law. The expansion of both the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors means that they will have to recognise their responsibilities as employers and form strong employers' organisations to support this process. In three of the study countries, even where there are systems of social dialogue, social services partners are not recognised in the national social dialogue process. This affects their

capacity to take part in effective collective bargaining negotiations and reflects the lack of recognition of the social services sector in the overall economy.

There is some system of collective bargaining in all of the twenty-five countries, which covers all or part of the social services sector. Coverage is highest for public sector workers and lowest for for-profit and not-for-profit workers. Some of these existing arrangements are facing problems because of funding problems within the social services sector. However, collective bargaining arrangements are an important set of structures on which to build further employer- employee dialogue. As a sector that is characterised by low pay and problems with recruitment and retention, the future of the sector will depend on finding shared solutions to these problems at national and EU levels.

EU level social dialogue has a strong legal basis and this framework should be used to establish an EU level social dialogue committee in the social services sector. An EU social dialogue committee could start by exchanging models of good practice and other solutions to problems facing social services. Action at EU level could address several problems facing the future of the social services sector across Europe, e.g. maintaining a sustainable workforce. It would help to strengthen social dialogue at national level. As the balance of provision of social services across public, for-profit and not-for-profit sectors is changing, any new or strengthened systems of representation will have to include employers and employees from all sectors.

Some countries, for example, Belgium and France, with well-developed social dialogue systems were cautious about whether an EU social dialogue committee would give value to their national social dialogue arrangements. Agreeing on common values would be an important basis for future European cooperation. An indication of the importance of language and shared values can be seen in the experience of Ireland, where social partners felt that social and civil dialogue should be separated from social partnership so that dialogue can continue between employers and employees.

Some countries with relatively new systems of social dialogue which were not particularly strong, for example, Slovakia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, felt that opportunities to share with other European countries would strengthen social dialogue in the social services sector.

More information about the social services sector, especially the growing for-profit sector, in a wider range of countries is needed to inform European actions and maintain an information base on the sector. A greater understanding of existing systems of social dialogue in this sector as well as good practices across the sector would increase the knowledge base on social dialogue. This would help to show the similarities between countries even though social services are characterised by local provision.

PESSIS Project Recommendations

European Union (EU) level

1. Poor working conditions, shortage and retention of staff, lack of training opportunities, needs of women workers, and working time are all issues that face the social services sector in many European countries.

Recommendation: This wide range of common problems facing all national social services sectors should be addressed through the development of social dialogue at European level.

2. Social dialogue in the social services sector is not organised at European Union (EU) level or sectoral level.

Recommendation: The European Commission should support the development of social dialogue instruments for the social services sector at EU level.

3. Further data is needed to further understand how social dialogue is organised in the social services sector in the PESSIS study countries and how it contributes to social value

Recommendation: The European Commission should commission follow-up research to further understand how social value in the social services sector is created so contributing to a fuller understanding of the full economic and social contribution of the sector.

4. The not-for-profit sector is expanding fast and becoming a significant employer in all countries.

Recommendation: New opportunities to promote reflection within the sector in order to identify employer responsibilities and ways of meeting them should be facilitated across Europe.

5. The European social services sector is diverse often with a lack of representation. More work is needed to understand how systems of employer representativity are created.

Recommendation: Employers and employees must recognise the role of actors at EU level to support social dialogue in the social services sector. More work to support the development of representativity for employers, through workshops and seminars, is needed at national and EU level.

6. Existing social dialogue in the social services sector needs to be better understood and more widely recognised.

Recommendation: Use future EU Presidencies to promote the PESSIS/ PESSIS 2/ PESSIS 3, and PESSIS + project conclusions and recommendations.

National level

7. Social partners in the social services sector need to develop a shared language for negotiations between employers and employees.

Recommendation: Support the creation of new social dialogue pilot projects to bring social partners together to create an effective social dialogue between employees and employers in the social services sector and make these experiences more widely understood.

8. Additional research is required to explore new ways of developing social services delivery, drawing on new technologies as well as preserving sensitive local delivery.

Recommendation: National governments and other stakeholders should commission research to explore how social services delivery could be restructured, using new technologies and new forms of organisation at local, regional and national levels.

8. References

- Blackburn J. *et al* (2016) Country case study: United Kingdom Project PESSIS 3: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue
- Boljka U. & Kobal B. (2012) Country report: Slovenia Project PESSIS: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue
- Borbély S. (2016) Country case study: Hungary Project PESSIS 3: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue
- Buhring T. & Larsen K.M. (Oxford Research) (2019) Country case study: Denmark Project Pessis + Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue
- Carrasco C. (2012) Country Report: Spain Project PESSIS: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue
- Conroy P. & Meagher M. (2012) Ireland National Report Pessis European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'
- Cortese C. (2014) Country case study: Italy Pessis 2 European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'
- Danielsson A., Gunnarsson J. Lindahl P. (2014) Country case study: Sweden Project PESSIS 2: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue
- Daue F. (2012) National Report Belgium Pessis European Project Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue
- Fansten M. (2012) A study of social dialogue in social services in France Pessis European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'
- Hilbert J., Evans M. Galtschenko W. (2012) Sociosclerosis: Employer-employee relations in German social services at the crossroads Project PESSIS: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue
- Horecký J. (2014) Country case study: Czech Republic Project PESSIS 2: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue
- Kirov V. (2019) Country case Study: Luxembourg Project PESSIS +: Promoting employers' social services in social dialogue
- Kopkova E.(Tenenet) (2016) Country case study: Slovakia PESSIS 3: European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'

Lamsa A. (2012) Social dialogue in social services National report, Finland Pessis European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'

Mouriki A. & Ziomas D. (2012) Promoting employers' social dialogue in the social services sector National Report-Greece Pessis European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'

Perl C. (2012) Social Dialogue in the Health and Social Service Sector Austrian report Pessis European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'

Plotnikova E. (2012) Promoting Employers' Social Services in Social Dialogue National report: Scotland Pessis European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'

Podzina D. (2019) Country case study: Latvia PESSIS + Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'

Snieškienė D., Karčiauskienė A., Vaičiaitytė O. (2014) Country case study: Lithuania PESSIS 2: European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'

Tomev L., Mihailova T., Ribarova E. (2014) Country case study: Bulgaria PESSIS 2: European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'

Tudose E. *et al* (Institute of Public Policy)(2016) Country case study: Romania PESSIS 3: European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue

Valadas C. (2016) Social Dialogue in the Social Services: the Portuguese case PESSIS 3: European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue

van Dijk M. & van Essen G. (2012) Social dialogue in caring for the disabled, the elderly and in child care The state of affairs in the Netherlands Pessis European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'

Wiacek A. with Wilczek J. (2014) Country case study: Poland PESSIS 2: European Project 'Promoting employers' social services organisations in social dialogue'

Other references

Commission of the European Communities (2007) Communication on "Services of general interest, including social services of general interest: a new European commitment" {COM(2007) 724 final} Available at:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0725:FIN:EN:PDF#>

Commission of the European Communities (2010) Second Biennial Report on social services of general interest Commission Staff Working Document Brussels, 22.10.2010, SEC(2010)1284 final. Available at:

http://www.socialsecurity.fgov.be/eu/docs/agenda/26-27_10_10_second_biennial_report.pdf

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (2009) Demographic change and social services Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

Lanzieri G. (2008) Population and social conditions Statistics in focus Eurostat 81/2008

Scottish Government (2013) Summary: Age Demographics National Statistics
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Equality/Equalities/DataGrid/Age/AgePopMig>

Appendix A: Trade union and employers organisations

Country	Trade union federation	Employer organisations
Austria	OGB Austrian Trade Union Federation	IV Federation of Austrian Industry (Industriellenvereinigung, IV)
Belgium	ABVV / FGTB General Labour Federation of Belgium (Algemeen Belgisch Vakverbond / Fédération Générale du Travail de Belgique) ACV / CSC Confederation of Christian Trade Unions (Algemeen Christelijk Vakverbond / Confédération des Syndicats Chrétiens) CGSLB / ACLVB General Confederation of Liberal Trade Unions of Belgium (Centrale Générale des Syndicats Libéraux de Belgique)	FEB/VBO Federation of Belgian Enterprises (Fédération des Entreprises de Belgique/Verbond van Belgische Ondernemingen)
Bulgaria	CITUB Confederation of Independent Trade Unions of Bulgaria PODKREPA Confederation of Labour	Association of the Organizations of Bulgarian Employers (hereinafter called AOBÉ)
Croatia	SSSH / UATUC Union of Autonomous Trade Unions of Croatia (Saveza Samostalnih Sindicata Hrvatske) NHS Independent Trade Unions of Croatia (Nezavisni Hrvatski Sindicati)	
Czech Republic	CMK OS Czech Moravian Confederation of Trade Unions	
Denmark	Akademikerne Danish Confederation of Professional Associations (Akademikernes Centralorganisation)	DA Danish Employers' Confederation (Dansk Arbejdsgiverforening)

	<p>FTF Confederation of Professionals in Denmark (Funktionærernes og Tjenestemændenes Fællesråd)</p> <p>LO-DK Danish Confederation of Trade Unions (Landesorganisationen i Danmark)</p>	
Estonia	<p>EAKL Association of Estonian Trade Unions Eesti Ametiühingute Keskkliit /</p> <p>TALO Estonian Employees' Unions' Association (Teenistujate Ametiliitude Organisatsioon)</p>	
Finland	<p>AKAVA Akava Confederation of Unions for Professional and Managerial Staff in Finland</p> <p>SAK Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions (Suomen Ammattiliittojen Keskusjärjestö)</p> <p>STTK Finnish Confederation of Professionals (Toimihenkilökeskusjärjestö)</p>	<p>PT Employers' Confederation of Service Industries (Palvelutyöntajat) (Finland)</p> <p>TI Confederation of Finnish Industry and Employers (Teollisuus ja Työntajat)</p>
France	<p>CFDT French Democratic Confederation of Labour (Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail)</p> <p>CFTC French Confederation of Christian Workers (Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens)</p> <p>CGT General Confederation of Labour (Confédération Générale du Travail)</p> <p>FO General Confederation of Labour - Workers' Power (Confédération Générale du Travail - Force Ouvrière)</p> <p>UNSA National Union of Autonomous Trade Unions (Union Nationale des Syndicats Autonomes)</p>	<p>MEDEF Movement of French Enterprises (Mouvement des Entreprises de France)</p>
Germany	DGB German Confederation of Trade Unions	BDA

	(Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund Bundesvorstand)	Confederation of German Employers' Associations (Bundesvereinigung der Deutschen Arbeitgeberverbände)
Greece	ADEDY Confederation of Greek Civil Servants' Trade Unions (Anotati Diikisis Enoseon Dimosion Ypallilon) GSEE Greek General Confederation of Labour (Geniki Synomospondia Ergaton Ellados)	SEV Federation of Greek Industries
Hungary	LIGA Democratic League of Independent Trade Unions MOSz National Federation of Workers' Councils MASZSZ. Hungarian Trade Union Confederation SZEF Forum for the Co-operation of Trade Unions (Szakszervezetek Egyuttmukodesi Foruma) ÉSZT Confederation of Unions of Professionals (Értelmiségi Szakszervezeti Tömörülés)	MGYOSZ Confederation of Hungarian Employers and Industrialists (Munkaadók és Gyáriparosok Országos Szövetsége) VOSZ National Association of Entrepreneurs and Employers (Vállalkozók és Munkáltatók Országos Szövetsége) (Hungary)
Ireland	ICTU Irish Congress of Trade Unions	CCI Chamber of Commerce of Ireland IBEC Irish Business and Employers Confederation
Italy	CGIL Italian General Confederation of Labour (Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro) CISL Italian Confederation of Workers' Trade Unions (Confederazione Italiana Sindacati Lavoratori) UIL Italian Union of Labour (Unione Italiana del Lavoro)	Confcooperative Confederation of Italian Cooperatives (Confederazione Cooperative Italiane) Unci National Union of Italian Cooperatives (Unione Nazionale Cooperative Italiane)
Latvia	LBAS Union of Independent Trade Unions of Latvia (Latvijas Brīvo Arodbiedrību Savienība)	LDDK http://www.lddk.lv/lapa/socialais-dialogs/ Employers' Confederation of Latvia Latvijas Darba devēju konfederācijas (
Lithuania	LDF Lithuanian Labour Federation	

	<p>(Lietuvos Darbo Federacija) LPSK / LTUC Lithuanian Trade Union Confederation (Lietuvos Profesiniu Sajungu Konfederacija) LPSS (LDS) Lithuanian Trade Union "Solidarumas" (Lietuvos Darbiniku Sajunga)</p>	
Luxembourg		
Netherlands	<p>CNV National Federation of Christian Trade Unions (Christelijk Nationaal Vakverbond) FNV Netherlands Trade Union Confederation (Federatie Nederlandse Vakbeweging) VCP Trade union federation for Professionals (Vakcentrale voor Professionals)</p>	<p>VNO-NCW Confederation of Netherlands Industry and Employers (Vereniging van Nederlandse Ondernemers-Nederlands Christelijke Werkgeversverbond)</p>
Portugal	<p>CGTP-IN General Confederation of Portuguese Workers (Confederação Geral dos Trabalhadores Portugueses) UGT-P General Workers' Union - Portugal (União Geral de Trabalhadores)</p>	<p>CCP Confederation of Portuguese Services and Commerce (Confederação do Comércio e Servicos de Portugal)</p>
Romania	<p>BNS The National Trade Unions Block CARTEL ALFA National Trade Union Confederation - Cartel ALFA (Confederatia Natională Sindicală) CNSLR-Fratia National Confederation of Free Trade Unions of Romania - FRATIA CSDR Democratic Trade Union Confederation of Romania</p>	<p>National Confederation of Romanian Employers "General Union of Romanian Industrialists" UGIR-1903 - Founded 1903</p>
Slovakia	<p>KOZ SR Confederation of Trade Unions of the Slovak Republic</p>	<p>Federation of Employers Associations of Slovakia</p>
Slovenia	<p>ZSSS Slovenian Association of Free Trade Unions</p>	<p>ZDS</p>

	(Zveza Svobodnih Sindikatov Slovenije)	Association of Employers of Slovenia (Združenje delodajalcev Slovenije)
Spain	<p>CC.OO Trade Union Confederation of Workers' Commissions (Confederación Sindical de Comisiones Obreras)</p> <p>ELA Basque Workers' Union (Solidaridad de Trabajadores Vascos Eusko Langileen Alkartasuna)</p> <p>UGT-E General Workers' Union - Spain (Union General de Trabajadores)</p> <p>USO Workers' Union - Spain (Union Sindical Obrera)</p>	<p>CEOE Spanish Confederation of Employers' Organisations (Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales)</p>
Sweden	<p>LO-S Swedish Trade Union Confederation (Landsorganisationen i Sverige)</p> <p>Saco Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations (Sveriges Akademikers Centralorganisation)</p> <p>TCO Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees (Tjänstemännens Centralorganisation)</p>	<p>Arbetsgivaralliansen Swedish Employers' Alliance (Arbetsgivaralliansen)</p> <p>KFO Cooperative Movement Bargaining Organisation (Kooperationens förhandlingsorganisation) (Sweden)</p>
United Kingdom	TUC Trades Union Congress	CBI Confederation of British Industry