

# DRAFT Minutes – 14/12/2017

## Agreed iAll-Ceemet

Bd A. Reyers Ln 80  
1030 Brussels – Belgium

 [www.ceemet.org](http://www.ceemet.org)

 [@ceemet](https://twitter.com/ceemet)

EU Transparency Register  
[61370904700-45](https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexp1/index.html)

### SOCIAL DIALOGUE PLENARY MEETING

#### 1) Approval of the agenda

The agenda was formally approved.

#### 2) Formal approval of the minutes of the Plenary meeting of 8 December 2016

The minutes of the previous meeting were formally approved.

#### 3) Future of social dialogue – implementation of the joint Ceemet-industriAll statement on how to promote a fit for purpose European sector social dialogue (September 2016)

##### ASD-iAll topic:

Mr. Combüchen opened this point highlighting the fact that the 2015 Ceemet-iAll strategy had been nearly achieved. He further stated that the criteria agreed on the iAll-Ceemet joint statement of September 2016 “to promote a fit for purpose European sector social dialogue” remain valid.

Mr. Combüchen continued by saying said that since 2015, European social dialogue is entering into a new dimension with more trade associations expressing their will to enter into some kind of (social) dialogue with industriAll. This is the case for ASD (European Aeronautics, Space, Defence and Security industries) that has expressed its will to set-up a specific sector social dialogue with industriAll.

Further he presented the three possible scenarios for the ASD-iAll “(social) dialogue”

- Formal autonomous ASD-iAll SSDC for the aerospace sector subject to the Commission decision;
- Ceemet-iAll SSDC structure opened to the aerospace sector;
- ASD and industriAll continue to engage in informal, stand-alone sector dialogue

He mentioned that under any of the 3 scenarios, ASD had committed itself to have a timely coordination with Ceemet and respect iAll-Ceemet rules of procedure on the basis of the “Weihe/Pie agreement”. Ceemet, for its part, wants to facilitate “ASD-iAll” structured dialogue within the Ceemet-iAll social dialogue, while protecting the “privileged”/overarching Ceemet-iAll sector social dialogue.

Mr. Triangle (Secretary General, industriAll) said that whereas iAll does not want to weaken the social dialogue it has built up with Ceemet, it also wanted to find a pragmatic solution to deal with issues specific to the aerospace sector. He further stressed, that Ceemet “should be integrated in this structure” and proposed that the 3 organisations find a common structure.

A round-table of discussions was opened on this issue.

Mr. Weihe, Ceemet co-Chair of the iAll-Ceemet Social Dialogue pointed the following:

- A potential “ASD-iAll” SSDC can be detrimental to iAll-Ceemet social dialogue;
- In some cases the sub-sectors over-emphasize “the perception” of the specificities of the subsector;
- Many of the issues aerospace/iAll and iAll/Ceemet are the same and should be handled within the overarching sector social dialogue. Therefore, it would be detrimental to all associations if (social) dialogue is set-up within the MET sub-sectors;
- Identifying the overarching issues for iAll-Ceemet social dialogue and sector specific issues for ASD-iAll would become an additional burden & responsibility.

Ms. Hadelier (Gesamtmetall, Germany) agreed that in general Ceemet-iAll social dialogue is not addressing different issues even though sector specificities to the aerospace sector might exist. For her, it is important to find a solution that works for all parties.

Mr. Strohbach, European Commission, highlighted the following:

- The criteria for the creation of social dialogue at European level are specified in the 1998 Decision;
- One of the criteria is linked to the representativeness of the social partners. To this end, Eurofound is currently developing the representativeness study for the MET sector. A first draft report will be presented in January/February 2018, giving a picture of the sector;
- Financial resources of the Commission are limited;
- The Commission proposed that the 3 organisations come together to bring up a solution.

Mr. Kainz (WKO, Austria) said that fragmenting “social dialogue” would be detrimental for both employers and for workers.

Ms. Correia (Aneme, Portugal) said that the MET sector is the most important industry sector and that the realities of the sub-sectors might have some economic nuances/differences but the strategies are common. For example, in the case of digitalization, iAll and Ceemet should concentrate their efforts on the impact of digitalization on companies and workers. Fragmentation of the sector social dialogue would be negative for all.

In that area, Ms. Gonçalves (Aneme, Portugal) added that in Portugal the subsectors (associations) are not real social partners, but “clusters”, which, therefore, do not necessarily have to be present in the social dialogue. Setting-up a sector specific social dialogue for ASD-iAll

could impact on the quantity and quality of social dialogue and even result on the “disintegration” of genuine social dialogue.

Ms. Petkovsek ( Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Slovenia) , said that she is in favour of an effective influential social dialogue, but not of subsectors having their own social dialogue since they are not real social partners.

Mr. Triangle (SG, iAll) said that iAll is not only dealing with social issues but also with industrial policy issues. The aim of the future structure with ASD would mainly focus on industrial policy issues. .

#### *Future of the iAll-Ceemet social dialogue:*

Mr. Weihe opened the debate on the future of industriAll-Ceemet social dialogue. He referred again to the agreed 2015 strategy and asked participants on possible ways to foster the iAll-Ceemet social dialogue in terms of participation and “added value/interesting” topics.

For industriAll representatives the following topics are of interest to the Ceemet-iAll social dialogue: digitalisation and education (need to train workers – linked to skills development and qualification of workers); and digitalisation and industry 4.0.

Mr. Lemb, iAll co-chair of the Ceemet-iAll social dialogue mentioned that the 2015 Ceemet-iAll agreed strategy pointed out, amongst others, that social dialogue should become more “political”. The MET social partners should define what becoming a “more political social dialogue” means.

For IG Metall, the European Pillar of Social Rights, the Reconciliation of private and work life package, the impact of digitalisation on production/workers and the issue of integration of migrants into the labour market are part of a more “political social dialogue”.

Mr. Weihe, wrapped up this item as follows:

- iAll-Ceemet needs focused joint statements (and other social dialogue outcomes) that can become even more influential on the EU arena;
- For employers a more political social dialogue means more influential in the EU arena;
- For the employers, it is not effective to discuss the same/very similar issues within the sub-sectors as the ones that are discussed within the overarching social dialogue.

#### Decisions:

- iAll-Ceemet-ASD will endeavour to agree on a “common workable solution” to agree on a structured dialogue between ASD-iAll within Ceemet-iAll social dialogue structure
- Fostering iAll-Ceemet social dialogue: the word political should be amended (understood) in the 2015 strategy as a more “influential social dialogue”.

#### 4) European Pillar of Social Rights

Mr. Uebe, Head of Unit Employment Strategies, (DG Employment, European Commission) delivered a presentation on the European Pillar of Social Rights. See presentation [here](#). He started by saying that all Heads of State and Government have endorsed the Pillar on 17 November 2017 and pointed the following:

- The Pillar is a programme of 20 principles;
- It is not a binding instrument but rather a political instrument with full respect of the principle of subsidiarity;
- Wages: the Commission will not legislate on wages, as this is an exclusive competence of the Member States and of the social partners. The Commission is just promoting fair wages with the aim of an upward convergence;
- All instruments at EU level would be mobilised (policy, *legislation when applicable*, funding etc.) to make the pillar a reality;
- The Social Partners were fully involved in the process of the Pillar;
- The Pillar will play a key role also within the discussions of the post 2020 MFF;
- The Pillar principles will “*become part*” of the European Semester;
- The “social scoreboard” accompanying the pillar has been adopted to monitor/track progress made by the Member States and take action if needed.

He then referred to different initiatives that the Commission has issued within the context of the pillar such as: work-life balance, access to social protection, written statement directive, working time directive etc.

Mr. Triangle said that iAll welcomes the Pillar, which it considers crucial:

- There is a high level of inequality between countries and inside countries;
- In-work poverty is increasing (up to 10%), this is a new phenomenon;
- The Pillar will eventually lead to a stable economy which is an advantage to companies
- Salaries in countries such as Bulgaria are very low, and therefore their highly skilled workforce is moving out from Bulgaria (brain drain);
- Inequality has fostered the raise of the radical and populist parties;
- iAll supports the legislative agenda that has followed-up the Pillar;
- The Member States have confirmed their commitment to implement the principles of the Pillar into their national level. The Commission is currently awaiting for the Member States roadmap;
- Funding is also crucial: the Pillar can only become a reality if there is enough funding.

According to Mr. Weihe the Pillar is a “mistake” as it will not enhance competitiveness, nor will it lead to job creation. Europe already today counts for 50% of the world social expenditure, and the EU should focus on promoting competitiveness in order to enhance job creation.

He further stated that all the legislative work has to be done within the “competence of the Member States”, especially when we speak of key issues such as “the definition of what an employee is”.

Mr. Combüchen referred to the level of implementation of the 2016 Country-Specific Recommendations that was only at a disappointing 2% “with full or substantial progress” according to information from the EPs Economic Governance Support unit.

Mr. Uebe replied the following:

- The Commission agrees with the competitiveness angle, and the Commission always has this angle in mind, when developing policies, since it is linked to job creation;
- Questions on competences: all Commission proposals issued in the context of the Pillar are in line with the EU competences and respect the national systems and national traditions etc;
- Definition of employee: The definition of employee will only be used for the purpose of the “*Written Statement Directive*” and will not create other “legal effects” outside this Directive.

Mr. Lemb, proposed that despite diverging positions, iAll and Ceemet try to reach a joint declaration on the Pillar.

Decision: Ceemet and iAll to try to develop a joint declaration on the Pillar.

## 5) Reports from the working groups and other activities

### SSD C&E working group.

Mr. Ruohoniemi and Mr. Asplund (co-Chairs of the iAll-Ceemet C&E Social dialogue) presented the reports from the SSD C&E WG of 8 March 2017 as well as the outcomes of the SSD C&E visit to Bosch on 13 October in Reutlingen, which was of big added value. See working documents for the meeting for more info.

The co-chairs presented the topics of the work-programme that were approved as follows:

- What issues could be raised from intensified monitoring of production through digitalisation?
- What implications do we see from being able to work remotely and at any time, in terms of work organisation, working time and health & security?
- Automatization and its impact on competitiveness & employment in the MET sector
- What design can we jointly recommend for public/EU initiatives supporting SME digitizing?

The first two topics will be dealt in 2018 and the other two in 2019.

### SSD E&T Working Group

Ms. Rudelli and Ms. Barthès (Co-Chairs of the iAll-Ceemet E&T Social dialogue Working Group) presented the outcomes of the joint event of 21 June and of the Working Group of 22 June.

The joint event at the European Parliament of 21 June was hosted by MEP Dlabajová and MEP Nekov (co-rapporteurs of the New Skills Agenda) and dealt with two topics: VET and digital skills.

The co-chairs also briefed the participants about the outcomes of the SSD E&T meeting of 22 June 2017. See minutes of the meeting for more information.

The draft work programme was presented and adopted:

- Submitting a joint pledge on apprenticeships – 2018 (European alliance for apprenticeships):
- Organising a joint event in 2018 – to be discussed in the near future: format, audience, content of event, communication activities etc.
- Continuing the development of the metindustry website: More input from iAll and Ceemet members needed
- Continuous education and training (CET): to be included in the agenda with the aim of possibility developing a joint position
- (Possibly) developing a joint statement on digital skills (to be annexed to the statement on digitalisation)

Decision: the work-programmes of the Social Dialogue WGs Competitiveness & Employment and Education & Training were adopted.

## 6) Integration of migrants into the labour market – discussion of the draft joint statement

Mr. Weihe, introduced this topic stressing that:

- In addition to language problems, many migrants are low skilled and therefore have difficulties in accessing the labour market;
- Responsibility of integrating migrants into the labour market is not for social partners but for the States;
- Education is important for the integration of migrants but is not the solution;
- The draft joint statement as it stands puts the main responsibility on social partners, it has to be reflected that Member States are the main responsible. Social partners can “resolve a bit of the problem” but the main solution is political;
- In Sweden, half of migrants only get their jobs after average 9 years;
- No special rules for migrants have to be created, same rules have to be applied for migrants as for the rest of employees.

Mr. Weihe proposed that the draft statement should be referred back to the secretariats for reformulating.

Mr. Kainz said that in his opinion it is not the role of the MET social partners to develop this joint statement. It is the duty of the State to take the necessary measures to deal with the integration of migrants into the labour market.

Mr. Weihe agreed that the main responsibility when dealing with the integration of migrants into the labour market is of the State, but as social partners are part of the labour market we could suggest measures that could be taken by the State.

Mr. Triangle made the following remarks:

- Important to have a joint statement on this topic;
- Agrees with the point of Ceemet on the role of the State;
- Important to invest in education (education is key when it comes to the integration of migrants);
- iAll would prefer not to mention strong and flexible labour markets (to be reformulated);
- iAll not in favour of deleting the part where it says that integration of migrants should not lead to other working conditions,

Mr. Weihe explained that:

- By strong and flexible labour markets, Ceemet is referring to well-functioning (inclusive) labour markets where most rightly skilled people have the possibility to get a job;
- Ceemet suggested not to have different rules for migrants and other employees

Decision: It was agreed that the joint statement would go back to the Secretariats for re-drafting and for possible adoption.

## 7) Roundtable of national developments

Mr. Mongon (UIMM/France) presented the national report for France. He made reference, amongst others, to the labour market reform introduced by President Macron.

Ms. Hadelar presented the national report for Germany. She made reference, amongst others, to IG Metall demands for the next collective bargaining rounds, amongst which: a wage increase of 6.0% for a period of 12 months and individual right to reduce the weekly working time up to 28 hours for a maximum duration of 24 months

Mr. Wahlstedt (Tekniföretagen/Sweden) and Mr. Apslund presented the national report for Sweden. They referred, amongst others, to the new collective bargaining agreements that are in place as of 1 April 2017 and will last for 2 years.

Mr. Ruohoniemi (Teknologioteollisuus/Finland) presented the national report for Finland. He mentioned that the economic situation in Finland that is doing better. In 2017 the economy grew by 2.8% and it is expected that in 2018 it will grow by 2.3%. The new collective bargaining in place is valid until 31 October 2020. Salary agreements to be negotiated locally.

## 8) AOB

The next meetings will be held on

- SSD WG C&E – 19 March 2018
- SSD WG E&T- 28 June 2018
- SSD Plenary meeting : 12 December 2018

\*\*\*