



**ECO/ESG**

Brussels, 27 February 2021

**APPENDIX  
TO THE  
RESOLUTION**

**Involvement of Organised Civil Society in the National Recovery and Resilience Plans –  
What works and what does not?**

of the  
**European Semester Group**

---

**Part I: Observations arising from the consultations  
Part II: Method for information collection**

## Table of contents

<b>Part I: Observations arising from the consultations</b> .....	3
<i>Question 1:</i> .....	3
<i>Are there mechanisms for consultation on the Recovery and Resilience (R&amp;R) Plans in your country?</i> .....	3
<i>Question 2:</i> .....	9
<i>Are there different consultation mechanisms for the social partners and the rest of organised civil society in your country?</i> .....	9
<i>Question 3:</i> .....	13
<i>Your country must submit its National Recovery and Resilience Plan by 30 April 2021 at the latest. Where is your country in the process?</i> .....	13
<i>Question 4:</i> .....	17
<i>How does the R&amp;R procedure differ compared to the consultation of OCS during the normal Semester procedure in your country?</i> .....	17
<i>Question 5:</i> .....	20
<i>To what extent does the R&amp;R Plan of your country correspond with the policy objectives of OCS in your country?</i> .....	20
<b>Part II: Method for collecting information</b> .....	24

## **Part I: Observations arising from the consultations**

### ***Question 1:***

#### ***Are there mechanisms for consultation on the Recovery and Resilience (R&R) Plans in your country?***

The majority of responses reported that some form of consultation mechanism has been established by the national government for the involvement of organised civil society (OCS) in the preparation of their recovery and resilience plan (19 out of 27). In some Member States, consultations with civil society have already been carried out, whereas in others they are still ongoing or foreseen to take place at a later stage. The mechanisms employed are varied, including submission of written proposals, high-level meetings with responsible ministers, and round table discussions between representatives of government and civil society organisations (CSOs). Some Member States have also relied and built on mechanisms established for consultation within the ordinary European Semester procedure.

Nevertheless, the majority of responses pointed to a lack of real inclusion of civil society in the preparation of plans. In many responses, participants raised concerns about consultations being viewed as mere formalities without any real capacity to influence the content of plans. One barrier for involvement was identified in the apparent unwillingness of some national governments to include civil society in the preparation of their plans. As opposed to the government seeking to involve civil society, consultation was often achieved at the initiative of the social partners and other CSOs.

Although formally included, another barrier to the true involvement of civil society was identified in the insufficient time reserved for stakeholder consultation. Participants were critical of the tight timetable adopted by some governments, as it is likely to hinder substantive debate and reflection of civil society input regarding the R&R plans. Only a small minority of participants mentioned having been successful in getting their proposals included in national plans. Hence, while a large number of Member States does have some form of consultation mechanism for OSC in the preparation of their plan, a significantly smaller number actually facilitates true involvement and influence of civil society.

Regrettably, a number of participants reported that no consultation has been carried out nor is foreseen to take place in the preparation stage of their national plan, despite CSOs' calls for involvement (3 out of 27). In addition, some respondents reported that although consultations have taken place, they have so far only encompassed the social partners or only remaining civil society (5 out of 27).

Three categories of Member States can be identified: those where there has been virtually no involvement at least so far (Denmark, Slovakia); those where there has been some formal or informal involvement but where no capacity to influence has been identified (Austria, Belgium, Czechia, Germany, Greece, Spain, Estonia, France, Croatia, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Latvia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Slovenia); and finally, those where there has been more structured involvement, which in some cases has had an impact on some aspect of the plans (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, Italy, Malta).

Overall, the responses reveal a strong desire on the part of OSC to contribute to the preparation of national recovery and resilience plans. Respondents representing social partner and civil society organisations pointed out attempts for proactively becoming involved, including drawing up proposals and reaching out to government representatives. In some Member States, these initiatives have led to a higher degree of inclusion of civil society in the preparation of plans, but unfortunately, in others they appear to have fallen on deaf ears.

Country	Summary	Condensed contribution
<b>Austria</b>	Yes, planned (at civil society's initiative)	Up to now, the social partners have received neither a draft of the Austrian R&R Plan nor an official invitation to contribute to the current European Semester process as a whole. However, the respondents expected a consultation process on the R&R Plan to start soon. On 26 January 2021 at 10 a.m., an online kick-off event took place on the 2021 National Reform Programme, hosted by the Federal Chancellery of the Republic of Austria. The Austrian social partners and diverse CSOs were invited. However, the Austrian Chamber of Labour had already reached out to the Austrian government to suggest initiatives eligible for R&R funds, while highlighting that the involvement of social partners in this process will be of the utmost importance. The Austrian Trade Union Federation has called for the process to start quickly and for trade unions to be involved, and has also proposed measures for the national plan. The Austrian Federal Economic Chamber has already developed proposals for the establishment of the R&R Plan.
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes, structural consultations with social partners and civil society organisations.	In Belgium, socio-economic dialogue is a structural tradition both at the federal level and at the level of the regions and communities because Belgium is a federal country with important powers for the regions and communities, among others as regards training, ecology and parts of social and economic policy. At all these levels there are structural instruments both as regards the social partners and the organizations of the civil society. Some examples: at federal level the central council for the economy, the federal council for sustainable development, the federal council for consumption. At the regional level: among others the economic councils of the regions.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes	There was a demand to start public discussion in the summer, and all social partners made themselves and their expertise available to the executive branch but only found out what the government had done during the period July-October when the first draft of the R&R Plan was presented on 30 October 2020. This was why they increased their participation in the debate through all possible formats, official bodies of cooperation between the government and the social partners, as well as bipartite and tripartite meetings on the various sections of the plan itself. Because of the social partners' efforts, in early December 2020 a meeting was held between members of the Bulgarian Economic and Social Council (ESC) and the Deputy Prime Minister, who is responsible for drawing up the plan. Thanks to the social partners, commitment to specific macroeconomic assessments are present in the second version of the plan. Within the Bulgarian ESC, the social partners also actively participated in the preparation of an opinion, containing a number of recommendations for improving the draft plan. In this opinion, ESC insisted on full transparency of the process for preparation, updating and implementation of the Plan. The second version of the plan has largely taken into account the comments made by ESC. The Bulgarian ESC is the first national economic and social council among all other European economic councils to publicly express its position on the plan for recovery and sustainability of its country. This is largely due to the efforts of the social partners.  From November 2020 there are many intensive meetings and discussions. Many proposals of the social partners have been prepared

		and discussed. The answer is yes - there is a consultation mechanism and it works well, because the edited second version of the plan is based on our main recommendations, which we have given from the very beginning.
<b>Cyprus</b>	Yes, ongoing (at government's initiative and with civil society having an impact)	Stakeholders have been closely involved from the start of the R&R Plan drafting process. The Minister of Finance initiated the dialogue with social and economic partners through a letter where the overall strategy and priority policy areas were described, and they were invited to submit tangible proposals. Most stakeholders have submitted written proposals and a number of them have already been included in the NRRP, while a few others are still under appraisal with a view to being included in a later version.
<b>Czechia</b>	Yes, ongoing (at civil society's initiative)	In principle, there is a mechanism for such kinds of consultations within the tripartite system, which is used for the standard European Semester process. On the other hand, this is not the case for the R&R Plan drafting process – in this case, the relevant council for Non-profit, Non-governmental Organisations was not contacted. Various stakeholders (Confederation of Industry of the Czech Republic, Czech Chamber of Commerce, Association of Regions of the Czech Republic, Union of Towns and Municipalities of the Czech Republic, etc.) appealed and have subsequently been gradually involved in the process.
<b>Germany</b>	Partly, only social partners (with criticism regarding impact)	The social partners are particularly involved in drafting the R&R Plan. The plan was discussed with the social partners and the chair of the National Productivity Board at the Macroeconomic Dialogue on 24 November 2020. So far, the meetings have been purely informational, and did not constitute effective involvement in shaping the R&R Plan. An exchange between the ministries and the consulted parties is currently scheduled for early February.
<b>Denmark</b>	No, not planned (but civil society has appealed)	For the time being, there has not been any consultation of the social partners or other civil society stakeholders in the process of drafting the plan. According to sources at the Ministry of Finance, there will not be a comprehensive public consultation and, if a consultation is launched, its format has not been decided. Together with the ETUC, the Danish Trade Union Confederation (FH) has tried to ensure that the final RRF proposal contains provisions for the involvement of national social partners. BusinessEurope and the Confederation of Danish Employers (DA) have also asked for social partners to be involved.
<b>Greece</b>	Yes, ongoing (with criticism regarding impact)	A specific mechanism for consultation on the NRRP has not been put in place. Instead, consultation has been based on the following existing mechanisms/procedures: the national plan was uploaded to the opengov.gr platform for public consultation. However, the document only included "The Strategic Guidelines of the National Plan", while the full text that was sent to the Commission with the actions and budget allocations was not made public. The Deputy Minister of Finance requested proposals from the Greek ESC, after which the ESC sent the draft opinion to all its member organisations, asking for their positions on the strategic guidelines of the NRRP and their detailed proposals on the individual pillars/outlines of action. The Deputy Minister of Finance sent a letter to the Greek General Confederation of Labour, asking it to submit comments on the strategic guidelines of the NRRP. A detailed reply was sent, but no feedback was received from the Ministry. It should be noted that some CSOs have also participated in the consultation process on their own initiative.

<b>Spain</b>	Yes, ongoing (with criticism regarding impact)	Yes, they exist. The specific social dialogue of the plan has started, with high-level meetings, and a national working group has been set up. The government has also held meetings with some large third sector organisations. However, most of the organisations consulted expressed the fear that the speed with which the government wants to approve the R&R Plan and the lack of experience with these procedures will make it very difficult to achieve real participation whereby the opinions of the organisations consulted could be reflected, to a significant extent, in the plan. The transition from merely informative meetings to those in which there is real participation, with proposals from the social partners and CSOs, should take place in the coming weeks.
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes, planned (with criticism regarding impact)	Over the coming months, five thematic brainstorming seminars will be held in Estonia, in which all umbrella organisations will take part. The aim is to discuss the main challenges and priorities in each thematic area, as well as the necessary focal areas and the needs of the various target groups. The contributions from the seminars will be used both to draw up the operational programme for the 2021-2027 structural instruments and the R&R Plan and to further develop the measures to be financed by these funds. The involvement and consultation of Estonia's social partners and civil society could have been better organised despite the tight deadlines. The social partners and civil society were indirectly involved in setting priorities for the future of Estonia through "Eesti 2035". However, this took place before the crisis. The activities planned for 2021 will give organisations the opportunity to comment on the document presented. At this stage, however, it will no longer be possible to make fundamental and more significant changes to it.
<b>Finland</b>	Yes, ongoing	Yes. There has been national-level consultation of large cities and a regional consultation tour – with high-level ministerial participation – of local public administrations, social partners and OCS. Social partners and OCS were directly consulted in round table discussions before the selection of priorities and later in theme-specific events. Additionally, the representatives of civil society have been proactive in promoting their views on the RRF.
<b>France</b>	Yes, ongoing (with criticism regarding impact)	There is no consultation procedure specific to the R&R Plan; rather, the traditional European Semester consultation mechanism has been used, including two R&R Plan presentations that were made to the French Economic, Social and Environmental Council (ESEC)'s European Semester Group and one to the Social Dialogue Committee for European and International Matters (CDSEI). These two bodies are the two main forums for consultation on the R&R Plan; some consultations have been carried out informally with certain organisations; some ministries have held consultations on specific topics; some discussions have taken place as part of the "France Relance" recovery plan, involving certain stakeholders. Several stakeholders told us that they had been consulted as a matter of form, but without any focus on how their comments were being taken into account.
<b>Croatia</b>	Partly, CSOs only (at social partners' initiative)	Representatives of the institutions supporting civil society development met with the national plan drafting coordinator on 19 January 2021. Prior to the meeting, there had been no formal consultation of or communication with CSOs. Representatives of the institutions supporting civil society development were shown a working version of the national plan, which is still being drafted.

		<p>Possible ways of including CSO activities and initiatives in the national plan were discussed. It was agreed to hold a thematic meeting of the Council for Civil Society Development focusing on the plan, involving the national plan coordinator and other relevant actors in order to ensure that civil society representatives are fully consulted. The social partners have not been involved, despite several requests to this effect. Representatives of several ministries and social partners held a two-hour online meeting on 5 January 2021. The representative of the Ministry of Finance, who was replacing the national plan coordinator, delivered a PowerPoint presentation on the national plan, but virtually no discussion was held.</p>
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes, planned	<p>The consultation mechanisms and information channels used to plan the RRF largely overlap with those used for other EU-related consultations. The narrower social partners' council (employees, employers + government) has no plans to discuss the RRF or the Semester, nor has it put these issues on a specific agenda. This approach is the same as that taken previously. The other, broader, hexagonal economic &amp; social council (NGTT – also including representatives of civil society, science, churches and arts) wants to put it on its agenda in Q1 2021, which is a new approach.</p>
<b>Ireland</b>	Yes, planned	<p>The Department of the Taoiseach (prime minister) has confirmed that a consultation process will be launched in the coming days. According to the Department, this forthcoming consultation will involve stakeholders being asked to comment on what Ireland's reform and investment priorities should be in its application to the RRF. In addition, the Department has advised us that there will be engagement, as the plan develops, through other forums, including the Labour Employer Economic Forum, and the Partnership Process Steering Group. It is understood that a public consultation is planned as part of the development of the plan.</p>
<b>Italy</b>	Yes, ongoing	<p>During the process of drawing up the NRRP, the government has so far certainly shown that it is open to closer consultations with institutional, economic and social stakeholders, as was also recommended in the Parliament's guidance document published in October. In the document approved on 12 January, the government states that consultations must continue, with a view to adopting the final version of the plan.</p>
<b>Lithuania</b>	Yes, planned (at civil society's initiative)	<p>At the initial planning stage, the relevant governmental institutions informed society about the essential aspects of the RRF and the main components of the R&amp;R Plan, including proportions and deadlines. However, it has not been done on their initiative but rather as the result of a push from industry, business organisations, unions and NGOs. In January, the Ministry of Finance worked out a preparation and consultation mechanism. The relevant ministries were instructed to hold separate preliminary consultations with social and economic partners, regional and local authorities, and NGOs. The consultations will include methodological preparation and the organisation of live joint thematic discussions based on established components and written consultations on an e-platform. It is still difficult to say how this consultation mechanism will work in practice.</p>
<b>Luxembourg</b>	No, not planned	<p>Currently, there are no consultation mechanisms specifically established for the R&amp;R Plan in Luxembourg. Consultations are supposed to take place in the context of the European Semester. However, due to the COVID-19 crisis, the European Semester meetings did not take place in 2020.</p>

<b>Latvia</b>	Yes (with criticism)	The involvement of OCS, including social partners, in consultations on the RRF in Latvia has been very limited and started at a late stage, with the first information sessions only being held in December. At the request of the social partners, discussions on R&R Plans in Latvia were included on agenda of the National Tripartite Cooperation Council (NTSP) meeting held on 18 December 2020. Thanks to the issue being raised at the NTSP meeting, the Ministry of Finance invited the social partners to a discussion on the RRF on 14 January 2021. Furthermore, social partners, other OCS representatives at the EESC and government representatives were due to discuss the RRF implementation process in Latvia on 29 January 2021. Although strong demands for consultation were made from early September, the Ministry of Finance ignored these requests. After fierce and repeated demands, on 14 December 2020 one information session was held for OCS between NGOs and the Cabinet through the Council for Implementation of the Memorandum of Co-operation. No party considered this event to be a consultation; it was defined as a session for providing information.
<b>Malta</b>	Yes, ongoing	The mechanism for consultation is the Malta Council for Social and Economic Development (MCSED), a forum where representatives of civil society meet on a regular basis to discuss socio-economic issues, national budgetary plans and key economic policies. The MCSED is chaired by the government. The R&R Plan would fall under the category "key economic policies".
<b>The Netherlands</b>	Yes, ongoing	The government uses a decentralised approach where various stakeholders are in contact with their respective departments. They are invited to provide ideas for investments.
<b>Poland</b>	Partly, only social partners (with criticism regarding impact)	The social partners have been seeking to play an active role in this process since the drafting phase of the R&R Plan via the Social Dialogue Council (SDC). In response to a call from the social partners in July 2020, the Ministry of Funds and Regional Policy (MFRP) invited them "to contribute to the process of drafting the NRRP, including identifying projects that could be put forward for funding from the RRF". In August 2020, the social partners' involvement in creating the SDC was formally increased, at their request, to include involvement in verifying all investment and reform projects submitted for the NRRP and in developing best project solutions. This work took place in dedicated thematic groups for the selection of projects for the NRRP. In addition, at the explicit request of the social partners in the SDC, a discussion with government representatives on the foundations of the NRRP took place on 22 October 2020. During the discussion, the social partners expressed concerns about the state of play of the government's strategic documents, the limited scope for consultation of the various stages of the NRRP, the lack of clear and transparent information from the government, the rushed pace, and the lack of proper information and access to documentation. The final decisions taken in many cases overlook the social partners' recommendations.
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes	The Portuguese government drew up an opinion coordinated by an expert who consulted various CSOs, in particular the Confederation of Portuguese Business (CIP – Group I) and the General Confederation of Portuguese Workers (CGTP – Group II). The Portuguese national plan provides for a monitoring committee – still to be set up – with the Prime Minister and a monitoring committee with the social partners and other CSOs. As European Semester Group (ESG) rules for 2021 are changing, taking into account the NextGenerationEU (National



		Recovery and Resilience Plans – previously the National Reform Plans), it is expected that there will be a single European Semester document in the course of the first quarter of 2021. The views of the Permanent Commission for Social Coordination and the monitoring committee will be heard, as will those of the national Economic and Social Council.
<b>Romania</b>	Yes, planned (with criticism regarding impact)	In theory, yes, according to both the general applicable legislation, as well as according to the most recent memorandum. However, according to the published calendar, the mechanism will allow little time for substantive debate. Organisation of a series of meetings with dialogue partners to collect and analyse their recommendations and proposals. In this sense, representatives of the Ministry of European Projects and Investments will act as facilitators. Collection, analysis and harmonisation of proposals submitted by ministries based on recommendations made by dialogue partners.
<b>Sweden</b>	Partly, only social partners	The government has engaged in dialogue with the social partners at both administrative and political level. The social partners have been given the opportunity to submit written comments. The Commission organised a meeting of social partner leaders in September. The usual meetings on the European Semester have been held with the social partners.
<b>Slovenia</b>	Partly, only social partners	Social partners should be involved in consultation on the R&R Plans in Slovenia through the Economic and Social Council (ESC) as the ESC usually held the debate on the National Reform Programme and Stabilisation Pact. However, no mechanism is in place for consultation on the R&R Plans with CSOs, namely NGOs. The mechanism for consultation with social partners within the ESC is formally adequate and appropriate, but the problem is that in practice the mechanism does not function at the moment as explained below. We do not consider mechanisms for consultation on R&R Plans with the rest of OCS adequate and appropriate.
<b>Slovakia</b>	No, not planned	The process of drafting the RRF has not included a broad-based discussion with civil society. Only municipalities, members of trade chambers and political parties have been involved in the process.

**Question 2:**

***Are there different consultation mechanisms for the social partners and the rest of organised civil society in your country?***

On the one hand, 10 out of 27 Member States have a different procedure for the consultation of the social partners and the rest of organised civil society in relation to their national recovery and resilience plan (Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czechia, Greece, Hungary, Spain, France, the Netherlands, Latvia). Where such a differentiated approach is present, respondents reported that the social partners are included on a more structured, institutionalised, and permanent basis whereas consultation of remaining civil society organisations instead takes place in an ad hoc and informal manner.

On the other hand, 7 out of 27 Member States have opted to rely on a common procedure encompassing all stakeholders (Austria, Estonia, Finland, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Romania).

As mentioned above, a number of Member States have solely consulted the social partners, and not broader civil society in the preparation of their plans (Germany, Poland, Sweden, Slovenia). The reverse is true for one Member State, where the government only consulted civil society without including the

social partners (Croatia). In addition, in a few Member States, no consultations have been carried out nor are they foreseen to take place at a later stage (Denmark, Luxembourg, Slovakia).

<b>Country</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Condensed contribution</b>
<b>Austria</b>	No, a common consultation (generally, yes)	The social partners – unlike CSOs – must be involved by the government in all EU matters due to national legal provisions.
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes	Both nationally and in the regions. Among other things concerning the environment, training, land use planning, consumption, the disabled, youth, education etc.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes	Yes, the representatives of the organized civil society were consulted in other forms - online presentation and discussion on each of the four sections of the first draft of the National Recovery Plan, separate consultative meetings were held depending on the declared interests. The social partners were consulted separately from civil society in three forms: 1) through bilateral and tripartite discussions (4 in total for the period November - January); 2) by preparing an opinion by the Economic and Social Committee and discussing with the team under the National Recovery Plan; 3) by preparing opinions of each of the social partners and discussing them.
<b>Cyprus</b>	Yes	Consultation with the social partners (employers'/business organisations and trade union federations) is very structured, takes place on a permanent basis, covers a range of related issues and is undertaken by the Ministry of Labour. Consultation on broader economic issues (e.g. the MFF, the Semester, the R&R Plan) is undertaken by the Ministry of Finance and includes the social partners plus relevant CSOs on an ad hoc basis.
<b>Czechia</b>	Yes, different	Although the process for involving stakeholders other than social partners in the European Semester consultation process is not perfect, it does exist. Consultation round tables on National Reform Plan involving representatives of the Council for Non-governmental Non-profit Organisations (RVNNO) were held on 17, 18 and 19 March 2020 and 15 December 2020. On the other hand, this is not the case in the NRRP drafting process – in this case, the RVNNO was not contacted. Various stakeholders (Confederation of Industry of the Czech Republic, Czech Chamber of Commerce, Association of Regions of the Czech Republic, Union of Towns and Municipalities, etc.) appealed and have subsequently been gradually involved in the process. A series of remote meetings was organised on 12, 19 and 26 November, and 3 and 10 December 2020 on various pillars of the NRRP with the participation of social partners. NGOs were invited for discussions on the NRRP in the Sustainable Development Council.
<b>Germany</b>	Yes, only social partners	Yes, the social partners are prioritised in the consultation processes. The ministry has not yet proactively extended an invitation to CSOs.
<b>Denmark</b>	No, no consultation	We are not aware of any differentiated approach, as the Danish government has not initiated a consultation process.
<b>Greece</b>	Yes, also see question 2	Official consultation between the Greek government and the social partners' representatives has been institutionalised and is carried out through Greek ESC, national committees and other bodies. However, the Greek government is not legally bound to consult with CSOs on every issue. There is no formal or institutionalised consultation

		procedure since the Greek state does not recognise CSOs as social partners.
<b>Spain</b>	Yes	The government's social dialogue with trade unions and employers is more structured. With other CSOs, such as the third sector, associations or social economy organisations, the dialogue is more ad hoc and multiform.
<b>Estonia</b>	No, a common consultation	Thematic brainstorming seminars will be held in Estonia, in which all umbrella organisations will take part.
<b>Finland</b>	No, a common consultation	All are included in the mechanisms presented above (see question 1).
<b>France</b>	Yes	The social partners had a separate meeting with the French government's General Secretariat for European Affairs. Aside from their participation in the ESEC's work, the representative social partners at national level are specifically consulted in the context of the CDSEI. The CDSEI is an informal advisory committee to the minister with responsibility for social relations. It brings together the relevant social partners and administrations and is the only official body for social dialogue on European issues.
<b>Croatia</b>		In line with the conclusions of the Council for Civil Society Development, representatives of the institutions supporting civil society development (the Council for Civil Society Development, the National Foundation for Civil Society Development and the Croatian government's Office for Cooperation with NGOs) met with the national plan drafting coordinator on 19 January 2021. The social partners (the Croatian Employers' Association and three representative trade union associations: the Union of Autonomous Trade Unions of Croatia, the Independent Trade Unions of Croatia, and MATICA – the Association of Croatian Trade Unions) have not been involved in the drafting of the national plan, despite several requests to this effect. Likewise, the Croatian government did not develop a specific mechanism for the timely involvement of the social partners in that process.
<b>Hungary</b>		The narrower social partners' council (employees, employers + government) has no plans to discuss the RRF or the Semester, nor has it put these issues on a specific agenda. This approach is the same as that taken previously. The other, broader, hexagonal economic and social council (NGTT – also including representatives of civil society, science, churches and arts) wants to put it on the agenda in Q1 2021, which is a new approach.
<b>Ireland</b>	-	No answer
<b>Italy</b>	No, a common consultation	For the time being, there are no formal, structured mechanisms for consulting economic and social organisations, meaning that there is no difference in how the social partners are consulted compared to other organisations. If anything, the latter organisations are more limited in number and were included at the last minute.
<b>Lithuania</b>	No, a common consultation	As there has been no specific consultation mechanism or special consultation plan so far, it is impossible to assess whether there are differences between the consultation mechanisms used for social partners and the rest of civil society. The Ministry of Finance says that it does not intend to use different consultation mechanisms for social partners and the rest of OCS.

		In general, business organisations, trade unions and NGOs have had different experiences consulting with governmental institutions on important issues. Normally in Lithuania, interaction between public authorities and NGOs is done through the Council of Non-governmental Organisations, while structured multi-stakeholder dialogue between public authorities and social partners is done through the main tripartite institution – the Tripartite Council of the Republic of Lithuania – as well as through specialised tripartite councils and tripartite councils under local municipalities.
<b>Luxembourg</b>	Yes	Structured social dialogue at national level in Luxembourg takes place mainly in the framework of the tripartite coordination committee and at the Economic and Social Council of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg (ESC). There is no institutional framework for consultation of other civil society actors. Since 2015, on the initiative of organisations representing workers and employers, a dialogue between the social partners and the government has taken place in Luxembourg under the auspices of the ESC. This process should in principle entail three meetings: an initial meeting following publication (in March) of the country-specific report, a second meeting before sending the National Reform Plan and the Stability and Growth Programme to the European authorities (in April), and a third meeting following the European Commission's recommendations to Luxembourg, but before their final adoption by the Council (end of June/beginning of July).
<b>Latvia</b>	Yes, different	The social partners and other OCS groups have different tools that can be used in discussions on the RRF through different platforms. The main platform for the social partners is the National Tripartite Cooperation Council (NTSP), including ten NTSP sub-councils and various working and advisory groups managed by ministers. Other OCS groups are also invited to participate in working and advisory groups.
<b>Malta</b>	No, a common consultation	No, the MCESD is the only forum for consultation purposes.
<b>The Netherlands</b>	Yes, different	The government uses a decentralised approach where various stakeholders are in contact with their respective departments. They are invited to provide ideas for investments.
<b>Poland</b>	Yes	The consultation mechanisms were not officially defined differently for the social partners and for the rest of OCS. However, it is also clear from the example of the NRRP that the institutionalisation of tripartite social dialogue is much better developed than that of dialogue with the rest of civil society. The main body of tripartite social dialogue at central level is the Social Dialogue Council (SDC), which has broad statutory powers. The main body of civil dialogue (excluding social dialogue) at central level is the Public Benefit Council (PBC), which does not have the same competences as the SDC. While representatives of the organisations that are part of the SDC were able to convince the government to include them in the work on the draft NRRP, other CSOs were excluded from this process. It is only now that the government has announced the inclusion of the PBC in the consultation process.
<b>Portugal</b>		
<b>Romania</b>	No, a common consultation	During the first round of consultations, there was a common public mechanism for all stakeholders. In the newly announced mechanism, it seems that there will also be a common consultation mechanism.

		Moreover, given the fact that the line ministries will have their own technical teams working on specific subject matters, it should be possible to use the normal social dialogue mechanism for consultations, at least with the social partners. However, given the experience with the first draft of the NRRP, we are expecting very uneven practices, depending on the ministry's openness.
<b>Sweden</b>	Only social partners	Yes, only the social partners have been consulted on the RRF. The Commission's Stockholm Office has undertaken to contact OCS once the Swedish plan has been published. A seminar is also being planned, with the participation of a broad range of stakeholders and OCS representatives.
<b>Slovenia</b>	Only social partners	Yes. As stated before, as only social partners are members of the ESC where consultation on economic and social measures, including the European Semester documents, are being held, the rest of OCS cannot be involved in the ESC's work on that matter.
<b>Slovakia</b>	No, no consultation	

**Question 3:**

***Your country must submit its National Recovery and Resilience Plan by 30 April 2021 at the latest. Where is your country in the process?***

In terms of substance, the responses gathered were mixed. While all participants reported that the national government has begun work to prepare their recovery and resilience plan, Member States are in different stages of the process. In a majority of Member States, a first version of the national recovery and resilience plan is under preparation in responsible ministries, most often the Ministry of Finance. A few Member States were reported to be working on a second version of their national plan, following submission of a draft plan to the European Commission at an earlier stage.

Some have concluded consultations with civil society, whereas others are yet to consult external stakeholders. A number of respondents also reported that their government is consulting closely with the European Commission or has a view to begin consultation shortly. In a number of Member States, a change in government was reported to have impacted the preparation of the plan.

<b>Country</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Condensed contribution</b>
<b>Austria</b>	Ongoing, 1st draft	The Austrian R&R Plan is being coordinated by the Federal Chancellery and the Federal Ministry for Finance. Unfortunately, the social partners and civil society cannot tell what stage Austria is currently at in this process. We are currently at the beginning of the process. Therefore, a delay is possible.
<b>Belgium</b>	Ongoing, EC dialogue	Belgium has introduced its plan to the Commission. The talks are ongoing and are closely followed by the social partners.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Ongoing, 2nd draft	In early February 2021 Bulgarian OCS received the second draft, which is much improved and largely reflects its notes, comments and recommendations. The social partners are preparing opinions on it and it is to be discussed in a tripartite format or in the National Council for Tripartite Cooperation.
<b>Cyprus</b>	Ongoing, 1st draft	The first draft is expected to be sent to the Commission in January 2021. The final programme will be submitted by the end of 2021. The policy priorities presented in the form of investments and reforms contained under the five policy areas are complementary and synergetic

		and aim to collectively contribute to the economy's resilience and sustainable growth.
<b>Czechia</b>	Ongoing 2nd draft, EC dialogue	The Prime Minister presented the first version of the NRRP to the European Commission without any consultation with the relevant stakeholders. The second version of the NRRP is now being drafted. The government intends to adopt the plan together with the National Reform Plan at the end of February; discussion in the highest tripartite body is planned for 22 February 2021. Therefore, we expect the stakeholders' consultations to be held in February.
<b>Germany</b>	Ongoing	There is a first draft of the R&R Plan, which was made publicly available in December 2020 in the form of a brochure. The investment plans are embedded in the broader framework of the federal government's June 2020 economic and future package. They are already included in the 2021 federal budget – adopted by the German Bundestag on 11 December 2020 – and in the financial plan to 2024.
<b>Denmark</b>	Ongoing, 1st draft	The Ministry of Finance is currently in the process of drafting the outline of the plans.
<b>Greece</b>	Ongoing, EC dialogue	According to the Ministry of Finance, the first round of preparation of the National Recovery & Resilience Facility was completed by the end of 2020, including all four main strands; a) cooperation with the European Commission; b) the first projects that will be pre-financed by the public investment programme with a view to their subsequent inclusion in the Recovery Fund; c) consultation on the strategic guidelines of the recovery plan; as well as d) preparation of technical procedures for the Recovery Fund.
<b>Spain</b>	Ongoing	On 7 October 2020, the Spanish government presented a framework proposal for the plan under the name "Spain Can". On 30 December 2020, it approved the Decree Law, which, in addition to establishing the plan's governance and social participation procedures, proposes broad administrative reform aimed at facilitating the implementation of the plan's investments. In the General State Budget for 2021, the government has included EUR 26,634 million worth of investments from the RRF and React-EU. The government has told the social partners that it is willing to approve the plan as soon as it is legally able to do so, i.e. as soon as the Parliament approves the Regulation on the Recovery and Resilience Mechanism.
<b>Estonia</b>	On hold	Due to the change of government, the development of the R&R Plan is currently on hold. It will be continued after the new government has been appointed.
<b>Finland</b>	Ongoing, 1st draft	The Government Report on the National Recovery and Resilience Plan was submitted to the parliament on 27 November and is undergoing review in the relevant parliamentary committees. Preparation of specific plans continues in the ministries, with a ministerial committee overseeing the work.
<b>France</b>	Partly submitted, EC contact	France has already sent half of its plan to the European Commission, with whom there are ongoing exchanges. France is to submit its entire NRRP by 1 February. The French government chose to reply to requests in a single document (R&R Plan and National Reform Programme).
<b>Croatia</b>	Ongoing	A draft version was sent to the European Commission for prior assessment on 18 December 2020.
<b>Hungary</b>		The development of the R&R Plan is a two-sided iterative procedure, i.e. Hungary submitted its first draft to the Commission's RRF team in mid-October 2020. Its public consultation started in early November on a dedicated website. This was partly supported by occasional mentions

		<p>of the plan by the competent state secretary during official visits and presentations. The disadvantage, however, is that the existence, website and timing of this consultation and these tools have not been widely advertised and most people are unaware of them. The initial feedback from the Commission and the early feedback from the civil society stakeholders consulted were recently received. The process of analysing and incorporating this feedback has just started. Upon completion, a second draft will be sent to the Commission next month and put forward for a second round of consultation. The final plan will be submitted before the deadline, i.e. the end of April.</p> <p>The EU's Permanent Representation held a promotion forum on the RRF (and one on the MFF) in mid-November, together with the state secretary, and they plan to repeat this communication in the near future. As usual, they keep organising similar annual discussions on the Sustainable Growth Strategy, its chapters and the country reports for the invited public.</p>
<b>Ireland</b>	Ongoing, 1st draft	<p>According to the information provided, Ireland's plan is at a relatively early stage – partially as result of awaiting greater clarity on the nature of the post-1-January arrangements for trade with the UK, for which we are the most impacted Member State. The development of the plan is being led by the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform, working with the Department of the Taoiseach, the Department of Finance and the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment.</p>
<b>Italy</b>	Ongoing, 2nd draft	<p>The first draft of the plan, presented by the government on 7 December, met with a considerable amount of criticism regarding its priorities, the balance between subsidies and investments, and the governance structure. In the following weeks, the government extensively revised the draft plan, coming up with a much more detailed document, consisting of 6 missions, 16 components and 47 areas of intervention. The draft plan was discussed and approved by the Council of Ministers on 12 January 2021.</p>
<b>Lithuania</b>	Ongoing, EC contact	<p>The thematic components of the R&amp;R Plan were developed under the leadership of the previous government in October-November. They were then discussed with the European Commission in December. The new government started getting acquainted with the documents containing the thematic components of the R&amp;R Plan and their alignment with the Programme of the Government. Certain components were expected to be revised before 26 January. Correspondingly, the process will be followed by active consultations with stakeholders and informal negotiations with the European Commission. Three iterations of the R&amp;R Plan are expected before final submission in April.</p> <p>Following the consultations with social partners and the rest of OCS, ministries drew up sectoral plans by 26 January. The Ministry of Finance will prepare a full-scale national plan and start consultations with the Commission by mid-February 2021.</p>
<b>Luxembourg</b>	Starting up	<p>According to our information, the government has not yet drawn up a draft R&amp;R Plan. Nevertheless, following a meeting of the enlarged Bureau of the ESC held on 21 December 2020, the social partners sent a letter to the government to sound out its views on the progress of the National Reform Programme and the R&amp;R Plan. In particular, they asked for details of the planned timetable and the form that consultation(s) of the social partners should take.</p>
<b>Latvia</b>		<p>According to the information presented by the Ministry of Finance, the draft R&amp;R Plan should be submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers in January 2021. Subsequently, discussions with the European</p>

		Commission and OCS should take place from the end of January until April 2021. Finally, the final version of the R&R Plan should be approved by the Cabinet of Ministers and submitted to the European Commission in the second quarter of 2021.
<b>Malta</b>	Ongoing	The Ministry of Finance is spearheading the R&R Plan in view of its links with the national budgetary plans. The plans appear to be progressing as they are consistent with the strategic vision outlined in the last national budget.
<b>The Netherlands</b>	Ongoing, 1st draft	Given the Dutch parliamentary elections in March 2021, the third Rutte cabinet has decided that the next government will submit the final R&R Plan for the Netherlands. This may imply that the Netherlands will not be able to meet the first deadline of 30 April 2021, and will submit a final R&R Plan between 15 October 2021 and 30 April 2022. Currently, the Netherlands is exploring the possible measures to include in our R&R Plan. The current government has initiated multiple reforms since February 2020 that seem to meet the conditions for the R&R Plan and provide a solid foundation for the draft plan. These reforms address the 2019 and 2020 country-specific recommendations and serve as the starting point for the draft R&R Plan.
<b>Poland</b>	Ongoing, EC dialogue	The broad public consultation announced by the government after the draft NRRP was created has not yet begun, although the partnership agreement between Poland and the EU has been under consultation since 18 January 2021. So far, projects submitted for the NRRP have been collected and evaluated. Work is currently focusing on areas such as identifying indicators, milestones and timetables for planned reforms in selected areas. A demarcation with other sources of funding was also indicated. An informal dialogue with the European Commission is ongoing at the same time. The government has consistently stated that it will submit the plan on time. There is therefore a concern that the pace of consultation on the prepared draft NRRP will be too fast, which will have a negative impact on its quality.
<b>Portugal</b>	Ongoing, submitted 1st draft	The government submitted its draft national plan on 14 October in Brussels. After the final plan has been submitted to the Commission by 30 April, the Commission will analyse it and send its guidelines to the Portuguese Economic and Social Council, which will then have to issue its views on the matter.
<b>Romania</b>	Ongoing, 2nd draft, EC dialogue	We have a first version of the plan, but as mentioned by both the European Commission and the social partners and CSOs, that first plan did not meet the criteria for the RRF. We are back to square one (nomination of teams and coordinators for each ministry). Nevertheless, there are some areas for which social partners and CSOs have already prepared and sent consistent proposals.
<b>Sweden</b>	Ongoing, EC dialogue	Work is underway and on schedule. The process of selecting which measures to include in the plan is more or less complete. The Ministry of Finance is currently working on the draft plan, in close cooperation with the Recovery and Resilience Task Force (RECOVER).
<b>Slovenia</b>	Ongoing	The draft R&R Plan is currently being prepared, but the draft that the government has approved is still held secret, bearing the security label that prevents the public from learning about the content of the proposal. Members of the ESC did receive the draft in physical form but are not allowed to distribute it to their members. That poses a huge obstacle for a public debate with relevant stakeholders, making it practically impossible. The government held a round of consultation within the ESG, but part of it took place even before the members received the draft and only a general debate was held after that. The part that relates



		to the labour market was the only part of the draft R&R Plan that was discussed a little more in depth, but without feedback so far as to which responses of the social partners were taken on board. The government is supposed to adopt the R&R Plan in the near future but, according to the press, the plan will only become public after that.
<b>Slovakia</b>	Ongoing 1st version, EC dialogue	Currently, the authorities are working on the final version of the document in close cooperation with the Commission representative.

**Question 4:**

***How does the R&R procedure differ compared to the consultation of OCS during the normal Semester procedure in your country?***

Also here, the responses are mixed and somewhat inconclusive. However, some of the same trends can be observed as in the answers to the previous questions: certain MS say that it is too early to say anything, some say that there is not enough time for a proper consultation, and some say that the social partners are more involved than the rest of OCS. Three MS (Finland, Ireland, Spain) state that the R&R procedure has been or will be more open to OSC than the normal Semester procedure, but four MS (Czechia, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia) state that the established consultation framework in place for the normal semester-exercise of OCS is not used for the R&R-work. A couple of Member States expressed that the consultation procedure has the potential to be better than the ordinary Semester procedure, if it lives up to government plans.

<b>Country</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Condensed contribution</b>
<b>Austria</b>	-	The BKA was and still is in charge of the European Semester consultation process, while the preparation of the national R&R Plan is to be coordinated by the BMF. At present, however, there is nothing to report regarding the quantity and quality of the process, as Austria is only at the very beginning. Therefore, a complete answer can only be provided at a later stage.
<b>Belgium</b>		The plans are adapted according to Brexit and the Corona crisis.
<b>Bulgaria</b>		Under the National Recovery Plan, the social partners are consulted separately from OCS in three different forms, while during the normal European Semester until 2020 the consultation was common for the social partners and civil society representatives within Working Group 31 of the Council of Ministers. The consultation took place through the exchange of e-mails, and now there are online meetings and discussions. During the European Semester, representatives of the European Commission consulted OCS separately or together at each stage of the cycle.
<b>Cyprus</b>	-	No answer
<b>Czechia</b>	Worse	Involvement of the social partners in both processes is ensured. However, lack of involvement in the initial crucial phase defining the basic architecture and pillars of NRRP has been criticised by all the parties. Involvement of other stakeholders in the Semester process is, as a minimum, ensured by inviting EESC Group III members to the consultations. This was not the case with the NRRP process. The non-profit sector has been invited to the NRRP consultation process only recently. The situation is improving following pressure from different stakeholders – the preparation of this input also helped.
<b>Germany</b>	More focused	The consultations usually carried out during the Semester procedure have been synchronised with the procedures for drafting the national recovery plans. Normally, exchanges are held on the Semester at the

		end of November each year, as part of the national macroeconomic dialogue on the Semester, as well as in the context of the meeting on the annual economic report (always in January). Currently, the inquiry is focusing not on the Semester in general, but on the national recovery plan.
<b>Denmark</b>	Worse	During the Semester procedure, the government meets the "Europa 2020-kontaktudvalget" – consisting of about 30 social partners and CSOs – four times a year. The Semester procedure provides for the formal involvement of the social partners. The social partners become officially involved in the reporting activities relating to the National Reform Programme but are not involved in policy initiatives. The social partners have not been involved in the R&R procedure, either formally or informally.
<b>Greece</b>	-	Due to the ongoing economic adjustment programmes, Greece had been exempted from the obligation to submit National Reform Programmes and stability or convergence programmes; it was in 2019 that the country was included in the European Semester for economic policy coordination, and received country-specific recommendations. As such, there is no data to assess the participation level of CSOs in designing and implementing the National Reform Programme.
<b>Spain</b>	Potentially better	On paper, the procedures created for the Recovery Plan should allow for broader and more genuine participation, but the timetable the government has in mind may prevent this, at least for the drafting phase.
<b>Estonia</b>		The social partners are usually involved in the European Semester process, but civil society is less likely to be involved (there is no specific mechanism for doing so). At the same time, civil society was closely involved in drawing up the "Eesti 2035" strategy, which is currently the starting point for the development of the R&R Plan. However, due to the relatively indirect involvement in the R&R Plan, it cannot be argued that the same process has been used or that the two processes are remotely comparable.
<b>Finland</b>	More open	The R&R procedure has thus far been more open to participation by civil society than the normal Semester procedure. While normal Semester procedure consultations have been primarily conducted between the Commission and civil society, now both the national ministries and the parliament have consulted extensively with civil society.
<b>France</b>	More in-depth	With regard to the economic and financial issues relating to the R&R Plan, and given that the post-COVID-19 economic recovery is a matter of urgency, the management of the process enabling France to benefit from the allocation of EUR 40 billion has been largely taken on by the Ministry for the Economy and Finance. The deadlines for the final report for the period also appeared to be tighter than usual. The French ESEC was consulted at an earlier stage, as was the CDSEI, after trade union intervention. The talks took place on the basis of a preliminary draft R&R Plan, allowing for a more in-depth discussion. However, its impact on the final decision is still difficult to assess at this stage.
<b>Croatia</b>	-	No answer.
<b>Hungary</b>		The main differences come from the new timetable for the Semester, the communication limitations resulting from the pandemic also due to the different method of planning, described in Q3.

<b>Ireland</b>	Likely to be better	Regarding a comparison between the consultation process for the normal Semester exercise and the NRRP, the consultation process envisaged would appear to be considerably better. The social partners and wider CSOs are unanimously of the view that the experience of previous years was very disappointing. Indeed, the general practice has been to send drafts of the plans to them for comment days before the deadline for submission. There has not normally been much dialogue and there is also a view that the observations they submit are rarely reflected in the final drafts. So, if the approach outlined in our work with the Department of the Taoiseach is followed through, it would represent some improvement.
<b>Italy</b>	Similar	Compared with the European Semester procedure, apart from the difference in terms of the scale of discussions, there are no discernible differences as regards method and structure. Moreover, as things currently stand, the criticism already voiced in respect of the European Semester – excessive fragmentation and the absence of a structural framework for making consistent comparisons of the overall picture – also holds true for the NRRP.
<b>Lithuania</b>	Worse (less involvement)	National public authorities consult social partners at certain stages of the European Semester within the framework of the tripartite council. Social partners and CSOs are involved in the key stages. The consultations have not yet taken place, and the EC has not engaged with this process either. The same applies to the rest of OCS, normally consulted within the framework of the Council of Non-governmental Organisations during the Semester process.
<b>Luxembourg</b>	-	As we have not yet received a reply from the government, we do not know the details of the consultation procedure for the R&R Plan.
<b>Latvia</b>	Less structured	Regarding the social partners, involvement in the procedure for the R&R implementation process and the normal European Semester procedure are completely different. In fact, we could say that there is no procedure for R&R implementation (that is outlined in detail and established). On the other hand, during the European Semester there is a very well organised procedure, a clear role for each party, and a fixed timetable for the activities for which the European Commission Representation in Latvia is responsible.
<b>Malta</b>	-	Consultations on the R&R Plan have yet to start. However, it is believed that detailed consultations will take place during the first quarter of 2021 and will be chaired by the Minister of Finance.
<b>The Netherlands</b>	Similar	The government uses a decentralised approach where various stakeholders are in contact with their respective departments. They are invited to submit ideas for investments. This decentralised approach is also used during the normal Semester procedure, but is less bound to a timeline and a budget.
<b>Poland</b>	More intensive for detailed docs, less strategic	Comparing the work on the NRRP and working methods under the ordinary European Semester procedure, it can be concluded that consultation of civil society on the NRRP is more intensive in the case of detailed documents (such as the assessment of individual projects for the NRRP, subject to the problems identified above), but much less intensive for documents of strategic importance. From the point of view of civil society, it is also complicated to assign responsibility for the NRRP to a ministry (MFRP) other than the one leading the European Semester process (MDLT), which is also currently carrying out the administrative tasks for the Europe 2020 Inter-ministerial Team – a consultative-advisory body of the Prime Minister, with the participation of representatives of the social

		partners and other civil society organisations. The work of this Team is also much less intensive than in previous years.
<b>Portugal</b>		The major difference is that the national monitoring committee of each country will be consulted. The same will apply to Portugal.
<b>Romania</b>		The consultations for the Semester procedure were coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and they were also rather limited. According to the memorandum published by the institution, they sent the 2020 National Reform Programme proposal to the social dialogue partners between 23 and 28 April 2020 and then sent the observations received to line ministries.
<b>Sweden</b>	Similar	The consultation is being carried out in a similar manner, and to some extent within the same structure as for the Semester. On the other hand, the substantive content of the national recovery plans is more the prerogative of each Member State, unlike the work of the ordinary Semester, and thus depends more on what the Member State wants to do.
<b>Slovenia</b>	Worse (but due to change in government)	There had been gradual but steady progress towards the active involvement of social partners within the ESC in the normal Semester procedure until 2020. The involvement had improved every year and the social partners had the ability to make proposals, comments and remarks on the drafts, some of which were also included in the final documents. In 2020, however, there was a change of government in Slovenia during the normal Semester procedure for 2020. The new government did not hold any consultations with the social partners in the ESC on the final documents of the Semester, and the involvement in the R&R Plan is as stated before. We could conclude that, compared to the years before 2020, social partners and civil society are much less involved in the procedures and consultations, and are even excluded to some extent.
<b>Slovakia</b>	-	No answer

**Question 5:**

***To what extent does the R&R Plan of your country correspond with the policy objectives of OCS in your country?***

The answer to this question falls in three broad categories. One group of MS think that the objectives generally correspond, either as a result of a consultation procedure or because the interests were already shared. A second group deplores that the public and well-known interests of OCS have been ignored by the governments in drawing up the plans, and the third and last group is unable to answer, either because of lack of solid knowledge, or because it is still too early in the process.

Only in two Member States is there full agreement (Bulgaria and Malta). In eight countries there is partial convergence between civil society policy objectives and those outlined in the national plan (Cyprus, Greece, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Malta, Poland, Slovenia). In six countries CSOs are critical (Czechia, Germany, Denmark, France, Latvia, Romania). In the remaining 10 countries it is premature to make judgements or no answer was submitted.

Country	Summary	Condensed contribution
<b>Austria</b>	-	Due to the described timetable, we can only answer this question at a later stage.

<b>Belgium</b>	Partially	Essentially, the organizations concerned approve of the objectives of Belgium and its regions. Above all, the possibility of the social partners and the organizations concerned to closely monitor the implementation of the plans is very important.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Partially	Despite the specific and numerous critical remarks and suggestions that aim only to improve the submitted document, the social partners fully appreciated all the merits of the plan, where there are a number of very well-defined highlights and priorities. The social partners have been able to formulate common goals and consolidated positions on the National Recovery Plan, while organized civil society representatives are highly fragmented, have very different interests and are impossible to unite. Their approach is to try to propose in bilateral contacts specific investment projects for inclusion in the plan.
<b>Cyprus</b>	Partially	Most stakeholders have submitted written proposals and a number of them have already been included in the NRRP, while a few others are still under appraisal/further scrutiny with a view to including them in a later version of the components.
<b>Czechia</b>	Criticism expressed	We can comment only on the first NRRP version from October 2020 as the second version is not yet available. Trade unions did have many comments on the structure and elements; a number of measures and actions proposed should be covered by the state budget and not the R&R Plan. The NRRP should be focused on the transformation of the economy and other actions should be proposed to achieve this goal. The Confederation of Industry and other employers' organisations stressed, in the same connection, that a number of NRRP projects and components do not focus on the post-pandemic recovery but instead are aimed at investing in areas which are neglected and underinvested, especially in the public sector. The Chamber of Commerce underlines that the NRRP should be a real recovery plan, also supporting resilience of sectors seriously hit by the COVID-19 pandemic crisis – tourism, gastronomy, retail and the hospitality sector; these sectors, however, are not explicitly mentioned in any of the proposed pillars.
<b>Germany</b>		From the point of view of employers and the National Productivity Council, there is a need for targeted and forward-looking use of funds. In our opinion, the current German R&R Plan is lacking clear prioritisation.
<b>Denmark</b>	Criticism expressed	The government has not – so far – presented the concrete policy initiatives the R&R Plan should be spent on. It has included the R&R Plan as part of the overall financing of the state budget and expects it to be able to partly support the reform of green taxation and a stimulus package. Denmark had preferred a separate set of policy objectives and initiatives in a separate R&R Plan on which the social partners were consulted, either in a public hearing or a closed meeting. Denmark would have preferred the plan to be aimed at initiating structural education and labour market reforms. The reforms would contribute to job creation and increase the supply of labour which would create better protection against future crises, not only pandemics. FH finds the strong focus on the Green Transition to be positive. In the spring, FH presented its proposal for a recovery plan and a comprehensive plan for a Just Green Transition.
<b>Greece</b>	Partially	According to the draft opinion the ESC of Greece, the objectives of the NRRP are in line with many of the policy objectives of organised civil society. However, more consultation is needed so that the

		National R&R plan fully responds to the priorities of the social partners and civil society organisations.
<b>Spain</b>	-	It is not possible to answer this question about Spain's R&R Plan since it is not yet known. Where divergences of opinion are possible is in the orientation and contents of the structural reforms associated with the implementation of the plan.
<b>Estonia</b>	-	The change of government could also have an impact on the initial financing proposal for the RRF. Therefore, it cannot be assessed at this stage whether the R&R Plan is in line with the priorities of civil society organisations. This will only be possible in the coming months once the new government has debated it and held consultations with the partners.
<b>Finland</b>	Generally	It is far too early to make definitive judgements, but thus far the priorities of the Government Report and the plans for specific actions are broadly in line with the policy objectives of the civil society.
<b>France</b>	Criticism expressed	In the view of several of the contacts consulted, the R&R Plan responds to the economic and financial emergency, but will not meet the expectations of civil society on many points. It will serve to stem the bleeding, but not to address in depth a situation that the COVID-19 crisis has made more precarious. The management of the plan appeared to be very much in the hands of the Ministry for the Economy and Finance and dominated by a few indicators: growth, employment, deficits, inflation. At no point were the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) mentioned.
<b>Croatia</b>	-	After the thematic meeting, it will become much clearer to what extent the Croatian R&R Plan is in line with the programme objectives of civil society organisations in Croatia.
<b>Hungary</b>	Partially	The first draft and chapters of the Hungarian R&R Plan correspond, more or less, to the expectations and policy objectives of the OCS representatives.
<b>Ireland</b>	-	No answer
<b>Italy</b>	Partially	The draft plan seems to have taken on board many of the comments made by a number of parties, as well as suggestions that emerged from the informal dialogue with the Commission's Task Force. It was considered a good basis for discussions with the Parliament, regional and local institutions, economic and social forces, the third sector and citizens' networks, leading up to the adoption of a final version.
<b>Lithuania</b>	-	We cannot say as real consultations with national authorities have not taken place yet.
<b>Luxembourg</b>	-	The social partners have not yet seen Luxembourg's R&R Plan or any draft of this plan. However, at their meeting of 21 December 2020 at the ESC, the social partners decided to focus on issues relating to, <i>inter alia</i> , taxation (budget revenue), investment policy, particularly in health infrastructure, and inequalities. They decided not to confine themselves to looking only at use of the EUR 93 million allocated to Luxembourg under the RRF, but also to analyse the R&R Plan in relation to the specific recommendations the European Council made to Luxembourg in July 2020.
<b>Latvia</b>	Criticism expressed	The social partners have identified some shortcomings and problems regarding the RRF (first reaction from the presentation of the Ministry of Finance). Among several problems, there is no connection between the RRF, financing from the state budget and the EU Structural Funds. The same applies to irrelevancies between the Latvian ministries' proposals regarding the RRF, the objective the

		RRF and its expected impact. Strong criticism about the process and content has been expressed by CSOs in thematic meetings beginning in mid-December and also during the European Affairs Committee meeting in the Latvian Parliament/Saeima on 22 January. The limited transparency on criteria for selecting or rejecting initiatives, extremely late submission of information and limited readiness for dialogue has given rise to questions by many players on the content, priorities and political motivation of decisions made.
<b>Malta</b>	Generally	The strategy outlined last year as part of the national budgetary process suggests that there is convergence between the policy objectives of OCS and the R&R Plan. Restructuring of the growth model is high on the agenda of government.
<b>The Netherlands</b>	-	See the answer to question 3.
<b>Poland</b>	Partially	As a general rule, the objectives set in the NRRP's provisions and the presented matrix are in line with what civil society representatives indicate as important and requiring intervention by public authorities. However, the NRRP and the abovementioned matrix do not appear to identify and respond to apparent specific problems to a sufficient extent. The lack of inclusion of the NRRP in the broad strategic framework for the socio-economic development of the country is also viewed negatively. In addition, it seems necessary to improve access to knowledge of workers' rights and protection thereof. It would also be important to support mechanisms for the democratisation of the workplace and collective bargaining. In addition, efforts to improve the situation of disadvantaged groups, including persons with disabilities and older people, should be stepped up. Support should also be given to non-profit civil organisations that provide social, health and educational services.
<b>Portugal</b>		
<b>Romania</b>	Criticism expressed	The plan has received criticism from social partners and OCS. This relates, for example, to making sure there is a strong social component to reforms; a special focus for vulnerable sectors; green transition requirements and standards; minimum standards related to youth and children. Trade Unions, employers organisations and CSOs all agreed on a similar message as well – that the plan should be restructured to meet the minimum criteria agreed at EU level and that it should go through a genuine consultation process that is transparent and thorough.
<b>Sweden</b>	-	It is difficult to answer this question without further consulting more civil society organisations. Unfortunately, debate on the recovery plan within OCS in Sweden is very limited.
<b>Slovenia</b>	Partially	The Slovenian R&R Plan only partially corresponds to the policy objectives of the social partners in Slovenia. While it contains some major investments which are important for the future development of Slovenia, it does not, in the opinion of the social partners, address some of the issues Slovenia should have dealt with in order to keep the labour market and social security systems stable and resilient in the long term.
<b>Slovakia</b>	-	No answer

## **Part II: Method for collecting information**

The table below provides an overview of the length of national reports as well as the consultation mechanisms used by national delegations between 13 January and 5 February 2021 for obtaining answers to the five questions in the questionnaire.

<b>Country</b>	<b>Length of report (in pages)</b>	<b>Only 3-person delegation/no information</b>	<b>Consultation of relevant OCS stakeholders</b>	<b>Consultation of government representatives</b>	<b>Involvement of the NESC</b>	<b>Thoroughness of consultation</b>
<b>Austria</b>	1.5	X				Low
<b>Belgium</b>	2.5		X			Low
<b>Bulgaria</b>	2.5	X	X	X	X	Medium
<b>Cyprus*</b>	2	X				Low
<b>Czechia</b>	2		X	X		High
<b>Germany*</b>	4		X			Medium
<b>Denmark*</b>	2		X	X		Medium
<b>Greece</b>	4		X		X	High
<b>Spain</b>	4		X		X	High
<b>Estonia*</b>	2.5		X	X		Medium
<b>Finland</b>	1	X				Low
<b>France</b>	4		X	X	X	High
<b>Croatia</b>	2	X				Low
<b>Hungary</b>	2		X	X		High
<b>Ireland</b>	2		X	X		Medium
<b>Italy</b>	2		X	X	X	High
<b>Lithuania*</b>	3		X	X		High
<b>Luxembourg</b>	2				X	Low
<b>Latvia</b>	3		X	X		Medium
<b>Malta</b>	3	X				Low
<b>The</b>	0.5	X				Low
<b>Poland</b>	2		X	X		High
<b>Portugal</b>	2		X			Medium
<b>Romania</b>	2		X			Medium
<b>Sweden*</b>	1.5			X		Medium
<b>Slovenia</b>	3		X			Medium
<b>Slovakia</b>	1	X				Low

\* = does not have a national Economic and Social Council