



**ECO/ESG**

Brussels, 18 May 2022

**APPENDIX  
TO THE  
RESOLUTION**

**Involvement of Organised Civil Society in the National Recovery and Resilience Plans –  
How can we improve it?**

of the  
**European Semester Group**

---

**Observations on the results of the consultations**

**Part I: The Questionnaire Annex  
Part II: The Round Tables Annex  
Part III: Method for collecting information**

---

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	2
<b>Part I: Observations on the results from the questionnaires</b> .....	4
<b>Section I:</b> What is the opinion of organised civil society on the content of the plans, their investment objectives and the proposed reforms? .....	4
<b>Section II:</b> How is the implementation of the plans, their investments and reforms progressing? .....	12
<b>Section III:</b> Potential impact of NRRPs on the economy and society of Member States .....	14
<b>Section IV:</b> Involvement of social partners and civil society organisations .....	15
Good Practices arising from the Questionnaire replies. ....	28
Other contributions from Civil Society Organisations .....	30
<b>Part II: Observations on the results from the round tables</b> .....	31
<b>Part III: Method for collecting information</b> .....	36

## List of Abbreviations

### Introduction

The resolution on the involvement of organised civil society (OCS) in the National Recovery and Resilience Plans (NRRPs) is based on consultations in the Member States. The European Semester Group of the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) has collected the views of civil society organisations (CSOs) and social partners via a questionnaire between October 2021 and April 2022. The questionnaire includes 21 questions on the involvement of social partners and civil society organisations regarding the content and the implementation of the NRRPs, and the impact of the green and digital transition on the economy and societies of the Member States. The individual country contributions have each been prepared under the responsibility of separate small delegations of EESC members (composed of 3 members from the 3 groups for each Member State). Therefore, they do not necessarily constitute the view of the EESC assembly as a whole. In total, responses to the questionnaire were received from 22 of the 27 Member States delegations. Besides, civil society organisations of the EESC Liaison Group were consulted via the questionnaire. In addition, this consultation was also carried out via round tables, organised jointly with OSC and /or the national economic and social councils, in 7 Member States between autumn 2021 and the end of March 2022. In total, 24 out of 27 delegations have participated.

This annex presents the outcomes of the consultations carried out via the questionnaire and the round tables and is divided into two parts. The questionnaire annex summarises all the replies to the questionnaire from the different Member States. The questions are categorised like the corresponding four sections in the resolution:

- I. What is the opinion of organised civil society on the content of the plans, their investment objectives and the proposed reforms?**
- II. How is the implementation of the plans, their investments and reforms progressing?**
- III. Potential impact of NRRPs on the economy and society of Member States**
- IV. Involvement of social partners and civil society organisations**

The results from the consultations with CSOs from the EESC Liaison group are briefly summarised in a subparagraph.

The round table contribution annex contains a summary of the information from the round tables reports. This part of the annex is divided into the following categories:

- I. Involvement of civil society in the NRRP process**
- II. Views on the content of the NRRPs and the RRF**
- III. Specific tools in the individual MS.**

## **Part I: Observations on the results from the questionnaires**

**Section I: What is the opinion of organised civil society on the content of the plans, their investment objectives and the proposed reforms?**

**Question 5: Which are the main goals and policy aims of your NRRP that social partners and other civil society organisations agree with and where they feel that their involvement can make a real difference? Please indicate those most relevant to your organisation.**

A large majority referred to measures in line with the objectives of the RRF. The green, digital and social objectives are largely supported by the respondents. Some respondents concentrate on green and digital goals and policy aims, others mention more diverse goals of the NRRP.

<b>Country</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Austria</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Investment in education and training for 2021-23</li> <li>2. Fighting energy poverty</li> <li>3. Community rehabilitation project</li> </ol>
<b>Belgium</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. economy</li> <li>2. social</li> <li>3. innovation and sustainability</li> </ol>
<b>Cyprus</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the competitiveness and resilience of the economy</li> <li>2. towards a digital age and its effects on labour market</li> <li>3. Cyclical economy.</li> </ol> <p>It depends on the government proposals to utilise OCS in the implementation process</p>
<b>Germany</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Digitalisation</li> <li>2. Climate Change</li> </ol>
<b>Czechia</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Promoting productivity, competitiveness and macroeconomic stability</li> <li>2. Inclusive growth and compliance with the European Pillar of Social Rights</li> <li>3. Reforms and investment to support research and innovation</li> </ol>
<b>Denmark</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Green tax reform</li> <li>2. Subsidies for investments in energy efficiency</li> <li>3. The Digitalisation Fund</li> </ol>
<b>Greece</b>	The four main Pillars (Green Transition, Digital Transformation, Employment - Skills and Social Cohesion, and Private Investment and Restructuring of the Economy and the State) respond to four major challenges of both Greece and our times
<b>Spain</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modernisation of the production model through ecological and digital transformations. Achieving a sustainable economic model, through decarbonisation, with the effective participation of SMEs.</li> <li>2. Labour market modernisation with the reform of the legal framework and the improvement of training for workers</li> <li>3. Improving territorial and social cohesion through the distribution of investments, fair, green and digital transitions etc.,</li> <li>4. Gender equality as an objective for projects and programmes.</li> </ol>
<b>Estonia</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Digital and green transition (employers)</li> <li>2. Employment and social protection (trade unions)</li> <li>3. Health and long-term care (civil society organisations). Overall, the involvement of civil society is important throughout the process – because only the organisations who have the knowledge of the field can actually say what is most needed.</li> </ol>

<b>Finland</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Green and just transition</li> <li>2. Development of employment and business services</li> <li>3. Skills and training development</li> </ol>
<b>France</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The shift towards the ecological transition</li> <li>2. Greater consideration of social cohesion objectives</li> </ol>
<b>Croatia</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recovery funds for entrepreneurs and small businesses</li> <li>2. Recovery funds for tourism</li> </ol>
<b>Ireland</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Measures to advance green and digital transition, particularly in relation to reskilling and upskilling</li> <li>2. Social and economic recovery and job creation</li> <li>3. Digital reform and transformation</li> </ol>
<b>Italy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impossible to answer on behalf of the diverse range of organisations.</li> </ol>
<b>Lithuania</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Economic transformation and competitiveness goals;</li> <li>2. Circular Economy goals;</li> <li>3. Goals related to integration into strategic value chains</li> </ol>
<b>Luxembourg</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase the supply of affordable and sustainable public housing</li> <li>2. Sustainable buildings and decarbonisation of transport (in particular the implementation of an aid scheme for charging stations aimed at companies)</li> <li>3. Digital skills for job seekers</li> <li>4. Reform of the qualifications of health professionals</li> <li>5. Protection of the environment and biodiversity</li> </ol>
<b>Portugal</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agenda for the promotion of decent work and modernisation education &amp; training</li> <li>2. Primary healthcare with more responses and digital health transition</li> <li>3. Affordable public housing stock</li> </ol>
<b>Romania</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reform of the social dialogue and of the labour market system</li> <li>2. Reform of the justice and public administration, including their digitalisation</li> <li>3. Green transition measures.</li> </ol>
<b>Sweden</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A well-functioning sustainable economy in line with the green and digitised agenda</li> </ol>
<b>Slovenia</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stability of the labour market, including lifelong learning</li> <li>2. A fair transition to a digital and green society</li> <li>3. Sustainability of the pension and health systems, while maintaining intergenerational solidarity and resilience to possible future crises</li> </ol>
<b>Slovakia</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Confederation of Trade Unions (KoZ) had additional comments on measures and disagreed with some of them. If a discussion and consultation had taken place, the KoZ would have been more supportive.</li> <li>2. Better living standards, but a plan &lt; 6 years, is not feasible</li> <li>3. Reforms concerning improved business environment and healthy, sustainable and competitive public finances are crucial</li> </ol>

***Question 9: Which structural reforms do you think should be given priority in your Member State?***

The mentioned structural reforms fall mostly into the green (e.g. energy poverty, ecological taxation, sustainable mobility, decarbonisation, circular economy), digital (social digital participation, digitalisation of the public sector), and social pillar (gender equality, affordable housing, labour market, education, territorial cohesion and care). Besides, some specific reforms are mentioned.

Country	Condensed contribution
<b>Austria</b>	Labour market policies and social balance. Important issues like energy poverty, long-term unemployment, and pre-primary education are not addressed at all. Moreover, the RRF could have been better used on the issue of a just transition of socio-economic transformation. More money is needed for labour foundations, upskilling and retraining. Digitalisation, digital investment in businesses, hydrogen research, connectivity, repair bonus for electrical appliances, industrial transformation (significantly insufficient funding in the plan), sustainable mobility, and circular economy. A key issue is the eco-social tax reform, with diverging views on the current plans.
<b>Belgium</b>	Social and economic reforms.
<b>Czechia</b>	eHealth services, Comprehensive support for investment and development of innovative companies, start-ups, projects and new technologies, putting the recodification of construction law into practice, renovation wave in the residential sector, increased efficiency, pro-client orientation and use of evidence-informed principles in public administration, Strengthening active labour market policy, partnership between public administration and the non-profit sector, greater involvement of citizens in policymaking.
<b>Germany</b>	Digitalisation, in particular social participation for disadvantaged people and digitalisation of the services and facilities of non-statutory welfare organisations. Climate change, in particular support measures for socio-ecological change, support for disadvantaged people in adapting to climate change and investment programmes for the climate neutrality of non-profit organisations.
<b>Denmark</b>	Tackling the labour shortage. Companies are having to turn down more orders, which means that Danish society is missing out on greater prosperity. There is a major need for structural reforms that increase the labour supply. These are reforms that 1) increase incentives to take up a job and 2) improve opportunities for companies to recruit foreign workers. There is also great potential for efficiency gains in the public sector, which requires speeding up digitalisation in the public sector and increasing public-private cooperation in public sector services between the state, regions and municipalities.
<b>Greece</b>	Structural reforms should prioritise the digital and green transition of the economy through the promotion of actions in the areas of environmental development, digital transformation, energy independence, modern skills and the development of a new framework for employment and social policy, with an emphasis on health and education.

<b>Spain</b>	Modernisation via digitalisation and decarbonisation. Fair, green and digital transitions, with special attention to the competitiveness of SMEs. Renewable energy investment to achieve energy independence. Strong industrial policy development, with a focus on industry with high-added value and competitive advantage. Labour market reform. Modernisation public services and public administration. Boosting R&D&I, training and qualitative education. Promoting opportunities for youth on a professional and general level. Promoting the urban and rural agenda to fight demographic challenges, strengthening the welfare state, provision of social and health services, boosting quality jobs in various sectors. Promotion of reforms linked to greater (territorial) cohesion. Strengthening systems and service provision linked to the care economy. Tax system reform. Promotion of gender equality in all the plan's actions.
<b>Finland</b>	The further preparation and follow-up of social and healthcare reform will play an important role. Priority should also be given to the development of education and structural reforms under the green transition.
<b>France</b>	This question was not discussed with the French Economic Social and Environmental Council, which represents the voice of organised civil society as a whole.
<b>Croatia</b>	Making society and the economy more resilient to future crises and green and digital transitions linked to climate change.
<b>Ireland</b>	Employers; Decarbonisation of enterprise sector, provision of social housing. Trade unions: tackling housing problems, improving access to quality, affordable care and education, universal healthcare. Community pillar: re-establishment of the Social Dialogue. Environmental: twin transition, promote private investment, energy efficiency, sustainable public transport, digital infrastructure, R&D.
<b>Lithuania</b>	1. Healthcare; 2. Circular economy; 3. Sustainable energy; 4. Ensuring the effectiveness of data management & open data. 5. Framework for labour market reform; 6. Deployment of competencies green and digital transition; 7. Joint science and innovation missions in smart specialisations. 8. A fairer growth-friendly tax system.
<b>Luxembourg</b>	Affordable housing and affordable energy (tackling energy poverty).
<b>Portugal</b>	Responses in the area of housing policy. Strengthening National Health Service. Enhancing qualifications and skills 4. Strengthening social responses 5. Digitalisation.
<b>Romania</b>	Reform of the public sector management system in order to address the challenges already identified in the European Semester reports on Romania, including the transparency of the financial management and the structural deficit, the reform of the pension system, reform of the social dialogue and predictability of the decision-making process.
<b>Sweden</b>	Reforms leading to sustainable economic development (growth). The environment and the digitalisation are important elements in such a development.
<b>Slovenia</b>	Reforms of social insurance systems, with a focus on the sustainability and resilience of these systems and equal access to quality rights in this field to the extent that they ensure a decent life. In the field of the rule of law, with a focus on the protection of workers' rights. In the area of the work of surveillance authorities, including the Labour Inspectorate. In taxation, with a focus on ensuring the stability of public coffers and access to quality public services. In the transition to a green and digital society, including the promotion of

	lifelong learning.
<b>Slovakia</b>	Reforms concerning an improved business environment and healthy, sustainable and competitive public finances are crucial, as well as better living standards.

**Question 13: Based on the situation in the autumn of 2021, to what extent do you think that the plan will be a success?**

A majority of the respondents reported that the plan will be a success based on the autumn 2021 situation (Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Spain, Estonia, Finland, Italy, Romania, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Czechia). Some are more neutral (Ireland, Germany, Croatia, Lithuania). Sweden and Slovenia do not expect the plan to be a success at all.

1 – Not a success at all

10 - An enormous success

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Country	Response									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Austria</b>							X			
<b>Belgium</b>						X				
<b>Cyprus</b>								X		
<b>Czechia</b>							X			
<b>Germany</b>				X						
<b>Denmark</b>							X			
<b>Greece</b>							X			
<b>Spain</b>							X			
<b>Estonia</b>								X		
<b>Finland</b>									X	
<b>Croatia</b>				X						
<b>Hungary</b>										
<b>Ireland</b>					X					
<b>Italy</b>						X				
<b>Lithuania</b>					X					
<b>Luxembourg</b>						X				
<b>Romania</b>						X				
<b>Sweden</b>		X								
<b>Slovenia</b>		X								
<b>Slovakia</b>						X				

**Question 14: On the same line, what is your assessment of the future of the plan as regards to contributing to long-term resilience in your Member State?**

The assessment of the plan in terms of resilience is mixed. It is noticeable that those countries that receive relatively little RRF funding are also not expecting that the plan will contribute to long-term resilience. Only the respondents from the Cyprus, Denmark, Italy, Estonia and Slovakia delegations evaluated the contribution to long-term resilience as highly positive. The Belgium, Greece, Romania,



Finland and Czechia delegations are also positive about the contribution. Spain, Croatia and Luxembourg expressed a more neutral position. The delegation of Slovenia, Sweden, and Ireland expressed a negative view of the contribution to long-term resilience.

1 – No effect at all

10 - Enormous effects

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Country	Response									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Austria				X						
Belgium						X				
Cyprus								X		
Czechia						X				
Germany				X						
Denmark								X		
Greece							X			
Spain					X					
Estonia						X		X		
Finland							X			
Croatia					X					
Ireland	X									
Italy								X		
Lithuania					X					
Luxembourg				X						
Romania							X			
Sweden		X								
Slovenia			X							
Slovakia								X		

**Question 15: What is your assessment of the future of the plan as regards its contribution to the green transition?**

The respondents have a mixed assessment of the future of the plan concerning the contribution to the green transition. The answers are rather fragmented. Whereas the assessment for Denmark, Greece, Finland, Italy and Lithuania is very positive, Ireland, Sweden and Slovenia reported to expect very few effects. In Belgium, Estonia, Czechia, Romania and Spain a considerable contribution to the green transition is expected. As regards Austria and Germany, effects are evaluated to be limited. Earlier explanations from the other questions and round tables tell us that for some Member States the effect of the RRF/NRRP is limited because either the energy/green transition is already a national reform priority and/or the RRF funds are relatively modest compared to the size of the economy of the Member States in question.

1 – No effect at all

10 - Enormous effects

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Country	Response									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Austria				X						
Belgium						X				
Czechia							X			
Germany				X						
Denmark								X		
Greece								X		
Spain							X			
Estonia							X			
Finland									X	
Croatia					X					
Ireland	X									
Italy								X		
Lithuania								X		
Luxembourg				X						
Romania						X				
Sweden		X								
Slovenia			X							
Slovakia								X		

**Question 16: What is your assessment of the future of the plan as regards its contribution to the digital transition?**

The assessment of the contribution to the digital transition is mixed. Very positive effects are evaluated in the case of Czechia, Denmark, Greece, Estonia, Romania and Lithuania. Considerable positive effects are expected in the case of Spain, Finland, Croatia, Italy and Belgium. Similarly, as for the previous question, Sweden, Ireland, and Slovenia again expressed that the digital component would not contribute much. The same holds for Germany and Luxembourg, but the assessment is somewhat more positive. Finally, Austria is more neutral. For this question, the same explanation holds as for question 15.

1 – No effect at all

10 - Enormous effects

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Country	Response									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Austria					X					
Belgium						X				
Czechia								X		
Germany				X						
Denmark								X		
Greece								X		
Spain							X			
Estonia								X		
Finland							X			

<b>Croatia</b>							X			
<b>Ireland</b>	X									
<b>Italy</b>							X			
<b>Lithuania</b>								X		
<b>Luxembourg</b>				X						
<b>Sweden</b>		X								
<b>Romania</b>								X		
<b>Slovenia</b>			X							
<b>Slovakia</b>								X		

**Question 17: What is your assessment of the importance of the social dimension in the plan?**

Concerning the importance of the social dimension, answers are also mixed. Specific additional comments were given. It was frequently mentioned that the social dimension is relatively underdeveloped (Austria, Germany, France, Slovenia, Greece). However, the Austria and Finland delegations also acknowledged that the other measures also address the social dimension.

– Not important at all

10 - Very important

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Country	Response									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Austria</b>			X							
<b>Belgium</b>						X				
<b>Czechia</b>					X					
<b>Germany</b>				X						
<b>Denmark</b>					X					
<b>Spain</b>							X			
<b>Estonia</b>							X			
<b>Finland</b>								X		
<b>Croatia</b>						X				
<b>Ireland</b>			X							
<b>Italy</b>							X			
<b>Lithuania</b>								X		
<b>Luxembourg</b>				X						
<b>Romania</b>						X				
<b>Sweden</b>		X								
<b>Slovenia</b>		X								

**Summary of the additional comments on the green, digital, and social dimension.**

<b>Austria</b>	While some measures aim at social objectives, the social dimension is relatively underdeveloped and should be strengthened by continuing to take action and by increasing existing ones.
----------------	--

<b>Croatia</b>	In terms of its contribution in general, there is very little visible progress; the plan will contribute somewhat, but only when it comes to those who know how to take advantage of the aid.
<b>Czechia</b>	Approximately 40% of NRRPs focuses on supporting the green transition, approximately 20% on the digital transition. In CZ, the NRRP is more focused on investment support.
<b>France</b>	The consideration of the social dimension is better. However, the document does not always show the priority given to social cohesion objectives and does not always link it to other challenges. In the French Economic Social and Environmental Council's view, the focus on youth is still insufficient and it believes that employment is not the only protection against precariousness.
<b>Finland</b>	All investment proposals under the green transition are potentially social investments too, as they aim to ensure a sustainable transition, including for workers, businesses and consumers, towards a carbon-neutral society – thus contributing to a sense of fairness in society
<b>Slovenia</b>	The plan fails to address long-term challenges on all three aspects. In the view of the delegation, the proposed NRRP missed the opportunity for some innovative solutions in the labour market and for the future of work. Reforms (pension, long-term care, the future of the labour market, health care) remain at the preparatory stage and do not have a clear direction, which should be designed in agreement with the social partners.
<b>Romania</b>	The Romanian NRRP is rather ambitious and the current lack of capacity in managing large and complex investment projects, as well as the weak political commitment for tough reforms might affect the green and social dimension of the plan. The digital transition objectives might be easier to achieve because they are more specific and depend to a larger extent to investments and interventions that can have a transformative capacity.
<b>Greece</b>	The NRRP gives excessive weight to addressing the first key challenge, that of changing the production model of the economy, by providing reforms in the energy, environment and digitalisation sectors. However, it does not take a balanced approach to the other two key challenges (adopting a new model of social policy, halting the country's demographic ageing).

## **Section II: *How is the implementation of the plans, their investments and reforms progressing?***

***Question 12: Do you have information about how much of the money committed to your Member State might not end up where it belongs (possible causes: lack of viable projects, red tape, corruption, unclear allocation criteria)? If yes, can you quantify it tentatively?***

A large majority reported not having information on this. Only five responses reported information Romania (20-30%) Cyprus, Czechia, Lithuania (10-20%) and Ireland (0-10%).

0-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30+%	No information
-------	--------	--------	------	----------------

Country	Response				
	0-10 %	10-20%	20-30%	30+%	No information
Austria					X
Cyprus		X			
Czechia		X			
Germany					X
Denmark					X
Greece					X
Spain					X
Estonia					X
Finland					X
France					X
Croatia					X
Ireland	X				
Italy					X
Lithuania		X			
Luxembourg					X
Portugal					X
Romania			X		
Sweden					X
Slovenia					X
Slovakia					X

*Question 18: Does your Member State plan to make use of both the grants- and the loan-part of the RRF? If your Member State intends to also use the loan-part of the RRF, please indicate here – to the extent possible - any differences in the use of grants versus loans.*

A majority of the Member States only uses the part of the grant. Those Member States who are also using the loan part reported no large differences between the use of grants and loans of the RRF.

Country	Response		A difference between grants and loans?
	No	Yes	
Austria	X		/
Belgium	X		Awaiting the advise central council business community and Labour Council.
Germany	X		/
Cyprus		X	No difference emerged yet in the use of grants versus loans.
Denmark	X		/
Czechia	X		Not planned.

<b>Spain</b>	X		On subsidies: yes, in their entirety. There are doubts about the loans: the government says yes, but no concrete information is known to date on the preparation of the plan for the loans.
<b>Estonia</b>	X		/
<b>Finland</b>	X		Currently, no decision to apply for RRF loan support.
<b>France</b>		X	Not applicable.
<b>Ireland</b>	X		Just grants.
<b>Croatia</b>	n/a	n/a	Large companies set up by the local government or the state will opt for loans.
<b>Italy</b>		X	There do not seem to be relevant differences.
<b>Lithuania</b>	X		/
<b>Luxembourg</b>	X		/
<b>Portugal</b>		X	Loans are differentiated according to whether they relate to housing or capitalisation of companies. The conditions will be different as these are loans and differentiated according to whether they relate to housing or capitalisation of companies.
<b>Romania</b>		X	/
<b>Sweden</b>	X		/
<b>Slovenia</b>		X	/

### Section III: Potential impact of NRRPs on the economy and society of Member States

**Question 10: How well do you think that the plan will contribute to the necessary, structural reforms in your Member State?**

The majority of the responses point to a considerable to near-perfect contribution to structural reforms. Belgium, Lithuania, Greece, Cyprus, Estonia, Romania, Italy, Slovakia, Czechia and Spain assess the contribution to structural reforms positively. Austria, Germany, Denmark, and Croatia evaluate the impact more neutral. Ireland, Sweden, Slovenia and Luxembourg are not expecting that the plan will contribute much at all to structural reforms.

1 – Not at all

10 - Perfectly

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Country	Response									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Austria</b>					X					
<b>Belgium</b>							X			
<b>Cyprus</b>								X		
<b>Czechia</b>							X			
<b>Germany</b>					X					
<b>Denmark</b>					X					
<b>Greece</b>									X	
<b>Spain</b>						X				

<b>Estonia</b>								X		
<b>Finland</b>							X			
<b>Croatia</b>					X					
<b>Ireland</b>	X									
<b>Italy</b>								X		
<b>Lithuania</b>									X	
<b>Luxembourg</b>			X							
<b>Sweden</b>		X								
<b>Romania</b>								X		
<b>Slovenia</b>			X							
<b>Slovakia</b>								X		

**Question 11: On a closely related issue, how much of the funding from the Recovery and Resilience Facility is going into investments that would have been undertaken by your Member State, even without this funding?**

A majority of the respondents reported that no information was available. Austria, Denmark and Luxembourg reported that more than 45% of the investment would have been undertaken without the RRF funding. In Finland and Italy (15-30%) and in Germany and Romania (0-15%).

Country	Response				
	0-15 %	15-30%	30-40%	45+%	No information
<b>Austria</b>				X	
<b>Germany</b>	X				
<b>Czechia</b>					X
<b>Denmark</b>				X	
<b>Greece</b>					X
<b>Spain</b>					X
<b>Estonia</b>					X
<b>Finland</b>		X			
<b>France</b>					
<b>Croatia</b>					X
<b>Ireland</b>					X
<b>Italy</b>		X			
<b>Lithuania</b>					X
<b>Luxembourg</b>				X	
<b>Romania</b>	X				

#### **Section IV: Involvement of social partners and civil society organisations**

**Question 1: How well was organised civil society (OCS) consulted when the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP) was drawn up in late 2020 and the first half of 2021?**

The answers are mixed. In some Member States OCS was well consulted, in others Member States OCS was only marginally consulted. According to the replies, OCS in Finland, Belgium and Sweden was very well-consulted. OCS in France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Greece, Estonia, Slovakia, Romania

and Lithuania, were also well-consulted. In Austria, and Portugal the assessment of OCS involvement is neutral. In Denmark, Czechia, Spain, Ireland and Luxembourg OCS was not well-consulted. In Germany, Malta and Slovenia OCS was barely involved.

1 – Not at all

10 - Perfectly

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Country	Response									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Austria					X					
Belgium								X		
Cyprus						X				
Czechia				X						
Germany		X								
Denmark				X	=					
Greece						X				
Spain				X						
Estonia						X				
Finland										X
France							X			
Croatia							X			
Ireland				X						
Italy							X			
Lithuania						X				
Luxembourg				X						
Malta		X								
Portugal					X					
Romania							X			
Sweden									X	
Slovenia		X								
Slovakia						X				

**Question 2: Did your organisation make a submission on the preparation of the Plan? How was your organisation involved in this work?**

A majority of responses (19/22) reported to having made a submission on the preparation of the plan in the form of a proposal (Austria, Denmark, Greece, Spain, Estonia, Finland, France, Croatia, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Portugal, Slovakia, Romania) letter (Germany), (special) RRP dialogue (Italy, Portugal, Lithuania) or consultation (Austria, Belgium, Germany, Spain, Romania, Estonia, Luxembourg, Sweden, Czechia). Only Malta and Slovenia have not made a submission on the preparation of the plan. Despite the high number of submissions, it was noted that many proposals were not sufficiently taken into account by the governments. In the case of Spain, Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, and Portugal there are good practices.



<b>Country</b>	<b>Condensed contribution</b>
<b>Austria</b>	Yes. The Trade Union confederation and the Chamber of Labour submitted proposals as part of the consultation process, but they had no opportunity to present them in an appropriate form. Apart from this, the social partners are generally involved in the legislative process. Thus, also in the preparation of the plan.
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes. Contribution via advisory councils, Central Council for Business Communication and National Labour Council.
<b>Czechia</b>	Yes. The Confederation of Industry of the Czech Republic (ČMKOS) was involved in the consultations as one of the few actors of organised civil society. ČMKOS was involved in the process when the main structure of the plan was already established, after which the involvement was in principle satisfactory. Representatives of the non-profit sector were not involved in either the preparation or the implementation process, only some directly approached organisations in very small numbers, which, however, do not represent the whole sector.
<b>Germany</b>	Yes. A letter was sent to the government at the end of 2020 and a joint statement in February 2021. The statement was submitted after consultations initiated by the government. No proposals were included by the government.
<b>Denmark</b>	Yes. proposals for investments in the green transition, digitalisation and health were sent to contribute to the Danish Recovery Plan. The government acknowledged the proposals but did not give any feedback. This limited the opportunities for dialogue on the government's priorities on the NRRP.
<b>Greece</b>	Yes. Specific comments were submitted during the preparation of the NRRP, which were sent to the Minister of Finance and to the Economic and Social Committee of Greece as part of the social dialogue process.
<b>Spain</b>	Yes. Involvement in general information meetings by the government, but no consultation procedure for the RRF or NGEU. A plan by the Business Confederation was included in the NRRP. The European Anti-Poverty and Social Exclusion Network was consulted through meetings with the government.
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes. Written input was provided and meetings were held. Civil society was involved to submit their submissions to Estonia 2035, not directly to the NRRP, but later there were numerous discussions and open consultations with Civil Society, Employers organisations and Trade Unions.
<b>Finland</b>	Yes. The Finnish Federation for Social Affairs and Health (SOSTE) made its own proposal on the use of funds under the RRF, and has promoted it in the public debate. SOSTE has put forward its views during consultations with civil society organisations.
<b>France</b>	Yes. The French Economic, Social and Environmental Council submitted its contribution to the State, involving all its working groups, on 05.04.2022. This contribution is annexed to the NRP.
<b>Croatia</b>	Yes. We submitted proposals regarding recovery to the government.
<b>Ireland</b>	Yes. All the OSC Pillars made submissions.
<b>Italy</b>	Yes. Proposals and documents were submitted. In addition, there was participation in conferences, hearings, and direct dialogue with relevant ministers in the preparatory stages. This applies to different degrees, and in different ways to the organisations of the social partners and CSOs.
<b>Lithuania</b>	Yes. Letters containing proposals and reminders on the EC recommendations regarding

	the NRRP were sent to the government and institutions. The organisation was involved in project presentations, putting forward its own proposals.
<b>Luxembourg</b>	Yes. There was no constructive debate or real consideration of the social partners' proposals by the government. Before the finalisation of the plan, two dialogues were held. Following a hybrid social dialogue with social partners and the ESC, a common position on the establishment of the RRP was drawn up. The government did not consider it necessary to consult the social partners ahead of this draft. Due to time constraints, a real debate/consultation was not possible.
<b>Malta</b>	No. Not asked.
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes. The views of the ESC have been taken into account, and the NRRP was tackled in consultation meetings with social partners.
<b>Romania</b>	Yes. OCS have contributed with many proposals, both through a dedicated fiche/ form that was made available, as well as through its participation to the consultations. However, very little from the contributions was taken on board and little or no feedback was provided with regards to the rejection of some of the proposals or with regards to the prioritisation of the proposals that were accepted.
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes. Usual consultations took place.
<b>Slovenia</b>	No. Trade union organisations were not actively involved in drawing up the plan. Meetings took place, but they were informative. It took a long time before the NRRP proposal was received by OCS. No comments or proposals were submitted. OCS was not invited to do this either, except for the part of the plan that fell in the remit of the Ministry of Labour. Comments were provided on the latter, but very little was taken into account.
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes. Comments were submitted. Involvement only took place as a formality. The plan was not submitted well enough in advance to enable the social partners to expertly assess and study it and give an opinion.

**Question 3: How well is this plan now known to OCS?**

The responses are divided. In most cases, the plan is known to OCS, but the extent is diverging. In the case of Romania, Germany, Estonia, Finland and Croatia, the plan was very well-known to the OCS. The plan was also well-known to the OCS in Belgium, France, Greece, Spain and Italy. The plan was less known to OCS in Austria, Cyprus, Denmark and Ireland. For OCS in Czechia, Lithuania and Luxembourg the assessment is neutral. In Malta, the plan was barely known.

1 – Not at all

10 - Perfectly

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Country	Response									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Austria</b>				X						
<b>Belgium</b>							X			
<b>Cyprus</b>				X						
<b>Czechia</b>					X					
<b>Germany</b>										X
<b>Denmark</b>				X						

<b>Greece</b>						X				
<b>Spain</b>						X				
<b>Estonia</b>								X		
<b>Finland</b>								X		
<b>France</b>							X			
<b>Croatia</b>								X		
<b>Ireland</b>				X						
<b>Italy</b>						X				
<b>Lithuania</b>					X					
<b>Luxembourg</b>					X					
<b>Malta</b>		X								
<b>Portugal</b>				X						
<b>Romania</b>								X		
<b>Sweden</b>								X		
<b>Slovenia</b>		X								
<b>Slovakia</b>						X				

**Question 4: What measures – if any – have been put in place by the government to inform and involve OCS?**

The measures fall into five broad categories; (1) **communication in the usual way** (e.g. statutory dialogue, campaigns, information sessions) in Austria, Belgium, and in Cyprus, (2) **publicly available websites**, for example, in Czechia, Germany, Spain, Estonia, Finland, Romania and in Italy), (3) **working groups**, like in Croatia, Lithuania, (4) **dedicated NRRP consultations** (Germany, Estonia, France, Romania) and (5) **no dialogue or proper consultation on the NRRP**, as it is the case in Denmark, Slovenia, and in Slovakia. In some cases, it is noticeable that the consultation was very comprehensive. In Spain, Finland, France, Germany, Italy and Estonia good examples of involvement are identified.

<b>Country</b>	<b>Condensed contribution</b>
<b>Austria</b>	Social partners were informed inadequately. Information sessions and an e-mail address are not sufficient. The final recovery plan has been made available online without any specific events.
<b>Belgium</b>	Via advisory councils.
<b>Cyprus</b>	The government informs in general information campaigns and issues statements from time to time.
<b>Czechia</b>	The Ministry of Industry and Trade as the Delivery Unit is currently trying to communicate the content and development of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan through its website, moderated discussions and consultation days. However, awareness of the NPO is still low among relevant actors in the country.
<b>Germany</b>	The NRRP is publicly available on a website, including the individual programmes. On Friday, 25 February 2022, a stakeholder meeting was held where comprehensive

	information on the plan and the individual measures were provided.
<b>Denmark</b>	No consultation was held on the Danish Recovery and Resilience Plan and it was only two months before the presentation of the Danish Recovery Plan that the Ministry of Finance, in a joint webinar with The Trade Council and the Commission Representation in Denmark, announced that external stakeholders could send suggestions to the Ministry of Finance's mailbox for the department working on the Danish Recovery Plan.
<b>Spain</b>	General communication related to some specific programs. Some periodic meetings with social partners to report on the development of the Plan. A website was set up to centralise NRRP info. Communication campaigns were launched by the government to disseminate calls for proposals financed by the Plan. The Spanish Business Confederation of the Social Economy (CEPES) has direct dialogue channels with different government departments to address initiatives affecting the Social Economy within the Plan.
<b>Estonia</b>	. There is a dedicated webpage for the <a href="http://www.rrf.ee">www.rrf.ee</a> and also detailed info in English. There are again dedicated hearings on the plan, organisations can easily ask the officials from Finance ministry or other related ministries to come and explain the RRF. The main problem is not so much related to informing rather than actually hearing what the main needs are. The priorities set in the very beginning were still based on the Estonia 2035 plan and not so much to the crises.
<b>Finland</b>	In 2020 the government organised a ministerial-led tour of Finland's regions with the purpose to inform and gather regional stakeholders' and CS organisations views and project ideas for reforms and investments, with discussions of where recovery funding should be used. In this light, a website was set up to provide information on events and the NRRP more generally. In addition, targeted stakeholder events for OCS were organised, including specific themes. Various parliamentary committees also invited civil society representatives to a hearing on the government's sustainable growth agenda report.
<b>France</b>	There was intensive dialogue and the organisation of several hearings prior to the submission of ESEC's contribution to the 2022 National Reform Plan (which includes NRRP investments).
<b>Croatia</b>	The government invited the OCS to take part in working groups.
<b>Ireland</b>	Given the small scale of the allocation it is difficult to generate interest in this issue. Public consultations were held earlier, but no further plans to involve the OCS.
<b>Italy</b>	Specific government portal on the NRRP and its implementation phases. Access to the Reports sent to Parliament and the public reports made available to the Permanent Table of the Partnership and the CNEL.
<b>Lithuania</b>	The government has undertaken some steps to inform and involve social partners and civil society. Projects related to the main policy directions were presented in the working groups.
<b>Luxembourg</b>	Two meetings were held in 2021. Besides, there were no special measures for the

	social partners in relation to the NRRP.
<b>Portugal</b>	Multiple rounds of public consultations, government initiatives to promote debate on the NRRP.
<b>Romania</b>	In the approved NRRP there are some mechanisms to inform OCS with regards to the enforcement of the plan – a sort of a monitoring committee and a constantly updated website/ dashboard. However, these measures are not yet implemented.
<b>Sweden</b>	The usual consultations have taken place.
<b>Slovenia</b>	No social dialogue took place on the subject of the plan. The government had not taken any measures to inform and involve the OCS in the preparation, implementation or monitoring of the NRRP.
<b>Slovakia</b>	A formal process of involvement took place in 2021. However, no real evaluation, discussion or consultation took place on the comments submitted. The debate (Oct, 2020) on how NRRP funds would be used was unclear as SCOs and social partners did not know how they were supposed to participate in it. In December 2020 an online public consultation was held. This form does not live up to the European Commission's idea of participation and social dialogue. The government did not make use of the available instruments and failed to consult. The initiative to discuss the NRRP came from the social partners, and not from the government.

**Question 6: How well is the OCS involved in the implementation of the plan? Please give concrete examples, if possible.**

The answers to this question are divided. OCS is well involved in the implementation in Sweden, Croatia, Finland (very positive), Belgium, Czechia, and Lithuania (reasonably positive). The OCS's involvement in Spain is neither good nor bad. Concerning Austria, Germany, Cyprus, Italy, Romania and Greece there is little OCS involvement. In France and Ireland, the OCS is not involved at all. In general, the involvement of the OCS in the implementation can be divided into the following categories: **Statutory basis/ general involvement** (Austria, Sweden, Belgium, Cyprus), **Special working groups/offices NRRP related** (Czechia, Spain, Finland, Croatia), **NRRP dialogue/stakeholder meetings** (Germany, Finland), **no involvement** (Denmark, Luxembourg) or **it is too early to tell** (Croatia, Estonia). However, the Luxembourg delegation pointed out that there is an indirect link in the implementation of the plan.

Country	Response										Examples / Further information
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<b>Austria</b>				X							Social partners are generally involved in the legislative process.
<b>Belgium</b>							X				Through various projects.
<b>Cyprus</b>			X								When the parliament discusses the plan it invites all stakeholders.

<b>Germany</b>				X							Stakeholder meeting in February. Further participation formats promised/announced.
<b>Czechia</b>							X				The so-called NRRP Committee includes selected representatives of OCS, who at the same time demanded early involvement in the preparation of programme and call settings to ensure absorption capacity and quality setting of conditions (including the inclusion of relevant associations). Component owners involve CSO representatives to varying degrees, e.g. in the preparation of calls. However, this is at the discretion of the component owner (usually a ministry). The real implementation of the plan started very slowly, so there is not much experience with the behaviour of component owners yet.
<b>Denmark</b>			X								The implementation was announced by a press release, but the government has not invited civil society to meetings on the plan's implementation.
<b>Greece</b>				X							n/a
<b>Spain</b>					X						Generally, CSOs & social partners do not participate in the implementation. Exceptions exist for companies benefiting from the grants. An NGEU technical office was set up for social economy companies to access the funds. Social partners are consulted about reforms in the labour market/pension in the plan.
<b>Estonia</b>	n/a										It is too early to say whether the OCS is well involved in the implementation of the plan, because there have not yet been concrete examples. The first implementations of the plan is starting in 2022 Q2.
<b>Finland</b>								X			Real-time economy structures plan for businesses to switch to a digital economy was launched with the consultation of stakeholders. close cooperation with private sector;  Progress on the Nordic employment service model implementation was regularly discussed with sub-working group;  Mental health and ability to work. Project promoters are trade organisations, social partners, etc.
<b>France</b>	X										n/a

<b>Croatia</b>									X		The OCS takes part in the working groups tasked with preparing tenders under the NRRP and in agreement with the Ministry of Tourism concerning measures for tourism. Some measures are probably being implemented through regular public consultation mechanisms and the tripartite social dialogue, but without any indication of being connected with the NRRP.
<b>Ireland</b>	X										n/a
<b>Italy</b>				X							n/a
<b>Lithuania</b>						X					The implementation of the plan is only at an early stage, making it difficult to speak about the involvement of civil society.
<b>Luxembourg</b>			X								There was no direct involvement of social partners in the implementation. However, there is an indirect link through the involvement of chambers of employers and employees in training in digitalisation.
<b>Portugal</b>											The OCS is involved by monitoring the implementation of the plan.
<b>Romania</b>		X									n/a
<b>Sweden</b>									X		Through ongoing contacts, the understanding of the positions and interests of the OCS are increased.
<b>Slovenia</b>	X										There is no awareness of any involvement of the OCS in the implementation. This involvement could be managed by the ESC, but it has not been operating for a year now due to violations of the rules on the functioning of the ESC by the government. Only social partners are involved, not other civil society organisations.

**Question 7: How well is OCS involved in the monitoring of the plan? Please give concrete examples, if possible.**

A number of respondents noted that this question was difficult to answer given the phase of the plan in their country. Those respondents who answered, evaluate this far from perfect. Only in Sweden a very good involvement of OCS is reported in the monitoring phase. OCS in Romania, Finland, Belgium and Slovakia is moderately involved. In Spain, Lithuania, Cyprus in Belgium the assessment is

neutral. In the remaining Member States, the involvement of OCS in monitoring was not that good. The delegations of Germany, France, Ireland, Luxembourg and Slovenia reported no involvement in monitoring at all. In Denmark, Austria, Estonia, Italy and Greece there is little involvement reported. Concrete examples of monitoring fall broadly into three categories: (1) **"special" NRRP monitoring committee**, (2) **Statutory monitoring** (3) **No involvement** (Croatia) or **no awareness of involvement**.

1 – Not at all

10 - Perfectly

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Country	Response										Examples / Further information	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
<b>Austria</b>			X									Involvement is low. Except for the statutory legal assessment and social partners are involved through existing contacts.
<b>Belgium</b>						X						Partly via advisory councils.
<b>Cyprus</b>					X							When parliament discusses the plan it invites the stakeholders.
<b>Germany</b>	X											Not aware of any procedure.
<b>Denmark</b>			X									/
<b>Greece</b>			X									/
<b>Spain</b>					X							Monthly monitoring meetings take place on the national level for SPs, in addition to the regions. The Spanish Business Confederation of the Social Economy (CEPES) expects to play a significant role once the PERTE on the social economy is approved. Reforms are discussed during Social Dialogue.
<b>Estonia</b>												Again very early to say but the monitoring committee will be set up, chaired by the state budget department of the Ministry of Finance. Several associations are expected to name their representative to this committee.
<b>Finland</b>							X					Transparent implementation is important. Therefore, a basis is provided for keeping stakeholders continuously informed and involved.
<b>France</b>	X											Not applicable, the French Economic Social and Environmental Council is not



											involved in the monitoring/follow-up of the NRRP ; it is only informed of the periods for disbursement of the instalments.
<b>Croatia</b>	n/a										No formal involvement.
<b>Ireland</b>	X										n/a
<b>Italy</b>				X							n/a
<b>Lithuania</b>					X						Participation in working groups, such as transformation of the circular economy, green and digital transformation, move towards 5g, Career guidance framework for labour market reform.
<b>Luxembourg</b>	X										n/a
<b>Romania</b>							X				Due to the monitoring platform of the European Commission, OCS are able to monitor the plan at least partly.
<b>Sweden</b>									X		Actions often demand national legislation. The OCS is an integrated part of the decision-making process through bodies of referral and normal lobbying work.
<b>Slovenia</b>	X										There is no awareness of any involvement. (see the previous answer).
<b>Slovakia</b>						X					n/a

**Question 8: In this respect, is there a difference between the social partners on the one hand, and other parts of OCS on the other hand? If yes, please explain.**

In general, this question was not well answered. Only Austria, Greece and Portugal reported an important difference. In Austria, the social partners are involved via statutory interest groups, but in other parts of the OCS involvement is much less or insufficient. In Greece, social partners are more actively involved in the whole process compared to other parts of the OCS. In Belgium, Spain, Cyprus, Finland, Italy and Slovakia there is some difference between social partners and other parts of the OCS. In Spain, for example, only social partners participate in the national round table of the plan and CSOs participate in sectoral round tables. In the reforms, social partners participate in the social dialogue round tables, occasionally CSOs are consulted. In Finland, social partner and labour organisations are better involved in the plan than other stakeholders. In Italy, there are additional and specific consultation tables of the social partners. Finally, in Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Lithuania, Romania and Luxembourg there is little difference reported between the social partners and other parts of the OCS.

Country	Response			Explanation
	Little	Some	A lot	
<b>Austria</b>			X	Social partners are statutory interest groups. However, in the European Commission country report, it was noted that recent government actions had reduced the proven capacity of the social partners to contribute to balanced socioeconomic development. The system of social dialogue and employer-employee relations is one of the success factors of Austria's unprecedented social and economic growth in recent decades. The pandemic has brought social partnership back to the forefront. It is to be hoped that this is not just a temporary phase. The involvement of other civil society organisations is much less or insufficient.
<b>Belgium</b>		X		n/a
<b>Cyprus</b>		X		n/a
<b>Czechia</b>	X			The plan was consulted with representatives of entrepreneurs and trade unions at the tripartite level, where, however, NGOs are not represented.
<b>Germany</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	At the stakeholder meeting in Feb 2022, there was no distinction between social partners and other civil society organisations.
<b>Denmark</b>	X			The government did not invite civil society to monitor how the Danish Recovery Plan is being implemented. Therefore, there is no obvious difference between the involvement of the social partners and other parts of organised civil society.
<b>Greece</b>			X	The social partners are more actively involved in the whole process compared to organised civil society and this is due to the fact that they are more organised in the social dialogue. At the present juncture, the formation of conditions of political and social understanding and the participation of the social partners and civil society in the formulation of a coherent NRRP that will respond to the problems created by the pandemic crisis and at the same time lay the foundations for the long-term economic and social development of the country is more necessary than ever.
<b>Spain</b>		X		Only social partners participate in the national round table of the plan. CSOs participate in sectoral round tables. In the reforms, social partners participate in the social dialogue round tables, occasionally CSOs are consulted.
<b>Estonia</b>	X			n/a
<b>Finland</b>		X		For those measures where the plan states that stakeholders are to be involved, social partner/labour organisations are mentioned most frequently.
<b>Italy</b>		X		There are additional and specific consultation tables of the social partners.
<b>Lithuania</b>	X			n/a
<b>Luxembourg</b>	X			Neither the social partners nor other civil society organisations were involved.
<b>Portugal</b>			X	n/a
<b>Romania</b>	X			n/a

<b>Slovenia</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	The question cannot be answered since the OCS was not informed about the implementation. This could have been different if the National Economic and Social Council (NESC) was operating, as it is an institutional platform for cooperation between government and social partners. There is no similar mechanism for other civil society organisations and it is likely that there would have been ad hoc cooperation with the social partners.
<b>Slovakia</b>		X		n/a

***Question 20: How effective is the participation of organised civil society in the implementation and monitoring of the NRRPs at regional and local levels?***

The participation of OCS in the implementation and monitoring of the NRRPs at regional and local levels is not very effective according to a majority of the responses. Only in Belgium and Estonia, it is the case that OCS is very effectively involved. In Slovenia and Slovakia regional involvement of OCS is reasonably effective. In Denmark, Romania and Spain, the involvement is neither effective nor ineffective. In the case of Czechia, Croatia, Ireland, and Slovenia there is almost no OCS involvement reported at regional and local levels.

1 – Not effective at all

10 - Very effective

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Country	Response									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Belgium</b>								X		
<b>Czechia</b>	X									
<b>Denmark</b>					X					
<b>Greece</b>			X							
<b>Spain</b>					X					
<b>Estonia</b>							X			
<b>Croatia</b>		X								
<b>Ireland</b>	X									
<b>Italy</b>			X							
<b>Lithuania</b>			X							
<b>Luxembourg</b>				X						
<b>Romania</b>					X					
<b>Sweden</b>						X				
<b>Slovenia</b>	X									
<b>Slovakia</b>						X				

## Good Practices arising from the Questionnaire replies.

*Question 19: After this review of the situation in your Member State, can you identify certain good Practices for involving the OCS that could be shared with the OCS in other Member States? What worked so well in your Member State that it could also have positive effects in other Member States?*

Several good practices were identified. A few responses pointed at a well-established social dialogue that works good. A government portal or website on the RRF has been set up by a number of Member States as well. Some respondents could not give a comprehensive answer as it was too early to identify good practices. In some cases, no good practices were identified as the OCS was insufficiently involved. There are more specific exemplary practices in the Member States:

- In Italy, a Permanent Round Table Partnership was established. A dialogue exists at territorial level;
- In Spain, the social partners recognise that the RRF and NRRP framework has helped to reach important agreements on labour and pension reforms through the tripartite social dialogue;
- In Croatia, the OCS is involved in working groups preparing tenders for the NRRP implementation in agreement with the Ministry of Tourism;
- In Portugal, the OCS is involved in monitoring the implementation of the NRRP, notably by analysing the results of the plan and impact assessment reports.

Country	Condensed contribution – Good Practices
<b>Austria</b>	The involvement of social partner organisations works very well. As part of the RRF, Austria falls short of this.
<b>Belgium</b>	To be answered later.
<b>Czechia</b>	The establishment of an official NRRP Committee, which created an umbrella space for the involvement of organised civil society - partly reminiscent of the Monitoring Committee in the Cohesion Policy Operational Programmes
<b>Germany</b>	In the case of the European Social Fund (ESF), the welfare associations and social partners are involved in a very cooperative manner, at an early stage and comprehensively at federal level via the BMAS (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs). Joint ESF federal programs of the BMAS are developed, elaborated and implemented on an equal footing. This is a very good example of how EU funds can be used sensibly and in a targeted manner with the participation of organised civil society, so that they really address needs on the ground.
<b>Denmark</b>	The EU countries receiving the largest grants from the EU Recovery Plan have had a more open process, with their governments presenting draft NRRPs early on and allowing civil society to submit concrete amendments. The same EU countries have been quick to set up a campaign webpage to provide information on the national recovery plan and on how the funds have been invested. In our view, this shows good practice so far, but the campaign webpages still lack information on upcoming tenders in the context of the recovery plans. The Commission should push for all EU countries to set up campaign webpages on their national recovery plans, and current

	as well as future campaign webpages should provide ex-post information not only on how the funds have been invested, but also on future tenders. The campaign webpages should also include supplier lists, where companies in all EU countries can register as potential suppliers/subcontractors for certain types of tasks.
<b>Spain</b>	The revitalised the social dialogue is the best example. Pension and labour reforms have been implemented by agreements during the tripartite dialogue
<b>Estonia</b>	The openness of the process in the internet is very welcomed, all the information related to whom you can contact in different topics is also good.
<b>Finland</b>	Active engagement by ministries. Early invitation to major discussion forums, but also bilateral reforms.
<b>France</b>	Systematic information and consultation of the French Economic Social and Environmental Council with a contribution attached to the NRRP sent to the Commission.
<b>Croatia</b>	An example of good practice is the co-creation of measures to save the economy and jobs during the first wave of COVID-19, and involvement in the working groups preparing tenders for the implementation of the NRRP, in agreement with the Ministry of Tourism.
<b>Ireland</b>	No good practices. The best way is the re-establishment of a structured Social Dialogue between the Business Confederation and the government.
<b>Italy</b>	The Permanent Partnership Table was set up by government decree and the various sectoral tables were set up in some ministries. It consists of specific working groups that critically monitor the direction and quality of the NRRP in terms of citizens' expectations. Good practices could also be replicated at territorial level, especially where significant investments are planned.
<b>Lithuania</b>	Given the early stage of implementation, there is nothing OCS can contribute regarding the involvement of civil society.
<b>Luxembourg</b>	After expressing the regret in a joint letter to the government, the Prime Minister responded to the social partners by stating that the exchanges are fundamental for the government's economic and fiscal activity. Following this, a preparatory meeting took place in February 2022 between the Ministers of Economy and Finance and the social partners, which will be followed with a round of social dialogue.
<b>Portugal</b>	The OCS is involved in monitoring the implementation of the NRRP, notably by analysing the results of the plan and impact assessment reports.
<b>Sweden</b>	A close and constructive cooperation between the social partners and CSOs is strengthened by openness, transparency and dialogue. Cooperating during the planning phase is important, but not decisive.
<b>Slovenia</b>	No good practices identified since civil society was not involved.

**Question 21: Please insert here any relevant information that has not been covered by the questions so far:**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Condensed contribution</b>
<b>Austria</b>	The presentations and statements on economic governance and the European Semester by the speakers of the Commission Representation in Austria were very informative. They replied in detail to all questions and also openly shared their views on critical issues, in particular the insufficient involvement of Civil society organisations. The ESG delegation felt that the debate with the European Commission and the participants was very fruitful and valuable.
<b>Czechia</b>	The plan is mainly implemented at the national level; regions and cities only play the role of beneficiaries.
<b>Spain</b>	For the business organisations, the difference between the government's publicity and reality, together with the regulatory limitations imposed by the EU and the enormous delay in implementation seriously compromise the achievement of the objectives set. The trade unions affirm that the cross-cutting pillar of gender equality that should inform the different programmes, projects and reforms is present in the Spanish Plan. We are still waiting to be able to evaluate its effectiveness in its implementation. No questions were asked about the timing of the Plan's implementation. The reform schedule is being adhered to. The execution of investments is behind schedule, especially those that depend on calls for project execution by regional and local administrations.
<b>Finland</b>	The regional perspective of organised civil society involvement is not explicitly mentioned in the implementation and monitoring of the plan. That is why we have not evaluated it.
<b>Italy</b>	See the Round Table outcomes.
<b>Sweden</b>	A heavy weight on future generations, both environmental and financial debts to repay. The generational aspect could also have been addressed in your questions.
<b>Slovenia</b>	We believe that the absorption of funds should depend on the level of active involvement of social partners and civil society organisations in the design of the plan, its implementation and the monitoring of its implementation. It would also be welcome for the Commission to conduct interviews with organised civil society on the implementation of the plan once a year and to monitor this systematically also in the context of the European Semester process.

### **Other contributions from Civil Society Organisations**

The questionnaire was submitted by 8 civil society organisations from the EESC Liaison Group<sup>1</sup>. 8 responses to the questionnaire were received from civil society organisations. A majority of these organisations reported that they were not well consulted regarding the NRRPs. Most of them have submitted proposals, but these were not taken into account sufficiently. Concerning the implementation, only one organisation reported to be involved. This is the same for involvement in monitoring. It has to be noted that a majority of the organisations mentioned that they could not answer the questions in a satisfactory way. Therefore, it is difficult to come up with general

<sup>1</sup> [Liaison Group with European civil society organisations and networks | European Economic and Social Committee \(europa.eu\)](https://eesc.europa.eu/en/activities/liaison-groups)

conclusions. Nevertheless, this indicates that there might be insufficient awareness among civil society organisations about the NRRPs.

**Part II: Observations on the results from the round tables**

As part of the consultations, round tables were organised in Austria (8/10/21, Bulgaria (12/10/21), Poland (17/11/2021), Italy (25/01/22), Spain (27/01/22), Denmark (11/3/22) and France (31/03/22). The discussions of the round tables were organised around three central themes:

- I. Involvement of civil society in the NRRP process**
- II. Views on the content of the NRRPs and the RRF**
- III. Specific tools in the individual MS.**

**Involvement of civil society in the NRRPs process**

<b>Planning</b>	<b>Implementation and monitoring</b>	<b>Communication between National Governments and the OCS on the Plans</b>
<p><u>Austria:</u> the late development of the RRP left little room for thorough consultations.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> formal and informal consultations took place. Some participants confirmed that proposals made by their organisations were largely taken aboard in the NRRP, while others complained that they were not involved at all, and that none of their proposals were adopted.</p> <p><u>Poland:</u> OCS is satisfied that it could give an opinion during the consultations. However, the initiative for hearings is one-sided, and therefore OCS has the view that authorities are insufficiently aware of the importance of the OCS consultations; There is agreement that there is a shortfall on OCS' expectations in the final draft. The government failed to take into account comments and concerns voiced by the OCS.</p>	<p><u>Austria:</u>socialpartners are particularly involved via the legislative scrutiny process. A call for a larger say in the implementation process.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria</u> The BG ESC declared its readiness to act as a monitoring committee in the implementation phase. Moreover, the ESC stated that it has the capacity to review all strategic documents of the plan, as its members represent all sectors.</p> <p><u>Poland:</u> It is too early to draw conclusions the plan is not yet approved by the EC; the establishment of the RRP monitoring committee is perceived as positive. Following consultations, the government broadened the committee by including i.a. territorial self-government bodies, trade unions, and social and economic partners. However, the OCS criticised the limited role of the monitoring committee as its design does not give the OCS a say in decision making. A number of representatives stressed the importance of participation in the selection of investment projects and the proper use of EU funds.</p>	<p><u>Austria:</u> there was good social partner involvement in the European Semester, but this was not as good in the case of the RRF.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> No information.</p> <p><u>Poland:</u> The OCS agreed that there is no information strategy on the RRP from the government, and criticises the absence of a government website with RRP related information; The RRP solely appears negatively in the public discourse, because of the block of the proposal by the EC; Participants addressed the need to stay informed by the government on a current basis on changes in the content of the RRP.</p> <p><u>Spain:</u> There was a call for a centralised website with information on calls and tenders, and the level of funds execution related to the</p>

<p><u>Spain:</u> The participants had the general criticism that OCS and partners were poorly involved in the elaboration phase?</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> The ESC was not directly consulted before implementing the NRRP.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> The time pressure and lack of resources in the preparation phase resulted in shortcomings in the plan; The Contact Committee and Special Committees of Parliament could have been involved in the preparation phase; The process was unsatisfactory, although the end result was acceptable.</p> <p><u>France:</u> There was no specific consultation procedure for the preparation of the NRRP. Instead, this took place through the European Semester consultation mechanism;</p> <p>Informal consultations with organisations and stakeholders by ministries took place. However, several stakeholders noted that this was only as a formality since their comments had not been taken into account sufficiently.</p>	<p><u>Spain:</u> The participants agreed that improvement of OCS and social partner involvement should be key in this phase; a general request for the Government to urgently establish a procedure for the participation of the social partners and OCS for the monitoring and evaluation of the plan. A concrete proposal was made for the ESC to play a pivotal role in this process; The delay in implementation and the short execution time are common causes of concern. Information, technical assistance and training and evaluation were identified as virtuous dimensions to ensure an adequate implementation;</p> <p>The importance of continuous evaluation was stressed by many participants.</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> Participants noted that civil society will play a key role in the European Semester exercise in the coming years, particularly monitoring of the NRRP and exchanges on the twin transition will be important; The ESC works together with specific working groups for the monitoring of the plan; Inadequate input from social partners in the implementation phase. Social partners have offered little; The ESC was not directly consulted before implementing the NRRP.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> There was a call for transparency in the allocation of the funding. No public debate or wide consultation was held to the regret of the participants. One participant used the expression "a very un-Danish</p>	<p>plan.</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> The control room is in charge of the promotion of information and communication. A website with comprehensive information is created; A public debate took place on the relevant infrastructure; Systematic involvement of the ESC and regions ensured broad civil society consultation and a solid involvement and input. There is no need for more consultation methods; rather the systems in place should be properly used.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> There is very little debate and very little awareness of the plan in DK.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Consultations on the NRP were mostly initiated by the ESEC. The government is not proactive in this respect. However, it was noted that the government represented were always welcome to exchange when requested. A positive development is noted when it comes to exchanges with the government.</p>
--	---	--



	<p>process" to describe it; The importance of asking how OCS would like to participate in the NRRP was addressed.</p> <p><u>France:</u> yearly consultations including a section devoted to the investments planned within the National Reform Programme (the NRP is adopted every year ; this year, the NRRP investments are included in it) and it consequently integrates monitoring; With the disbursement of the first instalment of the RRF, the French ESEC members explained that they had been informed, but not involved; The follow-up of the involvement of the NRRP into the existing NRP " France Relance" is complicated. The NRRP makes up 40% of the NRP volume. The NRP benefits from the governance and monitoring systems. However, it also makes the European plan less visible.</p>	
--	---	--

**Views of the Content of the NRRPs and the RRF**

<b>Perceptions of the overall success and contribution of the Plans in the Member States</b>	<b>Contribution to structural reforms, twin transitions and social aspects</b>	<b>Other comments regarding the content of the Plans</b>
<p><u>Austria:</u> the funds are relatively modest compared to the size of the Austrian economy. The recovery does not have the same status as in Italy or Spain. Some reforms would have been pushed through regardless of the fund. despite the plan does not have the same importance, it is a European value to be involved accordingly, as part of a proper evaluation process.</p>	<p><u>Austria:</u> the NRRP can make a difference in the areas of the green and digital transition, but the allocated budget is not enough.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> no information</p> <p><u>Poland:</u> the RRP is not ambitious enough in terms of climate ambition and the needs for the Next Generation (see next column).</p> <p><u>Spain:</u> The amount of investment allocated can allow for economic and</p>	<p><u>Austria:</u> Pre-primary education constitutes a weak area of the recovery plan.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> the ESC insisted that all proposals made by civil society organisations should be annexed to the NRRP with status comments, including rejection reasons.</p> <p><u>Poland:</u> the plan does not envisage special measures to provide needs for the next generation (social and</p>

<p><u>Bulgaria:</u> no information</p> <p><u>Poland:</u> Based on the report, there is general awareness of OCS that the RRP can contribute significantly.</p> <p><u>Spain:</u> The transition requires large social support to succeed. Moreover, there is a need for technical assistance and training.</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> The plan is intended to resolve structural problems and to set out principles of a new growth model that can promote convergence in Europe.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> n/a or mostly about the contribution to other MS (spillovers).</p> <p><u>France:</u> _____considerable contribution, but mostly through the national program.</p>	<p>social recovery, and a transformation of the economy; Shared concerns were expressed on the fact that industrial transformation cannot be achieved in a time span of 3 years; Social dialogue, anticipation, co-governance and transparency are the building blocks of just transition.</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> The plan is crucial for economic and employment growth. It is the tool to anchor the twin transition and to succeed in crucial reforms. This awareness comes from government, local and regional authorities, OCS and social partners.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> The plan is too much based on the national reform program.</p> <p><u>France:</u> The French ESEC stressed that social cohesion was not sufficiently targeted or clearly identified in the NRP.</p>	<p>psychological). Besides, the government ignored the concern of ecological organisations that the plan lacks climate ambitions.</p> <p><u>Spain:</u> Equity and social inclusion are part of the plan, but concrete indicators to measure the contribution to inclusion are missing.</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> the plan needs to reduce systemic inequalities. Social innovation needs to be reinforced.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> One participant noted the absence of policies for the next generation.</p> <p><u>France:</u> the aspects of social cohesion are not sufficiently identified in the plan. Moreover, there is not enough focus on the most vulnerable groups. This should be systemically measured.</p>
---	--	--

### Specific Tools in the MS

<b>Good Practices</b>	<b>Bottlenecks / Failures</b>	<b>Other remarks</b>
<p><u>Austria:</u> A good institutional set-up for social dialogue in Austria via the legislative scrutiny process.</p> <p><u>Poland:</u> The inclusive character of social consultations and a Monitoring Committee which includes CSOs, social partners and territorial self-governed bodies. Moreover, OCS' views were taken into account when setting up the committee.</p> <p><u>Spain:</u> the NRRP government portal, a proactive attitude of</p>	<p><u>Austria:</u> Funds from the national budget are released to contribute to the twin transition.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> The coal plants and rule of law are controversial aspects of the plan (do not significant harm principle).</p> <p><u>Poland:</u> A general problem with top-down information flow in Poland. The lack of RRP information hinders monitoring by the OCS; The government failed to take into account comments and concerns</p>	<p><u>Bulgaria:</u> the questionnaire was not submitted. An idea of the BG ESC to act as a monitoring Committee in the implementation process of the Plans was introduced, and the government representative agreed and mentioned that this was indeed under discussion already.</p> <p><u>Spain:</u> Participants proposed that the EESC could collect information on good national practices in the application of the NRRP and disseminate it through the most appropriate means.</p>

<p>the Spanish ESC in facilitating dialogue, successful dialogue ensured that CSO's approved reforms under the RRP.</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> Comprehensive involvement of OCS and is formalised through a specific legislation. As such, civil society has three entry points: it can be invited to the Control Room's meetings; it is the key actor of the permanent Table of partnerships and, on top of that, several tables have been created to deal with specific sectors (key actors of the civil society and of the social partners take part to these sectoral tables).</p> <p><u>France:</u> The existence of regular institutionalised consultations for the NRP. The ESEC members have noticed a greater receptiveness on the part of government contacts. Meetings requested are more regular. The existence of a national monitoring and evaluation committee under the France Relance Plan (NRP). Comments were taken into account e.g. The SDGs were added to the NRRP after the ESEC's concerns that they were missing in the first version of the NRRP.</p> <p>The regional deployment is a strong aspect. The regional committee of the "France Relance" Plan involves all stakeholders. There are also local committees.</p>	<p>voiced by the OCS.</p> <p><u>Spain:</u> The understaffing of the public administration and the lack of skills in key areas of the transition; Investment in clean energy is insufficient; the rejection of local communities to the development of clean energy as they do not feel sufficiently benefited.</p> <p><u>Italy:</u> Administrative reform is a perennial problem, especially in the Southern regions.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> A lack of central advice on what the plan can fund. Preferably, this should be centralised for all parts of the pool and the whole community where funding through the pool is desired</p> <p><u>France:</u> the draft NRRP was late. Given the pre-existing NRP (France Relance) ; Insufficient communication on the European part. The French people do not see it as European money because of the integration of the NRRP into the NRP.</p>	<p><u>Italy:</u> Continued cooperation between different member states is needed.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> The EU's main future role must be to ensure that the RRP rules are followed by all Member States. (There should be a right to monitor in other Member States); The Semester method can be used as a blueprint for the RRF to engage dialogue. (the consultations in the European Semester process worked better in terms of involvement than NRRP).</p> <p><u>France:</u> The result of the EESC's consultation could serve as a box of ideas, bringing together good practices in the various Member States regarding this involvement of the OCS.</p> <p>The French ESEC has put forward the possibility that it could organise something around the association of citizens with the issues that might concern them in the context of these reform plans. However, nothing has yet been decided. Finally, the French ESEC points out that it is not involved in the implementation or follow-up. It is the organisations that make it up that are involved;</p> <p>The ESEC proposed to involve more the OCS and to evaluate the impact and not only the quantitative aspect. It is necessary to look at the real impact on the populations of the use of European funds. This should be done systematically. The impact should be measured, particularly on the most vulnerable, and this would give a more interesting estimate. This is not</p>
--	--	--

		currently done.
--	--	-----------------

### **Part III: 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 2021 and April 2022 for obtaining answers to the five questions in the questionnaire.

<b>Country</b>	<b>Length of report (in pages)</b>	<b>Submission 3-person delegation</b>	<b>Round Table</b>	<b>Thoroughness Questionnaire reply</b>	<b>Thoroughness of consultation</b>
<b>Austria</b>	10	Yes	Yes	High	High
<b>Belgium</b>	6	Yes	No	Low	Low
<b>Bulgaria</b>	n/a	n/a	Yes	n/a	High
<b>Cyprus*</b>	3	Yes	No	Low	Low
<b>Czechia</b>	8	Yes	No	High	Medium
<b>Germany*</b>	7	Yes	No	High	High
<b>Denmark*</b>	6	Yes	Yes	High	High
<b>Greece<sup>2</sup></b>	9	No	No	Medium	Medium
<b>Spain</b>	10	Yes	Yes	High	High
<b>Estonia*</b>	7	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
<b>Finland</b>	8	Yes	No	High	High
<b>France</b>	6	No <sup>3</sup>	Yes	Medium	High
<b>Croatia</b>	6	Yes	No	Low <sup>4</sup>	Low
<b>Ireland</b>	3	Yes	No	Low <sup>5</sup>	Low
<b>Italy</b>	7	Yes	Yes	High	High
<b>Lithuania*</b>	7	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
<b>Luxembourg</b>	8	Yes	No	High	High
<b>Malta<sup>6</sup></b>	4	No	No	Low	Low
<b>Poland</b>	n/a	No	Yes	n/ a	High
<b>Portugal</b>	8	Yes	No	High	High
<b>Sweden*</b>	7	Yes	No	Medium	Medium
<b>Slovenia</b>	9	Yes	No	High	High

<sup>2</sup> Only a reply from Group I

<sup>3</sup> Reply from the president of the French Economic, Social and Environmental Council

<sup>4</sup> In the accompanied letter to the questionnaire, the delegation explained that it was too early to report on this phase.

<sup>5</sup> The scale of Irelands allocation it is difficult to generate much interest in the issue. Hence the report is rather short.

<sup>6</sup> Only a few questions were answered and it is not indicated whether all the members of the three groups have contributed.

<b>Slovakia</b>	7	Yes	No	High	High
-----------------	---	-----	----	------	------

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

---

### **List of Abbreviations**

<b>CSOs</b>	Civil Society Organisations
<b>OCS</b>	Organised Civil Society
<b>EC</b>	European Commission
<b>(N)ESC</b>	(National) Economic and Social Council
<b>ESG</b>	European Semester Group
<b>NGEU</b>	The Next Generation EU ( <b>fund</b> )
<b>(N)RRPs</b>	(National) Recovery and Resilience Plans
<b>RRF</b>	Recovery and Resilience Facility