1. Minutes of Madrid meeting
- Tuned presents several amendments
- Spain: OK with amendments, except on the subject of the Spanish engagement on the creation of the sector committee: its engagement only covers the promotion of this committee
- The amendments will be introduced in the final version of the Madrid minutes

2. Presentations TUNED (N. Salson) + EUPAN (Ph. Vermeulen)

3. Discussion
- Spain:
  Bureaucratic relations between MS make things difficult. TUNED has given us concrete and valuable information and details for us employers that we do not always know and master. Social dialogue is very important so that we can get out of the crisis together. Reductions and the crisis have made the public image paler, this must be better. Social dialogue is the best tool.
  - C. Cochrane:
    Agrees with Spain. If there’s any simple way that we could share data, this would benefit to all of us and allow us to find solutions to face these difficult times. Looking over our shoulder all around the world allows us to discover other models and solutions, build mechanisms.
    We have to understand on both sides what our respective tasks, responsibilities and duties are and how we can cope with the problems and consequences. The way forward is by working together.
  - J. Leroy:
    o Is it not legitimate or normal to make economies and savings before the crisis started?
    o Public demands to make savings as being natural, especially regarding a privileged sector.
    o Public administration not as part of the problem but part of the solution
    o Is it not legitimate to expect that PA functions at less cost, to be the most productive and efficient?

- TUNED (A.-M. Perret):
  Common points appear in both presentations. Foremost, under the ultraliberal philosophy, the State has been attacked, robbed and transformed which has led to a dysfunctioning. Whatever function and grade we have, it’s becoming more & more difficult to find our legitimate place and means of action.

- Sweden:
  What has been done in Sweden during the past 20 years is a gradual change at several levels instead of radical change. We have a civil service where employment and working conditions are in line with the labour market and that since a long time. In the state sector employers’ responsibility has been delegated entirely to the heads of the operational organisations and often even further to the line managers. Each agency has a productivity demand by a factor based on the growth in the private sector. This creates a constant process of change and development where we can adapt ourselves to the demands on the labour market. We also have a comprehensive job security system for those people that become redundant (1,5 – 2 per cent of staff yearly) that succeeds to help 80 per cent of the redundant to find new positive solutions.
We are all employees of the public sector. Our objectives are similar, our methods not. But Europe has become a Europe of competition in which the role of public services is not clear: is everything “marketable”? Where are we going? Do railroads work better? Do we not have private monopolies? The crisis affects all workers but it creates also opportunities. Of course there will be shifts in public administration due to external factors (ageing, transfer of expertise, competencies,…). How are we going to cope, stay efficient and effective and remain attractive? Which retirement age? That’s going to be at the heart of the discussions to come.

It would be good to enrich the presentations with what’s happening in the market sector. What’s the evolution of the public sector? How do we look upon this public sector and its’ workers? There’s a shift. In the Netherlands there’s an ongoing fundamental political discussion on how the public sector has to anticipate the coming challenges and what is (still) the core business of government, how this can be done and at what cost.

Social dialogue is key in Hungary. There are a lot of austerity measures but combined with social measures. The State has to ensure 3 domains: prevail the democratic process, achieve and sustain efficiency and effectiveness and overall quality. This has to be addressed jointly. Knowledge & competence management is also key, next to the feeling of security and mutual trust between civil servants and the public.

Image of the public services when it is confronted with a new culture (private consultants, managers,….) that is focused on personal gain and publicity: the public service cannot compete and this reflects on them. Savings in the public administration: only the beginning towards more structural savings which will reflect on the quality of services to the citizens in the long run, on the existence of public servicing itself while paradoxally society demands more – qualitative – services. If this cannot be done, at the end this will reflect on government itself

Don’t lose sight of the citizen – user of the public service and taxpayer. Most of the time he’s not associated or consulted. The public service must be able to respond to the needs of the citizens. They must have the means and most of the time the resources are available.

Savings as the most responsible way? The public sector is a stabilisation factor. (Public expenditure represents about 45% of GDP in the OECD countries). Problem is that savings do increase efficiency but do decrease quality. And it turns the image of the public sector.

Being a civil servant myself as well as a representative of the employers, we do have lots of things in common (care for the citizen, the existence and interest of the State,…). One theme, lobbying, has not been treated because it is not legitimate from a point of view as civil servant. We have a duty to inform and to counsel our ministers as they have the legitimacy. If the social dialogue wants to be effective, each of us has to play his respective role.

We all agree on being in favour of the organizing of the State. We often wear different hats, but we all are here with our respective mandates. To find solutions is more difficult, but at least we will find spaces and platforms to continue discussions and negotiations, to see what has worked (and not), how we can improve the image and to justify why we’re here, in plain language.