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Foreword

By Mario Bertone

Today, the term “local public services” has a particularly broad meaning. In fact, the word “local” goes well beyond its simple territorial definition, whether it be municipal, regional or otherwise, and is directly linked to International markets, transnational industries, and competitiveness, in a European rather than national scenario.

Just consider the complexity of the various networks such as gas and electricity, or the transport and waste management systems, which in recent years have been privatized so creating a new free market open also to international participants. This, in many cases, has resulted in the redefinition of company structure, also in public societies, and the introduction of new industrial mechanisms.

This has naturally provoked a change in the system of industrial relations together with new opportunities of citizen and worker participation in the new companies.

Due to the negative economic situation of the last 6 years, there has been a reduction in available public resources which, in the absence of any form of social dialogue, has transformed the management of local policies into nothing more than simplified accounting and number juggling. This is strongly penalizing families, workers and pensioners both economically and is also affecting the services provided. In fact, people are paying more taxes but are receiving lower quality services.

Therefore, together with protective actions on the workplace, today more attention is being paid to defending the rights of citizens directly on the territory. This is not surprising if one considers that local taxation, the cost of services, the difficulties that people encounter in bureaucratic procedures are all matters where the trade unions must intervene in order to better protect and represent citizens at territorial level.

The issues that must be faced in the following months and in years to come will require an ever better form of consultation and participation based on competences and skills. This means that there must be an increase in the professional levels and general know-how of the operators, representatives and the entire trade union system.
The management of local public services represents an important and particularly delicate asset for the Metropolitan cities of Europe. Today, we can regard this as the core business, if one considers the enormous quantity of people involved. This means it is necessary for the trade unions to take into consideration the public utility and universal nature of local services while at the same time working towards convincing the workers that their protection and the protection of the service provided for the citizens must go hand in hand.

Therefore, it is important to change management models (at least in Italy and particularly in Rome) because the current system has led to the accrual of debts in the companies involved and inefficient services for citizens.

For these reasons, a comparative research is required that can form the basis of an important working instrument, which can widen the perspectives of our current models and solutions, and which can lead to the creation of concrete development proposals and alternative trade union platforms, introducing widespread forms of concertation.

This work represents, therefore, an opportunity for the various Trade Unions in these European metropolitan areas to share experience. These consultations must remain ongoing and create value taking into consideration an objective that must become common to everyone: Europe needs to set up a new phase that overcomes the current purely economic dimension, and move towards a political Union that is deeply rooted in the Territory and which is based on labour issues.
Introduction

By Flavia Pace and Vilma Rinolfi

The project “Public services for a better governance of capital cities: second-level bargaining, social dialogue for territorial development” (VS/2013/0352) was financed by the European Commission, Budget heading 04.03.03.01 “INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND SOCIAL DIALOGUE” and realised in 2014.

The main objective of the project was to enhance the role of local trade unions as a key actor in the governance of European capital cities and for the co-management of local public services, which are of general social interest.

The project aimed to enhance networking and partnership among key social partners of the European capital cities facilitating the exchange of information and mutual learning among social partners in order to share common priorities, guidelines and good practices for a better governance of capitals and their surrounding territories.

Another objective of the project was to investigate and analyse different institutional models and social dialogue practices between local institutions and territorial social partners in the five European capital cities.

Furthermore, the project attempted to explore and investigate the role of social partners and collective bargaining in three key local public services of capital cities: local public transport (including urban and suburban transport), water supply and waste management.

Another goal of the project was to enhance the role of the social partners as a key actor in the local government of the cities and in the management of local public services and to improve the role of second-level bargaining as a contribution to territorial social dialogue, given that the link between company level and territorial level is crucial for a better governance of capital cities.

Regarding the research itself, it analysed the institutions and the management models of three local public services - local public transport, water supply, waste management - in Athens,
London, Madrid, Paris and Rome and the role of social partners in the governance of the cities and in the management of the three above-mentioned services.

The research, then, analysed the extension and contents of second-level collective bargaining in local public services and their different management models verifying the contribution and impact of democratic governance and economic participation of workers' organisations in local public service companies.

The project was carried out by

- CESOS Srl Impresa Sociale – Centro di Studi Sociali Economici e Sindacali. Cesos is a research centre for the study of economics, social science and trade unions. It coordinated all the project activities. Furthermore, Cesos, supported by Ust Cisl Roma Capitale and Rieti, realised the desk research regarding Rome and organised the Italian workshop foreseen in the project.
- EKA - ERGATOYPALLILIKO KENTRO ATHINAS is a local trade union organisation of Athens. It participated in the desk research regarding Athens and organised the Greek workshop.
- SERTUC - Trades Union Congress - Southern and Eastern Regional Council is an English local trade union organisation. It participated in the desk research regarding London and organised the UK workshop.
- UGT Madrid – Union General de Trabajadores de Madrid is a Spanish local trade union organisation. It participated in the desk research regarding Madrid and organised the Spanish workshop.
- UNSA –URIF – Union Nationale des Syndicats Autonomes union Regionale Ile de France is a French local trade union organisation. It participated in the desk research regarding Paris and organised the French workshop.

All the co-applicants of the project are members of the European Capital Trade Unions Network (ECTUN). All of them worked, together with Cesos, on the elaboration of the guidelines (see the specific chapter in this volume) and participated in all the project meetings.

The project was supported by the UST Cisl Roma Capitale e Rieti and by the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC).
- UST CISL Roma Capitale e Rieti (Unione Sindacale Territoriale Confederazione Italiana Sindacato Lavoratori Roma Capitale e Rieti) is a local trade union organisation of Rome. It contributed with its specific territorial competence and expertise to the desk research regarding Rome, participated in the Italian workshop and had a very active role in the elaboration of the guidelines.
- The European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), with its European expertise and knowledge, participated in the research process and in the elaboration of the guidelines. Furthermore, the supporter organisations participated in most of the meetings foreseen by the project and supported the dissemination of the project findings through their internal networks.

All the research activities were conducted by a Project Management Group formed by all the applicant project managers.
The project was implemented in five phases.

The phase of coordination and monitoring of all the activities of the project - both at technical and financial level - lasted throughout the entire project and was conducted by Cesos.

The second phase was in the form of desk research. In this phase, all the project applicants contributed to the analysis of the geographical and political profile of the 5 capital cities and the different management models of local public services on the basis of a common grid. This phase ended in February 2014 and all its findings are reported in the 5-city fact sheet on the project web page http://www.cesos.org/progetti/CAPITALCITIES.htm. This part of the research is summarised in a specific section of this report, titled Overview on five Capital Cities.

During the desk research regarding Rome, there was a very close form of collaboration between Cesos and Ust Cisl Roma Capitale and Rieti.

The third phase of the project involved a local analysis. In fact, a field research was conducted in all the five capital cities through local workshops in order to explore the role of second-level bargaining in local public service companies in the 5 Capital Cities and to identify best practices and successful experiences.

The workshops took place between spring and autumn 2014. They were based on a shared grid of indicators. For every workshop, applicants wrote a report (in English and in the local tongue) that can be consulted on the above-mentioned project web page.

In the fourth phase of the project, Cesos, as Co-ordinator of the project, collected all the information and organised the results of the previous phases as a whole, in order to produce a first draft of guidelines to be shared and edited by all applicants in an exchange seminar which took place in Florence in September 2014. In this phase of the project, all applicants, together with the associated organisations, actively contributed with their expertise to the elaboration of the final version of the guidelines.

In the final phase of the project a public conference was organised for January 2015 and on this occasion all the applicants made suggestions regarding a possible follow-up to the project.

During the implementation of the project, applicants met many times and kept constantly in touch through telephone and emails. The development of good relations between the partners made it possible to produce project findings, which were shared and verified by all the local actors involved.

---

1 The project originated from an idea of the Ust Cisl which, in mid-2012, asked Cesos srl Impresa Sociale to analyse the local public services in Rome, London, Paris, Athens and Madrid. Together with a group of UST-CISL researchers, Cesos realised the research between mid-2012 and March 2013.
In the first chapter of this report, you will find some guidelines which could help re-launch the role of social partners in local government and in the management of local public services.

In the second chapter, an overview summarises the main findings of the desk and field research. It reports the current geographical characteristics of the cities, their systems of government and their local public services and concludes with an explanation of the role of social partners in the government of the cities and in the management of the three local public services.

This project had a real European feel. In fact, the project aimed to enhance the European social model on a territorial and local level, through the promotion of an exchange of experiences and mutual learning among trade unions, taking inspiration from the most innovative practices in Europe and sharing common objectives and approaches in order to improve the economic and social well-being of Europe.

In this sense, the participation of the trade unions, which are all members of the ECTUN, was of particular importance in the realization of the project.

The guidelines reported in this document could help trade unions because they outline a common set of European objectives (based on sustainability criteria) which could be useful in negotiations at local level.
Guidelines for the development of social dialogue at territorial level

By Vilma Rinolfi and Sofia Sanz Alonso

Capital cities are important places for national and foreign people. Typical characteristics of capital cities include high population density, a large number of people travelling to and from the city daily, high immigration levels, traffic and many others aspects.

Therefore, the living and working conditions of capital city inhabitants are more difficult than in the other municipalities, and the role of social dialogue is fundamental in managing the issues related to these aspects.

Our analysis, in particular, highlights that the state of art is very different regarding local social dialogue among the five capital cities. However, there are some common features.

In any case, what is clear is that capital cities cannot be governed without taking the role of social partners into consideration. However, the relationship between social partners and local institutions have changed due to the current economic crisis. In the last five years, the underlying topics at the centre of collective bargaining and social dialogue have, above all, concentrated on the safeguard of the workplace and the purchasing power of citizens.

In London and in Madrid, local institutions have closed many channels of communication with the trade unions and in the other cities social dialogue has deteriorated. Regardless of the crisis, constructive dialogue between local authorities and the social partners is particularly necessary.

Social dialogue in the management of local public services also has not improved. In Athens and in Paris, trade unions and, in general, social partners are represented in the governing boards of some companies which manage the local public services (LPS). However, their role mainly remains consultative and they are not active in the decision-making process.

In many cases, above all in Madrid and London, local social dialogue seems to be deteriorating. Even in Athens, where social dialogue appears to be more articulated and, in
general, deeper-rooted, the situation is changing. In fact, the LPS are passing to forms of private management and, the role of social partners, in general, seems to be changing.

Thus it appears evident that social dialogue needs to be reinforced in all the cities analysed. This revival needs support from all institutions and social partners both at national and European level.

It is necessary to put an end to the stagnation of social dialogue of the last five years. This goal can be achieved with a common European strategy, so it is important to find common guidelines and key issues to re-launch and renew social dialogue at local level.

1. Strengthening social dialogue at territorial level

Social dialogue can play an essential role in local development, providing benefits for employers, workers, and for the economy and society as a whole. Also strengthening the territorial dimension in EU policies seems to be crucial in boosting regional development, growth and the quality of life, including the good functioning of local public services, which are of general common interest.

A closer involvement of local and regional authorities and social partners in the coordination of economic and financial EU policies is of particular importance. Furthermore, it is also necessary to assess the impact that new legislative proposals of EU policies will have on the territory. This will facilitate the contribution of capital cities in the growth strategy of the EU.

1. Renforcement du dialogue social à l’échelle territoriale

Le dialogue social peut jouer un rôle fondamental dans le développement local, offrant des bénéfices aux employeurs, aux travailleurs et à toute l’économie et à la société dans son ensemble. En outre, le renforcement de la dimension territoriale dans les politiques apparaît crucial afin de donner une impulsion au développement régional, à la croissance et à la qualité de la vie, y compris le bon fonctionnement des services publics locaux, d’intérêt général pour la collectivité.

Une plus grande implication de la part de l’UE des autorités et des partenaires sociaux locaux et régionaux dans la coordination des politiques économiques et financières associée à une adaptation à l’échelle territoriale des nouvelles propositions législatives sont, en outre, fondamentales pour valoriser la contribution des villes capitales à la stratégie de croissance de l’UE.
Il rafforzamento del dialogo sociale a livello territoriale

Il dialogo sociale può giocare un ruolo fondamentale nello sviluppo locale, offrendo benefici ai datori di lavoro, ai lavoratori e a tutta l’economia e la società nel loro insieme. Appare cruciale, inoltre, il rafforzamento della dimensione territoriale nelle politiche UE al fine di stimolare lo sviluppo regionale, la crescita e la qualità della vita, ivi compreso il buon funzionamento dei servizi pubblici locali, di generale interesse della collettività.

Un maggiore coinvolgimento da parte dell’UE delle autorità e dei partner sociali locali e regionali nel coordinamento delle politiche economiche e finanziarie insieme ad un adattamento territoriale delle nuove proposte legislative sono, inoltre, fondamentali per valorizzare il contributo delle città capitali alla strategia di crescita dell’UE.

Reforzar el diálogo social a nivel territorial

El diálogo social puede jugar un papel esencial para el desarrollo local, aportando beneficios tanto a trabajadores y empresarios como a la economía y a la sociedad en su conjunto y por tanto debe ser potenciado.

El fortalecimiento de la dimensión territorial en las políticas de la UE parece esencial para impulsar el desarrollo regional, el crecimiento y la calidad de vida de los ciudadanos, lo que incluye también el buen funcionamiento de los servicios públicos, en cuanto servicios de interés general.

Además, la evaluación del impacto territorial de las nuevas políticas legislativas de la UE junto con la mayor consulta e implicación de las autoridades locales y regionales y de los agentes sociales en el proceso de coordinación económica europea, resulta fundamental para facilitar la contribución de las ciudades capitales a la estrategia de crecimiento de la UE.

Η ενίσχυση του κοινωνικού διαλόγου σε τοπικό επίπεδο

Ο κοινωνικός διάλογος μπορεί να παίξει σημαντικό ρόλο στην τοπική ανάπτυξη, προσφέροντας οφέλη στους εργοδότες, στους εργαζόμενους και σε ολόκληρη την οικονομία και την κοινωνία. Διαφαίνεται επίσης ουσιώδης η ενίσχυση της τοπικής διάστασης στις
One of the core issues of the Europe 2020 Strategy\(^2\) launched by the EU is to focus more on sustainable and socially inclusive growth in urban areas, and, in capital cities in particular, which are major centres of economic activity as well as transport network hubs.

However, although capital cities are important for production and economic growth, they are also great consumers of energy and other materials, and are responsible for most greenhouse gas emissions. Furthermore, cities and urban regions are often afflicted by a wider range of social difficulties, such as crime, poverty and social exclusion.

In this context, social dialogue can play an essential role in local development, and can be beneficial for employers, workers, and for the economy and society as a whole. Also strengthening the territorial dimension in EU policies seems to be crucial in order to boost regional development, growth and the quality of life, including the good functioning of local public services.

However, in reality, social dialogue remains weak in many capital cities and there is also a trend, in some cases, to erode, down-grade or even eliminate bipartite or tripartite structures where social partners and other stakeholders take part.

As we saw in the preliminary findings of the Project, the relationship between trade unions and local institutions of the five capitals differ and in some cities, the trade unions have no statutory or negotiated involvement in decision making.

In London, social dialogue is worsening due the position of the local authorities which are stopping many consolidated practices with social partners. In this capital city, one of the first actions of the newly elected Conservative/Liberal Democrat Coalition Government in 2010 was to abolish the English Regional Development Agencies (RDAs). The RDAs recognised trade unions as a senior regional partner to be consulted, and one of their five statutory objectives

\(^2\) For more information see http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm
was to promote sustainability – and this was defined broadly, and included promoting equalities and social cohesion. There were nine RDAs, and their replacement structures (Local Enterprise Partnerships) are “business led” and most do not engage with trade unions.

A similar trend has also been reported in the city of Madrid where social dialogue is increasingly absent, in both the Region and the city. In particular, the 2010 Fiscal and Administrative Measures Act abolished, among others, the Council of Women, the Council for Young People and the Madrid Economic and Social Council, a consultative government body involved in socio-economic and employment concerns. Within this Council, social stakeholders traditionally expressed their opinions before the government adopted certain decisions.

In Athens, however, traditionally, trade unions have a consultative role with the Municipality of Athens regarding topics of common interest. A Council of Social Partners operates as a consultative and proponent body within the Municipality. In Athens, the main city stakeholders, including social partners, also participate in five thematic consultative committees which express opinions on important topics.

Also in Rome, trade unions have a consultative role within the local institutions, which supply the trade unions with institutional information and contact them in order to hear the unions’ opinions. These procedures regard all three local public services and the main matters discussed include the efficiency of the service, business strategies, tariffs and industrial plan. However, the existence of local social dialogue mainly depends on the personal attitude of the local administrators due the absence of a legislative regulation in this matter. For example, at the moment, social dialogue seems to be better developed at regional level: consultation and involvement of trade unions are frequent and lead to shared decisions and agreements (for instance, the Pact for the development of the Region).

As a result of these local social dialogue procedures, on 6 November 2013, an interesting agreement was signed between the Mayor of Rome, trade unions and the local public transport company (Atac Spa). The agreement foresees a series of measures in order to manage a re-organization of the company which is currently in a difficult financial position.

Another interesting issue that came to light during the Project regards the role of consumer groups in local social dialogue, especially in local public services. Regarding this matter, there are some differences among the cities analysed. While in Madrid the existing consumer associations must demonstrate their representativeness, which is officially recognised by the public administration, in London or in Paris, user groups are not always representatives of civil society, their delegates being often appointed by the government. In London, for example, user groups in the transport sector are becoming stronger, but they are not always independent and their role is, therefore, neither essential nor incisive.
However, there is an evident general weakening of every form of citizens’ representativeness in capital cities and, therefore, territorial social dialogue between local institutions, trade unions, employer organisations and other representative local stakeholders must be enhanced.

Linked to this, is the importance of strengthening the territorial focus of EU policies. A closer involvement of local and regional authorities and social partners in the economic and financial policy coordination process, together with a better assessment of the territorial impact of the EU legislative and policy proposals is fundamental in order to facilitate the contribution of capital cities to the EU growth strategy. This bottom-up approach, where all stakeholders may contribute to a system of multilevel governance in order to ensure that all relevant partners can meet and cooperate together to address common challenges, is key to encouraging sustainable growth and to creating jobs.
2. The economic crises and the impact on public services

Europe’s local and regional authorities have been hard hit by the crisis and by austerity measures, and this has led to a significant reduction in public expenditure despite the need to invest more in order to cope with high unemployment levels and social exclusion. This difficult context has had an obvious negative impact on the public services of capital cities. Furthermore, this has also had repercussions both on workers and citizens, given that they are users of essential local public services such as transport, water and waste management.

Although these events are taking place in a period of economic crisis, there is, however, the general perception that the crisis is being mainly used as an excuse to reduce rights and salaries and, in general, to reduce the role of collective bargaining.
Questo difficile contesto ha avuto, ovviamente, un impatto negativo sui servizi pubblici delle città capitali ripercuotendosi sia sui lavoratori sia sui cittadini, quali utenti dei servizi pubblici locali essenziali come i trasporti, il sistema idrico e la gestione dei rifiuti.

Nonostante i fatti sopra descritti abbiano avuto luogo durante un periodo di crisi economica, c'è, tuttavia, la percezione che la crisi sia stata soprattutto utilizzata come una scusante per ridurre diritti, salari e, in generale, la contrattazione collettiva sulla base di un preciso schema politico.

La crisis económica y el impacto en los servicios públicos

En los últimos años, las autoridades locales y regionales europeas han resultado duramente golpeadas por la crisis y por las medidas de austeridad económica. Esto ha implicado una significativa reducción del gasto público a pesar de la necesidad de invertir más para combatir los efectos del desempleo y de la exclusión social. Este difícil contexto y la reducción del gasto público ha tenido obviamente un impacto negativo sobre los servicios públicos en las ciudades capitales. Además, todo ello ha tenido repercusiones tanto sobre los trabajadores como sobre los ciudadanos, en cuanto a usuarios de servicios esenciales como el transporte publico, el agua o los residuos urbanos.

Aunque estos hechos han tenido lugar durante un periodo de crisis económica, se percibe, sin embargo, que la crisis ha sido utilizada prevalentemente como excusa para reducir derechos y salarios y, en general, para reducir el espacio de negociación colectiva, respondiendo a una precisa agenda política.

Η οικονομική κρίση και οι επιπτώσεις της στις δημόσιες υπηρεσίες

Οι τοπικές και περιφερειακές αρχές της ΕΕ χτυπήθηκαν βαριά από την κρίση με τα μέτρα λιτότητας και αυτό οδήγησε σε σημαντική μείωση των δημοσίων δαπανών παρά την ανάγκη να επενδύουν περισσότερα για να αντιμετωπισθούν τα υψηλά επίπεδα ανεργίας και τον κοινωνικό αποκλεισμό.

Αυτό το δύσκολο πλαίσιο είχε, ασφαλώς, αρνητική επίπτωση στις δημόσιες υπηρεσίες των ευρωπαϊκών πρωτεύουσών και επηρέασε τόσο τους εργαζόμενους όσο και τους πολίτες, ως κρήτες των βασικών τοπικών δημοσίων υπηρεσιών όπως είναι οι δημόσιες μεταφορές, η ύδρευση και η διαχείριση των αποβλήτων.

Παρόλο που τα προαναφερθέντα γεγονότα προκλήθηκαν σε μία περίοδο οικονομικής κρίσης, υπάρχει ωστόσο η αντίληψη ότι η κρίση χρησιμοποιήθηκε ως πρόσχημα για την ακύρωση
Europe’s local and regional authorities have been hard hit by the crisis and by austerity measures, and this has led to a significant reduction in public expenditure despite the fact greater investments are necessary to cope with high unemployment and social exclusion. This difficult context has had an obvious negative impact on the public services of capital cities. Furthermore, this has also had repercussions both on workers and citizens, as users of essential local public services such as transport, water and waste management.

For example, the public transport service in Athens has worsened due to the economic crisis because the frequency of the various routes has been reduced in order to decrease operational costs, and this has created operational gaps. Moreover, tariffs of public transport were significantly increased: new tickets of 1.40 € (duration of one hour and a half) and 1.20 € (duration of one hour) substituted the previous single ticket of 1.00 € for all forms of transport with no time limits. This increased the number of people travelling without a ticket. Therefore, in September 2014, the price of tickets for all public means of transport means was reduced again, returning to the previous tariff (1, 00 euro) with a duration of 70 minutes.

The crisis in Greece has also had an impact on the employees working in the public transport sector. In fact, the salaries of the employees have been drastically reduced by up to 45%, and the working conditions have worsened.

However, not only in Greece, hard hit by the crisis, have these problems arisen. In London, there were recent strikes on the tube against management’s proposals to close all ticket offices. This would lead not only to the loss of jobs, but also to the reduction of the service, including repercussions on the health and safety of the travelling public.

In Paris, the restrictions in public expenditure have forced some local authorities to resort to the private sector or to public-private partnerships in order to guarantee some local public services. This has, paradoxically, increased the overall costs of the service.

In Madrid, budget cuts have led to serious conflicts, the latest and most bitter of which saw street and park cleaners go on a widely-supported strike which resulted in the scrapping of a collective redundancy programme which would have seen virtually half the workforce lose their jobs.

Although these facts have taken place during a period of economic crises, there is, however, the perception that the crisis has been deliberately used by political institutions to reduce rights and salaries.
3. Conflict management in local public services

Social dialogue should be a principal feature of the regulatory system of public services, and should include a comprehensive and structured system of collective bargaining and consultation, fortified by high levels of information sharing.

Successful social dialogue and procedures also have the potential to encourage good governance, to minimise the disruption of public services, to adequately face new challenges regarding work organisation (work-life balance, equal opportunities, stress related to work, etc.) and to improve the quality of public services.

La gestion des conflits dans les services publics locaux

Le dialogue social devrait être l’une des caractéristiques principales de la gestion des services publics locaux, pour lesquels il faudrait aussi articuler un système structuré de négociation collective et de consultation et un niveau élevé de partage des informations.

Des processus de dialogue social bien structurés et de succès pourraient renforcer et encourager de bonnes politiques publiques locales, minimiser la dégradation du service public, affronter convenablement les nouvelles thématiques de l’organisation du travail (temps de vie et de travail, égalité des chances, stress lié au travail, etc.) et améliorer la qualité des services publics.

La gestione dei conflitti nei servizi pubblici locali

Il dialogo sociale dovrebbe essere una delle principali caratteristiche della gestione dei servizi pubblici locali, per i quali andrebbero anche articolati un sistema strutturato di contrattazione collettiva e di consultazione e un alto livello di condivisione delle informazioni.

Processi di dialogo sociale ben strutturati e di successo possono potenziare ed incoraggiare buone politiche locali, minimizzare il degrado del servizio pubblico, affrontare adeguatamente le nuove tematiche dell’organizzazione del lavoro (tempi di vita e di lavoro, pari opportunità, stress da lavoro correlato, ecc.) e migliorare la qualità dei servizi pubblici.
Gestión del conflicto en los servicios públicos locales

El diálogo social debería ser una prioridad principal en la gestión de los servicios públicos locales e incluiría un sistema estructurado y comprensivo de negociación colectiva y consulta, facilitado por la presencia de un elevado nivel de intercambio de información.

Los buenos sistemas de diálogo social tienen también el potencial de minimizar la interrupción de los servicios públicos en caso de conflicto, de mejorar la buena gobernanza de estos, de afrontar adecuadamente los nuevos desafíos relacionados con la organización del trabajo (igualdad de oportunidades, equilibrio vida-trabajo, estrés vinculado al trabajo, etc.) y de mejorar la calidad de los servicios públicos.

Η διαχείριση των συγκρούσεων στις τοπικές δημόσιες υπηρεσίες

Ο κοινωνικός διάλογος θα έπρεπε να αποτελεί ένα από τα κύρια χαρακτηριστικά της διαχείρισης των τοπικών δημοσίων υπηρεσιών, με την διάρθρωση ενός δομημένου συστήματος συλλογικής διαπραγμάτευσης και διαβούλευσης, ενισχυμένο από υψηλά επίπεδα ανταλλαγής πληροφοριών.

Ο επιτυχημένος και καλά δομημένος κοινωνικός διάλογος και διαδικασίες μπορούν να ενισχύσουν και να ενθαρρύνουν καλές πολιτικές σε τοπικό επίπεδο, να ελαχιστοποιήσουν την υποβάθμιση των δημοσίων υπηρεσιών, να αντιμετωπίσουν με επάρκεια τα νέα θέματα οργάνωσης της εργασίας (ισορροπία του προσωπικού χρόνου και του χρόνου εργασίας, ίσες ευκαιρίες, εργασιακό στρες κ.λπ.) και ποιοτική βελτίωση των δημοσίων υπηρεσιών.

Social dialogue should be a principal feature of the public services regulatory system, including a comprehensive and structured form of collective bargaining and consultation system, fortified by high levels of information sharing. Regarding public services, successful social dialogue structures and procedures have also the potential to encourage good governance, to minimise the disruption of public services, to adequately face new challenges regarding work organisation (work-life balance, equality opportunities, stress related to work, etc.) and to improve the quality of public services.

Nevertheless, there is little or no involvement of social partners in structures aiming at governing, planning or monitoring the three analysed local public services in some capital cities.

In London and in Rome, no statutory or established social dialogue bodies are foreseen for the management of local public services. In Madrid, the participation of trade unions is limited to
local public transport, where trade unions sit on the Management Boards of the Transport Consortium, which manage the service. The Transport Consortium, created in 1985 to tackle the lack of coordination in matters regarding infrastructure, responsibilities across various transport networks, tariffing etc, represented a great advance in terms of union participation in public service management. However, whilst at that time there was a desire to encourage the involvement of social agents, the tendency these days is the exact opposite – eliminate or reduce as far as possible their presence in consultative and participative bodies. Regarding other services, like waste management, there is currently no information on, or participation in the tender process, or any chance to express dissatisfaction through a vote on those matters.

In Athens, however, the involvement of trade unions in the management of local public services is higher. The trade unions in Athens are institutionally present in the Board of Directors of OASA (the current Urban Transport Service public company) and they have an active role in company management. Trade unions are also present on the board of Directors of EYPAP S.A. (the public controlled company which manages the integrated water service). They also have a consultative role in the management of city waste.

There is also a high involvement of trade unions in the management of the local public services of Paris. Unions sit on the councils of the EPIC (Industrial and Commercial Public Institution) where they take decisions and make recommendations regarding public companies involved in local public services (i.e. RATP and SNCF for transport, Water of Paris for integrated water service, etc.). Trade unions are involved directly in the company which manages local public transport, but are not involved in the management of the other two local public services.

A Water Observatory was created in Paris in 2010, which brings together associations of tenants, owners, large consumers such as hospitals or restaurants, environmental protection organisations as well as representatives of trade unions organisations. This Observatory advises the management, on price, quality of the water, contracts or the personnel.

The above-mentioned good practices could be a useful starting point towards more substantial social dialogue in the governance of public services, where the social partners not only share information, but also participate in more in-depth dialogue about issues raised and in policy definition.

ILO has produced an interesting document regarding these issues entitled *Practical guide for strengthening social dialogue in public service reform*, which proposes mechanisms for participatory decision-making which aim to improve the capacity of public service stakeholders

---


to engage in meaningful social dialogue and establish appropriate and sustainable social dialogue mechanisms for national development and the reduction of poverty.

This document contains a list of good practices regarding the prevention and resolution of disputes in public services which aims to minimize the disruption to public services. This is because in public services, there are competing interests (those of workers, citizens and local government), and therefore conflict management is of utmost importance. This means that a constant dialogue is necessary within the public service companies as well as quality dialogue with representative worker organisations.

In this regard, Paris offers an interesting experience. Since 1996, following major strikes in the RATP (the local public transport company) that paralyzed the capital, a dispute resolution procedure was created. This procedure is called “social alarm” and gives social partners and management time to talk things over whenever there is a risk of a conflict. An innovative new mechanism called “request for attention” was added to this tool in 2006 to prevent individual conflicts. This prolongs, on an individual level, the “social alarm” designed for collective conflicts.

These social dialogue tools have proven to be very effective. In fact, there has been a significant decrease in the number of strike days in the sector: 0.42 days per employee in 2012 and 0 in 2013.

The RATP example was adopted by the SNCF in the Act of 2005, where the social alarm tool was transformed into an “immediate consultation” process whenever there is a risk of a conflict. The number of strikes announced totalled 698 in 2006 and after the immediate consultation process, 92.9% of these were avoided4.

4 SNCF, Sustainable Development Report, 2006
4. Major challenges in local public service collective bargaining

Due to the current economic crisis, collective bargaining and social dialogue in the three analysed services have recently concentrated, above all, on the safeguard of the workplace and the purchasing power of citizens, omitting other matters that may affect the improvement of living and working conditions. Nevertheless, other matters are of crucial importance and should be included in collective bargaining such as security, work-life balance, work stress-related issues related to shifts, antisocial working hours, etc.

---

**Principaux changements de la négociation collective dans les services publics locaux**

À cause de la crise économique actuelle, les thèmes traités par la négociation collective et par le dialogue social dans les trois services publics analysés se sont concentrés principalement sur la sauvegarde du poste de travail et du pouvoir d'achat des citoyens, omettant d'autres matières qui pourraient contribuer à l'amélioration des conditions de vie et de travail. Il serait donc crucial de relancer, au sein de la négociation collective, des thèmes comme la sécurité, l'équilibre des temps de vie et de travail, le stress lié au travail, les horaires de travail antisociaux, etc.

---

**Principali cambiamenti della contrattazione collettiva nei servizi pubblici locali**

A causa dell’attuale crisi economica, i temi trattati dalla contrattazione collettiva e dal dialogo sociale nei tre servizi pubblici locali analizzati sono stati soprattutto concentrati sulla salvaguardia del posto di lavoro e del potere d'acquisto dei cittadini, omettendo altre materie che potrebbero contribuire al miglioramento delle condizioni di vita e di lavoro. Sarebbe cruciale, quindi, rilanciare, nella contrattazione collettiva, temi quali la sicurezza, l'equilibrio dei tempi di vita e di lavoro, lo stress da lavoro correlato, orari di lavoro anti sociali, ecc.
Principales desafíos de la negociación colectiva en los servicios públicos locales

Durante la actual crisis económica, la negociación colectiva y el diálogo social en los tres servicios públicos analizados se han concentrado, sobre todo, en la salvaguardia del puesto de trabajo y del poder adquisitivo de los trabajadores, dejando de lado cuestiones relativas a la mejora de las condiciones de vida y de trabajo. Cuestiones como la seguridad, el equilibrio vida-trabajo, la organización del trabajo, horario y turnos son de enorme importancia y por tanto no deberían ser desatendidos en la negociación colectiva.

Public service labour relations and, in particular collective bargaining, are a key component of public sector efficiency, performance and the wellbeing of society as a whole. Systems characterised by a high level of social dialogue between parties, which, in particular, have an inclusive collective bargaining regime where representatives of all or most key stakeholders are involved can contribute very positively to the development and improvement of public services.

Due the current economic crisis, collective bargaining and social dialogue in the three analysed services have recently concentrated, above all, on the safeguard of the workplace and the purchasing power of citizens, omitting other matters. Nevertheless, it seems crucial to take into account new issues of collective bargaining which may regard security, work-life balance, work stress-related issues related to shifts, antisocial working hours, etc.

A good example of this can be seen in London’s public transport, where wider discussions on local welfare, social inclusion and work-life balance take place although, in order to guarantee
a better service, it has been difficult to come to an agreement on flexible working hours. However, in this sector, there are some job-sharing agreements.

Another interesting discussion which has taken place in Paris RATP regards the inclusion of minorities given that specific religious demands are becoming more and more frequent: need for praying areas, halal meals, refusal of male drivers to use the same bus used before by a female driver, break for prayer, refusal to shake hands with a woman, etc. In order to avoid conflicts, the RATP has taken measures such as the transformation of some gyms into prayer room, but it has also requested all its employees to participate in some training programmes regarding secularism issues.

While in some capital cities, collective bargaining is tackling new challenges, in some other countries collective bargaining is under attack. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) imposed by the so-called “Troika” (the European Commission, the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund) in Greece has abolished free collective bargaining. Despite this abolition of collective bargaining, in 2013, the transport unions in Athens managed to sign a collective agreement at OSY. The increase in salaries was symbolic (only one cent) but the message was clear that despite the situation, unions could break the ban.

Furthermore, the privatisation of local public service companies has sometimes involved significant changes in the conditions established in collective agreements, creating negative differences between the staff originally employed by the public company and newcomers. In Madrid, after the water supply public company started a privatisation process in 2012, it ceased to have its own company level collective agreement. The previous agreement – which had been operational for many years and which had ensured excellent conditions for its staff – was substituted by a very “young” sector-wide collective agreement (the State Collective Agreement for industries involved in the uptake, elevation, transportation, treatment, distribution, sanitation and purification of drinking and residual water). Despite an intense legal fight by the unions to maintain the pre-existing agreement, since 2012 the sectoral agreement has been applied, with conditions that are significantly poorer than before.
5. Changes in the management of local public services: privatisation of public services and impact on social dialogue

In recent years, public services have changed considerably in capital cities: most public services, formerly supplied by public-owned companies, are now in the hands of private sector companies which operate under public tenders.

Free-market policies have consequently led to the fragmentation of the sectors here analysed. Different private suppliers have been involved and this, obviously, has influenced both social dialogue and collective bargaining. In fact, there has been a proliferation of different contracts with different terms and conditions within the same sector.

Furthermore, privatisation, in many cases, has led to the exclusion of social agents, hindering and even preventing their participation at different levels.

Changements dans la gestion des services publics locaux: privatisation des services publics et son impact sur le dialogue social

Au cours de ces dernières années les services publics des villes capitales ont subi de profondes transformations: bien des services, administrés précédemment par des entreprises publiques, sont, maintenant, aux mains de compagnies privées, qui exercent leurs activités sur la base de marchés publics.

Les politiques de libéralisation ont eu comme conséquence, avant tout, la fragmentation de la gestion des services en de nombreuses petites entreprises, conditionnant ainsi le dialogue social mais aussi la négociation collective. Les contrats collectifs sont devenus plus nombreux et prévoient des termes et des conditions différents, ce qui entraine une différence de traitement entre travailleurs du même secteur d’activité.

Dans de nombreux cas, la privatisation a, en outre, porté à des processus d’exclusion des agents sociaux, en en entravant, et même en en empêchant, la participation à différents niveaux.
Cambiamenti nella gestione dei servizi pubblici locali: privatizzazione dei servizi pubblici e impatto sul dialogo sociale

Negli ultimi anni i servizi pubblici delle città capitali sono stati profondamente trasformati: molti servizi, precedentemente gestiti da imprese pubbliche, sono, ora, nelle mani di compagnie private, che operano sulla base di appalti pubblici.

Le politiche di liberalizzazione hanno avuto come conseguenza, innanzitutto, la frammentazione della gestione dei servizi in tante piccole imprese, influenzando sia il dialogo sociale sia la contrattazione collettiva. I contratti collettivi sono diventati più numerosi e prevedono termini e condizioni differenti creando una disparità di trattamento fra lavoratori del medesimo settore di attività.

La privatizzazione, in molti casi, ha, inoltre, portato a processi di esclusione degli agenti sociali, ostacolandone e, addirittura, impedendone la partecipazione a vari livelli.

Cambios en la gestión de los servicios públicos locales: la privatización de los servicios y su impacto en el diálogo social

En los últimos años, los modelos de gestión de los servicios públicos han cambiado considerablemente en las ciudades capitales: algunos de los servicios, precedentemente garantizados por empresas públicas en régimen de monopolio, están ahora en manos de empresas del sector privado a las que se les adjudica el servicio mediante concursos públicos.

En algunas ciudades, esta transformación ha conllevado, además, la fragmentación de los sectores analizados en distintas empresas gestoras de un determinado servicio, con una consecuente proliferación de convenios colectivos con condiciones, en ocasiones, muy diferentes. Esto, obviamente, ha influenciado tanto la práctica del diálogo social como de la negociación colectiva en dichos sectores.

Además, la privatización de los servicios, en muchos casos, ha provocado la exclusión de los agentes sociales, obstaculizando e incluso impidiendo su participación a distintos niveles.
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One of the core issues of the debate regarding public services in Europe is linked to their model of management given that, in recent years, public services have changed considerably: most public services, formerly supplied by public-owned companies, are now in the hands of private sector companies which operate under public tenders. The reasons given for these changes tend to be financial (reduction of public debt), economic (a belief that private management is more efficient than public ownership) and political (less emphasis on public administration, more on private initiative).

However, privatisation in the public services not only regards the core service but also a great number of auxiliary services (maintenance, cleaning, storage, canteens, etc.) have been outsourced, where often subcontracting companies offer lower salaries and worse working conditions. Sharing and discussing the criteria to be used by local public authorities when awarding public contracts – not only the lowest price tendered – is an important issue that must be discussed with social partners.

Free-market policies have consequently led to the fragmentation of the sectors analysed here. This, obviously, has influenced both social dialogue and collective bargaining. In practice, the fragmentation of the service and the involvement of many supply companies means different contracts and conditions. For instance, the London bus service, which is supplied by 21 private operators on contracts lasting approximately five years, collective bargaining is conducted separately within each of the 21 companies. Thus terms and conditions vary from contract to contract and even within the same company, including hours, rates of pay, and holidays, while
wider terms and conditions such as Compassionate Leave tend to be established by law at national level. In this sector, pay levels can vary from company to company by as much as £10,000 a year and there has been a trend over the years to establish different terms within company agreements for current and new staff (pay variance here can be as much as £8,000 a year). Working hours also vary from 38 to 60 hours a week\(^5\). Low pay and different pay structures means that drivers frequently move from company to company creating instability for the company and lack of experience on routes for passengers, and is therefore a bad practice that benefits no-one.

A similar trend can be seen in Madrid’s waste management service, where workers are covered by a number of collective agreements of the many private companies (FCC S.A, Urbaser etc.) which offer these services in the city.

In such cases, a social dialogue structure that includes union representatives, local government and the private companies running the service seems necessary in order to establish a city-wide approach and common terms and conditions.

Furthermore, privatisation, in many cases, has led to the exclusion of social agents, hindering and even preventing their participation at different levels. In Madrid, for instance, although there used to be a number of institutional consultancies, many have been closed down as part of cutbacks. Trade unions have also been increasingly excluded from public service management, Governing Boards and other participatory bodies.

Privatisation has also led to changes in union policies. For example, regarding local train services in London, the union has political policies that oppose privatisation but, since the Tory government promoted the privatisation and fragmentation of the railways in 1996, the union has used it to their advantage, selling their skills as a scarce commodity. In fact, all Transport Operating Companies (TOCs) developed different terms and conditions for drivers and there was a general trend towards higher salaries. However some terms and conditions, such as bonus payments and Sunday overtime, were “sold” in return for higher wages.

The debate concerning the models of public service management services is still ongoing and is of great interest to the public and social partners. Furthermore and above all, it poses an important dilemma: the conversion of public to private, and the creation of a profit-making concern may make it difficult to provide affordable and high quality services of general interest without substantial government supervision.

However, London’s system of public services, which is the most privatised and free-market among the five capital cities analysed, also has other stories to tell. For example, in the East Coast line, the TOC abandoned the service they had been awarded, so it was placed in the

\(^5\) Note that the Working Time Directive does not apply.
hands of a publicly owned unit, Directly Operated Railways. Since then, the government has received millions of pounds of income from the operation, East Coast now receives a low government subsidy, and fares have been restrained to a significantly greater degree than in the commercial TOCs.

Nonetheless, the British government has now decided to organize a private tender for the running of the East Coast line with the successful bidder to be announced before the end of 2014.

The experience of returning from privately run services to public management has also been experienced in other sectors and cities. In Paris, for instance, the water supply service had been progressively privatised since the mid-eighties. In 2009, when the contract with the public-private ownership company expired, the service was transformed back into a municipality-controlled concern, Eau de Paris, because the Council wanted to “offer a quality service at a fair price”. The total operating revenue of the new organisation is now reinvested in the service to finance infrastructure or control the costs which users must pay in the form of tariffs.

A significant decision in this regard came from the Council of State of Greece (decision 1906/2014), which, at the request of protest groups organized by citizens, declared that the decision of the Interministerial Committee for Restructuring and Privatisation of the full privatization of EYDAP (water supply) was illegal. With this decision, the Assembly of the State Council highlights the responsibility of the State in maintaining and preserving the public character of utilities.

Similarly, in Rome, a referendum led to the abrogation of a norm (art.23bis of law 133/2008) which attempted to promote privatisation and competition in the management of local public services. The success of the 2011 referendum cancelled this norm, so issues became exclusively regulated by EU law.

Another key point of this debate is how to manage the transfer of responsibilities from the public sphere to the private sphere when the companies that provide public services are private but the service is overseen by a public body. In some cases, companies hide behind the excuse that it is the City Council that decides and is responsible for determining the terms and conditions. Meanwhile, the City Council argues that it only sets price and service quality conditions. There is a risk that such a continuous transfer of responsibilities regarding quality standards, frequency of the service etc., can seriously hit both the workforce and the service offered. Enhancing the role of social partners in the planning, monitoring and management of the local public services may be a way to eliminate this risky practice.
6. Quality of public services and key role of social partners

The improvement of service quality (for instance, because of the extension of the running hours of the service) which has a positive impact on users, may have a negative impact on employee working conditions when not adequately negotiated and managed with social partners. In this context, social dialogue is crucial when discussing future changes of the services and in order to guarantee new and fair provisions regarding the management of anti-social working hours, psycho-social risks due to shift work, work holidays, work-life balance, etc.

Enhancing regional social dialogue and the essential role played by trade unions, both as a social agent and as a representative organisation, are therefore key elements for the governance and successful planning and functioning of local public services.
Il rilancio del dialogo sociale regionale e del ruolo centrale dei sindacati, sia come agenti sociali sia come organizzazioni di rappresentanza, è, quindi, un elemento chiave per le politiche locali e per una positiva pianificazione dei servizi pubblici locali ed il loro buon funzionamento.

La calidad de los servicios públicos y el rol clave de los agentes sociales

La mejora de la calidad de un servicio público (por ejemplo, por la ampliación de horario del servicio), que tiene un impacto positivo sobre los usuarios, podría tener un impacto negativo sobre los trabajadores del servicio si estos cambios no fueran adecuadamente gestionados y negociados con los agentes sociales. El diálogo social es crucial a la hora de discutir cambios futuros en los servicios públicos con el fin de garantizar condiciones adecuadas para los trabajadores en relación con el horario de trabajo, los turnos, riesgos psicosociales, el equilibrio vida y trabajo, las festividades, etc.

Potenciar el diálogo social regional y el rol esencial que juegan los sindicatos como agente social y como organización representativa son, por tanto, elementos clave para garantizar la gobernanza, la planificación y el buen funcionamiento de los servicios públicos locales en las ciudades capitales.

Η ποιότητα των δημοσίων υπηρεσιών και ο ρόλος κλειδί των κοινωνικών εταίρων

Η βελτίωση της ποιότητας της υπηρεσίας (π.χ. η επέκταση των ωρών παροχής μιας υπηρεσίας) έχει θετική επίπτωση στους χρήστες, όμως μπορεί να έχει και αρνητική αντανάκλαση στις συνθήκες εργασίας των υπαλλήλων εφόσον δεν συζητηθεί κατάλληλα με τους κοινωνικούς εταίρους. Σ’ αυτό το πλαίσιο, ο κοινωνικός διάλογος παίζει καθοριστικό ρόλο στη διαχείριση των μελλοντικών αλλαγών των υπηρεσιών και στην πρόβλεψη νέων διατάξεων για θέματα εξουθενωτικών ωραρίων εργασίας και ψυχο-κοινωνικών κινδύνων στις βάρδιες εργασίας, άδειες, ισορροπία ζωής-εργασίας, κλπ.

Η αναθέρμανση του τοπικού κοινωνικού διαλόγου και του κεντρικού ρόλου των συνδικάτων, είτε ως κοινωνικοί παράγοντες είτε ως οργανώσεις εκπροσώπησης είναι, συνεπώς, ένα στοιχείο κλειδί για τις τοπικές πολιτικές και για τον θετικό προγραμματισμό των τοπικών δημοσίων υπηρεσιών κοινής ωφέλειας και την καλή τους λειτουργία.
Public services, whether they are delivered publicly or privately, are provided to sustain the wellbeing of each citizen and help the development of society as a whole. Improving the quality of public services is, therefore, a key element that can contribute positively to facilitate sustainable local economic and social development. However, the quality of public services needs the support of good labour relations systems, which are a key component of the network of social relationships and institutions of capital cities.

Within the political environment and legal framework under which trade unions currently act in most capital cities, it is however difficult for them to influence the quality of the local public services. Even though trade unions are involved in supporting the quality of the service their employer provides, this is viewed as a “political” activity (rather than an industrial one). In fact, this kind of dispute has been banned in Great Britain since the 1980s following legislation brought in by the Conservative government. However, good and imaginative leadership has demonstrated that unions can influence public opinion on such issues. An example of this is the recent strikes on London’s tube against the management’s proposal to close all ticket offices. In order to remain legal, the industrial action had to focus on the loss of jobs that would ensue rather than the reduction of the service provided for the public or travellers’ health and safety. Another strong example is the ongoing campaign by rail users and travelling public against continuously increasing rail fares: public opinion is now more in favour of the renationalisation of the transport service.

In these campaigns, there was an important customer service element that goes beyond the essential aspects of industrial action (salary, working time, benefits, etc.). However, both aspects – quality of local public services and improved working conditions of public service employees – are connected. They should, therefore, be reinforced. On the contrary, the worsening of working conditions in public service companies (due to budget cuts, reductions in personnel, increase of working hours, etc.) have a negative impact on the quality of the service and, therefore, on the whole society in terms of health, efficiency, sustainability and wellbeing.

Furthermore, as mentioned above, the privatisation of local public services, which has resulted in the immediate expulsion of trade unions from participatory bodies in some cities, has strongly held back the action of social agents regarding the planning and monitoring of public services, limiting their participation to purely labour matters: the negotiation of a collective agreement or issues related to health and safety on the workplace.

It is important to underline that the improvement of the quality of the service (for instance because of the extension of the running hours of the service) which has a positive impact on users, may have a negative impact on employees’ working conditions if not adequately discussed and managed with social partners. In this context, social dialogue is crucial when discussing future changes, in the planning and management of the services and when there is any debate regarding new provisions concerning the management of anti-social working hours, psycho-social risks due to shift work, work holidays, work-life balance, etc.
In this sense, it is essential to stress the importance of enhancing regional social dialogue and the fundamental role of trade unions, both as a social agent and as a representative organisation in the planning and functioning of local public services. Social dialogue and union participation means monitoring which in turn means ensuring quality of the service. This is a key element to contribute and sustain the wellbeing of citizens of capital cities and, more in general, to promote regional development.
Overview on City profiles, local public services and role of Trade Unions

By Vilma Rinolfi

This part contains the main findings of the project and some highlights regarding the main geographic and administrative characteristics of the five capital cities, the profiles of the three analysed local public services (local public transport, waste management and water supply) and the role of trade unions in the local social dialogue.

Data contained in the items come from Eurostat (Urban Audit) or from applicants, on the basis of the local official data sources (National Statistics Institutes, local companies, etc.).

In order to make comparison possible, common data (same year, same source, etc.) were used instead of city fact-sheet data, even when common data were older and less detailed than the data contained in the city fact-sheets.

However, due the limited availability of common data, sometimes they refer to different years or to a period before the start of the economic downturn (2008).
MAIN CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE FIVE CAPITAL CITIES
AND THEIR LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICES
### Governing Institutions and Geographic Aspects of the Five Capital Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athens</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Madrid</th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Rome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Status</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government of the City</strong></td>
<td>The Mayor Assessors</td>
<td>The Mayor Greater London Authority</td>
<td>Alcalde (The Mayor) Junta de Gobierno</td>
<td>Maire de Paris (The Mayor) 37 assessors</td>
<td>Sindaco (The Mayor) Giunta Capitolina (assessors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Local Authorities</strong></td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>London Assembly 3 Functional bodies</td>
<td>Pleno</td>
<td>Conseil de Paris</td>
<td>Assemblea Capitolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Area</strong> 8</td>
<td>38.91 km²</td>
<td>1,572 km²</td>
<td>605.77 km²</td>
<td>105.75 km²</td>
<td>1,307.7 km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residents</strong> 9</td>
<td>799,979</td>
<td>7,753,600</td>
<td>3,255,944</td>
<td>2,233,906</td>
<td>2,724,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Density (inhabitants/km²)</strong> 10</td>
<td>20,559.7</td>
<td>4,932.3</td>
<td>5,374.7</td>
<td>21,124.4</td>
<td>2,083.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployment Rate</strong> 11</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GDP Per Capita in PPS</strong> 12</td>
<td>31,100 euros</td>
<td>49,100 Euros</td>
<td>34,100 Euros</td>
<td>69,000 euros</td>
<td>32,900 Euros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 Please, note that all data in this column refer to actual city of Paris. In 2015, a new municipality (Le Grand Paris) will replace this city. The Grand Paris will include all the municipalities of the Region Ile de France and, will, therefore, be a lot larger than the Paris of today.

7 The Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime, Transport for London and London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority


9 Eurostat Urban Audit 2009.

10 Elaboration by Cesos on Eurostat data.


13 2013 15/17,000 Euros (data supplied by co-applicant).

14 2013 80,528 Euros (data supplied by co-applicant).
## LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE FIVE CAPITAL CITIES

### LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT

#### HIGHLIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of the transport networks</th>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293 bus and trolley bus lines, 2,148 vehicles, 366 trolley buses, 3 underground lines, 3 suburban Railway lines, 3 Tram lines</td>
<td>11 underground lines. More than 700 urban bus lines, 8,500 vehicles. Railway network: Docklands Light Railway (DLR), London Overground, Tramlink, suburban main line rail London River Services</td>
<td>12 underground lines and 4 overground lines (Metro ligero) 215 urban bus routes and 2,095 vehicles. 349 suburban bus routes and 1,939 vehicles. 9 suburban railway lines (Cercanias Renfe)</td>
<td>14 underground lines 351 urban bus routes, 4,300 vehicles. 5 urban and suburban railway lines (RER). 3 tram lines</td>
<td>3 underground lines 302 bus routes, 2,122 vehicles 220 extra-urban bus routes, 1,685 vehicles 6 tram lines, 165 trams 3 railway lines (urban and extra-urban)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

15 2013. Data supplied by applicants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Extension of the public transport network</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATHENS</strong></th>
<th><strong>LONDON</strong></th>
<th><strong>MADRID</strong></th>
<th><strong>PARIS</strong></th>
<th><strong>ROME</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underground, 76 km Buses, 4,100 km Tram, 26 km Suburban Railway network, 130 km (of which 50 km are urban)</td>
<td>The entire network, 14,850 km Underground 402 km</td>
<td>Underground 293 km Urban buses 3,618 km Suburban railway 382 km</td>
<td>Underground 213 km Tram 31.4 km RER 587 km</td>
<td>Underground 53.2 km Ground-level means of transport (bus and tram) 3,569 km Extra-urban bus 11,700 km Railway lines 139.3 km (49.9 km urban 89.4 km extra-urban lines)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANAGEMENT OF THE SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Controlled by</strong></th>
<th><strong>ATHENS</strong></th>
<th><strong>LONDON</strong></th>
<th><strong>MADRID</strong></th>
<th><strong>PARIS</strong></th>
<th><strong>ROME</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlled by</td>
<td>Public Company (OASA SA)</td>
<td>Department of Local Government (TFL)</td>
<td>Public Consortium of 177 municipalities of the Region Comunidad de Madrid</td>
<td>Public authority (STIF)</td>
<td>Department of Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operators</strong></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Mostly private (11 lines of the London Underground are managed by a public company)</td>
<td>Mostly public (2 overground lines - metro ligero - and some of interurban bus routes are managed by private companies)</td>
<td>Mostly public (some of the suburban bus routes are managed by private companies)</td>
<td>Mostly public (20% of suburban busses is managed by a private company)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

16 2013. Data supplied by applicants
## LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT

### DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controlled by:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Controlled by:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Controlled by:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Controlled by:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Controlled by:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASA SA <em>(Athens Urban Transport Organisation)</em>. It is a public company, 100% owned by the State.</td>
<td>(Except for Main Line Railways) TFL <em>(Transport for London)</em>. It is a department of the Greater London Authority (GLA).</td>
<td>C.R.T. <em>(Consortio Regional de Transportes de Madrid)</em>. It is a Consortium consisting of almost all municipalities (177) of the Region Comunidad de Madrid.</td>
<td>The STIF <em>(Syndicat des Transports Île de France)</em>. The STIF is a public authority at regional level (Île de France).</td>
<td>Dipartimento Mobilità e Trasporti di Roma Capitale It is a Department of the Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operators:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operators:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operators:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operators:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ODIKES SYNGKOINONIES S.A.</strong> “OSY” is a subsidiary company of OASA. Osy manages Trolley Buses in the metropolitan area of Athens.</td>
<td>London Buses Ltd is a limited liability company controlled by TFL. The operative management of the urban bus network has been assigned to 21 private operators through a public tender. Bus services are required to conform to the same system of tariffs.</td>
<td>Metro de Madrid Sociedad Anónima is a public company owned by the Comunidad de Madrid. It is the principal operator for almost the entire underground network (13 underground lines and 3 overground lines).</td>
<td>RATP <em>(Régie Autonome des Transports Parisiens)</em> public enterprise <em>(EPIC - Etablissement Public à Caractère industriel et Commercial)</em> 100% owned by the State. RATP manages the underground, urban bus routes, trams and 2 lines of the RER, which is a railway service that connects the centre of the city to the Parisian hinterland. SNCF <em>(Société nationale des chemins de fer français)</em> Transilien Public enterprise <em>(EPIC)</em>, 100% owned by the State. It operates in the region of Île de France (14 suburban railway lines, of which 2 are co-managed with RATP, 1 tram.</td>
<td>ATAC spa is a public company owned by Roma Capitale. The company manages most of the public transport network (buses, trolley buses, trams, undergrounds, regional railways) and some supplementary services (parking, control of preferential bus lanes, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATHERES SYNGKOINONIES S.A.</strong> “STASY” is a subsidiary company of OASA. Stasy manages the Metro, Electric Railways and Tram services in the metropolitan area of Athens.</td>
<td>London Underground Limited is a public company controlled by TFL. It manages the 11 lines of the London Underground. Some driver-monitored automatic operation trains are leased from private suppliers who also</td>
<td>Empresa Municipal de Transportes (EMT) Autobuses Urbanos is a public company owned by the</td>
<td></td>
<td>COTRAL Spa is a public company controlled by the Region of Lazio. The company manages the links between Roma Capitale and other municipalities in the Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roma Tpl s.c.a.r.l is a private consortium formed by Umbria Tpl and Mobilità s.p.a. (the public transport company of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With financial support from the European Union

Docklands Light Railway is a limited liability company controlled by the TfL.

It manages the railway network of East London.

The operative service has been assigned to a private enterprise, Serco Docklands, through a tender.

London Overground Ltd is a limited liability company controlled by TfL.

It manages the Railway network which links Inner London to the suburbs by radial and orbital routes.

The operative service has been assigned to a private enterprise, London Overground Rail Operations, through a tender.

Tramlink Ltd is a limited liability company controlled by TfL.

It manages the tram network which operates in the South of London.

The construction and planning of the tram network was assigned through a tender to a private company Tramtrak Limited.

Ayuntamiento de Madrid.

It manages 215 urban bus routes.

Renfe-Cercanías

(Red Nacional de los Ferrocarriles Españoles) is a public company, controlled by the Ministry for Development.

It manages the suburban railway service which connects the centre of Madrid to the other municipalities through a network called “Cercanías”, which comprises 9 lines and which is 382 kilometres long.

Recently the service has been sponsored by private companies (Vodafone)

Interurban buses

The service is provided by 3 municipal enterprises and 29 private companies.

Optile (Organisation Professionnelle des Transports d’Ile-de-France) Association which comprises 90 private suburban bus enterprises. Optile coordinates and guarantees the administrative management of the 1,079 urban and suburban bus routes, including school and specialized bus services operating in the region of Ile de France. The Optile association manages the service through a convention with the STIF.

Interurban buses

The service is provided by 3 municipal enterprises and 29 private companies.

Optile association manages the service through a convention with the STIF.
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Optile association manages the service through a convention with the STIF.

Interurban buses

The service is provided by 3 municipal enterprises and 29 private companies.

Optile association manages the service through a convention with the STIF.

Interurban buses

The service is provided by 3 municipal enterprises and 29 private companies.

Optile association manages the service through a convention with the STIF.

Interurban buses

The service is provided by 3 municipal enterprises and 29 private companies.

Optile association manages the service through a convention with the STIF.
London River Services is a division of Transport for London which coordinates and plans the passenger transport service on the River Thames.

The service has been assigned to various private operators through a public tender.
### HIGHLIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athens</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Madrid</th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Rome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity of waste collected</strong></td>
<td>2,000,000 tonnes per year 513.5 kg per inhabitant per year</td>
<td>3,822,000 tonnes per year 488 kg per inhabitant per year</td>
<td>1,266,441 tonnes per year 391.1 kg per inhabitant per year</td>
<td>1,137,586 tonnes per year 519 kg per inhabitant per year</td>
<td>1,754,000 tonnes per year 670.2 kg per inhabitant per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste treatment</strong></td>
<td>Directly to the dump (undifferentiated) 82% Recycling and compost 18%</td>
<td>Directly to the dump: 49% Incinerators: 21% Recycling: 27% Compost: 3%</td>
<td>Directly to the dump: 42.4% Incinerators: 5.6% Recycling: 13.8% Compost: 20.4%</td>
<td>Directly to the dump: 3.1% Incinerators: 75% Mechanical Biological Treatment: 6.6% Recycling: 15.3%</td>
<td>Directly to the dump: 44.8% Mechanical Biological Treatment: 29.5% Recycling/compost: 25.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MANAGEMENT OF THE SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Athens</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Madrid</th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Rome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection of waste</strong></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Mostly private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50% public (private in 10 out of 20 arrondissement) Coll. of glass: private Coll. of bulky waste: public</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment of waste</strong></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Mostly private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Mostly public Treat. of glass: private</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

17. 2013. Data supplied by applicants
18. Data refer to Attica Region
20. 2013. Data supplied by applicants
21. All producers and importers are obliged to organise or participate in recycling management of special types of waste. The recycling systems adopted must be approved and controlled by the Greek Recycling Organisation (E.O.AN)
22. Waste management is independently controlled by each Borough. Some of them manage the service directly.
## WASTE MANAGEMENT DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management of the service:</strong></td>
<td>Management of the service: The management of waste is independently controlled by each Borough. This naturally means that there are a number of different ways in which the service is organized in London. Some Borough authorities manage the service directly. In most of the districts, the waste collection and disposal service is assigned through a tender to one or more private enterprises (for example, in the city of London, the service is provided by four different companies). The enterprises that control the service in most of the</td>
<td>Management of the service: Collection of waste: FCC SA <em>(Fomento de Construcciones y Contratas SA)</em>, private company. Other small private enterprises. Treatment of waste: Various private enterprises</td>
<td>Management of the service: Collection of waste: STPP <em>(Service Technique de la Propreté de Paris)</em> is part of the Direction de la Propreté et de l’Eau (DPE) of the City Council of Paris. The collection of waste is managed by private operators in only four Parisian arrondissements out of twenty (each enterprise is assigned one neighbourhood); Collection of glass: managed by four private enterprises. Véolia, Derichebourg, Pizzorno-</td>
<td>Management of the service: AMA (Azienda Municipale Ambiente) S.p.a. Public company which is 100% controlled by Roma Capitale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection of waste:</strong></td>
<td>Municipality of Athens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment of waste:</strong></td>
<td>ESDNA (The Association of Municipalities of Attica Region). Public body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling:</strong></td>
<td>As regards the alternative management of waste, there are 20 Approved Systems (March 2014) for the collection and treatment of special waste (e.g. packaging, batteries, electrical and electronic equipment, used tyres,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*With financial support from the European Union*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste oils, vehicles, building rubble, construction waste, etc.).</td>
<td>boroughs are Veolia, Serco and May Gurney for the collection of waste and Veolia, Serco, WRG and Viridor for the disposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gragi, SAINT-GOBAIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All producers and importers are obliged either to organize or participate in Alternative Management Systems. Systems, which can be individually or collectively evaluated, approved and controlled by the Greek Recycling Organization (E.O.AN).</td>
<td>There is a London Waste and Recycling Board that invests in waste infrastructure and supports the boroughs in order to make efficiency savings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment of waste:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The LWRB works with the London Mayor and London Councils (a body made up of representatives of all London boroughs) and is funded by public money from the Government’s national Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SYCTOM (Syndicat intercommunal de traitement des ordures ménagères de l’agglomération parisienne), which, in 2011, was renamed Agence métropolitaine des déchets ménagers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The SYCTOM is a public administrative body which comprises 84 Municipalities of the Parisian area. The management of the waste treatment plants owned by the SYCTOM is assigned to various private operators through a public tender.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The treatment of collected glass is managed directly by the company, Saint-Gobain, which specializes in the production of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHENS</td>
<td>LONDON</td>
<td>MADRID</td>
<td>PARIS</td>
<td>ROME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>building materials and glass containers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The <em>Conseil de Paris</em> establishes the tax to be paid for the management of waste (taxe d’enlevement des ordures ménagères, TEOM).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# WATER SUPPLY

## HIGHLIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total consumption</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m³ per annum)²³</td>
<td>45,875,059</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>292,038,135</td>
<td>212,896,000</td>
<td>327,959,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumption per inhabitant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m³ per annum)²⁴</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of one cubic metre of domestic water</strong>²⁵</td>
<td>0.8 euro/m³</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1.5 euro/m³</td>
<td>2.3 euro/m³</td>
<td>0.4 euro/m³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MANAGEMENT OF THE SERVICE²⁶

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private²⁷</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Public²⁸</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

²³ Eurostat Urban Audit 2004 (Athens and Paris); 2008 (Madrid and Rome)

²⁴ Our calculation.

²⁵ Eurostat Urban Audit 2009 (Athens); 2008 (Madrid and Rome); 2004 (Paris)

²⁶ Data supplied by applicants.

²⁷ The Water Services Regulation Authority (OFWAT) is responsible for setting limits on the prices charged for water and sewerage services.

²⁸ The service was private until 2009.
## WATER SUPPLY DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management of the service:</strong>&lt;br&gt;ELYAP SA</td>
<td><strong>Management of the service:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Thames Water</td>
<td><strong>Management of the service:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Canal de Isabel II Gestion S.A.</td>
<td><strong>Management of the service:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Eau de Paris</td>
<td><strong>Management of the service:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Acea Ato 2 s.p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a joint-stock company which is publicly controlled. The Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund (state owned) holds 61% of shares.</td>
<td>Private company owned by Kemble Water, a consortium formed in late 2006 by Australian-based Macquarie Group’s European Infrastructure Funds. Other large shareholders in recent years include: BT Pension Scheme (13%), the Abu Dhabi Investment Authority (9.9%), and the China Investment Corporation (9%). Other minor players are Sutton &amp; East Surrey Water, and Affinity Water.</td>
<td>is a joint-stock company which is publicly controlled. 51% of public shares are distributed between the Comunidad de Madrid (32%) and the Municipalities (19%). The Municipalities are authorized to sell up to 17% of their shares to private concerns. To date, there have been no sales of shares but, should it happen, only 34% of the shares of Canal de Isabel II Gestion would be publicly owned.</td>
<td>Public enterprise (Régie), 100% owned by the City Council of Paris. The Council is responsible for defining water service policy and it controls the activity of the public operator. The tariffs applied by the public operator are established by the Council.</td>
<td>Regarding sectoral monitoring institutions and the public service tariffs, law 214/2011, art. 21, c.19 assigns regulative and control functions to the Authority for Electrical Energy and Gas (Aeeg).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Water Services Regulation Authority, or OFWAT, is the body responsible for economic regulation of the privatised water and sewerage industry in England and Wales. Ofwat is primarily responsible for setting limits on the prices charged for water and sewerage services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility for the supply of water is shared between the regional Autonomous Community and Madrid City Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROLE OF THE TRADE UNIONS IN THE GOVERNING OF THE CITIES
AND IN LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICES
THE ROLE OF TRADE UNIONS IN THE GOVERNING OF THE CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory involvement</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiated involvement</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making role</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultative role</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some influence through collective bargaining</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With financial support from the European Union
# The Role of the Trade Unions in the Governing of the Cities

## Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athens</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Madrid</th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Rome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EKA is the Athens Trade Union Organisation. It is an institutional interlocutor which collaborates with the Municipality of Athens and traditionally has a consultative role in issues related to the city such as urban improvement, social issues and other topics of common interest. There is also the Council of Social Partners which operates within the Municipality. This Council is consultative and their proposals are not binding for the municipality, whose decisional body is the Municipal Council. There are also 5 Thematic Consultative Committees for the discussion of important topics in which the main City’s stakeholders, | Trade unions have no statutory or negotiated involvement in decision making in London. Trade unions have some influence through their negotiating bodies – in terms of workers’ rights and conditions, but not directly on the delivery or management of services. | In Madrid, both as a Region and a City, social dialogue is decreasing. There is now practically no dialogue, not only with social stakeholders but also with more general organizations (associations, NGOs etc.). Today, UGT Madrid forms a part of the Madrid Region Consumer Council. As a member of this council, it participates in the Legislation Commission, voting on proposals regarding the tariffs paid by the users of certain services. As far as the City of Madrid is concerned, the role of | The trade unions have no role in the political institutions and the governance of the city. They are not involved in any form of joint management. | Principal matters discussed in consultations:  
- *By Law*: social policies.  
- *By consolidated practice*: the budget and social policies;  
- *By agreement*: social policies, environmental policy, mobility and transport;  
Ordinary consultations:  
- institutional information  
- contact in order to hear the unions’ opinions.  
This consultation takes place through a formal summons.  
On request by the trade |

---

With financial support from the European Union
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>including social partners, participate.</td>
<td>Industrial action and a ban on strikes in so-called essential services.</td>
<td>trade unions has been drastically restricted. In fact, now they have a purely formal, symbolic role. UGT Madrid participates in Madrid City Council’s Mobility Round Table, which seeks to improve mobility in the city. Furthermore, UGT Madrid participates in the tripartite City Council (Consejo Local).</td>
<td>unions: - negotiating table (for specific issues or regarding measures which aim to improve the system of public services). Generally, following negotiations: - monitoring phase of the solutions proposed through periodical meetings between actors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## THE ROLE OF TRADE UNIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICES

### HIGHLIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE ROLE OF TRADE UNIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENCE IN COMPANY’S MANAGEMENT BODIES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION-MAKING ROLE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTATIVE ROLE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE ROLE OF TRADE UNIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF COLLECTION AND TREATMENT OF URBAN WASTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENCE IN COMPANY’S MANAGEMENT BODIES</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION-MAKING ROLE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTATIVE ROLE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE ROLE OF TRADE UNIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF WATER SUPPLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENCE IN COMPANY’S MANAGEMENT BODIES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION-MAKING ROLE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTATIVE ROLE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

29 Involvement according to what has been established in National and company-level bargaining
30 At a local/Borough level, there can be local strategic transport discussion bodies.
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# Role of the Trade Unions in the Management of the Three Local Public Services

## Details

### Athens

**Transport**

The Union is institutionally represented on the Board of Directors of OASA and has an active role related to the company's management and development of the transport network.

**Water**

Within EYPAP S.A., eleven (11) first-level unions operate, which constitute the Union Federation.

**Waste Management**

All workers at ESDNA are represented by the Union of workers. This Union has a consultative role regarding the implementation of all aspects of local public transport.

### London

No statutory or established social dialogue bodies.

No role in management of LPS. At their own discretion, unions can and do monitor services and seek to influence planning, from the perspective of both the workforce and the public interest, but this is informal.

No role in decision making. Managers, councillors, officials and Ofwat (for water) make decisions.

Major changes in public services do require public consultation and unions/TUC can and do respond, but unions do not have any special right to do so. Unions seek to influence public opinion in support of their objectives.

### Madrid

The participation of trade unions in the management of local public services is consultative and limited to the field of transport.

UGT participates in the Transport Consortium's Governing Board.

The Board develops and plans the design of transport policy, seeking operational efficiency, as well as defending its role as a public service, opposing attempts to alter its set up, break it up or privatise it.

UGT also uses the Management Board to make suggestions regarding improvements to services, in terms of extending lines, routes, frequencies and so on, suggestions which are usually taken into consideration.

### Paris

Trade unions participate in the councils of the EPIC (Industrial and Commercial Public Institution) in which they make decisions and emit recommendations regarding public companies involved in local public services (for example RATP, SNCF, Water of Paris, etc.). The trade unions choose representatives in the boards of directors of public institutions. They make decisions concerning the political and financial orientation of the company including matters regarding capital expenses and operating expenses.

The trade unions have a role in the local public transport.

### Rome

In Rome, no consulting bodies have been set up with the social actors regarding the management and monitoring of local public services.

The involvement of the unions in consultation and information takes place according to what has been established in National and company-level bargaining.

---

*With financial support from the European Union*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... the company’s activities.</td>
<td>trade unions were offered 3 seats on the Board of TFL (Transport for London) and unions took up 2 seats under the previous Mayor of London. The present Mayor withdrew the seats. At a local/Borough level, there can be local strategic transport discussion bodies, but they are for consultation and communication, not decision making.</td>
<td>Obviously the role of trade unions can be increased or decreased depending on the political attitude of local institutions.</td>
<td>Transport is involved in the organisation of the agenda of the Board of Directors of STIF.</td>
<td>CPTP has only a consultative role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously the role of trade unions can be increased or decreased depending on the political attitude of local institutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATHENS</th>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>MADRID</th>
<th>PARIS</th>
<th>ROME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>political affinity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They meet every 45 days and participate in preparatory committees which decide on company strategy and economic and financial orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The trade unions’ status in EPIC is fixed by law and is subject to the French Labour Code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regarding the other two local public services (water and waste), the trade unions have no representation. They participate in the Council of Hygiene and Safety Working Council (CHSCT).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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