

PRESENTATION OF THE GENERAL RESULTS OF AICESIS ACTIVITIES ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF COVID19

- ❖ This presentation summarizes the main results of the information collected among the members of AICESIS on the socio-economic effects of Covid19 and the measures adopted in the different countries, highlighting the role that the institutions of social dialogue, like the Councils themselves, are playing in the adoption of those measures.

This work responds to a joint initiative AICESIS-OIT, developed in the field of cooperation agreements between both institutions. The information comes from the responses to a Questionnaire, with questions referring to the measures adopted in the areas of worker protection, the promotion of business activity, economic and employment measures, the use of social dialogue and the continuity of activities of the Councils.

- ❖ Taking into account the high number of members of AICESIS, and above all, the diversity of socio-economic (and also political) circumstances in which the Councils act, the responses are not uniform. But, even so, a series of common elements can be found in these responses, which speak to us about shared characteristics on a global scale of the effects of the pandemic and the measures adopted to combat them. It is thus possible to speak of several common problems as well as identify shared practices. So .it can be said that international exchanges, done in a multilateral way ,are a useful tool in order to identify good practices.
- ❖ This presentation will refer to them, while in the regional presentations the specialties influenced by the different degrees of impact of the pandemic and also by national practices regarding socio-economic policies and social dialogue will be seen in more detail.

- ❖ In general, we can speak of two types of impact of the pandemic, to which two types of measures correspond.

*Impact on the health of citizens in general and workers in particular, with special incidence in the health sector and in others in which, when working, contact with the public.

In the measures referring to these risks, the importance of having good information and preventive technical advice has been observed, and for this reason instruments such as preventive technical guides or checklists for risk assessment are frequently used. But, both in this area and in others, difficulties are observed in making these measures effective in areas that are further from the coverage of social protection systems or labor regulation: the informal economy, independent workers, migrants ... The risk that with the pandemic the inequality gap increases even more with respect to these groups, it appears clearly.

And they also highlight the problems to have protection equipment, due to supply problems, often related to bottlenecks in global supply chains. This seems a clear example of how a problem that occurs on a global scale, must have some kind of global response. On the other hand, it is observed how the crisis has accelerated the development of formulas such as telework, which seems to be consolidated in the future. And here also appears the risk of the digital divide, which can increase inequality for those who cannot access this form of work.

*Economic and employment impact. In this area, actions can be distinguished in the short term, when the confinement measures are more intense and general, and with this the economy sepaeralizes to a greater or lesser extent, and measures for recovery in the recessive phase derived from that paralysis. In the short term, there is a fairly broad use of favoring contract suspensions, to avoid dismissals, extensions of the coverage of social protection systems or facilities for access to credit. With a broader time perspective, economic policies to stimulate demand are designed, which include the mobilization of public funds, although, logically, their enhancement is highly conditioned by the fiscal position of the different states, frequently in the design of these new

ones. Policies seeks to relate them to other policies already in operation before this crisis, such as those of digitization or energy transition.

More in general , it can be said that Covid 19 crisis threatens the economic and social progress, what is at the base of SDG, and depending on wheter policies take this risk into account policy orientation , this risk will be reduced

- ❖ Regarding the role of social dialogue and its institutions, it seems that this has not been very intense in the early phases of the pandemic. This may have been influenced by both the urgency in the adoption of the measures and the role that the social dialogue had previously represented. Later, and especially in countries with more solid traditions of social dialogue, this may have played a more relevant role, for example in the processes of elaboration of policies for recovery, or in the development of measures to prevent occupational risks, particularly collective bargaining at the sectorial or sectorial level of the company.

Regarding the specific case of the CES / SI, they have been adapting their work procedures to continue developing their activities (teleworking, virtual meetings ...). In the first phase, in the same way that was commented with respect to social dialogue, their consultative activity did not It has been very intense. Subsequently, various examples of action on their own initiative (reports, statements) and also of participation in the process of drafting standards are observed. A greater presence of social dialogue institutions in the design and implementation of the actions will facilitate a best balance between economic efficiency and social cohesion.

And it should also be noted various cooperation practices between councils at regional level, exchanging their experiences on the effects of the pandemic, the measures adopted and the role of social dialogue institutions.