

*Szabó Imre Szilárd*

**„Best practices on Services in Alternative Dispute Resolution”  
Project Nr. 21-04-18-SE Balatonalmádi, 24-25 May 2018**

The opening speech was held by Imre Palkovics, the president of the National Confederation of Workers’ Organisations, who said: in Hungary the alliance of representations of the employee and employer interest has resulted in the establishment of the Labour Consultation and Dispute Resolution Service (later referred as ‘Service’), where the know-how of university labour law departments were providing the core stone of its structure. They have defined as a fundamental mission that for individuals affected by the labour relations the Service should provide help at the right interpretation of the legal environment and limited by its power at the support of domestic collective bargaining issues as well as at increasing the coverage of collective labour contracts. The Labour Consultation and Dispute Resolution Service is a so called alternative dispute resolution system, which provides the resolution of labour disputes arisen among employees and employers.

In his presentation Dr. Gábor Kártyás associate professor at the Labour Law Department of the Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, Pázmány Péter Catholic University in Hungary explained the definitions and procedures of alternative dispute resolution systems. The Service can normally be applied by collective labour disputes of interest, but exceptionally it can be used in case of collective labour lawsuits. After, the presenter gave a broad historical review on the evolution of the legal regulation of alternative dispute resolution. He stressed, that during the recent years the number of lawsuits, e.g. legal court disputes, has decreased which does not equal to the diminution of the volume of the existing labour disputes. Probably we can justly assume that nowadays a lot of conflicts are forced to remain at the work places. A part of these conflicts (e.g. ‘not submitted lawsuits’) can appear and evolve as a dispute of interest, where the Service and ADR mechanisms can play a role. In his comment Imre Palkovics reflecting on the tendencies behind the decrease of lawsuits said, that the ‘effect’ of the current labour law regulation in Hungary can be examined in all this, especially at the transformation of sanctions – short ‘easement’ - of illicit termination of employment furthermore the fact that in 2008 cost-free labour lawsuits have been annulled causing a troubling situation for employees in case of a lost trial.

Dr. András Krémer professional at mediation presented the Hungarian regulation in case of the education system followed by his opinion on the possibilities and challenges of the labour department approving the need for a better utilisation of the solutions of alternative dispute resolutions in labour law and especially at the collective labour law. He stressed, that the alternative dispute resolution is usually a sum of such procedures, which provide an alternative for the slow, non-flexible and expensive court trials.

Dr. Dorota Sylwia Majewicz (Poland) gave an extensive outlook on the main forms of alternative dispute resolution in the Polish legal system. In doing so she gave

a general overview of the evolution of regulation at the fields of civil legal disputes, criminal law cases, commercial legal relations, as well as customer protection, than she held a detailed presentation on the practice of labour mediation in Poland. Closing her presentation she mentioned the evaluation of challenges due to cross-border dispute resolution (e.g. posting workers, employment of alien residents), which is regarded as priority from the perspective of *Solidarność*.

In her we can call debate-initiating presentation Dr. Karin Schönpflug (Austria) mentioned the challenges of employee interests, more detailed the need for protecting the freedom of association, the challenges of the increasing of organisational power. During the presentation (approved by ILO and Eurostat statistics) she plastically portrayed those challenges, which at the same time affect the employees and their representatives of interest, stakeholders, so the questions relating to decentralisation, digitalisation, diversity and democracy (as external 'environment' and as internal 'operation'). She gave a review on European tendencies relating to the direct labour actions, such as the application of strike, finally she mentioned the possible advantages and thought-provoking the disadvantages of ADR.

In their presentations Dr. Katarina Rumora (Croatia), Dr. Adrian Iliev (Bulgaria), Renos Savva (Cyprus) joining the presenters before gave an overview with detailed statistical data on the practice of labour law in their countries stressing the role of Croatian, Bulgarian and Cyprian trade unions in the operation of ADR mechanisms.

During the roundtable discussion it was mentioned that ADR procedures can – somewhat compensate the potential perplexity, destitution of representations of interest as well as they can aid to solve disputes reaching a 'deadlock', standoffs. The participants were agreeing, that all this can promote the publicity, recognition, role of employee representation of interest (both towards employer and employee), but it can never mean a negative effect on the use of the trade union toolkit more it should be treated as some kind of a 'capacity building' function of representation of interest.

On the second day of the Seminar in his presentation Dr. Imre Szilárd Szabó stressed, that the Service and the wide scale of other services provided due to the open interpretation of labour disputes try to give quick, targeted, responsive and real-need aid for the parties in labour relations in the broadest way. He highlighted that the willingness for effective, proactive dispute resolution and the ability for the openness toward the Service should be part of both the vital, agile, constructive image of representation of interest (e.g. trade union) and the responsible, ethical employer 'brand'. In his presentation he explained the 'malleability' of the labour juridical distinction of collective interest and legal dispute – the fact, that during the operation of the Service disputes of interest ('regulation disputes') and legal disputes (the interpretation and application of the regulation effecting employment contract, even questions concerning individual application of law effecting a larger number of employees) have occurred, in practice often into one another. He presented the Service's functions overlapping its basic operation: besides supplying the specific cases the Service's mission is to become a certain centre, 'think-tank' in the world of collective labour law (e.g. through its professional network, publications, events and chain of partners). During the debate surrounding the presentation the operation and

possibility of development of the trade unions' individual legal aid services emerged. In his comment Andreas Gjecaj explained the relationship of the Austrian Chamber of Labour and the ÖGB highlighting the advantage of the proper distinction of competences resulting in a fruitful cooperation and contributing to the appropriate management of individual and collective disputes.