The participants in the Round Table were:

- EESC: Dorthe Andersen from Group II and Martin Salamon from Group III
- Employers' organisations: Bertil Egger Beck, The Confederation of Danish Industry
- Workers' organisations: Lise Lotte Toft, FH; Katrine Rafn, HK; Flemming Overgård, 3F; Kristina Aaltonen, DLF
- Diversity Europe: Julie Rosenkilde from New Europe and Dan Belusa from the 92 Group.
- European Commission: Trine Koch Jakobsen

1 pm – 2 pm

During the first round, the participants introduced themselves, after which the Commission representative made a presentation focusing on the general RRF, and with 4 slides specifically on Denmark's plan, approved by the Council in July 2021.

The following points were noted:

- There was a very high degree of consensus between the views of the different participants
- The Commission had a much higher level of understanding of the central administration's way of handling the process than the other participants
- The EU's main role in the future must be to ensure that the rules of the recovery plans are followed – in all Member States
- Support in Denmark for the EU and the recovery project could be strengthened in the 1,5B€ from the package was spent on clearly identifiable projects instead of being included in the normal budget.

In addition, there was a discussion of how the 37% and 20% targets had been established at EU level, the time pressure in preparing the plan and the resulting shortcomings, how Denmark had avoided addressing the point "preparing the workforce for the digital future", and the general taxonomy in the definition of "green" and "digital".

The absence of the Ministries of Finance and Foreign Affairs – who had both signed up for the event – was regretted. A dialogue between organised civil society, the Commission and the central administration was one of the main objectives of the Round Table.

2 pm – 3 pm

During the second part of the discussion, the participants were asked how the involvement of organised civil society should ideally take place and the following views were noted:
There needs to be transparency well in advance about where the money is actually going. An idea could be to have fewer fixed criteria (for example the 37 and the 20%) and instead broader frameworks complemented by concrete negotiations on how to fill them in. A taxonomy example with hybrid cars versus electric cars was given.

Especially when things are moving fast, it is important that the potential end-users are asked how they would like to be involved. Instead, the Danish plan was based too much on the National Reform Programme.

The Danish RRP should have been in a wide public consultation with an established roadmap. If there had been a public debate, the money could have been better spent.

Examples were given of a very fast consultation of for example climate groups, which meant a formal but not a real consultation.

The Danish focus is on the demand side from other Member States and not the 1,5B€ allocated to Denmark.

The consultation in the framework of the European Semester worked better in terms of involvement than in the NRRP.

There should a right to monitor other Member States as well.

The next step in the Semester process is the country reports and recommendations in April and May that must interact and be linked with the NRRP. The Semester method is an obvious opportunity to engage in dialogue with organised civil society and it is important to maintain the opportunity for dialogue, also in the RRF set-up. The NRRP must be integrated into the Semester and vice versa.

There should have been consultations and public debates with the parties in Parliament, interest groups etc. The process has been under fire, even if the content of the plan is actually OK. One participant used the expression "a very un-Danish process".

Lack of centralised advice and information on what the plan can fund, making the available advice and information fragmented and less effective. For example, employers’ organisations advise their members on how to use the available funds, but they only advise their own members.

The Contact Committee already exists and could have been involved in the preparation of the plan, but at the same time, there were diverging views on whether it could cover all views in a meaningful and balanced way, especially the very varied interests of Diversity Europe. The Special Committee of the Danish Parliament could also play a role here.

A more individual comment concerned the absence of Pillar 6 (Policies for the next generation) in the Danish plan.

The Commission signalled acceptance of Danish assurances that money laundering and aspects linked to education would be solved even without being specifically addressed in the Danish plan, that certain countries and sectors have been given more specific numeric and detailed treatment than Denmark, and that the Council's implementing decision – with its focus on principal milestones and targets rather than specific spending in individual areas – is central. The uniqueness of the situation surrounding the preparation of the Plan was also highlighted and characterised as a one-off situation, not helped by the lack of resources, in particular in the involved ministries.
**Preliminary conclusions:**

The process was unsatisfactory, although the end result was acceptable. Some of this is probably due to time pressure and lack of resources.

The good experience from the Semester process should also be used in the RRF process, especially as the RRF and the Semester are very closely linked.

It is difficult to define a participation that meets all legitimate interests in a balanced and fair way. There are mechanisms – The Contact Committee and the Special Committees of Parliament – that can improve consultations, as well as various well-established formats for stakeholder involvement that could be used in a meaningful way.

Advice and information – and preferably centralised, for all parts of the pool and for the whole community – on how to obtain funding from the grants is called for. There is very little debate and very little awareness of the plan in Denmark.