

Review of the Working Time Directive (Directive 2003/88/EC)

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Identifying information

Name:

ETUC

Address:

Bld du Roi Albert II, 5, 1210 Brussels

Phone number:

0032 2 224 05 68

E-mail:

wwameck@etuc.org

Country:*

Belgium

Language of your contribution:*

English (en)

Type of your organisation:*

Workers' organisation/ trade union

Your sector(s):

Other

Please specify:

Interprofessional

Register ID number (if you/your organisation is registered in the Transparency register):

If you would like to register, please refer to the following webpage to see how to proceed:

<http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/info/homePage.do>

06698681039-26

Views

Normal [Enhanced Contrast](#)

Languages

[Latviešu valoda](#) [Lietuvių kalba](#)
[Gaeilge](#) [Čeština](#) [Slovenščina](#)
[Hrvatski jezik](#) [slovenčina](#)
[slovenský jazyk](#) [română](#) [Dansk](#)
[Italiano](#) [Malti](#) [Magyar](#) [Português](#)
[Polski](#) [Svenska](#) [Français](#)
[български език](#) [English](#) [Eesti keel](#)
[Español](#) [Nederlands](#) [Deutsch](#)
[ελληνικά](#) [Suomi](#)

Contact

EMPL-CONSULTATION-WORKING-TIME@ec.europa.eu

[Download PDF version](#)

Your reply:*

- can be published with your personal information (I consent to publication of all information in my contribution and I declare that none of it is under copyright restrictions that prevent publication)
- can be published in an anonymous way (I consent to publication of all information in my contribution except my name/the name of my organisation and I declare that none of it is under copyright restrictions that prevent publication)
- cannot be published - keep it confidential (The contribution will not be published, but will be used internally within the Commission)

Nota bene

Please note that:

- The Working Time Directive only sets minimum standards and Member States are always allowed to provide higher levels of protection for workers in their national laws and regulations.
- Filling in the questionnaire, please keep in mind that the Working Time Directive only applies to workers and not to self-employed persons. Also keep in mind that it does not set levels of pay for working time, which is a purely national responsibility.
- The background document provides useful information regarding the concepts used in the following questionnaire. Please refer to it as necessary.
- There are a number of questions offering the possibility of making additional contributions under each point, and also a longer opportunity to express your opinion at the end.

*

- Please confirm you have read through these important elements.

1. Objectives and approach to the review of the Working Time Directive

1. A. Impact of the Working Time Directive

In your opinion, what is the impact of the **current Working Time Directive** giving workers the right to a limit to average weekly working time (currently set at 48 hours) and to minimum daily and weekly rest periods?

	Fully disagree	Tend to disagree	No opinion	Tend to agree	Fully agree
It protects the health and safety of workers and people they work with*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It ensures a level playing field in working conditions across the Single Market, avoiding that countries lower their labour standards to gain a competitive advantage*	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It boosts productivity notably by fostering a healthy European workforce*	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It allows flexible organization of working time*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
It allows workers to reconcile work and private life*	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It impacts on job creation*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-employment is used to circumvent the application of the limits imposed by the Directive*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It impacts the costs of running a business*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It has no major impact*	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please elaborate on your opinion with regard to the impact on health and safety of workers and people they work with

300 character(s) maximum(77 characters left)

[Optional]

Due to the many derogations (such as the opt-out and the autonomous workers) and the problems with enforcement of the WTD the ETUC is of the opinion that the directive does not adequately protect workers' health and safety.

If you see another impact, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum(3 characters left)

[Optional]

Research shows that changes in WT having the potential for generating higher productivity are: reduction of working hours and unsocial working hours, appropriate breaks and rest and "worker-friendly" WT arrangements.
The use of derogations by some MS make it more difficult to ensure a level playing field in terms of working conditions.
The WTD offers a lot of flexibility to the employers, but it does not take up the needs of workers; e.g. a right to work flexibly, to prior information, etc.

2. Thematic questions

2. A. Scope

Concurrent contracts

A single worker may be employed under several concurrent contracts. Should the limits provided in the Working Time Directive apply to all contracts taken together or to each contract separately?

If the Directive applies per worker, this means for example that all the hours worked under the different contracts should be added together and cannot exceed 48 hours on average (unless the worker signed an opt-out).

If the Directive applies per contract, this means for example that the worker can work 48 hours on average under each separate contract without an upper limit. *

[only one answer possible]

- It is up to Member States to decide whether working time rules shall apply per worker or per contract
- The Directive should stipulate that working time rules shall apply per worker in situations where a worker has more than 1 contract with the same employer
- The Directive should stipulate that working time rules shall apply per worker in situations where a worker has more than 1 contract in any event
- The Directive should make it clear that it only applies per contract
- Other
- Do not know

2. B. Concept of working time

On-call time

On-call time corresponds to any period where the worker is required to remain at the workplace (or another place designated by the employer) and has to be ready to provide services. An example could be a doctor staying overnight at the hospital, where he can rest if there is no need to attend to patients.

Under the current Working Time Directive, as interpreted by the Court of Justice, on-call time is fully regarded as working time for the purpose of the Directive, regardless of whether active services are provided during that time. The period of on-call time within which the worker actively provides services is usually referred to as 'active on-call time', while the period within which services are not provided can be referred to as 'inactive on-call time'.

(See in particular Cases [C-303/98 Simap](#), [C-151/02 Jaeger](#), [C-14/04 Dellas](#))

Please give your opinion on the following options as regards possible changes in the treatment of on-call time under the Working Time Directive:

	Very undesirable	Undesirable	No preference	Desirable	Very desirable
No change to the current rules*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Incorporate the interpretation of the Court into the Directive (i.e. codification to clarify that all on-call time has to be counted as working time)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Set the principle that defining "on-call time" should be agreed in each sector by national social partners, for example determining that only part of inactive on-call time will be counted as working time*	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you would like to add comments or indicate another option, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum(272 characters left)

[Optional]

The European Court has established a very comprehensive case-law on the topic of on-call time. On-call time is working time. No change to the definition in the WTD is necessary to ensure the case-law, only stringent enforcement.

Stand-by time

Stand-by time corresponds to any period where the worker is not required to remain at the workplace, but has to be contactable and ready to provide services. An example could be when a technician of a nuclear facility is at home, but has to be ready to come to the plant to provide services in an emergency.

Under the current Working Time Directive, as interpreted by the Court of Justice, stand-by time does not have to be considered as working time for the purpose of the Directive. Only active stand-by time, i.e. time in which the worker responds to a call, has to be fully counted as working time.

(See in particular Cases [C-303/98 Simap](#), [C-151/02 Jaeger](#), [C-14/04 Dellas](#))

Please give your opinion on the following options as regards possible changes in the treatment of stand-by time under the Working Time Directive:

	Very undesirable	Undesirable	No preference	Desirable	Very desirable
No change to the current rules*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Incorporate the interpretation of the Court into the Directive (i.e. codification to clarify that stand-by time does not have to be considered working time)*	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Introducing the obligation to partially count stand-by time as working time for the purpose of the Directive*	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Introducing a limit to the maximum number of hours that a worker may be required to be on stand-by in a given period (for instance 24 hours a week), together with a derogation possibility to set a different limit via collective agreements*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you would like to add comments or indicate another option, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum(369 characters left)

[Optional]

The treatment of stand-by time is an issue which can best be solved through collective bargaining on the pertinent level in the MS.

2.C Derogations

Compensatory rest

Under the current Working Time Directive, as interpreted by the Court of Justice, a worker who by derogation from the general rules has not received his/her minimum daily rest of 11 consecutive hours in a 24-hour period, will have to receive an equivalent period of compensatory rest (i.e. 11 hours) directly after finishing the extended working time period. This sets a maximum of 24 hours to a single consecutive shift.

(See in particular Case [C-151/02 Jaeger](#))

How would you assess the possible introduction in the Working Time Directive of provisions regarding the period within which such a compensatory rest has to be taken:

	Very undesirable	Undesirable	No preference	Desirable	Very desirable
No change to the current rules*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Incorporate the interpretation of the Court into the Directive (i.e. codification to clarify that compensatory rest has to be granted immediately after the extended period of work)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allowing employers the possibility of granting compensatory rest within 2 days*	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allowing the possibility of granting compensatory rest within 4 days*	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you would like to add comments or indicate another option:

500 character(s) maximum(190 characters left)

[Optional]

Postponing compensatory rest has detrimental effect on the health of the workers (see Deloitte p.38-39). Rest periods should be taken as early as possible in order to avoid the development and accumulation of fatigue or other impairing effects. This is possible with good internal organisation of working time.

Reference period

The limit to weekly working time of 48 hours provided by the Working Time Directive is a limit to *average* working time. This means that in certain weeks the worker can be required to work more than 48 hours as long as this is balanced out by lower hours in other weeks. This average has to be calculated over a certain period, i.e. 'a reference period'. Currently, the standard limit to the reference period is 4 months, which can in certain sectors be extended by law up to 6 months, and by collective agreement it can be set up to 12 months.

What would be in your view the most appropriate approach to the limit set to the reference period to calculate average weekly working time:

[only one answer possible]

- No change in the current provisions
- Allow that reference periods can be set up to 6 months by law in any sector, and maintain that they can only be set up to 12 months by collective agreements
- Maintain that reference periods can be set up to 4 months by law in any sector, but allow that reference periods can be set up to 12 months by law in certain specific sectors (e.g. to take into account the size of the undertaking or to take into account fluctuations of demand)
- Allow both previous options (i.e. option 2 and option 3), meaning that reference periods can be set up to 6 months by law for any sector and up to 12 months by law in certain specific sectors
- Allow that reference periods can be set up to 12 months by law in any sector
- Other
- Do not know

Opt-out

Under the current Working Time Directive, Member States have the possibility not to apply the limit to average weekly working time of 48 hours, when the worker agrees to it individually and freely with the employer, and does not suffer prejudice for revoking such agreement (the 'opt-out').

What is your view on this opt-out clause:*

[only one answer possible]

- It should be maintained unchanged
- It should be maintained, but stricter conditions for the protection of the worker should be added in the Directive
- It should be maintained, but it should be provided in the Directive that the opt-out cannot be combined with other derogations under the current Directive
- It should be abolished, but in compensation there should be additional derogations made available for employers (e.g. allowing not to count on-call time fully as working time)
- It should be abolished
- Other
- Do not know

Autonomous workers

"Autonomous workers", such as for example managing executives, can fully determine their own working time (i.e. decide when and how many hours they work). Member States have the option to apply the main provisions of the Working Time Directive to these workers.

Please choose the most appropriate statement according to your views:*

[only one answer possible]

- The current Working Time Directive provides an adequate exemption as regards autonomous workers, and should not be changed
- The current exemption should be maintained in substance, but more clearly formulated, in order to enhance legal clarity and to prevent abuse
- The definition of autonomous workers is too narrow and should be expanded to other categories of workers who should be exempted too
- The definition of autonomous workers is too wide and should be limited
- Other
- Do not know

2.D Specific sectors/activities

Emergency services

The current Working Time Directive as interpreted by the Court of Justice applies to workers in emergency services, e.g. civil protection services like fire-fighting services, in the normal operation of these services. The current Directive contains several derogations that can be applied to the working time and rest periods of these workers in order to ensure the effective provision of these services. In the event of a catastrophe/disaster, the Working Time Directive does not apply at all.

(See in particular Cases [C 397/01 to C 403/01 Pfeiffer](#) and [Case C-52/04 Feuerwehr Hamburg](#))

Please state your view on the application of the Directive to emergency services:*

[only one answer possible]

- The current rules adequately balance the need to protect the health and safety of the workers and the people they work with/for with the need to guarantee effective provision of emergency services, and should remain unchanged
- The current rules should be maintained in substance, but clarified in light of the case law of the Court of Justice, to improve legal certainty
- There should be additional derogations applicable to all or some categories of these workers, addressing their specific situation
- The Working Time Directive should not be applied to workers in emergency services
- Other
- Do not know

Health care sector

The current Working Time Directive provides a derogation for health care services when they require continuity of service, meaning particularly that the rest periods of health care staff can be postponed to some extent.

Should there be a different provision on the working time organisation of health care staff with a view to safeguarding patient safety?

Please state your view:*

[Only one answer possible]

- The current rules provide enough safety for patients
- The current rules should be maintained in substance, but clarified in light of the case law of the Court of Justice on on-call time and on timing of compensatory rest to improve legal certainty
- There should be additional derogations applicable to workers in the health care sector in order to improve continuity of service
- There should be a more narrow derogation applicable to workers in the health care sector in order to improve patient safety
- Other
- Do not know

Please specify:*

300 character(s) maximum(58 characters left)

The long working hours culture of workers in the health care sector has implications on patients' safety. Counting on-call time as working time and according compensatory rest immediately after a shift would better protect the patient safety.

2.E Patterns of work

Changes in working patterns

The Working Time Directive was conceived more than 20 years ago, when information and communication technologies were not as developed and many types of present jobs did not exist yet. In light of these changes in working patterns and organisation, should the Working Time Directive introduce specific rules regulating particular situations and types of contracts such as telework, zero-hour contracts, flexitime, performance-based contracts without working time conditions, etc.?

Please state your view:*

[multiple answers possible]

- The current rules are satisfactory and do not need to be changed
- The rules should be changed in light of increasing telework
- The rules should be changed in light of zero-hour contracts
- The rules should be changed in light of increased use of flexitime
- The rules should be changed in light of increased use of performance-based contracts without working time conditions
- Other
- Do not know

Please specify*

500 character(s) maximum(150 characters left)

The mentioned contracts are all very specific. A one suits all solution will not work in order to avoid abuse of these kind of contracts.
Solutions to the problems raised by these contracts need to be found, but the WTD is not the right tool to ensure good working conditions for those workers, as many concerns go beyond the issue of working time.

Reconciliation of work and private life

Do you think the Working Time Directive should support better reconciliation of work and private life by introducing any of the following specific rights:

	Very undesirable	Undesirable	No preference	Desirable	Very desirable
The right for a worker to ask for specific working time arrangements (e.g. flexitime, telework) depending on their personal situation, and to have their request duly considered	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
The right for a worker to request to take daily rest in blocks of time instead of uninterruptedly, allowing the worker for example to go home early in the afternoon and later continue work from home at night, and to have their request duly considered	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you would like to add comments or indicate another option:

500 character(s) maximum(150 characters left)

EUSurvey All public surveys would be endangered
[Login](#) | [About](#) | [Support](#) | [Download](#) | [Documentation](#) private life. Instead:
 more time sovereignty, considered working time well in advance, avoidance of unsocial hours would
 change the work life balance of European workers.

3. Looking ahead

Objectives for the future of the Working Time Directive

For the future of the Working Time Directive, how important do you consider the following objectives?

	Not at all important	Of little importance	Quite important	Very important	Do not know
While keeping the current Working Time Directive, to better ensure that Member States correctly and effectively put it into national law and practice*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To improve legal clarity, so that the rights and obligations following from the Directive are clearer and more readable and accessible to all*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To provide more flexibility in working time organisation for workers*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To provide more flexibility in working time organisation for employers*	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To provide a higher level of protection to workers*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To protect third parties involved (co-workers, passengers, patients, etc...)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Approach for the future of the Working Time Directive

Which of the following approaches for the future of the Working Time Directive do you prefer?*

[only one answer possible]

- No new initiative (maintaining the current rules)
 - No legislative changes but initiatives towards improved legal clarity so that the rights and obligations following from the Directive are clearer and more readable and accessible to all (interpretative communication; 'codification' of the case law (i.e. clearly stating the case law of the Court of Justice in the legal text)
- Legislative changes but focused on the sectors where there is a specific need in terms of continuity of service (e.g. public services; sectors that work on a '24/7' basis like hospital services and emergency services)
- Legislative changes which would lead to an overall revision of the Directive, containing a mix of simplification and additional derogations while avoiding regression of the protection of workers
- Other
- Do not know

Please specify:*

300 character(s) maximum(139 characters left)

The ETUC is not satisfied with the current situation of enforcement of the Working Time Directive. But we do currently not favor a revision of the WTD. see below

Please motivate your answer:

500 character(s) maximum(83 characters left)

[optional]

The ETUC regrets that although the revision of the WTD has been on the agenda for more than 10 years now, no solutions have been found to the derogations of the Directive, which harm the health and safety of the workers in the EU. Existing problems can and should be resolved in other ways. Enforcement of the WTD and of the CJEU is crucial. The Commission must take infringement proceedings against Member States.

4. Other comments or suggestions

Do you have any other comment or suggestion on the review of the Working Time Directive that you would like to share?

2,000 character(s) maximum(321 characters left)

Optional. No hyperlinked or attached documents allowed.

The ETUC believes that there are a number of problems with this questionnaire. Many questions can be understood in different ways. Moreover the different language versions do not seem to be coherent.

Example: Questions 1 A - the ETUC based its answer on the understanding of this question being extremely broad covering the Directive as such. Respondents are asked to evaluate the impact of the WTD on a number of issues including its "impact on job creation". It is not clear if the Commission means that the Directive facilitates or hinders job creation although the purpose of the directive is to protect the health and safety of workers. Question 3: the proposal of an overall revision is already a conditioned and limited one, as the Commission proposes to make a "mix of simplification and additional derogations", while the Commission believes this could "avoid regression of the protection of workers".

We trust that full account be taken of the explanatory text that respondents contribute and that no definitive conclusions are made just on the basis of the tick boxes responses.

In case the Commission decides in the future to nevertheless review the WTD the ETUC maintains its demands: end the individual opt-out from the 48 hour limit on weekly working time; keep the current reference periods in place; codify the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) jurisprudence on on-call time in the workplace; further limit the derogation of autonomous workers; and codify that the Directive applies per worker and to all workers.

The ETUC is of course ready to meet the European Commission in order to explain in detail our answers to this questionnaire.

Submit

Save as Draft

The EUSurvey project has been funded by the [ISA programme](#) for the promotion of European eGovernment

[User guide \(pdf\)](#) | [Support](#)