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1 Introduction

This paper has been prepared for the Peer Review on “The organisation, outcomes and effectiveness of social dialogue” within the framework of the Mutual Learning Programme. It provides a comparative assessment of the policy example of the host country (Belgium) and the situation in Croatia. For information on the host country policy example, please refer to the Host Country Discussion Paper.

2 Background to collective bargaining in Croatia

2.1 A short history of social dialogue in Croatia

Until 1990s Croatia was a part of former Yugoslavia and although it was a socialistic country with some elements of market economy, the classical social partnership in modern sense did not exist. On the level of the Republics (including Croatia), there were party-dominated mass trade union organisations, affiliated to the Confederation of Trade Unions of Yugoslavia. Membership in trade unions was officially voluntary, but in reality it was mandatory. Thus, most workers were members and had dues deducted directly from their pay. Because the self-management system had no evident division between employers and employees, trade unions (TUs) had relatively little responsibility. Their only official function was to nominate members of workers' councils.

The history of modern social dialogue can be traced back to 1993 when on the initiative of the TUs, the Government made an agreement with the Economic Chamber (later replaced by the Croatian Employers’ Association) and three trade unions. The participating TUs were a mixture of the transformed version of the worker organizations during socialism and newly founded. In 1994, the tripartite Economic-Social Council (ESC) was established. In 1995, the new Labour Act provided an important legal framework for the social partnership and social dialogue at the national and regional levels and the level of particular industrial branches. The ESC consists of fourteen members (four trade unions confederation presidents, four representatives of employers’ association and six government ministers), and it has a mainly advisory role in the preparation of various acts, political measures and strategies, but also related to negotiations of CAs. By law, social partners are also involved in the governing boards of the Croatian Institute for Pension Insurance, the Croatian Employment Service the Croatian Institute for Health Insurance and some other governing boards.

Despite the existing legal framework, social dialogue did not actually exist, particularly not at the level of industry. The new impetus came in 2001 when the Government signed the so-called “Partnership for Development” with four trade unions. However, the agreement with the trade unions soon failed, as the trade unions officially declared their dissatisfaction with the social dialogue with the Government. The reasons were that the government made rapid decisions in a unilateral manner and the trade unions deemed that they were only formally, but not really consulted and included into preparation and implementation of different economic and political measures. The Office for Social Partnership was established in 2001 in order to facilitate the work of the ESC. Although important achievements have been accomplished since then (regarding the provision of opinions on legislative proposals in the fields of labour, the economy and social security, and the encouragement of a peaceful resolution of collective and individual labour disputes), the dissatisfaction with the work of the ESC and regional ESCs (21 in total) is widespread. The ESC is often seen as an insufficiently effective body, with weak impact on policy formulation. In some counties ESCs collapsed because of a lack of interest from the local government but others are very active. It also seems that previous Governments have not paid adequate attention to the social dialogue, but the current Government is very active in ESC work. In comparison to the well-functioning Belgian collective bargaining system that manages to foster economic growth, collective bargaining in Croatia is not very well developed and needs further enhancement. Similar
to the Belgian situation, in Croatia there is a relatively strong legal protection of employees, which is not always the case in practice due to an implementation gap.

2.2 **Actors involved in collective bargaining and social dialogue**

From the beginning of the transition process, Croatia had several representative trade union confederations, each of them assembling unions covering various segments of the economy. All federations seem to represent a proportion of the core workforce, usually the employees of larger companies and the public sector, whose interests are relatively well protected. However, the unions' actions for the protection of the rights of existing employees may harm the unemployed and thus deepen the insider-outsider divide. There are internal differences among the federations stemming from the division of their membership according to sectors. Membership structure has important implications on the negotiating positions of the federations. The largest federation, the Union of Autonomous Trade Unions (UATUC), gathers around 37 percent of all unionised workers, most of them in manufacturing, retail trade and hospitality industry. Their membership is declining due to declining employment in traditional manufacturing and substitution of unionised jobs by the non-unionised ones. The second largest federation, Independent Trade Unions of Croatia – ITUC (32 percent of total union membership) encompasses mostly the public sector, former or current state monopolies in oil and petrochemicals, electricity generation and transmission, telecommunications, postal services, as well as the employees in financial institutions. Thus, there is a mostly hidden but existing conflict of interest between UATUC whose members are for the lessening of the tax pressure and reduction of the number of the employees in the state and public sector, and ITUC, whose members are against such proposals.

The Government as a representative of the state, defines the institutional and legal framework for collective bargaining and social dialogue. For their improvement, the Government proposed and the Parliament accepted *Zakon o reprezentativnosti udruga poslodavaca i sindikata* (The Act on Representativeness of employers’ associations and trade unions. OG 93/14, 26/15) with the goal to better define mentioned criteria. Furthermore, the Government in February 2017 (Vlada RH, 2017), accepted Guidelines for Negotiation of Collective Agreements that apply to employees in the state and public sector. Its aim is to improve the process of negotiations and conclusion of collective agreements applicable to employees in civil and public services, whose salaries and other supplements are financed from the state budget. However, some social partners, particularly from the trade union side, deem that the state/government is insufficiently interested in collective negotiation and bargaining at the sectoral level.

In a small country like Croatia (with 4.2 million inhabitants and 1.3 million employees), there is a huge number of registered trade union organisations: 625 in total, of which 314 are active in one country (there are 21 countries in total), while the 311 are active in two or more counties or on the level of the whole Croatia (Grgurev and Vukorepa, 2015). Fragmentation has weakened the labour movement, so trade unions mostly tend to avoid entering direct relations with employers due to their inability to challenge employers’ agendas and a lack of trust (Butković. 2016). In fact, unions frequently focus on the action by the state, searching for legislative solutions to issues that should normally be addressed at the bipartite level (Bagić 2010). An additional problem is union concentration in the public sector and a weak presence in the private sector which, to some extent, could be explained by socialist legacies.

On the side of employers, the Croatian Employers’ Association (CEA) is the only representative national-level social partner. The CEA assembles more than 5,000 companies that employ more than 50% of workers in the private sector, or close to 400,000 workers. However, the CEA’s internal structure does not always correspond with the structure of union organisations. The CEA is divided into 30 branches, some of which were created to cater to the interests of particular groups of employers, which lowers its capacity to participate in agreements at the level of specific sectors.
Like in Belgium, in Croatia collective bargaining agreements are reached between one employers’ organisation and one or more employees’ organisations, and settle the individual and collective rights and duties of the signing parties. Two important issues in the development of social dialogue relate to the different trade union density and various levels of collective bargaining, which significantly influence the outcomes of collective bargaining. Both aspects are discussed in detail below.

### 2.3 Trade union density

Bagić (2010) assesses considerable differences in Croatian trade union density rates according to three criteria. The first one is the difference between the public sector in wider terms (around 68 per cent) and the private sector (around 17 per cent). The second difference is in the private sector between the previously state-owned but later privatized companies (31 per cent) and newly-established private companies (9 per cent). The third one is the difference between large companies (around 40 per cent) and small companies (around 3 per cent). In the period between the second half of the 1990s and 2009 trade union density in Croatia was stable at around 35%. However, since the beginning of the economic crisis, unions have faced declining membership. Regarding trends in membership and representativeness, the public sector employees’ share in total membership was mostly stable, while the membership in trade unions in the private sector has been constantly decreasing.

The decrease is explained by the growth of self-employment (self-employed persons in Croatia are not TU members and they are not included in Collective agreements - CAs); by the increased employment in small and medium private firms; by the younger employees being less interested in membership. Many older trade union members are retired and/or are preparing for the retirement. Many younger employees are employed on fixed-term contracts and fear unionisation or do not see any direct benefit from it, as union representatives claimed. Furthermore, classic industry with many trade unions members in Croatia is disappearing, while service sector is employing more and more workers who are not particularly interested in the TUs. Grgurev and Vukorepa (2015) mention technological progress; unfair competition and failure of individual employers “obstruction” of small unions by large TU organisations; mobbing; preventing professional promotion due to union membership; fear of losing work due to union membership and blackmail as well as intimidation of union members from their employers. Moreover, many people work on the projects for a short period as well as on web platforms. In some economic sectors, like banking, there is the widespread practice of outsourcing all auxiliary services in the sector as well as digitalization which further undermines union membership. Around 6-10 thousand persons work through the agencies for temporary employment. These workers are not very concerned with trade unions, while TU organisations do not know how to include them into the membership.

According to the latest research by Bagić (2015), trade union density in the Republic of Croatia was 26 percent. However, there are significant differences with regard to the type of employer, activity of the employer and the size of the employer (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Trade union density in Croatia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large companies (250 workers and more),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-sized (10-250 workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME (less than 10 workers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bagić (2015)
The key factor of the trade union density is the existence of local unions or autonomous company-level trade unions, since the trade union density is on average 60 percent in those companies in which there is at least one trade union or a local union.

2.4 The representativeness and various levels of negotiations and coverage by collective agreements

The Act on Representativeness of the representativeness of employers’ associations and trade unions (OG 93/14, 26/15) stipulates that a higher-level representative trade union organisation participating in tripartite bodies at national level should cumulatively fulfil the following conditions. Firstly, it must be present in the register of trade union organisations of a higher level at least six months prior to submitting an application for recognition of a representative status. Secondly, its member trade unions must represent at least 50,000 unionised employees. Thirdly, it has to have at least five trade unions as its members and be active in various areas of activities as set out in the National Classification of Activities. Fourth, the higher-level representative trade union organisation or its member unions must have regional offices in at least four counties (of 21 counties in Croatia). Fifth, it must have the premises and other material conditions necessary to carry out its activities as well as employ at least five employees with a full-time employment contract, concluded for indefinite duration.

There is no uniform pattern of collective bargaining in Croatia with regard to the type of agreement in terms of its duration, bargaining cycles and dynamics of the amendments to the collective agreements by way of annexes and supplements. Roughly, we can distinguish among four different patterns of collective bargaining agreements considering their dynamics and the duration of a cycle. The first pattern comprises situations in which agreements are concluded for a definite period, a relatively short one, usually for a year or two. The second pattern are agreements concluded for a definite period, but a longer one – four or five years. Unlike the first pattern, this type of collective agreements is characterized by relatively frequent changes during the validity of the agreement. The third pattern are dynamic agreements concluded for an indefinite period, but which are often updated through amendments. The fourth pattern are poorly dynamic collective agreements concluded for an indefinite period. Those are the agreements, which, once concluded, are rarely or never changed.

Until 2018, four representative trade union confederations have been associated with 367 thousand members. All confederations compete for members since none of them is specialised in particular sectors of the economy or professions (Samardžija et al., 2017). In the summer of 2018, the Committee for the Determinacy of Representation passed the Decision on the representativeness of the higher level of trade union (OG 59/18). According to it, representative are the Independent Trade Unions of Croatia (Nezavisni hrvatski sindikati), the Union of Autonomous Trade Unions of Croatia (Savez samostalnih sindikata Hrvatske), and MATICA – Association of Croatian Trade Unions (Matica hrvatskih sindikata), while the Croatian Association of Workers' Union (Hrvatske udruge radničkih sindikata) lost this status.

According to Bagić (2015), 72 or 12.6% of the total number of collective agreements (570) in 2014, were concluded in Administration and public services, mostly by Local government; 134 or 23.5% by public enterprises and 364 or 63.9% by private employers. The last available data at the end of 2014 indicate that the rights of about 650,000 workers in Croatia were regulated by one or several collective agreements. Bagić (2016) explains that since at that time there were about 1.23 million employees, the collective bargaining coverage of all 570 collective agreements was around 53 percent. Given the fact there is no settled system of monitoring the data on collective bargaining coverage, it is not possible to follow the trends reliably. The previous comprehensive analysis of the coverage was made in 2009 and it showed the coverage of around 61 percent (Bagić 2010), which means that in the five-year period from 2009 until 2014 there was a substantial decrease of collective bargaining coverage by 8 percentage points.
Sectoral collective agreements are only those negotiated by all representative social partners at that level. According to data of the Ministry of Labour and the Pension System on the 1st of October 2016 there were five agreements of this kind in force and all of them concerned the public sector covering welfare services, primary education, secondary education, cultural institutions financed from the state budget as well as health and health insurance sector. In the first quarter of 2018, new collective agreements have been signed for civil servants in public services. In the private sector, as a rule, sectoral agreements are concluded only by some representative social partners and not all of them. On the 1st of October 2016 there were five such valid agreements covering construction, catering and tourism, travel agencies, seafarers on board ships in the international shipping trade as well as private healthcare.

The greatest “responsibility” for the decrease of coverage lies on the cancellation of the sectoral collective agreement for retail, which had been in force since the beginning of 1998, and which was extended to all workers in the sector by the decision of the competent minister. Since the retail sector employs 16 to 18 percent of the total workforce, the cancellation of that branch collective agreement, including its administrative extension, decreased the total number of workers whose rights were regulated by collective agreement by approximately 160,000.

Considering the lack of practices and infrastructure for branch collective bargaining in the majority of activities, lack of trade unions in a large number of private companies results in low level of collective bargaining coverage. Having in mind the previously mentioned, and when we exclude the sectors with branch collective agreements whose application has been administratively extended to all employers in the activity, there is a direct correlation between the trade union density in the sector and the level of collective bargaining coverage.

The negative impact on the total coverage of workers by collective agreements has further been caused by the negative effects of the economic crisis on employment in the sectors of construction, catering and tourism. These are two important sectors with valid branch collective agreements extended by the decision by the Minister of Labour to all employers and workers in those activities. The overall effects of the cancellation of the retail branch collective agreement and the effects of the economic crisis in the two activities in which there are extended branch collective agreements have decreased the coverage by almost 18 percentage points (Bagić, 2016). In 2009 the construction sector employed about 100 000 workers, with a share of around 8.3% in the total number of employees, while at the end of 2013 that number fell to about 70 000 and the share shrunk to only 6.4%. A similar trend was recorded in the tourism and hospitality industry, which in 2009 employed about 66 000 workers with a share in the total number of employees of 5.5%, whereas at the end of 2013 the number of workers fell to about 44 000 and the share dropped to around 4%. Therefore, the share of the two aforementioned sectors in the total number of employees was reduced by about 3.5 percentage points, and hence the bargaining coverage automatically dropped by the same percentage points.

There is a great difference in the level of coverage by collective agreements depending on the type of employer and predominant ownership. The greatest collective bargaining coverage is in the public sector, made of the state and local administration and public services (public education, health care, culture, etc.), in which approximately 88 percent of the employed are covered by collective agreements. In public companies, which are in majority ownership by the Government or local and regional self-administrations, the collective bargaining coverage is around 75 percent. The coverage in the private companies is significantly lower, amounting to only about 36 percent. Nevertheless, there are considerable differences within the private sector in terms of collective bargaining coverage with regard to the sector of the activity and the size of the company.
With regard to the activity, the collective bargaining coverage is from 100 percent in construction and catering and tourism, where branch collective agreements are applied which have been extended to all workers and employers by the decision of the Minister of Labour, to only 2 percent in the sector of expert, scientific and technical activities. Manufacturing industry – employing around one quarter of the employed in private companies – has the coverage of around 39 percent, while the coverage level in the retail sector, employing also around one quarter of the employed in the private sector, is considerably lower, amounting to a mere 8 percent. The coverage of the banking and financial sector is above average for the private sector with the strong tendency to decrease.

The differences among sectors of the activity in the level of coverage are a consequence of various factors. These factors are the structure of the sector in terms of the size of a company, existence of the branch association of employers, existence of the branch trade union and union density, level on which there is collective bargaining and the existence of extended application of collective agreements. The activities in which there is a practice of branch collective bargaining, as well as activities dominated by large and medium-sized employers have a higher level of collective bargaining coverage.

In short, although the trade union density rate and collective agreement coverage are relatively high, in contrast to the situation in Belgium, the outcomes of collective bargaining in Croatia are at least limited, which is explained in the following section.

3 Outcomes of collective bargaining

Unlike in Belgium, the impact of the social partners (SPs) on key labour market performance indicators in Croatia is weak or insufficient. This is caused by many factors, primarily related to low capacity of the SPs, the lack of experience in negotiation, inability to react to the new form of work and very low level of mutual trust between SPs. There are differences in social partners’ capacity. In Croatia, knowledge, skills, and experience of successful cooperation and negotiation methods are generally lacking or are insufficiently developed. Assessments show that the main challenge in most cases appears to be the need to consolidate the capacity of social partners for efficient social partners’ cooperation. Currently, trust between social partners has been an ongoing problem and remains insufficient for successful and efficient collective negotiation. Despite some signs of improvement, trust between the social partners, based on values such as responsibility, solidarity and cooperation, must be enhanced and/or consolidated. Furthermore, the new forms of work have been significantly neglected in the industrial relationship and collective bargaining in Croatia. There are almost no activities regarding representation in the new forms of work and they present serious challenge for social partners, particularly labour organisations.

As a regular practice, branch collective bargaining has been established only in some activities, and there are obstacles for greater coverage at the branch level both on the side of trade union structure and at the side of the employers' association structure. Trade unions in Croatia are extremely fragmented, and company-level trade unions dominate in the structure of active trade unions. Development of branch collective bargaining has obstacles also on the side of the structure of employers’ association, since different employers' branch associations use different definitions of the “branch of activity” in terms of the scope, i.e. the level according to the classification of economic activities.

In the public sector there is a significant problem with the legal principle of the most favourable right to the worker. Regarding this issue, there are many legal disputes in the public sector, so the court should determine the amount of the most favourable pecuniary right that applies to the worker.
Due to the lack of hierarchy of the CAs, the costs of the implementation are high. In calculation of a salary compensation for a sick leave, the amount of a per diem for business trips, etc., the employer often has to make three or four calculations. These calculations are made according to the Act, according to one or even two obligatory collective agreements and/or to the Ordinance, and the employer has to find out the amount or the most favourable amount that applies to the worker in each case. Moreover, laws are often changed, which causes legal instability and insecurity.

In comparison with Belgium, the impact of the social partners (SPs) on key labour market performance indicators in Croatia (e.g. wage setting; employment outcomes, etc.) is weak, due to many factors, but primarily related to the low capacity of the SPs, the lack of experience in negotiation and very low level of mutual trust between SPs. Thus, for Croatia there is a need to solve the burning issue of the lack of hierarchical relationships between different sources of labour regulation and CAs, even among similar types. The legislation and related enforcement rules should be stable, clear and simple. All mentioned should be accompanied by further improvement in SPs collaboration and increasing of their mutual trust.

4 Trends in collective bargaining

A significant drop in coverage with the sectoral collective agreements happened in 2013 when Croatian Employers’ Association cancelled the CA for retail sector, which used to be extended. As a consequence, in 2014, the coverage with collective agreements in that sector dropped from 100 per cent to only 8.5 per cent. The employers argued that cancelation of the sectoral agreement was necessary due to crisis, which changed conditions on the market, but that argumentation was contested by the trade unions. For them there were no objective crisis related reasons for cancelations of sectoral agreement. Instead, they saw the reason for cancelation in economic benefits, because employers no longer had to pay a seniority surplus on the salaries of their workers or to cover their transportation costs. Consequently, since 2013 the retail and wholesale sector experienced comparatively greater wage reductions than other sectors of Croatian economy. The coverage with collective agreements was further reduced in January 2015, because due to the new Labour Act, all extensions of sectoral agreements became invalid, forcing the trade unions to engage in renegotiations. Currently, the CA for construction and the CA for catering and tourism were extended by decision of the minister to all companies operating in these sectors.

During August 2015, an addendum was signed to the CA for health care and health insurance (OG 143/13 and 96/15) which introduced additions to salaries for special work conditions. Essentially, this represented compensation for the 4-10 per cent additions for years of service that were previously removed from the General collective agreement. The trade unions from the science and education sector reacted to this development by asking the same kind of compensation but the government refused. Therefore, in September 2015, employees in science and education went on strike which lasted for several days, but ultimately failed to bring the desired results. Critics of the strike underlined that its timing was problematic since it was held in the midst of election campaign for the new convocation of Croatian Parliament. The reasons for the privileged treatment of the health sector compared to education could be found in fact that the health sector in Croatia suffers from severe staff shortages (Butković et al., 2016).

Currently sectoral agreements do not exist in some sectors of Croatian economy such as agriculture, fisheries, food industry, energy, chemical and pharmaceutical industry, metal industry, information and communication industry or finance and insurance business. In these sectors, as in some additional ones, work related issues are settled only through single-employer agreements.
5 Questions

- How to explain the uniqueness of the social partnership in Belgium?
- Will it be possible to preserve and/or adjust the existing model of the social partnership in Belgium in the near and long-term future?
- Is it possible to provide more details on the role of SPs in the pension reform?
- What are the attitudes of SPs and their reaction to new forms of work (Uber, platform work)?
- Social partners’ national agreement for 2017–2018 is expiring soon. Are there information and activities for the period 2019-2020?
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Annex 1 Summary table

The main points covered by the paper are summarised below.

### Background to collective bargaining in Croatia

- In a former socialistic country, the classical social partnership did not exist.
- There were party-dominated mass trade union organisations, where membership was officially voluntary, but in reality it was mandatory.
- The history of social dialogue can be traced back to 1993.
- In 1995, a legal framework for the social partnership and social dialogue was established.
- On the initiative by the trade unions, the new impetus came in 2001 when the Government signed the so-called “Partnership for Development” with four trade unions.

### Outcomes of collective bargaining

- The impact of the social partners (SPs) on key labour market performance indicators in Croatia is weak or insufficient.
- This is caused by many factors, primarily related to low capacity of the SPs, the lack of experience in negotiation and very low level of mutual trust between SPs.
- The lack of trust between the social partners, based on values such as responsibility, solidarity and cooperation is a permanent problem, and it must be enhanced and/or consolidated.
- Due to the lack of hierarchy of the CAs, the costs of the implementation are high.
- In calculation of a salary compensation for a sick leave, the amount of a per diem for business trips, etc., the employer often has to make three or four calculations.

### Trends in collective bargaining

- There is a decrease in trade union membership, but it still relatively high.
- The collective bargaining coverage is above 50 percent.
- Trade unions in Croatia are extremely fragmented, and company-level trade unions dominate in the structure of active trade unions.
- There are significant differences in the public and the private sector in trade union coverage.

### Questions

- How to explain the uniqueness of the social partnership in Belgium?
- Will it be possible to preserve or adjust existing model of the social partnership in Belgium in the nearly and long-term future?
- Is it possible to provide more details on the role of SPs in the pension reform?
- What are the attitudes of SPs and their reaction to new forms of work (Uber, platform work)?
- Social partners’ national agreement for 2017–2018 is expiring soon. Are there any information and activities for the period 2019-2020?
## Annex 2 Example of relevant practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the practice:</th>
<th>Database for collective agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of implementation:</td>
<td>From 1 November 2014 until 31 October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating authority:</td>
<td>The coordinator of project activities was the Union of Autonomous Trade Unions of Croatia (UATUC), while the partners of the project were the Croatian Employers’ Association and three branch unions affiliated to the UATUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
<td>Strengthening bipartite partnership through joint work on collective bargaining was to contribute to effectiveness and sustainability of social dialogue in Croatia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main activities:</td>
<td>To establish the system for following and analysing the content of collective agreements, and to enhance the partnership between trade unions and employers’ organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results so far:</td>
<td>As a part of the project, the database of the collective agreements produced 250 collective agreements signed by the Union of the Autonomous Trade Unions of Croatia (UATUC) and/or employers - members of Croatian Employers’ Association (HUP) (available on <a href="http://www.kolektivni-ugovori.info/baza-kolektivnih-ugovora">http://www.kolektivni-ugovori.info/baza-kolektivnih-ugovora</a>). The database is used for monitoring and analysing collective agreements and represents the basis for other project activities, including comparative analysis of trends in collective bargaining in Croatia with other EU member states. The Project also included the production of the practical manual for the practitioners of collective bargaining, education for trade unions and employers’ experts on using and updating the database, three bipartite workshops on trends in collective bargaining in construction, tourism and metal industry, and four regional workshops on trends in collective bargaining for shop stewards and individual employers’ representatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>