Most of the legal orders made in continental Europe that confer normative value to collective bargaining agreements also include a system involving the survival of the content of the latter when they expire, generally called ‘after-effects’. In some cases, this is regulated by specific legislative provisions. In other cases, the absence of the latter has been supplied by jurisprudential constructions based on the application of the general principles of contract law. In cases such as Spain, this response has been developed as an answer to the disruption of collective bargaining under supranational pressure in the context of crisis measures. The comparative study of the different cases shows important convergence between the models, both in the adopted legal techniques as well as the pursued objectives, revealing common concerns in the maintenance of a certain balance between negotiating partners, whether through the consolidation of the respective models of collective bargaining or through the correction of the dysfunctions introduced by emergency measures. Those solutions are also embedded in the international definition of the right to collectively bargain, revealing the importance of a holistic vision of the regulation underpinning the European collective bargaining model.