## REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN AMONGST DELEGATES AT $13^{\text {TH }}$ ETUC CONGRESS (2015)

1. General trends regarding presence of women among delegates at ETUC Congresses in 1995, 1999, 2003, 2007, 2011 and 2015*.

| YEAR | TOTAL DELEGATES (CONFEDERATIONS+ETUFs)" | ${ }^{\circ}$ WOMEN DELEGATES | \% WOMEN DELEGATES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1995 | 503 | 120 | 24 \% |
| 1999 | 494 | 141 | 29 \% |
| 2003 | 501 | 146 | 29 \% |
| 2007 | 489 | 177 | $37 \%$ |
| 2011 | 544 | 213 | 40\% |
| 2015 | 566 | 240 | 42\% |

- Figure1: Gender breakdown at ETUC Congresses (1995-2015)
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### 1.1 National Confederations

- Table 1: Gender parity ( $50 \%$ ) among delegates of national confederations

| Year | Number | Confederations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | CITUB, PODKREPA, STTK, LCG-B, AF |

- Table 2: National confederations not complying with $1 / 3$ rule (art. 9 ETUC Constitution ${ }^{1}$ )

| Year | Number | Confederations |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | NHS, BSRB, LPSS (LDS), <br>  <br>  <br>  |
|  |  | SACO, LIGA, UGT-P, CNS <br> CARTEL ALFA, CISL, CITUB, |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | FTF, GSEE, CNV, Travail <br> Suisse, UNSA, SGB |
|  |  | CSC, BSRB, LDS (LPSS), |
|  |  | ICTU, CGTP-IN, CITUB, USO, <br> Travail Suisse, HAK-IŞ, TÜRK- <br> IŞ |

[^1]- Table 3: No women delegates in national confederations

| Year | Number | Confederations |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | TURK-SEN, FTF, ADEDY, GSEE, MszOSz, SZEF, <br> BSRB, CGT-L, GWU, CMTU, UNIE-MHP, BNS, CNSLR- <br> FRATIA, CDLS, CSDL, VSA, TURK-IS, DISK, HAK-IS, <br> KESK |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | CITUB, PODKREPA, TURK-SEN, SEK, FTF, TALO, <br> UNSA, CFTC, GSEE, ADEDY, MOSz, ASZSZ, ESZT, <br> ASI, CISL, LDF, LPSK-LTUC, CGT-L, GWU, CMTU, <br> CNV, UNIE-MHP, CNSLR-FRATIA, CARTEL ALFA, <br> CDLS, CSdL, ZSSS, TURK-IS, DISK, HAK-IS |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | TURK-SEN, UNSA, ADEDY, MSZOSZ, BSRB, LANV, <br> MHP, CSDR, CDLS, CSdL, KOZ-SR, SGB, HAK-IS, <br> TURK-IS, LDF, LPSK, GWU, CMTU, USM |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | USDA, CSDR, CDLS, ASZSZ, ESZT, TURK-SEN, CFTC, <br> ADEDY, MHP, ZSSS, DISK |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | SEK, TURK-SEN, CFTC, ESZT, SZEF, CMTU, USM, <br> CSDR, CDLS, CSdL, NEZAVISNOST |

## > Conclusions for national confederations

Good progress has been made by a good number of individual confederations, and backlash trends are this year quite limited. Some of the confederations with no women in their delegations or not complying with ETUC Constitution provision are generally very small unions.
The steady increased rate in the representation of women at Congress (42\% of total delegates) can be seen as a very encouraging progress matching the objective enshrined in the ETUC Charter of Gender mainstreaming (Art. 6 point 3: "Affiliates will take the need for gender parity into account, when sending representatives to the Executive Committee and the next Congress (...) Delegations to Congress should be gender-balanced, as a very minimum in proportion to the female membership of the organisation"). This result also mirrors general representation of ETUC membership which is about $45 \%$.

### 1.2 European Trade Union Federations

- Table 4: Gender parity (50\%) among delegates of European Trade Union Federations

| Year | Number | Federations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1999 | 0 | None |

- Table 5: European Trade Union Federations not complying with 1/3 rule (art. 9 ETUC Constitution)

| Year | Number | Federations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2011 | 3 | EFBWW, <br> EMCEF, EMF |
| 2015 | 1 | Industriall |

- Table 6: No women delegates in European Trade Union Federations

| Year | Number | Federations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1999 | 4 | EEA, EFA, <br> EFBWW, EFJ |
| 2003 | 0 | None |
| 2007 | 0 | EAEA, EFBWW, <br> EUROCOP |
| 2011 | 0 | None |
| 2015 | 1 | EFBWW |

## > Conclusions for ETUFs

Even though the number of women delegates, with respect to the last Congress, is almost the same (from 33 in 2011 to the actual 34), we can see an overall increase of the percentage of female delegates within the ETUFs (from 34\% in 2011 to 37,7\% in the last Congress). This has been possible thanks to the substantial decline in the number of federations with a female presence below the limit of $30 \%$.

## 2. Statistics on Speakers

- Statistics on Speakers at 13th ETUC Congress (Paris 2015)

| Subject | Total <br> Speakers | Women <br> Speakers | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ETUC Constitution | 5 | 2 | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ |
| Activity Report | 5 | 1 | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ |
| Pillar I "A strong economy for all working <br> people" " | 25 | 7 | $\mathbf{2 8 \%}$ |
| Pillar II "Stronger unions for democratic <br> values and democracy at Work" | 22 | 12 | $\mathbf{5 4 , 5 \%}$ |
| Pillar III "A core of ambitious social <br> standards" | 29 | 13 | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ |
| Interactive sessions | 8 | 4 | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ |
| Panels | 22 | 7 | $\mathbf{3 2 \%}$ |
| Resolution on Gender Balance | 7 | 6 | $\mathbf{8 6 \%}$ |
| Emergency Resolutions | 19 | 9 | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ |
| Overall | $\mathbf{1 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ |

- Gender breakdown of national confederations delegates at $13^{\text {th }}$ ETUC Congress

| Country | National Confederations | $N^{\circ}$ male delegates | $N^{\circ}$ women delegates | Total delegates | \% women |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andorra | USDA | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
| Austria | ÖGB | 7 | 4 | 11 | 36\% |
| Belgium | CGSLB | 3 | 2 | 5 | 40\% |
|  | CSC | 10 | 3 | 13 | 23\% |
|  | FGTB | 7 | 5 | 12 | 42\% |
| Bulgaria | CITUB | 3 | 1 | 4 | 25\% |
|  | PODKREPA | 2 | 1 | 3 | 33\% |
| Croatia | NHS | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
|  | SSSH-UATUC | 2 | 1 | 3 | 33\% |
| Cyprus | DEOK | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50\% |
|  | SEK | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | TURK-SEN | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Czech Republic | CMKOS | 2 | 3 | 5 | 60\% |
| Denmark | AC | 1 | 2 | 3 | 67\% |
|  | FTF | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
|  | LO-DK | 5 | 4 | 9 | 44\% |
| Estonia | EAKL | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50\% |
|  | TALO | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
| Finland | AKAVA | 2 | 1 | 3 | 33\% |
|  | SAK | 3 | 5 | 8 | 62\% |
|  | STTK | 3 | 2 | 5 | 40\% |
| France | CFDT | 4 | 4 | 9 | 44\% |
|  | UNSA | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
|  | CFTC | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
|  | CGT | 4 | 4 | 8 | 50\% |
|  | FO | 3 | 4 | 7 | 57\% |
| Germany | DGB | 21 | 16 | 37 | 43\% |
| Greece | ADEDY | 2 | 1 | 3 | 33\% |
|  | GSEE | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
| Hungary | ESZT | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | LIGA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 67\% |
|  | MaSZSZ | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
|  | MOSz | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50\% |
|  | SZEF | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Iceland | ASI | 2 | 1 | 3 | 33\% |
|  | BSRB | 0 | 2 | 2 | 100\% |
| Ireland | ICTU | 5 | 2 | 7 | 28\% |
| Italy | CGIL | 12 | 11 | 23 | 48\% |
|  | CISL | 6 | 6 | 12 | 50\% |
|  | UIL | 6 | 5 | 11 | 45\% |


| Latvia | LBAS | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liechtenstein | LANV | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50\% |
| Lithuania | LDF | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
|  | LDS (LPSS) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100\% |
|  | LTUC (LPSK) | 0 | 1 | 0 | Not registered |
| Luxembourg | LCGB | 2 | 1 | 3 | 33\% |
|  | OGBL | 2 | 1 | 3 | 33\% |
| Macedonia (FYROM) | FTUM (SSM) | 1 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
| Malta | CMTU | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  | GWU | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
|  | FOR.U.M. | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
| Montenegro | USM | 0 | 0 | 1 | Not registered |
|  | CTUM | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
|  | UFTUM | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
| Netherlands | CNV | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
|  | FNV | 6 | 5 | 11 | 45\% |
|  | VCP | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50\% |
| Norway | LO-N | 4 | 5 | 11 | 55\% |
|  | UNIO | 3 | 2 | 5 | 40\% |
|  | YS | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
| Poland | FZZ | 4 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
|  | NSZZ Solidarnosc | 3 | 3 | 6 | 50\% |
|  | OPZZ | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
| Portugal | CGTP-IN | 5 | 2 | 7 | 28\% |
|  | UGT-P | 2 | 3 | 5 | 60\% |
| Romania | BNS | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
|  | CNS « CARTEL ALFA" | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
|  | CNLR-FRATIA | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
|  | CSDR | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| San Marino | CDLS | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | CSdL | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Serbia | CATUS | 2 | 1 | 3 | 33\% |
|  | NEZAVISNOST | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Slovakia | KOZ SR | 2 | 1 | 3 | 33\% |
| Slovenia | ZSSS | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
| Spain | CCOO | 7 | 4 | 11 | 36\% |
|  | ELA | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50\% |
|  | UGT-E | 6 | 3 | 9 | 33\% |
|  | USO | 3 | 1 | 4 | 25\% |
| Sweden | LO-S | 6 | 6 | 12 | 50\% |


|  | SACO | 2 | 3 | 5 | $\mathbf{6 0 \%}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TCO | 7 | 4 | 11 | $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ |
|  | SGB | 3 | 2 | 5 | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ |
|  | Travail Suisse | 3 | 1 | 4 | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ |
| Turkey | DISK | 2 | 1 | 3 | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ |
|  | HAK-IŞ | 3 | 1 | 4 | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ |
|  | KESK | 1 | 1 | 2 | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ |
|  | TÜRK-IŞ | 4 | 1 | 5 | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ |
| United <br> Kingdom | TUC | 5 | 6 | 11 | $\mathbf{5 4 \%}$ |

- Gender breakdown of ETUFs delegates at $13^{\text {th }}$ ETUC Congress

| ETUF | $\boldsymbol{N}^{\circ}$ male delegates | $\boldsymbol{N}^{\circ}$ women delegates | Total delegates | \% women |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EAEA | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
| EFBWW | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| EFFAT | 3 | 3 | 6 | $50 \%$ |
| EFJ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not registered |
| IndustriAll | 14 | 1 | 15 | $7 \%$ |
| EPSU | 10 | 11 | 21 | $52 \%$ |
| ETF | 9 | 4 | 13 | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ |
| ETUCE | 5 | 5 | 10 | $50 \%$ |
| EuroCop | 1 | 1 | 2 | $50 \%$ |
| UNI-Europa | 11 | 9 | 20 | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ |


[^0]:    * Figures for 2015 Congress are based on those registered as delegates on 27 September 2015 and consists of delegates and deputy delegates.
    ** These figures do not take into account: ETUC Secretariat members nor specific group delegates (such as Women's Committee, IRTUC, Youth Committee, FERPA and Eurocadres)

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ All delegations must ensure that their delegations reflect the gender composition of their affiliates. In any event, at least one third of each delegation should be either women or men

