

**Report of the Social Dialogue Working Group  
2 February 2012**

Morning session

**1. Welcome, announcements, approval of the agenda**

Jean-Paul Devos (TUNED) opens the meeting and welcomes all participants. He will be chairing the Committee on behalf of TUNED in 2012 in the same constructive spirit as EUPAE did in 2011.

After a short tour de table, the Chair informs the participants that a letter was sent on behalf of the SDC CGA to the Polish Prime Minister, Donald Tusk, in order to convince him to consider the option of participating in the SDC CGA.

On the Image and attractivity project, he informs that the Finnish employers will participate in the project, and that the steering group is waiting for a response from the Icelandic and Polish authorities who have expressed some interest in the project.

The joint declaration on gender pay gap has been signed on 20 December last.

The Commission has published a Green paper on restructuring and anticipation of change. An encouraging point is the inclusion of the public sector, in line with our discussion with Commission's representatives in 2011. However, TUNED regrets that this is not a 2<sup>nd</sup> stage consultation of the social partners, as was foreseen. TUNED asks the employers to consider a joint response to the public service aspects of the Green Paper. The idea would be to approve a common text during our next meeting on 29 March, as the deadline for answering is 30 March.

Jacky Leroy (EUPAE) agrees on working on a common TUNED-EUPAE answer to the Green Paper.

The Chair, in wrapping up on this point, asks the steering group to make a draft proposal to be sent to all by e-mail before the March 29 meeting. He says that EPSU will have to wait for ETUC position on the Green paper.

François Ziegler (EC) confirms that a Consultation of the social partners on the basis of art 154 has not been chosen by the Commission. In this context, it is even more important that the Committee produces a common answer.

**2. Minutes of the last meeting**

The Chair proposes to postpone the adoption of the minutes, which have been distributed, at the beginning of the afternoon session. This proposal is accepted by the participants.

**3. Gender pay gap: data collection in central government administrations**

The Chair opens the discussion on the gender pay gap on the basis of last year's common declaration.

Anne-Claire Le Bodic (TUNED) presents the framework of action adopted by the audiovisual sector in October 2011.

Jacques Druart (EUPAE) explains on behalf of the Steering group the ambition set by the joint statement. It is proposed to collect gross average pay data for men and women in central public administrations. This includes other elements than the pure salary (bonuses etc). Pensions would be excluded at this stage, and the calculation is on an annual basis in a full-time equivalent. The steering group identified 11 different categories: the first 7 are based on job qualifications and functions. With the 4 additional categories, we will look at gender pay gap in different ministries. It is a first attempt by the steering group which can be amended. An additional criterion is the age category of the employees. Some more criteria are mentioned as optional and are meant to complete our analysis of the causes of the gender pay gap.

Nadja Salson (TUNED) recalls that according to our joint statement, we are looking at all employees of central administrations, meaning contractual as well as civil servants. We aim at gaining an agreement on the data to be collected and the way to collect them. Finally, she underlines that the non-inclusion of pensions excludes supplementary pensions but not statutory pensions.

Jacky Leroy (EUPAE) does not agree on the last point made by Nadja, as in Belgium for instance, the statutory system does not include a contribution to pensions.

Philippe Soubirous (TUNED) welcomes the methodology which covers, especially in its second part, direct and indirect discriminations. He underlines that the 4 sectors will put in light different remunerations levels according to the functions, administrative (women-dominated) vs. technical (men-dominated)

Hanne Johannessen (TUNED) does not think that it is possible to provide statistical data for Denmark on the basis of this methodology. She proposes to use the ISCO 08 classification, which is the standard internationally used, to collect the data.

Jacky Leroy (EUPAE) underlines that ISCO is not used in every country. Additionally, some internationally collected data are not useful or valid, as Eurostat data for instance.

Françoise Briand (EUPAE) informs the participants that the French data transmitted to the OECD are based on ISCO.

For Nadja Salson (TUNED), today's participants are not all necessarily experts on pay, but we know that getting transparent data on gender pay gap is still an issue in numerous countries. It would be useful to start asking each country if gendered pay data are available.

Jesus Gallego-Garcia (TUNED) asks what should be the period of reference for the data collection. It would make sense to start before the crisis, from 2007 on for instance, in order to see possible trends in gender pay gap.

Jacky Leroy (EUPAE) considers that we should start the collection as of today and keep monitoring in the coming years.

Carmen de la Viuda (EUPAE) mentions that in Spain pay is related to the job, not to the gender. The methodology presented is a good starting point, even if Spain might have some difficulties to provide some data.

The Chair closes the discussion on methodology and asks employers to present the available national data.

Jacky Leroy (EUPAE) presents the Belgian data. Approximately a 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the data for central national data are missing, but the panorama is surely representative. The data are collected monthly, but he will provide the Committee with annual data for future works.

Some gaps might be explained very easily. For instance, the fact that women are better paid between 33 and 45, can be explained by subsidies for part time work. Other gaps are more difficult to explain. One can for example wonder whether the gap between the men and women of older categories will come down with the next generation.

For the most qualified category (15 000 out of 60 000 employees), the main part of the gender pay gap can be explained through the age pyramid and the seniority principle: the main gap is not between men and women but between younger and older workers. Only a fourth of the middle management employees (A3-A5) are women. At the manager level, there are very few women.

As a conclusion, Jacky Leroy explains that most pay differences in the Belgian state administrations are based on part-time work and the low presence of women at the top of the hierarchy. Unfortunately, he cannot provide the Committee with data for each Ministry.

The Chair states that the methodology proposed allows us to draw some very useful conclusions.

Nadja Salson (TUNED) adds that women are also overrepresented at the bottom of the hierarchy and amongst contractual agents ( non civil servants).

Françoise Briand (EUPAE) indicates that the recent *Guégot report* gives useful indications on the gender pay gap in the French administration.

Her colleague Clément Muris (EUPAE) mentions that hierarchical categories are sometimes difficult to distinguish in France. Data on average pay differences in central administrations are available, but not on the basis of the proposed methodology.

Yves Labasque (TUNED) adds that the French annual report gives indications per age and per ministry. The gender pay gap reaches approximately 17% (23% in the private sector). He agrees with Jacky Leroy on the place of women in the hierarchy as being one of the main issues.

Jan Kravcik (EUPAE) mentions that Czech Republic is also using ISCO 08 since 2011. He also analyses the low representation of women in top positions as being one of the main causes of the gender pay gap.

For Nadja Salson (TUNED), average data are also useful at the beginning of our works. The use of this data should also be subject of an open discussion between the Committee's participants.

Jacky Leroy (EUPAE) agrees on this statement. Partial data are better than no data.

Valerio Talamo (EUPAE) informs the participants that the Italian Ministry of Economy publishes a yearly report, which is however not completely adapted to the proposed methodology. The concentration of women in certain sectors, especially education which allows a biggest

reconciliation between working and family life, is clearly shown in this data collection. In the document on the methodology proposed by the Steering group, he misses specific data on bonuses and performance related pay, where a major gap can occur. This kind of data should be relatively easy to collect for Italy due to the high level of transparency. Data which are already available will be translated into EN and sent to the committee.

The Chair takes this occasion to thank the Italian employers for the adoption of the resolution on crisis and closes the morning session. It was clarified that the proposed methodology aims at covering all components of pay including bonuses and performance-related pay.

#### Afternoon session

On the demand of several participants, the Chair defers the adoption of the minutes of the December plenary meeting to the next meeting on 29 March. Delegates are asked to send their remarks to the EUPAE or TUNED secretariat beforehand.

The debate on gender pay gap continues

Carmen de la Viuda (EUPAE) thinks that already collected data in Spain could be adapted to the criteria listed in our methodology. There was a gender equality plan adopted in June 2011, which includes a commitment to collect data on salaries. This has not been put in place yet as Spain is going through major administrative restructuring, but information will be provided as soon as possible.

Jesus Gallego-Garcia (TUNED) nuances this statement. He thinks that if some data are not collected in Spain, it is due to a lack of will to do so. However, he mentions that central administrations have been a driving force regarding gender equality. It's important to have a long-term perspective, there is no interest in having a snapshot of 2010, and evolutions should be made clear.

Carole Bentz (EUPAE) explains that Luxembourg has no data available which could be transmitted to the Committee. Applying the methodology developed by the Steering group to a very small administration would be useless. She mentions that measures were taken in 2003 to reinforce gender equality.

Romain Wolff (TUNED) thinks on the contrary that these data could be easy to collect. There is no gender pay gap in theory, as this is forbidden by the law, but we all know that is not the case in practice. He adds that in his view, the most interesting step will be our common analysis of the results, not the collection of data itself.

Britta Lejon (TUNED) expresses her surprise that administrations are reluctant to collect or transmit data, especially as TUNED and EUPAE agreed to work on this issue. This attitude is typical when it comes down to gender issues in general.

The Chair adds that this would be an error to think that because pay systems provide for gender equality this must be the case in practice. Moreover, austerity measures probably increase pay gaps.

Monica Dimitriu (EUPAE) explains that some figures are available for Romania. More than half of public servants are women, but the vast majority of top positions are occupied by men. A new

legislation on salaries for civil servants was enforced two years ago. There is a small difference in salaries measured in 2010. The data are not public yet. In her view, it's necessary that all members follow the same methodology, even if it demands a big effort, in order to be able to compare the data.

Stefan Teoroc (TUNED) promises to work together with the Romanian employer to collect reliable data.

Britta Lejon (TUNED) informs the participants that a lot of statistics are made available by the Swedish employers, unfortunately not in English. The last data available are from 2010. The official statistics are not made exactly the same way as proposed by the methodology, but most of the mentioned data can be provided.

Kalle Liivamagi (TUNED) underlines that data related to age and education are easy to get and provided every year, but gendered data are more difficult to access. The gender pay gap amounts to approx. 18% in the Estonian public service, compared to 30% in the private service. Trade unions are beginning to work in this field to reduce the pay gap. Most people are working full time. Basic salaries are transparent for every citizen, but there is no accessible information on bonuses.

Hanne Johannessen (TUNED) explains that data on the basis of the proposed methodology cannot be delivered, but a lot of other official data for 2010 based on ISCO are available. Her secretariat is not in the position to do the work. The Committee should maybe involve more professional people, maybe Eurostat.

For Nadja Salson (TUNED) we should at least get global figures, even if all aren't available. When data are not available and this might take longer time, we can take this time. We should today agree on what data we want to collect. An expert might not be needed at this stage but later at the analysis stage. Getting in touch with the Dublin Foundation could also be useful.

Philippe Soubirous (TUNED) agrees that the help of a statistician in the interpretation phase would be very useful.

Marco Ouwehand (TUNED) thinks that most of the parameters mentioned in the draft methodology can be collected for the Netherlands. He asks if the Commission could provide data for its own employees.

François Ziegler (European Commission) mentioned that gender and discrimination are now the portfolio of Ms Reding and not DG EMPL anymore. Concerning the Commission, data on access to higher positions for women are collected and can be transmitted. He is not sure that information on pay gap as such is available.

Hanne Johannessen (TUNED) gives some examples for the public service in general in Denmark, and explains that according to the concept of wage used, gender pay gap can vary considerably, and the part of "unexplainable" gap as well.

The Chair launches the debate on the proposed methodology. He proposes to discuss firstly our perimeter.

Nadja Salson (TUNED) reminds the understanding of our scope as transmitted to the Dublin Foundation: we do not include local and regional administrations, hospitals and teaching staff.

We represent both civil servants and non civil servants. Maybe information on gender pay gap in outsourced services could also be useful.

For Philippe Soubirous (TUNED), when teachers are in the scope of the national central administration, they should be included in the data collection. This is the case in France.

Valerio Talamo (EUPAE) asks whether the Committee decides to exclude teachers, which are central administrations' employees in Italy. Their exclusion would not be justified in his national context. He asks then what the Steering group meant with "statutory and contractual staff". Finally, when speaking about pay, there is a salary and variable pay, and only the latest can differ between men and women for the same function.

The Chair explains that the difference between statutory staff and contractual staff only applies to certain countries. Where it does not exist, we just have to mention it.

Nadja Salson (TUNED) proposes to postpone the discussion on the inclusion/exclusion of teachers. We should stick to the following principle: data collected concern all persons paid by central administrations.

The Chair opens the discussion on the proposed conception of "average gross earnings".

Romain Wolff (TUNED) proposes to include pensions, as gender pay gap during working life has an important impact on pensions.

Jacques Druart (EUPAE) thinks that we should have a pragmatic view: gender pay gap in pensions of ex state-employees is more difficult to collect and thinks that we should exclude pensions.

Nadja Salson (TUNED) reminds that the European Court of Justice considers pensions as deferred pay. She suggests that we redraft the footnote, stating that we exclude pensions "at this stage", and that we add "information about pensions levels" in the second part of the document mentioning addition all data to be possibly collected.

The Chair proposes that data on pensions are transmitted to the Steering group when available.

Nadja Salson (TUNED) comments the Italian remark on pay. It would be possible to move the definition given in the footnote up in the text, and also to have an idea of the share of the salary and the share of advantages in the global earnings.

Valerio Talamo (EUPAE) thinks that this change would be useful, to separate (where available) the data on salary on the one hand, and on bonuses/other advantages on the other hand.

The Chair asks the participants whether they agree on having the educational criteria (2 to 5) in our methodology

Valerio Talamo (EUPAE) explains that in Italy, some careers are only accessible via a specific diploma, but some other paths are possible. What should be the basis for our criteria?

For the Chair, we should look at the categories and the diplomas giving access to these categories, knowing that other paths might exist.

Jacques Druart (EUPAE) states that if there is in theory no difference between the salary of a man and the salary of a woman in central administrations, giving the average salary of men and of women working in the sector will allow to show that there is a global difference :

For Philippe Soubroux (TUNED), we should for now concentrate on collecting data on salaries, and only then start a common analysis on direct and indirect discriminations.

Carmen de la Viuda (EUPAE) agrees with Philippe Soubroux on the process.

The Chair explains why the steering group decided to include the bullet points 8 to 11. It wanted to put in evidence possible distinctions between male dominated and female dominated sectors. Maybe it should be moved to another place to make clear that these are not categories similar to points 1-7.

Nadja Salson (TUNED) proposes to move these 4 points and create a next point named “data broken down by different ministries”.

Françoise Briand (EUPAE) thinks that this approach is very useful. However, she doesn't know yet if the statistic department will be ready to give these data by ministry.

The Chair proposes to replace “in those 11 categories” by “in those 7 categories”.

Jesus Gallego-Garcia (TUNED) evokes possible problems with the local salaries paid by embassies for data under “foreign affairs”

Nadja Salson (TUNED) thinks that we should maintain the distinctions by categories (A, B, C...) for the different ministries, but that we could simplify the data collection by removing the age criteria.

The Chair informs the participants that the steering group will elaborate a proposal which will be circulated.

Valerio Talamo (EUPAE) mentions that some of the additional information mentioned is not available for Italy

The Chair asks the participants whether we should foresee open questions. In his view, it is maybe too early, and we should rather focus on data collection. However, additional data can be provided where available. We add the question of pensions as a last point for those countries where it is possible.

In wrapping up the following was said,

- The steering group will send an amended project to all members of the SDC CGA as soon as possible with a view to start collecting data before the next plenary meeting on 22 June.
- It was proposed and agreed to contribute to the European Equal Pay Day on 2 March by sending a joint press release on the activities of the SDC CGA and reiterating support for a Consultation on equal pay between women and pay, as was planned by the Commission.

The Chair thanks all participants for the lively and constructive debate.

**European Social Dialogue Committee for Central Government Administrations- SDC CGA**

2 February 2012, Brussels

**DELEGATES LIST FINAL**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>COUNTRY</b>
<b>TUNED</b>	
DEVOS Jean-Paul	Belgium
SUCHA Blanka	Czech Republic
JOHANNESSEN Hanne	Denmark
LIIVAMAGI Kalle	Estonia
LABASQUE Yves	France
SOUBIROUS Philippe	France
WOLFF Romain	Luxembourg
MANSCHOT Marieke	Netherlands
OUWEHAND Marco	Netherlands
NEAGOE Adrian	Romania
TEOROC Stefan	Romania
GALLEGO Jesus	Spain
LEJON Britta	Sweden
<b>TUNED Secretariat</b>	
SALSON Nadja	
LEBODIC Anne-Claire	
HEEGER Klaus	
GASSNER Diane	
<b>EUPAE</b>	
LEROY Jacky	Belgium
NECKEBROECK Bruno	Belgium
DRUART Jacques	Belgium
KRAVCIK Jan	Czech Republic
BRIAND Françoise	France
MURIS Clément	France
TALAMO Valerio	Italy
TAGLIETTI Roberta	Italy
BENTZ Carole	Luxembourg
DIMITRIU Monica	Romania
DE LA VIUDA Carmen	Spain
<b>European Commission</b>	
ZIEGLER François	