

**DECISION ON ADMISSIBILITY**

**4 July 2017**

**University Women of Europe v. Czech Republic**

Complaint No. 128/2016

The European Committee of Social Rights, committee of independent experts established under Article 25 of the European Social Charter (“the Committee”), during its 293<sup>rd</sup> session in the following composition:

Giuseppe PALMISANO, President  
Monika SCHLACHTER, Vice-President  
Karin LUKAS, Vice-President  
Eliane CHEMLA, General Rapporteur  
Birgitta NYSTRÖM  
Petros STANGOS  
József HAJDU  
Raul CANOSA USERA  
Marit FROGNER  
François VANDAMME  
Barbara KRESAL  
Kristine DUPATE  
Aoife NOLAN

Assisted by Henrik KRISTENSEN, Deputy Executive Secretary,

Having regard to the complaint registered on 24 August 2016 as number 128/2016, lodged by University Women of Europe (“UWE”) and signed by Ms Anne Nègre, a lawyer appointed by the President of UWE, Ms Edith Lommerse, requesting the Committee to find that the situation in the Czech Republic is not in conformity with Articles 1, 4, 4§3 and 20 of the Revised European Social Charter (“the Revised Charter”), read alone or in conjunction with Article E, as well as with the 1961 European Social Charter (“the 1961 Charter”) and Article 1 of the 1988 Additional Protocol; the complaint was notified to the Government of the Czech Republic (“the Government”) on 27 September 2016;

Having regard to the documents appended to the complaint;

Having regard to the observations of the Government on the admissibility of the complaint registered on 4 November 2016;

Having regard to the response submitted by UWE to the Government's observations on 20 March 2017;

Having regard to the additional observations of the Government registered on 12 May 2017;

Having regard to Articles 1§1 to 1§3 and 4§2 to 4§5 of the 1961 Charter and to Article 1 of the 1988 Additional Protocol, which read as follows:

**Article 1 – The right to work**

Part I: “Everyone shall have the opportunity to earn his living in an occupation freely entered upon.”

Part II: “With a view to ensuring the effective exercise of the right to work, the Contracting Parties undertake:

1. to accept as one of their primary aims and responsibilities the achievement and maintenance of as high and stable a level of employment as possible, with a view to the attainment of full employment;
  2. to protect effectively the right of the worker to earn his living in an occupation freely entered upon;
  3. to establish or maintain free employment services for all workers;”
- (...)

**Article 4 – The right to a fair remuneration**

Part I: “All workers have the right to a fair remuneration sufficient for a decent standard of living for themselves and their families.”

Part II: “With a view to ensuring the effective exercise of the right to a fair remuneration, the Parties undertake:

- (...)
2. to recognise the right of workers to an increased rate of remuneration for overtime work, subject to exceptions in particular cases;
  3. to recognise the right of men and women workers to equal pay for work of equal value;
  4. to recognise the right of all workers to a reasonable period of notice for termination of employment;

5. to permit deductions from wages only under conditions and to the extent prescribed by national laws or regulations or fixed by collective agreements or arbitration awards.

The exercise of these rights shall be achieved by freely concluded collective agreements, by statutory wage-fixing machinery, or by other means appropriate to national conditions.”

**Article 1 of the 1988 Additional Protocol - Right to equal opportunities and equal treatment in matters of employment and occupation without discrimination on the grounds of sex**

Part I: “All workers have the right to equal opportunities and equal treatment in matters of employment and occupation without discrimination on the grounds of sex.”

Part II: “The Parties undertake, as provided for in Part III, to consider themselves bound by the obligations laid down in the following articles:

1. With a view to ensuring the effective exercise of the right to equal opportunities and equal treatment in matters of employment and occupation without discrimination on the grounds of sex, the Parties undertake to recognise that right and to take appropriate measures to ensure or promote its application in the following fields:
  - access to employment, protection against dismissal and occupational resettlement;
  - vocational guidance, training, retraining and rehabilitation;
  - terms of employment and working conditions including remuneration;
  - career development including promotion.
2. Provisions concerning the protection of women, particularly as regards pregnancy, confinement and the post-natal period, shall not be deemed to be discrimination as referred to in paragraph 1 of this article.
3. Paragraph 1 of this article shall not prevent the adoption of specific measures aimed at removing de facto inequalities.
4. Occupational activities which, by reason of their nature or the context in which they are carried out, can be entrusted only to persons of a particular sex may be excluded from the scope of this article or some of its provisions.”

Having regard to the Additional Protocol to the European Social Charter providing for a system of collective complaints (“the Protocol”);

Having regard to the Rules of the Committee adopted by the Committee on 29 March 2004 at its 201st session and last revised on 6 July 2016 at its 286th session (“the Rules”);

Having deliberated on 4 July 2017;

Delivers the following decision, adopted on the above-mentioned date:

1. UWE alleges that the situation in the Czech Republic constitutes a violation of Articles 1, 4, 4§3, 20 and E of the Revised Charter, as well as the 1961 Charter and Article 1 of the 1988 Additional Protocol. UWE invokes the following grounds:

- a) The first concerns the wage gap between men and women in the Czech Republic, which still persists and is unfavorable to women. According to UWE, unequal pay is a reality, despite the international obligations entered into and the national legislation enacted. In this respect, UWE also alleges that, in practice, the bodies which are responsible for monitoring effective compliance with employment law in relation to equal pay for men and women, have failed

to fulfill their task, thus rendering existing legislation ineffective. UWE cites the work in particular of the Ombudsman and the labour inspectorate;

b) Secondly, UWE alleges that a very small number of women occupy decision-making positions within private companies, as national legislation does not have any specific provisions ensuring equality.

2. In its observations, the Government objects to the admissibility of the complaint. It argues in particular that the mandate of Ms Anne Nègre to represent UWE has not been appended to the complaint. Furthermore, the Government considers that UWE's competence in the field of the wage gap between men and women is not proven, because UWE has competence as regards to the education for women and girls. Finally, UWE refers to the statutes of the International Federation of University Women (IFUW), but this organisation is not on the list of those organisations which can lodge a complaint before the Committee, and, therefore, it is not relevant as regards the admissibility of the complaint introduced by UWE. Moreover, the Government considers the complaint too vague and not sufficiently grounded in order to identify a violation of the Charter. It lastly underlines that the Czech Republic has not ratified the Revised Charter, a text referred to by UWE in its complaint.

3. In its response to the Government's objections, UWE states that it has competence to lodge a complaint on women's rights and on wage discrimination. It further states that the mandate is appended to the file. UWE states that the complaint refers to national legislation and European and international reports concerning the Czech Republic, which point to the alleged violations as regards the wage gap between men and women, the absence of implementation of adequate mechanisms and the lack of measures ensuring a balanced representation of women in administration boards of private enterprises. Finally, UWE states that the complaint alleges violations of the 1961 Charter, as well as of the 1988 Additional Protocol, texts ratified by the Czech Republic.

4. In its additional observations, the Government reiterates that UWE has not proven its specific competences in the area of labour and wage gap. Moreover, the Government maintains that the complaint does not identify the alleged violations of the 1961 Charter by the Czech Republic. UWE refers to many reports and studies, but does not state in a detailed manner which practices are contrary to the 1961 Charter, the complaint therefore being too vague and imprecise. Finally, the Government again states that it has not accepted Article 4§1 of the 1961 Charter and has not ratified the Revised Charter.

## THE LAW

5. The Committee observes that, in accordance with Article 4 of the Protocol, which was ratified by the Czech Republic on 4 April 2012 and entered into force for this State on 1 June 2012, the complaint has been submitted in writing. The Committee further observes that UWE refers to the Revised Charter, a text not ratified by the Czech Republic. The Czech Republic has ratified the 1961 Charter, as well as the 1988 Additional Protocol on 3 November 1999, and the texts entered into force in its respect on 3 December 1999. The Committee recalls that all complaints must be based on provisions accepted by the defendant State (see in this sense *European Federation of Employees in Public Services (EUROFEDOP) v. Greece*, Complaint No. 3/1999, decision on admissibility of 13 October 1999). The Committee considers that only the accepted provisions of the 1961 Charter and the 1988 Additional Protocol are applicable.

6. The Government raises several objections concerning the grounds of the complaint, notably that the complaint is too vague and imprecise (see §§2 and 4 above).

7. As regards the first ground, concerning the wage gap between men and women for equal, similar or comparable work, UWE alleges specifically the violation by the Czech Republic of Article 4§3 of the 1961 Charter and Article 1 of the 1988 Additional Protocol. Article 4§3 of the 1961 Charter guarantees the right of men and women workers to equal pay for work of equal value. Article 1 of the 1988 Additional Protocol concerns matters of employment and occupation without discrimination on grounds of sex, including pay. According to UWE, statistical data and factual elements show that in the Czech Republic unequal pay is a reality, despite the international obligations entered into and the legislation enacted by the Czech Republic in this area. Concerning the practice of national bodies, UWE alleges also that the Ombudsman and the labour inspectorate are not able to fight efficiently against wage discrimination between men and women. These bodies have not removed existing obstacles to lodging complaints relating to discrimination on grounds of unequal pay for equal, similar or comparable work between men and woman.

8. As regards the second ground, concerning the representation of women in decision-making posts in private companies, UWE invokes the relevant national provisions and, in support of the allegation that these provisions are not applied in practice, also refers to statistical data reported by European and national sources concerning the performance of the Czech Republic in this area. The Committee recalls that the right to equal opportunities is guaranteed by Article 1 of the 1988 Additional Protocol.

9. Consequently, in light of the above, the Committee holds that the complaint relates to provisions of the 1961 Charter and of the 1988 Additional Protocol. The Committee further observes that UWE has indicated in what respect it considers that the Czech Republic has not ensured the satisfactory application of these provisions. The complaint therefore satisfies Article 4 of the Protocol for the purposes of admissibility. The Committee further recalls that consideration of any alleged lack of

substance in the complaint is a matter for the examination of the merits of the complaints, not its admissibility (see, among others, European Federation of Employees in Public Services (EUROFEDOP) v. Italy, Complaint No. 4/1999, decision on admissibility of 10 February 2000, §12). The Government therefore rejects the objections of the Government on this issue.

10. The Committee also observes that, in accordance with Articles 1 b) and 3 of the Protocol, UWE is an international non-governmental organisation with participatory status with the Council of Europe. It is included on the list established by the Governmental Committee of international non-governmental organisations entitled to lodge complaints before the Committee.

11. As regards the particular competence of UWE in the area of the complaint, the Committee notes that, according to Article 2 of its Statute, the social objective of UWE is:

“(a) to promote action consistent with the purpose of IFUW [International Federation of University Women] by encouraging cooperation between its European members at various levels and to enable them to collaborate with European International Organisations as well as to promote in Europe the programme of IFUW,

(b) to participate in the progressive development of European Civil Society, by working to achieve the programmes of the Council of Europe and the European Women’s Lobby and other European governmental and non-governmental organisations as is deemed appropriate by the aims and programmes of UWE,

(c) to promote lifelong education, especially for women and girls.”

12. The Committee considers that these activities fall within the context of actions in favour of gender equality, one of the fundamental criteria of democracy (Recommendation No. R(98)14 of the Committee of Ministers to member States on gender mainstreaming, adopted on 7 October 1988 at the 643<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Ministers’ Deputies). Wage equality for equal work is one of its pillars as well as a major societal challenge. Taking into account the broad scope of UWE’s activities, which are developed in the framework of equality of rights and non-discrimination, the Committee considers that the condition concerning the competence of UWE is fulfilled for the purpose of the instant complaint and rejects the objection of the Government on this point.

13. Finally, the complaint filed on behalf of UWE is signed by Ms Anne Nègre, a lawyer who, according to the mandate signed by Ms Edith Lommerse, President of UWE, and by Ms Roxana Elena Petrescu, General Secretary of UWE, is authorised to lodge a complaint against the 15 States Parties on behalf of UWE. The Committee considers, consequently, that the complaint complies with Rule 23 of its Rules.

14. For these reasons, on the basis of the report presented by Marit FROGNER, and without prejudice to its decision on the merits of the complaint, the Committee

**DECLARES THE COMPLAINT ADMISSIBLE IN RESPECT OF ARTICLES 1§1 to 1§3 AND 4§2 to 4§5 OF THE 1961 CHARTER AND ARTICLE 1 OF THE 1988 ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL**

In application of Article 7§1 of the Protocol, requests the Executive Secretary to notify the complainant organisation and the Respondent State of the present decision, to transmit it to the parties to the Protocol and the states having submitted a declaration pursuant to Article D§2 of the Charter, and to make it public.

Requests the Executive Secretary to publish the decision on the Internet site of the Council of Europe.

Invites the Government to make written submissions on the merits of the complaint by 13 October 2017.

Invites the complainant organisation to submit a response to the Government's submissions by a deadline which it shall determine.

Invites parties to the Protocol and the States having submitted a declaration pursuant to Article D paragraph 2 of the Charter to make comments by 13 October 2017, should they so wish.

In application of Article 7§2 of the Protocol, invites the international organisations of employers or workers mentioned in Article 27§2 of the Charter to make observations by 13 October 2017.



Marit FROGNER  
Rapporteur



Giuseppe PALMISANO  
President



Henrik KRISTENSEN  
Deputy Executive Secretary