## Annual Report to the College on progress towards achieving $40 \%$ of women in management by $2019^{1}$

The Commission made a commitment to achieve $40 \%$ female representation in senior and middle management by 2019, as noted in the Communication "The Working Methods of the European Commission 2014-2019". ${ }^{2}$

On 15 July 2015, the Commission adopted this figure as its target for female representation in middle and senior management to be achieved by December 2019.

In the case of middle management, the 15 July 2015 Decision broke down the $40 \%$ in subtargets by Directorate-General. ${ }^{3}$

In December 2015, DG Human Resources and Security (DG HR) clarified to DirectorsGeneral ${ }^{4}$ that, in order to reach the target of $40 \%$ by 2019 , efforts were required in terms of first appointments of women to Middle management functions. The increased inter-DG mobility of Heads of Unit being brought about by the new middle management decision will not increase the overall number of female middle managers and can therefore not count towards reaching the $40 \%$ female management targets. On that basis, and with reference to the College Decision of 15 July 2015, DG HR quantified the number of first appointments of women each DG must individually make before 2019 at the latest ${ }^{5}$.

The 15 July 2015 Decision calls for an annual report from the Vice-President in charge of Human Resources to the College on progress towards the $40 \%$ target.

The present report provides an overview of the achievements by 1 July 2016 both in middle management and in senior management.

## Overall picture

|  | 1 November 2014 |  |  |  |  | 1 July 2015 |  |  |  |  | 1 July 2016 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F |  | M |  | Total | F |  | M |  | Total | F |  | M |  | Total |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% |  | Number | \% | Number | \% |  | Number | \% | Number | \% |  |
| Senior managers | 92 | 27\% | 246 | 73\% | 338 | 98 | 29\% | 241 | 71\% | 339 | 106 | 30\% | 251 | 70\% | 357 |
| Middle managers | 349 | 31\% | 773 | 69\% | 1122 | 358 | 32\% | 775 | 68\% | 1133 | 375 | 33\% | 750 | 67\% | 1125 |

[^0]
## 1. First appointment

## 1. First appointment at Senior Management level

Between 1 November 2014 and 1 July 2016, of a total of 44 first appointments at senior management level, 18 concerned women (which corresponds to $41 \%$ of the first appointments). However, retirements during the same period brought the net increase of female representation at senior management level to just 14 (from 92 to 106).

This increase has been particularly significant at the very top level of management in the Commission, i.e. at the level of Director-General and Deputy Director-General. This contributed, along with internal promotions, to a significant increase of female representation at this level, as illustrated in the table below.

|  | November 2014 |  |  | July 2016 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Women | Men | $\%$ <br> W of | Women | Men | \% of W |
| Director-General | 6 | 30 | $17 \%$ | 10 | 31 | $24 \%$ |
| Deputy <br> General Director- | 3 | 26 | $10 \%$ | 13 | 32 | $29 \%$ |

Given the internal eligibility criteria for Director functions ${ }^{6}$, women represent approximately one quarter of the pool of eligible candidates. In particular, as of April 2016 ${ }^{7}$, there are 227 eligible female officials (as compared to 627 male officials), of whom 86 are aged 56 or more.

Since 15 July 2015, 22 vacancy publications (out of a total of 89 which were published) were extended due to an insufficient number of female applicants. This concerned selection procedures for 2 Deputy Director-General functions (extended by one week) and 20 for Director functions.

## 2. First appointment at Middle Management level

Between 1 November 2014 and 1 May 2016, of a total of 115 first appointments at middle management level, 49 concerned women (which corresponds to $43 \%$ of first appointments). ${ }^{8}$ However, retirements at middle management level and promotions to senior management functions during the same period brought the net increase of female representation at middle management level to just 22 (from 349 to 371).

The female talent pool available for management positions ${ }^{9}$ is quite large, equal to 2712 , of whom 521 are already occupying a non-organigram management post (Deputy Heads of

[^1]Units, Heads of Sector, team leaders). In spite of this, since 15 July 2015, DG HR had to extend the deadline for $25 \%$ of the vacancy notices due to lack or insufficient number of female applicants. In addition, 2 requests to propose additional female candidates to be interviewed by the selection panel were specifically made by DG HR.

The new talent management strategy foresees specific actions to develop and foster managerial capacities as well as to encourage more women to apply for management positions.

## 2. Female representation in Middle Management- Achievements in individual DGs

We can identify the following groups of DGs when examining the degree to which the services have reached their representativeness targets (see Annex for details):

## Group 1

Group 1 consists of the DGs which have (i) exceeded their representativeness targets, (ii) achieved their representativeness target or (iii) are between 1 and 5 percentage points away from their individual targets.

19 DGs belong to this group as follows:

- 7 DGs (COMM, EPSO, ESTAT, HOME, JUST, OIL and PMO) have exceeded their representativeness targets.
- the number of women in middle management of 3 DGs (RTD, SCIC and SJ) is equal to the representativeness targets.
- 9 DGs (CLIMA, DGT, ECFIN, EMPL, HR, MARE, OP, SANTE,TRADE) are between 1 and 5 percentage points away from their individual targets.

The representativeness of women within the DGs of Group 1 has increased between 1 November 2014 and 1 July 2016, with the exception of EPSC, EPSO, SJ and SCIC which had already reached their representativeness target on 1 November 2014.

The below analysis can be made with respect to the 19 DGs of Group 1:

- 5 DGs (COMM, EPSO, HOME, OIL and SJ) ${ }^{10}$ have reached or exceeded both their representativeness targets and their first appointment targets.
- 5 DGs (ESTAT, JUST, RTD, PMO,SCIC) have reached or exceeded their representativeness target but have not yet reached their first appointment targets.
- 6 DGs (DGT, ECFIN, EMPL, HR and SANTE) are close to their representativeness targets and their first appointment targets.

[^2]- 3 DGs (CLIMA, OP and TRADE) are between 1 and 5 percentage points away from their individual representativeness targets even though they have already reached their first appointment targets.


## Group 2

Group 2 consists of the 9 DGs which are between 6 and 10 percentage points away from their individual targets: AGRI, BUDG, CNECT, EAC, ENER, MARE, NEAR, OIB, REGIO, SANTE.

The representativeness of women within the DGs of Group 2 has increased between 1 November 2014 and 1 July 2016, with the exception of EAC, NEAR, SANTE where it has decreased and OIB and MARE where there has been no change.

The following analysis can be made with respect to the 9 DGs of Group 2:

- 6 DGs of Group 2 (AGRI, BUDG, CNECT, EAC, MARE and REGIO) are under way to reach both their representativeness and their first appointment targets.
- 2 DGs of Group 2 (ENER and OIB) still need significant effort to reach both their representativeness and their first appointment targets only if all future first appointments are women.
- DG NEAR remains at 8 percentage points away from its individual target even though it has already reached its first appointment target.


## Group 3

Group 3 consists of the 14 DGs which are 11 percentage points away from their individual targets or more: COMP, DEVCO, DIGIT, ECHO, ENV, FISMA, FPI, GROW, IAS, JRC, MOVE, OLAF, SG and TAXUD. The distance in percentage points from the target varies from $11 \%$ (DEVCO, DIGIT, FISMA, SG, TAXUD) to $40 \%$ (FPI).

The representativeness of women within the DGs of Group 3 has decreased between 1 November 2014 and 1 June 2016, with the exception of JRC, GROW and TAXUD where it has increased.

The below analysis can be made with respect to the 14 DGs of Group 3:

- 6 DGs amongst the DGs of Group 3 have appointed at least one female middle manager since November 2014. They however still need to make significant efforts in order to reach both their representativeness and their first appointment targets by 2019.
- 8 DGs (DIGIT, ECHO, ENV, FPI, GROW, IAS, OLAF, SG) are still very far from their representativeness targets and have not appointed any female middle manager since November 2014.


## 3. Conclusion

In senior management, the female population has increased from $27 \%$ in 2014 to $29 \%$ in July 2016. In this group, particularly good progress can be noted in relation to the appointment of qualified women to the top management of the Commission, i.e. to Director-General or Deputy Director-General positions. Special attention has been paid to these appointments, because they give a very strong signal about the Commission's firm commitment to reach its objectives.

This necessarily had an impact on the female Directors' population as women were promoted upwards, which in turn led to an impact on the female middle manager population which constitutes the reservoir for nominations to senior management.

The analysis in this report shows that while some Directorates-General have deployed considerable efforts, in terms of first nominations, other DGs lag behind. The overall picture, even if the percentage of female middle management has moved from $31 \%$ in 2014 to $33 \%$ in July 2016, shows that further efforts are required. It is therefore necessary to focus on increasing the female middle management population.

## Gender targets for middle managment

| DG | Female <br> MM <br> target <br> 2019* | Situation on 1 July 2016 | Distance vis-à-vis target | First appointments target for women** | Achievement First appointments | Achievement <br> First appointments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% W | \% | W | w | \% W |
| AGRI | 35\% | 29\% | -6\% | 9 | 2 | 40\% |
| BUDG | 35\% | 29\% | -6\% | 2 | 1 | 50\% |
| CLIMA | 45\% | 40\% | -5\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% |
| CNECT | 40\% | 32\% | -8\% | 8 | 0 | 0\% |
| COMM | 40\% | 41\% | 1\% | 4 | 5 | 63\% |
| COMP | 45\% | 29\% | -16\% | 4 | 1 | 14\% |
| DEVCO | 35\% | 24\% | -11\% | 6 | 1 | 17\% |
| DGT | 50\% | 47\% | -3\% | 17 | 3 | 75\% |
| DIGIT | 35\% | 23\% | -12\% | 3 | 0 | 0\% |
| EAC | 40\% | 35\% | -5\% | 5 | 2 | 67\% |
| ECFIN | 35\% | 30\% | -5\% | 5 | 1 | 33\% |
| ECHO | 45\% | 33\% | -12\% | 1 | 0 |  |
| EMPL | 40\% | 38\% | -2\% | 4 | 1 | 100\% |
| ENER | 40\% | 33\% | -7\% | 4 | 2 | 40\% |
| ENV | 35\% | 17\% | -18\% | 3 | 0 | 0\% |
| EPSC | --- | 100\% |  | --- |  |  |
| EPSO | 40\% | 50\% | 10\% | 0 | 1 | 100\% |
| ESTAT | 50\% | 52\% | 2\% | 4 | 1 | 50\% |
| FISMA | 35\% | 24\% | -11\% | 2 | 1 | 25\% |
| FPI | 40\% | 0\% | -40\% | 1 | 0 | 0\% |
| GROW | 35\% | 20\% | -15\% | 11 | 0 |  |
| HOME | 35\% | 50\% | 15\% | 2 | 5 | 100\% |
| HR | 40\% | 36\% | -4\% | 5 | 4 | 67\% |
| IAS | 40\% | 18\% | -22\% | 1 | 0 | 0\% |
| JRC | 35\% | 19\% | -16\% | 13 | 1 | 14\% |
| JUST | 50\% | 52\% | 2\% | 2 | 0 |  |
| MARE | 50\% | 44\% | -6\% | 2 | 0 | 0\% |
| MOVE | 45\% | 29\% | -16\% | 3 | 2 | 67\% |
| NEAR | 40\% | 32\% | -8\% | 2 | 2 | 40\% |
| OIB | 40\% | 33\% | -7\% | 3 | 1 | 33\% |
| OIL | 35\% | 40\% | 5\% | 0 | 0 |  |
| OLAF | 40\% | 26\% | -14\% | 2 | 0 | 0\% |
| OP | 40\% | 38\% | -3\% | 1 | 1 | 100\% |
| PMO | 30\% | 38\% | 8\% | 1 | 0 |  |
| REGIO | 50\% | 41\% | -9\% | 6 | 2 | 50\% |
| RTD | 40\% | 40\% | 0\% | 9 | 3 | 75\% |


| SANTE | $35 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 2 \%}$ | $-4 \%$ | 6 | $\mathbf{1}$ | $100 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SCIC | $50 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $0 \%$ | 5 | $\mathbf{0}$ | $0 \%$ |
| SG | $40 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 9 \%}$ | $-11 \%$ | 4 | $\mathbf{0}$ | $0 \%$ |
| SJ | $50 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ | $0 \%$ | 0 | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |
| TAXUD | $40 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 9 \%}$ | $-11 \%$ | 3 | $\mathbf{2}$ | $67 \%$ |
| TRADE | $30 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $-4 \%$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $40 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $-7 \%$ | 166 | $\mathbf{4 9}$ | $43 \%$ |

* QABD: July 2015
** Note December 2015



Female representation per DG - senior and middle management



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ PV (2015) 2135, point 5.1 and SEC (2015)336 final.
    ${ }^{2}$ Communication C (2014) 9004 of 12 November 2014, and in particular point 5.1 of Annex 4
    ${ }^{3}$ DGs changed acronym following the reorganisation of 1 January 2015 (BPA=EPSC,MARKT=FISMA, ENTR=GROW, ELARG=NEAR, SANCO=SANTE).
    ${ }^{4}$ See note (ARES(2015)603085-23/12/2015)
    ${ }^{5}$ A precedent for this approach is seen in the methodology used in the intake of new officials in the wake of the two most recent enlargements: inter-DG mobility was disregarded and only new recruitments were counted when establishing whether a DG had reached its EU-10:EU-12 recruitment targets.

[^1]:    ${ }^{6}$ Officials of grade AD13/AD14 with at least two years of middle management experience; if AD13 with minimum of two years in grade.
    ${ }^{7}$ Data for July2016 are not yet available. However, June date should be similar to the April ones as the pool of eligible officials is rather stable.
    ${ }^{8}$ Over the period between 1 November 2014 and 31 December 2015, the rate of first women appointments was $27 \%$. Looking only at the period between 1 January 2016 and 1 May 2016, the rate was of $60 \%$.
    ${ }^{9}$ number of women starting at AD8 with 2 years in the grade

[^2]:    ${ }^{10}$ It should be noted however that both EPSC and EPSO already reached their representativeness target and had no first appointments target.

