

UNIVERSITE CATHOLIQUE DE LOUVAIN
Institut des Sciences du Travail



**Sectoral Unions and Employers Organisations
in the Private Security Sector in the EU**

Summary of the report

December 2003

Project VT/2002/0215

Research project conducted on behalf of
the Employment and Social Affairs DG of the European Commission

Staff working on the summarised study

Author of the report

Olivier HOFF, researcher

Research Team

Prof. Armand SPINEUX

Prof. Pierre REMAN

Catherine DELBAR, researcher

Marinette MORMONT, researcher

Administrative co-ordination

Marie-Anne SAUSSU

Network of National Experts

Austria	Franz Traxler	Institut für Soziologie – Universität Wien.
Belgium	Jean Vandewattyne	Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB)
Denmark	Carsten Jorgensen	Forskningscenter for Arbejdsmarkeds- og Organisationsstudier, FAOS – Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen
Finland	Pekka Ylostalo	University of Helsinki, Department of Sociology
France	Anne-Marie Grozelier	Forum social européen
Germany	Dieter Sadowski Catherine Leillich	IAAEG – Universität Trier.
Greece	Aliki Mouriki	National Center for Social Research – Athens
Ireland	Pauline Conroy	Ralaheen Ltd
Italy	Franca Alacevich Manuela Galetto	Università degli studi di Firenze – Dipartimento di scienza della politica e sociologia politica.
Luxembourg	Franz Clement	Centre d'Études de Populations, de Pauvreté et de Politiques Socio-Economiques (CEPS – INSTEAD).
Netherlands	Marc Van Der Meer	University of Amsterdam – Department of Sociology.
Portugal	Marinus Pires De Lima	Universidade de Lisboa – Instituto de Ciências Sociais – Instituto Superior de Ciências do Trabalho e da Empresa (ISCTE).
Spain	Ramon De Alos-Moner Vila	Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona – Grup d'Estudis Sociològic sobre la Vida Quotidiana i el Treball
Sweden	Dominique Anxo	Center for European Labour Market Studies (CELMS) – Department of Economics – Göteborg University.
United-Kingdom	David Marsden	London School of Economics

Disclaimer

The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the opinion or position of the European Commission, Directorate-General Employment and Social Affairs. The study which is summarised in this paper has been carried out by independent experts. It therefore does not involve the Commission's responsibility in any way. The European organisations subject of this study have had the opportunity to comment on the content of this study before its final approval.

Introduction

This document is a summary of the 1st report arising out of the study commissioned from the Institut des Sciences du Travail (IST) at the Catholic University of Louvain by the European Commission services, DGV, following call for tenders No VT/2002/83. The report seeks to provide the Commission with empirical data that will facilitate an assessment of the *institutional representativeness* of European employers' and employees' organisations in the private security sector in the 15 Member States of the EU. It follows on from a series of researches that focused ie particularly on organisations recognised as 'social partners' in the intersectoral level in each EU country, organisations affiliated to the CEC¹ and to Eurocadres, and organisations that sign collective agreements in the construction, textiles, commerce sector, road haulage, agriculture, etc.

1. The context

In a Communication² published in 1993, the European Commission set out three criteria determining the access that employers' and employees' organisations had to the consultative process under Article 3 of the Agreement on Social Policy. According to the terms of this Article, organisations must '*1. be cross-industry or relate to specific sectors or categories and be organised at European level; 2. consist of organisations which are themselves part of Member States' social partner structures and with the capacity to negotiate agreements, and which are representative of all Member States, as far as possible; 3. have adequate resources to ensure their effective participation in the consultation process*'³.

A subsequent Communication published in 1998⁴, introduced the concept of '*Sectoral Dialogue Committees*'; these were intended to replace the existing *Joint Committees* and *informal working groups* that had hitherto been the *locus* of sectoral relations between employers and employees at a European level. The role of these latter bodies at the present time is, without prejudging its future extension, essentially consultative, as happened at intersectoral level. As regards an extension to their competence, each Committee '*(a) shall... be consulted on developments at Community level having social implications, and develop and promote the social dialogue at sectoral level*'⁵.

It follows that the setting up of these Committees is an extension of the process of social dialogue at European sectoral level, albeit relying on an

1 Confédération Européenne des Cadres.

2 COM(93) 600 final of 14 December 1993, Communication from the Commission concerning the application of the Protocol on Social Policy presented by the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, §24.

3 For a more in-depth discussion of these criteria, we refer the reader to the first study, which focused on employers' and employees' organisations at an 'intersectoral' level.

4 Communication from the Commission concerning the application of the Protocol on Social Policy presented by the OM(98)-322 of 20 May 1998, Luxembourg, Office for Publications of the European Communities Annex II. Commission to the Council and the European Parliament Adapting and promoting the social dialogue at Community level C

5 Op cit §2.

existing system. Before the Communication from the Commission was published, there were 9 Joint Committees and 11 informal groups in existence. By 1 February 1999, 21 applications from employers' and employees' organisations had been forwarded to the Commission⁶: they came from sectors as varied as agriculture, road transport, postal services, commerce, and hotels, restaurants and cafés.

The conditions of membership for the employers' and employees' organisations that might be encouraged to join these Committees, and/or file a joint application for one to be set up, are linked, as at the intersectoral level, to the notion of representativeness, and are broadly similar to the those articulated above in the 1993 Communication. The criteria governing Social Dialogue Committees state that:

- (a) they shall be related to specific sectors or categories and organised at European level;
- (b) they shall consist of organisations which are themselves an integral and recognised part of Member States' social partner structures and with the capacity to negotiate agreements, and which are representative of several Member States;
- (c) they shall have adequate resources to ensure their effective participation in the consultation process.

As may be observed, the changes focus on the disappearance of demands relating to the intersectoral nature of organisations and on the fact that they are established in all the Member States; the new rules have not been formulated in a very restrictive manner, they only require employers' and employees' organisations to represent several Member States. This relaxation of the implantation condition might eventually pose a demarcation problem in the sense that there is no criterion setting out a minimum number of Member States to activate it. For a more in-depth discussion of these criteria and of the problems that they may pose, we refer the reader to the first study carried out as part of this research⁷.

However, we wish to make it clear that the framework of the IST report will only examine the *institutional consequences* that flow from the recognised or unrecognised representative status of members affiliated to a European organisation. Furthermore, on a theoretical plane, with regard to the various national traditions in this field, representative status - or, more accurately, *recognition of the legitimacy of a social partner organisation* to negotiate collective agreements or take part in the development of social or labour market policies - may be interpreted in any number of ways ranging from the ability to mobilise the activist grass roots effectively, through systems of mutual recognition (in the strict sense of the phrase, in which no criterion is defined), to quantitative thresholds linked to the outcomes of trade union elections.

6 Source: Weber T, New era in sectoral social dialogue takes shape, in EIRO online, Dublin, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 1998 (<http://www.eiro.eurofound.ie/1999/02/features/eu990215of.html>).

7 Spineux A., Walthéry P. et al, Report on the representativeness of European social partner organisations, Report coordinated by the Institut des Sciences du Travail of the Catholic University of Louvain, for the European Commission Directorate-General for Employment, Industrial Relations and Social Affairs, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1998, pp.3-7.

2. The approach

Therefore, in this context the research aim, as far as existing sectoral committees are concerned, will mainly be to provide empirical data that will enable an assessment of the institutional representativeness of the organisations that sit on them, and on the basis of the three criteria mentioned above. More specifically, the report, which is summarised in this document, examines employers' and employees' organisations active in the private security sector. At a national level, in order to take account of the diversity of the various recognition mechanisms, only organisations that *participate in collective bargaining*, and which therefore one way or another have *ad hoc* recognition in the sectors referred to are considered. The only exception to this rule concerns organisations that are affiliated to one or other of the European federations that are directly the focus of our research.

3. The research design

For the purposes of the research, a network has been established of 15 European university researchers⁸ who were independent of both the European Commission and the social partners. The network was given the task of drawing up a report based on a common structure of organisations matching the above criteria in each of the Member States. Each national report issued from the expert has been submitted to the national organisations in order to enable them to make comments on collected data. The IST coordinating team then collated information that had been gathered for the purposes of comparative analysis. It presented information issued from the experts reports in order to produce comparable analysis for the different countries. Ongoing collaboration is planned between the coordinating team and the national experts. The aim of the process is to carry out a simultaneous 'top-down' approach at European level and a 'bottom-up' approach at Member State level; the IST will also directly collate information about each of the European organisations. The report will be checked by the European organisations that are being studied in order to enable them to make comments on the report. These will either be included in the report or appended to it. Lastly, the report will be checked by the Commission's services, which will decide whether the appended comments (if there are any) have to be included or not, before it is approved.

It is worth noting that the IST team with responsibility for coordinating the work and for editing the summaries and comparative analyses, and the 15 national experts wish to stress their complete independence as to the political consequences and the decisions that might be reached from this study. Their role is limited to contributing as much data as possible, with a view to both making the three criteria of representativeness defined by the European Commission intelligible and documenting them.

⁸ See list above.

The structure of this summary report will then proceed as follows: firstly, we will give consideration to aspects of the sector, and to differences with regard to collective bargaining that might exist from one EU country to another; then, we will present characteristics of members affiliated to the two organisations being studied by examining each of them in respect of:

I. Quantitative aspects of representative status

- *Employers' organisations:* number of affiliated organisations; number of enterprise members; staff employed in these enterprises, and the rate of affiliation calculated on the basis of employee numbers; if necessary, the detailing of particular characteristics of the organisation and its members.
- *Employees' organisations:* number of affiliated organisations; number of employee members; rate of affiliation.

Recognition

- Does the organisation participate in collective bargaining, does it have the ability to sign collective agreements?
- Challenges to representativeness: in the event of particular developments (e.g. the emergence of new organisations that challenge those already established in the sector, or a significant fall in membership), the expert will give a brief description of what has happened, the issues and current trends.

II. National and European affiliations

- List of higher-level, national associations to which the organisation is directly or indirectly affiliated.
- List of European associations to which the organisation is directly or indirectly affiliated.
- List of international associations to which the organisation is directly or indirectly affiliated.

Organisations that are not members of European organisations, but are considered as being significant, will also be mentioned and examined in respect of the criteria mentioned above.

Lastly, in respect of each Member State, we will present a summary of the bargaining structures, the organisations established there, and a more detailed description of their characteristics.

4. General methodological observations

We wish to draw the reader's attention to the quantitative data and the wide range of sources. In addition to the figures supplied by our network of national experts, there is information provided by national and European organisations and other bodies, and estimates made by the IST on the basis of available data. These estimates need to be viewed with considerable caution, and should only be used to develop a more global view of employment, and of trade union and employers' organisations membership at sectoral level.

As far as this statistical data is concerned (and with the exception of most density calculations, which are the outcome of our own calculations), we prefer to use figures that have been sent to us by our national experts. However, when a significant difference is identified between the data notified to us by experts and by other sources such as European organisations, we refer to the alternative figures sent to us by these organisations in a footnote.

We use density as a tool to estimate the quantitative importance of trade unions and employers' associations in the sector. Density for trade unions is calculated as the total of members divided by the number of employees throughout the sector. Density for employers' organisations is calculated as the total of employees in member companies divided by the number of employees throughout the sector [*density (employees)*]. It is also calculated as the total number of member companies divided by total number of companies throughout the sector [*density (companies)*]. In the absence of data relating to the number of employees, total employment figures are used, and self-employed workers are therefore included. These figures must be used with the greatest of caution and it is recommended do refer to the national summaries for a contextualised view of the proposed data.

In some countries, density has been calculated using two methods (density by sector and density by sub-sector). The reason was to take account of the comments of experts, according to whom such a sub-sectoral density calculation provides a more reliable picture of real membership levels in the country concerned. However, the use of these calculations is not possible in most other countries, due to the lack of specific figures.

An organisation's actual importance is not necessarily directly linked to its level of membership: for example, membership is low in France, but trade unions enjoy considerable legitimacy; and the results of workers' representatives elections may be deemed more significant than the number of members.

Different typefaces distinguish and clarify the origins of all the data:

BOLD: data from national experts;

BOLD ITALICS: data provided by European organisations or other bodies;

ITALICS: estimates made by IST on basis of available data.

The word *employees* refers to salaried workers, except where stated otherwise in national summaries, and thereby excludes self-employed workers and working family members.

Description of the sector at European level

1. Delimitation of the sector

Among Nace classifications, section 7460: *Investigation and security activities* is the closest to the sector of private security as organised in the countries of the UE15. The private security sector covers a wide range of activities. The European actors agree that there are four sub-branches in the sector: guarding (surveillance of goods/people requiring a human presence on the spot), monitoring (surveillance using technological means), the transport of cash and valuables (e.g. Cash-In-Transit) and airport security (e.g. luggage screenings, passengers checkings and airplane surveillance).

It is important to note that this distribution into four sub-sectors, which has the advantage of covering the activities usually included in the sector among member states, does not, from the point of view of either enterprises or collective bargaining, reflect a strict division in terms of categories. In practice, an enterprise's activities often simultaneously form part of several of the sub-branches referred to above.

When comparing different countries, activities included in the sector from a collective bargaining point of view can slightly vary: for example, airport security in Luxembourg does not rely on the private security sector in any way since the one airport is guarded directly by the state through the offices of the police and the customs authorities. Similarly, in France and Belgium, organisations of employers involved in installing alarms do not participate in security collective bargaining, while in some other countries, this activity is included in the sector for industrial relations and collective bargaining purposes.

2. Socio-economic features of the sector

Generally speaking, the sector is experiencing growth. Reasons for this phenomenon include the outsourcing of security services away from the public sector to the private sector (employees in private-sector enterprises are increasingly working, for example, in centres for asylum-seekers and on the transfer of prisoners to courts), the transfer by banks and large stores of some of their activities to private-sector security firms (particular for cash processing), and increased demand for security services at airports. According to European social partners, Cash-In-Transit activities are declining as a result of the Euro and bank cards. Activities related to airport security are growing in importance.

The competitive strategies adopted by firms have so far, and with the exception of the Netherlands, centred mainly on cost. However, we may look forward to changes in this area: a programme focusing on the degree of quality of service is at an advanced stage of preparation. It is also worth noting that large enterprises do not appear to be interested in entering small market niches such as bodyguarding and security at major events.

Large companies, which is where most employees work, are mostly concentrated around big cities, while smaller ones are usually distributed throughout the country. Most people who work in the private security sector are men, although female employment has grown substantially over these last years in some countries like the UK. The sector is characterised by a large number of precarious and part-time contracts and very high labour turnover. At the present time, it is also a low-wage, low-skill sector.

The principal issues for the sector are *professionalisation* (major efforts are being made, for example, to develop training programmes and to encourage the licensing of the companies), *modernising work organisation* (flexible working, training for security personnel, and adaptation to technological change), *harmonisation of national legislation* (for example, in the armour-plating of vehicles), *improving the sector's image, making the sector more attractive*, and *issues relating to European enlargement*. Another important issue is *client education*. In this context, the European social partners have mounted a campaign designed to encourage clients to take more account of the quality of services when choosing a security company.

European organisations and sectoral social dialogue at European level

1. Social dialogue

Generally speaking, the private security sector does not experience difficulty in respect of collective bargaining. Collective agreements are concluded without any major problems. Cooperation seems to be good, constructive and ongoing. Negotiating issues (e.g. wages and working) are in no way unusual. Training is becoming increasingly important in negotiations in some countries.

Although the four sub-branches referred to differentiate between types of activity in the private security sector, they do not play a structuring role from the point of view of collective bargaining. Most employers' associations bring together companies working in the various sub-sectors, and a given company may often carry out its activities in several of these sub-branches. For the most part, agreements focus on all activities in the sector, but they do not where there are exceptions that mark one of the activities: for example, in France, the employers have set up an "airport security" subdivision of the employers' federation to ensure that a specific collective agreement is only applied to airport security workers.

In most EU 15 countries, negotiations and agreements take place at sectoral level. In this respect, it is important to note the particular case of Britain where, when it does take place, collective bargaining in the private security sector occurs solely at company level.

The existence of negotiations at company level can be linked to the size of companies. For example, negotiations at company level in France only take place in large companies where different trade unions are established, whereas there are no trade unions at all in most small firms. This specific level of negotiations can also be used to make adjustments to an agreement covering a wider level. An example of this is Finland where, after concluding the sectoral collective agreement, the unions send it to the companies and to the company trade unions, which then negotiate a company agreement that applies the agreement to the needs of the company and the employees.

2. European employers' associations and trade unions

Since 1992, the representatives of the private security sector at European level - CoESS for employers and UNI-Europa for workers - have sat on a sectoral social dialogue committee under the aegis of the European Commission. The two organisations recognise each other as legitimate partners and representatives, and they have signed a reciprocal recognition agreement that sets out the objectives and resources of their dialogue.

At regular intervals, both UNI-Europa and CoESS meet in Brussels within the framework of their sectoral social dialogue committee, which is chaired by the European Commission (DG Employment and Social Affairs). These meetings can be plenary (with a full representation of most national affiliates of UNI-Europa and CoESS), restricted meetings (working parties focusing on specific issues), and secretariat meetings.

The main joint activities of the COESS and UNI-Europa are as follows:

- Vocational training in the European Security Industry (25 September 1996)
- Joint opinion of the European social partners in the Private Security Industry on the regulation and licensing (25 September 1996)
- Agreement between the CoESS and UNI-Europa with a view to setting up a Sectoral Social Dialogue Committee for the Private Security Sector (15 December 1998)
- Memorandum of CoESS and UNI-Europa on the award of contracts to private security companies in the public sector (10 June 1999)
- Joint declaration on the mutual recognition of CoESS and UNI-Europa and the social dialogue (10 June 1999)

This joint declaration on mutual recognition between the representatives of employers and those of workers involves their co-operation in achieving further progress in social dialogue in the private security sector. It guarantees the continuity of the common objectives developed in the framework of social dialogue, that is to say the need to improve working conditions, professionalism, training and the sector's image, while ensuring the ongoing expansion of the sector's activities. The declaration is not merely a declaration at European level: it also asserts mutual recognition between trade unions and employers' organisations at national level and within companies. This determination to establish a dialogue at all levels, and in particular within companies, is crucial to achieving the common objectives.

- Joint declaration of CoESS and UNI-Europa on the future enlargement of the European Union to include the Central and Eastern European Countries (11 June 1999)
- Joint declaration by CoESS and UNI-Europa on the modernisation of the organisation of work in the private security sector (11 July 2000)
- Joint declaration of CoESS and UNI-Europa on the European harmonisation of legislation governing the private security sector (13 December 2001)

- Code of conduct and ethics for the private security sector (18 July 2003)

It is important to bear in mind that there is no collective bargaining at European level in this sector, but the CoESS and UNI-Europa are keen to develop bases that they see as desirable in various countries. The CoESS and UNI-Europa are working on implementing joint declarations on a number of issues including vocational training, and the award of contracts to private security companies in the public sector. Matters of interest to the Committee's future activities are greater professionalism, modernising work organisation, harmonisation of national legislation, and improving the sector's image and attractiveness. The European social partners display no particular concern about the development of social relations in the sector.

I. Institutional characteristics of the organisations

a) CoESS (Confederation of European Security Services)⁹

CoESS (Confederation of European Security Services) has been founded in 1989 by a joint initiative of several national associations of private security companies belonging to EU Member States. According to the organisation, 12,564 companies are members of the CoESS (covering a total of 578,150 employees) among 14 countries in the UE15. CoESS has also affiliations (associate members) in 7 countries outside the UE15 and is also trying to extend its membership. The recent affiliation of national associations from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Turkey stresses the importance CoESS attached to its vocation to become a European-wide organisation. CoESS is continuing its efforts to look for membership also from other candidate countries.

According to its statutes, the purpose of CoESS is "to ensure in Europe and throughout the world the defence of the interests of the organisations and national companies that provide security services in all their forms in the countries of the European Union and to represent these joint interests, in particular, through involvement in the work aimed at the harmonisation of national legislation concerning the activity of its members.

Through its different Working Committees, CoESS wants to incorporate all branches of the industry. All working committees are composed by experts in the respective fields. They deal in practice with all pending and future issues concerning these fields. The presidents of the different committees are members of the Board of Directors, ensuring thus the necessary links, exchange of information and cooperation between the Board and the work of the Working Committees.

Until now, CoESS has held bi-annual General Assemblies. They have allowed all members of CoESS (full members, associated members and corresponding members) to take note of achieved results, to define mandates for new actions, to exchange views and to debate on on-going issues.

The CoESS is financed by means of financial contributions from the members. The financial contribution takes the form of a subscription, the amount of

⁹ Sources: Confederation of European Security Services –Activities report. Confederation of European Security Services –Articles of Association - Confederation of European Security Services –CoESS-Member turnover list 1.5.2002.

which is established each year by the Ordinary General Meeting. The annual subscription by State shall be calculated on the basis of the number of employees operating in this member State of the Confederation. The Confederation may call for exceptional financial contributions of its members to finance ad hoc actions decided by the General Meeting. The CoESS may also accept donations and bequests.

b) UNI-Europa¹⁰

General introduction

UNI-Europa is the European regional organisation of UNI (Union Network International) which brings together 1,000 trade unions in 140 countries. UNI-Europa is responsible for the social dialogue with the corresponding employers' organisations in numerous areas of activity in the service sector, including bank, insurance, telecommunications, postal services, commerce, hairdressing, temporary work agencies, the cleaning industry and the private security sector. UNI-Europa's section which includes private security is the *Property Services* section (Services of maintenance and supervision).

The members of UNI-Europa are the national trade unions which have members in those fields of activity. In the European private security sector, UNI-Europa represents about 30 trade unions and 200,000 members.

UNI-Europa's mission includes the exchange of information and co-ordination between trade unions, supporting efforts to organise and recruit workers into trade unions, social dialogue with employers' organisations at European level, facilitating contacts between trade unions and European institutions and promoting the development of social dialogue at company level through European works councils.

The priorities of UNI-Europa for the private security sector include: improving levels of unionisation, promoting solidarity between affiliated unions, supporting their collective bargaining, the improvement of working conditions, raising the standards in the industry, the development of better training standards, the improvement of health and safety standards and of career opportunities, the establishment of decent social standards, and the improved conciliation between private life and working life.

UNI-Europa has premises in the Executive Committee of the ETUC.

UNI-Europa-Property Services

UNI-Europa PROPERTY SERVICES consists of three sections: private security, cleaning and caretaking.

UNI-Europa PROPERTY SERVICES is financed by the affiliations fees paid by each organisation affiliated to UNI (and automatically to UNI-Europa) on the basis of membership numbers.

10 Sources : -Confederation of European Security Services –Activities report
 -contacts with UNI-Europa.

II. Basis of representativeness

a) Preliminary note

Activities covered by the figures included in the following tables may slightly vary from one country to another, either because of the national specificities, or because of the level of available data in statistics used to approach the sector¹¹. For this reason, we do invite the reader to take great caution and to look at the full-size report in order to apprehend national specificities when making comparisons.

b) Employers' organisations

Organisations affiliated to CoESS

The following table shows the different employers' organisations that belong to the CoESS from the 15 EU Member States. Certain organisations, which are not technically employers' organisations, but rather business associations, have particularly strong ties with other associations entitled to participate in collective negotiations and to sign collective agreements¹². This allows them to enjoy indirect representation. With a view to providing an accurate portrayal of the sector, it was decided to include them in this table. They are indicated in parentheses.

¹¹ In some countries, classifications more detailed than the 4 digits NACE classification have been adopted. However, these deeper classifications are not standardised. If some of them allow to get closer to the private security sector in terms of definition of activities, it may happen that for the same country, statistical data is only available for the NACE 7460 level. In every case where NACE classification has been used to collect data, the most precise level of available data has been chosen.

¹² For example, there is close cooperation in Sweden between SWEGUARD (member of the CoESS that is not an employers' organisation, with no right to take part in collective bargaining or to sign collective agreements) and ALMEGA, which has the ability to take part in collective bargaining and to sign collective agreements.

	<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Companies</u>	<u>Employees</u>	<u>Density (employees)</u>	<u>CB</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>National affiliations</u>		<u>European affiliations</u>		<u>International affiliations</u>	
	(original name)	(number)	(number)	%	yes/no	Yes/no	Direct (name)	Indirect (name)	Direct (name)	Indirect (name)	Direct (name)	Indirect (name)
<u>Austria</u>	[VSO] ¹³	51 ¹⁴ /8 ¹⁵	8,000 ¹⁶ /5,400 ¹⁷	90	No	No			COESS Euroalarm Eurosafte			
<u>Belgium</u>	APEG	16	13500	90	yes	yes	FEB		COESS			
<u>Denmark</u>	VABA	9	6,431	49,46%	yes	yes	HTS	DA	CoESS			
<u>Finland</u>	Palvelualojen Toimialaliitto	30	3500	60-70% ¹⁸	yes	yes	TT		COESS			
<u>France</u>	SNES	140	ND	ND	yes	yes	UFISS	MEDEF		COESS		
	SYLOVAL	7	8 000	6,75%	yes	yes	UFISS	MEDEF		COESS		
	SPESSAA	14-16			yes	yes	UFISS	MEDEF		COESS		
	GPMSE						UFISS			COESS		
<u>Germany</u>	BDWS	420	100 000	50%	yes	yes	footnote ¹⁹		CoESS			
<u>Greece</u>	ENEA	8	4000 ²⁰	36 ²¹	Yes	Yes			COESS			
	EOA	n.a.	5800	n.a.	Yes	Yes			COESS			
<u>Ireland</u>	SFI	305 ²²	n.a.	n.a.	Yes	Yes			COESS Euralarm	UEAPME	WOE	
<u>Italy</u>	ASSVIGILANZA	150	12,000 c.ca	23.3/ (27.2)**	yes	yes	Confcommercio		Coess			
<u>The</u>	VPB	80	30000	90	YES	YES	VNO-NCW		COESS			

13 The VSÖ is a business association which is not engaged in collective bargaining. It should be noted, however, that member companies of the VSÖ are represented on the AFG's collective bargaining committee, AFG having both the ability to take part in collective bargaining and to sign collective agreements.

14 Figure for the whole of the VSÖ.

15 In the private security sector.

16 Figure for the whole of the VSÖ.

17 In the private security sector.

18 % of total number of people working in the sector.

19 BHE, ASW, AWM, ZuW, EZK, DIN, FORSI.

20 It is impossible to establish the real number of workers represented, as the actual number of private security employees varies between 11,000 - 15,000 individuals. A very approximate estimate would be 36% for ENAE and the remaining 64% divided between SEEA and EOA. The figure is based on the author's own estimates.

21 It is impossible to establish the real number of workers represented, as the actual number of private security employees varies between 11,000 - 15,000 individuals. A very approximate estimate would be 36% for ENAE and the remaining 64% divided between SEEA and EOA.

22 Source: CoESS

<u>Netherlands</u>												
<u>Portugal</u>	AES	8	17.000	70	YES	YES	CCP	NO	COESS	NO	NO	NO
<u>Spain</u>	APROSER	12	63,000	70	Yes	Yes	No	No	COeSS	No	No	No
<u>Sweden</u>	[SWEGUARD] ²³	31	9,000	53%	no	no			COESS			
	Almega	110	17000	90%	yes	yes	Svenskt Näringslivs ²⁴		CoESS	UNICE		
<u>U.K.</u>	[BSIA] ²⁵	500 ²⁶	n.a.	n.a.	no	no			UNICE CoESS			

Density (employees) : rate of employees working in the private security sector for these companies compared to the total number of employees -all categories included- in the whole sector of private security.

******: This figure refers to the rate of employees working for these companies compared to the total number of employees working for cooperatives or private companies (according to the case) in the private security sector.

*******: This figure refers to the rate of affiliated companies compared to the total number of cooperatives or private companies (according to the case) in the private security sector.

CB: Does the organisation take part in Collective Bargaining? **CA**: Is the organisation able to sign Collective Agreements?

From an overall point of view, members of the CoESS can be considered as the main employers' organisations in the sector. It should be noted that although some of the organisations appear to be low in density compared to the overall sector of private security, their density can actually be quite high for the particular sub-branch of private security in which they are active.

Through these organisations, the CoESS is active in 14 of the 15 EU Member States: Luxembourg is the only country without a member organisation. In some cases, within a single country, several organisations are members of the European organisation. In most countries, the organisations active in the sector are not directly associated with the CoESS, as the following table shows:

²³ The main focus of SWEGUARD is to defend interests of the sector. It is not an employers'organisation. However, a strong collaboration takes place with ALMEGA which has the ability to take part in collective bargaining and to sign collective agreements

²⁴ Confederation of Swedish Enterprises

²⁵ British Security Industry Association is a trade association. Its main activities lie outside human resources, and so it is not a specialist employers'organisation. Nevertheless, it is widely seen as the employers'organisation in the industry.

²⁶ This figure is for public and private sectors, but almost the entire part of it is private sector.

Organisations not affiliated to CoESS

	<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Companies</u>	<u>Employees</u>	<u>Density</u> <u>(employees</u> <u>)</u>	<u>CB</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>National</u> <u>affiliations</u>		<u>European</u> <u>affiliations</u>		<u>International</u> <u>affiliations</u>	
							Direct (name)	Indirect (name)	Direct (name)	Indirect (name)	Direct (name)	Indirect (name)
	<i>(original name)</i>	<i>(number)</i>	<i>(number)</i>	%	<i>yes/no</i>	<i>Yes/no</i>						
<u>Austria</u>	AFG	27698 ²⁷	60000 ²⁸	100 ²⁹	yes	Yes	(WKÖ)					
	FG	5417 ³⁰ /5 ³¹	42615 ³²	100 ³³	yes	Yes	(WKÖ)		See footnote ³⁴			
									See footnote ³⁵			
<u>Germany</u>	BDGW	176	9 000	5%	(yes) ³⁶	no	AWM		ESTA	(CoESS) ³⁷		
	TWSU	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
<u>Greece</u>	SEEA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Yes	Yes						
<u>Ireland</u>	[ISIA]	48 ³⁸	5000 ³⁹	n.a.	Yes	No	None		None (BSIA) ⁴⁰		None	
	IBEC				Yes	Yes						
<u>Italy</u>	FEDERVIGILANZA	Between 70 and 80	8,000	15.5/(18.2)*	yes	yes	1 st Level Association					
	UNIV	100 c.ca	N.A.	n.a.	yes	yes	1 st Level Associati					

27 For the whole of the AFG, which is larger than the private security sector.

28 For the whole of the AFG, which is larger than the private security sector.

29 Among the kind of companies taken care of by the AFG.

30 Figure for 1999 For the whole of the FG, which is larger than the private security sector.

31 In the private security sector

32 Figure for 1999 For the whole of the FG, which is larger than the private security sector.

33 Among the kind of companies taken care of by the FG.

34 Arbeitsgemeinschaft internationaler Straßentransportunternehmer (the Association of Austria's International Road Transporters)

35 International Road Transportation Union

36 The BDGW does not take part in consultation, but since the BDWS and the BDGW are run under shared management, the interests of the BDGW are in effect being taken into consideration. The BDGW's statute obliges affiliated members to accept collective agreements negotiated by the BDWS. This is why the category "indirect affiliation" to the CoESS has been chosen as well, which formally is not correct.

37 The BDGW does not take part in consultation, but since the BDWS and the BDGW are run under shared management, the interests of the BDGW are in effect being taken into consideration. The BDGW's statute obliges affiliated members to accept collective agreements negotiated by the BDWS. This is why the category "indirect affiliation" to the CoESS has been chosen as well, which formally is not correct.

38 Source: CoESS

39 Source: CoESS

40 The BSIA is a reciprocal associate member of the British Security Industry Association.

							on					
	ANCST	Between 40 and 50	N.A.	n.a.	yes	yes	Legacoop					
	Federlavoro e Servizi	50	1300	2.5/(17.6)**	yes	yes	Confcooperative					
	ANCOSEL	13	975	1.9/(13.2)**	yes	yes	AGCI					
	ANIVP	144	N.A.	N.A.	yes	Yes	Confindustria			Coess		
<u>Luxemburg</u>	FEDIL	5	2110	90-95	Yes	no ⁴¹			UNICE		IOE	
<u>Portugal</u>	AESIRF	18	11.000	n.a.	YES	YES	NO	NO	EUROSAFE	NO	NO	NO
	ANESEL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	NO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
<u>Spain</u>	ACAES	86	12,000	8 (13) ⁴²	Yes	Yes	PIMEC-SEFES	No	Euroalarm	No	No	No
	FES	104	10,000	12	Yes	Yes	CEOE-CEPYME	No	No	UNICE	No	No
	AMPES	51	6,800	10	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No

Density (employees) : rate of employees working in the private security sector for these companies compared to the total number of employees -all categories included- in the whole sector of private security.

******: This figure refers to the rate of employees working for these companies compared to the total number of employees working for cooperatives or private companies (according to the case) in the private security sector.

*******: This figure refers to the rate of affiliated companies compared to the total number of cooperatives or private companies (according to the case) in the private security sector.

CB: Does the organisation take part in Collective Bargaining? **CA**: Is the organisation able to sign Collective Agreements?

It is important to note that some of the associations included here have special ties with the CoESS. This is notably the case in Germany, where the BDGW, although it cannot formally be considered as a member of the European organisation, still enjoys close ties with the latter since the BDWS (member of the CoESS) and the BDGW are run under shared management.

41 FEDIL does not sign CAs itself. The only collective agreement is signed by the five companies affiliated to the FEDIL

42 Density is 13%, but since some big companies are also affiliated to APROSER, ACAES has a recognised representativeness in social dialogue of 8%.

c) Trade unions:

Organisations affiliated to UNI EUROPA

The table below shows the employees' organisations that belong to UNI-Europa within the 15 EU Member States in the private security sector.

	<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Members working in the sector</u> ⁴³	<u>Density</u>	<u>CB</u>	<u>CA</u>	<u>National affiliations</u>		<u>European affiliations</u>		<u>International affiliations</u>	
	<i>(original name)</i>	<i>(number)</i>	%	<i>Yes /no</i>	<i>Yes /no</i>	<u>Direct (name)</u>	<u>Indirect (name)</u>	<u>Direct (name)</u>	<u>Indirect (name)</u>	<u>Direct (name)</u>	<u>Indirect (name)</u>
<u>Austria</u>	GHTV	1,370 (37,735)	23 ⁴⁴	(Yes) ⁴⁵	(Yes) ⁴⁶	ÖGB		UNI-Europa		UNI	
<u>Belgium</u>	CG	4744 (306466)	47,1 ⁴⁷	yes	yes	FGTB		UNI-Europa		UNI	
		4585 blue collar-workers	45,5 ⁴⁸								
	CCAS ⁴⁹	(212,925 ⁵⁰)		yes	yes	CSC		UNI-Europa		UNI	
		388 ⁵¹ white-collar workers	19,1 ⁵²								
	SETCA	807 (268649)	42 ⁵³	yes	yes	FGTB		UNI-Europa		UNI	
<u>Denmark</u>	DFE-S	3,500	27%	Yes	Yes	VSL	LO	UNI-Europa		UNI	
<u>Finland</u>	PAM	2,600 (201,000)	60	yes	yes	SAK		UNI-Europa		UNI	

43 Figures in brackets refer to total number of member workers for the organization, when it has affiliates in other sectors than the private security sector

44 Estimated density. The total number of employees working in the sector that has been used excludes those working in the five companies specialized in the transport of cash and valuables with a weight of 3.5 tons and more.

45 Only the ÖGB is formally entitled to sign collective agreements. In practice, the member unions conduct bargaining and sign collective agreements on behalf of the ÖGB, although they enjoy considerable autonomy in performing this task. This situation also applies to the GHTV.

46 Only the ÖGB is formally entitled to sign collective agreements. In practice, the member unions conduct bargaining and sign collective agreements on behalf of the ÖGB, although they enjoy considerable autonomy in performing this task. This situation also applies to the GHTV.

47 Density among blue-collar workers.

48 Density among blue-collar workers

49 Centrale Chrétienne de l'Alimentation et des Services (CCAS) or CSC-Alimentation et services

50 Source: UNI-Europa

51 Source : National Secretary of the CSC, based on the number of trade union's premium paid by the trade union organisation (2000). Note that this number was raising from 2000.

52 Density among white-collar workers.

53 Density among white-collar workers.

<u>France</u>	CGT	n.a. (685,186)	n.a.	Yes	Yes			ETUC UNI- Europa			
	CGT-FO	n.a. (1,000,000 ⁵⁴)	n.a.	Yes	Yes			ETUC UNI- Europa		CISL	
	CFDT	n.a. (865,528)	n.a.	Yes	Yes			ETUC UNI- Europa		CISL	
<u>Germany</u>	Verdi	30,000 (2,75 millions)	25%	Yes	Yes	DGB		UNI- Europa		ITF UNI	
<u>Greece</u>	OIYE	1500 (24,448)	n.a. ⁵⁵	Yes	Yes	GCGW ⁵⁶		UNI- Europa			
<u>Ireland</u>	SIPTU	6000	50% ⁵⁷	Yes	Yes	ICTU		UNI- Europa	ETUC		ICFTU UNI
<u>Italy</u>	FILCAMS	8,274	16%	yes	yes	CGIL			UNI- Europa - IUF		UNI
	FISASCAT	10,000 c.ca	19.4%	yes	yes	CISL			UNI- Europa - IUF - ILO - FIET		UNI
	UILTuCS	9,151	17.8%	yes	yes	UIL			UNI- Europa		UNI
<u>Luxemburg</u>	« Fédération des Services » de LCGB	N.A.	25% ⁵⁸	yes	yes			UNI- Europa		UNI	
	Syndicat Services et Energie de OGB-L	500 (ca. 2,500-3,000)	25-30%	yes	yes	OGB-L	CGT-L	UNI- Europa EPSU			UNI
<u>The Netherlands</u>	Unie MHP	4,500-5,000 (200,000)	14,3-15,9	yes	yes	Unie MHP		ETUC UNI- Europa		UNI	
	FNV Bondgenoten	2700 (491,169)	8,57	Yes	yes	FNV		ETUC UNI- Europa		UNI	
	CNV	950 (350,000)	3	yes	yes	CNV		ETUC UNI- Europa		UNI	

54 This figure is judged overestimated by the community of experts. The accurate figure is believed to be 50% inferior, as suggest the results of professionals elections.

55 As no reliable data exists regarding the real membership figures, union density cannot be estimated.

56 General Confederation of Greek workers

57 Estimate. Unionisation is 100% of workers in Cash-In-Transit sector, 50% of workers in the alarm sector (*the CoESS stated that unionisation is not 50% of workers in the alarm sector, but in the manned guarding sector*), a minority of workers in the alarm sector. Unionisation for doors supervisors is low to negligible.

58 For the whole of the LCGB.

<u>Portugal</u>	SLEDA	n.a. (210)	n.a.	YES	NO	UGT	No	UNI-Europa	No	UNI	No
<u>Spain</u>	FeS-UGT	15,000 (100,000)	22	Yes	Yes	UGT	No	UNI-Europa	ETUC	UNI	ICFTU
	FE de AADD-CCOO	10,000 (60,000)	15	Yes	Yes	CCOO	No	UNI-Europa	ETUC	UNI	ICFTU
	FETA-ELA	n.a.	n.a.	No	No	ELA-STV	No	UNI-Europa	ETUC	UNI	ICFTU
<u>Sweden</u>	Svenska Transportarbetareförbundet ST	8 000 (74 000)	(65% ⁵⁹) / 47%	Yes	Yes	LO-S		ETUC via LO ETWU UNI-Europa		- UNI	
	Tjänstemannaförbundet HTF	650 (160 000)	(70% ⁶⁰) / 3, 8%	Yes	Yes	TCO		ETUC via TCO ETWU NTF UNI-Europa Eurocadre via TCO		UNI	
<u>U.K.</u> ⁶¹	GMB	30,000 (700,000)	n.a.	y				UNI-Europa		UNI	
	PCS	6000/7000 (288,000)	n.a.	y				UNI-Europa		UNI	
	T&GWU	n.a. (900,000)	n.a.	y				UNI-Europa		UNI	

Density: number of affiliated employees working in the private security sector compared to total number of employees in the private security sector
CB: Does the organisation take part in Collective Bargaining? **CA:** Is the organisation able to sign Collective Agreements?

From an overall point of view, members of UNI-Europa can be considered as the main trade unions in the sector. Once again, it should be noted that although some of the organisations seem to be low in density compared to the overall sector of private security, their density can be quite high for the particular type of workers they take care of, or for the sub-branch of private security in which they are active.

Through these organisations, UNI-Europa is active in the sector in each of the 15 EU Member States. In some cases, within a single country, several organisations are members of the European organisation. In most countries, some organisations active in the sector are not directly associated with UNI-Europa, as the following table shows. Among these organisations, the ones that provided figures are usually lower in density than the trade union members of UNI-Europa.

59 refers to density for the specific category of workers being taken care of by the organisation

60 refers to density for the specific category of workers being taken care of by the organisation

61 figures for public and private sectors. Very approximate.

Organisations not affiliated to UNI EUROPA

	Organisation (original name)	Members working in the sector ⁶² (number)	Density %	CB Yes /no	CA Yes /no	National affiliations		European affiliations		International affiliations	
						Direct (name)	Indirect (name)	Direct (name)	Indirect (name)	Direct (name)	Indirect (name)
		744 blue-collar workers	7,4 ⁶³								
<u>Belgium</u>	CGSLB	(220,000)		No	No			NA		NA	
		88 white-collar workers	4,3 ⁶⁴								
<u>Denmark</u>	DEF	550 (30,100)	4.2%	Yes	Yes	LO					
<u>France</u>	CFTC	n.a (250,000)	n.a.	Yes	Yes					CMT	
	CFE-CGC	n.a. (200,000)	n.a.	Yes	Yes			CEC		CIC	
	UNSA	n.a. (360,000)	n.a.	No	No			ETUC			
	groupe des dix	n.a. (80,000)	n.a.	No	No						
	FNCR	n.a.	n.a.	Yes	Yes						
<u>Germany</u>	GÖD	n.a.	n.a.	Yes	Yes	CGB	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
<u>Greece</u>	OMYPAE	5053	n.a.	Yes	yes	GCGW					
<u>Italy</u>	UGL SICUREZZA CIVILE	5,596	10.9%	Yes	yes	UGL					
	SAVIP	1,300	2.5	No	no	autonomou s-	n.a-		n.a.		
<u>Portugal</u>	STAD	3.500 (10.000)	n.a.	Yes	Yes	CGTP-IN FEPCES	No	No	No	No	No
	FETESE	n.a.	n.a.	YES	YES	UGT					
<u>Spain</u>	FTSP-USO	6,000	9	Yes	Yes	USO	No	No	No	No	WCL
	CIG-Servicios	550-600 (n.a.)	0.8 (15-20% in Galicia)	Yes	No	CIG	No	No	No	No	No
<u>Sweden</u>	LEDARNA	300 (65 000)	(80% ⁶⁵) / 1,7%	Yes	Yes			CEC NTF		ITF via NTF	

Density: number of affiliated employees working in the private security sector compared to total number of employees in the private security sector

CB: Does the organisation take part in Collective Bargaining? **CA:** Is the organisation able to sign Collective Agreements?

62 Figures in brackets refer to total number of member workers for the organization, when it has affiliates in other sectors than the private security sector

63 Density among blue-collar workers

64 Density among white-collar workers.

65 refers to density for the specific category of workers being taken care of by the organisation