European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

Representativeness of the European social partner organisations: Inland water transport

This report is available in electronic format only.

Wyattville Road, Loughlinstown, Dublin 18, Ireland. - Tel: (+353 1) 204 31 00 - Fax: 282 42 09 / 282 64 56
e-mail: information@eurofound.europa.eu - website: www.eurofound.europa.eu

This study sets out to provide the necessary information for establishing consultation procedures between those involved in the inland water transport sector. The report identifies the employers and trades unions involved and also analyses relevant European organisations. There is a brief outline of the sector's economic background. The study also analyses relevant EU social partner organisations, except for those in Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Slovenia and Spain, which have virtually no inland water transport. It focuses on their membership, their role in collective bargaining and public policy, and their national and European affiliations. Finally, there is an analysis of the relevant European organisations, in particular their membership composition and their capacity to negotiate. The aim of the EIRO series of representativeness studies is to identify the relevant national and supranational social partner organisations in the field of industrial relations in selected sectors. The impetus for these studies arises from the goal of the European Commission to recognise the representative social partner organisations to be consulted under the EC Treaty provisions. Hence, this study is designed to provide the basic information required to establish and evaluate sectoral social dialogue.

Objectives of study

The aim of this **representativeness** study is to identify the **trades unions** and **employer organisations** involved in the inland water transport sector, and show how they relate to the sector's European interest associations of labour and business. This study seeks to provide basic information needed to develop a European sectoral **social dialogue**. It results from the European Commission's aim to identify the representative social partner associations to be consulted under the terms of the EC Treaty. The effectiveness of the social dialogue depends on whether its participants, across the EU, are sufficiently representative. Only European associations that meet this requirement will be involved in the social dialogue.

After identifying the relevant trades unions and employer organisations, this study will analyse the structure of the sector's relevant European organisations, focusing on how their membership is made up. The study includes only organisations whose membership is 'sector-related' (see below). At both national and European levels, many associations are not considered as social partner organisations as they do not essentially deal with industrial relations. There is a need for clear criteria to enable differentiation between the social partner organisations and other associations.

Nationally, to qualify as a sector-related social partner organisation, an association must be either a party to 'sector-related' **collective bargaining** or a member of a 'sector-related' European association of business or labour that is on the Commission's list of European social partner organisations consulted under Article 138 of the EC Treaty, and/or that participates in the sector-related European social dialogue. Affiliation to a European social partner organisation and involvement in national collective bargaining are of utmost importance to the European social dialogue, since these are the two constituent mechanisms that can systematically connect the national and European level. Following the criteria for national organisations, this study includes relevant European organisations which are on the Commission's list of consultation. The report also considers any other relevant European associations with sector-related national social partner organisations under their umbrella. Thus, the aim of identifying the sector-related national and European social partner organisations applies both a 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' approach.

Definitions

For the purpose of this study, the inland water transport sector is defined in terms of the Statistical Classification of Economic Activities in the European Community (*Nomenclature statistique des activités économiques dans la Communauté européenne*, NACE) (revision 2), to ensure the cross-national comparability of the findings. More specifically, the inland water transport sector is defined as NACE 61.2.

The domains of the trade unions and employer organisations and scope of the relevant collective agreements are likely to vary from this precise NACE definition. The study therefore includes all trades unions, employer organisations and multi-employer collective agreements that are 'sector-related' in terms of any of the following criteria:

- congruence – the domain of the organisation or scope of the collective agreement must be identical to the NACE demarcation, as specified above;
- sectionalism – the domain or scope covers only a certain part of the sector, as defined by the NACE demarcation, while no group outside the sector is covered;
- overlap – the domain or scope covers the entire sector along with parts of one or more other sectors. However, it is important to note that the study does not include general associations that do not deal with sector-specific matters;
- sectional overlap – the domain or scope covers part of the sector, as well as parts of one or more other sectors.

The European Commission established a European Social Dialogue Committee for the inland waterways sector in 1999. The European Barge Union (EBU) and the European Skippers' Organisation (ESO) for the employers, as well the European Transport Workers' Federation (ETF) for the employees, participate in the sector's European social dialogue. Thus, any national association affiliated to one of these organisations can be classified as a social partner organisation for the purpose of this study. However, it should be noted that an association's membership must be sector-related. This is important in the case of ETF; it has a diverse membership, but the study will include only its affiliated organisations relevant to inland water transport.

Collection of data

Unless cited otherwise, this study draws on data provided by the EIRO national centres. It is often difficult to find precise quantitative data. In such cases, rough estimates are provided rather than leaving a question blank, given the practical and political relevance of this study. However, if there is any doubt over the reliability of an estimate, this will be noted.

In principle, quantitative data may stem from three sources:

- official statistics and representative survey studies;
- administrative data, such as membership figures from the respective organisations, which are then used for calculating the density rate on the basis of available statistical figures on the potential membership of the organisation;
- personal estimates made by representatives of the respective organisations.

While the data sources of the economic figures cited in the report are generally statistics, the figures in respect of the organisations are usually either administrative data or estimates. It should be noted that several national studies also give data on trade unions and business associations that do not meet the above definitions, because they want to give a complete picture of the sector's associated 'landscape'. However, for the above substantive reasons, as well as for methodological reasons of cross-national comparability, this study will not consider such trade unions and business associations.

Structure of report

The study comprises three main parts. It begins with a brief summary of the sector's economic background. It then analyses the relevant social partner organisations in 19 EU Member States. Those excepted are Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Slovenia and Spain where there is virtually no inland water transport. The third part of the study considers the representative associations at European level. Each section will contain a brief introduction explaining the concept of representativeness in greater detail, followed by the study findings. As representativeness is a complex issue, it requires separate consideration at national and European level for two reasons. Firstly, the method applied by national regulations and practices to capture representativeness has to be taken into account. Secondly, the national and European organisations differ in their tasks and scope of activities. The concept of representativeness must therefore be suited to this difference.

It is important to note the difference between the research and political aspects of this study. Although the report provides data on the representativeness of relevant organisations, it does not decide whether that representativeness is sufficient for an organisation to take part in the European social dialogue. That is a political decision rather than an issue of research analysis.

Economic background

Inland water transport is a very small business sector in Europe, employing between 35,000 and 40,000 people in the 27 EU Member States. Only 19 out of the 27 states have inland water transport, with 12 of them having an interconnected waterway network. Inland water transport or, more precisely, river and canal shipping, accounts for a 6%–7% overall share of the total inland transport of goods in the EU27. In Member States where inland shipping is possible this share may come close to a national figure of 50%. Whereas, traditionally, inland shipping has a strong position in the long-distance haulage of bulk transport, it has – during the last couple of decades – also successfully entered new markets such as the transport of maritime containers. Consequently, some countries, such as Belgium and France, have experienced impressive growth rates in inland water traffic. Increases of more than 50% and more than 35%, respectively, have been achieved between 1997 and 2004 (EU Commission 2006: Communication from the Commission on the Promotion of Inland Waterway Transport 'NAIADES'). However, deregulation of market conditions during the past 25 years has been accompanied by large-scale restructuring and privatisation. This has led, in almost all the 19 countries, to a decline in the sector's workforce. In many cases, particularly in western Europe, large inland water transport operators are converting into service providers which sub-contract the actual haulage to so-called 'single-vessel operators'. These operators form by far the majority of companies in the sector. They are often family enterprises, have poor direct contact with shippers and mostly depend on large logistics providers and freight forwarders to obtain cargo. Such dependency may force them to operate with low and, at times, even negative margins (see the 'Prospects of inland navigation within the enlarged Europe (PINE) summary 2004'). The 2004 PINE report, carried out by four national inland navigation infrastructure agencies, identifies two countertrends in European inland water shipping. These are a limited concentration of enterprises in the key western European countries with a majority of 'single-vessel operators; and a splitting up of larger companies, often former national monopoly providers, mainly in countries applying to join the EU (ibid, p. 4).

Europe's freight transport system has increasingly suffered from congestion, capacity problems and delays. These affect mobility and economic competitiveness but are also detrimental to the environment and quality of life. Inland water transport offers a relatively cheap, low energy-intensive, environmentally-friendly and safe means of transporting goods. The European Commission, which has committed itself to trying to find more sustainable transport modes, has launched some initiatives to encourage the use of inland waterways. The Commission's 2001 White Paper, 'European Transport Policy for 2010: time to decide', identifies inland waterways, together with rail and short sea shipping, as the most effective transport mode in terms of sustainability. In 2006, the Commission introduced the NAIADES programme, which is aimed, after the complete liberalisation of the inland navigation market, at promoting inland waterway transport. The programme aims to:

- improve market conditions;
- harmonise the regulatory frameworks;
- modernise the fleet;
- make the profession more appealing;
- improve infrastructure.

The EU, which wants to improve working and social conditions and thus counteract the chronic shortage of highly skilled staff, has attempted to promote social dialogue about this at European level. During the past few years, the sectoral social partners at European level have been looking at how they can enhance labour mobility and achieve equivalence, across the EU, in professional qualifications. Negotiations on more flexible working time arrangements are underway. However, relatively poor working conditions in inland waterways have resulted in staff shortages which, since the 1990s, have only partially been counterbalanced by the influx of foreign crew members.

Tables 1 and 2 give an overview of the development of the sector from the mid 1990s to the mid 2000s. It presents a few indicators important to industrial relations and social dialogue. In about half of the Member States, for which related data are available, the number of companies more or less increased, often reflecting the liberalisation and partial expansion of the sector. Part of the growth in the number of companies may be attributable to the growing number of 'owner-operators'. Available data on total employment and the number of employees do not show a clear trend. The number of countries recording an increase in the number of employees is almost as high as those registering a decrease. Changes in the number of those employed within the decade are sometimes dramatic. Whereas in Hungary, Poland and Slovakia employment was – as a result of restructuring – reduced by half or even much more, Luxembourg is an example of an outstanding increase. In a few countries, for which data are available, such as Belgium, Germany and France, the number of employees remains far short of the total number in employment. This indicates that the sector is – at least in the western European countries – characterised by a high incidence of 'non-standard' employment in general and 'owner-operators' in particular. Table 2 also shows that the sector is very small. Its share in both aggregate employment and the number of employees is below 0.1% in all countries except for Luxembourg and the Netherlands and below 0.05% in about two thirds of the countries studied. Luxembourg, with a share of 1% of the country's employees in the sector, is outstanding in this respect. This figure is explicable against the background of several foreign water transport companies having settled in this country to take advantage of lax employment and social legislation. This practice has been firmly criticised by trades unions. Other favoured destinations for such practices are Cyprus and Malta, which do not even have inland waterways. In general, it has to be noted that employment figures provided in Tables 1 and 2 presumably tend to be underestimated, since they are supposed to give an appropriate picture on standard employment, while not properly reflecting the various forms of 'non-standard' work (often performed by foreign nationals).

Table 1: Total employment in inland water transport, 1995 and 2006

	Number of employers		Total employment		Male employment		Female employment	
	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006
AT	n.a.	73[a,b]	n.a.	379[a]	n.a.	273[a]	n.a.	106[a]
BE	174	159	2,889	2,382	2,693	1,685	196	697
BG	9[c,d]	17[d]	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
CZ	184	200	2,700	2,700	1,700	2,500	1,000	200
DE	1,253[e]	1,160[f]	12,000[e]	12000	9,000[e]	9,000	3,000[e]	3,000
DK	n.a.	37[f]	75	113[f]	59	85[f]	16	28[f]
FI	108	78	221	253	194	223	27	30
FR	1,050	968	2,974	3,642	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
HU	32[e]	349	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
IE	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	560	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
IT	247[h]	738[i]	2,090[h]	3,058[i]	1,936[h]	2,833[i]	154[h]	225[i]
LU	n.a.	128[f]	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
NL	4,470	3,375	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
PL	10	5	5,000	540	5,000	540	0	0
PT	n.a.	n.a.	647[h]	540[i]	497[h]	494[i]	150[h]	46[i]
RO	121[l]	136	4,121[l,m]	2,941[m]	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
SE	131[b]	191[b]	966	1,547	712	1,259	254	288
SK	5[k]	17	1,943[k]	756	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
UK	n.a.	35	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Notes: [a] 2005; [b] figure refers to companies rather than employers; [c] 2000; [d] figure includes inland ports which are not part of the sector; [e] 2003; [f] 2007; [g] approximate figures; [h] 1991; [i] 2001; [j] = 1997, [k] = 1996, [l] = 2004, [m] = figure does not include workers employed by foreign companies (on board ships flying a foreign flag), [n] = figure probably inflated; a European Commission report counts only around 2,000 employees in the sector (which is less than 0.01% of the total number of employees in the UK economy)

n.a. = not available

Source: EIRO national centres, 2007

Table 2: Total employees in inland water transport, 1995 and 2006

	Total employees		Male employees		Female employees		Total sectoral employment as % of total employment in economy		Total sectoral employees as % of total employees in economy	
	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006	1995	2006
AT	n.a.	325[a]	n.a.	234[a]	n.a.	91[a]	n.a.	0.01[a]	n.a.	0.01[a]
BE	1,241	726	1,144	641	97	85	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.02
BG	n.a.	1,903[d]	n.a.	1,269[d]	n.a.	634[d]	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.08[d]
CZ	2,700	2,600	1,700	2,400	1,000	200	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06
DE	7,548[e]	7,166	6,040[e]	5,589	1,508[e]	1,577	n.a.	n.a.	0.03[e]	0.03
DK	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
FI	199	230	173	202	26	28	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
FR	1,853	2,681	1,240[g]	1,690[g]	613[g]	991[g]	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
HU	2010[c]	1,044	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	<0.1	<0.05
IE	n.a.	560	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.03	n.a.	0.03
IT	1649[h]	2076[i]	1,514[h]	1,913[i]	135[h]	163[i]	0.01[h]	0.01[i]	0.01[h]	0.01[i]
LU	433[j]	3,192	433[j]	3,192	0[j]	0	n.a.	n.a.	0.2	1.0
NL	5,900	6,300[a]	5,300	5,300[a]	600	1,000[a]	n.a.	n.a.	0.1	0.1[a]
PL	5,000	28	5,000	28	0	0	0.03	<0.01	0.03	<0.01
PT	603[h]	528[i]	459[h]	483[i]	144[h]	45[i]	0.01[h]	0.01[i]	0.01[h]	0.01[i]
RO	4,092[l,m]	2,914[m]	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.05[l,m]	0.03[m]	0.09[l,m]	0.06[m]
SE	931	1,470	680	1,190	251	280	0.02	0.04	n.a.	n.a.
SK	1,878[k]	710	1,678[k]	620	200[k]	90	0.09[k]	0.03	0.1[k]	0.03
UK	n.a.	13,000[n]	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.05[n]

Notes: [a] 2005; [b] figure refers to companies rather than employers; [c] 2000; [d] figure includes inland ports which are not part of the sector; [e] 2003; [f] 2007; [g] approximate figures; [h] 1991; [i] 2001; [j] = 1997, [k] = 1996, [l] = 2004, [m] = figure does not include *workers employed by foreign companies (on board ships flying a foreign flag), ^{n} = figure probably inflated; a European Commission report counts only around 2,000 employees in the sector (which is less than 0.01% of the total number of employees in the UK economy)*

n.a. = not available

Source: EIRO national centres, 2007

National level of interest representation

In many Member States, statutory regulations explicitly refer to the concept of representativeness when assigning certain rights of interest representation and public governance to unions and/or employer organisations. The most important rights addressed by such regulations include:

- formal recognition as a party to collective bargaining;
- extension of the scope of a multi-employer collective agreement to employers not affiliated to the signatory employer organisation;
- participation in public policy and tripartite bodies of social dialogue.

Under these circumstances, representativeness is normally measured by the size of an organisation's membership. For instance, statutory extension provisions usually allow for extension of collective agreements to unaffiliated employers only when the signatory trade union and employer association represent 50% or more of the employees within the agreement's domain.

As outlined, the representativeness of the national social partner organisations is of interest to this study in terms of the capacity of their European umbrella organisations for participation in European social dialogue. Hence, the role of the national bodies in collective bargaining and public policymaking constitutes another important component of representativeness. The effectiveness of European social dialogue tends to increase with the growing ability of the national affiliates of the European organisations to regulate the employment terms and influence national public policies affecting the sector.

A cross-national comparative analysis shows a generally positive correlation between the bargaining role of the social partners and their involvement in public policy (see Traxler, 2004, pp. 571–598). Social partner organisations that are engaged in multi-employer bargaining are incorporated in state policies to a significantly greater extent than their counterparts in countries where multi-employer bargaining is lacking. This can be attributed to the fact that only multi-employer agreements matter in macroeconomic terms, setting an incentive for the governments to seek persistently the co-operation of the social partner organisations. If single-employer bargaining prevails in a country, none of the collective agreements will have a noticeable effect on the economy due to their limited scope. As a result, the basis for generalised tripartite policy concertation will be absent.

In summary, representativeness is a multi-dimensional concept that embraces three basic elements: the membership domain and strength of the social partner organisations; their role in collective bargaining; and their role in public policymaking.

Membership domains and strength

The membership domain of an organisation, as formally established by its constitution or name, distinguishes its potential members from other groups which the organisation does not claim to represent. As already explained, this study considers only organisations involved in the inland water transport sector. However, there is insufficient room in this report to delineate the domain demarcations of all the organisations. Instead, the report notes how they relate to the sector by classifying them according to the four patterns of 'sector relatedness', as specified earlier. Regarding membership strength, a differentiation exists between strength in terms of the absolute number of members and strength in relative terms. Research usually refers to relative membership strength as the density – in other words, the ratio of actual to potential members.

Furthermore, a difference also arises between trade unions and employer organisations in relation to measuring membership strength. Trade union membership simply means the number of unionised persons. In addition to taking the total membership of a trade union as an indicator of its strength, it is also reasonable to break down this membership total according to gender. However, measuring the membership strength of employer organisations is more complex since they organise collective entities, namely companies that employ employees. In this case, therefore, two possible measures of membership strength may be used – one referring to the companies themselves, and the other to the employees working in the member companies of an employer organisation.

For a sector study such as this, measures of membership strength of both the trade unions and employer organisations have also to consider how the membership domains relate to the sector. If a domain is not congruent with the sector demarcation, the organisation's overall density may differ from its sector-specific density. This report will first present the data on the domains and membership strength of the trade unions and will then consider those of the employer organisations.

Trades unions

Table 3 presents data on trades unions, their domains and membership strength. The table lists all trade unions that meet at least one of the two criteria for classification of a sector-related social partner organisation, as defined earlier. In the 19 countries under consideration, only two out of 58 unions (3.4%) have demarcated their domain in a way that agrees with the sector definition. This underlines the fact that statistical definitions of business activities, in particular in smaller branches of the economy, rather differ from the lines along which employees identify common interests and band together in unions.

Table 3: Interest representation of trade unions in inland water transport, 2006–2007

Country and trade union name	Type of member -ship	Domain cover-age	Membership			Density		Collec-tive bargain -ing	Consu l-tation	*National* and European affiliations*
			Members	Members in sector	Female member-ship (% of total membership)	Dom -ain	Sector (sectoral domain)			
AT										
vida	vol.	O	166,000	230	29%	n.a.	70 (70)	yes	yes	*ÖGB*, ETF, EFFAT, UNI-Europa
BE										
BTB	vol.	O^+	38,130	940	18%	65%	86 (86)	yes	yes	*ABVV/ FGTB*, ETF
ACV/CSC-	vol.	O^+	82,000	250	15%	35%	23 (23)	yes	yes	*ACV/CSC*,

Country and trade union name	Type of member-ship	Domain cover-age	Membership			Density		Collec-tive bargain-ing	Consu l-tation	*National* and European affiliations*
			Members	Members in sector	Female member-ship (% of total membership)	Dom -ain	Sector (sectoral domain)			
Transcom										ETF
BG										
TURNW-FTTUB	vol.	S+	620	620	6.1%	n.a.	32.6 (78.3)	yes	yes	*CITUB*
FTW PODKREPA	vol.	O+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	ETF
CZ										
OSN	vol.	O+	380	n.a.	0.003%	n.a.	<14 (n.a.)	no[a]	yes	ETF
OSD	vol.	O+	15,000	97	18%	n.a.	3.7 (n.a.)	no	yes	Č *MKOS*, ETF
DE										
ver.di	vol.	O	2,274,731	1,900	49.8%	23%	16 (16)	yes	yes	*DGB*, ETF
DK										
3F	vol.	SO	341,672	8	33.2%	75%	7 (100)	no	yes	*CO-Industri, LO*, EFBWW, EFFAT, ETF, UNI-Europa, EPSU
HK-Privat	vol.	SO	147,500	n.a.	75%	45% – 50%	n.a.	no	yes	*LO*, ETF, NTF, UNI-Europa
DEF-S	vol.	SO	18,777	5	24.3%	n.a.	3 (10)	yes	yes	*LO*, ETF
FI										
SMU	vol.	SO+	10,000	100	43%	90%	43 (n.a.)	yes	yes	*SAK*, NTF, ETF
SLPL	vol.	SO+	2,700	30	5%	90%	13 (n.a.)	yes	yes	*STTK*, NFBK, NTF
SKL	vol.	SO+	4,600	25	2%	85%	11 (n.a.)	yes	yes	*STTK*
FR										
FGTE-CFDT	vol.	O+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	*CFDT*, ETF
FNETT-CFE-CGC	vol.	SO+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	*CGC*, ECMF
SGMF-FPD-CGT	vol.	C+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	*CGT*
FEETS-CGT-FO	vol.	O+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	*CGT-FO*, ETF
HU										
FHFS	vol.	S	80	80	n.a.	30.2 %	7.7 (30.2)	yes	no	*MSZOSZ*

Country and trade union name	Type of member-ship	Domain cover-age	Membership			Density		Collec-tive bargain-ing	Consu l-tation	*National* and European affiliations*
			Members	Members in sector	Female member-ship (% of total membership)	Dom-ain	Sector (sectoral domain)			
BHFS	vol.	S^+	150	150	n.a.	45.5 %	14.4 (45.5)	yes	no	*MSZOSZ*
BHZS	vol.	S^+	80	80	n.a.	24.2 %	7.7 (24.2)	yes	no	*MSZOSZ*
IE										
SIPTU	vol. / oblig.[b]	O	225,000	232	n.a.	n.a.	41.4 (41.4)	yes	yes	*ICTU*, ETF
SUI	vol.[b]	SO	55,000	38	66%	n.a.	6.8 (n.a.)	yes	yes	*ICTU*, ETF
IT										
FILT-CGIL	vol.	O^+	147,279	376	12%–13%	13.6 %	12.3 (12.3)	yes	yes	*CGIL*, ETF
FIT-CISL	vol.	O^+	112,500	400	15%	10.4 %	13.0 (13.0)	yes	yes	*CISL*, ETF
UILT-UIL	vol.	O^+	103,312	245	20%	8.6%	8.0 (8.0)	yes	yes	*UIL*, ETF
UGL TRASPOR TI	vol.	O^+	80,676	96	45%	8.2%	3.1 (3.1)	yes	yes	*UGL*
FAISA-CISAL	vol.	O^+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	*CISAL*
FEDERM ANAGER	vol.	SO^+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	
LT										
LVTDPSF	vol.	O^+	750	670	17%	25% – 30%	35%	n.a.	yes	*LPSK*
LJS	vol.	O^+	1,560	1,500	4%	n.a.	60%–65%	no	yes	ETF
LU										
OGBL	vol.	O^+	60,000	40	33%	n.a.	1.3 (1.3)	yes	yes	*CGTL*, ETF
FNCTTFE L	vol.	O^+	6,500	300	5%	n.a.	9.4 (9.4)	no	yes	*CGTL*, ETF
LCGB	vol.	O^+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	
FCPT-Syprolux	vol.	O^+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	
NL										
Nautilus – FNV BG	vol.	SO^+	6,000 (470,000)[c]	800	<2%	n.a.	12.7 (18.2)	yes	yes	*FNV*, ETF
CNV Bedrijven-	vol.	SO^+	90,000	270	<2%	n.a.	4.3 (6.1)	yes	yes	*CNV*, ETF

Country and trade union name	Type of member -ship	Domain cover-age	Membership			Density		Collec-tive bargain -ing	Consu l-tation	*National* and European affiliations*
			Members	Members in sector	Female member-ship (% of total membership)	Dom -ain	Sector (sectoral domain)			
bond										
PL										
NSZZ Solidarność	vol.	O	n.a.	56	n.a.	n.a.	10.4 (10.4)	no	yes	ETF
PT										
SEMM-FESMAR	n.a.	SO^+	700	n.a.	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	yes[d]	n.a.	*FESMAR, UGT*, ETF
SITEMAQ -FESMAR	n.a.	SO^+	2,500	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes	n.a.	*FESMAR UGT*, ETF
SMMCM M-FESMAR	n.a.	SO^+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes[d]	n.a.	*FESMAR UGT*
SINCOMA R-FESMAR	n.a.	SO^+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes[d]	n.a.	*FESMAR UGT*
SITESE-FETESE	vol.	SO^+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes[d]	n.a.	*FETESE, UGT*, UNI-Europa
SIMA-MEVIP	vol.	O^+	2,900	n.a.	14%	n.a.	n.a.	yes	n.a.	*CGTP*
SITRA	vol.	O^+	n.a.	40	n.a.	n.a.	7.6 (n.a.)	yes	n.a.	*UGT*
STFCMM	vol.	SO^+	600	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	yes	n.a.	*CGTP*
SNTSF	vol.	SO^+	3,900	n.a.	13%	17.5 %	n.a.	yes	n.a.	*CGTP-IN*
SOEMM	vol.	SO^+	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	*UGT*, ETF
RO										
FSNN	vol.	O	15,000[e]	8,000[e]	2%	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	*ASTR, CSN Meridian*, ETF
SE										
SEKO	vol.	SO^+	150,000	200	40%	50% – 65%	14 (14–20)	yes	yes	*LO*, ETF, EPSU, UNI-Europa
Unionen	vol.	SO^+	500,000	1,000	n.a.	80% – 85%	68 (n.a.)	yes	yes	*TCO*, NFS, NTF, ETF
CF	vol.	SO^+	115,000	n.a.	22%	60% – 70%	n.a.	yes	yes	*SACO*, NordIng, ANE, Eurocadres, FEANI
TJ	vol.	SO^+	3,490	5	30%	80% –	0.3 (100)	yes	no	*SACO*

Country and trade union name	Type of member-ship	Domain cover-age	Membership			Density		Collec-tive bargain-ing	Consul-tation	*National* and European affiliations*
			Members	Members in sector	Female member-ship (% of total membership)	Dom-ain	Sector (sectoral domain)			
						85%				
SFBF	vol.	SO+	3,200	200–300	<10%	90% – 95%	14–20 (90–95)	yes	yes	*SACO*, ETF, NFBK, NTF
SBF	vol.	SO+	3,000	150	2%	90% – 100 %	10 (n.a.)	yes	yes	*LEDARNA*
SK										
OZ PVD	vol.	C	234	234	6%	33%	33 (33)	yes	yes	*KOZ SR*
UK										
RMT	vol.	SO+	74,539	n.a.	11%	n.a.	n.a.	yes	yes	*TUC*, ETF
Unite	vol.	SO+	1,941,610 [f]	11,000 [g]	11.5%	n.a.	80–90 (80–90)	yes	yes	ETF, EPSU, EMCEF, EMF, EFBWW, EFFAT
UKPA-Unite [h]	vol.	SO	6,000	600	n.a.	n.a.	4.6	no	no	ITF
Unison	vol.	SO+	1,343,000	2,000	70%	n.a.	15 (almost 100)	yes	yes	*TUC*, EPSU, UNI-Europa

Notes: See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.

vol. = voluntary; oblig. = obligatory; O = Overlap; SO = Sectional overlap; S = Sectionalism; C = Congruence

n.a. = not available

** = national affiliations are in italics; for the national level, only cross-sectoral, that is peak-level, organisations are listed; for the European level, only sector-related organisations are listed.*

+ = Domain overlap.

[a] = signs the ITF standard agreement only with foreign entities, but no autonomous collective bargaining; [b] = mixture of voluntary (in the private inland waterways sector) and compulsory (in the state-owned public sector organisation, Waterways Ireland) membership; [c] = 6,000 Nautilus and 470,000 FNV BG members; [d] = indirect collective bargaining involvement via higher-order unit; [e] = large number of its members are (domestic) workers employed by a foreign company (onboard ships under flags of foreign countries), which are not included in Table 1; [f] = including UKPA members; [g] = figure probably inflated; [h] = forms part of Unite.

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

Domain demarcations resulting in overlap in relation to the sector are common in inland waterways (39.7%). Overlap by and large arises from two different modes of demarcation. The first one refers to general (that is, cross-sectoral) domains – for example, the Confederation of

Independent Trade Unions (OGBL) in Luxembourg and the Independent and Self-Governing Trade Union Solidarity (NSZZ Solidarność) in Poland. The second and more frequent mode in the sector relates to various forms of multi-sectoral domains, covering contiguous sectors, mostly in the broader (water) transport segment of the economy – for example, Vida in Austria, the Belgian Transport Workers' Federation (BTB) and the General Christian Trade Union Federation (ACV/CSC) in Belgium, the Federation of Transport Workers Podkrepa (FTW Podkrepa) in Bulgaria, the Czech Trade Union of Seafarers (OSN) and the Transport Workers' Union (OSD) in the Czech Republic, the United Services Union (ver.di) in Germany and the General Federation of Transport and Civil Engineering (FGTE-CFDT) in France.

Sectional overlap can be found with half of the trade unions in the sector and is thus the most frequent domain demarcation in relation to the sector. This mode usually emanates from domain demarcations that focus on certain categories of employees which are then organised across several or all sectors. Employee categories are specified by various parameters. One such parameter is distinct occupations – for example, officers, see the Finnish Ship Officers' Association (SLPL); engineers, see the Finnish Engineers' Association (SKL); or managers, see the National Federation of Transport and Tourism Managers (FNETT) in France and the National Federation of Industrial Company Managers (FEDERMANAGER) in Italy. A second parameter is employment status – for example, blue-collar workers, as is the case of the United Federation of Danish Workers (3F) in Denmark, or white-collar employees, as is the case of the Union of Service and Communication Employees (SEKO) in Sweden and the Union of Commercial and Clerical Employees (HK) in Denmark.

Finally, sectionalism, representing 6.9% of the cases, ensues from the existence of one or more distinct sector-specific unions in a few countries. These unions then represent and organise only certain categories of employees in the sector, and do not organise employees outside the inland waterways sector. Such employee categories are in all cases specified by employment with a certain company – that is, company unions as is the case of Bulgaria's Trade Union of River Navigation Workers (TURNW-FTTUB) and of Hungary's Independent Trade Union of Waterway Navigators (FHFS), Independent Trade Union of Shipping on Lake Balaton (BHFS) and Trade Union of Balaton Shipping (BHZS). In general, due to the limited size of the sector, sectionalism in inland waterways occurs only in countries with a (fragmented) company trade union structure.

As the domains of the unions often overlap with the demarcation of the sector, so do their domains with one another in the case of most countries. Table 3 also informs about these inter-union domain overlaps. Inter-union overlaps of domains are endemic. In the majority of countries, the domain of any of their sector-related unions overlaps with the domain of all or most of the others. Depending on the scale of mutual overlap, this results in competition for members. High degrees of inter-union competition exist, for instance, in Hungary and Portugal.

Looking at the trade union membership data, it becomes apparent that female employees comprise the minority group in most of the unions for which gendered membership figures are available. Nevertheless, in a few trade unions, the proportion of female members is close to or even above 50%. At a first glance, this finding is quite remarkable, since the sector's employment is clearly dominated by male employees. However, closer examination shows that the predominance of female members in these unions is likely to be found in areas other than the inland water transport sector. The fact that men clearly prevail in European inland shipping (see Table 1) is – as far as related data are available –underlined by female membership rates of below 10% in those trade unions whose domain is congruent or sectional in relation to the sector.

Membership of trade unions is usually voluntary. However, in one or two of the 19 Member States, a few of the sector-related trade unions have some kind of compulsory membership. Ireland records a mixture of voluntary and compulsory membership in the sector. In private sector inland waterways companies, union membership of both the Services, Industrial, Professional and Technical Union (SIPTU) and the Irish Municipal Public and Civil Trade Union (IMPACT) is voluntary. By contrast, in the state-owned public sector organisation, Waterways Ireland (which is by far the largest organisation in Ireland's inland water transport sector), some element of compulsion to join one of these unions has been reported. Some sort of closed shop arrangement has also been alleged for some Portuguese unions. These arrangements stipulate that at least certain categories of employees must be unionised. Actually, for four small unions affiliated to the Portuguese Federation of Sea Workers (FESMAR), the situation has remained unclear.

The absolute numbers of trade union members differ widely, ranging from more than two millions to fewer than 100 members. This considerable variation reflects differences in the size of the economy and the comprehensiveness of the membership domain rather than the ability to attract members. Therefore, density is the measure of membership strength which is more appropriate to a comparative analysis. Domain density is 50% or higher in the case of 47.8% of the trade unions that document figures on density. More than one third of the unions (34.8%) represent 70% or more of the employees covered by their domain. Only 17.4% of the trade unions, for which data are available, organise fewer than 15% of the employees within their domain. The remaining trade unions (34.8%) record a density of between 15% and 49% of their potential members. Overall, therefore, domain density is relatively high.

These findings contrast considerably with the union density in the inland water transport sector. It is important to differentiate between the trade unions' sectoral density and their sectoral domain density. The former measures the ratio of members of a particular trade union in the sector to the overall number of workers in the sector (as defined by NACE). The latter indicates the total number of members of a trade union in the sector in relation to the number of workers in that part of the sector covered by the union domain. This means that the sectoral domain density must be higher than the sectoral density if a trade union organises only a particular part of the sector – that is, where the trade union's membership domain is either sectionalist or sectionalistically overlapping in relation to the sector. Even when taking the trade unions' sectoral domain density into account (which tends to be higher than their sectoral density for the reasons outlined above), the trade unions' density in the inland waterways sector falls short of the density ratio referring to their domain on aggregate. Sectoral domain density is 50% or higher in the case of only 33.3% of the trade unions for which data are available. The same share of unions records a sectoral domain density lower than 15% and between 15% and 49% each. Regarding those trade unions for which figures on both measures are recorded – that is, for sectoral domain density and domain density on aggregate – sectoral (domain) density tends to be lower compared with aggregate density, although some trade unions also show the reverse relationship between the two densities.

The relatively low unionisation rates in the inland water transport sector may imply that the trade unions are not very powerful here. Organised labour seems to have been forced into taking a defensive position for a variety of reasons. Firstly, the growing number of owner-operators is hard to unionise. The International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF) claims that employers frequently employ foreign crews on river vessels (in order) to avoid the regulations they might have to face if they employed locals, such as providing a proper employment contract. According to ITF, this leads to exploitation of foreign crews who are employed on the cheap, with little or no protection (see ITF inland navigation information sheet (135Kb PDF)). The widespread business practice of employing foreign crews, by bypassing national labour law regulations, means that the workers concerned are often prevented from exercising their collective and individual rights, all the more since it is often unclear which regulations do actually apply to them.

Employer organisations

Tables 4 and 5 present the membership data for the employer organisations in the inland water transport sector. Sector-related **employer organisations** are documented for 14 out of the 19 countries. In at least five of these countries, some of the listed employer organisations are not a party to collective bargaining. They are classified here as social partner organisations only because of their European-level affiliation to ESO or EBU. At least 12 of the 19 countries have employer organisations engaged in collective bargaining. In several countries – Bulgaria, Hungary, Luxembourg, Slovakia and the UK – there is no employer association that meets the definition of a social partner organisation, as outlined earlier. However, this does not mean that business has remained unorganised. Generally, business interest organisations may also deal with interests other than those related to industrial relations.

Organisations specialised in matters other than industrial relations are commonly defined as 'trade associations' (see **TN0311101S**). Such sector-related trade associations also exist in the inland water transport sector. In terms of their national scope of activities, all of the organisations that are not involved in collective bargaining according to Table 5 either primarily or exclusively act as trade associations in their country. It is only the conceptual decision to include all associational affiliates to ESO and EBU, regardless of whether they have a role in national bargaining, that gives them the status of a social partner organisation within the framework of this study. Of the 31 employer organisations listed in Table 4, at least six organisations belong to this group.

In seven of the 14 countries where employer organisations exist, only one employer organisation has been established. Pluralist associational systems are thus slightly less frequent on the employer side than the trade union side. Regardless of this, the employer organisations' domains tend to be narrower than those of the trade unions. Some 30.8% and 11.5% of these organisations rest on overlapping and sectionalistically overlapping domains, respectively. The respective domains of the Irish and the Danish employer organisations – that is, the Irish Business and Employers' Confederation (IBEC) and the Confederation of Danish Industries (DI) – are cross-sectoral. Most of the domain overlaps ensue from coverage of the broader water transport sector, often including port services and/or sea and coastal water transport. Overlaps of this kind can be found in Austria, Belgium, Finland, Portugal, Romania and Sweden.

Sectionalism or sectionalist overlaps (in the case of broader domain demarcation in terms of sector) are mainly caused by domain demarcations focusing on certain categories of employers. Such categories are specified according to various parameters including:

- company size – as is the case of the Central Office for Rhine and Inland Waterways (CBRB), the Association for Towing and Tugging on Rhine and Ijssel (VSDRIJ), the General Skippers Association (ASV) and the Independent Dutch Skippers' Union (ONS) in the Netherlands;
- type and/or size of the ships a company is operating – for example, Finland's Passenger-Ship Association (SM) and CBRB in the Netherlands;
- geographical region of shipping – as in the case of the Association des Maitres Batelier des Régions de Liège (AMBRL) in Belgium and both the Swedish Service Employers' Association (ALMEGA) and the Swedish Transport Group (SARF).

Some 34.6% of the associations are sectionalist with regard to their domain, while 23.1% of the cases have a domain congruent with the sector definition. Two employer organisations can rely on obligatory membership; in the case of both the Austrian Shipowners' Association (FSÖ) and France's National Chamber of Self-Employed Inland Shipping Entrepreneurs (CNBA), this is due to their public-law status as chambers. With regard to FSÖ, all of the sector's national companies are subject to compulsory membership, while CNBA's domain embraces only all self-employed skippers on French inland waterways.

With regard to the Austrian chamber organisation, sectoral, sectoral domain and aggregate density of both companies and employees is 100% by law. In the case of CNBA in France, the same holds true for the sectoral domain as well as the aggregate density. The sectoral density in terms of employees is very small since the association organises only a particular part of the sector. Unfortunately, for most of the voluntary associations data on their densities is lacking. Strikingly, data on all densities are not available for any of the voluntary employer organisations, and for 19 out of the 28 voluntary associations no density data are recorded at all. This is because most of the narrow sector's employer organisations are very small, which often either do not record or provide relevant data. Therefore, the employer organisations' densities in the inland waterways sector cannot be accurately assessed.

Table 4: Domain coverage, membership and density of employer organisations in inland water transport, 2006–2007

Country and employer organis ation name	Domain compre hensive ness	Type[a]	Membership		Density			
					Companies		Employees	
			Companies (companies in sector)	Employees (employees in sector)	Domain (%)	Sector (sectoral domain) (%)	Domain (%)	Sector (sectoral domain) (%)
AT								
FSÖ	O	Oblig.	75 (29)	426 (325)	100	100 (100)	100	100 (100)
BE								
FBB[b]	C	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Aequitas[c]	C*	Vol.	120 (120)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
AABB	n.a.	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
UCV	C*	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
VBO-FEB	C*	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
BVE	n.a.	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
VBR	S*	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
AMBRL	O*	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
BG	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CZ								
AVP-CZ	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
DE								
BdB	C*	Vol.	175 (175)	5,000 (5,000)	n.a.	n.a.	60	60 (60)
AdB	C*	Vol.	100 (100)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

BdS	S*	Vol.	150 (150)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
DK									
DI	O	Vol.	11,000 (1)	500,000 (40)	n.a.	2.7 (2.7)	n.a.	27 (27)
FI									
SM	SO	Vol.	60 (20)	1,000 (400)	50	25 (n.a.)	n.a.	n.a.
RASILA	--[d]	Vol.	2 (0)	45 (0)	2	0	25	0
FR									
CAF	C*	Vol.	80 (80)	2,500 (2,500)	n.a.	8.3 (8.3)	95	95 (95)
CNBA	S*	Oblig.	850 (850)	150 (150)	100	87.8 (100)	100	56 (100)
HU	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**
IE									
IBEC	O	Vol.	>7,500 (18)	n.a. (400)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	70 (70)
IT									
ASSTRA	O	Vol.	216 (n.a.)	100,000 (n.a.)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
LU	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**
NL									
CBRB	S*	Vol.	65 (65)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
VSDRIJ	S*	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
CBOB	S*	Vol.	350 (350)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
ASV	S*	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
ONS	S*	Vol.	220 (220)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
PL									
ZPAS	n.a.	n.a.	66 (66)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
PT									
AATF	O	Vol.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
RO									
APTNEP	O*	Vol.	30 (n.a.)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
AAOPFR	O*	Vol.	28 (20)	4,100 (3,160)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

SE								
ALMEGA	SO*	Vol.	8,900 (35)	400,000 (300)	n.a.	18 (n.a.)	n.a.	20 (n.a.)
SARF	SO*	Vol.	105 (2–3)	11, 700 (200)	90	1–3 (n.a.)	n.a.	14 (n.a.)
SK	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
UK	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Notes: [a] Vol. = voluntary membership; Oblig. = obligatory membership. [b] = federation is a result of a 2005 merger of part of BVE, part of VBR, AMBRL and others. [c] = federation is a result of a 2007 merger of UCV, part of BVE, part of VBR and others. [d] = RASILA's domain does not include inland water transport, but is considered in this study because it concludes collective agreements which also apply to the inland navigation sector.

** Domain overlap. O = Overlap, SO = Sectional overlap, S = Sectionalism, C = Congruence. n.a. = not available. See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.*

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

Table 5: Collective bargaining, consultation and affiliations of employer organisations in inland water transport, 2006–2007

	Collective bargaining	Consultation	*National* and European affiliations[a]
AT			
FSÖ	Yes	Yes	*WKÖ*, EBU, ECSA
BE			
FBB	n.a.	Yes	-
Aequitas	Yes	Yes	-
AABB	Yes	Yes	EBU
UCV	Yes	Yes	EBU
VBO-FEB	Yes	Yes	-
BVE	n.a.	n.a.	ESO
VBR	n.a.	n.a.	ESO
AMBRL	n.a.	n.a.	EBU
BG	-	-	-
DE			
BdB	No	Yes	EBU
AdB	Yes	Yes	EBU

	Collective bargaining	**Consultation**	***National* and European affiliations**[a]
BdS	No	Yes	ESO
DK			
DI	Yes	Yes	*CDE*
FI			
SM	Yes	Yes	*EK*
RASILA	Yes	Yes	*EK*
FR			
CAF	Yes	Yes	*MEDEF*, EBU
CNBA	No	Yes	*ESO*
HU	-	-	-
IE			
IBEC	Yes	Yes	-
IT			
ASSTRA	Yes	Yes	*Confser-vizi, Conf-industria*
LU	-	-	-
NL			
CBRB	Yes	Yes	*VNO-NCW*, *AWVN*, EBU
VSDRIJ	Yes	Yes	ESO
CBOB	Yes	Yes	ESO
ASV	No	Yes	ESO
ONS	Yes	Yes	ESO
PL			
ZPAS	No	n.a.	ESO
PT			
AATF	Yes	Yes	-
RO			
APTNEP	Yes	Yes	*CNPR*
AAOPFR	No	No	*CNPR*, EBU[b]
SE			

	Collective bargaining	Consultation	*National* and European affiliations[a]
ALMEGA	Yes	No	*SN, NFWO*
SARF	Yes	Yes	*SN*
SK	-	-	-
UK	-	-	-

Notes: [a] National affiliations appear in italics; only affiliations to sectoral European associations are listed. b = observer status. See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

Collective bargaining and its actors

Table 3 lists all the trade unions engaged in collective bargaining in this sector. Despite numerous cases of inter-union domain overlap and of unclear domain demarcation, only a few cases of inter-union rivalry and competition for bargaining rights have been identified. This is the situation in Hungary (in the case of BHFS and BHZS which both claim to organise employees in Balaton lake shipping) and Portugal, particularly between trade unions affiliated to different confederations. With regard to the sector-related employer organisations, no case of competition over collective bargaining is documented. This is mainly because in most countries – except for Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands – only one or two organisations with mostly clear and often distinct membership domains are operating on the employer side. In Belgium, due to a merger process affecting a number of smaller employer organisations in the sector, the seats in the joint committee (139) responsible for collective bargaining in the inland waterways stand to be re-distributed. This forthcoming change may, however, soon lead to inter-organisational conflict.

The data presented in Table 6 provide an overall picture of collective bargaining in the sector. . The importance of collective bargaining a means of employment regulation is measured by calculating the total number of employees covered by it in a certain segment of the economy as a proportion of the total number of employees in that segment (see Traxler, Blaschke and Kittel, 2001). Accordingly, the sector's rate of collective bargaining coverage is defined as the ratio of the number of employees covered by any kind of collective agreement to the total number of employees in the sector.

Two further indicators of the bargaining system are used. The first refers to the relevance of multi-employer bargaining (conducted by an employer organisation on behalf of the employer side), compared with single-employer bargaining which includes cases where two or more companies jointly negotiate an agreement. The percentage of the total number of employees covered by a collective, multi-employer, agreement provides an indication of the impact of the employer organisations on the overall collective bargaining process..

The second indicator considers whether statutory extension schemes have been applied to the sector. This analysis is confined to extension schemes that widen the scope of a collective agreement to employers not affiliated to the signatory employer organisation. Extension regulations targeting employees are not included in the research. Regulations concerning the employees are not significant to this analysis for two reasons. On the one hand, extending a collective agreement to those employees who are not unionised in the company covered by the collective agreement is a standard of the International Labour Organization (ILO), aside from any national legislation. Secondly, employers have good reason to extend a collective agreement concluded by them, even when they are not formally obliged to do so; otherwise, they would set an incentive for their workforce to unionise.

In comparison with employee-related extension procedures, schemes that target the employers are far more significant for the strength of collective bargaining in general and multi-employer bargaining in particular. Employers don't have to join an employer organisation. However, employer-related extension practices increase the coverage of multi-employer bargaining, and consequently may encourage more employers to join an employer organisation. This enables them to participate in the bargaining process and to benefit from the organisation's related services in a situation where the respective collective agreement will bind them in any case (see Traxler, Blaschke and Kittel, 2001).

Table 6: System of sectoral collective bargaining in inland water transport, 2006–2007

Country	Collective bargaining coverage (CBC) (%)	Proportion of multi-employer bargaining (MEB) as % of total CBC	Extension practices[a]
AT	80	100	(Pervasive)
BE	100	Almost 100	Pervasive
BG	>75	0	No practice
CZ	n.a.	0	No practice
DE	45[b]	MEB prevailing	No practice
DK	75–80	SEB prevailing	No practice
FI	Almost 100	Almost 100	No practice
FR	100	100	Pervasive
HU	56	0	No practice
IE	n.a.	MEB prevailing	No practice
IT	Almost 100	Almost 100	(Pervasive)
LU	3.1	0	No practice
NL	80–100	80	Pervasive
PL	0	n/a	No practice
PT	100	n.a.	Pervasive
RO	100	100	Pervasive
SE	100	80	Limited/exceptional or pervasive[c]
SK	Almost 100	0	No practice
UK	Almost 100	0	No practice[d]

Notes: Collective bargaining coverage = employees covered as a percentage of the total number of employees in the sector. MEB = multi-employer bargaining relative to single-employer bargaining. [a] Extension practices include functional equivalents to extension provisions, that is, obligatory membership and labour court rulings. Cases of functional equivalents are put in parentheses. [b] = figure is contested by ETF, which claims a CBC of 80%. [c] = no clear information provided. [d] = extension practices are only within companies to cover all employees whether they are union members or not. n.a. = not available. n/a = not applicable.

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

Collective bargaining coverage

In terms of the sector's collective bargaining coverage, 11 of the 17 EU Member States for which related data are available record a remarkably high coverage rate of 80% or more. Poland and Luxembourg are the most notable exceptions in this respect as collective bargaining is completely (in Poland) or almost completely (in Luxembourg) absent. In the case of Poland, this is a consequence of a dramatic transformation and privatisation of the sector, which is nowadays dominated by self-employment and almost completely lacks standard employment relationships. Aside from these two cases, the coverage rate is below 50% only in Germany. However, it should be noted that the finding with regard to Germany is contested by ETF, which claims a collective bargaining coverage rate of about 80% for the country.

Depending on national circumstances, several factors which sometimes interact with each other account for the high coverage rates (that is, 80% and more) of almost two thirds of the countries for which related data are available. Multi-employer bargaining coincides with a relatively high density of the trade unions and/or employer organisations – for example, Belgium, Finland and Sweden. Belgium, France, the Netherlands and Romania are examples of high coverage bolstered by pervasive extension practices. In the case of Austria, obligatory membership in the employer association works as a functional equivalent to pervasive extension. While coverage in countries with prevalent multi-employer bargaining is (with the exception of Slovakia) generally high, coverage is much more variable across countries operating under single-employer bargaining. In such circumstances, coverage ranges from 3% (Luxembourg) to almost 100% (Slovakia and the UK).

A broad estimate can be made of the relative importance of multi-employer bargaining. This type of bargaining prevails in 10 of the 17 countries for which data are available, whereas seven countries are characterised by predominant or – as is the case in six out of these seven countries – exclusive single-employer bargaining. Denmark is the only country of the latter group for which a mixed system of single-employer and multi-employer bargaining is documented. On average, the collective bargaining coverage in countries where single-employer arrangements prevail is only slightly lower compared with that of countries where multi-employer bargaining prevails. This only gradual difference on average is interesting since, in general, single-employer bargaining tends to be significantly less effective in relation to multi-employer bargaining, when it comes to regulating the employment terms in a particular sector. In the cases of Bulgaria, Denmark, Slovakia and the UK, for instance, collective bargaining coverage rates of between 75% and almost 100% in the inland water transport sector are achieved under single-employer bargaining arrangements. In these cases (except for Denmark), the sector is dominated by only one or a few larger enterprises covered by company agreements, which thus – due to the particular sector structure – cover a large part of the whole sector. It should be noted that multi-employer bargaining does not mean sector-level bargaining in all these cases. For instance, in Ireland, national-level multi-employer wage agreements cover all unionised workers in the sector. Ireland also represents an example of a country where central cross-sectoral multi-employer bargaining is supplemented by company bargaining, while sector-level bargaining does not exist.

Since extension schemes can only be applied to multi-employer settlements, the widespread practice of single-employer bargaining limits their use, even in cases where labour law provides for such schemes. Pervasive extension practices in inland waterways are reported for Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Portugal and Romania, while extension practices in a rather limited form do not occur. Extension of collective agreements is also reported for Sweden; however, the contacted experts disagree on the scope of such practices applied in Sweden. Referring to the aim of extension provisions, that is, making multi-employer agreements generally binding, the provisions for obligatory membership in the chamber system of Austria should also be noted. Obligatory membership creates an extension effect, since the Austrian Federal Economic Chamber (*Wirtschaftskammer Österreich*, WKÖ) and its sectoral sub-units are parties to multi-employer bargaining. Another functional equivalent to statutory extension schemes can be found in Italy. According to the country's constitution, minimum conditions of employment must apply to all employees. The country's Labour Court rulings relate this principle to the multi-employer agreements, to the extent that they are regarded as generally binding.

Participation in public policymaking

Interest associations may take part in shaping public policy in two ways. Firstly, they may be consulted by the authorities on matters affecting their members; or secondly, they may be represented on 'corporatist', in other words tripartite, committees and boards of policy concertation, where representatives of various projects get together to discuss results and common problems. This study considers only cases of consultation and corporatist participation that explicitly relate to sector-specific matters. Consultation processes are not necessarily institutionalised and, therefore, the organisations consulted by the authorities may vary according to the issues to be addressed and also over time, depending on changes in government. Moreover, the authorities may initiate a consultation process on an occasional rather than a regular basis. Given this variability, Tables 3 and 4 list only those sector-related trade unions and employer organisations that are usually consulted.

Trade unions

The trade unions are consulted by the authorities in the majority of countries. In 17 of the 19 EU Member States under consideration, regular consultation processes with the trade unions are reported. Only Hungary cites a lack of regular consultation. No information on consultation practices is available on Portuguese trade unions. One cannot rule out the possibility that the authorities favour certain trade unions over others or that the unions compete for participation rights. However, in the majority of countries where consultation is the norm, any existing trade unions may take part. Sweden and the UK are the only exceptions here. As a result, inter-union conflicts over participation in public policy matters do not figure prominently.

Employer organisations

Sector-related employer organisations are involved in consultation procedures in all countries where they exist. Due to their monopoly-like position in many countries, no conflicts over participation rights of employer organisations are reported. In the multi-organisation system of Germany, Finland, France and the Netherlands, where related data of all employer organisations are available, all of the sector's organisations are consulted. Only Romania and Sweden record the co-existence of organisations that are consulted and of those that are not. In all countries, where employer organisations co-exist with trade unions, consultation rights are shared between them in that at least one organisation on each side is consulted. This means that in all of the 13 countries for which information on consultation is reported for organised business and labour, representatives of both sides are consulted. No country records asymmetrical consultation practices. In those countries where an employer association does not exist – that is, Bulgaria, Hungary, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovakia and the UK – business is not necessarily excluded from consultation procedures. Under these circumstances, sectoral trade associations may be consulted.

Tripartite participation

Turning from consultation to tripartite participation, the findings reveal that genuinely sector-specific tripartite bodies have been established in only four of the 19 countries. This is mainly due to the small size of the inland waterways sector. Table 7 lists a total of six bodies of this kind. Half of them each rest on a bipartite agreement of the social partners and are based on statutes. Some of them primarily deal with labour market issues, with a special focus on issues related to working conditions as well as social security aspects. This reflects the need in virtually all countries with a noticeable inland shipping industry to regulate the sector's liberalised labour market, which is characterised by a lack of coherent legislation.. Low standards in terms of regulation, in particular with respect to the vocational and educational system, the social insurance system and labour law, have rendered careers in inland shipping less attractive and have thwarted the Commission's goal of good quality inland shipping.

Table 7: Tripartite sector-specific boards of public policy in inland water transport, 2006–2007

Country	Name of body and scope of activity	Origin	Participants	
			Unions	Business associations
BE	Promotie binnenvaart Vlaanderen	Statutory	BTB, ACV-Transcom	
	Commissie binnenvaart	Statutory	BTB, ACV-Transcom	UCV, AABB
	Instituut voor het transport langs de binnenwateren	Agreement	BTB, ACV-Transcom	UCV, AABB
BG	Council for Social Partnership in Water Transport within the Ministry of Transport; activities: health and safety, working time, working conditions, social insurance	Statutory	FTTUB, FTW Podkrepa, Seamen's Syndicate CITUB	BSC, BSA
DE	Forum for Inland Water Transport and Logistics	Agreement	Ver.di	BdB, AdB
SK	Sectoral tripartite body for water transport and infrastructure; mainly dealing with sector-related legislation, restructuring and employment issues	Agreement	OZ PVD	ÚDPT SR

Note: See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.

Source: EIRO national centres, 2008

European level of interest representation

The Commission has defined three criteria for an employer or union to be eligible to participate in social dialogue. A social partner organisation must:

- be cross-industry or relate to specific sectors or categories, and be organised at European level;
- consist of organisations that are themselves an integral and recognised part of Member States' social partner structures and that have the capacity to negotiate agreements, as well as being representative of all Member States, as far as possible;
- have adequate structures to ensure their effective participation in the consultation process.

Regarding social dialogue, the main feature is the ability of such organisations to negotiate on behalf of their members and to conclude binding agreements. Accordingly, this section on European associations of the inland water transport sector will analyse these organisations' membership domain, the composition of their membership and their ability to negotiate.

As outlined in greater detail below, one sector-related European association on the employee side, namely ETF, and two on the employer side, namely EBU and ESO, are particularly significant in the inland waterways sector. All of them are listed by the European Commission as a social partner organisation consulted under Article 138 of the EC Treaty. Hence, the following analysis will concentrate on these three organisations, while providing supplementary information on other organisations that are linked to participants in the sector's national industrial relations.

Membership domain

Since ETF, which is affiliated to the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), organises the entire transport sector, its membership domain overlaps with the inland water transport sector. The domain of EBU largely coincides with the sector, as this association represents the entire inland waterways industry. By contrast, ESO represents only the private inland shipping entrepreneurs – that is, self-employed skippers. Hence, ESO's domain is sectional in relation to the sector under consideration. Both EBU and ESO organise only business organisations rather than individual companies. However, the latter tend to be organised in the national-level employer organisations, most of which are affiliated to EBU or ESO.

Membership composition

It should be noted that membership of ETF, EBU and ESO extends beyond the 19 countries examined in this study. However, the report will consider only the members in these 19 countries. Also, the study will be confined to those ETF affiliates whose domain is related to the inland water transport sector. Table 8 lists the membership of ETF. This list does not fully correspond to the official list of members of ETF's inland navigation section. This is because, according to the information drawn from national reports, not all of this section's affiliates actually organise employees in the inland navigation sector. According to Table 8, at least one affiliation is recorded in each country under consideration except for Hungary and Slovakia. In many countries, multiple memberships occur. Overall, ETF counts 32 direct affiliations from the countries under examination. Around 55% of the unions listed in Table 3 are directly affiliated to ETF. From available data on sectoral membership of the national trade unions, it may be concluded that ETF covers the sector's most important labour representatives. Exceptional cases of uncovered major trade unions involve only those countries without any affiliation (Hungary and Slovakia, see above). All sector-related members of ETF, for which pertinent information is available, apart from six (the Czech Republic's OSN and OSD, Denmark's 3F and HK Privat, Luxembourg's FNCTTFEL and Poland's NSZZ Solidarnóść), are involved in collective bargaining in inland waterways.

Table 6: Members of ETF, 2008

Country	Members
AT	VIDA*
BE	ACV/CSC Transcom*, BTB*
BG	FTW Podkrepa**
CZ	OSD, OSN
DE	Ver.di*
DK	3F, DFF-S*, HK Privat
FI	SMU*
FR	FGTE-CFDT*, FEETS-CGT-FO*
HU	---
IE	SIPTU*, IMPACT*
IT	FILT-CGIL*, FIT-CISL*, UILT-UIL*
LU	OGB-L*, FNCTFFEL
NL	Nautilus*, CNV Bedrijvenbond*
PL	NSZZ Solidarnóść
PT	SEMM-FESMAR***, SITEMAQ-FESMAR***, SOEMM
RO	FSNN*
SE	SEKO*, SFBF*, UNIONEN*
SK	---
UK	RMT*, UNITE*

*Notes: Membership list is confined to the sector-related associations of the countries under consideration. * Involved in collective bargaining. ** No information available on collective bargaining involvement. *** Indirect collective bargaining involvement via higher order unit.*

See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.

Source: EIRO national centres, 2009

Table 9 lists the members of EBU and ESO. Of the 19 countries under consideration, EBU has only seven under its umbrella through associational members from these countries – Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Romania. Table 5 indicates that affiliated and unaffiliated associations co-exist in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Romania. Lack of comparable membership data makes it difficult to reveal the relative importance of affiliated and unaffiliated associations in these countries. Taking into account also the role in collective bargaining as an indicator of an association's significance does not show a clear trend in this respect. In several countries, some important or even all employer organisations that conduct bargaining in the inland water transport sector are not members of EBU or ESO.

There are also at least two countries (Germany and Romania) where the affiliates of EBU are not engaged in bargaining. With regard to ESO, affiliation is recorded only for five of the 19 countries under consideration – Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and – since 2009 – Poland. Multiple memberships exist in Belgium and the Netherlands. The fact that affiliations to ESO are so scarce ensues from both the organisation's narrow membership domain (covering self-employed skippers) and the fact that a noticeable group of self-employed skippers exists only in a few countries. As is the case for EBU, the relative importance of affiliated and unaffiliated associations (they co-exist in four of the five countries where ESO affiliations can be found) is hard to assess. Employing the indicator of collective bargaining involvement does not reveal a clear trend between affiliated and unaffiliated organisations either. In France, Germany, the Netherlands and Poland, one ESO affiliate each can be found which is not engaged in bargaining, while the situation in Belgium is unclear. Strikingly, in seven out of the 14 countries that record employer organisations in the sector – that is, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Romania and Sweden – only organisations other than EBU and/or ESO affiliates conduct bargaining. In all countries, where sectoral multi-employer bargaining is absent, apart from the Czech Republic, Portugal and Poland, employer organisations do not exist at all. In these countries, it is the companies themselves which negotiate.

Table 9: Members of EBU and ESO, 2008

	EBU members	ESO members
AT	FSÖ*	-
BE	AABB*, UCV*, AMBRL*	BVE**, VBR**
BG	-	-
CZ	AVP-CZ**	-
DE	AdB*, BdB	BdS
DK	-	-
FI	-	-
FR	CAF*	CNBA
HU	-	-
IE	-	-
IT	-	-
LU	-	-
NL	CBRB*	VSDRIJ*, CBOB*, ASV, ONS*
PL	-	ZPAS
PT	-	-

RO	(AAOPFR)***	-
SE	-	-
SK	-	-
UK	-	-

*Notes: Membership list is confined to the sector-related associations of the countries under consideration. * Involved in sector-related collective bargaining. ** No information available on collective bargaining involvement. *** Observer status.*

See Annex for list of abbreviations and full names of organisations.

Source: EIRO national centres, 2009

In comparison with ETF, a significantly larger proportion of EBU's and ESO's member organisations are not involved in bargaining. Industrial relations are thus not the primary concern of these organisations. Some EBU and ESO members may have a role in industrial relations only through consultation procedures and participation in tripartite bodies (see above); in fact, they may regard themselves as trade associations rather than as industrial relations actors. By contrast, EBU and ESO members cover collective bargaining in just five (Austria, Belgium, Germany, France and the Netherlands) and only one country (the Netherlands, the situation in Belgium is unclear), respectively.

Capacity to negotiate

The third criterion of representativeness at European level refers to the organisations' capacity to negotiate on behalf of their own members. All of the three European associations involved – that is, ETF's Inland Navigation Section as well as both EBU and ESO – have said that they have been given a mandate by their respective affiliates to negotiate in matters of the European social dialogue.

As proof of the weight of ETF, EBU and ESO, it is useful to look at other European organisations that may be important representatives of the sector. This can be done by reviewing the other European organisations to which the sector-related trade unions and employer associations are affiliated.

For the trade unions, these affiliations are listed in Table 3. Accordingly, European organisations other than ETF represent only a relatively small proportion of both sector-related trade unions and countries. Among the organisations listed are the following:

- the Union Network International – Europe (UNI-Europa), with six affiliations covering five countries;
- the Nordic Transport Workers' Federation (NTF), with five affiliations covering three countries;
- the European Federation of Public Service Unions (EPSU), with four affiliations covering three countries;
- the European Federation of Trade Unions in the Food, Agriculture and Tourism Sectors and Allied Branches (EFFAT), with three affiliations covering three countries;
- the European Federation of Building and Woodworkers (EFBWW) and the Nordic Shipping Officers' Congress (NFBK), each with two affiliations in two countries;

- the European Metalworkers' Federation (EMF), the European Mine, Chemical and Energy Workers' Federation (EMCEF), NordIng, the European Commercial Managers' Federation (ECMF), the Council of Nordic Trade Unions (NFS), the Association for Nordic Engineers (ANE), Eurocadres, and the European Federation of National Engineering Associations (FEANI), with one affiliation each.

While the affiliations listed in Table 3 may not necessarily be exhaustive, this overall picture underlines the principal status of ETF as the sector's labour representative, in particular since many of the above affiliations to other European organisations reflect the overlapping domains of the affiliates rather than indicating a real reference of the affiliations to the inland water transport sector.

Table 5 provides a similar overview of European organisations to which employer organisations are affiliated. The results indicate that organisational links of the sector-related employer associations with European federations other than EBU and ESO only exist in Austria, where FSÖ, whose domain comprises the whole water transport sector, is – apart from its affiliation to EBU – also a member of the European Community Shipowners' Association (ECSA). Aside from this, Table 5 does not list one single federation other than EBU and ESO at European level. This highlights the importance of EBU and ESO as the unmatched European voices of business in the sector, even though both associations have only part of the EU Member States under their umbrella through affiliations from these countries.

Commentary

During the past 20 years, the inland navigation industry, like the maritime shipping industry, has experienced considerable economic restructuring following the deregulation of the sector by the EU. This liberalisation has triggered the privatisation and fragmentation of former national monopoly providers, mainly in the new EU Member States. It has also changed the structure of the inland water transport sector in Western Europe. According to the PINE report, two effects have been observed. One is the conversion of large transport operators into service providers organising transport and logistics. The other is the emergence of 'single-vessel operators' which carry out the actual haulage. This growing incidence of owner-operators, according to the unions, frequently results from large companies subcontracting to single-vessel operators instead of hiring them as employees. By doing this, the large companies are able to save on direct and indirect labour costs.

Economic restructuring has sparked changes, in some countries, in industrial relations systems. In Austria and Belgium, this has just meant adapting the existing industrial relations system with privatised segments of the sector incorporated into existing collective bargaining structures (Austria) or employer organisations centralised and reorganised (Belgium). By contrast, in Poland, for instance, restructuring and privatisation have brought about a marginalisation of industrial relations with the growth of owner-operators, which has led to a lack of collective arrangements. Overall, economic restructuring in the inland navigation industry has had a downward effect in several countries in terms of employment for the past two or three decades. However, in terms of volume of freight (namely, tonne-kilometres) and also, to a certain extent of passenger transport, inland shipping has recorded quite impressive traffic growth rates since the 1990s. Europe's waterway infrastructure still has a large free capacity, which has not yet been used, due to:

- a fragmented market structure;
- strong inter-modal competition;
- limited reinvestment ability;

- lack of skilled labour due to stagnating or deteriorating working conditions;
- the further existence of strategic bottlenecks;
- co-existence of different sets of rules governing inland water transport at national, international and European level;
- an overall lack of political attention towards inland shipping.

Nevertheless, in some EU countries, the inland shipping industry's recovery, has, in most cases, been bolstered by relatively stable national industrial relations systems. This is despite the fact that, as outlined earlier, density of the trade unions is relatively low (data on the employer organisations are in most cases not available and thus do not provide a clear picture). In spite of low unionisation rates in inland waterways, the sector records a comparatively high level of collective bargaining coverage. In the case of larger companies dominating the sector, single-employer bargaining tends to prevail. By contrast, in a notable number of countries multi-employer bargaining, conducted by employer organisations, is the dominating pattern. Overall, there are slightly more countries operating under predominant multi-employer bargaining than countries with prevalent single-employer bargaining. However, it is important to note that – despite relatively high collective bargaining coverage rates – overall working conditions have remained relatively poor. This is because, in most of the countries with inland shipping, only small numbers of the workers are regularly employed, whereas many workers from outside the EU are employed on a 'non-standard' basis. Certain categories of employees – mostly foreign nationals – are excluded from national standard labour/social security law and/or the coverage of the applicable collective agreements – as seen at least in the cases of Austria and Romania. High incidences of atypical and poorly regulated employment in the sector strongly questions the finding of well-established industrial relations structures, at least as far as foreign crews are concerned.

Several EU shipping operators have sought to reduce costs in order to remain competitive in a global market. A trend for 'flagging out' and replacing EU crews with cheaper third-country nationals, who are often subjected to inferior conditions, has been observed by ITF for at least 20 years, similar in a way to the trend for this in the maritime shipping industry. Trades unions are calling for a uniform, EU-wide regulatory framework to govern at least the social and labour law aspects in European inland shipping. They argue this would be the only effective means of preventing inland shipping companies from operating from 'low-standard' countries in order to avoid collective bargaining, labour and social standards.

In order to promote this kind of framework, employer organisations EBU and ESO, and ETF for the employees, have started social dialogue. A working programme has been drawn up, dedicated to working time issues, the creation of a level-playing field as well as the harmonisation of job profiles, occupations and qualifications and manning requirements (EBU, 2008). This should help not only to establish fair and uniform working conditions, but also fair and competitive conditions throughout Europe. As outlined earlier, EBU, ESO and ETF are certainly by far the most relevant, if not the only EU-wide representatives of the sector's employers and employees. Thus, these three organisations have to be regarded as the best representatives of both sides of the sector's industry, even though their competence, in terms of labour market regulation, may still be in its infancy.

References

European Barge Union (EBU), *Annual report 07/08: Inland navigation – a vital part of logistics*, Brussels, 2008.

Traxler, F., 'The metamorphoses of corporatism', *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 43, No. 4, 2004.

Traxler, F., Blaschke, S. and Kittel, B., *National labour relations in internationalised markets*, Oxford University Press, 2001.

Annex: List of abbreviations

Country	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
Austria (AT)	FSÖ	Austrian Shipowners' Association
	ÖGB	Austrian Trade Union Federation
	VIDA	Vida Trade Union
	WKÖ	Austrian Federal Economic Chamber
Belgium (BE)	AABB	Algemeen Aktiecomité der Belgische Binnenscheepvaartorganisaties V.Z.W.
	ABVV/FGTB	Belgian General Federation of Labour
	ACV/CSC	Confederation of Christian Trade Unions
	ACV/CSC-Transcom	Confederation of Christian Trade Unions – Transport and Communication
	AEQUITAS	n.a.
	AMBRL	Association des Maitres Batelier des Régions de Liège
	BTB	Belgian Transport Workers' Federation
	BVE	Bond van Eigenschippers
	FBB	Fédération Batellerie Belge
	UCV	Unie der Continentale Vaart
	VBO/FEB	Belgian Federation of Employers
	VBR	Vereniging van Belgische Reders
Bulgaria (BG)	BSA	Bulgarian Shipowners' Association
	BSC	Bulgarian Sea Chamber
	CITUB	Confederation of Independent Trade Unions in Bulgaria
	FTW Podkrepa	Federation of Transport Workers Podkrepa
	FTTUB	Federation of Transport Trade Unions in Bulgaria
	TURNW	Trade Union of River Navigation Workers
Czech Republic (CZ)	AVP-CZ	n.a.
	ČMKOS	Czech-Moravian Confederation of Trade Unions
	OSD	Transport Workers' Union

	OSN	Czech Trade Union of Seafarers
Denmark (DK)	3F	United Federation of Danish Workers
	CDE	Confederation of Danish Employers
	CO-Industri	Central Organisation for Industrial Employees
	DFF-S	Danish Clerical Union
	DI	Confederation of Danish Industries
	HK	Union of Commercial and Clerical Employees in Denmark
	LO	Danish Confederation of Trade Unions
Finland (FI)	EK	Confederation of Finnish Industries
	RASILA	Employer Association for Coastal and Inland Water Transport
	SAK	Central Organisation of Finnish Trade Unions
	SKL	Finnish Engineers' Association
	SLPL	Finnish Ship Officers' Association
	SM	Finland's Passenger-Ship Association
	SMU	Finnish Seamen's Union
	STTK	Finnish Confederation of Salaried Employees
France (FR)	CAF	Committee of Inland Navigation Ship-owners
	CFDT	French Democratic Confederation of Labour
	CFE-CGC	French Confederation of Professional and Managerial Staff – General Confederation of Professional and Managerial Staff
	CGT	General Confederation of Labour
	CGT-FO	General Confederation of Labour – Force ouvrière
	CNBA	National Chamber of Self-Employed Inland Shipping Entrepreneurs
	FEETS	Federation of Civil Engineering, Environment, Transport and Services
	FGTE	General Federation of Transport and Civil Engineering
	FNETT	National Federation of Transport and Tourism Managers
	FPD	Federation of Ports and Docks
	MEDEF	Movement of French Enterprises
	SGMF	General Union of Inland Water Transport
Germany	AdB	Employer Association for the Inland Water Transport

(DE)		Sector
	BdB	Federal Association for the Inland Water Transport in Germany
	BdS - BiSchi	German Association of Self-Employed People: Inland Water Transport Section
	DGB	Confederation of German Trade Unions
	ver.di	United Services Union
Hungary (HU)	BHFS	Independent Trade Union of Shipping on Lake Balaton
	BHZS	Trade Union of Balaton Shipping
	FHFS	Independent Trade Union of Waterway Navigators
	MSZOSZ	National Association of Hungarian Trade Unions
Ireland (IE)	IBEC	Irish Business and Employers Confederation
	ICTU	Irish Congress of Trade Unions
	IMPACT	Irish Municipal Public and Civil Trade Union
	SIPTU	Services, Industrial, Professional and Technical Union
Italy (IT)	ASSTRA	Association of Local Public Transport Companies
	CGIL	General Confederation of Italian Workers
	CISAL	Italian Confederation of Autonomous Workers' Trade Unions
	CISL	Italian Confederation of Workers' Trade Unions
	CONFINDUSTRIA	General Confederation of Italian Industry
	CONFSERVIZI	National Confederation of Services of General Interest
	FAISA	Italian Autonomous Trade Union Federation of Local Transport Workers
	FEDERMANAGER	National Federation of Industrial Company Managers
	FILT	Italian Federation of Transport Workers
	FIT	Italian Transport Federation
	UIL	Union of Italian Workers
	UILT-UILTRASPORTI	Italian Union of Transport Workers
	UGL TRASPORTI	General Union of Workers – Transport
Luxembourg (LU)	CGT-L	General Confederation of Labour in Luxembourg
	FCPT-Syprolux	Fédération Chrétienne du Personnel des Transports – Syndicat Professionel des Cheminots Luxembourgeois
	FNCTTFEL	Fédération Nationale des Cheminots, Travailleurs du

		Transport, Fonctionnaires et Employés publics du Luxembourg
	LCGB	Luxembourg Christian Union Federation
	OGB-L	Independent Luxembourg Union Federation
Netherlands (NL)	ASV	General Skippers Association
	AWVN	General Employers' Association of the Netherlands
	CBOB	Christian Union for Entrepreneurs in Inland Shipping
	CBRB	Central Office for Rhine and Inland Waterways
	CNV	Christian Trade Union Federation
	CNV Bedrijvenbond	Industry, Food and Transport Workers' Union, affiliated to CNV
	FNV BG	Federation of Dutch Trade Unions – Bondgenoten
	KVNR	Koninklijke Vereniging van Nederlandse Reders
	Nautilus	Union for Maritime Professionals
	ONS	Independent Dutch Skippers' Union
	VNO-NCW	Confederation of Netherlands Industry and Employers
	VSDRIJ	Association for Towing and Tugging on Rhine and Ijssel
Poland (PL)	NSZZ Solidarność	Independent and Self-Governing Trade Union Solidarity
	ZPAS	Polish Independent Shipowners' Association
Portugal (PT)	AATF	Association of River Transport Operators
	CGTP	General Portuguese Workers' Confederation
	FESMAR	Federation of Sea Workers
	FETESE	Federation of Unions of Workers and Technicians in Services
	SEMM	Union of Engineers in the Merchant Marine
	SIMAMEVIP	Union Workers at the Merchant Marine, Transport Agents and Fishery
	SINCOMAR	Union of Captains [and] Officers of the Merchant Marine
	SITEMAQ	Union of Seamanship at the Merchant Marine, Energy and Stokers on Land
	SITESE	Union of Workers and Technicians in Services
	SITRA	Union of Transport Workers
	SMMCMM	Union of Petty Officers and Seamanship at the Merchant Marine

	SNTSF	National Union of Workers in the Railway Sector
	SOEMM	Union of Officers and Machine Engineers of the Merchant Marine
	STFCMM	Union of River, Coast and Sea Transport
	UGT	General Workers' Confederation
Romania (RO)	AAOPFR	Romanian Association of Inland Shipowners and Port Operators
	APTNEP	Employer Association in Naval Transport and Port Operators
	ASTR	Trade Unions of Transport Operators in Romania
	CNPR	National Confederation of Romanian Employers
	CSN Meridian	National Trade Union Confederation Meridian
	FSNN	National Union Federation The Navigator
Slovakia (SK)	KOZ SR	Confederation of Trade Unions
	OZ PVD	Trade Union of Water Transport Employees
	ÚDPT SR	Union of Transport, Post and Telecommunications
Sweden (SE)	ALMEGA	Swedish Service Employers' Association
	CF	Swedish Association of Graduate Engineers
	LEDARNA	Swedish Association for Managerial and Professional Staff
	LO	Swedish Trade Union Confederation
	NFWO	New Forms of Work Organisation
	SACO	Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations
	SARF	Swedish Transport Group
	SBF	Merchant Marine Officers' Association
	SEKO	Swedish Association for Service and Communication Employees
	SFBF	Swedish Ship Officers' Association
	SN - Svenskt Näringsliv	Confederation of Swedish Enterprise
	TCO	Swedish Confederation for Professional Employees
	TJ	SACO Association Traffic and Railways
	Unionen (former HTF)	Trade Union for Professionals in the Private Sector
United Kingdom	RMT	National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers

(UK)		
	TUC	Trades Union Congress
	UKPA	UK Pilots Association in the Marine Sector
	UNISON	UNISON Public Service Trade Union
	Unite	Unite General Union

Europe	Abbreviation	Full name of organisation
	ANE	Association of Nordic Engineers
	EBU	European Barge Union
	ECMF	European Commercial Managers' Federation
	ECSA	European Community Shipowners' Association
	EFBWW	European Federation of Building and Woodworkers
	EFFAT	European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions
	EMCEF	European Mine, Chemical and Energy Workers' Federation
	EMF	European Metalworkers' Federation
	EPSU	European Federation of Public Service Unions
	ESO	European Skippers' Organisation
	ETF	European Transport Workers' Federation
	Eurocadres	Council of European Professional and Managerial Staff
	FEANI	European Federation of National Engineering Associations
	NFBK	Nordic Shipping Officers' Congress
	NFS	Council of Nordic Trade Unions
	NordIng	
	NTF	Nordic Transport Workers' Federation
	UNI-Europa	Union Network International – Europe

Georg Adam, Department of Industrial Sociology, University of Vienna

EF/10/44/EN