

**Danuta Hübner**  
**Chair of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs, European Parliament**

**Remarks during the opening panel: Plugging the Skills Gap**

*Women3. The Power of Three Forum*  
*13 November 2015, Istanbul, Turkey*

I would like to start with a question which seems rather relevant for our discussion today. What are governments and parliaments today for? They are certainly to provide inclusive law. They are to ensure that we have an inclusive society. They are to facilitate development of inclusive enterprises. And last but not least, they are here and now to run inclusive policies. On either of these four necessities the contemporary democracies do not deliver to the satisfaction of citizens.

It is particularly visible in the broader context of the labor market. For decades we have been accumulating mismatches between what universities produce in terms of skills and talents and what businesses need.

This is an immediate effect of the fact that businesses and universities do not talk to each other. That businesses and governments do not talk to each other. That ministers of education do not talk to ministers of labor. Governments and parliaments are organized sectorially. All those who should get together to identify problems and find the best solutions for them live happily in their separate worlds. Functioning in silos does not provide a chance for a collusion of minds. And a good leadership often grows out of such a collusion.

Why is it so? Because governments and parliaments are a man's world with a tradition of hierarchical organization. It is practically entirely unlikely that such an organization can lead to a shared mindset.

Yesterday Laura Liswood told us that homogenous groups do not generate good solutions. Still, they are convinced they reach them.

If the entry barriers were less impermeable and a critical mass of women invaded governments and parliaments, we would have more collaborative models of management, fire place type of management where we could share not only warmth but also ideas and action.

Achieving critical mass of women in the public decision making bodies is a remote objective, today we see far too often a complete absence of women in those organizations. No wonder therefore that in governments there is no understanding of gender specific impact of policies and policy tools. Even if we put aside the ideology, we will still see lack of institutional capacity to analyze such impacts.

Julie Teigland mentioned before that in the years to come most of new jobs will be created in digital economy. It is a good example of a labor market segment where an important gender skill gap can grow. Girls do not go to technical universities. There

are many reasons for that, among others the fact that families do not encourage them to do it, peers do not encourage them, universities do not reach out to girls. Once again we will put women at disadvantage on the labor market by adding a new mismatch. But the loss is for entire society, not only for women.

The cost for society comes from the fact that technologies of today and tomorrow are not only about technology as such. New high technologies, and ICT in particular, to bring full benefits to our societies require understanding of the fast changing society and its changing needs, of new patterns of relations, of changing consumers' culture. The economy ahead of us will be more concentrated in industries that require a combination of hard skills with social skills. I also suspect that we, as economic and social actors, will need adaptability skills to change occurring at fast rate.

This change is tailored made for women. This is the environment where women thrive. This is about economy where everybody will be a stakeholder. Laura said yesterday how men care about shareholders, how women care about stakeholders.

This will be economy where everybody can become a leader in her or his field in "the room of their own". You might remember that Virginia Woolf talked about such a room as a sign of exclusion or a self-induced separation due to discriminatory practices against women. But today or tomorrow such "a room of her own" can be a place of creativity and collaboration across divides.

We are living era of a massive behavioral change, taking us toward a more collaborative society, sharing economy. But also more competitive when it comes to results. We are going to live under a collaborative- competitive tension.

If we do not want that with every new government we start the flight from scratch, we need binding legal solutions, like those on quotas on electoral lists. Sustainability of change can only come with legal guarantees.

But what is also needed is an overhaul of thinking about what is a cost in our socio-economic practices and what is an asset or social investment. Gender stereotypes are a cost. But we can afford going beyond fighting stereotypes. Julie said yesterday that we are a movement. I think we are more than a movement. Movement is against something, to say no to something. But we are further, we have a positive, constructive agenda. And it is not a feminist agenda, it is an agenda for a society that embraces new challenges with full use of its most precious assets. What we need is to make ourselves a more visible driver of the change.

We must work on getting more women into politics because our agenda is a new leadership agenda. Women go for politics of fairness and equality, for collaborative models of leadership, they detest dogmatism, look for smarter and leaner solutions, feel good out of the box, and definitely are better prepared when making the first step.

And I hope you will forgive my language but let me say that to start a change it is helpful if you are a little bit pissed off, a little bit angry. I think we are and this time it is a good news.