

Vice-President Kallas' staff forum – 12 October 2007

Answers to written questions received before and after the staff forum.

Index of questions (click for direct link to answer)

1) Need for keeping a summary record in Intranet of all issues to be raised at the Forum for the purpose to evaluate potential progress.

Suggestion to create an e-mail address where anyone concerned would be able to forward questions related to staff issues.

2) Staff forum transmission and video-conferencing facilities in Luxembourg

3) Involvement and participation of the staff working in the delegations in the staff forum

4) How does the Commission intend to promote the use of public transport by its staff?

5) Commission's housing policy: In the building Belliard 100 the quality of air (exposure to heavy road traffic) is a matter of concern for all staff working in this building; certain individuals already suffering from other health handicaps feel that equal treatment in terms of quality of the working place is not respected.

6) Parking places: In view of reducing the stress at the working place and to better combine private life and work sufficient parking places are a "must". What measures could the Commission propose? At B-100 the parking slots available are insufficient, it is proposed that the Commission hires parking possibilities of the parking area close to this building.

7) The staff feels that the Commission is not actively promoting sportive activities. The facilities offered by the Commission are not up to standard. An alternative would be the Commission negotiates rates with private sport clubs

8) The Commission promotes the mobility of staff, but there are no convincing measures that the resource gaps left by this internal mobility are temporarily filled. The hire of temporary staff is extremely difficult.

9) Equally the obligatory language training reduces the resources available (4 hours per week) without any compensation for the unit, colleagues have to accept higher work loads.

10) The access to posts of the middle management for officials appears to become more and more difficult. The prerequisite of having gathered experience in a similar position makes the internal career impossible.

10b) The staff feels that the promotion perspectives are seriously declining, especially if compared with those of other institutions. A clear Commission position is therefore most appropriate and would be largely appreciated.

11) Following the 2006 Staff Opinion survey, the Vice-President is invited to report about the evolution -since the last inquiry- of the Commission staff feeling of satisfaction and of pride for working for the institution.

12) Medical fees reimbursement:

- Staff deplores to pay in their home countries for health care more than their compatriots.
- The Commission is invited to comment about a European Health Card which would help to ensure the same costs for the same health service.

13) The availability of a wheel chair at the reception of some Commission buildings, to facility access for colleagues with temporary walking difficulty.

14) Lack of adequate meeting rooms and office space

15) Shortage of places in the Commission kindergartens (crèches).

16) European Schools

- Does the Commission consider the recent unilateral announcement Belgian authorities to delay the opening of the 4th European School in Laeken as a breach of Belgian contractual obligations?

- Does the Commission intend to take any legal or other actions against Belgian in this respect?

- If the answer is basically No (or No-equivalent "nice talk"): how would he assess the impact of such Commission non-action on the future Belgian attitude towards European Schools and on the impression given to Commission personnel (i.e. to my opinion non-action would clearly demonstrate that the Commission does not care about future developments of European Schools)?

- Would the Commission take any measures on the appropriate levels (e.g. school boards) that the current "sibling enrolment policy" is (at least partially) abandoned if further delays for Laeken are inevitable? Obviously this would mean making available more resources for the existing three Brussels European Schools.

- La Commission n'aurait-elle pas intérêt à augmenter l'allocation non forfaitaire pour rendre les autres écoles internationales à Bruxelles plus accessibles financièrement

17) Need for creating a new cellule "Chargé de mission"

18) Quels sont les possibilités de progresser pour les collègues qui ont réussi les GFIII?

19) Revision of the CDR and promotion system – doubts of the advantages of a qualitative appraisal system with a number of limited performance groups and a fixed range of promotion points

20) Internal competitions for translators of new language departments in DGT

1) Need for keeping a summary record in Intranet of all issues to be raised at the Forum for the purpose to evaluate potential progress.
Suggestion to create an e-mail address where anyone concerned would be able to forward questions related to staff issues.

The Staff Forum was established by Vice President Kallas to allow a regular annual debate between himself and Commission staff on a whole range of topical issues affecting staff. It is one of several different means of communicating with staff. For example, regular feedback on key issues is provided by means of mailings to 'everybody', through dedicated sites such as the European Schools site, via articles in Commission en Direct and through Intracomm, to mention but a few. There are also arrangements in place for consultation and feedback in many key areas for which the Admin family is responsible.

VP Kallas welcomes the above proposals. Therefore, in order to ensure that the annual Staff Forum is as productive and informed as possible, a dedicated Intracomm page will be opened one month before the next Staff Forum to provide up-to-date information on the key questions raised this time round, including for instance, progress with the CDR, the treatment of Contractual Agents, the situation with the European Schools.

Arrangements will also be made to receive advance questions from staff during the same period. This will allow the Vice President to tailor his opening comments to address key areas of concern without however pre-empting the opportunities for open debate during the Forum itself.

2) Staff forum transmission and video-conferencing facilities in Luxembourg

DG Admin concentrated Luxembourg's video conference link to my staff forum on the Kirchberg for a number of reasons:

Our experience with similar events is that take-up has been very limited when we offer video conferencing simultaneously in various locations in Luxembourg. As the staff forum is also an occasion to bring together staff from different DGs and services, we chose to concentrate our Luxembourg video-conferencing in the JMO M1 room. Moreover, staff also had the possibility of following the event from their own PCs via webstreaming.

Also, for the first time this year, we were able to offer audio-transmission from the Brussels site in English, French and German, thanks to the efforts of colleagues in SCIC. This level of multi-lingual access could only be made available in one video-conferencing room.

We will, however, consider your suggestions and this technical information when we plan the 2008 staff forum.

3) Involvement and participation of the staff working in the delegations in the staff forum

The format of this year's event was largely based on the highly successful first forum which took place in June 2006; participants from Commission DGs and Services put questions directly to Vice-President Kallas from the Charlemagne building in Brussels or via video link from Luxembourg.

We will consider your helpful suggestions and look to how they could increase the participation of Commission staff throughout the world when we organise the 2008 staff forum.

4) How does the Commission intend to promote the use of public transport by its staff?

In Brussels, work-related movements are assured by EUROBUS (lines 21 and 22), One Way Tickets and Airport Tickets, supplied under contracts negotiated with the STIB and distributed free of charge to Commission staff. In Luxembourg, the Commission has already secured significant advantages for users of the bus lines of the City of Luxembourg.

As regards the private use of public transport – for travelling to work – the Mobility Plan 2006-2009 adopted by the Commission in March 2006 anticipated, among other initiatives, the introduction of a financial contribution to the cost of public transport season tickets for staff, linking it to a mandatory renunciation to parking access badges. However, the implementation of this contribution scheme was conditional and dependent on the Commission receiving the necessary funding from the Budgetary Authority, which was denied for 2007 and again in the PDB for 2008.

Nonetheless, to promote the use of public transport, the Commission organizes each year information stands in the Commission buildings during the Mobility Week in September, in collaboration with the STIB and SNCB. Up-to-date information on public transport is available on IntraComm, with direct links to the STIB site, allowing user-friendly on-line verification of the best connections for individual needs. A special conference on public transport facilities was organized for the staff of the Commission in September 2006, with presentations by the STIB and SNCB. The map of the modified STIB network was distributed to all personnel in August 2007. In pursuing improvements to the quality of public transport, the Commission forwards to the operators all remarks and suggestions received from staff. As a result of the Commission's intervention the frequency of bus line 21 which serves rue de Genève, has been increased, the bus stops on rue d'Archimède outside the Berlaymont have been rearranged and more electronic panels showing the real-time position of buses have been planned for the bus stops most frequently used by Commission staff.

5) Commission's housing policy: In the building Belliard 100 the quality of air (exposure to heavy road traffic) is a matter of concern for all staff working in this building; certain individuals already suffering from other health handicaps feel that equal treatment in terms of quality of the working place is not respected.

The same air quality norms are applied in all Commission buildings. The air which comes into B-100 via the air conditioning system is drawn from the side of the building away from the street in question, through vents close to the top of the building before being passed through filters and being blown into the offices.

Problems can occur when staff open windows, allowing unfiltered external air, which may carry raised levels of dust, etc, into the building. DS 6 - USHT advises that windows should remain closed to avoid such problems and also to allow the air conditioning to work effectively. Recent air quality tests, focussing on microbiological and fungal levels, have found that the results are in line with those set at European level and found no evidence of pathogens that could be injurious to human health.

6) Parking places: In view of reducing the stress at the working place and to better combine private life and work sufficient parking places are a "must". What measures could the Commission propose? At B-100 the parking slots available are insufficient, it is proposed that the Commission hires parking possibilities of the parking area close to this building.

The number of parking places allowed per building is regulated by the local authority under planning and environmental permits at the time of construction or major renovation of buildings.

It should be noted that there is growing environmental pressure to further limit office parking in the centre of the city. For this reason, the Commission encourages the use of public transport and other alternative means of transport, an example of which is car-sharing (it is hoped to set up a website to facilitate car-sharing and to raise awareness through a series of articles in CenD).

Internally, the Commission reserves a number of parking spaces in line with DGs' and Services' organization charts. In addition, a number of places are reserved for medical cases, for use by technical services and two-wheeled vehicles such as motorcycles and bicycles. All remaining spaces in all Commission buildings are available to staff who have a parking access card, so as to allow colleagues the flexibility, if desired, of choosing to park in one building while working in another.

7) The staff feels that the Commission is not actively promoting sportive activities. The facilities offered by the Commission are not up to standard. An alternative would be the Commission negotiates rates with private sport clubs.

La Commission souhaite que son personnel puisse faire des activités sportives. Une série d'accords pour un tarif préférentiel est disponible sur le site : http://www.cc.cec/pers_admin/leisure_bxl/clubs_fr.html. Le centre sportif d'Overijse offre aussi la possibilité aux membres du personnel d'exercer certains sports. Des subventions sont accordées à des cercles de loisirs, dont certains proposent des activités sportives. Bien entendu, cet effort sera poursuivi tout en tenant compte des contraintes budgétaires qui sont imposées à l'Institution.

8) The Commission promotes the mobility of staff, but there are no convincing measures that the resource gaps left by this internal mobility are temporarily filled. The hire of temporary staff is extremely difficult.

The importance of planning and good human resource management practices cannot be underestimated in ensuring a positive experience of mobility for both the member of staff concerned and the institution as a whole. Ideally, there should be little or no resource gaps due to mobility. While it is not always possible to anticipate mobility, in some cases it is, for example in compulsory mobility, and this type of mobility can be well prepared and planned. DGs are free to publish posts even before they become vacant. For 'normal' (unanticipated) mobility, planning and good HR management is essential (publishing and filling vacant posts quickly).

Where there are unavoidable short gaps between a member of staff leaving a post and the new member of staff coming on board, good co-operation between the units involved should allow for support of the old unit and the new colleague. This should also include 'old' colleagues being available to answer questions etc and the preparation of handover files.

The hire of temporary staff (primarily contract agents) is also possible but should be used in cases where a post remains vacant for a longer period of time.

9) Equally the obligatory language training reduces the resources available (4 hours per week) without any compensation for the unit, colleagues have to accept higher work loads.

The balancing of work demands and essential training is a challenging issue for everyone in organisation, managers and staff alike, and does not only concern language training. The introduction of Art 45.2 in 2006, however, has not resulted in an overall increase in the number of participants in language training: in 2005,

our standard twice-weekly courses had a total of 10, 486 participants and in 2006 this figure was 10,348, so the impact on workplace resources in general has remained the same.

10) The access to posts of the middle management for officials appears to become more and more difficult. The prerequisite of having gathered experience in a similar position makes the internal career impossible.

Even though the Commission does not apply a quota system, it is in its interest to have a fair representation of all Member States amongst its staff. In order to guarantee such a sufficiently balanced representation of the new MS, recruitment targets for all levels of staff were fixed, including for middle and senior management levels. Sufficient new middle management functions were created since 2004 in order to cope with recruitment of EU-10 middle managers. Enlargement should therefore not have a significant impact on the possibilities for internal promotion to middle management functions. Moreover:

- Recruitment targets for middle management staff from EU-12 were allocated to the services on the basis of a balanced methodology, taking account of the number of middle and senior management posts, the number of additional posts received, turnover of management staff (retirement, mobility) and the specificity of the organisational structure of the DG (i.e. the room for creation of additional units/directorates).
- Control over the creation of units and directorates in DGs has indeed been tightened (this is now – more than was the case in the past – linked to overall staff, DG "family" as well as business rationale), but nevertheless – as stated above – quite some additional units *were* created since 2004, amongst others as a consequence of the additional posts allocated in the context of the EU-10 enlargement.
- The age structure of the management population and the resulting natural turnover will also provide quite some space for internal promotion.

The only prerequisite for applying for a *first* middle management position is to have followed the appropriate introductory management course.

Of course, a management career cannot be a prospect for all – not every colleague aspires to this type of career anyway. But overall, sufficient possibilities for normal career progression will continue to be available for those Commission officials who have the ambition *and* the potential to be organisation's future managers.

10b) The staff feels that the promotion perspectives are seriously declining, especially if compared with those of other institutions. A clear Commission position is therefore most appropriate and would be largely appreciated.

There is no basis for thinking that promotion perspectives are seriously declining. The method for requesting promotions to the budgetary authority is to translate promotion rates into the average length of time in the grade as set out in the staff regulations. We must demonstrate then to the budgetary authority that we respect the promotion speeds as set out in the staff regulations.

In recent years the number of promotions has been on a continuously increasing curve, even in what have been grades with a traditionally higher average length of stay. For the AD10, for example, grade the promotion rate has gone from 20% in 2003 to 37% in 2007. Far from promotion perspectives declining, the current upward trend will continue in coming years until a cruising speed is reached for all grades of the promotion rates set out in Annex 1B of the staff regulations which equally apply to the other institutions. While promotion rates in the entry grades are still below those in most others, this is because many officials in these grades are not eligible for promotion or have a seniority well below the average. Already in 2008, officials in these grades should see a substantial increase in the number of promotions compared to 2007.

11) Following the 2006 Staff Opinion survey, the Vice-President is invited to report about the evolution -since the last inquiry- of the Commission staff feeling of satisfaction and of pride for working for the institution.

The annual staff opinion survey has been a recurrent exercise since 2004. DG ADMIN reiterated, in its current and previous management plans, its decision to carry out an annual Staff Opinion Survey among Commission staff. As in previous years, the objective of the 2006 staff opinion survey was to “measure” the satisfaction levels of staff, and to what extent their expectations were met. It also compared the findings to those of 2004 and 2005. The report is available to all staff via the following Intranet site of ADMIN at http://www.cc.cec/dgintranet/admin/policy/planning/docs_evaluation/projects_2006/staff_opinion_survey.zip

In 2004 and 2005, DG ADMIN asked at the same time questions about the general working environment in the Commission, the services of DG ADMIN and the services of the Administrative Offices (the Paymaster Office, the Office for Infrastructure and logistics in Brussels and the Office for Infrastructure and logistics in Luxembourg). This resulted in comprehensive but somewhat long surveys. The approach of the third general staff survey was changed and the survey exercise was split into a two-year cycle. It was considered that this two-year cycle would streamline the survey length by splitting it up into two parts, one related to services of DG ADMIN and another related to the services of the Administrative Offices.

The 2006 survey was launched on Tuesday, 14 November and was closed on Thursday 30 November 2006. It dealt with the general working environment for Commission staff and the services of DG ADMIN only. In November 2007, DG ADMIN will ask staff core questions about the Commission's working environment, as well as questions on how satisfied they are with the services provided by the three Administrative Offices.

As regards the 2006 staff opinion survey, 23% more staff members participated as compared to 2005; this shows that staff see the benefit of this survey and that they are interested in it (6312 respondents in 2005 and 7734 in 2006).

The results of the survey show, overall, quite similar results compared to the two previous years. The results of the 2006 staff opinion survey clearly suggest that the European Commission is perceived by the large majority of its staff as being a good workplace in the sense of providing them with high job satisfaction and positive interpersonal relationships. In the section "Working in the Commission" seen from the motivational aspect, the constantly very high level of satisfaction shown for the items "job content and tasks in general", "the level of responsibilities and tasks in the job", "the opportunity to take decisions" and the "possibility to use experience and knowledge" is crucial and maybe the most important result of this survey. The high level of discontent in the previous 2 surveys with the "relation between work performance and career" – 45% stated to be dissatisfied or very dissatisfied – did not change. This element was taken into account when DG ADMIN proposed a revision of the CDR system. In regard to management in the Commission, the majority of the respondents are positive in regard to the appreciation of their line managers. However, the "clear feedback on the work – by the manager" was given a low score.

The general satisfaction with the services provided by DG ADMIN has increased slightly – but coming from a modest level of appreciation.

On 19 December 2006, the preliminary report on the results of the survey was distributed among the ADMIN and Office Directors. The data of the 2006 survey were subsequently statistically analysed by external consultants and they delivered the detailed aggregated overview. The Evaluation Function of DG ADMIN reviewed and interpreted the data and completed the survey report in April 2007.

The results of the 2006 staff opinion survey were explained in an article called "Feeling good? - 2006 Staff Opinion Survey results" published in Commission en Direct in June of this year. The results were also highlighted in an article in the newsletter "Management Matters" in May 2007.

As to the evolution since the publishing of 2006 survey results, it is too early to tell. As for the follow-up to the 2006 survey, each Service, Directorate or unit in DG ADMIN is to prepare, e.g. design and implement, the necessary actions to address as much as possible the concerns and the suggestions for improvement that were made by staff. This mainly refers to the services of DG ADMIN and of course not directly to the working environment of staff, where we are all jointly responsible in a way for our motivation and job satisfaction. Due to the fact that this is a recurrent exercise with a two-year cycle, DG ADMIN will detail the evolution and the actions that were taken before the launch of the new survey, expected around the period of October 2008. Having said so, the staff opinion

survey is a measurement of staff perception and this exercise is therefore complemented by in-depth evaluations into specific activities or policies to get a more complete and evidence-based picture. The evolution would therefore have to be seen in a broader context and the comparison of the results of different years, with the indication of the trend, highlights in itself the evolution.

12) Medical fees reimbursement:

- **Staff deplores to pay in their home countries for health care more than their compatriots.**

1. New equality coefficients have been adopted by the College of Heads of Administration and brought into force on 1 July 2007. These coefficients ensure that for all treatments with a reimbursement ceiling, the actual rate of reimbursement is the same in all Member States in at least 8 cases out of 10. The reimbursement ceilings have also been revised upwards.

2. New General Implementing Provisions for the reimbursement of medical expenses have foreseen the extension of the direct billing scheme to the one day clinic or to expensive therapeutic treatments; and the payment of an advance on medical expenses to persons who have low incomes.

- **The Commission is invited to comment about a European Health Card which would help to ensure the same costs for the same health service.**

The Regulation 1408/71 does not allow the persons insured by the Joint Sickness Insurance Scheme (JSIS) to benefit from the European health insurance card. Indeed, even if the JSIS is a primary system of obligatory sickness insurance, it is not treated as a national system of Social Security. Moreover, the conditions of coverage and access to the care in the countries accepting the European health insurance card are limited.

Wishing to maintain the full coverage level offered by the Staff Regulation and, aware of the need for the Members of the JSIS to have a world recognition by the health establishments (public or private), the Central Office of the JSIS is currently working towards a solution which would give global health coverage (public or private) allowing, for example, automatic direct billing in case of hospitalisation.

If staff experience difficulties in specific EU countries using the staff regulation provisions (for example the 'prise en charge' form given by the Commission), then they should inform the PMO/Vice-President who can then take the matter up with the appropriate authorities.

13) The availability of a wheel chair at the reception of some Commission buildings, to facility access for colleagues with temporary walking difficulty.

La Commission dispose de chaises roulantes et de brancards dans la plupart de ses bâtiments pour répondre aux urgences survenues sur le lieu du travail.

Dans le cas où un fonctionnaire ou agent, qui après autorisation par son médecin traitant, serait autorisé à travailler tout en nécessitant une chaise roulante, le service médical et son secteur interventions psychosociales prendront immédiatement toutes les mesures nécessaires pour répondre à ce besoin.

La Commission privilégie pour ce genre de problèmes une approche individualisée de sorte à apporter une réponse personnalisée au besoin spécifique de la personne considérée.

14) Lack of adequate meeting rooms and office space

The acquisition of office space in Brussels to DGs and Services is based on a thorough analysis of needs carried out by OIB in close collaboration with the DG or Service concerned. This analysis takes into consideration the number of staff

in position as set down in the APB. It also takes account of specific needs related to meeting and conference rooms, archiving space, video conference facilities, etc., as well as space related to the hierarchical needs.

It is nonetheless true that the Commission is currently experiencing a lack of reserve space, due to the necessary refurbishment of three of its buildings (BU24, BU29 and N105) under their respective contractual obligations. The situation is expected to improve somewhat as BU24 and BU29 re-enter the Commission's buildings park in March 2008 and N-105 in July 2008. However, additional needs for office space directly related to new staff recruitments following recent enlargements will continue to put pressure on space until the Commission acquires new office space estimated necessary to meet these demands.

The real question perhaps is how to optimise existing space and particularly the use of large meeting rooms. The sharing of meeting rooms amongst DGs should be encouraged and can work successfully as is the case for meeting rooms on the Beaulieu site, where the various DGs have shared meeting rooms since the beginning.

15) Shortage of places in the Commission kindergartens (crèches).

Up until now, the Commission has always been able to provide enough places in our nurseries in the "école maternelle" for children between the ages of 3 and 4, as some parents decide to take their children out of the nursery at the age of 2½ or 3 and put them into Belgian schools.

Between 2006 and 2007, 135 new nursery places became available; 81 of these places are located in two private local nurseries and 54 places in the new nursery in rue de Genève. In addition, OIB took over the management of the Council's new nursery where another 20 to 30 places have been made available to the Commission up until 2009.

OIB is also studying a project that foresees the opening of a new nursery in a building adjacent to the "Clovis" crèche.

Another project, "Cornet Lemman" nursery project is progressing. It is hoped to open this new nursery at the end of 2009.

Finally, OIB is currently analysing the possibility of a wider recourse to places in local nurseries until the opening of new Commission nurseries. Parents who already have children in the local nurseries under contract with the Commission are very satisfied. OIB is in close contact with the management staff of these nurseries to ensure that the contract specifications are respected. These nurseries have also been inspected by the USHT to ensure that the necessary safety and security measures are correctly implemented.

16) European Schools

- **Does the Commission consider the recent unilateral announcement (http://www.cc.cec/pers_admin/social_bxl/documents/eursc_message_280907_en.pdf) of Belgian authorities to delay the opening of the 4th European School in Laeken as a breach of Belgian contractual obligations?**

The Commission has demanded that the Belgian authorities should explain themselves and provide more details on the timing of the delay to the Board of Governors of the European Schools at its meeting on 22-24 October.

The Belgian authorities confirm that the infrastructure of the Brussels IV/Berkendael school will remain at the disposal of the European Schools for as long as is necessary.

The position of the Commission is that since Laeken is delayed, the Belgian authorities will have to provide some other infrastructure solution for the same date as the planned opening i.e. 2009. If this is not done, the Commission considers that the Belgian authorities would then be in breach of their commitments.

- **Does the Commission intend to take any legal or other actions against Belgium in this respect?**

The Commission will not hesitate to take legal action if this will prove necessary. An example of this is that the Commission is launching a legal action against the Kingdom of Belgium relating to the provision of first instalments in the European Schools which Belgium has not provided, and has as a consequence run up a debt to the system of the European Schools.

- **If the answer is basically No (or No-equivalent "nice talk"): how would he assess the impact of such Commission non-action on the future Belgian attitude towards European Schools and on the impression given to Commission personnel (i.e. to my opinion non-action would clearly demonstrate that the Commission does not care about future developments of European Schools)?**

Decisions concerning the European Schools are made by the Board of Governors of the European Schools based on intergovernmental co-operation as defined in the Convention of the European Schools. The Commission is thus not the only actor in the decision-making process.

The Commission is nevertheless investing considerable effort in the future

development of the European Schools and will not cease to put pressure on the Belgian authorities in the interest of its staff and their children.

- **Would the Commission take any measures on the appropriate levels (e.g. school boards) that the current "sibling enrolment policy" is (at least partially) abandoned if further delays for Laeken are inevitable? Obviously this would mean making available more resources for the existing three Brussels European Schools.**

To be clear, the enrolment policy for the Brussels schools is determined by the Board of Governors of the European Schools. It is then executed by the Central Enrolment Authority dealing with more than 1700 new applications per school year. The Administrative Boards of each individual school do not determine the enrolment policy.

As a matter of principle, if the necessary adequate infrastructure were to be made available by the Belgian Authorities, the Commission would then be in favour of introducing as much flexibility and openness into the enrolment policy as possible, in order to facilitate the daily life of staff and their families.

But, taking into account the attitude of the Belgian Authorities, the Commission currently has no choice but to continue to support a restrictive enrolment policy.

Indeed, the restrictive enrolment policy for the schools of Uccle, Woluwe and Ixelles, the so-called "Brussels I, II and III", was and still is necessary since they all suffer from serious overpopulation affecting the quality of life of the close to 8600 pupils enrolled in these schools already. These schools do not have any additional capacity to expand and they are reaching a situation of overpopulation that risk having serious implications on the security of the schools. It is difficult to see how this policy could be relaxed especially considering the recent announcement of the Belgian authorities relating to Brussels IV.

A first debate on the policy of enrolment will be held by the Board of Governors on 22-24 October.

- **La Commission n'aurait-elle pas intérêt à augmenter l'allocation non forfaitaire pour rendre les autres écoles internationales à Bruxelles plus accessibles financièrement**

Les contraintes imposées par l'Etat membre hôte - la Belgique - tant en termes de localisation des sites qu'en termes de places à Bruxelles sont de plus en plus lourdes et entraînent effectivement une politique d'inscription de plus en plus rigoureuse.

Jusqu'à présent, même si le choix de l'école ne peut pas toujours être pris en compte, une place a néanmoins toujours pu être proposée aux enfants du personnel des Institutions.

La solution proposée - augmenter l'allocation scolaire non forfaitaire pour permettre aux personnels des institutions d'envoyer leurs enfants dans d'autres écoles internationales - ne constitue pas aujourd'hui une réponse adaptée au problème de place dans les Ecoles européennes de Bruxelles et à la défense du système des Ecoles européennes lui-même.

17) Need for creating a new cellule "Chargé de mission"

Following the extensive work carried out by the Task Force on Simplification, the Commission adopted a Communication on simplification in July 2007, comprising 85 actions to be implemented in 2007 and 2008.

In the beginning of September 2007, Claude Chêne, Director General DG ADMIN, asked his Advisor Erik Halskov to coordinate the implementation of the different actions which for the large majority fall under the responsibility of the services within the ADMIN family, including PMO, OIB, DS. Others concern DIGIT, EPSO and RELEX.

In order to strengthen the coordination of the implementation of the simplification actions, a 'core' group of previous members of the Task Force has been activated to accompany and sustain the implementation of the identified actions.

As simplification is an on-going exercise, a functional mailbox has been created in order to enable staff to make new suggestions for further innovation and improvement. The address of this mailbox is: ADMIN SIMPLIFICATION. This mailbox is managed on a day-to-day basis by Dominique Maller, assistant to Erik Halskov.

It is envisaged to inform staff about the follow-up of the simplification exercise through Commission en Direct in the course of November 2007.

18) Quels sont les possibilités de progresser pour les collègues qui ont réussi les GFIII?

Les besoins des services en termes d'agents contractuels varient énormément d'une direction générale/office à une autre. Il appartient à chaque service d'organiser la structure de son personnel en fonction de ses besoins. A titre d'exemple, les délégations engagent des nombres importants d'agents contractuels dans le groupe de fonctions IV. Par contre, dans les Offices, les agents contractuels dans le groupe de fonctions II sont majoritaires. D'autres

institutions (telles que les agences d'exécution) engagent notamment des agents contractuels dans le groupe de fonctions III.

La réussite d'une sélection EPSO n'est pas une garantie d'être engagé. Chaque service peut consulter la base de données qui contient les noms des candidats qui ont réussi les tests de sélection CAST 27. Les services peuvent également envoyer des descriptions de postes aux candidats qui se trouvent dans cette base de données. Vous pourriez également prendre des contacts informels avec les départements de ressources humaines des services qui vous intéressent afin d'avoir une idée du nombre d'agents contractuels qu'ils recherchent dans les années à venir.

19) Revision of the CDR and promotion system – doubts of the advantages of a qualitative appraisal system with a number of limited performance groups and a fixed range of promotion points

The proposed modifications indeed focus on the outcome of the appraisal and its impact on career development. The clear link between evaluation and promotion gives officials an appropriate reward for their performance. Furthermore, appraisal focus on the performance related to the reporting year and not on an official's personal qualities as such. Typically, performance differs over time and might be outstanding in one year as a result of exceptional circumstances and just within the expected range of performance the year after. Officials will not be "booked" forever in one group but their performance will be assessed as compared to the other officials in the grade. We expect considerable movement between the groups.

The link between appraisal and promotion is explicitly established in the staff regulations and naturally requires coordination by the management in a DG. Aiming at a transparent and bottom-up procedure, our proposal specifies two stages of co-ordination during which it is obligatory to consult all reporting officers. The concept of quotas for top performance seems to me a simpler and fairer comparison of performances than the target average of merit marks which over time has led to a large number of officials crowding within a range of one point on a scale of 20 and hence practically no differentiation in career speed for the majority of staff.

5 % of staff' performance is expected to be assessed as group V. It is important to note that, unlike the limits for higher boxes, this figure is purely indicative. There is no legal obligation to identify a particular number of under performers for each DG or grade. It is rather an outcome of the pilot exercise that around 5 % of performances were considered to be lower than the larger group in the middle.

As you know, we are in the middle of the negotiations and about to analyse the results of the inter service consultation. We take all comments seriously during this final consultation process and are open to make the necessary modifications.

20) Internal competitions for translators of new language departments in DGT

The situation in DGT shows that, while the objective of the Commission is to fill permanent posts with officials, an important part of DGT's needs for EU-10 translators has been filled by temporary agents and that in addition there remains vacant positions for translators. The reason for this is that the specific EU-10 translator competitions did not deliver a sufficient number of laureates.

Since the needs for translator officials have been confirmed at inter-institutional level, it was decided to launch a new round of external competitions for languages where shortfalls of laureates have been observed (CS, LT, LV, MT, SK, SL). These competitions will be published soon, i.e before the end of the year. All current temporary translators in DGT are kindly invited to participate in such competitions.

The option of internal competitions might be considered in the future if the new competitions do not deliver the expected results.