

EUROPEAN EXTERNAL ACTION SERVICE



EEAS 2012 DISCHARGE

Answers by the High Representative / Vice President Catherine Ashton

To the written questions of the Committee on budgetary Control

Special representatives

1. In 2010 the HR stated that she wanted to abolish the special representatives. Currently there are eleven Special Representatives (SR): What was the budget of each of the SRs in place in 2012 and 2013, respectively?

EU Special Representatives 2013

Country / region	Name	2013 Budget (EUR)	Travel budget of the EUSRs	Travel budget of the staff of the EUSRs	Nr Staff		
					Seconded	International Contracted	Local Staff (Bxl & else)
Sudan and South Sudan (ended on 31/10/2013)	Rosalind MARSDEN	690,000 (4 months)	95,168	*	3	1	6
South Caucasus and Crisis in Georgia	Philippe LEFORT	1,050,000 (6 months)	145,365	*	10	2	8
MEPP	Andreas REINICKE	506,500 (6 months)	99,291	*	3	0	3
African Union	Gary QUINCE	585,000	34,200	*	3	0	9
Kosovo	Samuel ZBOGAR	1,870,000	112,500	*	6	6	18
Bosnia and Herzgovina	Peter SORENSEN	5,285,000	223,240	*	16	4	24
Sahel	Michel Dominique REVEYRAND DE MENTHON	1,350,000 (10 months)	516,732.55	*	4	0	2
Horn of Africa	Alexander RONDOS	4,900,000 (16 months)	454,164.75	*	4	2	4
Afghanistan	Franz-Michael MELLBIN	6,585,000	169,158	*	5	5	15
South Mediterranean	Bernardino LEON	945,000	220,770	*	3	0	1.5
Central Asia	Patricia FLOR	1,050,000	183,708	*	4	0	4
Human Rights	Stavros LAMBRINIDIS	837,000	182,630	*	2	0	1,5
Total		25,618,500	2,436,927.3		63	20	96

* The information on travel costs is not available for the EUSR and his staff separately.

How many staff posts are there for each SR and to which grade they belong to?

The staff posts (and the type) are included in the attached table.

Information on the grading of staff has been requested from the EUSRs and will be provided once available.

Could you please identify the problems between the EEAS and the SR when it comes to cooperational tasks? What would you list as their added value for the EU?

When the EEAS moved into its new HQ building in 2012, the HRVP decided to co-locate the special representative based in Brussels in the EEAD HQ in order to enhance the cooperation with the relevant EEAS departments.

EUSR are a useful foreign policy tool which provide high level expertise, visibility and

attention to specific international issues.

What are the HR plans concerning the integration of the EUSR into the EEAS?

Following the Council's conclusions on 17 December 2013, the HRVP proposed draft revised Guidelines on EUSRs with a view to Council agreement by the end of March 2014. The draft includes a proposal that in the future, administrative support be provided to EUSRs by the EEAS.

Moreover, the EEAS has supported the EP amendment in the draft 2014 budget proposing the transfer of the EUSR budget in the EEAS budget.

What was the amount of the travel costs of the SRs and of their staff in 2012 and 2013 respectively?

EU Special Representatives 2012

Country / region	Name	2012 Budget (EUR)	Travel budget of the EUSRs	Travel budget of the staff of the EUSRs	Nr Staff		
					Seconded	International Contracted	Local Staff (Bxl & else)
Sudan and South Sudan	Rosalind MARSDEN	1,900,000	485,634	*	4	2	6
South Caucasus and Crisis in Georgia	Philippe LEFORT	2,000,000	349,327	*	11	3	8
MEPP	Andreas REINICKE	1,300,000	147,731.40	133,928.40	3	0	3
African Union	Gary QUINCE	680,000	67,200	*	4	0	11
Kosovo	Samuel ZBOGAR	2,410,000	263,617	*	5	6	18
Bosnia and Herzgovina	Peter SORENSEN	5,250,000	156,960	*	16	4	36
Horn of Africa	Alexander RONDOS	4,900,000	454,164.75	*	3	2	4
Afghanistan	Vygaudas USACKAS	6,680,000	169,158	*	4	6	15
South Mediterranean	Bernardino LEON	945,000	257,200	*	3	0	2
Central Asia	Patricia FLOR	1,120,000	244,539.15	*	4	0	4
Human Rights	Stavros LAMBRINIDIS	712,500	175,850	*	2	0	2
Total		27,897,500	2,771,381.3	133,928.40	59	23	109

* The information on the travel budget is not available for the EUSRs and his staff separately (with the exception of the MEPP EUSR).

Reservations:

2. The COO of the EEAS maintained his reservations concerning security contracts in the EU delegations in Afghanistan and Libya. Which security companies are concerned?

Security services in the EU Delegation in Libya are provided by the company Argus Security Projects Ltd, Cyprus, and in Afghanistan by the company PAGE Protective Services Ltd, UK.

3. What was the purpose of the action plan initiated in 2011? Why the action plan was not successful?

The action plan for a better financial management of security contracts was initiated in 2012. Its main purpose was to address the reservation related to the outstanding payments, administrative errors and the use of extensions of contracts.

The implementation of the action plan took place throughout 2012 and 2013. The rapid development of the action plan in spring 2012 and its implementation can be considered largely successful. It eliminated late payments for security contracts managed by the HQ, the administrative errors were reduced to a level comparable with other sectors and extensions were applied only in very rare cases where no alternative was possible in order to ensure the continuity of the protection of the EU staff. The action plan resulted in substantial improvements in the general financial and contractual management in this area since 2012.

4. Which other reservations were issued? Why?

No other reservations were issued.

Delegations

5. In 2011, 27 EU delegations made a reservation and so did 21 in 2012. Which EU delegations made a reservation in 2011 and 2012?

The Delegations have tended to be prudent and preferred to register reservations in their draft annual activity reports. These draft reports triggered constructive discussion with Headquarters (HQ) services, leading in a number of cases to complementary information and analysis and a better overall assessment in the final ex-post control report.

Although 27 delegations presented a reserve and / or observations in the 2011 draft annual activity reports, subsequent discussion with HQ enabled 15 of these delegations to provide additional information and analysis which lead to the reserves and observation to be lifted in the final version of the report. The remaining 12 delegations were Afghanistan, Angola, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Cap Vert, Chili, Djibouti, Gabon, Liberia, Mozambique, Republic of Guinea, Yemen - which included a reserve in their final version of their annual activity report.

With the final analysis of the 2012 exercise, only Yemen, East Timor and Liberia retained their reservation, only Yemen and Liberia had also made a reservation in 2011.

6. How many EU-delegations with only one AD official do exist? Are there plans to merge these one-man delegations with other delegations?

There are 15 EU Delegations with only one EEAS AD official (listed below). This figure is reduced to six if Commission AD officials are also taken into account. The EU Delegation to New Zealand is about to be reinforced with a second EEAS AD official.

While there are currently no plans to close any of those Delegations, it is important to note that of the five Delegations where there will be only one AD official in 2014, four are regionalised Delegations, headed by a Chargé d'Affaires, under the responsibility of a Regional Delegation, who can provide support, as necessary, to the CAF.

15 EU Delegations with only one EEAS AD official

Council of Europe (Strasbourg)
 COSTA RICA
 EL SALVADOR
 Food and Agricultural Organisation (Rome)
 GAMBIA
 GUATEMALA
 HONDURAS
 LAOS
 LESOTHO
 MONTENEGRO
 NEW ZEALAND
 SOLOMON ISLANDS
 SWAZILAND
 TAIWAN
 TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

6 EU Delegations with only one EEAS AD official (and no COM AD official)

Council of Europe (Strasbourg)
 COSTA RICA
 GAMBIA
 NEW ZEALAND
 SOLOMON ISLANDS
 TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

7. How many unfilled EEAS posts were there on average in each delegation in 2012 and 2013, respectively? In which delegation do we find the most unfilled posts?

In 2012 around 30 expatriate posts became vacant at some stage during the year (but did not remain vacant the entire year); around half of those were officials' posts, the rest were contract agents. In 2013, the figure was slightly higher with around 35 vacant posts at some stage during the year, of which around 60% were officials' posts and the rest were contract agents. This amounts, on average, to 0.23 vacant expatriate posts per Delegation at some point in time during 2012 and 0.26 in 2013.

In 2012 the highest number of vacancies occurred in Djibouti (2.5), whereas in 2013, it was the Delegations to Iraq and the US that suffered the higher number of vacancies (3 and 2.5).

EEAS Vacant posts in Delegations	2012 Average				Average 2013			
	AD	AST	CA	Total	AD	AST	CA	Total
AFGHANISTAN			0.5	0.5			0	0
ALBANIA			0.5	0.5			1	1
ALGERIA				0			0	0
ANGOLA				0	1		0	1
ARGENTINA				0			0	0
ARMENIA				0		1	0	1
AU				0	2		0	2
AUSTRALIA				0			1	1
AZERBAIJAN			0.5	0.5			0	0
BANGLADESH				0			0	0
BARBADOS				0			0	0

BELARUS		1		1		1	0.5	1.5
BENIN				0			0	0
BOLIVIA				0		1	0	1
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA				0			0	0
BOTSWANA				0			0	0
BRAZIL				0			0	0
BURKINA FASO				0			0	0
BURMA/MYANMAR		1		1			0	0
BURUNDI				0			0	0
CAMBODJA				0			0	0
CAMEROON				0			0	0
CANADA							0	0
CAPE VERDE			0.5	0.5			1	1
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC				0			0.5	0.5
CHAD				0			0	0
CHILE				0			0	0
CHINA				0	1		0	1
COE				0			0	0
COLOMBIA				0			0	0
CONGO				0	1		0	1
CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REP				0	1		0	1
COSTA RICA				0			0	0
CROATIA		1		1	1		0.5	1.5
CUBA				0			0	0
DJIBOUTI	1	1	0.5	2.5			0.5	0.5
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC				0			0	0
ECUADOR				0			0	0
EGYPT				0	1		0	1
EL SALVADOR				0			0	0
ERITREA	1			1			0	0
ETHIOPIA	1			1	1		0	1
FAO				0			0.5	0.5
FIJI			0.5	0.5			0	0
FLOATERS	1	2	2.5	5.5		1	2	3
FYROM	1			1			0	0
GABON	1			1			0	0
GAMBIA				0			0	0
GEORGIA				0			0	0
GHANA				0			0	0
GUATEMALA				0			0	0
GUINEA CONAKRY				0			0	0
GUINEA-BISSAU	1			1	1		0	1
GUYANA				0			0	0
HAITI			1	1			0	0
HONDURAS				0			0	0
HONG KONG				0			0	0

ICELAND				0	1		0	1
INDIA			0.5	0.5	1		0	1
INDONESIA		1		1			0	0
IRAQ		2		2	2	1	0	3
ISRAEL				0			0	0
IVORY COAST				0			0.5	0.5
JAMAICA				0	1		0	1
JAPAN				0			0	0
JORDAN				0			0	0
KAZAKHSTAN				0			0	0
KENYA				0		1	0	1
KOREA				0			0	0
KOSOVO		1	1	2			1	1
KYRGYZSTAN				0			0.5	0.5
LAOS				0			0	0
LEBANON				0			0	0
LESOTHO				0			0	0
LIBERIA				0			0	0
LIBYA			0.5	0.5	1		0	1
MADAGASCAR				0			0	0
MALAWI				0			0	0
MALAYSIA				0			0	0
MALI				0			0	0
MAURITANIA				0			0	0
MAURITIUS	1			1	1	1	0	2
MEXICO				0			0	0
MOLDOVA				0			0	0
MONTENEGRO			0.5	0.5			0	0
MOROCCO				0			0	0
MOZAMBIQUE				0			0	0
NAMIBIA				0			0	0
NEPAL				0			0	0
NEW CALEDONIA				0	1		0	1
NEW ZEALAND				0			0	0
NICARAGUA				0			0	0
NIGER				0			0	0
NIGERIA		1		1			0	0
NORWAY				0			0	0
OECD/UNESCO				0			0	0
PAKISTAN	1		1	2	1.5		0	1.5
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	1		0.5	1.5		1	0	1
PARAGUAY				0			0	0
PERU				0			0	0
PHILIPPINES				0			0	0
RUSSIA		1	1	2			0	0
RWANDA				0		1	0	1

SAUDI ARABIA		1		1			0	0
SENEGAL				0			1	1
SERBIA				0			0	0
SIERRA LEONE	1			1			0	0
SINGAPORE				0			0	0
SOLOMON ISLANDS				0			0	0
SOUTH AFRICA				0			0	0
SOUTH SUDAN			0.5	0.5			0	0
SRI LANKA				0			0	0
SUDAN			0.5	0.5			0	0
SURINAM				0	1		0	1
SWAZILAND				0			0	0
SWITZERLAND				0			0	0
SYRIA	1			1	1.5		0	1.5
TAIWAN				0			0.5	0.5
TAJIKISTAN			0.5	0.5			0	0
TANZANIA				0			0	0
THAILAND				0			0	0
TIMOR-LESTE				0			0	0
TOGO				0			0	0
TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO				0			0	0
TUNISIA				0			0	0
TURKEY				0	1		0	1
UGANDA				0			0	0
UKRAINE				0			0	0
UN GENEVA	1	1		2			0	0
UN NEW YORK	2			2			0	0
UN/IAEA/OSCE		1	0.5	1.5			0.5	0.5
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES				-	1	1	0	2
UNITED STATES			1	1	1		1.5	2.5
URUGUAY				0			0	0
UZBEKISTAN				0			0.5	0.5
VANUATU				0	1		0	1
VENEZUELA			0.5	0.5			0	0
VIETNAM				0			0.5	0.5
WEST BANK AND GAZA STRIP	1			1			0	0
WTO		1		1			0	0
YEMEN	1			1			0.5	0.5
ZAMBIA				0			0	0
ZIMBABWE				0			0	0
Grand Total	9	8	15	32	16	5.5	14.5	36
Average	0.06	0.06	0.11	0.23	0.11	0.04	0.10	0.26

8. How many staff members in delegations were flown out due to complications during pregnancy in 2012? What were the costs? How many days of absence did they have in 2012?

In 2012, there was one medical repatriation for the spouse of a Commission staff member because of complications during pregnancy (risk of premature delivery).

Total costs linked to this repatriation were € 17 588.46.

This includes: €10423.46 (travel costs with accompanying husband and ground ambulance) + €5185E (accommodation costs) + € 1950 (return travel costs including ground transport and air ticket baby).

The days of absence linked to this repatriation were 3 days of special leave for the accompanying husband.

All other medical repatriations during pregnancy from the place of posting were linked to complementary exams or deliveries without complications.

Negotiated procedures

9. According to FR art. 126, 1b, 6 contracts with a value of 37,5 Mio. Euros have been negotiated. Which companies got the contracts? What was the amount of each of these contracts? How was the price of each of these contracts fixed? Why the EEAS decided not to do a call for proposals?

The contracts were signed with the following companies:

1. FUJITSU TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS SA: EUR 11.950.000
2. BRITISH TELECOMMUNICATIONS PUBLIC LIMITED: EUR 25.000.000
3. THE ECONOMIST INTELLIGENCE UNIT NA INC: EUR 270.000
4. OXFORD ANALYTICA LTD: EUR 168.500
5. SIEMENS ENTERPRISE COMMUNICATIONS SA: EUR 82.014
6. COLLINS BUILDING SERVICES INC CORPORATION: EUR 124.017

For contract 1, the preparation of the new tender could not be finalised and the specific services needed by the EEAS were not available in any other existing contracts signed by other institutions. For business continuity reasons, the EEAS could not be left without the services. Hence, the contractor was asked to maintain the prices they tendered for in a previous tender.

For contract 2, the EEAS wanted to join the interinstitutional tender launched by the Commission. However, due to the specific needs of the EEAS in particular those resulting from the delegations and the volume to be foreseen, the EEAS technical requirements could not be integrated in the interinstitutional tender. As a result, the EEAS had to launch its own tender in view of awarding the contract (new contract signed in 2013). While the new tender was being prepared, the previous contractor was the only one competing capable of performing the services because of the great investment in the existing telecommunication infrastructure.

For contracts 3, 4 and 5, the contractors were invited to submit a tender on the basis of tender documents provided to them. For contracts 3 and 4, the financial tenders submitted by the contractors during the tender procedure were negotiated downward. For contracts 3 and 4, the procurement procedure was decided by the General Secretariat of the Council who was the leading institution in these interinstitutional tenders. For contract 5, the development of CIMS which is the new system likely to be replacing NCN was delayed (CIMS 2 abandoned late 2013). Hence the only operator on the market capable of providing the service was the current contractor.

Contract 6 concerns the delegation to the UN in New York. This delegation is in a building

where the property manager does not allow access to the building to companies other than those with whom they concluded an exclusivity agreement. For this reason, the delegation could not consult other companies.

- 10. According to FR art. 127, 1a, 1 contract with a value of 407.000 euros has been negotiated. Which companies got this contract? How was the price of each of this contract fixed? Why the EEAS decided not to do a call for proposals?**

The contract was signed with DDNS Security Operations P/L t/a Securico Security Services Private Limited for the delegation in Zimbabwe.

The negotiated procedure was used following the failure of the restricted procedure in conformity with art. 127 a) IR. (i.e. following an unsuccessful call for tenders).

The four companies having submitted tenders in the previous call for proposals were invited to the negotiation and therefore received the tender documents. They all submitted a tender.

The price was set in the offer of the tenderer who was awarded the contract.

South Soudan

- 11. South Sudan: How much EU aid was paid out via the South Sudan delegation in 2012?**

In 2012, the Delegation has paid a total of €26.9 million of EU assistance implementing various programmes in Governance, Agriculture and Health, as well as support to project implementation.

- 12. President Salva Kiir wrote in 2012 a letter to 75 of his officials stating that they had embezzled 4 bn Dollar. What was the reaction of the EEAS and the EU ambassador to this letter? Are EU funds implied? Which conclusions were drawn for spending money in such an environment?**

The EU has been extremely concerned about the allegations of corruption raised in President Kiir's letter. No EU Funds are affected as our development assistance is channeled only through NGO and International Organisations. Conscious of the enormous challenges that South Sudan is facing since its independence, the EU has focused its engagement on state building and nation building, through programmes in the area of justice, social sector and agriculture, with direct benefits for the population.

Since the news of the embezzlement were made public, the EU and other key partners made the fight against corruption a recurrent theme in the political and policy dialogue with the Government at high level. The EU has also supported the World Bank's efforts to assist the Government with the investigation of this scandal and the prosecution of those responsible through the Stolen Assets and Recovery (StAR) programme. Finally, the EU has been a key actor in pushing for an IMF Staff Monitored Programme on reforms of public financial management.

The EU has conducted a risk assessment that looked in detail at corruption indicators and established benchmarks (e.g. the creation of an anti-corruption commission with investigative powers). For the time being, the EU has not channelled development aid through Government channels, e.g. through a state building contract and plans to do it in the future have been put on hold.

At present, the political and security environment is not conducive to regular development cooperation, and we are reviewing our portfolio of activities to determine what actions could continue being implemented and what actions would need to be suspended until stability is

restored. This review is being undertaken with prime concern for both the security and safety of our implementing partners and the needs of the population who currently benefit from EU development activities.

Origin of staff

13. Could you please provide a table indicating the country of origin of the EEAS-AD officials in the Headquarter?

EEAS Staff (Officials & Temporary agents) per nationality - HQ		
Data source: Sysper 2, 2 December 2013		
	Officials-AD	Temporary Agents -AD
Nationality	AD	AD
Austria	9	2
Belgium	29	6
Bulgaria	4	2
Croatia		
Cyprus	3	1
Czech Republic	5	2
Denmark	9	3
Estonia	4	2
Finland	7	6
France	58	19
Germany	50	12
Greece	15	5
Hungary	7	5
Ireland	11	4
Italy	60	9
Latvia	3	3
Lithuania	3	2
Luxembourg	2	
Malta	1	1
Nederland	12	4
Poland	23	3
Portugal	9	4
Romania	4	7

Slovakia	3	2
Slovenia	2	6
Spain	33	12
Sweden	22	2
United Kingdom	25	11
Grand Total	413	135

14. Could you please provide a table indicating the country of origin of the EEAS-AD officials in Delegations?

EEAS Staff (Officials & Temporary agents) per nationality – Del		
Data source: Sysper 2, 2 December 2013		
Nationality	Officials - AD	Temporary Agents-AD
Austria	7	7
Belgium	21	7
Bulgaria		8
Croatia		
Cyprus		
Czech Republic	5	10
Denmark	6	6
Estonia		5
Finland	6	2
France	23	20
Germany	21	10
Greece	9	4
Hungary	2	6
Ireland	5	3
Italy	26	7
Latvia	1	3
Lithuania	1	3
Luxembourg		
Malta	1	4

Nederland	8	6
Poland	4	7
Portugal	10	5
Romania		7
Slovakia		2
Slovenia		3
Spain	26	11
Sweden	3	8
United Kingdom	18	15

15. Could you please provide a table indicating the country of origin of the EEAS ambassadors in the delegations?

EU Heads of Delegation	No. of HoDs
Nationality	
Austria	4
Belgium	10
Bulgaria	3
Croatia	0
Cyprus	0
Czech Republic	4
Denmark	7
Estonia	1
Finland	1
France	15
Germany	10
Greece	3
Hungary	2
Ireland	5
Italy	14
Latvia	1
Lithuania	1
Luxembourg	0
Malta	1
Netherlands	9
Poland	4
Portugal	6
Romania	1
Slovakia	0

Slovenia	2
Spain	15
Sweden	3
United Kingdom	9
Grand Total	131

16. Could you please provide a table indicating the country of origin of the EEAS senior management in the headquarter?

Senior Management (Director level equivalent and above)	No. of senior managers
Nationality	
Austria	2
Belgium	4
Bulgaria	
Croatia	
Cyprus	
Czech Republic	
Denmark	
Estonia	
Finland	2
France	7
Germany	6
Greece	1
Hungary	
Ireland	1
Italy	5
Latvia	1
Lithuania	
Luxembourg	
Malta	
Nederland	2
Poland	1
Portugal	
Romania	1
Slovakia	
Slovenia	
Spain	1
Sweden	2
United Kingdom	3
Grand Total	39

Screening exercise

17. Has the EEAS undertaken any screening exercises? If yes, could the EEAS please provide the European Parliament with this information?

The EEAS undertook a screening of the resources it received from the Commission and the Council at the time of its creation, in order to identify and eliminate overlaps, enhance synergies and make savings possible. Since then, the EEAS has undertaken, firstly, a screening of HQ resources, to identify the 20 AD posts that were redeployed to Delegations in the context of the 2012 budget; and more recently, an overall review of resources in Delegations that has led to the decision to redeploy a number of posts (mainly local agents, but also a small number of contract agents and officials') to ensure that all Delegations were endowed with the minimum number of human resources necessary to perform sustainably over time.

Staff training

18. How many staff in the EEAS was involved in the management/ administration of staff training in 2012 and 2013?

Without taking into account the trainees there were 10 persons in 2012 and 11 in 2013.

19. How many days did the EEAS' staff spend on training activities on average per capita and overall in 2012 and 2013? What was the average budget per staff member in 2012 and 2013, respectively?

EEAS' staff participation in training courses (HQ and DEL)		
	2012	2013
Total time spent by EEAS staff on training activities (days)	12127	11718
Average time spent by EEAS staff in training activities (= overall training days/total number of EEAS staff (DEL+HQ)) (days)	3.9	3.8
Average budget spent per EEAS staff member in training activities (=overall training costs/total number of EEAS staff (DEL+HQ) (€)	299	280*

	2012	2013
Total time spent by EEAS staff on training activities (days)	12127	11718
Average time spent by EEAS staff in training activities (= overall training days/total number of EEAS staff (DEL+HQ)) (days)	3.9	3.8
Average budget spent per EEAS staff member in training activities (=overall training costs/total number of EEAS staff (DEL+HQ) (€)	299	280*

N.B: the cost for HR general offer and HR language offer is for the period Jan-Aug 2013. DG HR has not sent the invoice for the rest of 2013.*

N.B 1: data for training activities in delegations are not available. For 2012, they will be communicated at the end of January 2014. For 2013, they will be communicated in June 2014.

N.B 2: data for training actions organised by other entities (inside or outside the EEAS) are not available.

N.B 3: Officials, Contract Agents, Local Agents, Young Experts in Delegations have been taken into account for the purpose of establishing the number of EEAS staff.

Promotion

20. How many Staff of the EEAS has been promoted more than one grade within 1) one year 2) two years. If there are cases of fast-track promotions: Which grades are concerned? What were the reasons?

According to the Staff Regulations article 45 "Promotion shall be exclusively by selection from among officials who have completed a minimum of two years in their grade after consideration of the comparative merits...".

There was no case of official promoted more than 1 grade within one year.

The table below gives the number of officials promoted after two years in the grade.

Grade	No. of promoted staff	No. of promoted staff with 2 years in the grade
AD5	14	0
AD6	9	7
AD7	9	5
AD8	8	1
AD9	13	2
AD10	23	4
AD11	16	5
AD12	49	6
AD13	11	1
TOTAL	152	31
AST1	23	4
AST2	21	13
AST3	26	16
AST4	19	2
AST5	25	4
AST6	22	5
AST7	14	3
AST8	9	4
AST9	10	0
AST10	2	0
TOTAL	171	47

These officials, as all the other promoted staff, were promoted by decision of the Promotion Board after having been suggested for promotion by their management. The Promotion Board compared their merits and thereby, applied the criteria as defined in article 45 of the Staff Regulations – appraisal reports, use of languages and the level of the official's responsibility.

21. How many staff members had left the service in 2012 and 2013? How many of them retired? How many have left to go to other EU institutions? (Idem 160)

In 2012, 56 officials retired. In addition, 6 temporary agents resigned. 17 AD non-management and 26 AST staff left EEAS Headquarters to go to other EU institutions.

In 2013, 53 officials retired. In addition, 19 temporary agents resigned. 12 AD non-

management and 26 AST staff left EEAS Headquarters to go to other EU institutions while 1 AD non-management and 1 AST staff transferred from EU Delegations to other EU institutions.

Retirement

- 22. What was the amount of the highest and lowest pensions actually paid in the EEAS? What was the amount of the average pension of EEAS' officials and temporary staff covered by the Staff Regulations in 2013? Could you please distinguish between officials and temporary staff?**

The highest monthly pension was 10423,68 €, the lowest 1124,21 €. The average pension amounted to 5804,68 €. There is only one former temporary staff who received a pension of 1994,22 €, thus this is the lowest, highest and average pension for temporary staff.

- 23. In how many cases did officials and temporary staff of the EEAS take early retirement without reduction of pension rights (Article 9(2) of Annex VIII to the SR) in 2012 and 2013, broken down by salary group and function?**

In 2012, 1 AD member of staff and 2 AST members of staff took early retirement in this way. In 2013, the figures were 3 AD and 7 AST staff (in some cases implementation of decisions taken is part of the 2012 exercise).

- 24. How many officials in which functions and grades were moved to a 'non-active status' in 2012 and 2013 according to Article 41 of the staff regulations in the EEAS?**

In 2012 and 2013, no EEAS officials were moved to a "non-active" status within the meaning of Art.41 SR.

- 25. How many officials in which functions and grades were retired in 2012 and 2013 in the interest of service according to Article 50 of the staff regulations in the EEAS?**

In 2012, 2 AD staff were retired in the interest of the service according to Article 50 SR. In 2013, the figure was zero.

- 26. In order to ensure better synergies between the EEAS and DEVCO, Working arrangements between Commission Services and the EEAS were put in place on the 13th of January 2012. What are the results?**

The Working Arrangements set out the basic principles and practical implementation of cooperation between the Commission Directorates General and services responsible for external relations (TRADE, ELARG, DEVCO, ECHO, FPI) and the European External Action Service (EEAS). They have provided a stable and predictable framework for cooperation between colleagues in those different services and in the EU Delegations, and have therefore contributed to the smooth functioning of the EU Delegations in their interactions with HQ.

- 27. What kinds of services were agreed under Service level Agreements (SLA) and how many SLA have been made in 2012 and 2013? What were the "costs"?**

According to the 2010 Council decision establishing the EEAS, "the High representative and the EEAS shall be assisted where necessary by the General Secretariat of the Council and the relevant departments of the Commission. Service level agreements may be drawn up to offer to that effect ...".

The services provided range from service to the staff (recruitment procedure, medical examination, training, payment of salaries) to services to the administration (IT, buildings, meeting room facilities).

In 2012, there were 4 SLA with the Council Secretariat (for meetings and conference, medical

service, crèches and IT services) and 6 SLA with Commission departments and offices (DG HR, BUDG, DIGIT, OIB, PMO, SCIC). In addition, the EEAS is service provider for the Commission for the Commission staff in delegation (EEAS-DEVCO SLA).

In 2012, the total amount paid under the SLA (i.e. except the EEAS-DEVCO SLA) was €21.6M.

28. The staff regulations foresee staff committees in the EU institutions. How many persons belong to the staff committees of the EEAS? How many people did the EEAS employ in 2012 and 2013 to substitute staff committee members during their secondment? What are the costs involved?

The EEAS Staff Committee is composed of 20 members and 20 alternates. No additional staff have been employed in 2012 and 2013 in order to substitute EEAS staff members seconded to the Staff Committee.

29. Interest on late payments of charges: Could you indicate the three highest interest payments and tell us, why these payments were late?

The three highest interest payments paid have been as follows:

Economic operator	Amount of invoice (€)	Number of days delayed	Interest payment (€)	Reason mentioned by the responsible operational division
BT (British Telecom)	667,819.20	31	4,395.71	The delay was produced because of the additional time which took the complex technical analysis related to this invoice.
ARGUS	233,303.97	116	5,931.67	The delay was due to the need of technical verifications before proceeding with the payment.
GUNNEBO	128,870.88	234	3,717.84	Outstanding payment due to encoding problems (end date not signalled in the system).

Other staff matters

30. How many candidates from outside Brussels and Belgium or Luxembourg were invited to interviews in Brussels in 2012 and 2013?

In 2012, a total of 409 external candidates were invited for interviews (115 for posts at Headquarters and 294 for posts in EU Delegations).

In 2013, 204 external candidates were invited for interviews (28 for Headquarters posts and 176 for EU Delegation posts).

31. How many people on average were involved as members of the panel or as observers at interviews?

In accordance with the Decision of the HR/VP creating the EEAS Consultative Committee on Appointments (CCA), interview panels for senior management and Head of Delegation posts consist of seven people made up as follows: senior EEAS official in the chair (either Chief Operating Officer or Managing Director for Administration & Finance), Managing Director for the relevant EEAS geographical or thematic department, one senior representative each from the Commission and the General Secretariat of the Council, and two representatives from Member States. An additional EEAS official acts as secretary to the panel.

For middle management and AD non-management posts, interview panels are chaired by an EEAS staff member holding the appropriate grade and function, and consist of at least two

other EEAS personnel, with the possibility of enlarging the panel if the candidate is being interviewed for several posts at once or if specific expertise or experience needs to be tested.

32. What travel costs were incurred for interviewing candidates in 2012 and 2013?

In 2012, the cost incurred for expenses related to selection and recruitment of external candidates was €250,504.38 in total, made up of €74,361.59 for posts at Headquarters and €176,142.79 for posts in Delegations.

In 2013, the cost so far incurred is €135,474.99 in total, made up of €23,618.38 for posts at Headquarters and €111,856.61 for posts in Delegations. These figures will rise once we have paid the remainder of the expenses eligible for reimbursement. The expenses of 14 external candidates interviewed for Headquarters posts and 71 external candidates interviewed for Delegation posts will be paid on the 2013 budget.

The EEAS makes considerable efforts to schedule interviews so as to save money by reducing the number of times that candidates need to travel to Brussels. Use is made of videoconference facilities in some cases. In final interviews conducted by the HR/VP (i.e. for senior management and Head of Delegation posts), the practice is to use videoconferencing in cases where a candidate has already been interviewed before by the HR/VP for another post.

33. How many candidates were invited more than once?

In 2012, 19 external candidates were interviewed more than once for Headquarters posts and 56 external candidates were interviewed more than once for Delegation posts.

In 2013, 2 external candidates were interviewed more than once for Headquarters posts and 37 external candidates were interviewed more than once for Delegation posts.

The figures above also include cases in which the selection procedure required a second interview for shortlisted candidates.

34. Could the HR please state the number of invitations to the 10 candidates with the greatest number of invitations and the places they travelled from in 2012 and 2013, respectively?

The answers are as follows:

In 2012: 9 (France), 8 (Spain), 5 (Switzerland), 5 (UK), 4 (UK), 4 (Estonia), 4 (Italy), 3 (Bulgaria), 3 (Germany), 3 (UK).

In 2013: 6 (Spain), 5 (Netherlands), 4 (Netherlands), 4 (Ethiopia), 3 (Italy), 3 (Tunisia), 3 (France), 3 (Serbia), 3 (Spain), 3 (Spain).

35. New recruits: Could the HR please state, for the years 2012 and 2013 for each grade, whether the successful applicants came from an EU institution or a Member State? How many of the persons hired did not participate in EU competitions? At what grade levels have they been hired?

Idem 155

In 2012:

For AD non-management posts at Headquarters, the EEAS recruited 36 people from Member States (AD 05: 15; AD 07: 19; AD 09: 1; AD 10: 1). From other EU institutions, the EEAS recruited 18 people in grades AD5-14 and 50 people in the AST function group. One *lauréat de concours* was recruited at AD 05.

For AD non-management posts in Delegations, 18 EEAS staff and 21 candidates from Member States were appointed in 2012.

For middle management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation/Deputy Head of Delegation posts at the equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 18 people from Member States and 4 people from other EU institutions. For senior management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 3 people, all from Member States.

In 2013:

For AD non-management posts at Headquarters, the EEAS recruited 22 people from Member States (AD 05: 18; AD 07: 2; AD 10: 2). From other EU institutions, the EEAS recruited 7 people in grades AD5-14 and 38 people in the AST function group. No *lauréats de concours* were recruited at AD level.

For AD non-management posts in Delegations, 24 Member State candidates and 34 EEAS candidates were appointed in 2013.

For middle management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at the equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 11 people from Member States and 5 people from other EU institutions. For senior management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 8 people, 7 from Member States and 1 from another EU institution.

36. Could the HR please state the number of staff of each directorate at the end of 2012 and at the end of 2013, respectively?

EEAS Staff in HQ (Officials, Contract Agents) per Directorate

Data source: Sysper 2, December 2012

Directorate / entity	AD	AST	CA	Total
Crisis Management & Planning Directorate	31	13	3	47
Chief Operating Officer	14	23	2	39
Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability	21	15	3	39
Deputy Secretary General	17	14	3	34
European Union Military Staff		7	-	7
EUMS.A		2	-	2
EUMS.B		2	-	2
EUMS.C	1	2	-	3
EUMS.D		5	-	5
EUMS.E		1	-	1
G - Chair of the Political and Security Committee	7	4	-	11
Security Policy and Conflict Prevention	21	8	5	34
MD I - Asia and the Pacific	10	4	2	16
MDI.A	18	11	-	29
MDI.B	19	7	1	27
MDII - Africa	9	2	3	14
MDII.A	19	5	5	29
MDII.B	22	7	3	32
MDIII – Europe and Central Asia	5	1	1	7
MDIII.A	14	6	4	24

MDIII.B	38	13	3	54
MDIV – North Africa, Middle East, Arabian Peninsula, Iran & Irak	18	4	1	23
MDIV.A	39	15	5	59
MDR – Administration & Finances	1		1	2
MDR.A	21	64	34	119
MDR.B	13	43	9	65
MDR.C	34	75	33	142
MDV - Americas	8	4	1	13
MDV.A	32	15	-	47
MDVI – Global & Multilateral Issues	2	2	-	4
MDVI.A	23	10	7	40
MDVI.B	25	9	3	37
MDVII – Crisis Response& Operational Coordination	18	24	-	42
General Executive Secretariat	51	48	10	109
Total	551	465	142	1,158

EEAS Staff in HQ (Officials, Contract Agents) per Directorate
Data source: Sysper 2, December 2013

Directorate / entity	AD	AST	CA	Total
Crisis Management & Planning Directorate	30	12	3	45
Chief Operating Officer	15	24	3	42
Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability	23	16	2	41
Deputy Secretary General	17	13	4	34
European Union Military Staff		6	-	6
EUMS.A		2	-	2
EUMS.B		2	-	2
EUMS.C	1	2	-	3
EUMS.D		6	-	6
EUMS.E		1	-	1
G - Chair of the Political and Security Committee	8	3	-	11
K - Security Policy and Conflict Prevention	23	10	6	39
MDI- Asia and the Pacific	11	3	2	16
MDI.A	23	12	1	36
MDI.B	18	8	1	27
MDII- Africa	10	2	4	16
MDII.A	19	6	5	30
MDII.B	21	7	3	31
MDIII– Europe and Central Asia	4	2	1	7
MDIII.A	13	6	3	22
MDIII.B	35	12	4	51
MDIV– North Africa, Middle East, Arabian Peninsula, Iran & Irak	20	5	1	26

MDIV.A	37	14	6	57
MDR– Administration & Finances	2	2	-	4
MDR.A	21	63	32	116
MDR.B	13	49	8	70
MDR.C	29	77	29	135
MDV- Americas	9	4	1	14
MDV.A	31	18	-	49
MDVI– Global & Multilateral Issues	1	2	-	3
MDVI.A	22	9	8	39
MDVI.B	24	10	4	38
MDVII– Crisis Response& Operational Coordination	19	24	2	45
General Executive Secretariat	49	42	11	102
Total	548	474	144	1,166

37. Could the HR please state the number of staff working under each managing director at the end of 2012 and at the end of 2013, respectively?

EEAS Staff in HQ (Officials, Temporary Agents and Contract Agents) per Managing Directorate
Data source: Sysper 2, December 2012

	AD Total	AST Total	CA Total	Grand Total
Managing Directorate				
MDI	47	22	3	72
MDII	50	14	11	75
MDIII	57	20	8	85
MDIV	57	19	6	82
MDV	40	19	1	60
MDVI	50	21	10	81
MDVII	18	24	-	42
MDR	69	182	77	328
				-
Other department	163	144	26	333
CMPD	31	13	3	47
COO	14	23	2	39
CPCC	21	15	3	39
DSG	17	14	3	34
EUMS	1	19	0	20
G	7	4	0	11
K	21	8	5	34
SG	51	48	10	109
				-
Grand Total	551	465	142	1,158

Data source: Sysper 2, December 2013

	AD Total	AST Total	CA Total	Grand Total
Managing Directorate				
MDI	52	23	4	79
MDII	50	15	12	77
MDIII	52	20	8	80
MDIV	57	19	7	83
MDV	40	22	1	63
MDVI	47	21	12	80
MDVII	19	24	2	45
MDR	65	191	69	325
				-
Other department	166	139	29	334
CMPD	30	12	3	45
COO	15	24	3	42
CPCC	23	16	2	41
DSG	17	13	4	34
EUMS	1	19	0	20
G	8	3	0	11
K	23	10	6	39
SG	49	42	11	102
				-
Grand Total	548	474	144	1,166

38. How many posts did the EEAS have to fill in 2012 and 2013, respectively?

Idem 35, 155 and 159

In 2012:

For AD non-management posts at Headquarters, the EEAS recruited 36 people from Member States (AD 05: 15; AD 07: 19; AD 09: 1; AD 10: 1). From other EU institutions, the EEAS recruited 18 people in grades AD5-14 and 50 people in the AST function group. One *lauréat de concours* was recruited at AD 05.

For middle management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation/Deputy Head of Delegation posts at the equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 18 people from Member States and 4 people from other EU institutions. For senior management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 3 people, all from Member States.

In 2013:

For AD non-management posts at Headquarters, the EEAS recruited 22 people from Member States (AD 05: 18; AD 07: 2; AD 10: 2). From other EU institutions, the EEAS recruited 7 people in grades AD5-14 and 38 people in the AST function group. No *lauréats de concours* were recruited at AD level.

For middle management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at the equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 11 people from Member States and 5 people from other EU institutions. For senior management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 8 people, 7 from Member States and 1 from another EU institution.”

For AD non-management posts in Delegations, 18 EEAS staff and 21 candidates from Member State were appointed in 2012.

For management positions in Delegations, the EEAS recruited 19 people from Member States and 4 people from other EU institutions.

39. How many working days were granted as vacation days in 2012 for years of service in the EEAS? How many people were concerned?

In 2012, 545 days were granted as vacation days in 2012 for years of service. 109 colleagues were concerned.

40. We would appreciate a comprehensive overview of staff on sick leave during 2012 and 2013, could you please make a comparison to the year 2011 broken down by the number of staff members that were on sick leave and by how many days they were on sick leave?

In 2012, 2308 people were on sick leave for a total of 28402 days. This corresponds to an absence rate of 3.19%. In 2013, 2541 persons were on sick leave for a total of 32813 days. This corresponds to an absence rate of 3.73%. This compares to 2011, where a total of 2194 persons were on sick leave for a total of 26393 days, corresponding to an absence rate of 3.08%.

41. How many days of sick leave concerned Mondays and Fridays in 2012 and 2013?

The attempt to extract the number of sick leave days on Monday and Fridays led to the discovery of some technical anomalies in the EEAS Sysper2. As a result, we currently cannot provide reliable data for this question. We are aware that this is possible and similar data have been extrapolated for Commission staff. We will follow this issue with DG DIGIT and we will provide the required information to the EP as soon as possible when these technical anomalies have been resolved.

Staff regulations

42. Which costs occurred in 2012 and 2013 for EEAS staff in Delegations concerning:

a. Annual leave entitlement

In 2012, the annual leave entitlements paid out upon leaving the service amounted to 511 562.85 €. This concerned a total of 60 individuals. In 2013, the figure was 580 713.08 € for a total of 97 individuals.

b. the installation allowance

2012: 2 718 423 €

2013: 2 640 416 €

The current IT system does not allow us to get reliable data on the number of staff concerned, as the system counts advance payments and final payments as separate events.

2012 : no data available

2013 : 164 staff members approximately

c. taking up duty ticket

2012: 1 377 174 € - 2012 : 142 staff members data based on C2 rotation list for 2013
2013: 1 006 749 €. – 2013 : 179 staff members data based on C2 rotation list for 2013
In 2013, this concerned around 250 persons. We have no data on 2012.

d. moving, housing

Housing cost occurred in 2012 for EEAS staff in Delegation : 29 872 410 € concerning 675 individuals.

Housing cost occurred in 2013 for EEAS staff in Delegation : 30 388 686 € concerning 720 individuals.

Moving cost occurred in 2012 for EEAS staff in Delegation : 3 693 591 € concerning 629 households.

Moving cost occurred in 2013 for EEAS staff in Delegation : 4 149 713 € concerning 578 households.

e. annual travel

2012: 6 895 383 €

2013: 7 171 943 €

f. local conditions allowances

2012: 13 448 353.14 €

2013: 14 185 985.36 €

As of December 2013, a total of 1567 EEAS staff were in Delegations that receive a local conditions allowance. The number of staff will change throughout the year, as both the staffing of these Delegations and – more infrequently – the Delegations eligible for local conditions allowances will change.

g. weightings coefficients

2012: € 2 500 000

2013: € 3 900 000

In both years, this concerned around 230 individuals in about 40 Delegations.

h. school allowances

2012: 5 365 258 € concerning around 320 persons

2013: 5 061 511 € concerning around 310 persons

i. medical cover

It is unclear what this question refers to. Contributions to medical insurance are subtracted from the salaries automatically, as for all other officials.

j. accident insurance to family

2012: 2 521 135.03 €

2013: 2 587 696.31 €

concerning 584 individuals.

k. rest leave

2012: 1 065 362.59 €

2013: 778 490.91 €

In December 2013, 385 EEAS staff worked in Delegations eligible for rest leave. The

number of staff changes throughout the year, as both the staffing of these Delegations and – more infrequently – the Delegations eligible from rest leave will change.

- How many persons were concerned in each of these categories?

Please see above.

- With the entry into force of the new staff regulations, will there be savings on the special rights which are mentioned above? If yes, what will be the estimated savings of the respective categories?

Please see reply to question 215. The following economies were incorporated in the 2014 budget:

- Living condition allowances: €800.000
- Rest Leave: €200.000
- Annual Travel: €3.000.000

In addition, it is expected that changes to the housing policy, to be implemented over 4 years with effect from 1/9/2014 will yield increasing savings over the following years for the EEAS and the Commission.

43. The EEAS Report on Budgetary and Financial Management 2012 refers in Section 1 to the EEAS being "administratively light" as a result of its dependence on Service level Agreements (SLAs) for administrative support. Could you comment on how this situation is expected to continue into the future?

As foreseen in the 2010 Council decision establishing the EEAS, "the High representative and the EEAS shall be assisted where necessary by the General Secretariat of the Council and the relevant departments of the Commission. Service level agreements may be drawn up to offer to that effect ...". When the EEAS was set up in 2011 with the transfer of staff from the Commission and General Secretariat of the Council, the corresponding administrative support staff from Commission/GSC departments were not transferred. This means that the EEAS has to rely on obtaining such services via Service Level Agreements with the Commission/GSC departments in question.

Based on the results performed by the Internal audit service (IAS) and the audit division of the EEAS which both concurred in showing that the SLA have fulfilled their objective in terms of corporate support, and based on the assessment of the EEAS management, the EEAS intends to ask for the extension of the SLA with the Commission and the GS Council over a medium term (5 years +) perspective.

44. The Report on Budgetary and Financial Management 2012, refers in section 2.1 to a transfer of €2.5 million from reserves "pending the provision of detailed information by the EEAS on staff gender/nationality and status". Could you clarify this statement, as one would assume that this information was readily available in advance.

The Commission, with the support of the EEAS, provided information on EEAS staff through the Working Document No. VII in support of the draft EU budget for 2012, in accordance with the breakdown foreseen under what was then Article 33 of the Financial Regulation.

During the budgetary procedure for 2012, Parliament entered into the reserve €2.5 million of appropriations from the line 2100 Information technology at headquarters, pending further information from the EEAS on a detailed breakdown of its staff by category, grade, nationality and sex.

The transfer of appropriations n°2/2012 aimed at transferring this amount from the reserve to the budget line, since the requested information had been provided to Parliament and the

Council.

It was moreover agreed that the same information would be provided every year in the Working Document now No. VIII accompanying the draft EU budget for the following year. The new Financial Regulation later provided in its Article 38 paragraph 8 that the same information must be provided every year.

Accordingly, this information was provided with the draft budget for 2013 and will be provided annually in future.

45. The same section of the same document refers to appropriations for salary increases which were not required being transferred to other budget lines such as 3003 "Buildings and Associated Costs" which was reinforced during the year by €7.95 million. Could you clarify the use of the word "reinforce" in this respect? Is it simply virement - i.e. transfer between budget heads or does it imply shortfall and necessity?

Appropriations under the budget line 3003 "Buildings and Associated Costs" were increased by a total of €7.95 million through transfers of appropriations n°3 and n°4/2012.

As explained in the justification of those transfers provided to Parliament and the Council:

- The transfer n°3/2012 added €3.6 million to budget line 3003 to cover a deficit of this amount, which was traced to the depreciation of the euro in 2012, the opening of new delegations in Libya, South Sudan and Uzbekistan and increased security costs in Libya, Afghanistan New York and Kiev;
- The transfer n°4/2012 added €4.350 million to budget line 3003 to cover rents for buildings for delegations and staff accommodation which had increased by a higher rate of inflation outside the European Union and the adverse impact of exchange rates.

Neither Parliament nor the Council raised any objection to those transfers.

46. In the 2011 Discharge procedure, the replies to written questions stated that "the EEAS is fully cooperating with OLAF and will shortly finalise a specific Memorandum of Understanding to put this cooperation on a solid basis. The EEAS 2012 Annual Activity Report however refers to this Memorandum of Understanding as still being under discussion. What is the current situation?

Concerning the Memorandum of Understanding between OLAF and the EEAS, we reiterate our intention to have it finalized and signed as soon as possible. However, we are coordinating our efforts with the Commission in order to ensure overall EU coherence and this coordination exercise is taking some time to be completed.

47. Annex 4 of the 2012 Annual Activity Report gives an analysis of staff numbers by type as at 31st December 2011. There is no corresponding table in the previous year's report. Could you supply equivalent figures for 31st December 2010.

The EEAS was created on 1st January 2011. There are therefore no figures for 2010.

48. Of the quantifiable errors found, all of the errors occurred in transactions which had in principle been subject to Commissions checks. None of the errors were prevented or detected. What tools is the EEAS developing to improve the quality of the audits?

For the administrative budget, the EEAS presented in 2012 a very low error rate (0,51 % for Delegations and 0,69% for HQ). Notwithstanding these very satisfactory results, our ex ante, ex post and internal audit division are constantly incorporating lessons learned and deficiencies are progressively addressed through specific support from dedicated HQ divisions and through training.

Regarding the operational budget, as explained in the Commission's replies, ex-post corrective measures such as recoveries and waivers are still possible in some cases for the transactions that had 'in principle' been subject to Commission checks. The Commission agreed that measures have nevertheless to be taken to decrease further the number of errors and an Action Plan is being implemented. Particularly, Heads of Delegation will ensure the application of the measures developed to enhance the quality of audits, within the Action Plan for addressing the weaknesses in the control sector that has been approved by EuropeAid in May 2013.

49. The Court of Auditors has concerns about the effectiveness of EuropeAid's supervisory and control systems. What measures is the EEAS taking to ensure progress is made on the implementation of control mechanisms?

The recommendations by the European Court of Auditors are taken into account during the programming cycle. The EEAS has a regular dialogue with the Commission (DG DEVCO) on aid issues and the Action Plan following the 2012 Reservation. The EEAS, and in particular the Heads of Delegations as Authorising Officers by Sub-Delegation will take the appropriate measures to prevent errors to the extent possible and to address the concerns expressed by the European Court of Auditors. They will particularly facilitate, as far as they are concerned, the application of the measures foreseen in EuropeAid Action Plan. 6 out of the 8 specific objectives for the Action Plan concern particularly Delegations:

1. Awareness-raising on the most common types of errors and the ways to avoid them
2. Reinforcing the financial/control skills at Delegations
3. More specific training and guidance
4. Improving further the quality of external audits
5. Reinforcing the accountability of Delegations in the framework of the EAMR on monitoring of performance, and the follow-up and corrective measures to errors identified by audits
- (...)
8. Streamlining the control system and correcting possible weaknesses identified in Delegations

50. According to the Staff Regulation when the EEAS is fully set up and reaches its full capacity, 1/3 of the AD staff has to be from the national diplomatic services. Has this goal been reached?

Staff in AD grades represent about 24% of the staff establishment of the EEAS. By Summer 2013, 32.9% were Temporary Agents (TAs) from the diplomatic services of the Member States. The one third target for national diplomats was therefore met within the deadline set by the EEAS decision.

51. Is it possible to name the 5 Delegations with the highest percentage of mismanagement of administrative expenditures?

According to the results of the EEAS ex-post controls, the administrative error rate, material error rate and errors in procurement (applying also the Court of Auditors' methodology) are the highest in the five following Delegations:

-1- New Caledonia, -2- Fiji, -3- Angola, -4- Cameroun, -5- Barbados.

In this context it should be recalled that Delegations may also confront particular difficulties due to size, remoteness, local staff turnover, relatively limited availability of skilled local staff, difficulties with broadband access and other issues including a local market not used to compositing in structured competitive tenders.

52. Regarding the EEAS, the audit noted that some weaknesses persisted in the management of social allowances. The weaknesses in the management of social allowances were remarked also in 2011 annual report. Does this mean that the yearly update of the staff personal file is not guaranteed? Did the situation lead to incorrect payments? (par. 9.16. page 226 of the annual report)

If yes, what was the total amount incorrectly deducted? Were the incorrectly paid amounts recovered? If not, then how much is still to be recovered?

In March 2013, the PMO has launched an exercise designed to adjust the deduction of the allowances paid by the Belgian authorities from the family allowances received by the staff under the EU Staff Regulation. This deduction follows from Article 67 (2) of the Staff Regulations, according to which agents *"in receipt of family allowances shall declare allowances of like nature paid from other sources; such latter allowances shall be deducted from those paid under Articles 1, 2 and 3 of Annex VII"*.

The exercise concerned the indexations of 1 September 2008, 1 September 2010, 1 May 2011, 1 February 2012 and 1 December 2012. In addition, if applicable, the supplement(s) staff concerned have been receiving for children who turned 6, 12 or 18 years of age during the period from August 2008 up to now were included.

For those who did not declare any recent adaptations, they have been processed automatically and were included in the March 2013 salary.

Any debt inferior to € 200 has been automatically deducted from the March 2013 salary. If the debt incurred was equal or superior to €200, it would be recovered over a period of 12 months starting from the May 2013 salary. This concerned 207 cases.

Since April 2013 the automatic update of Belgian family allowances for all EEAS management centres have been running on a monthly basis and the module was applied in successive steps to deal with allowances received from other Member States: in May 2013 for Germany, in June for Ireland and later on for France and The Netherlands. For 2014 Finland, Sweden, Romania, Austria, Hungary and Latvia are scheduled.

The EEAS informs staff on an annual basis via the intranet and by e-mail of the obligation to inform the PMO of any changes in relation to the family allowances received from other sources.

53. There are understandably difficulties in managing procurement and taxes in Delegations, specifically those territories where procedures are completely different from those in the EU. Have you tried to exchange best practices and learn more from Member State national embassies in those places?

It is common practice that the heads of administration of EU delegations and the chancelleries and/ or staff responsible of the administration of MS embassies meet regularly to discuss and exchange experience related to administrative procedures and the problems they face in third countries.

The cooperation among Member States Embassies and EU Delegations includes the possibility of joint procurement of supplies or services foreseen in the new financial regulation.

54. Could the HR-VP indicate, since the establishment of the EEAS, how many Member-States Embassies and or Consulates have been closed in countries where an EEAS 'delegation' is present, or are planning to close down their diplomatic missions in the coming year?

The EEAS does not keep track record of the evolution of the network of each Member States Embassies/Consulates. Please see below, question 55.

55. In how many cases does the EEAS delegation offer facilities in their premises to diplomatic staff /representatives of Member-States who have shut down their embassy or consulate?

The EEAS has no general statistics on the number of closure or opening of member states embassies. At the same time and as the EU, Member States are also adapting their diplomatic network to better reflect their priorities. The EEAS is in close touch with Member States to offer, wherever possible, office space to facilitate their diplomatic presence in third countries, be it when they open a diplomatic mission on a small scale or when they reduce their diplomatic presence. Several successful projects have been achieved over the last years.

As far as the closure of diplomatic mission from EU member States is concerned, the EU Delegations in Belarus and Yemen offer facilities in their premises to diplomatic staff of Austria and Spain who have reduced their presence (although still formally having their own representation in the country). In Nicaragua, the EU Delegation offered one office to Sweden for six months after the embassy's closure.

56. Could the EEAS give an overview of those delegations providing consular assistance to EU citizens including the indication for which nationalities?

Consular protection remains a national competence, therefore Delegations do not provide direct assistance to EU citizens. Delegations support the Member States by facilitating cooperation and in helping them to provide assistance to unrepresented citizens. This is done in a number of countries. One recent example is South Sudan where the delegation helped the local coordination of evacuation unrepresented citizens (main nationalities of unrepresented citizens: Italy, Belgium, Finland, Portugal, Sweden, Ireland, Greece, Denmark) other recent examples are Lebanon and Philippines.

57. Can the EEAS guaranty that every European citizen can get consular assistance in those countries where the EEAS has an official delegation?

Consular protection is a national competence; however the EEAS, according to the mandate received, is working in close cooperation with Member States and Delegations to ensure that every EU citizen can get consular assistance from a MS present as provided by the Treaties.

58. Could the HR-VP indicate what was the approximate total amount of savings made by the Member-States in closing down their respective diplomatic missions?

This information is not available from Member States.

59. What simplification measures can be suggested and/or implemented in order to address the complicated funding sources structure consisting of 27 different budget lines, thus creating significant challenges in terms of the EEAS' budget administration?

Administrative expenditure in delegations is financed from the EEAS' budget, which itself receives contributions from the Commission in excess of €260 million a year to cover expenditure related to Commission staff in the delegations. Such contributions come from 26 different budget lines plus the European Development Fund. Some of these lines belong to the Commission's administrative budget. 9 are "ex-BA" lines, i.e. lines attached to operational programmes meant to finance the direct administrative costs of their implementation, and 8 others belong to various headings such as Research and OLAF.

Some expenditure is financed by one Commission budget line (e.g. the salary of a local agent working for an operational programme is financed by the "ex-BA" line attached to that programme).

Some "communal" expenditure is shared between the EEAS and various Commission budget lines (e.g. rents for delegations offices, security, informatics, cleaning, repairs) according to a breakdown key based on the number of posts attributed to the EEAS, the Commission and

the various operational programmes in the delegation concerned.

Costs for communications between headquarters and delegations are shared according to a global key based on the number of posts attributed to every funding source in the delegations network as a whole.

Investments in delegations' office buildings are shared between the EEAS' and the Commission's administrative budgets only, based on the number of posts attributable to each institution in the delegation concerned (staff implementing operational programmes in this case are attributed to the Commission).

Such communal expenditure can only be met if all the various sources involved have sufficient appropriations to provide their due contribution according the relevant distribution key. However, the major shortcoming of the current system lies in the fact that the budgets from the different sources (EEAS, Commission Heading V, ex-BA lines and EDF) are not always balanced since each budget follows an individual and parallel approval procedure. As a result, appropriations on the various lines in the budget finally approved do not necessarily match. Furthermore, any unforeseen increase in compulsory non-communal expenditure (e.g. on salaries) would lead to new imbalances on the budget for "communal expenditures". Technical blockages result, when one or more sources do not have enough resources to contribute their share to an item of communal expenditure.

Although applicable across the broad spectrum of communal administrative costs, this is especially true for large items of investment expenditure involving purchases of assets such as office equipment, vehicles or renovations. Appropriations available on certain budgets may remain unused because other budgets cannot provide their contribution to necessary communal expenses. This problem would arise with any system where a given item of expenditure has to be financed from multiple budget lines belonging to different institutions.

In order to alleviate the problem, the EEAS in November 2013 made a proposal to the Commission for simplification. One option would be to transfer to the EEAS' budget the appropriations for all communal administrative expenditure in delegations from the Commission's administrative budget and ex-BA lines. Appropriations for expenditure such as salaries, rent of housing etc. which is charged to only one source would not be transferred. The European Development Fund, to avoid any interference with the debate on its inclusion in the EU budget, would remain an outside source.

If this option is implemented, the number of funding sources for any communal expenditure will be reduced to a maximum of 2 (the EEAS, and where applicable the EDF), therefore greatly reducing the complexity and the risk of mismatch and technical impossibility to finance necessary expenses because of insufficient appropriations on one budget line.

60. What measures have been taken in order to increase the level of expertise required and the resources needed in respect of the EEAS' accounting function which, so far, has generated difficulties and heavy workload?

The increase of level of expertise and resources has been achieved by both increasing, by internal transfer of one post, the number of staff involved in the accounting function in the EEAS and by enhancing and clarifying the collaboration and division of tasks between the EEAS staff involved in the accounting activities and the staff of BUDG involved within the Accounting Service. The additional post has been dedicated to the function of Accounting Correspondent with specific responsibility for accounting quality and has been occupied by a staff member who previously worked in the accounting function of DG BUDG.

Thanks to this the accounting closure operations for year 2012 have been smoother than the same operations in 2011.

61. Can the HR-VP report about progress made regarding the new anti-fraud strategy which the EEAS started discussing with OLAF and which was supposed to be finalized in 2013? Has the envisaged Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the EEAS and OLAF been concluded and what have been the results of such a cooperation? If not, can the HR-VP inform the discharge authority of the reasons of the MoU's non-conclusion and suggest a possible way forward?

Concerning the Memorandum of Understanding between OLAF and the EEAS, we reiterate our intention to have it finalized and signed as soon as possible. However, we are coordinating our efforts with the Commission in order to assure overall EU coherence and this coordination exercise is taking some time to be completed.

62. What measures and actions have been taken in order to address the shortcomings of the management at the EEAS Headquarters as highlighted in the 2012 Annual Activity Report which are causing high levels of administrative errors, inter alia due to: the lack of support staff managing the appropriations covering administrative costs; the high dependency on the Commission and the Council corporate support which proved to be an obstacle to more efficiency and flexibility; the lack of human resources dealing with the increasing number of transactions which are seen by the sub-delegated authorising officers as potentially risky?

The EEAS has developed and implemented an action plan to specifically address the shortcomings mentioned in the 2011 and 2012 annual activity report and having justified a reservation. This action plan dedicated to the specific area of the management of security contract for delegations by the HQ has led to focus efforts on the reduction of administrative errors, the reduction of late payments and the better anticipation of the end of contracts to avoid contract extension.

At the same time, the EEAS is discussing with the Commission and the General Secretariat of the Council the way to improve wherever needed the corporate support services provided under the Service level agreements.

63. What remedial action has been taken to address the high level of administrative errors in the management of the security contracts?

The EEAS established an action plan in spring 2012 which was implemented throughout 2012 and 2013. Important measures of the action plan were the recruitment of more financial staff, training and close follow-up of budget execution (commitments and payments). See also question 3.

64. What measures have been introduced in order to improve the Delegations' compliance with some administrative procedures, especially the public procurement?

- The new financial regulation has simplified the procedures for "low value contracts" (i.e. contracts with a total value below EUR 60 000). Consequently, the delegations have received a specific guide for managing these contracts for being those more frequently tendered at Delegation's level. The specific guide for low value contracts in Delegations include examples for the most frequent supplies or services tendered by Delegations.
- For contracts of a value equal or above EUR 60 000, the EU Delegations use standard tender documents (templates) for the procurement of security and cleaning services, which are those contracts periodically renewed by Delegations of higher amount. In addition, all procurement procedures above EUR 60 000 are subject of an ex-ante control before a contract is signed.
- Monitoring ex-post publication of contract awards and contracts database (ABAC-contract)
- Regular training on procurement procedures is provided both at HQ and in Delegations with the participation of Heads of Administration of Delegations and local staff.

65. Can the HR-VP inform the discharge authority about the progress achieved in respect of security contracts for the Delegations in Libya and Afghanistan?

The current security contract in Libya started in June 2012 and is based on the Global Framework Contract of 2011. A new call of tender has been launched corresponding more to the specific needs and to better face the unforeseeable increased security challenges in Libya requiring a reinforced security set up. The contract will be awarded soon.

In Afghanistan a new tender procedure has been concluded resulting in a new framework contract whose implementation started on the 1 November 2013.

OLAF

66. What was the reason for establishing an OLAF contact point in the EEAS's Managing Directorate Resources?

The Managing Directorate Resources (MDR) supports the Chief Operating Officer in the administrative and financial management of the EEAS. It is also responsible for security and for human resources. In view of that, it is the department best placed to host the EEAS OLAF contact point.

67. How many times was this OLAF contact point contacted since its establishment?

Informal contacts and operational exchanges of information are frequent. Regular wrap up meeting take place on a yearly basis.

68. How many OLAF cases were opened since the creation of the Service where the EEAS, the Delegations, any individuals working for the EEAS or any of its service contractors were the subject of OLAF investigations?

Since the creation of the Service, 52 cases, related to either administrative expenditures (HQ and DELs) or to operational expenditures (DELs), were analysed by OLAF: specifically, 18 cases in 2011, 24 in 2012, 10 in 2013. In a number of cases, OLAF decided that there was no ground to open a formal investigation.

69. How many OLAF investigations concerning EEAS cases were closed? What were the results?

At the end of 2012 there were 22 ongoing investigations concerning EEAS staff. 20 of those investigations were closed during 2013.

Results;

- a. 8 of the investigations were closed with recommendations
 - i. 6 recommendations for Disciplinary actions
 - ii. 4 recommendations for Judicial actions
 - iii. 3 recommendations for Financial recovery
- b. 12 investigations were closed without any follow up

70. The new anti-fraud strategy of the EEAS prepared in cooperation with OLAF was planned to be finalized in 2013. Was it accepted as planned last year?

The EEAS anti fraud strategy was drafted in December 2013 and should be adopted by February 2014 (subject to ongoing consultation on the text).

71. If not then what is the reason for not finalizing the strategy which the Service started to prepare already in 2012?

In view of the dual financial responsibilities in the EU Delegations for EEAS and Commission

funds, it is necessary to ensure management and control policies which cover both. The negotiation of a common approach for an Anti-Fraud-Strategy for EU Delegations, which could combine the essential elements of the individual AFS of the relevant COM DGs and of the EEAS, has required time and extensive co-ordination work.

72. When is the Memorandum of Understanding with OLAF expected to be concluded? What is the reason for the delay in accepting the Memorandum of Understanding?

Concerning the Memorandum of Understanding between OLAF and the EEAS, we reiterate our intention to have it finalized and signed as soon as possible. However, we are coordinating our efforts with the Commission in order to assure overall EU coherence and this coordination exercise is taking some time to be completed.

EU Delegations

73. Are the bigger EU Delegations located in countries which are more important for the European Union's external relations?

The size of the EU Delegations is indeed a function of the importance of the EU's external relations with the host country. It is important, however, to bear in mind that as a result of the decentralised management of our cooperation programmes, Delegations in countries with large cooperation budgets tend to be larger, due to the number of staff required to manage the different projects.

74. Were there any new EU Delegations opened in year 2012 or 2013?

In 2013, an EU Delegation was opened in the United Arab Emirates, while 2012 saw the opening of the EU Delegation to Myanmar, and 2011, the EU Delegations to Libya and to South Sudan.

75. Were there any EU Delegations closed in year 2012 or 2013? If yes what was the reason for closing down those Delegations?

The EU tries to be represented in as many third countries as possible. This entails balancing budgetary constraints against EU foreign policy priorities. In order to liberate resources (financial and human) to make it possible to open the Delegations mentioned above, the EU Delegations to Vanuatu and to Suriname were closed in 2013. Responsibility for relations with those countries has been transferred to nearby Delegations. That same year, as a result of the accession of Croatia to the EU, the EU Delegation to Croatia was also closed. In addition, as of 1st January 2014, the former EU Delegation to New Caledonia has been replaced by a smaller Commission Office for Overseas Countries and Territories.

76. Who is deciding about the opening of EU Delegations and on what bases?

Article 5 (1) of Council Decision 2010/427/EU of 26.07.2010 establishing the organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service (EEAS) provides that the decision to open or close a Delegation shall be adopted by the High Representative in agreement with the Council and the Commission.

77. Who is deciding about the closure of EU Delegations and on what bases?

Article 5 (1) of Council Decision 2010/427/EU of 26.07.2010 establishing the organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service (EEAS) provides that the decision to open or close a Delegation shall be adopted by the High Representative in agreement with the Council and the Commission.

78. What was the reason for the closure of the EU Delegation in Suriname?

As stated above, the reason for closing the EU Delegation to Suriname was mainly budgetary. After evaluation, it was considered that EU relations with Suriname could be covered from the EU Delegation to Guyana, whose Head of Delegation was anyway already accredited to Suriname. This liberated resources necessary to open Delegations in other parts of the world, in line with international developments and the evolving priorities of EU foreign policy.

79. What were the financial impacts (running rental contracts, service contracts, security contracts, etc.) of the closure of the EU Delegation in Suriname?

The estimated annual savings generated by the closure of the delegation in Surinam can be equated to the former costs of this delegation, which in 2012 were:

Rental contracts	€63.610
Security	€31.200
Telecommunication	€13.400
Other (Transport, stationery, documentation)	€15.100
Total	<u>€123.310</u>

80. What was the reason of the closure of the EU Delegation in New Caledonia?

The reason for closing the EU Delegation to New Caledonia was the fact that New Caledonia is part of the French Overseas Countries and Territories. In order to make it possible to continue to manage our cooperation programmes with New Caledonia, the EU Delegation was replaced by a Commission Office as of 1st January 2014.

81. What were the financial impacts (running rental contracts, service contracts, security contracts, etc.) of the closure of the EU Delegation in New Caledonia?

The estimated annual savings generated by the closure of the delegation in New Caledonia can be equated to the former costs of this delegation, which in 2012 were:

Rental contracts	€88.563
Security	€1.257
Other (Transport, stationery, documentation)	€35.091
Telecommunication	€29.966
Total	<u>€154.877</u>

82. Are there any examples of EU Delegations sharing offices with the diplomatic services of Member States? If yes in which countries?

- Afghanistan: Lithuania
- Azerbaijan: Spain
- Belarus: Austria
- Colombia: Finland, Czech Republic
- East Timor: France and Spanish Cooperation
- Ethiopia: Luxembourg
- Iraq: United Kingdom
- Mauritania: United Kingdom
- Nigeria: Italy and Netherlands (same compound)
- South Sudan: Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom (same compound).
- Yemen: Spain and Danish Cooperation.

Several EU Delegations also have a "bureau de passage" used by Member States (in Djibouti, Iceland, Norway, Taiwan, Malawi, France, Russia, Nicaragua, USA, Singapore, Philippines).

83. Are there any examples of EU Delegations employing local staff together with the diplomatic services of Member States? If yes in which countries?

No

84. Are there any examples of EU Delegations sharing security service contracts with the diplomatic services of Member States? If yes in which countries?

There are several examples. In the case of co-location, agreements are established for the sharing of security services with Member States concerned. In Syria and Colombia, member states diplomats were and are co-located within the EU Delegation, and using Delegation services including security services. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, parts of the services of the security contractor of the EU Delegation are provided to the German embassy hosted in the same building. The costs are reimbursed to the EU Delegation. In Iraq, the protection of the EU delegation is performed by the security services of the UK embassy on the basis of a Memorandum of understanding and the EEAS is reimbursing the costs.

85. Are there any plans to further strengthen the cooperation between the diplomatic services of Member States and the EU Delegations? In which areas could they cooperate more and in which areas is there room for savings from the cooperation?

As regards colocation, a network of Directors and Heads of Department for Infrastructure within the ministries and the EEAS has been created and regular meetings are held to further strengthen the cooperation in this field. Informal bilateral consultations with Member States are also planned for 2014.

Cooperation could be further strengthened and savings achieved in areas such as: pooling of logistical/technical/human resources, joint procurement, sharing costs for securing the premises, joint field visits.

86. Are there any examples of EU Delegations taking over the tasks of issuing Schengen Visas? Are there any plans to make it possible to apply for Schengen Visas at the EU Delegations?

Issuing of Schengen visas is not in the mandate of the EEAS. This is the responsibility of Member States. However, EU Delegations chair local Schengen coordination meetings behalf of the Commission (Visa Code, Art 48).

87. What was the total amount paid by the EEAS and/or the Commission in 2012 for local agents in the Delegations?

The total amount paid by the EEAS and the Commission in 2012 for local agents in the Delegations was 116.6 Million €.

88. How many local agents were employed globally by the EEAS and the Commission in year 2012 in the Delegations?

In 2012 the EEAS and the Commission were employing about 3160 local agents in the Delegations (July 2012 data, the number changes every month).

89. How many EU Delegations were there with only with one Head of Delegation working in 2012?

The EU does not have any one-(wo)man Delegations. Therefore, the Head of Delegation is never alone, although there are a small number of Delegations (the six listed below) where

the HoD is the only official and sometimes even the only expatriate staff (outside those in support administrative and support functions). This is the case in the EU Delegations to the Council of Europe, Costa Rica and New Zealand. The latter, though, is about to be reinforced with a second EEAS AD official.

6 EU Delegations with only one EEAS AD official (and no COM AD official) :

Council of Europe (Strasbourg)

COSTA RICA

GAMBIA

NEW ZEALAND

SOLOMON ISLANDS

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

90. How many EU Delegations were there with only one AD staff in 2012?

Idem 6 :

There are 15 EU Delegations with only one EEAS AD official (listed below). This figure is reduced to six if Commission AD officials are also taken into account. However, the EU Delegation to New Zealand is about to be reinforced with a second EEAS AD official.

While there are currently no plans to close any of those Delegations, it is important to note that of the five Delegations where there will be only one AD official in 2014, four are regionalised Delegations, headed by a Chargé d’Affaires, under the responsibility of a Regional Delegation, who can provide support, as necessary, to the CAF.

15 EU Delegations with only one EEAS AD official

Council of Europe (Strasbourg)

COSTA RICA

EL SALVADOR

Food and Agriculture Organisation (Rome)

GAMBIA

GUATEMALA

HONDURAS

LAOS

LESOTHO

MONTENEGRO

NEW ZEALAND

SOLOMON ISLANDS

SWAZILAND

TAIWAN

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

6 EU Delegations with only one EEAS AD official (and no COM AD official)

COE

COSTA RICA

GAMBIA

NEW ZEALAND

SOLOMON ISLANDS

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

91. Which were the 5 Delegations which have indicated their Internal Control Standards compliance below 70%? What was the reason for these low values?

According to the 2012 Internal Control Standards (ICS) self-assessment done by the delegations, the 5 Delegations with compliance rates below 70% are:

Weighting	Delegation
52%	Djibouti
42%	Libya
59%	East Timor
47%	Uzbekistan
55%	Yemen

The low values can arise for a number of reasons, remoteness of the Delegation, size of the Delegation, staff turnover, newly created Delegation, local situation.

92. Which Delegation indicated its Internal Control Standards compliance to be only 42%? What was the reason for this low value?

This is from the 2012 Internal Control Standards (ICS) self-assessment carried out by the Delegations, the Delegation concerned is: LIBYA.

In the case of Libya, the Delegation was in a start-up phase in a challenging environment.

93. In 2011 14 Delegations showed effectiveness results below 50%, there were no Delegations in 2012 which showed their effectiveness results below 50% and only one displayed results below 75%. How did the EEAS achieve these positive changes?

Due to the follow up of the previous recommendations issued by the Ex-Post Control Division and the Delegation support and evaluation Service, and due to the experience acquired with e-DAS IT application by the Delegation, the Delegations have globally improved their knowledge on the Internal Control Standards and consequently it is reflecting in their implementation and on the related figures.

94. 57% of the Heads of EU Delegations considered in 2011 that the qualifications of their staff in the operational field and in the areas of finance, control and auditing are inadequate to perform their tasks. Was this evaluation repeated in 2012? If yes what results did it have?

Yes the evaluation was repeated in the framework of the External Assistance Management Report for year 2012. To the question: "*Do you consider that staff of the OPR/FCA sections have received the necessary training to fulfil their tasks?*", 51% of the Heads of Delegations answered "Yes" and 49% answered "No".

95. How many cases of security contracts signed or extended during extreme conditions occurred in 2012, and in which countries?

The need to open promptly an office of the EU in Benghazi in 2011 and the EU-Delegation in Tripoli early 2012, required to establish under time pressure the corresponding contract ensuring the security of the EU staff in Libya before a new tender procedure could be concluded in May 2012.

Given the complex legal and security situation in Afghanistan, the existing contract had to be extended in autumn 2012 until the tender procedure for a new framework contract could be concluded in 2013.

96. How is the Service solving the problem of EU Delegations working in extreme security conditions? Are there more funds allocated to Delegations operating in difficult security situations?

EU delegations working in extreme security conditions face many challenges. Because of the specificity of their security requirement, contracts are directly managed by HQ. These contracts are more costly than usual security contract, as they often encompass a close

protection component. Staff has to do a specific training for hostile environment. Because of the challenging working and living environment, staff receives an adequate living and condition allowance and enjoys rest leave.

Security service contracts for the protection of the EU Delegations and their staff are concluded for all EU Delegations where necessary. The scope of these contracts is defined after a thorough risk assessment of the security situation at the place of the EU Delegation and in the country concerned. The needs and scope for the specific Delegation have a direct impact on the costs. For Delegations working in extreme security conditions where e.g. a permanent close protection component is needed, the costs are higher. Accordingly more funds are allocated to these Delegations operating in difficult security situations.

97. Does the EEAS have a special rule of procedure for the staff in Delegations with extreme security conditions?

The EEAS applies Annex X, Art. 10, §2 of the Staff Regulation for staff in Delegations with extreme security conditions:

"If living conditions at the place of employment are such as to put the official at personal risk, a temporary additional allowance shall be paid to him by special reasoned decision of the appointing authority. That allowance shall be fixed as a percentage of the reference amount referred to in the first subparagraph of paragraph 1:

- where the authority recommends to its staff not to settle their families or other dependants in the place of employment, provided that they follow that recommendation;
- where the authority decides to reduce temporarily the number of staff serving in the place of employment.

In duly justified cases, the appointing authority may also determine that a post is a non-family posting. The above-mentioned allowance shall be paid to staff members who respect that determination."

98. Was the Action Plan fully implemented in the 5 Delegations (Afghanistan, Djibouti, Guyana, Solomon Islands and Zambia), where serious problems in the management of security contracts occurred in 2011?

The action plan of 2012 of the Security Directorate concerned only the security contracts managed by the HQ, e.g. Afghanistan, Libya etc.. Good progress has been achieved in the implementation of the action plan.

The deficiencies in the management of security contracts by delegations are subject of another action plan which started in 2013 and is in the implementation phase.

Specifically, for the Delegations in Djibouti and Solomon Islands, the EEAS HQ is providing specific support to tendering. In Guyana and Zambia there are no problems in the management of security contracts.

99. Who was responsible for the management of the security contracts in the 5 Delegations (Afghanistan, Djibouti, Guyana, Solomon Islands and Zambia), when there were serious problems in the management of security contracts in those Delegations?

See also question 98. Afghanistan contracts are managed by HQ. For the other Delegations, they are managed locally.

100. Were there any personal changes including the Head of Delegation and Deputy Head of Delegation in the 5 Delegations (Afghanistan, Djibouti, Guyana, Solomon Islands and Zambia), where serious problems in the management of security contracts occurred in 2011?

EEAS staff in Delegations generally rotate after 3 or 4-year postings (depending on the country), so there have been personnel changes since 2011 among EEAS staff in all of these delegations: Afghanistan, Djibouti, Guyana, Solomon Islands, Venezuela and Zambia.

The current Heads of Delegation in Afghanistan and Venezuela took up duty in 2013. The current Head of Delegation in Djibouti has been in place since 2012, and the current Heads of Delegation in Guyana, Papua New Guinea (also covering Solomon Islands) and Zambia have been in place since 2011.

Among the above Delegations, only Afghanistan has a Deputy Head of Delegation. The post was created in 2012.

101. Were there any examples of problems with the management of security contracts in 2012 or 2013 (similar to those in Afghanistan, Djibouti, Guyana, Solomon Islands and Zambia)? If yes in which Delegations?

After a general survey of all security contracts managed by the Delegations, an action plan has been launched in 2013 to assist a certain number of Delegations to retender their security contracts.

102. Were there any examples of problems with the management of building contracts in 2012 or 2013? If yes in which Delegations?

There were no significant problems in the management of building contracts. On the contrary, managing works contract in the infrastructure area in third countries is complex and challenging. For example, the construction of a new building in Port-au-Prince (Haiti) has suffered delays because of the difficulties in doing business in the local market.

103. Are there any EU Delegations where a similar Action Plan had to be set up after 2011, like the Action Plans set up in case of the EU Delegations to Afghanistan, Djibouti, Guyana, Solomon Islands and Zambia?

See answers to questions 99 and 101.

104. Were there any more cases after year 2011 like the case which occurred at the EU Delegation to Venezuela, which showed bad results in the managing of a contract for the provision of security services in 2011?

Yes. After a general survey of all security contracts managed by the Delegations, an action plan has been launched in 2013 to assist a certain number of Delegations to retender their security contracts. “

105. Are there any other EU Delegations with security contracts in force without modification for a long period (like the security contract of the EU Delegation in Venezuela which has been in force for 24 years without change), which is against the obligation to regularly tender service contracts?

There have been a few cases. Like Venezuela the contracts in Rome (Italy), Tanzania and Fiji were in force for more than 10 years in continuity without re-tendering. The EEAS HQ and services are working with these delegations to address this issue as part of the general action plan.

106. Is there a procedure to guarantee that the Delegations are regularly tendering their service contracts? How can the Service guarantee the regular tendering of the Delegations? What is the current procedure in force?

The procedure is foreseen in the financial regulation and its rules of application. In addition, on 10 March 2011 the Chief Operating Officer of the EEAS sent an instruction note to all EEAS authorising officers by sub-delegation (Headquarters and Delegations) with the rules of procedure for EEAS procurement and contract analysis.

A general reminder is sent to Delegations at the beginning of the year concerning their obligation to publish their tenders and regular renewal of contracts and specific instructions are sent to heads of delegation every time that it is found that a contract had to be renewed.

107. The Service requested the incorrectly paid amount to be refunded by the service contractor of the EU Delegation to Venezuela, is the amount fully recovered by now? If not how much is there to still be recovered and what is the reason for the delay?

The EEAS is not aware of any amounts which needed to be recovered from a service contractor in Venezuela. All services paid for under the former security contract were effectively rendered. Furthermore, the delegation in Venezuela did proceed with a new tender for security services to replace the former contract which had been in place for a long period of time. The tender was completed in 2013 and a new contract has been signed. The other issue concerning the delegation in Venezuela was the recovery of VAT from the host country which had not been reclaimed for a number of year. The delegation completed during 2013 all of the administrative steps to recover VAT for the years 2006 onwards and is now awaiting refund of the amounts due from the national authorities.

108. Did the personnel of the EEAS, including the Head of Delegation and Deputy Head of Delegation change in the EU Delegation to Venezuela since the problems in subject occurred?

EEAS staff in Delegations generally rotate after 3 or 4-year postings (depending on the country), so there have been personnel changes since 2011 among EEAS staff in the EU delegation in Venezuela.

The current Heads of Delegation in Venezuela took up duty in 2013.

109. Are there any other service contracts and contractors of the EEAS under the investigation of OLAF, like the contractor of the EU Delegation to Afghanistan, which had to repay 316.985 EUR? If yes in how many cases did OLAF start an investigation? Which Delegations were subject to OLAF investigation since 2011?

OLAF investigative work prior to the opening of a case is not always disclosed and is subject to legislation for personal data protection, the European Parliament is invited to request the information directly to OLAF.

There has been one other case of service contract where OLAF has suggested very recently the EEAS to repay a part of the amount of the annual cost of the contract.

110. Did the personnel of the EEAS, including the Head of Delegation and Deputy Head of Delegation change in the EU Delegation to Afghanistan since the problems in subject occurred?

EEAS staff in Delegations generally rotate after 3 or 4-year postings (depending on the country), so there have been personnel changes since 2011 among EEAS staff in Afghanistan,.

The current Heads of Delegation in Afghanistan took up duty in 2013. Afghanistan has a Deputy Head of Delegation. The post was created in 2012.

111. Are there any other examples where the EEAS has requested to refund amounts paid to service providers (building contracts or security contracts) since the case with the Venezuela and Afghanistan EU Delegation? If yes in which Delegation and what amounts?

There have not been any other cases where the EEAS has requested refunds from service providers in relation to building contracts or security contracts.

112. Is it possible to name the 10 Delegations with the highest percentage of mismanagement of administrative expenditures for year 2012?

If we combine administrative mismanagement + material error + incorrect tendering/CoA methodology, the 10 delegations with the highest error rates in 2012 were:

- 1- New Caledonia
- 2- Fiji
- 3- Angola
- 4- Camerun
- 5- Barbados
- 6- Roma
- 7- Paris
- 8- Strasbourg
- 9- Gabon
- 10- Congo RDC

Most of these delegations operate in very challenging environment or are very small and have very few transactions.

113. Was the security contract signed by the EEAS and Argus in 2011 in Libya re-examined after the extreme conditions were over in the country?

Yes. .The current security contract in Libya started in June 2012 and is based on the Global Framework Contract of 2011. A new call of tender has been launched corresponding more to the specific needs and to better face the unforeseeable increased security challenges in Libya requiring a reinforced security set up.

The need to open promptly an office of the EU in Benghazi in 2011 and the EU-Delegation in Tripoli early 2012, required to establish under time pressure the corresponding contract ensuring the security of the EU staff in Libya before a new tender procedure could be concluded in May 2012.

114. Who is responsible for the management of the security contracts in the Delegations?

The management of security contracts in the delegations falls under the responsibility of the Heads of Delegation as Authorising Officers by sub-delegation (AOSD). Certain more complex contracts in high risks contries are managed directly from headquarters.

EU Special Representatives

115. How many EU Special Representatives are there in total?

There were 11 EU Special Representatives in December 2013.

116. From which Member States are the EU Special Representatives from?

France: 2
Germany: 2

UK: 1
Hungary: 1
Denmark: 2
Greece: 2
Spain: 1

117. How many EEAS officials or temporary staff are working for each EU Special Representative?

There are no EEAS officials or temporary staff working for EU Special Representatives

118. How many Brussels-based EU Special Representatives are there?

There are 7 Brussels-based EU Special Representatives

119. How many local offices belong to each of the EU Special Representatives?

EUSRs who are “double-hatted” as heads of delegation use, together with their EUSR staff, existing buildings / office space of the EU delegation. The EU Delegation charges the EUSR for the use, maintenance and services related to the office space occupied by the EUSR staff. 4 EUSRs are double hatted and are housed on the premises of the EU Delegation (EUSRs for BiH, Afghanistan, African Union and Kosovo).

The Brussels based EUSRs are housed in the premises of the EEAS and reimburse the costs of office support.

Wherever the other EUSRs have local offices, these are always rented.

The EUSR for Kosovo, based in Pristina, has a local office in Mitrovica.

As regards Brussels based EUSRs only the following rent (or rented) a local office in the country / region concerned:

- Sudan and South Sudan (mandate t ended on 31/10/2013)) (Khartoum – Sudan)
- South Caucasus and Crisis in Georgia (Tbilisi, Georgia)
- MEPP (Jerusalem – office in use until end of February 2013)
- Horn of Africa (Nairobi, Kenia)
- Central Asia (Ashgabat, Turkmenistan)

120. The Brussels-based EU Special Representatives have a significantly higher travel budget than those based in the region/country they are responsible for, wouldn't it be more cost efficient if none of the EU Special Representatives would be Brussels-based?

There are good reasons to have Brussels based EU special representative. One of the reasons is that their region or subject of competence does not require a posting abroad (e.g.: human rights) or would require to chose a specific country which could undermine the regional dimension of their mission (Southern Mediterranean, South Caucasus, Central Asia, Sahel). The posting of these EUSR and part of their staff in Brussels does not automatically entail higher missions costs and is more cost efficient in terms of remunerations.

121. How is the Service dealing with conflicts between EU Special Representatives and directorates of the Service responsible for the same regions/countries?

There is no specific conflict between EU Special representative and geographical Directorate in charge. For double hatted EUSR (also holding a post of Head of delegation), a normal dialogue takes place with HQ as for other Heads of delegation. For EUSR who are not double hatted, dialogue and exchange of views is even facilitated through the fact that their office is

located in the EEAS HQ building, close to the department in charge of the same region / countries.

Training

122. What did the Service's 2012 training program include for Delegation staff?

- Annual Seminars per function group
- Pre-posting seminars
- Financial management courses
- Protective Security Training
- Language training
- Management training
- General and Specialized courses
- Regional Seminars
- Courses organised by training partners (MS, ESDC,EUI etc.)

123. What did the Service's 2012 training program include for staff in Brussels?

- General and Specific thematic courses
- General and Specific competences courses
- Protective Security training
- Language Training
- Financial Training
- Management training
- Courses organised by training partners (MS, ESDC,EUI etc.)

124. How many trainings were held for each function group?

It is very difficult to answer this question as the target audience of a training can be AD and AST desk officers and other trainings (like financial training) can be for all staff independently of their grade.

In 2012, 1 annual Seminar was organised for each delegation function group (Heads of Delegation, Assistants, Heads of Administration, Political officers etc).

125. How many individuals attended the trainings?

In 2012, 3583 individuals attended trainings.

In 2013, 2549 individuals attended trainings.

126. Are there any trainings held in the Delegations? If not then how can the staff working in Delegations attend trainings?

Training actions are regularly organised in Delegations (in particular language training). Delegation staff also attend training courses in brussels (often ombines with the official mission or leave).

127. Are there any examples of EEAS staff traveling to the HQ to attend trainings? If yes how many of these travels occurred in 2012?

753 individuals came to HQ on mission for training actions. The participation in training courses requiring a mission has been combined as much as possible with the annual leave.

128. Are there any trainings held by external training bodies? What were the costs of external trainings in year 2012?

Most of the trainings are delivered by external firms under Inter-institutional framework contracts (EIPA, DEMOS, BICK, EFE, Communicaid, Instituto Cervantes, CLL etc.). The cost for 2012 was 552,806.67€.

129. How many EEAS staff members took part in external training in year 2012 and for average how many days?

27 HQs staff with an average of 4,8 days took part in an external training in 2012. 4 of the 27 followed external training covering full/part of the academic year.

130. Was the permanent programme for advanced intelligence training introduced yet?

The advanced intelligence training will take place in 2014.

131. Is there any diplomatic training for the Service's staff? If so, then how many individuals took part in diplomatic training since the creation of the Service?

Most of the training activities offered by the EEAS (except ABAC and protective security) and its partners fall into the category of diplomatic training. Therefore a slightly lower number than the answer to question 125 participated in diplomatic training.

132. How many pre-posting Seminars were held in year 2012, how many persons took part in these Seminars?

5 pre-posting seminars were held in 2012. 186 individuals participated.

133. How many refresher courses were held for staff in Delegations and how many persons took part in these refresher courses?

5 refresher courses on financial management took place in 2012. 52 individuals participated.

134. Were the pre-posting Seminars and refresher courses held in Brussels or in the Delegations? Are they organised by the Service or by an external training body?

The pre-posting seminars were organised in HQ. Few sessions were organised by external bodies.

The refresher courses were organised by an external body.

135. Did the EEAS launch its first appraisal exercise for officials and temporary agents yet?

The EEAS launched its first appraisal exercise for officials and Temporary Agents on 11/2/2013. The exercise covered the years 2011 and 2012 and ended in May 2013.

136. How many persons were involved in the first appraisal exercise?

A total of 1561 staff members have been covered by the exercise.

137. What were the results delivered by the first appraisal exercise?

The exercise was carried out within the planned deadlines despite the fact that a specific IT application, E-Appraisal, had to be developed at short notice because the EEAS was not able to use SYSPER2 for this purpose. Following the exercise, an ex-post evaluation was completed to identify how the procedure can be further improved. This lessons-learned exercise will be taken into account in the next appraisal exercise as far as possible.

138. What were the recommendations of the working group set up in early 2012 to look at ways to improve working methods at the Service's Headquarters?

Further to a screening exercise in 2012, it was decided to set up an inter-service working group (WIGWAM) looking at the working methods in HQ and delegations. A set of actions were identified and tasked to the relevant services in the EEAS. These actions were grouped under a certain number broad chapters covering the following themes: the mandates of heads of delegation, the analysis of staffing in delegations in terms of resource allocations and training, a streamlining of internal procedures and guidelines on basis of best practice throughout the service, an improved internal communication and sharing of information (within HQ and with delegations), the development of thematic EEAS networks to strengthen expertise and finally adapt when relevant working arrangements within the EEAS and with the Commission.

139. Were these recommendations fully implemented?

The implementation of the recommendations of the WIGWAM was followed on a regular basis, including through an action plan whereby each relevant service was tasked to take necessary actions. In June 2013, most of the actions were implemented thanks to the coordinated efforts of the Corporate Board services, the Policy coordination division, the Strategic Communication division and the administration (MDR). For example, the "zero based review" of staffing levels in delegations was completed, training for staff in delegations is better targeted, a new EEAS intranet (EEASzone) was created allowing a facilitated access to guidelines and other relevant information or documents. The IT-tool for gathering briefings (TSAR) has been upgraded with new functions. Several thematic networks, working groups, steering committees as well as lunchtime debates are organised to stimulate reflexion and develop the EEAS corporate culture.

140. Are there any examples in year 2012 of conflicts of interest where the Head of Delegation informed the responsible directors-general of the Commission and of the EEAS? If yes, in which Delegations and were all the appropriate steps taken to remedy the situation? How fast did the Service and the Commission react?

No Head of Delegation has informed the EEAS (Appointing Authority) of a possible conflict of interest according to Art. 11a.

141. There is a compulsory ABAC training for newly appointed Head of Delegations by the Service. How many of the newly appointed Head of Delegations attended the strongly advised complimentary ABAC course organised by DEVCO?

20 new Heads of Delegation followed the DEVCO 3-day induction course in 2012 (called "complimentary ABAC course" in the question) consisting of several financial and contractual management training modules. ABAC training was provided by the EEAS following the DEVCO induction training.

Not all new Heads of Delegation who took up their posts in 2012 had to follow the course, notably those who had followed similar courses during their career in the Commission and who had already acted as authorising officers by sub-delegation were exempted.

The induction course or proof of similar training in the past was a pre-requisite for receiving the sub-delegation for DEVCO budget lines.

142. How many EEAS staff members took part in the training on the New Financial Regulation in year 2012 and 2013 held by the Commission?

22 persons of HQs staff followed the course in 2012. It was an exceptional course organised in view of the new financial regulation.

In subsequent years the new financial regulation was incorporated into the regular financial training.

143. Did the staff in the Delegations take part in these trainings as well?

Financial training (ABAC DEL courses), regularly organised by the EEAS for delegation staff (231 participants in 2012 and 209 in 2013), integrates the elements introduced by the new Financial Regulation.

144. How many days did the staff of the EEAS spend on training (internal/external) in average in 2012?

See answer to question 19

145. Was the Service's goal of average 10 working days of training for staff reached in 2012?

The indicative target of 10 days of training per year for each staff member includes an average of 5 days *off-the-job* training and an average of 5 days language and *on-the-job* training and development: according to the data shown in the answer to the question 19, this target has not been reached.

146. How much money did the EEAS spend on training measures in total/per employee (contract agent/official) in year 2012?

In 2012 the EEAS spent 961.571 euro for training courses and seminars.
See answer to question 19

IT

147. What IT tools were developed since the establishment of the Service to manage and improve the selection procedures?

The e-rotation/e-mobility application has been developed for all posts in Headquarters and Delegations: candidates apply via this system and can use it to monitor the status of their application throughout the selection process.

148. How did these IT tools increase the efficiency of the selection procedures?

This IT tool has simplified the application process by standardising the minimum information that candidates are required to provide. The system has also ensured a swifter, more accurate means of keeping candidates informed. At each stage of the selection process, candidates are able to check the status of their application, e.g. not eligible (with a specific reason given), eligible, pre-selected, shortlisted. Each update sent out via the system has a contact address the candidate can e-mail should they require further clarification. The system thus promotes a more rapid and personalised response to applicants.

149. What were the development costs of each these IT tools?

The IT costs of the e-MOBILITY information system (which includes many features to manage on-line applications, manage mobility exercises, etc.) until today reaches 166.040 € (including service provision to manage project, analyse requirements, build code, test code, defect correction, draft manuals, etc.), with in addition 36.067 € of annual hosting costs at the data centre of the Commission. End-users support costs are not included in these figures.

150. Who developed the new e-DAS IT tool? What were the costs of the new IT tool e-Das which was launched on 6 December 2012?

The e-DAS information system has been built by EEAS MDR.A3 IT division for F3 Ex-post Control Division. Since its launch in December 2012, the application has been improved in 2013 by adding new features regarding the follow-up of internal control standard implementation. From the launch of the original project in early 2012, the IT costs of the e-DAS information system until today reaches 128.928 € (including service provision to manage project, analyse requirements, build code, test code, defect correction, draft manuals, etc.), with in addition 35.326 € of annual hosting costs at the data centre of the Commission and about 1/3 of an AST FTE. End-users support costs are not included in these figures.

151. How many Member State Embassies are using the ACID software system by now?

Acid has been rolled out to 92 EU Delegations and the remaining will follow in 2014.

The intensity of use is variable but a total of 654 ACID certificates were distributed to Member State's Embassies. However as the diffusion of ACID to the end users depends of the national secured circuits the deployment is not completely achieved yet.

Staff

152. How many AST and AD permanent and temporary posts were there at the EEAS in year 2012 both in the HQ and in the Delegations?

The table below presents the breakdown of occupied posts between permanent officials and temporary agents in Headquarters and in Delegations.

Category	Occupied posts Dec-2012					
	HQ		DEL		TOTAL	
	FO	TE	FO	TE	FO	TE
AD	438	109	214	140	652	249
AST	467		183		650	
Total	905	109	397	140	1302	249

153. How many of the EEAS staff is in grade AD 12 and upwards and what nationalities?

EEAS staff AD 12 and upwards

**Data source: Sysper 2, 2
December 2013**

Nationality	AD Grade				
	12	13	14	15	16
Austria	10	3	4	2	
Belgium	14	16	10		
Bulgaria	3	2			
Croatia					
Cyprus					
Czech Republic	4	3			
Denmark	4	7	4	1	

Estonia	1	2	1		
Finland	3	3	2		
France	27	31	9	2	1
Germany	21	22	10	3	
Greece	7	5	6	2	
Hungary	4	1	1		
Ireland	2	8	6		1
Italy	18	35	9	2	
Latvia	2		1		
Lithuania				1	
Luxembourg		2			
Malta	2				
Nederland	6	8	7	1	
Poland	4	2	2	1	
Portugal	6	8	5		1
Romania	3			1	
Slovakia	1				
Slovenia	1	1			
Spain	20	22	5	1	1
Sweden	8	8	3	1	
UK	20	15	7	5	
Grand Total	191	204	92	23	4

154. How many vacant posts did the EEAS fill-in year 2012?

Idem 35,155 and 159

In 2012:

For AD non-management posts at Headquarters, the EEAS recruited 36 people from Member States (AD 05: 15; AD 07: 19; AD 09: 1; AD 10: 1). From other EU institutions, the EEAS recruited 18 people in grades AD5-14 and 50 people in the AST function group. One *lauréat de concours* was recruited at AD 05.

For middle management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation/Deputy Head of Delegation posts at the equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 18 people from Member States and 4 people from other EU institutions. For senior management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 3 people, all from Member States.

In 2013:

For AD non-management posts at Headquarters, the EEAS recruited 22 people from Member States (AD 05: 18; AD 07: 2; AD 10: 2). From other EU institutions, the EEAS recruited 7 people in grades AD5-14 and 38 people in the AST function group. No *lauréats de concours* were recruited at AD level.

For middle management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at the equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 11 people from Member States and 5 people from other EU institutions. For senior management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 8 people, 7 from Member States and 1 from another EU institution.”

For AD non-management posts in Delegations, 18 EEAS staff and 21 candidates from Member State were appointed in 2012.

For management positions in Delegations, the EEAS recruited 19 people from Member States and 4 people from other EU institutions.

155. For new recruitment in 2012 please state whether the successful candidate came from an EU institution or from a Member State.

Idem 35

In 2012:

For AD non-management posts at Headquarters, the EEAS recruited 36 people from Member States (AD 05: 15; AD 07: 19; AD 09: 1; AD 10: 1). From other EU institutions, the EEAS recruited 18 people in grades AD5-14 and 50 people in the AST function group. One *lauréat de concours* was recruited at AD 05.

For middle management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation/Deputy Head of Delegation posts at the equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 18 people from Member States and 4 people from other EU institutions. For senior management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 3 people, all from Member States.

In 2013:

For AD non-management posts at Headquarters, the EEAS recruited 22 people from Member States (AD 05: 18; AD 07: 2; AD 10: 2). From other EU institutions, the EEAS recruited 7 people in grades AD5-14 and 38 people in the AST function group. No *lauréats de concours* were recruited at AD level.

For middle management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at the equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 11 people from Member States and 5 people from other EU institutions. For senior management posts at Headquarters and Head of Delegation posts at equivalent level, the EEAS recruited 8 people, 7 from Member States and 1 from another EU institution.

156. How many EEAS posts were vacant in 2012 in the Delegations?

In 2012 there were around 30 expatriate posts that became vacant at some stage during the year (but did not remain vacant the entire year); around half of those were officials' posts, the rest were contract agents. In 2013, the figure was slightly higher with around 35 vacant posts at some stage during the year, of which around 60% were officials' posts and the rest were contract agents. This amounts, on average, to 0.23 vacant expat posts per Delegation at some point in time during 2012 and 0.26 in 2013.

In 2012 the higher number of vacancies occurred in Djibouti (2.5), whereas in 2013, it was the Delegations to Iraq and the US that suffered the higher number of vacancies (3 and 2.5).

157. How long did a post remain vacant in average in the Delegations in year 2012?

The EEAS makes every effort to fill Delegation vacancies which arise outside the annual rotation exercise as quickly as possible. Once a vacant post in a Delegation has been published externally, a reasonable period of about three weeks needs to be allowed for candidates to apply, and time is required thereafter to sift the applications, schedule and conduct interviews, and to complete recruitment formalities should an external candidate be selected. For Head of Delegation vacancies, time is also required to obtain the *agrément* of the host country. Delegation posts may therefore remain vacant for 4, or, in exceptional cases, up to 6 months. In urgent cases, and in the interest of the service, it is possible to transfer an existing EEAS staff member to the vacant post within a much shorter period of time under Art.7 SR.

158. How long does it take to fill-in vacancies in the Delegations (in year 2011 the Service reported 3-4 month to fill in a post in the Delegations), did this change in year 2012?

The average time to fill Delegation vacancies when an external candidate is selected (i.e. on a temporary agent contract) was still 3-4 months in 2012, but shorter for internal EEAS candidates.

159. For new recruitment in the Delegations in 2012 please state whether the successful candidate came from an EU institution or from a Member State.

For AD non-management posts in Delegations, 18 EEAS staff and 21 candidates from Member State were appointed in 2012.

For management positions in Delegations, the EEAS recruited 19 people from Member States and 4 people from other EU institutions.

160. How many staff members left the EEAS in year 2012? How many of these retired? How many went to other EU institutions? (Idem 21)

In 2012, 56 officials retired. In addition, 6 temporary agents resigned. 17 AD non-management and 26 AST staff left EEAS Headquarters to go to other EU institutions.

In 2013, 53 officials retired. In addition, 19 temporary agents resigned. 12 AD non-management and 26 AST staff left EEAS Headquarters to go to other EU institutions while 1 AD non-management and 1 AST staff transferred from EU Delegations to other EU institutions.

161. According to the Staff Regulation when the EEAS is fully set up and reaches its full capacity, 1/3 of the AD staff has to be from the national diplomatic services. Was this goal reached already in 2012?

Staff in AD grades represent about 24% of the staff establishment of the EEAS. By Summer 2013, 32.9% were Temporary Agents (TAs) from the diplomatic services of the Member States. The one third target for national diplomats was therefore met only in 2013, in line with the target date in the EEAS decision.

162. The regulation states that EEAS staff should comprise of an "appropriate and meaningful presence of nationals from all the Member States". Is the requirement of the geographical balance fulfilled both at the Headquarters and in the Delegations?

The nationality balance in the EEAS at Headquarters and in delegations, across the categories and grades of statutory staff, is set out in the 2013 EEAS Staffing Report. When EEAS vacancies are published, they continue to attract applicants from across the EU's Member States. For example, the 2014 external rotation exercise attracted applicants from all except one of the Member States.

In line with the Staff Regulations and the EEAS Decision, EEAS recruitment is conducted on the basis of merit. The EEAS does not and cannot apply national quotas. Participants in EEAS section panels are specifically requested to act impartially, without preference according to nationality.

The EEAS does, however, keep a close eye on the outcome of selection processes, and is ready to provide support and advice to Member States that are under-represented, especially those that have most recently joined the Union.

163. Please provide a table on the nationalities of the Head of Delegations and Deputy Head of Delegations

(data on heads of delegation are provided on answer to question 15).

Deputy Heads of Delegation	No. of DHoDs.
Nationality	
Austria	1
Belgium	2
Bulgaria	
Croatia	
Cyprus	
Czech Republic	2
Denmark	1
Estonia	
Finland	2
France	2
Germany	5
Greece	1
Hungary	2
Ireland	1
Italy	2
Latvia	1
Lithuania	
Luxembourg	
Malta	
Nederland	
Poland	1
Portugal	
Romania	
Slovakia	1
Slovenia	
Spain	2
Sweden	1
United Kingdom	3
Grand Total	30

164. Please provide a table on the nationalities of the staff at Headquarters in posts. Please provide a table on the nationalities of the staff in the Delegations.

EEAS Staff (Officials, Temporary Agents, Contract Agents) per nationality - HQ

Data source: Sysper 2, 2 December 2013

Nationality	AD	AST	CA	HQ Total
Austria	11	5		16
Belgium	35	107	45	187
Bulgaria	6	5		11
Croatia				-
Cyprus	4	2		6
Czech Republic	7	10	1	18
Denmark	12	15		27
Estonia	6	9		15
Finland	13	12	2	27
France	77	42	21	140
Germany	62	23	6	91
Greece	20	25	3	48
Hungary	12	9	1	22
Ireland	15	8	1	24
Italy	69	44	20	133
Latvia	6	3	1	10
Lithuania	5	2		7
Luxembourg	2			2
Malta	2	4		6
Nederland	16	12	2	30
Poland	26	23	5	54
Portugal	13	21	3	37
Romania	11	16	5	32
Slovakia	5	4	2	11
Slovenia	8	9		17
Spain	45	31	23	99
Sweden	24	19		43
United Kingdom	36	14	3	53
Grand Total	548	474	144	1,166

**EEAS Staff (Officials, Temporary Agents,
Contract Agents) per nationality - DEL**

Data source: Sysper 2, 2 December 2013

Nationality	AD	AST	CA	DEL Total
Austria	14	6	7	27
Belgium	28	52	45	125
Bulgaria	8		5	13
Croatia				-
Cyprus				-
Czech Republic	15	2	1	18
Denmark	12	1	1	14
Estonia	5	1		6
Finland	8	6	1	15
France	43	16	48	107
Germany	31	19	11	61
Greece	13	4	2	19
Hungary	8	1	1	10
Ireland	8	6	2	16
Italy	33	10	23	66
Latvia	4	1		5
Lithuania	4	3	3	10
Luxembourg				-
Malta	5			5
Nederland	14	11	1	26
Poland	11	2		13
Portugal	15	8	9	32
Romania	7	2	6	15
Slovakia	2		1	3
Slovenia	3	1	1	5
Spain	37	14	16	67
Sweden	11	7	1	19

United Kingdom	33	14	6	53
Grand Total	372	187	191	750

165. Please provide a table on the nationalities of the individuals from the Members States diplomatic services working for the EEAS.

EEAS Staff (Members States diplomatic services) per nationality

Data source: Sysper 2, 2 December 2013

Nationality	HQ	DEL	Total
Austria	2	7	9
Belgium	6	7	13
Bulgaria	2	8	10
Croatia			-
Cyprus	1		1
Czech Republic	2	10	12
Denmark	3	6	9
Estonia	2	5	7
Finland	5	2	7
France	18	20	38
Germany	11	10	21
Greece	5	4	9
Hungary	5	6	11
Ireland	4	3	7
Italy	9	7	16
Latvia	3	3	6
Lithuania	2	3	5
Luxembourg			-
Malta	1	4	5
Nederland	4	6	10
Poland	3	7	10
Portugal	4	5	9

Romania	7	7	14
Slovakia	2	2	4
Slovenia	6	3	9
Spain	11	11	22
Sweden	2	8	10
United Kingdom	9	15	24
Grand Total	129	169	298

166. What kinds of services were agreed under Service level Agreements (SLA) and how many SLAs have been made in 2012?

The services provided range from service to the staff (recruitment procedure, medical examination, training, payment of salaries) to services to the administration (IT, buildings, meeting room facilities).

In 2012, there were 4 SLA with the Council Secretariat (for meetings and conference, medical service, crèches and IT services) and 6 SLA with Commission departments and offices (DG HR, BUDG, DIGIT, OIB, PMO, SCIC). In addition, the EEAS is service provider for the Commission for the Commission staff in delegation (EEAS-DEVCO SLA).

167. What were the recommendations of the working group set up in early 2012 to look at ways to improve working methods at the Service's Headquarters? Were these recommendations fully implemented?

Further to a screening exercise in 2012, it was decided to set up an inter-service working group (WIGWAM) looking at the working methods in HQ and delegations. A set of actions were identified and tasked to the relevant services in the EEAS. These actions were grouped under a certain number broad chapters covering the following themes: the mandates of heads of delegation, the analysis of staffing in delegations in terms of resource allocations and training, a streamlining of internal procedures and guidelines on basis of best practice throughout the service, an improved internal communication and sharing of information (within HQ and with delegations), the development of thematic EEAS networks to strengthen expertise and finally adapt when relevant working arrangements within the EEAS and with the Commission.

168. What steps were done to make sure there is no delay in time between the conclusion of working contract and taking up duties for temporary staff, as revealed by the ECA?

EEAS staff begin working for the institution on the date of their recruitment or the start of their contract. Staff in delegations may attend relevant training and meetings in Brussels or sometimes elsewhere before arriving in the country of assignment.

169. The Service's answer stated that only a limited number of individuals started to work before their contracts were signed by both parties. How many cases does this exactly mean?

This text answers questions 169-170-171. As a rule, no EEAS staff member is paid for a period prior to their date of recruitment as an official or prior to the starting date of their contract as a Temporary Agent. In the small number of cases where a member of staff started working for the EEAS before their contract had been signed by both parties and returned to the administration, there had already been a firm mutual agreement between

the two parties, either orally or in writing, as to the date of taking up duties. In practice, a short time is sometimes needed before both parties have signed the contract, especially if one signatory or the other happens not to be present in Brussels.

170. Did the staff in question receive their salary from the Service in the period when they had no valid contract, if yes for how long and what was the total amount paid to staff without valid working contracts?

See answer 169

171. Were there any new cases in 2012 where new staff started working before their contract was signed by both parties?

See answer 169

172. Were there any cases since 2011 when the Service's individuals received incorrect payments due to their personal and family situation not being up-to-date?

This text answers questions 172, 173, 175 and 176 (cf. also the answer to question 52):

In March 2013, the PMO has launched an exercise designed to adjust the deduction of the allowances paid by the Belgian authorities from the family allowances you receive under the EU Staff Regulation. This deduction follows from Article 67 (2) of the Staff Regulations, according to which agents "*in receipt of family allowances shall declare allowances of like nature paid from other sources; such latter allowances shall be deducted from those paid under Articles 1, 2 and 3 of Annex VII.*"

The exercise concerned the indexations of 1 September 2008, 1 September 2010, 1 May 2011, 1 February 2012 and 1 December 2012. In addition, if applicable, the supplement(s) staff concerned have been receiving for children who turned 6, 12 or 18 years of age during the period from August 2008 up to now were included.

For those who did not declare any recent adaptations, they have been processed automatically and were included in the March 2013 salary.

Any debt inferior to € 200 has been automatically deducted from the March 2013 salary. If the debt incurred was equal or superior to €200, it would be recovered over a period of 12 months starting from the May 2013 salary. This concerned 207 cases.

Since April 2013 the automatic update of Belgian family allowances for all EEAS management centres have been running on a monthly basis and the module was applied in successive steps to deal with allowances received from other Member States: in May 2013 for Germany, in June for Ireland and later on for France and The Netherlands. For 2014 Finland, Sweden, Romania, Austria, Hungary and Latvia are scheduled.

We inform staff on an annual basis via the intranet and by e-mail of the obligation to inform the PMO of any changes in relation to the family allowances received from other sources."

Since April 2013 all EEAS management centres have been systematically included in the automatic monthly update of Belgian national family allowances, the first launch was combined with a recovery exercise in May 2013 going back 5 years and the manual update of non-standard files.

Subsequently the automatic update has been extended to the following Member States: Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, France and The Netherlands. Around +/- 160 files have been either automatically commuted or manually updated, in 2014 it is expected to treat and additional number of 54 files. In 2014 it is foreseen to include Finland, Sweden, Romania, Austria, Hungary and Latvia as well.

The PMO has also started a control exercise, targeting those agents of the EEAS population

(HQ and delegations) who are in receipt of Community family allowances and who had not declared any allowances received from elsewhere even though their spouse/partner/parent of the children is gainfully employed which makes them potentially eligible to the payment of national family allowances that are to be paid prior to Community allowances.

During the course of 2013, a stand-alone module to be used by agents to introduce any changes in family allowances received from other sources was developed by DIGIT and made accessible to the EEAS population. This tool is to be used exclusively when entitlements to a national or private allowance are established, modified or stopped. It is not to be used to inform the PMO/EEAS of a routine indexation of the allowance expected for the following countries: Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, The Czech Republic and the United Kingdom as well as other bodies/agencies and non-Member States. In those cases, the agent will be responsible for notifying changes in the indexations.

173. If yes then how many staff members were receiving incorrect payments since 2011 and what were the financial impacts of the incorrect payments?

See answer to question 172.

174. Were the incorrectly paid amounts recovered in all the 200 cases? If not, then how much is still to be recovered?

Any debt inferior to € 200 has been automatically deducted from the March 2013 salary. If the debt incurred was equal or superior to €200, it would be recovered over a period of 12 months starting from the May 2013 salary.

175. Did the measures taken by the Service in year 2011 and 2012 guarantee in 2013 that no incorrect payments were made?

See answer to question 172.

176. If not then what was the reason for the further incorrect payments in year 2013?

See answer to question 172.

177. How many individuals are working in the EU Delegations who are working as an official of the Commission?

COM Staff in DEL (Officials, Contract Agents, Local Agents) per Delegation
Data source: Sysper 2, 2 December 2013

Delegation	AD+AST	CA	LA	Total
AFGHANISTAN	6	12	38	56
ALBANIA	6	19	22	47
ALGERIA	4	8	16	28
ANGOLA	5	6	12	23
ARGENTINA	2	1	6	9
ARMENIA	4	5	11	20
AU	3	9	2	14
AUSTRALIA	1		3	4
AZERBAIJAN	5	4	10	19
BANGLADESH	7	13	26	46
BARBADOS	6	11	16	33

BELARUS	4	3	8	15
BENIN	5	8	13	26
BOLIVIA	3	7	15	25
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	6	9	61	76
BOTSWANA	5	5	10	20
BRAZIL	8	3	15	26
BURKINA FASO	8	7	29	44
BURMA/MYANMAR		7	1	8
BURUNDI	3	7	13	23
CAMBODIA	3	8	16	27
CAMEROON	4	10	16	30
CANADA	3		4	7
CAPE VERDE	3	2	2	7
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	2	4	13	19
CHAD	5	10	15	30
CHILE	2	2	4	8
CHINA	21	13	22	56
COLOMBIA	4	3	20	27
CONGO	4	6	10	20
CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REP	8	12	22	42
COSTA RICA		1	7	8
CUBA	1	3	3	7
DJIBOUTI	3	4	7	14
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	5	6	11	22
ECUADOR	1	3	7	11
EGYPT	10	14	40	64
EL SALVADOR	1	1	8	10
ERITREA	4	3	5	12
ETHIOPIA	9	12	28	49
FAO	4			4
FIJI	5	9	13	27
FYROM	6	16	37	59
GABON	5	8	14	27
GAMBIA		5	4	9
GEORGIA	4	10	20	34
GHANA	6	9	16	31
GUATEMALA	3	5	11	19
GUINEA	4	7	14	25
GUINEA-BISSAU	4	5	8	17
GUYANA	7	4	14	25
HAITI	8	10	16	34
HONDURAS	1	4	9	14
HONG KONG	1		2	3
ICELAND	2			2
INDIA	9	11	33	53
INDONESIA	6	5	23	34
IRAQ	1	1	2	4
ISRAEL	3	1	12	16
IVORY COAST	6	10	11	27
JAMAICA	5	6	13	24
JAPAN	6		11	17

JORDAN	4	14	16	34
KAZAKHSTAN	5	2	14	21
KENYA	15	17	31	63
KOREA	2		1	3
KOSOVO	5	17	48	70
KYRGYZSTAN	3	5	9	17
LAOS	1	4	14	19
LEBANON	5	12	16	33
LESOTHO	4	1	5	10
LIBERIA	3	7	5	15
LIBYA	2	5	1	8
MADAGASCAR	7	8	22	37
MALAWI	6	10	21	37
MALAYSIA	1	2	1	4
MALI	6	11	14	31
MAURITANIA	5	8	11	24
MAURITIUS	5	4	17	26
MEXICO	4	2	9	15
MOLDOVA	4	5	12	21
MONTENEGRO	4	11	21	36
MOROCCO	9	17	28	54
MOZAMBIQUE	8	14	17	39
NAMIBIA	4	3	7	14
NEPAL	3	6	12	21
NEW CALEDONIA			4	4
NICARAGUA	6	11	33	50
NIGER	6	9	20	35
NIGERIA	8	6	26	40
OECD/UNESCO	3	1		4
PAKISTAN	5	11	20	36
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	4	3	8	15
PARAGUAY	1	3	5	9
PERU	4	3	16	23
PHILIPPINES	4	7	14	25
RUSSIA	11	5	30	46
RWANDA	5	6	17	28
SAUDI ARABIA	1			1
SENEGAL	6	11	25	42
SERBIA	8	22	54	84
SIERRA LEONE	6	6	17	29
SINGAPORE	1		2	3
SOLOMON ISLANDS		2	2	4
SOUTH AFRICA	7	8	24	39
SOUTH SUDAN	4	7	7	18
SRI LANKA	3	5	10	18
SUDAN	4	3	16	23
SWAZILAND	1	3	5	9
SWITZERLAND	1			1
SYRIA		3	10	13
TAIWAN	1			1
TAJIKISTAN	3	4	11	18

TANZANIA	7	10	17	34
THAILAND	6	11	23	40
TIMOR-LESTE	2	5	6	13
TOGO	4	4	10	18
TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO		3	5	8
TUNISIA	7	12	20	39
TURKEY	10	19	89	118
UGANDA	6	13	21	40
UKRAINE	9	15	44	68
UN GENEVA	2			2
UN NEW YORK	4			4
UNITED STATES	15		16	31
URUGUAY	3		10	13
UZBEKISTAN	3	1	4	8
VANUATU		2	1	3
VENEZUELA			6	6
VIETNAM	6	4	22	32
WEST BANK AND GAZA STRIP	9	18	26	53
WTO	8		6	14
YEMEN	3	6	9	18
ZAMBIA	8	9	17	34
ZIMBABWE	5	8	14	27
Total	615	851	1,964	3,430

178. Please provide a table with the number of Commission staff working in each Delegation.

See answer to question 177.

179. How successfully could the Service integrate the personnel coming from the Commission, from the Council and from the Member States diplomatic services both in the Headquarters and in the Delegations?

The EEAS is trying to build up a distinctive European diplomatic culture, using the best practices of the diplomatic services of the Member States as a benchmark. The recruitment of Member State diplomats to serve in the EEAS as Temporary Agents is an integral part of promoting an EU-wide common foreign and security policy. The EEAS recently created a network of Human Resources directors with Member States' Foreign Ministries in order to help us to develop our policies, not least in terms of managing Temporary Agents. Temporary Agents are already well integrated into the EEAS. They are employed at all hierarchical levels, including as Heads of Delegation and in senior positions at Headquarters and they manage both staff and financial resources.

180. Do diplomats from Member States diplomatic services have the same career path in the EEAS as its own staff do?

Temporary Agents from the EU Member States are recruited on contracts of four years in duration, renewable for an additional four years and a maximum of two more years beyond that, and they are accorded equal treatment with permanent officials in line with the requirements of the EEAS Decision. This means that they are able, for instance, to participate on an equal footing in both the annual rotation of staff to EU Delegations, and in the annual Headquarters mobility exercise.

181. Is there a procedure in force for newly appointed EEAS staff to give a declaration of honour that they have not worked for intelligence services of any country in the past?

There is no legal or policy basis for the EEAS to request any such declaration. Previous experience in EU Member States' security services does not provide grounds for exclusion from consideration for EEAS posts. Concerning collaboration with the intelligence services of non-EU countries, this risk is averted by the existing security clearance requirements.

Ex-ante and ex post controls

182. How many individuals are working for the Ex Post Control Division?

The Ex-Post Control Division has 13 staff members.

183. How many individuals are working for the Internal Audit Division?

The staff of the Internal Audit Division are 5 people: 3 AD, 1 AST (B) and 1 AST (C)

184. The EEAS is a separate institution but the Accountant of the Commission is also the Accountant of the EEAS, will it remain like this? Is this an effective institutional set up?

As foreseen in Article 68(1) FR, the accounting officer of the Commission has carried out a range of accounting services for the EEAS. These services include :

- Treasury (central treasury and payment run, central bank accounts reconciliation, administrative management of imprest accounts services, validation of 'Third Party Files' and bank accounts, management of the early warning system),
- The accounting framework and system,
- Accounting and legal reporting,
- Recovery of debts and management of the offsetting procedure,
- Quality checks on all local accounting systems.

The cooperation between DG BUDG and the EEAS is very good. Both the EEAS and the competent services in DG BUDG are very satisfied with the current arrangements.

Economies of scales are evident in the area of treasury management, accounting and reporting. The services of the accounting officer of the Commission have a unique expertise covering all these aspects and in particular the treasury function which includes:

- The administrative management of imprest accounts;
- The comprehensive banking architecture needed to deal with the payment operations of the Institutions, and the related expertise that is also employed to support local banking and payment needs of the 140 EU over 100 delegations around the world; and
- Optimised cash and risk management, and robust business continuity procedures.

This supplementary support is considered of high quality and permits supplementary economies of scale relation to the resources potentially needed in case of complete internalisation in the EEAS.

Furthermore, the Accounting Officer of the Commission establishes the annual accounts and deals with the Court of Auditors for several other institutions. The accounting services of Commission have established efficient procedures and good working relationships with the Court of Auditors that the EEAS benefits from.

In summary, to set-up a stand-alone accounting department in the EEAS would unnecessarily increase the number of staff employed in the two entities since each of the key tasks above would require multiple new posts in the EEAS, while they have been already absorbed with minimum extra resources by the Commission. In the view of the EEAS the cooperation should

therefore be continued.

185. Were there any cases brought to the financial irregularity panel since the creation of the EEAS? If yes then how many and what kinds of cases?

Since the creation of the EEAS, no case has been brought to the financial irregularity panel.

186. The ex-ante controls in year 2011 resulted with a percentage of 38,5% anomalies within the files, the same value for 2012 was 17%, how did the Service achieve such a significant reduction?

In most cases the anomalies detected are related to internal procedures such as missing or illegible signatures of the financial actors, poor documenting or justification of the transaction (f.i. missing copies of reference documents), clerical errors or errors produced when encoding the transaction in the system.

As 2011 was the first year of operation of the EEAS with the introduction of a division in charge of the ex-ante control, the financial actors were not familiar with the new financial circuits and internal procedures. The reduction of anomalies detected in 2012 is by "learning from previous errors" and by targeted training of the financial actors.

187. How is it possible that out of the 3.071 controlled transactions, 682 anomalies were found in year 2012?

The ex-ante control role consists in the financial verification of all the different type of financial transactions (commitments, payments and recovery orders) issued by the operational divisions before the transaction is validated by the authorising officer. Anomalies detected are, thus, corrected before the financial transaction is validated.

Any financial transaction follows different steps of the financial circuits used by the EEAS (all circuits include initiation, verification, and validation) where there are different financial actors. In most cases the anomalies detected are related to internal procedures such as the choice of the financial circuit, missing or illegible signatures of the financial actors, poor documenting or justification of the transaction (f.i. missing copies of reference documents), clerical errors or errors produced when encoding the transaction in the system. The same transaction may contain more than one anomaly (the 682 anomalies correspond to 523 transactions).

In some cases the anomalies were detected by the financial or operational agents of the operational divisions themselves after their validation but before the transactions arrive to ex-ante control. In these cases the procedure to correct the anomaly is to request ex-ante control to reject the transaction ("refusal for correction") which allows the operational division to modify the transaction.

188. Why were there only 2 recoveries out of the 3.071 transactions in the sample? Is this a representative proportion with regard to all transactions of the EEAS?

The ex-ante control role entails the financial verification of all the different type of financial transactions (commitments, payments executed and recovery orders) issued by the operational divisions before the transaction is validated by the authorising officer. The ex-ante controls all the transactions (not a sample) with external economic operators.

Most of the transactions subject of ex-ante control are payments (2206) and commitments (863). Recovery orders (2) are exceptional transactions which are normally produced by errors in the invoices issued by contractors (including duplicate of invoices) or recoveries due to the application of penalties to contractors foreseen in contracts. However, in most cases where there are mistakes issued by contractors (including duplicate of invoices) the invoice is put on hold and credit notes are requested from the contractor.

In 2012 there were only two recovery orders among all the financial transactions (3071) of the operational divisions of the EEAS; these recoveries concerned airplane tickets, one for an amount of EUR 829.40, the other for an amount of EUR 2 262.90.

189. What was the anomaly discovered in one of the recoveries out of the 2 in the sample? Is the 50% anomaly rate for recoveries representative?

The anomaly discovered in the recovery order (of an amount of EUR 829.40) was a wrong choice of the financial circuit.

190. In how many cases did the ex-ante controls result with recovery orders? What was the total amount of the recovery orders in year 2012? How much was recovered from the total amount subject to recovery orders in 2012?

The ex-ante control role consists in the financial verification of all the different type of financial transactions (commitments, payments and recovery orders) issued by the operational divisions before the transaction is validated by the authorising officer.

Any anomaly detected by the ex-ante controls may result in stopping, cancelling or correcting a transaction but it does not result in issuing recovery orders as any erroneous transaction subject of a recovery detected by the ex-ante control (i.e. an error detected in a payment) is corrected before the transaction takes effect.

191. Does the EEAS believe that the best procurement procedure for building and security contracts is the negotiated procedure? Are there any exceptions when the Service uses a different procurement procedure or in case of building and security contracts it is always the negotiated procedure which applies?

Building contracts cover the purchase, long lease, usufruct, leasing, rental or hire purchase, with or without option to buy, of land, existing buildings or other real estate. This definition of building contracts, directly taken from the financial regulation and the Directive on public procurement (Directive 2004/18/EC), is inspired in the laws concerning property and civil codes of member states which make a distinction between real estate properties which cannot be moved and which are unique because of their location, size, design or other features, which do not allow a precise description of criteria for allowing an open competition or an award to the best offer according to procurement rules.

The financial regulation foresees for building contracts a negotiated procedure after prospecting the local market.

For security contracts and the other service contracts included in Annex IIB to Directive 2004/18/EC, the negotiated procedure involving a call for expressions of interest is an alternative among the different procurement procedures foreseen in the financial regulation. The EEAS uses as preferred option for all its security contracts the "restricted procedure" with publication of the contract notice in the Official Journal of the EU.

192. Please list the ten Delegations which received the most recommendations after the ex-post-control-results. Please list the 3 divisions in the Headquarters which received the most recommendations.

For 2012 the 10 Delegations which received the most recommendations to apply, including recommendations brought forward from previous periods still open and new recommendations for the 2012 accounting year, are:

Delegation	Total REC	%
ANGOLA	33	2.3%

BARBADOS	50	3.5%
CHINA	33	2.3%
CAMEROUN	35	2.4%
DJIBOUTI	48	3.3%
ETHIOPIA	44	3.1%
GUYANA	35	2.4%
HAITI	34	2.4%
JAMAICA	34	2.4%
TANZANIA	45	3.1%

These 10 Delegations have received 27.2% of the 1,438 recommendations to be followed-up for the 2012 exercise.

It should be noted that the remoteness of a Delegation, staff turnover and matters such as the particular local situation may have an effect on the number of recommendations raised.

The three Divisions at HQ which received the most recommendations to apply, including recommendations brought forward from previous periods still open and new recommendations for the 2012 accounting year, are :

Division		Total REC	%
MDR B2	HQ Security	15	24%
MDR C2	Selection of staff	14	23%
MDR C6	Rights and obligations	8	13%

These 3 Divisions represent 60% of the 62 recommendations to be followed-up for the 2012 exercise.

It should be noted that the portfolio of responsibilities, or the nature of work, of different HQ Divisions can give rise to more recommendations than for other Divisions managing comparable budgets and of comparable size. It should also be noted that the Divisions within the C Directorate have had a number of responsibilities moved between them and with changes of responsibilities matters have had to be examined again.

193. The Health & Safety visits to Delegations are executed by the EEAS itself and also by an external consultant. How many Health & Safety visits were done in year 2012 and how much money was paid to the external contractor for these visits and its findings? What is the reason for having an external consultant doing the Health and Safety visits, when the Service has its own Delegation Support and Evaluation Service division established in 2012?

In order to carry out the health and safety inspections in accordance with the legal provisions, rules , standards and criteria that apply, the European External Action Service (EEAS) has concluded a multiple framework contract (2010/09/SER/RELEX/K7) for a duration of 48 months with three companies (EEAS contacts the tenderer at the top of the list). The purpose of the contract is to carry out inspections and to present health and safety in the workplace reports on European Union delegations/offices mainly located in Third Countries as well as the residences of Heads of delegation (only areas dedicated to the obligations of representation for these).

EEAS do not carry out any health & safety inspection by itself because it does not have the appropriate internal technical expertise on these specific matters.

The health and safety visits are carried out by an external consultant because it is necessary to have the expertise and the technical special equipment to execute the required measurements.

During 2012, 13 inspections were carried out by the external consultant in the following Delegations/countries:

African Union (Addis Abeba, Ethiopia)
Ethiopia (Addis Abeba)
East Timor (Dili),
Venezuela (Caracas)
Malawi (Lilongwe)
Congo (Kinshasa)
Congo (Brazaville)
Albania (Tirana)
Israel (Tel Aviv)
West Bank Gaza (Jerusalem)
Nepal (Katmandu)
Ivory Coast (Abidjan)
Saudi Arabia (Riyadh)

In total an amount of €271.229 was committed for these purposes in 2012, of which €85.585,53 was paid in 2012 and 176.467,07 in 2013 (total payment of €262.052,60).

194. How many individuals are working for the Delegations Support and Evaluation Service? How many of them were traveling on each of the 17 evaluation missions covering a total of 23 Delegations? What was the total cost of the 17 evaluation missions?

The Delegation Support and Evaluation Service (DSES) comprises 13 members of staff, including 3 logistical support staff.

Each evaluation mission is carried out by a team of two or three evaluators depending on the size of the Delegation to be evaluated. Additionally, when a new evaluator joins the DSES, he has to go on a training mission and thus becomes supplementary participant in one specific mission.

In 2012 6 double missions, i.e. visiting two Delegations, and 5 single missions, i.e. visiting one Delegation, were carried out by a team of two.

4 single missions were carried out by a team of three, incl. a new staff member on training on 3 of these missions.

1 double mission was carried out by a team of four, incl. a new member on training.

A total of 16 missions covering 23 Delegations.

The total travel costs of these missions amounts to 183.684,81 €.

195. How is it decided which Delegations are visited by the evaluation missions?

The programme of visits is established annually with the aim of ensuring all Delegations are covered once in a 4-year cycle (i.e. during the normal mandate of the Head of Delegation). Normally missions are not carried out during the first year of the mandate of a Head of Delegation, unless specifically requested by the Delegation or the responsible HQ lead service.

196. How can the Service make sure that the Head of Delegations will implement the recommendations of the evaluation reports resulting from these missions?

At the end of the mission, a draft report, together with recommendations and draft action plan are presented to the Head of Delegation and relevant HQ (EEAS and COM) services for comment. Following these consultations a final report and proposed action plan are circulated to the Corporate Board, leading to the adoption of the action plan. The action plan has an operational and binding character. Before adoption in its final form, it is subject to agreement with the Commission whenever there are budgetary or organisational implications for that institution. The Delegation Support and Evaluation Service ensures the

follow-up through monitoring of the implementation of the action plan by the Delegation and HQ Services concerned, under the authority of the Chief Operating Officer in agreement with the Corporate Board.

197. Does the Ex Post Control Division, which controls the administrative expenditures of the Delegations also do on the spot evaluations? If yes then how many of these on the spot evaluations were conducted by the Ex Post Control Division in 2012?

Yes the Ex-Post Control Division also carries out on-the-spot controls, these controls are concerned primarily with appraising the level of sound financial management carried out by the Delegation.

The Ex-Post Control carried out 11 missions on the spot in 2012.

198. Out of the outcomes of the ex post controls 2.388 recommendations were made. How many were implemented by 31 December, 2013?

The figures for the follow-up of the 2012 recommendations in 2013 will not be able until after April 2014. The Ex-Post Control Division monitors the follow-up of recommendations categorized as being very important or critical. Recommendations below these rankings are for the Delegation to follow-up themselves without monitoring by Ex-Post Control.

Budget

199. How can the service ensure that its using and allocating its resources and funds the most effective way and which are the most successful areas of its operation, both in external relations and institutionally?

The budget of the EEAS is a purely administrative budget, used to finance the cost of staff in Headquarters and in delegations. The vast majority of this budget is devoted to the payment of compulsory expenditures on items such as the salaries of officials, contract and local agents, rent of offices including delegation buildings, rent and security of housing for expatriate staff and informatics and telecommunication costs. The cost of such items is determined by the Staff Regulations in the case of salaries and by the appropriate tendering procedures foreseen in the Financial Regulation in the case of contracts with third parties (for example in relation to security).

With regard to resources, the EEAS constantly reviews the allocation of resources – this led for example to the re-deployment of 20 AD official posts from HQ to the delegations under the 2012 budget and has also resulted in the closure of the delegations in Surinam and New Caledonia.

See also the answer to question 216 concerning initiatives taken by the EEAS to improve use of resources.

200. How high was the final level of administrative errors shown by the ex post controls in year 2011, 2012 and 2013?

The final level (weighted average) of administrative errors (i.e not the material error and without considering neither the implementation of the ICS 7 to 13 nor the COA new methodology) was: 78% in 2011 and 76% in 2012, i.e. 78% of transactions were free of administrative error in 2011 and 76 % were free of administrative error in 2012. The EEAS has made a considerable effort to rationalise the administrative control environment in 2013 and as from 01/01/2014 a new 'Delegations' Guide' has entered into force which should ensure easier access to the administrative rule framework in force.

It is important to underline that administrative errors are errors that do not have a financial

consequence.

201. In 2012 120 Delegations gave positive Declaration of Assurances, when in 2011 only 100 Delegations gave Positive Declarations. How did the Service achieve these better results?

Following the completion of the 2011 exercise the response of each Delegation was analysed and each and every Delegation that had given a declaration was given direct feedback. The 2012 exercise was the second exercise and therefore with the feedback and the familiarity of approaching the exercise a second time the Delegations were more experienced and better equipped to give their response.

202. In 2012 21 Delegations gave a Declaration of Assurances with a reservation or observation, when in 2011 the same number was 27. How did the Service achieve these better results?

Please see answer to question 201.

203. There were no Declarations in 2012 which were not in conformity with the model foreseen, where in 2011 there were 9. How did the Service achieve these better results?

Please see answer to question 201.

204. Did the new e-DAS IT tool introduced in 2012 contribute to the Service achieving these better results?

The new tool has certainly facilitated the exercise it is user friendly and guidance is also provided. Nonetheless the provision of bilateral feedback to all Delegations on the 2011 exercise is likely to have been a major factor in achieving better results.

205. What was the reason for the four transfers made within the EEAS administrative budget which amounted a total of 26.4 million EUR (only part of this amount is explained in the AAR)?

The transfer No.1/2012 transferred to the budget articles for delegations €1.272 million which had been entered into the reserve by Parliament during the budgetary procedure, to be released if the monthly Infor EURO EUR/USD exchange rate had fallen below 1.3 to the euro.

The transfer n°2/2012, as explained in reply to the question No.44, transferred to the line 2100 -Information technology at headquarters - €2.5 million which had been entered in the reserve by Parliament during the budgetary procedure until the EEAS would provide more information on its staff.

The justifications for transfers n°3 and 4/2012 can be found in the attached letters which submitted them to Parliament at the time.

It should be borne in mind that, when the budget for 2012 was drafted in early 2011, the EEAS had just been established from transfers of staff from the Commission and the General Secretariat of the Council and no track record of budgetary implementation was available as a basis for estimates for the same perimeter. The decisions on salary adaptations for 2011 and 2012 were unexpected at the time the budget for 2012 was drafted and even approved. In addition, fluctuations in exchange rates have a strong impact on expenditure in delegations (see reply to question n° 216). Evolutions in the international situation led to the opening of new delegations in Libya and South Sudan, while security costs in countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq were high. All such factors explain why the transfers n°3 and 4/2012 were relatively substantial.

206. Were there any reservations made by the COO in the Headquarters in year 2012 for the Headquarters management? If yes what were they?

The only reservations for the HQ concerned the direct management of security contracts for delegations.

207. Were there any reservations made by the COO or the Head of Delegations in year 2012 for the Delegations management? If yes what were they?

No.

208. How many open entries were on the suspense accounts of the Delegations on 31 December, 2013 (being 46.000 in 31 December, 2012 and 51.000 on 31 December, 2011), did the Service manage to further reduce the number of open entries?

On 31.12.2013 there were 51.717 open entries in all the suspense accounts used by the EEAS. The increase compared to the situation at the end of 2012 is mainly due to an increase in two of the main suspense accounts:

- The suspense account used to register recoverable VAT (+2.668 compared to 31.12.2012) and
- The suspense account used to register compulsory contributions in the payslip of the local agents (+5.718 compared to 31.12.2012).

These two suspense accounts correspond to legal obligations which the EEAS has with respect of the host country and the capacity of the EEAS to rapidly regularise the entries in these accounts lies in the hands of the administration of the host country.

The use of suspense accounts is a part of the normal accounting procedures of the EEAS and the average balance on these accounts at any given moment is about 50.000 entries (as indicated by the last three years end of year balance). It is also useful to note that each year the EEAS, with its network of delegations, produce about 400.000 entries on the suspense accounts, most of which are rapidly regularised. The remainder depend to a large extent on the local authorities' capacity to swiftly process the files.

209. How big was the total value of the balance on the suspense accounts of the Delegations on 31 December, 2011 and on 31 December, 2012 and on 31 December 2013?

The value of open entries on the suspense accounts was as follows:

31.12.2011: €6,1 M

31.12.2012: €6,7 M

31.12.2013: €8,9 M

The large majority of the suspense account balances are not amounts to be regularised against the budget of the EEAS but are amounts to be regularised with a payment to the host country (such as payment of local taxes and contributions), or with a reimbursement from the host country administration (such as the case for the reimbursement of VAT), or are just technical entries used by the accounting system in relation to imprest operations or the payment of salaries.

In particular, the increase in the value of the balance at the end of 2013 is mainly due to the increase of the balance on a technical suspense account used between the EEAS and the PMO to process the payment of salaries (+ 0,8 mio € compared to 2012) and the increase in the balance of a technical suspense account used to register the transfer of money between bank accounts in different currencies in delegations (+ 0,7 mio € compared to 2012).

210. What is the reason for the many open entries on the suspense accounts of the Delegations?

The main reason for the use of suspense accounts is the legal obligation to track separately VAT in order to be able to claim back the VAT from the local authorities and the legal obligations related to the management of the monthly salary of several thousands of local

agents - as the delegation performs a role of "employer" in each of the host countries there is an obligation to account for the compulsory contributions to social security and taxes. After deduction from the salary of the local agent, these amounts are posted to a suspense account pending payment of these contributions to the host country in accordance with local legislation.

These two are the main suspense accounts used by the delegations; there are also other suspense accounts used mainly to account for advances on missions (which have to be regularised after the mission has been completed), accounting operations in HQ for salaries between the EEAS and the PMO, technical entries related to the management of the local imprest accounts and other operations.

211. Who is responsible for the balance and open entries on the suspense accounts of the Delegations?

The authorising officer by sub-delegation (the Head of Delegation) is responsible for the entries made to all suspense accounts in his/her delegation. However, locally, the follow up of the open items is assured by the Head of Administration.

The overall follow up is assured by the HQ, in particular by the Budget Division of the EEAS, and is submitted to a strict control by the Accounting Officer's services (DG BUDG). The situation of the suspense account entries is a key element in the judgement by the Accountant of the EEAS (BUDG) of the quality of the accounting and financial management of the EEAS.

The ultimate responsibility for suspense account entries lies with the Authorising Officer of the EEAS (the Chief Operation Officer).

212. Which are the Delegations with the 5 biggest number of open entries on the suspense accounts?

At the end of 2013 the five delegations with the highest number of open entries were:

• Bosnia:	8.726
• Switzerland-Geneva	2.043
• Gabon:	1.831
• Burundi:	1.685
• South Africa:	1.450

213. Which are the Delegations with the 5 biggest amounts of open entries on the suspense accounts?

Bosnia:	€739.378,90
Switzerland-Geneva :	€641.331,63
Israel:	€562.314,83
Mozambique:	€479.910,89
West Bank Gaza Jerusalem:	€458.726,96

It is important to underline that the large majority of the HB balance amounts are not to be regularised against the budget (thus are not suspended budgetary posting) but are regularised with a payment to the hosting Country (such as the case for the local taxes and contributions), or with a reimbursement from the hosting Country administration (such as the case for the reimbursed VAT), or are just technical entries used by the accounting system in respect of the imprest operations or liquidation of salaries.

214. What were the six points of the action plan drawn up in order to reduce the balance and number of outstanding open entries of the suspense accounts of the Delegations? Were those six points fully implemented in 2012?

The action plan related to the management of suspense accounts at EEAS foresaw six main points which were:

1. Put in place an early warning system in order to detect immediately if there is an uncontrolled increase of the use of one or more suspense accounts in order to be able to swiftly intervene with mitigating actions.
2. Put in place an early warning system in order to detect immediately if there is a problem in one, or more, delegation potentially leading to an uncontrolled increase of the use of suspense account entries in order to be able to swiftly intervene with mitigating actions.
3. Put in place an action in order to reduce the big number of Payroll-related suspense account entries related to the salaries of officials and contract agents.
4. Put in place a verification action in order to check the consistency of the suspense account entries related to rental guarantees.
5. Put in place a verification action in order to check the consistency of the suspense account entries related to non-rental guarantees.
6. Increase the consciousness of the Head of Delegations and Head of Administration about the importance of the correct use of the suspense.

All the actions foreseen for the six points of the action plan are in place since end 2011.

215. Were there any new initiatives set up in 2012 or in 2013, like the EEAS Smart Savings Initiative set up in 2011? If yes what results did they have?

The EEAS took four main initiatives for smart savings since 2011:

- The Living Conditions Allowance (LCA) awarded to staff in delegations has been gradually reviewed in the course of 2012 and 2013 in accordance with the Staff Regulations with a view to adapting its level to current local conditions. Current conditions in industrialised countries and swift progress in emerging countries have warranted reductions. In particular, conditions in a number of countries in Asia (China, Japan, Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea & Taiwan) and Latin America (Argentina, Chili) have been deemed equivalent to those prevailing in the EU and the LCA in those countries has been brought down to zero. High allowances have been focussed on postings in crisis countries and in particularly difficult situations. In this regard, the LCA has been increased to the maximum rate (40%) in Angola, DR Congo, Djibouti, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Libya, Nigeria, Syria and Timor East. As a net result, appropriations in the budget for 2014 were reduced by €800 000. The Living Condition Allowance continues to be reviewed regularly in accordance with the new provisions in the Staff Regulations;
- The Rest Leave scheme for staff in delegations has also been reviewed gradually. In particular, it has been decided that in a number of cases, from 2014 onwards, the rest leave should be taken in the region of posting rather than in Brussels, resulting in savings on travel costs. Appropriations for rest leaves in the budget for 2014 were reduced by €200 000;
- The EEAS contributed to the change in the provisions in the Staff Regulations on the annual journey for staff in delegations (Article 8 paragraph 4 of Annex VII to the Staff Regulations). The switch from business class to economy class as the basis for establishing the amounts due is estimated to lead to an annual saving of almost €3 million. Appropriations in the EEAS budget for 2014 were reduced accordingly in the course of the budgetary procedure.

- A new policy for staff accommodation in delegation has been designed in agreement with the Commission. It will apply to staff newly deployed to delegations. As about ¼ of staff rotate every year, it will be introduced gradually over four years, starting on 1 September 2014. In 89 delegations, staff will no longer be provided with accommodation in accordance with Article 5 of Annex X to the Staff Regulations but their rent will be reimbursed up to a ceiling in accordance with Article 23 of the same Annex. It is expected that this new policy will reduce the administrative burden for delegations and will yield increasing savings over the following years for the EEAS and the Commission.

216. What unexpected costs occurred due to the changes of the EUR/US exchange rates in 2012? How does the EEAS prepare itself for such situations?

The impact of exchange rates fluctuations on delegations' costs can only be estimated ex post, assuming that payments have been spread evenly over the year. It affects costs in euros for the EEAS' budget and Commission contributions (Commission's administrative budget, "ex-BA" lines, European Development Fund).

More than 86 million USD were paid out in 2012 for delegations, of which €41 million from the EEAS' budget and €45 million financed from Commission contributions. The euro on average fell from 1.40 USD in 2011 to 1.29 USD in 2012. The resulting additional cost can be estimated at almost €5.5 million, of which €2.6 million for the EEAS' budget.

The total loss in 2012 due to exchange rates fluctuations (all currencies) can be estimated at €7.4 million compared to what would have been paid out if exchange rates had remained at their 2011 level, of which €4.4 million for the EEAS' budget. Apart from the US dollar, the overall impact was particularly strong for the yen (€0.9 M) and the renmimbi (€0.5 M).

In 2012, €1.272 million of these additional costs could be covered by the reserve created by Parliament in the course of the budgetary procedure. The rest had to be absorbed, as far as the EEAS is concerned, thanks to appropriations initially foreseen for the 2011 and 2012 salary adaptations, which were not granted, the postponement of recruitments to the new 20 AD posts given to the EEAS in 2012 and of IT investments.

As exchange rates fluctuations are unpredictable and given that the tight financial context makes the creation of reserves for possible additional costs difficult, it is in effect hardly possible to prepare for such events. The impact has to be managed during the year, in practice by redeploying surpluses which may appear during implementation and by postponing investments. The inclusion in the budgets for 2012 and 2013 of appropriations for salary adaptations which at the end of the day were not granted has eased such management. It would be more difficult to face a depreciation of the euro in 2014, when all such appropriations have been taken out of the institutions' budgets.

217. Are there any plans to simplify the complicated system of the administrative costs divided between the Commission and the EEAS?

See answer to question 59.

218. Did the new Financial Regulation lead to improvements and simplification of this system?

The new Financial Regulation brought no change to the complex system for sharing costs in delegations between the EEAS and the Commission.

219. On what bases are the common costs of the administrative expenditure of the Delegations shared between the Commission and the Service?

Expenditure in delegations is financed from the EEAS' budget, which itself receives contributions from the Commission in excess of €260 million a year to cover expenditure

relating to Commission staff. Such contributions come from 26 different budget lines plus the European Development Fund. Some of these lines belong to the Commission's administrative budget. 9 are "ex-BA" lines and 8 others belong to various headings such as Research and OLAF.

Expenditure in delegations when attributable to one institution or programme is charged to the one corresponding funding source: for instance the remunerations and accommodation costs of EEAS staff are charged to the EEAS; the salary of a local agent working for an operational programme is financed by the "ex-BA" line attached to that programme.

Some expenditure in delegations is shared between the EEAS and various Commission budget lines (i.e. rents for delegations offices, security, informatics, cleaning, repairs) according to a breakdown key based on the number of posts attributed to the EEAS, the Commission and the various operational programmes in the delegation concerned.

Costs for communications between headquarters and delegations are shared according to a global key based on the number of posts attributed to every funding source in the delegations network as a whole.

Investments in delegations' office buildings are shared between the EEAS' and the Commission's administrative budgets only, based on the number of posts attributable to each institution in the delegation concerned (staff implementing operational programmes in this case are attributed to the Commission).

220. In which countries and in how many individual cases were the two specific additional allowances for crisis situations applied?

The two specific additional allowances for crisis situations were applied for all Officials, Temporary Agents and Contract Agents working in the Delegations of Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Mali, South Sudan, Yemen and Pakistan.

221. What changes were made by the EEAS to the living condition allowance and rest leave in year 2013?

As of 1 August 2013, the living condition allowances (LCA) were increased for Bangladesh (from 35% to 40%), Mali (from 35% to 40%) and Niger (from 35% to 40%). The LCA were lowered for Azerbaijan (from 25% to 20%), Nepal (from 35% to 30%), Sri Lanka (from 30% to 25%) and Timor-Leste (from 40% to 35%). A provisional LCA was fixed for Turkmenistan (25%) and Somalia (40%).

On 20 December 2013, it was decided that as of 1 January 2014, the LCA will be increased for Myanmar (25% to 30%), Syria (35% to 40%), Timor-Leste (35% to 40%) and Tunisia (10% to 15%), and the LCA will be diminished for Algeria (30% to 25%), Nepal (30% to 25%) and Russia (25% to 20%).

Concerning rest leave, as of 1 January 2014, rest leaves were eliminated for Nepal and Djibouti, and the number of rest leaves was reduced to one for Timor-Leste. The rest leaves for Bangladesh (as of 1 January 2013) and Mali (as of 1 August 2013) were increased to two rest leaves, and the rest leaves for Niger were increased to three rest leaves (also as of 1 August 2013). The Delegation in Somalia was attributed 3 rest leaves.

222. Is the decision on development funds and humanitarian aid done in a fully transparent way? What is the procedure in force for these kinds of decisions?

The decision processes on EU development funds and humanitarian aid are fully transparent. Funding decisions on specific actions in the field of development are based on multi-annual programming documents adopted by the Commission.

The multi-annual programming documents establish the multi-annual allocations and

priorities for a partner country, region or theme, as provided for in the basic act and, where relevant, in the delegated act modifying them. These are prepared by the EEAS / Commission in accordance with the EEAS decision and the current EEAS/DEVCO working arrangements and are adopted by the Commission after consultation with other Commission services. The content of these decisions are established in close consultation with the concerned partner regions/countries and other relevant stakeholders (for instance, civil society).

The programming documents, as well the specific financing decisions implementing them, are subject to Comitology, which means that Member States are consulted for their opinion and the European Parliament and the Council may exert its right of scrutiny. In addition, following the agreement on the external action financial instruments for the 2014-2020, the Commission undertakes a strategic dialogue with the Parliament on the main elements of programming before adopting the programming documents."

Humanitarian aid (ECHO) is excluded from Art.9 of the EEAS Council Decision. The programming cycle for this area is unified and continues to be managed by the Commission. DG ECHO consults the EEAS, as well as Commission services, through the interservice consultation process.

Allocations to individual beneficiary countries/regions are established, under Humanitarian Aid, on the basis of a multi-phased methodology, governed by the Integrated Analysis Framework (IAF), an internal needs based decision making process. which brings together the information and data requirements from different sources, including the Global vulnerability and crisis assessment (GVCA) the Forgotten Crisis Assessment (FCA) and the Food Insecurity Needs Assessment (FINAT) tools. This methodology ensures: i) a more integrated approach to the analysis of context, vulnerability and needs ii) quality of country analysis and transparency

A share of the humanitarian budget (more than 10%) remains however unallocated and put aside to address new crises or deterioration of existing crises during the year. Decisions on the mobilisation of this operational reserve to cover these new situations are based on specific assessment of the needs.

223. How is the EEAS preparing for the 2014-2020 MFF period, when it will have 96 billion EUR of EU external assistance funds to decide on with shared responsibility with the Commission?

The EEAS already started the exercise by defining the relevant country allocations considering the new development cooperation orientations (e.g. Agenda for change) and political priorities with partner countries. It is now accelerating the decision making process for the adoption of the strategy documents (country team meeting, interservice consultation etc...), with a view to finalize it by end 2014. Current working arrangement with the COM are the basis on which the programming of funds is jointly being carried out with DEVCO.

224. What is the procedure in force to decide whether the EEAS takes part in an international conference or not? What is the average size of an EEAS delegation attending an international conference?

The decision to participate or not in an international conference is left to the Managing Director of the department responsible for the policy in question. Participation will of course depend on the importance of the subject for the European Union and the importance of the function and role which the EEAS has in such a conference. It is recalled that the EEAS reduced its mission budget for HQ staff for 2012 by 10% compared to 2011 and has maintained the budget at that level for 2013 and 2014 (representing a reduction in real terms). Guidelines have also been issued internally to limit participation in missions to the number strictly necessary to enable the department to carry out its official functions. The

guidelines also promote, among other things, the increased use of video-conferencing to obviate the need for missions. No separate statistics are available for participation in international conferences.

Buildings

225. Are there any examples where the Service took loans to purchase offices or residences? if yes in which countries, and what did the Service purchase?

There has not yet been any loan operations to buy real estate

226. How are the agreed housing norms calculated in third countries?

EU Delegations draw up a proposal for housing norms based on a comprehensive analysis of the local housing market and a comparison with the housing situation of officials of the Member States present in the third country. EEAS HQ validates the proposed housing norms.

227. Were there any examples when the EEAS Managing Directorate for Administration and Finance was not approving the building contract signed by the Head of Delegation? If yes then what was the reason and in which countries?

There are no such examples as the Head of Delegation doesn't sign the building contract before getting the approval from the HQ.

228. How can the Service guarantee that the outcome of the negotiated procedure regarding building contracts is the most cost efficient?

See also answer given to the question 191. According to the article 121 rules of application (RAP) of the financial regulation, building contracts cover the purchase, long lease, usufruct, leasing, rental or hire purchase, with or without option to buy, of land, existing buildings or other real estate. The financial regulation (article 134, h) foresees for building contracts a negotiated procedure after prospecting the local market.

Negotiated procedure is the most cost efficient procedure as it entails first a prospection of the local market which means that the EEAS is fully aware of all the real estate opportunities and on their financial conditions on each local market.

229. Is the Head of Delegation the one in charge for managing the negotiated procedure?

In the case of opening of new delegations, the head of the operational division in charge of infrastructure is the contracting authority for managing the negotiated procedure.

In the case of long time established delegations moving premises it is the Head of Delegation as the contracting authority who is responsible.

230. Who is responsible for the management of the building contracts in the Delegations?

The Head of Delegation is responsible for the management of the building contracts of the Delegation with the assistance of the HQ in case of needs.

231. Please provide information on the three building contracts (table 12 (a) purchase of the Nigeria Offices, leases of the KO 150 and 115) signed in 2012 by the HQ (sqm, facilities, annual cost, length of the contract).

Kortenberg 115	Kortenberg 150	Nigeria Offices
Sqm : 2482	9019	2652
Annual cost : 469 321.08 €	2 407 246.77 €	3 775 000 € (purchase price)

**Length of
the contract :** 13 years 18 years EU Property

232. Please provide information on the building contracts (table 12 (b), 416 contracts with total value of 21.629.425,21 EUR) with value higher than 100.000 EUR signed by the Delegations in 2012 (country, sqm, facilities, annual cost, length of the contract).

This request concerns 179 building contracts. Because of the very large amount of information, the requested information could be provided if necessary.

233. Please provide information on the building contracts declared secret (table 13, 413 contracts with total value of 148.882.391,92) with a value higher than 100.000 EUR signed by in 2012 (country, sqm, facilities, annual cost, length of the contract).

No secret contracts were signed in 2012 – see also answer to question 2

234. What is the reason for certain building contracts being declared secret and other building contracts signed in the same year not?

There were no secret contracts in 2012. This is a double encoding. The contents of Table 12 should have been set in table 13.

235. What is the reason for not naming the country that the building contract is made in table 12 and table 13 this year?

According to article 124.2 (RAP) the list of contractors to whom building contracts are awarded shall indicate only the name of the contractor, the subject and the value of the contracts awarded. The name of the country could be added in the next AAR report.

236. What is the average office monthly rental price per square meter that the Service is globally paying for its premises?

The average office monthly rental price per square meter globally paying is around 17 €.

237. What is the average monthly housing rental price per square meter for apartment/residence the Service is globally paying for its staff?

The average monthly housing rental price per square meter_for apartment, residence is around 13€.
