



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

**REPLIES AND FOLLOW-UP TO THE
DISCHARGE FOR 2010**

Table of contents

I. SECRETARY GENERAL	4
1. Response to the financial crisis and general context.....	4
2. Communication of information.....	5
3. Buildings.....	6
4. Relative costs of EP's places of work.....	6
5. Internal audit reports.....	8
6. Accountability of the Bureau and discharge follow-up.....	10
7. Transparency.....	10
8. Legal actions.....	11
9. House of European History.....	11
10. Rules for family members' employment by MEPs.....	13
11. Carry-overs by political groups.....	14
12. Public procurement.....	14
13. Security.....	17
14. Restructuring.....	19
15. Costs of accommodating outside organizations.....	19
16. Data retention.....	19
17. Power blackout procedures.....	20
18. Budget line 3242.....	21
II. DG INTERNAL POLICIES (DG IPOL) AND EXTERNAL POLICIES (DG EXPO)	22
III. DG COMMUNICATION (DG COMM)	24
19. Information offices / Europa Houses and associated costs.....	24
20. Audiovisual subsidies.....	27
21. Europarl TV.....	27
22. Prizes.....	28
23. Visitors' centre - Parliamentarium.....	32
IV. DG INFRASTRUCTURE AND LOGISTICS (DG INLO)	32
24. Buildings.....	32
25. Office occupation rates.....	35
26. Relighting project, asbestos, emergency generators.....	36
27. Parliament cars.....	38
28. Three locations.....	38
29. Canteens and restaurants.....	40
V. DG FINANCE (DG FINS)	41
30. Long-term review of the Parliament's budget.....	41
31. End of budget year 'mopping up'.....	41
32. Lump sum payments.....	42
33. Members' presence.....	43
34. Transport costs.....	44
35. Public procurement.....	45
36. Voluntary pension fund.....	47
VI. DG PERSONNEL (DG PERS)	48
37. Missions' costs.....	49
38. Equal treatment of staff recruited before and after May 2004.....	52
39. Trends amongst staff leaving the employment of the EP.....	53
40. Missions from information offices.....	54

VII. DG INTERPRETATION (DG INTE) 54
VIII. DG INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL SUPPORT (DG ITEC)..... 56
IX. DG TRANSLATION (DG TRAD) 56

I. SECRETARY GENERAL

1. Response to the financial crisis and general context

What proposals are there to reduce the costs of the European Parliament during this severe economic and financial crisis? Has an independent audit been considered in order to assess the organisation, efficiency and costs of the European Parliament? Has the Secretary General identified any overlapping activities among different services of the European Parliament in 2010 or other years?

Taking account of the difficult economic conditions and the financial crisis, the budgetary procedure 2012 provided a number of structural savings based on innovative measures that affect neither the efficiency of Parliament's activities nor the resources made available to each Member.

The following proposals were adopted during Parliament's reading of the draft budget in October 2011 and the final vote in December 2011:

- 1. structural savings** in the area of interpreting and translation to achieve **resource efficient full multilingualism**. While safeguarding full multilingualism, these savings are based on more efficient use of resources (saving EUR 10 million on external interpreting and EUR 11 million on external translation of the verbatim report of proceedings and of written questions);
- 2. a programme of restraint** consisting in reducing by 5% Members' travel expenses and staff mission expenses and freezing the general expenditure allowance at the 2011 nominal level; additionally reduce the cost of traditional publications by EUR 250 000 and energy costs by EUR 486 000 (overall saving of EUR 6.2 million);

In addition, during the last 5 years' budgetary procedures, **182 posts were redeployed** in Parliament in order to ensure efficient and effective management of human resources and to avoid unnecessary creation of new posts.

Parliament's building policy is a further example for a long term strategy where tax payers' money is invested in remaining assets rather than spent in rents (163 Mio. of savings per year). For estimations on yearly savings due to this policy, please, refer to part IV, DG INLO question 24.

Appropriations entered in the budget of the Parliament are based upon the obligations resulting from different legal acts such as the Statute of Members (appropriations entered under Chapter 10), Staff Regulation (Chapter 12, chapter 14), the Statute of Accredited Assistants (chapter 42) and the decisions taken by political bodies like the Bureau and the Conference of Presidents (all chapters).

Parliament's bodies have demonstrated that they are able and willing to take the necessary difficult decisions themselves.

Proportion of Parliament's budget within Heading 5 of the Multiannual Financial Framework

Year	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
% Heading 5	19,64	19,48	19,67	19,99	20,03	19,62

2. Communication of information

What system exists to ensure unanswered mail and e-mail items requiring a holding reply and/or an acknowledgement of receipt are automatically flagged up? If such a system is still not in place, will it be ready before 1 May 2012? The Ombudsman refers to the European Code of Good Administrative Behaviour as a 'vital' instrument and it should be noted that particularly relevant to questions from MEPs are articles 14 and 17.

Parliament disposes of a custom made software solution called GEDA to manage administrative documents, including correspondence. The use of this tool ensures that all incoming and outgoing official mails are registered and assigned to the responsible services and persons, who are given a deadline to take the necessary action. Follow-up is made easier with the tool, though it naturally remains the responsibility of the individuals to respect the deadlines and actually send holding replies and final answers.

It nevertheless has to be seen that the GEDA software is outdated and lacks supervision functionality for the monitoring of deadlines. A replacement application is to be envisaged.

In relations with the public, to which the above-mentioned Code refers, the same tool is used for (paper-based) mails. The overwhelming majority of inquiries is answered to within 2 weeks, and if not, a holding reply constituting also an acknowledgement of receipt is sent to the citizen. Electronic inquiries entered on Parliaments website are managed by another specific software tool that immediately requests the confirmation of the validity of the sender's e-mail address and then generates an acknowledgement of receipt automatically. The rare cases that can not be answered within 2 weeks are flagged up and a holding reply is sent.

For email communication, the sender himself can also request a delivery receipt and/or a read receipt from the addressee.

On the recipient side (ie. the EP in this case), a system sending automatically such receipts should be technically possible, it requires from this system the ability to distinguish automatically the emails which by their content or some other attribute require an answer, a holding reply and/or a formal acknowledgement of receipt, from the emails which do not. Such an automatic distinction would require that the emails concerned feature some clear characteristic on which such an automatic selection could be made. The EP's email system should indeed allow to set up such an automatic email flagging, when the migration to its new version (Microsoft's *Outlook* 2010) will have been carried out in the first few months of 2012. This flagging system would however work only for emails sent from within the EP email system, and would require some customisation for each user.

As far as emails sent from outside the EP's email system are concerned, the required flagging could be possible provided the email system of the sender is similar to the EP's. This should however be tested during the pilot phase of the *Outlook* migration. If however the email system of the sender is different from the EP, the interlink between the outside email system with the EP's one must be thoroughly tested before any guaranty can be given as to the feasibility and reliability of the requested message flagging.

3. Buildings

The Internal Auditor's report 09/03 'audit of building policy: planning, assessment and management of accommodation needs', adopted in 2009, contained seventeen proposed actions. Some were to be completed before 30 June 2010 and others before 30 November 2010. *Were the actions undertaken as proposed in each case, and what were the outcomes?*

In accordance with its 2011 Work Programme, the Internal Audit Service has been carrying out a follow-up to Report no. 09/03, in which it is examining the implementation status of the 17 actions contained in the original report. That follow-up audit is now being finalised and the report is likely to be adopted during the first quarter of 2012.

4. Relative costs of EP's places of work

The Internal Auditor's report 09/03 also mentions an agreement between Messrs. Hänsch and Juncker which states, inter alia, that the majority of the permanent and temporary staff of the Secretariat-General of the European Parliament, with the exception of staff working for the political groups and staff posted to information offices, shall be based in Luxembourg. *What will it take to revoke that agreement from 1996 (amended in 2000)?*

Firstly, the seat of the European Parliament is determined in Protocol n°6 to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. The protocol in question on the Location of the Seats of the Institutions and of Certain Bodies, Offices, Agencies and Departments of the European Union provides in its sole Article, point (a), that the General Secretariat of the European Parliament and its departments are based in Luxembourg.

Parliament is honouring the engagement to have at least 2060 staff in Luxembourg basically fulfilling support functions. The current number of EP staff in Luxembourg is 2491.

If the staffing of Luxembourg is to be changed drastically, it would require a revision of the Treaty since Parliament is bound to maintain its General Secretariat in this Member State.

Additionally, if staff currently working in Luxembourg were to be transferred to Brussels in bigger numbers, Parliament would have to find office space. Taking into consideration that office spaces are significantly cheaper in Luxembourg (see annex to question 7.1. in 2009 discharge questionnaire) and additional cost for office space in Brussels is by no means balanced by the economies which could be made on mission expenses.

How many such staff members (permanent and temporary, excluding those working for political groups or posted to information offices) are based in Luxembourg?

As at 22/11/2011, 2491 agents were based in Luxembourg (2191 officials, 100 temporary agents and 200 contract staff)

Is it possible for cleaning/maintenance and energy consumption figures to be juxtaposed to those of future annual estimates and separated in such a way that the cost for the different places of work becomes apparent?

The Secretary-General would like to point out that this question does not strictly relate to the 2010 discharge, but rather to the budgets of future years and would therefore concern the Committee on Budgets. A comprehensive answer is nevertheless provided herewith.

Commitments on budget item/ expenditure type (in EUR millions)	2009			2010			2011			2012			2013		
	BXL	STR	LUX	BXL	STR	LUX	BXL	STR	LUX	BXL	STR	LUX	BXL	STR	LUX
2022 - Building maintenance, upkeep, operation and cleaning															
Maintenance	10,1	6,6	2,4	13,6	9,2	2,7	13,7	12,1	3,0	14,7	12,8	4,8	23,3	13,3	4,4
Cleaning	7,2	4,5	2,9	6,4	3,9	2,9	7,0	4,0	2,6	7,0	4,2	3,0	7,3	4,2	3,2
Total	17,3	11,1	5,3	20,0	13,1	5,6	20,7	16,1	5,6	21,7	17,0	7,8	30,6	17,5	7,6
Total 3 places	33,7			38,7			42,4			46,5			55,7		
2024 - Energy consumption															
Water	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,5	0,2	0,1	0,5	0,1	0,2	0,5	0,2	0,1	0,5	0,2	0,1
Urban heating	0,0	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,0	1,2	0,0	0,0	1,4	0,0	0,0	1,3	0,0	0,0	1,3
Gas	2,1	0,3	0,5	2,3	0,3	0,5	2,1	0,2	0,4	2,0	0,4	0,6	2,2	0,5	0,6
Electricity	6,5	2,7	2,1	5,7	2,7	2,2	6,0	3,1	2,0	5,9	3,3	2,7	6,4	3,8	2,5
Heating oil	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,0
Total	8,8	3,2	3,7	8,5	3,2	4,0	8,7	3,4	4,0	8,5	3,9	4,7	9,2	4,5	4,5
Total 3 places	15,7			15,7			16,1			17,1			18,2		
Grand total	49,4			54,4			58,5			63,6			73,9		

What is the explanation for cleaning and maintenance seeming to be more expensive in Strasbourg than in Brussels while more time is spent in Brussels per year?

Cleaning and maintenance are currently more expensive in Strasbourg (55 €/m²) than Brussels (40 €/m²).

Les contrats de maintenance font l'objet de mise en concurrence par appels d'offres ouverts toutes les 5 années. La différence entre les deux sites s'explique par le fait que le contrat de conduite et maintenance des installations techniques à Bruxelles n'inclut pas encore certaines prestations déjà incluses dans le contrat de Strasbourg. Il s'agit notamment de la garantie totale et d'autres prestations garantissant un niveau de qualité répondant aux exigences de la nouvelle politique de maintenance (maintenance accrue du fait de l'âge des bâtiments). Le nouveau contrat de conduite et maintenance des installations techniques à Bruxelles devrait entrer en vigueur dans le courant de l'année 2012 et les prévisions pour le budget 2013 intègrent ces nouvelles prestations. En 2013 les coûts de maintenance et nettoyage à Bruxelles

devraient s'élever à 59,5 €/m² à comparer aux 58,4 €/m² à Strasbourg. Tout en sachant que le Parlement européen s'est résolument orienté vers une politique de maintenance de haute qualité (point 7.f de la décision du Bureau du 24 mars 2010), les coûts de la maintenance des immeubles du Parlement européen restent relativement stables et comparables, à qualité de services égale, à ceux du marché.

Cleaning service is reduced in Strasbourg between sessions weeks, but it can not be entirely suspended, as certain meeting rooms and common areas are used by visitor groups and various events. On the other hand, technical installations are maintained permanently, as they must function perfectly during the sessions. Indeed, turning off an equipment at the end of the session to turn it on at the beginning of the next or a few days before presents a significant risk of functional problems during the session and would reduce its life span.

5. Internal audit reports

The 2009 Discharge resolution, point 74: “Is of the opinion that the internal audit reports should be made available, under specific conditions, to the Members of the Committee on Budgetary Control; urges the Chair of that committee to agree with the Secretary-General on those conditions;” *Has the Secretary-General meet with the CONT Chair to discuss the conditions for granting confidential access to the internal audit reports for CONT Members? What stage has been reached have any obstacles been identified which could prevent access?*

A meeting between the CONT Chair MEP Jan MULDER and the Secretary General on this issue took place on 22/11/2011. During the meeting it was recalled that:

The Internal Auditor in the European Parliament has an important role for quality control and improvement of financial and budgetary management. According to the "Charte de l'Auditeur Interne":

Art. 1. L'audit interne constitue une fonction indépendante d'examen et d'évaluation, créée au sein du Parlement européen afin d'examiner et d'évaluer toutes les activités et tous les services de l'institution, au profit des autorités de décision, des ordonnateurs et du personnel d'encadrement. En assurant ce service conformément aux normes professionnelles les plus élevées, l'audit interne contribue à la saine gestion financière des crédits budgétaires de l'institution.

Art. 8 L'auditeur interne s'adresse directement au Secrétaire général et au comité de suivi des audits. S'il le juge nécessaire, il peut s'adresser directement au Président du Parlement européen pour des questions concernant l'accomplissement de ses tâches.

Art.16 stipulates clearly that the IA transmits the reports to the SG and the Audit Panel.

According to the current Financial Regulation (Art. 85.4) the institution transmits annually a summary report indicating the number and type of Internal audits , the recommendations formulated therein and the follow up given to the recommendations.

For the EP's management the Internal Auditors' reports have a very high value for improving its financial and budgetary management. The Internal Auditors' independence could be jeopardised by a differential treatment by the discharge authority of internal auditors' reports depending on the institution.

Currently the EP's Internal Auditor is presenting the Annual report and not only a summary in the CONT committee. Furthermore, the rapporteur has full access to the annual report and to specific internal auditors' reports on demand. This practice goes already much further than practice from any other institution.

In the outcome of the meeting it was decided that in the light of the ongoing reform of the Financial Regulation to continue to present the Annual Report of the IA in CONT and grant access via the secretariat to the rapporteur of EP discharge. The revised Financial Regulation should define clearly the treatment of Internal Auditors' reports for all institutions with regard to the discharge authority.

Furthermore, the rapporteur continues to have confidential access to specific reports on demand.

Has the Bureau ever delayed submitting the Annual Report of the Internal Auditor to the Committee on Budgetary Control? How can the Bureau be made fully aware that the Internal Auditor's independence must be respected and that the Bureau is not required to agree with or endorse his conclusions? Can the Internal Auditor's Annual Report be sent to the Committee on Budgetary Control directly rather than via the Bureau?

The Bureau has always acted in full cognizance of its responsibilities with regard to the annual report of the Internal Auditor. In line with the Internal Rules on the Implementation of the EP Budget, this report is dealt with by the Bureau during the month of September and then immediately sent to the CONT Committee. In 2010, the report was only dealt with in the middle of October owing to a very heavy agenda of the Bureau.

The Bureau is fully aware that the Internal Auditor is independent thus does not interfere with or endorse his conclusions. As regards the possibility to send the Internal Auditor's annual report directly to the CONT Committee, Art. 12 of the Internal Rules governing the implementation of EP budget stipulates that it is first examined by the Audit Panel (made up of three Vice-Presidents) and the Bureau as a whole, prior to be sent to the discharge authority. In this context it is to be recalled that according to the Rules of procedures of the European Parliament Rule 23, Paragraph 2 the Bureau shall take financial, organisational and administrative decisions on matters concerning Members and the internal organisation of Parliament, its Secretariat and its bodies.

6. Accountability of the Bureau and discharge follow-up

In line with the 2009 Discharge report:

- *Have all Members of the European Parliament been "sent copies of key policies adopted by the Bureau during the course of this parliamentary term, such as, for example: the buildings strategy, the ICT strategy, the Communication Action Plan*
- *Has the Bureau sent out any "draft papers on key subjects of common interest to all Members of the European Parliament in order to facilitate discussion within the political groups before any final decisions are taken" (for example, on buildings or security policies)?*

The Members of the European Parliament have access to decisions adopted by the Bureau in line with Article 5 of the Rules of Procedures; the decisions are also published on the Bureau's website (Intranet). With regard to major decisions, such as the ones relating to building policy, security and ICT strategy, the members of the Bureau have undertaken to consult their respective political groups prior to the actual decisions' being taken by the Bureau.

Is the Bureau formally sent a copy of the Parliament Discharge report once adopted by plenary? Is a debate on the Parliament Discharge report put on the agenda of the Bureau following its adoption by Parliament? Is the Bureau given a summary of all the decisions of Parliament contained in the discharge report, where it is competent to act with an indication of steps required in order to carry out the wishes of Parliament?

The Bureau discusses the discharge resolution via individual subsequent decisions. Background documentation is provided to members of the Bureau and it includes the advice given in the resolution itself. All Bureau Members are Members of Parliament and as such fully involved in debates and Plenary votes on the discharge of Parliament.

Could the Conference of Presidents schedule a separate debate on the Parliament discharge, to allow special consideration and provide a useful forum for individual members to debate the organisation of the Parliament with Bureau members?

In principle, yes. Any such decision would depend upon the political appreciation of the group Chairs as to whether the broader annual discharge debate first in the Committee in charge followed by Plenary provided insufficient scope to debate the relevant issues relating to the Parliament discharge.

7. Transparency

How much progress has been made to creating "a user-friendly tool on the Internet showing money flows not only in figures, but also through lines of different sizes" as proposed in the 2009 discharge report?

Though the question is not specific about the "money flows" to be presented, it addresses the possibility of a more intuitive, graphical presentation of budgetary and financial matters in the

European Parliament's online communications. This is indeed one of the editorial directions in which, on the basis of the Bureau's decision of 22 November 2010 on the renewal of the web presence of the European Parliament, online communications are evolving, with substantially increased use of multimedia and infographics on the website. Infographics are now used on a weekly basis to illustrate news stories published on the "Headlines" page of the website, while a series of sophisticated multimedia infographics are in production to illustrate various facets of the Parliament's activities, powers and organisation, including in the budgetary field, in documentary parts of the site.

With specific reference to budgets, this is an area where the use of graphics has been pioneered, with a recent notable example provided in a flash animation illustrating the sources and uses of EU budgetary funds. Extremely positive feedback has been received in response to such material, the use of which will, in line with the availability of the necessary resources, be extended, both within the budgetary field and elsewhere.

Budget infographic:

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/content/20111107MUN30717/html/EU-budget-at-glance-updated-with-latest-figures>

8. Legal actions

For 2010 how much money did the European Parliament lose in Court cases and what was the nature of the cases? Have there been such cases in other years?

In 2010 the European Parliament lost EUR 22,082 in Court cases, all in the field of staff matters. A limited amount of appropriations has been spent in that field in other years.

9. House of European History

Can the Secretary-General provide a comparative table with the original business plan of 2010 in the left and the actual costs in the right-hand column, laid out side-by-side, as, in the current format, some costs appear to have been omitted from the later narrative version. What is the comparison between 2010 figures and those for the following year?

In the current period of financial austerity, what progress is being made to limit the European Parliament's budgetary exposure to this project and to make this museum, if it is to go ahead, fully independent, given that running a museum is not core Parliamentary business? What is the legal base for the work carried out to date and have the Committee on Budgets and Plenary approved the full running costs which, according to a revised business plan are to be reduced from €13.5 million to €11.5 million p.a? Is the July 2010 decision to include the facility in the EP communication strategy still appropriate or should cancellation be considered?

In the context of the lifting of the reserve of € 2,5m from budget line 2007 (buildings in Brussels), necessary in order to sign the contract with the architect, a background note was presented to the Committee on Budgets (COBU) for its meeting on 3 March 2011. During this meeting the COBU postponed its decision on the release of the €2,5m from the reserve and requested additional information, notably on the running costs of the House of European

History. The Project Coordinator produced an explanatory note for the COBU meeting on 15-16 March 2011, containing the figures indicated in the table below.

Further to resolutions adopted in the framework of the budget 2012 preparation, a fully-fledged Business Plan (see Annex) was drafted, which took account of the request to reduce the running costs (see table below for figures presented in the Business Plan). The Business Plan was adopted by the Bureau on 26 September 2011. The Business Plan also included the development cost which amount to €31m for the renovation of the Eastman building and €21,4m for fitting-out the exhibitions, based on 4.800 m² of exhibition surface.

In parallel, the European Commission's President, confirmed in a letter on 28 September 2011, to EP President Buzek (see Annex), "to commit to provide a substantial contribution to ensure, in support of the EP, the functioning of the House of European History." thus giving a positive follow-up to requests in various Parliament's resolution for co-financing the project.

Summary of running costs/year (in millions €)		
	Figures presented by Project Coordinator to COBU for meeting 15-16 March 2011	Figures in Business Plan, adopted by the Bureau on 26 September 2011
Fixed costs	3,1	3,1
Variable costs	3,85	2,65 ¹
Floor staff*	1,3	1,9 ²
Academic staff*	3,2	2,1 ³
Security*	2	1,75 ⁴
Cafeteria/Shop	-	0
Storage	PM	PM
Total	13,45	11,5

*2011 prices

With regards the legal status of the House of European History, Parliament's Legal Service undertook a legal analysis (SJ-0315-2011 of 16 June 2011) and concluded that the "appropriate legal basis for the project is to be found in Parliament's power of internal organisation stemming from Article 232 TFEU...." and "...The project relates to Parliament's information policy and it is for the Bureau to adopt fundamental decisions concerning the project in accordance to Rule 23(2) of the Rules of Procedure."

¹ €1,75m until 2022, to increase by €0,9m when parts of permanent exhibition needs updating.

² Based on realistic estimate of 22 floor staff during opening hours (information desks, cloakrooms, lifts, exhibition floors)

³ Staff of 31, reduced from 36 staff in proposal sent for 15-16 March meeting of COBU.

⁴ Reduced following a reduction of the opening hours of the HEH in comparison to proposal sent for COBU meeting on 15-16 March 2011.

10. Rules for family members' employment by MEPs

EP discharge report paragraph 100 "deplores the fact that the employment of family members as assistants is still permitted under the derogations to the Members' Statute adopted by the Bureau at its meeting of 23 November 2009". *Can the Secretary General provide the justification for family members still employed as assistants?* (This has not yet been included in the follow-up report).

Related to this point, the follow-up report indicates that the 0.6% of assistants in this situation are correctly employed in line with the Implementing Measures for Members Statutes (IMMS) but that it is not possible to prevent one Member employing someone from another Member's family as this would go against the freedom of employment principle. *How does the Legal Service foresee prevention of conflicts of interest or abuse of public money in such cases?*

The rules regarding the employment as assistants and the use of services of Members' family members are laid down in Article 43 (c) (d) IMMS. They provide, in particular, that the sums paid for assistance from personal staff may not be used directly or indirectly to cover expenses in connection with a contract for provision of services where this may give rise to a conflict of interests, or to fund contracts for the employment of Members' "spouses or stable non-marital partners, or their parents, children, brothers or sisters". By way of derogation to this provision, Article 78(3) IMMS provides for transitional measures and allows to maintain the contracts concluded with Members' family members before 1 July 2008 until the end of the present parliamentary term. However, new contracts with family members who did not have a contract with the MEP prior to the date of 1 July 2008 are no longer accepted.

11. Carry-overs by political groups

Can the Secretary-General state the amount of unused appropriations impossible to carry over, by political group for each of the last five years?

The amounts refunded to the budget of the EP by the political groups are the following:

Year	Group	Amount (EUR)	Remarks
2004	EDD	29.958	Group dissolved in 2004
2005	PSE	322.107	Article 2.1.6: balance above 50% of allocation
	ADLE	788.845	Article 2.1.6: balance above 50% of allocation
2006	ADLE	25.404	Article 2.1.6: balance above 50% of allocation
2007	ITS	318.624	Group dissolved end 2007
2008	No funds returned		
2009	UEN	151.369	Group dissolved in 2009
	IND/DEM	312.433	Group dissolved in 2009
2010	No funds returned		

12. Public procurement

EP 2009 Discharge Report, Point 55: “Stresses that the value of procurement contracts amounts approximately to a third of Parliament’s overall budget and that public procurement is the area most vulnerable to mismanagement; therefore repeats its request to regularly evaluate the procurement systems and in particular to perform internal controls on the contracts awarded in negotiated and restricted procedures;” *What progress has been made on such an evaluation, given the apparently significant number of cancellations, periodic calls for tender and re-organisation of services, and what further savings could have been achieved on translation and interpretation, catering, cleaning, and maintenance, as well as travel services and facilities, other external services?*

The follow-up report states that the same control and transparency steps are followed for both open and restricted procedures (point 13), without enumerating these steps. In order to fulfill our discharge duties, *we would like a document listing all controls and checks that are implemented by the European Parliament in public procurement procedures, be they open or restricted. The discharge authority would also like to receive data concerning all contracts awarded in negotiated and restricted procedures including at least: the date of the contract, the period for which the contract was signed, the beneficiary (including basic data about the beneficiary), the value of the contract, and any additions increasing the value or modifying any elements of the initial contract.*

The questions raise two different issues:

12.a. Evaluation, internal controls and checks

It is reminded that under article 60 of the Financial regulation, internal control measures are to be effected under the responsibility of the Authorizing Officer by delegation (AOD), in compliance with the framework set up by the Institution. These measures comprise in any case a three pair of eyes principle in financial management and procurement (the initiator or contract manager, the ex ante verifier and the authorizing officers are distinct). Ex post verifications are to be applied.

DG's provide information on the internal control measures taken in the Annual Activity Reports (AARs) available on the CONT website.

The following response thus sets out the measures taken on a central level in Parliament, and on the level of the AOD.

12.a.1. On a central level:

Reference is made to the Replies and Follow up to the resolution of 10 May 2011 (bloc 10, questions 38 / 39, p. 21). On a central level the Secretary-General endorsed:

(i) measures proposed by the Procurement forum, including among others, in principle the centralisation of procurement procedures within each DG, the obligation of use of central templates and a better use of procurement management tools and reporting procedures (note of the Secretary-General of 17 December 2011).

This process is well under way and followed up by the Secretary-General. The view is taken that DGs having a resource directorate should aim at such centralisation.

Out of the DGs that dispose of a resource directorate, only 3 DGs (IPOL, EXPO, INTE) have, indicated that in accordance with the endorsed opinion decentralisation would continue as the size and nature of their operations would not justify centralisation. Also in these cases the Secretary general has asked for enhanced coordination and having the main stages supervised by experts.

(ii) Obligation to require advise of the Procurement Forum for any exceptional negotiated procedure to be launched (article 54 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation (IR)) with a value over € 60,000.

The Procurement Forum will report to the Secretary General on the results of this procedure, after the closure of the 2011 financial year and the essential data being at its disposal to assess the follow up of the procedure (the annual activity reports 2011 and the registration of contracts in Webcontracts).

(iii) Creation of resources directorates, which are now in place in most DGs (except for DG FINS and the Legal Service seen their size).

(iv) The procurement Vademecum and guidelines on different aspects, as well as templates for contracts and other documents are kept up to date by the Central Financial Unit (DG FINS) and are available on the Intranet (http://www.epintranet.ep.parl.union.eu/intranet/ep/lang/en/content/administrative_life/finance).

Moreover, Webcontracts (an IT tool comprising contracts and templates enabling to draft, register and monitor contracts online) was started up in 2010 and its scope was gradually increased during 2011 and will continue in 2012.

Models of checklists for ex ante verifiers, commitments and payments are also provided on the above-mentioned Intranet site, paying due attention to procurement process. DG FINS assists the AODs in implementing. As set out below, the central checklist models have been elaborated further by AOD to take into account the specificities of each DG.

12.a.2 On the level of the Authorizing Officers by Delegation.

Based on the responses by the Authorizing Officers by delegation the following information can be provided:

progress in the procedural field

1. Most DG's have now set up, in compliance with the aforementioned opinion of the Procurement Forum, a **central procurement structure** mostly in the form of a dedicated Unit within the resources directorate, bringing together knowledge and experience. Also in the DGs that have opted for a decentralized approach (EXPO, IPOL, INTE) the resources' structures such as the financial units act as an advisory body.

2. In the wake of this decision, DGs have issued **specific instructions** as to the procurement process. Based on the templates and guidance provided on a central level, and besides the use of central guidance and advice provided by the procurement Forum and DG FINS, DGs apply planning documents, **checklists and procedural documents** adapted to their needs (sample checklist annexed).

Templates of procurement and contractual documents used are based on the models approved by the Procurement Forum; specific templates adapted to the specific environment of a DG are to be submitted to the Procurement Forum. The regularity of the process further benefits from the progressive application of the Webcontracts IT tool (see above).

3. To this adds the **ex-ante verification function** which is exercised for all financial operations and ensures compliance with legality, regularity and sound financial management. It is understood that on the basis of the Financial regulation and the Internal Rules, the ex ante verification is separated from both the authorizing officer and the initiating (contract management) function. This makes the decisive stages in the process subject to a "three pair of eyes" review. Also the ex ante verifiers apply checklists in matters of procurement (sample checklist annexed).

Potential Savings

The question has been raised as to potential savings that could have been achieved in tendering. It is recalled that the tender procedures provided for in the Financial regulation aim to ensure competition: contracts are awarded to the tenderer offering either the lowest price or the best value for money. Tender specifications and criteria are established with this view. Parliament is of course bound to follow the compulsory procedures and to limit its assessment to the admissible offers eventually submitted by the market in order to make its choice. Considering this, an assessment of potential and hypothetical savings is difficult to make. Savings can be achieved by using the lowest price criterion, but this would trigger a reduction of the quality of the services requested, or by reducing the level of services - e.g. by not

commissioning them - which implies a political decision on the matter: please see reply to question n° 1.

12.b. Contracts awarded in negotiated and restricted procedures

It is reminded that the main information requested is provided in the Annual report on contracts awarded by the European Parliament (2010) which is available on the CONT website. This Report is drafted in compliance with the provisions of the Financial Regulation (art 54 and 90) and its Implementing Rules (article 11-119) and, in addition, contains information requested by Parliament in various discharge resolutions. The information already submitted on contracts with a value of more than 25000 EUR goes, for example, beyond legal requirements.

Information on all negotiated and restricted procedures (thus contracts where a competitive procedure is in principle required under Article 129-3 of the FR Implementing Rules) are provided in the annexes.

13. Security

What was Parliament's total budget for security in 2010? Taking into consideration the recent theft in the post office in Brussels, what types of measures have been implemented in order to improve security and prevent future security breaches? What action has been taken to implement the Global Security Concept since it was adopted in July 2011? Can it be concluded that more will be achieved with less money?

The total security budget in 2010 amounted to 47.557.000 EUR.

Following the theft in the post office, several measures have been implemented, in particular:

- a complete revision of all access points has been established sealing all existing weak points (ex. President parking zone),
- a strict application of security rules has been enforced (ex. rules for access for external users have been tightened and specific access points have been identified according to the category of users),
- a complete revision of the CCTV system in Brussels has been carried out checking its functioning and adapting it to the actual needs.
- a complete risk assessment for all commercial entities operating within EP premises has been carried out providing detailed security requirements that these entities must comply with.

Long term solutions have been integrated in the Global Security Concept (GSC) adopted by the Bureau in July 2011.

An extensive action plan has been prepared stating objectives, general actions and detailed tasks to be realised in given deadlines. Key actors have also been identified. The state of play of the GSC has been welcomed by the Bureau at its meeting on 12 December and the Secretary General and the Deputy Secretary General have been invited to present a further update by mid 2012.

The main actions are:

- internalisation and professionalization of command and control functions of all the security services - accreditation, internal security, risk management and technical support;
- establishment of a risk-based security management, including the drafting of new security guidelines of security incidents and the revision of the business and crisis management plans;
- design of different levels of protection of the EP premises, according to a modern risk assessment methodology which takes into account the activities carried out in those premises, the architectural specifications and the threats and vulnerabilities specific to those premises ("zoning");
- periodic exercises (including evacuation drills) based on the guidelines and testing staff reaction and management capacities;
- developing of a security culture in the EP.

Thanks to measures taken during the year, the 2011 budget execution has shown decreasing expenditure compared to 2010.

The implementation of the GSC will provide a more modern and efficient security for MEPs. It is not possible at this stage to quantify the budget economies created by the new concept.

How many surveillance cameras are installed on the individual sites? Which firms have supplied Parliament, to date, with surveillance cameras and software? What was the total expenditure on cameras in 2010?

For security reasons this information can be given in a confidential manner to the rapporteur. The total expenditure for 2010 on cameras was 32.530 Euro.

What evolution is there in costs of technical equipment as compared to the evolution for total security costs? If there is a decrease in the costs for the technical equipment, while the security costs in total are rising, why does extra expenditure not lead to improving the security inside the European Parliament?

in EUR millions	2008	2009	2010
Total security costs	40,5	43,0	43,9
of which: cost of technical equipments	3,8	4,8	5,4
Ratio of costs of technical equipment in total security costs	9,5%	11,1%	12,4%

14. Restructuring

DG Presidency underwent major restructuring in 2010, as described in point 2.1 (General situation in the DG) of its annual report. *What is the impact of these reforms on the budget management of the DG in 2010? Could the Secretary-General provide further details concerning the consolidation stage of the DG in 2010, in particular as regards its working methods and budget management?*

With the creation of the Resources Directorate, in March 2010, a reorganization of the structure on budget management of the DG was implemented. This reorganization has centralized, at the same time, functions related to the financial initiation and verification ex-ante (Finance Unit) and the planning and management of procedures linked to tenders, procurements and contracts (Planning, Budgetary Management and Contracts Unit). This latter unit is also in charge of management of appropriations and budget execution to ensure the security of goods and people within the Institution.

This new structure meets the principles of separation of duties and tasks, reduces the risks including those relating to third-party relationships, and ensures harmonization of budget management within the DG. Moreover, it enables rationalization and a synergy of expertise between the different actors implicated by the restructuring (Security and Risk Assessment Directorate, Planning Budgetary Management and Contracts Unit and Finance Unit) and allows redeployment within the Security Directorate of some human resources (5 posts) to reinforce core security matters in the service.

This reorganization responds to the recommendations of the Internal Auditor, including the procedures for procurement of the General Directorate.

Concerning consolidation of control of activities related to the security and budgetary matters a "Vérificateur ex-post" has been appointed.

15. Costs of accommodating outside organizations

Were there still accredited lobbying organisations given offices in Parliament's premises in 2010? What costs were incurred by Parliament as a result?

There are no assigned offices for lobbyists. Les associations des anciens députés, des parents, du fonds du pension des députés, les fondations Pégase et Kangourou occupaient au total 16 bureaux avec un surface de 248 m² dont la plupart en Bruxelles. La mise à disposition des bureaux aux deux fondations se terminait, par décision des Questeurs, au 31 décembre 2011.

16. Data retention

Personal details are requested from Members' guests when they are admitted to Parliament: passport information is taken, as are photographs of individuals. *How long is such data stored? Who has access to this data?*

The Secretary-General would like to point out that this question does not relate to the 2010 discharge. However, the following information can be given: According to the procedure for accreditation of Members' individual guests (below 10) currently in force, photographs are no longer taken. Instead, to facilitate the procedure, visitors' passports or ID cards are scanned and returned immediately to their owners. Scans, along with standard invitation forms containing first and family names only, are retained at the level of receptionists for 1 week. Afterwards they are stored by the central secretariat of the Accreditation Unit for 2 years. Only a limited number of statutory staff of the Accreditation Unit and the Risk Management Unit has access to this data that are kept in conformity with the protection data rules. Parliament's Data Protection Officer has also been notified accordingly.

17. Power blackout procedures

The power blackout in Brussels in September 2011 affected all European Parliament buildings, as well as other buildings in the vicinity, and showed flaws and inconsistencies in the EP security system. For example, the general alarm was not activated, nor the alarms in the elevators, and some automatic security doors were kept locked.

In addition, the security service did not give clear instructions to people in the buildings. There was no general evacuation, some staff stayed in their offices and had no instruction to leave the office from the security staff, but only from colleagues already outside the building. To date, no comprehensive analysis of the handling of this incident has been communicated to people working in the buildings. *Has there been an audit of Parliament's security, and the procedures followed, following this incident, to measure the effectiveness in relation to the cost of the service?*

The black-out showed the importance of having accurate data concerning the number and identity of people present on Parliament's premises. The necessary actions, among them electronic signature for Members, were already called for in the discharge report for financial year 2009. *What progress has been made towards a smarter, simpler and more effective security system?*

What assurance can DG Presidency and the Secretary-General give that measures are now being put in place, improving on procedures adopted vis-à-vis major incidents 2010 and 2011 to ensure better management in future, including full and immediate communication with staff in the buildings?

The Secretary-General would like to point out that this question does not only relate to the 2010 discharge. However, the following information can be given:

Internal Audit is currently performing a follow-up to its audit of the public procurement process in DG Presidency (Report no. 09/02, adopted on 26 October 2009), which focused on security contracts. The scope of that follow-up includes a preliminary review of a new framework for monitoring the implementation of security contracts.

An extensive summary of the electricity blackout that occurred on 19 September 2011 was elaborated by the Deputy Secretary General for the attention of the President and the Secretary-General and sent on 21 September 2011. The same report was also presented to the Bureau.

In the report, the Deputy Secretary-General pointed out that, due to the fact that there was no emergency or immediate danger to those present in the buildings, it was decided not to

activate the alarm so as to avoid any sense of panic. Instead, the security guards were instructed to advise, though not oblige, all persons to leave the buildings by the stairs and main exits due to the lack of appropriate working conditions.

One of the main conclusions driven from the incident was in fact the absence of means of communicating instantly to all persons in all buildings at the same time. This conclusion served as a basis for a study performed by the Directorate for Security and Risk Assessment in cooperation with other Directorates-General to identify and implement such means. Currently, three main solutions are examined in-depth:

1. intercom system,
2. instant messaging using SMS dispatched centrally on service mobile phones,
3. alert system using individual computer screens and information screens in public spaces of the EP.

The intercom is already in place, but only in 3 buildings and must be extended to all the EP premises. The SMS system is already being tested with a distinct possibility of becoming fully operational as of the beginning of 2012. Finally, the latter system requires several modifications in the IT architecture and its feasibility is currently being analysed by the Directorate for Security and DG ITEC.

All solutions make part of the Global Security Concept adopted by the Bureau in June 2011.

18. Budget line 3242

Can the Committee on Budgetary Control be given a detailed breakdown of all the items within the overall budget line 3242 for 2010 so that "specific activities and their associated costs [...] be clearly and transparently itemised" (paragraph 85 of the 2009 discharge resolution)?

The sub-items 3242-01 and 3242-02 cover a wide range of activities organised both at central level of DG COMM and by the Information Offices, such as expenditure on information publications, including electronic publications, information activities, public relations, participation in public events, trade fairs and exhibitions in the Member States and the accession countries and the countries in which the European Parliament has a liaison office.

Directorate A of DG PRES is responsible for sub-item 3242-03 (OEIL - Legislative Observatory). Appropriations entered under this sub-item are intended to cover the management costs of the 2009-2012 framework contract EP/DGB/SER/2008-003-1 in respect editorial services for the provision of summaries to be published in the procedural files of the Legislative Observatory.

The following is a breakdown into the three sub-items of the line 3242:

Sub-item	Heading	2010 Outturn
3242-01	Expenditure on publication, information and participation in public events: publications, information actions, public events	8.100.943
3242-02	Expenditure on publication, information and participation in public events: electronic news and information (Internet)	5.191.108
3242-03	Expenditure on publication, information and participation in public events: Legislative Observatory (OEIL)	341.082

II. DG INTERNAL POLICIES (DG IPOL) AND EXTERNAL POLICIES (DG EXPO)

What is the actual time it takes delegations to submit supporting documentation to justify the advances made?

In 2010, it took on average 11 working days for the delegations to submit supporting documentations and settlement of the imprest account advance.

In 2010, what were the ten most costly⁵ delegation trips inside, and the ten most costly delegation trips outside the EU, approved by the Conference of Presidents, and how many MEPs took part in each of them?

There is a large number of different types of delegations such as Inter-parliamentary delegations, ad hoc delegations, Committee delegations and delegations to multilateral parliamentary Assemblies, Election observation missions. However the competence to authorise these delegations is split among the Conference of Presidents and the Bureau.

The Bureau is deciding for instance on most of the EU internal travel which tends to be primarily Committee travel, whereas the Conference of Presidents decides on travel of Inter-parliamentary delegations, which in principle do not meet inside the EU apart from the three EP working places.

A further complication to answer this question is that different parts of the expenditure are linked to different budget lines and thus DGs (DG IPOL, EXPO, INTE, TRAD, PRES). This renders an exact comparison by order magnitude of different kinds of delegations impossible with the current system. An evaluation on the sole ground of the financial fiches presented by the initiator is not always reliable, as final costs are often changing not at least due to last minute changes in the composition of delegations.

⁵ in terms of cost per participating MEP

However, Parliament is aware of the need of reliable, comparable data and therefore is currently working on the development of a new SAP based accounting system, which should replace the current accounting systems and which among a number of other advantages should integrate a component of cost accounting.

However, DG FINS services have extracted from the data available the following as the most expensive missions outside the EU (however there is no information about the travel cost of Political group staff nor of accompanying assistants).

Table 1 below shows the ten most costly DG EXPO delegations outside the EU. It can be mentioned that the total costs of the delegations are managed in the budgets of several DGs (DG FINS, DG PERS, DG INTE and DG EXPO). The total cost in the table is based on DG EXPO's actual cost and on information received from other DGs concerning their actual cost for these delegations.

Table 1, DG EXPO ten most costly delegations outside the EU in 2010

Delegation	Total actual cost €	No of MEPs	Cost per MEP	No of days	Cost per MEP and day
ACP-EU JPA, Kinshasa, November 2010, DRC	1.025.530	50	20.511	8	2.564
Eurolat PA meeting in Cuenca, Ecuador, November 2010	463.193	39	11.877	4	2.969
Transatlantic Relations, EU-US IPM & TDL Meeting, Washington, Dec 2010	204.671	28	7.310	3	2.437
Interparliamentary delegation to China, November 2010	176.970	11	16.088	8	2.011
EU-Chile 13th JPC Meeting in Chile, November 2010	150.602	9	16.734	6	2.789
Enlarged Bureau visit to China, Sanghai, May 2010	144.538	7	20.648	8	2.581
EU-Mexico 11th JPC Meeting in Mexico, November 2010	129.710	11	11.792	6	1.965
TAR delegation to Ottawa, November 2010	117.610	9	13.068	9	1.452
ACP delegation, Seychelles, July 2011	105.819	13	8.140	5	1.628
Eurolat delegation, Buenos Aires, March 2010	105.182	4	26.296	5	5.259

Table 2 below shows DG EXPO's most costly delegations inside the EU. As DG EXPO is responsible for external policies, the destination of major part of the delegations is outside the EU or the meetings take place in the three working places of the EP.

Table 2, DG EXPO most costly delegations inside the EU in 2010

Delegation	Total cost €*	No of MEPS	Cost per MEP €	No of days	Cost per MEP and day in €
ACP-EU JPA, Tenerife, January 2010	707.133	64	11.049	7	1.578
Eurolat, Sevilla, May 2010	242.601	51	4.757	3	1.586
EU-US IPM TLD, Madrid, June 2010	106.699	28	3.811	4	953
INTA Rome, May 2010	45.337	7	6.477	4	1.619

III. DG COMMUNICATION (DG COMM)

The ECA's Annual Report for 2010 contains criticism of the reimbursement of travel expenses incurred by official *visitors' groups*, and it appears this is now being revised. *Will the Parliament conduct a study to examine if the new system from January 2012 duly reflects real travel costs more effectively than in earlier years up to and including 2010? What would be the duration of such a study and when could results be analysed and acted upon?*

The Bureau updated on 30 November 2011 the Rules governing the reception of groups of visitors and the Euroscola and EuroMed-Scola programmes. This revision was based amongst other elements on the findings of the Internal Audit Report No 10/03 dating from 27 April 2011. As from 1 January 2012 the subsidy for visitors is normally composed of 3 allowances: meal (40€), accommodation (60€) and travel (0,09€ per kilometre). The allowance for accommodation is only granted if the group stays overnight and travels more than 200km one way, an important step towards real costs of the journey.

19. Information offices / Europa Houses and associated costs

What was the cost, in 2010, of each of the 'Europa Houses'?

The total budgeted appropriations (covering property costs, staff costs and operating costs) per Information Office /antenna can be found in the Annex.

Up until recently, the Commission bought all "Europe Houses" and the European Parliament rented space in these houses. However, the two last houses, Budapest, and now Sofia, is being bought by the European Parliament. *What are the reasons for this change? As regards the Sofia house, could the Secretary General please inform the Committee about how the contracts are proceeding?* (NB. also concerns DG INLO)

The Purchase Agreement for the House of Europe in Budapest was signed on May 11th 2010. For the House of Europe in Sofia, a "Preliminary Purchase Agreement" was signed on July 7th 2011.

Before entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the European Commission was the only Institution to buy properties in the name of the European Union, European Parliament needed a mandate of the Commission for purchasing.

After entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the European Parliament can now directly purchase in the name of the European Union. However, joint policy on the Houses of Europe means that buildings are purchased by both Institutions in view of the achievement of

economies of scales, compared to the previous situations. The European Parliament is hitherto the Institution that advanced the necessary amounts for the acquisition of buildings which are reimbursed by the Commission on the basis of their budget availability. Without the commitment of the European Parliament, favourable opportunities on the property market couldn't have been used and thus savings in the long term, compared to lease contracts, wouldn't have been possible.

Furthermore, in February 2008, the Bureau adopted a policy guideline related to the purchase of the Houses of Europe. European Commission and Parliament share costs at a ratio of 60:40. An agreement on this issue between the Parliament and the European Commission is in preparation and should be finalised before the end of 2012.

As regards the European House in Sofia, the above mentioned agreement provides for fitting-out works to be completed by November 1st 2011, to a clearly defined standard which would offer the same working conditions as in other Europe Houses. The Institutions gave a local firm of architects the task of supervising work. In the course of its inspections, the firm identified and documented instances of poor workmanship. DG INLO is regularly visiting the site in Sofia and contributed to an early detection of shortcomings in quality and work schedule.

DG INLO's concerns tend to structural soundness and fireproofing of the building, two issues fundamental to the safety of its future occupants. The result of these inspections was duly notified to the Vendor.

With a view to safeguarding the evidence of poor workmanship ahead of possible legal proceedings, Parliament has initiated a procedure for preservation of evidence, conducted by an independent expert. Under these circumstances, no payment was made until today. The contract in force envisages a total payment only after completion and reception of the renovation works.

According to the last forecast issued by Parliament's architects and engineers work could be completed in April 2012 if the detected shortcomings can be remedied by the Vendor in a persistent manner.

What is the explanation for the media monitoring contracts for the Athens office costing four times as much as those for Berlin? (Line 03220-09-51)

The difference in cost between the media monitoring contract in Athens and the one in Berlin is due to a difference in the services required in the respective Technical Specifications sent out to tenderers before the contracts were signed.

The services asked for in the Technical Specifications of the Greek media monitoring contract, are the following:

- Clippings and daily press review from all economic and political national press;
- Clippings and weekly press review bulletin from 7 selected regional newspapers;
- Monitoring, recording, mailing and daily review bulletin of TV-clippings of the main news bulletins of 9 television stations;

- Monitoring, recording, mailing and review bulletin of Radio-clippings of the 4 main radio broadcasters;
- Monitoring and drafting of press review of the internet portal
- Drafting of summaries for the Daily Press and Media Review related to actions of the EP;
- Drafting of a Special Monthly Press Review on the EP Plenary Session in Strasbourg;
- Drafting of quarterly, bi-annual and annual reports which include statistical data regarding the number of articles and press reports pertaining to the EP;

The Office in Berlin only pays for copyright licences for printed media and not for any further media monitoring services comparable to the services being provided to the Athens Office.

These differences in the services provided in the two offices, justify the difference in cost between the two media monitoring contracts.

What were the concrete benefits of the activities of the Washington Liaison Office in 2010 and how did staffing levels change over the course of that year?

1. Benefits of EPLO activities.

The core team was obliged to build up the new office from scratch and to start up its activities as launched officially by EP President in April 2010 (end of organisational Phase I). As EPLO was the first ever non-EU based antenna of the European Parliament, establishing it in Washington DC needed extensive and complicated preparatory work regarding local infrastructure, premises, shaping of relations with the EU Delegation etc. This was however accompanied from the start by regular activities oriented towards the US Congress, preparing EP visits to the US Congress as well as establishing first contacts with non-congressional bodies (executive branch, think-tanks, academia, business and diplomatic communities, etc.).

Phase I also focused on finding the best ways to cooperate with the EP headquarters, in particular in the framework of the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (TLD Steering Committee, US Delegation and TAR UNIT), with responsible Vice-Presidents, individual Members, staff of the General Secretariat and of the Political Groups. The first steps towards creating a Rolling Transatlantic Legislative Agenda (RTLTA) were also undertaken by involving TLD Administrators from the competent EP Committees in identifying legislative areas suitable for enhanced transatlantic cooperation.

The envoys from the policy DGs completed the staff, liaising operationally with relevant EP Committees and other EP bodies (their arrival marked the end of Phase II) and facilitating regular exchange of information. This included both general information (e.g. about new, post-Lisbon EP competences and EP institutional architecture) and more sector-specific briefings. With the arrival of the four envoys, EPLO could monitor the agenda of Congress - plenary and committees - informing EP stakeholders accordingly, as well as helping better prepare visits from and to Brussels.

It also became possible to monitor events via US media and to edit on a regular basis several publications (weekly Liaison Letters and Media Reviews as well as daily press clippings) which were sent to stakeholders. Also, the EPLO webpage was built. The key activity was to inform both US and EP stakeholders about recent legislative developments, which was critical in the run-up to visits and meetings. The Rolling Transatlantic Legislative Agenda (RTLTA) was developed and completed by reference to the responsible players on each side.

In brief, year 2010 was marked by:

- establishing the new Office and setting ways of its daily operation,
- informing US partners about the EP's post-Lisbon powers,
- devising *modi operandi* between EP and US Congress,
- identifying major legislative issues and actors to be dealt with across the Atlantic,
- creating a system of information exchange with HQ and with US stakeholders,
- building first networks between staffers of the two institutions.

2. Staffing levels at EPLO

The Washington Office was set up with the posting of four officials (2 AD and 2 AST) to Washington. These postings constituted a redeployment of existing officials and there was no change to the grade/step of the officials concerned. A further two officials (1 AD and 1 AST) were sent to Washington on long-term mission to reinforce the start-up team. Since October 2010, a system of one year missions for four officials - one each from DG PRES, DG IPOL, DG EXPO, and DG COMM - has been put into operation. This means that the setting up of the Washington Office has not entailed the creation of any new posts.

20. Audiovisual subsidies

What kind of aid is given under line 03248-01-07("subventions audiovisuelles" ca 994 000 euro in payments) and how did they differ from grants?

The purpose of the grants expenditure under the line 3248-01 is to finance audiovisual operations (radio and television productions) within the wider DG COMM annual grants programme for which - following the decision of the Bureau of the European Parliament of 26 January 2005 - projects are awarded a financial contribution if they contribute to achieve objectives of the European Parliament's information policy.

21. Europarl TV

The cost-efficiency of Parliament's WebTV has raised serious questions for some time. The number of individual viewers has remained low and the Parliament has asked for an evaluation of possible savings in this area. Has the review required by the 2009 discharge process been concluded? Have the 'key performance indicators' proposed in the Secretary General's replies to the 2009 discharge been identified? Could the Committee on Budgetary Control be given details? What are the latest estimated viewing numbers (broken down into direct and indirect viewers) and is the necessary action been taken towards more cost-efficient means of communication?

The preparation and implementation of the call for tender looking to appoint service providers to run EuroparlTV in its second phase served as a platform for evaluation of the project.

DG COMM worked on the assumption of a **reduced budget** of €8m, instead of the previously budgeted figure of €9 million. This represents savings of 14% on a yearly basis and up to €4 million for taxpayers over the course of the full duration of the contract.

Furthermore, savings were achieved through a shared framework contract active at DG COMM level that allowed to further optimise technical human resources. This includes an optimised use of existing audiovisual facilities such as the Paul-Henri Spaak television studio, the Voxbox studio, the editing rooms, etc.

Savings on translation costs, however, could not be made in similar fashion with the imperative to run a 22-language service, which in turn explains the magnitude of EuroparlTV's budget.

Finally, following the recent launch of Parliament's new website, EuroparlTV was given a more prominent position, which should have a significant impact on its direct viewership.

The **viewing figures** can be found in Annex.

Work on the development of Key Performance Indicators is being undertaken across the DG in the context of the implementation of the Action Plan Horizon 2014.

22. Prizes

Has the Bureau reviewed the existence of all prizes as requested in the 2009 discharge report? Can the Committee on Budgetary Control be given a detailed breakdown of the full costs of all prizes, including all costs (including staff time, support staff (i.e. press), related missions, conferences/seminars, publicity, translation/interpretation, etc) as requested in the 2009 discharge report?

The expenditure relating to the different prizes is spread across several budget lines depending on its nature (prize itself, costs directly relating to the prize itself, communication activities). A calculation of the overall costs of the European Journalism Prize, the Sakharov Prize, the Charlemagne Youth Prize and the LUX Prize has been made on the basis of payments as recorded in FINORD and can be found in the Annex.

1. Journalist Prize

The Parliament has called for an end to the Journalist Prize several times. *Has DG COMM clearly decided to respect the Parliaments will in this issue and has this now been cancelled? Has the Bureau been invited to consider the express wish of the Parliament, given the overwhelming vote in plenary on the relevant paragraph in the 2009 discharge report?*

The European Parliament Prize for Journalism 2011 had already been launched before the adoption of the 2009 discharge resolution. 355 applications from all Members States had been submitted between 15 January and 31 May 2011. DG COMM organised the award ceremony as foreseen on 19 October 2011. The Bureau has not taken a decision to discontinue the price.

2. LUX prize

The LUX prize is supposed to be an external communication activity run by DG COMM but for 2011 there was considerable costly advertising of the prize internally through distribution of the magnetic lottery 'tickets' with a pre-written European Parliament email addresses on them. *What were the comparative costs of the promotion in 2010 and 2011 and how was this divided between external vs. in-house stands and advertising?*

How much did the construction of the temporary cinema on the third floor of the Spinelli building cost in 2010 and 2011? How many members used it? Can this cost be saved in future years, using digital distribution instead, given that the films are available through several digital means and that many rooms in the EP are already equipped with screens, seating and sound systems?

How many members voted in the LUX prize in 2010? What was the breakdown by country and group? Were voting members required to confirm they had seen all the films on the shortlist?

Based on successive decisions by the Bureau since 2006⁶, the LUX Prize is a communication tool aiming to raise awareness of the Parliament's stance as regards the promotion of cultural identity. Based on the financial factsheet attached to the Bureau's decision of 23 October 2006, the cost of in-house communication designed to back the screening of the films in Competition is estimated at EUR 70.000. The 2011 budget for internal communication amounted to was of EUR 85.000. In particular, the display stands and the silhouettes cost EUR 51.000, but will be recycled for the next editions, and the magnetic lottery tickets cost EUR 2.760. The ratio between external⁷ and internal communication is 1.85/1 (1.12/1 in 2010).

Since 2007 the temporary theatre set up on the third floor of the Spinelli building has been used from one year to the other. The development costs of this temporary cinema amounted to EUR 96.000. Since 2009, the amount spent on this purpose has been significantly reduced, in 2010 EUR 25.000 were paid. This year, Members had the opportunity to access four different channels: theatre, internal TV network, DVD and VOD. 240 Members requested a DVD-set or a VOD access; the figures related to the theatre and the internal TV network are not available because access was not controlled. As the question suggests, it would be desirable that digital means of screenings progressively replace traditional ones. However, this might lead to a significant increase of fees for screening rights⁸.

221 Members cast their votes in 2010, meaning 30% of the Members and a 400% increase in 4 years:

⁶ The Bureau endorsed the principle of a European Parliament film prize on 3 April 2006 and approved the subsequent implementing arrangements on 23 October 2006.

⁷ EUR 158.000, for communication actions and related events organised in relevant international film festivals (Berlin, Cannes, Karlovy Vary and Venice) and addressed to stakeholders and general audiences

⁸ If the case of Video on Demand Services, the screening fees differ whether the VOD service is a SUBSTITUTE service to the traditional media (higher rights to be paid), whether it is an accessory of a traditional media.

	2010	2009	2008	2007
Electorate:	736	-	-	-
Votes cast:	221	164	131	54
Annual increase of votes cast:	35%	25%	143%	-

Breakdown by country in 2010:

2010	Electorate:	Votes cast:	Turn-out:	Ranking in terms of turn-out:
Austria :	13	5	38%	8
Belgium :	22	7	32%	9
Bulgaria :	17	2	12%	24
Czech Republic:	22	2	9%	25
Cyprus :	6	4	67%	2
Denmark :	13	3	23%	15
Estonia :	6	1	17%	19
Finland :	13	2	15%	20
France :	72	28	39%	7
Germany :	99	49	49%	5
Greece :	22	18	82%	1
Hungary :	22	6	27%	11
Ireland :	12	3	25%	12
Italy :	72	40	56%	4
Latvia :	8	2	25%	12
Lithuania :	12	3	25%	12
Luxembourg :	6	4	67%	2
Malta :	5	1	20%	16
Netherlands :	25	5	20%	16
Poland :	50	6	12%	23
Portugal :	22	3	14%	22
Romania :	33	5	15%	21
Slovakia :	13	4	31%	10
Slovenia :	7	3	43%	6
Spain :	50	9	18%	18
Sweden :	18	1	6%	27
United Kingdom:	72	5	7%	26
	732	221	30%	

In 2010 all seven political groups and the non-attached took part in the vote:

2010	EPP	S&D	ALDE	Greens/EFA	ECR	EUL/NGL	EFD	NA	
Electorate:	265	186	84	55	54	35	30	27	736
Votes cast:	98	64	12	28	2	14	2	1	221
Turn-out:	37%	34%	14%	51%	4%	40%	7%	4%	30%
Rank in light of the turn-out:	3	4	6	1	8	2	7	8	

Members' names are confidential; they are not required to confirm they have seen any film on the shortlist.

What staff/mission costs have been associated with promoting the prize and at how many film festivals (for example: Venice, Berlin, Cannes, etc) since its inception? Were they supporting any MEPs and, if so, how many members were present and at what cost? How is the LUX prize project being expanded and what is the evolution in overall costs, year on year?

Promoting the LUX Prize and the European Parliament in the major film festivals in Europe and the related missions result from:

- the provisions approved by the Bureau when, on a yearly basis, it has been, invited to assess the balance of the LUX Prize's current edition and the main lines of the following one; in 2007 and 2008 no mission occurred
- the Bureau's mandate of 5 July 2010 to *"to lay the foundations for the LUX Prize in the future"* and the subsequent decision of the Bureau's Working-Party for Information and Communication Policy of 30 November 2010 stating.
- Members' attendance at the above-mentioned film festivals, notably some of the Vice-Presidents of the Working-Party for Information and Communication Policy and chairperson of the Committee on Culture and Education, to follow-up and assess the provisions adopted by the Working-Party;
In such circumstances, the administration gives assistance to the Members in the completion of their respective tailor made working programmes.

Since the prizes inception, it has been promoted at 1 film festival in 2009 (Venice) and 4 in 2010 (Berlin, Cannes, Karlovy Vary and Venice). A total of 2 MEPS participated in 2009 and 5 in 2010. The total number of related mission orders was 2 in 2009 and 5 in 2010.

The overall costs of the LUX Prize in 2010 are available in the Annex.

23. Visitors' centre - Parlamentarium

The European Parliament's Visitors' Centre opened its doors on 14 October 2011.

What was the total amount of financing as compared to the initially planned budget? Are there any other EU institutions providing co-financing to the Centre - for the construction and opening and for the daily functioning?

The total cost of the Parlamentarium - The European Parliament's Visitors' Centre is estimated at 20,53 mio € (a number of contractual balance payments are still pending). This is an increase of 15,3, % compared to the 2007 cost estimate of 17,8 mio €.

The cost increase relates to the following categories of expenditure:

- (1) Additional works/supplies/services: 1,04 mio € (+5,8%)
- (2) Contract prolongations: 1,57 mio € (+8,8%)
- (3) Contractual price revisions: 0,12 mio € (+0,7%)

According to the Bureau's decision of 4 July 2005, the Visitors' Centre shall *"be managed by the Institution itself within the framework of its broader information and communications policy"*. The Parlamentarium is thus fully financed by the European Parliament.

IV. DG INFRASTRUCTURE AND LOGISTICS (DG INLO)

24. Buildings

The current climate of financial austerity is a cause for widespread concern and is the new context for the Parliament's building strategy. A medium term building policy was adopted in 2006, and the current strategy adopted in March 2010 contains information dating back to 2009 and does not include an overview of the current buildings situation. *How much has been spent acquiring, redeveloping and renting specific buildings each year in the five years up to and including 2010, and what savings can be identified from purchase vs rental.*

Payments on budget item / place of work (in EUR millions)	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
2000 - Rent					
BRU	5,8	5,5	6,3	6,6	7,6
STR	11,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
LUX	13,9	14,3	14,4	15,7	17,6
Total:	31,2	19,9	20,8	22,3	25,3

2001 - Lease payments					
BRU	55,5	55,2	58,6	37,2	5,7
STR					
LUX					
Total:	55,5	55,2	58,6	37,2	5,7
2003, ex 2006 - Acquisition of immovable property					
BRU	22,8	22,7	22,7	0,0	20,2
STR	143,1				
LUX					
Total:	165,9	22,7	22,7	0,0	20,2

Malgré le contexte économique actuel, le prime yield des immeubles de bureau dans le Quartier européen à Bruxelles est resté très constant (6% à 6,5%)⁹ ces dernières années. L'acquisition est donc toujours préférable à la location quand l'occupant des bâtiments prévoit d'y rester au moins de 15 à 17 années. Dans le cadre d'une location, après cette période de 15 à 17 années d'occupation, le locataire aura payé un montant de loyer équivalent à la valeur du bâtiment. Pour la grande majorité des bâtiments occupés par le Parlement, c'est ce cas de figure qui prévaut.

De plus ces dernières années, à Bruxelles, l'indexation (2% de moyenne annuelle) a augmenté beaucoup plus sensiblement que les loyers des immeubles mis sur le marché. Ceci a pour conséquence, qu'en fin de bail, le loyer est largement devenu supérieur à ce qui est pratiqué sur le marché.

The annual savings generated by the purchase of buildings are a strong argument in favour of continuing to give priority to this policy, particularly as it has been strongly recommended by the Court of Auditors for many years.

With reference to the amounts mentioned in point 57 of the 2005 discharge resolution, can the Secretary-General state the respective amounts per year since 2006?

Hypothesis for additional annual expenditure of the EP in the absence of the buildings policy (in EUR millions)			
	Prime yield*	Value of EP buildings **	Annual rent
BRU	6%	1,374	82
STR	7.50%	981	74
LUX	6.25%	112	7
Total per year			163

*: annual rent / property price

**: expert report by Immolabel on 15 July 2009 at the request of the Committee on Budgets

⁹ Q2 2011 - Leopold District - (Cushman & Wakefield : 6,2%) (CB Richard Ellis : 6,25 %) (Jones Lang LaSalle : 6 %) - Pour les contrats de longue durée (sup. à 9 années) , le yield peut descendre jusqu'à 5%.

Hypothesis for additional expenditure of the EP in the absence of the buildings policy, compared to investments (in EUR millions)			
	1992-2006*	2007-2010**	Total
Investments	1,400	874	2,274
Assumed savings on rents	700	652	1,352

*: as mentioned in point 57 of the 2005 discharge resolution

**: assumed savings on rent: EUR 163 million x 4 years

The above calculations reflect a partial and cash-based budgetary point of view, listing only possible annual rent payments and payments for investments.

How much expenditure on specific buildings (both purchase, redevelopment and rent) is foreseen for the years ahead?

The Secretary-General would like to point out that this question does not strictly relate to the 2010 discharge, but rather to the budgets of future years and would therefore concern the Committee on Budgets.

See also list of the decisions of the Bureau regarding to all the forthcoming building (incl. Strasbourg) (see Annex)

What kind of approach and expertise will be used for revisions to ensure the buildings strategy is appropriate to the current financial climate?

La DG INLO reçoit trimestriellement les rapports d'analyse du marché immobilier, notamment pour Bruxelles ceux de Cushman & Wakefield, CB Richard Ellis, Jones Lang LaSalle et DTZ.

La DG INLO est par ailleurs abonnée à "Expertise News", qui reprend notamment les transactions du marché et est indépendant des agents immobiliers.

Les services en charge de la politique immobilière des Institutions se réunissent également trimestriellement pour, notamment, échanger leur analyse du marché immobilier.

What evolution has there been in market values of EP buildings since the request made in paragraph 18 of the 2007 discharge resolution, and what methods of calculation were used in the calculation at that time? The Secretary-General is requested to provide an overview of the current market value of every building owned by Parliament compared to its purchase price, and to indicate the methods of calculation chosen and the reasons for the choice.

La valeur des bâtiments a été évaluée en juillet 2009 par un expert externe. Après une légère dépression du marché au niveau de toute l'Europe en 2009, le marché immobilier dans le Quartier européen au cours de ces deux dernières années est resté très stable. Le tableau en annexe reprend la valeur historique des bâtiments acquis par le Parlement de même que leur

valeur vénale intrinsèque, déterminée suite à l'expertise réalisée par un expert immobilier (voir supra).

In the AAR it is said that the contract for the *geothermal works* for the new KAD building in Luxembourg was concluded at a price some 30% below estimate, thanks to the wide ranging procurement procedure, in which firms from more than four different countries participated. *How was the first estimate done?*

L'estimation du coût des travaux, établie par les bureaux d'étude spécialisés qui ont élaboré le cahier des charges, était de 3.977.000 €. Le montant du marché attribué était de 3.077.978 €, y compris une marge d'imprévu et d'aléas, c'est-à-dire presque 1 mio. en dessous des estimations initiales.

Can this wider tendering procedure be used routinely by the DG in future, going beyond the Member state where the project is located?

Conformément au Règlement financier, toutes les procédures de marché avec publication d'un avis de marché (procédures ouvertes et restreintes) lancées par la DG INLO sont publiées au Journal Officiel de l'Union dans toutes les langues. Tous les soumissionnaires potentiels des pays de l'Union sont donc informés des procédures de marché avec publication de la DG INLO.

25. Office occupation rates

We note there are significant numbers of 'bureaux de passage' (temporary desks) for people based in one workplace and go to one or other workplace for a number of days each month. *Can we have analysis of the rate of occupation of these offices' for 2010, as compared with the previous year and this year, and could they be replaced with a hot-desk system where the desk/office space is used by more than one person? What percentage of EP office space is occupied 100% of the time?*

DG INLO calculates and assigns a total amount of office modules to each Political Group and Directorate-General, according to their "organigrammes" and to the rules on permanent and transit office. It is the responsibility of each entity to distribute the modules in the best and most efficient way between their staff, always respecting the recommendations of the Committee on Prevention and Protection at Work, and to determine how many of the offices will be actually used as transit office.

According to the figures available, the percentage of transit offices compared to the total amount of offices are the following: 3% in Brussels, 1.5% in Luxembourg and 93% in Strasbourg.

However, given the fact that each Directorate-general and political group manages autonomously the mission organigrammes of their staff, the occupancy rate of the transit offices is assumed to fluctuate substantially and is in any case not available in a centralised level.

A l'occasion de la planification la rénovation de l'immeuble Paul-Henri SPAAK, la DG INLO a saisi l'opportunité de concrétiser sa volonté d'améliorer et de moderniser les conditions de travail des Députés, des assistants parlementaires et du personnel tout en tenant compte du fait que

- l'évolution historique de la nature et des modes de travail amène à une adaptation conséquente de l'espace et des outils de travail à proposer.
- la prise de conscience de la durabilité change en profondeur la mentalité dans le monde. Le plan d'action EMAS illustre la prise en charge de ces aspects au PE, la gestion rationnelle de la surface bâtie en est un exemple.

Pour ces raisons, la DG INLO a lancé des études afin de développer un nouvel environnement de travail. Ce développement se fait par concertation étroite entre les Directions Générales INLO, PERS et ITEC d'un côté, et par réflexion interne approfondie des représentants des services concernés du Parlement, et, de l'autre côté, autour de 3 axes :

- Offrir un environnement et des outils de travail en adéquation avec les besoins d'aujourd'hui, en améliorant l'offre de l'aménagement par des espaces diversifiés, le respect des principes d'ergonomie, le soutien par des outils technologiques performants et une formation adaptée à la façon moderne de travailler, liée à un environnement fonctionnel basé sur la collaboration, la communication et la gestion de l'information.
- Regrouper tous les bureaux de passage des différents services de façon à optimiser l'utilisation de ces espaces.

Minimiser l'empreinte écologique en optimisant l'utilisation des surfaces de travail par une gestion efficace du bâti et une utilisation rationnelle du papier.

26. Relighting project, asbestos, emergency generators

A new relighting project has been launched in the EP as a part of the EMAS plan. Currently, 90% of the bulbs in the EP have been replaced by LED lights, according to the screens in the EP. What is the amount invested in the relighting project in 2011 and what would be its impact on the electricity bills compared to 2010? Are all corridors and public spaces in the European Parliament buildings to be equipped the same way?

The Secretary-General would like to point out that this question does not strictly relate to the 2010 discharge, but rather to the budgets of future years and would therefore concern the Committee on Budgets. A comprehensive answer is nevertheless provided herewith.

EUR 2,010,000 have been invested in the relighting project in 2011, making possible annual savings of approximately EUR 375,000. The investments covered public areas, i.e. mainly the corridors and circulation areas in the three main buildings (Altiero Spinelli, Willy Brandt and József Antall). The second phase of the project, which will be broader in scope, is scheduled for the period 2012-2013 and will involve more complex work on the lighting arrangements for offices, meeting rooms and other communal areas.

What were the costs of removing / safeguarding asbestos, especially but not only, in the new buildings JAN and WIB, in 2010?

Les deux nouveaux bâtiments József Antall et Willy Brandt ne contiennent pas d'amiante. En 2010, des travaux de désamiantage dans les bâtiments MONTOYER 63 et EASTMAN (2 encapsulations et 1 enlèvement) ont été exécutés pour un montant de 4.253 €.

En 2010, des travaux de désamiantage ont été exécutés dans les bâtiments Winston CHURCHILL, Salvador DE MADARIAGA et Pierre PFLIMLIN à Strasbourg pour un montant de 2.464.701 €. Suite à un accord en date du 16 décembre 2008, la Ville de Strasbourg a remboursé au Parlement le coût des travaux à hauteur de 2.015.000 €.

What are the capacities and the range of the emergency generators in the European Parliament?

The Secretary-General would like to point out that this question does not strictly relate to the 2010 discharge. However, for your information, emergency generator output varies between 0 and 6,600 kVA in the different buildings, covering between 0 and 83% of the installed power output. A high coverage is typical for the souterrain parkings, while it is lower for standard office buildings.

Why was there no generator power in the rooms in the basement without daylight (including the fitness-studio) during the black-out in September 2011?

The Secretary-General would like to point out that this question does not relate to the 2010 discharge. A comprehensive answer is nevertheless provided herewith.

La réglementation prévoit que tous les dégagements et les grands espaces tels que les salles
1) doivent être équipés avec 25% d'éclairage secouru sur les groupes diesel,
2) sont munis d'éclairage de sécurité sur batterie autonome.

Dans le cas du fitness-studio, pendant le laps de temps qu'il a fallu pour que les groupes diesel se mettent en marche, l'éclairage de sécurité sur batterie autonome a assuré un éclairage minimum, ensuite 25% de l'éclairage normal est resté allumé afin permettre aux personnes d'évacuer en toute sécurité.

What annual maintenance costs are associated with the emergency generators in the European Parliament and how have these evolved over the years 2009, 2010, 2011?

(in EUR)	2009	2010	2011
BRU	20.850	21.168	21.491
STR	30.000	30.000 70.000*	31.000
LUX	17.000	17.000	18.000
Total	67.850	138.168	70.491

*: 10 yearly maintenance work

27. Parliament cars

Could the Secretary General provide a complete list of all officials, including their grades and posts, entitled to the use of a chauffeur driven car? Are the cars made available for the Secretary General, the vice Secretary Generals and the General Directors put to the budget of each DG, or are the costs taken by one DG?

The Secretary-General and the Deputy Secretary-General have a car and a driver at their disposal (Art. 2(1) of the Bureau decision of 30 November 2011 on Rules governing transport arrangements for Members in the European Parliament's places of work).

Director-Generals and the Jurisconsult are authorised, after individual decision of the Director-General of DG INLO, on a case-by case basis, a transport between the three working places (Brussels, Luxembourg, Strasbourg).

DG INLO acts as authorising officer for this budget item.

What costs are associated with the change of the rules regarding provision of a car to the outgoing President of parliament and was the change of rules definitive?

Already in the past former Presidents were entitled to a car. The duration was, according to the Bureau decision of 30 November 2011, prolonged from 6 months to 2,5 years.

The annual amortisation of a service car for a president is of 13.200 Euro (with an amortisation time of 4 years, meaning that the last 5th year there is no amortisation cost to take into account), the annual running cost of a service car is of 18.000 Euro (this covers fuel, tyres, maintenance and insurances).

This rule is applicable to all former Presidents of Parliament in the future.

28. Three locations

• What was the annual cost of transporting the canteens/trunks for the Strasbourg plenary sessions in 2010 compared to 2009 and 2011?

(in EUR)	2009	2010	2011*
Transport of trunks	108.030	118.950	120.520
Loading or unloading	187.485	171.010	172.505

*: provisional figures pending receipt of further invoices

- *What is the current annual cost of the Strasbourg infrastructure as it appears previous figures are no longer up to date?*
- *Is separate but comparative information available on the infrastructures in Strasbourg, Luxembourg and Brussels? To date figures only seem to be available for the three locations combined.*

Commitments on budget item (in EUR millions, provisional figures)*	2011			
	BRU	STR	LUX	Total 3 places
2000 - Rent	6,9	0,1	18,2	25,1
2001 - Lease payments**	10,2	-	6,2	16,4
2003 - Acquisition of immovable property**	16,5	6,7	-	23,2
2005 - Construction of buildings**	-	-	5,2	5,2
2007 - Fitting-out of premises**	11,7	7,7	1,3	20,7
2008 - Specific property management arrangements	1,1	0,5	0,4	1,9
2022 - Building maintenance, upkeep, operation and cleaning	20,7	16,1	5,6	42,4
2024 - Energy consumption	8,8	3,5	4,0	16,2
2026 - Security and surveillance of buildings	19,1	8,4	8,0	35,4
Total	94,9	42,9	48,8	186,6

*: without 212 Furniture and 214 Technical equipment and installations

** : These items also include investments that can not ultimately be considered as current annual costs, but were included nevertheless for information.

- *What is the carbon footprint of the Strasbourg seat in terms of energy consumed? A Deloitte study carried out in 2008 on the subject does not now seem to be available and an update would be useful.*

According to the carbon footprint of the year 2010, the energy consumed in the buildings of the European Parliament in Strasbourg accounted for 1.533 tonnes of CO₂.

After the calculation of the first version of the European Parliament's carbon footprint by an external consultancy company in 2008, a member of the EMAS coordination team, trained in the ADEME Bilan Carbone system, prepares today the regular annual updates. The carbon footprint report forms part of the annual environmental report (Environmental Statement) whose last version can be downloaded from the EMAS intranet webpage:

http://www.epintranet.ep.parl.union.eu/intranet/ep/lang/en/content/practical_life/environmental_management/documentation/environmental_declaration

- *What are the exact costs of using Strasbourg as seat of the Parliament, not including those costs due to a three site Parliament or if there was a single seat in Brussels?*

Les coûts annuels de l'infrastructure pour Strasbourg se chiffrent à 33,5 Mio. d'Euros; Les coûts supplémentaires opérationnels pour 12 sessions à Strasbourg par rapport à ces sessions à Bruxelles est de 18 Mio. d'Euros, soit un total de coûts spécifiques de Strasbourg de 51,5 Mio d'Euros. (pour les détails voir Annexe)

29. Canteens and restaurants

Is it the case that the services of the Parliament have already decided that competition amongst catering outlets (as proposed in the 2009 discharge report) is not going to be possible even though a study is promised for 2012 (ref. the Secretary General's reply to the 2009 discharge report which both proposes a study and appears to conclude it is not going to be possible)? Will the terms of reference of the study be submitted for consideration by the Bureau before the study is begun? Will the terms of reference include the consideration of offering facilities to retail outlets which will not necessarily need kitchen facilities on site (i.e. sandwich retailers)? When will this study be concluded? When will it be submitted to the Bureau?

A call for tender has been launched to prepare an expert study on the possibilities of simultaneously having both internal and external (outlet) points of sale, as well as the necessary need of changes from an infrastructural point of view or from any other point of view to be considered in this context. It should be delivered before the end of first quarter 2012 and presented to the Quaestors during the second quarter. If necessary, the Quaestors will refer the matter to the Bureau.

Where substantial equipment items are purchased (such as the vegetable cutter bought at a cost of EUR 38.000 and the cooking vessels costing EUR 53.000 in 2010 for the Strasbourg kitchen) what measures are taken to ensure that a large enough range of suppliers is consulted to ensure that real value for money is achieved?

The concerned service proceeds by defining first the requirements for the equipment to be purchased, as well as the environment in which it is going to be used (independent equipment? complementary equipment? etc.), the place where it has to be installed, the measures, the energy needed, etc. A tender documentation is prepared and the service selects companies that it thinks could dispose of the required equipment, as well as of the know-how for the installation and the after sale services. For contracts between EUR 25,000 and 60,000 the minimum number of companies to be contacted is 5.

For the vegetable cutter for Strasbourg (ED 41063/2010), 6 companies were contacted and 4 of them tabled an offer. The amounts of the offers were in a range between EUR 38,611.60 (the one retained) and EUR 66,657. The criteria taken into account were a) the price, with a specific weight in the tender analysis of 60%, b) the period of guarantee (15%), c) the quality of the equipment (15%) and d) the delay of delivery (10%).

For the two vessels for Strasbourg (ED 41355/2010), 7 companies were contacted, 4 of them took part in the visit of the installation site and all of them finally tabled an offer. The amounts of the offers were in a range between EUR 53,000 (the one retained) and EUR 67,873.88. The criteria and their specific weight were the same than in the above-mentioned case.

In both cases the concerned services are definitely of the opinion that value for money was achieved.

V. DG FINANCE (DG FINS)

30. Long-term review of the Parliament's budget

The 2009 discharge report called for "a long-term review of the Parliament's budget" and "asked for "future potential savings to be identified in order to reduce costs and create resources for the long-term": *Has this long-term review now been launched and what is expected to be the timing of its conclusions?*

Please refer to answer Nr.1 on Parliament's reaction to the financial crisis.

31. End of budget year 'mopping up'

Were there any budgetary mopping up procedures at the end of budget year 2010 and, if so, what are the details?

There was no budgetary mopping up procedure at the end of 2010 but two targeted transfers were made before the end of the financial year 2010 in line with the medium-term property policy and the medium-term ICT strategy plan adopted by Bureau decisions of 24.3.2010. The details of these transfers were as follows:

Expenditure category receiving transfer	Purpose	Amount transferred (€)
Property policy	Purchase project for a Europe House in Sofia	9 240 000
IT	4 IT projects concerning electronic voting equipment, electronic Mail migration, retention of videos and the capacity of Data Centres	10 923 000

Was the EP's *treasury function* audited in 2010, and if not, why not?

The Internal Auditor draws up his annual and strategic work programmes, in full independence, based on an annual global risk analysis that enables him to prioritise areas for audit. One of the strategic audit areas is Accounting, Treasury and Revenue.

In the audit of the public procurement process in DG Finance (Report no. 09/05, adopted on 18 June 2010), Internal Audit examined the procurement of banking services, which has a

fundamental impact on treasury operations. That audit included a substantial increase in scope whereby Internal Audit also assessed the level of protection afforded to the Parliament by its banking contracts and by other risk responses against the potential impact of the global financial crisis.

As part of its strategy, Internal Audit has also performed an audit of the processing of payment requests (Report no. 08/03 of 14 November 2008), which it followed up in 2011. The main objective of the original audit was to assess the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the processing of admissible payment requests, from the date on which their receipt is registered through to their authorisation and presentation to the Accounting Officer for payment. The treasury function plays a key role in this process.

32. Lump sum payments

What is the reason for not asking for justifications for payments defined as lump-sums, given the risk of preventing transparency, and given that the dictionary definitions simply refer to how the money is paid and not the reasons or justification for payment? In which domains were lump sum payments used in 2010, is their use changing over time, and which ones require justification for payment?

According to the Members' Statute and the Implementing Measures of the Statute of Members lump sum payments are used in the following areas

1. **General expenditure allowance** to cover expenses which arise in the course of Members' parliamentary activities and which are not covered by other allowances under these implementing measures or other Parliament rules.
2. **Distance and duration allowances** are paid to Members in order to cover travel-related costs,
3. **Subsistence allowance** for each day's attendance in a place of work or at a meeting venue.

Pursuant to recital 17 of the Statute of Members:

"Les dispositions relatives au remboursement des frais doivent être conformes aux principes définis par la Cour de justice des Communautés européennes dans l'arrêt *Bruce of Donington*¹⁰. Cela permet au Parlement d'effectuer le remboursement par forfait dans des cas où c'est approprié afin de réduire les dépenses et les charges administratives inhérentes à un système comportant la vérification de chaque dépense individuelle, et relève donc d'une bonne administration".

L'article 25 MAS a concrétisé ainsi le régime d'utilisation d'indemnité de frais généraux, prévue à l'article 20.3. du Statut, qui est conçue sous la forme de "forfait". Elle est soumise à un contrôle à posteriori de la part de l'administration, sauf si après avoir eu accès à des informations/plaintes externes/internes, les services responsables sont convaincus d'une utilisation incorrecte. D'autre part et dans le cadre de l'application de l'article 25, le Bureau du

¹⁰ Arrêt de la Cour du 15 septembre 1981 dans l'affaire 208/20, *Bruce of Donington/Eric Gordon Aspden*, Recueil 1981, p. 2205.

PE a adopté, comme annexe, une liste indicative des actions/événements qui pourraient être couverts par cette indemnité.

Dans le cadre de la réglementation actuelle, les députés ne sont pas tenus de légitimer leurs dépenses. Ils ne peuvent pas être obligés de justifier l'emploi de cette allocation, sauf en cas d'évidente utilisation illégale de cette indemnité.

Cependant, l'administration a établi des recommandations à l'égard de cette indemnité en vue d'aider les députés qui souhaitent tenir une comptabilité personnelle relative à l'utilisation de cette somme. Ces recommandations contenues dans les FAQ ont été entérinées par le TEG, lors de sa réunion du 13/12/2011, et feront l'objet d'une diffusion à l'ensemble des députés.

D'autre part, l'indemnité de durée et distance établie dans l'article 19 du MAS contient des éléments forfaitaires et qui sont destinés à couvrir tous les frais accessoires relatifs aux voyages. Cette indemnité est limitée uniquement aux voyages principaux réalisés par les membres une fois par semaine pour se rendre au lieu du travail du PE, à partir de leur lieu de résidence. Les montants prévus aux articles 20 et 21 du MAS représentent des montants parfois peu élevés dont le caractère forfaitaire se justifie pleinement dans la mesure où une gestion des justificatifs relatifs à ces dépenses entraînerait une surcharge de travail totalement disproportionnée par rapport aux montants engagés.

DG COMM made lump sum payments for MEPs' visitor groups in 2010. However, the MEPs' visitor groups system has been changed in the meantime in accordance with the Bureau decision of 30 November 2011 following a proposal by the Secretary General as an answer to criticism by the ECA and the Internal Auditor.

The only service in DG Presidency where lump-sums exist is the National Parliaments service. The Internal Rules signed by the Authorising Officer on 12/01/2010 provide for a lump-sums system to cover hotel and travel expenses for visits. According to article 3.4 of said Internal Rules, the fixed-sums may be annually revised, in order to maintain such sums as close as possible to real costs incurred on average by participants

Le tableau ci-dessous indique l'évolution de **l'utilisation des forfaits concernant les missions des fonctionnaires et autres agents** depuis 2009. L'administration constate ainsi une diminution dans l'utilisation des forfaits depuis 2009.

Evolution of the percentage of staff missions including the payment of lump sums between 2009 and 2011

YEAR	NUMBER OF MISSIONS	N° OF MISSIONS INCLUDING LUMP SUMP PAYMENTS	%
2009	31 647	14 140	44.7
2010	33 139	12 760	38.5
2011	30 951	11 417	36.9

33. Members' presence

What was the number of presence days of Members in Strasbourg and in Brussels in 2010 compared to 2009? What would be the costs or savings associated with the introduction of a possible electronic signing-in system?

	Presences 2010	Presences 2009
Bruxelles	79 306	67 537
Strasbourg	48 859	36 053
Autres	6 709	6 093
TOTAL	134 874	109 683

As indicated in the 2009 discharge questionnaire, an internal study was conducted by DG ITEC in the past to evaluate the possibilities for electronic signatures, but the following proposal was not taken up by the political authorities at that time.

However, the administration has developed the working method to collect the Members' signatures through a harmonisation and electronical introduction of an important part of the presence lists. Nevertheless, time consuming manual interventions persist in relation with introduction and control of the lists. The relevant services are working to improve the method for the electronic registration of the signatures.

34. Transport costs

What progress is being made to introduce "electronic invoicing, which should result in important simplification and cost-savings" (paragraph 120 of the 2009 discharge resolution)?

The first pre-production tests for electronic invoicing were made in early December 2011. The system is planned to be operational in 2012.

Is the travel agency monitored to confirm that it is getting the best prices available and what steps are being taken to improve the prices obtained via this agency?

Between 01.01.11 and 27.11.11, 1.231 flight reservations for officials, which represents about 20 % of all the reservations, made by the travel agency, for which a mission order has been established, have been controlled by DG FINS. No significant errors have been detected and the prices of the tickets were in line with the contractual obligation of the agency: the ticket must have the best "quality/price" value.

The agency does not have any interest in selling more expensive tickets, since the payment of their services is not related to the prices of the tickets: the agency receives a monthly payment, contractually defined, and not influenced by the ticket prices.

The agency is obliged to respect the different travel policies, applicable on the different categories of clients: a minimum degree of flexibility, with respect to the class (business or economy) asked by the passengers or instructed by the applicable rules.

With 24 flight companies, DG FINS negotiated, together with the European Commission and the European Council, corporate rates (reduced prices). These 24 companies are the most frequently used companies by the Institutions. The size of the reductions depends mainly on the destination and can vary from 5 to more than 50 % of the public price.

Paragraph 28 of the Report on Budgetary and Financial Management of the European Parliament in 2010 states the number of journeys MEPs have made in 2010 and its Annex 3 shows a utilisation rate of this budget line of 100%. As requested in its discharge resolution on the financial year 2009, and as adopted in the EP budget for 2012, when will the secretariat come forward with a proposal on how to use accumulated air miles to purchase air tickets?

The Secretary General is currently preparing a report to the Bureau on possibilities of savings in this area. In this context systems in National Parliaments will also be analysed for possibilities to learn from best practice.

At present, Members are not obliged to buy their tickets for missions at the travel agency of the Parliament. According to article 13(4) of the Implementing Measures of the Statute of Members a Member can purchase tickets from Parliament's travel agency on his or her sole responsibility. The use of awarded miles during missions in exercising their mandate lies also in the responsibility of the Member, the awarded miles are not managed by the Parliament.

If the Parliament would decide that miles collected in the framework of professional trips, paid by the Parliament, have to be used for paying other professional trips, the Parliament is completely depending on the good will of the passenger, as the flight companies would not share this confidential information directly with the Parliament. As a result, the passenger has to give the confidential information himself to the Parliament at the moment of the reservation, or has to make the reservation himself, using his free miles, not asking the reimbursement of his tickets afterwards.

35. Public procurement

EP Discharge Report, Point 56: “Asks the Secretary-General to report whether the increase of the ceiling for *low-value contracts* from EUR 50 000 to EUR 60 000 in 2007 has facilitated access by small companies as intended, without substantially weakening scrutiny of the procurement process; notes that these contracts made up only 0,76 % in value but 39,29 % in number of the total contracts awarded;”

Considering that the follow-up report does not mention the trend of small companies' access to procurement process after the increase of the ceiling, *the discharge authority would like to know whether the increase of the ceiling for low-value contracts from EUR 50 000 to EUR 60.000 in 2007 facilitated access by small companies as intended? How many small companies secured such contracts each year, up to and including 2010?*

As set out at point 13 of the Replies and follow up to the resolution of 10 May 2011 (2009 discharge), the new provisions of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation on low value contracts (i.e under EUR 60,000), to which the question refers, allow contracting authorities, with a view to reduce administrative burdens, not to require a number of official documents and economic data (balance sheets and turnover) of the economic operator participating in a call for tender. Consequently, the administration does not dispose of information on the number of small companies that secured low value contracts during last years. Relieving tenderers from certain administrative burdens naturally reduces the data available for statistics. Asking tenderers to proof that they are a SME according to EU definition would increase this burden beyond the requirements of the Financial Regulation.

In respect of imprest accounts, have all actions laid out in the annual reports of the internal auditor for the years 2007, 2008 and 2009 been completed?

Two actions remain open in respect of imprest accounts. Both concern delays in the regularisation of imprest expenditure to the budget, where the time taken by the authorising department to settle transactions continues to exceed the time-limit set by the Financial Regulation's Implementing Rules. The DGs concerned are Communication (for the imprest accounts of information offices) and Finance (for the imprest account for Members' expenditure). The IAS will continue to follow these actions up in 2012.

At 31 December 2011, the overwhelming majority of DG Communication's unsettled balances related to imprest accounts established during November and December 2011, which is a significant improvement compared to earlier situations.

36. Voluntary pension fund

What were the actuarial deficits of the voluntary and other MEP pension funds in 2010 and did they change over the year? With reference to the answer to point 31 of the 2007 discharge resolution, how many MEPs opted to be covered by their national pensions (art. 25) instead of the pension of the European Parliament (art. 14)? What were the actual or forecast costs for the European taxpayer?

As of year end 2010, the deficit of the additional (voluntary) pension scheme amounted to 178.96 M€.

Obligations pertaining to the other various pension schemes can be broken down as follows:

Obligations arising from PEAM Rules schemes:

<i>PEAM Rule Annex I & II (Survivor's and Invalidity pension)</i>	28.95 M€
<i>PEAM Rule Annex III (Retirement pension)</i>	195.64 M€
Subtotal	224.59 M€
<u>Obligations arising from the Statute:</u>	152.21 M€
<u>Total</u>	376.8 M€

The difference between the 2009 and 2010 figures is explained by:

- an adjustment to the figure pertaining to the deficit related to the PEAM rules legacy schemes in order to include the obligations arising from PEAM Annexes I and II (28.8 M€);
- the inclusion for the first time in 2010 of the actuarial quantification of the obligations arising from the Statute for Members (152.2 M€).

In 2010, 32 MEPs were still in "opt out" situation in the meaning of Article 25 of the Members' Statute. 704 MEPs acquired rights under the provision of article 14 of the Statute.

VI. DG PERSONNEL (DG PERS)

Along the same lines as the information published by the Commission and as indicated in point 78 of the 2006 discharge resolution, *can the Secretary-General produce a table of Parliament's staff (officials and other servants), broken down by grade, nationality and gender accompanied by an evaluation of the evolution of geographical and gender representation for 2009, 2010 and 2011?*

The following tables are available in the Annex:

- Parliament's staff as at 31/12/2009, 2010 and 2011 broken down by **grade, nationality and gender**.
- Evolution 2009-2011 of the **geographical and gender representation**.

The population includes officials, temporary agents and contractual agents for the General Secretariat and the political groups.

Has reduction of permanent staff been considered, in 2010 or other years, based upon an analysis of efficiency versus costs?

The Parliament always takes into consideration the efficiency of its operations before requesting the creation of new posts. During the last 5 years' budgetary procedures, 182 posts were redeployed in Parliament in order to ensure efficient and effective management of human resources and to avoid unnecessary creation of new posts.

Can the Secretary General give additional information about allegations made in a recent Daily Telegraph article highlighting concerns about possible double payments of allowances, and the risk of file handlers dealing with payments to relatives? What were the financial implications and how have procedures been changed so that this cannot occur in the future?

Parliament implemented the following measures to strengthen sound financial management:

- a) launching of a campaign to check eligibility for some allowances, which led to the recovery of more than 70 000 EUR;
- b) implementation of an automated control tool ('electronic fiche') allowing an annual verification of the staff's personal and administrative data;
- c) performance of checks on the establishment of individual entitlements during recruitment procedures or when staff change category.

In addition, the organization of the Individual Entitlements and Payroll Unit does not allow file handlers to handle their own files; measures have been taken to avoid this possibility:

- a) Each file handler is responsible for an alphabetical range of files designated so as to avoid that any agent can modify or give any entitlement to him or herself.
- b) Due to the fact that personal files are connected when a couple is married or has common children, provision a) avoids giving entitlements to members of ones own family.
- c) At the end of the process of entitlement, the Appointing Authority must validate each entitlement individually. To allow someone to bypass this procedure, and grant him or herself any kind of entitlement, this procedure (both by paper and by informatics) would imply that there is a scheme/collusion between the agent and the Appointing Authority.
- d) The most important procedures are submitted to a prior verification by the ex-ante controller. Other minor modifications are submitted to ex-post verification. Both ex-ante and ex-post verifications are implemented by agents who are fully independent.
- e) Concerning the payroll, the procedure described in a) is also followed, and the control of individual data is made by an agent other than the one who updated the program, before the closure of the pay. Complementary ex-ante and ex-post controls of salaries are systematically made by a third person.
- f) On top of this, all salary statements of people working in the pay process are checked every three months (for the whole period) by an agent not involved in the pay update. This control is intended to verify whether or not the salary of people involved in the pay corresponds to their real entitlements and career.
- g) All these procedures are communicated to all agents working in any part of the process of fixing and paying individual entitlements and salaries.

37. Missions' costs

How many missions were made from Luxembourg to Brussels during 2010?

During 2010 the following missions were made from:

- Luxembourg to Brussels: 4.861 missions
- Brussels to Luxembourg: 2.282 missions

How many missions were made from Luxembourg to Strasbourg during 2010?

During 2010 the following missions were made from:

- Luxembourg to Strasbourg: 4.695 missions
- Strasbourg to Luxembourg: 172 missions

What are the costs of personnel working only in Strasbourg? How many people depend on the Parliament in Strasbourg for the whole of their employment?

As at 31/12/2010, 93 staff were employed in Strasbourg. The annual cost (salaries and other allowances) charged to the budget amounts to 7.366.000€. The mission costs of personnel in Strasbourg amount to 117.938 EUR.

What were the mission costs in 2010 for missions in which more than four administrator-level (non interpreting) staff attended a specific activity or meeting, how many such missions were there, and what change does this represent on the previous year?

Unfortunately, our IT application does not permit us to extract such data, however, the new accounting system might offer the possibility to extract such data due to an integration of cost accounting.

What measures are being put in place to reduce mission costs, and what changes in IT use can bring further reductions?

When establishing mission orders, the Line Manager certifies that "*the option of organising an audio or a video conference has been evaluated and that he consider that this alternative does not suit the nature of the work to be done*". In 2012, a short video will be available on the EP website in order to promote the use of video conference.

Since February 2011, DG INLO has been monitoring the mission costs and CO₂ emissions saved by the use of videoconferencing for meetings which otherwise would have entailed staff missions between the three places of work.

This reporting shows that a total of 647 individual missions were avoided between February and November 2011 resulting in savings in mission costs of 118 893 € and 45 264 kg of CO₂.

Staff members are required to inform DG Personnel of the nature of the jobs of their partners, so that this service can determine whether a conflict of interest exists. How many staff members in 2010 with partners sent in their information, indicated as a percentage of the number of staff? (This should be feasible from the monthly payment systems where the information is logged.)

Partners' activity must be declared for three reasons:

- a) To avoid conflicts of interest
- b) To decide if the agent is entitled to the household allowance when there are no children.
- c) To decide if the agent's partner and children are covered by the Joint Sickness insurance as a primary or secondary entitlement.

The following actions/controls are carried out by DG PERS in this regard:

At the moment of taking up duty and at latest in the case of change or end of professional activity of the spouse, colleagues are obliged to send to DG PERS a declaration of activity conforming to Article 13 of the statute of verification of any possible conflict of interest. (this obligation is mentioned in the list of documents to be provided at the recruitment stage).

It has to be noted that as far as procurement is concerned, members of the evaluation committees must complete a declaration of non-conflict of interest.

In addition, the Individual Entitlement and Payroll Unit performs a yearly check (or on demand of taking up duties during the year) to verify the activity of spouses in order to check household allowances. This check only concerns staff without children which represents

around 800 agents. Following this annual check, an average of 40 entitlements must be corrected/ backdated and the amounts paid are recovered. The number of people involved in this operation is around 11% of the staff, the number of corrections represents 0,53 % of the staff.

Point c) is followed directly by the European Commission, as the Joint Sickness insurance is managed by the European Commission.

What was and is being undertaken to promote car-sharing on missions to Strasbourg? If nothing is being undertaken, could the possible economies be studied to allow a change of the missions form? Has any other proposal been prepared or negotiated with regard to reducing the cost of the European Parliament's expenses incurred by travelling to Strasbourg every month? (NB. also DG INLO - EMAS)

With regard to transport organised by the EP between Brussels and Strasbourg on the one hand and between Luxembourg and Strasbourg on the other hand, the following changes have been implemented recently:

Brussels - Strasbourg

A second Thalys train has been operational on Mondays of session weeks since May 2011, while from January 2012 a second train will operate also on Thursdays. At the same time, other charter planes have been cancelled.

These changes hardly influence the total cost of transport organised by the EP and have a positive impact on the longer term due to the increase of capacity

- before May 2011, the maximum capacity on Mondays was 888 seats (charter plane and Thalys train), while currently 1.110 seats are offered.
- from 2012 on, the capacity of organised transport will rise to 1200 seats.

Different positive effects are to be expected:

- especially during the winter the increase of the offer of train seats will diminish the use of personal cars and presumably have a lasting effect as passengers will probably carry on using trains;
- an increase of passengers is also to be expected when passengers are certain to have a seat on the Thalys on Mondays and on Thursdays, which is not the case today.

As a result, a reduction of costs, due to the decrease of personal cars usage, is to be expected in the forthcoming months.

Finally, the impact on the CO₂-emissions is considerable and the reduction may be estimated as 74 tons less CO₂ per session.

Brussels - Luxembourg

Since February 2011, Parliament organises transport by bus to Strasbourg on the Monday of each session. Since the success of the initiative is rather poor, an evaluation shall be made in March 2012, after the winter. The financial consequence of this organisation is negligible.

Furthermore, DG INLO (the Mobility service of the General Coordination Unit, in collaboration with the IT Service and Mobility Point) is advancing (second coordination meeting in week 49, 2011) with a study for the establishment of a car-sharing platform (intranet page, or other) which would facilitate the matching of details of staff interested in sharing a car to travel on mission between the three places of work. Once a detailed statement

of needs is established and the Data Protection issues resolved, the appropriate procurement procedure will be launched.

38. Equal treatment of staff recruited before and after May 2004

In a recent decision by the Ombudsman, the European parliament's staff *promotion system was criticised*. *What are the Secretary General's comments to this decision? What action has been taken with reference to the Ombudsman cases 2986/2008/MF and 2987/2008/MF (decisions finding a breach of Articles 4 ('lawfulness'), 5 ('absence of discrimination') and 11 ('fairness') of the European Code of Good Administrative Behaviour and constituting a serious instance of maladministration in connection with salary multiplication factors?*

The Secretary General recalls the 2007 discharge report of European Parliament adopted on 23/03/2009 where Plenary adopted the following text in paragraph 59: *"Notes that the transitional provisions introducing the multiplication factor (Annex XIII to the Staff Regulations) enacted by the reform are so singularly opaque and even self-contradictory¹¹ that they gave rise to divergent interpretations between the various institutions and to numerous cases before the Court of Justice; underlines the importance of clarity and simplicity in the drafting of legal texts; insists that the transitional period between the old pre-2004 salary scale and the new post-reform salary scale should be kept to a minimum (the Commission's pre-reform explanatory document having envisaged an end to the transitional period by 2006)".*

The decisions of the European Ombudsman in cases 2986/2008 and 2987/2008 do not concern Parliament's promotion system as such but a rather technical aspect on the establishment of the so-called "multiplication factor" the purpose of which being to bring staff from the pre-2004 salary grid to the one adopted at the last Staff Regulation revision. According to Parliament's administrative practice, officials promoted after the entry into force of the revised Staff Regulations (i.e. 1 May 2004) will obtain a multiplication factor equal to one, two years after their promotion.

The complainants promoted under the old system (before the entry into force of the new Staff Regulations) claimed the same treatment as the officials promoted under the new regime. It is however correct that the European Ombudsman took the view that Parliament's administrative practice was not in conformity with Article 7(7) of Annex XIII of the Staff Regulations and that its practice leads to a difference of treatment between officials, depending on the date of their respective promotions. Nevertheless, there has been no judgement of the Court against the interpretation given by Parliament to Article 7 of annexe VIII.

DG PERS is closely monitoring the development of the career of the officials concerned and has come to the conclusion that part of the problem is eliminated by the fact that a majority of the officials have now attained a multiplication factor of 1. In fact, after the 2011 promotion exercise, the total number of staff who have a multiplication factor under one is limited to 280 people. According to estimates, 112 officials will attain a multiplication factor of 1 either in

¹¹ Parliament's reply to paragraph 11.7 of the Court's annual report.

2012 (76) or in 2013 (36). Yet another group of some 68 officials should obtain a multiplication factor of one, two years after their promotion possibly in 2014 or 2015.

It should be noted that the issue of multiplication factor is partly the result of a complicated transitional regime where some anomalies are hard to avoid completely. The global picture reveals however, that Parliament's approach has contributed to shorten considerably the so called "transition period" and has contributed to the transparency of the system for the staff.

39. Trends amongst staff leaving the employment of the EP

Can the Secretary-General provide the following information:

- *details of people who resigned voluntarily each year since 2001, by grade;*
- *an overview of the EP staff who went on (pre-)pension, each year since 2001, by grade and indicating the number of years service they had acquired in the EP or other EU institutions;*
- *an analysis of the five most frequently cited reasons given by staff leaving the service, also by grade if possible;*
- *an overview of where staff go on to work to if they leave permanent employment in the EP?*

How do the findings for 2010 compare to previous years?

The table in Annex 14 provides details on staff terminated their activities during the period 2001-2011. The number of people who resigned voluntarily is given in column "early retirement / retirement on request". As DG PERS does not have the detailed breakdown of these two categories (early retirement and retirement on request) it is impossible to determine precisely the number of people who went on pre-pension (early retirement in DG PERS terms). The number of people who went on pension is given in column "normal retirement".

DG PERS does not receive any information on the reasons given by people who leave service on personal grounds neither does it have any information about where these staff members go to.

40. Missions from information offices

In 2010 how many missions were made from the Information offices in the Member States to Strasbourg and Brussels respectively, by Information office, and what were the Council-Presidency related costs of missions for DG COMM? (NB. also concerns DG COMM)

The number of missions made by staff from the Information offices in the Member States to Strasbourg and Brussels respectively appear in Annex 15.

A total of 713 missions were made by EIPO staff to travel to Strasbourg. The total cost of these missions amounted to 758 427 €.

A total of 265 missions were made by EIPO staff to travel to Brussels. The total cost of these missions amounted to 185 903 €.

Council Presidencies give rise to a number of missions from Brussels to the Member State in question, in particular to provide audiovisual services to cover such events as visits by the President, meetings of the Conference of Presidents, meetings of Parliamentary bodies, etc. It is difficult to identify the costs of these missions since there is no specific identification code for the related mission orders.

* * *

VII. DG INTERPRETATION (DG INTE)

According to the indicators to budget line 1402.01, more working days were done by Contractual interpreters than staff interpreters. What is the financial effect of this? Does it save money? Have there been any studies done on the quality of work provided of the contractual agents as compared to the civil servants?

Staff and Auxiliary Interpreters

In 2010 there were a total of 5664 EP meetings, held both within and outside of the three places of employment of the Institution. These meetings do not follow a regular demand pattern but rather present huge variations in volumes according to the period/weeks/days concerned and the political needs of the Institution. The number of staff interpreters and auxiliary conference interpreters (ACIs) deployed in meetings on any given day, therefore, varies greatly. The allocated numbers of staff interpreters represent the fixed costs for this activity sector, whereas the ACI's represent the variable costs. The number of staff interpreters in 2010 was 334; this level of staffing is sufficient to cover the minimum needs for interpretation but is insufficient to cover interpretation needs of the EP during peak periods. To cover the needs during these periods ACI's are recruited. If staffing were fixed at a level to cope with peaks in meeting activity, during calmer periods this would lead to overcapacity during less busy days or periods and therefore wastage of resources. Economies are therefore achieved by recruiting ACIs to cover peak periods rather than covering these

with staff interpreters. In addition, when the EP demand for interpretation falls below capacity, staff interpreters made available to other institutions on a regular basis. Further economies are achieved by recruiting local ACIs wherever possible; ACI domicile being one of the selection criteria taken into account when recruiting.

Quality Assurance

Staff interpreters are recruited on the basis of qualifications and results at EPSO competitions. Regular assessment is carried out following recruitment and during the entire career of the interpreter. Auxiliary interpreters are accredited on the basis of qualifications and inter-institutionally organised tests. ACIs working for the Institution are regularly assessed for quality of performance.

The deployment of both staff and auxiliary interpreters to meetings occurs according to global programming needs for the day in question and is based on the language profiles of meetings and the individual language combinations of the interpreters, rather than on their administrative status. The criteria and benchmarks used in assessing the quality of interpretation of both staff and ACIs are the same. Overall quality is therefore equivalent.

The Bureau at its meeting of 12.12.2011 has endorsed the proposal by the Secretary-General to save 10 Mio €/year for interpretation services by the following additional measures:

- more stringent application of the durations of meetings in the evening;
- spreading Committee meetings more evenly over the week;
- matching real interpretation demand to the available resources;
- providing interpretation for new accession countries by EP staff interpreters only.

According to the AAR for the DG, there are difficulties filling the posts of interpreters, which are likely to be aggravated by forthcoming retirements. *What options are being considered to ensure that appropriate services are maintained for parliamentary activities in the future?*

Future Recruitment

DG INTE is investing in various measures to ensure that high quality interpretation will continue to be guaranteed. The unit for training and contacts with universities has ongoing initiatives, including:

- an induction programme for new freelance interpreters to enable them to become operational more quickly in the complex EP environment as well as cultivating loyalty to the institution, vital in a competitive freelance market;
- a coaching scheme for new graduates in conference interpreting to ensure that the best graduates have the required skills and standard to pass our accreditation tests;
- "virtual classes" with different universities across Europe (including Turkey and Russia) where our staff give master classes via video link to export our standards to the universities and ensure that students can match our needs;
- presence of staff interpreters at final exams in conference interpreting courses to guarantee standards are maintained at the high level we require and also to identify talented graduates at this early stage;
- study visits by students from best performing conference interpreting courses to maintain contacts, motivate students and exchange with teaching staff so as to ensure changing needs are catered for.

Other awareness raising activities include speaking at careers' fairs, organising conferences, producing films for internet-based communication such as YouTube and generally networking and developing contacts with the major players in the field of interpretation training. We should not though forget that under the principle of subsidiarity, training is an **obligation for the Member States**. If they do not comply with this obligation, we cannot fully step in to take over.

VIII. DG INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL SUPPORT (DG ITEC)

DG ITEC took a decision to install *new voting equipment and interpretation facilities* in the Hemicycles. *What would be the impact of this investment on the overall activities of the EP compared to 2010 and what is the exact amount spent in new equipment? What would be the operational costs of these new facilities?*

The decision to replace the voting equipment in the Hemicycles was made because the existing equipment, which had been installed in 1996-1997, had become obsolete (for example, some spare parts could not be sourced any longer). The cost of this new equipment in the Strasbourg and Brussels Hemicycles was EUR 2,135,623, fully financed on 2010 appropriation.

Regarding the operational costs, the cost of maintenance and of technical assistance for the voting equipment in Strasbourg and Brussels was EUR 147.149 in 2010, and is due to decrease during the period of the warranty provided by the supplier for the renewed equipment.

Finally, as far interpretations facilities are concerned (which are part of DG INLO's remit), no significant investment was made in 2010 in that domain in the Hemicycles, only a limited one of EUR 2,448 for an additional facility, which has been installed in both hemicycles to allow to visually bring to the Members' attention that they are possibly speaking too fast for the interpretation.

IX. DG TRANSLATION (DG TRAD)

What would have been the costs in 2010 for *transcribing the meetings* of one committee *in English*, the language most commonly used, e.g. of CONT (80.75 hours) as opposed to the full language regime?

In 2010, the Committees' meeting minutes were written almost exclusively in English, with each Committee deciding on its own whether to request the translation of its meeting minutes into all official languages (i.e. 21 translations) or rather just into the Committee's working

languages. JURI had the smallest number of working languages (11, i.e. 10 translations), the average across the 20 committees being approximately 18 languages for each (i.e. 17 translations).

The Committees meeting minutes amounted to 50 to 100 pages for each of them (e.g. CONT: 81 pages) for 2010. Applying the average price of translation per page of EUR 132 to an average of 75 pages for 20 committees with a full language regime of 21 translations would give EUR 4,158,000 as approximate total cost of such translations. If Committees requested only translations into the working languages, the total cost would be around EUR 3,366,000.

As the originals were almost exclusively in English, keeping that version only without any translations would not entail any significant costs.