

EP DISCHARGE 2017

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS AS PROPOSED BY THE
CONT CHAIR DURING THE EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL ON 26 NOVEMBER 2018**

- 1. Regarding your general explanations, in point A.3 of the questionnaire, it is stated that security measures were further continued during 2017 while taking into account that the EP is an open institution.**
 - a. Please provide us with more details and specific measures that were implemented in 2017.**
 - b. Please indicate which measures still need completing and how will the final product in terms of secure building policy look like.**
 - c. What is the end goal in terms of standards as well as personnel qualifications and their complete “mission statement” so to speak?**

During 2017, the relevant services of Parliament continued the implementation of the measures decided by the Bureau on 11 April 2016 (for the whole Brussels and Strasbourg sites) and on 12 December 2016 (for the MARTENS and ADENAUER buildings).

The additional security measures agreed in these two Bureau decisions can be divided by nature in the following way:

- A – Peripheral security to the central buildings;
- B – Security enhancement of building entrances;
- C – Security enhancement of building facades.

The measures implemented by Parliament in 2017, following these three categories, are:

A – Peripheral security to the central buildings

Brussels: Peripheral security works around the WAYENBERG nursery.
Strasbourg: Peripheral security works around WEISS and DE MADARIAGA buildings.

B – Security enhancement of building entrances

Brussels: Enhancement of security for the entrances of the MONTOYER 63, MONTOYER SCIENCE, MONTOYER 70, SQUARE DE MEEUS and MARTENS buildings.
Strasbourg: Enhancement of security for the entrances of the CHURCHILL and HAVEL buildings.

C – Security enhancement of building facades

Brussels: Façades protection in SPINELLI and MARTENS buildings.
Strasbourg: Façades protection in WEISS, CHURCHILL, DE MADARIAGA, PFLIMLIN and HAVEL buildings.

As for the measures related to the iPACS (Integrated Physical Access Control) project, the access control systems at Brussels and Strasbourg entrances – persons and vehicles – migrated to the new iPACS system.

In view of providing the Institution with security services able to respond to its specific needs and to address new threats commensurate with the complex security context, the Bureau approved in 2016 the creation of two new services along with the creation of a new unit “Protection” meant to regroup these two new services:

- 1) A close protection service for the President;
- 2) a service composed of armed personnel aimed at ensuring the security of strategic points within Parliament premises.

A number of administrative and organisational steps were taken throughout 2017 in order to integrate this new category of staff, which shall follow long specific high-level technical, psychological and behavioural trainings. The recruitment procedures of the bodyguards started early 2017 and the results of the ongoing selection for temporary agents aimed to compose the President’s close protection team shall be known early 2019.

The implementation of the measures decided by the Bureau is still continuing. More concretely:

- the new security concepts for entrances will also apply to new buildings (MONTROYER 63 and ADENAUER);
- in Strasbourg, a new welcome building Weiss security entrance will be constructed in 2019-2020;
- security work around the perimeters of Parliament’s buildings in Strasbourg and around the ADENAUER building in Luxembourg will continue;
- all remaining access control points, external and internal, will have to be migrated to the new iPACS system, as well as the CCTV (Closed-Circuit Television) to the new iPACS concept.

The expected final product in terms of secure building policy

The end goal is to attain a common security standard for all sites, buildings, security infrastructure and security procedures, based on the following principles:

- Secured building entrances allowing an automated controlled access to authorised persons and at the same time guarantee openness and facility of access to all people independently of access type and this in-line with the risk levels.
- Secured parking entrances allowing an automated controlled access to authorised vehicles and persons and this in line with the risk levels.
- Use identical and appropriate security equipment (access control, radios, etc.) and set-up similar operational procedures (security, safety, controls, etc.) on all Parliament sites.

In terms of personal qualifications and standards, the end goal is to:

- Further professionalize the various security services in order to provide tailor-made security for Parliament’s work capable of responding to the development of the security context;
- Perfect the planning of deployment in order to develop long-term planning capable of achieving work-life balance, motivating staff and adjusting to the needs of Parliament’s work and services;

DG SAFE's personnel and more specifically prevention and surveillance agents, armed agents and the close protection team need to demonstrate very special qualities to match the exceptional and demanding role that they are called upon to perform, consisting of round-the-clock service all year round, which entails shift work and demands the utmost concentration and vigilance, as well as a physical presence at all times.

DG SAFE therefore aims at providing Parliament with qualified, specialised, motivated and multilingual staff. Their training takes into account both the special nature and demands of Parliament's activities and the highest national standards applicable in the security and fire prevention fields. Moreover, their training is intended to familiarise them with the procedures, practices and working methods specific to the Institution. Each staff member received on average a little more than 70 hours training during the year to the highest possible standard in order to allow them to be fully competent and equally operational in both places of duty.

In more concrete terms, 6 160 days of training were initiated in 2017, giving a total of 49 292 hours. This increased effort, amounting to 56% compared with 2016, has helped to professionalise the service still further while boosting commitment and motivation among the staff. The professionalisation programme also covers prevention, first aid, and fire safety, despite the fact that the services concerned are still provided by outside staff. Senior and middle management in the directorate responsible have undergone advanced training in these fields.

Furthermore, all security and safety staff have been trained in evacuation and first aid techniques, with a view to building synergies between security sectors and providing a more effective service to Members and other Parliament users. DG SAFE has also continued to pursue its project for an evacuation system based on the involvement of trained volunteers. A comprehensive in-service training programme in the field of fire safety and first aid has accordingly been drawn up.

2. Under point E.1 Media and stakeholder dialogue, it is stated: “In 2017, 223 press seminars were organised in the Member States with more than 3 076 journalists. On top of that, 1 905 journalists were invited to take part in plenary sessions, centrally organised press seminars and High Level Conferences.” How will these measures be intensified in preparation of the European Elections 2019 - considering the long-term and multi-annual budgetary planning and considerations of an increased communications budget - and which turnout is expected during seminars and conferences?

The efforts for the European Elections have started in May 2018, one year ahead of the Elections. Between May and November, 3 769 journalists have been involved in Elections-related activities, meaning they have received at least a briefing on the European Elections and the Elections Press tool-kit. This includes briefings in the Member States and in Brussels or Strasbourg. The Media Services Unit calculates that a similar number of journalists will be involved in the next six months, and services concerned have been informed of the increased number of journalists invited to Plenaries and other EP-related events.

- 3. Please provide us with an overview for 2017 over how many:**
- a. stakeholder conferences and dialogues**
 - b. citizens' dialogues and**
 - c. seminars with/for journalists were held in EUIOs in the member states, divided into the 35 single EUIOs.**

The overview of the stakeholders dialogues is presented in Annex 1.

The table with the calculations of the number of press seminars per Member State can be found in Annex 2. According to this calculation, there 243 seminars took place.

- 4. What are the rules for MEPs visiting EUIO to conduct stakeholder dialogues related to drafting EU legislation? Is there a limit of EUIOs an MEP can visit? Are there financial constraints?**

In November 2017, the Bureau approved the proposal of the Secretary General that the travel of rapporteurs on mission for stakeholder dialogues who travel outside of their Member State of election shall be considered as ordinary travel, as laid down in Article 10.2 of the Implementing Measures for the Statute for Members of the European Parliament.

According to this article the following shall be regarded as ordinary travel expenses: "travel expenses incurred by Members in undertaking any specific mission authorised by the President, the Bureau or the Conference of Presidents."

There is no limit of Member States a rapporteur, of a given legislative file included in the list of topics, can visit in the framework of the IPOL/COMM Stakeholder Dialogue Project. The list of topics is proposed by DG IPOL and a consolidated list is established by DG COMM on the basis of communication priorities. This list is then submitted for agreement to the Bureau Working Party on Information and Communication and the Conference of Committee Chairs. Upon approval the list is submitted to the European Parliaments Liaison Offices who on this basis can invite the rapporteurs.

- 5. Please provide us with additional information regarding the costs incurred in 2017 in relation to the Jean Monnet House, including but not limited to: acquisition costs, renovation costs, external contractors, furniture, ICT equipment, etc.**

The total costs for the Jean Monnet House incurred in 2017 were:

- Subvention to the Jean Monnet association: EUR 210 000
- Operations related to the Heating, Ventilation and Air-Conditioning (HVAC) maintenance of the Conference Center: EUR 13 500
- Legal assistance in the framework of the purchase of the plot of land adjacent to the House: EUR 10 110

6. Please provide us with a detailed overview regarding the aftermath of the ceiling collapse in Strasbourg in 2008: what was the financial damage to the institution (reparations, security assessment, structural assessment, etc...), how high were legal fees that the institution had to cover, does the 20-million-settlement cover all the previous costs incurred? If there is any surplus, what happens with the money?

After the collapse of the ceiling of the hemicycle in Strasbourg, and following the audits requested by the Parliament, many other defects were discovered in the WEISS building, in particular concerning the ceiling in the hemicycle lobby and the fire protection coating. The technical reports of experts and analysis led to several reparations and structural improvements. The total cost of the works amounted to EUR 22.38 million.

Additionally, during this period, the number of firemen was increased to reinforce the safety checks to comply with the requirements of the relevant French authorities (Commission de sécurité du Bas-Rhin). The cost of this action was EUR 1.9 million.

Legal fees amounted to EUR 3.3 million. Most of the fees were paid in the context of the inquiry carried out by the judicial experts appointed by the Court (Tribunal de Grande Instance) in order to establish the causes of the defects, the liabilities and the amount of the damages. Numerous parties were involved in this inquiry, which was of a very technical nature and lasted 7 years. According to the French system, the representation by a lawyer is compulsory in this context. Judicial expert fees amounted to EUR 1.8 million. Once the judicial experts finished their technical reports, lawyers approached each other in order to reach a settlement agreement.

The initial proposal from the insurance company was only around EUR 600 000 and contributed to the decision taken by the Bureau to go to Court.

The EUR 20 million settlement covers 68% of the total cost and is slightly higher than the estimate of the damages provided by the judicial experts (about EUR 18 million; this amount included judicial expert fees, but did not include legal fees). The difference between the total costs and the estimate provided by the judicial experts is due to the fact that the repair of several defects was not covered by the ten-year guarantee according to French law.

The 20 million compensation returned to the Parliament's budget in the form of assigned revenues. Assigned revenues are repayments/revenues which enter the EU Budget and are regulated by the Financial Regulations (FR). According to the relevant provisions of the FR, these appropriations have to be committed before 31 December 2018 (revenue rule). Therefore, they have been committed to finance the KAD II project (as works related to WEISS building had already been executed).

7. The institution takes great care to achieve 100% carbon off-setting, but what does this mean in terms of financial commitment? How much does 100% off-setting cost?

Parliament offsets its irreducible carbon emissions in line with the Bureau decision of October 2015 on an annual basis but limited to the financial means available under budget line 239.

The costs for offsetting mainly depend on the number of credits purchased to offset the full amount of Parliament's irreducible CO2 emissions and the volatile prices per credit on the offsetting market.

In 2018, the European Parliament offset 100.000 tonnes of carbon emissions from 2017 for a total amount of EUR 184.095 for the following projects in Africa:

- Efficient fuel-saving cook stoves in Ghana
- Integrated Biomass Energy Conservation in Malawi
- Water Purification and Access in Eritrea

8. *Regarding the common warehouse:*

- a. *where will it be located?***
- b. *which security checks will be performed there?***
- c. *how are costs shared between the institutions?***
- d. *how many heavy-goods vehicles will the EP need for transport between the warehouse and EP buildings?***
- e. *are these carriers bought, rented, leased?***
- f. *will they have combustion engines or are they electric battery powered vehicles?***

- a. The warehouse identified by the Commission and the Council to replace their logistics warehouses, whose lease have expired and which they propose to share with Parliament, is located in Neder-Over-Heembeek.
- b. A thorough security check (X-Ray scan) will be carried out there, after which the goods will be transported into our buildings using sealed Parliament vehicles. For the time being, these checks will apply to all deliveries made to the Parliament except for the food and mail.
- c. Two Service Level Agreements are currently under development, one between DG INLO and the Office for Infrastructure and Logistics Brussels defining the logistical aspects and rental costs and another one between the European Commission and DG SAFE defining access and security control procedures and arrangements.
- d. The operations between the future warehouse and the Parliament buildings would require the acquisition of one heavy-goods transport truck (12 or 19 tonnes) as well as two or three vans (20 m3).
- e. Parliament's vehicle fleet will be fully internalised in 2019 and therefore all the future Parliament vehicles will be bought (mainly for security reasons, but in regard of the trucks also for reasons of sound financial management, as leasing and renting of trucks is much more expensive already in medium term).
- f. In view of the technical constraints and the availability, if possible, the heavy-goods transport truck would be a hybrid truck while the vans would be electric powered vehicles.

9. Regarding the delegation to Egypt, please provide us with an explanation of, on average, EUR 1.900/person. Was this the cheapest option? Was this a regular or chartered carrier?

The total travel cost for the 16 officials was EUR 30.750. Regular flights were booked and the cost of each flight ticket ranged from EUR 1.616 to EUR 2.170. The travel agency books the cheapest available option for flights, according to the applicable rules, for the different types of travellers. This does not necessarily mean the cheapest of the available fares, as that fare may not be changeable or not include luggage. Furthermore, since all officials took the same route (unlike Members for example) the ticket cost, on that specific route, naturally rises with each ticket issued, making the last tickets more expensive than the first.

10. Regarding costs related to the plenary sessions in Strasbourg, please provide us with more information regarding:

- a. distance travelled in kilometres by**
 - i. car,**
 - ii. train and**
 - iii. airplane**
- b. How many of Parliament's cars travel to Strasbourg and back?**
- c. What are the EP's rules concerning the use of the cars for the BXL – STR – BXL trips for MEPs / EP Staff?**

a) i. car

The Missions Unit's Information System has not been conceived to provide precise information about the number of kilometres travelled on mission by EP staff.

However, the Missions Unit has put in place a reporting system to estimate the number of kilometres travelled by EP staff on mission to provide it to EMAS.

Concerning the missions related to the plenary sessions in Strasbourg, the reporting system provides estimations only about missions between the three working places (missions from the EPLOs to Strasbourg are not included). These estimations do not include some combined missions as it is not possible to clearly identify the itinerary for each means of transport used.

The 2017 estimates for EP staff are 11 350 000 km by car.

The total distance for MEP was approximately 2 105 000 km. However, the calculation does not include the part of distance exceeding 1000 km per declared leg. This is because a maximum of 1000 km per leg are reimbursable per the applicable rules; therefore, information in relation with the number of the travelled kilometres by MEP and exceeding this limit is not recorded in the IT system.

ii. train

The 2017 estimates for EP staff are 10 250 000 km by train. The kilometres travelled in train by MEP is not an available information, but requires longer complex treatment of data not feasible in the current timeframe,

and taking into account that the trains represent only 7% of the MEP transport travel costs to Strasbourg.

iii airplane

The 2017 estimates for EP staff are 500 000 km by airplane.

A total of 3 636 946 km was travelled by the MEP by airplane, with tickets booked via Parliament's Travel agency (BCD), for missions in relation to plenary sessions in Strasbourg. This information is available through statistics from Parliament's travel agency IT systems.

However, Parliament's travel agency IT systems cannot readily retrieve this data for tickets purchased by MEP via external travel agencies, and Parliament's services would need longer complex treatment of data not feasible in the current timeframe. Nevertheless, given that in 2017 the number of air tickets booked by MEP via BCD represented 79% of all air tickets invoiced to Parliament's administration, a proportional extrapolation would provide an approximate total of 4 603 729 km for all MEP airplane tickets paid by Parliament's administration that year.

- b) For each part-session, the drivers of the Parliament drive on average 124 vehicles (limousines and mini-vans) to Strasbourg and back.
- c) The rules governing missions for EP staff are described in the "General Implementing Provisions Concerning Reimbursement of Mission and Duty Travel Expenses (Bureau Decision of 17 June 2009)" and the "Internal Rules Governing Missions and Duty Travel by Officials and Other Servants of the European Parliament." The use of cars for trips between the three places of work for the EP staff is regulated by the following articles of the Implementing Provisions.

"Article 5 - Reimbursement of travel expenses"

5.1. The means of transport that best serves the needs of the mission and the interests of the service and is most cost-effective shall be used for journeys.

- 5.2. All duty travel shall commence at the normal place of employment. Any additional costs arising from a detour undertaken for personal reasons shall be paid by the staff member to be sent on mission.*

[...]

- 5.10. The use of a car shall be permitted if, on account of the specific nature of the mission, it makes the journey and/or the overall mission more cost-effective, particularly if several colleagues travel together in the same vehicle.*

For duty travel between the three places of work and for missions in the country in which the staff member concerned is normally employed, use of a car shall not be subject to authorisation.

5.11. The staff member sent on mission shall remain fully liable for any accidental damage caused to his/her vehicle or by his/her vehicle to third parties as well as for any traffic offences.

[...]”

Upon request by and in close cooperation with the Parliament travel service, the People Transport Unit offers a minivan/bus shuttle transport for mission travel between Brussels and Strasbourg during part-sessions. The Parliament travel service gives priority to the chartered Thalys train which is exclusively in place on Mondays and Thursdays of the part sessions with the aim to fill the capacity of the trains in the first place. Once the number of transport requests exceeds the capacity of the trains, the People Transport Unit provides (according to the availability of vehicles) the shuttle service and hence allows to make best use of the Parliament transport offer for mission travel.

For MEPs, the reimbursement of expenses for travel by car is governed by the provisions of the Implementing Measures for the Statute for Members of the European Parliament (IMMS), adopted by the Bureau on 12 December 2016 (in particular articles 13, 15, 17,18,20,21, and 23 thereof).

In line with the rules in force on the use of service cars for all journeys on Mondays of a Strasbourg part-session between 7.00 and 11.00, pre-reservations for trips from Brussels to Strasbourg must be made before 20.00 on Thursdays preceding the Strasbourg part-session. On Thursdays of a Strasbourg part-session the journeys back to Brussels are organised at short notice and upon availability of vehicles.

11. What was the highest, lowest and average pension paid from the additional pension scheme for former MEPs from Italy, France and Luxembourg (Annex III PEAM rules) in 2017 and 2018? We would be very grateful if you provided the figures per nationality.

It is important to underline that the pension scheme defined under Annex III to the PEAM rules is a primary old-age pension scheme, not an “additional” pension scheme. The following tables show the highest, average and lowest monthly pension payments to former MEPs during the years 2017 and 2018.

2017			
	Maximum	Average	Minimum
France	EUR 4 414,00	EUR 1 575,00	EUR 91,00
Italy	EUR 7 709,00	EUR 3 235,00	EUR 332,00

2018			
	Maximum	Average	Minimum

France	EUR 4 414,00	EUR 1 611,00	EUR 106,00
Italy	EUR 7 397,00	EUR 3 175,00	EUR 83,00

Only two former Members elected in Luxembourg receive old-age pensions under the scheme. Disclosing average pension levels would therefore be akin to providing the exact pensions of these two individuals which would constitute the disclosure of personal data under Regulation 2018/1725. As such, this part of the question cannot be addressed.

- 12. What will be the estimated aggregated pension costs (to be borne by the EP) until 2038 with regard to the**
- additional pension scheme for former MEPs from Italy, France and Luxembourg (Annex III PEAM rules)**
 - Voluntary Pension Fund (Annex VII PEAM Rules)?**

Regarding point a., it must be underlined that the pension scheme defined under Annex III to the PEAM rules is a primary old-age pension scheme, not an “additional” pension scheme. Secondly, as no separate actuarial study is performed for the pensions to former MEPs elected in Luxembourg, Parliament’s administration is not in a position to calculate the aggregated pension costs until 2038 for pensions to be paid to these MEPs.

The following figures have been calculated based on the estimated annual cash flows contained in the latest actuarial studies for the two PEAM Annex III pension schemes.

Type of pension (PEAM Rules)	Accumulated pension payments 2019 – 2038
Annex III, Italy	EUR 142.4m
Annex III, France	EUR 70,4m

Regarding point b., it is not possible to calculate the costs to be borne by the European Parliament within any reasonable accuracy for the following reasons:

- All pension payments are at present borne by the voluntary pension fund which is external to Parliament’s budget;
- It is not known at what date and under what circumstances the voluntary pension fund will cease to pay the monthly pensions under the scheme. These two factors will significantly affect the size of the future expenses to be potentially borne by Parliament.
- On 10 December 2018, the Bureau adopted two modifications to the rules governing this pension scheme which will further impact the future costs to be potentially borne by Parliament.
- According to the latest actuarial report regarding the Additional (Voluntary) Pension Scheme, the estimated accumulated pension payments 2019 - 2038 under this scheme will amount to EUR 384,4m; however, as the fund still possesses considerable assets, this amount is not equal to the costs to be potentially borne by Parliament.

13. Additional pension scheme for former MEPs from Italy, France and Luxembourg (Annex III PEAM rules) – are there still pensioners from Luxembourg or deferred ones who have acquired rights from that pension scheme? If yes, how many?

Two former Members elected in Luxembourg are currently in receipt of an old-age pension under this scheme. There are no former Members elected in Luxembourg with deferred rights under this scheme.

14. On EP's Voluntary Pension Fund:

- *has the EP's Secretariat General prepare its own analysis of the state of affairs of the VPF?*
- *Is there any proposal on EP's side on how to deal with the situation?*
- *How does the EP plan to assist / react in different scenarios that might occur?*

All analyses prepared by Parliament's services have been presented to the President and to the Bureau.

As a reminder, following the measures introduced by the Bureau in 2009 and in view of the increasing liquidity problems of the fund as well as the repeated remarks in Parliament's discharge resolutions, on 12 March 2018 the Bureau considered a note from the Secretary-General on "Improving the sustainability of the voluntary pension fund".

As a further step, following a proposal by the Secretary-General, on 10 December 2018, the Bureau adopted two modifications to the rules governing this pension scheme which will further improve the sustainability of the fund. More concretely, the Bureau endorsed the proposal to increase the retirement age from 63 to 65 and introduce a levy of 5% to pension payments (for future pensioners).

15. DG INTE Senior Management was in Bazoches for 2 days – the total costs were EUR 26.000, which corresponds to EUR 788 per Person. The trainer costs amounted to EUR 7.545. How many and which speakers were invited and what were the respective costs (per speaker)? The costs for the location were EUR 5048 - which makes it seem like the location was very exclusive. Could you please provide us with further details on the location, this could perhaps explain these costs?

The trainer was contracted via the usual inter-institutional framework contracts used for management training, because he has specific expertise on innovation. The price covers 3 per diems and travel costs in addition to training preparation and delivery.

The costs at the Jean Monnet House were indeed €5048, including 2 coffee breaks, 2 lunches and a dinner, which amounts to 153 euros/person. Meals included as part of the conference costs are of course deducted from the mission costs, therefore there is a division between facilities and mission costs presented in the table. As the European Parliament owns the Jean Monnet House, using its (free-of-charge) conference facilities for management training days means that Parliament avoids the expensive fees charged by other conference venues.

16. During one “away day” from Senior Management of the EPRS, one trainer was hired for EUR 2.430 for 0.5 days. How was this trainer procured and what was the topic that EPRS senior management was instructed on?

Strictly speaking, the meeting in question was an external professional training (in Brussels), rather than an ‘away-day’, of the kind encouraged for all management in the various directorates-general. The subject matter was how to move from reactive to more pro-active planning in the human resources field. This is necessary both because of increasing resource scarcity and the desirability of delivering products and services increasingly efficiently.

The trainer chosen for this particular external training module is a well-known, senior human resources expert, who has worked for various parts of the administration on several occasions. He notably delivered a ten-month master class on “Mastering HR Management” in 2016-17.

Following this latter series of training modules, DG EPRS enquired as to whether the same external trainer might provide a tailor-made training session, in the form of a “Strategic HR Forward Planning Workshop”, for its senior management, in order to enhance its own strategic HR planning, in line with previous training modules.

The trainer was contracted through the standard inter-institutional framework contract for management training. The price covered one per diem and travel costs, in addition to the preparation and delivery of the training.

17. Art 42c Staff Regulations was applied to six officials, for organisational needs linked to the acquisition of new competencies within the institution. Could you please explain further the reasons for the application of this article? What were the reasons that two officials were promoted shortly before they were placed on leave in the interest of the service?

The rationale of Article 42(c) of the Staff Regulations (SR) is to help the institution achieve a certain level of staff turnover, within the limits set at an inter-institutional level, with a view to ensuring that staffing better corresponds to the needs of the service and to the changing working environment, e.g. innovation, new IT tools and working methods. It offers a way for a small number of colleagues at the end of their career, who show difficulties with the acquisition of new competences needed to work effectively with new procedures or digital tools, to leave the service before reaching the pensionable age. In the European Parliament, all decisions on leave in the interests of the service are linked to such considerations and to the interest of the service.

The promotion of 2 of the 6 officials put on leave in the interests of the service in 2017 is a separate procedure, completely apart from that of Article 42(c) of the SR.

Indeed, their promotion was retroactive in that it took effect on 01/01/2017 (all promotions in Parliament's Secretariat take effect retroactively on 1 January) and is a result of those two officials having reached the points' threshold for being promoted according to the applicable rules. Therefore, there is no connection whatsoever between those two facts.

18. *Could you please give us further information on the reasons for the following long-term missions: Paris (2015); La Haye (2016); Valetta (2017); Tallinn (2017); Sofia (2018)?*

All these long-term missions, except the one for Paris, are the result of an agreement within the Parliament to reinforce the office of the country that holds the presidency with a colleague from DG TRAD.

The mission costs are borne by DG COMM, and exact duration of these missions was:

Sofia (2018): 15/1/18 to 30/6/18 prolonged for 2 weeks up to 13/6/18
Malta (2017): 3/01/17 to 30/06/17, prolonged till 30/9/17 following the leave of the Head of Office
Tallinn (2017): 1/7/17 to 31/12/17.
The Hague (2016): 18/1/16 to 30/6/16

Paris is a different case. The Head of Unit position was advertised and the procedure unsuccessful. In order to maintain the management of the Office, an Acting Head of Unit was designated on 5/3/2015 while waiting for the post to be republished.

- 19. *Q140. What were the meeting expenses for the entire Board, the actual incurred travel costs for the chairpersons, and the allowances for the chairpersons in 2017?***
- 20. *Q141. Who bears the costs for the advisor from the European Commission? What were these costs in 2017?***
- 21. *Q142. How many staff members are employed on a full or part-time basis directly by the ASBL and the SICAV, respectively? What are their tasks? What are the total costs per month for all of the staff?***
- 22. *Q143. Could you please list all the companies, registries or auditors that provided or are providing services to the ASBL or the SICAV in 2017, while linking them to their respective tasks? What were the total costs in 2017?***
- 23. *Q145. What were the costs for the legal opinion from Daldewolf to the Fonds de Pension – Députés au Parlement Européen, ASBL of 30 August 2018?***
- 24. *Q146. How many legal opinions did the voluntary pension fund commission and how often did the fund ask for legal advice in 2017 and 2018? What were the corresponding costs?***

Parliament's administration has forwarded these questions to the Voluntary Pension Fund, which has provided the following answer:

"In line with the Fund's Statutes (and procedures dating back 25 years) the Fund's 2017 accounts and report will shortly be sent to the Presidents of the European Parliament, its Budget Control and Budget Committees, and the European Court of Auditors.

Given that the Funds accounts are not subject to the Discharge procedures, the answers to questions 140 to 146 are in line with Article 32 of the Fund's statutes, approved by the Bureau of Parliament on 8th July 1993, namely that *"The Association's accounts shall not be subject to the discharge procedure applicable to the general budget of the European Communities."*

25. Link to MEP personal websites

A link to the personal website of Members can now formally be included on the personal pages of the Members on the website of the European Parliament. Some Members have a personal website and also an administrative website on which they publish their contacts with lobbyists and their office expenses. On the EP website only one website can be linked.

Will you create the possibility to link two or more websites, and if so, when?

To explain the references to the personal websites, there should be a possibility to place an accompanying text on the personal page of the Member. On the current EP website this is not possible; since there is only a button to click on, that refers to your personal website.

Will the possibility be created to include an accompanying text on the personal page of Members and if yes, when?

Furthermore, quaestors or DGs of the European Parliament regularly communicate changes to Members and assistants, but the possibility to include a link to their personal page on the website, has not been communicated.

In what way and when will Members be informed about the possibility to include references to their personal pages on the EP-website?

Rapporteurs always receive a lot of information regarding their reports, for example about how many pages a report may include, what the deadlines are, etc. Rapporteurs also have contact with lobbyists while they write their report. However, they do not receive the form for the legislative footprint from the relevant secretariat, in which rapporteurs can register their contacts with lobbyists whilst writing their report. For writing a report, the relevant secretariat must provide the rapporteur the form for the legislative footprint as standard.

Why does this not happen? Can this be done from now on?

It is currently possible to include more than one personal link from the Members Europarl profile to personal websites, blogs, facebook, twitter, youtube, etc. This means that links to both the personal site as well as an administrative site can be included.

The Bureau was informed of the implementation on this new feature by the Secretary General in its meeting on 10.09.2018. Since 6 November 2018, together with the update of the Members profile pages, it is possible to include a link to the personal web pages on the meetings with interest representatives.

It is foreseen that for the new legislature Members will be informed that they can include on a voluntary basis a link to their personal web pages on the meetings with interest representatives as is currently already the case for their web site, email social media sites.

In accordance with the model for a voluntary legislative footprint adopted by the Bureau on 12 September 2016, a model and explanatory note were sent to all Members on 6 October 2016. Since 1 November 2016, the template in “word” format is fully available as an annex to the model for draft report, report, draft opinion and opinion. The list of contacts is drawn up on a purely voluntary basis by the office of the Member concerned and under the exclusive responsibility of the rapporteur. The Secretary-General has meanwhile instructed Parliament's competent service to provide an IT tool to serve rapporteurs who might wish to make available a voluntary legislative footprint alongside their draft reports. The committee secretariats will be reminded to inform the rapporteur of the possibility to attach the voluntary legislative footprint to a report.

26. House of European History staff

Expo Crew Members of the House of the European History are paid 15 euros per hour. The European Parliament pays 40 euros per hour to Manpower Group Solutions.

Is this information correct?

If so, how do you explain the huge difference?

If this is correct, do you agree that the costs for MGS exceed the bounds of common sense? What are the reasons for the huge difference?

Furthermore, external guides earn 50 euros per hour, and 100 euros per guided tour that lasts two hours, while internal staff earns 20 euros per tour.

Is this correct? If so, how do you explain the huge difference?

If this is correct, do you agree that the costs for MGS exceed the bounds of common sense?

Salaries are determined on the basis of the Commission Paritaire 200. This is the lowest ranking one can think of.

How is it determined that the salaries must be given on the basis of the classifications in the Commission Paritaire 200?

Who has decided this?

Is there any other classification system that could be applicable for the Expo Crew of the HEH?

The net salaries of museum attendants in the Netherlands are double of what Expo Crew Members earn at the HEH; the Expo Crew Members are far below the salary that is usual for museums in the Netherlands.

Do you agree that the Commission Paritaire 200 is a table that should not be used and that the workers are entitled to a decent salary?

There will be a new tender.

Would it not be better to take the staff in-house? For the drivers and the security of the staff in the European Parliament, a comparative study was conducted on the difference between in-house staffing and external hiring of personnel, which led to the conclusion that in-house staffing was more effective and efficient. Can a similar study be made for the Expo Crew team in due time, before the new tender starts?

According to our information, EXPO Crew members are only allowed to sit when there are no visitors in the room? Sometimes this means that the have to stand for 3 hours in a row.

Is it correct that the Expo Crew Members can only sit if there is no one in the room and that they have to stand as soon as a visitor enters. And is it human to have people stand for such a long time.

In last years' annual performance chats (2017-2018) standing was also assessed as part of the performance evaluation. Expo Crew Members that were sitting down were evaluated negatively.

Could you guarantee that this is not included in the annual performance chats, as this is inhuman?

During the construction of the building, a place to wash dishes for the Expo Crew was not countered for. This means that dishes has to be washed in toilets.

Do you find it normal that personnel has to wash dishes in the toilet? What plans are there to create facilities to wash dishes in a proper way?

The Expo Crew Members receive non-personal uniforms.

The female staff must repair any holes in the uniforms themselves.

Do you agree that this is a degrading treatment?

Expo Crew Members are also waiting for replacement of shoes.

When will Manpower Group Solutions ensure decent footwear and decent uniforms?

House of European History staff

Expo Crew Members of the House of the European History are paid 15 euros per hour. The European Parliament pays 40 euros per hour to Manpower Group Solutions.

Is this information correct?

If so, how do you explain the huge difference?

If this is correct, do you agree that the costs for MGS exceed the bounds of common sense? What are the reasons for the huge difference?

The price that the European Parliament pays to its contractor, Manpowergroup Solutions Belgium (MGS), on the one hand, and the salary that this contractor pays to its employees, on the other hand, are two quite distinct issues.

The European Parliament is only accountable for the price paid to the contractor. The European Parliament is bound by the provisions of the framework service contract signed between both parties (1), whereas it has entered into no legal contract with the Expo Crew Members of the House of European History who remain under the sole authority of their employer, MGS (2).

(1) Following an open call for tenders, the European Parliament signed on 7 July 2015 a framework service contract for the provision of service staff for the Parliament's visitor facilities. It includes services in the House of European History, the Parliamentarium, Station Europe and the Atrium Welcome Point where buses with visitor groups arrive.

The awarding of the framework contract followed a thorough evaluation procedure based on the examination of a combination of quality and price criteria. The award criteria used in this respect were made public, as required by the applicable public procurement law¹. The contract was eventually awarded to MGS as it offered the best price quality ratio.

Information on the awarded contract was duly published in the Official Journal of the European Union², as required by the applicable public procurement law, and having due regard for the requirements of confidentiality (protection of the contractor's commercial interests), that is why the European Parliament cannot disclose the price per hour agreed with MGS.

(2) It is not in the remit of the European Parliament to decide about the salaries of the Expo Crew Members of the House of the European History as that decision remains with their employer, MGS. This is expressly provided for in the framework service contract signed between the European Parliament and MGS, which stipulates that *"the contractor shall have sole responsibility for the staff who performs the tasks assigned to him"* and *"in no circumstances may the European Parliament be considered the employer of the contractor's staff."*

This being said, the contractor is under an obligation to prove to the European Parliament that it complies with any legal obligations incumbent on it, notably those resulting from the employment and social protection legislation. In accordance with the terms of the framework service contract, the contractor shall undertake to comply with the statutory obligations concerning the protection of employees and working conditions in force in accordance with applicable laws. The European Parliament is granted a right to carry out itself any inspections and checks on the contractor which are necessary to ensure compliance with the social and equal opportunities provisions applicable. The contractor must be able to prove to the European Parliament at any time that its staff is employed in compliance with the applicable rules.

To finish, it is to be pointed out that several factors may explain the difference between the price paid to the contractor and the salary paid by the contractor to its employees:

¹ <https://ted.europa.eu/udl?uri=TED:NOTICE:107227-2015:TEXT:EN:HTML>

² <https://ted.europa.eu/TED/notice/udl?uri=TED:NOTICE:260113-2015:TEXT:EN:HTML>

- a) Income taxes and social security contributions by employer and employee: according to OECD's "Taxing wages" report 2018, Belgium had, with an average of 40,5%, the highest rate of income tax and social security contributions combined. In addition, the EP pays the number of worked hours, whereas the contractor also has to pay staff during holidays, sickness leave, etc.;
- b) The contractor's overhead costs (not separately paid in the framework service contract but included in the all-in hour prices), such as: site and team leaders, planning, administration, uniform, shoes, water, back-office (payroll, human resources, etc.) etc.;
- c) The gross profits and taxes paid by the contractor.

Furthermore, external guides earn 50 euros per hour, and 100 euros per guided tour that lasts two hours, while internal staff earns 20 euros per tour.

Is this correct? If so, how do you explain the huge difference?

If this is correct, do you agree that the costs for MGS exceed the bounds of common sense?

The framework contract, signed on 20 June 2018, for the Provision of guided tours and learning services for the European Parliament's visitor facilities is the result of an open call for tenders. In the tender documents, the weighting between quality and price was set at 70-30, very clearly prominently giving greater weighting relevance to the quality and less to the price.

In respect of the question regarding the prices, reference is made to the reply of the previous sub-question.

If, by "internal" and "external" staff, the question refers to the staff working for the contractor (either hired externally or its own "internal" employees), the contractor confirms there is no discrimination in the pay level. If, by "external staff", the question refers to tour guides working for other museums in Brussels, it is possible that there is a difference in gross pay levels. If guides in other museums work as freelancers it has to be taken into account that their social security contributions are substantially higher than those paid by employees in Belgium.

Salaries are determined on the basis of the Commission Paritaire 200. This is the lowest ranking one can think of.

How is it determined that the salaries must be given on the basis of the classifications in the Commission Paritaire 200? Who has decided this?

Is there any other classification system that could be applicable for the Expo Crew of the HEH?

In Belgium, the social dialogue in the private sector, in particular for wage negotiations, takes place in so-called Commission Paritaires (joint commissions (CP)). These CPs are grouping businesses in similar activities to agree on work conditions, regulations and wages in so-called collective employment agreements. They are established for all branches of activity, including non-profit. In each CP there is an equal number of representatives of employers' organisations and representatives of trade unions (hence the word "paritaire").

The services performed by the contractor, including by all their internal staff as well as the floor staff crew, are grouped in CP 200 which deals with the employment of over 400.000 employees. Other CPs deal with other sorts of job categories. Based on the nature of the job, floorstaff expo crew (as well as all other internal staff of the contractor) are grouped in CP 200.

The net salaries of museum attendants in the Netherlands are double of what Expo Crew Members earn at the HEH; the Expo Crew Members are far below the salary that is usual for museums in the Netherlands.

It is very difficult to compare net salaries for similar jobs in Belgium and the Netherlands. It depends e.g. on the collective employment agreements in the branches. Tax and social security systems and levels are very different with Belgium at the highest rate, at 40.5%, of all OECD countries and the Netherlands at 30% (2018 figures OECD) and other elements such as purchasing power should be taken into account to be able to compare.

Do you agree that the Commission Paritaire 200 is a table that should not be used and that the workers are entitled to a decent salary?

As said, the Commission Paritaire 200, is a body between employers' representatives and trade unions that negotiates collective employment agreements. CP 200 is the appropriate CP for the contractor's internal staff and floor staff crew. For example CP 302 is for those employed in hotels and restaurants, CP 337 is for staff in non-profit organizations.

There will be a new tender.

Would it not be better to take the staff in-house? For the drivers and the security of the staff in the European Parliament, a comparative study was conducted on the difference between in-house staffing and external hiring of personnel, which led to the conclusion that in-house staffing was more effective and efficient.

In order to replace the expiring framework contract, the tender must be launched (published in the Official Journal of the EU) in January 2019, at the latest. This timing is too short notice to conduct a study which should be ordered by the hierarchy of the Parliament or the Bureau.

In order to provide the quantity of services requested by the Parliament, it could mean that hundreds of extra staff should be recruited e.g. only for the House of European History services during its opening hours by some 28 floor staff a far larger team is required to cover holidays, sicknesses, weekends etc. Also the management of this staff, currently in hands of the contractor, would require substantial additional staff at the European Parliament.

In the end, it is a political decision whether Parliament wants to internalize service providers. It should be taken into account that in that situation only staff with EU nationality can be recruited while currently also staff is employed from countries outside the EU.

Can a similar study be made for the Expo Crew team in due time, before the new tender starts?

Given the date of expiry of the current contract and the deadline for publication of the new open call for tenders is in January 2019, time is too short for a proper study.

According to our information, EXPO Crew members are only allowed to sit when there are no visitors in the room? Sometimes this means that they have to stand for 3 hours in a row.

Is it correct that the Expo Crew Members can only sit if there is no one in the room and that they have to stand as soon as a visitor enters. And is it human to have people stand for such a long time.

In the House of European History, on each floor there are two chairs. Throughout the building there are 8 stools (high chairs) and 14 more have been ordered.

The chairs can be used by staff when no visitors are around. For the part of the crew's work which concerns welcoming services, the floor staff crew is requested to stand as they have to provide optimal services for the visitors which difficulty can be done in a sitting position, like answering questions, giving directions and explaining the tablets. However, the stools can be used all the time as it gives the impression that the floor staff is standing thus providing the welcoming services for visitors and comfort for the floor staff crew. Furthermore, there are some positions where services can sit regularly such as at the distribution of the tablets and the cloak-room. As there is a rotation system between all crew members periodically occupy these positions.

In last years' annual performance chats (2017-2018) standing was also assessed as part of the performance evaluation. Expo Crew Members that were sitting down were evaluated negatively.

Could you guarantee that this is not included in the annual performance chats, as this is inhuman?

The contractor's team leaders are helping and monitoring the floor staff crew members. One of their many tasks is to address floor staff crew when they are sitting on chairs when visitors are present as otherwise they cannot optimally perform the requested welcoming services.

During the construction of the building, a place to wash dishes for the Expo Crew was not countered for. This means that dishes have to be washed in toilets.

Do you find it normal that personnel has to wash dishes in the toilet? What plans are there to create facilities to wash dishes in a proper way?

Expo crew can bring its own lunch, or can benefit from the existing cafeteria facilities in HEH or Parlamentarium. When they return dishes to the cafeteria and want to wash them beforehand or want to wash other items they have to use the sink in the multifunctional room, where separately there is also the toilet.

The staff of the European Parliament uses the same spaces for washing up their cups and dishes.

In the plans of the renovated Eastman building a place to wash dishes was not considered. As said, all staff housed in the building, both internal HEH staff and external staff, are in the same situation. The responsible services in the European Parliament will be asked to look at this issue but available space in the building is unfortunately very limited.

***The Expo Crew Members receive non-personal uniforms.
The female staff must repair any holes in the uniforms themselves.
Do you agree that this is a degrading treatment?***

Uniforms which are still in a very good condition are systematically cleaned by a professional cleaning service after being returned by staff leaving the project. Impeccable uniforms are re-distributed to new staff. The contractor has instructed its team leaders to double-check the state of the uniform that is redistributed.

It is possible that the crew fix loose buttons themselves, but the contractor is formal in its policy that all clothes with holes must be thrown away and replaced.

***Expo Crew Members are also waiting for replacement of shoes.
When will Manpower Group Solutions ensure decent footwear and decent uniforms?***

New staff receives new shoes. If the staff leaves the project it is by no means the intention to redistribute the shoes to newcomers but possible individual mistakes might have been made. The contractor has given new instructions to the team leaders on that subject.

On demand of the crew, the contractor is currently looking for new and more convenient shoes. The floor staff crew is involved in the selection process and crew members are testing the shoes that have been proposed by the current supplier. The crew rejected the current model proposed and the contractor is awaiting new proposals. In the meantime, crew in need of new shoes can buy black neutral shoes themselves and are reimbursed 50 € when they bring in the receipt.