

2018 Discharge
Questionnaire to the European Court of Justice
Hearing: 12 November 2019

General Questions

- 1. What progress has been made to decrease significant backlog of cases? Could you provide us with a table of how has the caseload backlog evolved since 2013?**

The main element in the effort to reduce the backlog of cases is the reform of the General Court, whose last phase ended in 2019 with the arrival of the last group of new judges. The productivity of the General Court has significantly improved thanks to the reform, and the number of pending cases before the General Court has declined accordingly. In 2018, the General Court closed 13% more cases than in 2017 (1009 vs. 895) and reduced the number of pending cases by 12% (1333 vs. 1508).

The cumulated number of pending cases (for the Court of Justice, the General Court and, until 2016, the Civil Service Tribunal) is as follows:

Year	Number of pending cases
2013	2420
2014	2426
2015	2382
2016	2497
2017	2420
2018	2334

2. Did the CJEU undertake any practical arrangements to achieve the shortening of the deadline for the presentation of the annual activity report?

In 2019, the CJEU made available the annual activity report for the year 2018 on its website on April 29th, 2019. This is considerably earlier than the July 1st deadline imposed by Financial Regulation (Article 74(9)). This was made possible through a considerable effort by the CJEU's services to advance the preparation of their respective contributions. The CJEU will continue to explore, in cooperation with other institutions, every possible avenue to further streamline the process.

3. Have there been any new efforts to lower the average length of proceedings? Or any new proposals for the reform of Protocol No 3 on the Statute of the CJEU in this regard?

Adjudicating on the cases brought before the Court of Justice or the General Court within a reasonable period of time has always been one of the main priorities of the Institution, together with the preservation of quality of the decisions.

As was indicated last year (discharge 2017), the reduction of the average time of the proceedings before the General Court is one of the major results of the reform of the judicial architecture of the EU. Whereas the average duration of the proceedings before that Court was 20,6 months in 2015 (but 27,7 months for state aid and competition cases), it went down to 16 months in 2017 (and 23,8 months for state aid and competition cases). In 2018, the average duration of proceedings (20 months) has increased compared to 2017. This was due to the disposal, in 2018, of a significant number of competition cases of such scope and complexity that the duration of proceedings was naturally higher than the average. Despite this circumstantial factor, it is pertinent to note that the duration of proceedings remains at levels markedly below those observed before the implementation of the reform of the judicial architecture of the European Union.

Since several years, the average duration of the proceedings at the Court of justice is low: 16,4 months in 2017 and 15,7 months in 2018. This is the result of a continuous attention of the Court of Justice, in particular with regard to the preliminary ruling cases – representing +/- 75 % of all cases brought before it – where the proceedings before the national courts is stayed until the decision of the Court of justice.

Both the General Court and the Court of Justice strive to preserve this achievement. This implies however a continuous attention, inter alia in the context of an increasing workload. As the number of new cases lodged at the Court of justice, at the end of October 2019, was already close to the total number of cases brought before that Court in 2018 (839 cases), additional measures have to be taken in order to preserve the capacity of the Court of justice to give judgment within a reasonable period of time.

This may imply e.g. a larger use of Article 99 of the Rules of procedure [whereby the Court of justice rules by reasoned order when the questions referred to it for a preliminary ruling may be clearly deduced from existing case-law or admit of no reasonable doubt].

This may also imply a new proposal of amendment of Protocol n° 3 on the Statute of the Court of justice of the EU, implying a new division of competences between the Court of justice and the General Court, for example by the transfer of some infringement proceedings, and/or novel ways to handle cases within each court. In any case, such a proposal would not be made prior to the presentation of the report assessing comprehensively the reform of the General Court, by 26 December 2020 as foreseen by Regulation 2015/2422.

4. **Have there been any new development regarding the measurement of performance from the Integrated Case Management System (ICMS) project, which the CJEU undertook as a follow-up to the recommendation of the Court of Auditors set out in Special Report No 14/2017 ('Performance review of case management at the CJEU')?**

Please see the answer 6.

5. **What was the cost of outsourcing of translation in 2018? What would have been the cost if the translations had been carried out by in-house services?**

The overall cost of an **outsourced translated** page in 2018, based on KIAPI methodology, was EUR 103.1. The cost is lower than in 2017 (EUR 111.30 per page).

In 2018, more than 40% of the translation workload has been externalised, exceeding 485 000 pages.

The overall cost of an **in-house translated** page in 2018, based on KIAPI methodology, was EUR 128.07. The cost is lower than in 2017 (EUR 136.70 per page).

Under current conditions, it is not possible to significantly increase the outsourcing rate because it is impossible to entrust freelancers with confidential or too urgent documents (court decisions, representing almost 40% of the global translation workload, are confidential documents as long as they have not been delivered, and thus cannot be externalised before delivery). On the other hand, it is difficult to recruit or build up the high skills required of freelancers, particularly for certain language combinations. Freelancers, for whom translating for the CJUE does not constitute their main professional activity, are frequently unavailable. In addition, there is a need for systematic quality controls, through in depth contacts and feedback, not only because financial regulation requires it, but also because it is essential to maintain and continuously improve quality.

As regards the cost of internal translation, it must be taken into account that the final cost comprises all the activities needed in the execution and finalisation of the translation: translation, revision, proofreading and all others activities such as IT pre-treatment, etc. Therefore, the cost include sub-costs of salaries, the contributions of the employer towards the pension scheme, the costs of IT development, the maintenance and the contribution to the Inter-institutional IT projects, the professional training, the library services, translation related missions and other non-staff related expenditures. Finally, these costs also comprise the sub-cost of the buildings occupied.

The Directorate-General for Multilingualism is constantly working to improve the quality of outsourced translations and the capacity of freelancers markets to absorb the growing demand. The fact remains, however, that the legal translation is a highly specialized niche service in a complex field, requiring high level lawyers, specialized in the comparative law and languages, with a limited availability and high market value. Additionally, in order to ensure top level of quality, requested for judicial documents, internal revision must be systematically executed. And finally, the confidential nature of the majority of documents, that the Directorate-General for Multilingualism is translating, naturally limits the possibility of outsourcing.

Translation costs are closely related to performance. Increased performance allows lower costs, increased quality and/or liberates time to assume new tasks. Amongst the many actions the CJEU

has undertaken in order to increase performance, which directly or indirectly lead to a reduction in costs for translation, the following can be mentioned:

I. IT

The Directorate-General for Multilingualism uses the same advanced technological tools as other institutions (IATE2, Euramis, DocFinder or Quest II) and cutting edge technologies such as neuronal translation tool eTranslation, which it co-finances. For several years, the CJEU has been working with dedicated CAT tool SDL Trados Studio. This new environment allows direct connection of the abovementioned tools (IATE2 etc.) as well as the CJEU's own databases of legal terminology (CuriaTerm) to the work environment of the lawyer-linguist. Using this CAT tool is ensuring more convergence with the working methods of the translation services of other institutions, and will yield not only increased quality, namely through consistency of translations, but savings too.

II. Terminology

All of the language units of the Directorate-General for Multilingualism cooperate with the Unit of Projects and Terminology Coordination in order to produce high quality legal terminology including descriptions and a comparative law approach. In house products available in CuriaTerm such as JUDIT (terminology of the Rules of Procedure) and Comparative multilingual legal vocabulary are constantly updated and enriched in order to spare lawyer linguists long and complicated analysis and research, therefore allowing them to translate more pages of high quality.

III. Training

Lawyer linguists attend lectures organized by the CJEU and given either by outside lecturers from the national legal communities or by other lawyer linguists on specific topics. Moreover, numerous discussion groups, led by lawyer linguists on legal texts in their language and open to lawyer linguists of other legal cultures, focus on particular topics. IT, language and other trainings are also organised.

Working groups within units and across units promote knowledge sharing and transfer among colleagues.

The competence thus created and/or maintained increases performance.

6. What is the state of play of the implementation of an Integrated Case Management System?

Following the recommendation of the Court of Auditors set out in Special Report No 14/2017, a project was started mid-2018 to achieve an integrated case management system. The project started by designing the future system concept and requirements gathering (business and technical) during the months that followed. Over 40 internal workshops with representatives of the two judicial bodies and the departments concerned took place in 2018 and over 35 technical workshops (mainly in Q1 2019). Based on this work, an internal team wrote the specifications and a call for tender was launched mid-2019. The procurement procedure is currently ongoing.

Performance measurement requirements have been included in the call for tender. In particular, we can highlight:

- The operational dashboard capabilities that the Integrated Case Management System will deliver and the possibility to tailor them at different levels (institution, judicial body, departments, etc...);

- Statistics and reports, which will rely on the integrated system and one source of data to cover the end-to-end workflows of all types of cases;
- Tailored workflow per types of cases;
- Auditing capabilities.

7. Please name three of the CJEU's main achievements and successes in 2018. How do they affect in the institution's challenges for the future?

The major achievement of the Institution in 2018 is related to its capacity to adjudicate on the cases brought before it within a very reasonable period of time. Some of these cases were of economic, social or political importance and concerned questions such as asylum and migration, the independence of the judiciary in some Member States or the possibility for a Member State to revoke the notification of its intention to withdraw from the European Union unilaterally.

Besides this major achievement, mention should be made of the bringing into operation of the Judicial Network of the European Union, allowing an exchange of information and documents between the Court of justice and the constitutional and supreme courts of the Member States, in particular the documents related to the preliminary ruling procedures. The success of that network is so important that the CJEU has decided to make most of the documents exchanged through that platform available soon to all the citizens of the EU, on the Curia website.

Finally, mention should be made of the E-Curia application, the use of which has become compulsory for the exchange of procedural documents between lawyers and the General Court as from 1st December 2018. This evolution has contributed both to the security and the speediness of such exchanges and to the improvement of the environment (less paper), not to mention the reduction of the costs linked to the use of postal services.

Staff

8. What progress has been made to establish and implement strict obligations regarding new rules on 'revolving doors', for members?

The revised Code of conduct for Members, entered into force on 1st January 2017, imposes very strict obligations on former Members with regard to their new professional undertakings after their ceasing to hold office, to prevent that advantage can be taken from their past occupation.

Article 9 of the Code sets out different kinds of incompatibilities regarding the activities they can carry out. On one hand, article 9 provides for a three-year waiting period during which they shall not be involved, in any capacity, in cases before the CJEU. On the other hand, they cannot become involved, in any manner whatsoever, in cases which were pending before the court of which they were a Member when they ceased to hold office or in cases connected with cases, whether pending or concluded, which they had dealt with.

In any event, one must stress out that Members are not relieved from their duty of integrity, dignity, loyalty and discretion after ceasing to hold office and that the secrecy of deliberation is not limited in time.

9. What progress has been achieved by revising the Code of Conduct for members that came into force on 1 January 2017, which provides new rules to prevent cases of conflict of interests and to ensure the independence of the members?

The CJEU is confident that, prior to the revision of the Code of conduct, conflicts of interest were duly avoided. Under the previous code, it was already the case that any Member of the CJUE who had an interest in a case was obliged to recuse him- or herself. The new code, through the obligation for the Members to declare their financial interests, has reinforced the internal control mechanisms for ensuring that such conflicts do not arise.

10. What progress has been made in formulating a list of external activities of the members of the CJEU, which is published on the website of the CJEU? Does the list contain the purpose, the date, the venue and the travel and subsistence costs of the listed events and whether they were paid by the CJEU or by a third party?

Since 1st January 2018, the list of the external activities carried out by Members in the previous year is generated automatically thanks to a specific application. This list, as produced by the application, is then published on the Curia website, in all official languages, allowing the CJEU to render the procedure of publication as efficient as possible.

This publication contains the name of the Member who took part in the activity, the purpose of the activity (representation of the institution or court; intervention contributing to the dissemination of EU law or to the dialogue between courts; teaching activities; attendance to the invitation of a public figure; award of a decoration), the venue and, more importantly to ensure a proper control of compliance with deontological rules, the full name and nature of the organizer (EU institution, national court, teaching, training or research body, national institution...).

The list does not contain the date of the event for security reasons, as some of them may be recurring and repeated on a fixed date every year.

For technical reasons, the annual list of external activities produced automatically and published on the Curia website does not integrate the information on travel and subsistence costs. Nonetheless, this information is available upon request.

11. How many trainees worked at the CJEU in 2018? How many of these trainees were remunerated and what was their remuneration? What progress has been made in ensuring an appropriate allowance being paid to all trainees in order to provide sufficient reimbursement for the trainees' efforts and not to reinforce discrimination on economic grounds?

12. Has the CJEU found a solution to provide a decent remuneration to all trainees working in the institution with a view to ensuring equal opportunities?

In 2018, 274 trainees worked at the CJEU. Of these, 87 trainees, who completed a five month paid traineeship in the departments of the institution, were entitled to a monthly stipend of 1 120 euros.

On 3 December 2018, the CJEU adopted new rules regarding trainees, which provide that each Member may receive in his/her cabinet one trainee for a five-month paid traineeship every year. These trainees, who are selected in the context of a competitive application procedure, receive the same stipend as those selected by the departments of the institution. This measure will substantially

increase the number of paid trainees. The CJEU sees an interest in also hosting other trainees, in particular, those who receive internship grants from other sources.

According with the new rules, all trainees also receive a contribution for their travelling expenses.

13. According to replies from CJEU, in 2017 there were 12 burnout cases among the staff. How many burnout cases were in your institution in 2018?

According to the CJEU's medical service's best estimate, in 2018, there were 12 cases where members of staff showed symptoms which could be associated with a diagnosis of burnout.

14. What is the average overtime of the CJEU's staff in 2018?

In 2018, the total amount paid by way of fixed allowance for overtime was EUR 664 538 (56 people receiving an average of EUR 11 866 each per annum). The total amount spent compensating overtime on the basis of individual additional hours worked was EUR 11 261 (18 people receiving an average of EUR 625 each).

15. In the context of the CJEU ruling of 2015 in which EPSO's recruitment policy was discriminatory (in relation to languages), this led to the annulations of three recruitment initiatives. How was the situation improved in 2018?

Following the ruling of 2015, EPSO put in place new rules on language regime for open competitions. The question should thus be addressed to EPSO itself.

16. What percentage of disabled employees was there in 2018 in CJEU?

In 2018, 17 staff members were disabled; this figure represents 0.75% of the total number of staff.

17. How many British members of staff work for your institution (cut down by category; civil servant, temporary agent and contract staff)?

On 1st October 2019, 29 members of the CJEU's staff were UK nationals (and did not have the nationality of another Member State). Of these 20 were officials, 7 were temporary agents and two were contract agents.

The breakdown according to function group was as follows:

Officials: 18 AD and 2 AST

Temporary agents: 7 AD and 0 AST

Contract agents: 1 GFI and 1 GFII

18. Could you please provide a table of all human resources broken down by nationality, type of contract, gender and grade for the year 2018, and an overview of how these figures compare with the year 2017?

Detailed table: Annex 1.

In 2018, the CJEU's staff was composed of 1 413 officials (64%), 650 temporary agents (29%) and 154 contract agents (7%). Overall, 1 345 women (61%) and 872 men (39%). 56% AD, 34% AST, 3% AST/SC and 7% contract agents.

In 2017, the CJEU's staff was composed of 1 409 officials (65%), 622 temporary agents (28%) and 149 contract agents (7%). Overall, 1 319 women (61%) and 861 men (39%). 56% AD, 34% AST, 3% AST/SC and 7% contract agents.

19. Could you please provide us a table of staff broken down by type of contract for 2013 and 2018? What was the average duration of contractual employments (including renewal of contracts) in 2013 and in 2018?

2013		2018	
STATUTORY LINK		STATUTORY LINK	
Temporary agents	612	Temporary agents	650
	139		154
Contract agents	GFI : 72	Contract agents	GFI : 87
	GFII : 23		GFII : 20
	GFIII : 36		GFIII : 38
	GFIV : 8		GFIV : 9

2013: Average duration of contracts (not including contracts for indefinite periods): 3,5 years.

2018: Average duration of contracts (not including contracts for indefinite periods): 3,9 years.

20. Please present a gender and nationality breakdown of your middle and senior management positions.

Detailed table: Annex 2

21. We would appreciate a comprehensive overview of staff on sick leave in 2018, broken down by the total number of staff member that were on sick leave and by how many days they were on sick leave in total. How many days lasted the three longest cases of sick leave? How many days of sick leave concerned Mondays and Fridays in 2018? What was the evolution since 2013?

A total of 22 049 days of sick leave were taken by the CJEU's staff in 2018. This works out at an average of approximately 9,95 days per member of staff. Of these, 924,50 days were taken only on a Monday and 863 days only on a Friday.

Sick leave without medical certificate: 3 537 days and 1 070 persons (average per person calculated on the basis of the total number of staff members in 2018: 1,6 days).

Sick leave with medical certificate: 18 512 days and 1 020 persons (average per person calculated on the basis of the total number of staff members in 2018: 8,35 days).

The three longest cases of sick leave in 2018 concerned staff who were absent for 283, 243 and 235 days (staff members with very serious illness).

Due to the implementation of a new IT system in 2013 and 2014, statistical data are only available from 2015 onwards.

In 2015, a total of 20 860,50 days of sick leave were taken by the CJEU's staff. The average was approximately 9,74 days per member of staff.

22. To what extent has staff been involved in carrying out activities that would justify a higher function group?

Members of staff are assigned duties whose level of difficulty and responsibility correspond to their function group and are not required to carry out duties corresponding to a higher function group.

However, members of staff are also encouraged to work to the best of their abilities and it can happen that some aspects of their duties evolve, with their agreement, to a level of difficulty or responsibility corresponding to a higher function group.

This is taken into account during the annual evaluation of staff and, in particular, in assessing applications for the certification procedure.

23. What were the three most important actions taken by the institution in favour of equality?

- The CJEU makes every effort to remove all obstacles which would hinder the appointment of women to senior and middle management positions. In 2018 and 2019, the CJEU strengthened its policy on equal opportunities and diversity, setting up a special entity within the Directorate for Human Resources and Personnel Administration which introduced and followed-up concrete and harmonised measures in this field and joined inter-institutional networks of female officials and agents and of female managers in order to examine all means of ensuring women's access to management positions through mentoring, coaching, communication and jobshadowing.
- Setting up of a jobshadowing program. This operation aimed to provide to all staff members the chance to network within the institution, to develop new skills and to accomplish on the ground and in house active 'training' in order to evaluate their competencies and to envisage mobility or middle management positions.
- The entity equal opportunities and diversity of the Directorate for Human Resources and Personnel Administration organised meetings, in the presence of the Court of Justice's Registrar, with all male and female managers in order to sensibilise them on the key role that they play in the career evolvement of their staff and in order to provide them guidelines to avoid any risk of discrimination in the evaluation of competencies and in the assignment of major projects to their male and female team members.

It is important to underline the positive tendency concerning women's presence in senior and middle management positions at the CJEU. In the 2013-2018 period, the percentage of women occupying management positions at the CJEU has increased from 30% to 37.5 % (with an additional increase in 2019, reaching already 39.7%).

24. What were the three most important actions taken by the institution in favour of disabled people?

The CJEU's buildings are designed to ensure easy access for disabled people. In addition, the CJEU takes specific measures in favor of disabled people on a case-by-case basis as the need arises. These

measures include, for example: providing special office equipment, changing office layout, providing dedicated parking places, providing particular medical and social assistance, making special arrangements in the context of selection procedures, taking account of disability in the context of the annual evaluation procedure and providing financial support for the purchase of special equipment necessitated by a handicap. In particular, in 2018, the CJEU complied with the local legislation under which an assistance dog accompanying a disabled person or his foster family is authorised to access to premises open to the public and for collective use or to the workplace, by allowing one of its staff to access and work on its premises accompanied by an assistance or therapy dog.

25. Were there any improvements done to the organisation of workspaces? What changes have there been in 2018?

Following a survey about "Open space" organized by the Staff Committee in 2017 and presented to the Directors-General on 30 January 2018, a working group chaired by the director of Buildings and Security was set up, including staff members working in open office spaces and the President of the Staff Committee. Following the recommendations of this group, some improvements were undertaken concerning the organization of workspaces in 2018. The Information Technology Directorate converted part of its office space into individual offices, opting for smaller individual offices in order to make space available for meetings in different forms (sitting or standing). The operations took place from 15 November to 20 December 2018 and concerned three floors of one of the towers of the CJEU's building complex.

26. What flexible working arrangements does your institution offer?

Flexible working arrangements available at the CJEU include part-time work, flexitime, parental leave, as well as structural and, recently, occasional telework.

27. How often are the flexible working arrangements used? Has there been a development in the frequency?

In 2018, the total number of officials and agents who used flexible working arrangements was as follows:

- Part-time work: 210
- Parental leave: 299
- Flexitime: 775
- Structural Telework: 305

28. What is the share of men and women respectively using these working arrangements?

- Part-time work: 194 women and 16 men
- Parental leave: 240 women and 59 men
- Flexitime : 500 women and 275 men
- Structural Telework: 218 women and 87 men

29. To what extent does your institution encourage young parents to make use of flexible working arrangements to improve life-work balance?

Information about the existing flexible working arrangements is provided at the entry of service and is published with detailed explanations on the Staff Vademecum (Intranet). Staff members, especially young parents, who request parental leave or part time arrangements, are also informed about the whole range of existing flexible working patterns.

30. Can all categories of staff apply to these flexible working arrangements?

The categories of staff entitled to apply to these flexible working arrangements are officials, temporary agents and contract agents, of all function groups. However, the nature of the duty may be a restrictive factor for the use of telework.

31. Was any staff member placed on leave in the interest of the service according to Article 50 of the staff regulations? If yes, what were the reasons?

Article 50 of the Staff Regulations was applied to one member of staff in 2018. This measure was justified by organisational reasons in the framework of the implementation of a new policy.

32. How many former judges are currently employed by the CJEU? Please specify the function and the grade.

One former Member of the Civil Service Tribunal was employed as a special advisor in 2018. He was employed to advise, in particular, on matters relating to Brexit as well as on matters relating to the application of the Staff Regulations and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants.

His contract came to an end on September 2019.

33. How do you explain the increase in expenditure concerning the CJEU's contribution to the early childhood centre?

The CJEU is fully dependent on the cost evaluation by OIL and the Commission. The quote part of the CJEU is calculated objectively on the basis of the staff population and the number of children attending the Center.

34. Concerning the purchase of mobile workstations for the members and the staff in their cabinets, could you specify the cost of acquisition per unit?

An inter-institutional contract was used for purchasing these mobile workstations. Basic equipment unit price being 504 EUR for laptops and 987 EUR for tablets (very limited number of tablets purchased, about 5% of the total).

35. The CJEU's administration is working on more detailed rules governing the exercise of external activities by staff. When would those measures be put in place and could you already tell us what is intended?

We intend to have these measures adopted during the course of 2020. The envisaged rules will lay down detailed provisions on individual obligations related to conflicts of interest, outside activities, occupational activities after leaving the service, gainful employment of the spouse, public offices, and publications.

36. Would you say that the CJEU had a fair recruitment practice policy in 2018? Were there any complaints, lawsuits or otherwise reported cases of non-transparent hiring or firing of staff?

The Directorate for Human Resources and Personnel Administration, in particular, the Human Resources unit, constantly assists and advises all the CJUE's services in order to ensure that recruitment procedures are objective and fair and respect the applicable provisions of the Staff Regulations and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants. Each individual procedure is reviewed to ensure that the applicable criteria have been met before a proposal is submitted to the appointing authority.

In particular, since 2018, specially trained members of staff of the Directorate for Human Resources and Personnel Administration regularly participate in the selection procedures in order to assist the recruiting services on these matters while the procedures are ongoing. One of the purposes of this is to ensure, in a timely manner, that best practice is observed as regards fair and objective recruitment procedures.

No complaints, lawsuits or otherwise cases reported of non-transparent hiring or firing of staff were recorded in 2018.

37. What were the costs in 2018 respectively for away days, trainings, closed conferences or similar events for staff? How many staff members participated in the respective events? Where did these events take place?

Three away days were organised in 2018, all taking place at the European Foyer Luxembourg. The total number of participants was 56 persons and the total cost 15 489 EUR. The breakdown is as follows:

Department	Participants	Expenses	
		Logistics	Trainer
Security Unit	15	810	4 155
Directorate for Buildings and Security	26	1 404	4 155
Directorate for Buildings and Security	15	810	4 155
Total	56	3 024	12 465
		TOTAL :	15 489

Communication

38. What has been done to improve the communication with Union citizens? How does the CJEU continue to strive for the best use of various communication channels to raise awareness about its work among citizens?

The communication's strategy of the CJEU is constantly seeking to bring the institution closer to citizens.

The CJEU continues to develop communication products relating to its activity or on specific themes relating to its case-law. For the fourth year in a row, a version of the CJEU's Annual Report designed specifically for the lay person has been published by the institution alongside its traditional Annual Report which is aimed primarily at legal experts. This simplified annual report entitled "The Year in Review" features prominently on the Curia website and is distributed widely to all the Member States in cooperation with the Publications Office.

As regards multimedia, the CJEU now has a total of 13 short animated films, in 23 official EU languages, available on its YouTube channel. The latest 3 to be added explain some of the CJEU's case law in the field of Data protection in the Digital world, the environment, and the realm of sport (<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCTfyrAlsJRZF1nGLLgnDiMA>). A further 3 films are currently in production. The CJEU's YouTube channel contains, in addition to the multimedia animations, videos on events organised at the CJEU. Now that this library of content has been built, our focus will shift more towards the promotion of this content to ensure that we exploit its full potential.

In terms of social media, the Communication Directorate continues to strengthen its presence on Twitter where it now has more than 74 000 followers (61 500 at the end of 2018 up from 42 200 at the end of 2017) with well above average engagement rates.

Lastly, the Curia website was given a completely new design in June 2018, a move that was broadly welcomed by users who responded to a survey about the website conducted in May this year. This survey will inform the further developments of the website.

39. What was the CJEU's budget for communication activities in 2018?

The budget for 2018 was EUR 429 000. This covers all the activities of the Communication Directorate such as the publication of the Annual Report (the Report on Judicial Activity, the Year in Review and the Management Report), brochures and other printed material, media monitoring services, the production of animations, communication material, professional photography, outreach events (including seminars for journalists, the CJEU's Open Day, materials for job fairs, etc.), some development work for the CJEU's website and expenses linked to memberships of legal associations.

40. What progress has been made in CJEU's outreach on social media? What are the most efficient social media channels? What difference do you observe in this regards among the different social media channels?

The CJEU has very limited staffing resources to devote to social media. Its activities in 2018 in this field were therefore limited to two Twitter accounts of its press service and one YouTube channel. The CJEU has recently taken the decision to be present on LinkedIn and has use a Facebook Events page to promote its 2019 Open Day.

Twitter was chosen specifically for its audience of informed professional individuals who use the platform as a means of gathering and disseminating information. Analysis of our followers shows that the CJEU's audience is widely spread throughout the EU and, in comparison to the overall Twitter audience, is much more interested in news, politics and current affairs. The tweets that are sent by the CJEU are limited in number, to avoid flooding our followers with news that does not interest them, and always inform the audience directly of the result of a case or of an important event. As a result of this policy, the engagement rate of the CJEU's tweets is usually in the region of 2.5 – 3.5%, which compares very well both with the average engagement rate of 0.05% across

Twitter as a whole, and with the industry standard view that an exceptionally high engagement rate is around 1%. This clearly shows that the CJEU is tweeting about information that its followers want to know more about.

As mentioned in the response to Question 38, the combined Twitter accounts now have more than 74 000 followers (61 500 at the end of 2018 up from 42 200 at the end of 2017).

The CJEU also uses YouTube to host and disseminate its video content. The account was opened in January 2017 with the first videos posted publicly in April 2017.

The channel is used to share videos of various events, such as press conferences, and also as a platform for hosting a series of short animations about the CJEU. The short animations are part of the CJEU's strategy to reach out to a wider audience, in particular younger citizens, by providing, short, simple information about the institution and its work in a different format. The first four animations were published in April 2017, a further 6 in May 2018 and 3 more animations were published in May 2019.

In total, the CJEU has over 197 000 views of its videos since launching the channel. In 2018, the videos were viewed 82 800 times, 2019 will have even better viewing figures, with 2018's figures already surpassed by September 2019.

As in 2017, the videos have been particularly effective at reaching younger citizens, with 63.5% of viewers falling in the 18-24 years bracket and 27.1% in the 25-34 years range.

As with Twitter, the content appears to be of interest to the viewers with all videos showing a well above average retention rate compared with other videos of this length. Furthermore, the click through rate (the number of times viewers click on the video when it appears on the screen) is at the higher end of the YouTube average range of 2-10% (the actual rate varies depending on the video, with the older videos performing better as YouTube learns more about them).

41. How do you reach out for specific target groups via these social media channels? Based on available insights and/or social media analytics can you tell whether this target group has been reached?

See the answer to Question 40 in terms of insights and analytics.

Content is key to reaching out to particular demographics and to succeeding on different platforms.

The CJEU therefore uses appropriate channels to target specific demographics (by age group, by professional status, etc.).

As an example, the CJEU made a conscious decision to reach out to a wider audience who may not be particularly aware of the impact of the institution on their lives. The use of short animations, focused on subject areas likely to appeal to this audience (the Digital world, environmental issues, and sport to name a few) which were then posted on YouTube has helped us to reach that audience. The combined effect of the subject matter, the style of communication and YouTube's large user-base has been particularly effective.

Similarly, the CJEU's use of Twitter was decided based on the demographic of Twitter users (mainly professionals) which suited the need to ensure a rapid and broad distribution of its Press Releases and other news to interested parties.

Current reflections taking place within the CJEU about the presence on other platforms are also largely driven by the need to provide appropriate content for the platform and its specific demographic and whether the latter is one which the CJEU needs to do more to reach out to.

42. What are the results of the external evaluation of the CJEU's website, which was carried out before the end of 2018? Would the recast of the website in terms of structure and content in order to make it even more user-friendly?

Following the redesign of the Curia website in June 2018, a number of structural changes were made to the content to improve management of a multilingual website. Further modifications were made to provide content that is more appropriate for the general public, including making available the CJEU's thematic brochures available in html form so as to be more mobile friendly.

Share buttons have also been added to the site in order to allow for better dissemination of individual content.

Changes were made to the website to improve compliance with data protection rules following the entry into force of new legislation and to comply with Court rulings in this matter.

A survey conducted in May 2019 has shown a very high level of satisfaction amongst website users, with 79% of users rating the website 4 or 5/5 and only 4% rating it unsatisfactory, at 1 or 2/5. Many of the comments about what could be improved focused on the case law database provided by the CJEU. This information will feed into an overhaul of this system, which will be the subject of a major project in 2020.

Before the end of this year, the CJEU will also make available further information in a new part of its website dedicated to the Judicial Network of the EU. The availability of this type of information, in particular, the references for preliminary rulings from national courts, and the CJEU's research notes, was also high on the list of requests from survey participants.

Further improvements to site structure and content will take place over the coming months, informed by user feedback, accessibility requirements and privacy concerns.

43. What progress has been made in creating the 'Judicial Network of the European Union' covering the Constitutional Courts and Supreme Courts of the Member States to promote Union case-law and case-law of the Member States?

The creation of the Judicial Network of the European Union (JNEU) constitutes one of the CJEU's major accomplishments in the field of judicial cooperation and transparency, as demonstrated by its short-listing by the European Ombudsman among the three finalists for the Award for Good Administration 2019 (category "Excellence through collaboration").

The launching of the JNEU secured platform on January 2018 allowed the exchange of previously undisclosed documents of judicial or academic nature, that bear a high value in order to support the judicial decision-making process and to strengthen the consistency of EU law application. After only 18 months of operation, the platform counts about 2 500 users and the activity recorded on the website shows that more than 2 700 researches have been made and almost 300 000 pages viewed. Moreover, about 1 500 documents (plus their translations) uploaded on the platform have never been published (like references for a preliminary ruling or research notes prepared by the CJEU's Research and documentation directorate), or shared outside their original judicial body.

Given the success of the platform, it has been decided to create a public section dedicated to the JNEU on the Curia website, in order to allow public access to some of the most valuable documents shared on the JNEU platform, including references for a preliminary ruling or research notes. This section will be opened in November 2019.

44. What progress has been achieved in introducing paperless information and documentation to ensure swift and efficient communication? How does the CJEU proceed in lodging of all procedural documents via e-Curia?

The CJEU has improved the situation of the paperless office inside and outside the organization.

In the first case, the CJEU invests in systems and equipments that replace gradually paper distribution with electronic distribution. It should be noted that internal actions are coordinated with the EMAS (Eco-Management and Audit Scheme) program, one of the objectives of which is to limit or, if possible, reduce the number of printers.

With regard to the outside world, the main progress in 2018 concerning the introduction of paperless information and documentation to ensure swift and efficient communication was the fact that e-curia became, on 1 December 2018, the sole means of exchanging judicial documents between the representatives of the parties and the General Court. This development concerns all parties (applicants, defendants and interveners) and all types of proceedings. However, certain exceptions are provided for in accordance with the principle of access to the courts (in particular where the use of e-Curia is technically impossible or where legal aid is requested by an applicant not represented by a lawyer).

Mandatory e-Curia has been possible by means of a technological re-engineering of e-Curia system, allowing it accommodate a larger number of users and has put an end to the management of numerous different formats, the digitisation of documents lodged in paper format and, in the case of lodgment in paper format preceded by lodgment by fax, double entries in the database and the need to ensure that the document lodged in paper format is identical to that lodged by fax. The simplification of the rules on the submission of procedural documents (in particular the waiver of the obligation to lodge certified copies of the original) should also help further to reduce the number of regularisations.

In close connection with other IT developments, notably the integrated case-management system, e-Curia will evolve in the next few years in order to become a true digital parties' portal.

The increase in the number of holders of access accounts to that application, the very high percentage of lodgments of procedural documents made before the two Courts (Court of Justice and General Court) by e-Curia, the satisfaction expressed by users with this free and ecological system, the widespread digitisation of all stages of the judicial process finalised or in the process of being finalised in most Member States and the gains associated with the use of an exclusive method of lodging and service of procedural documents are among the factors that justified the General Court's proposal to move towards fully paperless exchanges between the Registry and the parties' representatives. The announcement of that reform was very well received by the Member States and by the lawyers represented by the European Bar Council (CCBE).

A similar approach will be introduced by the Court of justice to make e-Curia the preferred means of communication by the end of 2019.

45. What was the CJEU's budget for communication activities in 2018? How did it evolve between 2013 and 2018?

The evolution of the budget over the last 6 years has been as follows:

Year	Amount
2018	€ 429 000
2017	€ 331 500
2016	€ 306 500
2015	€ 243 500
2014	€ 305 500
2013	€ 330 500

As mentioned in the answer to Question 39, this covers all the activities of the Communication Directorate such as the publication of the Annual Report (the Report on Judicial Activity, the Year in Review and the Management Report), brochures and other printed material, media monitoring services, the production of animations, communications material, professional photography, outreach events (including seminars for journalists, the CJEU's Open Day, materials for job fairs, etc.), some development work for the CJEU's website and expenses linked to memberships of legal associations.

Over this period, there has been a move away from printed media and a reorientation of spending to more visual communication means.

Payments

46. What are the reasons for persistent mismatch in the commitments for missions and payments over the last years and how will the CJEU deal with it? What improvement has been made in estimating the amount for the upcoming budget?

We understand this question as related to Members' missions. See the reply to question 47 for staff missions.

It is important to point out, first, that this kind of expenditure is by nature difficult to estimate in advance. In any case, as far as Members' missions are concerned, two points have to be emphasized. First, the actual execution of the appropriations has improved, in terms of payments, from 46.2% for the 2016 budget to 57.1% for the 2018 budget. This latest percentage is calculated as of today, and could still improve since the payments using 2018 appropriations could be completed until the end of 2019. Second, the budget for Members' missions has been reduced from EUR 342 000 in 2018 to EUR 280 000 in 2020, in spite of the increase in the number of Members following the reform of the General Court.

47. What are the reasons for overestimating commitments for various budget lines under Chapter 14 'Other staff and external services', inter alia for missions (budget line 162) and further training (budget line 1612) over the last years? What progress has been made in ensuring sound financial management in order to avoid significant discrepancies between commitments and payments?

We understand this question as related to Chapter 16, "Other expenditure relating to persons working with the Institution".

There are slight variations from year to year in expenditure on training and missions for staff. Both activities vary over time and are difficult to estimate with absolute precision one year in advance.

As for appropriations for staff missions (line 162), the execution in terms of payments has improved from 71.40% of the 2017 appropriations to 73.24% of the 2018 appropriations (as of today, with a possible further improvement since payments with 2018 appropriations are possible until December 31st 2019).

As for staff training (line 1612), we also register an improvement in the use of appropriations, from 75.77% of the 2017 appropriations to 86.99% of the 2018 appropriations, again with the possibility of a further improvement before the end of 2019.

48. What amount has been allocated by the CJEU to meet the payments of damages awarded by the General Court on the basis of a failure to adjudicate within a reasonable period of time in 2018?

An amount of EUR 6 401,01 by way of compensation for non-material damage as established in Case T-479/14 was paid in 2018 after the case was finally settled by the judgment of 13 December 2018 in Case C-150/17 P.

A total amount of EUR 130 000 had been allocated in 2018 to the budget line 232.00 "Legal expenses and damages". This amount took into account the possibility that the damages awarded by the General Court in 2017 in the "undue delay" cases (T-479/14, T-577/14, T-725/14, T-40/15 and T-673/15), or at least part of these damages, would have to be paid. By its judgments of 13 December 2018 (C-138/17 P + C-146/17 P, C-150/17 P and C-174/17 P + C-222/17 P), and a further judgment of 5 September 2019 (C-447/17 P + C-479/17 P), the Court of Justice annulled the judgements of the General Court, bringing down the total amount of damages awarded by the General Court, i.e. EUR 1 462 350,66 (+ interest), to a total amount of EUR 16 000 (+ interest). The latter amount has been paid to the plaintiffs concerned at the end of 2018 and at the beginning of 2019.

Since the plaintiff in Case T-673/15 insisted on being paid, notwithstanding the pending appeal, an amount of EUR 731 596,63 had been paid in August 2017. Given the judgment of 5 September 2019 (C-447/17 P + C-479/17 P), this amount is currently being recovered.

49. What achievement has been made in the application of the principles of performance-based budgeting?

The CJEU has gradually developed a culture of performance based budgeting within the institution and, in 2018, the system by which the CJEU applies performance criteria in the establishment and management of its budget was already operational and helping the management to take informed decisions regarding resource allocation.

During the preparation of the estimates for each annual budget, the departments of the CJEU are internally obliged to accompany their budgetary requests with a series of performance-based objectives. Such objectives must be specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound (SMART). The objectives are accompanied by one or several objectively verifiable indicators. For each indicator, the service must state the expected results for the given year. At the end of the budgetary exercise, departments report on the actual results achieved.

In particular, during the year 2018, workshops with all the services were organized in order to harmonize the approach and exchange best practices between them, both in terms of definition of the objectives as in terms of identification of the best possible indicators to measure the achievement of those objectives.

50. Had the CJEU carry out any sponsoring activity in 2018? Has the CJEU put in place clear and robust rules for sponsoring that guarantee equal treatment of events?

The CJEU does not sponsor events and, therefore, there is no need to put in place rules regarding this matter.

51. How do you explain the increase of 11.81% in cleaning and maintenance between 2017 and 2018? What explains the fact that the costs were more expensive than initially envisaged?

This increase is mainly due to the following factors:

- The indexation mechanism applicable to existing contracts;
- The more intensive use of architectural maintenance framework contracts, in particular for additional actions related to the security policy (i.e. replacement or upgrading of the outdoor surveillance cameras);
- The connection of the technical facilities and management systems of the extension of one staff car park (part of the 5th extension of the Court's main site) to the CJEU's building complex;
- The signing of a new technical maintenance contract, which includes wider services and a transitional 3 month period during which the new contractor had to establish an inventory of the installations and set up its maintenance procedures, while the previous contract was still being executed.

Concerning the fact that a reinforcement of this budgetary line was necessary during the year, it has to be underlined that some of the expenses mentioned above had initially been underestimated in the preparation of budget 2018. Moreover, other urgent expenses had not been estimated at all, namely:

- Some urgent maintenance works on the fire prevention system;
- Technical work related to the partial reconversion of open office spaces to individual offices (see reply to question 25).

Harassment

52. What were the expenditures in 2018 for the management of court cases and CJEU sentences? What was the specific amount for harassment cases?

The cases in which the CJEU was a party in 2018 were managed by the Legal Adviser for Administrative Matters of the CJEU. There was no specific expenditure for the management of those cases, since no external lawyers were used.

Expenditures for sentences in cases in which the CJEU was a party were the following in 2018:

- an amount of EUR 10 129,47 for plaintiffs' costs to be borne by the CJEU in Case T-702/16 P;
- an amount of EUR 6 401,01 by way of compensation for non-material damage as established in Case T-479/14 (one of the undue-delay cases), paid after the case was finally settled by the judgment of 13 December 2018 in Case C-150/17 P.

The CJEU was not a party in any harassment case in 2018.

53. Where there any cases related to harassment reported, investigated and/or concluded in 2018?

There were no such cases in 2018.

54. What measures is your institution taking to raise awareness about the possibility to file harassment complaints?

The CJEU is committed to preventing all forms of harassment in the workplace. The internal rules and procedures of the CJEU are published on the Internet site of the institution in order to promote a respectful working environment and to prevent any form of harassment. The CJEU's staff is informed, by that means, about the possibility to initiate a formal or an informal procedure in case of inappropriate behaviour. The HR department examines complaints and carries out investigations if necessary.

55. Has there been any recent modifications to your anti-harassment rules, and could you specify to what extent?

There were no recent modifications to the CJEU's anti-harassment rules.

56. Do you have a functioning team of the confidential-staff-councillors? Did they and the staff as a whole, receive any special training / seminars on the prevention of harassment?

The institution's counsellors in the event of harassment, appointed amid the staff members in 2017, received intensive training in order to be able to advice and support people seeking their assistance or guidance. The same training has been followed by certain members of the staff of the Human Resources Directorate.

In addition, an interinstitutional network of counsellors was set up, with the participation of all the institutions located in Luxembourg, in order to exchange experiences and best practices in the field of prevention of harassment and counselling.

Furthermore, the Staff Committee, in collaboration with the CJEU's administration, organised thematic weeks with workshops, debates and dissemination of documentation on recognition at work and management of emotions.

Whistleblowing

57. Were there any whistleblower cases coming out of the CJEU and in such a case how did you follow-up on them?

There were no such cases in 2018.

Transparency

58. Is the CJEU intending to publish the declaration of financial interests of its members in the near future?

The purpose of the declaration of financial interests provided for in Article 5, paragraph 3 of the Code of conduct for Members and former Members of the Court of justice of the European Union is to ensure the impartiality and the independence of the Members. It enables the President of each court to check at the earliest possible point in the proceedings whether a judge might have a conflict of interest in a given case and to avoid allocating that case to such a judge.

Moreover, any Member who has an interest in a case is obliged to recuse him- or herself from participating in the proceedings. This obligation applies regardless of any obligation for a judge to declare his or her financial interests.

Inasmuch as the declarations of financial interest are conceived as an internal means to ensure the impartiality and the independence of both courts, the CJEU does not see the publication of financial interests of its Members as relevant.

59. How many call for tenders did your institution organise in 2018? Please indicate the value and the number of applicants for each tender.

In 2018, the following tender procedures above the thresholds laid down in Directive 2014/24/EU were launched:

Object	Value	Type of procedure	Number of applicants
Supply of books and specialised supplements in the legal field	2 000 000	Open	4 (lot 1) 5 (lot 2) 4 (lot 3)
Cleaning of buildings and maintenance of green spaces at the CJEU	18 235 344	Open	2
Securing the fire and safety control station (PCI/PCS)	221 727	Open	1
Removal services for the administrative departments of the CJEU	709 982	Open	3
Preparation of French language summaries of judgments	960 000 (est.)	Open	Not awarded
Automobile driving training services for drivers of European institutions in Brussels and Luxembourg	1 302 000	Open	2 (lot 1) 2 (lot 2)
Supply of conference tables with multimedia connectivity for the CJEU	221 580	Open	8
Refurbishment of the deliberation room of the Annex C building of the CJEU — 4th floor	253 406	Open	1 (lot 1) 1 (lot 2)

60. On 11 December 2018, the rules for data protection in the EU institutions were brought in line with the rules set out in the GDPR. Did your institution need to proceed to any changes in the way it handles data to adapt to this new legislation? What were those changes?

The data processing operations conducted by the institution were compliant with the previous data protection regulation applicable to the EU Institution, Regulation 45/2001. The entry into force of the new data protection regulation did therefore not significantly impact those data processing operations. Nevertheless, different data processing operations were verified and the information on these operations was updated following the entry into force of the new data protection regulation for the institutions.

The adjustment to the new data protection regulation as well as the review and update of all data processing operations continues in 2019.

Measures were also taken in order to comply with new obligations, such as the obligation to maintain a central register of data processing activities and the requirement to document all processing activities accordingly. When required, a data protection impact assessment was made. Furthermore, a specific procedure to report data breaches was set up. Measures were also taken to

raise awareness regarding data protection and the new regulation, such as a training sessions open for all staff, a workshop for staff responsible for data handling, a presentation for all heads of unit, awareness sessions for new staff and meetings of a group of data protection coordinators representing the different services within the institution.

61. What activities has the CJEU started and what policies implemented in the area of transparency in 2018?

The CJEU pays the greatest attention to transparency and constantly endeavors to improve its policies and practices with this respect, as reflected by the creation, in January 2018, of the Directorate-General for Information in the course of the restructuration of the CJEU's administrative departments.

Three major achievements obtained in 2018 and pertaining to transparency should be mentioned.

The first one concerns the publication on the Curia website, on a yearly basis, of the list of external activities pursued by Members, in accordance with the revised Code of conduct applicable to them (see Question 10).

The second one relates to the launching of the secured platform of the Judicial Network of the European Union (see Question 43), where previously undisclosed documents are now made available to participating courts, such as anonymized references for preliminary ruling or research notes. The success of this platform will lead to the opening, in November 2019, of a section dedicated to the JNEU on the Curia website, where most of the documents contained in the protected platform will be made available to the public.

The third one concerns the release of a new dissemination product on the Curia website, named "Factsheets", which aims at presenting an overview of the reference case-law in a specific area of EU Law, in all official languages. The number of factsheets uploaded on the Curia website increases regularly since their introduction in 2018.

2018 is also the year during which important steps or preparatory works have been undertaken in order to strengthen, clarify and simplify the information delivered to the public. Among other actions, mention can be made, for instance, to the facelift of the Curia website, which makes it easier to find relevant information according to the user profile (see Question 42).

62. Did the Ombudsman issue any recommendations to the CJEU in 2017 or 2018 and how did you follow-up on them?

The Ombudsman did not issue any recommendations to the CJEU in 2017 or 2018.

63. Could you please provide a list of external activities pursued by the Judges in 2018? How many working hours of judges were spent in 2018 for external activities? Please provide us with the details of the presence of the judges on these activities.

The list of external activities pursued by the members of the CJEU is published on the Curia website. (https://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2018-02/tra-doc-en-div-c-0000-2018-201800885-05_01.pdf).

Members are fully committed to their mandate, which specific nature does not accommodate the concept of working hours applicable for civil service. In compliance with the Code of conduct, external activities, which form part of the Members' duties regarding the dissemination of EU Law, are subject to a prior authorization by the college of Members and can only be carried out if they are compatible with judicial activity.

Fraud & Corruption (including co-operation with OLAF)

64. How many OLAF investigations were carried out in 2018 with regard to the CJEU? How many of them led to a sentence?

One OLAF investigation was carried out in 2018 with regard a member of the CJEU's staff. Upon reception of the OLAF report, the CJEU took the appropriate measures, of which it informed OLAF.

65. How did you co-operate with OLAF and the Court of Auditors in the spheres of prevention, investigation or corrective measures?

The CJEU cooperated with OLAF in the context of the investigation referred to in the answer to question 64 and replied to a request for information submitted by OLAF.

Conflict of Interests (Rules and control mechanism)

66. What measures / rules has (or had been introduced in 2018) the CJEU to prevent and fight conflict of interests? How did those rules change until today?

The main changes, established in 2017, concern: (i) article 5 of the Code of Conduct applicable to Members and former Members relating to the "Notification and declaration as to personal interests", in particular the new obligation for the Members to declare their financial interests; (ii) article 8 of that Code containing detailed provisions concerning the external activities of the Members and providing for the publication of these activities on the Curia website.

While the Members still have to notify the President of the court to which they belong if they are to hear a case in which they have an interest that might give rise to a conflict of interest, the declaration of financial interest provided for in Article 5(2) of the new Code of conduct allows the President of the court concerned to act pro-actively and to avoid conflicts of interests from arising.

Indeed, before attributing a case to a Judge Rapporteur, it is verified, on the basis of said declaration, whether the judge has a financial interest in the case.

As far as the enforcement of the Code of conduct is concerned, current and former Members informally contact the President whenever an issue relating to the interpretation of the Code may arise. Exceptionally, the Consultative Committee provided for in article 10 of the Code of conduct is convened. This may e.g. occur when a complaint has been lodged against a Member or a former Member of the institution.

Concerning, in particular, the pre-recruitment declaration on the absence of conflicts of interests which future new members of staff must make, and following a recommendation of the CJEU's internal auditor, the recruitment procedure has been modified to ensure that the Human Resources unit always has time to assess such declarations and, if necessary, to propose particular measures to the Appointing Authority, in good time before a definitive offer of employment is sent.

67. Do you have a functioning 'Revolving doors Policy'?

The CJEU applies directly, and in a strict manner, the obligations set out in the Staff Regulations and the Conditions of Employment of other servants concerning professional activity after service in the institution. Nevertheless, the CJEU's administration is also continuing to work to establish more detailed rules regarding professional activity after service (See question 35).

Activities to Lower the Environmental footprint (EMAS rules, energy, water, paper consumption, CO2 offsetting)

68. Please present your activities and achieved results in this field.

As in the previous years, the CJEU improved its environmental performance by using the Environmental management system in accordance with the EMAS regulation which requires a monitoring of the different environmental aspects on the basis of indicators. Most indicators, in the form of a ratio per FTE (Full Time Equivalent), showed a favourable trend in 2018 compared to base year for EMAS regulation 2015, for example:

- a reduction of electricity consumption by 8.3% (kWh/FTE),
- a reduction of water consumption by 2.1% (m3/FTE),
- a reduction of paper consumption by 15.5% (kg/FTE).
- a reduction of the mixed household waste by 4.5 % (kg/FTE).
- an increase of the number of videoconferences by 52.9 % (number/FTE).

Since 2010 we also observed a reduction of the greenhouse gas emissions, measured in tons of CO₂ equivalents, by 30.3 %.

The various environmental projects that form the basis for continuous improvement of environmental performance are as follows:

- as part of the CJEU's comprehensive carbon footprint update, a survey on staff commuting is conducted annually to evaluate the magnitude of greenhouse gas emissions related to this item. Measures required to reduce this part of the greenhouse gas emissions generated by our institution will be determined based on these results;

- in order to further reduce these emissions, the CJEU decided to participate, jointly with the other European institutions based in Luxembourg, in the vel'OH! service, the self-service bike system introduced in 2008 by the City of Luxembourg. In addition to this, a global reflection is under way to determine where additional vel'OH! rental stations may be installed in the vicinity of the CJEU's buildings;
- the gradual implementation of the pilot scheme designed to reduce the number of individual printers in use in the services will also contribute to reduce the carbon footprint under this item;
- it was also decided that the CJEU will participate in the European Parliament's carbon offsetting system;
- a project to reduce the consumption of single-use plastic products has been launched with a particular focus on catering. As a first step, a complete inventory of the various plastic products in use has been established, which will serve as a basis for further improvement measures;
- more precisely, in order to reduce the quantity of single-use plastic bottles, the CJEU launched a pilot project aimed at promoting the consumption of drinking water from the city's distribution network, in particular through the installation of additional and new water dispensers. In light of the good results reported from this experience, it is planned to install additional water dispensers in the CJEU's premises;
- the Paper Working Group will continue to make recommendations to reduce paper consumption.

Cybersecurity

69. What steps has the CJEU taken towards improving cybersecurity of the institution? Were any of these steps coordinated with any other EU institution or has the CJEU started taking such steps on its own initiative?

In 2018, the CJEU has undertaken multiple steps to improve the cybersecurity of the institution.

Many important undertakings in the domain of cybersecurity haven been coordinated with CERT-EU and the CII (Informatics Inter-institutional Committee) subgroup security.

The CJEU is member of the Steering Board of CERT-EU and part of the CERT-EU Technical Forum. The CJEU is using the extended services offered by CERT-EU, which ensures information exchange, punctual collaboration, resources pool, knowledge and best practices sharing, all of that leading to inter-institutional synergy effects.

The coordination with other institutions on the level of the CII subgroup for security matters together with the application of recommendations by CERT-EU led to an improvement of email security amongst the institutions by implementing encryption and authenticity methods (TLS, DKIM, SPF, DMARC).

Apart from these coordinated activities, an important internal IT governance revision has introduced a "security and privacy by design" approach in the IT project and demand management workflows. This new approach is in place since mid-2018.

As part of this new governance approach, the CJEU has conducted security tests of the public applications e-Curia and JNEU in 2018 using Commission DIGIT services.

DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF 2018 - OFFICIALS, TEMPORARY AND CONTRACT AGENTS

Nationalité		Sexe		Lign. statuaire																Total
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
Allemagne	F						4	7	4	3	8	3	5	2	3	9	2			12
	Agents temporaires						1	1	1	2	3	3	5	3	2	2				1
	Agents contractuels						2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				3
	F Total						6	8	5	5	10	4	5	6	3	11	2			17
	M						1	1	1	2	5	4	6	2	2	8	2	4		
Allemagne Total							3	1		1				2	6					12
	F						2	1	1	2	6	4	7	2	4	14				4
	M						1													4
Autriche	F						3	9	6	7	16	8	12	8	7	25	3	7	2	54
	Agents temporaires						1			3	3	1	1	2	1	2				12
	Agents contractuels						2	9	6	4	13	7	11	6	6	23	3	7	2	42
Autriche Total							3	1		3	1			3						14
	F						1			2	2	1	1	2	1					9
	M						2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1			5
Belgique	F						1	1		5	3	1	1	2	1					19
	Agents temporaires						1	1	6	10	7	7	1	2	2	2	1			59
	Agents contractuels						2	3	3	2	10	3	1	1	4	1				40
	F Total						1	4	10	9	19	13	8	2	6	4	2			2
	M						1	3	5	5	8	2	9	2	7	5	4	3		55
Belgique Total							2	7	4	6	12	2	10	3	7	12	5	12	4	95
	F						8	17	20	14	31	15	18	5	13	16	7	13	4	196
	M						2	3	3	2	2	2	7	6	1				31	
Bulgarie	F																			8
	Agents temporaires						1	1		1										3
	Agents contractuels																			5
	F Total						2	1	6	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1			8
	M						3			1										4
Bulgarie Total							5	6	6	3	2	1	1	1	1	1				12
	F						1	3	4	2	2	2	10	3	7	5	12	4		42
	M						2		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				8
Chypre	F																			1
	Agents temporaires																			1
	Agents contractuels																			1
	F Total						2	1	9	3	4	2	11	11	4	1	1			57
	M						1													4
Chypre Total							3	1	3	4	2	11	11	4	1	1				61
	F						1		3											4
	M																			1
Croatie	F																			1
	Agents temporaires																			1
	Agents contractuels																			1
	F Total						1		3	4	2	11	11	4	1	1				27
	M						1													12
Croatie Total							2		4	4	2	11	11	4	1	1				39
	F						1		2	2	11	11	4	1	1					28
	M						1													11
Danemark	F																			1
	Agents temporaires																			1
	Agents contractuels																			1
	F Total						2	2	4	1	1	3	5	2	4	1	6	3	1	36
	M						2	2	4	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	2	2		13
Danemark Total							4	4	2	2	2	6	6	5	5	7	5	3		49
	F						1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				11
	M						3	3	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	38

Danemark Total											51								
Espagne	F	2	3	5	1	1	1	4	6	7	5	2	7	3	3	1	1	1	49
	Agents temporaires	2	3	4	1	2	1	4	6	6	3	5	3	5	2	1	1	1	16
	Agents contractuels																		3
F Total		2	4	7	3	10	3	4	9	6	3	8	5	2	1	1	1	1	68
M		1	3	3	1	1	3	3	3	8	2	4	7	3	4	1	1	1	44
M Total		1	3	6	4	11	6	7	12	16	5	11	14	5	5	2	2	2	15
Espagne Total											60								
Estonie	F	3	4	12	4	11	7	9	12	15	6	14	18	5	6	2	2	2	128
	Agents temporaires	1	1	2	1	4	2	3	5	5	9	7	1						35
	Agents contractuels																		2
F Total		2	2	2	1	4	2	4	5	4	9	8	1						38
M		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1						7
M Total		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1						7
Estonie Total											45								
Finlande	F	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	4	6	10	9	1	9	7	2	2	2	30
	Agents temporaires	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
	Agents contractuels	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4
F Total		3	2	3	2	2	2	2	5	7	4	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	37
M		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
M Total		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
Finlande Total											50								
France	F	1	5	7	13	9	10	16	15	13	7	2	6	4	2	2	6	4	110
	Agents temporaires	4	17	38	10	17	18	18	8	4	6	6	10	3	4	16	5	4	165
	Agents contractuels	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
F Total		5	23	46	23	26	30	35	23	17	13	10	17	7	7	17	11	282	
M		2	6	6	5	7	11	8	7	3	5	2	9	1	4	2	2	70	
M Total		3	2	2	2	4	4	5	3	5	3	3	9	1	5	5	1	88	
France Total											196								
Grèce	F	8	28	94	30	38	41	48	31	25	22	35	43	13	22				478
	Agents temporaires	1	4	3	1	1	1	2	11	4	4	3	1	1	2				38
	Agents contractuels	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1				14
F Total		2	7	10	2	6	4	8	13	9	5	12	6	5	1	1	1	1	89
M		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	36
M Total		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	42
Grèce Total											142								
Hongrie	F	1	1	1	1	3	7	4	2	1	5	11	5	1	1	1	1	1	42
	Agents temporaires																		14
	Agents contractuels																		4
F Total		1	1	1	1	3	7	4	2	1	5	11	5	1	1	1	1	1	46
M																			14
M Total																			4
Hongrie Total											19								
Irlande	F	1	1	2	3	9	5	3	2	10	16	6	2	1	1	1	1	1	61
	Agents temporaires																		10
	Agents contractuels																		6
F Total		1	1	2	3	9	5	3	2	10	16	6	2	1	1	1	1	1	67
M																			16
M Total																			16
Irlande Total											83								
Italie	F	1	2	2	4	1	1	11	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	3	1	1	29
	Agents temporaires																		50
	Agents contractuels																		26
F Total		1	2	2	4	1	1	11	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	3	1	1	75
M																			2
M Total																			2
Italie Total											77								

Portugal	M Total		1	3	5	8	6	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	2	2	3	2	2	33
Portugal			3	5	8	6	3	3	1	4	4	9	10	9	4	6	5	3	3	82
Roumanie	F	Fonctionnaires	1	2	3	1	3	1	3	5	3	3	3	3	13	3	2	2	36	
Roumanie		Agents temporaires	3	4	2	2	4	1	3	1	3	1	1	1	1			1	15	
Roumanie		Agents contractuels											1						1	
Roumanie	F Total		4	4	4	4	3	5	4	8	4	4	4	3	14	1	2	2	52	
Roumanie	M	Fonctionnaires		1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	3			13	
Roumanie		Agents temporaires						2	2	1	1								4	
Roumanie		Agents contractuels										1							3	
Roumanie	M Total		2	1	1	1	1	4	4	3	1	3	1	3	3				20	
Roumanie Total	F	Fonctionnaires	6	1	5	4	9	4	11	11	5	6	15	6	15	4	2	2	72	
Roumanie-Uni		Agents temporaires	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	17	
Roumanie-Uni		Agents contractuels							8	8					1			14	14	
Roumanie-Uni	F Total		1	1	1	1	3	1	10	2	2	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	33	
Roumanie-Uni	M	Fonctionnaires		1	1	1	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	1	1	20	
Roumanie-Uni		Agents temporaires					2	1	3	1	1				1				9	
Roumanie-Uni		Agents contractuels																	1	
Roumanie-Uni Total	M Total		1	1	1	1	3	3	6	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	1	30	
Slovaquie	F	Fonctionnaires	1	1	2	1	6	1	16	1	1	6	5	6	7	2	5	4	63	
Slovaquie		Agents temporaires	1	1	1	1	5	2	4	2	2	4	4	6	6	3	3	2	23	
Slovaquie		Agents contractuels		2	1	1			1					1	1			5	5	
Slovaquie	F Total		1	2	2	2	1	1	20	1	1	10	9	12	13	5	7	6	29	
Slovaquie	M	Fonctionnaires							5	3	7	4	4		3	3	1	1	15	
Slovaquie		Agents temporaires		2				1	1						2			6	6	
Slovaquie		Agents contractuels																	1	
Slovaquie	M Total		2	2	2	2	1	1	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	2	2	22	
Slovaquie Total	F	Fonctionnaires	1	4	2	2	1	6	3	8	4	4	4	1	10	8	2	1	51	
Slovaquie		Agents temporaires	1	1	1	1	4	2	3	2	2	5	6	6	6	2	1	1	26	
Slovaquie		Agents contractuels		1	1	1			2					2	2			5	5	
Slovaquie	F Total		2	1	3	1	1	4	1	5	2	2	2	2	6	2	2	2	32	
Slovaquie	M	Fonctionnaires							2	2	2	1	3	3	2	2			14	
Slovaquie		Agents temporaires							1										1	
Slovaquie		Agents contractuels																	1	
Slovaquie	M Total		2	1	3	1	1	4	1	5	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	1	16	
Slovénie	F	Fonctionnaires	2	1	5	2	4	1	8	3	8	4	4	8	8	4	1	1	48	
Slovénie		Agents temporaires	2	1	5	5	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	6	2	6	2	2	25	
Slovénie		Agents contractuels							4					1	1			6	6	
Slovénie	F Total		2	1	5	5	3	3	11	4	11	6	6	14	14	7	4	4	32	
Slovénie	M	Fonctionnaires							1		1			3	3	2	4	4	16	
Slovénie		Agents temporaires													1	1	1	2	2	
Slovénie		Agents contractuels																	1	
Slovénie	M Total		2	1	6	3	3	3	5	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	5	5	19	
Slovénie Total	F	Fonctionnaires	2	1	7	3	7	2	11	4	9	5	11	11	11	6	2	2	51	
Slovénie		Agents temporaires	2	1	7	3	4	1	4	2	2	10	5	4	4	4	2	2	29	
Slovénie		Agents contractuels							4									6	6	
Slovénie	F Total		2	1	7	3	4	3	15	6	11	15	15	15	15	10	6	6	38	
Slovénie	M	Fonctionnaires							1		1			2	2	4	4	4	12	
Slovénie		Agents temporaires												2	2	2	2	2	2	
Slovénie		Agents contractuels												1	1	1	1	1	1	
Slovénie	M Total		2	1	7	3	4	3	5	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	19	
République tchèque	F	Fonctionnaires				3	7	2	2	8	2	5	2	5	3	5	11	4	2	51
République tchèque		Agents temporaires					1	1	2	4	1	2	5	10	5	1	1	1	29	
République tchèque		Agents contractuels								4									6	6
République tchèque	F Total					3	9	2	4	12	3	7	10	15	6	6	3	3	38	
République tchèque	M	Fonctionnaires				1				1	1	2	3	4	4	1	1	1	12	
République tchèque		Agents temporaires																	2	2
République tchèque		Agents contractuels																	1	1
République tchèque	M Total					1	1	2	1	2	2	4	4	4	4	2	2	2	15	
République tchèque	F	Fonctionnaires								1	1	1	1	1	3	4	1	1	15	
République tchèque		Agents temporaires													1	1	1	1	2	2
République tchèque		Agents contractuels																	1	1
République tchèque	M Total																		2	2
Autres	F	Agents temporaires																	1	1
Autres	F Total		45	88	235	114	182	130	264	175	203	214	189	183	72	95	17	1	2217	
Total			45	88	235	114	182	130	264	175	203	214	189	183	72	95	17	1	2217	

SENIOR AND MIDDLE MANAGEMENT - 31.12.2018

Code sexe	Libellé pays nationalité	Directeur-général	Directeur	Chef d'unité	Grand Total
F	Allemagne		1	1	2
	Belgique			1	1
	Croatie			1	1
	Danemark			2	2
	Espagne		2	1	3
	Estonie			1	1
	Finlande		1		1
	France			4	4
	Hongrie			2	2
	Italie			2	2
	Lettonie			1	1
	Lituanie			1	1
	Roumanie		1	1	2
	Royaume-Uni		1	1	2
	Slovénie			1	1
	Suède			1	1
F Total			6	21	27
M	Allemagne		1	3	4
	Belgique	1	2	6	9
	Bulgarie			1	1
	Danemark			2	2
	Espagne		1	2	3
	Estonie		1	1	2
	Finlande			1	1
	France			3	3
	Grèce		1	2	3
	Irlande		1		1
	Italie	1		3	4
	Lettonie			1	1
	Lituanie			1	1
	Malte			1	1
	Pays-Bas			2	2
	Pologne			1	1
	Portugal			3	3
	Royaume-Uni			1	1
Slovaquie			1	1	
République tchèque			1	1	
M Total		2	7	36	45
Grand Total		2	13	57	72