



# 2014 Discharge

## Questionnaire to the European Ombudsman

### General

**1. Which measures were taken during 2014 to make the Institution more cost efficient and to reduce overall costs of the Institution? How much savings were made in 2014 from which budget lines? Could it be indicated for which purpose these savings were used/ or transferred to other budget lines?**

In line with the Ombudsman's new strategy, substantial savings were made on the budget lines for translation (EUR 190,500) and communication (EUR 60,000) by reducing the size of documents to be translated and by adapting our communications documents. The Ombudsman used these savings to reinforce the budget line for staff salaries which helped to cover the additional expenditure on remuneration resulting from the 2012 salary increase decided by the budgetary authority in 2014.

**2. Could the Ombudsman outline the cost-effective and sustainable measures in place for the Ombudsman's premises?**

The Ombudsman occupies office space in buildings managed by the European Parliament, giving economies of scale through inter-institutional cooperation. The Ombudsman does not need extra staff to manage its own premises and benefits from all services put in place by Parliament. Sustainability measures made by the European Parliament are therefore also applicable to the European Ombudsman. The Ombudsman has limited control over its premises, but in 2016 she will make more efficient use of the rented office space through greater office sharing and reduced storage space. These measures are already being implemented (office sharing and archive management for instance) but the future approach will be more systematic .

**3. How did the Institution meet the principle of green public procurement in 2014?**

The European Ombudsman's Office organises only a very limited number of public procurement procedures, participating instead in inter-institutional public procurement, leading to economies of scale in terms of organisation, and better offers through linking with large institutions with considerable purchasing power. We therefore rely on the leading institutions to respect the principle of green public procurement.



The rare tenders which are organised by the Ombudsman directly usually concern small amounts of less than EUR 15,000 or exceptionally of less than EUR 60,000. In such tenders we try to invite local tenderers whenever the need to meet the contractor regularly is of importance and when the cost and impact of travel or transportation would be considerable. We also require the use of sustainable material when possible.

**4. What were the expenditures in 2014 for the management/ Court sentences of harassment cases?**

None

**5. What would the expected savings be if the Ombudsman's staff was to be transferred from Strasbourg to Brussels?**

The Ombudsman's Office has no parallel structures that were created due to the presence of staff both in Strasbourg and in Brussels. Over time, an increasing number of staff have been located in Brussels although the larger number remains in Strasbourg. The founding Ombudsman statute directed that the seat of the European Ombudsman should be the seat of the European Parliament. Any move to change this would be a political matter and outside the control of the Ombudsman.

**Salaries:** The salary costs of staff assigned to Strasbourg are an additional payment EUR 411,000 per year corresponding to the co-efficient weighting for France, in line with the Staff Regulations, and determined on a yearly basis by EUROSTAT. The current weighting for Strasbourg is 114,6% (116,8% in 2014), compared to 100% in Brussels. At the same time, half of the 41 staff members in Strasbourg do not receive the expatriation allowance (16%), to which they would be entitled to in Brussels if the same staff were to move there (EUR 171.000 per year). Today, the overall savings in terms of salaries would thus amount to approximately **EUR - 240,000** per year.

**Missions:** In 2014, the Ombudsman and her staff went on 157 missions to Brussels and on 55 missions to Strasbourg. The overall cost was EUR 126,000. Since March 2015, the Ombudsman herself has opted to receive no daily allowance while on mission in Brussels.

As at least half of the travel time takes place during office hours an approximation of EUR 60,000 could represent the working time lost. Moving the staff to Brussels would therefore save approximately **EUR - 186,000** per year.

**Rent:** The rent per square metre paid by the Ombudsman to Parliament for the premises in Strasbourg is lower than the rent paid to Parliament in Brussels. The additional office space that would be needed in Brussels would require an increase of appropriations of approximately **EUR + 231,000** per year.

**In summary, the yearly savings that could be expected would amount to EUR 195,000.**



This calculation does not take into consideration the one-time cost of moving 41 staff members to Brussels (possibly up to EUR 750,000 in individual entitlements). It does however also not include any costing figure for the benefits of having the team in one place in terms of synergies and increased collaboration.

**6. Can the Ombudsman provide a comparative analysis of the evolution of complaints for the following items in the last five years: national origin of complaints, subject matter, against whom, average time to solve complaints etc.**

The Ombudsman receives complaints. If a complaint is not inside the Ombudsman's mandate and/or it does not fulfil the relevant admissibility conditions, the Ombudsman rejects the complaint. The case/file is thus closed.

Whenever a complaint is inside the mandate and it fulfils the admissibility conditions, the Ombudsman may open an inquiry. This involves taking further steps in the case and carrying out a substantive assessment of the allegations, claims and arguments presented in the case. In a small proportion of inquiry cases, the Ombudsman exercises her power to open inquiries at her own initiative (OII). Such inquiries may be directly based on complaints that she has received, or involve systemic issues in line with the new Ombudsman strategy.

The statistical information is contained in the Annual Reports. The relevant data is compiled in Annex 1.

**7. The number of inquiries closed by the ombudsman in 2014 significantly fell from 461 to 40 and for the first year since 2011. Can the Ombudswoman provide the reasons for this change of trend?**

The evolution of inquiries opened and closed since 2010 is the following:

- 2010: 335 inquiries opened – 326 inquiries closed
- 2011: 396 inquiries opened – 318 inquiries closed
- 2012: 465 inquiries opened – 390 inquiries closed
- 2013: 350 inquiries opened – 461 inquiries closed

2014: 342 inquiries opened – 400 inquiries closed

The number of inquiries closed in a given year is closely connected to the number of inquiries opened in the previous year. Therefore, since there was an exceptional number of inquiries opened in 2012 (465) a similar number of inquiries were closed in 2013. The fact that the Ombudsman closed 400 (not 40) inquiries in 2014 is also positive since it is higher than the inquiries opened in 2013, and therefore reflects the fact that the office closed 'old cases' thereby reducing the backlog as explained in the reply to question 8 below.

In line with the new Strategy, resources were invested in Own Initiative Inquiries that achieve more systematic and systemic impact and that often bundle together several individual complaints. This obviously had an impact on the Office's capacity to close even more inquiries.



The impact of more systemic inquiries will further technically reduce the number of inquiries closed in 2015 since many individual complaints have been closed as 'no grounds' cases as the issue at stake is already dealt with through an own initiative inquiry. This happened, for example, during the OII on the transparency of the TTIP negotiations where many complaints about the Commission's refusal to release certain documents could be prevented. The success of this OII also significantly limited the number of complaints in this area as the Commission began proactively to release many records that might previously have been refused. The Ombudsman therefore considers this a highly efficient use of her resources.

#### **New method of workload calculation - 2016**

In order to capture better the workload involved in OIIs and many other admissible cases requiring a thorough legal analysis, significant research and investigation, but not necessarily grounds for the requesting of an opinion from an institution, as from 2016, the office will reclassify these cases as inquiries. As a result, the number of inquiries opened and closed in 2016 and beyond is likely to increase and will represent a more accurate picture of the workload of the inquiries units dealing with citizens' complaints.

The relevant parliament committees will be notified before this adjustment begins in 2016, and the relevant explanation will be provided in the corresponding Annual Report and/or Annual Activity Report.

#### **8. Although the Ombudswoman has improved the average duration of cases closed in 2013, it keeps nevertheless a high level (27%) of cases closed after more than 18 years which is below the target figure of 90%. Has the Ombudswoman put in place measures to reduce the high level of cases closed well beyond one year?**

The percentage of cases closed after 18 months was 73%, i.e. below the target of 90%. This is due to the fact that, for the third year running, efforts were made in 2014 to complete as many as possible of the inquiries that had been ongoing for more than two years. Paradoxically, however, the very success of this effort had a negative effect on the relevant result as cases that had been open for a long time were closed and thus taken into account in the calculation of this KPI.

With the very limited resources available, the office continues to make every effort to close old cases while ensuring that no new backlog is created.

In line with the Strategy Towards 2019, the office has developed new KPIs and set itself the ambitious target of closing 50% of its inquiries within 6 months and 80% within 18 months.

At the end of the third quarter of 2015, both targets were exceeded, i.e. respectively 52% and 82%.



**9. The proportion of cases in which the admissibility decision is taken within one month has not reached the 90 % target. Can the Ombudswoman provide arguments for this underperformance?**

The percentage of cases in which the admissibility decision was taken within one month (KPI 2, second aspect) decreased in 2014 to 73% (compared to 89% in 2013). This is a temporary phenomenon linked to the introduction of a new complaint management software system at the end of May 2014. The transition involved a one-week suspension of the handling of new complaints in order to put the new system in place and train staff. A month by month analysis of the figures shows that the rate was at 28% for the single month of June but increased to 86% again in December.

Continuous efforts are being made to decide on admissibility as rapidly as possible. At the end of the third quarter of 2015, the result was 87%, i.e. close to the target of 90%.

**10. Has the creation of the new figure of own initiative coordinator had an impact on the Key Performance Indicators, in particular the number of inquiries closed and the admissibility decision taken within one month?**

The OII coordinator role was established in Spring 2014 to assist the Ombudsman in her efforts to achieve the strategic objectives of visibility, impact and relevance set out in the Strategy – Towards 2019.

As regards the KPIs included in the Annual Management Plan 2014, the most pertinent ones as regards the work of the OII coordinator are:

KPI 5 (Number of systemic own-initiative inquiries launched)

With a target of 6, a total of 9 systemic OIIs were launched in 2014, covering issues such as the transparency of the TTIP negotiations, the respect of fundamental rights in EU cohesion policy, the composition of Commission expert groups, whistleblowing, transparency of clinical trial data, and respect for fundamental rights in forced returns operated by Frontex.

KPI 6 (Provide our external stakeholders with timely, useful and easily accessible information)

As regards the frequency and significance of external stakeholders contacted, one can note that with a target of 24 press releases, 25 were published in 2014, 8 of which concerned systemic OIIs.

**Number of press cuttings in 2014 that covered systemic OIIs**

Number of press articles per topic:

TTIP = 180

EMA = 169

Conflicts of interests (revolving doors) = 54

EULEX = 43

Expert groups = 38

FRONTEX = 37



Total number of press articles in 2014 = 1.850

Total number of press articles in 2014 on systemic OIIs = 521

% of articles on systemic OIIs compared to overall amount of press articles in 2014 = 28%

As regards KPI 2, the proportion of cases in which the admissibility decision is taken within one month is irrelevant to systemic OIIs, as no admissibility decision is required. As regards KPI 3 (the proportion of inquiries closed within (i) 12 months and (ii) 18 months), it can be noted that out of the 9 systemic OIIs opened in 2014, one was closed within three weeks (OI/15/2014/PMC), one in just over 3 months (OI/11/2014/RA), one in just over 5 months (OI/10/2014/RA), one in 6.5 months (OI/9/2014/MHZ), one in just over 7 months (OI/1/2014/PMC), one in 1 year (OI/8/2014/AN) and one in 16 months (OI/7/2014/NF). Two are ongoing (OI/3/2014/FOR and OI/6/2014/NF).

**11. Does the Ombudswoman consider that the target figures for KPI 6 (external stakeholder contacted), in particular the number of press releases, events and press cuttings, are relevant to the objective?**

Until 2014, the Ombudsman used KPI 6 to measure how external stakeholders were provided with timely, useful and easily accessible information. KPI 6 gave target figures for press releases, press cuttings, visitors to the website, advice given through the interactive guide, stakeholder events, queries from the European Network of Ombudsmen (ENO), and discussions on the ENO extranet.

In 2015, the Ombudsman reformed all KPIs with a view to making them more relevant as regards the measurement of the key strategic objectives.

In relation to the old KPI 6, the following changes were introduced:

New KPI 5: The Ombudsman keeps track of the number of media articles as this remains an important tool to measure "visibility. On top of this, a new measurement of "Twitter engagement" was added to reflect the growing importance of social media activities.

New KPI 6: The Ombudsman keeps measuring unique visitors to the website and advice given through the interactive guide.

New KPI 1: The Ombudsman introduced a new stakeholder survey which replaced the number of events/meetings with stakeholders.

The Ombudsman no longer counts the number of ENO queries and discussions on the ENO Extranet in the framework of her KPIs.

Conclusion: The Ombudsman agrees that the old KPI 6 as well as other old KPIs had deficiencies as regards relevance. She, therefore, reformed the KPIs with a view to better measuring the impact, relevance and visibility of her work in 2015.



**12. The number of complaints outside the mandate of the Ombudswoman compared to the number of complaints inside the mandate remains very high in some Member States (i.e., Spain or Poland). This can lead to frustration among complainants and is due sometimes to the fact that citizens are not aware of the competences of the Ombudswoman. Has the Ombudswoman put in place measures to try to reduce these disparities? Which communication policy has developed to address this issue?**

The rate of complaints that are outside the mandate is not abnormal. Even in a national context, parliamentary ombudsmen receive a large proportion of correspondence / complaints outside their remit because citizens are not fully aware of the extent of that remit. Citizens understandably have even greater difficulties understanding the remit of the European Ombudsman, in particular because they often contact the Office on the presumption that it can handle all grievances related to 'the EU', including the implementation of EU law in the Member States. The interactive guide on our website is the most powerful tool to direct complainants to the competent problem solving mechanism in the EU and beyond. They save time and energy and immediately get the correct weblink, address and telephone number of the competent national or regional ombudsman, SOLVIT, or similar. The Ombudsman therefore considers that this offers a very valuable service to citizens even though it does not lead to within mandate complaints.

In order to reduce the number of outside mandate complaints, since 2012, contacts with the Polish national ombudsman office were intensified (notably through transfers of complaints), which should in theory, help the national office to better help Polish citizens to understand what the EO can and cannot do. A second example, concerning Spain, is a novel feature introduced and now used several times: instead of registering so-called mass complaints and writing back to individuals, a single outgoing message is put on the internet (usually in petitions.org). This significantly spreads the message about the competences of the European Ombudsman.

Ultimately, you cannot prevent citizens with a grievance from complaining to the Ombudsman, even if the interactive guide clearly indicates that we are not the competent body. However, as noted above, many citizens are ultimately helped by the Ombudsman by being directed to the appropriate national or other authority.

Through our outreach work (media, social media, events, visits to the Member States, closer cooperation with ENO, publication "Who can help you?" in 24 languages, etc.) we try to communicate our mandate and thus minimise out of mandate complaints.



## Staff

**13. The new staff regulations entered into force on the 1st of January 2014. Could you explain how the 5% staff reduction is being implemented by the Ombudsman?**

In order to meet the 5% staff reduction target, the Ombudsman has to reduce its establishment plan by three posts. This is implemented by the Ombudsman through the reduction of one post per year in 2015, 2016 and 2017.

**14. The new career structure was a new element after the reform of the EU Staff Regulation. Promotion for normal AD staff should only be possible until AD 12. As of AD 13, promotion should be linked to a management position. Supposedly there will be a new category of senior experts and senior assistants who have access to AD 13 - AD 14 and AST 10 - AST 11, respectively. How many senior experts and senior assistants in which grades do you employ or plan to appoint? Will you inform the Parliament on a regular basis about new appointments?**

In 2014 the Ombudsman did not employ any senior assistant and the institution's establishment plan does not foresee assistant positions of a grade higher than AST 8.

One temporary post was occupied at an AD 13 grade before the adoption of the new career structure. It continued to be occupied at that level in 2014. In 2015 that post became permanent and was filled at a lower grade. The Ombudsman currently does not have AD 13 or AD 14 officials or agents. At this stage there is no plan to appoint senior experts at grade AD 13 or AD 14. If so requested the Ombudsman would inform Parliament of developments in appointments at grades AD 13 and AD 14 for non-managers.

**15. How many officials worked in the institution in 2014? Could the Ombudsman provide the Parliament with the table of all human resources broken down by nationality, gender and grade? Please specify the position of the Heads of Unit, Directors and Director-Generals.**

On 31/12/2014, 39 officials, 29 temporary agents and 8 contract agents worked in the Institution.

Table of all Human Resources broken down by nationality and gender on 31/12/2014

Nationality	Male	Female	Total
BE	3	2	5
AT		1	1
CZ	1		1
DA	1		1
DE	4	2	6
ES	1	2	3
FI	1	1	2
FR	5	17	22
GR	2	4	6





Nationality	Male	Female	Total
HU	1	1	2
IE	4	1	5
IT	1	3	4
MT		1	1
NL		1	1
PL		2	2
PT	3	1	4
RO		1	1
SE		1	1
SI		2	2
SL	1		1
UK		3	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>74</b>

Table of all Human Resources broken down by grade and gender on 31/12/2014

Grade AD	Male	Female
AD16	1	
AD15	2	
AD14		
AD13	1	
AD12	2	1
AD11	1	1
AD10		1
AD9	3	4
AD8	1	
AD7	1	2
AD6	1	2
AD5	6	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>

Grade AST	Male	Female
AST11		
AST10		
AST9		
AST8	1	
AST7	1	
AST6	1	1
AST5	2	4
AST4		4



Grade AST	Male	Female
AST3		5
AST2	1	
AST1	3	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>21</b>

Grade Contract	Male	Female
GIII	1	1
GII		3
GI	2	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>

Specification of the position of the Heads of Unit, Directors and Directors General

	grade	nationality	male	female
Director General	AD16	UK	1	
Directors	AD 15	DE + PT	2	
Heads of Unit	AD12	IE + GR	2	
	AD12	PL		1
	AD11	IE	1	
	AD9	DE + UK + DA	3	
	AD9	SE		1
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>



Important gender balance improvements have been achieved in 2015 in the AD grades and particularly among managers. The manager situation on 31/12/2015 is the following: male (5) and female (5), in comparison with male (9) and female (2) one year earlier. There has also been a reduction in managers, from eleven (11) to ten (10).

**16. Can the institution provide the details on how it recruits its staff? How many staff members were recruited following an EPSO competition in 2014? How many staff members have been recruited without passing any competition in 2014? How many staff members have been recruited by tempo working agencies in 2014? Could the institution provide detailed information on the different systems in place to recruit staff? Please specify how many recruitments of Heads of Unit, Directors and Directors' General have the Ombudsman organised in 2014 and how many women and men were selected as Heads of Unit, Directors and Director- General in that year.**

#### **Staff recruitment in the Ombudsman's office**

##### Selection of 5 officials

In order to fill permanent positions of officials, the Ombudsman published vacancies on 5 occasions. Two selections were unsuccessful. One selection led to the appointment of three officials, one by way of transfer from the European Commission and two were recruited from EPSO reserve lists. Two other selection procedures led to the appointment of candidates who had succeeded in internal competitions organised in 2011 and 2013.

All officials were recruited after having passed either an EPSO or an internal competition.

##### Selection of 8 temporary agents

One temporary agent was recruited for an indefinite period in the Ombudsman's cabinet and selected personally by the Ombudsman and her Head of Cabinet.

The other temporary agents were recruited for definite periods. Three temporary agents were selected from lists established by EPSO. Two temporary agents were selected from list previously established by the Ombudsman in order to secure the services of lawyer linguists. Finally two temporary agents were recruited by way of urgency for short term contracts in order to replace staff who had left on short notice, both had been former trainees in the Ombudsman's office.

##### Recruitment of one contract agent

One candidate who had succeeded in an internal administrator competition for a permanent position was offered a contract agent position.

#### **How many staff has been recruited on 2014 following an EPSO competition?**



The 2014 selections led to the appointment as officials of two EPSO laureates and three temporary agents who had previously been tested by EPSO.

#### **Staff recruited without competition.**

Three temporary agents have been recruited in 2014 without passing a formal selection procedure at some stage.

#### **Detailed information on the different systems in place to recruit**

The European Ombudsman recruits via internal, interinstitutional and external publication of notices of vacancies, via EPSO lists, via EPSO CAST lists, internal competitions or external selection procedures organised by the Ombudsman. Exceptionally the Ombudsman fills posts, for a short duration, by way of urgency without having organised a formal selection of the recruited candidate.

#### **Recruitment of Head of Units, Directors and Directors General in 2014**

Two vacancies for Head of Unit positions were published internally in 2014. Both led to the appointment of candidates who had previously passed internal competitions for such positions in 2011 and 2013. One further position of Head of Unit was filled in the Cabinet of the Ombudsman. Two out of the three new Heads of Unit selected in 2014 are women.

#### **17. What is the total number of temporary staff hired in 2014 and what are the total costs for temporary staff broken down by the type of service they provide?**

Eight temporary agents were recruited in 2014, 6 under Article 2b, 1 under Article 2a and 1 under Article 2c of the Staff Regulations.

The total cost of temporary staff employed by the institution in 2014 is the following:

2014	Sum of Cost/year	Sum of FTE
Cabinet & Management	€845.711,89	6,32
Legal Officers	€784.281,26	6,91
Assistants	€662.555,18	10,58
ITC officers	€198.430,95	2,00
<b>Total</b>	<b>€2.490.979,28</b>	<b>25,81</b>

#### **18. What is the procedure to select temporary staff? Do applicants have an appeal right with what regards the rejection of their application? If no, are you envisaging putting into place an appeal procedure?**

##### **What is the procedure to select temporary staff?**

The European Ombudsman has its own decision concerning the filling of temporary posts in the European Ombudsman's establishment plan (Annex 2). For historical reasons, namely the overwhelming number of temporary posts in the Ombudsman's establishment plan before changes in the recent years, this



decision did not foresee provisions as to the recruitment of temporary agents on permanent posts. A new decision setting out provisions to recruit temporary staff on permanent position is being prepared.

**Do applicants have an appeal right with what regards the rejection of their application?**

Applicants have a right to appeal. When selections are organised and rejection letters dispatched, the latter contain a reference to this right and candidates are invited to submit appeals before a given date.

## **Buildings**

**19. Has the institution established a CO2 offsetting budget line? How much did the institution spend in 2014 for the CO2 emission? And how much would have been needed to have a fully offset funding covering all direct and indirect emissions?**

The European Ombudsman does not have such a budget line and does not have the internal resources to provide the requested information.

Furthermore, assuming that the premises are the main source of CO2 emissions, the European Ombudsman does not have its own services for the management of the buildings the institution occupies. The institution rents office space in Parliament buildings. The requested information would therefore presumably form part of the information Parliament could provide on this aspect.

**20. How much electricity did the Institution use in 2014? How does it correlate to the usage of the previous years? How many percent of the total usage was coming from renewable energy resources? How much did the Institution pay for the electricity? Did the Institution invest into solar or wind energy to support its energy needs? How much did the Institution invest in energy efficiency in 2014?**

The European Ombudsman does not have its own services for the management of the buildings the institution occupies. The institution rents office space in Parliament buildings and pays a lump sum per m2 for rent + charges. Our services do not have information as to the institution's actual consumption. To limit the use of resources we follow the expert advice of the services in Parliament, we will continue to do so and will reinforce our attention to this aspect in the future, in particular when adopting policies on the use of IT and of office space.

## **Translation and interpretation**

**21. What were the costs for translation and interpretation ordered by the Ombudsman for year 2014?**

The Ombudsman spent EUR 389,000 for translations in 2014.



## **Missions and travels + Away days, conferences and other events**

**22. Could the Ombudsman provide the Parliament with the list of costs for away days, conferences and other events for the staff for year 2014?**

The 2014 appropriations for internal meetings and missions were used to organise one away day, for a total cost of EUR 26,900 € and two staff meetings for a total cost of EUR 7,700.

## **Pensions**

**23. What was the amount of the highest pensions for officials of your institution paid in 2014? What was the average pension paid in 2014 for officials of your institution? What is the average pension paid for officials of your institution who retired in 2014?**

In 2014 the Ombudsman did not have retired officials or agents. By the end of 2015, three officials or agents will have retired, but their pension is neither calculated by the Ombudsman's Office nor paid out of the Ombudsman's budget. The Ombudsman would therefore not be in a position to provide the requested information.

## **Annexes**

Annex 1: Statistical information referring to question 6

Annex 2: Internal rules concerning the filling of temporary posts in the Ombudsman's establishment plan.



## Annex 1

### Evolution of complaints in the last five years: national origin

The figures in the table refer to of all complaints received in the relevant period.

Country	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Luxembourg	34	29	39	34	20
Cyprus	22	26	30	27	16
Belgium	207	190	182	153	147
Malta	9	7	14	7	11
Slovenia	34	28	31	27	29
Latvia	21	9	16	9	12
Bulgaria	63	71	66	73	66
Slovakia	43	29	34	31	17
Spain	349	361	340	416	309
Ireland	32	38	50	47	61
Finland	39	31	25	34	33
Portugal	71	71	77	70	74
Estonia	9	3	7	6	3
Czech Republic	63	64	42	29	36
Lithuania	20	18	23	21	14
Greece	65	53	74	67	78
Austria	48	52	45	38	40
Poland	214	233	235	248	208
Hungary	51	47	76	70	44
Germany	375	308	273	269	219
The Netherlands	60	44	51	67	41
Sweden	32	41	38	35	23
Romania	73	42	58	59	65
Denmark	16	23	34	7	17
France	171	167	138	135	98
Italy	132	97	118	108	125
United Kingdom	132	141	162	139	127
Others <sup>1</sup>	131	137	138	82	103
Unknown <sup>2</sup>	151	150	26	93	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>2667</b>	<b>2510</b>	<b>2442</b>	<b>2401</b>	<b>2051</b>

<sup>1</sup> Other than EU Member States

<sup>2</sup> In some complaints, the complainant only provides her/his name and electronic address. In some of those cases, the origin of the complaint cannot be identified.



### Evolution of complaints the last five years: subject matter

The figures in the table relate to the subject-matter of all inquiries opened in the relevant period (own-initiative inquiries indicated in brackets).

NB: One inquiry may involve more than one subject matter.

Subject Matter	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Administration and Staff Regulations	39 (2)	62 (5)	65 (11)	76 (1)	45 (2)
Award of tenders or grants	20 (2)	26	26 (3)	44 (1)	33 (3)
Competition and selection procedures (including trainees)	39 (3)	43 (5)	82 (8)	68 (3)	77
Dealing with requests for information and access to documents (Transparency)	107	80 (9)	84 (5)	118 (3)	86 (3)
Execution of contracts	24 (2)	23 (5)	17 (7)	34 (2)	24 (2)
Institutional and policy matters	46 (3)	36 (7)	45 (6)	81 (2)	64 (9)
EC as Guardian of the treaties Article 258 of the TFEU -ex Article 226 of the EC Treaty	51	48 (1)	84 (1)	88	77





### Evolution of complaints in the last five years: against whom

The figures in the table indicate the number of inquiries opened per institution.

Institution	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
European Commission	219	231	245	225	204
EPSO	35	42	78	25	32
Parliament	22	16	24	15	12
Council of the EU	6	10	3	7	5
Court of Justice	4	3	3	6	3
EIB	2	4	7	10	4
EEAS			14	14	13
Other <sup>3</sup>	50	97	84	99 <sup>4</sup>	75 <sup>5</sup>

### Evolution of complaints in the last five years: average time to solve (close) inquiries (excluding own initiative inquiries)

Inquiries	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Average in months	9	10	11	13	11

<sup>3</sup> Other addressees of inquiries included in particular EU agencies, but also other EU institutions, bodies and offices.

<sup>4</sup> EU Agencies 84

<sup>5</sup> EU Agencies 47