



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Committee on Budgetary Control

07.12.2012

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

to Catherine Ashton

Committee on Budgetary Control

1. The political dimension of the Cotonou Agreement states that the parties shall have regular dialogues on developments on human rights and the rule of law. In countries where political prisoners and prisoners of conscience are held, how can the dialogue be more fruitful? What will Catherine Ashton do to ensure the fundamental rights of these prisoners if the dialogue does not advance?
2. In regards to the Foreign Affairs Council Conclusions of 19 November 2012, will the EU abandon the Common Position on EU-Cuba relations? After the death of another dissident in Cuba in March 2010, the European Parliament put forward a resolution against Cuba and calling for the release of political prisoners. How would such a dialogue be possible without clear objectives to encourage a process of transition to a pluralist democracy and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms?
3. What is the legal basis for the mandate of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC?
4. Who defines – and how - what EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC may do?
5. What were the budgets for EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC respectively in 2010 and 2011?
6. Of what specific areas of expenditure do the budgets of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC consist, and what were the amounts in each case?
7. How many staff in which pay categories and from which Member States were working for EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC in 2010 and 2011?
8. How are the budget and staff requirements for EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC calculated?
9. Are any of the costs of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC borne directly by the Member States? If so, which costs, and what are the amounts in question?
10. Who is responsible for the internal audit of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC, and how does this process work?
11. Does the European Court of Auditors have the power to audit the expenditure of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC?
12. Was the expenditure of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC covered by the investigation by the European Court of Auditors?
13. Does OLAF have the power, where sufficient suspicion exists, to look into events at EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC and to carry out investigations into their staff?

14. Does OLAF have the power, where sufficient suspicion exists, to search the premises of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC?
15. Who may request products from EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC, and who decides which products are sent to whom?
16. What types of product do EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC offer, and who requires each of these products?
17. Were there any complaints concerning the products of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC in 2010 and 2011?
18. Is there a complaints process for EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC? If so, how does it work?
19. Who monitors the quality of the products of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC, and how does this quality control process work?
20. Can the quality of the products of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC be measured, and if so, has the quality risen in recent years?
21. What measures does the Vice President / High Representative consider should be taken as a priority to improve the quality of the products?
22. What monitoring is carried out to ensure that the products are used exclusively for their intended purpose?
23. How many cases does the Vice-President / High Representative know of in which the products of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC were improperly used in 2010 and 2011, and what were these cases?
24. What mechanisms exist to penalise the improper use of the products of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC?
25. How often were instances of the improper use of products of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC detected in 2010 and 2011?
26. How many requests for products were made to EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC in 2010 and 2011?
27. To how many of these requests was it possible to give a positive response?
28. How many products of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC were classified as EU TOP SECRET, EU SECRET, EU CONFIDENTIAL und EU RESTRICTED in 2010?
29. Can the products of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC contain personal data?

30. Can the Vice-President / High Representative produce a staffing plan of EUMS-INT, INTCEN, Situation Room and EUSC?
31. What action did the Vice-President / High Representative and the EEAS take in 2011 in the area of Freedom of Religion and Belief (FORB) and/or the protection of religious minorities? What specific appropriations were used in this area?

The construction of the EEAS

32. Do you have some concrete measures to ensure better synergies between the EEAS and DEVCO and EEAS and national diplomacies?
33. Do you plan to establish a code of conduct for the Delegations to follow when contracting works, the supply of goods and services and the provision of services in general?
34. How well is the EEAS able to respond to rapidly changing circumstances in specific countries and how well adapted is the expenditure capacity and financial management to the need for ever changing focus, furthermore how well do EU Delegations cooperate with the diplomatic missions of the EU Member States and their foreign ministries?
35. The information note of the Court of Auditors indicates that the most likely error rate for the group 'external relations, aid and enlargement' is 1,1%. Could you inform on us the error rates for the specific groups?
36. Delegations with only one EEAS AD official - how many are they? Not being Head of Unit that AD could not incur into administrative expenses. If that situation does not change, how do you plan to solve the problem?
37. Professional organisations represented in EU delegations: How many joint meetings of the offices of Heads of Delegation and Regional Security Officers took place in 2011, and how long did each take, including journey time? How many people participated in each of these meetings?
38. Double coordination: Why do the Council Working Groups still exist, even though [the tasks of] their staff are also represented in the EEAS? What is the VP/HR doing to eliminate this double coordination of the same European foreign policy, which European taxpayers are having to pay for twice over?
39. In 2010 the VP/HR stated that she intended to do away completely with the Special Representatives. Now there are 11 – two of them from 2010, five from 2011, answering principally to the Council, as laid down in the Council Regulations. What influence does the VP/HR have on the Special Representatives? How were they selected? How are they paid? What is the budget for each of the Special Representatives that existed in 2011, and from what budget line are they funded? How many staff posts are there per Special Representative? At what grades? What are the

travel costs of the Special Representatives? And of their staff? The Council Regulations give the Special Representatives wide-ranging powers to (directly) recruit staff. How were these posts filled? By whom? Who manages the budget? Where do the Special Representatives have their respective headquarters? Are they required to live there? How do they work with the delegations and the Heads of Delegation, in cases where there is no sharing of staff?

40. How does the EEAS ensure its input in Heading 4 expenditure, particularly for the CSFP and the stability instrument and then how does the administrative support to the EEAS by Commission and GS Council work in practice?
41. In the first part of the EEAS Annual Activity Report 2011 – an outline of foreign policy – the Special Representatives are all mentioned by name. None of the EU ambassadors are. Do they have no role to play in shaping EU foreign policy?
42. What costs were incurred for the EEAS by the organisation and coordination of the Special Representatives?
43. How many Senior Coordinators are there? Where? How are they paid? How many staff do they have? What costs were incurred for the EEAS by the organisation and coordination of the Senior Coordinators?
44. What direct and indirect costs were incurred for the EEAS by the organisation and coordination of the EU Training Missions?
45. What direct and indirect costs were incurred for the EEAS by the organisation and coordination of the CSDP Missions?
46. In September 2011 the Special Investigative Task Force (SITF) started work. What direct and indirect costs did it incur in 2011? Can you supply a breakdown of these costs?
47. What direct and indirect costs were incurred for the EEAS by the organisation and coordination of the EU Monitoring Missions? What other costs were incurred by missions?
48. Are there any procedures set up for heads of Delegations before taking up their duties to "complete specific training courses on the tasks and responsibilities of authorising officers and the implementation of the budget"?
49. Were the heads of Delegations' annual activity reports and the statements of assurance on the internal management and control systems within their Delegations transmitted to the European Parliament?
50. Are there any rules for heads of Delegations to act as authorising officers to ensure that they take all the measures necessary to prevent "any conflict of priorities which is likely to have an impact on the implementation of the financial management tasks sub-delegated to them"?

51. Are there any examples in year 2011 of conflicts of interest where head of Delegations informed the responsible directors-general of the Commission and of the EEAS? If yes, were all the appropriate steps taken to remedy the situation? How fast did the Service and the Commission react?
52. What kind of services was agreed under Service level Agreements (SLA) and how many SLA have been made?
53. Which measures did the EEAS put in place to overcome the weaknesses detected by the ECA concerning procurement?
54. The table presenting the Delegations IC compliance self-assessment (31.12.2011) gives the results for 131 Delegations. What happened to the missing 9 (there are 140 delegations, right?)? In the annual activity report there is never the feedback of the totality of the Delegations. Why is it so?
55. Fifty-seven percent of the Heads of EU Delegations consider that the qualifications of their staff in the operational field and in the areas of finance, control and auditing are inadequate to perform their tasks.
- a. What is the EEAS's view of the qualifications of its staff in the individual delegations?
 - b. Does the EEAS consider there are serious shortcomings in the qualifications of its staff?
 - c. How does the EEAS propose to identify and eliminate existing shortcomings in future?
 - d. What measures are being and have already been taken?
 - e. To what extent is it possible to draw conclusions from the Heads of Delegation on this matter about the performance of the individual delegations?
 - f. What other options has the EEAS discussed to measure the adequacy of staff qualifications? To what extent have these options been discussed with the Commission?
56. What criteria are used to allocate staff members to the individual delegations?
57. How is the allocation of staff members to the individual delegations evaluated?
58. What measures has the EEAS taken to evaluate management structures?
59. What specific reports have been demanded from the Heads of the EU Delegations?
60. How does the EEAS justify the payment of around EUR 700 000 to Iran in 2011?
61. FPI Management: How does FPI management at the Commission work and how is it coordinated with the EEAS? Who decides on the expenditure? What were the

administrative costs for FPI management at the Commission in 2011? And at the EEAS?

62. Are there any concerns regarding the reliability of the statistics and the Annual Activity Reports of the Delegations due to the fact that 2011 was the first year of full operation?

Staffing

63. Transference of staff from the general Secretariat of the Council and from the Commission - why exclude staff from the other European institutions and have it included in the article 27 of the Treaty?
64. The EEAS organisation chart is quite special/peculiar. Can you explain the duties of the corporate board, especially those of the current Executive Secretary?
65. How many posts did the EEAS have to fill in 2011?
66. According to the Staff Regulation when the EEAS is fully set up and reaches its full capacity, 1/3 of the AD staff has to be from the national diplomatic services. Is this goal reached?
67. Statement in the annual activity report 2011: "...target of having one third of its entire AD staff recruited from Member States by (...) mid 2013." - How far are you from this target?
68. How many staff working in Brussels or Luxembourg were invited to interviews?
69. How many candidates were invited to interviews in Brussels from places other than Brussels, the rest of Belgium and Luxembourg in 2011?
70. How many people, on average, were present at the interviews as participants in the selection process or observers?
71. What is happening to the speed of filling vacancies in delegations? Does it now take longer than in previous years and are there consequences with regard to implementation of activities and expenditure? What is the trend in numbers of people willing to work in delegations? Are there more or less than in the past and what consequences does this have? What conclusions can be drawn from the experience of recruitment of MS diplomats?
72. In 2011 out of the 1.643 permanent and temporary posts at the EEAS, 723 were AST and 920 were holding an AD level position. There is no other institution with such high rate of AD posts. What is the reason for that?

73. The regulation says that EEAS staff should comprise an "appropriate and meaningful presence of nationals from all the Member States". Out of the 1643 posts for year 2011 how many positions were filled by citizens of the new Member States? Is the requirement of the geographical balance fulfilled?
74. What have you done/will you do to correct the time gap between the conclusion of contracts with temporary staff and their taking up of duties, following the ECA observation?
75. According to the ECA analysis of the salary paid to three temporary staff out of a sample of eight audited showed that the contracts of employment were signed by both parties between three and seven months after the staff members had taken up their duties. Was any salary or benefits paid to these temporary staff during the period when no contract was signed? If yes, then how is it possible that staff without a valid contract receives salary from a European institution?
76. The Service's answer states that the EEAS will take the necessary steps to ensure that such cases do not re-occur in the future. What are the guarantees that all the staff of the EEAS will work with a valid contract in the future?
77. How is it possible that in six cases out of 17 audited information available to the services of the European External Action Service (EEAS) on the personal and family situation of the staff members was not up-to-date?
78. In three of these cases, it even led to incorrect payments because the amounts deducted did not reflect the latest applicable value of benefits paid by national authorities. What was the total amount incorrectly deducted? Were the incorrectly paid amounts recovered? If not, then how much is still to be recovered?
79. The Service's answer to the Court's findings was that the EEAS will request its staff to update their personal file once a year. How will this yearly update be guaranteed?
80. Which measures were taken to ensure the regular information update of the personal and family situation of the EEAS staff members?
81. What travel costs were incurred for the candidates in 2011?
82. How many candidates were invited on more than one occasion?
83. Please state the maximum number of invitations for the ten candidates with the largest number of invitations, and the places from which they travelled.
84. The Member States are supposed to supply one third of the staff of the EEAS. Please state, for new recruitments to each grade, whether the successful candidate came from the EU institutions or from the Member States.

85. Please state, for each grade in the whole EEAS, whether the post holders came from the EU institutions or from the Member States.
86. Is it true that applicants from Member States were placed in a higher grade than applicants from the EU institutions? Please state the pay grades for newly appointed EU ambassadors, political advisers etc. in 2011, broken down according to whether they originated in EU institutions or Member States.
87. Please state the nationalities of the staff at headquarters in posts from director upwards.
88. Please state the nationalities of the Heads of Delegation for each delegation.
89. Please state the number of staff in each directorate.
90. Please state the number of staff each managing director has under him or her.
91. Why was the post of Head of Personnel unoccupied for a year during the EEAS's setting-up phase? Is it a coincidence that the current holder of this post did not meet the criteria for a year, as if the post had been 'reserved'? Why was the post advertised even though it had already been decided who the successful candidate would be?
92. It is reported that some participants in EEAS selection procedures decided to withdraw because the successful candidate had allegedly already been decided in advance. Which posts were advertised even though the person to fill them had already been chosen?
93. How many of the staff members recruited left the EEAS before the end of 2011? How many of these retired? How many went to other EU institutions?
94. How many EEAS posts were unfilled, on average, in the individual delegations?
95. How many EEAS staff members, on average, were actually present at the locations of the individual delegations?
96. Can the EEAS provide Parliament with an outline of the supplements it pays for dangerous conditions? Are these different from the payments made by the Commission? If so, why?
97. How will training be carried out regarding the new Financial Regulation in place from 1 January 2013? Is there adequate training for example in dealing with budget support financing and relations with other international bodies, and can staff in delegations take advantage of it? Are the trends different for staff in different areas of work?
98. Could you provide us with the training strategy of the EEAS? How many staff operate as internal trainers (how many hours)? How many days does the staff of the EEAS spend on average on training (internal/external) in 2011? How much money does the EEAS spend on training measures in total/ per employee (contract agent/ official)? What amount of money is used for external trainers? In regard to training courses, what is the procedure for identifying the needs of staff?

99. What is the explanation for the difference in staffing levels between the military and civilian planning units at the Brussels headquarters in 2011? In view of the EU missions that were decided upon in 2011, should not more resources have been diverted to civilian planning?
100. Do you see opportunities for savings in the field of the EEAS Staff Regulations (e.g. concerning the rules on home leave for members of EU delegations)? In this connection, would you consider paying flat-rate sums rather than reimbursing the actual costs?

Financial management

101. Concerning the complexity of the administrative budget of the delegations (the Institutions own administrative budget + contributions from a myriad of different Commission budget lines) do you plan to propose concrete changes into the draft budget format to ensure that in the future you/we will get a more clear and transparent description of who is contributing to which part of that budget?
102. What economies has the EEAS been able to effect and in what expenditure areas? What has happened in terms of security-related costs? Does the EEAS now have the right number and distribution of Delegations around the world and is its budget now sufficient to meet the objectives set?
103. EEAS Smart Savings Initiative: What results were achieved in 2011? How were the savings used and/or redistributed?
104. Financial Irregularities Panel: What is the current state of play?
105. The total amount of transactions audited affected by error has risen from 23% in 2010 to 33% in 2011. What are the causes for this increase?
106. What briefings on financial management did the Heads of Delegation receive, for each delegation? How many hours did these last in total?
107. Why is the EEAS unable to detail the overall execution rate of the 2011 administrative budget, referring to the end of 2012 (!) ('The overall execution rate for 2011 will be determined at the end of 2012 when all expenditure on credits carried over has been accounted for' (p. 40, AAR)? What was the overall execution rate in 2011?
108. Why was the negotiated procedure the most used procurement procedure by the Delegations?
109. On Table 11: Why were the contracts with Argus Security Projects Ltd. for over EUR 1 million concluded using the negotiated procedure? What did these contracts concern? To which country did they relate? Why were contracts simply extended without first attempting to determine the market price? Is the EEAS aware that firms in Member States which treat EU funds in this way have to repay 100% of the sum to the EU? Can fraud be ruled out?

110. Are there still bottlenecks in terms of signatures for financial authorisations in delegations as this was reported to be a problem in 2011? Are such problems being overcome and, if so, how?
111. Was there any trend in relation to procurement activities and problems being encountered in this area of work between 2011 and 2012, and if so what are the underlying reasons?
112. Which consequences did the EEAS take after having discovered the serious problems in the management of security contracts (“absences of prior budgetary commitments, erroneous choice of tender procedures...”). Which were the 5 delegations with “insufficient opinion”?
113. The Delegation to Venezuela showed bad results in the managing of a contract for the provision of security services: a) an invoice to the monthly payment of 5340 € was wrongly endorsed as 'certified correct' whereas the services had not yet been provided; b) that security contract has been in force for 24 years without modification; c) did not recover VAT since 2000. What has been done to correct it?
114. How is it possible that contrary to Article 79 of the Financial Regulation an invoice related to the monthly payment of 5.340 EUR for the provision of security services to the Delegation to Venezuela was wrongly endorsed as ‘certified correct’ whereas these services had not yet been provided?
115. The audit also noted that the Delegation only obtained informal exemption from paying VAT, although the VAT recovery legislation had been in force in Venezuela since 2000. How much is the amount of VAT unrecovered over this period? Has this money been recovered yet?
116. The security contract has been in force for 24 years without modification. The Delegations of the EEAS are obliged to regularly tender their services contracts. How can the Service guarantee the regular tendering of the Delegations? What is the current procedure in force?
117. There are indications about similar tendering problems in Moscow. What were the exact problems with the tendering procedure of the EEAS Delegation to Russia? What has the Service done to ensure the correct tendering procedure?
118. The results of the ex-post controls show that the quality of the financial management of the administrative expenditures for 5 Delegations and 8 Headquarter Divisions were insufficient in 2011 and it was not satisfactory in 41 Delegations and at 3 Headquarter Divisions. Is the high percentage of mismanagement of administrative expenditures both in the Delegations and the Headquarter showing significant weakness of the Service's control systems? What were the consequences of the errors and mismanagement of EU budget revealed by the ex-post control?
119. Is it possible to name the 5 Delegations with the highest percentage of mismanagement of administrative expenditures?

120. What is the procedure concerning the 1.665 recommendations for the Delegations resulting from ex post controls and the 176 recommendations for the Headquarters Divisions? Is there a follow up on how the Delegations and the Headquarter is implementing the necessary measures to restore the sound financial management?
121. How much money has been recovered from the security contract for Afghanistan? What was the problem of the financial circuits for the payment of invoices in Afghanistan? Can the EEAS exclude fraud? Is the EEAS willing to provide the audit report in the secured reading room?
122. The ex ante control results state in the main findings on financial transactions that some anomalies '... relate principally: to the gradual adjustment of contracts during the transition phase from RELEX to SEAE; to compliance with the validation process (...); to the validity and availability of the supporting documents; and to some instances of amounts which were partially ineligible'. Can you explain these anomalies better? Do you consider graduating these anomalies into different levels?
123. On p. 48 there is a report on the result of ex-ante checks, according to which, in the case of two contracts, nearly EUR 1 million was clawed back. What was the subject and cost of these contracts? Are the reservations expressed by the Chief Operating Officer based on these two contracts?
124. All contracts above 60.000 € have an ex ante control function done by Unit MDR A2. Why was this threshold chosen?
125. Problem in tendering procedure: "only 50% of the files submitted by Delegations for the first request of opinion concerning calls for proposals have received a positive advice... against 90% of the Headquarter (p 50 AAR). As most of the procurements have to be done in Delegations: Which conclusions the EEAS intends to draw? How the headquarters intends to support Delegations during those procedures in often difficult countries?
126. 41% of procurement procedures in Delegations were negotiated procedures. How does the EEAS comment this very high figure and which conclusions the EEAS intends to draw?
127. 118.000 transactions were done in Delegations, 9.500 in the Headquarters: Which kind of transactions could be simplified in centralizing them in the headquarters?
128. In year 2011 an amount of 3.681.134 EUR was spent on "purchase or replacement of furniture and specialised furniture, rental of furniture during missions and meetings outside EEAS premises, maintenance and repair of furniture". It means that about 2.240 EUR per staff member was spent on furniture. What is the reason for such high amount in year 2011?
129. In year 2011 an amount of 18.389.432 EUR was spent on "computer systems and telecommunications", which means that 11.192 EUR per staff member was spent on

computer systems and telecommunication. What is the reason for such high amount in year 2011?

130. Ex-post-control-results: Delegations: Please list the ten delegations which received the most recommendations. Headquarters: Please list the 3 divisions in the Headquarters which received the most recommendations.
131. The EU Delegations share a lot of information with the Member States embassies. The “Inspections of Delegations” point out that “relations with Member States embassies were generally good”. Did the EEAS make sure that Member States also share information with the EU Delegations? How they do make that sure?
132. The Inspections of Delegations attract the attention to the inadequate building condition in Delegations. How the EEAS intend to react to these findings?
133. Can the EEAS provide the Budget Control committee with its report on the screening exercise as does the Commission every year?
134. Compliance with national tax legislation of local agents: Despite the 2009 “Guidelines for Delegations and local staff serving in third countries” tax evasion of local agents of the EU continues to be a problem, as the Court of Auditors points out. We see that the COO (Chief Operating Officer) recalls the obligations of the delegations November 20th 2012 to a proper handling of these procedures. Apart from the written recall – which other measures the EEAS intends to undertake? Which delegations are the most in danger to abet tax evasion?
135. Annual salary negotiations by the Head of Delegations: The average salary of international organizations is one of the parameters for the annual salary negotiations for the local agents. Obviously, the international organizations and the EU are in a permanent mutual competition which leads to always higher salaries. To avoid the decoupling of EU local agents from the local salary level: Is the EEAS willing to consider also the comparable salaries in the national ministries of the host country as one parameter for those negotiations?
136. What does “crossed sub-delegation” mean (AAR, p 58)?
137. Reservations of the COO in the Headquarters: There is one reservation (3.6.1) for the Headquarters management: which security contracts are supposed to be covered by this reservation?
138. Reservations of the COO in the Delegations: Which delegation had an internal control standard rate of 59%? 7 delegations have an evaluation rate of their internal control system below 50%. Please list the delegations. The COO makes a reservation (point 3.7.) for “the management of security contracts for Delegations”. Which delegations are meant by this reservation?
139. The Declaration of Assurance of the COO (part 4, p. 60) does not mention these reservations. Only persons consulting the whole document discover the reservations.

For the sake of clarity and honesty: Could the COO please mention in his next report the reservations in the declaration itself?

140. Twenty-two delegations¹ report that more than half of the resources classified as government-to-government assistance was channelled through national country systems.
- a. What specific characteristics of these countries qualified them to channel government-to-government assistance via the country systems?
 - b. How do the EU ambassadors monitor this system?
 - c. How does the EEAS justify this practice in the above-mentioned cases?
141. What has been the effect of the Euro exchange rate on the EEAS budgets in 2011 and how has the situation evolved in 2012?

Buildings

142. What are the key issues related to acquisition or rental of premises for delegations and what would enable economies to be made in this area?
143. Table 12: What other buildings does the EEAS plan to use apart from the Axa building (EUR 12.5 million per year)? For what period have KO 150, KO 158 and KO 115 (for a total of EUR 4 million per year) been extended? To what buildings do these relate?
144. The EEAS Delegations have signed various building contracts in year 2011, the amounts in the Annual Activity Report are for the whole duration of the contract without specifying the duration. Are these contracts public or available for the Budgetary Control Committee of the European Parliament? For what duration is the Service renting parking space in Afghanistan for 1.050.000 EUR, a residence in the Dominican Republic for 779.661 EUR, office in Swaziland for 1.522.883 EUR or accommodation in Pakistan for 2.959.274 EUR? What is the procedure for signing the building contracts?
145. Costs for accommodation of EU staff in third countries:
- a. Azerbaijan: 249.000 Euro were spent for “the property for Contract Agent”. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
 - b. Bolivia, 13.331 Euro, Accommodation CA. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
 - c. Brazil, 266.000 Euro, Residence for HoD. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).

¹ Ghana, Honduras, Ethiopia, Armenia, India, Tanzania, Mauritius, Moldova, Burkina Faso, Mozambique, Niger, Vietnam, Ecuador, Rwanda, Zambia, Morocco, Georgia, Namibia, South Africa, Tunisia, Jordan, Trinidad

- d. Hong Kong, 335.000 Euro, Accommodation of Official and 210.000 Euro Rent for Residence. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- e. Congo, R. D., 278.000 Euro, Accommodation official. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- f. Cuba, 468.000 Euro, Rent of Residence, Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- g. Dominican Rep., 779.000 Euro, Rent of Residence, Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- h. FYROM, 360.000 Euro, Rent of Residence, Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- i. Guinea, 39.900 Euro and 129.000 Euro, Accommodation Contract agent, please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- j. Haiti, 237.000 Euro, accommodation official and 108.000 Euro accommodation contract agent. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost) and reasons to treat EU staff in such a different way.
- k. Jamaica, 871.000 Euro, Residence HoD, Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- l. Liberia, 507.000 Euro, Housing official, please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- m. Malaysia, 209.000 Euro, delegation offices and 234.000 Euro Residence lease contract. Please give data (sqm, facilities, persons, annual cost).
- n. Pakistan, 1,09 Mio Euro, 1,04 Mio Euro, 614.000 Euro, Accommodation. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- o. Papua New Guinea, 2x 307.000 Euro, accommodation official. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- p. Philippines, 471.000 Euro, Residence. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- q. Russia, 423.000 Euro, 397.000 Euro, 2 accommodations for officials. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- r. Ukraine, 234.000 Euro, accommodation for official. Please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).
- s. Vanuatu, 460.000 Euro, Residence Chargé d’Affaires, please give data (sqm, facilities, housed persons, annual cost).

146. Could you please explain the acronyms: GSC, MDR, EUCI, CHAR, HRM, CAMAR.

147. The financial circuits used by the EEAS in the delegations were DEL_NORM (IA-VA/IAH - AOSD) and DEL_SMALL. What do these acronyms mean?