

From: COMITE CENTRAL DU PERSONNEL

Sent: Friday, July 01, 2016 2:32 PM

Subject: PROMOTION - NOTE FOR THE ATTENTION OF MS K. GEORGIEVA



Bruxelles, 1st July 2016

NOTE FOR THE ATTENTION OF MS K. GEORGIEVA Vice President of the Commission

On 20 June the list of 4597 officials proposed for promotion by Directors-General has been published as planned. This corresponds to 95% of promotions available for 2016, while the remaining 5% will be proposed by the Joint Promotions Committees for AD and AST staff following exam of the appeals introduced in Sysper2 by non-proposed staff. The AIPN will then conduct a last comparison round and award the promotions early November.

According to the existing legal basis (Art. 45 Staff regulations, its General Implementing Provisions and the most recent jurisprudence of the Civil Service Tribunal) promotions are based on the comparison of merits of all eligible officials, taking into account the appraisal reports since last promotion, the level of responsibilities and the use of languages.

During the first stage of the promotions exercise, the Central Staff Committee has appointed its representatives to take part in the so-called “dialogue meetings” with Directors General where draft promotion lists are discussed. No formal minutes are taken as a result of these meetings but each party is free to take notes.

Based on the contributions of its delegates participating in these meetings as discussed at its 482th plenary of 16 June, the Central Staff Committee intends now to share some observations on the first stage of the exercise that are a source of concern.

- 1) **Quota calculation and distribution among and within DGs:** As already reported in previous exercises, quota calculation remains based on the population in the grade in year n-1, while quota distribution among DGs is based on their individual population without taking into account the seniority of staff in place. In spite of some corrections, this leads to aberrations with quotas lacking in some grades (this year in the grades AST1, AST2 and AD10) and DGs, and abounding in other. The observed subsequent distribution of quotas by directorates within some DGs added further bias and unduly favored some colleagues to the detriment of others.
- 2) **Quality of reports:** As already witnessed in the past, this year again a number of Directors General openly admitted that they could not rely on the content of CDR reports due to subjective evaluation habits shown by certain Reporting Officers. Therefore, they took proposal decisions that appeared poorly justified on the basis of available evidence. Based on that, it could be concluded that

notwithstanding existing tools like trainings for Reporting Officers and general guidelines for writing CDRs, still important incoherencies exist in the language, style and approach to merit assessment in the evaluation reports across the institution.

- 3) **Weighting of merit components:** Very few DGs provided (or were able to provide) information as to the weight and relative importance given to the three merit criteria to be considered (reports, level of responsibilities and use of languages), so it is still remains not confirmed that there is a coordinated approach in this regard.
- 4) **Acceptance of remarks made by the** delegation appointed by the Central Staff Committee: Some 58 promotion proposals were modified following the dialogue meetings, with some Directorate-General proving true collaborative spirit and other total intransigence in their decisions. Compared to the total promotions proposed, this number remains negligible at only 1%.

While recent jurisprudence *Sylvan vs Commission (F-83-14)* case has to some extent contributed to clarifying the legal framework applicable to the promotions exercise, the Central Staff Committee maintains that the current implementation is far from ideal. It remains a serious source of concern for the Staff representation and of great dissatisfaction for colleagues.

After the 2015 promotion exercise ended with similar concerns, a joint working group including Directors in the meantime appointed Director-General assessed the state of play and drafted proposals to alleviate the existing shortcomings. Its conclusions have however neither been made public by DG HR nor taken into consideration to improve the 2016 promotion exercise.

Considering the new talent management strategies launched by the Commission and the recognized shortcomings within the current promotion process, **the Central Staff Committee kindly asks Vice-President Georgieva to call a urgent meeting aimed at defining remedial actions to be implemented already in the remaining stages of the current exercise.**



Ignazio IACONO

President of CSC

Cc : Mme Souka, M. Levasseur, M. Roques