

Bulletin

Information bulletin for members of the Association

June 2014

SEPS secretariat can be reached

by telephone: **+32 (0)475 472 470**

by fax: **+32(0)2 2818378**

or by internet: info@sfpe-seps.be

Version française au verso

21.06.2014
NM/1417 EN

SEPS Administrative Board

President	Serge Crutzen
Vice-president	Brigitte Pretzenbacher (relations Commission – active staff)
Vice-president	Hendrik Smets (legal affairs)
Vice-president	Rainer Dumont du Voitel (relations Council)
Vice-president	Philippe Bioul (health)
Treasurer	Georges Distexhe
Secretary	Anna Giovanelli
Secretary	Nicole Caby
Members	Pierre-Philippe Bacri ; Fabio Bolognese ; Giustina Canu ; Patrizia De Palma, Gina Dricot, Mitsou Entringer ; Annie Lovinfosse ; Marc Maes ; Antonio Pinto Ferreira; Yasmin Sözen ; Rosalyn Tanguy, Myriam Toson.

Honorary President: Marina Ijdenberg

Bulletin editorial team

Nicole Caby; Serge Crutzen; Rainer Dumont du Voitel; Mitsou Entringer; Brigitte Pretzenbacher; Hendrik Smets; Yasmin Soezen; Rosalyn Tanguy

Important notices

Bank account for the annual subscriptions:

IBAN: **BE 37 3630 5079 7728**

BIC: **BBRUBEBB**

Please don't use the Post bank account any more

Changes of address

Many members forget to inform us of their change of postal address. A telephone call to +32 (0)2 475 472 470, or e-mail or note to our secretariat would avoid several weeks' gap in receiving news.

Your Internet address

Please don't forget to let us know your e-mail address.

Many SEPS messages are sent by e-mail.

The address used is info@sfpe-seps.be

**The annual subscription has been increased to
minimum €30**

Decided at the AGM of 13 December 2013

Forthcoming SEPS information meeting

VM2 – Room 2. 2, rue Van Maerlant, 1040 Brussels
Metro Maelbeek – exit Chaussée d'Etterbeek.

Following the usual agenda of the meetings at Overijse : from 11.00 to 16.00

- Information: SEPS
- Lunch at the Brasserie
- Pensions, sickness insurance, Staff Regulations
- Members' problems
- Questions

Thursday 23 October 2014 (AGM)

Don't forget to contact the secretariat to reserve your lunch (€25)

Secretariat: e-mail info@sfpe-seps.be ; fax : +32(0)2 2818378

Tel : +32 (0) 475 472 470

Payment for the lunch can be made on site or to the SEPS ING account (See page 2)

Four parking places can be reserved ten days in advance
for those members having difficulty in walking.

SFPE – SEPS, 175 rue de la Loi, office JL 02 40 CG39, BE-1048 Brussels
29, rue de la Science, office SC29 02/22, BE-1049 Brussels
Tel : +32 (0)475 472470 Fax: +32(0)2 2818378 ASBL N°: 806 839 565
Email : info@sfpe-seps.be Web : www.sfpe-seps.be

Contents

I.	Letter from the Editor	4
II.	Information provided by the Commission	5
III.	Vice-president Šefčovič conclusions on the PMO's 2013 activity report	6
IV.	JSIS – Letter from the CSC to DG HR&S	4
V.	Annual adaptation of salaries and pensions	5
VI.	The Solidarity Charter of the CSC	9
VII.	Personal opinions	
	1. European elections 2014 – 56,5 voters absent	
	2. Immigration from outside the EU – cont'd	15
	3. TTIP : promesses et dangers	15
	4. Public consultation on the TTIP	21
VIII.	Information – Members' questions	
	1. 2014 seminar of the federal FFPE	21
	2. Declaration on the spouse's income	22
	3. Direct funding of hospitalisation	23
	4. The right to a single room at a clinic	23
	5. Requirement for prior authorisation for certain types of treatment	24
	6. Softening the application of certain rules of the JSIS, which PMO is applying strictly?	24
	7. Sickness or accident during holidays : Advice from PMO	24
	8. Reimbursement of removal costs	24
	9. Obtaining an ECAS account	25
	10. Vade-mecum part 3	25
IX.	Annexes	
	1. Letter of the CSC to DG HR&S	25
	2. The solidarity charter	26
	3. In Memoriam	27
	4. Order form for SEPS documents	29
	5. Registration sheet	31

I. Letter from the Editor

Now that elections are over it is the time for lively discussions on the results obtained by the eurosceptics, populists and so on. The results came as no surprise to us since we already spoke about them with a touch of black humour in an article in our February Bulletin¹.

The very reason for the SEPS' existence is to defend the pensioners' acquired rights. Hence, we shall not enter into a diatribe about developments in the European Parliament nor about which high officials have been appointed to serve the European Union's Institutions.

¹ February Bulletin, "The gallows – the vehemence of certain eurosceptics", page 14.
SEPS-SFPE

The SEPS' main disappointment regarding the Commission is its lack of communication with its pensioners, for whom it should be caring dutifully: an official is the person who was appointed to a post as an official².

The Paymaster's Office has brought about too many changes in the application of the rules governing invalidity and the Joint Sickness Insurance Scheme (JSIS) without the pensioners' being informed other than by having a reimbursement claim refused, having a request for the extension of serious illness status refused or even by hearsay.

We have been insisting for two years now that the PMO and HR DG take some action: retirees are entitled to be informed directly, in the same way as officials in active employment. Fifty percent of our pensioners do not use internet – a fact that could justify a lack of information – but the remaining fifty percent are not informed either!

At last, someone has taken the initiative: since May 2014 Unit HR C.1 of the Commission has started to publish a bi-monthly information bulletin – Senior Info – intended for all pensioners.

In addition, since May this year, all pensioners have been provided with a modicum of information through articles emanating from PMO in AIACE's magazine VOX!

However, judging from the questions it receives on a daily basis, SEPS can see that pensioners have an ongoing need for more precise and detailed information. For many of them, this can only be provided in written form sent by post. All pensioners have a right to expect this costly but essential service, given that their health insurance and pensions are subject to changing Commission regulations.

Serge Crutzen

II. Information provided by the Commission

1. INFO SENIOR

DG HR C.1 has launched its information bulletin. Let us take note of its message

You will receive INFO SENIOR at home, systematically every two months in paper form. Our aim is to provide you with a maximum amount of information on a variety of subjects which concern you directly. To obtain more detailed information please contact the persons referenced. You can also find INFO SENIORS on the web at My Intracomm. You will then also have access to the internet links and to versions of the Bulletin in French, English, German, Italian and Dutch.

We thank Monique THEATRE, who took this initiative.

² Article 1a. For the purposes of these Staff Regulations, 'official of the Union' means any person who has been appointed, as provided for in these Staff Regulations, to an established post on the staff of one of the institutions of the Union by an instrument issued by the Appointing Authority of that institution..

2. Message from PMO to pensioners

At last, at the beginning of May 2014, PMO sent out a message to all pensioners, using VOX³, the magazine that AIACE distributes to all pensioners.

This is a very good initiative: the 4 central pages (29 à 32), of the magazine deal with aspects of the regulations governing the JSIS and of the pension system, both subjects which generate a lot of questions from members of SEPS.

A few remarks are, however, necessary.

As far as the JSIS is concerned

PMO insists on certain aspects which are problematic for pensioners, especially the older pensioners:

JSIS on-line – Many members of SEPS do not intend to use this. Reimbursement requests sent by post remain valid.

An estimate for hospitalisation: A requirement which is usually difficult to fulfil and which has already obliged some members of SEPS to switch clinics. The cost of a single room is probably available; this is however not often the case for the costs of an operation and for doctors' fees. However, the form for the request for direct payment specifies only that the cost of the room, if single, needs to be indicated in order to obtain this authorisation.

PMO does not mention in its article which are the **excess ceilings** which are or will be applied, except for single rooms: the cost of the least expensive single room in the clinic. The implementation rules of the JSIS do not specify these ceilings either. The JSIS Medical Officer is the sole arbiter!

As far as supporting documents are concerned, PMO refers us to the regulations of 2002 (on supporting documents) which have however been modified by the 2 July 2007⁴ decision on the regulations governing the JSIS.

The subjects serious illness, psychotherapy, have been dealt with in previous Bulletins.

As far as pensions are concerned

PMO repeats what was already announced in the November 2013 SEPS Bulletin : the possibility to have pensions paid into an EU bank in another country than that of one's elected domicile, without losing the benefit of the corrective co-efficient.

The retroactive adjustment of the corrective coefficients is dealt with in chapter V here below.

As far as a **declaration of revenue** is concerned, please note that there is a new edition of the report of Mr Beukenhoudt: "The European civil servant and taxes", April 2014⁵: A detailed declaration of revenue is recommended by PMO for whoever wants to apply for a

³ AIACE – Vox N° 97 – April 2014 sent to pensioners early May 2014

⁴ A note sent to PMO on this subject remains unanswered.

⁵ Available on MyIntracomm or on request from the secretariat of SEPS

government subsidy (for renovation, insulation, study stipendiary, etc) Let us add that before making such a declaration it would be best to be certain of qualifying for and obtaining such a government subsidy.

The **two yearly declaration** is necessary for the good management of the pensions system. Someone's experience of this was presented in the February 2014 SEPS Bulletin (point VIII.2. hereunder).

III. Conclusions of Vice-President Šefčovič on the PMO's 2013 Activity Report

Subsequent to the presentation of the Annual Activity Report of PMO, Vice-President Sefcovic made several declarations:

"Vice President Šefčovič congratulates all the PMO staff for the very positive results for 2013 and for the first term of 2014, which are very promising in that it is possible to discern certain benefits which result from the modernisation of the instruments at the disposal of PMO (reduction in the reimbursement periods and improvement in communications with our clients). The VP Šefčovič encourages PMO to pursue the process of modernisation of its working environment. The VP also highlighted the success of PMO in the good execution of the reforms of the new staff regulations since 1 January."

The VP Šefčovič seems to be unaware that, in as far as communication is concerned, pensioners were totally forgotten.

Vice-President Sefcovic recalled the need to remain highly vigilant not to let the financial equilibrium of the JSIS, whose structural deficit is now fully recognised, deteriorate further. He intends, in due course, to hand over to his successor a detailed inventory of the situation as well as possible paths for further reflection."

This declaration is the prime motivator behind the restrictive attitude of PMO when dealing with such issues as recognising serious illnesses, applying the reimbursement rules, the conditions for hospitalisation,...

IV. JSIS – Letter from the CSC to DG HR&S

Following a meeting between the Central Staff Committee of the Commission and the mandated staff of the JSIS management committee, and representatives of retired staff, the CSF sent a letter to DG HR&S on the main grievances which have already been expressed in the past on PMO's increased severity concerning the reimbursement of medical expenses ; the increasing number of claims introduced (Article 90§2); the recognition of serious illness and its renewal; the reimbursement of health care provided by specific professionals: psychotherapy and osteopathy; direct payments and the requests for preliminary health care estimates; the information policy and relations with PMO; control of the JSIS management committee. This letter can be viewed in Annex 1.

Once more, SEPS-SFPE repeats that

It is not acceptable to suddenly confront retirees with the suppression or the brutal reduction of certain acquired rights. A long period of notice before retirement is required. Once retired it becomes virtually impossible to compensate changes to JSIS by for instance taking out supplementary insurance.

Pensioners are more inclined to accept an increase in their monthly contributions to the system, even unilaterally⁶, or complementary premiums as may be proposed by JSIS, in the same way as certain national health insurance providers do.

V. Annual adaptation of salaries and pensions

Reminder

Over a period of 5 years (2010-2014) the adaptation of salaries and pensions of permanent staff and agents of the European Union will have been as follows :

- *In 2010, the method defined in Article 3 of Annex XI resulted in an adjustment of 0.1%*
- *For 2011 and 2013 the results of a global approach to resolve the dispute led to an adjustment of 0% and 0.8% respectively*
- *For 2013 and 2014, as stipulated in the reform of the Staff Regulations, salaries and pensions remain frozen*

Position of the unions

However, according to certain staff unions, the Court of Auditors affirms that the basis of the calculation for the adjustment of 0.9% proposed by the Commission (which became 0.8 for 2012) “is not sufficiently transparent” and draws attention to the fact that “the exception clause on which are based the Commission’s proposals is no longer valid”. There are a sufficient number of elements which suggest that these regulations are illegal and certain unions are consulting with legal counsel for the best way to challenge them.

Several unions propose launching a classical « Article 90§2 » so that the staff (active and retired) can launch a complaints procedure. A typical complaint form will be made available in July. It will be proposed to several retirees to undertake this procedure.

Procedure for the implementation of the automatic method in 2015

⁶ Unilateral : without asking the Member States to increase their contribution, which in line with the Staff Regulations represents 2/3rds.

The new method for the adaptation of salaries and pensions which resulted from the 2014 reform of the Staff Regulations is automatic. As from July 2015 the adjustments are no longer subject to negotiations with the Member States.

DG HR is studying the procedure to be applied! In fact, this new automaticity results in an incongruity: a decision which has budgetary implications will be taken each year without a specific decision by the Council or the Parliament!

This automaticity can therefore not be applied without information and approval from the services concerned, for example from DG BUDG. A certain number of controls are necessary to ensure that the proposal is correct! The “decision” which has financial implications will in fact take effect without an official decision by the Council or by the Parliament!

A procedure for information and verification is therefore being developed by DG HR.

Communication by Eurostat → evaluation by DG HR → verification by DG BUDG → report to the Council and to the EP → meeting of GTR → info to PMO → info to the other institutions → publication within 15 days in the Official Journal.

Target dates: 15 June (if an intermediary adaptation is needed⁷) and 15 December of each year. The procedure will thus be applied in time for the salary/pension slip of December.

This procedure is therefore not decisional, simply informal. These steps are needed to “reassure the budgetary and legal authorities”.

Staff and pensioners will thus be informed during the meetings of the GTR, but this group is informal.

What will happen to social dialogue? An information meeting with the staff unions may be decided by DG HR in addition to the meeting of GTR, which is a group of “experts”.

Remark : information and not social dialogue : logical in the context of an automatic method !

Backpay and reimbursement of overpayments

The corrective coefficients have been decided for both the EU and non-EU.

For certain countries (Italy, new Member States...) this results in a significant reduction in salary with retroactive effect. For pensioners in Italy this also means a reduction in their pensions.

The recuperation of overpayments needs to be undertaken within the year (Staff Regulations). DG HR has suggested that PMO undertake this recuperation over a period of 12 months, since the overpayments can be quite significant. In some cases the negative effect of the corrective coefficient is compensated by variations in the exchange rates.

⁷ There will probably be an intermediary adaptation on 15.05.2014 in the new Member States
SEPS-SFPE

VI. The Solidarity Charter of the CSC

Message from the Commission's Central Staff Committee

The assembly for the mobilisation of solidarity took place on 24 February 2014 at the Commission's Central Staff Committee in the presence of a large audience and representatives of associations and humanitarian activities within the European Institutions.

This follows on from the movement initiated on the occasion of the "Etats généraux du volontariat" of 22 November 2011.

It received the backing of an important message from President Barroso, who « wanted to commend the initiatives which underpin the manifestation », stating notably "Your approach arouses respect on many fronts. It should be underscored, shared and disseminated". This assembly has led, in the presence of Vice-President Sefcovic, to the adoption of a solidarity charter of the European Institution staff (Annex 2), which encourages solidarity initiatives for the benefit of the most vulnerable in Europe and in the world.

If you would like to support these initiatives, we invite you to sign the charter on-line by going to the following website: <http://www.chartedelasolidarite.eu>

VII. Messages and opinions on subjects that are important for the future of Europe

The opinions expressed in these paragraphs do not necessarily represent the opinions of all members of the Administrative Board and are not the responsibility of SEPS.

1. European elections 2014 : 56,5% voters absent

Giovanni Martinetto

There has been yet another miscarriage of justice to which everyone, starting with the media, has been profoundly indifferent.

All commentators are concentrating on the number of votes and their reasoning is such that these votes represented the entire population or, at the very least, the whole electorate. The vast numbers of voters who abstained have simply been forgotten although they are not "abstentionists" in the sense that believe in abstention – no, they are simply citizens who, most of the time, do not know for whom nor for what to vote. So we shall quite simply call them "abstainers". By virtue of this deliberate forgetfulness it has been claimed that the majority of French people have stated that they are against Europe and in favour of leaving the euro area or that one Frenchman in four voted for the National Front. This viewpoint was shared by all parties because it was in all their interests to forget the "abstainers". It was indeed one thing to claim that one achieved 20% of votes and another to have to admit

that – with 56.5% of “abstainers” – the actual result, in relation to the total electorate, was only 8.7%. It would have been too humiliating for French political parties to admit that they had all – every one of them – been rejected by the vast majority of voters.

When you have 80.5% of “abstainers” in a country like the Czech Republic, the reason for it cannot and should not be sought in a population that normally goes to vote regularly in all other elections. The cause will be found in the national parties which all speak only of subjects within their sphere of competence and knowledge, namely of strictly national matters, and have only very confused ideas about Europe and the Union. Also, responsibility weighs heavily upon “European governance” which is strictly silent on all matters essential for the citizens and their future – such as the transatlantic treaty. However, what leads people to abstain in particular is that the decision-makers at European level – both governments and institutions – take their decisions as if the people did not exist. So people end up believing that “to vote or not to vote amounts to the same thing”. One thing is certain, abstention does not point to a fierce opposition to Europe since, for that, it would suffice to vote for one of the numerous eurosceptic parties.

These “abstainers” represent the forgotten people to the extent that the results are calculated as though they did not exist. Their choice in no way influences the result. Proof of this can be seen if we imagine that there would be an abstention rate of 93% in Germany – then the 7% that voted would have gained the 96 seats provided for under the treaty.

It had been proposed that this injustice be remedied by suggesting to the media and the European Parliament that the participation rate should affect the number of seats actually allocated. First of all, this would take account of the “abstainers” choice and, next, it would encourage the emergence of true European parties enabling them to choose in full knowledge of the facts. These would be parties which – with European aims and dimensions – would do the same within the Union as the national parties are trying to achieve at national level: in other words, enable us to experience representative democratic rule. It would then be far more difficult not to know for whom or what to vote in the European elections.

Here is the proposal: with a participation equal to or above 50%, a country would retain all the seats allocated to it by the treaty; on the contrary, a lower rate would set the number of seats actually allocated. The Parliament has 751 seats in 2014; according to the proposed system, it would have only 358 because there are only five countries with a rate of over 50%: Denmark, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg and Malta. For example, Poland would have only 12 seats instead of 51. It should be noted that, under this system, parties would go on receiving all the seats that they would have had if all voters had voted. All the system does is prevent them from claiming seats destined for voters who in fact abstained but who would never have wanted to be ousted by parties which they had rejected.

Now, for the next four years there will be 393 “usurped” seats in Parliament which account for 39.5% of the total. It would be a good thing if the MEPs were to bear this in mind so that they remain aware of the real situation and their true degree of representativity.

The proposal still stands for the next bout of elections but it is certain that, given such a diluted Parliament, we, the citizens, will have to pay even more attention to all the goings-on at European level.

For example, it will be interesting to watch what will happen to the so-called “populist” parties which, especially if they find themselves all in the same Group, will soon find out how similar they are to one another: all keen on sovereignty; all worried about immigration; all preoccupied by Islam; all wanting protection from rampant globalization; all protesting against the same unemployment, the same poverty, the same lack of means, the same “heading for the wall”. Will they not come to see that they are all fighting the very same fight – for one and the same person, the European?

2. Immigration from outside the European Union

Giovanni Martinetto

The discussion on “immigration” will continue to play an important part in European politics. Therefore, this article by Giovanni Martinetto is a logical sequel to what he expounded in the February and April Bulletins.

Part four: and if the host State had the power to decide - whether it could opt out as well.

Setting out from an apparently very clear and distinct difference between “politically correct” and “malodorous populism” (see part one - February 2014), it sufficed to pose the question as to whether the decision on immigration should be taken by the host State to see alliances that had seemed obvious fall apart and affinities form between stances that one believed to be totally different and opposing (see parts two and three – April 2014). One wondered then what was left of States’ decision-making power given the numerous UN and European conventions to which they are party.

1.

This is what we going to look at now, focusing on **Italy** which, since it is a peninsula, could very easily detect and send off any chance vessel getting near its coastline but which is being accused by the other member countries of the Union of having “a frontier like a sieve” and is running the risk, therefore, of being excluded from Schengen. It is not as though Italian governments were able to act otherwise and as if there were no increasingly clear contradiction between the States’ decision-making powers and the increasing demands contained in conventions concerning migrants. It is a contradiction of which one is not yet entirely conscious but which is already dictating a certain behaviour to States and will end up imposing some very painful choices upon us.

The fact that this contradiction is not striking in the case of Italy is because it has remained, so to speak, within an old, strictly European framework. It is on the basis of the 1951 Geneva Convention (C51) on refugee status, as interpreted by the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) set up in 1959 that Italy has seen its decision-making power taken away. **These are the facts:** in 2009 Italian coastguards “aided” “on the high seas” persons whom they rushed to “disembark in Libya”, a country with which Italy “had signed an

agreement” on control of illegal immigration and trafficking in human beings “having received its commitment” to applying international conventions and to provide three thousand million euro per annum together with military boats. On 26 May 2009, the ECHR received a complaint and condemned Italy to pay damages (*case Hirsi Jamaa et al. versus Italy*). These are the arguments:

“whatever the reason for Italian coastguards’ intervening”, as soon as the persons concerned were under the constant and absolute control of Italian sailors – whether it be in Italian territorial waters, on the high seas or in the territorial waters of a third country – those persons came under Italian jurisdiction and hence Italy became responsible for their protection and was duty bound to question them individually, with all the formal guarantees foreseen. Their disembarkation could be described as “collective expulsion” (which was also forbidden by protocol n° 4 to the 1950 European Convention on human rights) and return to an “unsafe” country. At the time, Italy should not merely have accepted Libya’s assertions but should have consulted organizations such as Amnesty International, the Red Cross, Human Rights Watch and the office of the High Commissioner for Refugees in order to make sure that there was no “inhuman and degrading treatment”.

This was how Italy got stuck and still is. As soon as some chance vessel goes to sea Italy is obliged to provide assistance – by virtue, for example, of the Montaigne Bay Convention – but as soon as its sailors make contact, Italy becomes responsible for the migrants and must keep practically all of them because it is extremely difficult to find “safe” countries meeting the criteria of the organizations we have mentioned, in whose eyes even belonging to the European Union is not sufficient guarantee.

2.

And what about the **Union**? What we have just said about Italy can also apply to all other access points to the community area and could call in question one of the pillars of its construction. The Schengen area, created between five States in 1985, was integrated into the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1995 and has now expanded to cover 22 Member States and 7 others. It needs its corollary to exist: that is efficient control and defence of its external frontiers. This is why, following the first disturbances in Libya, the number of immigrants arriving in Italy just exploded (22 000 in three months, as against 147 over the same period in 2010), tension already existing among States became violent. As soon as the ECHR judgment on the *Hirsi* affair came out (23/2/2012) the justice ministers’ Council immediately adopted (on 7-8/6/2012) a decision allowing every Member State to decide, unilaterally, to leave the Schengen area temporarily without Commission approval.

This decision simply strengthened the Member States’ resistance to all efforts to bring migration policy under Community rule, resistance which found its expression in two basic principles: (a) each State decides how many migrants it wishes to receive; (b) to grant or refuse asylum is the task of the first State with which the migrant enters into contact (and the biometric data registered on EURODAC are there to check that it is the case). The situation got worse when the Court in Luxembourg (CJEU) annulled Council Decision 2010/252 whereby the Commission, in order to urge the Member States to accept a sharing of responsibility, allowed the Frontex Agency, inter alia, to take the following steps: “stopping,

boarding and searching the ship, its cargo and persons on board, and questioning persons on board” [...] “seizing the ship and apprehending persons on board” [...] “ordering the ship to modify its course outside of or towards a destination other than the territorial waters or contiguous zone, escorting the vessel or steaming nearby until the ship is heading on such course” [...] “conducting the ship or persons on board to a third country or otherwise handing over the ship or persons on board to the authorities of a third country”, it being understood that: “priority should be given to disembarkation [of the above persons] in the third country from where the ship carrying [them] departed or through the territorial waters or search and rescue region of which that ship transited”. Although the Court of justice ruled that these “enforcement measures” constituted substantial amendments to the texts establishing Frontex and the Schengen code, it did not comment upon them but merely annulled Decision 2010/252 because of procedural defect: it should have been adopted by the Council and the Parliament. Hence, the measures are still in force since the legislator has decided to give an opinion on the Commission’s new proposal (of 12/4/2013) after the 2014 European elections. We shall see.

The strategy being followed in the framework of the Global Approach and proximity policy is aimed at “externalizing” checks on migratory flows and several countries have been contacted for this – Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia plus African countries south of the Sahara – even China - so that they cooperate in stemming the flow and ensuring that migrants benefit from the protection required under international conventions. Given that these countries are not very interested in this thing, the Union is trying to tempt them with tens of thousands of euros (at the risk of spending the entire Development Cooperation budget on it) and by granting visas to their citizens. This is precisely what Italy was doing with Kadhafi and it is strange that the Commission – which actually refers to the *Hirsa* case in its new proposal – is not afraid of getting the same condemnation. The risk is all the greater since, following a long procedure started in 1979 and as provided for in Article 6 of its Treaty, the Union as such will soon be acceding to the 1950 European Convention on Human Rights and, from that moment on, it will be subject to external checks by the ECHR as are the Member States and will be open to attacks by any person or company, European or otherwise. The opportunity will arise from the principles of C51 which crop up everywhere where it is a question of migration/refugees/asylum, including the principle of “non- refoulement” referred to in Article 78 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and constitutionalized in the Charta, which has been the equivalent of a treaty ever since Lisbon. In order to render itself even more vulnerable, the Union has created numerous departments with the job of pointing up the slightest violation in this matter (EASO, FRA, COHOM, EEAS).

What is the harm in all this? None. Making oneself the knight-errant of adhering to human rights conventions is a time-honored practice dating from the Cold War. But times have changed. Once constraints imposed by convention, being freely accepted, contradict to such an extent the right of a State (or the Union) to control the entry, stay and repatriation of non-nationals (see *Hirsa* 113), one must choose. However, it is very difficult, after so much practice and propaganda, to admit that if one wants to retain the right one must contravene

the conventions. Nevertheless, hiding behind the Union's texts, this is the route the Member States are taking, especially where the ECHR and C51 are concerned. (We shall see this in our fifth text).

What we should note here is that this – sometimes radical – procedure is the work of governments and parties that think they are “politically correct”. Of course, care is taken to dress it up in the usual speeches. But such camouflage does not deceive anyone. On the eve of the Brighton conference on reform of the ECHR in 2013, some 90 organizations and associations felt the need to speak up, together, in defense of the Court. It is the battle between a law of conventions becoming increasingly invasive, interpreted by international Courts (and defended by the “conventionalists”) and the law anchored in a territory and interpreted first and foremost by the judicial bodies on the spot. Here, in this legal sphere we find the same opposition as in the economic sector. The day one decides to lay one's cards on the table will be the time when a large section of the Union's legal structure will come under scrutiny again, starting with the treaty.

3. TTIP (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership)

Raison d'être - Advantages – Questions-Uncertainties

Serge Crutzen

Following discussion among members of the SEPS Administration Board, it appeared that there was a need to offer our readers a summary relating to the TTIP. The aim of this summary is to try informing the un-initiated reader of the reasons for this initiative, the advantages it is hoped will be gained from it and the puzzlement of many experts and editorialists.

This text contains numerous paragraphs from articles by DG TRADE⁸ and the Madariaga Foundation – College of Europe⁹. The 2013 SEPS June Bulletin¹⁰ already mentioned a series of dangers which such a free-trade agreement could entail for the EU.

The raisons d'être

The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is the name of a trade agreement that is being negotiated between the European Union and the United States. The negotiations aim at removing trade barriers (tariffs, unnecessary regulations, restrictions on investment etc.) in a wide range of economic sectors so as to make it easier to buy and sell goods and services between the EU and the US. The EU and US also want to make it easier for their companies to invest in each other's economy.

⁸ DG TRADE (<http://ec.europa.eu/trade/policy/in-focus/ttip/questions-and-answers/#what-is-ttip>)

⁹ Fondation Madariaga- Collège d'Europe (<http://www.madariaga.org/publications/madariaga-papers/940-marche-transatlantique-ou-identite-europeenne>)

¹⁰ Pages 18 et 19

Possible advantages

The EU carried out an impact assessment of the potential effects of the agreement. This assessment examined not only the potential economic impact, but also possible social and environmental impacts. It looked at what might happen as a result of varying degrees of trade liberalisation between the EU and US. In every case, the overall outcome for the EU was positive; but what was clear was that the more liberalisation there was, the better the overall result. One of the studies on which the Commission's impact assessment was based was an independent report commissioned by the EU from the London-based Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR).

It suggests the EU's GDP could grow by 0.5% and its economy could benefit by €119 billion a year – equivalent to an extra €545 for a family of four in the EU. Although tariffs between the EU and US are already low (on average 4%, except for certain products such as chocolate!), the combined size of the EU and US economies and the trade between them means that dismantling tariffs will be good for jobs and growth.

Besides removing tariff barriers, doing away with unnecessary rules and regulations (what we call “non-tariff barriers”) is an essential aim. Such barriers are the result of differing regulations and standards. It can be complicated to get rid of them because, although both the EU and the US have well-developed systems for ensuring safety and consumer protection, they often adopt different approaches to achieve the same goal. Having to comply with two separate sets of rules can cost time and money. The transatlantic partnership is not aimed at convincing one or other party to change its own system but rather to arrive at respective systems that operate properly.

For example: Both the EU and US have high car safety standards. The TTIP could make it possible for the EU and US to recognise each other's standards so that cars proven safe for sale on one side of the Atlantic could be sold on the other side without having to pass further tests or be adapted to meet extra specifications – it would be a win-win situation.

Vehicles, medical apparatus and pharmaceuticals in particular are three areas in which greater convergence of regulations could be considered.

The US is interested in selling more of its agricultural commodities, such as wheat and soy. EU exports to the US are mostly higher value food products like spirits, wine, beer, and processed food (such as cheeses, ham and chocolate). At the moment, some European food products, such as apples and various cheeses, are banned from the US market; others are subject to high US tariffs.

Essential Commission statements

1. As regards EU – USA only

European standards will not be endangered: consumer protection is still an essential ingredient of the European attitude. We will not negotiate existing levels of protection for the sake of an agreement. Our high level of protection here in Europe is non-negotiable. But let us not forget that the US also takes protection of its citizens very seriously. Both the EU and

the US are committed to high levels of protection for our citizens, but we go about it in different ways:

- the EU sometimes relies more on regulations,
- the US more on litigation.

This is not a race to the bottom. Making our regulations more compatible does not mean going for the lowest common denominator, but rather seeing where we diverge unnecessarily. There will be no compromise whatsoever on safety, consumer protection or the environment. But there will be a willingness to look pragmatically on whether we can do things better and in a more coordinated fashion. Obviously, each side will keep the right to regulate environmental, safety and health issues at the level each side considers appropriate.

Basic laws, like those relating to GMO or hormones or those which are there to protect human life and health, animal health and welfare, or environment and consumer interests will not be part of the negotiations.

In the negotiating guidelines, the Member States made it clear to the Commission that the audio-visual sector is not part of the negotiations dealing with services and the right to establishment.

There is no intention of harmonising EU and US laws on intellectual property rights. By allowing us to look at a limited number of important IPR issues of interest to both the EU and the US, the TTIP could make trade between us easier without weakening these rules.

There are other negotiations underway between the EU and the USA on data protection.

The TTIP will not automatically overrule, repeal or amend EU laws and regulations. Any changes to EU laws, rules or regulations in order to liberalise trade would have to be approved by the EU's Member States in the Council and by the European Parliament.

Although the EU and the US are developed economies, investors can still come across problems affecting their investments which their domestic courts systems are not always able to deal with effectively. That is why we believe there is a clear added value in including provisions in the TTIP that protect investors.

Now that negotiations have started, the Commission has started a trade sustainability impact assessment on lasting development. It will be centred on the potential environmental and social effects of the transatlantic partnership.

The TTIP will be a trade agreement fit for the 21st century - the increased business will not only benefit multinationals, but also small and medium sized firms, either through exporting directly or as suppliers to bigger companies.

The actual talks will probably last a couple of years. For trade negotiations to succeed, you need a certain degree of confidentiality, otherwise it would be like showing the other player one's cards in a card game. It should be noted that the Commission is more open than the United States in this matter. In the course of the negotiations, though, the European Commission will continue to reach out to trade associations, consumer organisations, industry and other representatives of civil society.

It will keep the Member States – in the Council – and the European Parliament informed of developments.

At the end of the negotiations, it is these two institutions – the Council containing representatives of Member States' governments and the directly elected European Parliament – that will approve or reject the agreement. On the American side, the agreement will have to be approved by the US Congress.

Some changes might be phased in over time, though.

2. As regards the world outside the EU – USA

The TTIP should encourage China to adopt the standards set by the Euro-American regulatory block, which accounts for 43% of world GDP and 31% of world trade in goods.

Insofar as the TTIP brings together the top two world economies, this partnership should serve as a model for the future. If the Union and the United States manage to harmonize a large proportion of their regulations and standards, the result could form the basis for international rules, with all the economies of scale and economic advantages it would imply.

The transatlantic partnership could also encourage other countries to revive the WTO negotiations.

It is not only trade between the Union and the USA that ought to increase: owing to greater demand for raw materials, components and other inputs, Union exports to other countries should also increase.

Disquiet and questions expressed by European experts

The United States is a federal State which concludes international agreements at top level, without reference to the federated States, whereas the European Union commits its Member States as well when it signs such agreements. Could the commitment be asymmetrical? Also, since it is federal, the American government can act and react more speedily than the Union.

Is a negotiation with a strong and united America, really a negotiation of equals?

How do we see the negotiation between the United States and Europe in the (many) areas where the EU has unfortunately not yet achieved unity – energy, finance, telecommunications, digital industries, defence industry?

How do we deal with a situation where European interests are directly opposed to those of the USA; for example in the case of Airbus and Boeing or agriculture, etc.?

The dollar benefits from a strong position in that it can be devalued considerably and has the federal Reserve which can provide the support of a zero interest rate: American firms have a great advantage. However, the dollar's status could change, especially under pressure from countries such as China, Japan and Saudi Arabia that are diversifying their reserves.

How does one reconcile the coexistence of a weak dollar and a strong euro in an integrated “transatlantic internal market”? Can we envisage a *dollarization* of European national economies in case of collapse of the euro area?

Is the expected 0.5% growth of GDP in the EU as a result of the TTIP realistic? Or will German industry and the City of London reap most of the benefits on the European side, further widening the economic divergence between Member States, and increasing social inequality in Europe? What is more, maybe only two thirds or even half of this TTIP programme would be applied thus reducing its positive impact.

Customs tariffs are already very low. Hence, it would be necessary to be able to remove trade barriers by harmonizing standards. Can this be done upwards between a USA and an EU? The Commission assures us that it will not be done downwards.

Within a free-trade area we could be obliged to accept products that the vast majority of Europeans do not want: hormone-treated beef, GMOs, chlorinated chickens, although the Commission says not. Will it actually be possible to retain consumer protection, so dear to the Europeans, as a basic principle? The same applies to protection of private data, financial, social and environmental standards. Will Europe not gradually be losing part of its social model, the mark of its identity? As referred to above, Europe and the United States have neither the same collective preferences, particularly where avoiding risk is concerned, nor the same methods to manage them. Indeed, the EU, having adopted the precautionary principle, gives priority to the law that prevents the risk whereas America prefers litigation once the damage is done.

How to counter the formidable power of the American lobbies, primarily in Congress, but also in Brussels, at the heart of the European Institutions and national governments?

The hope that China will rally in support of standards set by a Euro-American regulatory block, and the resulting pressure for China to abide by them (combined with the Trans-Pacific Trade Partnership (TTP) much favoured by Washington) will appear to Beijing no less than a containment strategy. Will this strategy succeed given China’s bargaining power, stemming from the expected growth in the Chinese domestic market?

Certain critics consider the possibility of unfavourable dispute settling arrangements. There have been examples showing that the multinationals could win a case against the EU and its consumers.

In the opinion of TTIP opponents there are other aspects that could be highlighted but by far the most fundamental is that European integration is going through a deep crisis and the Union finds itself, so to speak, back in its infancy. Opposing trends are tearing each other apart on the subject of its future: everything is being called in question. Europeans would need to be left alone to see more clearly and should certainly not be confronted with the USA in their present weakened and disunited state. Moreover, the most sceptical critics consider that the TTIP simply provides the USA with the possibility of “dividing to rule” at the heart of the legislative procedure for European integration.

If this partnership were to turn out more unfavourable than favourable, would the EU not be running the risk of becoming dependent not only strategically (within NATO for example) but also economically?

By way of conclusion

First of all, why not set about exploring all ways of improving the material well-being and outlook for all citizens on both sides of the Atlantic and in the world generally if an instrument such as the TTIP should prove effective ?

Secondly, the mutual recognition of differing standards instead of harmonizing them, could lead, in one way or another to the application lower protection standards.

Moreover, the instance of arbitration (ISDS) could overrule the democratically voted consumer protection law of a state by imposing a heavy penalty on that state for using the law to erect trade barriers. This would sacrifice democratic intent to commercial interest.

There is thus a need for transparency at every stage. An open democratic discussion on the choice of guidelines is necessary.

On 27 March this year, Karel De Gucht, member of the Commission responsible for trade, announced that a public consultation had been launched on investor-to-state dispute settlement (ISDS) within the TTIP. The main issue in this consultation is to find out whether the approach proposed for the TTIP can ensure the correct balance between protection of investors in EU countries and preservation of the EU's right and ability to protect the European citizen.

4. TTIP – Public consultation online

The executive FFPE committees Council and Brussels Commission and non-Union

The European Commission is currently undertaking an online consultation of the public on the protection of investment in the framework of the transatlantic trade and investment partnership (TTIP). The FFPE has decided to take part in the consultation to express its viewpoints because we are convinced that the trade agreement being negotiated between the European Union and the United States does offer opportunities but also presents certain dangers.

Our replies to the questions in the survey can be summarized as follows: the aims of the EU set out by the Commission do seem entirely reasonable but care must be taken to ensure transparency and democratic control of the procedure so that European citizens are sure that these aims will be achieved.

We welcome the announced objective of setting up guarantees to safeguard the EU's right to issue regulations, notably the possibility of adopting interpretative decisions that would place restraints on arbitration tribunals. In our comments we have emphasized that

adoption of such decisions must be democratically controlled, e.g. by adopting delegated acts.

We also welcome the aim of guaranteeing the openness and transparency of the system being put forward for the settlement of disputes between investors and States. In order to achieve this objective, we have stressed in our comments that the dispensation of the obligation to inform the public regarding trade secrets and confidential data must be established in the strictest possible manner.

Also, we are pleased to note that it is proposed to form a pool of suitably qualified independent and impartial arbiters but feel we must insist that the pool be rendered public and be subject to democratic control (e.g. via the European Parliament's approval procedure).

The FFPE would like to invite you to express your opinion as a member of staff of the Institutions but also as a citizen of Europe!

<http://ec.europa.eu/yourvoice/ipm/forms/dispatch?form=ISDS>

VIII. Information – Questions from members

1. 2014 seminar of the federal FFPE

The federal FFPE meets at regular intervals, gathering the representatives of all its sections to overhaul its issues, strengthen its cohesion and look into the future. This year the FFPE invited representatives of SEPS. The seminar took place in Greece (Heraklion/Crete) from 21 to 23 May 2014. A report of this meeting will become available soon.

Important subjects such as the recommencement of the social dialogue process, the split between staff (pre and post 2004), and communication were discussed in order to develop action in the near future.

The essential subject is that of social dialogue, which has vanished. The Lisbon Treaty which initiated the “co-decision Council-Parliament” did not include social dialogue in this process. That which the Commission proposed as social dialogue for the end of the reform and the adaptation of salaries was in fact an information monologue.

The FFPE would like to re-introduce the “Commission of Presidents” (of the main) institutions¹¹ to discuss with a small delegation of union representatives present in several institutions. The dialogue between the Commission of Presidents and the union representatives should take place during the whole common legislative process (co-decision): it should take place at all stages of the process.

2. Declaration on the spouse's income

¹¹ Already initiated at the time of CECA
SEPS-SFPE

To avoid conflict with PMO about household allocations it would be wise to consider Article 13 of the Staff Regulations: *If the spouse of an official is in gainful employment, the official shall inform the appointing authority of his institution.*

The declaration which active staff and pensioners need to make concerns the income which results from gainful activity and not the income resulting from property or investment income.

3. Direct funding of hospitalisation

Procedure

The new form for direct funding contains demands and conditions for such direct funding. My Intracomm-Ext provides information on the detailed procedure to follow. For those who do not have access, we provide a summary here below :

Download the form for direct payment or request it in writing to the secretariat.

Note : For convalescent homes, nursing homes or similar, a form requesting direct funding for a convalescent home, a nursing home or similar needs to be completed.

On the form, indicate all your contact details, in addition to name and the date of birth of the person who is ill.

Note : Direct funding is not possible for those who have supplementary insurance, except where it is clearly established, from documentary evidence, that the JSIS becomes the primary health insurance.

Tick the box which corresponds to your particular case: hospitalisation, external patient care (for those who suffer from a serious illness) or recurrent medical expenses, the monthly costs of which represent more than 20% of the month's salary or pension.

Also provide the **contact details of the hospital** or the health care provider: this is important for the reimbursement office to be able to send the request for direct payment.

Beware! Don't forget to sign and date the form so that it becomes valid!

During the 60 days preceding the medical intervention, you send the form to your reimbursement office. The address is provided on the form.

In case of urgent hospitalisation, make the request for direct payment as soon as possible.

The reimbursement office will contact your health service provider, who will send his bills directly to the reimbursement office. If you receive a bill in connection with a service for which direct payment has been authorised, send this bill to the reimbursement office.

The reimbursement office will send you a breakdown of costs.

As a result of this direct payment, the totality of bills is paid for by the reimbursement office. However, it is probable that a portion of this is for you to pay. For example, the 15 – 20% not covered by JSIS or costs which exceed the ceiling decided by the Medical Officer. Usually this amount is retained during subsequent reimbursements (possibly directly from your pay, your pension or even from a totally unrelated sum that your institution is due to

pay to you). You are required to liquidate this advance **within the three years following the date of the payment of the advance** (Art. 30§3 of the joint regulations).

You can also spontaneously reimburse these additional costs, directly to the bank account of the European Commission:

BNP PARIBAS FORTIS IBAN : BE70 0016 7694 8225 BIC/SWIFT : GEBABEBB
In the reference, indicate: "RCAM/AVA" and your personnel/pension number.

Condition

As mentioned under III here above, the form for requesting direct payment requires you to indicate the cost of the room, if you opt to have a single room. Without this information, direct payment will not be authorised.

4. The right to a single room at a clinic

The Secretary of the JSIS management committee (CGAM) informs us of the following :

It would be useful to bring the following Belgian legal dispositions to the attention of both active and retired affiliates, which permits them to know:

- 1) That doctors and surgeons do not have the right to put their patients under pressure to accept a single room, which would allow them to charge higher fees.
- 2) In which circumstances a patient is entitled to a single room, without any increase in fees.

Article 97 of the Belgian law relating to hospitals and other health care establishments, coordinated on 10 July 2008 stipulates the following:

Article 97, § 1 : For a stay in a single room, including the case of daytime hospitalisation, a supplement above the amount of the financial resources may be charged to the patient who has expressly requested such a room, on condition that at least half of the hospital beds available can be placed at the disposal of patients who wish to be admitted without supplementary costs. (...)

§ 2. For a stay in a single room, including for daytime hospitalisation, no supplement identified in §1 above can be charged in the following cases:

- a) When the state of health of the patient or the technical conditions of the examination, or the nature of the treatment or the need for supervision requires a stay in a single room ;*
- b) When the needs of service or the non-availability of unoccupied beds in a two-bed room or in a general ward requires a stay in a single room ;*
- c) When admission takes place in an intensive care unit or in the accidents and emergencies department, without the agreement of the patient and for the duration of the stay in such a ward;*
- d) When the admission concerns a child accompanied by a parent during the hospital stay. (...)*

5. Requirement for prior authorisation for certain types of treatment

Several members inform us that the prior authorisation needs to be obtained for certain treatments and for certain medication for which, in the past, reimbursement occurred without question. These authorisations are sometimes requested a posteriori but with the risk that they may not be granted. SEPS hopes to learn more about this as soon as possible. .

6. Softening the application of certain rules of the JSIS, which PMO is applying strictly?

During the last meeting of the JSIS management committee, the possibility for softening the application of certain rules was considered, without however this implying a decision by PMO.

- **Psychotherapy** : for the first 10 sessions there is no further need for a prescription from a psychiatrist, but that of a GP will suffice.
- **Serious illness** : the president of the management committee proposed sending a letter to the Medical Counsel to inform it of the discussion which the JSIS management committee had had and to ask the Medical Counsel to reflect on how to take account (to variable degrees) the 4 criteria (notably : shortened life expectancy, chronic nature of illness, serious treatment and/or therapeutic interventions, the presence or risk of a serious handicap). The PMO could reconsider the strict application of these 4 criteria by introducing a potential weighting (inspired also by external international rules).

7. Sickness or accident during holidays : Advice from PMO

Be prepared, take the following three documents with you:

- an attestation that you are covered by JSIS (in the language of the country to be visited) which you can obtain from “JSIS on-line” or from “PMO Contact on-line”. You can ask for it at the SEPS Secretariat.
- the form for declaring an accident, if you are an active official or if you have subscribed to a specific accident insurance (e.g. AIACE-Vanbreda Int. - Cigna)
- the form for requesting direct payment, so that in the event hospitalisation becomes necessary, your costs could be paid directly by JSIS.

Subscribe to a private insurance : Certain hospitals do not accept direct payment and demand immediate payment. This is why, the PMO advises you to subscribe a supplementary insurance with a private insurance company. The latter also covers the costs which would not be paid by our medical insurance scheme, such as transportation or repatriation to domicile costs or that portion of costs which may be yours, especially in countries where medical costs are expensive.

8. Reimbursement of removal costs

SEPS relays the following information from the FFPE Council:

A modification to the Staff Regulations which has not so far provoked much discussion is the change to Article 9 of Annex VII. This modification obliges the institutions to fix ceilings for the reimbursement of removal costs.

During the negotiations on the implementation modalities (DGE) at the secretariat of the Council of the European Union, at the end of last year, the administration insisted that the ceilings would be high enough to permit the reimbursement of the totality of the costs in most cases. We are told that the reason for the ceilings was to prevent removal companies from providing exaggerated cost estimates.

We already know of a few problematic cases where the proposed estimates are largely in excess of the ceilings. Please let us know of any other cases you may know about, whether it concerns your own removal or that of a colleague.

9. Obtaining an ECAS account

Whoever would like to gain access to the websites of the Commission and more particularly that of « JSIS on-line » to request the reimbursement of medical expenses by internet, can obtain assistance from PMO.

This proposal is essentially aimed at those affiliates who live in Belgium, though it could also concern retired colleagues who are passing through Brussels.

In order to facilitate obtaining an ECAS account, PMO has opened an office where it is possible to obtain such an account within more or less 20 minutes.

Colleagues **Olivier Pypens** and **Tony Masini** are at your disposal on the ground floor of **SC29 00/3 from 9h to 12 h and from 14h to 16h.**

Do not bother with fixing an appointment, but take your mobile phone and the password of your computer.

10. Vade-mecum part 3

Volume 3 of the Vade-mecum is constantly being revised: every month changes of address and responsibilities are announced, mainly within PMO. Those members who wish to have the addresses of PMO, of the Social Services, ... need to regularly request the latest version of the Vade-Mecum Part 3 or download it from the website of SEPS.

XIII. Annexes

Annex 1

Bruxelles, le 30 avril 2014
CCP - II/BP/ D (14) 109

Note à l'attention de Mme Souka,
Directeur général DG HR&S

Objet: Mise en œuvre de mesures restrictives pour les affiliés du Régime Commun d'Assurance Maladie

See annex 1 of the French version.

Annex 2

European Institutions Staff **Charter of Solidarity**

Poverty is not inevitable in today's world.

We can all work together for a world of solidarity.

Following the 2011 Volunteering Forum, organized by the Central Staff Committee, the staff of the European Institutions has come together to support micro-projects fighting poverty, for the most deprived, and thereby continue to convey the spirit of the founders of a united Europe.

They respond and contribute to this great momentum to attempt to meet some of the many challenges of poverty in the world.

This commitment to solidarity should be encouraged and enhanced.

To achieve this, a **Committee for the mobilization of solidarity** has been created in the European Institutions.

With the support of the humanitarian associations and the actions which have already been taken, this committee is called on to promote the involvement of European Institutions staff - citizens of Europe and of the world -, in the fight against poverty.

The Committee will provide a catalyst for future initiatives and, with the support of the main associations and humanitarian actions within the European Institutions, develop a strong momentum of solidarity.

The Committee members are focused to implement these goals and to celebrate each year the solidarity actions that have been undertaken, on the **Solidarity Day** which is dedicated to them (9 May).

Annex 3

In memoriam

(April – May 2014)

Name	Birth	Death	Institution
WILHELM Serge	20/02/1928	06/06/2014	ICOM
MATTYS Edwige	05/05/1928	27/05/2014	CE
MOYENS Frans	11/11/1940	27/05/2014	COM
DALL'ACQUA Romano	09/08/1933	26/05/2014	CE
MASSERER Philipp	04/01/1911	25/05/2014	COM
REINERT Norbert	07/12/1950	25/05/2014	COM
KIESECKER Herbert	05/10/1928	23/05/2014	COM
GHEROLDI Lina	23/09/1924	21/05/2014	COM
DE BRAEL Yvonne	24/07/1928	21/05/2014	COM
DIONIGI Francesco	09/11/1933	20/05/2014	PE
KOPSCH Daniela	12/02/1970	19/05/2014	COM
JAECK Germaine	25/08/1922	17/05/2014	COM
BOSMAN Jules	06/10/1948	14/05/2014	COM
RONCHI Luigi	04/04/1936	11/05/2014	COM
DE LAET-WINDELEN Leonia	20/02/1938	11/05/2014	COM
GERBER Georg	05/05/1926	08/05/2014	COM
VOLGER Cornelis	24/09/1936	05/05/2014	PE
DESCOINGS Marcel	10/08/1919	04/05/2014	COM
SILVESTRI Alfredo	12/07/1934	03/05/2014	COM
SPADA Renzo	09/10/1948	03/05/2014	COM
ARIOLI Luigi	12/08/1923	01/05/2014	COM
DE NEVE Robert	21/02/1939	30/04/2014	COM
WATGEN Fernand	30/05/1933	30/04/2014	PE
SAMMONS Brenda	09/06/1943	29/04/2014	COM
CIMADEVILLA DEL CAMPO Maria Dolores	24/06/1955	26/04/2014	COM
DINKESPILER Jean Albert	04/05/1927	25/04/2014	COM
DE BRUINE Reinier	19/12/1942	22/04/2014	COM
BAUDIN Pierre	30/06/1932	21/04/2014	COM
GASPAR Jean-Jacques	17/08/1927	21/04/2014	COM
GIANNINI Antonio	28/06/1928	20/04/2014	COM
GONSCHOREK Edith	04/08/1922	18/04/2014	COM

WUNDT Hermann	09/10/1921	17/04/2014	COM
FANK Jeanny	11/10/1956	17/04/2014	CDC
KANOUN Margaret	01/08/1951	16/04/2014	COM
OYARZABAL LECUONA Alberto	19/04/1937	16/04/2014	COM
KOEGLER Max	07/11/1922	12/04/2014	CJ
VANDER ROOST Godelieve	01/11/1943	10/04/2014	COM
DUJARDIN Carlos	18/01/1936	09/04/2014	COM
BIASINO Jean-Jacques	19/03/1951	09/04/2014	COM
MARGININI Andrea	02/11/1942	08/04/2014	COM
RETTET André	14/12/1939	08/04/2014	COM
SAVOIA Amabile	07/06/1932	06/04/2014	COM
LEROY Roland	20/11/1933	06/04/2014	COM
MAES-JANSSENS Claude	23/05/1940	06/04/2014	COM
MURTAGH John	31/12/1941	04/04/2014	COM
BOUTET Max	20/06/1916	04/04/2014	COM
BUCQUE Adolf	21/01/1917	03/04/2014	COM
BIANCHI Alberto	21/11/1930	02/04/2014	COM
LIBERT Alfred	21/02/1923	02/04/2014	COM
ANDRIGHETTI Vittorio	21/10/1926	30/03/2014	COM
BARNASCONI Giuseppe	25/08/1924	26/03/2014	COM

Annex 4.

<p style="text-align: center;">Files and documents available. Order form</p>

Please send this reply slip to the secretariat

I should like to receive the English edition of the following documents

SEPS Vade-mecum

Part 1 (Procedures)

Part 2 (forms /pers. data)

Part 3 (addresses PMO – ADMIN. ...) Edition February 2013

Part 4 (reimbursement forms – RCAM/JSIS)

Summary of the SR reform (DG HR - 12 pages)

Supplementary health insurances Edition june 2013

Invlidity allowance and survival pension (Hendrik Smets)

EU Officials and taxation (Me. J Buekenhoudt)

Inheritance (Me. J Buekenhoudt)

JSIS Guide

Please send these documents to :

Surname.....

First name

Address :

.....

.....

.....

Date : Signature :

To be sent to

SFPE – SEPS
175 rue de la Loi,
Bureau JL 02 40 CG39,
BE-1048 Bruxelles

Fax: +32(0)2 2818378

GSM: +32 (0)475 472470

Email:

info@sfpe-seps.be

APPLICATION FORM

I, THE UNDERSIGNED:

HOME ADDRESS:

HOME Tel: GSM: Email:

FORMER OFFICIAL OF (Institution + DG or Dep.):

IF still active: date of birth and number of years of service:

HEREBY APPLY FOR MEMBERSHIP OF THE "ASSOCIATION OF SENIORS OF THE EUROPEAN PUBLIC SERVICE " (S.E.P.S).

NATIONALITY: DATE:..... SIGNATURE:

*The annual subscription is €30, payable every year on the date of joining.*Bank account No. of SEPS: **363-0507977-28** **ING bank** Brussels**IBAN BE37 3630 5079 7728** **BIC BBRUBEBB**Communication: **Annual subscription + 1st and 2nd names***Please return this application form to:*SEPS - SFPE
Office 02 40 CG39
175, rue de la Loi,
B-1048 BRUSSELS

If you choose to pay by standing order (see below), please send the slip YOURSELF direct to your bank.

STANDING ORDER

(Please send direct to your bank)

I, the undersigned,

HEREBY INSTRUCT(Name of bank)

to pay on(date) and on the same date each year, until further notice, by

debit of account N° the sum of : **€ 30** to:**SEPS - SFPE JL Office 0240CG39,
rue de la Loi 175
B 1048 Brussels**Account N° **363-0507977-28** **ING Bank** Brussels**IBAN BE37 3630 5079 7728** **BIC BBRUBEBB****Reference : Annual subscription (+ first name and surname)**

DATE : SIGNATURE :

To be sent to

SFPE – SEPS
175 rue de la Loi,
Bureau JL 02 40 CG39,
BE-1048 Bruxelles

Fax: +32(0)2 2818378

GSM: +32 (0)475 472470

Email:

info@sfpe-seps.be