SEPS
SFPE
Seniors of the European Public Service
Seniors de la Fonction Publique Européenne

Bulletin

Information bulletin for members of the Association

September 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

21.09.2014
NM/1426 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 meetings

Room VM18 -1/32[1] – 18, rue Van Maerlant, 1040 Brussels
Maelbeek metro stop – take exit Chaussée d'Etterbeek.

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

- **Information about SEPS or General meeting**
- **Convivial lunch in the Brasserie**
- **Pensions, JSIS, supplementary health insurances**
- **Problems nencountered by members**
- **Questions**

Thursday 23 October 2014

(Information meeting)

Thursday 11 december 2014

(General meeting and Christmas lunch)

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 in situ or to the SEPS ING account (See page 2)

There are 4 parking spaces available for persons with severe handicap if reserved 15 days before the meeting.

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

[1] Rue Van Maerlant 18, due to unavailability of room VM2.

Contents

I. Letter from the Editor

At the time of the establishment of the new European Commission, several messages were addressed to President Juncker, notably from several of the staff unions of the European Institutions.

The staff representation hopes that the new Commission will be able to work towards creating a new commitment from the European populace to the development of the Union and at the same time work to defend and reactivate the European Civil Service, which is essential for the success of this undertaking. SEPS shares these hopes.

The staff unions have made known to the President that social dialogue has been neglected by the out-going Commission, as also by other institutions.

In fact there has been little opportunity for negotiations between the Commission and the Staff, in particular during the whole process of drawing up the new 2014 Staff Regulations

as also during the discussions at the level of the three institutions (Trialogue) on the adaptation of salaries and pensions from 2011 to 2013. This social dialogue needs to be re-established or maybe even re-invented for when decisions need to be taken in accordance with the co-decision process between the Parliament and the Council. In this context, the staff unions are ready to offer their idea and their support.

If this new Commission offers the hope for a revival of the hopes of pensioners for a strong European Union, many among them are very perturbed by the attitude of our "Caisse Maladie" in particular and of PMO in general. Although it is due to DG HR that contact has been re-established since June of this year, little precise information has been provided to pensioners as justification for the unexpected management style of PMO since several months. A deficit of our health system has to be offset, it is however low compared to to the annual expenditure. Many of our members are in total disarray because of the radically more severe application of certain rules of the JSIS.

Before january 2014, who was speaking of a "structural" deficit of the JSIS was banned. Curiously enough, since the approbation of the new Staff regulations, the Commission itself speaks of a structural déficit. It is evident that the out-going Commission wanted to obey the Member States' injunction, as it was expressed on the occasion of the approval of the 2014 Staff Regulations, to the letter: *"The Commission should continue to monitor the financial health of the JSIS and take all necessary measures in the event of a structural imbalance within the system."*

Serge Crutzen

II. Soft Measures for Hard Targets

The unions, the staff committee and the associations for pensioners have discussed a note from the president of the CGAM (Committee for the management of the JSIS), which confirms the current strategy which PMO-JSIS have put in place to eliminate, in the short term (2015-2016), the structural deficit[2] of our health system.

The recommendation is to apply "soft" measures, namely:

- Reimbursement limitations (use of the rule of excessiveness – discretion of the Medecin Conseil? – as these ceilings have not changed since 2007)
- Stricter management in accordance with the rules and regulations (for example: the rules concerning the recognition of serious illness and of thebprolongation: the requirement for fiscal documents: …)
- Recourse to the market (for social conventions)

PMO has been applying these principles since the end of 2013, but without having properly informed JSIS affiliates beforehand, in particular pensioners.

The EU Council section of the FFPE, followed by the Brussels and Out of Union Commission section of FFPE, has issued tracts on this attitude of PMO. Some of these tracts, relatively harsh towards PMO, have induces confirmations from the active staff.

[2] Cf the June 2014 SEPS Bulletin, page 7, declaration of Vice-President Šefčovič

Similar reactions have already been expressed by several members of SEPS: pensioners are the JSIS affiliates most likely to suffer from the "soft" measures applied by PMO.

There are numerous examples, within every one of these categories:

- Since almost 2 years PMO has modified the interpretation of the rules concerning serious illness. Recognition is difficult to extend, and this causes great difficulties for many pensioners, knowing that this recognition was granted to them 20, sometimes even 30 years ago and that the evolution of their maladie is not positive.

- Many of our members have been confronted by a refusal to reimburse the services of an osteopath, of a medical chiropodist, of a psychologist… because the receipt provided was considered to be fiscally invalid, whereas, in several cases, Belgian health insurances accept them.

- As from January 2015 all receipts concerning health related services will need to be "fiscally correct". Such requirements put affiliates in difficult situations with the providers of health services from whom they ask for these "fiscal" receipts, which are frequently refused. Affiliates are thus obliged to change service provider and, as from 2015, perhaps even doctors or clinics…? Fortunately PMO has informed the Belgian Order of Doctors (Annex 1).

- Obtaining direct billing has now become conditional: a cost estimate for hospitalisation is now required. If a single room is being requested, the cost of this room is required. In addition, this cost must be that of the least costly of the single rooms available in that establishment. There is inevitably a great risk that these costs will be exceeded and that the principle of excessiveness will be applied. No doubt prudence will force several colleagues into choosing two-bed rooms, despite the discomfort this may engender for someone of advanced years who is faced with a difficult recuperation.

- Conventions are signed with certain health establishments: so far, in Brussels, there is the case only with St Luc, Erasmus and perhaps CHIREC. What about the principle of free choice guaranteed by the JSIS?

- For several treatments or some medication our members are obliged, in contrast to the past, to request prior authorisation. Although this authorisation is usually granted, it does not arrive in a timely fashion. Tired of waiting, our colleagues undertake treatment without knowing whether they will be reimbursed for it or not.
- …

These are examples of the so-called "soft" measures which are radically changing the relationship between the managers of JSIS and its affiliates. For many of us, these measures appear severe! Whereas the objective is to cover a relatively "soft" deficit!

The last report of the inter-DG working group on the financial health of the JSIS asserts that the "reimbursement ceilings appear to be exerting their effect concretely now, since the

amounts requested for reimbursement have grown more sharply than the amounts actually reimbursed". This is a clear confirmation of this general tendency of JSIS to diminish its support to us.

Relative to the measures qualified as "soft", once more SEPS-SFPE repeats that:

It is not acceptable to confront pensioners with a brutal suppression of certain acquired social rights. It is necessary to provide a long advance notice prior to retirement. Once retired, it is difficult if not actually impossible to compensate changes to JSIS with, for instance, complementary insurance.

Pensioners are inclined to accept an increase in their contribution to the system, even unilaterally[3], through complementary premiums which JSIS could propose, like certain national health insurers do.

Is it not legitimate to believe that the Commission and therefore PMO should show a minimum of concern for former staff members and therefore to propose positive actions instead of catching its affiliates off guard. What are the real objectives of PMO?

III. Splits within staff of the Institutions

What this means for retired staff

The Federal branch of the FFPE held a seminar on 20, 21 and 22 May 2014 where one working party's theme was:

Splits within the staff and the breaking up of union territory, with particular reference to the emerging unions of a categories of staff.

Evelina Milenova of the Council section of the FFPE has produced minutes of the discussions which have been used in part below and adapted specially to draw the attention of our pensioners to this matter.

The pensioners should be following discussions on the splits so as to understand and anticipate the changing attitude that could be adopted by staff representatives in defence of the rights of the entire staff and of pensioners in particular.

1. The facts

As the years have gone by, with their various reforms, we have seen the unity and solidarity of the European Civil Service begin to crack.

Splits have appeared within the Institutions' staff leading to the forming of "category" unions, which damage staff unity and weaken its representatives in relations with the administrations whose sole wish is to comply with the Member States' political demands.

This results in a crisis for staff representation and diminished effectiveness of union action.

[3] Unilaterally: without asking the Member States to increase their contribution, which according to the Staff Regulations represents 2/3.

2. What kind of split?

- Linked to **recruitment date** (hence recruitment conditions)

Colleagues recruited from May 2004 were very frustrated by implementation of the Staff Regulations that were revised that year. Often they were colleagues of a certain age, over-qualified and having accumulated considerable professional experience prior to recruitment to the Institutions but that experienced had not been recognized. Hence, a certain amount of jealousy of older - but not necessarily much older – staff arose in many of these recruits because of the much higher career level. The "new recruits" see themselves as "shipwrecked" because of the 2004 reform: their working conditions are distinctly inferior to those of staff recruited prior to 2004. In these circumstances, it was inevitable, that a union (Génération 2004) specifically dedicated to defence of their interests should emerge.

- Linked to the **culture** or the feeling of a need to defend interests

Generally speaking, staff members from the "new Member States" are not very interested in action to defend staff interests. These colleagues are afraid of being penalised if they join a professional organization or a union and take part in union activities.
It has been noticed in the European Commission that colleagues aged around 35 tend to lose interest in defence of the staff. There is a serious risk that there will not be enough volunteers to run the staff representatives' committees and to represent the staff.

- Linked to the increasingly **precarious situation** of other agents

The increase in the number of staff on contracts (11 000 for the Commission and agencies) confirms the general tendency to undermine the European Civil Service, a fact which compromises its independence.

3. Consequences of the split

The declarations of responsible members of the "Génération 2004" group at social dialogue meetings on the 2014 reform and what is written in that group's newsletters are most instructive. There is a recurrent theme of "pre-2004 officials and pensioners are well treated: if we were to make a few changes to their advantages it would be possible to improve the situation of those "shipwrecked by the 2004 reform" who were taken on too low a level and are condemned to a less than favourable career[4]."

If this attitude continues, knowing that the proportion of new recruits will constantly increase in relation to earlier officials, it will be increasingly difficult to defend the claims of those officials and even more difficult with regard to the pensioners, as regards maintaining parallel progression of salaries and pensions and the non-application of the solidarity levy, good communication and respect of the Institutions' duty to care for its former staff who depend on the Commission for their social security.

4. How can we overcome these splits?

According to the FFPE we shall need to:

- Reconstruct an "esprit de corps" for the European Civil Service

[4] Declarations of G2004 at social dialogue meetings with Vice-President Šefčovič in 2013

Encourage the emergence of a firmer claim to a European Civil Service with an unique status but there is the risk that a model of an UN-type restricted civil service[5] will gain more and more ground.

- Integrate the "categoryt" unions (Génération 2004) into the "concert" of traditional staff representatives; envisage alliances with them on particular subjects or in deeper discussions. To be noted: there are already numerous colleagues that have been recruited since 2004 taking an active part in traditional unions and the constitution of Generation 2004 provides for its dissolution as soon as its objectives are achieved.
- Fight the diminishing interest of the (young) colleagues for questions related to defending the staff.

5. Conclusion regarding pensioners

Associations of former staff and staff representatives must take into account the frustrations and problems of the younger officials: those recruited after 2004 and staff on contract. It is important that pensioners try to understand and even help younger staff, as recommended by the unions.

If we cannot mend this split we shall be faced with a weakening of the staff representation and in particular of pensioners' acquired rights. We should explain to the 2004 generation that they have everything to gain from protecting pensions: they will be in a pensionable situation too.

In any case the pensioners should be represented in any future negotiations and they should not hesitate to take an interest in representing the staff.

All staff representatives in the Commission are currently cooperating to prepare a conference on how to counteract the injustice caused by the 2004 and 2014 reforms of the Staff Regulations. We will keep you informed.

IV. Annual salary and pension adjustment – Article 90§2

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*

[5] Civil service made up of administrators checking that procedures are respected by officials "parachuted" by the Member States, all other staff being on contract.

The Commission has therefore broken with the established practice of more than 40 years to make proposals based on the objective data established on the basis of the evolution of costs within the reference Member States. The proposals of the Commission to the Council and to the Parliament (twice 0.9%) of a purely political nature produced the above-indicated results, without any form of social dialogue. The idea of a legal challenge to this double decision has therefore been germinating in the minds of staff defenders.

Action of the unions and the pensioners' associations

Several unions, AIACE and SEPS have proposed an "article 90,2" type action so that the staff (active and retired) could launch the complaints procedure. These "typical" complaints were made available end July, early August 2014.

Several models were proposed: either combining the two decisions, that of the non-adaptation of 2011 and that of the adaptation of 0.8% of 2012, or to lodge two separate complaints for 2011 and 2012.

In any event, more than 1000 Article 90,2 arrived at the Appeals unit of the Commission (HRD2). About 20 members of SEPS have sent us copies of their complaints.

It is hoped that if a positive result is obtained by the end of this procedure (end 2015 or 2016), it will be applied to all staff and not only to the plaintiffs.

The standard response obtained from DG HR D2 is

"A motivated decision should reach us within the space of four months from the date of the submission of the complaint.

If it is not possible to respect this deadline and therefore the expiry of it, the default response to the complaint will equate to an implicit rejection of the complaint, which could give rise on your part to an appeal to the Civil Service Tribunal of the European Union under the conditions foreseen in Article 91 of the Staff Regulations."

It is therefore probable that the unions and associations will launch a coordinated appeal to the European Civil Service Tribunal at the end of the year.

The administrative board of SEPS will meet in October to take the necessary decisions for a possible follow up on the appeal together with the unions.

V. Social Dialogue: how can it be re-launched?

The social dialogue process between the staff and the Commission is necessary and established for all that concerns the creation and the modification of rules which concern civil servants and agents of the institutions. Without this dialogue one can qualify decisions relating to the creation and modification of the Staff Regulations as arbitrary.

The staff therefore expects its representatives to be invited to a dialogue on the reforms to the Staff Regulations, for changes to the JSIS DGE and for the salary adaptations….

The administrations of the institutions should consider this dialogue as an investment for social peace and not as an unwelcome obligation.

Certain phases of the last revision of the Staff Regulations, the non-adaptation of salaries and pensions in 2011, 2012, the change in approach of PMO to the application of the rules concerning JSIS are examples of where the staff considers that the principles of social dialogue have not been applied.

The staff representatives should therefore propose a revision of the principles governing this dialogue.

The issue is not straight forward since for important rules the Treaty of Lisbon has initiated the co-decision procedure between the Parliament and the Council. As could be seen during the adaptation of salaries and pensions a few months ago, during the trialogues organised to reach a co-decision, it proved impossible to insert social dialogue within the negotiations involving the three actors: Commission, Parliament, Council. We have had the benefit of information meetings organised by the Vice-Presidency of the Commission and by DG HR, but there was no question of dialogue.

The unions have new proposals for the re-launching of this social dialogue. It is clear that these proposals will be addressed to the new Commission.

SEPS intends to support proposals for the resumption of the dialogue, aware that sooner or later discussions on the cost of pensions will be re-launched by certain Member States.

VI. 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.

Message of « AGE Platform Europe» to President Jean-Claude Juncker

AGE Platform Europe congratulates Mr Juncker for his election as President of the European Commission. Older Europeans took note with great interest of his commitment to appoint a Commissioner in charge of the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and now hope this person will take forward an ambitious agenda to protect EU citizens' rights, regardless of their age.

EU's approach to the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights has been so far on an ad hoc and fragmented basis and there is incoherence between how rights are addressed in EU's internal and external action, which entails important disparities about how EU citizens can access their rights.

We therefore hope that the new Commissioner will take concrete steps to render the interventions of the EU institutions and the Member States in the area of fundamental rights

more structured, better coordinated, effective and accountable.We further expect a close consultation and involvement of civil society to shape EU's priorities in the area of fundamental rights.

Age discrimination is a key aspect here. Older Europeans are discriminated against in many areas of their lives, including access to employment and health, age limits in financial services and insurance products, and this has to stop if we want to build a Europe based on equality, fairness and inclusion.

Such Commissioner will have to play a crucial role to push as soon as possible the EU Council to adopt the long-awaited draft directive on equal treatment, as Mr Juncker promised this morning at the European Parliament. This would give the EU the relevant tools to fight against discrimination in all areas of its citizens' lives and would close the existing gap in the implementation of article 25 of the EU Charter.

We also call Mr Juncker to adopt an EU Strategy on Demographic change to make sure that challenges posed by the ageing of the population will be addressed adequately and in a coordinated way in the coming years.

As the largest network representing older people in Europe, we remain committed to closely collaborate with the new President and future College of Commissioners to make the EU more age-friendly.

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, April and June Bulletins.

Part 5

Although the picture of what is "politically correct" and what is "foul populist" clearly appeared to reveal a definite gulf. We have seen it shattered once the question of the host country's decision-making power was raised and we were surprised to see just how little remained of that power once our States had signed various conventions. There is a reaction brewing, notably regarding the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) and the 1951 Geneva Convention (C51) on the rights of refugees.

ECHR Signed in Rome on 4 November 1950, the European Convention on Human Rights , according to the Council of Europe, was the first instrument to cristallize some of the rights stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to render them binding. It is also the first treaty to have set up – in 1959 – a supranational judicial system to ensure that the States taking part do in fact adhere to their commitments. This was an historic stage in the development of international law. The sovereign States, in accepting supranational

condemnation, recognized *de facto* that human rights legislation took precedence over nationa legislation and practice.

There are two movements involved here: the first comes from above, emanating from "Man" (the voice of humanity as a whole) which sets out its rights and – quite rightly – expects that they be respected wherever there are humans: the second comes from below, from the States which have set out the definitions in the Declaration, Convention, ECHR, and their constraints - and established their scope. It is only to be expected that the above text places the emphasis on the first movement, given that it emanates from an institution devoted to "Man" and his "Rights" and which, as such, sees itself as superior to any States. There is much tension – and frequently battling – between these institutions and all that surrounds them – human rights associations, NGOs, specialized lawyers and so on – and the States themselves with their three powers (executive, legislative, judiciary). It is just that both sides tend to forget the original limits set and accepted by them. The States do so because they are involved in the difficulties of everyday life; the institutions and their entourage do so because what they loudly proclaim to be human rights can always be gone into more deeply and expanded. The conflict is all the more necessary because there would not be any "rights" at all if there were no States that created obligations corresponding to their accession to these Declarations and Conventions which –as Kirkpatrick has pointed out – would be mere "letters to Father Christmas". That which gives life and strength to a Right is acceptance of a corresponding Duty which lends it concrete form. When an institution imposes anything beyond this Duty upon a State it is surpassing its competence.

Mr Bossuyt, who presided over the Belgian Constitutional Court for many years, described his conviction as follows: *I came to the conclusion that the most relevant distinction between judges in a superior Court, be it international or national, is the one between judges taking an activist attitude and judges taking an attitude of restraint. Activist judges have a tendency to adopt a large interpretation of the jurisdiction of their court and of the material provisions they have to apply. They believe that they are better qualified to interpret the applicable legal provisions than the original framers of these texts. Not seldom, they show a distrust of political organs such as the governments and parliaments that have approved the texts. Restrained judges, on the contrary, show more respect for the intentions of the authors of the treaties, constitution and laws they have to apply. They believe that political options should be made by politically responsible organs and that only when the manner by which those organs have translated those options into legal regulations manifestly contradicts superior legal principles, they are entitled to sanction such regulation. So what does he think of the ECHR? According to him, it exercises its jurisdiction in an increasingly activist way.*

Let us look back to the *Hirsa* case. In order to understand it, we must return to 1989: Mr Soering is being extradited from the United Kingdom to the United States where he has been condemned for two murders. He appeals to the ECHR claiming he risks being submitted to […] inhuman and degrading punishments or treatment (Article 3 of ECHR.). The United Kingdom is evoking in particular the thirty-year-old practice of the Court (which has always condemned only direct violations on the part of signatory States), but the Court is condemning here for *indirect responsibility* for the bad treatment the defendant *might* receive if he were extradited. What is more, it does not hesitate to base its decision on *very*

recent acts (such as the *Convention against torture*, which entered into force only in 1987) and on *interventions by third parties* (such as Amnesty International), called for by the Court. Hence, it would suffice that Article 33 of C51 forbade sending *a refugee back to the frontiers of territories where his life or liberty would be endangered* for the ECHR – via the similarity with Article 3 referred to above – to evoke "indirect responsibilty", take over C51 and, in a few years' time, make it the basis for all case law in the matter of refugee/asylum/immigration. In so doing it has abused C51 since the latter:

(a) took only into consideration *persecution by a State* and not that by private groupings;

(b) distinguished between the *State's territory*, *high seas*, and *third-country territory*;

(c) did not refer to *collective expulsion*, it being understood that a refugee, in order to be expelled, had actually *to be* in the country;

(d) *allowed* refoulement of persons presenting a serious threat to the host country (such as terrorists);

(e) had no provision stipulating that, to be effective, a measure be *suspensive* and tied to *provisional measures* – described as recommendations and thereafter rendered compulsory and operable immediately (and that despite the constant refusal of party States to insert them in the Convention).

Why these changes? Because the ECHR deems them *dynamic*, *evolutionary*, stopping the gaps in the C51, calling for *good faith* and based on third-party intervention highly concerned with the question of Rights.

There is another essential point: an office of High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was set up to manage a programme to protect refugees and find solutuins to their problems – it was not supposed to exercise legal control. In the case of a dispute about the interpretation of the C51, States could submit it to the International Court of Justice (ICJ). However, one may choose the instrument into which the ECHR has changed the C51, but one should not forget that the States in fact signed a different one.

It must be admitted that the ECHR's case law on asylum and refugees is a determining factor but it forms only a small part of the Court's activity which has grown enormously since 1998, that is since the Commission was relieved of the task of receiving and examining claims in the first instance a few days per month. Now that this filter has gone, the Court – which now sits permanently and is accessible direct by all manner of physical and moral entities of the 47 member States of the Council of Europe (800 million inhabitants) and which, as we saw in the *Hirsa* case, may also receive claims from elsewhere – has seen its backlog of cases build up (over 120 000 in 2010, 2011 and 2013). This success, which threatens to strangle it, calls for reform. Everyone agrees but, in fact, the unanimity is but on the surface and underneath lies a sly battle between Court and States. The Court has reorganized itself (with a make-up of 1, 3, 7, 17 judges), created an order of priority for claims (which were dealt with previously in order of arrival), sends repetitive claims back to the States for them to apply established case law, has had to reject any claim that is of little interest for the claimant and for the law, resisted those conditional upon payment or a barrister, but has had to accept that claims be presented more promptly. There have been,

and still are persistent battles for or against i*ndividual claims*, a mechanism which the Court considers essential so that it can root its way into people's everyday lives and which is abhorrent to the States because it enables the ECHR to interfere with the operation of their instituions. The States' dislike was expressed at the Conference of Interlaken (2010), that of Izmir (2011) and Brighton (2012) where the *subsidiary nature* of the Court's case law and the *wide margin of discretion* of the States came out clearly. The Court was invited to ***limit itself*** to establishing *model cases* and clarifying *broad principles*. Also, the Court will be obliged henceforth to respond (unless refusal is duly motivated) to legal questions posed by all national courts (whereas the Court would prefer to receive such questions only from the country's highest court) and without such responses being binding (against the Court's wish). The Council of Europe's ministerial committee has been requested to find simplified procedures for the Court's action (at the moment, decisions require unanimity of the 47). The Court has even been obliged to counter those who dared suggest that it translate all its decisions while they were on the point of reducing its budget. All this to ensure that the Court had no more, or very scarce, time for individual claims.

Why? The ECHR is accused of activism, of assuming functions for which is was not created, which – according to Bossuyt– consist in making sure that a State party to the Convention passes legislation and follows procedures in line with that Convention. He states that the Court should not lose sight of tha fact that it has a doubly subsidiary task: taking action after the national legislator, who is the only politically responsible body, and after national laws have been passed. The Court is intending to bring all legal regulations with a human rights aspect under its competence, even if the signatory States did not want it. Today, the Court has taken on three tasks that are not part of its basic mission. It is behaving sometimes as though it is a basic appeal court and sometimes as a supreme court of appeal (by checking whether a signatory State has applied its own legislation properly), and it has also turned into a judge sitting in chambers (by imposing compulsory provisional measures for questions of asylum). Besides, previously, the ECHR dealt only with the relationship between the individual and the State, imposing on the letter *negative obligations* that were absolute and permanent (*Thou shalt not torture*!) but now it deals with private/private questions and imposes ***positive obligations*** touching on socio-economic and political matters and which vary according to the circumstances. The ECHR is constantly inserting new rights into the Convention by means of protocols signed by too few States (for example 10 out of 47) but which the Court imposes on all of them.

We have already seen how a State's *indirect responsibility for violations that may be committed by another State –signatory or not)* have been added to the signatory State's *direct responsibility*.

On 24 January 2012 a proposal for a *Resolution concerning excesses of competence by the ECHR (which is acting more and more like a government of judges*) was put before the Belgian Senate and specialists in the United Kingdom have been examining the terms and consequences of their country's withdrawal from both the Court and the Convention.

C51: As it was signed at a time when it was becoming increasingly difficult to move from one block to another, the Convention, bears the marks of Acts passed in 1926, 1933, 1938 and 1939 the aim of which was to protect groups of Europeans subject to persecution. It no longer refers to groups but defines a refugee as a person who, 'as a result of events taking place prior to 1 January 1951, (*this phrase was to be deleted in 1967*) finds himself – in Europe – outside his own country, *in fear of persecution because of his race, religion, nationality, membership of a certain social class or because of his political opinions*. It was a product of European history, stamped with the date of its establishment and applied up until the implosion of the Eastern block. It was not at all destined to end up as a basic text for questions of asylum and immigration. For that, it needed the ECHR to make use of the concept of *indirect responsibility* in 1991 in order to encompass it into its own sphere, alter it fundamentally and expose it to the whirlpool that created human rights. For, although it appears rooted in Europe, the ECHR is still (cf above) *an instrument embodying and enforcing certain rights set out* in universal acts - of the UN, to be more precise. An essential instrument because there are no constraints, no rights, only needs.

How does a universal right come about, for example, in the field of migration? First of all, we find that there are increasing numbers of people, very different from one another, that are no longer protected by their country and need international protection. Such protection can come only from States, in a dual manner: welcome and finance. Then, if we manage to make such welcome obligatory for certain States, the migrant will no longer be a needy person in their eyes, but entitled to a right. In order to impose such an obligation we have the choice of either a new convention – but we would not know whether, when and to what extent it would be accepted – or new clauses written into well-established conventions from which it remains difficult to escape. Efforts are being made to do this with C51 by bringing in *economic refugees* in particular. According to Mr Blondel' analysis, this is how it is to be done. Could this *refugee* be seen as a *person fearing persecution because he belongs to a certain social class*? As for persecution, since there is no universally accepted definition, we must look to see what the Qualification Guideline says and conclude that *economic vulnerability of an individual could be seen as persecution if it were such as to call in question seriously certain fundamental rights. This threshold of severity is certainly crossed when the person is in a situation of extreme poverty*. As for belonging to a certain social class, the ECHR states that the phrase should be understood in an evolutive sense, open to the diversity and changing nature of classes in different societies and to the progression of international standards in the matter of human rights and we come to the conclusion that we can afford protection to economically disadvantaged people who make up the population of the vast majority of developing countries. Blondel adds, moreover, that *the poor* are recognized by case law in Canada as a social class within the meaning of C51. (cf.*La protection internationale et européenne des réfugiés, éd A. Pedone, 2014).*

Given that there are analogies with other categories of *refugees,* for example *environmentalists*, there is a risk that C51 will explode and attention will be directed towards abandoning categories and adopting notions that will encompass all those requiring international protection by calling them all *vulnerable people* or quite simply *migrants* who, unlike refugees, may or may not come from the original country.

One UN special envoy has studied the immigration measures of the European Union for over a year and criticised it severely, recommending in his 2009 report putting the stress on the protection of human rights and no longer on checks and supervision, condemning expressions such as illegal immigrant or stowaway, preferring the term irregular migration which, as he emphasized, is not a breach of the law.

This is how the *Convention on the protection of rights of all migrant workers* – amongst others – saw the light of day, a document that blew up the workers' demands for rights so much that it was signed only by the migrants' countries of origin (47) and not by the host countries despite its supporters' numerous campaigns.

Notes

Just a few remarks – we'll come back to them later.

1. The ECHR's *activism* is not just one judge's attitude. It expresses the Court's vocation as it itself sees it. The Court is there to *enforce* the texts constantly being produced in UN circles by a swarm of organizations in order to deepen and enlarge (so they say) the Rights contained in the Universal Declaration.

2. We shall content ourselves here with a reference to two aspects of this *activism*.

a. Its pretension to be omni-present

Senior Law Lord Hoffman had this to say about the ECHR in 2009:

It has been unable to resist the temptation to aggrandise its jurisdiction and to impose uniform rules on member states. […] As the case law shows, there is virtually no aspect of our legal system, from land law to social security to torts to consumer contracts, which is not arguably touched at some point by human rights. But we have not surrendered our sovereignty over all these matters. We remain an independent nation with its own legal system, evolved over centuries of constitutional struggle and pragmatic change. I do not believe that the United Kingdom's legal system is perfect but I do argue that detailed decisions about how it could be improved should be made in London, either by our democratic institutions or by judicial bodies which, like the Supreme Court of the United States, are integral with our own society and respected as such.

What he said about the United Kingdom is equally valid for the European Union and brings up the question as to whether we should adhere to the ECHR and its Convention. *(to be continued)*

b. Its political nature and goals

A major phenomenon in our present world is the explosion of the number of displaced persons – apparently hundreds of millions. Solutions must be found. Non of the UN bodies nor any of the other bodies busying themselves with this phenomenon (UNHCR, Red Cross, Amnesty International and so on) has the strength or the intention of dealing with the causes of this plague and they call upon all the States that are there to listen to provide a welcome and money. They could merely put in requests but they prefer *recourse to conventions* which mean that States not only accept obligations but can be subject to checks and condemnations by courts such as the ECHR. Thus, the Rights become a

political instrument which is then, paradoxically, at the service of the same economic and political powers which brought about the situations of poverty, violence and exploitation that led these people to leave their homes and become *displaced*. There is objective connivenve between those causing a mass exodus and those trying by all means (including judicial) to find a place for them to go. The state of the signatures to the *Convention on the rights of migrant workers* is a sign of this collusion. Certain States try to fob their excess population on the *others* whilst imposing as many obligations as possible on them for their *former* citizens. It is a way of salving their conscience …
However, this obliges us to regard immigration and its attached *rights* in quite a different way!
(to be continued)

VII. Testimonies

The use of JSIS on-line has split those pensioners who have expressed a wish to open an ECAS account.

This new system for submitting requests for reimbursement of medical expenses is more efficient for the follow up of the dossier and for the speed of reimbursement.

For some of our members, in addition to the difficulty in obtaining an ECAS account (and even the impossibility of obtaining one) it is not correct to ask pensioners to acquire informatics equipment in order to undertake work that PMO should be doing. Let us not forget, however, that the 'paper' procedure is still valid.

For others, if the number of treatments and consultations is great, respecting the rules (for example, listing each individual medication line by line) becomes a fastidious task, which leads them to 'return' to the 'paper' option.

For others even who have been subject to the control of the bills and documents sent by internet and then sent by post, their appreciation is again different and often negative. Mrs Pletschette has authorised SEPS to publish in its Bulletin her letter to JSIS expressing her annoyance.

Letter from Nelly Pletschette-Lodiso and Guy Pletschette to the PMO

Brussels, 4 August 2014

Dear PMO / JSIS contact

This is it – I'm writing to you – I can't go on any longer.

I'm 80 years old, perfectly right in my head, the only thing is my legs won't hold me up any more – It's difficult for me to get about. My husband is 83; his head is all right but his legs aren't. We're hanging on; it's not easy to convince ourselves that we're heading for an old people's home. I have a son who doesn't live far from us but he "hasn't got the time". That's life!

I was so pleased to see that we could send our medical claims online (for that, one already has to be quite gifted in manipulating a computer to find one's way around and, furthermore, be very organized!). Never mind, that's progress for you. I'm still convinced that, lurking behind the indifferent, if not inhuman, "System", there are some "people" – doubtless with many qualities - but unfortunately they just carry out the tasks that the System demands and dominates.

I am very often subjected to (sudden) conformity "checks" – now I'm confronted with a €100 analysis for my husband, declared non-reimbursable because the doctor's stamp is illegible. I have to re-scan the document, yes, but there's no point because the result will be the same. Doctors are complicated animals who have no time to spare and insist on using a blue biro rather than a black one even if the patient has a black biro in his pocket and offers it for use! The rubber stamps have a mind of their own and are as worn out as the doctors who thoroughly dislike "paperwork" and the ink pads are dehydrated from lack of ink! Hence, improving the administrative procedure of a doctor is like tackling an obstacle course and I am in no fit state to undertake that.

What is more, I am afraid when I have to send documents through the post because, dear "System", have you not heard that a postman once threw an entire bag of letters destined for 500 people into the dustbin? Oh yes, our modern postal service is going down the drain as well.

If I must send documents by post I have to go out; I have to send them in A4 envelopes (which I have to buy) and pay double for the stamps, which are not for nothing. All that because you don't trust us – is that really logical?

You say we mustn't use the two systems – internet and post . I understand that. However, to save me all this trouble, I think I shall go back to filling out my claim forms by hand and taking them myself to Rue de la Science while I still have someone to drive me there from time to time.

All things come to an end. One day my poor body will give up the battle and dust will return to dust. This galaxy of millions of atoms that was myself will die as the stars die, sprinkling its dusty matter into space. All these atoms dancing within me will go dancing elsewhere – like puppets doing their little turn on stage and disappearing in a puff of smoke. They will make their mark on a butterfly's wing, the bark of a tree, a wispy cloud, the hair of a flea - let others carry on this song as they please. There is food for thought here though, isn't there?

This ends the humorous missive of a retired lady who dislikes "Systems".

VIII. Information – Questions from members

1. Commission information to pensioners

INFO SENIOR

The information bulletin "Info Senior" of DG HR C1 addresses the need for information of all pensioners, whether they are connected to the internet or not. The SEPS Bulletin will not

repeat the information contained in “Info Senior” unless complementary details appear useful.

Message of PMO to pensioners through the magazine VOX

At last, at the beginning of May 2014 PMO sent a message to all pensioners using the magazine VOX[6] of AIACE, which is distributed to all pensioners. The 4 pages (29-32) in the centre of the magazine concern aspects of the rules governing JSIS and of the pension system, questions which are frequently asked by members of SEPS.

In the June 2014 Bulletin, SEPS made several remarks about this communication.

In the VOX magazine of July 2014 PMO published four pages of information in English and in French. The chapter on school allowances may be of interest to our pensioner colleagues who still have children or grand-children to care for. It is important to know the rules concerning the age of children, those concerning further studies and those concerning the possible income of the spouse or partner and of the child. The school allowance, as the household allowance, could be interrupted if one of the criteria is no longer satisfied and in this case there may be sums to reimburse to PMO (see also “Info Senior” no 1)

As from next year, it will be necessary to request an extension by submitting a specific form for this.

2. Voluntary work

Reminder – Active Senior (INFO Senior No 2)

Making use of the expertise of former staff consists of requesting the voluntary input of former civil servants to undertake unpaid activities within the Commission. The initiative aims to promote the use of the expertise of retired staff, whatever level he/she occupied within the institution at the time of retirement, on a voluntary basis both on the part of the Commission services as on the part of the former staff member.

The areas of activity can be very varied

- Information, presentation of policies, conferences, brain storming groups
- Political expertise, advice, participation in specific task forces
- Scientific and technical expertise, evaluation of projects, research
- Participation in competition juries, selection panels

Whoever is interested needs to contact their former DG, or DG HR C1 or respond to calls for interest.

Needs of the pensioners’ associations

[6] AIACE – VOX no 97 – April 2014 received by pensioners early May 2014

The associations at the service of former staff members need volunteers for the daily administration, for animation and for direct help to colleagues in difficulty. There are few volunteers truly available for such support tasks and yet it should be possible to respond systematically to requests from former colleagues who do not always find the contact or the reply to their questions from the services of the Commission.

Support Group Ukraine, put in place by the Commission in April 2014

The Administration asks us to draw attention to this appeal, which has already been sent out to pensioners: The objective of this "task force" is to provide support to Ukraine in its political and economic reform process, which is necessary for stabilising the country and for enabling it to become democratic, independent and prosperous. The support group is directed by Mr Peter Balas. He invites retired civil servants of the Commission to engage themselves under the "Active Senior" programme through the call for interest form in annex. If you are interested to contribute to the work of this support group, please send your candidacy by e-mail to EC-SGUA-ANCIENS@ec.europa.eu or, if preferred, by letter to Peter Balas, Support Group for Ukraine, J-70 06/71, European Commission, BE-1049 Brussels.

3. Vanbreda International has become CIGNA

Vanbreda International has been bought out by the American insurer Cigna. Progressively the name Vanbreda International will be replaced by Cigna. Vanbreda International/Cigna remains an important insurance broker for civil servants and agents of the institutions with close to 18,000 insurance contracts with the European institutions. These contracts concern complementary health insurances, the accident insurances for pensioners and invalids, the insurance "savings plan and supplementary pension", dependency insurance, negotiated by Afiliatys and AIACE (cf point 4 below).

4. Complementary health insurance to JSIS and other insurances

A new edition of the SEPS working paper on complementary health and accident insurances is available (FR – EN 21 August 2014). It concerns a series of insurances proposed to the staff of the institutions by Afiliatys, by AIACE and by certain staff unions.

The insurances concerned are as follows:

Complementary health insurances limited to hospitalisation:

HOSPI SAFE of Allianz BE / Vanbreda Int(Cigna) (BCVR 8672) negotiated by Afiliatys
GROS RISQUES of Allianz BE / Vanbreda Int(Cigna) (BCVR 8673) negotiated by AIACE
EUROHOSPI of Santalia / EAS, introduced by R&D
EUCARE HOSPI of Santalia / Wyr, introduced by FFPE
ELP PLUS GOLD EU – option 1, of Expat & Co / Wyr, intoduced by FFPE
EUROSANTE - option 1, of Allianz DE / WWCare / Concordia, introduced by Union Syndicale

Wider ranging complementary health insurances (hospitalisation and ambulatory care, medication, dental care, optics, health equipment…)

HOSPI SAFE PLUS of Allianz BE / Vanbreda Int(Cigna) (BCVR 8672, 2nd Option) negotiated by Afiliatys
DKV EU Plus of DKV Luxemburg / Wyr, introduced by FFPE
EUROSANTE+ of Santalia / EAS, introduced by R&D
EUCARE+ of Santalia / Wyr, introduced by FFPE
Europat Local Plus Gold EU of Expat & Co / Wyr SCRL introduced by FFPE
EUROSANTE, of Allianz DE / WWCare / Concordia, introduced by Union Syndicale

Specific accident insurance with capital in case of invalidity

ACCIDENTS (100%; invalidity-death capital) Cigna / Vanbreda Int (Cigna)/AIACE
DEATH & DISABILITY Allianz BE / Vanbreda Int(Cigna)/Afiliatys

Other insurances considered

Debt balance of Allianz BE / Vanbreda Int(Cigna), Afiliatys
Supplementary pension & saving plan of Allianz BE / Vanbreda Int(Cigna)/Afiliatys
Travel assistance of Europe Assistance / Vanbreda Int(Cigna)/Afiliatys

The SEPS document provides a brief summary of the coverage offered by each of these insurances and includes a table of the annual dues as a function of the age of the insured.

5. Special reimbursement Art 72,3 and supplementary health insurance to JSIS

Reminder: Article 72, 3

Article 72,3 of the Staff Regulations, special reimbursement, limit the risk which might represent the 20% or 15% which are not reimbursed in the event of significant health care: if, within the space of 12 months the total of expenses not reimbursed by JSIS exceeds half a month's salary or half a month's pension, a supplementary reimbursement can be requested[7]. This reimbursement, consisting of the amount which exceeds the half month's salary or pension, may be 100% but will take account of the family circumstances (DGE of 01.07.2007).

The risk is therefore limited (if this supplementary reimbursement is granted[8]): approximately half a month's salary or pension per year. But the ceilings and exclusions remain, which may make the non-reimbursed portion and thus the risk greater. The JSIS affiliate may wish to reduce or eliminate this risk[9] by subscribing to a complementary insurance.

Procedure

[7] Special form to be found on (My Intracomm-Ext)
[8] Apparently always granted so far
[9] For example: a retired, divorced director general providing substantial monthly maintenance to his former spouse.

In principle the Reimbursements office informs the affiliate if the ceiling of half-a-month's pension has been exceeded, but this is not always the case, as the regulations stipulate. (DGE JSIS):

"An information note, established on the basis of the amounts exceeding the maximum during the last 36 months, is automatically sent to or at the request of the affiliate who may qualify for this special reimbursement.

The affiliate needs to send back this information note indicating which 12 month period he/she wishes to be taken into account. Without this indication from the affiliate of the chosen period, the period which appears to be the most advantageous for the affiliate is used to calculate the level of the special reimbursement."

There is a form (My Intracomm-Ext) to be filled in for requesting this special reimbursement.

Case of complementary health insurance for JSIS

There is no question of benefiting from this special reimbursement from JSIS whilst at the same time obtaining an equivalent reimbursement through a complementary health insurance which reimburses up to 100%.

For example, the complementary health insurance policy "Hospi Safe" (cf point 4 above) stipulates clearly:

In the event a special reimbursement in line with Article 72, 3 of the Staff Regulations is granted to the insured, the insured is under obligation to inform Vanbreda International about this.

The amount of the special reimbursement granted to the insured by JSIS is to be paid to the Insurance company (who reimburses 100%) in accordance with a schedule agreed between the two parties.

After a period of 12 months or more, if this special reimbursement is granted, or even for a shorter period, if a hospital bill is very high and alone can already generate a request for special reimbursement, the insurance broker can ask for the reimbursement of part of what he has already paid in the framework of the complementary insurance, i.e. the sum granted which represents the excess over the half-month's salary or pension, within the ceilings of the JSIS.

6. JSIS – Coverage of the spouse/partner – Reminder

All pensioners will have received No 25-2014 of the administrative notices. It is necessary to insist on this given the disappointment of some of our members. This information concerns the conditions for obtaining the household allowance *and for obtaining the top-up cover under the JSIS.*

If the household allowance and/or the complementary coverage to JSIS has been granted to you on the strength of the income of your spouse or recognised partner, you are obliged each year send a declaration of his/her activity or professional income to PMO.

The top-up cover by JSIS for your spouse ends on 30 June each year. You are advised therefore to submit the declaration of income for your spouse/partner as soon as possible so that your request for reimbursement of his/her medical expenses is not rejected.

This declaration form can be obtained via SYSPER, via PMO Contact online, or by poste at the following addresses:

Commission européenne PMO 3 – RCAM – SC27 1/35 1049 Bruxelles	Commission européenne PMO 5 – RCAM – DRB B1/85 L-2920 Luxembourg	Commissione Europea PMO 6 – RCAM – TP 740 Via E. Fermi, 2749 I – 21027 Ispra (VA)

7. JSIS – Accident cover

Given the frequent telephone calls received following publication of the first issue of INFO SENIORS N°1, we feel the need to explain the situation as regards accident cover.

Medical costs incurred as a result of an accident or occupational disease leading to the application of Article 73 of the Staff Regulations **are reimbursed at the rate of 80% and 85% for officials in active employment, pensioners and staff on invalidity allowance.**

However, reimbursement of the remaining 15% or 20% is provided under Article 73 of the Staff Regulations relating to cover of risks for accidents and occupational diseases (statutory insurance) for staff in active employment only. This insurance also covers invalidity and death.

We can see from this that, for pensioners and officials benefiting from invalidity allowance, costs related to an accident are covered by the JSIS as though it were an illness (reimbursement at 80% or 85%[10]). Statutory insurance no longer protects them fully. There are also ceilings, limits and exclusions to take into consideration.

The supplementary health insurance policies provided by AFILIATYS, AIACE "High risks and Accidents", DKV EU Plus, EUROSANTE/EUROHOSPI – EU CARE, ELP GOLD EU grant top-up cover (15%, 20% or 100%) if not given by the JSIS (for pensioners and those with invalidity), provided that the treatment is specifically covered by the policy – and this depends on the option taken (e.g. hospitalization only).

It is essential in all cases to declare that it is an accident case (for example to justify the use of an ambulance).

8. JSIS: As from January 2015, in Belgium, a fiscal receipt will be essential to receive reimbursement

Doctors, dentists and physiotherapists in Belgium give a certificate to patients for the treatment provided – a green, white, orange or blue paper.

[10] Cf JSIS Regulation – Decision of 02.07.2007 C(2007)3195

If your doctor or practitioner has not necessarily provided this document up to now, you are entitled to request it. It will be required in January to obtain reimbursement from JSIS. (*What to do if it is refused?*)

It is the official Belgian body responsible for checking that the rules on national insurance for sickness and invalidity (INAMI) that has approved this obligation. It should not be a problem for your doctor because all qualified doctors and other medical practitioners have been issued with a complete set of certificates.

The National Council of the Belgian Order of medical practitioners has been informed and should disseminate this information to its members, who, as a result, should no longer be surprised when such fiscally correct receipts are requested. The letter of the Director of PMO to the President of the National Council of the Belgian Order of medical practitioners is given in Annex 1.

According to PMO, we, the beneficiaries of JSIS, would be more protected against the surcharges levied by some doctors, if we obtain a completed form indicating the treatment received and on which the amount we will have paid is shown.

The health care providers who are not government regulated will however be free to determine their fees. The requirement for them to deliver a fiscally correct receipt may incite some to increase their fees and since the ceilings are fixed, the reimbursement that affiliates receive will inevitably be proportionately lower.

The JSIS will be issuing its official information to members and the measures will enter into force on 1 January 2015.

9. Use the correct forms

For your dental estimates

You must send in an estimate prior to receiving certain dental treatment such as orthodontics, periodontics, implants or prostheses. In order to speed up your request, the PMO requests that you use the official form.

Select the form you need: orthodontic treatment = B1 or any other treatment = A1.The dentist should fill out the form, stating which teeth are involved (n° of tooth and chart) together with the cost of each treatment. The form must be signed and stamped by the dentist.

Ask your dentist for a separate estimate for each type of treatment – occlusions, periodontics, prostheses and implants. In the case of complicated treatment where there are several choices, one estimate per option is required.

Use the latest forms available on My Intracomm-Ext to request direct billing, prior authorization, special reimbursement and so on. The PMO has made changes to several forms over recent months. You may always ask the SEPS Secretariat for them if you so wish (part 4 of the Vade-Mecum).

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.

IX. Annexes

Annex 1

Letter of the PMO director to the Council of the Medical Order in Belgium.

Not available in EN. See French version of the Bulletin, Annex 1.

Annex 2.

In memoriam

June, July, August 2014

Name	Birth	Death	Institution
CHARLIER Nicole	22/11/1944	31/08/2014	COM
VAN KRALINGEN Jansje	29/09/1923	30/08/2014	COM
PRINS Albert	20/06/1933	27/08/2014	COM
LISCHETTI Luisella	12/07/1951	26/08/2014	PE
HIGHAM-NOEL Jeannette	16/02/1948	26/08/2014	COM
SCHILLINGS Gerda	18/07/1923	24/08/2014	COM
GHISLAIN Jean	05/06/1937	23/08/2014	PE
VAN GELDEREN-TRIFONI Maria Bruna	20/07/1928	23/08/2014	CJ
ZANARDI Rina	05/06/1949	22/08/2014	COM
GONELLA Natale	28/02/1931	21/08/2014	COM
DALDRUP Franz	08/02/1918	21/08/2014	COM
LENOIR Sieglinde	16/07/1927	21/08/2014	COM
MANNARA Giuseppa	19/05/1938	19/08/2014	COM
MIENER Johannes	27/10/1928	18/08/2014	COM
MEERT Marcel	27/01/1938	15/08/2014	CES
SORENSEN Frederik	14/09/1936	14/08/2014	COM
HEINZ Andrea	21/06/1960	12/08/2014	COM
DE VREESE Rene	27/06/1927	12/08/2014	CM
SAUZE Jacques	13/06/1935	10/08/2014	COM
VAN HELLEPUTTE Georges	23/11/1925	10/08/2014	COM
WAGNER Ursula	02/08/1923	10/08/2014	COM
SOLA Alain	01/06/1930	10/08/2014	COM

DE BACCI Mario	10/05/1931	06/08/2014	COM
BINA Giulio	28/09/1925	05/08/2014	COM
THIRY Juliette	01/07/1932	04/08/2014	COM
DEBERGHES Daniel	11/09/1942	02/08/2014	COM
GOPPEL Michael	03/08/1936	01/08/2014	COM
WYEME Thierry	25/04/1960	31/07/2014	COM
CIAVAGLIA Giovanni	19/10/1929	31/07/2014	COM
HERMES Liliane	08/12/1937	29/07/2014	COM
BERETTA Maria-Anita	27/11/1927	29/07/2014	PE
RECCHIONI Simonetta	31/03/1949	28/07/2014	CES
GOULIOURIS Nikolaos	13/07/1938	27/07/2014	COM
VISSER Frederik	08/12/1927	26/07/2014	COM
PONTI Pietro	31/03/1934	24/07/2014	COM
PETERMANN-HEUSBOURG Josée	05/11/1927	24/07/2014	CM
VOLPI Pierfranco	23/05/1930	23/07/2014	COM
BOVENDEERD Charles	11/01/1927	21/07/2014	CM
MANZOTTI Angelo	01/03/1925	21/07/2014	COM
DAVIDSON Samuel	16/12/1919	20/07/2014	COM
DELANNOY Jean-Claude	04/07/1944	18/07/2014	COM
DISPA Jacques	26/02/1928	18/07/2014	COM
WEBER-PERL Bernadette	29/04/1925	15/07/2014	COM
LANGEVIN Bernard	03/08/1941	15/07/2014	COM
MARCOLINI Fausto	14/07/1935	14/07/2014	COM
BERCKMANS Jacqueline	26/06/1942	13/07/2014	COM
GOFFART Claire	28/01/1942	11/07/2014	CM
BIRKHOFF Gerhard	01/07/1927	10/07/2014	COM
BOURGEOIS Christian	09/11/1944	09/07/2014	COM
MANTHEY Gunther	20/01/1944	09/07/2014	COM
WAELBROECK François	25/05/1924	08/07/2014	COM
VANDAMME Omer	11/07/1926	06/07/2014	COM
OPPETIT Robert	14/09/1924	05/07/2014	COM
MANENTI Bartolomeo	20/10/1949	04/07/2014	CM
PALMER Michael	02/02/1933	04/07/2014	PE
SAGGIORO Zeno	12/04/1929	03/07/2014	COM
PIRES Manuel	05/03/1943	01/07/2014	COM
JOHNSTONE Hugh	01/05/1931	30/06/2014	COM
SCHUMACHER Karl-Ernst	13/03/1938	27/06/2014	COM
LEEMANS Christa	01/02/1942	26/06/2014	CM
DEVOGELAERE Pierre	27/03/1937	25/06/2014	COM
GRECO Stefano	14/09/1933	23/06/2014	CJ

PETTINI Francesco	07/01/1938	22/06/2014	COM
BERARDI Bruno	08/02/1942	21/06/2014	PE
SERVRANCKX Jean-Paul	22/05/1928	20/06/2014	COM
PAULIN Bernard	12/09/1928	20/06/2014	COM
WHITE David	28/05/1933	19/06/2014	COM
CHRISTOYANNOPOULOS Athanassios	25/07/1945	19/06/2014	COM
NOWAK Andreas	31/01/1935	18/06/2014	COM
MERTENS Anne-Marie	24/08/1929	18/06/2014	COM
TONDEUR Jean	02/11/1951	17/06/2014	CM
PEETERS Roger	18/05/1933	17/06/2014	PE
LOWY Irene	30/08/1933	15/06/2014	COM
SARSFIELD Jeremiah	05/07/1949	15/06/2014	PE
VLESSING-BAKKER Grietje	10/06/1933	13/06/2014	COM
FROEHLINGSDORF Reinhard	24/06/1950	13/06/2014	COM
BADOGLIO Pietro	31/03/1939	12/06/2014	COM
BENOIT Jacqueline	06/07/1923	11/06/2014	COM
VAN HAUWERMEIREN Marie-Gerard	07/09/1938	10/06/2014	COM
BOEKESTEIN Gerda	27/02/1923	08/06/2014	COM
MASCETTI Ermanno	21/10/1936	07/06/2014	COM
WILHELM Serge	20/02/1928	06/06/2014	COM
SOLARI Francesco	13/07/1951	06/06/2014	PE
BAUER Manfred	09/01/1943	05/06/2014	COM
MOROSI Luigi	14/09/1922	05/06/2014	COM
KORZILIUS Robert	09/03/1921	05/06/2014	COM
THORSHOJ Brigitte	19/05/1949	04/06/2014	CJ
CALCAGNO Alessandra	05/08/1939	04/06/2014	CdR
BERTOLETTI Silain	04/11/1930	01/06/2014	COM

Annex 3.

Files and documents available.
Order form

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)	O
Part 2 (forms /pers. data)	O
Part 3 (addresses PMO – ADMIN. …) Edition February 2013	O
Part 4 (reimbursement forms – RCAM/JSIS)	O
Summary of the SR reform (DG HR - 12 pages)	O
Supplementary health insurances Edition june 2013	O
Invlidity allowance and survival pension (Hendrik Smets)	O
EU Officials and taxation (Me. J Buekenhoudt)	O
Inheritance (Me. J Buekenhoudt)	O
JSIS Guide	O

Please send these documents to *:*

Surn*ame*…… ….

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