



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

Bulletin

Information bulletin for members of the Association

June 2016

SEPS secretariat can be reached

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

or by internet: info@sfpe-seps.be

Version française au verso

02.07.2016
NM/39/1618 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

***Most of the articles of the Bulletin were written in French. Translations are from
Yasmin Sözen***

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

Forthcoming Information Meeting

Location : Au Repos des Chasseurs

*Avenue Charle-Albert, 11 1170 Bruxelles (Boitsfort)**

+32(0)26604672

Thursday 16 June 2016

* Near to AXA – Boulevard du Souverain - Tram 94. Transport by colleagues could be organised if necessary.

According to the traditional pattern : 11:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

- Information relating to the SEPS-SFPE
- Lunch
- Pension and JSIS information - Relations with the PMO
- Help to retirees.
- Problems encountered by members
- Questions

Don't forget to contact the secretariat

- **To reserve your lunch (€25)**
- **To indicate the number of accompanying persons as well as their name and nationality**

SFPE – SEPS, office JL 02 40 CG39, 175, rue de la Loi, BE-1048 Brussels
E-mail info@sfpe-seps.be Tel : +32 (0) 475 472 470

Payment can be made in situ or to the SEPS-SFPE bank account:

IBAN: BE 37 3630 5079 7728

BIC: BBRUBEBB

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

	Page
I. Letter from the Editor	4
II. Let us imagine a more promising future for the European Union ...	6
III. Brexit, example of an English reaction	9
IV. Non-transferred pension rights.	10
V. The cost of pensions	13
VI. Summary of the outcome of the CGAM meeting of 25 and 26 May 2016	16
VII. Serious illness – evolution of case law	20
VIII. Recalculation of pension rights not transferred to the Community system	21
XI. Information – Questions from members	
1. PMO newsletter	
a. Declaring your spouse's 2015 income Impact on household allowance and JSIS reimbursement	22
b. Helpdesk for matters relating to salaries and individual entitlements	23
c. Family allowances	23
d. Divorce and separation: which parent will receive family allowances?	23
e. PMO in figures	24
2. A problem of ethics - a reminder	24
3. Reminder: Reimbursement of health care in general	24
X. Annexes	
1. Cover for the spouse/recognized partner of a member of the JSIS	25
2. In memoriam	26
3. Files and documents available. Order form	29
4. Application form	31

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

Decided at the GM of 13 December 2013

I. Letter from the Editor

It is the day after the vote in favour of Brexit that we finish this June Bulletin. I would like to express the sadness I feel about the result of the referendum. It seemed impossible that such a result might be attained: too many warnings had been made, even by the British authorities themselves.

“It is increasingly difficult to argue that people would be better off in the event of our departure” declared the governor of the Bank of England.

We belong to a generation which has known the Second World War, or those who have received very clear messages from their parents. We have known the reconstruction of Europe and the birth of the European Communities. We regret the years of stagnation that we have just lived through, but we must admit that the EU has helped us to reconstruct our society after the war years. The EU has helped us to improve our standard of living. The EU has obliged the 6 founding countries to work together without reservation and in the end 28 countries have opened their frontiers.

The situation is however uncertain. The referendum is not a decision in itself in Great Britain. The British Parliament still needs to confirm Brexit and the British government needs to initiate the process of Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty. The separation process is expected to take 2 years. This will probably be the minimum and there will be time to achieve an exit which will be as honourable as possible for the EU and for Great Britain. New relations will need to be built between the EU and the United Kingdom, let us hope, without weaknesses.

As an association for the retired of the European Institutions, SEPS/SFPE is concerned about what might happen to our retirees in Great Britain and to the British retirees in the EU of 27.

Our Staff Regulations define us as “permanent” civil servants, as the President of the Commission confirmed when addressing our British colleagues:

“You are "Union officials". You work for Europe. You left your national 'hats' at the door when you joined this institution and that door is not closing on you now.”

In the same way many authorities in Great Britain have attempted to reassure citizens of the EU established in the UK.

I therefore hope that our retired (and active) colleagues will not be taking hasty decisions. Unfortunately it will not be possible to avoid the economic and financial fallout caused by this announced separation.

What can we hope from our political leaders? Rainer Dumont du Voitel offers us an article on this subject. He would like to be optimistic that a European nucleus will revive, but the leaders of the 6 founding nations do not seem to feel inclined to foster our enthusiasm!

The objectives of SEPS/SFPE are to defend the acquired social rights of retirees. The Association will continue on this path, within the means at its disposal, whether its members are British or not.

Serge Crutzen

II. And if, after a joyless Brexit, we were to imagine a promising future for European integration...

Rainer Dumont de Voitel, Vice-President of SEPS/SFPE

Let us not hesitate to admit that the process of unifying Europe, process of which we have been part for more than 60 years, represents a kind of miracle which could only happen given the political will of the ruling class.

Since the conclusion of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 however, the process of European unification has gone through very difficult times, notably due to the successive and precipitate enlargements, which since the start of the financial crisis and that of sovereign debt have become more and more apparent. The enthusiasm for a united Europe has in the meanwhile eroded into an often worrying kind of Euro scepticism.

It is true that the political leaders in Europe and in their respective Member States have all too often let themselves be seduced by economic ultra-liberalism at the global level at the expense of the social and fiscal dimension of European unification. It is this omission and not the project of a unified Europe which the French voters wanted to sanction by rejecting the proposed constitutional treaty in 2005. It would be futile to try to detail the various omissions and side trackings that have contributed to the rift between the European citizens and European construction and to analyse them one by one. We therefore inevitably have to look forwards.

To do this, we need to come to an agreement on a clear and common objective, underpinned by corresponding shared convictions and attitudes with the ambition to serve the people by providing them with orientation, protection and hope which a Europe, as a peaceful power in a globalised world, can offer.

A new element has, however, just recently emerged. It has hit the headlines in all the media. Our British friends decided on 23 June 2016 with a small majority to leave the European Union. This issue has at least now been decided. It would have been unhealthy to leave it unsettled. The adherence of Britain to the European Communities more than 40 years ago under the deceptive appearance of wanting, without reservation, to participate in this unification process and to accompany it in a constructive manner very quickly revealed itself to be the start of a 'strategic' sabotage, which on many an occasion seriously undermined the process of integration in the original Community and in the European Union that followed.

There are many countries – unfortunately also Germany among them – who have hidden themselves behind the same type of attitude. Strutting around with European successes, 'selling' them at the national level as the exploits of the respective governments, while at the same time attributing to "Brussels" and to Europe all the less agreeable dimensions of the compromises which have, in minute detail, been elaborated together; permanently deriding the work undertaken for the unification of Europe by denigrating the European Institutions

and the people who work there; all of these are behaviours which over the years have seriously degraded the image and the reputation of Europe in the minds of our populations. For integration to have a promising future of any kind, our governments and the media which accompany them will have to end this unhealthy practice once and for all: Are they capable of it?

In future Europe will in any case need more veracity. The aforementioned truths about our recent common history should therefore be able to be aired as no one has been faultless in these deviations.

**New challenges can favour cohesion
(without yet speaking about refugees, of state indebtedness or of global warming).**

The European dimension and often even the global nature of new challenges which suddenly appear with each successive crisis are obvious to everyone. Other phenomena, no less important, can however manifest themselves more discretely. In this way the effect and the obligatory nature of the common values, so often cited in Europe (as also in our Western 'advanced' industrial societies), have eroded over the last decades. We have effectively neglected to take care of these values and to reanimate them relentlessly (let us give just a few examples: 'democracy', the role of remunerated work and social ties as they appear in our biographies, the concept of "equality", the position of the "family" and of "children", human rights of course, the reliability of the Administration at the service of its citizens, or the increasingly nebulous concept of "social justice"). We must review these concepts and issues truthfully and lucidly in order to reposition these values as our foundation, if we want them to guide us and if we want our lives in Europe and in the Member States to be exemplary by giving meaning and respect to these values. This is as true for the ruling class, who will need to set the good example, as it is for every European citizen in each of the Member States.

One can now say that at the time of the birth of the European Communities during the 1950's, still under the vividly felt shock at the destruction caused by war between the European nations, the founding fathers and other transnational movements who were in favour of integration, as for example the European federalists, seriously underestimated the cohesive force exerted by language and nation. The mutual and equal respect agreed then between the Member States, the search for a symbiosis between competitiveness and solidarity and the renunciation of any imperialist tendencies have nonetheless given rise to an example worth pursuing. Since the beginning and to this day this consensus represents a very good reason for being proud of the chosen path and to identify ourselves with the agreed pathway. Other large regions in this world would do well to inspire themselves from this consensus, thereby also abandoning any sense of superiority.

All this however does not change the fact that the creation of a common interest for the Member States of the EU still leaves much to be desired. The big enlargement towards the East after the fall of the Berlin wall happened too swiftly; in addition, these enlargements were not fully covered by the initial concept of the founding fathers of the original Community of Six. As a result numerous exaggerated expectations from the new adhering nations were ultimately disappointed. Many of these countries were moreover not inclined to give up the liberties newly found after the implosion of the Soviet Union to join the European Union, with its own constraining forces, against whatever form of counterpart or benefit. This reservation did not however in any way affect their desire to become part of this very European Union.

When gathering new momentum to pursue and strengthen the construction of Europe, it will be necessary to take account of some of the ambiguities and paradoxes which will continue to be part

of our efforts to grow closer in order to act together, and if necessary, to open them out to democratic debate.

**Creation of a strong political nucleus capable of acting at the EU level
of the 27 Member States, that we will be from now on.**

A path which can be both envisaged and realised to consolidate the 'acquis communautaire' whilst pursuing unification would be to reach agreement among the Member States to no longer advance in unison at whatever cost in pursuit of the construction of the EU and to develop the concept of a European nucleus which is harder and stronger and which would be able to act equal to equal with other powerful nations at the global level, whilst respecting the values we defend and thereby respect the European way of life with conviction. This would however also require an awareness and a political will to exercise responsible power as a European entity in the global arena. The strength to do this could come from the fact that this nucleus would remain fully incorporated within the European Union which already exists in reality, but which would take a small step back from its current level of integration to find better support from those who do not yet feel ready to take that step towards political union, but who nonetheless wish to preserve and consolidate stronger cooperation within the area of free-trade, which exists and with which they can identify.

A pertinent criterion for defining the proposed concrete nucleus could be to have at least one geographical frontier with another of the partner countries of this nucleus to be created. The nucleus could thus constitute the original six Member States (France, Germany, Italy and the three countries of the Benelux, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg) to which could be added the two countries of the Iberian peninsula (Portugal and Spain) and perhaps Austria; a nucleus of 9 countries, although it is entirely possible that given current the state of mind of the peoples of the Netherlands and of Austria, they may not yet be ready to take this step, so that the number of countries constituting the initial nucleus may be more limited.

The remaining 18 (or more) countries of the EU would, together with those of the nucleus, form the full entity of the Union, within which the nucleus to be created with its more integrated political structure, would be incorporated. The countries outside the nucleus, but still within the larger Union (among whom countries like Greece, Poland and Hungary) could thus adjust and consolidate the 'acquis' with their more or less euro-sceptic ideas (for instance in the sense of provisionally limiting their pursuit of greater integration efforts in favour of a free trade area accompanied by variable levels of cooperation) without affecting the evolution of this cooperation or stalling the adherence of one or the other Member State to the nucleus at a later stage under more studied and more acceptable conditions.

In this way one could also adjust and consolidate the 'acquis' in order to make it more comprehensible and transparent (for example the Euro zone, the Schengen region and what remains of the Western European Union, in the sense of circles and ellipses which overlap each other and create a common centre.

The said Nucleus of Europe should however gradually spread democratically to the real spheres of external relations, economics, fiscality, social affairs and defence to become a Political Union. Within such a European nucleus it would be possible and even necessary to give more concrete form to the concept of subsidiarity and to enable this concept to evolve so that flesh can be put on the framework of the famous Unity within Diversity.

Within such a framework it would finally be possible to gradually develop a European identity, whilst still maintaining a space for our different national identities, local and cultural without undermining

possible future evolution, as no one can really say where the absolute frontiers of Eastern or Southern Europe actually lie.

Ultimately this is about creating a concept for Europe which combines a measured retreat of the whole with a large qualitative step forward for a portion of it, without excluding a future perspective of coming together again. A concept within which the believers in Europe would find their space in addition to the federalists and the separatists, even the euro sceptics, and it would have the advantage, above all, of finding the necessary support from all the groups concerned within our societies.

In that sense, the 500 million that we are now (which represents about 7% of the world population) could once again say, with total conviction and a light heart, that “our future lies in Europe”! The little country from which we each stem, whichever it might be, will never again be the only place which represents a better elsewhere! And as far as our British friends are concerned, the EU will console itself, despite the new complications still to come, with the fact that all the countries from which the British have withdrawn in the past have subsequently gone on to prosper beautifully.

III. Brexit, an example of English reaction

**University College London (UCL) statement. Early on 24 June 2016
Professor Michael Arthur, UCL President & Provost**

The outcome of the referendum is now known. While UCL did not take a formal position during the referendum campaign, I have given my personal view:

(<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/staff/staff-news/0316/03032016-provosts-view-brexit>)

and you will have heard many other voices from the UCL community. The loss of EU membership will have a clear impact on universities such as UCL, particularly around the mobility of students and funding of research.

Today, more than ever, I want to reaffirm to you all that UCL will remain a global university through our outlook, people and enduring international partnerships. I also want in particular to address UCL’s staff and students from all countries of the European Union. We value you enormously – your contribution to UCL life is intrinsic to what the university stands for.

In the short term, I would like to reassure our staff and students that barring unilateral action from the UK government, the vote to leave the European Union does not mean there will be any immediate material change to the immigration status of current and prospective EU students and staff, nor to the UK university sector’s participation in EU programmes such as Horizon 2020 and Erasmus+. Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty foresees a two-year negotiation process between the UK and other member states, during which time the terms of the UK’s exit from the European Union will be decided.

IV. Rights to a pension which have not been transferred

Mrs X versus the Belgian Pension Office with the support of SEPS/SFPE. Pension Office – checkmate !!!

If the rights to a national pension have not been transferred to the community pension scheme, the Member State is obliged to grant a national pension for the years of service rendered beyond the service time spent with a European Institution, to the extent that the total of the years served for the national employer and for the European Institution does not exceed the number of years required to obtain a full national pension.

Mrs X, member of SEPS/SFPE, had worked for 13 years for Belgian employers before entering the service of the European Institutions where she had a complete career lasting 35 years.

The Belgian National Pension Office (NPO) (currently the Service Fédéral des Pensions - SFP) informed her on 11 September 2012 that they had examined her retirement pension as a salaried worker for the 13 years of work in Belgium and had determined that she had the right to a pension for 3 of her work years with the Belgian employer.

In effect the NPO was applying Article 10 of the Belgian Arrêté Royal (A.R.) N° 50 of 24 October 1967 which assimilates a complete career of 45 years in Belgium with a complete career in the European Institutions of 35 years.

Mrs X consulted me and I addressed a note to the NPO pointing out that the Belgian social legislation could not diverge from the European social provisions in view of the principle that international law supercedes national law. More precisely Article 48 of the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union (TFUE), which foresees the addition of all the periods of time worked towards social security -including towards pension- rights and also Articles 45 and 48 of Regulation CE 883/2004 (formerly CE 1408/71).

NPO rejected my note, on the pretext that European civil servants are not subject to the regulation, which according to them is only applicable to those workers who are dependant on the national social security schemes. With the agreement of Mrs X, SEPS/SFPE entrusted this affair to Mme Viviane VANNES, lawyer, recommended by Mr RODRIGUES of the law firm Lallemand et Legros of Brussels. Mme VANNES redacted a long document of conclusions (26 pages) for the Francophone Employment Tribunal of Brussels, suggesting that in case of doubt, the question should be filed with the EU Court of Justice in Luxemburg (hereafter called “the Court of Justice”).

The Tribunal pronounced itself on 19 August 2014, submitting a legal question, different however from that proposed by Mme VANNES. Invoking on the one hand the principle of loyal cooperation and Article 4§3 of the TFUE and on the other Article 34§1 of the Charter of fundamental rights, the Tribunal asked the Court of Justice if these textes do not prevent a

Member State from reducing, even refusing, a retirement period granted to a salaried worker by virtue of his/her accomplished working life when the total of the career years accomplished within that Member State together with that from within the European Institutions exceeds the 45 year career bracket.

Since with its letter of 23 October 2014 the NPO had even reduced the pension of Mrs X to zero, invoking an error of codification, we also attacked this latter decision by asking the Brussels Employment Tribunal to link the two decisions.

SEPS/SFPE, in agreement with Mrs X, did not think it necessary to submit new conclusions to the Court of Justice, given the clarity of the question already filed. However, Mr Stéphane RODRIGUES, lawyer, defended us well during the oral procedure in Luxembourg.

The Court of Justice replied on 10 September 2015 stating that indeed “Article 4§3 of the TFUE, together with the Staff Regulations of the European Civil Service (...) needs to be interpreted in the sense that it forbids a regulation of a Member State, which is likely to induce a reduction or a refusal of pension rights which would be granted to a salaried worker” (if “such a reduction is greater than that which would have been applied if the total career of the said worker had been accomplished as a salaried employee within the Member State in question”).

In other words, the Member State owes the employee a pension for those years worked for that Member State, if when added to the years worked in the European Institutions the total does not exceed the limit of 45 years, should this be the criterion for obtaining a full pension in the Member State concerned.

It follows from this response, therefore, that, for example someone who works for 35 years in the European Institutions and for 13 years for an employer of a Member State would have the right to a national pension of 10 years, since the national total of 45 years cannot be exceeded. Someone who has worked in the institutions for 30 years and for 18 years in a Member State enterprise would be entitled to a national pension of 15 years.

The NPO having capitulated took the initiative, on 18 February 2016, though the appeal was due to be held in front of the Brussels Employment Tribunal on 19 April 2016, to avoid the judgement becoming a precedent, granted Mrs X a monthly pension for her 10 years of service to Belgium and paid all the arrears back to 2013.

However, SEPS/SFPE, with the agreement of Mrs X, preferred to ensure that a judgement be obtained which would serve as precedent. In this way, on 19 April, I was able to plead the case for our member.

On 23 May 2016 the Tribunal rendered its decision, which will in future set a precedent for all similar cases.

Our member obtained satisfaction.

A pension has been granted to her for 10 years worked for a Belgian employer.

The delayed interests and the legal costs of the case, reduced in cases of social issues by A.R. of 26 October 2007, have been granted to her. However, she was refused the counter-

indemnity. The Tribunal reproached me for having failed to demonstrate the specific losses our member had incurred as a result of the successive changes of mind of the SFP (ex NPO).

I had, however, pleaded for the moral and material distress caused to the defendent resulting from the three year period of waiting and uncertainty about whether she would get her pension. Maybe the Tribunal was influenced by Mr M. Leclerq, defending the SFP, who emphasised the level of the pensions granted to former civil servants of the European institutions !

Conclusion: Mme X and SEPS/SFPE have obtained a decision of principle in and for Belgium, which also applies to the other Member States:

A Member State cannot refuse a pension to a European civil servant, who has worked for one or more national employers, to the extent that the total of his years of service for the European institution and for the national employer cannot exceed the number of years required within that Member State to qualify, in accordance with its social security system, for a full pension.

This needs to be considered along with the Court of Justice decision in the MY case of 16 December 2004 – C-293/03 – where the Court considered that a Member State has the obligation to take account of the years a civil servant of the European Communities has worked to fix the minimum number of years required by a Member State in order to obtain a national pension. For example if the minimum required is 15 years, and if the employee has worked for 5 years for a national employer and 10 years for the European Commission, he would be entitled to a national pension for the 5 years.

Hendrik Smets
Vice-President in charge of legal matters

V. The cost of pensions

1. Reminder: The PSEO (Pension scheme of the European Officials)

It is important to understand our pension system well, so as to be in a position to respond to questions and criticisms with the true facts.

**What needs to be remembered above all is that retirees have paid for their pension
and that the active colleagues are paying for their own pension.**

2. Effects of the 2004 reform

At the request of the Netherlands an evaluation was undertaken in 2010 to determine what effect the 2004 reform had had on pension expenditure.

The 2004 reform has made it possible to have a saving each year since the reform. For 2059 this saving will amount to ± €1 billion, after 50 years, the saving is calculated to reach ±€25 billion.

3. Effects of the 2014 reform

Following the reform signed at the end of 2013 (Staff regulations of 01.01.2014) the Council asked the Commission to up-date the long term evaluations on the budgetary implications of the pensions of staff of the institutions and agencies.

It looks at the major tendencies in the field of pension costs during the 50 year period 2015-2064. A projection over 50 years is normal in actuarial terms and several Member States have undertaken studies covering similar time lapses.

Eurostat has isolated the parameters affected by the reform and which have an impact on pension related expenditure.

Eurostat has calculated the evolution of PSEO related expenditure, as modified by the 2014 Staff Regulations compared to this evolution without the reform of 2014. The difference between the two evolutions provides an estimate of the savings resulting from the 2014 reform.

The essential parameters which Eurostat has considered are as follows:

- Retirement age: 66 years and the table of transitions
- The accrual rate of pension rights: 2% (prior to 2004) or 1.9% (prior to 2014) or 1.8%
- The new career structures (contractual, AST SC, AST, AD) with their respective barriers; the changes concerning invalidity, ..., the hypothesis that 50% of the AST staff will have become ASTSC by 2064; no hypothesis is made concerning the evolution of the number of contractual agents
- The rate of interest applicable to the virtual capital
- The non application of salary adjustments for the period 2013 to 2015
- The reduction of staffing levels by 1% per year from 2015 to 2017.

In addition:

- The evolution of the staff levels has been studied and simulated (58,500 in 2014, 56,800 in 2064)
- The tables of mortality are those provided in Annex XII
- Changes in the attitude of staff have been anticipated
- Salary adjustments in accordance with Article 65 are assumed to be respected
- Article 45 defines the rate of promotions

The savings found on the basis of the hypotheses listed above, are summarised hereunder:

Due to the 2014 reform:

*by 2064 the savings will amount to €450 million,
over 50 years it will be approximately €13 billion.*

*However, the expenditure corresponding to the pension budget will remain at
€1.4 billion in 2020,
€2 billion in 2040 and
€1.4 billion in 2064.*

Even though the savings are substantial, the figure of €1.4 to €2 billion per year is what will upset the Member States! It will be compared to the salary budget of active staff!

It has to be outlined that the referred expected savings, are additional to those produced by the 2004 reform of the SR, having the present study only focused on the impact of the above mentioned key parameters amended by the 2013 SR reform.

It is noteworthy that as from 2060 the number of non active staff (retired, invlid, survivor) will stabilise at 49,000 as against the current level of 23,000.

Remarks from the Remunerations Working Group

1. The study clearly demonstrates the actuarial nature of our pension scheme and it consequently serves to avoid the misunderstanding that ours is a pay-as-you-go system.
2. What is the significance of the article which appeared in “the Times” in December 2015¹? What is written there has not been considered by the Eurostat evaluation.

“The most important dimension of the reform (still to come?) is the reduction in the number of persons for whom you would need to pay a pension. ... In the future we will have a core number of civil servants and a flexible work force.”

3. What will be the reaction of the Staff Regulations group of the Council (Member States)?
 - Maybe a better understanding of the scheme!
 - Maybe a demand for further reform!

Internal danger: cleavage among staff

The attacks against our pension system usually come from the outside. But it is now necessary to counter attacks coming from inside: those of “Generation 2004”.

This staff union has been clear about its intentions and since more than a year we have been reporting them in the SEPS/SFPE Bulletin.

¹ SEPS Bulletins of February and April 2016

- Generation 2004 has compared our pension system to the Titanic. Our system is however perfectly well defined and in financial equilibrium from year to year.
- Generation 2004 proposes that the contribution of pre-2004 staff to the PSEO be increased relative to that of post-2004 staff.
- Generation 2004 proposes that a special contribution be levied on the highest pensions, (But we have paid for our pension with a special levy on that contribution to the PSEO).
- Generation 2004 suggests doing away with the bonus ! (It would become more difficult to reach a full pension).
- Generation 2004 proposes that the age of retirement be increased
- Generation 2004 proposes that the virtual pension fund be transformed into a real pension fund! Who will pay the €50 billion into this real fund?

What is essential to remember is that we have paid for our pensions. (A summary was given in the April Bulletin, page 13)

The characteristics of this system are repeated in detail at every opportunity by Ludwig Schubert (Honorary President of AIACE International). He has published yet another detailed article in the VOX magazine (AIACE – Vox N° 102, Mar 2016, pages 11,12,13), sent by mail to all pensioners, entitled: “*Our reformed pension scheme*”. Members of SEPS are invited to read the article².

The Protocol on Privileges and Immunities establishes our social security system:

Our system is therefore not a system of redistribution but rather a capitalization system. Our pension is a deferred salary.

Our system remains in continuous financial equilibrium.

The pension fund appears in the Budget accounts, in the passive annual account of the European Union (€58.6 billion end 2014)³.

The Member States guarantee the payment of our pensions at their maturity!

VI. Summary of the outcome of the CGAM meeting of 25 and 26 May 2016 **Brigitte Pretzenbacher Vice-president SEPS/SFPE,** **Monique Breton**

The 359th meeting of the CGAM took place in Brussels on 25 and 26 March 2016. The outcome and the essential facts are summarised hereafter:

² Article also published in the bulletin “L’Ecrin” of AIACE-BE, N° 74, Mar 2016

³ Debt created over decades and which will be “paid” as pensions over a period of ±50 years according to the maturity date of the individual rights.

Court Decision F76/15 (refused extension of recognition of serious illness) won by Mr Louis (see also VII hereunder)

The matter concerned the son of an affiliate, a young adult, suffering from partial paralyses of one arm, with an amputated foot and part of a leg. The affiliate had benefited during a number of years from the provisions granted on recognition of a serious illness for his son before its renewal was refused.

The TFP criticised the motivation of the Medical Council and declared that given the situation had not evolved, the renewed recognition should be granted, otherwise this would be contradictory and should be seen as “an obvious error of judgement”. The judges insisted on a concrete and detailed examination of the case by the Medical Council.

One might deduce from this that where a situation is stable or has deteriorated, the affiliate has the right to renewed recognition. However, if his situation has improved it would be necessary to check whether the criteria are still being fulfilled.

According to Mr FETELIAN, Head of Unit PMO3 – RCAM, the court decision corresponds to a strict reading of the regulations, as applied by the PMO, on a case by case basis. It was the justification for the refusal to extend this recognition, which was faulty. This ruling therefore does not put into question those negative decisions already taken in the past. In order to justify the re-examination of a refusal to extend recognition of serious illness, there must be a new element or a demonstration that PMO’s analysis was faulty. There is no justification for any form of automaticity on this issue.

Mr FETELIAN also pointed out that a handicap is not automatically a serious illness. Brigitte Pretzenbacher draw the attention on the refusal, since a number of years, to extend recognition of serious illness to retirees, PMO replied that it would do its best to treat such cases as ‘humanely as possible’. Where the non-extension of recognition of serious illness may result in serious psychological distress for the party concerned, PMO can offer the services of a psychologist.

Working group on the equity coefficient

The DGE oblige there to be an up-date, every two years of the equity coefficient to be applied to reimbursements in the various countries. On the basis of statistics supplied by PMO, the codes of the services on offer in each country are compared. These statistics are however not sufficiently screened. Surgical interventions can pose a problem: the fees of a surgeon and of an anaesthetist can be submitted together or separately.

A working group has been created to look into this issue. Its members are: Messrs Morisset, Wiessenberger and Karzel (Administration) and Messrs Cordy, Peleman and Schwartz (Staff Committees).

Complaints (Art. 90§2)

This time, of the 54 complaints listed by PMO 16 have become ‘null and void’.

The staff representatives regret that neither those who have introduced the complaints have been satisfied nor have the staff representatives sitting at the CGAM been informed as to the reasons which led to a solution of the problem. Was it due to an error on the part of PMO or an error (insufficient documentation) on the part of the plaintiff? What about those who have not introduced complaints? There is a situation of inequality which is developing among affiliates.

The staff representatives insist that a clear justification should be provided in each and every case.

Among the complaints, 4 have been about the extension of recognition of serious illness; 2 have been accepted, one will be reviewed in the light of further evolution and for the fourth case the refusal has been unanimously confirmed. Explanation given: the fitting of a pacemaker contributes to extended life expectancy; there is no aggravation of the situation, no significant therapeutic input is required but the costs of the pacemaker and the continued supervision of a cardiologist will be reimbursed at 100%.

Thoughts from Mr FETELIAN to improve reimbursement delays

Mr FETELIAN proposes

- That it become obligatory for all active affiliates to submit their reimbursement requests on-line
- That the reimbursement form be limited to one line
- That the reimbursement occurs in two stages: 80% at the moment of receipt of the request and the remainder, after examination, later.

Responses from the CGAM

- Agree to invite active users to submit their reimbursement requests on-line, without however obliging them to do so (reasons: lack of confidentiality on photocopiers and scanners in the services)
- There is no reason for reimbursement forms to be reduced to one line. One should be able to directly submit the receipt – maybe with a sticker supplied by PMO (as is, for example, the case in Belgium)
- The two stage reimbursement proposal is considered to be too complicated and likely to create administrative bottle-necks and become incomprehensible to the affiliate.

Discrimination resulting from the application of different tariffs to nationals and to European civil servants

“The setting of different fees is discriminatory”. The Ferlini court ruling⁴ still raises hopes: the Court of Justice indicated that the application of higher tariffs to affiliates of JSIS than that applied to insured nationals constitutes discrimination on the basis of nationality. However, the Court added a reserve: discrimination is proscribed only in the absence of

⁴ Court ruling Ferlini of 3 October 2000, C-411098, ECLI: EU:C:2000:530
SEPS/SFPE

objective justification. But then the agreement with hospitals in Luxemburg is based on a variety of justifications to culminate in a convention which foresees the application of an increase of 15% on fees for affiliates of JSIS and the payment of what is called “structural costs”.

Mr FETELIAN announced that there would soon be talks with the Minister of Health of Luxemburg in order to try to obtain the suppression of the structural costs, which are not charged to the Luxembourger affiliates. We will be informed as to the outcome of these negotiations.

The head of the accidents sector has indicated that the negotiations with the Finnish health scheme (KELA) are well under way.

Agreements have been reached with the regional Spanish health insurances and with a group of Spanish hospitals.

For health care in certain countries (United Kingdom, USA,...) PMO can (in emergency situations) pay advances to affiliates so that they can pay the ensuing bills themselves (instead of asking for direct payment from JSIS) so as to obtain very significant cost reductions (up to 50%) relative to what would be charged to an ‘insurance’.

In the south of France PMO needs to intervene to indicate that it will take care of all the costs since hospitals are in the habit of charging patients directly for costs which are non-reimbursable under the French health insurance scheme.

Medical Council

The minutes of meetings of the Medical Council should get to us more regularly and before the full meetings of the CGAM. The chairman will invite the Medical Council to the next meeting.

Annual report of JSIS

The administration is of the view that the establishment of an annual report for CGAM⁵ is not indispensable: The deadline for the 2015 report is 30 June 2016. The staff representatives are asked to content themselves with the PMO annual report⁶. However, the latter have pointed out that their view of the evolution of the Health Insurance scheme is different to that of PMO; in view of this, they would like the establishment of a JSIS annual report to be maintained.

The administration points out that there are already four reports concerning JSIS: the ECFIN report, the Court of Auditors report, the PMO report and the JSIS one.

The PMO annual report (Art 47) will become available in June. It is essentially factual, with the exception of the summary. The scheme’s finances are balanced, which voids discussions.

⁵ Art 38 of the regulations of the JSIS. Major task – 38 pages – 3 weeks of work

⁶ Art 47 of the regulations of the JSIS.

Monique Breton, member of the working group mentioned the difficulty she had had to obtain replies to her questions concerning the 2014 CGAM report. For instance, no one, whether within PMO or the CGAM itself was in a position to explain how the provisions had been calculated, even as they amount to more than €60 million on the balance sheet. However the external audit office suggested that this system of provisions be reviewed. There is no established norme which determines this method. Other members of the CGAM argue that “Everything has been validated by the Auditor” and in any event one should not change the method (even if no-one knows what this method is about!!)

The staff representatives have agreed to base themselves on the PMO report, on condition that the colleagues involved in the writing up of the 2014 report are associated and that they receive all the information requested. A joint working group will therefore be constituted (4 – 6 persons) to work by written procedure.

Miscellaneous

Supporting documents: the osteopath receipts accepted by the Belgian health insurances are once again accepted by PMO for the reimbursement of fees. PMO will establish a new circular on supporting documentation.

ASSMAL 3 is being studied: Belgium is soon to embark on the electronic management of medical expenses – PMO will need to adapt itself to this situation.

Belgium also foresees generalising the system of direct payment by the insurer (tiers-payant). PMO will probably accept this for those affiliates who are in complementarity. (2017)

The joint working group « measures to reduce the deficit » meets under the chairmanship of Mr Singelsma.

Revision of the DGE: this potential revision of the DGE (the rules which guide the application of the regulation on the JSIS) is seen by some as dangerous, since the Member States are hostile. It would be better to undertake certain amendments which do not require the complete revision of the existing rules.

VII. Serious illness: Evolution in the case law.

(see also point VI.1 above)

A few months ago I made a comment on the decision of the European Civil Service Tribunal of 23 November 2010 which rejected a request for recognition of serious illness.

The Tribunal had rejected this request because it had not fulfilled the four criteria foreseen in Title III, Chapter V f the DGE of JSIS of 2 July 2007, notably:

Recognition of serious illness is granted to such illnesses as tuberculosis, poliomyelitis, cancer, mental health and other illnesses of similar gravity as decided by the AIPN.

These illnesses concern states of health, which to varying degrees fulfil the four following criteria

- *Unfavourable life prognosis*
- *Chronic evolution*
- *Need for diagnostic measures and/or heavy therapies*
- *Presence or risk of serious handicap*

The Tribunal had not even authorised an expert's assessment or the hearing of witnesses.

This jurisprudence coincided perfectly with the new policy of JSIS, which has started to apply the existing rules in a very restrictive fashion in order to generate substantial savings. PMO demanded, for instance, that all four criteria be triggered at the same time before recognising a serious illness, where often the unfavourable life prognosis criterion triggered ineligibility!

However, with its decision of 28 April 2016, FY affair – (F76/15) the European Civil Service Tribunal gives new hope to those whose illness had for years been recognised as serious. With the support of the Union Syndicale Mrs FY lodged an appeal with the ECST against the 8 April decision of the Brussels liquidator bureau of JSIS, which refused to continue to recognise the state of her son as seriously ill.

Thanks to the remarkable conclusions by Mr Louis and the thorough examination the Tribunal had made into the case, the latter decided to annul the JSIS decision.

The Tribunal recognised the two arguments put forward by the plaintiff:

1) Absence of justification

The Tribunal considered that if the four criteria had been fulfilled in the past (in the present case since 1992), the Medical Council needed, via a detailed examination, to demonstrate that this was no longer the case and that considering the three other criteria, the fourth criterion could nonetheless be seen as being fulfilled, even if the Medical Council claimed the contrary by focusing only on that single criterion (cf point 31 of the Court's ruling). The Tribunal therefore concluded that in the absence of any justification, the Medical Council had failed to explain why the four criteria, which had been fulfilled during the period 1992-2013, from 1 January 2014 were no longer fulfilled.

The Tribunal also added: the decision is contradictory : when the Medical Council concluded, without any explanation, that there had not been any "alternation in life prognosis, or in heavy therapies" , the JSIS had considered these same criteria as being fully pertinent until 31 December 2013. (cf point 38)

2) Blatant error of appreciation

The recognition of the state of serious illness is subordinate to a detailed examination of the state of health of the person concerned. However, the decision under attack provided no element which could have lead the JSIS to reverse its appreciation of the state of illness of the plaintiff's son relative to his state on 31 December 2013.

Conclusion

Those whose recognition of their serious illness has been refused, especially after several years of it being recognised, have every interest in submitting a new request for recognition to the PMO/JSIS on the basis of medical report undertaken by the specialist practitioner caring for the illness, demonstrating clearly that the four criteria are fulfilled (to varying degrees).

And, in the event of this request being rejected it may be justified to introduce an appeal, firstly in accordance with Article 90§2 of the Staff Regulations and then to the ECST, citing the aforementioned Court ruling.

**Hendrik Smets,
Vice-President of SEPS, in charge of legal matters**

VIII. Recalculation of pension rights transferred into the Community system

FRIEBERGER ECST ruling of 2 March 2016

Through this Court ruling Mr Frieberger, and he alone, obtained the right to ask for his transferred pension rights to be recalculated following the revisions to the Staff Regulations.

On 26 March 2016 the European Commission introduced an appeal against the ECST's decision in order to have this ruling overturned.

In support of its appeal the Commission invoked the following 5 elements:

- 1) The Tribunal had taken account of factual elements which had not been submitted by the parties and deduced conclusions from these facts which were favourable to the plaintiffs,
- 2) The non-application of Article 26§5 of Annex XIII of the Staff Regulations, which according to the Tribunal is still applicable
- 3) Absence of justification: The Tribunal has insufficiently justified its assertion that Article 26 remains applicable
- 4) A legal error in the interpretation of the notion of the transfer of pension rights in application of Article 11§2 of Annex VIII of the Staff Regulations, an interpretation, which according to the Commission, should have taken account of other parameters than solely the age of the civil servant
- 5) A violation of the principle of equal treatment: The Tribunal has authorised the revaluation of the transferred pension rights of civil servants who requested their transfer before 1 May 2004 and not of those who undertook it after this date.

It now remains to be seen to what extent the staff unions in response to the Commission's memo and then the Tribunal will counter the legal arguments invoked by the Commission.

Hendrik Smets,

XI. Information – Questions from members

1. PMO newsletter

a. Declaring your spouse's 2015 income – impact on household allowance and JSIS reimbursement

If you receive a household allowance based on the level of income of your spouse/recognised partner, you must declare his/her professional activity and income for the year 2015. You have to do so even if he/she has no income. (See annex 1 of the French version)

If your spouse/recognised partner benefits from the Joint Sickness Insurance Scheme, you also have to declare his/her income. The coverage is suspended every year on **30th of June**. Therefore, make this declaration on time in order for his/her sickness coverage to continue for another year.

How to submit your documents

There are different ways of submitting proof of your spouse/recognized partner's income.

If you have no access to SisPer, use PMO Contact of the postal services.

Via PMO Contact Online

If you have the possibility of scanning your documents, please submit them electronically using the following link: <https://ec.europa.eu/pmo/contact>

Choose the following domains:

- « Sickness Insur/Accidents/Occup disease »
- « Membership/Certificates »
- Click on « Contact PMO » at the bottom of the screen

You can attach your document inside the message by clicking on "Browse" at the bottom of the screen.

You will receive a ticket number by return e-mail and will be informed when your file has been updated.

If you have difficulties with PMO Contact on line, SEPS/SFPE can do it for you.

Paper route

Please send a paper copy by post to the address of your Settlement Office / Membership Team, indicated hereunder:

Brussels : European Commission PMO.3 – JSIS - SC27 03/21 B - 1049 BRUSSELS

Luxembourg : European Commission PMO.5 – JSIS - DRB-B1/85 L - 2920 LUXEMBOURG

b. Helpdesk for matters relating to salaries and individual entitlements

Since 1 March 2016, a new telephone helpdesk has been available for anyone whose salary and individual entitlements are managed in Brussels. This service is offered to Commission and EEAS staff posted within the EU (except for Luxembourg).

If you have a question or doubts about your payslip or need more information on your financial entitlements (allowances, etc.), phone 93333.

The salaries and individual entitlements helpdesk is available from Monday to Friday, 09.30 to 12.30 – tel.: **(+32 2 29) 93333**

c. Family allowances

The family allowances that you receive for your children are part of your pay package. However, these allowances should be paid to the parent having the highest grade.

d. Divorce and separation: which parent will receive family allowances?

The family allowances that you receive for your children are part of your pay package. However, the Staff Regulations state that these allowances should be paid to the person who has custody of the children.

It is increasingly common for parents to share the care of their children in the event of separation or divorce. This means that parents may have joint custody. In some Member States, parents are free to organise the custody of their children and only parental authority is confirmed by a court decision.

Payment of family allowances will therefore be established either on the basis of a judicial or administrative decision confirming the custody situation, or on the basis of the arrangements for custody of minors that come directly from the relevant national legislation.

If a decision of this type clearly determines to whom family allowances should be paid, the administration will arrange payment on the basis of this decision without taking the custody situation into account. In the absence of a judicial or administrative decision, a mutual agreement signed by both parents establishing the recipient of the allowances may also be taken into account for the payment of family allowances.

! Payment of family allowances does not equate to payment of a maintenance allowance. It is therefore important that you check that you continue to fulfil the financial obligations imposed on you by a judicial or administrative decision.

Finally, don't forget to inform the administration of any further change in your children's situation (such as changes in educational circumstances, finishing schooling, etc.) that may have an impact on the payment of family allowances.

e. PMO in figures (Processing time)



2. An ethical problem (reminder)

The affiliate to JSIS can, at one and the same time, obtain the special reimbursement granted by PMO by virtue of Article 72§3 (on request) and the reimbursement from a complementary to JSIS health insurance (for instance insurance Cigna-ex Vanbreda) for the same medical expenses!

- The affiliate, insured (Cigna or another) must avoid being reimbursed twice for the same expenses!
- PMO asks that the reimbursements from the complementary insurance be declared for its own benefit! PMO will deduct the insurer's reimbursement from the corresponding special reimbursement

Yes, but who pays the insurance premium?

3. Reminder

Reimbursement of health care expenses in general

Health care expenses are reimbursed following four schemes:

- *The JSIS (Staff Regulations)*
- *Health insurance policies to supplement JSIS*
- *Accident insurance (Staff Regulations)*
- *Assistance schemes when travelling*

1. The Joint Sickness Insurance Scheme - JSIS

This scheme, enshrined in the Staff Regulations is obligatory, provides a theoretical level of reimbursement of 85% or 80% as a function of the type of health care being considered. However, due to certain ceilings, to certain limits and the application of the principle of excessiveness in certain cases, reimbursement has been demonstrated statistically to average somewhere between 75 and 80%.

2. Health insurance policies to supplement JSIS

These optional insurances (hospitalisation or more complete) allow for top up reimbursement against what has already been reimbursed by JSIS so that the total reimbursement is 100% or virtually 100%. These insurances are offered by the associations (Afiliatys and AIACE – collective insurances) and by the majority of the staff unions (individual insurances).

3. Specific accident insurance - invalidity and death (Staff Regulations)

The legal accident insurance is provided only to active colleagues. Pensioners, colleagues on invalidity, spouses and children do not benefit from this insurance, though JSIS would cover medical costs which result from an accident (in the same way as if it were an illness: Cf 1 above)

JSIS would however not provide any compensation in case of invalidity or death after an accident. A specific accident insurance is offered by AIACE to pensioners, to the handicapped and to spouses (for children in the near future). In addition to a capital payment in the event of invalidity or death, this insurance will cover 100% of the costs of medical care if they result from an accident anywhere in the world.

4. Assistance schemes when travelling.

During a trip in the EU and overseas it is essential to be covered for emergency health care costs (sickness - and accident if not already covered) far from Brussels or Luxemburg, where JSIS is least recognised. These insurances are, in addition, probably the only ones which can organise and take charge of repatriation.

X. Annexes

Annex 1

Cover for the spouse/recognized partner of a member of the Joint Sickness Insurance Scheme

Administrative notice N° 25-2016 / 24.05.2016

See French version of the Bulletin

Or: <https://myintracomm-ext.ec.europa.eu/infoadm/en/2016/Pages/ia16025.html>

Annex 2

In memoriam

On 01.05.2016

<i>Name</i>	<i>Date of birth</i>	<i>Date of pension</i>	<i>Date of death</i>	<i>Institution</i>
FERNANDES PEREIRA Jose Luis	25-01-49	01-04-04	12-04-14	CM
SAGUI Jeanne	13-04-25	01-05-90	22-05-15	COM
STREIBEL Ute	02-10-41	01-06-83	04-02-16	COM
ADJEMIAN Alain	20-10-43	01-11-08	27-02-16	COM

VANISTENDAEL Maurits	25-07-22	01-08-87	03-03-16	COM
BURKE Richard	29-03-32	29-03-97	15-03-16	COM
AYALA FERNANDEZ Pablo	17-08-48	01-12-08	24-03-16	COM
GUGLIEMI Anna	26-10-24	01-11-89	25-03-16	PE
SUKUP Viktor	06-06-47	01-07-12	25-03-16	COM
SCHUETZLER Sigrid	24-12-39	01-01-00	26-03-16	COM
JOPPIEN Inge	28-01-40	01-03-00	26-03-16	PE
FOIS Mario	24-05-36	01-06-01	29-03-16	COM
VAN GEET Christiane	16-09-42	01-05-04	29-03-16	COM
KARLSTROM Haakan	13-03-48	01-04-13	30-03-16	COM
CERNITORI Hildegard	29-09-33	01-03-96	01-04-16	BER
NOZZA Annie	13-06-44	01-07-09	02-04-16	CJ
RIVIERE Y MARTI Juan	04-04-47	01-05-12	04-04-16	COM
MARELL Fons	27-11-36	01-12-01	05-04-16	COM
THEBAULT Jean-Claude	08-10-50	01-11-15	06-04-16	COM
GREGOIRE Emile	17-01-26	01-02-91	08-04-16	COM
BRUNS Heinz	01-04-19	01-06-83	09-04-16	COM
ROHAERT Albert	11-06-25	01-10-86	09-04-16	PE
MARCOTTY-CLARE Eliane	18-11-39	01-06-93	10-04-16	COM
COPERE Joelle	31-07-46	01-08-01	10-04-16	COM
HELIN Bernard	06-07-52	01-01-14	11-04-16	COM
DECEUNYNCK Philip	06-04-64	01-12-13	12-04-16	COM
BENEDETTO Marco	13-04-41	01-09-06	14-04-16	COM
DE BIEVRE Paul	07-07-33	01-06-98	14-04-16	COM
AHERN Stephen	04-09-36	01-06-97	15-04-16	COM
RISCH Benno	11-10-30	01-11-95	16-04-16	COM
APPELS Raphael	12-03-40	01-11-97	16-04-16	COM
JANSEN Marcel	06-09-37	01-10-02	16-04-16	COM
VAN CLEVEN Odette	17-08-27	01-01-83	17-04-16	COM
SCHANZ Baerbel	07-06-39	01-09-99	17-04-16	COM
MEUGENS Jules	18-06-24	01-01-89	18-04-16	COM
MILANESI Gisela	19-08-27	01-08-79	19-04-16	CM
DROEGEHORN Gerd	15-10-29	01-11-94	20-04-16	COM

On 01.06.2016

FARENZENA René	24-08-32	01-01-84	11-03-16	CES
FRIIS Thomas	15-05-49	01-01-05	27-03-16	CM
KAMARAINEN Asko	26-11-63	01-01-07	05-04-16	PE
HAENEN Hubert	27-12-31	01-01-97	13-04-16	COM
TURCHETTO-GOLLINO Ada	20-04-34	01-04-93	15-04-16	COM
DEMONT René	24-01-33	01-03-87	22-04-16	COM
SAMBON Maximin	26-09-37	01-10-97	22-04-16	COM
KENNIS Willy	11-02-37	01-10-00	28-04-16	COM
QUIK Franciscus	20-04-39	01-10-01	28-04-16	COM

RAINALDI Vanni	27-02-44	01-11-04	28-04-16	COM
SORMUNEN Markku	08-03-57	01-11-12	28-04-16	COM
SIRONI Maria	08-04-42	01-09-98	29-04-16	COM
ALLARD Christian	17-08-24	01-07-84	30-04-16	COM
AGRIDOPOULOS Constantin	09-07-37	01-02-00	30-04-16	COM
MUELLER Elisabeth	04-10-43	01-07-05	01-05-16	COM
WARTENA Johannes	08-02-30	01-03-95	02-05-16	COM
GATTONE Enrico	06-06-33	01-07-98	02-05-16	COM
VENTOURAS Haralabos	27-08-49	01-04-04	02-05-16	COM
HELL Wolfdieter	27-07-44	01-08-09	02-05-16	PE
TIMMERMANS Jacques	01-02-42	01-03-07	04-05-16	CC
PETSCH André	20-02-26	01-03-91	05-05-16	COM
SOLDATI Rizieri	16-04-22	01-05-87	08-05-16	COM
TRAESKMAN Stig	06-02-43	01-03-08	08-05-16	PE
GARCIA MARTIN Silverio	11-05-51	01-11-12	10-05-16	COM
RIGODANZO Agostino	24-01-33	01-08-81	11-05-16	COM
VOKOS Ioannis	28-12-39	01-01-05	11-05-16	COM
LORENZON Iris	03-07-22	01-10-82	12-05-16	COM
HEINE Joachim	17-12-37	01-01-03	13-05-16	COM
JANSSENS Brigitte	30-10-49	01-01-13	13-05-16	PE
MILLAR David	30-04-29	01-05-94	14-05-16	PE
VAN MERHAEGE Willy	21-05-32	01-08-92	14-05-16	COM
FIGURELLI Antonio	11-11-39	01-01-04	14-05-16	CM
ROMOLI VENTURI Giancarlo	01-07-30	01-08-95	15-05-16	COM
KIRK Robert	25-11-31	01-01-88	16-05-16	COM
DE PRETIS CAGNODO Mario	26-06-35	01-02-92	18-05-16	COM
EYQUEM Bernard	15-08-23	01-12-86	20-05-16	COM
CATON-ALARCON Gerardo	04-09-44	01-10-09	21-05-16	COM
KOSTITSIS Nikolaos	05-04-44	01-03-04	21-05-16	PE
MOLONIA Francesco	28-02-45	01-06-03	22-05-16	CM
RESMINI Giusppe	10-03-40	01-08-00	23-05-16	CM
PORTIER François	09-08-34	01-06-96	28-05-16	COM
HARTL Werner	13-01-26	01-04-87	28-05-16	COM
LOMMEZ Jan	16-01-26	01-12-87	29-05-16	COM
COSTANTINI Angelo	26-08-24	01-09-89	30-05-16	COM

On 01.07.2016

DAUSES Manfred	10-03-44	01-04-94	xx/04/2016	CJ
KOCH Marie-Christine	13-09-52	01-07-09	02-05-16	CM
DANDUMONT Edmond	14-01-38	01-05-88	24-05-16	COM
TRACY Michael	22-10-32	01-03-90	26-05-16	CM
MALHOTRA Marilena	17-07-45	01-11-97	26-05-16	COM
PORREZ Diane	14-01-44	01-05-01	28-05-16	COM
DE LANGE Raphael	11-03-49	01-04-99	02-06-16	COM
LATHAM Edward	21-11-26	01-12-91	03-06-16	COM
VERNETTI Sandro	08-01-37	01-07-00	03-06-16	COM

BENSKIN Francis	16-05-22	01-06-87	06-06-16	COM
GOLDSCHMIT Fernand	09-05-34	01-06-99	06-06-16	COM
DERMIENCE Michel	23-11-44	01-08-99	06-06-16	COM
OSTYN Patrick	14-06-50	01-09-10	06-06-16	COM
DE CONINCK Patrick	20-08-53	01-06-15	06-06-16	COM
DE PASSOS Manuel	18-08-48	01-12-12	08-06-16	CJ
OJHA Girish	18-02-39	01-03-04	09-06-16	COM
ADAM Nicolas	13-02-51	01-12-09	11-06-16	COM
ALPANDE MACHADO Maria de Fatima	09-03-60	01-04-16	12-06-16	CM
DOMINICI Guido	30-05-30	01-06-95	14-06-16	COM
MUTZBAUER Georg	19-09-30	01-10-95	14-06-16	COM
VAN LONKHUIZEN Victor	17-07-42	01-08-05	15-06-16	CES
FERRARI Mario	17-03-32	01-10-95	16-06-16	COM
HOBAN Gerald	26-03-36	01-04-01	17-06-16	COM
SOLER MARTINEZ Ignacio	27-02-56	01-04-15	17-06-16	CM
STREIGNAERTS Vital	04-04-27	01-12-87	19-06-16	COM
CONTI Piero	15-06-39	01-03-04	19-06-16	COM
MARIEN Pierre	19-11-29	01-12-84	20-06-16	COM
PISANI Edgard	09-10-18	01-01-88	20-06-16	COM
CARTA Gesuino	08-04-36	01-04-86	20-06-16	COM
RIJKE Pieter	17-05-31	01-06-96	24-06-16	COM
MORREN-ROULENT Liliane	14-07-31	01-10-87	26-06-16	COM

**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 – edition august 2015 FR only)

Part 2 (forms /pers. data)

Part 3 (addresses PMO – ADMIN. ...) Edition April 2016

Part 4 (reimbursement forms – RCAM/JSIS) (April 2015)

Supplementary health insurances Edition February 2016

Invlidity allowance and survival pension (Hendrik Smets)

Orphan survivor’s pensions (Hendrik Smets)

EU Officials and taxation (Me. J Buekenhoudt)

Inheritance (Me. J Buekenhoudt) (October 2015)

JSIS Guide (was sent by poste to all pensioners)

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
