



CSAIO 19



**19th annual Conference of Staff
Associations of International
Organisations**

Summary of discussions

11 and 12 October 2018

**European Parliament
Brussels, Belgium**



Welcome speech by Kristian Knudsen, Acting Director-General, Directorate-General for Personnel — European Parliament

Mr. Knudsen thanked the CSAIO's Scientific Committee for inviting him to the conference and welcomed all the participants to the European Parliament, which received an average of 10 000 visitors every day and which accommodated the elected representatives of the people.

He appreciated the fact that the CSAIO stood for the principle of co-operation between the staff representatives of different international organisations, which allowed it to serve as a forum for the discussion of a range of shared concerns, problems and challenges.

Mr. Knudsen hoped that the discussions that were to take place on that and the following day would feed into the social dialogue of the different organisations. The subjects raised were very important from the standpoint of the Administration. The main challenge facing EU institutions, just like other institutions, was how to remain attractive, especially to the younger generation. Workers' current concerns were no longer the same as several decades ago. Stable, long-term employment, for example, was no longer an attractive proposition—quite the opposite, in fact.

One of the issues that we would need to address in the years to come was that of salary structure. Current salary structures had been established along very traditional lines, at least in the EU institutions, and would ultimately become unviable.

The same applied to recruitment procedures, which tended to take a long time, and hence did not always allow the recruitment of young people.

Another pressing issue was performance evaluation, which needed substantial improvement. Some viewed the exercise as a kind of test, a way of making sure that everything had been done, and in some cases, it was not used in a constructive way. In fact, it was a valuable opportunity to take stock with every member of staff, to discuss ways to increase their personal satisfaction and that of the organisation.

Mr. Knudsen was convinced of the constructive nature of the discussions that would take place during the conference and was counting on the European Parliament Staff Committee to provide him with its feedback and reactions. He wished all participants a productive conference.

Job classification and salary structure

The speakers presented the job classification and salary structure of their respective institutions:

- [Christel OSTERROTH-CARTIGNY](#) (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development—OECD) [*presentation in French*];
- [Manuel SUTIL](#) (European Investment Bank—EIB) [*presentation in English*];
- [Anne-Marie THÉVENOT-WERNER](#) (Université Paris 2 Panthéon-Assas) [*presentation in French*];
- [Fabrice ANDREONE](#) (European Commission) [*presentation in French*].

Alain DUMONT (European Patent Office—EPO), chairing the session, invited the participants to ask questions, comment on the presentations and share the experience of their institutions. They provided the following information:

- Recruitment:
 - At the European Commission: internal competitions.
 - At the OECD: candidates were hired at the first step of their grade, but candidates had the option of negotiating and HR were able to take account of their previous salaries.The Staff Association did not contribute to any official recruitment decision, which were managed within Directorates. A Staff Review Board (some members of which were



- appointed by the Staff Association) could issue advisory opinions to ensure the compliance of the recruitment process.
- At the EIB: candidates were hired at almost the very lowest step.
 - Job classification and salary structure:
 - At the European Commission: grades were determined in advance for vacancies; the Staff Rules defined four types of grade, and increases were given in steps—one step for three years of service.

When the pay scale was changed, the Rules had therefore been changed accordingly. To effect the change, a consultation procedure had been set up, including formal talks with the unions, and the Commission sought the opinion of the Staff Association. There then ensued a genuinely three-way conversation between the Parliament, the Staff Association of the European Commission and the Commission itself. The Staff Association did not communicate much with the staff.
 - At the OECD: four categories of staff (administrators, linguists, technicians and assistants); officials could apply to other positions on their own initiative; all posts were open to external applications (very few, if any, vacancies were open only within the Organisation).

Some grades were twinned, allowing officials to be promoted to the higher grade through a more streamlined process.
 - At the EIB: there were no longer any steps.
 - At the ECJ: although a guarantee had been issued to maintain levels of pay when the status was changed in 2014, some categories of official (especially recent recruits and lower grades) had seen a considerable decline in their salaries.
 - From a legal perspective: there was no automatic right to requalification of a position, but the Organisation was able to re-evaluate a post. In the event of a dispute, the principle of equality of treatment was admissible but required that the plaintiff prove that the two contracts were of the same type. In extreme cases, the tasks required of an official who was overqualified for his or her position could be qualified as exploitation, which had been banned by international law, in judgment No. 3726 of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization.
 - The salary adjustment method:
 - At the European Commission: this method was based on purchasing power parity between countries, as calculated from research and surveys by Eurostat.
 - At the OECD: the method was based on three factors—inflation, purchasing power parity and a reference index tracking pay in eight national civil services.
 - At the EIB: salary bands had been put in place; salaries were aligned with inflation; a new system had been introduced in 2014.
 - Career development / promotion:
 - At the OECD: performance assessment by the official's line manager linked to step progression; for serving officials to be promoted in their current position, the job description had to change and be reassessed at the higher grade. If the request originated with the official, the promotion had to be validated by the Director and then be passed by a board to ensure that the promotion was justified. If the request originated with the Administration, the official would be promoted if his or her line manager considered that he or she would be able to fulfil the requisite professional duties. An allocation of exceptional leave could be granted to officials on reaching the final step of their grade if their performance was rated exceptional.

If an official's performance was found to be unsatisfactory, various measures could be taken (deferring the granting of the next step or not granting it at all; failing to renew the contract).
 - At the European Commission: failing to give satisfaction on a professional level was not a disciplinary matter, but was considered as failing to meet the targets set by the



Administration and therefore led to a remediation plan involving coaching by a colleague or an external service provider, with the official being supervised for a year. If no change was observed after this, the official would not be granted the following step and a redundancy procedure would be launched; it was possible to be promoted in the same job without a change in role; the careers of some categories of official could not go on for longer than six years.

- At the EIB: bonuses were calculated on an annual basis.
- At CERN: the promotion system had been reviewed eleven times in 15 years; the Administration wanted to abandon it completely and replace it with a bonus system. According to the rules of the organisation, officials were entitled to re-evaluation if they were promoted. In practice, if an official was not put forward for promotion by their management, he or she did not have much chance of being promoted. If an official requested promotion and this request was turned down, he or she would have no chance of promotion for a further five years.
- At the European Parliament: an annual merit-based staff report. Officials receiving a mark of zero would be subject to an incompetence procedure, officials receiving a third mark of zero would be demoted, and officials receiving a fifth mark of zero could have their contracts terminated.
- At EUROCONTROL: officials could be promoted to fill newly vacant positions or in recognition of their performance.
- Contract staff:
 - At the European Parliament: this category of staff had been introduced in 2004, with the possibility of open-ended contracts.
- The ability of an Administration to review and/or change the rules in the context of case law: everything depended on the rules and how they were changed—a rule could only be amended by the Member country which had written it; rules could not be amended retroactively.

The exchanges continued on various subjects related to the sharing of experience:

- Budget / promotion:

[EUROCONTROL] Before the beginning of the financial year, the Directorate-General set the budget for promotions and step increases. Because of budget constraints, some officials were not promoted despite sufficient performance.

Did the same procedure exist in other Organisations? Was it correct, from a legal standpoint, that the Directorate-General exercised discretionary power over the promotion budget?

 - From a legal standpoint, this kind of decision contesting the Directorate-General's total power over the budget was not brought before the courts. An individual complaint would have to be lodged or the budget committee prosecuted directly.
 - [CERN] Depending on the budget available, senior management decided which positions would be considered for promotion but no administrative decision was taken at that stage.
 - [FICSA] The job description was linked to promotion. In the event of major changes, it had to be updated and reviewed or reclassified. This was considered to be an organisational decision. Whether to promote was an administrative decision.

The budget of each organisation was adopted by the Member countries and the Council. Officials that were promoted would be paid more, and the Organisation was bound to adhere to the available resources and the budget adopted.

A tendency had been observed in international organisations to change the different types of compensation offered, and changing a job description did not necessarily mean changing the grade.



Steps were generally used to adjust positions.

- Long-term sick leave:

[ITER] Could long-term sick leave be considered valid grounds for redundancy? Had other international organisations already been faced with this scenario?

Most officials had fixed-term contracts. Only a handful of staff members had started their five-year contracts, and an official's announcement to management of an absence of over six months in a five-year period therefore represented a considerable burden for the Administration, which had refused.

- [CERN] After 24 months of sick leave, a decision determining whether the staff member was able to return to work was taken. If a return to work was found to be impossible, the official was given invalidity status. The situation described could therefore not arise, and indeed seemed to violate the duties of an international organisation, its civil servants, Member countries and host country. In this particular case, therefore, it might be necessary to apply to the ILOAT.

- [ITER] The ILOAT was typically applied to in the case of an official's contract not being extended in the event of serious illness. The Rules allowed contracts to be terminated in these circumstances.

In the case of an official on long-term sick leave (at least six months), was that person replaced?

- [OSCE] If the contract of a civil servant was due to expire during a period of sick leave, that contract had to be extended. The contract of an official who was on sick leave could not be terminated. There was, moreover, no financial loss for the Organisation.

- [ECB] The contract of a permanent official could not be terminated in this case, unless it could be proven that the official was guilty of non-compliance. If the term of the sick leave was longer than six weeks, the official was required to see the doctor of the institution in order to be declared fit for work at the end of the period of sick leave. Upon return from sick leave longer than 6 weeks, the Medical Officer gave an opinion on whether the official was fit to return to work and under what conditions (part time, for example).

A specific budget was set aside for the internal replacement of officials on sick leave for longer than six weeks.

- [FICSA] This practice was illegal and unethical. Sick leave was a right, with a defined number of days. If sick leave was granted for longer than this specified term, an invalidity procedure would be launched (or early retirement, if applicable). If the sick leave was extended, the administration could consider transferring another official's position.

- [ILO] It was important to use the right terms: non-renewal and discontinuation were not interchangeable and had different legal implications and consequences. The non-renewal of a contract was one thing, and the lay-off of an official on sick leave was another. At the ILO, officials' contracts could be terminated for health reasons (if they could no longer carry out their professional duties as set out in the job description, for example), but not while they were on sick leave.

- [European Parliament] There was a strategy in place to help officials back to work after sick leave.

- [ECB] If an official was unable to work after one year of sick leave, he or she would be placed on invalidity status following a medical assessment and an invalidity allowance would then replace the salary (in the area of 70% of former basic salary plus some allowances). During disability, there are regularly checks by the medical service (depending on the nature of the invalidity, frequency may deviate between a few months and one to two years).

- [OSCE] If a civil servant was on long-term sick leave, there was a back-to-work plan with variable part-time hours. It was the responsibility of the human resources department to draw up the back-to-work plan. In some cases, it was difficult to come back to work full time



- after three years away (changes in working methods, software, etc.). This responsibility was to be shared, including with the Staff Committee.
- [CERN] These were very difficult situations. Ideally, CERN always tried to put officials back in the position they had held or an equivalent position. The bigger the organisation, the easier it was to offer another kind of position and move officials to different jobs. The impact on their colleagues in the team was considerable.
 - [ILO] Although special agreements were in force in international organisations, ought not the rules of the host country be taken as a minimum standard to guarantee some job security?
 - [ITER] The Organisation was not concerned about legal action.
 - [FICSA] The Directorate General was responsible, as were the staff representatives. The internal rules had to be changed.
 - [EPO] This was a blatant infringement of the official's rights. A similar case had been noted which had been taken to the European Court of Human Rights.

Performance evaluation and its consequences for career development

The speakers presented the performance evaluation systems in their respective institutions and their consequences for career development:

- [Yannick TROADEC and Mona ALGHAIT](#) (Council of Europe—COE) [*presentation in French*];
- [Elisabeth FOMBUENA](#) (International Labour Organization—ILO) [*presentation in French*];
- [Monique BRETON](#) (Court of Justice of the European Union—ECJ) [*presentation in French*];
- [Imed ZABAAR](#) (Federation of Associations of Former International Civil Servants—FAFICS) [*presentation in English*].

Based on these presentations, Fabrice ANDREONE (European Commission), chairing the session, invited the participants to ask questions, comment on the presentations and share the experience of their institutions. The resulting conversation revealed different experiences of the following subjects:

- Modernisation / changes to evaluation systems / training in the evaluation tool:
 - [UNIDO] Modernisation of the performance evaluation system since 2012. Over the years, it had been observed that in theory the system could make a positive contribution to the organisation. In practice, however, the managers needed special skills to optimise that contribution. And it was necessary to make sure that all staff knew how to use it properly.
 - [OSCE] The performance management system was changed in 2016. It was essential to raise awareness of these changes among the managers and all staff. Online training was available on how to prepare reports.
Evaluation was not just supposed to be a tool for setting targets. It also had to facilitate dialogue with one's line manager.
 - [FICSA] FICSA had provided training to staff and managers on how to use the evaluation system and the new policy.
Staff members' objectives had to be consistent with the objectives of the Organisation.
 - [European Parliament] SMART objectives could only be set by managers who had been trained in these special objectives.
 - [ILO] Once an evaluation system had been adopted, its feasibility and impact on work were examined.
Since 2018, evaluations had been carried out on an annual basis, whereas they had previously been based on the cycle of programme and budget set for a two-year period. This had increased the workload. Officials also needed the time to carry out the tasks on which the evaluation was based. Dialogue was very important in the event of underperformance.



- The evaluation of behaviour:
[EUMETSAT] How was behaviour evaluated? According to which criteria? Was there a procedure for evaluating behaviour in an objective and transparent way? Because behaviour was often a source of conflict and factual criteria were easier to assess.
 - [European Commission] This was considered to be a secondary issue for which there were no particular rules of management.
 - [FICSA] Two criteria were given special consideration: receptiveness and co-operation.
 - [ILO] This evaluation was considered to be secondary; preference was given to results-based assessment.
- Evaluation linked to promotion / evaluation of objectives:
 - [FICSA] The "reward" system was a sensitive question for which very clear criteria had been laid down, and any reward had to be justified and publicly posted. This fostered greater transparency.
 - [European Parliament] Although the exercise was enormously time-consuming for all parties (staff and managers), it was a vital process that opened the way to promotion. Evaluations were based solely on the objectives set and required the greatest possible objectivity, even if managers' comments were often subjective in practice.
 - [ILO] Evaluation took place between the official and his or her line manager. In the event of a disagreement, the Reports Board was consulted.
 - [CERN] Evaluation was like an agreement between supervisors and the staff they supervised. The subjective nature of the exercise could generate a certain amount of discontent. Evaluation was not an administrative decision; and for this reason it could not be challenged. There was no appeal process available to staff.
 - [UNIDO] Performance ought not to be linked to career development.

- In whose interest was performance being evaluated?

[EUIPO] Performance evaluation had to be useful. It could have a negative impact—demotivating staff, causing stress and additional pressure.

In some categories, staff had no performance evaluation. Should there be categories that did not follow the procedure? Should there be a special evaluation for longer-serving staff? And should staff representatives be evaluated?

- [European Commission] Even senior management was evaluated, so there existed a certain amount of pressure at every level.
The case where an official had been given a poor rating because he was a staff representative had already arisen.
- [ECJ] There was a staff report for temporary personnel—if it was negative, their contract might not be renewed.
- The time allowed for recording comments or appeals:
 - [European Commission] In the event of the official's disagreeing with the line manager, he or she had five working days in which to respond.
 - [FICSA] There was a date on which the procedure had to be officially finalised, even if the official had disagreed with the content, in which case an official procedure had to be launched within two months.

[EBRD] What appeals mechanisms were available to challenge a performance evaluation? What were the different steps? Could an official take a case all the way to the Tribunal? Who could assist the complainant (staff representative, mediator, etc.)?

System impartiality: an employee and a supervisor could separately appoint a person to provide written feedback to be taken into account in the annual evaluation.

- [European Commission] Officials had five days to apply to the relevant body in the event of a disagreement. They were also able to apply to the EU jurisdiction in the event of a bad evaluation.



- From a legal standpoint: it was possible to challenge an evaluation but only within the context of an administrative decision.
- The evaluation of managers:
 - [FICSA] The role of manager was actually not straightforward: depending on grade, some managers only found themselves in a supervisory role because they were experts in their field, but they did not have any real managerial skills. In motivating some members of staff, others could be demotivated. It was important to distribute the workload fairly. In some cases, the evaluation system could be used against the staff.
 - [COE] 360° evaluations had not been around for long enough to allow sufficient perspective to assess their impact.

[UNIDO] A committee could be set up to investigate measures, rules and practices to be proposed in order to improve the operation of evaluation systems, consisting of all persons present who wanted to participate.

Preparation of the next conference

The CSAIO's Scientific Committee invited participants to step forward if they were interested in co-organising the next conference. Three institutions volunteered:

- The European Patent Office (EPO);
- The European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN); and
- ITER.

The Scientific Committee asked these organisations to confirm their wish to co-organise the next conference in writing by sending it an email.

All participants then proposed the subjects they wished to see on the agenda of the next conference:

- The different internal justice systems within international organisations;
- How to promote a respectful working environment;
- The role of the Staff Committee/unions in consultation processes (and the levels of negotiation);
- The different health insurance systems in international organisations (national, specific, etc.);
- The internal management of complaints;
- The situation/status of some categories of personnel (interns, service providers, etc.);
- Externalisation/sub-contracting;
- Mobility and secondment;
- Redundancy/contract termination (in the event of over-recruitment, for example, how could people be laid off? What were the conditions?);
- Contractual policy and types of contract;
- Equality and diversity in international organisations;
- Gender policy (compliance in name only?);
- The right to legal redress;
- Family-based policies;
- The review of parental leave, and leave for paternity, maternity and adoption;
- The internal structure of Staff Associations and how they worked.

To mark the twentieth anniversary of the creation of CSAIO in 2019, the Scientific Committee would consider suitable events.

There would also be a tribute to Marie-Christine Delcamp (former Executive Secretary of the OECD Staff Association), as proposed by CSAIO.



Role of Staff Representatives

The speakers presented the role of staff representatives and the Staff Association in their respective institutions:

- [Karim HAGGOUCHI](#) (EUMETSAT) [*presentation in English*];
- [Amonida ZADISSA](#) (European Molecular Biology Laboratory—EMBL) [*presentation in English*];
- [Francesco PRETI](#) (EUROCONTROL) [*presentation in English*];
- [Nizar ZAHER](#) (Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe) [*presentation in English*];
- [Dinara ABYKANOVA and Marina PARSONS](#) (European Bank for Reconstruction and Development—EBRD) [*presentation in English*].

On the basis of these presentations, Elisabeth FOMBUENA (International Labour Organization), chairing the session, invited the participants to ask questions, comment on the presentations and share the experience of their institutions. The resulting conversation revealed different experiences of the following subjects:

- Representatives / their careers / sharing of experience between representatives:
 - [FICSA] Staff representatives did not enjoy any privileges.
 - [EUMETSAT] There needed to be a balance between the different roles (official and staff representative) and between the time spent on each.
According to the rules of the organisation, on learning that an official had become a staff representative, the management was required to reduce said official's annual objectives to free up 20% of his or her time for this role.
 - [OSCE] A regional round table of the representatives from all different sites was held every year. Annual meetings with managers in the field and office administrators were also held. Representatives from other organisations could be invited, depending on which subjects were on the agenda and on established partnerships.
 - [EBRD] Representatives' objectives were set for the year. The role required a lot of commitment, of time especially, and few people were attracted to it. Some would ask themselves what they wanted: did they really want to put their careers on hold to move into staff representation? Because choosing to become a staff representative did mean putting one's career on hold. Furthermore, not everybody was cut out for the job, which required certain essential qualities (strength of character, a willingness to fight, solidarity, etc.).
 - [EUMETSAT] New representatives underwent two capacity-building training sessions of three full days each.
- The status of Staff Associations:
 - [FICSA] It was unacceptable that in some organisations the Administration was calling the role of the Staff Committee into question. This was a very specific function which needed to be defended. If the Staff Committee was not mentioned in the rules of the organisation, there was a problem, and it was imperative to negotiate official recognition. If any organisation needed advice in this connection, the FICSA was prepared to share its experience.
 - [European Parliament] The Rules stated that the Staff Association represented the interests of the staff and provided a permanent interface with the Administration. This had not always been the case in practice. The current Staff Committee was working in collaboration with the Administration, which appreciated the advantage for the institution in working together. It was not always easy to earn recognition as an essential partner, which was a long-term battle.
- Legal advice:
 - [FICSA] In some organisations, funds were earmarked for legal advice. Many specialised lawyers were prepared to work for the Association once or twice a week, because of the high potential and possibility of being paid by the Staff Association if the funds were available.



- The role / influence / independence / representativeness of a Staff Association:
 - [EPO] The Staff Association sat on a few committees only. The more influential a Staff Association became, the more time needed to be given to its different activities. There was also an issue of jurisdiction.
 - [European Parliament] In some cases, independence could be relative, such as when the Staff Association depended on the Administration for its budget.
 - [EUROCONTROL] It was important to know the ongoing cases in detail and to keep up to date with current discussions (internal and in other organisations) and to understand in which direction things were moving.
 - [OSCE] The Staff Committee had a seat on the Directorate Committees and working parties. Since any change to the Rules had to be accepted by the Committee, it was consulted well ahead of time, and took part in both informal preparatory meetings and relevant debates.
 - [EMBL] The Staff Association was involved when there were proposals to amend the Rules and Regulations (the latter of which were in fact currently being reviewed). It collected proposals, met with the Administration and took part in negotiations. If common ground could be found, joint proposals were submitted to Council. If not, proposals were submitted separately.
 - [EUIPO] Good representation was vital for the good of the organisation. The Staff Associations ought to receive equal resources.
 - [EUMETSAT] The Staff Association was able to delegate representation to an official of its choosing.
 - [UNIDO] It was difficult to obtain full representation, especially in organisations which did not have a strong union culture.
Consultative process with the Administration; relationship based on partnership.
 - [OECD] By working with the Administration as far upstream of events as possible, the work of a Staff Association was more effective, thanks to its involvement at the beginning of the process. This also gave it more credibility.
 - [EUROCONTROL] The Organisation understood that labour relations were an integral part of the management of the institution.
 - [EBRD] Some other Staff Associations had considerable power to intervene. It was important to be visible and to explain the role and mission of a Staff Association. Encouraging interaction was good for getting staff interested.
 - [CERN] A Staff Association needed to build up a network of knowledge, and it was essential to meet and get to know the representatives of Member countries. In the event of a problem or emergency, staff representatives would then know who to call, and the conversation was easier if they knew the person already.
 - [OECD] The representativeness of the Staff Association did not depend on the type of contract of the staff: around 80% of all staff belonged to the Staff Association, while around 50% of staff were on fixed-term contracts and 50% were on open-ended contracts. The Staff Association defended all staff.
During a recent consultation about the proposal to change the contractual policy, the Staff Association had highlighted problematic issues and suggested ways around them. It was essential to be involved in discussions as far upstream as possible.
 - [EBRD] A meeting with the president was held twice a year and there were frequent meetings with the Human Resources Directorate. Discussions were frank. The Administration was a little afraid of the Staff Association, which lent it weight during negotiations, but its views were not always taken into account.
 - [EIB] The Staff Association should be responsible for keeping staff informed of developments in different fields, but often lacked the required resources in terms of both manpower and budget.



- Financing:
 - [EUMETSAT] Having an allocated budget gave a Staff Association some room for manoeuvre in managing its funds. The budget was not inspected by the Administration but by the auditors—thereby preserving the confidentiality of expenditure and the independence of the Staff Association.
 - [OSCE] The Staff Association was not financed by the Administration. In 2016, an automatic system of staff contribution of €3 was introduced. Ideally, this would be increased to €5, then €7 and ultimately to €10.
When events were organised, the Administration was invited to make an ad hoc contribution to their financing.
 - [OECD] Contributions of 0.3% of salary deducted at source were used to pay three legal advisors, one communications officer and one assistant.
The salaries of the Chair (on full-time secondment), the two Vice-Chairs and the HSWC delegate (all three on part-time secondment) were paid by the Administration. On the expiry of their terms of office, all were guaranteed to be able to return to their previous jobs.
 - [CERN] Annual contributions of 0.2% of salary allowed the organisation to recruit one full-time member of staff, for example.
- The recruitment of representatives:
 - [OSCE] Few people volunteered to act as staff representative. It was hard to attract staff members to this role that was not always easy, and required considerable commitment for very little recognition. It was therefore essential to communicate with staff and present the vital role of their representatives.
Interns allowed representatives to free up time to work on the most important cases.

The discussions then turned to comments of a more general nature:

- [Invited participant] Full of admiration for all the work carried out by the Staff Associations: it was vital to keep going!
If some people were looking for interns, they should not hesitate to contact graduates in international civil service law from Paris 1 and Paris 2.
- [CERN] Experience sharing was of paramount importance. Other Staff Associations needed to be persuaded to join the CSAIO.
- [OSCE] Human resources and management were our partners. It was important to meet the Administration regularly and get to know it well so as to approach issues in the right way. The staff was the backbone of the Staff Associations, which must never imagine that they were weak or blacklisted.
Following these discussions, there was a need to launch initiatives. The following conference would provide an opportunity for an update on all these ideas. If an institution needed help, there were many representatives willing to help and advise on how to approach top management, or even act as intermediary.
- [ECMWF] If it had not already been done, and to allow discussions to continue throughout the year and ideas to be shared, a live chat could be set up.
- [EBRD] Working groups could be set up as a forum for the discussion of different subjects.
- [European Parliament] Some thought would have to be given to the way in which a debate of the legal issues could be pursued.

The Scientific Committee thanked the European Parliament for co-organising the Conference, the interpreters, chairs of the sessions, the speakers who agreed to give presentations and all the participants for attending.