

Attractiveness of the Luxembourg site?

Has the Commission already abandoned Luxembourg?

Luxembourg, 11/12/2020

At its <u>meeting</u> on 25 November, the Commission's Corporate Management Board discussed the implementation of the Georgieva/Asselborn <u>agreement</u> concluded in 2015 with the Luxembourgish authorities. It also discussed possible ways of improving this agreement on the basis of an overall and qualitative assessment.

As a reminder, this <u>agreement</u> foresees a gradual increase in the number of EU staff (inside the Commission as well as inside the other EU institutions and bodies) based in Luxembourg, focusing on three main areas:

- 1. <u>Legal</u> through the establishment of the **European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO)** responsible for the fight against serious cross-border crime affecting the EU budget. Both the establishment plan and the mandate of this body have been reduced in the meantime.
- 2. <u>Digital</u>: The **European High Performance Computing (Euro HPC)** was created with a minimalist establishment plan and huge recruitment difficulties due to attractiveness problems. In parallel, the recent and very wide selection of Commission temporary staff at low grades resulted in a small number of candidates recruited and above all with low (?) profiles. Furthermore, CNECT, which was supposed to either create posts in Luxembourg or to transfer them from Brussels, has failed and many posts officially based in Luxembourg which are in fact occupied by Brussels-based colleagues have disappeared. Are the weak EuroHPC deployment as well as the recent failure hosting the Cybersecurity Center (80 posts and 2Bio € projects) other signs of oblivion?
- 3. <u>Financial</u>: the EIB Group (EIB and EIF) has increased its number of posts and can expect more under the new MFF.

Overall, where the Commission predicts the increase of its posts in Luxembourg, the current total of its posts has in fact fallen dramatically. This decrease is exacerbated by the large number of posts based in Luxembourg but not fulfilled. During the meeting, it was noted that the reduction in Commission' staff in Luxembourg was significantly greater than in Brussels.

Concretely, since 2005, where the agreement indicated an increase of at least 150 posts by 2020, the reality has been a loss of 250 posts transferred or to be filled (figures dating from mid-2020).

Another paradoxical example is the closure of CHAFEA: where the agreement predicted/had foreseen the possible development of the activities of this executive agency (which manages a DG SANTE programme also based in Luxembourg) and whereas the future MFF provides for foresees a significant development of health programmes, this agency is finally relocated to Brussels.

Union Syndicale Fédérale Luxembourg deplores the amateurism shown in the closure of this agency in Luxembourg to the detriment of staff. The majority of them do not wish to move to Brussels. The Commission not only appears to have abandoned its staff in Luxembourg, but is also clearly relying on the other institutions to find solutions, thus admitting to be unsuccessful.

According to USFL, if the problem of the cost-living as well as that of medical overcharging are not resolved, there will be no solution to find new recruit and keep them in Luxembourg, be it at the Commission or in other institutions/bodies.

Union Syndicale Fédérale Luxembourg requests a meeting with DG HR on the attractiveness of Luxembourg site, which in fact obviously is a secondary or even a negative priority for the Commission

Need help? Contact us:

REP-PERS-OSP-USF-LUXEMBOURG@ec.europa.eu

Your representatives:

BECH et T2:	Gasperich:	OP:
N. MAVRAGANIS,	R. DELGADO-SAEZ,	I. WOLFF,
C-A POPESCU	S. KARDARAS	M. COLLIGNON
	N. FETTAH-ZAIT	J-M DEHOY

UNION SYNDICALE FEDERALE LUXEMBOURG

Contact: REP-PERS-OSP-USF-LUXEMBOURG@ec.europa.eu www.usf-luxembourg.eu



