

<b>EN</b>
<b>EPSU honours its commitments</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In its election campaign, the EPSU list, which won, made a series of commitments, concerning, amongst others, the functioning of the Staff Committee.</li> <li>● To fulfil its mission, the Staff Committee had, first of all, to escape from the quagmire in which it had been sunk by the previous majority.</li> <li>● These were the <b>commitments</b> EPSU made concerning governance :             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not to <i>gag</i> any minority;</li> <li>○ To put an end to the blocking, crisis and disrepute;</li> <li>○ To make proper use, for the benefit of our colleagues, of the <b>human resources</b> made available to the SC (3 members and 2 permanent staff working full-time for the SC).</li> <li>○ To replace confused talk and exclusion with genuine <b>dialogue</b> with the staff, within the SC and with the Institution.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● The staff gave us its mandate to advance in that direction.</li> <li>● However, the rearguard of the previous StaffCom majority, which now forms the minority, has not grasped that message and is trying to bog us down again.</li> <li>● Worse than that, US-L is rewriting history, by claiming that <i>"in the past such resources were allocated on a proportional basis in the light of the election results"</i> (!).</li> <li>● Let's tell the truth! First of all, a distinction must be drawn between :             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❶ Nominations to joint committees;</li> <li>❷ The Bureau's composition; and</li> <li>❸ Human resources made available on a full-time basis.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Here is an overview of how things evolved :</li> </ul>

Cdp 2006-2008			Cdp 2008-2010	
Évolution des sièges au Cdp entre 2006 et 2008 →				
Elections 2006	Sièges au Cdp en début de mandat	Sièges au Cdp en fin de mandat	Elections 2008	Sièges au Cdp
SJE	7	4	SJE	0
Transparence & changement	3	6	US-L	4
majorité (7 + 3, puis 4 + 6, un total de 10)			❶ Sièges de la minorité dans (tous) les organes paritaires : <b>22 (38%)</b> ❷ Bureau proposé : 2 sur 5 ❸ mises à disposition: 0	
US- Alliés pour l'avenir	3	3	EPSU	9
❶ Sièges de la minorité dans les organes paritaires : <b>4 (7%)</b> (exclue des organes 'sensibles') ❷❸ Bureau/mises à disposition : 0			majorité	

<p>● However, figures alone do not provide a full picture of reality.</p>
<p>❶ Under the 2004-2008 <i>regime</i>, a minority member nominated to a <b>joint committee</b> was forced to “represent and advocate the views of the Staff Committee majority”, under the threat of expulsion.</p>
<p>Although EPSU has told US-L representatives clearly that their nomination will not be subject either to veto or censorship, the latter persist in <i>proudly upholding</i> the previous StaffCom’s practice of banning dissenting opinions.</p>
<p>❷ To avoid congestion of plenary meetings’ work, EPSU announced its intention to establish a real 5-member Bureau including the minority.</p>
<p>❸ As for the 3 full-time members, EPSU, after 6 weeks of collective reflection, came to the conclusion that including one of the US-L team would unavoidably and seriously jeopardise the fulfilment of the StaffCom’s mission.</p>
<p>US-L should have learnt that the <i>least</i> effective method for ‘persuading’ us is lying and blackmail. Indeed, how could one co-operate on a day-to-day basis for 2 years, for the staff’s benefit, inside a micro-service such as the StaffCom, with those who are lying openly and publicly?</p>
<p>The conduct of one trade union which, having lost its power to exclude another, <i>appeals to the Administration to arbitrate</i> is deplorable. By contrast, the Administration is under a duty to intervene, as it did in fact in 2006-2007, only if the StaffCom is exceeding the limits of legality.</p>
<p>● It is time now for us to work to build upon the scorched earth which we have inherited.</p>