

EN

Place of employment Luxembourg vs Luxembourg capital ?

● A « collective » of not less than 7 (seven) trade unions informs you of its demand that a correction coefficient be created for Luxembourg.

- However, by addressing an open letter to Eurostat's Director General, the 'seven' :
1. attempt to mislead staff on the scope of the legal provision they rely upon;
 2. conceal the fact that the claim can only be satisfied through reviewing (and therefore renegotiating) the Staff Regulations.

● Which are, in fact, the relevant rules in the Staff Regulations on correction coefficients?

Article 64 of the Staff Regulations:

"An official's remuneration [...] shall [...] **be weighted** at a rate above, below or equal to 100%, depending on living conditions in the various places of employment.

These weightings shall be adopted by the Council, acting by a qualified majority on a proposal from the Commission [...]".

⇒ In other words, the introduction of any weighting requires the adoption of a **Council Regulation**.

Article 1 (3), (a), of Annex XI to the Staff Regulations:

In so doing, "Eurostat shall [...] calculate the economic parities which establish the equivalence of purchasing power:

- (i) of the salaries of officials of the Communities serving **in the capitals** of the Member States".

● The 'seven' mention Article 9 of Annex XI to the Staff Regulations, reckoning that no-one will take time to read it. So, here's what is laid down in this article:

Indeed, amongst others, "the representatives of officials of the Communities **in a given place of employment** can request the creation of a correction coefficient specific to that place".

It is added that:

« This request should be supported by objective factors revealing an appreciable difference over some years in the cost of living **between that place of employment and the capital of the Member State concerned**".

● A 'place of employment' is not to be con-

fused with a 'country'. Here are some examples in force, which illustrate this difference:

Country / Place	Remuneration 1.7.2006
Germany	100,1
Bonn	97,2
Karlsruhe	95,8
Münich	106,6
Italy	112,5
Varese	100,3
United Kingdom	139,4
Culham	114,2

- First absurdity: our friends are claiming a correction coefficient for the '*place of employment*' Luxembourg, as opposed to the one applicable to the '*country*' Luxembourg, which by definition coincides with the capital of this country.
- What, then, about the correction coefficient for the 'country' Luxembourg?

Article 3 (5) of Annex XI to the Staff Regulations is unambiguous :

"No correction coefficient shall be applicable in Belgium and Luxembourg".

- Clearly, to abolish this rule, it is necessary to **amend the Staff Regulations themselves**. In other words, the 'seven' want to renegotiate the Staff Regulations.
- Strangely enough, during the negotiation of the Reform of the Staff Regulations, which took effect in 2004, the 'seven' proudly abstained from negotiating, contenting themselves with denouncing the package, while the latter was put under the Council's microscope, only to turn up to the negotiations' table after the Council had already decided on the key issues.
- Now, once again they misinform the staff, by seeking to open Pandora's Box.

• The Members States, still not sufficiently satisfied with savings made on the new staff, are waiting for us for the next round.

• And what about you? Do you feel safe in knowing that you are represented by such unreliable representatives?