

**Answer given by Mr Prodi on behalf of the Commission**

(29 June 2001)

The Commission has already had the opportunity to set out its position on publication of the report on this case by the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) in its answer to Written Question P-3457/00 by Mme Paulsen <sup>(1)</sup>. In its answer, the Commission states that, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1073/1999 <sup>(2)</sup> of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 concerning investigations conducted by OLAF, the investigation report was sent to the Commission and to the Swedish judicial authorities. Information communicated and obtained in this context is subject to professional secrecy and may not be passed on to persons other than those within the Community institutions or in the Member States whose duties require them to know it, nor may it be used for purposes other than to combat fraud and corruption.

In adopting Regulation (EC) No 1073/1999, the co-legislators thus decided that it was in the public interest for this kind of report to remain confidential.

Following authorisation by the Swedish judicial authorities, OLAF has stated that it sent its report in confidence to Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control, at its request, on 19 March 2001.

Judicial proceedings are still in motion in Sweden.

The Commission will keep Parliament informed of the outcome of the proceedings in due course.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 163 E, 6.6.2001.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 136, 31.5.1999.

---

(2001/C 350 E/037)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-0787/01****by Daniela Raschhofer (NI) to the Commission**

(13 March 2001)

*Subject:* Rotation of A1 and A2 Commission officials

According to the Commission document (SEC(2000) 2305/5), it is a general rule that A1 and A2 officials are appointed for a maximum period of five years. The Commission's administrative reform is particularly geared towards enhancing performance. The purpose of rotating officials is to counter job fatigue, which can develop after occupying the same post for five years. In special cases, the period can be extended by a further two years, resulting in a total of seven years.

There are Commission officials who have occupied their posts for more than seven years.

Why has the Commission not complied with its own rules?

Which officials have held the same position for over seven years and why?

Does this signal the failure of the Commission's internal reform?

**Answer given by Mr Kinnock on behalf of the Commission**

(11 June 2001)

The Commission's commitment to the job rotation of senior personnel set out in its decisions of September 1999 and December 2000 is clear, and significant progress has already been made by the Commission in implementing its stated objectives.

The Honourable Member will appreciate the reality that implementation must, for practical reasons, be a process rather than an event and, in 1999 and 2000, the Commission launched two major initiatives for job rotation of its senior management:

- Directly after taking up office in September 1999 the Commission decided on a series of appointments of Directors-General resulting in the rotation of 10 DGs (about a third of the total). An important factor in this decision was the period of time a Director-General had occupied the same post.
- In January 2000 the Director-General for Personnel and Administration launched an initiative which identified A2 officials who had occupied the same posts for more than five years. These officials were asked to indicate, in order of preference, three desired alternative posts.

These two initiatives have contributed to developments which mean that, since 1999, new job-holders have been appointed to more than 40% (36 A1 and 76 A2) of all A1 and A2 posts:

- in 1999, 13 A1 (four new appointments, nine internal transfers) and 26 A2 (11 new appointments, 15 internal transfers) positions were filled by new appointees. In 2000, a further 23 A1 (15 new appointments, eight internal transfers) and 50 A2 (37 new appointments, 13 internal transfers) jobs changed hands,
- as of April 2001, six A1 and 21 A2 officials four of whom are due to retire in 2001/2002) have been in their posts for more than seven years. These figures represent 10% of both the A1 and A2 cohorts respectively. A list of the officials concerned is transmitted direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

The Honourable Member will appreciate that the implementation of the Commission decision of 21 December 2000<sup>(1)</sup> on senior management requires new procedures and systems to be put in place.

The Commission intends, meanwhile, to begin another job rotation procedure during 2001. Feedback from the senior management appraisal system will be incorporated into this ongoing process. The new appraisal system is scheduled for approval by the College at the end of 2001. Once approved it will be implemented during 2002, in accordance with the timetable set out in the above-mentioned decision of December 2000.

Factual detail of what has been done and is being done, and of constructive policy that will be implemented completely contradicts the Honourable Member's negative assumptions about the progress of reform.

<sup>(1)</sup> SEC(2000) 2305/5.

(2001/C 350 E/038)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-0790/01**

**by Eurig Wyn (Verts/ALE) to the Commission**

(13 March 2001)

*Subject:* Export of live horses

The export trade in live horses for slaughter for meat has increased within Europe since the escalation of the BSE crisis.

Is the Commission aware of the appalling conditions in which the horses are transported and the inhumane treatment they receive prior to death?

Does the Commission support stricter regulations on the live transport of horses and all other animals?

Does the Commission support stricter regulations for the humane treatment of these animals?