AAPOCAD

COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE · ECMWF · esa · NATO OTAN · OCDE · EUMETSAT · UWEO

2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France • Téléphone: +33 1 45 24 85 87
E-mail: *aapocad@oecd.org* • Site Internet: *www.aapocad.org*

Bulletin No. 66 *(Orig. Fr.)* **February 2022**

In this Issue

Annual Report of the Chairman 2

- AAPOCAD Membership Statistics 8
- Annual Adjustment of Pensions in 2022 8
- Calendar of Co-ordination Meetings for 2022 9

Draft Summary Record: 43rd General Assembly 2021 10

Written statements by the speakers at the AAPOCAD General Assembly 2021 15

- *Mr Chris Woodward, Head of Human Resources, OECD* 15
- *Mr Syd Maddicott, Chairman of the Co-ordinating Committee on Remuneration (CCR)* 17
- *Mr Christian Overbeck, Chairman of the Committee of Representatives of the Secretaries/Directors-General (CRSG)* 18
- *Mr Jeremy Maddison, Chairman of the Committee of Staff Representatives (CRP)* 19
- *Mr Hannes Langeder, Chairman of Pensions Administrative Committee of the Co-ordinated Organisations (PACCO)* 21
- *Mr Jean-François Poels, Head of International Service for Remuneration and Pensions (ISRP)* 22
- *Ms Margaret Gilman Jaouen, Head of the Payroll Administration Unit (ISRP)* 23

Regional Delegates' Reports 2021 25

Elections for the 2022-2023 AAPOCAD Governing Board 34

Glossary of Co-ordination & Pensions 36

In Memoriam 39

New Members by Organisation 40

REMINDER …

- If you wish to be a candidate in the **Election of the Governing Board**, please fill in the form on **the AAPOCAD website** and return it to us by **Friday, 18 March 2022**.
- Please inform us if you have an e-mail address not previously notified to AAPOCAD or if your contact details have changed recently. The GDPR regulations do not allow the pension units to share this information with us.

Annual Report of the Chairman

1. Introduction

One year ago, I expressed a hope that I believe we all shared, namely that the arrival of various vaccines would allow us to view the future with a degree of optimism and even to pick up the pieces of something resembling the "normal" life we enjoyed prior to March 2020. We did not bargain on the Delta and Omicron variants stealing a march on us to gain the upper hand and make life complicated again.

However, as hope springs eternal, let us trust that the growing number of scientific studies will prove correct in forecasting that the current pandemic will soon wane into an endemic disease like the flu that we have lived with for decades.

It is with this in mind – from the sunlit slopes of the Three Valleys in Savoie, where I am writing this report – that I wish you all a very happy 2022.

2. The Life of the Association

a. Bureau and Governing Board

As in 2020, in 2021 AAPOCAD had to adapt in order to continue to operate. The Bureau and Governing Board kept to their standard calendar of meetings but held them all by videoconference except in October 2021, when a hybrid format was employed, as was the case for the 2021 General Assembly, with strictly limited physical attendance on OECD premises. For the second consecutive year, the social programme associated with the General Assembly (dinner, excursion the following day) could not go ahead.

Among the topics addressed – and discussed later in this report – the most prominent was the appeals lodged against the reform of the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme (CPS), followed by matters of general scope such as pension adjustments reckoned using the new version of Article 36 of the Pension Scheme Rules, long-term care insurance for pensioners of the Co-ordinated Organisations, the taxation of pensions in France (where there are certain specific issues) and the finalisation of the tax adjustment for pensioners in various countries.

b. Elections and composition of the Governing Board

The elections were held in the spring with votes cast electronically and by post. Of the 729 ballot papers eligible to be counted (i.e. excluding 29 blank or spoiled papers), 570 or 78.2% were submitted electronically – more than in 2020 (70.2%). This trend should be encouraged, since electronic voting is very straightforward for the voter and makes the count itself much easier.

Two outgoing members of the Governing Board, Mélina Babocsay (Council of Europe) and Barbara Lerch (OECD), chose not to stand for re-election. On behalf of all members of the Governing Board, I would like to thank them for their dedication and contributions to the Board's work.

Austin Woods (European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts, ECMWF) decided to step down from his post as elected representative of the ECMWF while remaining a member of the Governing Board in his capacity as Chair of the ECMWF Pensioners' Association.

Following the elections, the Governing Board welcomed as new members: Linda Duboscq (OECD), Alain Bataillé (ECMWF) and Philippe Courades (Council of Europe).

We also welcomed Lothar Winzer as Chair of the Association of Retired ESA Staff, replacing Jochen Schaper whose six-year term has come to an end, and Franco Veltri, the newly appointed Regional Delegate for Italy.

c. Membership of the Association

Membership of our Association has fallen slightly from 3 041 at end-November 2020 to 3 026[1] at end-November 2021. In other words, new members did not fully offset the farewells that we sadly had to bid between those dates.

Our "penetration rate" (number of members of AAPOCAD compared to the total number of pensioners of the Co-ordinated Organisations) therefore continues to fall, sliding from 35.97% in 2019 to 34.80% in 2020 and 33.93% in 2021.

[1] These figures include those forwarded annually by the ISRP (see the table on p. 8) and the handful of members who pay their subscriptions directly to the AAPOCAD Secretariat, of whom there were 26 in 2020 and 24 in 2021.

This is undoubtedly linked to the fact that the "pool" of potential members affiliated to the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme (CPS) is inevitably shrinking over time as a direct result of the gradual closure of the scheme to new members since 2002.

Having said that, for members of the New Pension Scheme (NPS) that took over from the CPS in several Co-ordinated Organisations, the differences between it and the CPS, now that the arrangements for pension adjustments are the same in both schemes, affect only still-serving staff. Joining AAPOCAD should therefore be of great interest to NPS members, and efforts must be made to convey this message to them.

In a similar vein, in October last year the Governing Board approved the first reading of a draft Resolution allowing pensioners from a Co-ordinated Organisation who are covered by a pension scheme other than the CPS or the NPS (or, for the Council of Europe, the Third Pension Scheme) to join AAPOCAD subject to certain conditions, if only to retain contact with former colleagues and keep abreast of specific news and developments. The draft resolution will be submitted for adoption to the General Assembly in October 2022.

d. Finance

As you will see elsewhere in this Bulletin (see the pages on the General Assembly of 15 October 2021), AAPOCAD is in a sound financial position: the 2020 accounts have been approved, the implementation of the 2021 budget raised no concerns and the initial budget for 2022 is balanced.

3. General Assembly 2021

The slight improvement in the health situation encouraged us to try out a "hybrid" formula for the General Assembly on 15 October 2021. A room at the OECD Conference Centre was the venue for the meeting attended in person by the Chairman, one of the Vice-Chairs, the Executive Secretary, the Treasurer, the Permanent Assistant and all of the invited delegates (the Representative of the Secretary-General of the OECD, the Chair of the CCR, the Chair of the CRSG, the Chair of the CSR, the Head of the ISRP, and the Head of the ISRP Payroll Unit) except the Chair of the PACCO who had to take part by videoconference because of timetable pressures.

In contrast to the GA 2020, simultaneous interpretation was provided in 2021.

This method proved rather successful and will definitely encourage us to hold "hybrid" General Assemblies in future even with many more participants physically present, in order to make it easier for AAPOCAD members who live a long way from Paris or any other meeting venue to participate.

Papers on the General Assembly 2021 are available elsewhere in this Bulletin.

4. Co-ordination

AAPOCAD is the only pensioners' association that is authorised to take part in the Co-ordination processes, and, as usual, its delegates to the Committee of Staff Representatives (CRP) participated in all meetings on co-ordination held this year, including meetings of the CRP working groups (pensions, legal matters). All meetings were held by videoconference (on Zoom or Webex).

The only major item on the agenda of the tripartite meetings was the salary adjustment method which, following the amendment to Article 36 of the Pension Scheme Rules, is no longer of direct interest to retired staff. The Latin phrase *parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus* would perfectly sum up the discussions of April, June and September: apart from a few purely technical tweaks that have no real effect on the outcome, the only sticking point between the CCR and the other two committees (CRSG and CRP) concerned the inclusion, which was ultimately carried, of an "exception" clause that would make it possible to delay the application of the method's results for 11 months subject to conditions that are unlikely ever to be met during the life of the method (which relates to salary adjustments for 2022 to 2025, extendable to 2026 or 2027).

5. Appeals against the amendments to the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme Rules

The cases before the Administrative Tribunal of the Council of Europe and the Appeals Board of the ex-WEU were heard on 28 October 2020 and 14 November 2020 respectively; those before the Administrative Tribunal of NATO on 26 March 2021; those before the Administrative Tribunal of the OECD on 14 June 2021; those before the Administrative Tribunal (formerly the Appeals Board) of ESA on 15 October 2021; and those before the Appeals Board of EUMETSAT on 19 October 2021.

We learned very recently that a face-to-face hearing on the appeals lodged with the Appeals Board of the European Centre for Medium-range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) will be held in Reading (UK) on 15 March 2022.

The first decision of the judicial bodies came after a long wait: the ruling of the Administrative Tribunal of the Council of Europe – which went against the applicants – was handed down only on 20 April 2021 and was followed sporadically by further unfavourable findings from the Administrative Tribunal of NATO (1 June 2021), the Appeals Board of the ex-WEU (17 June 2021), the Administrative Tribunal of the OECD (30 June 2021), the Administrative Tribunal of ESA (15 November 2021) and the Appeals Board of EUMETSAT (30 November 2021).

With the odd slight difference, all the findings handed down follow the line of argument set out by the Administrative Tribunal of the Council of Europe, which would appear merely to endorse the arguments of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe. This is a huge disappointment to all of us because we had based our strategy both on the strength of our arguments and on a positive assessment of the tribunal's composition: two of the three judges were former judges at the European Court of Human Rights. It appears that, at most, we are entitled to a method for the adjustment of our pensions and to the maintenance of their purchasing power, apparently by accounting for inflation. But are these "assurances" likely to persist if inflationary pressure grows and remains high?

The proceedings before the various bodies are costly. AAPOCAD provided for a total budget for 2020 and 2021 of EUR 75 000 and reached agreement with "local" associations of pensioners from each Organisation (AIA, AIACE, ARES, CNRCSA, etc.) on their token involvement for a sum to be determined when all costs are known, subject to a cap of EUR 5 per association member; in so doing, we are enlarging the "funding" circle for the proceedings on the basis that, although not all pensioners are members of AAPOCAD, they will all be affected by the outcome.

6. Adjustment to pensions on 1 January 2022

As pension adjustments are now based on the harmonised index of consumer prices (HICP), or the consumer price index (CPI) for countries where the HICP does not exist (or is no longer calculated), it is necessary to wait for the publication by Eurostat or by the relevant national statistical authorities of the indexes for the month preceding the date on which the adjustment takes effect. Therefore, where our adjustment on 1 January 2022 is concerned, the indexes in question are those for December 2021. The indexes are usually published only towards the middle of January, too late to be taken into account in January's pension payments; pensions will therefore be adjusted retrospectively in February for most countries concerned.

Surging inflation during the second half of 2021 in most countries where the pensioners of the Co-ordinated Organisations live means that adjustments of magnitudes not seen for years should, under Article 36 as amended of the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme Rules (CPSR), be automatically applied to pensions in the coming weeks in line with the percentages shown in column (g) of the table below; the table also shows how pensions have changed since the amendment to the CPSR and the changes in salaries *in Organisations that awarded salary adjustments as recommended by the CCR*[2] for the years 2020, 2021 and 2022.

The difference between the increases in salaries and the increases in pensions over the three-year period 2020-2022 as set out in the final column of the table must be read with care. The reference periods for the salary and pensions adjustments are not the same, with the result that the acceleration in inflation that occurred during the second half of 2021 is taken into account in the pensions adjustments on 1 January 2022, whereas it will not be accounted for in the salary adjustments until 1 January 2023.

[2] Namely ECMWF, ESA, EUMETSAT and NATO.

AJUSTEMENTS – SALAIRES ET PENSIONS 2020-2022
ADJUSTMENTS – SALARIES AND PENSIONS 2020-2022

Bases: *Salaires/ Salaries:* *Rapports du CCR/CCR Reports*
Pensions: *IPCH (ou IPC)/HICP (or CPI)*

AJUSTEMENTS DES SALAIRES SALARY ADJUSTMENTS					AJUSTEMENTS DES PENSIONS PENSION ADJUSTMENTS					
01-2020 [CCR 264]	*01-2021 [CCR 272]*	*01-2022# [CCR 281]*	*Progression salaires/salaries 2020-2022*		01-2020	01-2021	01-2022	*Progression pensions 2020-2022*		Ecart entre progression pensions/salaires 2020-2022 Difference between pension and salary progression 2020-2022
(a)	*(b)*	*(c)*	*(d)*		(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)		(h) - (d)
1.60%	*2.20%*	*2.70%*	***6.6%***	**B**	1.30%	0.62%	6.6%	**8.7%**	**B***	**2.1%**
2.60%	*3.40%*	*3.70%*	***10.0%***	**F**	1.40%	0.38%	3.4%	**5.2%**	**F**	**-4.8%**
2.40%	*4.20%*	*3.80%*	***10.8%***	**D**	1.50%	-0.66%	5.7%	**6.6%**	**D**	**-4.2%**
0.40%	*1.60%*	*1.40%*	***3.4%***	**I**	0.80%	-0.67%	4.2%	**4.3%**	**I**	**0.9%**
1.60%	*1.60%*	*4.10%*	***7.5%***	**L**	1.30%	0.20%	5.4%	**7.0%**	**L**	**-0.5%**
3.20%	*4.20%*	*1.80%*	***9.4%***	**NL**	2.70%	1.47%	6.4%	**10.9%**	**NL**	**1.5%**
1.30%	*4.40%*	*4.50%*	***10.6%***	**E**	0.60%	-0.86%	6.6%	**6.3%**	**E**	**-4.3%**
2.30%	*2.60%*	*2.60%*	***7.7%***	**UK**	2.00%	1.20%	5.4%	**8.8%**	**UK**	**1.1%**
6.00%	*5.20%*	*2.70%*	***14.5%***	**P**	0.70%	-2.06%	2.8%	**1.4%**	**P**	**-13.1%**
1.00%	*0.70%*	*0.70%*	***2.4%***	**CH**	0.70%	-1.60%	1.3%	**0.4%**	**CH**	**-2,0%**
16.00%	*14.90%*	*18.40%*	***57.8%***	**TR***	15.70%	22.05%	36.1%	**92.2%**	**TR***	**34.4%**
			97,3%	**TR****					**TR****	***-5.1%***

*** TR : Application de l'ajustement exceptionnel des salaires au 1.1.22 (283ème Rapport du CCR*
*** TR : Application of special salary adjustment of 25% at 1.1.22 (CCR 283 Report)*

 # Y inclus le 0,1% reporté de 2021 à 2022 (application de la clause dite de modération)
 # Including 0.1% carried over from 2021 to 2022 in application of the moderation clause.

** Les ajustements exceptionnels viennent en déduction des pourcentages annuels indiqués*

** Special adjustments have to be deducted from the annual percentages indicated*

La période de référence pour l'ajustement des salaires court du 01 juillet au 01 juillet

La période de référence pour l'ajustement des pensions court du 01 janvier au 01 janvier

The reference period for salary adjustments runs from 01 July to 01 July

The reference period for pension adjustments runs from 01 Jan. to 01 Jan.

In any event, it is apparent that the losses incurred by pensioners are particularly acute in countries where salaries have been boosted by the application of particularly strong purchasing power parities, namely France, Germany, Spain and Portugal.

The situation – and the losses incurred – are different in Organisations that have applied "affordability" measures to salary adjustments: at the Council of Europe, the adjustments recommended by the CCR were allocated only partially in 2021 and 2022, and those for 2022 will further be paid in instalments, whereas, at the OECD, the 2021 adjustments were lower than the CCR recommendations as well as paid in instalments.[3]

Tables setting out the position of pensioners from those two Organisations specifically will be available for AAPOCAD members from our secretariat.

Turning to the "impressive" adjustment in the case of Turkey on 1 January 2022, please bear in mind that this is the result of a return to what could be termed "galloping" inflation: between June and December 2021, the HICP rose by 25.48%, and in December alone leapt up by 13.57% compared to November. If it continues at this pace, the exceptional pensions adjustments in line with the Turkish scale, of which there were two in 2021, could become a monthly occurrence.

The difference already noted three years on from the first implementation of Article 36 as amended of the CPSR between increases in salaries and increases in pensions means that we will have to keep a very watchful eye with a view ultimately to triggering Article 36(2), which provides: "At regular intervals, the Secretary General shall establish a comparison of the difference between increases in salary and increases in pensions, and may, where appropriate, propose to the Committee [Council] of Ministers measures to reduce it."

7. Work of the Regional Delegates

AAPOCAD has Regional Delegates in most countries where there are significant numbers of pensioners from the Co-ordinated Organisations, namely Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

Their role is to act as an initial point of contact for pensioners living in the country concerned who need advice or assistance in their dealings with the Organisation they came from or the national administration of their country.

You will find their reports elsewhere in this Bulletin, and I encourage you to read them.

– *Looking for a new Regional Delegate for Germany*

Rüdiger (Roger) Neitzel, who has been an exemplary Regional Delegate for Germany for many years, indicated over a year ago that he would like to hand the baton on to a successor. Any AAPOCAD member living in Germany who feels that they can step into Roger's shoes is invited to contact him directly (his contact details are on the list of members of the Governing Board) before submitting an application to the Chairman of AAPOCAD.

8. Long-term care insurance

Long-term care insurance is compulsory in some countries (including Germany and the Netherlands) and is normally provided for any person covered by a sickness insurance scheme in the country of residence.

For pensioners of the Co-ordinated Organisations, the situation is anything but clear and, in some cases, it is wholly unacceptable. If covered only by the scheme specific to the Organisation they came from (bear in mind that sickness insurance and social insurance more generally are not co-ordinated), everything will depend on what that scheme provides for by way of benefits: some include cover equivalent to a long-term care insurance and others do not.

Our Regional Delegate for Germany, Roger Neitzel, has had various dealings with the German authorities to try and plug this hole, but the authorities have passed the buck to the organisations, some of which are simply choosing not to listen.

Social security legislation in the Netherlands has been modernised. Whereas, previously, pensioners had to state their membership of a sickness insurance scheme that is offered by their international Organisation and provides benefits comparable to state schemes, they must now state that the Organisation's scheme includes the provision of home-based care as well as long-term care. NATO plans to modernise its

[3] At the OECD, serving staff will receive all salary adjustments recommended by the CCR in 2022, but their implementation will be in four stages (January, July, September and December).

sickness insurance this year but seems reluctant to include those two types of care. Excluding them could prove problematic.

What is the situation in the other Organisations?

The Governing Board will keep this item on the agenda to see how AAPOCAD can best become involved in this matter, one that is undoubtedly of general concern but that requires solutions specific to each Organisation.

9. Finalising tax adjustments / Information on payslips

The finalisation of the tax adjustment – a procedure that is normally performed annually – has recently caused a number of issues, whether because of lengthy delays in some countries (particularly Italy) or by way of the explanations for sums credited or (more importantly!) debited that are included in payslips but may be somewhat opaque to those of us who do not keep close tabs on such matters.

The ISRP has managed to engage with the tax authorities of the countries concerned and the issues identified are in the process of being resolved. I extend my thanks to the ISRP for its commitment to ensuring it will use plain language in any explanations or messages it may need to include in pay/pension slips.

10. At-source deduction of income tax (France)

In view of the patchwork of changes to pensioners' circumstances in France in relation to at-source deduction of income tax and its consequences, whether direct or indirect, last spring the CRSG and the ISRP agreed to undertake, with assistance from the PACCO, an in-depth study of this matter. Currently, we have no information on the progress they have made, but we will keep our members who live in France up to date with any news we receive on this thorny matter.

In the meantime, we can only reiterate the advice given previously to all pensioners whose tax domicile is in France, i.e. continue to complete your income tax return as you have always done, and set aside, every month, the amount you consider necessary to meet your tax obligations.

11. General Assembly 2022

Following a vote at the General Assembly on 15 October 2021, it was decided that future General Assemblies will be held in October. The date of the next Assembly is **Friday 14 October 2022**.

If, finally, the worst of Covid is then behind us, and it is possible to attend in person, the Assembly will take place in Paris with, we hope, the social programme initially planned for 2020: dinner on the Friday evening at the "Bel Canto" restaurant in Neuilly-sur-Seine, and a guided tour on the Saturday morning of the French Senate at the Palais du Luxembourg, followed by lunch at the Senate restaurant.

12. Acknowledgements

As ever, I cannot conclude this report without thanking all those who have supported, aided and advised me throughout the past 12 months. First among them is our Permanent Assistant, Doris Cachin, without whom practically nothing would get done; then our Executive Secretary Elfi Lindner and our Treasurer Michèle Lobin; Vice-Chairs Nico De Boer, Michel Garrouste and Hessel Rutten; Honorary Chairmen Yves Boris and Bernard Wacquez; my teammates working in Co-ordination over the past year, especially Isabelle Tezcan for her work in the CSR Working Parties on pensions and legal issues, and Jean Le Ber for his contributions to the discussions on the new salary adjustment method; and all members of the Bureau or Governing Board who, in one way or another, have made their mark.

It would be unthinkable for me to finish this report without paying tribute to the former Secretary-General of the OECD, Angel Gurría, for his unfailing support for AAPOCAD throughout his 15-year mandate which ended in June 2021, or expressing the hope that his successor, Mathias Cormann, will display the same understanding of the important role that AAPOCAD has to play.

Once again, I extend my thanks to Josée Touchette, the OECD's Executive Director, for the moral and practical support she has provided us with since she joined the Organisation, and to the services that she oversees, especially the information technology department whose services I have had occasion to call upon several times in 2021.

John Parsons
Chairman

AAPOCAD Membership Statistics

NOMBRE D'ADHERENTS A L'AAPOCAD COMPARE AU NOMBRE DE PENSIONNES, PAR ORGANISATION (*)

PROPORTION OF PENSIONERS AFFILIATED TO THE AAPOCAD vs NUMBER OF PENSIONERS, BY ORGANISATION (*)

DATES	RUBRIQUES	AGENCE SPATIALE EUROPEENNE EUROPEAN SPACE AGENCY	CEPMMT ECMWF	CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE COUNCIL OF EUROPE	OCDE OECD	OTAN NATO	UEO WEU	EUMETSAT	TOTAL
30-Nov-17	Pensionnés / Pensioners <a>	1467	122	873	1646	3779	126	62	8075
	Adhérents / Affiliated <b>	481	72	301	763	1206	88	9	2920
	% b / a	**32,79%**	**59,02%**	**34,48%**	**46,35%**	**31,91%**	**69,84%**	**14,52%**	**36,16%**
30-Nov-18	Pensionnés / Pensioners <a>	1481	125	878	1617	3884	123	66	8174
	Adhérents / Affiliated <b>	471	72	326	753	1202	87	11	2922
	% b / a	**31,80%**	**57,60%**	**37,13%**	**46,57%**	**30,95%**	**70,73%**	**16,67%**	**35,75%**
30-Nov-19	Pensionnés / Pensioners <a>	1550	131	903	1653	3989	122	73	8421
	Adhérents / Affiliated <b>	476	84	369	756	1239	86	19	3029
	% b / a	**30,71%**	**64,12%**	**40,86%**	**45,74%**	**31,06%**	**70,49%**	**26,03%**	**35,97%**
30-Nov-20	Pensionnés / Pensioners <a>	1610	134	942	1661	4122	114	80	8663
	Adhérents / Affiliated <b>	465	91	366	741	1251	82	19	3015
	% b / a	**28,88%**	**67,91%**	**38,85%**	**44,61%**	**30,35%**	**71,93%**	**23,75%**	**34,80%**
30-Nov-21	Pensionnés / Pensioners <a>	1676	139	986	1690	4154	112	90	8847
	Adhérents / Affiliated <b>	449	98	357	740	1259	80	19	3002
	% b / a	**26,79%**	**70,50%**	**36,21%**	**43,79%**	**30,31%**	**71,43%**	**21,11%**	**33,93%**

(*) Ces chiffres ne tiennent pas compte des pensions d'orphelin. / These figures do not take into account orphans' pensions.
SIRP/11/2021

Annual Adjustment of Pensions in 2022 (percentage)

AUSTRALIA	3.5
AUSTRIA	3.8
BELGIUM*	0
CANADA	4.8
DENMARK	3.4
FINLAND	3.2
FRANCE	3.4
GERMANY	5.7
GREECE	4.4
IRELAND	5.7
ITALY	4.2
JAPAN	0.8
LUXEMBOURG	5.4
NETHERLANDS	6.4
NEW ZEALAND	5.9
NORWAY	6.1
PORTUGAL	2.8
SPAIN	6.6
SWEDEN	4.5
SWITZERLAND	1.3
TURKEY**	20.3
UNITED KINGDOM	5.4
UNITED STATES***	0.8

* Special adjustment of 6.6% granted on 1 December 2021.
** Special adjustment of 6.4% granted on 1 June 2021 and of 6.3% granted on 1 October 2021.
*** Special adjustment of 6.2% granted on 1 November 2021.
N.B. In accordance with the amended Article 36.1 of the Pension Scheme Rules, the adjustments should be applied automatically.

Calendar of Co-ordination Meetings for 2022

<table>
<tr><th>DATE</th><th>VENUE</th><th>FORMAT</th><th>ITEMS ON THE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION</th></tr>
<tr><td>3 May (pm)</td><td>OECD, Boulogne or by videoconference</td><td>CRP</td><td rowspan="4">To be continued:
– Extension of the number of steps in grade L1

Recurrent items:
– Balance sheet of the CPS
– 2023 Programme of work
– Election of the CCR Chairperson
– Chairman’s activity report for 2021
– Pensions adjustment on 1 January 2022 (for information only)

New items:
– Alignment of the exceptional adjustment clause for allowances in absolute values with that for salaries
– Trend analysis of the components/building blocks of the remuneration package in the COs’ employment markets. Modernising the compensation and benefits package with the view to support Diversity policies.</td></tr>
<tr><td>4 May</td><td>OECD, Boulogne or by videoconference</td><td>CRSG/CRP</td></tr>
<tr><td>21 June</td><td>EUMETSAT, Darmstadt, Germany</td><td>CCR, CRP and CRSG separately</td></tr>
<tr><td>22-23 June</td><td>EUMETSAT, Darmstadt, Germany</td><td>Tripartite Session</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td>12 September (pm)</td><td>OECD, Boulogne or by videoconference</td><td>CRP</td><td rowspan="4">To be continued (if necessary):
– See list above

Recurrent items:
– Annual adjustment of salaries at 1 January 2023
– Adjustment of allowances/supplements expressed in absolute values at 1 January 2023
2023 ISRP Budget (CCR/CRSG)</td></tr>
<tr><td>13 September</td><td>OECD, Boulogne or by videoconference</td><td>CRSG/CRP</td></tr>
<tr><td>26 September</td><td>OECD, Boulogne</td><td>CRP</td></tr>
<tr><td>27-28 September</td><td>OECD, Boulogne</td><td>Tripartite Session</td></tr>
</table>

Draft Summary Record: 43rd General Assembly
Held on Friday 15 October 2021 from 10.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. by video conference

1. Opening of the General Assembly

1. The Chairman, Mr John Parsons, opened the meeting at 10 a.m., explaining that it would be in two parts, with the morning devoted to addresses by the guest speakers and the afternoon to AAPOCAD business. He added that the recording of the meeting would be posted on the AAPOCAD website for the benefit of those who had been unable to log on, and then proceeded to introduce each of the guest speakers.

2. Welcome Address by Mr Chris Woodward, Acting Head of Human Resources at the OECD, representing the new Secretary-General, Mr Mathias Cormann

2. Speaking on behalf of the new Secretary General of OECD, Mathias Cormann, Mr Woodward welcomed the participants and outlined current OECD policies and thinking in the fields of human resources and pensions.[4] There were no questions in response to Mr Woodward's address.

3. Speakers invited to address the AAPOCAD General Assembly 2021[1]

3. The Chairman gave the floor to Mr Maddicott, Chairman of the CCR, in response to whose address Mr Campbell remarked that pensioners were in fact very interested in the salary adjustment method since a number of pension deductions stemmed from the salary adjustment method.

4. Mr Wacquez was curious to know how it was that the excellent reputation enjoyed by the Coordinated Organisations in various forums was not reflected in the CCR's actions. Why, using the quest for modernisation as a pretext, were the Organisations constantly under attack from the CCR?

5. Mr Maddicott agreed that there was indeed a disconnect. This could in part be attributed to the financing of Organisations, which fell to Foreign Ministries, and there were quite frequent disputes between those and other Ministries. Times had changed, though, and the hardline delegations of several years ago had given way to a rather more emollient approach. Also, the radical proposals of the past, sometimes hitting pensions, had been ruled out on legal grounds. The change to the salary adjustment method agreed in June changed very little, he said, and the exception clause that had been inserted was akin to locking the stable door after the horse had bolted. It was true that the removal of the education allowance for pensioners and the change to pension adjustments were obviously unpopular, but Mr Maddicott did not see any further changes to the CPS in the pipeline. Fewer and shorter CCR meetings were scheduled and he assured the AGM that he would always seek consensus.

6. Referring to the indexation procedure, Mr Scott pointed out that it had been agreed in 1978 that pensions would always follow salaries, so it was very disappointing that this promise had been broken. As a result, the OECD's own estimates showed that it would be saving €100 million – out of pensioners' pockets. Also, what other proposals might be on the table, notably with regard to the French and Belgian idea of removing the tax adjustment?

7. Mr Maddicott replied that the delinking of salaries and pensions had of course been deeply unpopular, but the CCR had been told that it had the authority to make that recommendation and had of course done so. He believed that the Franco-Belgian proposal was unlikely to resurface; it had been deemed arbitrary in nature and its impact, combined with the other measures already taken, could possibly lead to a defeat if a case were brought before a Tribunal. In that event, France and Belgium had said they would not pay for the costs of such a defeat. Finally, said Mr Maddicott, pensions were not in the CCR's programme of work for 2022.

8. The next speaker was Mr Overbeck, Chairman of the CRSG, in response to whose address Mr Palmieri observed that we were not in an ivory tower and that there had always in the past – for 20 years – been open discussions between all parties. But the CCR had never been satisfied, largely because all the studies carried out with different recruitment pools had never shown that international civil servants were especially privileged. So the CCR and CRSG had to reform to reflect what was going on in the world. Mr Overbeck replied

[4] For the texts of the welcome address and addresses given by the guest speakers, see pp. 15-24 below.

that countries did after all have to look at their own situations and many national civil services had undergone significant reform.

9. Coming back to the education allowance, Mr Maddicott said that some countries had wanted to see it substantially reduced, but it had been seen as a key component of the remuneration package and the changes to it could be seen as the CCR being moderate. Mr Jagtman added that receipt of the allowance should not be tied to entitlement to expatriation.

10. The next speaker was Mr Maddison, CRP Chairman.

11. Mr Scott observed that endlessly cutting did not in fact save much money since Organisations were ultimately obliged to recruit at higher levels, offering extra steps and/or promotions. In addition to this, Organisations were in some cases recruiting the third or fourth candidate on the list, the top one(s) having rejected the offer. Mr Maddison naturally agreed, adding that HRM was introducing a new employment package which was a matter of some concern. Perhaps more attention should be paid to all the work done by the OECD in such areas as tax evasion, which obviously save Member countries money, but little or nothing was said about it. While Mr Overbeck agreed that recruitment was or could be a problem, he pointed out that it was especially the case in those Organisations that recruited in the technical sectors such as engineering or IT. Mr Maddison drew attention to the time lags between increases in civil service remuneration and in Co-ordinated Organisation remuneration. CCR delegates could not always understand the latter increases, not realizing they were coming as much as 18 months later than those in national civil service. The CCR, he said, looked at adjustment methods, not at salary levels, which was perhaps a problem. Closing this particular debate, Mr Wacquez insisted on a different aspect – the end of solidarity between serving staff and pensioners. The change to Article 36 had cut this link and it was highly regrettable.

12. Next came Mr Langeder, Chairman of PACCO.

13. His address prompted another question from Mr Scott concerning the OECD's Pension Fund which was designed to cover members' liabilities under the CPS. The said Fund was earning a return in the region of 4%, but PACCO had to assume a 10-year bond rate of return in the regions of 1%, and it was this that was driving big increases in pension contribution rates. In reply, Mr Langeder confirmed that the Fund's performance did not come under the rules governing the 5-year review of contribution rates and, of course, not every Organisation had such a Fund. However, he said, the discount rate was indeed a big issue and it was set to be discussed at the December meeting of PACCO with the CRP's Pensions Working Group. Using different data sets might be a possibility, he added.

14. Mr Poels and Mrs Gilman Jaouen spoke on payroll administration.

15. The first question for Mr Poels came from Mr Jagtman who had had no apology from ISRP for the tax adjustment error that had caused a big reduction in his ESA pension in May 2021. The error had been rectified, but Mr Poels immediately apologised for the time this had taken.

16. Mrs Carpentier, recently retired from the OECD, asked about the tax adjustments to pensions in early 2021, which she found very confusing. Could she, she asked, have a copy of the Rules containing the tables used for the relevant calculations? It was explained, however, by Mrs Gilman Jaouen that the tables were restricted to Administrations and the ISRP. Also, for someone retiring during 2021, i.e. with less than a full year's taxable benefits, it was probable that there was no entitlement to the tax adjustment. The latter would be reconsidered at the start of the following tax year. Regarding methodology, Mr Poels explained that it was the harmonised index of consumer prices, or HICP, for the country on whose (salary) scale the pension was calculated that was used, whatever a pensioner's country of residence might be, and of course pensions were now adjusted for inflation. So the ISRP had to wait for the end of the year or when it received the relevant figures from each country, meaning that the relevant adjustments had sometimes to be made retroactively.

17. Mr Veltri raised the issue of the non-finalisation of the tax adjustment for Italian pensioners for four consecutive years. While he knew that the ISRP had not received the necessary information for those years, he pointed out that pensioners in Italy had been deprived of their right to complain because there was no visibility regarding the ISRP's contacts with the Italian authorities. More transparency was needed, and what was being done to remedy the situation?

18. Mr Poels confirmed that the Italian authorities had indeed not validated the tables for the tax adjustment, but he had in principle now convinced them of the need to validate or, if necessary, amend the said tables, so he hoped that a remedy had been found. If not, he was afraid that the risk of people going to their local authorities to complain could have the opposite of the desired effect.

19. Intervening at a later stage in the debate, Mr Rutten felt that it would not be unreasonable for the ISRP to tell Mr Veltri who its contact person was. As an example of the direct action that the ISRP had on occasion

taken, he said that one European country had been told that the ISRP would be proceeding in a specific way if no information was forthcoming, so the ball would then be in that country's court. In conclusion, Mrs Gilman Jaouen confirmed that two years' finalisation of tax adjustments was now payable in Italy.

20. In reply to a question from Mr Courades who wanted to know if there were any changes on the withholding tax front, Mr Poels said that the Co-ordinated Organisations had said that they could not implement withholding tax for pensioners, with the result that the ISRP had not introduced any such system. And what of the waiving of charges on bank transfers asked Mr Erler? The UN Pension Fund had apparently been able to reach a new agreement waiving such charges and perhaps the ISRP could ask the UN Pension Fund what bank they were now using so that the Co-ordinated Organisations could enjoy the same waivers. Unfortunately, said Mr Poels, the ISRP looked after eleven different Organisations and they almost all used different banks, so there was little or nothing that the ISRP could do.

21. Mr Hugonnier wondered whether there was not a contradiction between Mr Poels' claim that the ISRP did not take any decisions and its role, like that of any committee, in producing reports and analyses that could influence decision-making. Mr Poels agreed that the ISRP produced reports and analyses but maintained that the different colleges reacted in a manner relevant to their needs, and he was therefore not about to go back on anything he had said.

22. Closing the morning's discussions, Mr Poels said openly and directly that he remained more than happy and willing to engage in dialogue in the future, a sentiment shared wholeheartedly by the Chairman.

4. Adoption of the Agenda [AAPOCAD/AG/A(2021)1]

23. The afternoon session began with the adoption of the Agenda. There being no Other Business, the Agenda was duly adopted.

5. Approval of the Summary Record of the 42nd General Assembly

24. Mr Roden wished to thank Mr Moore and Mr Gain for their selfless work in drafting the Minutes. With 97.4% in favour, 2.5% of abstentions and no votes against, the Minutes were duly approved.

6. Annual Report of the Chairman

25. The report, voted on by 327 members (up from last year), had been approved by 99.29% of voters, with none against and 0.71% of abstentions. There being no questions or comments, the Chairman's Report was duly approved.

7. Results of Elections to the Governing Board

26. Mrs Babocsay of the Council of Europe and Mrs Lerch of the OECD had stood down, while Mr Woods had resigned as an elected member, but would remain on the Governing Board as Chairman of the Weather Centre's pensioners' association, and Mr Schaper had reached the end of his six-year mandate as Chairman of ARES. This meant that the Governing Board would be welcoming as new members Mrs Duboscq of the OECD, Mr Courades of the Council of Europe, Mr Bataillé of the Weather Centre (and Chairman of the CRP before Mr Maddison), and Mr Winzer, the new Chairman of ARES. The Chairman then asked the newly elected members to briefly introduce themselves, and he then welcomed them to the Board.

8. Finance

a) 2020 Accounts

27. Mrs Lobin presented the AAPOCAD financial situation for 2020 and the 2021 and 2022 Budgets. She began by saying that the accounts and financial statements of AAPOCAD for the 2020 financial year had been audited by Mr Laurent Hervé, the AIA Treasurer. Mrs Lobin had had the foresight to take home with her all the documents needed by the auditor, who had done the necessary work at home, the OECD being closed because of the pandemic. She explained that COVID had prompted big changes in AAPOCAD operations, video conference meetings having resulted in a substantial fall in travel and hotel costs, and also General Assembly costs, while printing and postage costs had naturally risen. Expenditure of €60,000 had been authorised for appeals procedures for the 2020 financial year, but real expenditure in 2020 had totalled only €56,000 – consisting almost solely of lawyers' fees.

28. When it came to questions, Mr Rutten wanted to know where the figures were concerning the amounts due from local associations in respect of contributions to the cost of appeals. The Chairman replied that the figures were not in the accounts because they were not yet known, but there would certainly be a request for contributions. A request from Mrs Carpentier for a note on this question met with an assurance from the Chairman that this would be done.

b) Discharge of the Treasurer and the Governing Board

29. Discharge was duly given, with 317 votes in favour and 10 abstentions

c) Revised 2021 Budget

30. After pointing out that the receipts had initially been underestimated, with the result that income now came in at €172,000 and had been retained in the 2022 Budget as it was thought to be an entirely reasonable sum, Mrs Lobin added that the projected deficit, posted at €7,500, would quite possibly disappear altogether. Voting on the Revised Budget had resulted in 318 for, 6 abstentions and no rejections.

31. Mr Pignède, recently retired from ESA, congratulated all concerned on the quality of the papers and presentations, but thought that reducing travel costs by means of more, or continued virtual meetings could be the way to go – particularly from an environmental standpoint. As the Chairman said, much would depend on how the health situation evolved.

9. Appeals against the changes to the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme Rules

32. Appeals, said the Chairman, had been launched in all 7 Co-ordinated Organisations, i.e. including the former WEU. So far there had been four hearings and the verdicts had all been unfavourable. A further hearing was scheduled for the same day at ESA, while that at EUMETSAT would be held the following Tuesday; the date of the Weather Centre hearing was as yet not known.

33. Regarding the four decisions already handed down, Mr Palmieri said that they were very disappointing, not least because they contained many erroneous details and some of the arguments put forward were not based on any evidence. The two lessons that could be learnt were that pensioners had two acquired rights – the right to a pension and the right to an adjustment method.

34. So why, one might wonder, had Councils moved to have pensions linked to inflation? Because the Organisations maintained that the financing of pensions was costing too much. However, they were ignoring the fact that the Funds which most of the Organisations had were producing healthy yields. The Tribunals claimed that the new method gave security and no chance of affordability being applied, but it in fact meant the end of pensions moving in accord with purchasing power parities (PPP), which was a fundamental component of our contracts. Agreements with the CCR and the CRSG were very rare, and the failure to honour the Noordwijk agreement strongly suggested that the CRP should not give much thought to reaching agreements with the CCR in the future as the end result would never be favourable.

35. For Mr Garrouste the CCR Chairman's suggestion that the CCR was going for reasonable proposals and arrangements could result sooner or later in a sort of piecemeal approach, with the CCR coming back in a few years with further "reasonable" proposals. It was also important, he said, to keep a record of all the sacrifices or losses pensioners had suffered. With all of this Mr Palmieri fully agreed, wondering what else the CCR could tackle, such as retirement age or the adjustment method itself.

36. Coming back to the appeals themselves, Mr Wacquez wanted to know how much notice was given ahead of time, but Mr Palmieri said that there were really no rules; it could be a few months or just two to three weeks.

37. It was observed by Mr Scott that our pensions were no longer indexed the way pensioners had been told and therefore assumed they would be. Our pensions were designed to maintain our standard of living, but the judges failed systematically to comprehend the difference between the standard of living and purchasing power. Pensioners could, he said, be losing anything from ½ to 1% per year from now on. The new paragraph 2 in Article 36 said that the Secretaries-General could make proposals concerning the gap between salaries and pensions. Was it time to make use of this provision? To which the Chairman replied that the Governing Board had counselled caution inasmuch as the trend could be being reversed. Also, the gaps in question varied hugely from one country to another, as was illustrated by the table showing inflation trends in the 8 reference countries.

38. Mr Rutten found all the Tribunal decisions extremely disturbing. Apart from our right to a pension, our acquired rights had all gone. Should we not contact the UN and the EU, which might also have cause for concern? In the EU though, said Mr Palmieri, it was the general principles prevailing in the States which were the rules, so in theory they were less well placed than the Co-ordinated Organisations in terms of pensions. The Co-ordinated Organisations, he said, had always applied the general principles of the law of acquired rights which, in principle, protected us from any major upheaval regarding our rights. And of course the four decisions handed down to date claimed that they did not constitute a major upheaval, so what was to be done?

39. With no further questions on appeals, the Chairman came back to the table on inflation in 8 countries which suggested that pension adjustments were tending to catch up with salary adjustments in some, though not all, countries. However, the reference period for salaries was July/July, while for pensions it was January/January, so there was not strict comparability. For the time being only ESA had approved the report on the new salary adjustment method, while it was pending elsewhere. The CRSG had said it would be wise to wait

for another 2 to 3 years to have a clearer picture of what was really happening on the salaries front, so perhaps, said the Chairman, this could be a lesson for us too. Hitherto, he added, it was the Co-ordinated system that had been the rule, but now it was potentially up to the Secretary-General of each Organisation who could be invited to examine what action was needed.

40. Mr Scott agreed that it did now seem to be up to individual Organisations to act, and this was what was indicated in paragraph 2 of Article 36. Perhaps it would be advisable, he said, to look at those countries where pensioners had been particularly disadvantaged – a prime example being NATO pensioners in Portugal – to alert the Secretary-General to that particular situation. Prudence was called for, but the fact remained that leaving a worsening situation for too long would leave pensioners in some countries in a situation from which they could not catch up. The Chairman agreed that this was a fair point but suggested that the January 2022 figures would hopefully give a clearer picture of the developing situation.

41. Mr Vanston was almost certain that inflation in France would hit 3% by the end of the year, meaning that our pensions would also go up by a good 3%, while if salaries also rose sharply the CCR might want to look towards affordability again. And for pensions to increase more than salaries would be even more unacceptable.

42. Several speakers, meanwhile, had expressed their disappointment at the position adopted by Mr Overbeck, the CRSG Chairman. He had been happy with the inflation correction, seeing it as not a bad thing, while for Mr Bataillé he was simply following the party line, taking what the Secretaries-General (minus the OECD) proposed and putting this to the CCR, which always agreed.

43. Closing this agenda item, the Chairman assured all participants that AAPOCAD would be keeping all the parameters and indices under constant review and would remain alert to any warning signals. With that he moved on to Item 10.

10. General Assembly 2022

44. Before tackling the question of next year's General Assembly, the Chairman carried out a poll in order to determine whether the Assembly should now continue to be held in October instead of May, as had always been the case until COVID had forced our hand. The result was 37 in favour of October, 17 in favour of going back to May and 5 abstentions. With that, he handed over to Mrs Lindner who reiterated that another attempt would be made in 2022 to hold a normal meeting in Paris, with a Bel Canto dinner on the Friday evening and a long-awaited visit to the Senate on the Saturday. Clearly this would stand a better chance of taking place as described in October rather than May. Regarding where to meet in 2023, the preference seemed to be for Lisbon, where both the Council of Europe and NATO had offices. Also, it would be interesting to learn more about Portugal's tax legislation and how it might apply to any Co-ordinated Organisation pensioners moving there. Other proposals for a venue would be welcomed.

45. After concluding, in answer to Mr Vanston's question, that Co-ordinated Organisation pensioners had not been the population most seriously impacted by COVID, the Chairman closed the meeting by thanking all those who had contributed to the smooth functioning of AAPOCAD and wishing everyone a happy and healthy end of the year.

⌘

Statements by the speakers at the AAPOCAD General Assembly 2021

Mr Chris Woodward

Head of Human Resources, OECD

(Original English)

Dear Mr. Chairman, Mr. Parsons,

Chairpersons of the three Committees of Coordination,

Dear friends of the AAPOCAD,

It is with great pleasure that I welcome you today at this hybrid session for your 2021 Business Assembly.

My name is Chris Woodward, and I'm the acting Head of Human Resources here at the OECD. It is my privilege to be representing Mathias Cormann the Secretary-General here today. I have read and heard about AAPOCAD and as such I understand and value your provision to our people and your purpose. But it is fantastic to put faces to names, to meet you today and I will enjoy chatting to those I can in the margins.

Here at the OECD it feels like we are a coiled spring. As we emerge from COVID into a new normal, the new Secretary-General brings new priorities, a listening ear and a thirst to deliver on our mandate. His two clear priorities are for a net zero strategy and to reform global tax paradigms. He has already delivered on this latter point with a truly ground-breaking tax deal, fit for the digital age that ensures multinational organisations are subject to a minimum 15% tax rate from 2023. This landmark deal, agreed by more than 136 countries, representing more than 90% of global GDP will reallocate more than 125 billion dollars of profit from around 100 of the world's largest and most profitable multi-nationals to countries worldwide, ensuring firms pay a fair share of tax wherever they operate. It is great to see so visibly how the OECD is creating better policies for better lives!

In my role as the Head of HRM here at the OECD, I am responsible for the smooth delivery and improvement of our end to end HR service or value proposition but it's early days – I am in week 6. I lead a wonderful, hard working team of 78 people. My HR Ops team is also my reward function and Jean-Pierre Couchinave, who leads this team, is my point man when liaising with ISRP, the Co-ordination Committees and pension matters. I believe we have a very positive relationship with AAPOCAD and I am keen to keep it that way!

I have a background in reward across both the public and private sectors in the UK. I am a former HR consultant and Armed Forces Veteran. I currently benefit from an Armed Forces pension provision already and liaise closely with that pension society so as a beneficiary of a pension society already I understand the importance of the advice and protections that organisations such as yours provide. As a consultant (I am ex Korn Ferry) I have helped both public and private sector organisations develop their HR functions and strategies, from rethinking reward and the point of pay through to talent development and people and culture transformations. I get how pension provision supports an organisation's offer and how it shapes how an organisation is perceived in the labour market determining overall levels of attraction – I must admit, pensions do not always get the attention they deserve!

I have no specific reform agenda but there are definitely plans to sensibly and responsibly enhance our value proposition for employees while meeting Member objectives. My responsibilities and the impact of what we do in HRM is not limited to the Officials and Members of the Organisation, but also towards former and retired colleagues and their dependants. An important dimension of my role is therefore to foster and promote solidarity between serving and pensioned staff, to increase levels of engagement, conversation and co-ordination and to make sure that our current and any new pension schemes are managed and implemented correctly. Pensions matter. However I have seen across sectors that there is a trend that is not so helpful: inside organisations pension conversations are seen through a finance lens more so than a people lens, whereas outwith organisations, for example in alumni circles, pensions are hugely personal, hugely impactful to one's quality of life and as such I have determined to ensure both lenses are given equal weight when we look at pension reform. In this regard, let me say a few words on work we are doing to review the New Pension Scheme (NPS).

Review of the New Pension Scheme

It is not surprising that a review of our pension scheme is being conducted when you look at the cost of pensions from a Member perspective. Many countries have gone – and are still going through – large-scale and often painful reforms of their welfare systems. They often wonder why the OECD is not doing the same. While we operate in very different ecosystems, changes in Member States impact us also in International Organisations.

So members have asked that we accelerate a review of the New Pension Scheme. My direction has been clear that any review must be done thoroughly, done well and with expert advice. Whilst we are under pressure to deliver recommendations to our Member Countries quickly, rushing a programme like this would not be in anyone's interests – we are moving forward deliberately.

Here are some of the key developments:

- *Council invited the Executive Committee, at the end of 2019, to undertake a review of the NPS taking into account the retirement age and other relevant parameters.*

- *Since June 2020, the Executive Committee has engaged in an intense, transparent and constructive dialogue with the Secretariat and possible options for reform will be addressed in early 2022.*

- *The Secretariat sees its role as providing the Council with the most comprehensive advice, which would in a very transparent manner, highlight the opportunities and risks of pension reform options.*

- *The review assesses the costs and benefits of any such modifications, including how to maintain competitiveness in terms of attraction while also considering the legal risks of any proposals.*

- *There are a number of significant litigation risks– to which an inadequate review of the pension scheme could expose the Organisation. To mitigate this we are engaging widely with experts and all relevant bodies across the Co-ordinated Organisations to help us build a pension offer that works for all. We are listening.*

- *There are also of course opportunities from conducting such an exercise. We can consider together what pension scheme might best meet the needs of our current and future OECD population, while being financially sustainable and responding to Members' needs.*

- *We are therefore routinely seeking the advice and involvement of the ISRP, as well as in-house and external pension and reward experts to enable a truly objective and holistic review, which meets objectives on all sides.*

Of course much of this work has been happening as we coped with the COVID pandemic; as you may imagine this has been an unprecedented additional challenge for my team.

The Covid pandemic

This pandemic has taken, ruined and changed lives forever – it has completely changed the nature of work – but we have also seen benefits from accelerating agendas around flexible working and increasing employee choice. We at the OECD are still on the road to a new normal, helping Directorates to implement and manage a more concentrated focus on wellbeing and connectivity with their people and latterly supporting managers to balance the benefits we see from flexible working with the benefits of face to face interaction. We are well set up for hybrid working here and this is creating opportunities to improve employee voice and levels of engagement.

COVID has shone a light on what it really means to be an international civil servant. Despite COVID-19, the Organisation never stopped its core work and on the contrary intensified the support it provides to our Members. At the same time, many officials were confined or working far from home, detached from loved ones for such a long time. At the OECD, we have tried to support staff and former staff through this crisis as much as possible. We have completely adapted our working methods and have applied much greater flexibility to many of our HR policies. I admit it has been very challenging!!!

It has been difficult for all of us but I sense we are emerging stronger from all this. The fact that the AAPOCAD has organised its Assembly as a hybrid event, showcases how plans can adapt (and I applaud you for meeting today) but I personally long for opportunities to meet whole teams face to face too. Many staff are looking forward to returning to the office and we are seeing numbers increase. After all those months apart, returning to the office will give us the opportunity to re-connect and optimise the spirit of contribution that thrives across our knowledge-based Organisation.

Significant developments in OECD and Upcoming priorities and challenges for 2022

So, looking at where we are and to the future, the OECD held its 2021 MCM in our Organisation's 60th anniversary year last week with the US chairing the MCM and Korea and Luxembourg being the vice-chairs.

Secretary-General Mathias Cormann opened the MCM by highlighting the fact that this major event for the OECD comes at a particularly important moment in time for the world, with clear opportunities for the OECD to help contribute solutions to some of the key global challenges we are facing. The OECD is:

- Optimising the strength and the quality of the recovery from the pandemic;

- Driving and supporting global leadership on more ambitious, effective, and globally coordinated action on climate change;

- Seizing the opportunities to accelerate digital transformation of economies while better managing some of the associated and growing risks, challenges and disruptions;

- Has delivered a multilaterally agreed approach to international taxation, making international tax arrangements fairer and work better in the context of digitalisation and globalisation;
- Advancing gender equality;
- Actively supporting the crucial work of the WTO – to help ensure we can have a well-functioning, open global market underpinned by a rules-based multilateral trading system in good working order;
- Strengthening our global engagement and promoting OECD values, principles and standards – in particular towards the Asia-Pacific and Africa while keeping the momentum going in our engagement with other regions, from Latin America to South Eastern Europe.

Membership with the OECD has been positively transformative for those who have joined over past decades and it has increased our global reach. In this context, six countries – Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Croatia, Peru and Rumania – have expressed their strong commitment to joining the OECD as Members.

These priorities will be reflected in the forthcoming discussions on the 2023-24 Programme of Work and Budget which will start later this year.

Finally, I would conclude this section on the Organisation's priorities by repeating the Secretary-General's commitment to ensure the Organisation remains diverse, transparent, responsive, and accountable to its Members.

To conclude

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to your Association and to thank you. You play a vital role in representing and defending the interests of former Members of staff of the Co-ordinated Organisations and their dependants and I want to say that you always do it in a very constructive way. I have not (yet) had a chance to attend Co-ordination meetings personally, but my teams tell me that they appreciate the fact that AAPOCAD points of view are both stimulating and well-considered and this is always done in a positive spirit. So once again, thank you very much for maintaining such a fruitful collaboration and it is a relationship I will continue to forge.

So, I wish you a successful General Assembly, intense and fruitful discussions, and I look forward to continuing a constructive dialogue with you during my period here at the OECD.

Thank you and all the very best.

Chris Woodward

Mr Syd Maddicott

Chairman of the CCR

(Original English)

Dear Fellow Pensioners,

I am very pleased to be able to join you again at your General Assembly. I am sorry not to be able to see you all in the flesh but this hybrid-format meeting is probably about the best that can be managed in these difficult times.

Let me begin by wishing you all the very best for your health.

Of course, for those of us working in Co-ordination it has been very difficult operating in the middle of the COVID pandemic. I therefore pay tribute to the ISRP and others, including your own officers, for keeping things moving.

We have had to hold Co-ordination meetings virtually and one of the difficulties caused by this is that Webex, the system used, and chosen for its security features, does not facilitate simultaneous translation. I am therefore very grateful to francophone colleagues for their patience and forbearance in using English when they would normally use French. I have been at some pains to tell them that they are free to use their preferred official language but, realising the difficulty this would cause many other Delegates, they have most considerately shown great restraint in doing so. I hope that 'normal service' will be resumed as soon as possible and that Delegates will be able to intervene in their preferred official language. (If you wish to ask me a question in French today, please speak quite slowly.)

I would normally talk about key developments in Co-ordination as set out in the Chairman's Annual Activity Report but as we are at the end of planned Co-ordination meetings for 2021, I will try and give you a complete update.

2020 saw a couple of developments. The first was changes to the Education Allowance. By a Report issued in 2019, limits were set to the ability of pensioners to benefit from the Education Allowance. I understand there are cases still to be decided in the tribunals on the changes made to the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme (CPS) although none of the cases yet heard has resulted in a decision that would tend to overturn the changes that were made. We will have to be a bit more patient to see how the remainder are decided.

In any case pensioners will continue to benefit from the Education Allowance for some years yet. The latest changes agreed set lower age limits on dependent children than existed before. But these do not apply to existing pensioners (or, more precisely to those who retired before the recommendation was approved by the Governing Council of their Co-ordinated Organisation). The CCR, with the support of the CRP, resisted a proposal of the CRSG to allow Co-ordinated Organisations to pay Education Allowance as an averaged payment rather than against receipted bills.

You may recall that in return for agreement by the CRSG to the changes it recommended in 2019 to the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme, the other Committees tried to extract a guarantee from the CCR that it would pursue no further changes to the scheme. This was not possible because each CCR meeting is sovereign and cannot commit further meetings to a particular course of action. But the CCR agreed to remove discussions on the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme from the 2021 work programme. I sense a very reduced appetite from even the most hawkish CCR Delegations for any further discussions. The topic is not in the 2022 programme of work - at least not at this point.

The one outstanding aim of some CCR Delegations from the discussions of 2019 was increasing the normal retirement age. This would have only affected serving staff, not existing pensioners, so we needn't trouble ourselves here with the question of whether this aim will be seriously considered by the CCR in the future – I rather think it will not be as the savings to be made will chiefly occur in one Organisation.

Another of the changes made to the CPS in 2019 was the de-linking of salaries and pensions when it comes to annual adjustments to be made. I realise this change was unpopular with many pensioners but the CCR acted after considering the legal advice it was given and, as I have mentioned before, we will have to wait for the outcome in the remaining tribunal cases before we can see a completely clear picture.

An effect of that change is that pensions are now adjusted on the basis of changes to local inflation. This means that any changes to the Salary Adjustment Method (SAM) are not going to affect pensions.

I am sure you will be interested, nonetheless, in the latest changes that have now been recommended to the Salary Adjustment Method.

A new Salary Adjustment Method was agreed at the CCR in June. It doesn't make significant changes to the calculations (in fact salary adjustments for January 2022 would be the same whether the new Salary Adjustment Method is used or the existing one were to be). The most significant change is the insertion of an Exception Clause. This will come into force if the GDPs of the eight reference countries are forecast to show a 3% decline in the prior twelve months before a salary adjustment is to be made. The effect will be delay of the positive part of the reference index for eleven months. (In other words, if the reference index is above 100, the 1 January adjustment indices would be recalculated with a reference index frozen at 100, while the original calculations with the actual average evolution in National Civil Services would be applied on 1 December). The aim is to ensure that apparently generous awards resulting from an average increase of NCS salaries in real terms are not seen to be made at the outset of a major economic crisis such as that provoked by the COVID pandemic.

The Exception Clause would have operated at the time of the financial crisis of 2008 and the COVID crisis of 2020.

The other Committees argued that it was not strictly necessary but they did understand the political context in which CCR Member States were operating. With some safeguards built in, they all approved the CCR Report (one CCR Delegation could not accept the Report and I was obliged to make it a Chairman's Report which has the same legal status).

Let me underline the fact that the Exception Clause will not apply to pensions which are de-linked from salary adjustments.

I think I will leave it there and invite any questions.

Syd Maddicott

Mr Christian Overbeck

Chairman of the CRSG

(Original English)

Thank you very much, John. It is good to have an excuse to take off the mask for a few minutes. And first of all thank you, of course, for inviting me here. It is the first time that I have the pleasure of being physically present. Now it is with a limited amount of people around the table, but it is still good that so many are attending remotely. As it was mentioned indeed before, also for us, AAPOCAD is an essential and key partner in the Co-ordination process. It is a very useful information source. It is the way for you also to express concerns, so it is of course an important element in the whole functioning of Co-ordination when it comes to pension aspects.

Now as we move through different speakers, it becomes more and more difficult to come up with original topics. I will try to avoid being repetitive. First, some comments, maybe also on some of the issues that were just discussed by Syd. We can for sure confirm that Syd does an excellent job in making Co-ordination work and notably in making CCR Delegates come to a consensus. I think that is why we come to reasonable solutions in the end, because on the side of the CRSG, it is true that we also, of course, have a concern over time of seeing a trend which, is not always positive in terms of the way that it affects conditions of employment.

Indeed, there is an impact all the time, every time, we adopt measures affecting individuals. It can be the staff, the pensioners, their dependants. There is an impact on the way the Organisations function, of course. We have to make the shop work. We have to attract people. We have to keep them. And of course, the fact that you are in an expatriate environment means you have particular needs. So it is true that the overall trend is not always something with which we in CRSG are incredibly happy. However, so far, we seem to have come to reasonable compromises. And as you also very well described, Syd, there is an element of disconnect in the process. Some of it is there for very natural reasons. Indeed you have the member states' finance ministries and then the specific ministries responsible. But you also have to look, for instance, at the different Organisations which have different needs. Then there are the Delegations in the different Organisations who also have slightly different views, which are not necessarily well-aligned with what happens in Co-ordination.

We also see that there are sometimes perceptions – sometimes correct, but other times entirely wrong – about how conditions are for international civil servants. We see a great variety and also when we consider that, maybe the trend is not the best one. I think we also need to distinguish between the different topics. I would say that the situation of the pension reform is rather different from other topics that we have been looking at. I think here, we need to be a little bit realistic. We are not – in the Co-ordinated Organisations or in the international civil service in general – living in some kind of splendid isolation. It is a fact that in our countries, people are living and working longer. There are more people retiring. It becomes more expensive. Of course there is a cost increase and something has to be done. Someone has to pay the bill in the end.

You know that a little while ago, we introduced a reform of the Education Allowance which had nothing to do with the pensions specifically. There we had quite some fears as to what could happen. In the end, I think the outcome was quite reasonable, because essentially we managed to keep most of the advantages or benefits of the system without changing too much. We managed to introduce the possibility to consider the high inflation we have seen in education costs in general, which is even more flagrant of course in the UK, where BREXIT has drastically changed the situation for some. The ceilings in place – which are based on references to the dependent child allowance – suddenly made it rather difficult to evolve at a pace which took into account the evolution we saw.

Fundamentally, what we got in place in the education allowance reform was the 3-year review mechanism. So at regular intervals, we will be able to see if we more or less match the needs on the ground.

A second issue, I would like to stress that honestly, when we have seen how things have evolved around us over the past few years, having an automatic adjustment of pensions for inflation is actually not bad at all. Our salaries depend all the time not only on the salary adjustment method, and now this exception clause, but also subsequently on a political decision in each Organisation. Now I can certainly understand that there has been anger and all that about the pension reform. It gave rise to a lot of litigation. I understand certainly the concerns. But ok, I think we have to be a little bit realistic about our situation.

Now a last point, which is very specific to the CRSG, is that we have started discussing – actually we have been doing it for a little while now, with the support of the CAPOC – specifically in France, there is an issue with the social security contributions, CSG and CRDS. You will know that these were contributions introduced in the 90's to fill the deficit of the social security scheme. The question that has come up is that, it is not clear to what extent the French consider that our pensions are subject to these social security contributions. Now there has been jurisprudence and the logic, to put it very simply, is that if you profit from the system, you need to contribute to it, and if you do not profit from it, for instance because you benefit from a social security scheme of a Co-ordinated Organisation, then logically you should not pay it. However, things in reality are a bit more complex than that, and that is something that we are working on, so that hopefully we can get a co-ordinated position on it for approaching the French authorities. We are fully aware that at individual level, there are people who face problems because they maybe have a local tax office that has a specific opinion which is not necessarily consistent or coherent with the jurisprudence. Thank you.

Christian Overbeck

Mr Jeremy Maddison

Chairman of the CRP

(Original French)

Dear Chairman, dear John, dear colleagues,

Thank you for inviting me to this AAPOCAD General Assembly, and I am delighted to be here.

The COVID-19 health crisis has been long and complicated. I hope that AAPOCAD members and their families have not been affected by the virus, have remained in good health, and continue to make the most of their well-earned retirement.

This is my first AAPOCAD General Assembly after recently having the honour of being elected Chair of the Committee of Staff Representatives at Co-ordination level for the first time. I am well aware that I have committed myself to an important and delicate responsibility. I am sure that we will continue to make good progress together, but we will have to remain constantly resolute and determined.

Indeed, I have kept abreast of the work carried out at Co-ordination level over the past few years, and it is undeniable that the Member countries are seizing every opportunity to chip away at the various benefits. We have seen the significant downgrading of the expatriation allowance, the withdrawal of the household allowance from officials recruited as of 2017, and substantial reductions in the remaining allowances. The Member countries have also modified the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme despite it being a defined benefit scheme reliant on their commitment. The CCR sadly decided to abandon its undertakings when it significantly amended the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme by linking pension adjustments to inflation rather than salary development and removed pensioners' entitlement to the education allowance; this mean-spirited and serious move has led to a legal battle in the tribunals that is not over yet. We have every right to be concerned that the modification of the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme by the Member countries will pave the way for all kinds of other attacks. We will therefore have to be careful, both serving staff and pensioners, because the CCR's decisions on such important issues can have serious repercussions and it is essential that the Member countries continue to respect their past commitments.

To top it all, our remuneration adjustment method was also reviewed a few months ago after the CCR introduced, in addition to the budget affordability clause and the moderation clause… an exception clause! The purpose of this clause is to cover exceptional crises – such as the COVID crisis – that reduce GDP levels in some countries, despite the fact that this kind of problem is already taken into consideration in the current salary adjustment method and despite us already suffering enough from the health crisis. Suffice to say that COVID is a convenient scapegoat and that the CCR could not afford to miss a golden opportunity to deteriorate the salary adjustment method.

It is the duty of the Committee of Staff Representatives at Co-ordination level to do its upmost to defend the rights of serving and retired officials of Co-ordinated Organisations, given how the CCR, whenever it has a chance, is issuing recommendations to our governing bodies that are eroding benefits.

Serving and retired officials need to close ranks. AAPOCAD's presence on the CRP is valuable as you are the keepers of the institutional memory, you can warn serving officials of the CCR's intentions as you have the experience that we need. We are going to continue to defend the benefits of serving and retired officials, all together, with strength and determination. It is vital that we co-ordinate our actions and our resolve in the face of all these attacks.

It is nonetheless true that the world of work is shifting, and that recent new hires have a different way of seeing things. The notion of a sense of belonging is diminishing, because short-term fixed appointments are increasingly replacing open-ended appointments, because temporary staff (who can be paid the minimum wage, as is the case at the OECD) and interns are increasingly being used to perform relatively high-level functions, and because the constantly increasing workload can sometimes cause individuals to take self-centred actions designed to extricate themselves from a difficult personal situation.

Nor does this new generation of officials necessarily have the same opinion of pensioners. The notion of solidarity may be lost on them. How can they be expected to show solidarity when their own contracts are precarious, when most of them will never receive a pension from their Organisations, and when they are in any case already affiliated to another, non-coordinated, pension scheme?

It is even reasonable to fear that the Co-ordination system and its role will be one day be called into question.

If the CCR and some of its Members in particular continue to look for ways to systematically reduce our remuneration, pensions and allowances, then the rift between the CCR and the Organisations is likely to widen. The discontent of serving officials and pensioners will grow and cause a breakdown in relations with the Member countries. Our Councils will have every right to ask themselves what purpose the CCR serves, and what purpose Co-ordination serves, if they find themselves having to manage internally within each Organisation issues that should be finding a compromise and consensus at Co-ordination level.

In my opinion, it is very important that the representatives of the Secretaries/Directors-General on the CRSG and the staff representatives on the CRP find a common ground on the need to defend Co-ordination in the interest of retired officials, serving officials, and therefore the Organisations. I am a firm believer in constructive dialogue in the pursuit of compromise.

The recent discussions on the amendment to the salary adjustment method with the introduction of an exception clause is a good example of how effective it can be when the two committees (CRSG and CRP) agree on how to defend a system that is fair and that works. As a result, the final agreement limited the damage of the CCR's offensive.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the CRSG Chair, Christian Overbeck, for our respectful and constructive discussions, and to the CCR Chair, Syd Maddicott, who is not necessarily in an easy position given the sometimes extreme ideas expressed by some CCR members.

I would like to end by letting you know how much I enjoy working with AAPOCAD on the CRP as a key partner for employee representation at Co-ordination level. With the Chair, John Parsons, as well as with Isabelle Tezcan, Bernard Waquez, Jean le Ber, Ivan Divoy, and not forgetting Michel Garrouste. Their knowledge of Co-ordination and their technical assistance are absolutely essential when it comes to making progress. I thank you most sincerely on behalf of the CRP.

I have a deep respect for our former officials, because we are constantly learning from you. Whatever the Member countries throw at us, we will continue to move forward arm in arm because we are stronger together.

Thank you, Chairman, thank you, John. Thank you all.

Jeremy Maddison

Mr Hannes Langeder

Chairman of Pensions Administrative Committee of the Co-ordinated Organisations

(PACCO)

(Original English)

Mr. Chairman, dear John, dear colleagues,

I have - for the first time - the pleasure to address you in my role as CAPOC Chairman, being in this role only since June 2020, as successor to Bernard Job, who had chaired this Committee for 13 years. Since spring last year, and as has been the case for all of us in various committees, CAPOC Members were only able to meet in a "virtual format" due to the unfortunate circumstances we all know about. I however would like to assure you that this format has never hampered the proper functioning of the CAPOC!

The Pensions Administrative Committee of the Co-ordinated Organisations was created in 1974 to ensure uniform application of our pension regulations. It reports to the CRSG, meets four times a year and will hold its 208th meeting - yet again - in virtual format, and will on this occasion also meet the CRP Pensions Working Group – but more on this a bit later.

The Committee consists of representatives from the six Co-ordinated Organisations, from observers, like the RATU (of the former WEU), the EU Sat Cen, EUISS, as well as the European Patent Office whose pension management is entrusted to the ISRP. The CAPOC secretariat is provided with great efficiency by the ISRP, which allows us to benefit from its legal, fiscal and actuarial skills.

You are all aware that the Committee's scope has been enlarged since its creation with the arrival of new pension schemes in the various Co-ordinated Organisations, and it does also provide technical opinions on the other defined benefit schemes which are the New Pension Scheme (NPS) (Council of Europe, ESA, EUMETSAT, OECD), ECMWF's Defined Benefit Funded Pension Scheme (DBFPS) or the Council of Europe's Third Pension Scheme (TPS).

The tasks the Committee covers are, in a nutshell: (i) review of the Pension Rules, or provision of technical opinions thereon at the request of the CRSG, (ii) review of the Staff Contribution rates of the different Pension Schemes, (iii) pension transfer agreements, (iv) matters relating to taxation/tax adjustment, (v) the annual balance sheet, and (vi) approving the assessment of pension rights.

When now looking more into current issues dealt with by CAPOC, let me focus in the following part on two prominent ones.

We are in the process of starting the work on the five-year review of the pension contribution rates, which will normally be applicable as of January 2025. To this end CAPOC will meet the CRP Pension Working Group in the margin of its next meeting for an initial exchange of views.

You will all recall that we saw big increases when the contribution rates were updated last time in 2020. The main driver of the increase at that review cycle was the low discount rate. It was already clear at that time that the discount rate evolution would be equally a prominent driver in the next review, which is due to start now. It is against this background that a detailed analysis of the discount rate calculation and options relating thereto is on the agenda. The CRP Pension Group will be supported by an external actuary, who will participate in the December meeting. This will ensure that a transparent exchange of views with the appropriate technical background can take place.

It is also clear that this is only the starting point in a series of calculations, data collection exercises and meetings before a proposal is submitted to CRSG and to the other Committees, leading to the 2025 contribution rates for the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme. In parallel, rates for the other Pensions Schemes, i.e. the NPS, the DBFPS and the TPS, will also be prepared for submission to the Organisations' Governing Bodies.

As second point, I would like to give a very short status update on the long-standing matter of CSG/CRDS in France. The CRSG asked CAPOC for a technical analysis and the Committee has since started a written consultation process. We have decided to do this to speed up the process and thereafter allow the CRSG to formulate a position, considering also the political aspects on this complex matter.

Before coming to an end with my first short intervention, I would like to continue the good tradition started by my predecessor and pay tribute to the excellent work of the ISRP in providing the CAPOC Secretariat, calculating and managing your pensions, as well as those of other organisations, and all this with professionalism and kindness, and without whose support CAPOC could not function.

Thank you for your attention and I am now available to answer your questions.

Hannes Langeder

Mr Jean-François Poels

Head of the International Service for Remuneration and Pensions (ISRP)

(Original English)

Thank you Mr Chairman and good morning to you, Ladies and Gentlemen,

When you are at the bottom of the list of the speakers you have the advantage of benefiting from what has been said by the preceding speakers. On the other hand you need to be patient, so we have been patient. Together with Margaret here, we will give you some additional information on ISRP operations and more specifically on the payroll unit. Before that, I wish to say a few words that I believe are important for you.

The first one is to thank you for the invitation. I really appreciate it and I am really quite happy to attend this meeting. The second one is to say that I can share probably everything that has been said before. Be it what has been said by Chris or Syd's description of how the CCR functions or what has been said by you Christian and by you Jeremy. I wish to draw your attention – and I did already a couple of years ago – I invite you to read what has been said -, you will notice that even though we are in the same reality, the reading of that reality might be different depending on the three colleges. And it is normal. The ISRP is in between and the role of the ISRP is to provide the analysis, to provide the food for thought on Co-ordinated matters. So before I go on to the operational side and before we announce a couple of important pieces of information for you as well, I wish to clarify one point. I noticed in some past newsletter or perhaps in a summary record of a preceding Assembly that some of you, I say some of you, expressed concerns about the "decisions" taken by the ISRP. I wish here to say that the ISRP does not take decisions and I will repeat it, to make sure that it is well understood, the ISRP does not take decisions. I think you heard the preceding speakers saying that they appreciate, and I thank them, the work that we deliver for helping the Co-ordination to function, be it on the operational side or be it on preparing the documents on which the discussions are going on. But I will now turn to you and say, "Do we take decisions on your behalf, Jeremy? No. Do we impose our views at the CRSG meetings? No." We offer a number of options and they decide, and you know that. Do I take the floor to say to the CCR what they have to do? Do you think that they would allow me to do so? Don't you think that they have their own views? And when it was a difficult part of the work for Syd to get a consensus, don't you think that it was because the Member States have their own views? So no, the ISRP does not take decisions, and I will explain even further. The CRSG makes proposals – proposals – and CCR can amend them. The CCR, once all those discussions have taken place, sends a recommendation. Sometimes the CRSG proposal is not even unanimous. They go to the CCR with recommendations of 5 Organisations plus one, and it has happened more than once, showing that those are decisions by the Organisations, by the management of those Organisations, not by the CCR, not by the ISRP. And then when the CCR recommendations are sent to the six Councils, do you think that it is the ISRP that decides on behalf of the Councils? Really? No. Instead, the Councils are free to adopt or to reject or even to amend or to postpone the CCR recommendations. It has happened in the past. So when some people state that the ISRP takes decisions, at the level of Co-ordination, it is just incorrect. And I need to say it so that you all are aware of that. Now I took some examples but I can also take examples outside the Co-ordination, because, as it has been said, the ISRP is also involved in providing or actually requested to provide analyses on non-Co-ordinated topics. The ISRPs is tasked by the OECD Management to provide analyses on the New Pension Scheme (NPS) or on the New Employment Policy (NEP) and we do provide those analyses. But it is up to the management of the Organisation to decide what to do with them.

I took the example of the NPS and NEP at the OECD, but a few years ago we had the same request from NATO on the Defined Contribution Pension Scheme (DCPS) and we had interviews with staff, managers, with Member States, and we provided a comprehensive report. For what the management and the Member States did with that report we are not responsible, and I can tell you that even now I do not know what are the decisions that were taken on the DCPS at NATO. We are not aware of them. We do not have that information. Because it is up to them to decide what to do with it.

So here I wish to add a last example, in order to convince perhaps the most sceptical. When we are dealing, and we have to do so, with undue payments to pensioners, as we are here to talk of pensioners, I think we need to take those examples as well. When we have to recuperate undue payment, we do it based on an agreed procedure with each Organisation. We work with 11 Organisations, not only with the Co-ordinated ones, so each Organisation has its way, an agreed process, that we have to follow. So do not shoot us when we implement the Organisation's decisions. I can go even further. When a case is happening that does not fall into these agreed processes, do you think that we just take a decision on our own? No we don't. We contact the management of that Organisation and we say, "This is the situation. What do you want us to do?" and we apply what is communicated to us. I can agree and I understand that in some cases people – and I am talking about people who could be active staff or could be pensioners – people are not happy with decisions taken by the Organisation. As an individual, I am sometimes disappointed with some policies or decisions. I am a manager with 40 staff and I am sometimes upset by the environment in which I have to work. It happens. But as a manager, I have to deal with that and you as individuals you need to understand that the ISRP is actually applying what is agreed with the Organisations, be it Co-ordinated Organisations or associated Organisations.

So I do not want to turn the knife in the wound, but I do wish to say that this also applies to what was for you the painful exercise of the regularisation of the tax adjustment for 2018, and I do not want to hide that. It was a painful exercise for you. But do you understand that even the communication that was sent to you was reviewed and validated and sometimes amended by the management of the Co-ordinated Organisations? We did not just decide to write what we wanted. The ISRP drafted a communication. The ISRP sent it to the management of the Co-ordinated Organisations. They validated it or amended it, and you need to be aware of that, because otherwise there seems to be a misperception of the ISRP role. I wished to explain very transparently how we work. I have no problem to explain how we work because there is nothing to hide.

What I wish also to highlight is the fact that, as you have heard, and I thank you for that also, Jeremy, you (Jeremy) say that you appreciate the work delivered by the ISRP. This is also true for the feedback we receive from the other Organisations, and actually we are pleased, we are honoured, to see that the work of the ISRP is appreciated, be it on the remuneration side, the analyses that we provide, be it on the actuarial side, as mentioned by Hannes, as well as support for the CAPOC, or be it on the payroll side, and we will come to this in a minute. Actually, our colleagues appreciate that you recognise the quality of our work. What I wish is that there is no confusion between the way we work, our professionalism, and the results of the implementation of the rules leading to sometimes inopportune personal initiatives or even threats. Some people, and I am talking about some pensioners only, send messages of threats to my staff. I do not think that it is appropriate, and there should therefore be no confusion when you have questions on the amounts that you find on your payslips.

We can make a mistake. We are human. If we do make a mistake, because it happens that we do something wrong, I will be the first to recognise that we made a mistake or that I made a mistake and I will apologise and we will correct it. Because obviously if it is a mistake, we have to correct it. But if it is a decision that has been taken by the Organisation, we have to apply that decision. In that case, it is not a mistake. So I am open to answer all questions, on figures that you may find on your payslips. But if we say that there is no mistake, then do not be angry with us.

Now I think that, coming back to ISRP's operations, I will now pass the floor, with your permission, to Margaret, who will present some pleasant information. Payroll operation is a growing activity and we are investing a lot in order to be even more efficient than we were in the past. So the floor is yours and I will answer all questions.

Jean-François Poels

Ms Margaret Gilman Jaouen

Head of the Payroll Administration Unit (ISRP)

(Original English)

Thank you, Mr Chairman and hello everybody,

It is a pleasure to be here and report news from the Payroll Administration Unit this year.

I am very pleased to announce that we took on the payroll operations of pensioners of the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF). ISRP has been serving their pensions since July of 2021 and the transfer of functions went smoothly.

ESA newly mandated ISRP to facilitate the transition of ESA staff from their status as workers to their status as pensioners. We are building within our team a dedicated group of colleagues to deliver these new tasks.

The payroll unit at ISRP currently handles 8,062 pensions per month, at the end of September 2021. This includes 139 Weather Centre pensions, that are not new, but they are new to us. I would also like to add that, in addition to pensions, our same payroll unit has also been processing the payroll of active staff of the Council of Europe Development Bank since January 2021. The relationship has been very productive, another big success of which we can be proud.

I would also like to take this opportunity to remind you that the Payroll Administration Unit continues to work with personal contacts; we are not an anonymous call centre. You are familiar with the names of those who help you with your pensions, Viviane, Justine, Andrea, Eric, Tricia, Vanessa, Yukari, Elise and Agnès to name only the most visible. You will get to know our newer staff as well. I am very proud of this personal touch; I hope that you enjoy and appreciate this important distinction from other schemes.

I want to remind you that we, the Payroll Administration Unit staff, are still working remotely as we have been for over 18 months, since March of 2020. This complies with our host Organisation's regulations and we are not back to normal operations. This COVID situation has consequences on you but also on us, on our way of organising our work so that we can ensure that every month you get your pension and you get it on time. You haven't even had to worry about that during this crisis. That is thanks to the dedication of our staff, and they have given their all to protect your pension benefits.

We have continued the digitalisation of our processes, and I would like to thank you for helping us go forward in this effort. A few years ago, Jean François Poels pointed out the hundreds of kilos of paper that we consumed to print and mail monthly payslips. Thanks to your encouragement, we now use the web platform IPSI-KiosK. We are reaching about 5,000 of the 8,000 pensioners, who obtain their pension scheme documents by going online wherever they are, whenever they want.

I would also like to announce that this week, for the very first time, we put a portion of the pension population's Annual Form on IPSI KiosK. We tested before launching and overall it was successful. We had some teething pains: having put the Annual Forms online on Tuesday, we noticed on Wednesday that there was a glitch in an address for about two percent. Detection was thanks in part to pensioners who said, "Hey, this looks kind of funny." Today we are solving that problem.

This is another example of our moving forward and your saying gently, "This can be better." Thank you for your constructive feedback. Working together enables us to design service that is responsive both to your needs and to our wish to be more efficient and to protect the environment. Together we can make this better. I really appreciate your helpful comments.

To wrap up, the Payroll Administration Unit is not just a bunch of number crunchers. We are real people, and, thankfully, you know that: we receive regularly from you messages of thanks and appreciation. I want to say clearly how rewarding they are for us, especially during these difficult times. So please continue, it is truly motivating - you can hear the emotion in my voice on behalf of my colleagues!

Thanks for your attention. Stay well.

Margaret Gilman Jaouen

BELGIUM

Mr William RODEN +32 2 466 2273
williamroden@skynet.be

(Original French)

The past year has been surprisingly quiet as only a few AAPOCAD members residing in Belgium have contacted me. To live happy, live hidden? They were all NATO pensioners who wanted information on taxation by the Belgian authorities of individual premiums paid for supplementary medical insurance. The NATO administration has undertaken to contact the host nation authorities on this matter.

Kind regards,

Billy Roden

FRANCE

Mr Malcolm GAIN +33 6 84 30 85 43
malcom.gain@orange.fr

(Original English)

The past year has been fraught with uncertainty for many of us, and the coming year may well be no better. Apart from concerns about the effects of the COVID pandemic on our lives and our health and that of those around us, we are faced with varying degrees of uncertainty as regards our tax situation in France. A particular cause for concern is liability – or otherwise – for CSG and CRDS contributions on our Co-ordinated Organisation pensions over and above the income tax we all pay already. The situation is unclear, with policy and practice currently depending on the tax office to which one is attached, and the attendant issues are complex. This being so, CRSG and ISRP are reviewing the whole problem with a view to a future agreement with the French authorities on a commonly applicable policy that takes account of every aspect. We will circulate further information as soon as we have it.

I indicated last year that the position of the French Finance Ministry, known colloquially as Bercy, from the part of Paris where its main building is located, is that they consider pensions paid by Co-ordinated Organisations with their headquarters in France as being of French (and not foreign) origin. That position has not changed (although some local tax offices take a different view) and implies that we should declare our pensions as such on our tax forms (in box 1AS or 1BS, as appropriate); if we do this, we will most probably be asked to pay our tax in respect of year n in four equal instalments in the last four months of year n+1. If, however, we declare them in box 1AM (or 1BM, if one is "deuxième declarant") – and some tax offices insist that we do – we will be required to pay monthly instalments (called acomptes contemporains, directly debited from our bank accounts by the tax authorities) on our pension in the year in which we receive it.

It would be helpful if members in France could inform AAPOCAD of any sudden or recent changes in the manner in which income tax(es) are levied on their pensions, so that AAPOCAD can in turn keep CRSG and ISRP abreast of the situation on the ground.

Despite the uncertain times in which we live I wish you and your loved ones all peace, health and happiness in 2022 and beyond.

Kind regards,

Malcolm Gain

GERMANY

Mr Rüdiger NEITZEL +49 261 210 0202
neitzel-ruediger@t-online.de

(Original English)

Dear "Pensioners",
Dear members of AAPOCAD,

I am the German delegate since long and I am looking forward to somebody to replace me in this function. I am almost 80 years old and I think it is time a younger person takes over. I promise a smooth transition and help as long as needed.

Here are the points of concern in Germany:

1. Taxation

I have repeatedly explained that in Germany there is a difference in taxation between "Pension" (for civil servants only) and "Rente" for all other employees. We have been fighting long to convince the German authorities that we belong to the group of "Rentners" because we contributed some 8% to our pension system (just like every other German employee). We have been to the German Federal Fiscal court as well as to the German Constitutional Court and lost in all cases.

I would not repeat this story if there would not have been lately a note to all members titled "pension aggregation" which caused a lot of confusion, questions and mails. Let me explain again: This has nothing to do with your "Pension" from the International Organisation but simply and only with the German "Rente" in case you have contributed to the German "Rentenversicherung" before you joined the service of an International Organisation. If you are (or might be) eligible for a German Rente (on top of your international Pension) it is worthwhile to obtain more information under the following link:

[Zusammentreffen mehrerer Versorgungsbezüge (§ 54 BeamtVG) (beamtenversorgung-online.de)]

I would also like the opportunity to inform you that the German law concerning civil servants has been changed again effective September 2021. German Civil Servants (that includes soldiers) **who joined** the international service as employees **after retirement** or end of their national service must **no** longer expect a **cut** in their German „Pension" for the years they worked in an International Organisation. But you have to request that from your payment office, that is why I had sent a mail to all members in Germany.

2. Health Care

2.1 Everybody living in Germany is obliged to have a "Pflegeversicherung" (long term care insurance) which will cover the cost in case we need to be "taken care of" and which should prevent that costs become unbearable for the families.

It is understandable that most persons like to stay at home as long as possible, but without professional help that is in most cases not possible and without financial support not affordable. There is a gap between the German legal requirement and the health insurances of the Co-ordinated Organisations which I have pointed out often enough.

In order to show the benefits of the German System I attach here two tables which have been translated into English for this purpose.[5]

2.2 I had also written two letters to the German Minister for Health in which I made him aware that there are a number of people living in Germany which have (so far) not managed to meet the German legal requirement to have a "Pflegeversicherung". I have asked him to look into the matter and invited him to ask the International Organisations officially to what degree their health insurance contracts meet the German requirement.

I did not get any answer until I got my local member of the parliament in support. The answer is still not satisfactory, but I have renounced further action because of the Corona Pandemic.

My idea is still to ask the German Government to insist that International Organisations meet the German standards for health care and I will proceed with this idea at the next General Assembly.

3. For 2022 I have the following wishes:

- I hope we will overcome this Covid pandemic and be able soon to meet in person at our to regular meetings.
- I would like to hand this job over to a successor, please volunteer!

Best regards,

Rüdiger (Roger) Neitzel

[5] The tables supplied by Roger can be found on page 27.

Overview of benefit entitlements for subscribers to long-term care insurance in 2018

		Level 1 Minor restriction of independence or capacities	Level 2 Considerable restriction of independence or capacities	Level 3 Severe restriction of independence or capacities	Level 4 Severest restriction of independence or capacities	Level 5 Severest restriction of independence or capacities, with particular nursing care needs
Home care	Monthly care allowance (€)[1]	-	316	545	728	901
	Maximum monthly non-cash benefits (€)[1]	-	689	1 298	1 612	1 995
Respite care[2] • By close relatives[3]	Maximum annual coverage of care for up to six weeks in the calendar year (€)	-	474 (1.5 times 316)	817.50 (1.5 times 545)	1 092 (1.5 times 728)	1 351.50 (1.5 times 901)
• By other persons[4]		-	1 612	1 612	1 612	1 612

[1]Cover is provided for either a care allowance or non-cash home care benefits. A combination of the two is possible, however, with the "combination benefit", in which the care allowance for a given month is reduced in proportion to the value of the non-cash benefits received in that month.
[2]During respite care, claimants will continue to receive half of the care allowance they previously received, for up to six weeks per calendar year.
[3]Close relatives may, on the provision of receipts, be refunded up to €1 612 per calendar year for unavoidable expenses such as loss of earnings and travel costs, in the form of a lump-sum payment. This amount can be raised to €2 418 per calendar year to cover recourse to respite care (see note 4).
[4]The amount of benefits may be raised by up to €806 from hitherto unused funds for respite care, up to a total of €2 418 per calendar year. The additional amount used for respite care is deducted from the benefit amount for respite care.

Technical care supplies and other care supplies	Amount of expenses per product	100% of costs An additional payment of 10% will be made under certain conditions, however, capped at €25 per product. As far as possible, technical care supplies will be made available on loan at no additional cost.				
Measures to improve the home environment	Maximum expenses	€4 000 per measure (up to four times the amount of the contribution i.e. up to a total of €16 000 if several claimants are living together)				
Payment of pension scheme contributions for caregivers[8]	Maximum monthly amount, depending on type of benefit (€) (former East Germany)	-	152.92 (135.34)	243.54 (215.55)	396.46 (350.89)	566.37 (501.27)
Payment of contributions to unemployment insurance for caregivers[9]	Monthly amount (€) (former East Germany)	-	45.68 (40.43)			
Grants to health and care insurance for caregivers during periods of care	Maximum monthly health insurance (€)[10]	158.34				
	Care insurance	25.88				
Gross care assistance grant for workers during a short period of being unable to work	Up to ten days	90% - when in receipt of one-off payments liable for contributions in the twelve calendar months preceding the leave of absence, regardless of their amount 100% of the lost earnings				

[8]In the case of at least ten hours per week of regular non-professional care of one or more persons in care in a home environment at care level 2 or higher, spread over at least two days in the week, provided the caregiver has no employment of over thirty hours per week and is not claiming a full retirement pension and has not reached the statutory retirement age.
[9]In the case of at least ten hours per week of regular non-professional care of one or more persons in care in a home environment at care level 2 or higher, spread over at least two days in the week, provided the caregiver was insured immediately before the provision of care or was entitled to regular remuneration.
[10]The calculation was based on the general contribution rate to statutory health insurance of 14.6% and the average supplementary contribution rate of 1.0%. Persons covered by statutory health insurance may observe discrepancies owing to the consideration of the supplementary contribution rate, which varies between health insurance funds.

ITALY

Mr Franco VELTRI +39 335 843 3313
fveltri@hotmail.com

(Original English)

The number of AAPOCAD members residing in Italy is 119 (86 NATO, 24 ESA, 4 OECD, 3 CE, 1 ECMWF, and 1 EUMETSTAT). Two issues have been at the focus of our attention:

- First, the hope that further legal actions are possible to react to modifications to Art. 36. Many of us believe that the Co-ordinated Organisations created a self-protecting appeal system that deprives us of a basic human right: Everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal. The ATs are far from being independent and impartial. However, Italian courts declare themselves incompetent to exercise jurisdiction over labour disputes related to international workers, thus leaving us without any independent tribunal to accede. We hope AAPOCAD can find a different legal forum, like the Strasbourg Court, that can help overturn the ATs decisions as these tribunals by their nature are not impartial.

- Second, late final tax adjustments. As of April 2021, NATO and ESA pensioners living in Italy had not received final tax adjustment since 2017. That month ESA pensioners received the final adjustment for 2017 and eventually the remaining overdue adjustments. NATO pensioners, apparently because of temporary manning problems within the NATO Pension Unit, started receiving the late final adjustments in November. The pension offices claimed they could not calculate the final adjustments since 2017 because they had not received from ISRP tax tables vetted by Italian authorities, and were sitting and waiting. Our associations pushed the issue without results, until ESA eventually intervened with Italian authorities and revitalized the dealings between the Italian tax office and ISRP.

  While this longstanding issue evolved in the right direction, it has taught us a bitter lesson: pensioners of International Organisations are totally dependent on the good will of the same Organisations. We have been unable to obtain, in four years, an official explanation of who was responsible for the delay. The procedure to determine tax parameters lacks transparency and similar problems may emerge again. Furthermore, there is no mechanism for us to verify if any mistake is made during calculations, either by ISRP or by national authorities. ISRP has a policy (confirmed during our latest General Assembly) to refuse to provide information about their dealings with the national office that is causing a delay, thus depriving us of the right to formally complain, as allowed by national law.

  This procedure should be revisited and we hope AAPOCAD can help in obtaining more transparency from all those involved.

Finally, reference the latest report by a Regional Delegate for Italy (2018), for the sake of the records I am obliged to note that in Italy it is still difficult if not impossible to obtain the aggregation of national contributions to the pension scheme with those paid in the International Organisations, which is an option allowed by European legislation. The AAPOCAD President requested the Italian Labour Ministry, in February 2019, to modify their implementing instructions that make the aggregation impossible for those who receive a pension from an International Organisation. Nevertheless, the situation is unchanged. It is therefore up to individual pensioners to bring the case to the Italian labour courts, with the associated costs. Which is likely the deterrent the Italian Pension Institute counts on.

Kind regards,

Francesco Veltri

LUXEMBOURG

Mr Fortunato IACONELLI +352 399854
iaconelli@internet.lu

(Original English)

The main activity in 2021 was in line with the usual routine of providing, as in past years, answers to members resident in Luxembourg requesting information related to the sickness insurance as well as to taxation and tax adjustments.

The activity in 2021 has been influenced by the lockdown because of the Covid-19 pandemic crisis and is by now slowly resuming.

The presentations in both official languages, for the yearly “Workshops for future retirees”, at the NATO Support and Procurement Agency could not be held because of the Covid-19 problems.

In the field of the changes of Article 36 of the CPS and the revision of the rules for adjusting, the pension this matter was submitted to the judgement of the NATO Administrative Tribunal and regretfully the decision was not positive for the pensioners.

Kind regards,

F. Iaconelli

THE NETHERLANDS

Mr Nico DE BOER +31 0299 690 529
nicodeboer@xs4all.nl

(Original English)

2021 has been a quiet year for the regional delegate for The Netherlands. There was only a very limited number of requests for information and/or support.

In the beginning of the year the ESA pensioners were confronted with a final correction for the 2020 Tax Adjustment. But the December 2020 pay slip showed already the 100% regularization for the year 2020. ESA and SIRP were contacted and it appeared that there had been a misinterpreting of the status of the different adjustment tables and that the December 2020 regularisation was based on provisional tables. This had not been properly communicated to the pensioners, hence the confusion. NATO pensioners however received information from their Pension Unit that the 2020 adjustment was delayed and that due to the negative outcome the pay back would be spread out over the months of September to November

In 2021 little progress has been made in respect to the harmonisation of the taxation of the pensions of the Co-ordinated Organisations. In 2020 the Ministry of Finance had promised to submit new proposals but the submission was postponed several times. Recently the participants were informed that a meeting will now be organised in January 2022.

The discussions related to the compatibility of the social security systems in the Co-ordinated Organisations with the national social security system are still going on. In particular the issue of getting access to nursing homes is a central part in these discussions. Unfortunately, in 2021 little progress has been made.

Kind regards,

Nico de Boer

TURKEY

Mr Kamil ERKER +90 532 738 9266
aapocad.regdel.turkey@gmail.com

(Original English)

After almost four years of active involvement as the Regional Delegate of pensioners in Turkey, the prevailing task of fighting the erosion of the purchasing power of pensioners on the Turkish scale remains the *raison d’être* of my representation function.

1. <u>CONSEQUENCES OF THE CHANGE IN THE PENSION ADJUSTMENT METHOD IN TURKEY IN 2020 AND 2021</u>.

The very low pension levels of the Co-ordinated Organisations’ payroll for Turkey when converted to NATO’s base country currency remain a constant issue. The problem had arisen from unrealistic purchasing power parities used for Turkey coupled with the infrequent and slow implementation process of Special Adjustments in the method of CCR’s 244th Report that had effectively impaired the desired effect of the annual and interim adjustments. Unfortunately, the 263rd Report that resulted in the de-linking of pension adjustments from salary adjustments through the unilateral change in Article 36 of the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme (CPS) rules as from 1 January 2020 has done away with the principle of purchasing power parity in pensions altogether.

The AAPOCAD Governing Board unanimously agreed that appeals would be initiated against the various Council decisions to adopt the new pension adjustment method with a view to revert to the “linked” method. Pensioners in Turkey joined forces in opposing any change to the CPS and submitted the letter prepared and sent to CCR by AAPOCAD. Deplorably, NATO’s Administrative Tribunal has rejected the appeals filed by pensioners and serving staff against the de-linking of the adjustment methods. The issue of the preservation of the purchasing power of pensioners in my region has consequently transpired as the ensuring of the timely and accurate adjustment of their pensions henceforward solely based on the harmonized indices of consumer prices (HICP) applied by the International Service for Remunerations and Pensions (ISRP) for Turkey. The new method was implemented beginning with the 1 January 2020 annual pension adjustment in also NATO. I am sure all pensioners will agree that concerning the "new" pension adjustment method, I have to be constantly mindful of the future scales that would be applied in the currency of a high inflation country.

As regards the 1 January 2020 annual pension adjustment, since the amended Article 36 of the CPS had entered into force at that same date, the 1 January 2020 Annual Adjustment (CCR's 264th Report) which became applicable only to serving staff salaries and no longer made reference to pension adjustments would not be applicable to pensioners. Hence, the new version of Article 36 logically necessitated a separate legal approval for pension adjustments, which was referred to the Committee of the Representatives of the Secretaries/Directors General of the CO (CRSG).

As a reminder, NATO CPRs Annex IV (Rules of the Co-ordinated Pension Scheme) Article 36 [Follow-up] Instruction 36.1/2 defined the inflation indices to be used: "*Consumer price trends will be monitored with reference to the consumer price indices used in the remuneration adjustment procedure in force in the Organisation.*" At the risk of repeating myself, this did *not* mean that the index increases that would be "monitored" for the serving staff's salary adjustment method would be applied directly to the pension adjustments. The relationship between the term "revaluation coefficients" used in the new pension adjustment rule and the relevant price index increases remains unexplained to date. Considering the possibility of the "revaluation coefficients" serving to reduce the pension adjustment figure, it would have been desirable that the appeals against the change in CPS Article 36 would have included an objection in that regard as well.

The 1 January 2020 pension adjustment for Turkey was implemented as +15.7% based on the HICP increase during the relevant Reference Period, since the new method of the 263rd Report required "*the Organisation to adjust pensions, every year, in accordance with revaluation coefficients based on the consumer price index for the country of the scale used to calculate each pension*". As the 244th Report no longer applied as from 1 January 2020, ISRP instructed the NATO Pensions Unit to use the index for the entire Reference Period 1 July 2018-1 July 2019. It had become clear that CRSG had agreed that pension adjustments would be based *directly* on the applicable consumer price indices, the term "revaluation coefficient" based on those indices remaining in the text of the rule itself admittedly as embellishment.

As I have reported last year, in application of the [follow-up] Implementing Instructions for the modified CPS Article 36, special pension adjustments have been implemented for Turkey with effect from 1 January 2020 (separate from the 1 January 2020 annual pension adjustment) and 1 August 2020. However, pensioners in Turkey had to wait through August 2020, until the aforementioned [follow-up] Implementing Instructions were published, for the 1 January 2020 special adjustment to take effect. The 1 August 2020 special adjustment was implemented in September 2020. I continued to monitor the indices for August through December 2020 for the purpose of the balance of the 1 January 2021 annual pension adjustment. Meanwhile, the HICP increase for Turkey as from 1 August 2020 exceeded the 6% threshold in November and a Special Adjustment became due with effect from 1 December 2020. Thus, a special adjustment of 6.4% retroactive to 1 December 2020 was included in the February 2021 pension payment along with the balance of the 1 January 2021 annual adjustment. The HICP increase for December 2020 was 1.25% and the balance of the January 2021 annual pension adjustment for Turkey was equal to that increase.

In continued application of the NATO CPRs [follow-up] Implementing Instructions for the modified CPS Article 36, implementation of special pension adjustments has continued for Turkey in 2021. The first became due with effect from 1 June 2021 and the second, very recently, with effect from 1 October 2021. The former covered the HICP increase of 6.38% for the initial 5-month period 1 January-1 June 2021 of this year's Reference Period and the raise was implemented with the July pensions. However, the NATO Pensions Unit could only effect the payment of the arrears for June with the September pensions. The second adjustment covered the HICP increase of approximately 6.3% for the 4-month period 1 June-1 October 2021 after the HICP for September was published by Eurostat.

I will continue to monitor the official CPI increase data for Turkey and Eurostat's corresponding HICP increase figures for November and December 2021 for the purpose of determining whether the threshold would be breached for a third time within the 2021 Reference Period. With the HICP increase for October recorded by Eurostat as 2.40%, that may be likely in the two months that remain. In the event it does not, the balance of the 1 January 2022 annual pension adjustment for Turkey will be based on the HICP increase during the last 3 months of the year.

2. <u>RESULT OF THE APPEAL ON THE OMITTED SPECIAL ADJUSTMENT WITH EFFECT FROM 1 JULY 2018 FOR TURKEY</u>.

Please refer to my 2020 Annual Report for the developments that led to my Appeal against NATO IS to seek the payment of lost arrears for the 6-month period from 1 July through the end of 2018 as a result of the omitted Special Adjustment of 7% that should have been implemented with effect from 1 July 2018, but were only incorporated 6 months later into the 1 January 2019 Annual Adjustment.

The HICP increase in Turkey exceeded 7% for a second time during the last 4 months of the Reference Period 1 July 2017-1 July 2018, to reach +7.3% from 1 March to 1 July 2018, i.e. *within* the relevant Reference Period. Inflation continued to remain comfortably above 7% in the two following consecutive months of July and August 2018. A Special Adjustment had become due in accordance with Article 7 of the applicable adjustment method.

It was incumbent upon me and my Legal Counsel to persuade NAT that they must not uphold NATO HR management's double standards defying Council-approved reports, not to mention basic logic. Several colleagues had recommended that I invoke the Appeal process as the only resort. I wish to repeat here my gratitude to the AAPOCAD Bureau for their decision to provide partial financial assistance for legal expenses. I would like to trust in our unity of purpose and believe that all AAPOCAD colleagues now sincerely acknowledge the merits of my Appeal that I amplified at the second GB meeting of 2021 and were included in the summary record.

As for the proceedings of the Appeal since last year's report, I received NATO IS' Rejoinder in October and developed my detailed arguments used in the preparation of my Appeal and Reply documents in response to NATO IS' claims in their Rejoinder. Mr. Palmieri elaborated on those at the Hearing that was finally held online on 14 December 2020.

Mr. Palmieri received the Tribunal's Ruling on 18 January 2021. The Tribunal rejected the Appeal based on their unconvincing justification that the three-month inflation trend watch for the months of June, July and August 2018 did not fall entirely within the relevant Reference Period that ended on 1 July 2018. The Tribunal went on to argue that the issue of whether ISRP accounted for all of the indices of the four months as from 1 March to 1 July 2018 had thus become moot! The Tribunal failed to mention whether or not they disagree with our premise that Special Adjustments are granted based on inflation exceeding the threshold within a reference period and prior to their date of effect. They veiled themselves behind the mere unpersuasive argument of the following two months' inflation watch as having to fall within the Reference Period, in spite of the last sentence of the applicable article stating that the first month had to fall therein and therefore no others had to! I remain highly critical of the Tribunal's ruling, because as the author of the rule, NATO had a responsibility to honour the *contra proferentem* doctrine invoked by my legal counsel and interpret it to the favour of the appellant.

I should mention that the ruling did not affect the current level of pensions in Turkey. All I was seeking was arrears for a period of six months for 7% of the January 2019 annual adjustment that should have been granted with effect from 1 July 2018, i.e. six months earlier.

In any event, the [follow-up] Implementing Instructions for Special Adjustments approved by CRSG and adopted by NATO have established that the index of the month whose first day was the date of effect of an initial Special Adjustment cannot be omitted in further tracking indices for an eventual second Special Adjustment (CPRs Annex IV Article 36 Instruction 36.1/4). I mentioned this during the Hearing, however the Tribunal chose to declare the issue concerning the skipping of the index for March 2018 moot, only when it concerned my case.

I wish to point out that Mr. Palmieri has defended our correct arguments in the best way possible and it has been a privilege for me to have co-operated with as seasoned a legal counsel as him throughout the process of the preparation of the Appeal, Reply and hearing Plea. As mentioned, I did pinpoint a number of factual errors and argument discrepancies in the AT Judgment. However, Mr. Palmieri has advised me that it was not legally possible to request a revision of a ruling by the NATO Administrative Tribunal based on the relevant Annex of the NATO CPRs as it stands. I should add that pensioners on the scale for Turkey are utterly frustrated by the result of my Appeal that confirmed the limits of pensioners' judicial protection.

3. <u>CONSIDERATIONS ON THE FUTURE APPLICATION OF THE PENSION ADJUSTMENT METHOD AND COMPARISONS OF ITS RESULTS WITH THOSE OF THE SALARY ADJUSTMENT METHOD</u>.

The special pension adjustment mechanism incorporated in CPS Article 36 involves the publication of the monthly HICP increases by Eurostat and a concurrence by silence procedure at PACCO/CRSG level in accordance with the new CPS Art. 36. These technicalities have lately caused a delay of up to 2 months for the implementation to take place after the threshold was reached. It has taken Eurostat up to the first three weeks of the following month to publish HICP increase figures for a given month, at least for Turkey, although Turkey's Statistics Institution (TÜİK) has kept publishing CPI increase figures systematically within the first 5 days of the month. I continually alerted the Pensions Unit every time the CPI exceeded the threshold and ironed out any problems due, for example, to late arrears payments with them, as recommended. I do not think the matter warrants AAPOCAD involvement at present.

In connection with the implementation of special pension adjustments, and more precisely, the relevant indices in view of the different Reference Periods used for the two separate adjustment procedures, care should be applied in comparing the results of the upcoming 2022 annual pension adjustment with those of the 2022 annual salary adjustment. This is about the technical glitch created by the 6-month "décalage" between the two existing reference periods.

In the case of Turkey, pensioners have already received compensation for the last 6 months of 2020 with the balance of the 1 January 2021 annual pension adjustment in application of the new method, whereas *serving* staff in Turkey have to wait for the January 2022 annual salary adjustment for the *balance* of the compensation for the same 6 months, because those fall within their relevant 1 July 2020-1 July 2021 Reference Period. Nonetheless, serving staff in Turkey have received a special adjustment of 7% with effect from 1 March 2021; but had to wait for two more months in accordance with their method. As for inflation compensation for the remaining months of their Reference Period that ended by 1 July 2021, they have to wait, as mentioned, for the upcoming annual salary adjustment. Whereas *pensioners* on the scale for Turkey have already received a second special adjustment as compensation for the HICP increase of the four months of June through September 2021 with effect from 1 October 2021, for now, serving staff will only be compensated for the HICP increase of up to and including June 2021 as the last month of their reference period. The serving staff's inflation compensation for the remaining 6 months of 2021 will materialize with potential special adjustments in 2022 and as late as the 1 January 2023 annual salary adjustment.

Hence, a more accurate comparison of the adjustment percentages for a given country should involve pensioners' Reference Period (calendar year) HICP increase with that of the last 6 months of the Reference Period of the salary adjustment method increased by that of the first six months of the following Reference Period (first 6 months of the same calendar year plus the last 6 months of that year), rather than comparing the annual adjustments that bear the same date of effect. The latter approach creates an error of comparison, particularly in the case of high inflation countries; but the difficulty that would be posed by the Reference Index that no longer figures in *pension* adjustments should be recognized. That difficulty can be overcome should HICP increase figures be compared on the basis of the 1 July to 1 July reference period of the salary adjustment method. Then, obviously the difference in single-year adjustment percentages of the two methods would boil down to the effect of the Reference Index. This would bring forth the advantage of the pension adjustment method in that it allows for annual adjustments to be implemented with effect from the month (January) immediately following the relevant Reference Period (calendar year). Nonetheless, if annual adjustments are to be compared based on their date of effect, a clearer picture would be obtained by following a monitoring of percentage increases for several years, so that the effect of the 6-month time lag between the two different Reference Periods could perhaps be minimized.

The perennial problem has been that the overall CPI figures as published and relayed to OECD do not necessarily reflect those that would be based on the weighting of the pensioners' consumer spending patterns. The published *annual* CPI increase in Turkey stands at 19.89% as at the end of October 2021. Eurostat's last published annual HICP increase for the same period is also 19.89%. Should the annual figure stand at about 21% by the end of the year, the balance of the 1 January 2022 annual pension adjustment for Turkey would be around 6%; barring of course a third interim adjustment with effect from a month within the last 3 months of the current Reference Period. (Eurostat-published HICP increase figures for Turkey have been within minus 0.01 to 0.02% of nationally-published CPI increase figures for the last 2 years.)

4. <u>MEMBERSHIP</u>.

Based on the AAPOCAD membership data for Turkey, there were 46 AAPOCAD members residing in Turkey as of 31 December 2020. With the help of my colleagues who represent NATO retired staff in Turkey (ANARCP members), I continued to follow a proactive approach to enlist every retiring NATO staff in Turkey to AAPOCAD in also 2021, while also trying to reach other pensioners on the payroll for Turkey who are not AAPOCAD members. The resulting new number of my region's members will be shown on the AAPOCAD database as of 31 December 2021.

On behalf of pensioners in the Turkish region, I wish to extend my gratitude to Mr. Parsons and Mrs. Cachin for accommodating my requests in also 2021. My special thanks go to all AAPOCAD Governing

Board members for their kind assistance. Your support is indispensable in also 2022 and beyond.

I wish every AAPOCAD member and their families a happy Holiday Season and a peaceful New Year safe from the effects of the pandemic to include the Omicron threat.

Yours sincerely,

Kamil ERKER

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Robin Adrian FLOOD +44 737 823 5253
aapocad@dragonsblood.org.uk

(Original English)

Dear Colleagues,

I have had no queries this year, but from personal experience the UK tax authorities are currently extremely slow in responding to documents sent by post, no doubt because most staff are still working from home.

To everyone then I wish health and happiness in 2022.

Sincerely,

Robin A. Flood

⌘

Elections for the 2022-2023 AAPOCAD Governing Board

The mandates of 12 Governing Board Members expire this coming month of May.
The available posts, by Organisation, are as follows:

NATO	2
OECD	2
ESA	3
CoE	1
ECMWF	1
EUMETSAT	2
WEU	1
	_
TOTAL	12

The names of the Board Members whose mandates are expiring are shown **in bold** in the table, which for convenience indicates also all the other existing Members of the Board.

***

Board Members whose term of office is ending and who would like to stand again and pensioners or their dependants who wish to be candidates for the Governing Board are all asked to complete the application form on the website.

Candidates should keep the presentation of their previous experience and of the reasons why they wish to be a Board Member short and concise, i.e., no longer than one-half typed page. This summary should be presented in English and French.

The form is available in English and French on the website under the section "Forms". If you wish to have an electronic or paper copy of the form, please contact the AAPOCAD Secretariat (+33 1 45 24 85 87).

a) Your application form must reach the AAPOCAD Secretariat no later than the final deadline of **Friday, 18th March**.

b) The Bureau will verify that the applications are formally admissible, after which the table of the candidates and the positions to be filled will be prepared along with the ballot papers, which will be sent to you the week of **21st March**.

c) You must then choose how you wish to vote, i.e. either electronically on the AAPOCAD website (please use this method if possible) or by post.

   The practical instructions for voting electronically or by post will be sent to you together with the ballot papers.

d) Your vote(s) must be received by the deadline of **29th April**, and they will be counted immediately afterwards, with the results being announced at the AAPOCAD Governing Board on **13th May** and ratified at the General Assembly on **14th October 2022**.

e) Any additional information will be sent to you together with the list of candidates and the ballot papers.

Thank you for respecting these deadlines.

John Parsons
Chairman

MEMBRES ÉLUS DU CONSEIL D'ADMINISTRATION À OCTOBRE 2021
ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BOARD AT OCTOBER 2021

Les noms en gras indiquent les mandats se terminant en 2022
Names in bold show mandates ending in 2022

Nom - Name	Mandats - Mandates 1er-1st	Fin-End
OTAN / NATO		
M. DESBOIS	**2019**	**2022**
Mme LOBIN*	**2016**	**2022**
M. RODEN	2011	2023
Mme TEZCAN	2017	2023
Mme THILL	2020	2023
M. CORBELLINI	2015	2024
M. GOYENS	2015	2024
M. RUTTEN	2009	2024
OCDE / OECD		
M. HUGONNIER	**2016**	**2022**
M. VANSTON	**2007**	**2022**
M. GARROUSTE	2008	2023
M. MOORE**	2017	2023
Mme DUBOSCQ	2021	2024
Mme LINDNER	2003	2024
ASE / ESA		
M. CAMPBELL	**2007**	**2022**
M. DE BOER	**2007**	**2022**
M. JAGTMAN	**2016**	**2022**
M. LE BER	2011	2023
M. VELDHUYZEN	2011	2023

Nom - Name	Mandats - Mandates 1er-1st	Fin-End
CE / CoE		
M. PARSONS	**2016**	**2022**
M. PALMIERI	2014	2023
M. BOHNER	2012	2024
M. COURADES	2021	2024
UEO / WEU		
M. DE GOU	**2013**	**2022**
Mme BRISSET	2012	2024
CEPMMT / ECMWF		
M. ERLER	**1995**	**2022**
M. BATAILLE	2021	2024
EUMETSAT		
Mme NICOLAS	**2019**	**2022**
M. THIEM	**2013**	**2022**

* Membre de 2004 à 2010, réélue en 2016
** Membre de 2009 à 2015, réélu en 2017

AUTRES MEMBRES DU CONSEIL / OTHER BOARD MEMBERS

PRÉSIDENTS D'HONNEUR/
HONORARY CHAIRS

M. BORIUS (OCDE)
M. WACQUEZ (OCDE)

VICE-PRÉSIDENT(ES) D'HONNEUR/
HONORARY VICE-CHAIRS

M. DIVOY (OCDE)
Mme DU VILLARD (UEO)
M. NEITZEL (OTAN)
M. VAN SCHENDEL (OTAN)

DÉLÉGUÉS RÉGIONAUX/
REGIONAL DELEGATES

France :	M. GAIN (OCDE)
Italie / Italy :	M. VELTRI (OTAN)
Luxembourg :	M. IACONELLI (OTAN)
Turquie / Turkey :	M. ERKER (OTAN)
RU / UK :	M. FLOOD (ESA)

PRÉSIDENTS DES ASSOCIATIONS/
CHAIRS OF ASSOCIATIONS

M. COMBARIEU (UEO)
M. GUIDETTI (OTAN)
M. WINZER (ESA)
M. WOODS (ECMWF)

Glossary of Co-ordination & Pensions

FORMER STAFF ASSOCIATIONS

AAPOCAD: Association of Pensioned Staff of the Co-ordinated Organisations and of their Dependants.

Its purpose is to bring together all pensioned retired staffs of the six Co-ordinated Organisations, excluding retired staff receiving only a "Provident Fund".

AAUEO: Association of Former Staff of the WEU

AIA: International Association of Former OEEC & OECD Staff

AIACE: International Association of Former Council of Europe Staff Members (AIACE)

AIACE: International Association of Former European Communities Staff

ANARCP: Association of NATO/ACE (Allied Command Europe) Retired Civilian Personnel

APE: Association of pensioners of EUMETSAT

ARES: Association of Retired ESA (European Space Agency) Staff. (ASE)

ARNF: Association of Retired NATO Agents in France

ARNS: Association of Retired NATO Civilian Staff and of their Dependents

CNRCSA: Confederation of NATO Retired Civilian Staff Associations

NFSA: NSPA [*NATO Support and Procurement Agency*] Former Staff Association

CO-ORDINATION

Purposes of the Co-ordination system:

To make recommendations to the governing bodies of the Co-ordinated Organisations relating to:

1. Basic salary scales and the method by which they are adjusted, applicable to the staff categories and all the countries where there are serving staff or pensioners,
2. The Coordinated Pension Scheme Rules,
3. The purpose, amount and method of adjustment of the various allowances.

CCR: Co-ordinating Committee on Remuneration

The future of our pensions and the correct application of the 1974 Pension scheme are the subject of on-going discussion within the so-called Co-ordination system, which brings together delegates to the CCR proper (comprising some twenty Member countries) and representatives of the staffs and heads of the Co-ordinated Organisations (see below).

CRP: Committee of Staff Representatives from the six Co-ordinated Organisations (on which AAPOCAD is represented), which takes part in all Co-ordination negotiations.

CRSG: Committee of Representatives of the Secretaries/Directors-General of the Co-ordinated Organisations, which advances the views of the Secretaries/Directors-General in the Co-ordination negotiations.

ISRP: International Service for Remunerations and Pensions

This service, resulting from the merger of the JPAS and IOS, is charged essentially with:

a) The management and monitoring of all matters pertaining to the remuneration of staff of the Co-ordinated Organisations (COs) and the Pension Scheme common to the COs;

b) Providing the Secretariat of the Co-ordinating Committee, the PACCO, and working groups of the CCR.

PACCO: Pensions Administrative Committee of the Co-ordinated Organisations (CAPOC in French)

This body is appointed by the CRSG for more technical work on subjects such as the Pension Rules. This is an administrative body but has sometimes called on AAPOCAD for its expertise.

PENSIONS

The paragraphs which follow consider, in very condensed terms, some provisions of the Co-ordinated Pension scheme adopted in 1974 which are of practical interest for pensioners. Naturally, reference will have to be made to the actual Pension scheme rules for any details relating in particular to the establishment and calculation of rights to a pension and allowances. The Secretariat of AAPOCAD will, on request, supply a copy of any provision concerning our pensioners.

Right to a pension

Retirement pension:

Any permanent member of staff who has completed ten or more years actual service in one or more of the Co-ordinated Organisations is entitled to a retirement pension (for less than 10 years a "leaving allowance" is paid).

- Entitlement to a deferred pension: "entitlement to a pension" starts at the age of 60; if a member of staff retires before pensionable age, payment of his/her retirement pension is deferred until he/she reaches that age.

- Survivor's pension: the surviving spouse of a staff member who dies in service is entitled to a pension, provided they had been married to each other for at least one year at the time of the staff member's death (unless death results either from disablement or illness contracted in the performance of his duties or from an accident).

- Reversionary pension: there is entitlement to a reversionary pension for the surviving spouse:

    - Of a former staff member in receipt of a retirement pension provided they have been married for at least one year prior to the staff member's retirement;

    - Of a staff member in receipt of an invalidity pension provided they had been married when the invalidity was recognised;

    - Of a former staff member entitled to a deferred pension provided they had been married for at least one year when he/she retired.

- The pension payable to the surviving spouse of a member or former member of staff is normally 60% (i) of the retirement pension to which the member of staff would have been entitled while in service; (ii) of the retirement pension to which the former member of staff would have been entitled at the age 60 in the case of a pension deferred to that age; (iii) of the invalidity pension which was being paid to the former member of staff at the date of his/her death; (iv) of the retirement pension which was being paid to the member of staff at the date of his/her death.

Scales for the calculation of pensions

Pensions under our Scheme are initially calculated by reference to the basic monthly salary and the scale applicable to the country of the staff member's last posting at the time the staff member retires. This is the basic rule, but if a former staff member settles subsequently either in a country of which he is a national or in a country of which his/her spouse is a national or in a country where he he/she has served for at least five years in one of the Co-ordinated Organisations, he/she may opt for the scale applicable to that country; in this case the pension is recalculated in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 5 of the Pension Scheme Rules.

On the death of his/her spouse, a former staff member may, on settling in the country of which he/she is a national and /or of which his/her deceased spouse was a national opt for the scale applicable to the country concerned, the pension then being recalculated in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 5 of the Pension Scheme Rules.

Once exercised, these options are irrevocable.

The salary scales for Co-ordinated Organisations staffs are on calculated in euros for the European Union countries which have adopted the euro as their common currency.

Annual adjustment of pension benefits

The new adjustment method which came into force on 1 January 2020 is a consequence of the CCR's 263rd Report: on 1 January each year the adjustment corresponds to the inflation observed according to the national consumer price index (HCPI or CPI) for the country on the basis of whose salary scale the pension is calculated. The adjustment therefore no longer takes account of salary trends in the reference national civil services (B, D, E, F, I, L, NL, UK) or of purchasing power parities.

AAPOCAD is challenging this significant change to an essential feature of the Coordinated Pension Scheme Rules.

"Tax adjustment" applying to pensions

The "tax adjustment" established by Article 42 of the Pension scheme rules is one of the provisions of the scheme which has been most fiercely defended by AAPOCAD over the last few years because some Member countries would purely and simply have liked to put an end to this system.

If this had happened, the real level of pensions would have been significantly and in some cases considerably lowered depending on each pensioner's tax position.

The "tax adjustment" has recently been called into question again by some national delegations in the CCR.

The principle underlying the fiscal adjustment is as follows: as pensions are taxable (whereas they were originally calculated by reference to a non-taxable salary) an adjustment is allowed at the rate of 50% of the amount by which the pension of the individual concerned would have to be increased so that, after deduction of any national taxes on the whole sum, the balance is the same as the pension paid. The figure of 50% is due to a compromise reached between Member countries when the 1974 scheme was started because the theoretical adjustment should logically have been 100%.

In calculating the theoretical figure indicated above account is taken only of the statutory tax regulations affecting the tax base or amount of tax for all pensioned taxpayers in the country concerned; obviously no account is taken either of the individual tax position or the assets of the pensioner; or of income other than that paid under the Pension scheme, or of the incomes of spouses or dependants.

The ISRP works out for each Member state correspondence tables, which specify for each pension paid a figure for the adjustment to be added. These tables determine the recipients' entitlements.

⌘

In Memoriam*

On behalf of all the AAPOCAD Members, I would like to express my deepest sympathy and sincere condolences to the families and relatives of those of our members who have left us this last year and whose names are listed below. These colleagues and friends will always be present in our memory. - *The Chairman*

ASE / ESA

Norma ANAV	11-07-2021
Jean ARETS	19-10-2021
Gordon BOLTON	24-08-2021
J. W. CORNELISSE	30-07-2021
Jacoba ELLIS - BOUMA	17-07-2021
Ebba K. FOGELBERG	14-04-2021
Mireille GALANTE	19-04-2021
Rita Mary HART	07-04-2021
Clifford HUGHES	03-03-2021
William G. KING	15-08-2021
Rolf Michael KOKSVIK	25-02-2021
Willy LEBRUN	23-11-2021
M. LOMBARDO	24-02-2021
Oscar OJANGUREN	29-07-2021
Michel PION	20-04-2021
Hélène ROUSSELOT	04-06-2021
Alfred SMIT	03-05-2021
Donald TRIGG	16-05-2021

CE / CoE

Patricia BEESLEY	31-12-2021
Antonietta DE VIGILI	18-10-2021
Denise GASSMANN	04-12-2021
Jean-Pierre GEORGES	08-04-2021
Nicolas GIRASOLI	04-06-2021
Paule GOMI REYNERIE	16-08-2021
Marcel GRUBER	28-12-2021
John HARTLAND	17-07-2021
François LEBLANC	03-09-2021
Janine LIEUTAUD	01-01-2021
Marlyse LINDER	19-09-2021
Carmen MICHELET	22-05-2021
D. MONTANARI	07-09-2021
Solveig STEKIS	20-06-2021

CEPMMT / ECMWF

Blanche HARVEY	05-02-2021
Norman P. WIGGINS	06-01-2021

OCDE / OECD

Godfrey AMOS	16-05-2021
D. BOURGUIGNON	18-05-2021
Pierre BROUILLAUD	02-09-2021
Philippe CAMBIER	11-03-2021
Gabrielle CASSAVETTI	14-05-2021
Sylvie DELECLUSE	06-03-2021
Daniel DHIEUX	09-10-2021
Yvette DUDOGNON	12-06-2021
Adèle HOSTALRICH	29-11-2021
Ferdinand KUBA	14-01-2021
Barbara KUSCHEL	13-01-2021
Andreas LINDNER	11-09-2021
Frania MAJORCZYK	11-10-2021
Margaret MARRIS	02-09-2021
Robert NABOR	07-06-2021
Marie PIALLAT	29-04-2021
Lilliane ROBIN	16-09-2021
Martine WAGENER	16-06-2021

OTAN / NATO

Evelyne ADAMS	08-10-2021
Gerald BATTRAM	25-09-2021
Odile BERTHO	12-10-2021
Gérard BOISSET	06-02-2021
Andrée BRANDERS - ALEWAETERS	01-01-2021
Adrianus BRUGEL	06-09-2021
Klaus BURCHARDT	25-04-2021
Fernande CLIFFORD	05-10-2021
Maria-Gezina DE BRUIJN-STRUIJK	19-05-2021
Bernadette DELWAIDE-DE CHAMPS DE ST LEGER	07-03-2021
Michael FRANCIS	25-11-2021
Sidney R. GLANFIELD	22-12-2021
Bernhard GOSSEN	10-02-2021
Richard GRAHAM	27-04-2021
Alexander GRANT	17-03-2021
Wilhelmus HAPPEL	09-08-2021
Hendrik M. C. JONGEN	07-02-2021
Gérard LE GUEN	14-02-2021
Eckhard LIPPE	14-09-2021
Renate MACKRODT	04-07-2021
Gerrit MANNESSEN	08-04-2021
Christian MASSINON	21-06-2021
Lambertus MELIS	22-02-2021
Konstantin MEUFFELS	12-04-2021
Arlette MICHELSON	01-07-2021
Jorunn I. MYKING	07-08-2021
Hélène NINAUD - ARNAUDAS	29-06-2021
Kristen NYGAARD	13-05-2021
Simone PARENT	04-05-2021
Peter, J PINGRAM	05-02-2021
Hélène QUANTIN	04-06-2021
Ernst SCHUBERT	07-09-2021
P.H. VAN DEN HOUT-GOOIJAARTS	24-11-2021
Ate VAN DER WERFF	20-02-2021
Paul VAN LIMBEEK	15-08-2021

UEO / WEU

Michel FOURMOND	05-04-2021
Sybil NORTH - COOMBES	30-09-2021

* The information contained in this section is, to the best of our knowledge and belief, correct.

New Members by Organisation*

ASE / ESA

Ciro CINOTTI
Els HOOGEVEEN
Fred JANSEN
Alain LEFEBVRE
Max PIGNÈDE
Etienne TILMANS
Lothar WINZER

CE / CoE

Patrick ADJEDJ
Paul Jacques DEWAGUET
Odile GEBHARTH
Michael LARSEN
Evelyne LEBLANC SCHULER
Noura MASSUE-BELAYACHI
Helen Louise MONKS
Claire PEDOTTI
Mihail SEMERTZIDIS

CEPMMT / ECMWF

Tony BAKKER
Alain BATAILLE
Roberto BUIZZA
Dominique MARBOUTY
Yvonne Ruth WIGGINS

OCDE / OECD

Isabelle BRAUD
Adrienne CARPENTIER
Helen CHARLES
Marc DUMONT
Adrienne DUNDON
Jean, Bernard DUDOGNON
Françoise DROUILLON
Frans LAMMERSEN
Nora LE CAM
Grainne MOONEY
Ezio NICCOLAI
Sylvie NIOT
Katherine POINSARD
Emilienne ROZE
Roberto SARDINA
Aude SCANDEL
Vaclav VOJTECH

OTAN / NATO

Heinz-Willi APWEILER
Anita BERGACKER
Antonius BERNARDI
Anita Jane BROOKS
Necdet ÇEVİK
Helmut CREMERS
Lena Ria DISSE – MANNESSEN
Illeana GANZ
Grethe HORGEN
Nicolaas J. H. JANSSEN
Jean JONES-BOWEN
Martin KREBS
Wilhelm LANGE
Ilmar LOBBACK
Giorgio MAGGIO
Bruno MALTER
Alexander MCINTOSH
Jos MEERTENS
Willy MICHELS
Susanne MICHAELIS
Jan MOOREN
Annie MORIOT
Astrid OSWALD - SCHLOEMER
Nikolaos PATEROMICHELAKIS
Florina PETERS
Patricia RAATS
Daniel RICKE
Jos SNIJKERS
Johannes STEERT
Sharmila TURBANG
Benoît TRAGNEE
Peter VAN DE LAAR
Daniel VERHOEVEN
Petra VON SCHWERIN - BODE
Erik VRANKEN
Jacqueline WETZELS-DE LA ROIJE
Andrew WRIGHT

* The above-mentioned members have agreed to have their name appear on the list of members. However, having regard to the EU law on data protection we are not publishing their contact details. Should you wish to contact one of them, please send an e-mail request to aapocad@oecd.org.