



**Does the Commission still believe  
in social dialogue?  
Does it really care about the working conditions  
of its officials and staff?**

**The bad example set by the current Commission to the  
Member States European citizens and its own staff**

In a play in three acts, the Federation presents to you the exemplary social dialogue that the Commission wishes to promote in our Member States and compares these fine principles with the very different way it is actually implemented within its own Institution.

In practice, the current Commission is exploiting the absence of staff from its offices because of the Covid crisis to force through, without any consultation of its staff, moves to unsuitable premises offering non-validated accommodation conditions (Flexidesking / Hot-desking).



**The CIANO case and what it reveals about the current Commission:  
a bad example or the exception that proves the rule?**

You no longer see our cafeteria and canteen staff? It's not just because you don't go to the office yourself: unfortunately, their disappearance is not just temporary or because of the pandemic. You won't see them again soon, even if all hope is not lost...

In fact, they were purely and simply **dismissed** following the suspension by the OIB (Office Infrastructure Brussels) of the contract between the Commission and their direct employers, the companies CIANO/Unijolly and Eurest.

As soon as we were informed of this **social tragedy**, the Federation appealed to the President of the Commission, asking our Institution to show some compassion and soften the social impact through a total or partial reconsideration of these brutal decisions.

This appeal went unheeded, but this **lack of concern** on the part of the Commission fortunately did not prevent the staff from taking the case to court, and they were well advised to do so. The judgement of the Brussels Courts vindicated them

**The employer was condemned** in law for having neglected to consult, before the dismissal decision, the Works Council, a joint structure which must be consulted beforehand and effectively before any change in working conditions.

These requirements derive from the collective agreement between these employers and their representatives, which is supposed to comply with **European Directives 2001/23/EC and 2002/14/EC** (harmonisation of Member States' laws relating to the safeguarding of employees' rights).

The Belgian Court could not have been clearer in its ruling that informing is not equivalent to consulting, and that there was, in this case, no attention paid to the active participation of the employees in the modification of their working conditions.

It is astonishing that our highest authorities (President, Commissioner Hahn, Director General of Personnel, etc.) did not take a more legal, not to say humane, look at the conditions of dismissal of such dedicated staff who were so valuable in the day-to-day running of the services.

Were the DG HR teams so short of legal experts? Were our top leaders too busy attempting to put an end to the health crisis? Could it be that their ambition to build a 'geopolitical' Commission lost sight of what they considered to be the too mundane realities of **social Europe**?

**And now you will be asking what this has to do with us, Commission Officials and Agents...?**

**More in Act 2 coming soon...**