

ACTIVITY REPORT
OF THE INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY OFFICE OF THE
COMMISSION
(IDOC)

2011

The Investigation and Disciplinary Office of the Commission (IDOC) was established by a Commission Decision of 19 February 2002¹.

The first task of the Office is to carry out impartial administrative inquiries with a view to establishing whether potential breaches of the Staff Regulations have occurred.

The Office also carries out, under mandate from the Appointing Authority (AA), preliminary hearings prior to the opening of disciplinary procedures which allow the officials concerned to comment on the facts of their case following an inquiry by IDOC or OLAF or where the facts have been sufficiently established.

In addition, the Office conducts disciplinary procedures on behalf of the AA.

The Office's workload therefore depends on the number of mandates for inquiries and preliminary hearings issued by the AA as well as the number of disciplinary procedures opened as a result of those inquiries and hearings. The statistical data at the end of this report summarise the division of the workload of IDOC during 2011.

The facts examined or followed up are extremely diverse and vary from year to year. During 2011, the Office dealt *inter alia* with cases of undue financial benefits, alleged harassment, situations of conflict of interest, acceptance of unauthorised gifts, unauthorised external activities, improper use of the Commission's informatics, electronic and telephone equipment, inappropriate use of the Commission's internal mail system, false declarations of mission expenses, unjustified absences, false declarations of medical expenses, behaviour constituting a penal offence and inappropriate behaviour with respect to the high standards of ethics and integrity expected of staff members of the Commission, including in their private lives.

In carrying out its mission, the Office operates in liaison with different services of the Directorate General for Human Resources & Security (DG HR) and with other Directorates General. In certain cases those services are the source of the administrative inquiries carried out by IDOC. This includes in particular the Security Directorate of DG HR, DG HR.D.2 (Appeals and Case Monitoring) with regard to complaints and requests for assistance in cases of harassment, and the PMO with regard to rights to financial allowances or for determining whether invalidity should be granted on professional grounds. In some cases, the Directorates General refer cases to IDOC leading to the opening of an inquiry or a pre-disciplinary procedure. Examples include cases of irregular absence or improper use of the Commission's internet system.

¹ Replaced by final decision C (2004) 1588 of 28 April 2004 laying down general executive measures relating to inquiries and disciplinary procedures. For further information regarding past activities and IDOC procedures, see http://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/hr_admin/en/idoc/Pages/index.aspx

IDOC is also in regular contact with OLAF, either to determine which of these two offices will conduct a potential inquiry, or to carry out the appropriate disciplinary follow-up of an OLAF investigation.

IDOC also works in close cooperation with DG HR.B2 (Recruitment and end of service) for cases concerning temporary or contractual agents. The administration is entitled to dismiss an agent *with notice*, who has committed an offence serious enough to result in a breakdown of the relationship of trust between them and the institution². The administration can also terminate the contract of a temporary staff member *without notice* on disciplinary grounds in serious cases of failure to comply with obligations under the Conditions of Employment of other Servants of the Commission (CEOS)³. In addition, a contract must be terminated if, when taking up a job, a staff member deliberately submitted false information either as to professional ability or the requirements of Article 12(2) of the CEOS and where this false information was a determining factor in his or her engagement⁴. In the latter cases, the contract is terminated after the disciplinary procedure has been followed under Annex IX of the Staff Regulations.

ADMINISTRATIVE INQUIRIES

NEW INQUIRIES

1. 8 mandated inquiries referred to IDOC in 2011

In the course of 2011, the Director-General of DG HR in her capacity as AA, mandated IDOC to conduct **8 administrative inquiries**. These inquiries gave rise to **67 hearings**, comprising both officials/agents concerned by the inquiries and witnesses.

Following receipt of the mandates for inquiry, the staff members concerned in the case are informed of the opening of the inquiry and of its purpose. They are also informed at the end of the inquiry of the provisional conclusions arrived at by the IDOC investigators and are invited to submit any comments on the facts before the final inquiry report is transmitted to the AA.

2. The facts in question

Of the 8 new inquiries opened in 2011:

- 3 concerned allegations of **psychological harassment**

These cases involved more than 40 hearings of witnesses in order to determine whether or not the alleged behaviour could constitute harassment in the sense of Article 12a of the Staff Regulations.

² Judgement of the General Court T-283/08P of 7 July 2011, Longinidis v. Cedefop, not yet published. In 2011, 2 contracts were terminated, one for false declarations in connection with a medical visit prior to recruitment, the other for production of a falsified document.

³ Articles 49 and 119 of the CEOS.

⁴ Articles 50 and 119 of the CEOS

The cases originated from requests for assistance made under Article 24 of the Staff Regulations.

- 2 inquiries related to the potential criminal behaviour of an official which, if proven, is contrary to the obligation to **"refrain from any action or behaviour which might reflect adversely upon his position"** under Article 12 of the Staff Regulations.
- 1 inquiry related to the alleged inappropriate **use of the Commission's internet access** which was picked up by the service of the user in question.
- 1 inquiry related to alleged **irregularities and acts of favouritism relating to internal competitions**.
- 1 inquiry related to the ethical conduct of officials, suspected of having benefited from various **favours from companies submitting bids for tenders** to the Commission. The file was transmitted to IDOC by OLAF for follow-up and potential disciplinary action.

COMPLETED INQUIRIES

1. 14 administrative inquiries completed by IDOC in 2011

During 2011, **IDOC completed 14 administrative inquiries** with a final report transmitted to the AA, the majority of which had been opened in the preceding year.

2. The facts concerned

The alleged facts investigated concerned:

- **exercising external activities** without prior authorisation as required by Article 12b of the Staff Regulations;
- **publication of texts relating to activities of the Union without prior notification to the AA** in violation of Article 17 of the Staff Regulations;
- **failure to declare the gainful activity of one's spouse** in violation of Article 13 of the Staff Regulations;
- allegations of **psychological harassment** arising from a request for assistance under Article 24 of the Staff Regulations;
- **misuse of sick leave**;
- **a malicious accusation** concerning acts of favouritism;
- **acceptance of favours from a company participating in a call for tenders**;
- **criminal behaviour likely to reflect adversely on the position of the official concerned**.

On the basis of the conclusions of the inquiries, the AA decided in **8 cases, to close the case without further action** because the facts were not proven, and informed both the officials concerned and the witnesses of the outcome.

In 3 cases, the AA decided, in view of the conclusions of the inquiries, to hear the persons concerned under Article 3 of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations, considering that the facts established by the inquiry could constitute disciplinary breaches⁵.

3. The length of inquiries

The length of inquiries conducted by IDOC depends on many factors, notably the complexity of the case, the number of hearings to be carried out and the availability of the people to be heard. **The average length of inquiries conducted by IDOC in 2011 was 9 months**⁶.

HEARINGS PRIOR TO THE OPENING OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

The hearing prior to the possible opening of a disciplinary procedure, under Article 3 of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations, is intended to enable the AA to decide whether to close the file without further action, to issue a warning to the staff member concerned or to open disciplinary proceedings against them with or without referral to the Disciplinary Board.

The hearing takes place following the conclusions of a report on the inquiry conducted either by IDOC or by OLAF. The hearing may also be held without any prior inquiry where the facts are sufficiently established. Before being heard, the staff member is granted access to all the evidence in his/her file in order to be able to present any elements which could exonerate him or her or could otherwise lead the AA to decide not to open a disciplinary case, even where breaches may have been established.

1. 45 mandates and 37 hearing reports

During 2011 IDOC received **45 mandates** from the AA to conduct hearings under Article 3 of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations and transmitted **37 hearing reports** to the AA.

In 6 cases, the file was closed without further action. In 10 cases, the Director-General of DG HR, in her capacity as AA, decided to address a warning to the staff member concerned and in 11 cases decided to open disciplinary proceedings⁷. In one case, the decision was taken by the Vice-President responsible for Human Resources, in accordance with the AA Tables⁸. This warning, which does not constitute a disciplinary sanction, is

⁵ In 3 other cases the follow-up decision was taken in 2012.

⁶ This represents the actual duration of the inquiry, from the conferring of the mandate to IDOC until the transmission of the final report to the AA, that is the time during which the progress of the inquiry was not interrupted by any legitimate cause for suspension, such as the non-availability of the person concerned or any essential witness for medical reasons.

⁷ In 10 cases the follow-up decision was taken in 2012.

⁸ <http://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/infoadm/en/2010/Pages/ia10013.aspx>

placed in the staff member's personal file for a period of 18 months, after which period they may request its deletion.

Apart from the possibility of sanctioning a statutory breach with a warning, the AA can also send a letter of admonition to any staff member, or former member, where their behaviour gives rise to criticism but is not serious enough to justify the opening of a procedure under Article 3 of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations⁹.

DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

On the basis of the results of the hearing under Article 3 of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations, the AA may decide that the breach of statutory obligations justifies opening a disciplinary procedure.

If the proposed sanction does not have a financial impact (written warning or reprimand), the case is not referred to the Disciplinary Board. Where the sanction under consideration would have a temporary or long term impact on the career of the official in question (suspension of step advancement, relegation in step, downgrading, classification in a lower function group or removal from post) or would affect the retirement pension or invalidity allowance (temporary reduction), the AA must consult the Disciplinary Board, which is required to give a reasoned opinion as to whether the facts are established, and any subsequent potential penalty.

The sanction imposed must be proportionate to the seriousness of the misconduct. The AA takes into account all mitigating or aggravating circumstances and comes to its decision with particular regard to the points set out in Article 10 of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations (nature of the misconduct; the extent of the damage to the integrity, reputation or interests of the Institution; the degree of intent or negligence; motives leading to the breach; the grade and seniority of the official; their personal responsibility; the level of their duties and responsibilities; possible re-offending and of the conduct of the official throughout their career).

1. Disciplinary procedures opened in 2011

The AA opened 15 disciplinary procedures against the staff member concerned, 8 of which were referred to the Disciplinary Board¹⁰.

2. Disciplinary procedures completed in 2011

In 2011, 20 disciplinary sanctions were imposed. In 13 of these cases, the Director-General of DG HR, in her capacity as AA, issued a written warning or reprimand for the misconduct. In 7 other cases, the "tripartite" AA, consisting of the Director-General of DG HR, the Director-General of the official concerned and a third Director-General¹¹ designated by the Secretary General, decided, following a procedure before the Disciplinary Board, to impose sanctions ranging from relegation in step to dismissal or termination of contract.

⁹ In 2011, two letters of admonition were addressed to former officials for non-declaration of external activities undertaken after cessation of functions.

¹⁰ 1 of these procedures led to two hearings before the disciplinary board

¹¹ Or Deputy Director General.

3. *The duration of disciplinary procedures*

The length of disciplinary procedures varies according to whether or not they involve referral to the Disciplinary Board. The average length of disciplinary procedures closed in 2011 was 12 months without referral to the Disciplinary Board, and 17 months with referral¹².

THE FACTS FOR WHICH A SANCTION WAS IMPOSED

Disclosing information which has not been rendered public and accepting gifts without prior authorisation

An official shall refrain from any unauthorised disclosure of information received in the line of duty, unless that information has already been made public or is accessible to the public¹³.

Members of staff must not accept, without prior authorisation, an award, a medal a favour, a gift or remuneration of any kind¹⁴.

An official was dismissed and his pension rights reduced to the minimum subsistence level for 20 years (the combination of two sanction decisions) for having received gifts and other favours of considerable value from various stakeholders in the industrial sector in **which he exercised his duties**. This same official had regularly provided these entities, outside of the Commission, with confidential information or information which had not been made public, which he had obtained in the context of his work.

The AA imposed a heavy sanction for this flagrant and repeated breach of the duty of loyalty. Judicial proceedings have been brought against this official for passive corruption. These parallel penal proceedings did not, however, prevent a sanction from being imposed for facts admitted by the official and established to the requisite standard of proof required in the disciplinary procedure.

Facts constituting a penal offence

Facts constituting a penal offence, established by a national jurisdiction, may lead to disciplinary proceedings against the offender, even when these facts are not linked to the exercise of duties and were committed before recruitment.

The invalidity allowance of a former official was reduced by 250€ a month for five years for having been found guilty of a serious penal offence committed before his recruitment. Due to the excessive length of the case the national authority could no longer convict the offender. In spite of this, a disciplinary procedure was opened, since the facts were established and their serious nature harmed the image and reputation of the institution and its

¹² This represents the total length of the disciplinary procedure, from its opening to final closing (sanction decision or closure without further action).

¹³ Article 17 of the Staff Regulations

¹⁴ Article 11 of the Staff Regulations

personnel. The AA did not follow the opinion of the Disciplinary Board, which considered that facts committed prior to recruitment could not be sanctioned by any disciplinary measure. The AA considered that the date when the facts had been committed was not the determining factor since the case had become a matter of public knowledge after the official entered into service.

False declarations

False declarations made to obtain a financial benefit constitute behaviour which reflects adversely on the position of an official¹⁵ and an act of disloyalty against the institution¹⁶.

Two former officials were sanctioned by a reduction of their invalidity allowances for having made false declarations in order to benefit unduly from the weighting allowance applicable to the United Kingdom, which they declared to be their principal place of residence since going on invalidity. In addition, the falsely claimed allowances were fully recovered.

In both cases the officials concerned went on invalidity before 1 May 2004. The previous version of the Staff Regulations provided that the retirement pension or invalidity allowance be subject to a weighting at a rate fixed for the country where the recipient proved he had his residence¹⁷ and that it was their responsibility to provide proof of such residence¹⁸. The jurisprudence specifies that the residence to be taken into consideration is the place where the former official has fixed his centre of interests with a view to establishing a stable and durable place of residence.

Contrary to the declarations sent to the administration and the documents produced to support them, nothing demonstrated that the individuals in question effectively resided in the United Kingdom during all or part of the period in question.

One of the two former officials, who had in fact never fixed his centre of interests in the United Kingdom, had his invalidity allowance reduced to the subsistence level for 20 years, as there were no mitigating circumstances.

The invalidity allowance of the second person, who did not have his centre of interests in the United Kingdom for a certain part of the period in question, was reduced by 1500€ per month for 5 years. The AA did not follow the opinion of the Disciplinary Board which had recommended a lighter sanction over a shorter period. The person concerned had, in fact, provided a series of false declarations not only with regard to his effective place of residence but also with regard to the reimbursement of removal expenses of his partner. He had therefore demonstrated a persistent intention to profit from undue allowances and to produce forged documents in order to obtain these allowances.

In a third case, the **false declarations by a temporary agent made in order to obtain the expatriation allowance** (16% of the basic salary) instead of foreign-residence allowance (4% of the basic salary) **led to the termination of his contract without notice.** This decision,

¹⁵ Article 12 of the Staff Regulations

¹⁶ Article 11 of the Staff Regulations

¹⁷ Article 82, 1st paragraph, 2nd indent of the former Regulations.

¹⁸ Article 43 of Annex VIII of the former Regulations.

taken following a procedure that involved a referral to the Disciplinary Board¹⁹, sanctioned the breach of the duty of loyalty. There were no mitigating circumstances.

False declaration of mission expenses

An official who had made a **false declaration in order to speed up the reimbursement of his mission expenses** was sanctioned by a **reprimand** (*article 9, 1st paragraph, letter b) of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations*). Although a false declaration constitutes a serious breach likely to be sanctioned heavily, the absence of financial damage resulting from the declaration, and the difficult personal and family circumstances of the official in question led to the relatively light sanction in this particular case.

Irregular medical expenses claims

An official received a warning for having claimed the reimbursement of hospital expenses that were not yet paid. By signing the reimbursement request the official confirms that the claim is correct and that the expenses involved have been paid. An incorrect statement engages the responsibility of their author and exposes him/her to potential disciplinary action for breach of duty of loyalty (Article 11 of the Staff Regulations). In this particular case, no fraudulent intent was established and the family circumstances of the individual could partially explain the delay before the individual finally settled the expenses in question. Taking these circumstances into consideration the AA decided not to open disciplinary proceedings in this case.

Misuse of the Commission mail service

The Commission mail service is for the dispatch and distribution of the official mail of the institution.

Outgoing private mail is allowed on an occasional basis but it must always carry the correct postage and be clearly addressed and the sender's address must be on the back of the envelope²⁰.

An official was sanctioned by a downgrading of one grade (*article 9, 1st paragraph, letter f) of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations*) **for having sent, over an extended period, a large number of private packages on behalf of a third party at the Commission's expense.** The Disciplinary Board had recommended a lighter sanction, namely a relegation of two steps. Due to the seriousness of the misconduct, the AA decided to impose a sanction which had a heavier financial impact on the individual, mainly because the functions he exercised meant that he was very well aware of the rules regarding the use of the Commission's mail services. In addition, under Article 22 of the Staff Regulations, this official was required to pay back the full amount of the financial loss suffered by the Commission²¹.

¹⁹ Article 49 of the CEOS.

²⁰ Administrative Notice n° 74-2003 of 11 November 2003.

²¹ The requirement of an official to make good any damage suffered by the institution as a result of serious misconduct on his part (Article 22) is to be distinguished from the recovery of sums overpaid (Article 85) which applies where the recipient was aware that there was no due reason for the payment or where the fact of the overpayment was patently such that he could not have been unaware of it.

Inappropriate use of the I.C.T. services of the Commission

Commission computer equipment, email, internet access, telephones, mobile phones and fax equipment (I.C.T.) are intended for official use. Private use of this equipment is allowed if it is on a purely occasional basis and does not amount to extensive use of the equipment for private purposes. The Commission's I.C.T. services may not be used for illegal or irregular purposes, in a way that might disrupt the functioning of the service itself or in a manner contrary to the interests of the Union²².

2 officials were sanctioned by a **reprimand** (article 9, 1st paragraph, letter b) of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations) for having made improper use of informatics equipment, put at their disposal for professional purposes.

One case concerned the **downloading of films for private use**. The other case involved frequent visits to **internet sites and downloading material, much of which was of a pornographic nature**. As regards content, the Practical Guide on ethical matters and the behaviour of staff, available on My IntraComm, expressly states that "the Commission's server may not be used to consult websites which have content which is shocking, racist, discriminatory, sexually explicit or any other improper sites".

Non-authorised external activities

All members of staff who wish to take part in external activities must obtain the prior permission of the AA²³.

Commission decision C (2004) 1597 of 28 April 2004 relating to external activities and assignments²⁴ defines external activities as "all (other) activity, paid or unpaid, that is of an occupational character or goes otherwise beyond what can be reasonably considered as a leisure activity".

During 2011, **11 officials and 1 contractual agent** were sanctioned (one case involving a **referral to the Disciplinary Board**), for failing to ask for **prior authorisation for external activities**. In all of these cases the activity was for companies or commercial bodies and as such would not have been authorised if the people concerned had asked for permission²⁵.

A reprimand was imposed on one contractual agent for having regularly and over a long period of time exercised an external activity, which was remunerated above the annual maximum ceiling of 4500 euros as set out in the Commission Decision of 2004.

The financial difficulties of this staff member were considered to be mitigating circumstances together with the fact that he only became aware of his statutory obligations at a late stage.

²² Administrative Notice n° 45-2006 of 15 September 2006.

²³ Article 12b of the Staff Regulations, articles 11, 54 and 81 of the CEOS.

²⁴ Administrative Notice n° 85-2004 of 29 June 2004

²⁵ Article 8 of the decision C(2004) 1597 of 28 April 2004: "Permission shall not be granted for assignments or activities for firms and companies whose objects are commercial, even if the official's relationship with the company or firm in question entails no remuneration or purely nominal remuneration".

Training or presentations given in the context of seminars organised by a commercial organisation, constitutes an external activity²⁶ that requires prior authorisation from the AA in accordance with Article 12b of the Staff Regulations.

This prior authorisation must even be requested if there is no contractual relationship with the organisation in question or no remuneration or other benefit gained in connection with the services offered. This duty applies irrespective of the content of the training and presentations, their link with the functions of the person concerned, the public to which they are addressed, their frequency and the time and place where they are given.

This applies equally when a staff union cooperates in a training course with a commercial organisation.. Failure to respect this obligation can lead to a disciplinary procedure and a possible sanction, in line with the relevant facts and circumstances of the case.

9 officials were sanctioned for having infringed their statutory obligations in this way: **6 were sanctioned by a written warning** (article 9, 1st paragraph, letter a°) of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations), and **3 by a non-disciplinary warning** (article 3, 1st paragraph, letter b) of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations). The decision not to impose a disciplinary sanction on these three officials was based in particular on the minor or isolated character of the breach and the absence of any intended harm to the integrity, reputation or interests of the institution.

An official who actively took part in the management, supervision and the promotion of a pay internet site was sanctioned by reclassification into a lower function group (AD to AST) (article 9, 1st paragraph, letter g) of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations) following a procedure before the Disciplinary Board. The person concerned, who had obtained prior authorisation from his former institution for publishing on the site, was giving the impression of complying with the rules, but was in reality managing and promoting the site, while also publicising his own publications. By using his official status, the individual also gave the false impression that this site, of a purely commercial nature, enjoyed the backing of the Commission.

Non-authorised publications

All members of staff who have the intention to publish or to have published any paper on a subject that concerns the activities of the Commission must inform the AA in advance²⁷.

A disciplinary procedure before the Disciplinary Board was opened against an official **for having failed to previously inform the AA of articles published during a period of leave on personal grounds**. The AA followed the opinion of the Disciplinary Board and imposed a **reprimand** (article 9, 1st paragraph, letter b) of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations) on the official in question. The fact that the activities exercised by the individual during his absence on personal leave, of which the AA had been duly informed, involved regular publishing was seen as a mitigating circumstance, as was the absence of any personal benefit from these publications.

²⁶ Article 1, paragraph 3 of the Commission decision C (2004) 1597 of 28 April 2004 (Administrative Notice n° 85-2004 of 29 June 2004), defines an external activity as "all other activity, paid or unpaid, that is of an occupational character or goes otherwise beyond what can be reasonably considered as a leisure activity"

²⁷ Article 17(a), paragraph 2 of the Staff Regulations

Public accusations and insults against an official

Members of staff must abstain from any action or behaviour which might reflect adversely on their position²⁸.

An official was sanctioned by a **reprimand** (article 9, 1st paragraph, letter b) of Annex IX of the Staff Regulations) **for having repeatedly sent emails to a large number of recipients both internal and external to the Commission, containing accusations of an abusive and vexatious character against another official.** These accusations consisted of reiterating, without any additional justification, allegations and administrative complaints that had already been the subject of a definitive decision. This behaviour, intended to discredit the official concerned, was found to be contrary to Article 12 of the Staff Regulations.

Non-respect of financial procedures

Two officials in active service and two retired officials received a warning for having made irregular use of a framework contract for building renovation works. The persons concerned were all involved in different capacities in the financial circuit, from the budgetary commitment to the payment of the expenses. The Financial Irregularities Panel was consulted on the financial irregularities committed and the responsibility of the individuals, and concluded that they were guilty of gross negligence. The AA was, however, invited to take into account the small amounts involved, the absence of any personal gain of the persons concerned and the systemic shortcomings of the control mechanisms in place at the time. These considerations, and the circumstance that the irregularities took place a long time ago, led the AA not to open disciplinary procedures against the four officials and former officials in question.

Theft on Commission premises

A contractual agent received a **warning after taking food from a Commission kitchen for his own personal consumption.** The very limited value of the items in question and the regret expressed by this agent led the AA to not open disciplinary proceedings in this case.

Unjustified absence

All members of staff, who are unable to work because of sickness or an accident, must notify the institution as soon as possible and must provide a medical certificate as from the fourth day of their absence. This medical certificate must be sent in, at the latest, on the fifth day of their absence. Failing this, and unless failure to send the certificate is due to reasons beyond their control, the absence is considered to be unjustified. The unjustified absence will be deducted from the annual leave entitlement. In the case where all annual leave has been taken, the staff member's remuneration will be stopped for the corresponding period.
All unjustified absences can give rise to disciplinary procedures²⁹.

A **warning** was issued to a contractual agent who had presented medical certificates **outside the time limit, retrospectively justifying repeated absences** that had taken place

²⁸ Article 12 of the Staff Regulations

²⁹ Article 59 of the Staff Regulations

during the preceding two years. The fact that the absences in question, which had been checked by the medical service, were justified on medical grounds, was taken into consideration in the decision not to open disciplinary proceedings.

COMMUNICATION, TRAINING AND PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

The annual activity report of IDOC, disseminated to all the Commission services and available on My IntraComm, is intended to inform staff of the activities of the Office. Its purpose is also to make staff aware of the ethical rules and of the consequences that the breaches of these rules had during the year.

In 2011 the Office also gave a number of presentations to individual Directorates General, to agencies and to the EEAS.

IDOC was further involved in training sessions on disciplinary matters for information and preventive purposes, including the training given to new officials and to officials leaving the institution.

IDOC also helped draft and clarify the various rules on ethics, based on their experience in conducting inquiries and disciplinary cases.

More information on IDOC's activities, including the activity reports from previous years, can be found on the IDOC website:

http://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/hr_admin/en/idoc/Pages/index.aspx



