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**Executive Summary**

Any Survey or study carried out under the auspices of EUPAN has to acknowledge the complexity of trying to compare 27 different systems and traditions of public administration. Some respondents did not distinguish between the public service as a whole and central government administration or Civil service due to changes in classification over the period of the Survey (2006 -2012). Working within this constraint and using the earlier Surveys conducted by Ireland (2004) and by Austria (2006) as a basis, the Irish Presidency Surveysought to assess the impact of the recent economic crisis on the structure and scale of the Public Services across EUPAN Member States.

Using 2006 as the base year, EUPAN Members were requested to provide up-to-date structural data and key reform information under six main headings.

1. Structure of the Public Service
2. Number of Public Servants
3. Number of Ministries
4. Structure within each Ministry
5. Department/Ministry with Responsibility for HR Policy
6. HR Reforms since **2009**. Member States were asked for changes that have taken place in:
	1. General Terms and Conditions of Service
	2. Rates of Pay / Rates of Pension
	3. Pension Entitlements or Conditions of Qualification
	4. Holiday / Annual Leave Entitlements
	5. Sick Leave Entitlements
	6. Maternity / Paternity Leave
	7. Family Friendly Policies
	8. Methods of Recruitment and Selection to the Civil Service
	9. Structure of the Senior Public Service
	10. Recruitment and Selection for the Senior Public Service

Responses were received from **27 EU Member States**, the **EU Commission**, **Croatia,** **Montenegro**, **Norway**, and **Switzerland**. Not all respondents answered all questions. The span of our analysis is quite long (2006-2012) and it covers both expansionary and recessionary economic times. In the period immediately following 2006, many Member States were still expanding their public service to take account of extra responsibilities arising from their recent membership of the EU. This factor, and general economic prosperity, led to a peak in numbers around 2008 with numbers declining thereafter.

**The key responses by category are summarised as follows:**

**(a) Number of Public Servants**

Seventeen Member States **(Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia and the UK)** reported a decrease in the number of civil servants/public servants since the 2006 Survey. The decrease ranges from 3% to 35% compared to the base year. Significant change is reported in some Member States such as Finland which reports a 35% decrease primarily due to the transfer of staff from the university sector to the private sector.

There is a definite downward trend and even those Member States reporting increased numbers (**Bulgaria,** **Denmark, Greece, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain, and Sweden**) qualify the increases by reference to a peak in numbers reached in the period around 2008/9. In some cases (**Bulgaria, Greece, and Romania**) restructuring has led to an increase in numbers where staff not previously classified as civil or public servants are included in more recent figures.

**(b) Changes in rates of pay**

Ten Member States (**Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Romania, and Slovenia**) reported a reduction in rates of pay / allowances / bonuses since 2009, by as much as 25% in **Romania** and 24% in **Latvia.**

A further six Member States (**France, Hungary, Italy, Poland,** **Spain and the UK**)reportedpay freezes or deferral of increases as a response to the Crisis. Three Member States (**Finland, Malta and Slovakia**) report an increase in pay.

**(c) Changes in rates of pension**

Four Member States (**Austria, Germany, Ireland** and **Greece)** reported reductions in the pension rate. **Austria** reduced the pension rate by 4.2%, **Germany** reduced the maximum pension entitlement from 75% to 71% of the pensionable final salary and in **Ireland** there was a once-off cut of approximately 4% to public service pensions above €12,000.

In **Cyprus**, there is a freeze on any increases in pensions until 2015. In **Estonia**, pensions have not been reduced but national contributions to the mandatory pension schemes were frozen for two years from 2009 while in the **Netherlands**, pension rates have not been adjusted for inflation since 2006.

The most common changes reported by Member States were pension freezes and pension reductions and revised methods for calculating pensions.

**(d) Changes in pension entitlements**

Eighteen Member States responding to this question (**Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, and the UK**) reported changes to pension entitlements or conditions of qualification since 2009.

The most frequently reported change in the pensions area related to incremental increases in the statutory retirement age for civil and public servants. The retirement age across Member States now ranges from age 60 up to 70. A sample of the other key changes in the pension area includes:

* **Ireland** introduced a new Single Pension Scheme providing for an incremental increase in the minimum pension age (from 66 to 68), a “career average pay” system, a 40-year limit on pensionable service and the extension of pension abatement (full or partial suspension of pension payment) on re-entering public service employment.
* Four Member States (**Cyprus, France, Ireland, and the UK)** have introduced changes in pension contribution rates
* The **UK** is carrying out a review of pension provisions with a view to having a new pension scheme in place by 2015.
* **Austria** has reported measures to discourage early retirement while **Greece**, in contrast, has reported measures to encourage early retirement.

**(e) Maternity Leave, Paternity Leave and Family Friendly Policies**

The Survey identifies a number of changes in the related areas of Maternity Leave, Paternity Leave and Family Friendly Policies. The main driver of change in these areas is the effect of EU policy as expressed in EU Directive 2010/18/EU on Parental Leave. The Survey shows increased rates of parental leave across a number of Member States and identifies the application of parental leave to same sex couples, to adoption and fostering. The Survey also identifies enhanced Maternity Leave in a number of Member States.

**(f) Changes in the Structure of and Appointment to the Senior Public Service**

In respect of changes in the structure of and appointment to the Senior Public Service, the Survey shows that only 4 Member States reported a change in the structure of the Senior Public Service with changes being reported by **Austria** (greater focus on women as leaders), **Hungary, Ireland** (where a new Senior Public Service has been established) and the **Netherlands** (where the Foreign Affairs Department is being included in the Senior Public Service).

The survey suggests a greater focus on the competencies required of senior public servants. It also shows a movement towards more focused recruitment with an emphasis on dedicated recruitment structures and selection procedures.
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**Background**

In 2004, the Irish Presidency carried out a survey on the structure of the Civil and Public Services of the Member States of the European Union, new Member States and three Applicant Countries. In 2006, the Austrian Presidency carried out a further Survey to update the information provided in the 2004 Survey. The Spanish Presidency commissioned a more detailed and comprehensive study on Public Employment in the Member States of the EU during its tenure. In the Irish Presidency Programme it was signalled that Ireland intended to update the Austrian Survey from 2006 and collect summary data for use by EUPAN members.

It was also considered timely to gather information on the reforms that have taken place since 2009 as a result of the Crisis. With this in mind, EUPAN Members were requested to provide up-to-date structural data under 5 headings and key reform information under item six below:

1. Structure of the Public Service
2. Number of Public Servants
3. Number of Ministries
4. Structure within each Ministry
5. Department/Ministry with Responsibility for HR Policy
6. HR Reforms: - since 2009, changes that have taken place in:
7. General Terms and Conditions of Service
8. Rates of Pay / Rates of Pension
9. Pension Entitlements or Conditions of Qualification
10. Holiday / Annual Leave Entitlements
11. Sick Leave Entitlements
12. Maternity / Paternity Leave
13. Family Friendly Policies
14. Methods of Recruitment and Selection to the Civil Service
15. Structure of the Senior Public Service
16. Recruitment and Selection for the Senior Public Service

Responses were received from **27** EU Member States, the **EU Commission**, **Croatia**, **Montenegro, Norway** and **Switzerland**. This document identifies the trends which have emerged from the responses of the EU Member States under each heading. Every effort has been made to ensure that the information is accurate but, in some cases, differences in administrative structures have made it difficult to reconcile the chosen year on year comparisons.

In tracking the changes over the period under review we have, where possible, used the figures supplied in the 2006 Survey as a baseline from which the percentage change is derived.

The **EU Commission**, **Croatia**, **Montenegro, Norway** and **Switzerland** were not included in the earlier surveys so there is no comparative data against which to measure the current response. A summary of the key elements from their returns is included at the end of the document.

**RESULTS**

**1. STRUCTURE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE**

**Structure of the Public Service across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

In comparing the returns from 2006 with those from the current Survey there are no significant changes to report in this category.

**2. NUMBER OF PUBLIC SERVANTS**

**Figure 1.1: Number of Public Servants across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

The evidence suggests that the impact of the Crisis on the public service and public expenditure has resulted in reductions in public service numbers in 17 of the 27 Member States and an increase in the remaining 10. The number of Member States reporting an increase is more a function of the relatively long time span of the Survey (2006-2012), which covered both expansionary and recessionary periods. For example, in the period 2006 to 2008, a number of Member States were expanding the public service to take account of extra responsibilities arising from membership of the EU. In that period also the economic situation across Member States was still positive, resulting in a peak in public service numbers around 2008 and public service numbers began to fall after 2008 across EUPAN members. The analysis is therefore critically dependent on the base year chosen.

Figure 1.2 and Figure 1.3 below show the Member States experiencing numbers reductions and increases respectively over the period 2006-2013

**Figure 1.2: Percentage Decrease in Number of Civil Servants/Public Servants**

**across Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

**Finland**, at 35%, shows the biggest reduction. The returns for 2012 reflect the effects of reforms in the university sector; since 2010 approximately 34,000 employees in the university sector are now treated as private sector and are no longer counted in central government figures.

At the other end of the spectrum, the results for **Ireland** show a reduction of only 2% when compared with 2006. However, the transfer to the Civil Service of 1,770 public servants (Community Welfare Service and National Training Authority) masks the overall reductions in the period. Without these transfers the Civil Service figure would have been closer to 34,600 as against 36,239 representing a reduction of 6.5%.

The figure for **Italy** at 3% includes the addition of 22,000 officials not previously classified as civil servants in the 2006 returns.

In **Portugal**, the response to the Crisis resulted in a reduction of 22% in numbers serving in central government.

**Figure 1.3: Percentage Increase in Number of Civil Servants/Public Servants**

**across Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Ten Member States (**Bulgaria,** **Denmark, Greece, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain, and Sweden**) reported an increase in the number of civil servants/public servants since 2006.

In **Bulgaria**, the increase was due to major restructuring involving the inclusion of 11 new structures within the scope of the State administration.

In **Greece** and **Romania** the figures supplied for the 2013 Survey included categories of employee which were not previously included in the figure supplied for the 2006 Survey. It should be noted however that since 2010, roughly 15,000-20,000 public servants retire each year from the Greek public service

In **Latvia** and **Spain** there was a peak in the number of civil servants/public servants in 2006 and 2009 respectively.

The newer EU Member States experienced a similar peak and noted specifically that this was necessary to meet the requirements of EU Membership. There was an increase, for example, in **Lithuania** in the number of civil servants in the period 2006 - 2008 in response to economic growth and European integration. However, in the period 2009 - 2012, **Lithuania** experienced a 10% reduction in the public servants number aside from some limited temporary recruitment to cover EU Presidency commitments.

Overall the apparent increases since 2006 in some Member States masks the downward trend in civil servant/public servant numbers of more recent years.

**3. NUMBER OF MINISTRIES**

**Figure 1.4: Number of Ministries across Eupan Member States – 2012 v 2006**

In approximately half of the Member States (**Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Spain**) there was a decrease in the number of Ministries since 2006. **Portugal**, for example, reported 10 Ministries in 2013 as compared with 14 in 2006. Similarly, **Spain** reported 13 Ministries in 2013, as compared to 17 in 2006.

Seven Member States (**Austria, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania and Sweden**) report an increase in the number of Ministries. In **Ireland**, for example, the establishment of the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform increased the number of Ministries by one to 16 compared to 15 in 2006. This increase was achieved by way of transfers of functions and without the appointment of any additional staff.

The other 7 Member States (**Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Luxembourg, and the UK**)report no change in the number of Ministries.

**4. STRUCTURE OF EACH MINISTRY**

**Structure within each Ministry across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

In comparing the returns from 2006 with those from the current Survey there are no significant changes to report in this category.

**5. DEPARTMENTS/MINISTRIES WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR HR POLICY**

**Figure 1.6: Department/Ministry with Responsibility for HR Policy across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Twenty seven Member States responded to this question. Twenty three Member States report that a central Department/Ministry is responsible for the development of HR policy. Individual Departments/Ministries are then responsible for the implementation of this policy in respect of their staff:

In **France**, for example, the Directorate General for Administration and the Civil Service is responsible for the development of HR policy, while each Ministry has a HR Directorate responsible for implementation.

In **Germany**, the Federal Ministry of the Interior is responsible for regulations governing the Public Service, while the execution of these regulations is the responsibility of each Ministry.

In **Greece**, the Ministry of Administrative Reform and e-Government has this responsibility.

In **Ireland,** the newly formed Department of Public Expenditure and Reform has taken over responsibility for matters relating to the Civil Service previously under the Department of Finance and has overall responsibility for unifying terms and conditions across the public service.

**6. REFORMS IMPLEMENTED SINCE 2009**

***a. General Terms and Conditions of Service***

**Figure 1.7: General Terms and Conditions of Service across EUPAN Member States**

Twenty two Member States responded to this question. Ten Member States reported changes to the general terms and conditions of service since 2009 (**Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, and Slovakia**). Examples of changes to non-pay terms and conditions include:

In **Belgium**, an important reform of the career system is currently in train. The existing system of “certified trainings” which gave a bonus to civil servants who passed certain tests is to be terminated. This system will be replaced by career progression based on a mix of results assessment and seniority.

There have been changes in the Public Law status of civil servants in a number of Member States including **Bulgaria,** **Estonia** and **Hungary.**

In **Bulgaria**, a new performance appraisal model linked to the attainment of individual goals, administrative unit goals and administration goals has been introduced. It includes self-evaluation and peer review by colleagues.

Flexible working hours have been introduced in a number of Member States including **Bulgaria** and **Cyprus.**

Greater mobility and redeployment arrangements have been introduced in **Greece** and **Ireland**.

In **Germany**, amendments to the law governing Federal Service careers will strengthen the requirements for securing life tenure and will make it possible to promote high performers during probation.

In **Malta**, there have been a number of changes: for example fixed-term contracts now become indefinite after four years’ service. In cases of resignation or termination of employment, employees are now entitled to a notice period proportionate to the length of their service.

In **Slovakia**, the 2009 Civil Service Act introduced service contract, stronger protection of civil servant status (employment stability), a more flexible legal framework for professional education, the abolition of yearly performance assessment connected to financial evaluation of civil servants and the introduction of telework and home office work.

***b. (i) Rates of Pay***

**Figure 1.8: Rates of Pay across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Twenty-four Member States responded to this question. (As some Member States reported a combination of measures – for example both a pay freeze and a pay reduction – they are represented more than once in Figure 1.8.).

Ten Member States (**Bulgaria,** **Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and Slovenia**) reported a reduction in rates of pay

Five Member States (**Bulgaria, Cyprus, Lithuania, Poland and Slovenia**) reported the abolition or reduction of allowances/bonuses since 2009.

Five Member States (**Cyprus,** **France, Hungary, Slovakia and the UK**)reportedpay freezes.

Only two Member States (**Finland and Malta**)reported increases in pay.

Nine Member States (**Bulgaria, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Romania, Spain and the Netherlands**) reported a number of other changes including the introduction of uniform pay scales, the introduction of performance-based pay systems and developments in relation to pay-related collective bargaining.

Two Member States (**Austria and Denmark**) reported no major changes to rates of pay.

In **France**, for example, the basic salary of civil servants has been frozen since 2010, while in the **UK** a two-year pay freeze for public sector workers was introduced in 2010.

In **Ireland**, the Financial Emergency Measures in the Public Interests Acts 2009 introduced a Pension Related Deduction (PRD), at an average of 7%, and reduced remuneration (at rates of between 5% and 20%). In addition, in 2011, the pay scale for all new recruits was reduced by 10%.

In some other Member States, including **Cyprus**, some allowances were both abolished and reduced.

In **Italy**, for example, legislation has been introduced which precludes pay-related collective bargaining at the national level until 2013; currently there is only annual decentralised bargaining at the local level.

The most common changes reported by Member States were pay reductions, pay freezes, and the abolition/reduction of allowances/bonuses.The bar chart below illustrates the incidence of these changes across the Member States.

**Figure 1.9: Changes to Rates of Pay across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

**b. (ii) Rates of Pension**

**Figure 1.10: Rates of Pension across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Thirteen Member States responded on this question. Four Member States (**Austria, Greece, Germany and Ireland)** reported a reduction in the rates of pension since 2009.

**Austria** reduced pensions by 4.2%; in **Germany,** pensions will now be based on 71 %ofthe final pensionable salary instead of 75%; in **Ireland** pensions over €12,000 were reduced by 4%.

Three Member States **(Cyprus, Estonia and the Netherlands**) report a freeze on pensions. In **Cyprus**, there is a freeze on any increases in pensions until 2015. In **Estonia,** pensions have not been reduced but national contributions to the mandatory pension schemes were frozen for two years from 2009. In the **Netherlands**, pension rates have not been adjusted for inflation since 2006.

The most common changes reported by Member States were pension freezes, pension reductions and revised methods of calculating pensions.

**c.** **Pension Entitlements or Conditions of Qualification**

**Figure 1.11:** **Pension Entitlements or Conditions of Qualification across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Twenty Seven Member States responded to this question. Eighteen Member States (**Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, and the UK**) reported changes in pension eligibility covering the areas of retirement age, pension contributions or conditions of qualification.

Of these, 15 Member States, **(Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Slovenia)** reported incremental increases in the statutory retirement age; retirement ages now range from 60 to 70.

In **Ireland**, in January 2013 a new Single Pension Scheme was introduced for new entrants. It provides for an incremental increase in the minimum pension age (from 66 to 68), a “career average pay” system, a 40-year limit on pensionable service and the extension of pension abatement) on re-entering public service employment.

The **UK** reported plans to introduce a new pension scheme from 2015.

Some Member States, including **Austria**, reported measures to discourage early retirement, while **Greece** reported measures to encourage early retirement.

Changes in contribution rates are reported by 4 Member States (**Cyprus, France, Ireland and the Netherlands).**

The most common changes reported by Member States were increases in the statutory retirement age. Other changes included the tightening of early retirement conditions, an increase in pensionable service, revised contributions/contribution period and the introduction of a career-average scheme.

**d. Holiday / Annual Leave Entitlements**

**Figure 1.12:** **Holiday / Annual Leave Entitlements** **across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Twenty seven Member States responded to this question. Of these, ten Member States (**Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Slovenia**) indicated that there had been changes to holiday/annual leave entitlements since 2009. The other respondents reported no change.

Some Member States, including **Ireland** and **Portugal**, reported reductions in the number of holidays.

**Germany** and **Belgium** reported an increase in the number of days’ annual leave based on either service or age.

**Italy** no longer pays for untaken leave.

The changes reported by Member States included reductions in the number of holidays, restrictions on holiday pay and on pay in lieu of untaken holidays.

**e. Sick Leave Entitlements**

**Figure 1.13:** **Sick Leave Entitlements across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Nineteen Member States responded to this question. Eight Member States (**Estonia, France, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Portugal and Slovenia**) indicated that there had been changes to sick leave entitlements since 2009. These changes included reductions in the amount of sick pay and the point at which sick pay becomes payable:

In **Estonia**, sick leave is now paid from the 4th day rather than the 2nd day and the sick pay allowance has been reduced from 80% of salary to 70%.

In **Ireland,** revised sick leave arrangements have effectively halved the amount of paid sick leave. Public servants may now claim 7 days self-certified sick leave in a period of two years. Previously they could claim 7 days in a single year.

In **France**, civil servants and military personnel are no longer paid for the first day of sick leave.

In **Italy**, in order to reduce absenteeism, the daily sick pay rate has been reduced.

In **Portugal** there is no payment for the first 3 days of a temporary disability and only 90% of salary is paid for day 4 to day 30.

The most common changes reported by Member States were reductions in the amount of sick pay and restrictions on when sick pay becomes payable.

**f. Maternity / Paternity Leave**

**Figure 1.14:** **Maternity / Paternity Leave across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

22 Member States responded to this question. Eleven Member States (**Austria, Belgium, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Slovakia**) reported changes to maternity/paternity arrangements since 2009. The majority of these changes were of a positive nature and provided enhanced benefits. Ten Member States (**the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Lithuania, Sweden, and the Netherlands)** reported no change.

In **Austria**, male public employees may now take up to four weeks’ unpaid paternity leave during the period of the mother’s statutory maternity leave.

In **Belgium** there have been a number of changes including the extension of maternity/paternity leave to parents of the same sex and an increase in the maximum duration of maternity/paternity leave from three to four months.

In **Finland**, the duration of paternity leave has been extended to 54 days and can be paid in respect of more than one child.

In **Hungary**, extra parental leave is available up to a maximum of 7 working days for more than two children under 16 years of age.

In **Malta**, foster parents are now eligible for parental leave.

In **Poland**, since 2012 there are two options for maternity leave – 6 months at 100% of salary or 12 months at 80%.

**g. Family Friendly Policies**

**Figure 1.15:** **Family Friendly Policies across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Twenty One Member States responded to this question. Twelve Member States (**Austria, Belgium, Estonia, France, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia**)indicated that there had been changes to family friendly policies since 2009. The majority of these changes were positive and provided enhanced benefits.

In **France**, flexible working measures such as teleworking have been introduced.

Since 2011, civil servants in **Greece** may take unpaid leave for a period of five years.

In **Ireland**, there have been a number of changes in relation to Force Majeure Leave, Paid Family Illness Leave, Bereavement Leave, the Career Break Scheme, Parental Leave, the Shorter Working Year Scheme and Unpaid Leave for Domestic Reasons.

In **Italy**, special leave for the care of people with severe disabilities has been extended.

In **Malta**, public employees now have the right to work reduced hours to care for a child of up to 16 years (previously, the limit was 12 years). Adoptive leave is now treated the same as maternity leave.

**h. Methods of Recruitment and Selection to the Civil Service**

**Figure 1.16:** **Methods of Recruitment and Selection to the Civil Service across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Nineteen Member States responded to this question. Seventeen Member States (**Belgium, Bulgaria, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and the UK**) reported changes to the methods of recruitment and selection to the Civil Service.

Two Member States (**Denmark and Norway**) reported no major changes.

Some Member States reported measures to improve the recruitment/selection procedures for the Civil Service. In **Belgium**, for example, the recruitment timeline has been accelerated. The three types of procedures (internal to the department, inter-federal mobility and external) are now run simultaneously and not consecutively as before, with a single comparative ranking of the candidates counting for all three.

**Estonia** introduced a new Public Service Act with a requirement for open competition, increased transparency in recruitment, a guarantee of equal public access and a new public service recruitment portal.

Increased use of open recruitment is reported by **Estonia, Germany, Ireland,** **Poland, Slovakia**, and the **UK.**

In **Malta**, there has been an increase in the use of open recruitment at Ministry level.

Three Member States (**Ireland, Slovenia and the UK**) also reported a full or partial recruitment freeze in addition to changes to the methods of recruitment and selection to the Civil Service. A further five Member States (**Austria**, **Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Greece, and Italy**) reported a full or partial recruitment freeze alone. (Recruitment freezes have not been interpreted as changes to the methods of recruitment and selection to the Civil Service. As a result, these figures are not represented in Figure 1.16).

**i. Structure of the Senior Public Service (SPS)**

**Figure 1.17:** **Structure of the Senior Public Service across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Twenty seven Member States responded to this question. Four Member States (**Austria, Hungary, Ireland and Latvia**) reported changes in relation to the structure of the senior public service. Six Member States reported no specific senior public service (**Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Sweden**) as a distinct element of the Civil Service. No change to the structure of the senior public service is reported by 17 Member States (**Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain and the UK**). Of those reporting change:

In **Austria**, the proportion of women in top managerial positions increased from 21.3% (2009) to 23.2% (June 2012). Out of a total of 69 Directorates General, 16 are currently headed by women. Measurements like gender auditing and the Cross Mentoring programme are available to support this positive trend.

In **Ireland** the Senior Public Service (SPS) has been established to promote a more integrated Public Service and strengthen its senior management and leadership capacity.

The new Government that came into power in **Hungary** in 2010 has introduced reforms in the senior public service.

In **the** **Netherlands**, the top management of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been included in the Senior Public Service.

A number of Member States identified a senior public service cadre as an option for further consideration and possible development. **Latvia** considered the SPS as a key area for Civil Service reform and, in this context, expects to introduce a shared service centre for the selection of senior public servants.In the majority of Member States no change has been is reported to the structure of the Senior Public Service.

**j. Recruitment and Selection of the Senior Public Service**

**Figure 1.18:** **Recruitment and Selection for the Senior Public Service across EUPAN Member States – 2012 vs. 2006**

Twenty seven Member States responded to this question. Thirteen Member States (**the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and the Netherlands**) reported that there had been changes in relation to the recruitment and selection to the Senior Public Service. Many of these changes relate to the regularisation/standardisation of selection procedures:

Some Member States, including **France,** reported on a review of the professional knowledge and/or experience required for entry into the Senior Public Service.

In **Ireland**, there have been a number of initiatives, including the establishment of a pilot executive coaching programme and a mobility subgroup of the Senior Public Service Management Committee to promote mobility across the public service. Since 2007, all Assistant Secretary (Deputy DG) posts are advertised by way of open competition. Since 2011, all Secretary General (DG) posts are advertised openly.

In **Malta**, there is an increased focus on the core competencies for the position; applications may now be submitted by electronic means and candidates must sit a psychometric test followed by an interview with the Senior Appointments Advisory Committee.

In **Italy**, *Reform decree n◦ 150* sets out a new format for the appointment and recruitment of managers and senior managers in the public service.

**Lithuania** is also reforming the selection of senior civil servants by establishing new qualification requirements and a more focused examination of candidates for senior civil servant positions.

1. **Overview of Other Responses**

The following is an overview of the responses received from the **EU Commission, Croatia, Montenegro, Norway and Switzerland.** As these were not represented in the 2006 Survey, no comparative data is available. Instead, the focus here is on HR Reforms since 2009.

1. **EU Commission**

The EU Commission reported that there had been a number of HR reforms since 2009. Regarding **family friendly policies**, the Commission indicated that:

* A Decision on Telework has been adopted which encourages the use of structural telework, fixes a target of 3,000 teleworkers by 2014 and offers the possibility of up to 30 days occasional telework per year; and
* Two new arrangements have been added to the existing five arrangements for part-time work.

Regarding **methods of recruitment and selection to the Civil Service,** the Commission indicated that:

* Selection methods were revised so that selection is now by means of a competency-based rather than knowledge-based assessment;
* In the period 2008-2010, the European Personnel Selection Office (EPSO) introduced measures to modernise the analysis and planning of staffing needs and the organisation of generalist competitions; and
* The EPSO Development Programme, launched in 2008, provides for a number of measures to improve the speed of competitions and the quality of reserve lists.
1. **Croatia**

Croatia also reported that there had been a number of HR reforms since 2009. Regarding the **general terms and conditions of service,** Croatia indicated that several statutes had been introduced which, amongst other matters:

* Improved the performance appraisal system;
* Increased the mobility of Civil Servants;
* Strengthened the responsibility of Civil Servants; and
* Introduced the possibility of occupational training in state bodies without establishing an employment relationship.

Regarding **rates of pay,** Croatia indicated that draft legislation, which seeks to introduce a unified salary system for Civil Servants based on job classification, is currently being considered by a Working Group comprising representatives of the Croatian Government and Civil Service trade unions.

Regarding **methods of recruitment and selection to the Civil Service,** Croatia indicated that Civil Servants are recruited into the Civil Service on the basis of a public competition procedure, unless otherwise stipulated by law.

In respect of Senior Civil Servants, selection also takes place on the basis of a public competition procedure. A public competition procedure is implemented by the selection board, which always includes a representative of the Ministry of Public Administration. The selection board establishes a list of candidates who meet formal requirements stated in the competition notice, and invites them for an interview to determine their professional knowledge, competences and skills, as well as previous professional achievements. The interview with the candidates is conducted by the head of the relevant body or a person authorised by him/her for this task. Based on the results of interviews, the head of the body proposes a candidate for nomination to the Government.

1. **Montenegro**

Montenegro also reported that there had been a number of HR reforms since 2009. Regarding the **general terms and conditions of service,** Montenegro indicated that a new Law on Civil Servants and State Employees, which entered into force in January 2013, introduced a merit-based system and made amendments to grading, probation and disciplinary procedures.

Regarding **rates of pay,** Montenegro indicated that Article 11 of the Law on Salaries of Civil Servants and State Employees, which determines pay grades by reference to qualifications and experience, has applied since January 2013.

Regarding **pension entitlements or conditions of qualification,** Montenegro indicated that there had been several changes to both the conditions for retirement and the conditions for early retirement.

Regarding the **methods of recruitment and selection to the Civil Service,** Montenegro indicated that the new Law on Civil Servants and State Employees made several changes to the recruitment process. These included changes to:

* the advertisement process, which is by means of internal advertisement followed by public advertisement
* the drawing up of lists of candidates, which is done by the Human Resources Management Agency (HRMA) by reference to professional and performance qualities;
* the testing procedure, which is done by a Commission (comprised of representatives of the HRMA and the particular state agency and skills experts), is based on a situational assessment; and
* the short-listing of candidates by the HRMA, which is then submitted to the Head of the State Agency.

Regarding the **methods of recruitment and selection to the senior public service,** Montenegro indicated that there had also been several changes:

* recruitment is by means of public competition;
* the HRMA draws up a list of candidates except where the vacancy is for a senior public service position in the Service of the Parliament, in which case an authorised civil servant draws up the list;
* testing is done by a Commission (comprised of representatives of the HRMA and the particular agency and an expert in the area of competency of that agency); and
* the Head of the State Agency proposes the appointment to the Government.
1. **Norway**

Norway reported that there had been a number of HR reforms since 2009. These included:

* The upgrading of **rates of pay** in accordance with agreements with central trade unions during the period 2009 to 2012;
* The implementation of a **pension reform** in 2011; and
* In relation to **family friendly policies,** the renewal of the tripartite Agreement on a more Inclusive Working Life in 2010.
1. **Switzerland**

Switzerland reported that there had been a number of HR reforms since 2009. These included changes in relation to:

* Working time models;
* Holiday regulations;
* Compensation system;
* Salary parity between men and women;
* Reference system for salaries; and
* Change and termination of employment contract.