



## Results of our November survey on the accommodation conditions in our office buildings and when teleworking at home

In summary, **the Federation** notes that:

- Two thirds of **colleagues reject "HotDesking"**: this nomadism imposed by the Administration!
- Almost one in two respondents say they consider **changing DG to avoid "HotDesking"**.
- Three out of four colleagues request that the Administration organize the **alternate sharing of offices**, each keeping a fixed place in more traditional offices.
- One third still has **trouble in teleworking from home**.
- 87% expect **the Administration to compensate for the costs induced by teleworking from home** as planned (thanks to the constant efforts of **the Federation**) in its draft Decision on "Hybrid" work.

**The Federation** asks the administration to finally consider its proposals to take into account the expectations of its staff !

**The Federation** now presents its detailed analysis of the results.

Many colleagues are returning to the Commission's offices, but rather than going back to their familiar office where they would have been able to acclimatise after 20 months of teleworking, they find themselves facing a major deterioration in their working environment.

Indeed, **the Administration is taking advantage** of the fact that colleagues have been forced to move away from their offices because of the pandemic to advance its disastrous plans to introduce "hot desking" systematically into new buildings (LOI 107, Copernicus...) when allocating office space!

In order to fight more effectively against the most harmful aspects of the changes decided by this Administration, which does not explain its choices and impose them without consultation with the staff or with its representatives, **the Federation invited you** a month ago **to make your opinions known by means of an anonymous Survey via EU SURVEY**.

**Here are the results based on the more than 3000 responses received from colleagues who took time to participate and whom we thank:**

**To question 1: How do you feel about the ongoing transformation of your workspace in the Commission buildings into a "hot-desking" environment ?**

**67% found this transformation unacceptable;** 19% are indifferent to it and 14% considered it acceptable.

**The Federation** witnesses, survey after survey, **the massive rejection** of this form of office accommodation. **The Federation** neither understands nor tolerate the Administration's stubbornness in making working conditions more precarious and demands an immediate end to the use of "hot-desking", which is as useless as it is ineffective, and **which furthermore increases the risks of psychosocial problems and burnout...** not to mention the health risk that this generalised personal proximity will accentuate.

**To question 2: As an alternative to hot-desking, would you favour a shared accommodation solution between colleagues in the same unit which ensures that everyone keeps a fixed location in traditional offices?**

**74% of colleagues are in favour of this approach** of alternating occupation of traditional offices; 14% are indifferent and 12% against.

**The Federation** notes that three quarters of the respondents ask the Administration to organise the sharing of offices between colleagues in the same unit, each keeping a fixed location in more traditional offices.

**To question 3: The reduction in the number of our buildings is also most often accompanied by hot-desking. Would you consider changing DGs to avoid such office conditions ?**

**43% of respondents say they are ready to change jobs and DGs** in order to have better accommodation conditions in the office; 36% do not consider it and 21% do not comment.

**To question 4: The reduction in the number of our buildings is also accompanied by an even greater reduction in parking spaces, without alternatives. Would you consider changing your DG to improve your access to more parking?**

**While 52% of respondents do not plan to change jobs or DGs** to have better parking possibilities, 27% of colleagues, and therefore a significant number, are actually considering it and 21% do not comment at this stage.

**The Federation** notes that the problem of **reducing the number of car parks is seen as a difficulty** by a significant minority: a quarter of those polled. For them but also for all the other colleagues, **the Federation** has formulated [concrete proposals](#) for the Commission to act in order to promote multiple forms of mobility and in particular those which are virtuous in terms of the environment: cycling, walking, public transport, carpooling, peripheral car parks ...

**To question 5: Do you consider your current home working conditions satisfactory ?**

58% answered yes; but **34% are in difficulty.**

**The Federation** therefore notes **that more than a third of colleagues** continue to face difficulties after more than 20 months of compulsory teleworking. The Administration has admittedly allowed certain improvements in terms of equipment, but this does not resolve the material or family organisation situations, particularly for those whose homes are not large enough to have a dedicated office space.

**The Commission must look into this situation** and respond to this need for assistance which still concerns a third of colleagues.

**To question 6: Through its constant efforts and on the basis of your massive response to its surveys, the Federation has led the Administration to consider financial compensation for telework in its new decision on "hybrid" work in its article 12.2: "If appropriate, DG HR may adopt a decision providing for a lump sum covering certain costs of teleworkers."**

**Do you consider that the administration should compensate the costs incurred (energy, water...) as a consequence of teleworking at home?**

**24% ask for compensation to be paid to colleagues with modest salaries;**

**63% ask that compensation be paid to everyone;**

**5% are against it and 7% are indifferent.**

**The Federation** notes that **87% of respondents expect the Commission**, like national administrations and large companies in our Member States, **to provide financial compensation for the additional costs incurred by teleworkers**; this compensation being easily financed from savings made on buildings, unused "mission" budgets, etc.

