

2012 PROMOTION EXERCISE

REPORT OF THE JOINT MONITORING COMMITTEE

1. CONTEXT OF THE EXERCISE

- This report refers to the first promotion exercise conducted under the new General Implementing Provisions (GIPs) of article 45 of the Staff Regulations adopted on November 14th, 2011. (period: 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012).
- Its aim is to present an overview of the entire course of the past exercise, to reflect on its results and to set out recommendations for the 2013 exercise.
- The Joint Monitoring Committee (JMC) is set to meet once at the end of the promotion exercise with the aim to evaluate its results and propose solutions for the future exercises respectively (article 5 of the GIPs 45).

2. AGENDA OF THE EXERCISE – USE OF RESSOURCES

- The exercise met the objectives of the new system implemented in 2012 (simplification of the procedure, reintroduction of a dialogue between DGs and staff representatives before the publication of the DG lists, considerable decrease of the appeals and therefore of the workload of the working groups and Joint Promotion Committee). The substantial decrease of the number of appeals in particular led to a smooth conduct of the whole exercise and to a less resource-consuming procedure than in previous exercises conducted under the old GIPs.
- The main steps of the exercise were implemented successfully according to the planning without any severe delays. The ability to respect the planning allowed for the signature of the promotion decisions in October. This in turn allowed for the promotions to be included in the November salaries.
- When the exercise was designed in 2011, it was planned to organise the appraisal in winter and the promotion phase in autumn. The promotion process was scheduled to last 6 months, with the aim to finalise the appeal phase and promotion decisions in October: this objective was met in 2012. However, given the work volume and the sequencing generated by the system, it is considered that the promotion process cannot last less than 6 months.

3. ABOUT THE APPRAISAL PHASE

The JMC is not mandated by the GIPs Article 45 to examine the appraisal exercise as such, as they limit its scope only to the promotion exercise. However, given the fact that the appraisal report is a key element in the promotion exercise, the JMC felt it useful to discuss the main events and elements of the appraisal exercise in its report. The JMC recommends that a similar mandate is given for the next exercises.

3.1 PROCESS

- The 2012 appraisal phase was launched in January 2012 and was concluded in April 2012 when the appeal phase against the reports ended.
- This phase was based on the GIPs for Article 43 of the staff regulations. The main steps of this phase were: self-assessment by the job holder, dialogue held between the reporting officer and the job holder, appraisal report established by the reporting officer, communication of the reports to the job holders, possibility of appeals against the reports, final decision on the reports by the appeal assessors.
- The aim of this phase was to appraise the efficiency, abilities and the conduct in the service of every official and temporary agent of the Commission.
- Out of a total of 21,695 reports launched, 99,4 % were completed by 23 April 2012, which was the target date for the final decision of the Appeal Assessors.
- Only 193 appeals were made of which 92,1% have been dealt with by the Appeal Assessors by 23 April 2012: the number of appeals has considerably decreased in comparison to last year's exercise (1716 appeals against the report in 2011). The JMC has received no feedback on the results of lodged appeals against the report (change or no change of the report by the appeal assessor) and recommends such data to be compiled for next year's report.
- At the end of 2012, out of 21,695 reports, only 32 were not finalised mostly for reasons of long justified absence.

3.2 QUALITY OF THE APPRAISAL REPORTS

- Following the recommendations of the 2011 Joint Monitoring Committee report and in the context of the launching of the new appraisal and promotion exercises, the vast majority of DGs have organised one or more training sessions for Reporting Officers, before the launching of the new appraisal exercise, in order to enhance as much as possible the quality of the appraisal reports.
- According to the groups examining the appeals against the non-proposal for promotion in September 2012, it is considered that the appraisal reports were generally of acceptable quality. However, some issues pointed out in previous years were found once again in a certain number of reports:
 - Absence of objectives and assessment criteria for numerous jobholders
 - Reports being too short, lacking information, not detailed enough to enable an accurate assessment of the performance, and/or reports mechanically copied from previous exercises.
 - A tendency to homogenization of the reports, which could in the future make difficult the comparison of merits in the grade. This remark should be taken into consideration in the new trainings for reporting officers organised by DG HR for the 2013 appraisal exercise.

4. PROMOTION PHASE

- This first promotion phase under the new rules started in May 2012 and was concluded in October 2012 with the publication of the list of the staff promoted to a higher grade.
- The procedure is based on the GIPs for Article 45 of the staff regulations. The main steps of this phase were: calculation of promotion possibilities by DG/grade according to the methods described in explanatory Annex 12 which has been added to the final report at the request of the JMC, launch of promotion exercise, consultation of Reporting Officers, comparison of merits, discussion with staff representatives, proposals communicated to staff and sent to Joint Promotion Committee, deadline for staff to make an appeal against non-promotion, draft decisions of the Joint Promotion Committee Preparatory groups, recommendations of the Joint Promotion Committees, final comparison of merits by the Appointing Authority and adoption of the list of officials promoted.

The JMC staff representatives wish to add that the discussion of the DG promotion proposals with the staff representatives lead to 167 changes in those promotion proposals Commission-wide (figure provided by the staff representatives). The JMC staff representatives recommend relevant data to be compiled for the next exercises.

- The promotion procedure is conducted on the basis of three criteria described in article 4, of the GIPs 45, namely the appraisal reports drawn up since the last promotion or, failing that, since their recruitment, the use of languages, the level of responsibilities.
- The JMC studied the 5-year rolling average promotion rates for all grades (Annex 5) in comparison with the percentages laid down in Annex IB of the staff regulations. The staff regulations also provide for a number of exceptions described in Annex XIII which were applicable until the 2011 exercise and thus still affecting the five-year rolling averages for a number of grades.

The staff representatives raise the issue of the non-respect of the Annex IB rates over 5 rolling years for a number of grades: AD13, AD12, AD10, AST9, AST1, AST5/C and AST4/C. In those grades the average 5-year rolling rate is below the Annex IB percentages. In other grades the average 5-year rolling rate respects the Annex IB, while in some grades the 5-year rolling rate is above the Annex IB percentages. The overall situation seems to be improving but is not yet in conformity.

Under the new promotion system in force since the 2012 exercise the Annex IB rates were "translated" into average time spent in the grade. The Annex 7 has been reformulated at the request of the JMC to allow the verification of the average seniority in the grade in the 2012 exercise.

5. 2012 TRANSITIONAL MEASURES

- As stated in Annex 2 of the GIPs 45, at the start of the 2012 promotion exercise, the total number of promotion points accumulated by each official, following deduction for a promotion where appropriate, had to be compared with the promotion threshold set at the end of the 2011 promotion exercise.
- Officials who, at the end of the 2011 exercise, were twelve promotion points or less below the promotion threshold for their grade, were brought to the attention of their directorate-general by the DG HR (i.e. "flagged" in Sysper2).
- If, following the comparison of merits, an official who at the end of the 2011 exercise was five promotion points or less below the promotion threshold for his or her grade was not on the list of officials proposed for promotion, the Director-General had to send an explanation based on a comparison of merits in the grade in question. The explanation had also to be provided in the case of officials who, following a comparison of merits, were not included on the list even though they were within six promotion points of the promotion threshold for their grade at the end of the 2011 exercise and received an average of at least six promotion points over the last three promotion exercises (i.e. justification for "deflagging").
 - The Joint Promotion Committee received 41 justifications for "deflagging" justifying the non-proposal for promotion of AD officials. Out of 41, 18 justifications were based on absence of validated third language, 14 were linked with non-activity (leave on personal grounds, pension or invalidity), 4 were based on performance problems and 5 were based on other reasons. In conclusion, more than 78% were grounded on absence of validated third language and non-activity.
 - For AST officials, the Joint Promotion Committee received 44 justifications for "deflagging" justifying the non-proposal for promotion. Out of 44, 23 justifications were based on absence of validated third language, 7 were linked with non-activity (leave on personal grounds, pension or invalidity), 11 were based on performance problems and 3 were based on other reasons. In conclusion, almost 70% were grounded on absence of validated third language and non-activity.
- The staff representatives raise the flagging mechanism as less efficient in specific grades. They draw the JMC's attention in particular on:
 - AD12 grade: the AD12 promotion threshold under the previous system was not yet considered as stable but still descending – from 41 (2010) to 33 (2011), leading to less JH being flagged as -5/6* as compared to other grades, thus penalising the AD12 grade.

The staff representatives conclude that the JH in this grade flagged as -12 are to be brought to the attention of their respective DG with the same implications as the -5/6* flag, i.e. automatic promotion unless justified by the DG.

- 5044 possibilities of promotion were made available to the DGs during the first step of the exercise. After the comparison of merits, a total of six possibilities of promotions remained unused by DGs.
- The officials referred to in paragraph 2 and who have not been promoted in 2012 will remain flagged in Sysper2 as long as they have not been promoted, as stated in the GIPs 45.
- The staff representatives underline the average age at the first promotion in the AD5 and AST1 grade (shown from Annex 6 as 37 for AD5 and 39,5 for AST1) leading to estimated retirement ages of 75 and beyond based on an average full career.

6. FLEXIBILITY TOOLS

- "Cascading down" possibilities of promotion: exceptionally, at the occasion of the first year of the new exercise, a certain flexibility was granted by DG HR to small entities, which did not receive possibilities of promotion in certain grades.
- In concrete terms, a possibility of promotion not used in a superior grade could be allocated in an inferior grade. The maximum number of cascades was related to the population of the DG and was limited to 4 in each function group (AD and AST).

Population in each function group	Maximum number of cascades
1 – 49	2
50-149	3
150+	4

- *Definition of the maximum number of cascades in a DG*
- DGs could also address exceptional requests to the Joint Promotion Committee to ask for an additional possibility of promotion, in specific cases.
 - 42 notes were sent for AD officials: 52% of them were requesting an additional promotion for particularly deserving officials, 28% were sent by small entities with few or with no possibilities of promotion in the grade, 13% were linked with a return from leave on personal grounds after the publication of the DG lists, 7% were linked to the attribution of additional points as a consequence of an Art.90 procedure.
 - 34 notes were sent for AST officials: 44% of them were requesting an additional promotion for particularly deserving officials, 38% were sent by small entities with few or with no possibilities of promotion in the grade, 15% were linked with a return from leave on personal grounds after the publication of the DG lists.

7. APPEAL PHASE

7.1 ORGANISATION OF THE APPEAL PHASE

- The appeals against the non-proposal for promotion were analysed by two working parties (Joint Preparatory Groups), one for AD and one for AST. The role of the working groups was to examine the appeals against non-proposal for promotion on the basis of the criteria described in GIPs 45, to issue draft decisions confirming the non-proposal for promotion or recommending the promotion of the official at the attention of the Joint Promotion Committee, to examine DGs exceptional requests and justifications for "deflagging", to transmit the draft decisions to the Joint Promotion Committee.
- In 2012, 5% of the total number of promotions was attributed to the Joint Preparatory Groups during the appeal phase (143 AD and 127 AST, total of 270 possibilities of promotion), with the possibility of cascading down (4 cascades per function group granted by DG HR before the launching of the working sessions in September). The internal rules of the working groups introduced also the possibility to examine, on their own initiative, cases of non-proposed officials, who did not introduce an appeal (*auto-saisine*).

7.2 MAIN OUTPUTS OF THE APPEAL PHASE

- Detailed appeals by grade, for AD and for AST are presented in Annex 2.

Appeals against the non-proposal for promotion

- Number of appeals = 795 (469 AD and 326 AST)
- 3.5 % of the staff with a promotion file introduced an appeal against non-promotion
- On the basis of the analyses and conclusions of the AD and AST working groups, the AD and AST Joint Promotion Committees transmitted their recommendations to the Appointing Authority (Annex 11). In the great majority of cases, the Appointing Authority subsequently followed these recommendations. The JMC notes that the Joint Promotion Committees' recommendations were not followed by the Appointing Authority in 4 AD and 15 AST cases. The Appointing Authority added on its own initiative 11 AD and 12 AST promotions.

7.3 FEEDBACK ON THE APPEAL PHASE

The feedback on the appeal phase is based mainly on information provided by the presidents and members of the working groups examining the appeals against the non-proposal for promotion, as well as on discussions with representatives of HR units.

- Regarding the organisation of the appeal phase:

- The support documents for the examination of the appeals, exceptional requests and "deflagging" justifications by the working groups were sent five working days before the starting date of the working sessions scheduled on 3 September.
- Two weeks were initially planned for the sessions of the working groups; however, they had to concentrate their work on a shorter period, as some of the members were not available in early September. The draft decisions were issued and transmitted to the Joint Promotion Committee during the last week of September.
- Regarding the functioning of the groups:
 - Discussions were generally held in a very positive and constructive atmosphere. In the AD working group, the totality of the draft decisions were reached by consensus. In the AST working group, 17,8% of the draft decisions were reached by vote.
 - During the sessions, the presidents of the working groups informed DG HR about grades with "deficit" or a "surplus" of deserving officials. In accordance with their members, they addressed a note to the Joint Promotion Committee recommending the reallocation of the "unused" possibilities of promotion to an extent exceeding the four possibilities of cascades per function group and, in the case of the AST working group, with the use of cascades from inferior grades to superior grades. The Joint Promotion Committee transmitted this recommendation to the Appointing Authority, which allowed extra flexibility in the grades where it was justified (i.e. entry grades) and rejected however the cascades from inferior grades to superior grades.
- Regarding the "strategy of DGs" to use the appeal phase:
 - In a some cases, it was considered that some DGs have continued to "use" the appeal phase to allocate more possibilities of promotion to their staff and thus overcome the quotas by for instance leaving the jobholder close to the promotion threshold 2011, counting on the jobholder to appeal and receive an additional promotion during the appeal phase, or by introducing an important number of exceptional requests.

8. PROMOTED OFFICIALS

- In the 2012 exercise, in total 5,263 officials have been promoted (5,832 in 2011), which corresponds to an average promotion rate of 25% (26.3% in 2011), see Annex 3. These officials met the eligibility criteria for promotion. A separate promotion decision will be organised in 2013 to include officials who met the eligibility criteria after the closure of the promotion exercise (i.e. officials who managed to demonstrate their third language before 31 December 2012, return from leave on personal grounds of a -5/-6* flagged official, etc.). The list of these promoted officials will also be published after the signature of the promotion decisions.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE APPRAISAL AND PROMOTION EXERCISES

- In the context of the contributions done by the Ad hoc group following the JH's declaration to have been elected or nominated by the staff representation for certain tasks during the appraisal period (via the appropriate tick box in the self-assessment), it is recommended that a similar tick box be made available for the staff designated by the administration for similar tasks with the sole aim of bringing these additional tasks performed by the JH to the attention of the JH's reporting officer. The flag will not trigger any related contributions or appraisals on these additional tasks, but will be used only to clearly draw the attention of the reporting officer to the additional tasks completed by the JH.
- Training for reporting officers is commonly organised at the beginning of the appraisal exercise. In an effort of raising awareness of the reporting officers for the importance of high quality reports, it is suggested that the staff representatives who participate in the appeal phase of the promotion exercise (via the working groups and promotion committees) will be given the opportunity to participate in these trainings, thus helping to deliver to the participants the importance of well written reports which in turn will increase the comparability of the reports which becomes a vital element in the promotion exercise.
- The JMC recommends to maintain the possibility of cascading promotions possibilities to the following exercise, as it has shown to provide a much needed flexibility during the 2012 exercise.
- Request from the staff representatives for more detailed information on the calculation of the promotion quota given the problems encountered in the past promotion exercise where some grades were under or over "allocated". In this respect the explanatory Annex sent to the JPC on the allocation of quota was added as Annex 12. The staff representatives requested to have more detailed information on these calculations at Commission's level, i.e. before these quota are distributed to the DGs.
- With regard to the discussion of the DG promotion proposals with the staff representatives, the staff representatives strongly suggest a more efficient and rationalised organisation of these discussions between staff representatives and Directors General in the form of a system with time slots to be communicated to the DGs.
- The Appointing Authority is invited to give special attention to the entry grades (in particular AD5 and AST1) as the percentage of JH that stay longer than normal in these grades is much larger than what is foreseen in the Sefcovic guarantees.
- With regard to the work of the JMC itself:
 - the JMC, convinced that there are no confidential elements in its report, recommends the Appointing Authority to consider publishing the report.
 - After the 2013 exercise the JMC should hold its first meeting at the beginning of December and to finish its work no later than 2,5 months after the publication of the list promoted officials.

Annexes

- Statistics

Annexes identified with * will be made public via the promotion webpage on MyIntracomm.

Annex 1: List of promoted officials to the upper grade in 2012

Annex 2: Appeals per grade, all budgets

Annex 3*: Promotion rates per grade, all budgets

Annex 4: Promotions per budget and grade

Annex 5: Average promotion rates over 5 rolling years (2003-2012)

Annex 6*: Seniority and age of promoted officials

Annex 7: Seniority breakdown of promoted officials

Annex 8: Average seniority of promoted officials over 5 rolling years (2003-2012)

Annex 9: Reference population for 2012 the appraisal exercise

Annex 10: Reference population for the 2012 promotion exercise

Annex 11: Number of promotions in 2012

Annex 12: Note explicative sur le calcul et la répartition des possibilités de promotion

- Minutes

Annex 13: JPC AD minutes

Annex 14: JPC AST minutes



Annex 3 - Exercise 2012 - Commission promotion rate

All budgets, Officials, 1ère filière excluded. Grades excluded from promotion are not in this table.

FG	Cat	Grade	Final promotion list	Pop ref 01.01.2011	Annex IB rates	Total 2012 Promotions	Reference promotion rate (Promoted over pop on 01/01/11)		
AD	AD	AD13	84	1.767	20%	84	4,8%		
		AD12	613	2.743	25%	613	22,3%		
		AD11	243	651	25%	243	37,3%		
		AD10	201	1.153	25%	201	17,4%		
		AD09	273	683	25%	273	40,0%		
		AD08	251	785	33%	251	32,0%		
		AD07	329	1.030	33%	329	31,9%		
		AD06	388	1.187	33%	388	32,7%		
		AD05	437	1.220	33%	437	35,8%		
		AD Total			2.819	11.219		2.819	25,1%
AD Total			2.819	11.219		2.819	25,1%		
AST	AST	AST10	54	299	20%	54	18,1%		
		AST09	115	804	20%	115	14,3%		
		AST08	194	856	25%	194	22,7%		
		AST07	243	935	25%	243	26,0%		
		AST06	166	630	25%	166	26,3%		
		AST05	243	1.003	25%	243	24,2%		
		AST04	244	591	33%	244	41,3%		
		AST03	318	1.053	33%	318	30,2%		
		AST02	234	701	33%	234	33,4%		
		AST01	216	583	33%	216	37,0%		
		AST Total			2.027	7.455		2.027	27,2%
		AST/C	AST06/C	103	831	25%	103	12,4%	
			AST05/C	119	555	25%	119	21,4%	
			AST04/C	110	484	33%	110	22,7%	
			AST03/C	14	24	33%	14	58,3%	
			AST02/C	2	4	33%	2	50,0%	
		AST/C Total			348	1.898		348	18,3%
		AST/D	AST04/D	44	215	33%	44	20,5%	
			AST03/D	-	1	33%	-	0,0%	
			AST02/D	1	1	33%	1	100,0%	
AST/D Total			45	217		45	20,7%		
AST Total			2.420	9.570		2.420	25,3%		
Grand Total			5.239	20.789		5.239	25,2%		



Annex 6 - Promoted breakdown per age and promotion seniority

Officials, additional wave not included, 1ère filière excluded

FCT	Cat	Grade	Gender	Promoted	Promotion seniority			Promoted age on 31/12/2012			
					Avg	Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	
AD	AD	AD13	F	17	3,6	2,5	5,0	54,9	48,0	59,1	
			M	67	3,8	2,0	6,0	57,6	46,3	64,6	
			AD13 Total		84	3,8	2,0	6,0	57,1	46,3	64,6
		AD12	F	187	4,2	2,0	6,8	51,8	40,5	63,5	
			M	426	4,2	1,2	6,8	52,4	40,8	64,8	
			AD12 Total		613	4,2	1,2	6,8	52,3	40,5	64,8
		AD11	F	97	3,8	2,0	4,8	47,8	37,7	63,7	
			M	146	3,9	2,0	7,5	49,3	37,2	64,1	
			AD11 Total		243	3,9	2,0	7,5	48,7	37,2	64,1
		AD10	F	75	2,9	2,0	7,5	45,3	37,5	61,4	
			M	126	3,1	2,0	9,3	46,5	36,2	63,8	
			AD10 Total		201	3,0	2,0	9,3	46,1	36,2	63,8
		AD09	F	118	3,7	2,0	4,8	45,5	34,2	66,4	
			M	155	3,8	2,0	5,8	46,6	37,0	61,9	
			AD09 Total		273	3,8	2,0	5,8	46,1	34,2	66,4
		AD08	F	110	2,4	2,0	8,0	43,5	33,3	59,2	
			M	141	2,5	2,0	5,9	45,0	32,5	57,3	
			AD08 Total		251	2,5	2,0	8,0	44,3	32,5	59,2
		AD07	F	143	2,7	2,0	5,1	41,6	32,1	59,4	
			M	186	2,7	2,0	4,8	43,0	33,9	63,8	
			AD07 Total		329	2,7	2,0	5,1	42,4	32,1	63,8
		AD06	F	193	2,7	2,0	4,3	38,9	29,9	62,7	
			M	195	2,8	2,0	4,6	40,8	31,6	61,1	
		AD06 Total		388	2,7	2,0	4,6	39,8	29,9	62,7	
	AD05	F	240	3,2	2,0	4,5	36,5	28,0	59,0		
		M	197	3,1	2,0	4,5	37,6	29,3	53,3		
		AD05 Total		437	3,1	2,0	4,5	37,0	28,0	59,0	
		AD Total		2.819	3,3	1,2	9,3	45,1	28,0	66,4	
AD Total				2.819	3,3	1,2	9,3	45,1	28,0	66,4	
AST	AST	AST10	F	11	8,2	3,0	11,8	58,9	55,5	64,5	
			M	43	9,2	7,8	14,8	58,9	52,1	64,3	
			AST10 Total		54	9,0	3,0	14,8	58,9	52,1	64,5
		AST09	F	29	3,9	2,0	4,8	56,8	48,2	62,8	
			M	86	4,1	2,0	5,0	56,2	48,4	63,7	
			AST09 Total		115	4,0	2,0	5,0	56,4	48,2	63,7
		AST08	F	84	3,3	2,0	5,8	51,9	41,4	62,8	
			M	110	3,5	2,0	5,8	51,4	41,1	60,9	
			AST08 Total		194	3,4	2,0	5,8	51,6	41,1	62,8
		AST07	F	146	3,6	2,0	7,0	51,9	36,6	64,3	
			M	97	3,7	2,0	6,7	49,4	36,4	63,5	
			AST07 Total		243	3,6	2,0	7,0	50,9	36,4	64,3
		AST06	F	130	3,8	2,0	5,8	52,2	35,7	65,0	
			M	36	4,1	2,0	7,7	52,5	37,2	62,5	
			AST06 Total		166	3,8	2,0	7,7	52,3	35,7	65,0
		AST05	F	179	3,4	2,0	4,8	47,0	37,4	61,1	
			M	64	3,4	2,0	5,8	48,6	37,4	60,3	
			AST05 Total		243	3,4	2,0	5,8	47,4	37,4	61,1
		AST04	F	137	3,0	2,0	4,8	45,6	33,1	63,3	
			M	107	3,1	2,0	10,8	45,2	34,4	61,3	
			AST04 Total		244	3,1	2,0	10,8	45,4	33,1	63,3



Annex 6 - Promoted breakdown per age and promotion seniority

Officials, additional wave not included, 1ère filière excluded

FCT	Cat	Grade	Gender	Promoted	Promotion seniority			Promoted age on 31/12/2012			
					Avg	Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	
AST	AST	AST03	F	204	2,4	2,0	4,9	40,5	29,2	62,7	
			M	114	2,8	2,0	6,0	40,9	30,2	59,1	
		AST03 Total			318	2,5	2,0	6,0	40,6	29,2	62,7
		AST02	F	194	2,7	2,0	4,0	40,8	29,9	65,4	
			M	40	2,5	2,0	3,8	40,6	31,8	53,6	
		AST02 Total			234	2,7	2,0	4,0	40,7	29,9	65,4
		AST01	F	191	3,2	2,0	5,9	39,4	29,1	63,8	
			M	25	3,4	2,5	5,9	40,3	33,6	56,3	
		AST01 Total			216	3,2	2,0	5,9	39,5	29,1	63,8
	AST Total				2.027	3,4	2,0	14,8	46,5	29,1	65,4
	AST/C	AST06/C	F	84	4,5	2,0	6,8	55,6	45,5	64,4	
			M	19	4,4	3,0	5,8	57,2	48,6	64,1	
		AST06/C Total			103	4,5	2,0	6,8	55,9	45,5	64,4
		AST05/C	F	100	4,0	2,0	5,8	51,1	40,8	63,3	
			M	19	4,3	3,0	5,8	54,1	47,3	64,9	
		AST05/C Total			119	4,1	2,0	5,8	51,5	40,8	64,9
		AST04/C	F	88	4,1	2,0	6,3	48,7	36,5	64,4	
			M	22	4,0	2,0	5,8	54,2	41,2	63,2	
		AST04/C Total			110	4,1	2,0	6,3	49,8	36,5	64,4
		AST03/C	F	10	4,9	3,3	9,9	46,1	36,3	59,6	
			M	4	5,1	4,8	5,8	51,0	45,8	55,5	
		AST03/C Total			14	4,9	3,3	9,9	47,5	36,3	59,6
		AST02/C	F	2	4,4	4,0	4,7	32,1	29,6	34,6	
			AST02/C Total			2	4,4	4,0	4,7	32,1	29,6
		AST/C Total				348	4,2	2,0	9,9	52,0	29,6
	AST/D	AST04/D	F	12	13,1	7,8	16,5	55,7	48,0	65,0	
			M	32	13,8	6,8	20,8	54,9	46,1	61,3	
		AST04/D Total			44	13,6	6,8	20,8	55,1	46,1	65,0
		AST02/D	F	1	4,5	4,5	4,5	52,0	52,0	52,0	
			AST02/D Total			1	4,5	4,5	4,5	52,0	52,0
	AST/D Total				45	13,4	4,5	20,8	55,1	46,1	65,0
AST Total				2.420	3,7	2,0	20,8	47,5	29,1	65,4	
Grand Total				5.239	3,5	1,2	20,8	46,2	28,0	66,4	