30 October 1974 in Case 188/73 *Grassi* v *Council* [1974] ECR 1099).

3. The comparative examination of the merits of candidates for A 3 posts, may, in view of their nature and importance, be properly conducted without taking account of the area of activities in which the duties connected with those posts must be performed and by taking into consideration solely the specific qualities of the candidates and in particular their ability to direct a large administrative unit, where the vacancy notices for the post do not require the candidates to have specific qualifications in the area of activities covered by the provisions concerned.

4. Reasons for promotion decisions are not required to be given either to the officials promoted, whom they cannot adversely affect, nor to candidates not promoted, who might be harmed by such a statement of reasons (see the judgment of 16 December 1987 in Case 111/86 *Delauche* v *Commission* [1987] ECR 5345).

5. In accordance with consistent case-law, the appointing authority has a wide power of appraisal as regards the comparative examination of the respective merits of officials who are eligible for promotion and the Court must limit its review to the question whether the appointing authority has used its power in a manifestly erroneous manner.

OPINION OF THE ADVOCATE GENERAL

Mr Advocate General Jacobs delivered his Opinion on 27 June 1989.* He concluded that the Court should:

(1) dismiss the application;

(2) order the Economic and Social Committee to pay the costs.

* Original language: English.