



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

2015/2040(INI)

31.3.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 41

Draft opinion
Aldo Patriciello
(PE549.460v01-00)

on procedures and practices regarding Commissioner Hearings, lessons to be taken from the 2014 process
(2015/2040(INI))

AM\1055788EN.doc

PE552.132v01-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Acknowledges that public hearing of Commissioners-designate present an important opportunity for the Parliament and EU citizens to assess the priorities of each candidate and their suitability for the role;

Amendment

1. Acknowledges that public hearings of Commissioners-designate ***although not provided for by the Treaty, is a well-established practice developed over the last 20 years, which*** presents an important opportunity for the Parliament and EU citizens to assess the priorities of each candidate and their suitability for the role;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Acknowledges that public hearings of Commissioners-designate present an important opportunity for Parliament and EU citizens to assess the priorities of each candidate and their suitability for the role;

Amendment

1. Acknowledges that public hearings of Commissioners-designate ***are an important element in European democracy and*** present an important opportunity for Parliament and EU citizens to assess the ***skills and*** priorities of each candidate and their suitability for the role;

Or. fr

Amendment 3
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Emphasises that as far as opening statements are concerned, it would be preferable, in line with section 1(b)(7) (Hearings) of Annex XVI to the Rules of Procedure, to give all candidates the same amount of time so as to ensure that all Commissioners-designate enjoy an equal and fair opportunity to present themselves and their opinions.

Or. en

**Amendment 4
Frédérique Ries**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Considers it legitimate to refrain from reaching prior political agreements, which partially distort the very aim of the hearing and reduce Parliament's ability to assess objectively the knowledge that Commissioners-designate possess concerning the subjects with which they will have to deal if they are confirmed in post;

Or. fr

**Amendment 5
Valentinas Mazuronis**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Recognises that the installation of the Commission was unduly delayed because

some Member States were slow to nominate their candidates; to avoid a repetition of such a situation in the future, calls for Member States to be subject to a deadline for putting forward at least two nominations;

Or. It

Amendment 6
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ia. Requests the Committee on Constitutional Affairs to change Annex XVI to the Rules of Procedure by amending Rule 118 and calling the Annex not "guidelines" but "provisions", thereby making it binding;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ia. Considers that it would be desirable for each Member State to put forward at least two candidates – one male and one female – for consideration by the Commission President-elect; notes that more candidates would partly solve the "take-it-or-leave-it" problem when a single candidate is found to be inadequate for various reasons;

Amendment 8
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ib. Considers that it would be useful, for practical and political reasons, to set a deadline by which all Member States have to put forward candidates.

Or. en

Amendment 9
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ic. Notes that the 2014 hearings generated more media and public interest than previous hearings, partly because of the evolution of social media; believes that the impact and influence of social media is likely to grow in the future; considers that provisions should be made to use social media and networks to include the citizens more effectively in the process of the hearings;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Valentinas Mazuronis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Recommends that section 1(b)(7) (Hearings) of Annex XVI to the Rules of Procedure (Guidelines for the approval of the Commission) provides that questions ‘may’ rather than ‘shall, where possible’ be grouped together by theme; believes that such a change would be consistent with the need for political groups to set their own political priorities in questioning and would enable greater flexibility in the arrangements for the increasing number of joint committee hearings (involving two or more committees);

Amendment

2. Recommends that section 1(b)(7) (Hearings) of Annex XVI to the Rules of Procedure (Guidelines for the approval of the Commission) provides that questions ‘may’ rather than ‘shall, where possible’ be grouped together by theme; believes that such a change would be consistent with the need for political groups to set their own political priorities in questioning and would enable greater flexibility in the arrangements for the increasing number of joint committee hearings (involving two or more committees); ***maintains that questions should be of use in making a value judgement and intended to assess the competence and qualifications of the Commissioner-designate;***

Or. It

Amendment 11

Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process ***arguably*** enabled some candidates to avoid ***confronting*** more sensitive issues; whilst there is merit in examining this problem, underlines the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings;

Amendment

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process enabled some candidates to avoid ***responding to*** more sensitive issues; ***considers that all Members should be allowed to ask a very short follow-up question on the same topic as raised in the first question, respectively, to allow for a better evaluation of the candidates;*** underlines the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings;

Amendment 12
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process arguably enabled some candidates to avoid confronting more sensitive issues; *whilst there is merit in examining this problem, underlines the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings;*

Amendment

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process arguably enabled some candidates to avoid confronting more sensitive issues;

Amendment 13
Valentinas Mazuronis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process arguably enabled some candidates to avoid confronting more sensitive issues; whilst there is merit in examining this problem, underlines the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings;

Amendment

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process arguably enabled some candidates to avoid confronting more sensitive issues; whilst there is merit in examining this problem, underlines the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings, *and of apportioning time in accordance with the principle of equal treatment;*

Amendment 14
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process arguably enabled some candidates to avoid confronting more sensitive issues; ***whilst there is merit in examining this problem***, underlines the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings;

Amendment

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process arguably enabled some candidates to avoid confronting more sensitive issues; ***considers that the democratic function of the hearings would be better served by permitting members to ask targeted follow-up questions***; underlines the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Giovanni La Via, Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process arguably enabled some candidates to avoid confronting more sensitive issues; ***whilst there is merit in examining this problem***, underlines the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings;

Amendment

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process arguably enabled some candidates to avoid confronting more sensitive issues; ***wishes, therefore, to see the structure of the hearings altered to enable Members to put supplementary questions to which a Commissioner-designate must reply on an ad hoc basis***; underlines, ***furthermore***, the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the

maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings;

Or. it

Amendment 16
Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process arguably enabled some candidates to avoid confronting more sensitive issues; whilst there is merit in examining this problem, underlines the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings;

Amendment

3. Considers that the lack of follow-up questions to Commissioners-designate in the 2014 process arguably enabled some candidates to avoid confronting more sensitive issues; whilst there is merit in examining this problem ***and finding a suitable answer to it, for example by making it possible to give a rejoinder to a reply***, underlines ***furthermore*** the importance of guaranteeing to political groups the maximum amount of question time possible, particularly in the case of joint committee hearings; ***recommends introducing the catch-the-eye system at committee meetings at which hearings of Commissioners-designate are held;***

Or. hu

Amendment 17
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Considers that the second hearings organised during the 2014 process for certain Commissioners-designate

provided a useful opportunity for political groups to reflect on the answers given during the first hearings, and to return to issues of key concern in order to better assess the candidates; believes, therefore, that the Rules of Procedure should allow for second hearings to be called as a matter of routine for all Commissioners-designate, and not only in cases where there is a lack of consensus on the evaluation;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Considers that it should be possible to extend the hearing of Vice-Presidents given their enlarged competences as compared to ordinary Commissioners, not least to allow all committees involved to be able to properly assess the candidate;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Kateřina Konečná

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Recommends that the hearings be conducted in such a way as to allow more time for substantive discussions, which would make it possible to learn more about the candidate's views without

leaving any questions unanswered; feels, moreover, that the hearings should take greater account of human limitations and should, therefore, provide for the possibility of a break;

Or. cs

Amendment 20
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses that the duration of the hearings of Vice-Presidents and Commissioners-designate with extensive powers ought to be extended beyond three hours to make it possible to assess their preparedness in relation to all the topics in their portfolio;

Or. it

Amendment 21
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Recalls that section 1(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex provides that ‘Parliament shall evaluate Commissioners-designate on the basis of their general competence, European commitment and personal independence. It shall assess knowledge of their prospective portfolio and their communication skills.’, and emphasises that no other criteria are relevant in the evaluation of the candidate;

4. Recalls that section 1(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex provides that ‘Parliament shall evaluate Commissioners-designate on the basis of their general competence, European commitment and personal independence. It shall assess knowledge of their prospective portfolio and their communication skills.’, and emphasises that no other criteria are relevant in the evaluation of the candidate;

notes further that under paragraph 1a, the scrutiny of the declaration of financial interests applies to a candidate in their capacity as Commissioner-designate and not as a Member of the European Parliament;

Or. en

Amendment 22
Iratxe García Pérez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls that section 1(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex provides that ‘Parliament shall evaluate Commissioners-designate on the basis of their general competence, European commitment and personal independence. It shall assess knowledge of their prospective portfolio and their communication skills.’, ***and emphasises that no other criteria are relevant in the evaluation of the candidate***; notes further that under paragraph 1a, ***the scrutiny of the declaration of financial interests applies to a candidate in their capacity as Commissioner-designate and not as a Member of the European Parliament***;

Amendment

4. Recalls that section 1(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex provides that ‘Parliament shall evaluate Commissioners-designate on the basis of their general competence, European commitment and personal independence. It shall assess knowledge of their prospective portfolio and their communication skills.’; notes further that under paragraph 1a, ***Parliament is entitled to seek any information relevant to its reaching a decision on the aptitude of the Commissioners-designate, including in particular, where applicable, information concerning activities performed, or offices held, in any European institution and the declarations of interest submitted in that connection***;

Or. es

Amendment 23
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls that section 1(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex provides that ‘Parliament shall evaluate Commissioners-designate on the basis of their general competence, European commitment and personal independence. It shall assess knowledge of their prospective portfolio and their communication skills.’, and emphasises that no other criteria are relevant in the evaluation of the candidate; notes further that under paragraph 1a, the scrutiny of the declaration of financial interests applies to a candidate in their capacity as Commissioner-designate and not as a Member of the European Parliament;

Amendment

4. Recalls that section 1(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex provides that ‘Parliament shall evaluate Commissioners-designate on the basis of their general competence, European commitment and personal independence. It shall assess knowledge of their prospective portfolio and their communication skills.’, and emphasises that no other criteria are relevant in the evaluation of the candidate; notes further that under paragraph 1a, the scrutiny of the declaration of financial interests applies to a candidate in their capacity as Commissioner-designate and not as a Member of the European Parliament; ***considers that an assessment by the Committee on Legal Affairs of the compliance of a declaration of financial interests can only be a formal check and cannot replace a political assessment of the independence of the candidate based inter alia on his/her declaration of interests;***

Or. en

Amendment 24
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls that section 1(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex provides that ‘Parliament shall evaluate Commissioners-designate on the basis of their general competence, European commitment and personal independence. It shall assess knowledge of their prospective portfolio and their communication skills.’, ***and emphasises that no other criteria are***

Amendment

4. Recalls that section 1(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex provides that ‘Parliament shall evaluate Commissioners-designate on the basis of their general competence, European commitment and personal independence. It shall assess knowledge of their prospective portfolio and their communication skills.’; ***suggests, however, that prior professional***

relevant in the evaluation of the candidate; notes further that under paragraph 1a, the scrutiny of the declaration of financial interests applies to a candidate in their capacity as Commissioner-designate and not as a Member of the European Parliament;

experience and conduct be considered as supplementary criteria of suitability; notes further that under paragraph 1a, the scrutiny of the declaration of financial interests applies to a candidate in their capacity as Commissioner-designate and not as a Member of the European Parliament;

Or. en

Amendment 25 **Biljana Borzan**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 4**

Draft opinion

4. Recalls that section 1(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex provides that ‘Parliament shall evaluate Commissioners-designate on the basis of their general competence, European commitment and personal independence. It shall assess knowledge of their prospective portfolio and their communication skills.’, and emphasises that no other criteria are relevant in the evaluation of the candidate; notes further that under paragraph 1a, the scrutiny of the declaration of financial interests applies to a candidate in their capacity as Commissioner-designate and not as a Member of the European Parliament;

Amendment

4. Recalls that section 1(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex provides that ‘Parliament shall evaluate Commissioners-designate on the basis of their general competence, European commitment and personal independence. It shall assess knowledge of their prospective portfolio and their communication skills.’, and emphasises that no other criteria are relevant in the evaluation of the candidate; notes further that under paragraph 1a, the scrutiny of the declaration of financial interests applies to a candidate in their capacity as Commissioner-designate and not as a Member of the European Parliament; ***considers that the scrutiny of the Declaration of Financial Interests of Commissioners designates should be broadened to include their wider family if possible.***

Or. en

Amendment 26
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Stresses that Members of Parliament should always be guaranteed the possibility of obtaining a full and exhaustive reply from Commissioners-designate;

Or. it

Amendment 27
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Recommends that Commissioners-designate be given the option of submitting a written statement within 12 hours after the hearing is declared closed in cases in which they have not succeeded in giving a full and exhaustive reply to a question;

Or. it

Amendment 28
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Stresses that committee coordinators should endeavour to reach a consensus on

5. Stresses that committee coordinators should endeavour to reach a consensus on

the evaluation; believes nevertheless that, where they are unable to do so, they should be able to act by a majority representing a large majority of the committee, having regard to the respective strengths of the various groups; considers further that groups which dissent from the majority view should be able to request an appropriate reference in the evaluation letter; recalls that the Rules of Procedure in any event also allow for a political group to request that the Chair convene a full committee meeting;

the evaluation; believes nevertheless that, where they are unable to do so, they should be able to act by a majority representing a large majority of the committee, having regard to the respective strengths of the various groups; ***stresses that, given the limited time available to reach a position, coordinators should limit their comments to those covering the criteria outlined in I(a)(1) of the abovementioned Annex;*** considers further that groups which dissent from the majority view should be able to request an appropriate reference in the evaluation letter; recalls that the Rules of Procedure in any event also allow for a political group to request that the Chair convene a full committee meeting;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. ***Stresses*** that committee coordinators ***should endeavour*** to reach a consensus on the evaluation; ***believes nevertheless that, where they are unable to do so, they*** should be able to act by a majority representing a large majority of the committee, ***having regard to the respective strengths of the various groups;*** considers further that groups which dissent from the majority view should be able to request an appropriate reference in the evaluation letter; recalls that the Rules of Procedure in any event also allow for a political group to request that the Chair convene a full committee meeting;

Amendment

5. ***Believes*** that committee coordinators, ***where they are unable*** to reach consensus on the evaluation, should be able to act by a majority representing a majority of the committee; considers further that groups which dissent from the majority view should be able to request an appropriate reference in the evaluation letter; recalls that the Rules of Procedure in any event also allow for a political group to request that the Chair convene a full committee meeting;

Or. en

Amendment 30
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that committee coordinators should endeavour to reach a consensus on the evaluation; *believes nevertheless* that, where they are unable to do so, they should be able to act by a majority representing a large majority of the committee, having regard to the respective strengths of the various groups; considers further that groups which dissent from the majority view should be able to request an appropriate reference in the evaluation letter; recalls that the Rules of Procedure in any event also allow for a political group to request that the Chair convene a full committee meeting;

Amendment

5. Stresses that committee coordinators should endeavour to reach a consensus on the evaluation; *considers* that, where they are unable to do so, they should be able to act by a majority representing a large majority of the committee, having regard to the respective strengths of the various groups; considers further that groups which dissent from the majority view should be able to request an appropriate reference in the evaluation letter; recalls that the Rules of Procedure in any event also allow for a political group to request that the Chair convene a full committee meeting, *including a vote on the evaluation of the candidate*;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that committee coordinators should endeavour to reach a consensus on the evaluation; believes nevertheless that, where they are unable to do so, they should be able to act by a majority representing *a large* majority of the committee, *having regard to the respective strengths of the various groups*; considers further that groups which dissent from the majority view should be able to request an

Amendment

5. Stresses that committee coordinators should endeavour to reach a consensus on the evaluation; believes nevertheless that, where they are unable to do so, they should be able to act by a majority representing *at least a 2/3* majority of the committee; considers further that groups which dissent from the majority view should be able to request an appropriate reference in the evaluation letter; recalls that the Rules of

appropriate reference in the evaluation letter; recalls that the Rules of Procedure in any event also allow for a political group to request that the Chair convene a full committee meeting;

Procedure in any event also allow for a political group to request that the Chair convene a full committee meeting;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Valentinas Mazuronis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that committee coordinators should endeavour to reach a consensus on the evaluation; believes nevertheless that, where they are unable to do so, they should be able to act by a majority representing a large majority of the committee, having regard to the respective strengths of the various groups; considers further that groups which dissent from the majority view should be ***able to request an appropriate reference*** in the evaluation letter; recalls that the Rules of Procedure in any event also allow for a political group to request that the Chair convene a full committee meeting;

Amendment

5. Stresses that committee coordinators should endeavour to reach a consensus on the evaluation; believes nevertheless that, where they are unable to do so, they should be able to act by a majority representing a large majority of the committee, having regard to the respective strengths of the various groups; considers further that ***the opinion of*** groups which dissent from the majority view should be ***recorded*** in the evaluation letter, ***together with the relevant related information***; recalls that the Rules of Procedure in any event also allow for a political group to request that the Chair convene a full committee meeting; ***considers that the evaluation of the Commissioner-designate should be put to the vote at a committee meeting***;

Or. It

Amendment 33
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Notes that methods and practices of the post-hearing evaluation vary between committees; points out that coordinators should make their evaluation guided by a list of issues and specific criteria; considers it useful to establish a set of evaluation guidelines to be used by the coordinators;

Or. en

Amendment 34
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, believes that the Rules of Procedure should provide for the statement of evaluation to be adopted as soon as possible, and made public within 24 hours after the hearings are declared closed.

Amendment

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, ***in order to make the process clearer and avoid any sort of confusion which may come out from a wrong interpretation of the Section 1(c) (6) of Annex XVI to the Rules of Procedure***, believes that (the Rules of Procedure) should provide for the statement of evaluation to be adopted as soon as possible, and made public within 24 hours after the hearings are declared closed.

Or. en

Amendment 35
Giovanni La Via, Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, believes that the Rules of Procedure should provide for the statement of evaluation to be adopted as soon as possible, and made public within 24 hours after the hearings ***are declared closed***.

Amendment

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, believes that the Rules of Procedure should provide for the statement of evaluation to be adopted as soon as possible, and made public within 24 hours after the ***end of the individual hearings***.

Or. it

Amendment 36
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, believes that the Rules of Procedure should provide for the statement of evaluation to be adopted as soon as possible, ***and made public within 24 hours*** after the hearings are declared closed.

Amendment

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, believes that the Rules of Procedure should provide for the statement of evaluation to be adopted ***and made public*** as soon as possible after the ***evaluation meeting of the committee coordinators***.

Or. en

Amendment 37
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, ***believes*** that the Rules of Procedure ***should*** provide for the ***statement of evaluation to be adopted as soon as possible, and made public within 24 hours after the hearings are declared***

Amendment

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, ***stresses*** that the Rules of Procedure ***are very clear insofar as they provide for the adoption and publication of the statement "within 24 hours of the hearing"; the singular form***

closed.

clearly indicates that the 24 hours start ticking after the end of each of the hearings, respectively, and not after the end of all hearings; calls for a strict and uniform application of those Rules across all committees.

Or. en

Amendment 38
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, *believes* that the Rules of Procedure should provide for the statement of evaluation to be adopted as soon as possible, and made public within 24 hours after the hearings are declared closed.

Amendment

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, *recalls* that the Rules of Procedure provide for the statement of evaluation to be adopted as soon as possible, and made public within 24 hours after the hearings are declared closed.

Or. en

Amendment 39
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, believes that the Rules of Procedure should provide for the statement of evaluation to be adopted as soon as possible, and made public within 24 hours after the *hearings are declared closed.*

Amendment

6. As regards the deadlines applicable to the evaluation statements, believes that the Rules of Procedure should provide for the statement of evaluation to be adopted as soon as possible, and made public *on the Parliament's website* within 24 hours after the *evaluation is completed.*

Or. en

Amendment 40
Valentinas Mazuronis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Maintains that the opinion of the committee responsible should be legally binding; considers further that Parliament's requests should be taken into account when it asks for a candidate to be replaced or given a different portfolio.

Or. It

Amendment 41
Kateřina Konečná

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Recommends that individual hearings be subject to clear time limits and that, in addition to the minimum duration for a hearing, a maximum duration be set; feels that, where necessary, it would be appropriate to hold a hearing over two days;

Or. cs