



2015/2319(INI)

30.9.2016

AMENDMENTS

1 - 27

Draft opinion
Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann
(PE589.119v01-00)

Control of the Register and composition of the Commission's expert groups
(2015/2319(INI))

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that transparency *is* of paramount importance in the composition of the expert groups; therefore welcomes the fact that the selection process is now taking place publicly; stresses in this connection that it needs to be clearly visible what practical experience and qualifications the experts possess;

Amendment

1. Notes that transparency ***and coordination of interinstitutional activities are*** of paramount importance, ***helping to strike a suitable balance from the point of view of the expertise and opinions represented*** in the composition of the expert groups, ***and helping to improve their operation***; therefore welcomes the fact that the selection process is now taking place publicly; stresses in this connection that it needs to be clearly visible what practical experience and qualifications the experts possess; ***takes the view that the entire selection process should guarantee a high level of transparency and should be governed by clearer, more concise criteria with particular stress being placed on candidates' practical experience alongside their academic qualifications***;

Or. ro

Amendment 2
Enrico Gasbarra

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that transparency is of paramount importance in the composition of the expert groups; therefore welcomes the fact that the selection process is now taking place publicly; stresses in this connection that it needs to be clearly visible what practical experience and ***qualifications*** the experts ***possess***;

Amendment

1. Notes that transparency is of paramount importance in the composition of the expert groups; therefore welcomes the fact that the selection process is now taking place publicly; stresses in this connection that it needs to be clearly visible what practical experience, ***qualifications*** and ***possible conflicts of***

interest the experts *have*;

Or. it

Amendment 3
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that transparency is of paramount importance in the composition of the expert groups; therefore welcomes the fact that the selection process is now taking place publicly; stresses in this connection that it needs to be clearly visible what practical experience and qualifications the experts possess;

Amendment

1. Notes that transparency is of paramount importance in the composition ***and the action*** of the expert groups; therefore welcomes the fact that the selection process is now taking place publicly; stresses in this connection that it needs to be clearly visible what practical experience and qualifications the experts possess;

Or. el

Amendment 4
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Welcomes the fact that a connection has already been established between the Register of Commission expert groups and the Transparency Register, thus ensuring improved transparency;

Or. bg

Amendment 5
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Is concerned that the Commission Decision of 30 May 2016 does not set out clearly and precisely what is meant by balanced composition of the Commission expert groups;

Or. bg

Amendment 6
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1c. Finds it regrettable that the attempt to conduct a public consultation on the establishment of the new rules was unsuccessful; calls on the Commission to act in a transparent manner and to be accountable to the citizens of the EU;

Or. bg

Amendment 7
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Takes the view that the Commission has made progress towards a more balanced composition of the expert groups; regrets, ***however***, that as yet no express distinction is drawn between those representing economic and non-economic interests in order to

2. Takes the view that the Commission has made progress towards a more balanced composition of the expert groups, ***but regrets that, despite that progress, no working document drawn up by the Commission's services and no***

guarantee a maximum of transparency and balance;

Commission decision offers clear and firm solutions to all the questions raised by Parliament up to now; regrets, likewise, that as yet no express distinction is drawn between those representing economic and non-economic interests in order to guarantee a maximum of transparency and balance; stresses the need, in this connection, for the Commission to make it clear in the public call for applications how it defines a balanced composition and which interests it seeks to be represented – with the corresponding justification – , and to state the grounds for any possible deviation from the balanced composition as defined beforehand, when the expert groups are established;

Or. ro

Amendment 8 **Enrico Gasbarra**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Takes the view that the Commission has made progress towards a more balanced composition of the expert groups; regrets, however, that as yet no express distinction is drawn between those representing economic and non-economic interests in order to guarantee a maximum of transparency and balance;

Amendment

2. Takes the view that the Commission has made progress towards a more balanced composition of the expert groups; regrets, however, that as yet no express distinction is drawn between those representing economic and non-economic interests in order to guarantee a maximum of transparency and balance; ***considers it important therefore to involve Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee in order to produce a more balanced definition of that distinction;***

Or. it

Amendment 9
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Takes the view that the Commission has made progress towards a more balanced composition of the expert groups; *regrets*, however, that as yet no express distinction is drawn between those representing economic and non-economic interests *in order* to guarantee a maximum of transparency and balance;

Amendment

2. Takes the view that the Commission has made progress towards a more balanced composition of the expert groups; *notes*, however, that as yet no express distinction is drawn between those representing economic and non-economic interests *so as* to guarantee a maximum of transparency and balance, *and proposes, to that end, that possibilities for increasing the number of experts of the second type be explored*;

Or. bg

Amendment 10
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Takes the view that the Commission *has made* progress towards a more balanced composition of the expert groups; *regrets*, however, that as yet no express distinction is drawn between those representing economic and non-economic interests in order to guarantee a maximum of transparency and balance;

Amendment

2. Takes the view that the Commission *should make* progress towards a more balanced composition of the expert groups; *deplores the fact*, however, that as yet no express distinction is drawn between those representing economic and non-economic interests in order to guarantee a maximum of transparency and balance;

Or. el

Amendment 11
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that for financial and organisational reasons it is frequently not possible for under-represented groups, which are often representatives of civil society and of small and medium-sized undertakings, to participate; therefore calls on the Commission, in the interest of ensuring balanced composition of expert groups, to consider possibilities for financial support to enable them to participate;

Amendment

3. Notes that for financial and organisational reasons it is frequently not possible for under-represented groups, which are often representatives of civil society and of small and medium-sized undertakings, to participate; therefore calls on the Commission, in the interest of ensuring balanced composition of expert groups, to consider possibilities for financial support to enable them to participate ***and, as a first step, to explore options for remote participation via video link, which would be more economical;***

Or. bg

Amendment 12
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that for financial and organisational reasons it is frequently not possible for under-represented groups, which are often representatives of civil society and of small and medium-sized undertakings, to participate; therefore calls on the Commission, in the interest of ensuring balanced composition of expert groups, to consider possibilities for ***financial*** support to ***enable them*** to participate;

Amendment

3. Notes that for financial and organisational reasons it is frequently not possible for under-represented groups, which are often representatives of civil society and of small and medium-sized undertakings ***or other organisations of general public interest***, to participate; therefore calls on the Commission, in the interest of ensuring balanced composition ***and the smooth functioning*** of expert groups, to consider possibilities for support to ***make it possible for experts*** to participate;

Or. ro

Amendment 13
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. *Notes* that for financial and organisational reasons it is frequently not possible for under-represented groups, which are often representatives of civil society and of small and medium-sized undertakings, to participate; therefore calls on the Commission, in the interest of ensuring balanced composition of expert groups, to ***consider possibilities for*** financial support to enable them to participate;

Amendment

3. ***Deplores the fact*** that for financial and organisational reasons it is frequently not possible for under-represented groups, which are often representatives of civil society and of small and medium-sized undertakings, to participate; therefore calls on the Commission, in the interest of ensuring balanced composition of expert groups, to ***seek an increase in*** financial support to enable them to participate;

Or. el

Amendment 14
Enrico Gasbarra

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission to ensure that all minutes of meetings are published; stresses in this connection that the content and the positions expressed by the experts at these meetings must be clearly shown; also calls for the possibility of publishing minority decisions;

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission to ensure that all minutes of meetings are published; stresses in this connection that the content and the positions expressed by the experts at these meetings must be clearly shown; also calls for the possibility of publishing minority decisions; ***reiterates the importance of making public the decisions of the expert groups and believes that this principle should remain valid even where a qualified majority of their members support the need to keep secret a specific meeting or part of a meeting;***

Or. it

Amendment 15
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission to ensure that all minutes of meetings are published; stresses in this connection that the content and the positions expressed by the experts at these meetings must be clearly shown; also calls for *the possibility of publishing minority decisions*;

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission to ensure that all minutes of meetings are published *in full*; stresses in this connection that the content and the positions expressed by the experts at these meetings must be clearly shown, *and expressed in a way that is accessible for European citizens*; also calls for minority *opinions to be published, bearing in mind that the experts sitting on these Commission groups are performing a public service*;

Or. ro

Amendment 16
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission to ensure that all minutes of meetings are published; stresses in this connection that the content and the positions expressed by the experts at these meetings must be clearly shown; *also calls for the possibility of publishing minority decisions*;

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission to ensure that all minutes of meetings are published; stresses in this connection that the content and the positions expressed by the experts at these meetings must be clearly shown;

Or. bg

Amendment 17
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission to ensure that all minutes of meetings are published; stresses in this connection that the content and the positions expressed by the experts at these meetings must be clearly shown; also calls for the possibility of publishing minority decisions;

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission to ensure that all minutes of meetings are published ***in order to produce greater transparency***; stresses in this connection that the content and the positions expressed by the experts at these meetings must be clearly shown; also calls for the possibility of publishing minority decisions;

Or. el

Amendment 18
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Stresses that users need to be given access to a range of documents (agendas, reference documents, various reports), with a view to efficient monitoring by interested stakeholders; takes the view, further, that the website of the Register of expert groups – whether as such or through hyperlinks to other relevant websites – should be one of the instruments or mechanisms used to obtain constantly updated information on policy developments, thereby guaranteeing a high level of transparency;

Or. ro

Amendment 19
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

4b. Regrets that even today the Commission persists in a system in which meetings are held behind closed doors, with deliberations being held in public only where a simple majority of the members of expert groups thus decides; calls on the Commission to take account of the recommendations made by the European Parliament and the European Ombudsman to the effect that the deliberations of expert groups should be held in public unless a qualified majority of the members decide that a specific meeting or part of a meeting should be held behind closed doors; takes the view that, given that the decisions adopted following the deliberations of Commission expert groups serve the public interest, the debates that led to the adoption of those decisions should be made public as a rule and not as an exception;

Or. ro

Amendment 20
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

4c. Emphasises that the measures provided for must be taken immediately when conflicts of interest become apparent, particularly among individuals appointed in a private capacity, acting independently and expressing their personal viewpoint in the general interest; points out that closer consideration should be given to these measures because their application will constitute the guarantee of experts' independence;

Amendment 21

Daniel Buda

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Highlights furthermore that the Commission, in preparing and drafting delegated acts, must ensure that all documents, including draft acts, must be communicated to the European Parliament and the Council at the same time as to the Member States' experts, as agreed in the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making of 12 May 2016.

Amendment

5. Highlights furthermore that the Commission, in preparing and drafting delegated acts ***and in drawing up strategic guidelines***, must ensure that all documents, including draft acts, must be communicated to the European Parliament and the Council at the same time as to the Member States' experts, as agreed in the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making of 12 May 2016.

Or. ro

Amendment 22

Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Highlights furthermore that the Commission, in preparing and drafting delegated acts, must ensure that all documents, including draft acts, must be communicated to the European Parliament and the Council at the same time as to the Member States' experts, as agreed in the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making of 12 May 2016.

Amendment

5. Highlights furthermore that the Commission, in preparing and drafting delegated ***and implementing*** acts, must ensure that all documents, including draft acts, must be communicated to the European Parliament and the Council at the same time as to the Member States' experts, as agreed in the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making of 12 May 2016.

Or. de

Amendment 23
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Highlights furthermore that the Commission, in preparing and drafting delegated acts, must ensure that all documents, including draft acts, must be communicated to the European Parliament and the Council at the same time as to the Member States' experts, as agreed in the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making of **12 May** 2016.

Amendment

5. Highlights furthermore that the Commission, in preparing and drafting delegated acts, must ensure that all documents, including draft acts, must be communicated to the European Parliament and the Council at the same time as to the Member States' experts, as agreed in the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making of **13 April** 2016.

Or. bg

Amendment 24
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. ***Highlights furthermore*** that the Commission, in preparing and drafting delegated acts, must ensure that all documents, including draft acts, must be communicated to the European Parliament and the Council at the same time as to the Member States' experts, as agreed in the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making of 12 May 2016.

Amendment

5. ***Stresses*** that the Commission, in preparing and drafting delegated acts, must ensure that all documents, including draft acts, must be communicated to the European Parliament and the Council at the same time as to the Member States' experts, as agreed in the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making of 12 May 2016.

Or. el

Amendment 25
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. (recital)

***having regard to the Commission
Decision of 30 May 2016 establishing
horizontal rules on the creation and
operation of Commission expert groups,***

Or. bg

**Amendment 26
Angel Dzhambazki**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. (recital)

***having regard to the Framework
Agreement on Relations between the
European Parliament and the European
Commission,***

Or. bg

**Amendment 27
Angel Dzhambazki**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 c (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5c. (recital)

***having regard to the Interinstitutional
Agreement on better law-making between
the European Parliament, the Council of
the European Union, and the European
Commission,***

Or. bg

