



2017/2155(DEC)

19.1.2018

AMENDMENTS

1 - 11

Draft opinion

Kostas Chrysogonos

2016 discharge: EU Judicial Cooperation Unit (Eurojust)
(2017/2155(DEC))

Amendment 1
Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses the recommendation of the Court of Auditors of 2011 regarding re-
redefinition of respective roles and
responsibilities between the Administrative
Director and the College to avoid the
overlaps of responsibilities; regrets that no
corrective measures has been taken by
Eurojust since 2011 since the new Eurojust
Regulation was still under consideration by
the legislator end of 2016;

Amendment

3. Stresses the recommendation of the
Court of Auditors of 2011 regarding re-
redefinition of respective roles and
responsibilities between the Administrative
Director and the College to avoid the
overlaps of responsibilities; regrets that no
corrective measures has been taken by
Eurojust since 2011 since the new Eurojust
Regulation was still under consideration by
the legislator end of 2016 **and**
recommends avoiding future delays in
taking corrective action;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Roberta Metsola, Petr Ježek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses the recommendation of the
Court of Auditors of 2011 regarding ***re-***
redefinition of respective roles and
responsibilities ***between*** the Administrative
Director and the College to avoid the
overlaps of responsibilities; ***regrets that no***
corrective measures has been taken by
Eurojust since 2011 since the new
Eurojust Regulation was still ***under***
consideration by the ***legislator end of***
2016;

Amendment

3. Stresses the recommendation of the
Court of Auditors of 2011 regarding ***the***
redefinition of the roles and
responsibilities ***of*** the Administrative
Director and the College, to avoid the
overlaps of responsibilities; ***acknowledges***
that the Eurojust Regulation was still
being negotiated by the ***co-legislators in***
2016, thus no corrective measures could
have been taken to solve this matter;

Or. en

Amendment 3

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Welcomes the strengthening of the Eurojust's position as the centre for judicial cooperation and coordination against cross-border crime and as a centre of judicial expertise within the Union; highlights the launch of the European Judicial Cybercrime Network; notes that Eurojust received requests for assistance in 2306 cases (+4%), that it organised 249 coordination meetings on 288 cases and provided support to 148 joint investigation teams, including financial support to 90 of them (+32%); notes the publication of the forth Eurojust report "Foreign Terrorist Fighters: Eurojust's Views on the Phenomenon and the Criminal Justice Response" of December 2016;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 4
Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Welcomes the strengthening of the Eurojust's position as the centre for judicial cooperation and coordination against cross-border crime and as a centre of judicial expertise within the Union; highlights the launch of the European Judicial Cybercrime Network; notes that Eurojust received requests for assistance in 2306 cases (+4%), that it organised 249 coordination meetings on 288 cases and provided support to 148 joint investigation teams, including financial support to 90 of them (+32%); notes the publication of the

4. Welcomes the strengthening of the Eurojust's position as the centre for judicial cooperation and coordination against cross-border **crime, of serious types of organized** crime and as a centre of judicial expertise within the Union; highlights the launch of the European Judicial Cybercrime Network; notes that Eurojust received requests for assistance in 2306 cases (+4%), that it organised 249 coordination meetings on 288 cases and provided support to 148 joint investigation teams, including financial support to 90 of

forth Eurojust report “Foreign Terrorist Fighters: Eurojust’s Views on the Phenomenon and the Criminal Justice Response” of December 2016;

them (+32%); notes the publication of the forth Eurojust report “Foreign Terrorist Fighters: Eurojust’s Views on the Phenomenon and the Criminal Justice Response” of December 2016;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Roberta Metsola

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Welcomes the strengthening of *the* Eurojust’s position *as* the centre *for* judicial cooperation and coordination against cross-border crime and as a centre *of* judicial expertise within the Union; highlights the launch of the European Judicial Cybercrime Network; notes that Eurojust received requests for assistance in **2306** cases (+4%), that it organised 249 coordination meetings on 288 cases and provided support to 148 joint investigation teams, including financial support to 90 of them (+32%); notes the publication of the *forth* Eurojust report “Foreign Terrorist Fighters: Eurojust’s Views on the Phenomenon and the Criminal Justice Response” of December 2016;

Amendment

4. Welcomes the strengthening of Eurojust’s position *at* the centre *of* judicial cooperation and coordination against cross-border crime and as a centre *for* judicial expertise within the Union; highlights the launch of the European Judicial Cybercrime Network; notes that Eurojust received requests for assistance in **2.306** cases (+4%), that it organised 249 coordination meetings on 288 cases and provided support to 148 joint investigation teams, including financial support to 90 of them (+32%); notes the publication of the *fourth* Eurojust report “Foreign Terrorist Fighters: Eurojust’s Views on the Phenomenon and the Criminal Justice Response” of December 2016;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Auke Zijlstra, Nicolas Bay, Lorenzo Fontana, Gilles Lebreton, Janice Atkinson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Deplores that Eurojust faced budgetary availability issues due to known structural problems with its funding and*

Amendment

deleted

that for the second successive year was forced to resort to mitigation measures subject to an amending budget, leading to the postponement of some of its ongoing activities and the deferral of valuable technological developments;

Or. en

Amendment 7

Péter Niedermüller, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Deplores that Eurojust faced budgetary availability issues due to known structural problems with its funding and that for the second successive year was forced to resort to mitigation measures subject to an amending budget, leading to the postponement of some of its ongoing activities and the deferral of valuable technological developments;

Amendment

5. Deplores that Eurojust faced budgetary availability issues due to known structural problems with its funding and that for the second successive year was forced to resort to mitigation measures subject to an amending budget, leading to the postponement of some of its ongoing activities and the deferral of valuable technological developments; ***points out in this regard that Eurojust has an ongoing dialogue with DG Justice and DG Budget in order to secure a proper level of funding for the coming years.***

Or. en

Amendment 8

Roberta Metsola, Petr Ježek

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. ***Urges*** Eurojust ***to*** step up its efforts ***for finalising*** clear internal rules ***on*** the protection of whistleblowers;

Amendment

6. ***Calls on the European Commission to ensure the swift adoption of its guidelines on whistleblowing that will consequently be immediately adopted and effectively implemented by Union Agencies, including Eurojust; urges the***

Agency in the interim to further step up its efforts *to ensure* clear internal rules *for* the protection of whistleblowers.

Or. en

Amendment 9

Péter Niedermüller, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Urges Eurojust to step up its efforts for finalising clear internal rules on the protection of whistleblowers;

Amendment

6. Urges Eurojust to step up its efforts for finalising clear internal rules on the protection of whistleblowers; *notes, however, that Eurojust was waiting for guidance or input from the Commission before it could finalise its rules;*

Or. en

Amendment 10

Jean Lambert

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Urges Eurojust to step up its efforts for finalising clear internal rules on the protection of whistleblowers;*

Amendment

6. *Calls on the Commission to ensure the swift adoption of its guidelines on whistleblowing that will consequently be immediately and effectively adopted and implemented by Union Agencies, including Eurojust;*

Or. en

Amendment 11

Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Urges Eurojust to step up its efforts for finalising clear internal rules on the protection of whistleblowers;

Amendment

6. Urges Eurojust to step up its efforts for finalising clear internal rules on the protection of whistleblowers, ***who must benefit from the presumption of good faith until the verification of the information;***

Or. en