



**WEDNESDAY 20 APRIL 2016**

09.00 - 12.30 and 15.00 - 18.30

**THURSDAY 21 APRIL 2016**

09.00 - 12.30

Room: József Antall (6Q2)

## 1. AGENDA

The draft agenda (in EN) was emailed to Members on 12 April 2016 and is in the [file for the meeting](#).

## 2. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman draws attention to the following points:

### Languages available

FR, DE, IT, NL, EN, DA, ES, FI, CS, HU, LT, PL, SK, SL, BG, RO

### Webstreaming

The CONT meeting is webstreamed on the [Europarl web-site](#).

Please be aware that each time a speaker activates the microphone to make an intervention, the camera will be automatically directed to the speaker.

### Voting cards

The electronic voting system will be used for the vote scheduled on 20 April and Members are reminded to bring their electronic voting card.

**WEDNESDAY 20 APRIL 2016**

9.00 - 11.30

**PUBLIC MEETING**

**\*\*\* VOTING TIME \*\*\***

## 3. THE ACTIVITIES, IMPACT AND ADDED VALUE OF THE EUROPEAN GLOBALIZATION ADJUSTMENT FUND BETWEEN 2007 AND 2014



### Adoption of draft opinion

Rapporteur: [Marco Valli](#) (EFDD)

Administrator: Hrvoje Svetić

Main Committee: EMPL

The CONT committee is giving an opinion to the EMPL committee on the activities, impact and added value of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) between 2007 and 2014;

The Rapporteur stressed that it has been difficult to clearly evaluate the success of the instrument and its real contribution as single instrument to the reintegration of workers, and considered that the EGF should be able to provide its financial contribution rapidly in order to maximise its impact and to allow the affected workers to benefit from the funded measures at the earliest after having been made redundant.

The draft opinion and the amendments (EN) are available on the [CONT website](#).

The voting list, including the rapporteur's recommendations will also be circulated as soon as possible.

**CONT Timetable:**

Event	Body	Date
Deadline for amendments	CONT	04/04/2016
Adoption in CONT	CONT	20/04/2016
Adoption in EMPL	EMPL	15/06/2016
Adoption in Plenary	Plenary	SEPTEMBER 2016

## 4. ASSESSMENT OF THE EU YOUTH STRATEGY 2013-2015



### Adoption of draft opinion

Rapporteur: [Derek Vaughan](#) (S&D)  
Administrator: Tereza Pinto de Rezende  
Main Committee: CULT

The draft opinion received fifteen amendments which focus on Erasmus+ programme, youth unemployment and the corresponding EU funds to combat it, the young entrepreneurs and their role in the economic growth of Europe.

The opinion will be voted in CONT on 20 April.  
CULT report to be adopted in May.

The draft opinion and the amendments (EN) are available on the [CONT website](#).

The voting list, including the rapporteur's recommendations will also be circulated as soon as possible.

**CONT Timetable:**

Event	Body	Date
Deadline for amendments	CONT	04/04/2016
Adoption in CONT	CONT	20/04/2016
Adoption in EMPL	CULT	30/05/2016
Adoption in Plenary	Plenary	JUNE II



## 5. FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION AND FOLLOW-UP OF THE CRIM RESOLUTION



### Adoption of draft opinion

Rapporteur: [Julia Pitera](#) (EPP)  
Administrator: Tereza Pinto de Rezende  
Main Committee: LIBE

The opinion received 46 amendments that will be considered by Members.

The amendments consider a vast range of issues among which the urgency of tackling VAT fraud, particularly the cross-border VAT carousel fraud, within a fully functioning EPPO. Also Members ask for the creation of a common definition at EU level of organised crime, the establishment of a proper instrument for the exchange of banking information and show concern with the professionalism of smugglers. The EU should give more attention to the fighting against corruption in public procurement and to the existing tax havens, and continue encouraging transparency procedures to face corruption and fraudulent activities. A few compromise amendments are possibly envisaged.

The opinion will be voted in CONT on 20 April.  
LIBE report will be adopted in May.

The draft opinion and the amendments are available on the [CONT website](#).

The voting list, including the rapporteur's recommendations will also be circulated as soon as possible.

### CONT Timetable:

Event	Body	Date
Consideration of draft opinion	CONT	23/02/2016
Deadline for amendments	CONT	04/03/2016
Adoption in CONT	CONT	20/04/2016

**\*\*\* END OF ELECTRONIC VOTING \*\*\***

## 6. ECA SPECIAL REPORT 21/2015 (2015 DISCHARGE) ON "REVIEW OF THE RISKS RELATED TO A RESULTS-ORIENTED APPROACH FOR EU DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION ACTION"



### Presentation of the Special Report by the Member of the European Court of Auditors responsible, Karel Pinxten, and consideration of a working document

Rapporteur: [Bart Staes](#) (Greens)  
Administrator: Olivier Sautière

Substantial resources are devoted to assisting the development of the world's poorest countries. While emphasising the fact that there is no single source of data on development finance, the Commission estimated in July 2014 that the cumulative resources available to developing countries over the ten-year period from 2002 were in the region of 2 171 billion USD, including domestic and international public and private finance.



As part of the commitment to attain the internationally agreed Official Development Assistance (ODA) target of an ODA/GNI ratio of 0.7 %, in 2013, collective EU (including Member State) net ODA spending was 56.5 billion euro, which is equivalent to an ODA/GNI ratio of 0.43 % of the EU's collective GNI. The amounts scheduled to be made available for development and cooperation over the 2014-20 period are 19 661 million euros through the EU general budget, and 30 506 million euros for ACP countries through the European Development Fund.

The Court analysis aimed to provide in a single document an overview of what the Court considers to be the main risk areas related to a results approach for EU development and cooperation action and was guided by the following question: did the Commission adequately address the key risks entailed by a results approach for EU development and cooperation measures? On this basis, the Court identified, for nine key risk areas related to a results-oriented approach for EU development and cooperation action, the following shortcomings:

- the use of inconsistent results-related terminology or failure to establish a clear logical chain between action, outputs, outcome and impact leading to confusion and undermining the assessment of what has been achieved;
- an increased complexity due to the integration of cross-cutting issues in EU programmes being a supplementary risk for the achievement and reporting of results;
- a lack of harmonisation between development partners' aid delivery instruments, results framework and accountability structures;
- weaknesses in the evaluation and results reporting;
- a lack of consolidated reports or an overview of results achieved by EU aid;
- a lack of sufficient, relevant, reliable and up-to-date data;
- a focus on budgetary outturn as the sole management objective with regard to the budget implementation;
- insufficient preliminary risks analysis sometimes in the choice of an aid implementation modality.

The Rapporteur welcomes the observations of the special report and acknowledges the fact that the Commission has integrated the issue of risks in the management of its external operations which is characterized by complex and fragile environment with numerous types of risks, partner countries having different level of development and governance frameworks.

He particularly welcomes the Court's recommendation to the Commission to improve the use of terminology regarding long-term results (outputs, outcomes and impacts) and stresses the importance of formulating a true S.M.A.R.T. objectives before any decision on financing different projects is taken while highlighting the need to put extra focus on formulating "Attainable and Realistic" goals.

The Rapporteur also notes that the regular monitoring and mapping of main risk factors (external, financial and operational) and their quantification is a prerequisite for a good financial management, quality expenditure and the credibility of the Union interventions.

He finally emphasizes that undermining performance monitoring and results evaluation is detrimental to public accountability and to comprehensive information of policymakers.

The Rapporteur's working document (EN) is available on the [CONT website](#).

The Rapporteur's conclusions will form part of the Commission's discharge report for the financial year 2015.



## 7. ECA SPECIAL REPORT 4/2016 (2015 DISCHARGE) ON "THE EUROPEAN INSTITUTE OF INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY MUST MODIFY ITS DELIVERY MECHANISMS AND ELEMENTS OF ITS DESIGN TO ACHIEVE THE EXPECTED IMPACT"



### Presentation of the Special Report by the Member of the European Court of Auditors responsible, A. Brenninkmeijer

Rapporteur: [Dennis de Jong](#) (GUE/NLG)

Administrator: Hrvoje Svetić

The objective of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT) is to overcome the weak links between the worlds of education, science and business. Its mission is to reinforce the EU's innovation capacity 'by promoting synergies and cooperation among ... higher education, research and innovation of the highest standards, including by fostering entrepreneurship'.

The Court's audit focused on whether the EIT is an effective tool to foster innovation in the EU. The Court considered whether the EIT's rationale and design address the needs of the innovation communities and assessed the implementation and monitoring of the EIT's activities. The Court concluded that, despite a valid *raison d'être*, the EIT's complex operational framework and management problems have impeded its overall effectiveness.

The EIT is not a research centre and does not directly contribute to financing individual projects. Instead, it provides grants to the knowledge and innovation communities (KICs) which are selected on a competitive basis. The Court noted that the main reasons for setting up the EIT are well founded and generally supported by its stakeholders. Thanks to the EIT, the three KICs launched in 2010 have brought more than 500 partners together across disciplines, countries and sectors. KICs are autonomous, an EIT feature particularly valued by the KIC partners. Through the EIT, the KICs have offered new opportunities to carry out innovative activities and have promoted an entrepreneurial culture.

The Court's audit identified several weaknesses in key concepts and operational processes, including little or no added value to the KIC complementary activities funding condition, which is not funded by the EIT and unnecessarily complicates the monitoring and reporting of the EIT's financial contribution, practical arrangements between the EIT and the KICs, being ill suited given the nature of the innovation activities the EIT aims to support as, doubtful financial sustainability of the KICs as well as the performance indicators and the monitoring and reporting processes which do not provide an informative picture of results and impacts.

The Court concluded that, if the EIT wants to become the ground-breaking innovative institute it was originally conceived to be, significant legislative and operational adjustments are required to better foster the EU's innovation potential.

The Rapporteur will present his working document in June (exact date to be confirmed).

The Rapporteur's conclusions will form part of the Commission's discharge report for the financial year 2015. Amendments may be tabled in this context and the deadline will be the same as the Commission's discharge.



## 8. ECA SPECIAL REPORT 10/2016 (2015 DISCHARGE) ON "FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED TO ENSURE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EXCESSIVE DEFICIT PROCEDURE"



### Presentation of the Special Report by the Member of the European Court of Auditors responsible, *Milan Martin Cvikl*, and consideration of a working document

Rapporteur: [Brian Hayes](#) (EPP)  
Administrator: Mauro de Oliveira

The proper functioning of the economic and monetary union required the introduction of a mechanism to safeguard the soundness of public finances and to reduce the risk of spillover from Member States pursuing unsuitable fiscal policies.

The preventive arm of the mechanism aims to ensure sound budgetary policies in the medium-term and avoid excessive deficit situations. The corrective arm addresses excessive deficit situations and is known as the excessive deficit procedure (EDP). Member States that breach the ceiling on budgetary deficit or debt (respectively 3 % and 60 % of GDP) may be subject to an EDP.

The main parties to an EDP are the Member State, the Commission (DG Economic and Financial Affairs and Eurostat) and the Council.

The Court's audit assessed whether the Commission managed the implementation of the EDP procedure appropriately (as applied to Cyprus, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy and Malta between April 2009 and May 2015) and concludes inter alia that:

- In the first phase of the EDP process improvements are needed to strengthen the basis of the EDP and enhance the objectivity of assessments;
- Data quality assessments and economic analyses lack transparency; analyses are carried out according to the rules, but focused more on government deficit than on debt;
- Member States' reporting on EDP corrective action does not provide a sufficiently wide and solid basis for the Commission to implement its monitoring and surveillance tasks;
- Monitoring and surveillance by the Commission is subject to increasingly complex rules, lacks transparency and provides a limited assessment of the effect of structural reforms;
- EDP reforms have introduced tools for enhancing budgetary discipline, but the EDP has not proved fully effective as a corrective mechanism.

The Rapporteur's working document is available on the [CONT website](#).

The Rapporteur's recommendations will form part of the Commission's discharge report for the financial year 2015. Amendments may be tabled in this context and the deadline will be the same as the Commission's discharge.

## 9. CONT DELEGATION TO GERMANY (3 TO 5 NOVEMBER 2015)



### Presentation of the Report on Mission to Germany

Rapporteur: [Ingeborg Gräßle](#) (EPP)  
Administrator: Christian Ehlers

From 3 to 5 November 2015 a CONT delegation paid a visit to Berlin, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern and Hamburg. The political objectives were twofold: to discuss the





calculation collection and management of own resources, and to follow-up on structural funds' programmes under reservations. The delegation arrived at the following conclusions and recommendations:

#### Conclusions

- The effectiveness of the European Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control political efforts can be further increased if it stays in regular contact with its national counterparts.
- The current own-resource system is complex and would benefit from simplification.
- The CONT delegation fully supported the findings in the Special Report 11/2013 on Gross National Income (GNI) data issued by the European Court of Auditors (ECA).
- The German "VAT gap" (the difference between the theoretical tax liability according to the tax law and the actual revenue collected) is estimated at 11,2 % in 2013; the percentage amounts to EUR 24,873 million.
- Financial engineering instruments are an attractive source of finance in a competitive business environment
- European legislation in the area of structural funds is often considered to be too complex and unclear.
- Cooperation between different national and European bodies working on security risk analysis in trade has proven very important

#### Recommendations

- National parliaments should be encouraged to support national declarations for the implementation of European funds with the view to establishing a single audit chain.
- National parliaments should support the European Parliament's endeavour to hold the Council to account.
- A more accountable, transparent, simple financing system of the EU budget needs to be established.
- The CONT delegation reiterated its demands on GNI data as voted in the 2013 Commission discharge resolution.
- Member States should increase their administrative cooperation in EUROFISC
- The use of Intermediate Bodies (IB) and multitude of different instruments should be avoided as they increase the risk of error.
- Management Authorities (MAs) and Audit Authorities (AAs) should be asked for concrete proposals which legal provisions should be simplified (Done by letter from the Chair to the respective MAs and AAs).
- OLAF should strengthen its coordinating role in the cooperation between different national and European bodies working on security risk analysis in trade

**WEDNESDAY 20 APRIL 2016**

**11.30 - 12.30**

**IN CAMERA**

## **10. COORDINATOR'S MEETING**



**Meeting held in camera**



**WEDNESDAY 20 APRIL 2016**

15.00 - 18.30

**PUBLIC MEETING**

## **11. HEARING ON THE 'CONTROL OF PROJECTS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF EU FUNDS IN THE AREA OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT - EFFECTIVENESS AND PROBLEMS'**



Rapporteurs: [Claudia Schmidt](#) (EPP) & [Ryszard Czarnecki](#) (ECR)  
Administrator: Olivier Sautière

The purpose of the hearing is to enable a thorough discussion, at the European Parliament level, on key issues related to the control dimension of projects and the implementation of EU funds in the areas of infrastructure and transport.

This hearing is also an opportunity to have an exchange of views with key stakeholders and listen to their practical experiences particularly on ways to select, control transport and infrastructure projects and assess their effectiveness. Inherent and operational constraints in such investment projects will also be addressed on the basis of a case study, namely the Lyon-Turin project.

The hearing will start with the opening remarks by the Chair Ms Gräßle, followed by an introduction by the co-Rapporteurs Ms Claudia Schmidt and Ryszard Czarnecki.

Seven participants are invited to present their views on these issues in the following two panels:

First panel: *'Control of EIB financed projects: what kind of challenges the EIB has to face?'*

- Mr Neil Valentine, EIB, Head of division in the Projects Department,
- Ms Ivory Yong-Prötzel, EIB, Head of Operations Evaluation,
- Mr Xavier Sol, Director Counter Balance (Brussels).

Second panel: *'The implementation of EU funds in infrastructure and transport: lessons learnt from the project Lyon Turin'*

- Mr Olivier Onidi, European Commission, Director of DG MOVE, Mr Stéphane Ouaki, European Commission, Head of Unit B.4. of DG MOVE, and Mr Herald Ruijters, Head of Unit B.1. of DG MOVE
- Mr Hubert du Mesnil, Société Tunnel Euralpin Lyon Turin (TELT), Président,
- Mr Daniel Ibanez, économiste des Procédures collectives (redressements et liquidations judiciaires).

The closing remarks will be made by the co-Rapporteurs.





**THURSDAY 21 APRIL 2016**

9.00 - 11.30

**PUBLIC MEETING**

## **12. ECA SPECIAL REPORT 18/2015 (2015 DISCHARGE) ON "FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO MEMBER STATES IN DIFFICULTIES"**



**Presentation of the Special Report by the Member of the European Court of Auditors responsible, *Baudilio Tomé Muguruza*, and consideration of a working document**

Rapporteur: [Inès Ayala Sender](#) (S&D)  
Administrator: Mauro de Oliveira

The financial crisis that hit Europe in 2008 triggered the European sovereign debt crisis. The sovereign debt crisis had many causes, including weak banking supervision, poor fiscal policies and the difficulties experienced by large financial institutions (the bailout costs of which were borne by the general public).

The crisis affected the EU Member States in two waves. In the first instance, the contagion of the financial crisis spread through foreign credit and trade channels to a number of non-euro area Member States. The second wave of the crisis concerned euro area Member States.

The purpose of the financial assistance was to help countries repay or finance their maturing debt and deficits. The objectives of each programme differed in detail, but the overall aims of financial assistance were to return Member States to sound macroeconomic or financial health and restore their capacity to meet their public-sector (euro area) or balance-of-payments (non-euro area) obligations.

The Court's audit examined whether the Commission's management of financial assistance programmes was appropriate and concludes inter alia that:

- the Commission systematically over-estimated the strength of countries' public finances and prior to 2009 lacked reporting on the build-up of contingent public-sector liabilities;
- Commission's surveillance did not adequately assess the link between large foreign financial flows, the health status of the banks and, ultimately, government finances;
- Different countries were not treated in the same way in a comparable situation and the conditions for assistance were managed differently in each programme;
- The Commission's borrowing was an accomplishment, as all bond issues attracted sufficient demand from the capital markets;
- Member States complied with most conditions set in their programmes that were successful in prompting reforms.

The Rapporteur's working document is available on the [CONT website](#).



### 13. ECA SPECIAL REPORT 24/2015 (2015 DISCHARGE) ON "TACKLING INTRA-COMMUNITY VAT FRAUD: MORE ACTION NEEDED"



#### **Presentation of the Special Report by the Member of the European Court of Auditors responsible, *Neven Mates*, and consideration of a working document**

Rapporteur: [Nedzhmi Ali](#) (ALDE)  
Administrator: Michal Czaplicki

The single market abolished border controls for intra-Community trade. This created a risk that exports of goods and services to another Member State remain untaxed in both the supplying State and in the State of consumption. In addition to the revenue loss for Member States, uncollected VAT has an effect on the European Union's Own Resources.

The European Court of Auditors audited the issue and arrived at the conclusion that the EU system is not sufficiently effective and that is adversely affected by the lack of comparable data and indicators on intra-Community VAT fraud at EU level. VAT fraud is often linked with organised crime. According to Europol's representatives, it is estimated that 40-60 billion euro of the annual VAT revenue losses of Member States are caused by organised crime groups and that 2 % of those groups are behind 80 % of the Missing Trader Intra-Community (MTIC) fraud. The EU has put in place a battery of tools that Member States may use to fight against intra-Community VAT fraud but some of them need to be strengthened or more consistently applied.

The rapporteur believes that the Commission should initiate a coordinated effort of Member states to establish a common system of estimating the size of intra-Community VAT fraud, which would allow Member States to evaluate their performance in terms of reducing the incidence of intra-Community VAT fraud, increasing detection of fraud and increasing tax recovery following the detection of fraud. It should recommend to Member States to introduce a common risk analysis including the use of Social Network Analysis to ensure that the information exchanged through Eurofisc is well targeted to fraud and improve the speed and frequency of these information exchanges. The Commission should support the Member States to negotiate Mutual Assistance Arrangements with the countries where most of the digital service providers are established.

The Rapporteur's working document (EN) is available on the [CONT website](#).

The Rapporteur's recommendations will form part of the Commission's discharge report for the financial year 2015. Amendments may be tabled in this context and the deadline will be the same as the Commission's discharge.

### 14. ECA SPECIAL REPORT 25/2015 (2015 DISCHARGE) ON "EU SUPPORT FOR RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE: POTENTIAL TO ACHIEVE SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER VALUE FOR MONEY"



#### **Presentation of the Special Report by the Member of the European Court of Auditors responsible, *Nikolaos Milionis*, and consideration of a working document**

Rapporteur: [Georgi Pirinski](#) (S&D)  
Administrator: Philippe Godts

The European Court of Auditors examined whether the Commission and the Member States had achieved value for money with the rural infrastructure measures they decided to finance.



The audit focused on European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) infrastructure investments financed under measures 125, 321, 322 and 323. Projects financed using the LEADER approach were audited in Germany (Saxony) and Spain (Extremadura), as these two regions used this approach for significant infrastructure investments.

The Court assessed:

- 1) the justification of the need for EU funds for rural infrastructure and the coordination with other funds;
- 2) several key aspects related to the Member States' implementation of the measures like: the application of selection criteria, the checks on the reasonableness of costs, the sustainability-related requirements and the timeliness of the administrative processes;
- 3) whether the results of the measures had been monitored and evaluated in such a way as to allow the Member States and the Commission to identify and respond to any problems which may have arisen, and to provide objective information on the results of the measures financed.

The Court points out that all individual audited projects delivered their expected physical outputs and, in some cases, made a clear positive contribution to the rural areas. Nevertheless the Court found that the Member States and the Commission had achieved only limited value for money, as aid was not systematically directed towards the most cost-effective projects addressing the objectives set in the Rural Development Programmes (RDP) and there was insufficient information to demonstrate the success of the measures.

In order to address the deficiencies detected by the Court, the rapporteur recommends in particular that the EU investments in rural infrastructure are targeted explicitly to projects that allow improvement of public services and/or contribute to jobs' creation and economic development in rural areas, and for which there is a demonstrable need for public support and which deliver added value.

He also recommends that Member States use a coordinated approach which quantifies needs, where applicable, and funding gaps and justifies the use of the RDP measures, and which considers not only EU funds and programmes, but also national, regional and local programmes and public and private funds that could address — or are already addressing — the same needs as the RDP.

He calls on the Commission to build upon the first steps taken to ensure effective coordination and complementarity between the different EU funds and to provide further guidance to Member States during the implementation of the programmes on how to achieve not only better complementarity, but also on how to avoid the risk of substitution of funds and to mitigate the risk of deadweight; in this regard, he asks the Commission to intervene also by promoting good practices;

He calls for respecting the principle of additionality on all levels and insists therefore on a proper set-up of monitoring committees and their active participation in the process of coordination.

He also requests the Commission and the Member States to introduce requirements that oblige the beneficiaries to ensure long-term sustainability and proper maintenance of the infrastructure financed by EU investments, and to check implementation of respective requirements.

The working document is available on the [CONT website](#).

The Rapporteur's recommendations will form part of the Commission's discharge report for the financial year 2015. Amendments may be tabled in this context and the deadline will be the same as the Commission's discharge.



**THURSDAY 21 APRIL 2016**

11.30 - 12.30

**PUBLIC MEETING**

**15. AMENDING REGULATION (EU, EURATOM) No 883/2013, AS REGARDS THE SECRETARIAT OF THE SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE EUROPEAN ANTI-FRAUD OFFICE (OLAF)**



**Exchange of views with the Vice-President of the European Commission responsible for Budget and Human Resources, *Kristalina Georgieva***

Administrator: Christian Ehlers

The proposal, pursuant to Article 325 of the Treaty, aims at remedying a punctual weakness in the OLAF regulation and is therefore limited in scope: The proposal aims at that the secretariat of the Supervisory Committee of the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF-SC) being provided by the Commission and that the appropriations for the Supervisory Committee and its secretariat being entered into the section of the general budget of the European Union relating to the Commission.

Given the limited scope of the proposal and given the fact that the proposal corresponds to long standing demands made by Parliament and the OLAF-SC itself, the Council, the Parliament and the Commission envisage a swift adoption of the proposal.

Political coordinators of CONT and JURI agreed to the application of the simplified legislative procedure without amendment.

**16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**17. NEXT MEETINGS**

**NEXT MEETINGS**

- **26 April 2016, 15.00 - 18.30 (Brussels)**
- **23 May 2016, 15.00 - 18.30 (Brussels)**
- **24 May 2016, 9.00 - 12.30 and 15.00 - 18.30 (Brussels)**

**WATCH LIVE**

Watch the CONT committee meeting live on the [EP website](#) or on [Europarl TV](#)

**PAPERLESS PROGRAMME (INTERNAL USERS ONLY)**

Access CONT committee meeting documents on [eMeeting](#) or any CONT committee information on [eCommittee](#)

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

Contact the [CONT Secretariat](#) or visit the [website](#) of the CONT committee