

Amendment 1

Daniel Freund, Michael Bloss, Patrick Breyer, Saskia Bricmont, Reinhard Bütikofer, Damien Carême, Fabio Massimo Castaldo, Anna Cavazzini, Leila Chaibi, David Cormand, Ignazio Corrao, Ciarán Cuffe, Jakop G. Dalunde, Rosa D'Amato, Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield, Karima Delli, Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg, Pascal Durand, Bas Eickhout, Cornelia Ernst, Eleonora Evi, Romeo Franz, Alexandra Geese, Sven Giegold, Markéta Gregorová, Claude Gruffat, Francisco Guerreiro, José Gusmão, Henrike Hahn, Heidi Hautala, Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana, Martin Häusling, Stasys Jakeliūnas, Radan Kanev, Ska Keller, Marcel Kolaja, Stelios Kouloglou, Alice Kuhnke, Sergey Lagodinsky, Philippe Lamberts, Katrin Langensiepen, Marisa Matias, Karen Melchior, Tilly Metz, Hannah Neumann, Niklas Nienaaß, Grace O'Sullivan, Jutta Paulus, Piernicola Pedicini, Mikuláš Peksa, Terry Reintke, Diana Riba i Giner, Michèle Rivasi, Caroline Roose, Mounir Satouri, Helmut Scholz, Jordi Solé, Tineke Strik, Marie Toussaint, Ernest Urtasun, Monika Vana, Thomas Waitz, Sarah Wiener, Lara Wolters, Sabine Verheyen, Tatjana Ždanoka, Alviina Alametsä, François Alfonsi, Rasmus Andresen, Margrete Auken, Brando Benifei, Benoît Bêteau, Damian Boeselager

Report**A9-0260/2021****Daniel Freund**

Strengthening transparency and integrity in the EU institutions by setting up an independent EU ethics body
(2020/2133(INI))

Motion for a resolution**Paragraph 34***Motion for a resolution*

34. Believes that at the end of this period the reasoned recommendation of the independent ethics body, without prejudice to the General Data Protection Regulation and personal rights, should be made public, together with the decision of the competent authority who should provide an explanation if the recommendations are not fully followed; considers as a first measure that the publication or forwarding of recommendations and decisions could constitute a sanction in itself; stresses that such a body cannot replace the CJEU; suggest that, in exceptional cases, when the competent authority duly justifies that more time is needed to investigate the case, it can ask the ethics body to extend its deadline for making a decision by up to 20 working days; considers that this two-step

Amendment

34. Believes that at the end of this period the reasoned recommendation of the independent ethics body, without prejudice to the General Data Protection Regulation and personal rights, should be made public, together with the decision of the competent authority who should provide an explanation if the recommendations are not fully followed; considers as a first measure that the publication or forwarding of recommendations and decisions could constitute a sanction in itself; stresses that such a body cannot replace the CJEU; suggest that, in exceptional cases, when the competent authority duly justifies that more time is needed to investigate the case, it can ask the ethics body to extend its deadline for making a decision by up to 20 working days; considers that this two-step

approach should apply whenever ***there are no*** reasonable grounds to believe that the ***individual acted in bad faith***, and recommends that any intentional breach, gross negligence, concealment of evidence, non-compliance or non-cooperation should be considered aggravating factors with respect to recommendations for sanctions, even when the breach itself has ceased;

approach should apply whenever ***the individual had*** reasonable grounds to believe that the ***information was true at the time of disclosure***, and recommends that any intentional breach, gross negligence, concealment of evidence, non-compliance or non-cooperation should be considered aggravating factors with respect to recommendations for sanctions, even when the breach itself has ceased;

Or. en