



2024/2008(ACI)

10.4.2024

AMENDMENTS

1 - 52

Draft report

Daniel Freund

(PE759.998v01-00)

on the conclusion of an Agreement between the European Parliament, the Council, the European Commission, the Court of Justice of the European Union, the European Central Bank, the European Court of Auditors, the European Economic and Social Committee and the European Committee of the Regions, establishing an Interinstitutional Body for Ethical Standards for Members of Institutions and advisory bodies mentioned in Article 13 of the Treaty on European Union
(2024/2008(ACI))

Amendment 1

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Citation 3

Proposal for a decision

- having regard to Article **13** of the Treaty of the European Union,

Amendment

- having regard to Article **2** of the Treaty of the European Union,

Or. en

Amendment 2

Daniel Freund

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz

on behalf of the S&D Group

Leila Chaibi

on behalf of The Left Group

Nikolaj Villumsen, Manon Aubry, Helmut Scholz, Gilles Boyer

Proposal for a decision

Citation 11 a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

- *having regard to its resolution of 13 July 2023 on recommendations for reform of European Parliament's rules on transparency, integrity, accountability and anti-corruption^{1a},*

^{1a} *Texts adopted, P9_TA(2023)0292.*

Or. en

Amendment 3

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Recital -A (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

-A. whereas the rule of law is of paramount importance for the functioning of the Union; whereas all acts of the Union require a legal basis in the Treaties; whereas there is no such legal basis for an interinstitutional ethics body;

Or. en

Amendment 4

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Recital A

Proposal for a decision

A. whereas the independence, transparency and accountability of EU institutions are of the utmost importance for their democratic legitimacy and for fostering citizens' trust;

Amendment

A. whereas the independence, transparency and accountability of EU institutions are of the utmost importance for their democratic legitimacy and for fostering citizens' trust; **whereas the European Parliament today ranks amongst the most transparent legislatures in the world;**

Or. en

Amendment 5

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Recital B

Proposal for a decision

B. whereas there is a need to address the shortcomings **stemming from** the current ethics framework, **which is fragmented across the EU institutions,**

Amendment

B. whereas there is a need to address the shortcomings **of the implementation of** the current ethics framework **as existing rules were not enforced in incidents such**

bodies, offices and agencies, with different rules, procedures and levels of enforcement;

as ‘Qatargate’; whereas under the current Treaties every EU institution is responsible for its own rules on standards in public office and harmonisation of some of these rules is desirable;

Or. en

Amendment 6

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Recital C

Proposal for a decision

C. whereas Parliament *proposed, in its* resolution of 16 September 2021, and *reiterated, in* its subsequent resolutions of 16 February 2023 and 12 July 2023, to set up an *ambitious, genuine and independent* ethics body;

Amendment

C. whereas Parliament’s *negotiation mandate is defined in* its resolution of 16 September 2021 *on strengthening transparency and integrity in the EU institutions by setting up an independent EU ethics body^{1a}* and its subsequent resolutions of 16 February 2023 *on the establishment of an independent EU ethics body^{1b}* and 12 July 2023 *on the establishment of the EU ethics body^{1c}*; *whereas that mandate to support the set up of an ethics body fully includes the Council and the European Council;*

^{1a} OJ C 117, 11.3.2022, p. 159._

^{1b} Texts adopted, P9_(2023)0055.

^{1c} Texts adopted, P9_TA(2023)0281.

Or. en

Amendment 7

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Recital C a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

Ca. *whereas the term “ethics” is legally undefined and may lead to a misinterpretation of the role of the body in the future; whereas precedent in Member States establishes more appropriate terms such as “standards in public office”;*

Or. en

Amendment 8

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Recital D

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

D. *whereas the Commission presented its proposal for the establishment of an interinstitutional ethics body on 8 June 2023, putting forward a standard-setting body **mainly lacking capacity to examine individual cases and potential breaches of ethical rules;***

D. *whereas the Commission presented its proposal for the establishment of an interinstitutional ethics body on 8 June 2023, putting forward a standard-setting body **in line with the Treaties, however retaining the questionable term “ethics body”;***

Or. en

Amendment 9

Daniel Freund

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz

on behalf of the S&D Group

Leila Chaibi

on behalf of The Left Group

Nikolaj Villumsen, Manon Aubry, Helmut Scholz, Gilles Boyer

Proposal for a decision

Recital D

Proposal for a decision

D. whereas the Commission presented its proposal for the establishment of an interinstitutional ethics body on 8 June 2023, putting forward a standard-setting body mainly lacking capacity to examine individual cases and potential breaches of ethical rules;

Amendment

D. whereas the Commission presented its proposal for the establishment of an interinstitutional ethics body on 8 June 2023, putting forward a standard-setting body; ***whereas that Commission proposal fell far short of the ambition put forward in Parliament's resolutions***, mainly lacking ***in*** capacity to examine individual cases and potential breaches of ethical rules ***as well as to recommend sanctions***;

Or. en

Amendment 10

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Recital E a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Ea. whereas the conclusion of the Agreement does not reflect the mandate; whereas Parliament needs to consider its position in light of the draft Agreement;

Or. en

Amendment 11

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Recital F

Proposal for a decision

F. whereas an interinstitutional ***ethics*** body ***will*** contribute to strengthening trust in Union institutions and their democratic legitimacy, as well as to building an

Amendment

F. whereas an interinstitutional body ***for standards in public office has the potential to*** contribute to strengthening trust in Union institutions and their

institutional culture based on *the highest ethical standards*;

democratic legitimacy, as well as to building an institutional culture based on *clearly defined rules that are enforced*;

Or. en

Amendment 12

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Recital G

Proposal for a decision

G. whereas Parliament's current ethical rules in its Rules of *p*rocedure provide for many standardised written declarations including declarations of private interests, declarations of assets, declarations on awareness of conflict of interests for office holders, rapporteurs, shadow-rapporteurs and participants in an official delegation or interinstitutional negotiations, declarations of scheduled meetings with interest representatives, also when delegated to their assistants, declarations of input by the rapporteurs on their files, declarations of attendance at events organised by third parties, declarations of gifts and declarations of intergroups or informal groupings on external financial support;

Amendment

G. whereas Parliament's current ethical rules in its Rules of *P*rocedure provide for many standardised written declarations including declarations of private interests, declarations of assets, declarations on awareness of conflict of interests for office holders, rapporteurs, shadow-rapporteurs and participants in an official delegation or interinstitutional negotiations, declarations of scheduled meetings with interest representatives, also when delegated to their assistants, declarations of input by the rapporteurs on their files, declarations of attendance at events organised by third parties, declarations of gifts and declarations of intergroups or informal groupings on external financial support; *whereas the scope of these declarations needs to be streamlined in the next legislative term*;

Or. en

Amendment 13

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 1

Proposal for a decision

1. **Welcomes** the Agreement **allowing for strong common ethical standards and for individual cases to be examined by the independent experts at the request of an institution or an advisory body that is a party to the Agreement regarding any declaration of their Members;**

Amendment

1. **Rejects** the Agreement **as it constitutes an attack on the functioning of the Parliament; calls for the defence of parliamentary independence; questions the independence of the third-party experts referred to in the agreement; expresses grave concern concerning the potentially chilling effects on the rule of law if this agreement is taken as an example at national level;**

Or. en

Amendment 14

Daniel Freund

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz

on behalf of the S&D Group

Leila Chaibi

on behalf of The Left Group

Nikolaj Villumsen, Manon Aubry, Helmut Scholz, Gilles Boyer

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 1

Proposal for a decision

1. Welcomes the Agreement **allowing for strong common ethical standards and for individual cases to be examined by the independent experts at the request of an institution or an advisory body that is a party to the Agreement regarding any declaration of their Members;**

Amendment

1. Welcomes the Agreement **enabling the development of strong common ethical standards and the exchange of best practices,** and **allowing** for individual cases to be examined by the independent experts at the request of an institution or an advisory body that is a party to the Agreement regarding any declaration of their Members;

Or. en

Amendment 15

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 2

Proposal for a decision

2. Underlines *the fact that the final decision-making power on implementation remains with the relevant authorities of the institutions or bodies; notes that any consultation of the independent experts on an individual case begins with a request of a party to the Agreement as regards its own members;*

Amendment

2. Underlines *that a publication of investigations and suspicions even in cases where no conflict of interest has been established is prejudicial;*

Or. en

Amendment 16

Daniel Freund

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz

on behalf of the S&D Group

Leila Chaibi

on behalf of The Left Group

Nikolaj Villumsen, Manon Aubry, Helmut Scholz, Gilles Boyer

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 2

Proposal for a decision

2. Underlines the fact that the final decision-making power on implementation remains with the relevant authorities of the institutions or bodies; notes that any consultation of the independent experts on an individual case begins with a request of a party to the Agreement *as regards its own members;*

Amendment

2. Underlines the fact that the final decision-making power on implementation remains with the relevant authorities of the institutions or bodies; notes that any consultation of the independent experts on an individual case begins with a request *as regards its own members* of a party to the Agreement *in accordance with its internal rules; underlines that the declarations of financial interests of the Commissioners-designate, as high level cases transcending the interests of the institution concerned, should as a rule be subject to examination by the independent experts;*

Amendment 17

Daniel Freund

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz

on behalf of the S&D Group

Leila Chaibi

on behalf of The Left Group

Nikolaj Villumsen, Manon Aubry, Gilles Boyer

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

2a. Reiterates, however, that Parliament remains fully committed to an independent ethics body, capable of carrying out investigations on its own initiative and issuing recommendations for sanctions to the responsible authorities of the participating institutions or bodies, composed of independent experts as full members, that covers Members of EU institutions and bodies before, during and after their term of office or service as well as staff, as envisaged in Parliament's resolution of 16 September 2021 on strengthening transparency and integrity in the EU institutions by setting up an independent EU ethics body^{1a} and reiterated in its resolutions of 16 February 2023 on the establishment of an independent EU ethics body^{1b} and 12 July 2023 on the establishment of the EU ethics body^{1c};

^{1a} OJ C 117, 11.3.2022, p. 159._

^{1b} Texts adopted, P9_(2023)0055.

^{1c} Texts adopted, P9_TA(2023)0281.

Amendment 18

Leila Chaibi, Manon Aubry, Nikolaj Villumsen, Helmut Scholz

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

2a. *Deeply regrets that the decision-making procedure of its members is based on consensus; underlines that this risks aligning decisions with the lowest common ground among institutions on ethical standards, particularly considering that some institutions covered do not have a code of conduct;*

Or. en

Amendment 19

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 3

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

3. *Regrets* that the *European* Council decided *not* to join the Agreement;

3. *Notes* that the *Council decided to* join the Agreement *only in enforcement mechanisms; points out an inter-institutional power imbalance arising from this; calls on Parliament to refuse to sign the Agreement and to resume the negotiations until all institutions fully take part in an interinstitutional agreement;*

Or. en

Amendment 20

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 4

Proposal for a decision

4. **Regrets** the unwillingness of the Council not to allow an extension of the scope of the Agreement to at least the representatives at ministerial level of the Member State holding the Presidency of the Council, by arguing that there is no legal basis in the Treaties to adopt common minimum standards applying to the representatives of Member States; ***is of the opinion that Members of the Council, like Members of the European Parliament, could be bound by the rules set by the Council pursuant to its power of self-organisation, which would prevail in the event of a conflict with national rules; underlines, in this context, that representatives of the Member States gathered in the Council act in their capacity as Members of the Council when adopting EU legal acts; commits to seeking a legal clarification as to whether the Council could bind its Members by common minimum standards;***

Amendment

4. **Highlights** the unwillingness of the Council not to allow an extension of the scope of the Agreement to at least the representatives at ministerial level of the Member State holding the Presidency of the Council, by arguing that there is no legal basis in the Treaties to adopt common minimum standards applying to the representatives of Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 21

Daniel Freund

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz

on behalf of the S&D Group

Leila Chaibi

on behalf of The Left Group

Nikolaj Villumsen, Manon Aubry, Helmut Scholz, Gilles Boyer

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 4

Proposal for a decision

4. Regrets the unwillingness of the Council ***not to allow an extension of*** the scope of the Agreement to at least the

Amendment

4. Regrets the unwillingness of the Council ***to extend*** the scope of the Agreement to at least the representatives at

representatives at ministerial level of the Member State holding the Presidency of the Council, by arguing that there is no legal basis in the Treaties to adopt common minimum standards applying to the representatives of Member States; is of the opinion that Members of the Council, like Members of the European Parliament, could be bound by the rules set by the Council pursuant to its power of self-organisation, which would prevail in the event of a conflict with national rules; underlines, in this context, that representatives of the Member States gathered in the Council act in their capacity as Members of the Council when adopting EU legal acts; commits to seeking a legal clarification as to whether the Council could bind its Members by common minimum standards;

ministerial level of the Member State holding the Presidency of the Council, by arguing that there is no legal basis in the Treaties to adopt common minimum standards applying to the representatives of Member States; ***commits to use the first review of the Agreement to address this legal gap and calls, in the meantime, on the upcoming Council Presidencies to voluntarily apply its provisions***; is of the opinion that Members of the Council, like Members of the European Parliament, could be bound by the rules set by the Council pursuant to its power of self-organisation, which would prevail in the event of a conflict with national rules; underlines, in this context, that representatives of the Member States gathered in the Council act in their capacity as Members of the Council when adopting EU legal acts; commits to seeking a legal clarification as to whether the Council could bind its Members by common minimum standards;

Or. en

Amendment 22
Leila Chaibi, Manon Aubry, Nikolaj Villumsen

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

4a Takes the view that the rules applicable to the resources and to the secretariat of the body shall take into consideration in an equal manner both the actual body composed by one representative of each party to the agreement and the five independent experts assisting the institutional representatives and joining the body as observers; regrets that according to Article 17 of the Agreement, any cost resulting from a consultation of the

independent experts shall be covered by the requesting party; stresses that this provision not only adds a financial burden to the requesting party but will also constitute a severe burden on the parties most willing to enhance ethical standards and work towards harmonisation of rules;

Or. en

Amendment 23

Daniel Freund

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz

on behalf of the S&D Group

Leila Chaibi

on behalf of The Left Group

Nikolaj Villumsen, Manon Aubry, Helmut Scholz, Gilles Boyer

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

4a. Takes the view that the resources made available must enable the proper functioning of both the actual body composed of one representative of each party to the Agreement and the five independent experts assisting the institutional representatives and joining the body as observers, as well as any necessary support therefor; regrets that according to Article 17 of the Agreement, any cost resulting from a consultation of the independent experts is to be covered by the requesting party, as this might result in a limitation of the number of such consultations;

Or. en

Amendment 24

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

**Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 5**

Proposal for a decision

5. ***Is of the opinion that*** the independent experts, which shall be appointed by consensus of the parties to the Agreement, ***shall have professional experience specifically in the areas of ethics, integrity and transparency, in addition to the requirements outlined in Article 5(2) of the Agreement referring to an impeccable record of professional behaviour and experience in high-level functions in European, national, or international public organisations;***

Amendment

5. ***Expresses grave concern at the inclusion of so-called*** independent experts, which shall be appointed by consensus of the parties to the Agreement ***in the event of the ratification of the Agreement; calls for the introduction of a confirmatory vote in Parliament for any external experts prior to them taking up their office;***

Or. en

Amendment 25
Sven Simon
on behalf of the PPE Group

**Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 6**

Proposal for a decision

6. ***Emphasises the essential role of the independent experts in examining individual cases at the request of a party to the Agreement; is of the opinion that each party sending a small random sample of cases to the independent experts would be highly beneficial for the purpose of developing or updating an ethical standard;***

Amendment

6. ***underlines a potential conflict of interest of NGO representatives serving as de facto judges in a trial by public opinion of elected Parliamentarians;***

Or. en

Amendment 26
Daniel Freund
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group
Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz

on behalf of the S&D Group
Leila Chaibi
on behalf of The Left Group
Nikolaj Villumsen, Manon Aubry, Gilles Boyer

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

6a. Believes the body should rely on the existing powers of institutions to ask their members for information or on the agreement of national authorities to share information; believes that the independent experts should be able to exchange information with national authorities where necessary for the performance of their tasks, while treating such information with the same confidentiality as the originating authority did; stresses in this regard that the independent experts should have access to the administrative documents of participating parties, especially the party consulting them on a case, in order to allow them to carry out well-reasoned and well-documented assessments;

Or. en

Amendment 27
Sven Simon
on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 7

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

7. Notes that the independent experts shall designate a speaker from amongst them; takes the view that the independent experts should have full autonomy in organising their work, as well as in convening their own meetings; **deleted**

Amendment 28

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 8

Proposal for a decision

8. Believes that the reasoned recommendation of the independent experts, without prejudice to the General Data Protection Regulation and personal rights, should be made public by the institution or body, together with the decision of the competent authority who should provide an explanation if the recommendations are not fully followed;

Amendment

8. ***Requests that the independent experts sign a non-disclosure agreement including a sworn affidavit under Belgian law prior to taking office and underlines that any breach of confidentiality shall result in termination of office as well as criminal liability;***

Amendment 29

Daniel Freund

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz

on behalf of the S&D Group

Leila Chaibi

on behalf of The Left Group

Nikolaj Villumsen, Manon Aubry, Helmut Scholz, Gilles Boyer

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

8a. Calls for the interinstitutional ethics body to lead by example on transparency by publishing all recommendations, annual reports, decisions and records of spending in a machine-readable open data format available to all citizens, and in accordance with the applicable data protection rules,

including, inter alia, the written opinion of the independent experts on the institutions' self-assessments in accordance with Article 10 and the anonymised and aggregated annual account of every year which summarises in aggregated and anonymised form the consultations and questions submitted by the parties and actions to follow them up in accordance with Article 7(4); underscores the importance of protecting the privacy of the individuals concerned to an appropriate extent and the presumption of innocence; calls on the parties to the Agreement to develop common guidance for the consultation of the independent experts and the publication of their recommendations;

Or. en

Amendment 30

Daniel Freund

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz

on behalf of the S&D Group

Leila Chaibi

on behalf of The Left Group

Nikolaj Villumsen, Manon Aubry, Gilles Boyer

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 8 b (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

8b. *Believes that, in order to be fully effective, the interinstitutional ethics body would need to combine the functions of existing organs responsible for ethics and that therefore, for cases which require specific consideration or for the purpose of developing or updating an ethical standard each participating party should consult the independent experts;*

Or. en

Amendment 31
Sven Simon

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 9

Proposal for a decision

9. Remains committed to constructively engaging in the review of the Agreement which is to be conducted ***three years after its entry into force in order to improve and enhance the ethics body, as provided for in Article 21 of the Agreement;***

Amendment

9. Remains committed to constructively engaging in the review of the Agreement which is to be conducted ***annually; calls for a confirmatory vote by Parliament whether to remain party to the Agreement 12 months after its entry into force;***

Or. en

Amendment 32
Leila Chaibi, Manon Aubry, Nikolaj Villumsen, Helmut Scholz

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

9a. Recalls its position that the body should be able to investigate on its own initiative alleged breaches of ethical rules by officials and staff of EU institutions and to conduct on-the-spot and records-based investigations using the information that it has collected or that it has received from third parties;

Or. en

Amendment 33
Leila Chaibi, Manon Aubry, Nikolaj Villumsen, Helmut Scholz

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 9 b (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

9b. *Reiterates its call for a revision of the Staff Regulations, especially Article 22c thereof, in order to align them with the standards of Directive (EU) 2019/1937 of the European Parliament and of the Council^{1a}; reiterates therefore its calls on the Bureau, in the interim, to immediately revise Parliament's Rules of Procedure implementing Article 22c of the Staff Regulations to bring them in line with the protections provided for in that Directive;*

^{1a} *Directive (EU) 2019/1937 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2019 on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law (OJ L 305, 26.11.2019, p. 17).*

Or. en

Amendment 34

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 10

Proposal for a decision

10. *Approves* the conclusion of the Agreement annexed hereto;

Amendment

10. *Does not approve* the conclusion of the Agreement annexed hereto *and calls for its renegotiation*;

Or. en

Amendment 35

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

10a. *Calls to establish a body for standards in public office instead; notes that such a body should have the authority to set standards for all institutions and to guide Members and institutions in implementing those standards;*

Or. en

Amendment 36

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

10a. *Asks for the body to be renamed the “Standards for Public Office Commission” in line with precedent in Member States;*

Or. en

Amendment 37

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 10 b (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

10b. *Calls on the President not to sign the Agreement unless the Council either joins the agreement as a full member or is no longer a party to the agreement at all;*

Or. en

Amendment 38
Sven Simon
on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 10 c (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

10c. Insists that the secretariat of the body be hosted by the European Parliament;

Or. en

Amendment 39
Sven Simon
on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 10 c (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

10c. Stresses that the body should set clearly-defined legal rules instead of vaguely defined ethical standards; calls for the renegotiation of the Agreement to this end;

Or. en

Amendment 40
Sven Simon
on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision
Paragraph 10 d (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

10d. Insists that the appointment of independent experts should not be

renewable;

Or. en

Amendment 41

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 10 e (new)

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

10e. Calls on the Parties to renegotiate the agreement to ensure that the body provides for the harmonisation of standards instead of the investigation of individual cases;

Or. en

Amendment 42

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Paragraph 11

Proposal for a decision

Amendment

11. Instructs its President to sign the Agreement with the President of the Council, the President of the Commission, the President of the Court of Justice of the European Union, the President of the European Central Bank, the President of the Court of Auditors, the President of the European Economic and Social Committee and the President of the Committee of the Regions ***and arrange for its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union;***

11. Instructs its President to ***issue a letter with the intention of re-negotiating*** the Agreement with the President of the Council, the President of the Commission, the President of the Court of Justice of the European Union, the President of the European Central Bank, the President of the Court of Auditors, the President of the European Economic and Social Committee and the President of the Committee of the Regions;

Or. en

Amendment 43

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Draft Agreement - Article 1 - paragraph 1

Present text

1. The European Parliament, ***the Council of the European Union***, the European Commission, the Court of Justice of the European Union, the European Central Bank, the European Court of Auditors, the European Economic and Social Committee and the European Committee of the Regions ('the Parties') establish by this Agreement an interinstitutional framework for cooperation on ethical standards setting up an interinstitutional body for ethical standards ('the Body') for the members of the Parties.

Amendment

1. The European Parliament, the European Commission, the Court of Justice of the European Union, the European Central Bank, the European Court of Auditors, the European Economic and Social Committee and the European Committee of the Regions ('the Parties') establish by this Agreement an interinstitutional framework for cooperation on ethical standards setting up an interinstitutional body for ethical standards ('the Body') for the members of the Parties.

Or. en

Amendment 44

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Draft Agreement - Article 1 - paragraph 1

Present text

1. The European Parliament, the Council of the European Union, the European Commission, the Court of Justice of the European Union, the European Central Bank, the European Court of Auditors, the European Economic and Social Committee and the European Committee of the Regions ('the Parties') establish by this Agreement an interinstitutional framework for cooperation on ethical standards setting up an interinstitutional body for ***ethical***

Amendment

1. The European Parliament, the European Commission, the Council of the European Union, the Court of Justice of the European Union, the European Central Bank, the European Court of Auditors, the European Economic and Social Committee and the European Committee of the Regions ('the Parties') establish by this Agreement an interinstitutional framework for cooperation on ethical standards setting up an interinstitutional body ***for standards in***

standards ('the Body') for the members of the Parties.

public office ('the Body') for the members of the Parties.

Or. en

Amendment 45

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Draft Agreement - Article 2 - paragraph 1 - point b a (new)

Present text

Amendment

(ba) the members of the Council of the European Union in relation to the exercise of their Union mandate;

Or. en

Amendment 46

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Draft Agreement - Article 5 - paragraph 5

Present text

Amendment

5. The term of the independent experts shall be 3 years, **renewable once**. If an independent expert ceases office before the completion of the 3-year term or if the Parties decide by consensus to revoke the appointment of an independent expert, the Parties shall appoint by consensus a new independent expert for 3 years.

5. The term of the independent experts shall be 3 years. If an independent expert ceases office before the completion of the 3-year term or if the Parties decide by consensus to revoke the appointment of an independent expert, the Parties shall appoint by consensus a new independent expert for 3 years.

Or. en

Amendment 47

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision
Draft Agreement - Article 5 - paragraph 6

Present text

6. ***For purely administrative purposes***, the independent experts ***shall receive the status of Special Adviser from the Commission and shall be administratively attached to the Commission***. They shall be reimbursed the travelling and accommodation expenses they incur when carrying out their duties. They shall receive a *per diem* allowance per day of work calculated on the basis of the remuneration of a Union official in grade AD12.

Amendment

6. The independent experts shall be reimbursed the travelling and accommodation expenses they incur when carrying out their duties. They shall receive a *per diem* allowance per day of work calculated on the basis of the remuneration of a Union official in grade AD12.

Or. en

Amendment 48

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision
Draft Agreement - Article 7 - paragraph 1

Present text

1. If deemed to be particularly relevant by a Party, ***either for cases which require specific consideration or*** for the purpose of developing or updating an ethical standard, the Party may consult and submit questions to the independent experts on the compliance of declarations of interests or any other standardised written declarations, or elements or drafts of such declarations, of its own members with the common minimum standards developed by the Body and reflected by the Party in its internal rules. Pending agreement on common minimum standards such questions may be referred to the independent experts based on other relevant standards applicable to the Party.

Amendment

1. If deemed to be particularly relevant by a Party for the purpose of developing or updating an ethical standard, the Party may consult and submit questions to the independent experts on the compliance of declarations of interests or any other standardised written declarations, or elements or drafts of such declarations, of its own members with the common minimum standards developed by the Body and reflected by the Party in its internal rules. Pending agreement on common minimum standards such questions may be referred to the independent experts based on other relevant standards applicable to the Party.

Amendment 49

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Draft Agreement - Article 9 - paragraph 1

Present text

1. The Body shall assess the necessity for an update of common minimum standards where ***one or more members of*** the Body ***consider*** that a review is necessary.

Amendment

1. The Body shall assess the necessity for an update of common minimum standards where the Body ***unanimously considers*** that a review is necessary.

Or. en

Amendment 50

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Draft Agreement - Article 10 - paragraph 8

Present text

8. The self-assessment and the report shall be made ***public on the website of the Body***.

Amendment

8. The self-assessment and the report shall be made ***available only to Parties and subject to confidentiality***.

Or. en

Amendment 51

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Draft Agreement - Article 16 - paragraph 2

Present text

2. The Secretariat shall be ***formally*** hosted

Amendment

2. The Secretariat shall be hosted ***at the***

in *the Commission* and operate under the coordination of the official who, within the Party chairing the Body, is responsible for the ethical rules for the members of that Party, or an official specifically designated for that purpose by the Party chairing the Body ('the coordinator'). The coordinator shall represent the Secretariat and shall oversee its day-to-day work, in the common interest of the Parties.

European Parliament in Brussels and operate under the coordination of the official who, within the Party chairing the Body, is responsible for the ethical rules for the members of that Party, or an official specifically designated for that purpose by the Party chairing the Body ('the coordinator'). The coordinator shall represent the Secretariat and shall oversee its day-to-day work, in the common interest of the Parties.

Or. en

Amendment 52

Sven Simon

on behalf of the PPE Group

Proposal for a decision

Draft Agreement - Article 19 - paragraph 2

Present text

2. The website shall, in particular, contain the following:

(a) the composition of the Body, the calendar of its meetings **and the meeting agendas**;

(b) the common minimum standards;

(c) the self-assessments and reports referred to in Article 10(1) and (6), respectively;

(d) all the applicable rules of all Parties in the areas covered by the common minimum standards.

Amendment

2. The website shall, in particular, contain the following:

(a) the composition of the Body **and** the calendar of its meetings;

(b) the common minimum standards;
deleted

(d) all the applicable rules of all Parties in the areas covered by the common minimum standards.

Or. en