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2019 discharge: General budget of the EU - Court of Auditors
(2020/2144(DEC))
Amendment 1
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1

1. Notes that the annual accounts of the Court of Auditors (‘the Court’) are audited by an independent external auditor in order to apply the same principles of transparency and accountability that the Court applies to its auditees; notes the auditor’s opinion that the financial statements give a true and fair view of the Court’s financial position;

Amendment
1. Notes that the annual accounts of the Court of Auditors (‘the Court’) are audited by an independent external auditor in order to apply the same principles of transparency and accountability that the Court applies to its auditees; notes with satisfaction the auditor’s opinion that the financial statements give a true and fair view of the Court’s financial position;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

8. Appreciates the fact that the Court will look into the suggestion of the 2018 discharge resolution that an independent annual report on the Union institutions should be presented as part of the reflections on the Court’s strategy for the 2021-2025 period, which should be adopted by the end of 2020;

Amendment
8. Appreciates the fact that the Court is looking into the suggestion of the 2018 discharge resolution that an independent annual report on the Union institutions should be presented as part of the reflections on the Court’s strategy for the 2021-2025 period, which should be adopted by the end of 2020;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Luke Ming Flanagan

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8
8. Appreciates the fact that the Court will look into the suggestion of the 2018 discharge resolution that an independent annual report on the Union institutions should be presented as part of the reflections on the Court’s strategy for the 2021-2025 period, which should be adopted by the end of 2020; in this regard reiterates the need for a deeper examination by the Court of each and every institutions in order to allow Parliament to fulfil its duties as discharge authority;

---

**Amendment 4**

Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 8 a (new)**

8 a. Welcomes the Court’s dedication to prepare the first report on the performance under the Union budget, following the request of the Parliament, aimed at assessing the results achieved from spending under the Union budget and, in particular, by providing an assessment of the performance under each Union policy; believes that performance audit is essential to evaluate the real impact of Union investments; is deeply concerned that Member States are providing the Union institutions with unreliable data, providing an over-optimistic view of the value for money of the funds spent; requests that the Court relies less on audits conducted by Member States but rather conducts more audits itself;
Amendment 5
Luke Ming Flanagan

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

8 a. Regrets that the Court’s follow-up to the 2018 discharge resolution provided only limited responses to Parliament’s remarks; stresses that the follow-up is essential to enable Parliament’s Committee on Budgetary Control to determine whether the Court has implemented Parliament’s recommendations; calls on the Court to include all necessary responses and more detailed explanations on the implementation of Parliament’s recommendations in their next follow-up report, making explicit reference to each paragraph of the resolution, and providing all necessary documents, including annexes;

Amendment 6
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

8 a. Echoes the Court’s recommendation for the Commission to publish the Annual Management and Performance Report (AMPR) earlier every year in order to examine and report on the regularity of the information presented; acknowledges the constraints following the COVID-19 pandemic that
forced the Court to publish its 2019 annual report in November 2020;

Amendment 7
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Notes that at the end of 2019, there were 853 permanent and temporary posts compared to 891 posts in 2013, constituting a decrease of 4.26%; notes that the level of staff is kept under continuous review and that the Court’s authorised establishment plan remains the same as in 2017 and in 2018 with 853 posts; notes that following the UK withdrawal from the Union, and in accordance with the result of the negotiations, the establishment plan was adapted during 2019;

Amendment

9. Notes that at the end of 2019, there were 853 permanent and temporary posts compared to 891 posts in 2013, constituting a decrease of 4.26%; notes in particular that permanent posts decreased 6.91 percentage points while temporary posts increased 10.07 percentage points; asks the Court to assess whether the increasing tendency of using temporary posts responds to the Court’s specific needs or rather is a response to budgetary constraints; notes that the level of staff is kept under continuous review and that the Court’s authorised establishment plan remains the same as in 2017 and in 2018 with 853 posts; notes that following the UK withdrawal from the Union, and in accordance with the result of the negotiations, the establishment plan was adapted during 2019;

Amendment 8
Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Appreciates that the Court, in

Amendment

10. Appreciates that the Court, in
accordance with its 2018-2020 strategy, has extended its contacts with researchers, academia and think-tanks and that the Court has as of 1 June 2020 seconded 15 staff members to other international institutions; notes that the Court regularly hosts staff seconded from other international bodies and that the Court also provided 55 internships (compared to 60 in 2018) for university graduates for periods of three to five months; welcomes the fact that the Court entered into several partnerships with universities and professional organisations with a view to future cooperation;

or. en

Amendment 9
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

12. Appreciates the fact that the Court’s activities related to staff well-being such as the Court’s network of confidential contact persons across the organisation to provide professional, and, if requested, anonymous support to members of staff; notes that the Court also provides free access to psychologists;

Amendment

12. Appreciates the fact that the Court followed-up on the 2018 Staff Satisfaction Survey and implemented activities related to staff well-being such as the Court’s network of confidential contact persons across the organisation to provide professional, and, if requested, anonymous support to members of staff; notes that the Court also provides five free sessions with psychologists and organises presentations on how to deal with burnout and, for managers, on how to detect and deal with harassment;

or. en
Amendment 10
Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

12. Appreciates the fact that the Court’s activities related to staff well-being such as the Court’s network of confidential contact persons across the organisation to provide professional, and, if requested, anonymous support to members of staff; notes that the Court also provides free access to psychologists;

Amendment
12. Appreciates the Court’s activities related to staff well-being such as the Court’s network of confidential contact persons across the organisation to provide professional, and, if requested, anonymous support to members of staff; notes that the Court also provides free access to psychologists;

Amendment 11
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

13. Is concerned about the decrease in the number of female directors from 30 % in 2018 to 20 % in 2019 and in the number of female heads of unit from 39 % in 2018 to 35 % in 2019; notes, however, the slight increase in female Court members from 21 % in 2018 to 26 % in 2019; underlines the commitment of Parliament’s Committee on Budgetary Control to support the nomination process for Court members in order to increase the share of women (seven women and 20 men were members in 2019);

Amendment
13. Is concerned about the decrease in the number of female directors from 30 % in 2018 to 20 % in 2019 and in the number of female heads of unit from 39 % in 2018 to 35 % in 2019; notes the slight increase in female Court members from 21 % in 2018 to 26 % in 2019; underlines the commitment of Parliament’s Committee on Budgetary Control to support a revision of the nomination process for Court members in order to reach gender balance (seven women and 20 men were members in 2019);

Amendment 12
Luke Ming Flanagan
Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13

13. Is concerned about the decrease in the number of female directors from 30% in 2018 to 20% in 2019 and in the number of female heads of unit from 39% in 2018 to 35% in 2019; notes, however, the slight increase in female Court members from 21% in 2018 to 26% in 2019; underlines the commitment of Parliament’s Committee on Budgetary Control to support the nomination process for Court members in order to increase the share of women (seven women and 20 men were members in 2019);

Amendment

13. Is concerned about the decrease in the number of female directors from 30% in 2018 to 20% in 2019 and in the number of female heads of unit from 39% in 2018 to 35% in 2019; notes, however, the slight increase in female Court members from 21% in 2018 (six out of 28 members) to 25% in 2019 (seven out of 28 Members); underlines the commitment of Parliament’s Committee on Budgetary Control to support the nomination process for Court members in order to increase the share of women, recalling the invitation to Member States to more actively encourage women to apply for these kinds of positions; reiterates that the Council should always present at least two candidates, one female and one male, during the appointment procedure;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Ádám Kósa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14 a (new)

14 a. Appreciates the participation of the Court in the Joint Committee of Equal Opportunities and in the Equal Opportunities Action Plan for the 2018-2020 period, which also addresses the issues of age and disability; asks the Court to report on the implementation of the action plan to the discharge authority;

Amendment

14 a. Appreciates the participation of the Court in the Joint Committee of Equal Opportunities and in the Equal Opportunities Action Plan for the 2018-2020 period, which also addresses the issues of age and disability; asks the Court to report on the implementation of the action plan to the discharge authority;

Or. en
Amendment 14
Tomáš Zdechovský, Monika Hohlmeier, Ádám Kósa, Lefteris Christoforou

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

15. States that the geographical proximity of France, Belgium and Germany to Luxembourg may be a reason why these three nationalities are generally overrepresented among the staff at the Court; notes, however, the Court’s firm position that when recruiting new staff members the Court acts solely in the interest of the service and without regard to nationality, as stipulated in Article 7 of the Staff Regulations;

Amendment

15. Urges the Court to strive for further improvements in the context of geographical balance of staff (specifically for AST functions groups 1-4 and 5-9 there is a significant overrepresentation of certain nationalities); calls on the Court to prepare an action plan for the recruitment of new staff members with regard to nationality, as stipulated in Article 7 of the Staff Regulations;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Alin Mituța, Martina Dlabajová, Olivier Chastel, Ramona Strugariu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

15. States that the geographical proximity of France, Belgium and Germany to Luxembourg may be a reason why these three nationalities are generally overrepresented among the staff at the Court; notes, however, the Court’s firm position that when recruiting new staff members the Court acts solely in the interest of the service and without regard to nationality, as stipulated in Article 7 of the Staff Regulations;

Amendment

15. States that the geographical proximity of France, Belgium and Germany to Luxembourg may be a reason why these three nationalities are generally overrepresented among the staff at the Court; notes, however, the Court’s firm position that when recruiting new staff members the Court acts solely in the interest of the service and without regard to nationality, as stipulated in Article 7 of the Staff Regulations; calls for actions that aim at improving the geographical balance of the staff, including at management level;

Or. en
Amendment 16
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15 a (new)

Amendment

15 a. Notes that flexible working arrangements are available for all members of staff except for certain categories where this is not possible for practical reasons; notes, however, that a large majority of members of staff benefiting from those working arrangements in 2019 were women (87% of staff working part-time and 68% of staff who took parental leave); calls on the Court to reflect on this situation in the frame of its career opportunities and diversity policies;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15 b (new)

Amendment

15 b. Echoes the Court’s remarks regarding the high cost of living in Luxembourg as one of the main factors that leads to difficulties in hiring and retaining staff; reiterates its concerns about the growing problem of the purchase power disparity suffered by Union civil servants posted to Luxembourg;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Isabel García Muñoz
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18 a (new)

Amendment

18 a. Takes note of the measures taken with respect to the safety of the staff, namely a contingency plan to deal with large-scale incidents, an internal procedure in case of a possible nuclear accident and a service level agreement with the EEAS to benefit from its advice regarding missions to high and critical threat level countries;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Mikuláš Peksa on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20 a (new)

Amendment

20 a. Welcomes the setup of the Digital Steering Committee with the aim to move forward with the digital transformation of the audit under an initiative called “ECA audit goes digital”; notes that in 2019, the ECA Lab supported ten audit tasks, including a pilot on using big data for performance audit; asks the Court to report to the Parliament on any obstacles encountered while requesting data in a machine readable format from Union institutions;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Mikuláš Peksa on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group
Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

21. Welcomes the fact that the Court’s IT systems are based on solid architectural principles that take into account a cost/benefit approach in relation to mainstream technologies procured inter-institutionally; notes that open source technologies are used at the Court in accordance with those principles;

Amendment

21. Welcomes the fact that the Court’s Decision No 6-2019 on the open data policy and the reuse of documents was published in April 2019 and that the Court’s IT systems are based on solid architectural principles that take into account a cost/benefit approach in relation to mainstream technologies procured inter-institutionally; welcomes that open source technologies are used at the Court in accordance with those principles; encourages the Court to prioritise open source technologies in order to prevent vendor lock-in, retain control over its own technical systems, provide stronger safeguards for the privacy and data protection of users and increase security and transparency for the public;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21 a (new)

21 a. Notes with satisfaction that the Court set up an action plan in 2016 to be prepared for the General Data Protection Regulation and be compliant with that Regulation as soon as it became applicable to Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies; notes that data protection and information security responsibilities were restructured in 2019 in order to split and reinforce the resources allocated;

Amendment

21 a. Notes with satisfaction that the Court set up an action plan in 2016 to be prepared for the General Data Protection Regulation and be compliant with that Regulation as soon as it became applicable to Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies; notes that data protection and information security responsibilities were restructured in 2019 in order to split and reinforce the resources allocated;

Or. en
Amendment 22
Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21 a (new)

Amendment

21 a. Encourages the Court to follow the EDPS recommendations to renegotiate the Inter-Institutional Licensing Agreement and implementation contract, signed between the Union institutions and Microsoft in 2018, with the objective of achieving digital sovereignty, avoid vendor lock-in and lack of control, and ensure the protection of personal data;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 25

Motion for a resolution

25. Asks the Court to explore the possibility of joining the transparency registry on the basis of a service level agreement; acknowledges the inter-institutional cooperation through service level agreements between the Court and other Union institutions and bodies; is interested to know if any cost benefit analysis takes place before entering into any agreement;

Amendment

25. Strongly recommends the Court to join the transparency registry on the basis of a service level agreement; acknowledges the inter-institutional cooperation through service level agreements between the Court and other Union institutions and bodies; is interested to know if any cost benefit analysis takes place before entering into any agreement;

Or. en

Amendment 24
26. Welcomes the administrative arrangement signed in 2019 between the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the Court in order to provide a structured framework for co-operation between OLAF and the Court, and to facilitate their timely exchange of information under Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 883/2013 and the Court’s decisions related to internal investigations; notes that this arrangement also contains provisions on non-operational issues such as the organisation of training sessions, workshops and exchange of staff; notes that in 2019, the Court reported ten cases of suspected fraud compared to nine cases in 2018 (eight identified in the course of audit work and two denunciations made by third parties);

arrangement signed in 2019 between the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the Court in order to provide a structured framework for co-operation between OLAF and the Court, and to facilitate their timely exchange of information under Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 883/2013 and the Court’s decisions related to internal investigations; notes that this arrangement also contains provisions on non-operational issues such as the organisation of training sessions, workshops and exchange of staff; notes that in 2019, the Court reported ten cases of suspected fraud compared to nine cases in 2018 (eight identified in the course of audit work and two denunciations made by third parties);

welcomes the fact that the arrangement already resulted in more efficient cooperation between the Court and OLAF, the establishment of permanent contact points allowing frequent exchanges, and faster and more regular feedback on cases transmitted by the Court to OLAF; notes that this arrangement also contains provisions on non-operational issues such as the organisation of training sessions, workshops and exchange of staff; notes that in 2019, the Court reported ten cases of suspected fraud compared to nine cases in 2018 (eight identified in the course of audit work and two denunciations made by third parties);

_________________

Amendment 26
Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

Amendment


26. Welcomes the administrative arrangement signed in 2019 between the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the Court in order to provide a structured framework for co-operation between OLAF and the Court, and to facilitate their timely exchange of information under Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 883/2013 and the Court’s decisions related to internal investigations; notes that this arrangement also contains provisions on non-operational issues such as the organisation of training sessions, workshops and exchange of staff; notes that in 2019, the Court reported ten cases of suspected fraud compared to nine cases in 2018 (eight identified in the course of audit work and two denunciations made by third parties);

26. Welcomes the administrative arrangement signed in 2019 between the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the Court in order to provide a structured framework for co-operation between OLAF and the Court, and to facilitate their timely exchange of information under Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 883/2013 and the Court’s decisions related to internal investigations; notes that this arrangement also contains provisions on non-operational issues such as the organisation of training sessions, workshops and exchange of staff; notes that in 2019, the Court reported ten cases of suspected fraud compared to nine cases in 2018 (eight identified in the course of audit work and two denunciations made by third parties); asks the Court to report back to Parliament’s Committee on Budgetary Control on how these suspected fraud cases were handled and resolved by the respective authorities in charge;


Amendment 27
Ádám Kósa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 30

30. Notes that the European Ombudsman invited the Court (in the context of a consultation undertaken with all Union institutions) to comment on the Ombudsman’s draft Practical recommendations for the EU administration on The use of the EU official languages when communicating with the public (case SI/98/2018/DDJ) to which the Court replied by indicating that its current policy is already compliant;

requests that national sign languages also be included in this process;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Mikuláš Peksa on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 31 a (new)

31 a. Notes that the Court makes use of the following proprietary social media channels: LinkedIn, Facebook, Instagram and Twitter, and that social media posts about the Court’s publications were displayed nearly 24 million times, more than four times higher than in 2018; notes that the number of followers increased by 31%; encourages the Court to establish a presence on free and open-source social media networks, such as Mastodon, to achieve further transparency and broader outreach;

Or. en
Amendment 29
Tomáš Zdechovský, Ádám Kósa, Lefteris Christoforou

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32

Motion for a resolution

32. Recognises that the Court applies a set of key performance indicators to monitor progress made, such as for example measuring the implementation rate of the Court’s recommendations; notes that the Court’s analysis showed that 96% of the recommendations made in the 2015 annual report and 94% of the recommendations made in the 2015 special reports have been implemented in full, mostly or in some respects; notes that the Court issued six annual reports, three opinions, 18 audit previews and four other publications, being part of the altogether 67 publications it issued in 2019;

Amendment

32. Recognises that the Court applies a set of key performance indicators to monitor progress made; notes with appreciation that the Court’s analysis showed that 96% of the recommendations made in the 2015 annual report and 94% of the recommendations made in the 2015 special reports have been implemented in full, mostly or in some respects; notes that the Court issued six annual reports, three opinions, 18 audit previews and four other publications, being part of the altogether 67 publications it issued in 2019;

Or. en

Amendment 30
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32

Motion for a resolution

32. Recognises that the Court applies a set of key performance indicators to monitor progress made, such as for example measuring the implementation rate of the Court’s recommendations; notes that the Court’s analysis showed that 96% of the recommendations made in the 2015 annual report and 94% of the recommendations made in the 2015 special reports have been implemented in full, mostly or in some respects; notes that the Court issued six annual reports, three

Amendment

32. Recognises that the Court applies a set of key performance indicators to monitor progress made, such as for example measuring the implementation rate of the Court’s recommendations; notes that the Court’s analysis showed that 96% of the recommendations made in the 2015 annual report and 94% of the recommendations made in the 2015 special reports have been implemented in full, mostly or in some respects; notes that the Court issued six annual reports, 36 special
opinions, 18 audit previews and four other publications, being part of the altogether 67 publications it issued in 2019; reports, three opinions, 18 audit previews and four other publications, being part of the altogether 67 publications it issued in 2019; notes that in 2019 approximately 52% of the Court’s audit resources were used for its Statement of Assurance work and the financial audits of the Union agencies and other bodies; asks the Court to report on the impact and satisfaction of its special reports and other products, as well as on the selected audit topics;

Amendment 31
Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32

Motion for a resolution

32. Recognises that the Court applies a set of key performance indicators to monitor progress made, such as for example measuring the implementation rate of the Court’s recommendations; notes that the Court’s analysis showed that 96% of the recommendations made in the 2015 annual report and 94% of the recommendations made in the 2015 special reports have been implemented in full, mostly or in some respects; notes that the Court issued six annual reports, three opinions, 18 audit previews and four other publications, being part of the altogether 67 publications it issued in 2019;

Amendment

32. Recognises that the Court applies a set of key performance indicators to monitor progress made, such as for example measuring the implementation rate of the Court’s recommendations; notes that the Court’s analysis showed that 96% of the recommendations made in the 2015 annual report and 94% of the recommendations made in the 2015 special reports have been implemented in full, mostly or in some respects; notes that the Court issued six annual reports, three opinions, 18 audit previews and four other publications, being part of the altogether 67 publications it issued in 2019; invites the Court to consider reviewing its key performance indicators to improve its reporting with the aid of better defined targets;

Amendment 32
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32 a (new)

Motion for a resolution Amendment

32 a. Calls on the Court to explore other ways of providing more information on the administrative expenditure of other Union institutions in the context of the discharge; reiterates that the Court’s overall audit approach deserves further auditing work and better targeted assessment; repeats its call for a more dedicated review of the administrative expenditure and support activities of other Union institutions, specifically on topics that are becoming of higher relevance or even critical;

Or. en

Amendment 33
Ryszard Czarnecki, Ryszard Antoni Legutko, Raffaele Fitto, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Elżbieta Rafalska

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32 a (new)

Motion for a resolution Amendment

32 a. Welcomes the fact that the Court sees a strong increase in media interest with particularly high coverage of its special reports;

Or. en

Amendment 34
Ryszard Czarnecki

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32 b (new)
Motion for a resolution  

Amendment 32 b. Welcomes the Court’s efforts, in line with the Financial Regulation, to produce its special reports generally within 13 months while noting that the average time to produce the special reports is still longer than that time limit;

Or. en

Amendment 35  
Mikuláš Peksa  
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 33 a (new)

Motion for a resolution  

Amendment 33 a. Notes that the Court of Justice found that Mr Pinxten breached the Court’s Code of Conduct for the Members of the Court by abusing of the rights and privileges attached to his position in the context of activities unrelated to his duties, by leaving for unjustified absences and failing to declared external activities, transmitting confidential information in an unauthorised fashion, as well as being in a conflict of interest; welcomes the fact that the Court asked OLAF to conduct an investigation, brought the case before the Court of Justice and is committed to comply with the recommended sanctions to recover all losses to the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 36  
Tomáš Zdechovský, Ádám Kósa, Lefteris Christoforou

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 34
Motion for a resolution

34. Notes that the audit showed that the case of a former member investigated by OLAF was an isolated case; stresses that the report concluded that the Court’s management and control systems were affected by certain shortcomings which have, however, been effectively remedied since then and that, overall, the management and control procedures currently in place are reliable; takes into account that the IAS made recommendations aimed at improving further the management and control system, that the audit report was strictly confidential and that all members and the secretary-general of the Court received the report;

Or. en

Amendment 37
Luke Ming Flanagan

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

34 a. Notes the Opinion of Advocate General Hogan delivered on 17 December 2020 1a, in which he clearly states that a breach of the obligations arising from the office of being a Member of the Court took place and recommends a sanction corresponding to the deprivation of two thirds of Mr Pinxten’s pension rights and connected benefit as from the date of the judgment in the present case

1a Case C-130/19, European Court of Auditors v Karel Pinxten (Article 286(6) TFEU – Breach of the obligations arising from the office of a former member of the Court of Auditors of the European Union – Deprivation of the right to a pension or
Amendment 38  
Tomáš Zdechovský, José Manuel Fernandes, Ádám Kósa, Lefteris Christoforou

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 37

37. Welcomes that the IAS considers that overall, reliable ex-post controls have been conducted for most of the high risk areas of the work of the directorates of the secretariat-general, based on the risk register and the operational objectives; appreciates being kept informed (in particular in the context of the past problems identified by an OLAF investigation on a former member of the Court) that the IAS has not observed any shortcomings that are of such importance as to seriously call into question the overall reliability of the internal control systems put in place by the authorising officer by delegation with regard to the legality and regularity of financial operations in 2019;

Amendment

37. Welcomes that the IAS considers that overall, reliable ex-post controls have been conducted for most of the high risk areas of the work of the directorates of the secretariat-general, based on the risk register and the operational objectives; appreciates being informed (in particular in the context of the past problems identified by an OLAF investigation on a former member of the Court) that the IAS has not observed any shortcomings that are of such importance as to seriously call into question the overall reliability of the internal control systems put in place by the authorising officer by delegation with regard to the legality and regularity of financial operations in 2019 and would appreciate such updates also in the future;

Amendment 39  
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution  
Paragraph 38

38. Agrees with the Court’s current strategy to improve the added value of the statement of assurance, focus more on the performance aspects of Union action and

Amendment

38. Agrees with the Court’s current strategy to improve the added value of the statement of assurance, focus more on the performance aspects of Union action and
make sure to deliver clear messages to the audiences; *reiterates* that in 2019 a group of four supreme audit institutions (the supreme audit institutions of Estonia, the Netherlands, Denmark and the United States) carried out a peer review of the Court’s strategy; notes that the report was published in March 2020 and provides valuable input for the next strategy; make sure to deliver clear messages to the audiences; *notes* that in 2019 a group of four supreme audit institutions (the supreme audit institutions of Estonia, the Netherlands, Denmark and the United States) carried out a peer review of the Court’s strategy; notes that the report was published in March 2020 and provides valuable input for the next strategy;

Amendment 40
Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 38 a (new)

*Motion for a resolution*  

Amendment

38 a. *Is deeply concerned that Mr Opioła was nominated by the Polish government and then appointed to the Court by the Council despite a very large majority of the Parliament (536 to 156 votes) being against his candidacy based on his involvement in national politics, his clear lack of experience with respect to budgetary control and his previous misuse of state property for political campaign purposes;*

Amendment 41
Tomáš Zdechovský, Monika Hohlmeier, Ádám Kósa, Lefteris Christoforou

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 39

*Motion for a resolution*  

Amendment

39. *Notes that members are authorised to use official vehicles in the performance of official duties; notes that the use of*
official cars for other journeys is additional to the performance of such duties and that since 1 January 2017, the costs and kilometres related to the use of official cars have decreased significantly; notes that new rules entered into force on 1 January 2020 and introduced a monthly EUR 100 contribution for the non-official use of the vehicles as well as a liability on the part of the members and the secretary-general for certain costs and charges;

emphasises the new rules on increased transparency with regards to the use of official cars and drivers to ensure that members’ journeys are related to the execution of their duties; notes that new rules entered into force on 1 January 2020 and introduced a monthly EUR 100 contribution for the non-official use of the vehicles as well as a liability on the part of the members and the secretary-general for certain costs and charges;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Isabel García Muñoz

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 39

Motion for a resolution

39. Notes that members are authorised to use official vehicles in the performance of official duties; notes that the use of official cars for other journeys is additional to the performance of such duties and that since 1 January 2017, the costs and kilometres related to the use of official cars have decreased significantly; notes that new rules entered into force on 1 January 2020 and introduced a monthly EUR 100 contribution for the non-official use of the vehicles as well as a liability on the part of the members and the secretary-general for certain costs and charges;

Amendment

39. Notes that members are authorised to use official vehicles in the performance of official duties; notes that the use of official cars for other journeys is additional to the performance of such duties and that since 1 January 2017, the costs and kilometres related to the use of official cars have decreased significantly; notes that new rules entered into force on 1 January 2020 and introduced a monthly EUR 100 contribution for the non-official use of the vehicles as well as a liability on the part of the members and the secretary-general for certain costs and charges; asks the Court to duly inform the Parliament of the monitoring of costs and savings related to the management of the car fleet; is furthermore of the opinion that the use of official vehicles for private use should not take place under any circumstances; considers that this practice may harm the
reputation of the Court and, in general, of the Union institutions; asks the Court, therefore, to reconsider this subject and to keep Parliament informed;

Or. en

Amendment 43
Luke Ming Flanagan

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 39

Motion for a resolution

39. Notes that members are authorised to use official vehicles in the performance of official duties; notes that the use of official cars for other journeys is additional to the performance of such duties and that since 1 January 2017, the costs and kilometres related to the use of official cars have decreased significantly; notes that new rules entered into force on 1 January 2020 and introduced a monthly EUR 100 contribution for the non-official use of the vehicles as well as a liability on the part of the members and the secretary-general for certain costs and charges;

Amendment

39. Notes that members are authorised to use official vehicles in the performance of official duties; notes that the use of official cars for other journeys is additional to the performance of such duties and that since 1 January 2017, the costs and kilometres related to the use of official cars have decreased significantly; notes that new rules entered into force on 1 January 2020 and introduced a monthly EUR 100 contribution for the non-official use of the vehicles as well as a liability on the part of the members and the secretary-general for certain costs and charges; reiterates its opinion that the use of official vehicles for private use should not take place under any circumstance, considering that this practice may harm the reputation of the Court and, in general, of the Union institutions

Or. en

Amendment 44
Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 39
39. Notes that members are authorised to use official vehicles in the performance of official duties; notes that the use of official cars for other journeys is additional to the performance of such duties and that since 1 January 2017, the costs and kilometres related to the use of official cars have decreased significantly; notes that new rules entered into force on 1 January 2020 and introduced a monthly EUR 100 contribution for the non-official use of the vehicles as well as a liability on the part of the members and the secretary-general for certain costs and charges; is of the opinion that the Court vehicles should only be used for official use; asks the Court to reconsider the new rules on the use of vehicles, as the monthly fee is not proportionate to the real costs to the Union budget;

Amendment

39. Notes that members are authorised to use official vehicles in the performance of official duties; notes that the use of official cars for other journeys is additional to the performance of such duties and that since 1 January 2017, the costs and kilometres related to the use of official cars have decreased significantly; notes that new rules entered into force on 1 January 2020 and introduced a monthly EUR 100 contribution for the non-official use of the vehicles as well as a liability on the part of the members and the secretary-general for certain costs and charges; is of the opinion that the Court vehicles should only be used for official use; asks the Court to reconsider the new rules on the use of vehicles, as the monthly fee is not proportionate to the real costs to the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 45
Luke Ming Flanagan

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 39 a (new)

39 a. Regrets that only very limited follow up was done by the Court with respect to paragraph 18 of the 2018 discharge resolution on the need for a register of leave for members of the Court, notes that the Court will consider carrying out a comparative analysis of the rules and best practices existing in other Union institutions as regards the presence and absence of Union high-level public office holders as defined in Regulation (EU) 2016/300; reminds that Parliament has made a clear call on the Court to establish procedures for keeping a register of members’ annual leave, sick leave and
Absence from work for other reasons to ensure that all leave taken by members is effectively recorded; stresses that the current practice could undermine the trust of Union citizens and institutions in the Court;

Or. en

Amendment 46
Luke Ming Flanagan

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 40

40. Appreciates the fact that, in the light of the obligations of the members to attend all meetings of the Court, of the chambers and of the administrative committee to which they belong, an attendance register is kept by the Court’s secretariat; notes that it reflects the presence and absence of members and shows also which absences are considered as excused by the president; notes that the attendance register is part of the Court’s rules implementing its rules of procedure;

Or. en

Amendment 47
Tomáš Zdechovský, Ádám Kósa, Lefteris Christoforou

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 41

41. Asks the Court to provide information on the results of three harassment complaints, which were reported and investigated in 2019; notes that they were handled in accordance with the procedures laid down in the policy for maintaining a
maintaining a satisfactory working environment and combating psychological and sexual harassment; notes that in terms of expenditure, the investigations of each case were carried out internally and thus did not entail any additional costs; notes that it is foreseen that the Court’s policy on protecting staff against harassment shall be evaluated every three years and that this exercise is due to be carried out in 2020; acknowledges that in terms of expenditure, the investigations of each case were carried out internally and thus did not entail any additional costs; welcomes the intention to evaluate the Court’s policy on protecting staff against harassment every three years and that this exercise is due to be carried out in 2020;

Or. en

Amendment 48
Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 42

Motion for a resolution

42. Highlights the fact that the supreme audit institutions of Poland and Croatia carried out a significant peer review of the Court’s ethical framework; notes that in the opinions of the peers the Court’s ethics control system should be further improved by a more comprehensive assessment of ethics risks, greater consistency and clarity in its rules on ethics, and improved information and communication activities;

Amendment

42. Highlights the fact that the supreme audit institutions of Poland and Croatia carried out a significant peer review of the Court’s ethical framework; notes that in the opinions of the peers the Court’s ethics control system should be further improved by a more comprehensive assessment of ethics risks, greater consistency and clarity in its rules on ethics, and improved information and communication activities; calls for enhanced mutual cooperation with the future Independent Ethics Body (IEB), generating a steady information exchange within the respective mandates of the Court and the IEB;

Or. en

Amendment 49
Tomáš Zdechovský, Ádám Kósa, Lefteris Christoforou

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43
43. **Calls on** the Court to provide information on any decisions taken related to the process of reviewing and amending the code of conduct for its members; supports the conclusions of the peer review with respect to the need to introduce regular updates of declarations, which would increase their reliability; is in agreement that the ethics committee plays a crucial role to the extent that the president and the members may seek its advice on any question pertaining to ethics and on the interpretation of the code of conduct; notes, moreover, that the committee is entrusted with approving any external activity undertaken by the members, including former members who intend to carry out an activity in the year after they leave the Court, which is an efficient tool in ensuring the absence of conflicts of interest.

43. **Urges** the Court to provide information on any decisions taken related to the process of reviewing and amending the code of conduct for its members; supports the conclusions of the peer review with respect to the need to introduce regular updates of declarations, which would increase their reliability; is in agreement that the ethics committee plays a crucial role to the extent that the president and the members may seek its advice on any question pertaining to ethics and on the interpretation of the code of conduct; notes, moreover, that the committee is entrusted with approving any external activity undertaken by the members, including former members who intend to carry out an activity in the year after they leave the Court, which is an efficient tool in ensuring the absence of conflicts of interest.

**Amendment 50**
**Luke Ming Flanagan**

**Motion for a resolution**
**Paragraph 43**

43. **Calls on** the Court to provide information on any decisions taken related to the process of reviewing and amending the code of conduct for its members; supports the conclusions of the peer review with respect to the need to introduce regular updates of declarations, which would increase their reliability; is in agreement that the ethics committee plays a crucial role to the extent that the president and the members may seek its advice on any question pertaining to ethics and on the interpretation of the code of conduct; notes, moreover, that the declarations of interest are of a self-declaratory nature and that, given the current legal framework, neither the Court nor its ethics committee have any investigation powers to ensure

43. **Calls on** the Court to provide information on any decisions taken related to the process of reviewing and amending the code of conduct for its members; supports the conclusions of the peer review with respect to the need to introduce regular updates of declarations, which would increase their reliability; **nevertheless reiterates its concern that the declarations of interest are of a self-declaratory nature and that, given the current legal framework, neither the Court nor its ethics committee have any investigation powers to ensure**
The committee is entrusted with approving any external activity undertaken by the members, including former members who intend to carry out an activity in the year after they leave the Court, which is an efficient tool in ensuring the absence of conflicts of interest.

**Amendment 51**

Mikuláš Peksa
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 43**

43. Calls on the Court to provide information on any decisions taken related to the process of reviewing and amending the code of conduct for its members; supports the conclusions of the peer review with respect to the need to introduce regular updates of declarations, which would increase their reliability; is in agreement that the ethics committee plays a crucial role to the extent that the president and the members may seek its advice on any question pertaining to ethics.

**Amendment**

43. Calls on the Court to provide information on any decisions taken related to the process of reviewing and amending the code of conduct for its members; supports the conclusions of the peer review with respect to the need to introduce regular updates of declarations of interest, which would increase their reliability; is in agreement that the ethics committee plays a crucial role to the extent that the president and the members may seek its advice on any question pertaining to ethics.
and on the interpretation of the code of conduct; notes, moreover, that the committee is entrusted with approving any external activity undertaken by the members, including former members who intend to carry out an activity in the year after they leave the Court, which is an efficient tool in ensuring the absence of conflicts of interest.