



**2020/2023(INI)**

14.5.2020

# **AMENDMENTS**

## **1 - 32**

**Draft opinion**

**Loránt Vincze**

(PE650.591v01-00)

Recommendations on the negotiations for a new partnership with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland  
(2020/2023(INI))



**Amendment 1**  
**Dragoş Tudorache**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2**

*Draft opinion*

2. Stresses that the envisaged partnership must be based on the shared values and principles of democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights, which should be expressed in binding political clauses; stresses that, while the EU will remain bound by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, the agreement on the future relationship must incorporate the United Kingdom's continued commitment to respect the framework of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR);

*Amendment*

2. Stresses that the envisaged partnership must be based on the shared values, ***mutual trust*** and principles of democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights, which should be expressed in binding political clauses; stresses that, while the EU will remain bound by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, the agreement on the future relationship must incorporate the United Kingdom's continued commitment to respect the framework of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR);

Or. en

**Amendment 2**  
**Terry Reintke**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4**

*Draft opinion*

4. Expresses concern about the progress of negotiations, including the cancellation of two negotiation rounds planned during the COVID-19 confinement period as well as the resumption thereof as of 20 April; notes, that, according to the information received from the European Commission's Task Force for Relations with the United Kingdom, despite a first exchange on the issues of security, law enforcement and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, data protection and citizens' rights, as well as ***irregular*** migration and asylum, that took place during the second round of the

*Amendment*

4. Expresses concern about the progress of negotiations, including the cancellation of two negotiation rounds planned during the COVID-19 confinement period as well as the resumption thereof as of 20 April; notes, that, according to the information received from the European Commission's Task Force for Relations with the United Kingdom, despite a first exchange on the issues of security, law enforcement and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, data protection and citizens' rights, as well as migration and asylum, that took place during the second round of the

negotiations, no significant progress has been achieved; recalls that, pursuant to Article 132 of the Withdrawal Agreement, the transition period may be extended by a single decision of the Joint Committee before 1 July 2020; takes into account that the UK government, during the second negotiation round, stressed its intention not to request an extension of the transition period; is deeply concerned about the chances of finalising negotiations on all the essential matters at stake by the end of the year, in view, notably, of the current context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the slow progress achieved so far; calls on the negotiating partners to make every effort to advance on all areas of the negotiations in parallel, including the most difficult areas, and to adopt a comprehensive negotiating strategy;

negotiations, no significant progress has been achieved; recalls that, pursuant to Article 132 of the Withdrawal Agreement, the transition period may be extended by a single decision of the Joint Committee before 1 July 2020; takes into account that the UK government, during the second negotiation round, stressed its intention not to request an extension of the transition period; is deeply concerned about the chances of finalising negotiations on all the essential matters at stake by the end of the year, in view, notably, of the current context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the slow progress achieved so far; calls on the negotiating partners to make every effort to advance on all areas of the negotiations in parallel, including the most difficult areas, and to adopt a comprehensive negotiating strategy;

Or. en

### **Amendment 3** **Sira Rego**

#### **Draft opinion** **Paragraph 4**

##### *Draft opinion*

4. Expresses concern about the progress of negotiations, including the cancellation of two negotiation rounds planned during the COVID-19 confinement period as well as the resumption thereof as of 20 April; notes, that, according to the information received from the European Commission's Task Force for Relations with the United Kingdom, despite a first exchange on the issues of security, law enforcement and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, data protection and citizens' rights, as well as *irregular* migration and asylum, that took place during the second round of the negotiations, no significant progress has been achieved; recalls that, pursuant to

##### *Amendment*

4. Expresses concern about the progress of negotiations, including the cancellation of two negotiation rounds planned during the COVID-19 confinement period as well as the resumption thereof as of 20 April; notes, that, according to the information received from the European Commission's Task Force for Relations with the United Kingdom, despite a first exchange on the issues of security, law enforcement and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, data protection and citizens' rights, as well as migration and asylum, that took place during the second round of the negotiations, no significant progress has been achieved; recalls that, pursuant to

Article 132 of the Withdrawal Agreement, the transition period may be extended by a single decision of the Joint Committee before 1 July 2020; takes into account that the UK government, during the second negotiation round, stressed its intention not to request an extension of the transition period; is deeply concerned about the chances of finalising negotiations on all the essential matters at stake by the end of the year, in view, notably, of the current context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the slow progress achieved so far; calls on the negotiating partners to make every effort to advance on all areas of the negotiations in parallel, including the most difficult areas, and to adopt a comprehensive negotiating strategy;

Article 132 of the Withdrawal Agreement, the transition period may be extended by a single decision of the Joint Committee before 1 July 2020; takes into account that the UK government, during the second negotiation round, stressed its intention not to request an extension of the transition period; is deeply concerned about the chances of finalising negotiations on all the essential matters at stake by the end of the year, in view, notably, of the current context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the slow progress achieved so far; calls on the negotiating partners to make every effort to advance on all areas of the negotiations in parallel, including the most difficult areas, and to adopt a comprehensive negotiating strategy;

Or. en

#### **Amendment 4** **Evin Incir**

#### **Draft opinion** **Paragraph 4**

##### *Draft opinion*

4. Expresses concern about the progress of negotiations, including the cancellation of two negotiation rounds planned during the COVID-19 confinement period as well as the resumption thereof as of 20 April; notes, that, according to the information received from the European Commission's Task Force for Relations with the United Kingdom, despite a first exchange on the issues of security, law enforcement and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, data protection and citizens' rights, as well as *irregular* migration and asylum, that took place during the second round of the negotiations, no significant progress has been achieved; recalls that, pursuant to Article 132 of the Withdrawal Agreement, the transition period may be extended by a

##### *Amendment*

4. Expresses concern about the progress of negotiations, including the cancellation of two negotiation rounds planned during the COVID-19 confinement period as well as the resumption thereof as of 20 April; notes, that, according to the information received from the European Commission's Task Force for Relations with the United Kingdom, despite a first exchange on the issues of security, law enforcement and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, data protection and citizens' rights, as well as migration and asylum, that took place during the second round of the negotiations, no significant progress has been achieved; recalls that, pursuant to Article 132 of the Withdrawal Agreement, the transition period may be extended by a

single decision of the Joint Committee before 1 July 2020; takes into account that the UK government, during the second negotiation round, stressed its intention not to request an extension of the transition period; is deeply concerned about the chances of finalising negotiations on all the essential matters at stake by the end of the year, in view, notably, of the current context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the slow progress achieved so far; calls on the negotiating partners to make every effort to advance on all areas of the negotiations in parallel, including the most difficult areas, and to adopt a comprehensive negotiating strategy;

single decision of the Joint Committee before 1 July 2020; takes into account that the UK government, during the second negotiation round, stressed its intention not to request an extension of the transition period; is deeply concerned about the chances of finalising negotiations on all the essential matters at stake by the end of the year, in view, notably, of the current context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the slow progress achieved so far; calls on the negotiating partners to make every effort to advance on all areas of the negotiations in parallel, including the most difficult areas, and to adopt a comprehensive negotiating strategy;

Or. en

## **Amendment 5**

### **Dragoş Tudorache**

#### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 5**

#### *Draft opinion*

5. Takes note of the discussions taking place in the EU-UK Joint Committee established under the Withdrawal Agreement and the upcoming meeting of the specialised committee on citizens' rights; calls on the co-chairs of the Joint Committee to actively involve citizens and civil society organisations in this regard; requests that Parliament be fully informed of all the discussions held and decisions taken by the Joint Committee; is concerned that, according to the latest EU Settlement Scheme Statistics<sup>1</sup>, published by the UK Home Office on 16 April 2020, of the total number of 3.4 million (3 468 700) applications received up to 31 March 2020, only 58 % were granted settled status and 41 % were granted pre-settled status; reiterates the Parliament's call<sup>2</sup>, with regard to resident status schemes both in the UK and in the Member States, that

#### *Amendment*

5. Takes note of the discussions taking place in the EU-UK Joint Committee established under the Withdrawal Agreement and the upcoming meeting of the specialised committee on citizens' rights; calls on the co-chairs of the Joint Committee to actively involve citizens and civil society organisations in this regard; requests that Parliament be fully informed of all the discussions held and decisions taken by the Joint Committee; is concerned that, according to the latest EU Settlement Scheme Statistics<sup>1</sup>, published by the UK Home Office on 16 April 2020, of the total number of 3.4 million (3 468 700) applications received up to 31 March 2020, only 58 % were granted settled status and 41 % were granted pre-settled status; reiterates the Parliament's call<sup>2</sup>, with regard to resident status schemes both in the UK and in the Member States, that

these schemes be non-discriminatory, user-friendly and transparent, and free of charge, that they have a declaratory nature and grant a physical document as proof of status; recalls that EU citizens holding pre-settled status should be treated equally with UK citizens under the Withdrawal Agreement, including with regard to access to benefits; calls on the Joint Committee and the Commission to monitor relevant developments; notes that little progress has been achieved regarding Parliament's call to address issues with regard to the EU Settlement Scheme, notably in relation to the accessibility of the application, the independence of the Monitoring Authority, and the possible consequences for Union citizens of not meeting the deadline, as well as the applicability of the UK's EU Settlement Scheme in relation to EU-27 citizens in Northern Ireland who have not sought UK citizenship under the terms of the Good Friday Agreement, and the need to fully respect the Good Friday Agreement in all its parts as stated in the Withdrawal Agreement; urges the UK authorities to ensure that there is no diminution of rights for citizens in Northern Ireland; stresses that these issues would need to be fully addressed and evaluated by the end of the transition period as a pre-condition for a future agreement;

---

1

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/879569/eu-settlement-scheme-statistics-march-2020.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/879569/eu-settlement-scheme-statistics-march-2020.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> European Parliament resolution of 12 February 2020 on the proposed mandate for negotiations for a new partnership with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland- Texts adopted, P9\_TA(2020)0033.

these schemes be non-discriminatory, user-friendly and transparent, and free of charge, that they have a declaratory nature and grant a physical document as proof of status; recalls that EU citizens holding pre-settled status should be treated equally with UK citizens under the Withdrawal Agreement, including with regard to access to benefits **and the healthcare system**; calls on the Joint Committee and the Commission to monitor relevant developments; notes that little progress has been achieved regarding Parliament's call to address issues with regard to the EU Settlement Scheme, notably in relation to the accessibility of the application, the independence of the Monitoring Authority, and the possible consequences for Union citizens of not meeting the deadline, as well as the applicability of the UK's EU Settlement Scheme in relation to EU-27 citizens in Northern Ireland who have not sought UK citizenship under the terms of the Good Friday Agreement, and the need to fully respect the Good Friday Agreement in all its parts as stated in the Withdrawal Agreement; urges the UK authorities to ensure that there is no diminution of rights for citizens in Northern Ireland; stresses that these issues would need to be fully addressed and evaluated by the end of the transition period as a pre-condition for a future agreement;

---

1

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/879569/eu-settlement-scheme-statistics-march-2020.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/879569/eu-settlement-scheme-statistics-march-2020.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> European Parliament resolution of 12 February 2020 on the proposed mandate for negotiations for a new partnership with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland- Texts adopted, P9\_TA(2020)0033.

Or. en

**Amendment 6**

**Javier Zarzalejos, José Manuel García-Margallo y Marfil**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 6 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**6 a. Stresses the need to protect the residents' rights and especially those of workers who move from both sides of the fence until a definitive agreement is reached between the governments of Spain and the United Kingdom for the decolonization of Gibraltar, in accordance with the United Nations resolutions, which were endorsed by the European Parliament and the European Council. This agreement should be concluded before summer 2021 to allow for the early application of the Community provisions affecting the individual rights (e.g. air traffic) which are currently suspended.**

Or. en

**Amendment 7**

**Dragoş Tudorache**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 7 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**7 a. Stresses the importance of promoting and protecting the fundamental rights to privacy and data protection, including security of personal data, as a key enabler in the digital economy and points out that the EU requires full compliance with these principles in all current and future developing commercial exchanges;**

Or. en



## Amendment 8

Morten Petersen, Sophia in 't Veld, Nathalie Loiseau

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 11

##### *Draft opinion*

11. Is concerned about the fact that, during the first round of negotiations (2-5 March 2020) for the future partnership agreement, the UK stated that, as regards judicial and police cooperation in criminal matters, it will not commit to enforcing the European Convention of Human Rights, nor will it accept the jurisdiction of the CJEU; deplores the fact that the latter position has been maintained during the second round of negotiations; fully endorses the declaration made by the EU negotiator Mr Barnier that, if this position is maintained by the UK, this will have immediate and practical consequences for the cooperation between the EU and the UK, which will remain possible on the basis of international agreements but will not be very ambitious<sup>8</sup> ; takes note also of the declarations made by the EU negotiator Mr Barnier further to the second negotiation round, stating that, during this second round, the UK refused to provide firm guarantees on fundamental rights and individual freedoms and insisted on lowering current standards and deviating from agreed mechanisms of data protection, thus creating serious limitations for our future security partnership<sup>9</sup> ;

---

8

<https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorn>

##### *Amendment*

11. ***Takes the position that if the UK does not explicitly commit to enforce the European Convention of Human Rights and will not accept the jurisdiction of the CJEU, there will be no agreement possible on judicial and police cooperation in criminal matters.*** Is concerned about the fact that, during the first round of negotiations (2-5 March 2020) for the future partnership agreement, the UK stated that, as regards judicial and police cooperation in criminal matters, it will not commit to enforcing the European Convention of Human Rights, nor will it accept the jurisdiction of the CJEU; deplores the fact that the latter position has been maintained during the second round of negotiations; fully endorses the declaration made by the EU negotiator Mr Barnier that, if this position is maintained by the UK, this will have immediate and practical consequences for the cooperation between the EU and the UK, which will remain possible on the basis of international agreements but will not be very ambitious<sup>8</sup> ; takes note also of the declarations made by the EU negotiator Mr Barnier further to the second negotiation round, stating that, during this second round, the UK refused to provide firm guarantees on fundamental rights and individual freedoms and insisted on lowering current standards and deviating from agreed mechanisms of data protection, thus creating serious limitations for our future security partnership<sup>9</sup> ;

---

8

<https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorn>

er/detail/en/INF\_19\_5950

9

[https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement\\_20\\_739](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_20_739)

er/detail/en/INF\_19\_5950

9

[https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement\\_20\\_739](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_20_739)

Or. en

## **Amendment 9** **Terry Reintke**

### **Draft opinion** **Paragraph 12**

#### *Draft opinion*

12. Considers it necessary to pay particular attention to the legal framework in the UK in the fields of national security or processing of personal data by law enforcement authorities; recalls that mass surveillance programmes ***might not be*** adequate under EU law; advocates taking into consideration CJEU case law in this field, such as the Schrems case as well as ECtHR case law;

#### *Amendment*

12. Considers it necessary to pay particular attention to the legal framework in the UK in the fields of national security or processing of personal data by law enforcement authorities; recalls that mass surveillance programmes ***are not*** adequate under EU law; advocates taking into consideration CJEU case law in this field, such as the Schrems case as well as ECtHR case law;

Or. en

## **Amendment 10** **Nathalie Loiseau, Morten Petersen, Sophia in 't Veld**

### **Draft opinion** **Paragraph 13 a (new)**

#### *Draft opinion*

#### *Amendment*

***13 a. Underlines that the UK as an EU Member in 2014 by way of opt out decided to participate no longer in EU instruments in the field of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, but then opted back into legislative measures on a case-by-case basis;***

Or. en

**Amendment 11**  
**Dragoş Tudorache**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 15**

*Draft opinion*

15. Reiterates its call that, in view of the geographical proximity and the shared threats the EU and the UK are confronted with, the negotiating parties should endeavour to maintain effective arrangements for law enforcement cooperation that is effective and mutually beneficial for the security of their citizens, taking into account the fact the UK is now a third country and may not, therefore, enjoy the same rights and facilities as a Member State; underlines the fact that separate stand-alone agreements would undermine legal consistency in the areas of law enforcement and judicial cooperation in criminal matters; urges the Commission to adhere to its negotiating directives and strive to negotiate a single comprehensive agreement;

*Amendment*

15. Reiterates its call that, in view of the geographical proximity and the shared threats the EU and the UK are confronted with, the negotiating parties should endeavour to maintain effective, ***balanced and reciprocal*** arrangements for law enforcement cooperation that is effective and mutually beneficial for the security of their citizens, taking into account the fact the UK is now a third country and may not, therefore, enjoy the same rights and facilities as a Member State; underlines the fact that separate stand-alone agreements would undermine legal consistency in the areas of law enforcement and judicial cooperation in criminal matters; urges the Commission to adhere to its negotiating directives and strive to negotiate a single comprehensive agreement;

Or. en

**Amendment 12**  
**Morten Petersen, Sophia in 't Veld, Nathalie Loiseau**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 16**

*Draft opinion*

16. ***Is deeply concerned about*** the UK's request to receive direct access to the EU data information systems in the field of Justice and Home Affairs and to retain a status in the Justice and Home Affairs agencies close to that enjoyed by the Member States; stresses once more in this regard that the UK, as a non-Schengen

*Amendment*

16. ***Strongly objects to*** the UK's request to receive direct access to the EU data information systems in the field of Justice and Home Affairs and to retain a status in the Justice and Home Affairs agencies close to that enjoyed by the Member States; stresses once more in this regard that the UK, as a non-Schengen

third country, cannot have direct access to EU information systems data or participate in the management structures of the EU agencies in the area of Freedom, Security and Justice; cautions that any sharing of information, including personal data, with the UK should be subject to strict safeguards, audit and oversight conditions, including an equivalent level of protection of personal data to that provided by Union law;

third country, cannot have direct access to EU information systems data or participate in the management structures of the EU agencies in the area of Freedom, Security and Justice; cautions that any sharing of information, including personal data, with the UK should be subject to strict safeguards, audit and oversight conditions, including an equivalent level of protection of personal data to that provided by Union law;

Or. en

### **Amendment 13**

**Morten Petersen, Sophia in 't Veld, Nathalie Loiseau**

#### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 16 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***16 a. Recalls the UK authorities' hack of Belgian telecommunications provider Belgacom, which came to light in 2013, and which was attributed to the GCHQ as concluded by the Belgian Federal Prosecutor in 2018;***

Or. en

### **Amendment 14**

**Morten Petersen, Sophia in 't Veld, Nathalie Loiseau**

#### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 16 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***16 b. Recalls that UK authorities failed to forward details of 75 000 convictions against EU citizens to their home country in accordance with Council Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA and concealed this failure from other Member States, for fear of damaging the UK's reputation as***

*regards law enforcement cooperation and judicial cooperation in criminal matters; deplores that the UK have still not forwarded details of these 75 000 cases to law enforcement authorities in the EU-27;*

Or. en

**Amendment 15**  
**Dragoş Tudorache**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 17**

*Draft opinion*

17. Recalls that the Schengen Information System (SIS) was created as a compensatory tool to remedy the lifting of border controls in the Schengen area; points out that the SIS legislation explicitly forbids the access of third countries to the system; underlines that, as a third country, the UK cannot have access to the SIS; recalls that, in 2015, the UK started applying certain provisions of Schengen acquis related to the SIS in the area of police cooperation<sup>10</sup> and that serious deficiencies in its application by the UK were identified and have still not been remedied; considers that future cooperation between the EU and the UK in the area of law enforcement and judicial cooperation should be based on mutual trust; considers, therefore, that the arrangements for the future cooperation between the EU and the UK in the area of law enforcement and judicial cooperation should be dependent on those deficiencies being remedied; underlines, in this regard, the importance of robust rules on data protection in both negotiating parties;

*Amendment*

17. Recalls that the Schengen Information System (SIS) was created as a compensatory tool to remedy the lifting of border controls in the Schengen area; points out that the SIS legislation explicitly forbids the access of third countries to the system; underlines that, as a third country, the UK cannot have access to the SIS; recalls that, in 2015, the UK started applying certain provisions of Schengen acquis related to the SIS in the area of police cooperation<sup>10</sup> and that serious deficiencies in its application by the UK were identified and have still not been remedied; ***recalls that on March 5 the Council issued a set of recommendations addressing the serious deficiencies in the 2017 evaluation of the UK on the application of the Schengen acquis in the field of SIS and there is little intention in UK's reply in applying these recommendations and reciprocate and therefore calls for the immediate suspension of the provisional access of the UK to the Schengen Information System;*** considers that future cooperation between the EU and the UK in the area of law enforcement and judicial cooperation should be based on mutual trust; considers, therefore, that the arrangements for the future cooperation between the EU and the UK in the area of law enforcement and

judicial cooperation should be dependent on those deficiencies being remedied; underlines, in this regard, the importance of robust rules on data protection in both negotiating parties;

---

<sup>10</sup> Council Decision 2007/533/JHA of 12 June 2007 on the establishment, operation and use of the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II), OJ L 205, 7.8.2007, p. 63.

---

<sup>10</sup> Council Decision 2007/533/JHA of 12 June 2007 on the establishment, operation and use of the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II), OJ L 205, 7.8.2007, p. 63.

Or. en

## Amendment 16

Morten Petersen, Sophia in 't Veld, Nathalie Loiseau

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 17

##### *Draft opinion*

17. Recalls that the Schengen Information System (SIS) was created as a compensatory tool to remedy the lifting of border controls in the Schengen area; points out that the SIS legislation explicitly forbids the access of third countries to the system; underlines that, as a third country, the UK cannot have access to the SIS; recalls that, in 2015, the UK started applying certain provisions of Schengen acquis related to the SIS in the area of police cooperation<sup>10</sup> and that serious **deficiencies** in its application by the UK were identified and have still not been remedied; considers that future cooperation between the EU and the UK in the area of law enforcement and judicial cooperation should be based on mutual trust; considers, therefore, that the arrangements for the future cooperation between the EU and the UK in the area of law enforcement and judicial cooperation should be **dependent on those deficiencies being remedied**; underlines, **in this regard, the importance of** robust rules on data protection **in both**

##### *Amendment*

17. Recalls that the Schengen Information System (SIS) was created as a compensatory tool to remedy the lifting of border controls in the Schengen area; points out that the SIS legislation explicitly forbids the access of third countries to the system; underlines that, as a third country, the UK cannot have access to the SIS; recalls that, in 2015, the UK started applying certain provisions of Schengen acquis related to the SIS in the area of police cooperation<sup>10</sup> and that serious **violations** in its application by the UK were identified and have still not been remedied; considers that future cooperation between the EU and the UK in the area of law enforcement and judicial cooperation should be based on mutual trust; considers, therefore, that the arrangements for the future cooperation between the EU and the UK in the area of law enforcement and judicial cooperation should be **made conditional upon the full remedy of the violations of the SIS and the failed transfer of details of 75,000 convictions**

*negotiating parties;*

*prior to any agreement; underlines that such cooperation can only be considered if robust rules on data protection are established and if strong enforcement mechanisms are in place;*

---

<sup>10</sup> Council Decision 2007/533/JHA of 12 June 2007 on the establishment, operation and use of the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II), OJ L 205, 7.8.2007, p. 63.

---

<sup>10</sup> Council Decision 2007/533/JHA of 12 June 2007 on the establishment, operation and use of the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II), OJ L 205, 7.8.2007, p. 63.

Or. en

## **Amendment 17**

**Loránt Vincze, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Terry Reintke, Sira Rego, Morten Petersen, Evin Incir**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 18**

#### *Draft opinion*

18. Points out that the automated exchange of DNA data with UK under the Prüm Framework was launched only in 2019 and that the Council is about to **adopt** an implementing decision which would allow the UK to take part in automated exchanges of dactyloscopic data; reminds the negotiators that the Council decisions authorising these automated data exchanges will expire at the end of the transition period; stresses the need for a timely agreement on new arrangements for the future relationship, given the importance of information exchange in the fight against serious and organised cross-border crime and terrorism; considers that the future relationship should not be predetermined by the rules applied during the transition period; believes that the agreement should be based on the principle of full reciprocity; strongly urges the UK, therefore, to reconsider its position not to disclose data of suspected persons, failing which, exchanges under Prüm between the

#### *Amendment*

18. Points out that the automated exchange of DNA data with UK under the Prüm Framework was launched only in 2019 and that the Council is about to **decide upon the adoption of** an implementing decision which would allow the UK to take part in automated exchanges of dactyloscopic data; **points out in this regard that under the special consultation procedure for the ex-third pillar acts on 13 May 2020 the Parliament rejected the Council's draft decision due to concerns over full reciprocity for fingerprint data exchange, over data protection guarantees, as well as over the very short time of its application;** reminds the negotiators that, **if adopted**, the Council decisions authorising these automated data exchanges will expire at the end of the transition period; stresses the need for a timely agreement on new arrangements for the future relationship, given the importance of information exchange in the fight against serious and organised cross-

EU and the UK will have to remain limited;

border crime and terrorism; considers that the future relationship should not be predetermined by the rules applied during the transition period; believes that the agreement should be based on the principle of full reciprocity; strongly urges the UK, therefore, to reconsider its position not to disclose data of suspected persons, failing which, exchanges under Prüm between the EU and the UK will have to remain limited;

Or. en

## **Amendment 18**

**Morten Petersen, Sophia in 't Veld, Nathalie Loiseau**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 18**

##### *Draft opinion*

18. Points out that the automated exchange of DNA data with UK under the Prüm Framework was launched only in 2019 and that the Council is about to adopt an implementing decision which would allow the UK to take part in automated exchanges of dactyloscopic data; reminds the negotiators that the Council decisions authorising these automated data exchanges will expire at the end of the transition period; stresses the need for a timely agreement on new arrangements for the future relationship, given the importance of information exchange in the fight against serious and organised cross-border crime and terrorism; considers that the future relationship should not be predetermined by the rules applied during the transition period; believes that the agreement should be based on the principle of full reciprocity; ***strongly urges the UK, therefore, to reconsider its position not to disclose data of suspected persons, failing which, exchanges under Prüm between the EU and the UK will have to remain***

##### *Amendment*

18. Points out that the automated exchange of DNA data with UK under the Prüm Framework was launched only in 2019 and that the Council is about to adopt an implementing decision which would allow the UK to take part in automated exchanges of dactyloscopic data; reminds the negotiators that the Council decisions authorising these automated data exchanges will expire at the end of the transition period; stresses the need for a timely agreement on new arrangements for the future relationship, given the importance of information exchange in the fight against serious and organised cross-border crime and terrorism; considers that the future relationship should not be predetermined by the rules applied during the transition period; believes that the agreement should be based on the principle of full reciprocity;



*limited;*

Or. en

## **Amendment 19**

**Morten Petersen, Sophia in 't Veld, Nathalie Loiseau**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 19**

##### *Draft opinion*

19. Is concerned that the UK negotiating mandate lacks ambition in important areas of judicial cooperation in criminal matters such as anti-money-laundering provisions; insists that a level playing field on anti-money laundering is essential for a final agreement; believes that a solution allowing for a more ambitious cooperation than the one under the Council of Europe convention on extradition could be found by the negotiating parties;

##### *Amendment*

19. Is concerned that the UK negotiating mandate lacks ambition in important areas of judicial cooperation in criminal matters such as anti-money-laundering ***and counter terrorism financing*** provisions; insists that a level playing field on anti-money laundering is essential for a final agreement; believes that a solution allowing for a more ambitious cooperation than the one under the Council of Europe convention on extradition could be found by the negotiating parties;

Or. en

## **Amendment 20**

**Evin Incir**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Subheading F**

##### *Draft opinion*

***Irregular*** migration, asylum and border management

##### *Amendment*

Migration, asylum and border management

Or. en

## **Amendment 21**

**Sira Rego**

**Draft opinion**  
**Subheading F**

*Draft opinion*

***Irregular*** migration, asylum and border management

*Amendment*

Migration, asylum and border management

Or. en

**Amendment 22**  
**Terry Reintke**

**Draft opinion**  
**Subheading F**

*Draft opinion*

***Irregular*** migration, asylum and border management

*Amendment*

Migration, asylum and border management

Or. en

**Amendment 23**  
**Assita Kanko**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 20**

*Draft opinion*

20. Stresses the need to agree the terms of cooperation on the irregular migration of nationals other than those of the two parties, recognising the need to protect ***the most vulnerable; reiterates its call that such cooperation should, at the very least, contain arrangements that enhance safe and legal pathways to access international protection, including through family reunification;***

*Amendment*

20. Stresses the need to agree the terms of cooperation on the irregular migration of nationals other than those of the two parties, recognising the need to protect ***genuine refugees.***

Or. en

**Amendment 24**  
**Evin Incir**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 20**

*Draft opinion*

20. Stresses the need to agree the terms of cooperation on ***the irregular*** migration of nationals other than those of the two parties, recognising ***the need*** to protect the most vulnerable; reiterates its call that such cooperation should, at the very least, contain arrangements that enhance safe and legal pathways to access international protection, including through family reunification;

*Amendment*

20. Stresses the need to agree the terms of cooperation on ***all types of*** migration of nationals other than those of the two parties, recognising ***fundamental rights and need to uphold human dignity for all and*** to protect the most vulnerable; reiterates its call that such cooperation should, at the very least, contain arrangements that enhance safe and legal pathways to access international protection, including through family reunification;

Or. en

**Amendment 25**  
**Sira Rego**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 20**

*Draft opinion*

20. Stresses the need to agree the terms of cooperation on ***the irregular*** migration of nationals other than those of the two parties, recognising the need to protect the most vulnerable; reiterates its call that such cooperation should, at the very least, contain arrangements that enhance safe and legal pathways to access international protection, including through family reunification;

*Amendment*

20. Stresses the need to agree the terms of cooperation on migration of nationals other than those of the two parties, recognising ***fundamental rights and the need to uphold human dignity for all and*** to protect the most vulnerable; reiterates its call that such cooperation should, at the very least, contain arrangements that enhance safe and legal pathways to access international protection, including through family reunification;

Or. en

**Amendment 26**  
**Terry Reintke**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 20**

*Draft opinion*

20. Stresses the need to agree the terms of cooperation on ***the irregular*** migration of nationals other than those of the two parties, recognising the need to protect the most vulnerable; reiterates its call that such cooperation should, at the very least, contain arrangements that enhance safe and legal pathways to access international protection, including through family reunification;

*Amendment*

20. Stresses the need to agree the terms of cooperation on migration of nationals other than those of the two parties, recognising the need to protect the most vulnerable; reiterates its call that such cooperation should, at the very least, contain arrangements that enhance safe and legal pathways to access international protection, including through family reunification;

Or. en

**Amendment 27**  
**Terry Reintke**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 21**

*Draft opinion*

21. Stresses the need for strong cooperation between the parties in order to combat human smuggling and trafficking in human beings, in line with international law, which will remain applicable to the border between the UK and the EU; ***calls on the negotiating parties to clarify the potential role Europol and the European Border and Coast Guard could have in enabling such cooperation;***

*Amendment*

21. Stresses the need for strong cooperation between the parties in order to combat human smuggling and trafficking in human beings, in line with international law, which will remain applicable to the border between the UK and the EU;

Or. en

**Amendment 28**  
**Sira Rego**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 21**

*Draft opinion*

21. Stresses the need for strong cooperation between the parties in order to combat human smuggling and trafficking in human beings, in line with international law, which will remain applicable to the border between the UK and the EU; ***calls on the negotiating parties to clarify the potential role Europol and the European Border and Coast Guard could have in enabling such cooperation;***

*Amendment*

21. Stresses the need for strong cooperation between the parties in order to combat human smuggling and trafficking in human beings, in line with international law, which will remain applicable to the border between the UK and the EU;

Or. en

**Amendment 29**  
**Assita Kanko**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 23**

*Draft opinion*

23. ***Stresses once again the need for the adoption of a plan on family reunification, which should be ready to enter into force at the end of the transition period, in order to avoid any gaps with humanitarian impacts and to respect the right to family life of asylum seekers in accordance with Article 8 of the ECHR, which remains applicable in both the UK and the EU;***

*Amendment*

***deleted***

Or. en

**Amendment 30**  
**Assita Kanko**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 25**

*Draft opinion*

25. Stresses the importance of a coordinated approach by the EU ***on all***

*Amendment*

25. Stresses the importance of a coordinated approach by the EU, as

*these issues*, as bilateral arrangements between the UK and individual Member States *on issues such as family reunification for asylum seekers or refugees, relocation or readmission arrangements*, risk having negative consequences for the coherence of EU asylum and migration policy; calls *both negotiating sides* to strive for *a balanced and constructive approach in all those matters, including legal pathways and readmission agreements for third-country nationals*, prioritising the need to provide international protection to those in need of it and to pay particular attention to the most vulnerable, an approach to which both sides have committed;

bilateral arrangements between the UK and individual Member States, risk *creating incentives for secondary movements within the EU and irregular migration movements*, having negative consequences for the coherence of EU asylum and migration policy; calls *upon the Commission* to strive for *agreements on the mutual readmission of third country nationals who entered the Union or the UK irregularly*, prioritising the need to provide international protection to those in need of it and to pay particular attention to the most vulnerable, an approach to which both sides have committed;

Or. en

### Amendment 31 Sira Rego

#### Draft opinion Paragraph 25

##### *Draft opinion*

25. Stresses the importance of a coordinated approach by the EU on all these issues, as bilateral arrangements between the UK and individual Member States on issues such as family reunification for asylum seekers or refugees, relocation or readmission arrangements, risk having negative consequences for the coherence of EU asylum and migration policy; calls both negotiating sides to strive for a balanced and constructive approach in all those matters, including legal pathways *and readmission agreements* for third-country nationals, prioritising the need to provide international protection to those in need of it and to pay particular attention to the most vulnerable, an approach to which both sides have committed;

##### *Amendment*

25. Stresses the importance of a coordinated approach by the EU on all these issues, as bilateral arrangements between the UK and individual Member States on issues such as family reunification for asylum seekers or refugees, relocation or readmission arrangements, risk having negative consequences for the coherence of EU asylum and migration policy; calls both negotiating sides to strive for a balanced and constructive approach in all those matters, including legal pathways for third-country nationals, prioritising the need to provide international protection to those in need of it and to pay particular attention to the most vulnerable, an approach to which both sides have committed;

**Amendment 32**

**Loránt Vincze**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 26**

*Draft opinion*

26. Reiterates its call to clarify the future practical cooperation between the UK authorities and the EU agencies in the field of Justice and Home Affairs, taking into account the status of the UK as a non-Schengen third country.

*Amendment*

26. Reiterates its call to clarify the future practical cooperation between the UK authorities and the EU agencies in the field of Justice and Home Affairs, taking into account the status of the UK as a non-Schengen third country ***and a key partner in the fight against terrorism and organised crime; stresses that close cooperation in the area of policing and criminal justice in the form of information exchange and joint teams would be mutually beneficial for both sides; urges the negotiating parties to strive towards close strategic and operational cooperation with Europol and Eurojust in particular, while respecting the technical and legal limits of such cooperation;***