

# Procedure file

Basic information	
COD - Ordinary legislative procedure (ex-codecision procedure) Regulation	1998/0329(COD) Procedure completed
Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF Repealed by <a href="#">2006/0084(COD)</a>	
Subject 8.70.04 Protecting financial interests of the EU against fraud	

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	<b>CONT</b> Budgetary Control		20/01/1999
		PSE <a href="#">BÖSCH Herbert</a>	
	Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
	<b>BUDG</b> Budgets		19/01/1999
	PPE <a href="#">TILLICH Stanislaw</a>		
	<b>JURI</b> Legal Affairs, Citizens' Rights		24/02/1999
		ELDR <a href="#">THORS Astrid</a>	
	<b>LIBE</b> Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs		20/01/1999
		PSE <a href="#">BONTEMPI Rinaldo</a>	
Council of the European Union	Council configuration	Meeting	Date
	<a href="#">Economic and Financial Affairs ECOFIN</a>	<a href="#">2205</a>	08/10/1999
	<a href="#">Economic and Financial Affairs ECOFIN</a>	<a href="#">2181</a>	25/05/1999
	<a href="#">Economic and Financial Affairs ECOFIN</a>	<a href="#">2167</a>	15/03/1999

Key events			
01/12/1998	Legislative proposal published	COM(1998)0717	Summary
11/01/1999	Committee referral announced in Parliament, 1st reading		
15/03/1999	Resolution/conclusions adopted by Council		
20/04/1999	Vote in committee, 1st reading		Summary
20/04/1999	Committee report tabled for plenary, 1st reading	<a href="#">A4-0240/1999</a>	
20/04/1999	Modified legislative proposal published	<a href="#">02383/2/1999</a>	

28/04/1999	Modified legislative proposal published	COM(1999)0225	
03/05/1999	Debate in Parliament		
06/05/1999	Decision by Parliament, 1st reading	T4-0426/1999	Summary
25/05/1999	Act adopted by Council after Parliament's 1st reading		
25/05/1999	Final act signed		
25/05/1999	End of procedure in Parliament		
31/05/1999	Final act published in Official Journal		

### Technical information

Procedure reference	1998/0329(COD)
Procedure type	COD - Ordinary legislative procedure (ex-codecision procedure)
Procedure subtype	Legislation
Legislative instrument	Regulation
	Repealed by <a href="#">2006/0084(COD)</a>
Legal basis	Euratom Treaty A 203; EC Treaty (after Amsterdam) EC 280-p4
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	CONT/4/10685

### Documentation gateway

Legislative proposal		<a href="#">COM(1998)0717</a> <a href="#">OJ C 021 26.01.1999, p. 0010</a>	01/12/1998	EC	Summary
Supplementary legislative basic document		COM(1999)0140	17/03/1999	EC	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, 1st reading/single reading		<a href="#">A4-0240/1999</a> <a href="#">OJ C 279 01.10.1999, p. 0008</a>	20/04/1999	EP	
Modified legislative proposal		<a href="#">02383/2/1999</a> <a href="#">OJ C 131 12.05.1999, p. 0005</a>	20/04/1999	CSL	
Supplementary non-legislative basic document		COM(1999)0225	28/04/1999	EC	Summary
Text adopted by Parliament, 1st reading/single reading		T4-0426/1999 <a href="#">OJ C 279 01.10.1999, p. 0253-0291</a>	06/05/1999	EP	Summary
Implementing legislative act		<a href="#">31999D0731(01)</a> <a href="#">OJ C 220 31.07.1999, p. 0001-0002</a>	19/07/1999	EU	Summary
Implementing legislative act		<a href="#">32001D0424(01)</a> <a href="#">OJ C 120 24.04.2001, p. 0001-0002</a>	04/04/2001	EU	Summary
Follow-up document		<a href="#">N5-0031/2002</a> <a href="#">OJ C 234 30.09.2002, p. 0001-0040</a>	30/09/2002	CSL	Summary
Follow-up document		<a href="#">COM(2003)0154</a>	02/04/2003	EC	Summary
Implementing legislative act		<a href="#">32003D0607(01)</a> <a href="#">OJ C 134 07.06.2003, p. 0001-0002</a>	08/04/2003	EU	Summary

Implementing legislative act	<a href="#">32005D0833</a> <a href="#">OJ L 312 29.11.2005, p. 0049-0050</a>	04/11/2005	EU	Summary
Document attached to the procedure	N6-0004/2007 <a href="#">OJ C 091 26.04.2007, p. 0001</a>	27/10/2006	EDPS	Summary

#### Additional information

European Commission

[EUR-Lex](#)

#### Final act

[Regulation 1999/1073](#)

[OJ L 136 31.05.1999, p. 0001](#) Summary

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

**PURPOSE:** to establish a European Fraud Investigation Office. **CONTENT:** Following the European Parliament's adoption of the Bosch report on UCLAF on 7th October, the Commission has made this proposal in line with its undertaking to do so by the beginning of December: - It is proposed that, once a seat has been designated, this Office be created as an autonomous body, independent of the Commission with its own legal personality. - Its main task will be to carry out internal (within the European institutions) and external (within Member States) fraud investigations, and also to make available its expertise to help the fight against fraud. - With regard to external investigations, the Commission may ask the Office to open an investigation, at the request of a Member State, the Office itself, or on its own initiative. Once started, the Commission may have no influence on an investigation. Following the Office's final report, follow up action will be taken by the Commission. - In the case of internal investigations, an institution may request the Office to conduct an investigation. The Office's final report will then be transmitted to that institution, in order for it to take appropriate follow-up action. - The Office's powers do not impinge on the Commission's rights of legislative initiative, coordination of anti-fraud activities, and the launching of investigations, or any other powers conferred on it by Treaty. - The Office will be headed by a Director, who will act as its legal representative, and appointing authority, and will implement its budget. The Director will be proposed by the Commission, and appointed by a Board of Management, comprising six independent experts (three designated by the EP, three by the Council), two Commission representatives, and one Court of Auditors representative. This Board will have disciplinary authority over the Director - The Commission and Member States will be required to provide the Office with any information relevant to a current investigation, while the Office is required to respect EU and national provisions on data protection and professional secrecy. - The Office's final report will have legal weight at an EU and national level. - Persons implicated by Office investigations will have the same right of appeal to the European Court of Justice as they currently do against the Commission. - During the third year of the Office's existence, the Commission will transmit to the EP and the Council a progress report on its activities containing, if necessary, proposals for the modification of its tasks.?

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

On 01/12/98, the Commission presented a proposal for a Council Regulation establishing a European Fraud Investigation Office, the purpose being to set up an autonomous body, with its own legal personality and without any form of subordination to the Commission, to carry out external and internal investigations as part of the fight against fraud affecting the Community budget. During discussions of this proposal in the European Parliament and the Council, it emerged that the proposed approach did not meet with broad support and that there was a clear preference for maintaining a Fraud Prevention Office within the Commission, while guaranteeing its independence in discharging its fraud investigation function. The Commission has decided to follow this new approach and is accordingly presenting an amended proposal. The Commission's amended proposal takes a new approach, whereby it is no longer the Community legislative which is to set up an independent body outside the Commission, but the Commission itself which is to establish the Office among its own departments. As a result, the provisions laying down the legal framework for the external independent body have been deleted, either because they serve no purpose under the new approach or because they will be included *mutatis mutandis* in the internal Commission decision establishing the Office. The amended proposal lays down clearly the function of the Office as being to carry out external and internal administrative fraud investigations. The amended proposal now provides that the Office will carry out fraud investigations internal to the institutions and bodies. Contrary to the provisions of the original proposal, the institutions and bodies can no longer choose whether or not to confer this task on the Office. The proposal now lays down the powers enjoyed by the Office vis-à-vis all the institutions and bodies: it has access to premises, information and all documents. The conditions and procedures for internal investigations, in particular the rights and obligations of officials and the related guarantees will be laid down by internal decisions of each institution and body, the content of which should be largely identical as a result of the Interinstitutional Agreement, pending amendment of the Staff Regulations. In practice, the Office's independence in discharging its investigative function is enshrined in the right granted to its Director to open an external or internal investigation on his own initiative. Member States may also ask for an external investigation to be opened and each institution and body may ask the Office to carry out an internal investigation in its departments. The Office's independence is further enshrined in the right to transmit information obtained during internal investigations direct to the judicial authorities of the Member State in question, without having to ask for the prior agreement of the institution or body concerned. The Office's independence is also guaranteed by the procedure for appointing its Director and by the provision that he may not seek or take any instructions in carrying out his duties. As the Office will not be a body with its own legal personality, it cannot have a board of management. However, the Commission feels that the Office should be assisted by a supervisory committee, made up of independent persons who are experts in the Office's field of activity. This committee will monitor the work of the Office, reporting its findings to the institutions, and assist the Office by formulating opinions. Finally, for the purposes of reviewing the legality of the Office's activities in

connection with external investigations, the remedies provided for by the EC Treaty (in particular Articles 173 and 178) may be pursued against the Commission. However, special provisions are still necessary for internal investigations, pending amendment of the staff regulations, as a normal appeal to the appointing authority under Article 90 of the Staff Regulations would have no legal force in view of the Office's independence, which prohibits the institutions and bodies from giving it instructions. It is therefore proposed that provision be made for appeals to the Director of the Office, with the possibility of subsequent referral to the Court of Justice in accordance with the procedures laid down in Articles 90 and 91 of the staff regulations.?

---

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

The Committee gave the green light for an EU fraud prevention office to be set up as quickly as possible when it adopted a report by Herbert BÖSCH (PES, A). The report deals with a proposal for a regulation concerning investigations to be conducted by the office and comes under the EP-Council codecision procedure pursuant to new Article 280 of the Amsterdam Treaty, which enters into force on 1st May 1999. The text of the proposed regulation is the fruit of close cooperation and an agreement reached by the ad hoc high level group consisting of Parliament, Council and Commission. The group made significant changes, on the lines desired by Parliament, to the Commission's initial proposal. The modified text defines more closely the tasks and investigatory rights of the new office (OLAF), which will replace UCLAF. It will be able to conduct investigations in the Member States and the administrations of all Community institutions and bodies, the aim being to protect the Community's financial interests and also ensure that all kinds of irregularities which could be liable to administrative or criminal proceedings are covered. OLAF will enjoy complete operational independence. It will be headed by a director (to be appointed after consultations between the Commission, Parliament and Council), who will have an obligation to forward directly to the judicial authorities such information as the Office has obtained in internal investigations concerning matters open to criminal charges. Its staff numbers will be greater than those of UCLAF. It will be subject to monitoring by a Supervisory Committee made up of five independent qualified experts. The director of OLAF will be able to go to the Court of Justice to protect OLAF's independence. It will inform not only the Commission but also Parliament, the Council and the Court of Auditors about its investigations. The procedure for the adoption of the texts needed to set OLAF up is already under way. The Commission has to adopt a decision establishing the European Fraud Prevention Office (OLAF) as a replacement for UCLAF. In parallel, Parliament and the Council will adopt the modified regulation at a single reading under the codecision procedure. Parliament will then take its final decision at the May part-session in Strasbourg. The Council has undertaken to adopt the text on May 25th. In addition, an interinstitutional agreement between Parliament, Council and Commission will be adopted, to which all the other EU institutions and bodies are invited to subscribe with a view to laying down precise arrangements for investigations by OLAF in those institutions and bodies. It is therefore hoped that the framework needed for OLAF to come into being will be in place by June 1st.?

---

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

At first reading under codecision procedure, the European Parliament approved the amended proposal for a Council regulation concerning investigations conducted by the European Fraud Prevention Office (OLAF), subject to amendments. In particular, these require that all institutions, bodies and organs should be subject to a definite obligation to provide the Office with information. They also provide that if the Office's Director considers that a measure taken by the Commission calls his independence into question, he shall have recourse before the Court of Justice.?

---

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

PURPOSE: laying down of rules concerning investigations conducted by the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) with a view to combating fraud, corruption and all other illegal activities detrimental to the Communities' financial interests. COMMUNITY MEASURE: Regulation 1073/1999/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers concerning investigations conducted by the European Anti-Fraud Office. CONTENT: The new Fraud Prevention Office introduces the following important innovations: - The Office has its own right of initiative to carry out investigations and will be totally independent from instructions; - investigations can be carried out as well in the Member States as in all bodies, institutions and offices in the Community; - The Office will be strengthened by appointing well-experienced investigators - also from the Member States; - The Office's investigators will have access to all necessary information and will be able to cooperate directly with national justice authorities and Eu authorities; - The Director of OLAF will be nominated by the Commission in agreement with the Council and the European Parliament. His work will be monitored by a Supervisory Committee of 5 independent external personalities of high standing, who will also be appointed jointly by the Council, the European Parliament and the Commission; - The Director will neither take nor seek instructions from any government or any institution, body, office or agency in the performance of his duties with regard to the opening and carrying out of external and internal investigations or to the drafting of reports following such investigations. if the Director considers that a measure taken by the Commission calls his independence into question, he shall be entitled to bring an action against his institution before the Court of Justice; - Internal investigations carried out by OLAF must be conducted in accordance with the Treaty and in particular with the Protocol on the privileges and immunities of the European Communities, while respecting the Staff Regulations of officials and conditions of employment of other servants of the European Communities, and with full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular the principle of fairness, for the right of persons involved to express their views on the facts concerning them, and for the principle that the conclusions of an investigation may be based solely on elements which have evidential value; - OLAF must be guaranteed access to all premises of the institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and to all information and documents held by them; - the reciprocal exchange of information between the Office, the Member States and the relevant institutions, bodies, offices and agencies must be organised, subject to rules of confidentiality where information is subject to professional secrecy, while ensuring that it enjoys the proper data protection; - the activities of the Office will be evaluated by the Commission after three years of the Office's operations: this report will be transmitted to the European Parliament and the Council, together, where appropriate, with proposals to modify or extend the Office's tasks. ENTRY INTO FORCE: 01/06/1999.?

---

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

COMMUNITY MEASURE : Decision of the European Parliament, of the Council and of the Commission appointing the members of the Supervisory Committee of the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF). CONTENT : the following persons are hereby appointed as members of the Supervisory Committee of the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) as from 1 August 1999: - Mireille DELMAS-MARTY; - Edmondo BRUTI-LIBERATI; - Jos? Narciso da CUNHA RODRIGUES; - Raymond KENDALL; - Harald NOACK.?

---

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

---

COMMUNITY MEASURE : Decision of the European Parliament, of the Council and of the Commission appointing a member of the Supervisory Committee of the European Anti-fraud Office (OLAF). This document is no longer in force. CONTENT : Mr Alfredo José de Sousa is hereby appointed member of the Supervisory Committee of the European Anti-fraud Office (OLAF) until 31 July 2002.?

---

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

---

This report consists of the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) Supervisory Committee's report from the period September 2001 to June 2002. This third activity report marks both the completion of the first Supervisory Committee's term of office and the end of the three-year period following which the institutions must examine how the system has operated in order to adapt or supplement it, where necessary. Having treated its last annual report as a general stock-taking exercise, the Committee has not formulated any proposals or recommendations, as it did in its first two reports, but has concentrated on presenting an assessment of progress in achieving the objectives of the Regulation and of OLAF's status. On the basis of this stocktaking exercise, the Committee feels that OLAF's tasks must now be consolidated so that it can be made to operate in a way that meets these objectives. This should pave the way for the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor, which the Committee considers as vital for the establishment of a complete, coherent system for protecting financial interests. In practice, this report demonstrates that OLAF does not fully enjoy the legal, administrative and budgetary autonomy that would allow it to set up structures offering an adequate guarantee of its independence and of the proper conduct of investigations. However, the Committee feels that, the decisive guidelines having been adopted, we can and must envisage consolidating OLAF's status, structure and mission, as a vital step towards achieving the aims laid down by the legislator. Consolidation should cover: - OLAF's administrative, budgetary and legal autonomy, with its status probably developing along similar lines to that of the European Ombudsman, - the operational level, i.e. the development of an investigation policy, scrutiny and control of the management of investigations and operations, checks on legality, the safeguarding of individual rights and effective follow-up, - the definition of OLAF's mission and how it relates to the spheres of responsibility of its partners (institutions and Member States), in order to develop, spell out and enhance its specific role as an independent investigative body seeking to protect financial interests, - the function and the status of the Supervisory Committee as an independent interinstitutional body. Lastly, a consolidation exercise of this kind, which could then be assessed by a management audit, would allow OLAF to function effectively and fulfil properly the mission assigned to it by the legislator. It would also prepare OLAF to take up its place in a complete, coherent system for protecting financial interests, the need for which no longer requires any demonstration.?

---

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

---

In accordance with Article 15 of Parliament and Council Regulation 1073/1999/EC and Council Regulation (and Euratom) 1074/1999/EC on investigations carried out by the European Antifraud Office, the Commission shall transmit to the European Parliament and the Council a progress report on the Office's activities, accompanied by the Supervisory Committee's opinion, together, where appropriate, with proposals to modify or extend the Office's tasks. The object of the evaluation exercise is to come to an overall assessment of the Office's activities, supplementing the analyses conducted by the Office itself and the Supervisory Committee, by examining its functions, the means available and the difficulties encountered. Account is taken of the impact of anti-fraud activities on the protection of the Communities' interests, sound implementation of the budget and healthy and rigorous financial management. The exercise takes account of the impact of the reform on prevention, cooperation and deterrence/enforcement. There is also reference to the subsidiarity and proportionality principles, respect for fundamental human rights, transparency, and the costeffectiveness ratio (economies of scale). The interinstitutional dimension of the Office's activities (credibility of the institutions and of European integration) was also taken into account. This overall assessment should provide a means of weighing up the pros and cons of the structure that emerged from the 1999 reform. The recommendations contained in this report are proposals that have been put forward with a view to optimising the Office's work. Some of these proposals are for improvements to secondary legislation; others relate to OLAF's working practices and the arrangements for cooperation between it and its different partners, particularly at national level. The fact remains that, irrespective of the progress made in attaining the objectives of the reform, and of the benefits derived, the difficulties identified should not be underestimated. They centre mainly on the question of the Commission's political and legal responsibility vis-?-vis the Office and its operational activities, in conjunction with the Office's functional independence in the exercise of its activities, and the choices to be made regarding its budget and staffing policy. They also concern the view taken in some quarters that there is a risk of interference, based on possible suspicion of meddling by the Commission in the Office's internal investigation activities. Many of these difficulties also spring from the fact that the reform was set in motion immediately, from the duration of the transitional period and from the necessary re-assignment of the staff of the Office. The development of its operational activities, particularly with regard to internal investigations, may also have aggravated the difficulties. Several factors militate in favour of retaining the overall consistency of the system devised in 1999. Furthermore, the overall assessment of the Office's activities, three years on, suggests that the difficulties encountered in this transition period are gradually diminishing. In the current situation, the consolidation of the Office is therefore a priority. Work on the Corpus Juris and the follow-up to it, the preparation of the Green Paper of the protection of the Community's financial interests and the Commission's proposals for the establishment of a European Prosecutor are a good example of the synergy offered by the proximity of work on the ground and preparation and negotiation of Commission initiatives. Internal reform initiatives, in the legislative sphere and elsewhere, and the contributions to the Convention on the future of the European Union are all visible proof of the benefits to the Commission of capitalising on these synergies within it.?

---

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

---

COMMUNITY MEASURE : Decision of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission renewing the term of office of the members of the Supervisory Committee of the European Anti-fraud Office (OLAF). CONTENT : the following are appointed members of the Supervisory Committee of the European Anti-fraud Office (OLAF) for a new term of three years: - Mr Edmondo BRUTI-LIBERATI; - Mr Alfredo Jos? DE SOUSA; - Ms Mireille DELMAS-MARTY; - Mr Raymond KENDALL; - Mr Harald NOACK. This decision shall have effect as from 1 August 2002.?

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

---

LEGISLATIVE ACT : Decision 2005/833/EC, Euratom of the European Parliament, of the Council and of the Commission of 4 November 2005 appointing the members of the Supervisory Committee of the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF)

CONTENT : Regulations 1073/1999/EC and 1074/1999/Euratom provide that the Supervisory Committee of the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) is to be composed of five independent outside persons who possess the qualifications required for appointment in their respective countries to senior posts relating to the Office's areas of activity. The members of the Supervisory Committee appointed with effect from 1 August 1999 have reached their maximum term of office. By common accord of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission, the following persons are hereby appointed as members of the Supervisory Committee of the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) as from 30 November 2005:

- Mr Peter STROMBERG,
- Mr Kalman GYORGYI,
- Ms Rosalind WRIGHT,
- Mr Luis LOPEZ SANZ-ARANGUEZ,
- Ms Diemut R. TEATO.

Should any of the above persons resign from the Supervisory Committee, die or become permanently incapacitated, they shall immediately be replaced by the first named person on the following list who has not yet been appointed to the Supervisory Committee:

- Mr Eugeniusz RU?KOWSKI,
- Mr Albertus Hendrikus KORTHALS,
- Mr Jaroslav FENYK,
- Mr Stefano DAMBRUOSO.

## Fight against fraud: investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office OLAF

---

Opinion of the European Data Protection Supervisor on the Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 1073/1999 concerning investigations conducted by the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF).

The EDPS welcomes this proposal insofar as it makes more explicit the procedural guarantees of individuals concerned by OLAF investigations, including the protection of personal data of such individuals.

From the perspective of the protection of individuals' rights to the protection of their personal data and privacy, the EDPS considers that for the most part the proposal contains improvements vis-à-vis the current legal framework. In particular, certain measures aim to contribute to the respect of the right of information or confirm the application of the partial right of access and rectification in the context of OLAF investigations.

The EDPS welcomes the proposal's recognition that Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 applies to all data processing activities carried out in the context of OLAF investigations, as it will contribute to ensuring a consistent and homogeneous application of the rules regarding the protection of individuals' fundamental rights and freedoms with regard to the processing of personal information.

Although the EDPS is appreciative of the amendments aimed at boosting procedural and data protection rights outlined above, he is concerned by the fact that most of the proposed amendments do not reach the minimum data protection standards contained in Regulation (EC) No 45/2001. The EDPS is concerned that if the proposal could be deemed to take precedent over the application of the general data protection framework contained in Regulation (EC) No 45/2001, this would entail an unacceptable watering down of the data protection standards in the context of OLAF investigations. In the EDPS's opinion this is particularly worrisome in the light of the sensitive nature of the type of data that may be collected in the framework of OLAF investigations. In order to avoid this outcome, the EDPS requests the Community legislator to take into account the following issues and make the related amendments in the Proposal in order to address them:

- Shortcomings regarding the right of information in the context of OLAF investigations: the amendment aim to provide information to individuals to ensure fair processing constitutes an indispensable safeguard which should not be unduly compromised, as the proposal does.
- Shortcomings regarding the right of access in the context of OLAF investigations: to ensure effective access rights, the proposal should include a new provision recognising as a general principle the right of access to personal information gathered in the context of OLAF investigations.
- Shortcomings regarding the right of rectification in the context of OLAF investigations: (i) a provision should be added stating that suspected individuals have a general right to have their views known regarding any piece of information that referred to them, except if an exception ex Article 20 of Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 applies.

In addition to the above, the EDPS is of the view that it would be appropriate for this proposal to include a new paragraph guaranteeing the confidentiality of whistleblowers.

