Procedure file

Basic information

INI - Own-initiative procedure	2000/2008(INI)	Procedure completed
Reform of budgetary control procedures and institutions Subject 8.70.03.01 Basic texts on discharge		

Key players

European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	CONT Budgetary Control		13/10/1999
		PSE MORGAN Eluned	

Key events

21/01/2000	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
05/12/2000	Vote in committee		Summary
05/12/2000	Committee report tabled for plenary	A5-0383/2000	
12/12/2000	Debate in Parliament		
13/12/2000	Decision by Parliament	T5-0565/2000	Summary
13/12/2000	End of procedure in Parliament		
17/08/2001	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information

Procedure reference	2000/2008(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Initiative
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 55
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	CONT/5/12348

Documentation gateway

Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A5-0383/2000	05/12/2000	EP	

		OJ C 232 17.08.2001, p. 0009			
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T5-0565/2000 OJ C 232 17.08.2001, p. 0082-0194	13/12/2000	EP	Summary

Reform of budgetary control procedures and institutions

The committee adopted the own-initiative report by Eluned MORGAN (PES, UK) calling for an overhaul of the budgetary control procedures and institutions. The report said there were a number of problems with the current procedure, including those arising from the "contradictory procedure" (under which a right of reply was allowed to reports by the Court of Auditors). It stressed that the point of the discharge should be to ensure that EU taxpayers' money was properly spent by identifying administrative problems which led to mismanagement and lack of financial control. The committee emphasised that the Court of Auditors should concentrate on areas of highest risk and those with the largest sums of money involved. It called for specific problems identified in the Member States to be listed in an annex to the Annual Report and the amount recovered from each Member State to be included in an additional annex. The committee wanted the Court of Auditors' special reports to be given high priority. It called on the Court to follow up on its reports in order to ensure that the EU institution or Member State concerned had taken remedial action. The report argued that discharge reports should contain specific references to good and poor performances by departments responsible. If cases of previously undetected serious irregularities emerged, they should not affect the validity of discharge decisions already taken. Instead the committee should consider freezing or reducing the amount of funding for these headings in the following year's budget and/or requesting that the President of the Commission demand the resignation of the Commissioner(s) concerned. The committee also felt that the discharge reports should contain a proposal for a decision to grant, postpone or refuse discharge. A decision to refuse discharge should be followed by a debate on the political position of the Commission. In accordance with the Framework Agreement between Parliament and the Commission, the Commission should forward all information necessary for the discharge procedure, as requested by the committee chair. Lastly, the committee called for the Commission's Audit Progress Committee to follow up Parliament's discharge recommendations. ?

Reform of budgetary control procedures and institutions

The European Parliament adopted the resolution by Mrs Eluned MORGAN (PES, UK) which calls for an overhaul of the budgetary control procedures and institutions. (Refer to the previous document as the recommendations tabled by the committee responsible mirror those of the adopted text). Parliament also wants new rules of procedure concerning discharge to include the requirement that major decisions by plenary to refuse discharge should only be taken by an absolute majority of the Members of Parliament in order to underline the serious political consequences of such a step. Furthermore, following an initial decision to postpone discharge, Parliament shall, by the July part-session at the latest, grant or refuse discharge. ?