


Procedure file

Basic information		
BUD - Budgetary procedure	2000/2092(BUD)	Procedure completed
2001 budget: EP's estimates		
Subject 8.70.60 Previous annual budgets		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	BUDG Budgets	PPE-DE FERBER Markus	27/01/2000
Council of the European Union			

Key events			
29/03/2000	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
18/04/2000	Vote in committee		Summary
18/04/2000	Budgetary report tabled for plenary	A5-0121/2000	
16/05/2000	Debate in Parliament		
18/05/2000	Decision by Parliament	T5-0223/2000	Summary
18/05/2000	End of procedure in Parliament		
23/02/2001	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2000/2092(BUD)
Procedure type	BUD - Budgetary procedure
Procedure subtype	Budgetary preparation
Legal basis	EC Treaty (after Amsterdam) EC 272
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	BUDG/5/12638

Documentation gateway				
Budgetary report tabled for plenary, 1st reading		A5-0121/2000	18/04/2000	EP

Budgetary text adopted by Parliament	T5-0223/2000 OJ C 059 23.02.2001, p. 0127-0224	18/05/2000	EP	Summary
--------------------------------------	---	------------	----	---------

2001 budget: EP's estimates

The committee adopted the report by Markus FERBER (EPP/ED, D) on Parliament's budgetary estimates for 2001. The committee supported a budget of EUR 987.8m as compared to the current year's figure of EUR 965.5m (a rise of 2.28% to take account of the expected inflation rate in 2001 of 2%). These figures would allow Parliament to keep to its self-imposed ceiling of 20% of the total administrative expenditure (Category 5 of the financial perspective) for all the institutions in the year in question. The report called for budgetary rigour to continue, while nevertheless highlighting the increased workload Parliament had faced since the Amsterdam Treaty came into force (largely owing to wider use of the codecision procedure). The committee pointed out that Parliament had to start preparing in 2001 for the consequences of enlargement (including language costs) while not anticipating political decisions which would be taken in due course. In addition, Council and Parliament were asked to cooperate on the adoption of statutes for MEPs and parliamentary assistants. In the light of the Court of Auditors' preliminary observations on the expenditure of the political groups, the committee asked the Bureau and the Secretary-General to ensure complete transparency in the use of those funds for a transition period until the statute for European political parties had entered into force, by entering the appropriations for European political parties under a separate budget heading. On staff policy, the report urged the Secretary-General to compare existing staff profiles with Parliament's constantly evolving requirements in order to pave the way for any changes needed. It also envisaged additional funding to allow a moderate increase in staff numbers. Lastly, the report called for a continuation of the present policy of purchasing any buildings Parliament needed and supported the policy of paying for them in as short a time as possible to reduce the interest burden to a minimum. As to the refinancing and purchase operation of the Louise Weiss building (LOW), this could only take place once a settlement of the final construction cost had been agreed with the promoters. The committee said that the refinancing scheme should be transparent and legally watertight, especially if Council once again refused the direct financing procedure.?

2001 budget: EP's estimates

The European Parliament adopted the report drafted by Markus FERBER (EPP/ED, Germany) on the preliminary draft budget estimates for Parliament's 2001 budget. The amount required by Parliament totalled EUR 987.8 million. Its own resources amounted to EUR 60.8 million. The contribution due from the European Communities is therefore EUR 926.9 million. Parliament needs adequate resources to prepare for enlargement, including timely measures in the linguistic sector. It decided to increase the appropriations for item 2101 (distributed data-processing systems) by EUR 1.5 million to improve the level of technical support for Members, and in particular, to meet the costs of providing a second networked computer for all Members in Brussels. The Council is expected to cooperate with Parliament in the most constructive way possible to adopt the Statute of Members of the European Parliament, and to adopt also the Statute for Members' assistants. On political group funding, Parliament referred to the Court of Auditors document, which recommends a provisional solution based on a separate budget line to record the appropriations for European political parties, and stated that there must be complete transparency regarding the use of appropriations for a transitional period up until the entry into force of the statute on European political parties. On the question of new staff, Parliament rejected the proposal to occupy the 35 vacant posts from the "enlargement" reserve in the language sector, but requested its Secretary-General to present a report before Parliament's first reading of the 2001 budget, on the measures to be taken to prepare Parliament's language service for enlargement. The necessary appropriations for certain posts in the Parliament were agreed, including posts in the Data Processing and Telecommunications Directorate and the Directorate-General for Committees and Delegations. Parliament postpones its decision on certain posts until September 2000, including those in the Legal Service and the Security Service. It awaits the information requested from other institutions before deciding on staff upgradings. With regard to buildings policy, Parliament noted that the estimates for 2001 are partly based upon an interest rate of 4% and that this rate might increase further. It may re-examine in September the level of appropriations for the repayments for the Parliament buildings, accordingly. It regretted that the Council once again refuses the direct financing procedure for buildings. Parliament approved increasing the value of the Sakharov prize to EUR 50 000, as well as the opening of an 'Info-Point' within the Parliament's premises in Brussels. Finally, the Parliament observed that, although it is by nature an open institution, certain security standards are required and that the quality of Parliament's Security Service must be improved.?