

Brussel, 23 September 2020

DRAFT ANNOTATED AGENDA¹⁻²

Meeting of the Coordinators

of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs

23 September 2020

(13:45 - 15:45)

József Antall (6Q2), Brussels

and with remote participation of AFCO Coordinators

- 1. Nominations**
- 2. Working documents in view of the Conference on the Future of Europe**
- 3. Brexit (situation created by British Internal Market Bill)**
- 4. European Electoral Law**
- 5. Right of Inquiry**
- 6. European political parties**
- 7. Project Action Plan for the Implementation Report on the assessment of the implementation of Article 50 TEU**
- 8. German Constitutional Court case, the consequences of the BVG decision of 5 May**
- 9. Letter of Mr Reynders requesting a joint hearing (LIBE/PETI/JURI) o the report on citizenship**
- 10. Petitions for AFCO opinion**
- 11. Petitions for information**
- 12. Documents received for information**
- 13. Any other business**

¹ Please refer to annex 1 for the outcome of the Coordinators meeting of 29 June 2020.

² Please refer to annex 2 to see the updates on the point system.

1. Nominations

a) REPORTS

- **Assessment of the implementation of the Agreement on the withdrawal of the UK from the EU**

➤ *Coordinators are kindly requested to indicate a rapporteur for the INI report on the assessment of the implementation of the withdrawal agreement with the UK.*

[2 points]

b) OPINIONS

- **Proposal for a Council regulation laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2021 to 2027 (2018/0166(APP))³**

AFCO opinion to BUDG

In the previous legislature, AFCO drafted an opinion to the “Interim report on the MFF 2021-2027 – Parliament’s position in view of an agreement”, in which it set out its views on the 2018 Commission proposals on the MFF 2021-2027 and on a new own resources decision and proposed amendments to the MFF proposal

As part of its European recovery plan, the Commission presented an Amended proposal for a Council regulation laying down the Multiannual Financial Framework for the years 2021 to 2027), which must be approved by the Council by unanimity, after receiving the consent of the Parliament⁴.

AFCO is entitled to provide an opinion to the BUDG report on the MFF consent, to be tentatively voted by the plenary in December 2020.

Such opinion may usually only contain a recommendation to approve or reject the new MFF, without any further statements as to the appreciation of the content. However, in case that the opinion is delivered in the form of a letter (as was done for the opinion on own resources), AFCO could raise institutional aspects in the

³ See annex 3

⁴ Article 312(2) TFEU.

form of resolution text (as opinion giving committees have done with the AFCO report on UK Withdrawal Agreement). If AFCO would wish to take account of the outcome of negotiations between the EP and Council, the time for adoption of an opinion will probably be very limited and will not allow for a fully-fledged amendment procedure. In this case it may be necessary to resort to negotiations between political groups during the drafting process of the letter.

➤ *Coordinators are kindly requested to decide whether to draft an opinion on the EP's consent to the MFF 2021-2027 and in the affirmative, to decide on the form of the opinion and its allocation to a political group*

[1 point]

● **AFCO opinions on discharge 2019: EU general budget**

- AFCO/9/03706\NLG - 2020/2140(DEC)\2019 discharge: General budget of the EU - **European Commission**\A : Opinion COM(2020)0288 - C9-0220/2020
- AFCO/9/03726\NLG - 2020/2141(DEC)\2019 discharge: General budget of the EU - **European Parliament**\A : Opinion COM(2020)0288 - C9-0221/2020
- AFCO/9/03746\NLG - 2020/2142(DEC)\2019 discharge: General budget of the EU - **Council and European Council**\A : Opinion COM(2020)0288 - C9-0222/2020
- AFCO/9/03766\NLG - 2020/2143(DEC)\2019 discharge: General budget of the EU - **Court of Justice**\A : Opinion COM(2020)0288 - C9-0223/2020
- AFCO/9/03786\NLG - 2020/2144(DEC)\2019 discharge: General budget of the EU - **Court of Auditors**\A : Opinion COM(2020)0288 - C9-0224/2020
- AFCO/9/03806\NLG - 2020/2145(DEC)\2019 discharge: General budget of the EU - **European Economic and Social Committee**\A : Opinion COM(2020)0288 - C9-0225/2020

- AFCO/9/03826\NLG - 2020/2146(DEC)\2019 discharge: General budget of the EU - **European Committee of the Regions**\A : Opinion COM(2020)0288 - C9-0226/2020
- AFCO/9/03846\NLG - 2020/2147(DEC)\2019 discharge: General budget of the EU - **European Ombudsman**\A : Opinion COM(2020)0288 - C9-0227/2020
- AFCO/9/03855\NLG - 2020/2149(DEC)\2019 discharge: General budget of the EU - **European External Action Service**\A : Opinion COM(2020)0288 - C9-0229/2020
- AFCO/9/04039\NLG -2020/2194(DEC)\ **Report on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Union agencies for the financial year 2019: performance, financial management and control**\A : Opinion COM(2020)0288 - C9-0282/2020

Last year AFCO adopted an opinion on the discharge on 2018 discharge as regards the General budget of the EU - **Council and European Council**

➤ *Coordinators are kindly requested to decide whether to draft an opinion to one or more of the aforementioned reports on discharge*

2. Working documents in view of the Conference on the Future of Europe

At their meeting of 29 June coordinators agreed to draft up to 7 Working Documents and that coordinators would, on the basis of the suggestions formulated by the secretariat, transmit their suggestions as to precise titles and scope of these documents, as well as their preferences for the authorship of the Working Documents (co-authorship being accepted). It was agreed furthermore that in principle, the WDs will be drafted following the method used during the last legislature (descriptive part, reflections of the authors, summary of discussions/views expressed in committee). Coordinators agreed moreover that the WDs could serve as a preparation for a future INI or resolution to be presented by AFCO to the plenary.

Following updated suggestions circulated by the secretariat on 15 July, coordinators are near an agreement on the subjects for Working Documents, with an agreement still to be reached on:

- whether there should be two separate WDs (EPP position) on national parliaments (WD no 3) and subsidiarity and proportionality (WD no (4) or one combined WD (S&D position); and
- the allocation of WD to political groups, with possible co-authorships.

➤ ***Coordinators are invited to agree on the subject of working documents to be drafted and on the allocation of WDs to political groups.***

Suggestions of the secretariat 15/07/2020

1. Democratization of the EU: improving the accountability, transparency, capacity and responsiveness of the Union's institutions

This working document would focus on the proposals for reforms in the functioning of the Union's institutions and on relations between them, building on the reports adopted in the previous legislature.

This proposal combines elements from different proposals from the EPP (1,4 and 5), Renew (2) and Greens/EFA(3)

2. Institutional reforms in the face of the COVID crisis and other potential future crises: A health Union and new emerging social needs, crisis preparedness

This WD could examine the institutional limits to effective action at Union level under the current Treaties to address the current COVID-19 crisis and its consequences. It could address institutional obstacles for effective action and possible new needed competences for the Union, in the field of health and social policies, while looking also at crisis preparedness of the European Union more in general: how is the EU ready to react to other potential financial and economic, health, security and defence and natural disaster crisis institutionally?

This proposal combines elements from different proposals from the S&D (1,2 and 5) and Greens/EFA (2)

3. Encouraging the dialogue between the European Parliament and the national and regional parliaments for strengthening democracy through the Conference on the Future of Europe

- This working document aims to assess the possibilities of substantial dialogue with the national and regional parliaments during the Conference on the Future of Europe, evaluating the means through which European parliamentarism on all levels could be strengthened. Therefore it will look at the establishment of common forums and mechanisms in the process of the Conference;
- There are joint parliamentary meetings on horizontal topics: meetings in the form of Joint Committee Meetings, the possibility for ad hoc interparliamentary meetings, meetings on the level of committee chairs, with the Conference of Speakers of the European Parliaments, delegations, group and party meetings, the idea of the

European Week. There are examples like the COSAC, the CFSP-IPC, or the IPEX-meetings and in the field of European legislation there is the Early Warning Mechanism. None of these tools has been used to its full potential, and moreover, they are not specific for the challenge of conducting a thorough dialogue in the process of the Conference on the Future of Europe. This is why an assessment is needed to conclude which tools, or combination of tools would be the most appropriate for the task at hand.

This proposal combines elements from proposals of the EPP (7) and S&D (4)

4. The principles of subsidiarity and proportionality

This WD analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality building on the reports adopted in the previous legislature (Bresso/Brok, Verhofstadt, Rangel) and look at practical ways forward to implement the ideas expressed in those reports in this regard.

This proposal combines elements of proposals from the S&D (4) and ECR (1)

5. The community method and intergovernmentalism;

This WD could analyse in more detail the Community method vis-a vis intergovernmental decision making and reasons why Member States resorted to intergovernmentalism especially in recent crises.

The proposal combines elements from the EPP (3), S&D (11)

6. Overcoming the deadlock of unanimity voting

This WD could expand on ways to overcome the deadlock of unanimity voting, inter alia through passerelle-clauses and/or reinforced cooperation and analyse the role of smaller Member States in this context as well as the question how to guarantee an inclusive approach in EU integration;

This proposal is based on a proposal of Renew(1)

7. Citizen's and civil society's participation in the COFE.

This WD could offer a reflection, ahead of the start of the Conference, as to the way in which citizen's and youth agora's could be organised within the Conference on the Future of Europe, as well as the feedback mechanisms between the different actors and platforms of discussion in the Conference, as well as how civil society can be involved and contribute-with expert advice.

This proposal combines proposals from Greens/EFA(1) and GUE/NGL (1,2)

The proposals received from political groups by the 29 June 2020 can be seen in Annex 1A.

3. Brexit (situation created by British Internal Market Bill)

Following the publication by the UK government of the draft “United Kingdom Internal Market Bill” on 9 September 2020, and which is now at committee stage⁵, the Chair of the Parliament’s UK Coordination Group (UKCG), David McAllister, called its Members for a meeting on Friday, 11 September.

This meeting included an exchange of views with Commission Vice-President Maroš Šefčovič on the implementation of the Withdrawal Agreement (WA) and the outcome of the extraordinary meeting of the Joint Committee of 10 September.

After the publication by the UK government of the draft bill Vice-President Šefčovič called for an extraordinary meeting of the EU-UK Joint Committee on 10 September to request the UK government to elaborate on its intentions and respond to the EU's serious concerns. In the meeting, VP Šefčovič made clear that the situation created a serious breach of trust, as the spirit and the letter of the WA were seriously undermined, putting at risk the Good Friday Agreement. The UK Government underlined that the bill constitutes a safety net in case no agreement in the current negotiations on a Free Trade Agreement is reached. The Commission considered unsatisfactory the arguments provided by the UK, and called on the UK to withdraw the measures from the bill by the end of the month of September at the latest. A Statement by the European Commission following the extraordinary meeting of the EU-UK Joint Committee was published and is available in the Commission’s website:

https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_20_1607

Following its meeting of 11 September, the UKCG and the Parliament’s political group leaders also issued a statement, where they make clear that Parliament expects the UK Government to uphold the rule of law and ensure the full implementation of all provisions of the Withdrawal Agreement, and that should the UK breach – or threaten to breach – the Agreement, Parliament will, under no circumstances, ratify any future agreement between the EU and the UK.

As you remember, at their meeting of 29 June, coordinators agreed to set up a Monitoring Group on the implementation of the Agreement on the withdrawal of the UK from the EU, chaired by Danuta Hübner, and that the political groups would

⁵ Committee stage is where detailed examination of the Bill takes place. If the Bill starts in the Commons the committee is able to take evidence from experts and interest groups from outside Parliament. Amendments (proposals for change) for discussion are selected by the chairman of the committee and only members of the committee can vote on amendments during committee stage. (Source: [House of Commons website](#))

transmit to the secretariat the names of the Members participating (one per political group). Until now, all but two political groups (ID and ECR) transmitted to the Secretariat the names of the Members of the Group.

Given that the Commission announced that a deadline was given to the UK Government to withdraw the contentious measures from the draft bill by the end of September, we have to wait and see what concrete measures will be taken by the UK in this matter.

The Monitoring Group will surely accompany very closely the evolution of this and will report to the Coordinators and the Committee.

Composition of the Monitoring Group on the implementation of the Agreement on the withdrawal of the UK from the EU

POLITICAL GROUP	MEMBER
PPE	Danuta Maria Hübner (Chair)
S&D	Pedro Silva Pereira
Renew	Charles Goerens
ID	
Verts/ALE	François Alfonsi
ECR	
GUE/NGL	Helmuth Scholz
NI	Fabio Massimo Castaldo

4. European Electoral Law

The coordinator of S&D, Domenèc Ruiz Devesa requested that the issue of launching a report on the modification of the European Law pursuant to article 223(1) TFEU be discussed at coordinators level.

At an earlier stage, coordinators had discussed the possibility of AFCO taking another legislative initiative on this matter, notably in order to address some issues that were not taken on board in the proposal it adopted in November 2015. At their meeting on 28 January past, coordinators agreed that AFCO should indeed prepare a new legislative initiative on the basis of article 223(1) TFEU proposing the modification of the European Electoral Act at a later stage, "*after the report on stocktaking of the elections and conditional on a clear perspective as to the state of play of the current ratification process of the text agreed by EP and the Council*".

In fact, the decision of the Council of 13 July 2018 modifying the act on the election of the members of the EP (*vulgo* European electoral law), adopted by the Council on the basis of the proposal of the EP and after receiving the consent of this one, has not yet been ratified by all Member States, as requested by article 223 TFEU. Three member states are missing: Germany, Spain and Cyprus.

According to information received by informal diplomatic channels, it is possible that the procedure for the ratification of the decision be revived soon in some of those member states, but there is no clarity about when this could take place.

- ***Coordinators are kindly invited to discuss whether AFCO should request to the CoP authorisation to launch an INL report on the basis of article 223(1) TFEU after the conclusion of the ongoing procedure on the report on stocktaking of the elections.***
- ***In the affirmative, coordinators are kindly requested to decide on the rapporteurship, should they be already in a position to do so.***

5. Right of Inquiry

Following the last contacts with shadow rapporteurs, the rapporteur and S&D coordinator, Domenèc Ruiz Devesa, requested that coordinators have a discussion on the next steps concerning the procedure on the right of inquiry of the EP, and possibly endorse the draft documents prepared in cooperation with the shadow rapporteurs⁶.

- *Coordinators are kindly requested to express their views on the strategy proposed by the rapporteur to relaunch institutional contacts on this file, taking into account the possible timing of those contacts, also in view of the state of play on other ongoing dossiers on institutional affairs (notably, the revision of the European Ombudsman's statute and the negotiations on the Transparency Register).*

⁶ Documents presented by the rapporteur:

- Draft letter from the chair and the Rapporteur to the German Presidency of the Council (Annex 25)
- Draft Oral Question with debate to the Commission (Annex 26)
- Draft Oral Question with debate to the Council (Annex 27)
- Working Document (Annex 28)

6. European political parties

According to Article 38 of Regulation 1141/2014, last modified on 25 March 2019:

"The European Parliament shall, after consulting the Authority, publish by 31 December 2021 and every five years thereafter a report on the application of this Regulation and on the activities funded. The report shall indicate, where appropriate, possible amendments to be made to the statute and funding systems."

Taking into account the preparatory work, which will be needed before being able to start the drafting as such of the report, it is suggested to already agree on the rapporteur, who will coordinate and organise this preliminary work.

He or she could propose a working calendar, which could encompass thorough exchanges of views with all the relevant stakeholders, among others the European political parties and foundations themselves, the European Commission, the Authority for European political parties and European political foundations, the Vice-Presidents of the European Parliament in charge of relations with these entities, the Directorate-General for Finance and the Legal Service of the Secretariat-General of the European Parliament,...

A hearing could also be organised with academic experts and a study be ordered.

- *Do coordinators agree on already appointing a rapporteur in view of preparing and subsequently drafting the evaluation report Parliament is due to adopt before the end of 2021? And if yes to which political group (and rapporteur) it should be assigned?*
- *Do they support the suggestions made above as to the preparatory work, which will serve as a basis for the report?*

7. Project Action Plan for the Implementation Report on the assessment of the implementation of Article 50 TEU

AFCO was authorised to draft an implementation Report on the assessment of the implementation of Article 50 TEU and Danuta Maria HÜBNER (EPP, PL) was appointed rapporteur.

The rapporteur would like to start working on this project as soon as possible and has prepared a draft action plan for this implementation report for which she asks endorsement of AFCO Coordinators.

Action	Date
Kick-off meeting of the administrative project team	Week of 12 October 2020 (tbc)
First exchange of views in AFCO without text	28 October 2020
Conclusion of a research paper by EPRS	16 November 2020
Presentation of Working Document by Rapporteur	2 December 2020
Public Hearing (also with the participation of the Commission, Council and of the opinion giving committees)	January 2021
Presentation of study Policy Department C Study to be commissioned, on the legal analysis of the interpretation and application of Article 50 TEU (identifying also the problematic issues and exploring the venues for possible future reform of the Treaty in this regard)	February 2021
Send draft report to translation	Tbc
Presentation of draft report in AFCO	March 2021
Deadline for amendments	Tbc
Consideration of amendments	April/May 2021
Vote of draft report in AFCO	June 2021
Adoption of report in Plenary	July 2021

- *Coordinators are requested to discuss and possibly endorse the proposed project action plan*

8. German Constitutional Court case, the consequences of the BVerfG decision of 5 May

On 1 September the S&D coordinator, Domènec Ruiz Devesa, requested the inclusion of a point on the agenda of coordinators to invite the European Commission to the AFCO committee to explain its position on the German Constitutional Court's ruling

Background

In its [ruling](#) of 5 May 2020 the Second Senate of the German Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht, (BVerfG)) granted several constitutional complaints directed against the Public Sector Purchase Programme of the European Central Bank (ECB), finding that the Federal Government and the German Bundestag violated the complainants' rights enshrined in the Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG) by failing to take steps challenging that the ECB, in its decisions on the adoption and implementation of the PSPP, neither assessed nor substantiated that the measures provided for in these decisions satisfy the principle of proportionality.

The BVerfG considers that the review undertaken by the CJEU with regard to whether the ECB's decisions on the PSPP satisfy the principle of proportionality is not comprehensible (*nachvollziehbar*) and to this extent found that the judgement of the Court of Justice (C-493/17, Weiss and Others, of 11 December 2018 on the Public Sector Procurement Programme (PSPP) of the European Central Bank was rendered ultra vires and that these ECB decisions exceed EU competences.

While finding that 'it is not ascertainable that the PSPP violates the constitutional identity of the Basic Law in general or the overall budgetary responsibility of the German *Bundestag* in particular', the BVerfG said that 'based on their responsibility with regard to European integration (*Integrationsverantwortung*), the Federal Government and the German *Bundestag* have a duty to take active steps against the PSPP in its current form' and that 'specifically, this means that, based on their responsibility with regard to European integration (*Integrationsverantwortung*), the Federal Government and the *Bundestag* are required to take steps seeking to ensure that the ECB conducts a proportionality assessment'. The BVerfG gave a transitional period of not more than three months for the necessary coordination with the Eurosystem after which 'the Bundesbank may no longer participate in the implementation and execution of the ECB decisions at issue, unless the ECB Governing Council adopts a new decision that demonstrates in a comprehensible and substantiated manner that the monetary policy objectives pursued by the PSPP are not disproportionate to the economic and fiscal policy effects resulting from the

programme’. It also held that ‘on the same condition, the *Bundesbank* must ensure that the bonds already purchased under the PSPP and held in its portfolio are sold based on a – possibly long-term – strategy coordinated with the ESCB’.

On 8 May the CJEU issued a [press release](#) recalling in general the view held by the Court that ‘a judgment in which the Court gives a preliminary ruling is binding on the national court for the purposes of the decision to be given in the main proceedings’ and that the CJEU alone is competent to rule of an EU institution contrary to EU law, for reasons of ensuring the uniform application of EU law, the unity of the EU legal, legal certainty and equality of Member States in the EU.

On 10 May, European Commission President von der Leyen issued a [statement](#), recalling that the Unions’s monetary policy is a matter of exclusive competence and asserting that EU law has primacy over national law and that rulings of the European Court of Justice are binding on all national courts. She said that the Commission would analyse the ruling in detail and examine possible next steps which could include the option of infringement proceedings.

AFCO held a hearing together with JURI on 14 July to which it invited experts to give their views on the judgement and its consequences.

On 2 July a majority in the Bundestag adopted a joint [motion](#) tabled by CDU/CSU, SPD, FDP and Grünen on the PSPP considering that the requirements contained in the ruling of the Federal Constitutional Court to carry out a proportionality test in connection with the PSPP are fulfilled. The German Central Bank had asked the ECB for a statement on its proportionality assessment. While not issuing a “new decision” the ECB released several meeting minutes and authorised the Deutsche Bundesbank, on condition of confidentiality, to disclose to the German Federal Government and to the extent necessary also to the Bundestag, non-public minutes containing proportionality considerations for the PSPP as from its start. Furthermore the Bundestag considered a range of documents, among which minutes of the meeting of the ECB governing Council of 3 and 4 June, containing detailed proportionality considerations.

On this basis both the Ministry of Finance and the Bundestag considered that the proportionality assessment can be qualified as comprehensible. The motion adopted paves the way for the Deutsche Bundesbank to continue participating in the PSPP⁷.

➤ *Coordinators are invited to react to the proposal of the S&D coordinator, Domènec Ruiz Devesa.*

⁷ Further reading : <https://eulawlive.com/three-months-after-weiss-was-nun/>

9. Letter of Mr Reynders requesting a joint hearing (LIBE/PETI/JURI) on the report on citizenship

On 11 September the Chairs of the AFCO, LIBE, PETI and JURI Committees received the letter from the Commissioner for Justice Didier Reynders⁸ informing about the Commission's ongoing preparations to the next EU Citizenship Report and suggesting to jointly organize a hearing on the EU citizenship rights in the first half of October 2020.

A similar event on the 'EU Citizenship in Practice: our common values, rights and democratic participation' was organized jointly by the European Commission (DG Justice and Consumers) and the LIBE, PETI, AFCO and JURI Committees on 15 March 2016⁹.

The PETI coordinators have already expressed interest in the organisation of the requested hearing. However, they acknowledged the difficulties to hold the hearing already in the first half of October, bearing in mind the restrictive rules governing the organisation of hearings due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The PETI secretariat approached the cabinet of Mr Renders to express preliminary interest in the joint hearing and to request to specify the topics for the hearing, duration and structure as well as to explore the Commissioner's availability to hold the hearing at a later stage in case the first half of October proves to be very difficult. The cabinet is expected to provide answers in the coming days.

- *Coordinators are kindly invited to express the interest in organizing the hearing on the EU citizenship rights jointly with the Commission and LIBE, JURI and PETI committees and in the affirmative, to decide on the timing bearing in mind the limitations imposed by the current EP rules.*

⁸ See Annex 8

⁹ <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/product-details/20160315CHE00221>

10. Petitions for AFCO opinion

*Since the last Coordinators' meeting on 29 June 2020 **no petitions** have been transmitted to the AFCO Committee **for opinion**.*

11. Petitions for information

The following Petition, which has been transmitted to the AFCO Committee for information, do not necessarily require a follow-up.

Should there be a report on the same subject, the Petition will be forwarded to the rapporteur.

Unless coordinators decide otherwise, no other follow-up will be given.

PRES-A-COURRIER D (2020) 308741 ¹⁰

Petition No 0080/2020 by Renato Lelli (Italian), on behalf of AGSPP, on the revision of the Maastricht and Lisbon Treaties

The petitioner objects to the economic and monetary policy provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and the objective of ‘a highly competitive social market economy’ as stipulated in the Treaty on European Union, arguing that they run counter to the fundamental principles and rights enshrined in the Italian Constitution. He accordingly takes the view that a political European Union needs to take shape before a financial union and calls the EU treaties to be revised accordingly.

Recommendations PETI

- Declare admissible;
- inform him that the procedure for revision of the Treaties is governed by Article 48 of the Treaty on European Union, which requires the convening of an intergovernmental conference to adopt proposed amendments by consensus for fundamental changes to the powers of the EU; any amendments to the Treaty must be ratified by all EU Member States before they can enter into force; inform the petitioner that the committee is not empowered under the Treaties to initiate the ordinary procedure for revision thereof;
- inform the petitioner that the Commission has launched on 22 January 2020 a Communication to the European Parliament and the Council on “Shaping the Conference on the Future of Europe” (COM (2020)27), which aims at finding a new push for European Democracy using an open discussion focussing on what matters to Citizens. The Conference should eventually create the right space for Europeans to have their say and enable citizens to shape EU policies;
- inform the petitioner about the related European Parliament Resolution of 15 January 2020 on the European Parliament’s position on the Conference on the Future of Europe (2019/2990(RSP)) and the Conclusions of the European Council at its meeting of 12 December 2019.(5573/20);
- thank the petitioner and inform him the committee has taken note of his observations

¹⁰ See Annex 29

12. Documents received for information

The following documents, which have been transmitted to the AFCCO Committee for information, do not necessarily require a follow-up.

Unless coordinators decide otherwise, these documents will be dealt with as indicated below or, in the absence of any indication, no follow-up will be given

- (Pour avis. Disclaimer: This notification does not constitute the opening of a procedure: if your committee wants to react to this document, an authorisation would need to be requested) COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION OF 21.8.2020 ON THE REQUEST FOR REGISTRATION OF THE PROPOSED EUROPEAN CITIZENS' INITIATIVE ENTITLED 'RIGHT TO CURE' (C(2020) 5705 FINAL) ¹¹
- Gabrielle Brakebusch (Landtag von Sachsen-Anhalt) - OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE CONFERENCE ON THE FUTURE OF EUROPE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE REGIONS [ANNEX=COURTESY TRANSLATION] ¹²
- Iordache Florin (Romanian Parliament Chamber of Deputies) - OPINION OF A NATIONAL PARLIAMENT (RO) ON THE COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL SHAPING THE CONFERENCE ON THE FUTURE OF EUROPE (COM/2020/27 FINAL) ¹³
- Ondřej Benešík (Chairman of the Committee on European Affairs of the Chamber of Deputies of the Parliament of the Czech Republic) - OPINION OF A NATIONAL PARLIAMENT (CZ) ON THE ANNEXES TO THE COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION – COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME 2020: A UNION THAT STRIVES FOR MORE (COM(2020)37)

¹¹ See Annex 24

¹² See Annex 4

¹³ See Annex 5

AND ON THE ANNEXES TO THE COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION – ADJUSTED COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME 2020 (COM(2020)440) ¹⁴

● COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION - ANNUAL ACCOUNTS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2019 (COM(2020) 289 final) ¹⁵

● Folketinget - Danish Parliament - PROPOSAL TO HOST A CITIZENS' EVENT DURING THE CONFERENCE ON THE FUTURE OF EUROPE ¹⁶

● President David Maria Sassoli to MEPs Greens/EFA Group: OBSERVATIONS ABOUT iVOTE SYSTEM FOR VOTING IN COMMITTEE MEETINGS ¹⁷

● President David Maria Sassoli to MEPs GUE/NGL Group: OBSERVATIONS ABOUT iVOTE SYSTEM FOR VOTING IN COMMITTEE MEETINGS ¹⁸

● President David Maria Sassoli to MEP ID Group: OBSERVATIONS ABOUT iVOTE SYSTEM FOR VOTING IN COMMITTEE MEETINGS ¹⁹

● European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) - Statement on the Conference on the Future of Europe - Social Europe should be at the centre of the Conference on the Future of Europe ²⁰

● Jahier Luca - European Economic and Social Committee - EESC CONTRIBUTION TO THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S 2021 WORK PROGRAMME ²¹

● Committee of the Regions - RESOLUTION ON THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2021 ²²

● European Anti-Poverty Network (EAPN) - EAPN PRIORITIES FOR THE FUTURE OF EUROPE CONFERENCE ²³

¹⁴ See Annex 6

¹⁵ See Annex 7

¹⁶ See Annex 9

¹⁷ See Annex 10

¹⁸ See Annex 11

¹⁹ See Annex 12

²⁰ See Annex 13

²¹ See Annex 14

²² See Annex 15

²³ See Annex 16

- SEIMAS / Parliament of the Republic of Lithuania: OPINION OF A NATIONAL PARLIAMENT (LT) ON THE COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION - COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME 2020 - A UNION THAT STRIVES FOR MORE (COM/2020/37 FINAL) AND ON THE COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION - ADJUSTED COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME 2020 (COM/2020/440 FINAL) ²⁴
- Committee of the Regions: THE EUROPEAN COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS' PRIORITIES FOR 2020-2025 ²⁵
- Movimento Europeo - OBSERVATIONS CONCERNANT LES ACCORDS ADOPTES PAR LE CONSEIL EUROPEEN LE 21/07/2020 ²⁶
- Movimento Europeo - OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE EU NEGOTIATED AGREEMENTS ON THE MFF AND RECOVERY PACKAGE ²⁷
- Gemelli Vitaliano - OBSERVATIONS CONCERNANT LES DECISIONS DU CONSEIL EUROPEEN EXTRAORDINAIRE TENU A BRUXELLES, 17-20 /07/2020 ²⁸
- Europe's People's Forum - A RAPID AND INDEPENDENT START OF CITIZENS ENGAGEMENT IN THE CONFERENCE ON THE FUTURE OF EUROPE ²⁹
- EPRS (European Parliamentary Research Service): 4TH EDITION OF THE STUDY on "EVALUATION IN THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION - ROLLING CHECK-LIST AND STATE OF PLAY" ³⁰

²⁴ See Annex 17

²⁵ See Annexes 18 and 19

²⁶ See Annex 20

²⁷ See Annex 21

²⁸ See Annex 22

²⁹ See Annex 23

³⁰ See Annex 30

13. Any other business

- **AFCO opinion to the JURI report on the ‘Monitoring the application of European Union law 2017 and 2018 (2019/2132(INI))’.**

In line with the usual practice AFCO was attributed the opinion to the JURI report on the ‘Monitoring the application of European Union law 2017 and 2018 (2019/2132(INI))’. As a consequence of leaving the AFCO committee by the rapporteur for the opinion - Maria Grapini, at the end of August the S&D group nominated Pedro Silva Pereira as the new rapporteur for the opinion.

Following the decision of the JURI coordinators to enlarge the scope of the report by the Commission Annual Report for the year 2019, JURI requested the change of the report's title into 'Monitoring the application of European Union Law 2017, 2018 **and 2019**'. The request was approved by the Conference of Committee Chairs (CCC) on 14 September and by the Conference of Presidents (CoP) on 16 September.

The vote in JURI will take place on 7 December 2020 and the opinion giving committees are required to provide their opinions by 16 November 2020.

In the view of above and after consultations with the rapporteur for the opinion the initial timetable foresees the presentation of the opinion on 12 October with the deadline for the amendments **in English only** on 13 October CoB and the vote on 28 October.

- ***Coordinators are kindly invited to take notice of the state of play of the opinion and agree on the tentative timetable as well as the working method in EN only.***