

2006 discharge: European Judicial Cooperation Unit Eurojust

2007/2055(DEC) - 26/03/2008

The Committee on Budgetary Control adopted the report by Hans-Peter **MARTIN** (NI, AT) recommending that the Parliament grant the administrative director of EUROJUST discharge in respect of the implementation of its budget for the financial year 2006.

The parliamentary committee notes that the final annual accounts of EUROJUST are as annexed to the Court of Auditors report.

MEPs make a series of general comments on the EU agencies before focusing on the individual case of EUROJUST.

1) General comments on the majority of EU agencies: MEPs note that the budgets of the 24 agencies and other satellite bodies audited by the Court of Auditors totalled **more than EUR 1 billion** and that the number of agencies is constantly increasing. The number of agencies subject to the discharge procedure evolved from 8 in 2000 to 20 in 2006. They conclude therefore that the auditing/discharge process has become cumbersome and disproportionate compared to the relative size of the agencies and that, in the future, this type of procedure should be simplified and rationalised for decentralised agencies.

On the basis of the financial analysis, MEPs are of the following opinion:

- **Fundamental considerations:** given the constantly increasing number of agencies, MEPs request that, before the creation of a new agency, the Commission provide clear explanations regarding agency type, objectives of the agency, internal governance structure, products, services, clients and stakeholders of the agency, formal relationship with external actors, budget responsibility, financial planning, and personnel and staffing policy. They also request that each agency be governed by a yearly performance agreement which should contain the main objectives for the coming year and that the performance of the agencies be regularly audited by the Court of Auditors (and extend the financial analysis of expenditure to also cover administrative efficiency and effectiveness). More generally, MEPs take the view that, in the case of agencies, which are continually overestimating their respective budget needs, technical abatement should be made on the basis of vacant posts in order to reduce the assigned revenue for the agencies and therefore also lower administrative costs of the EU. They recall that it is a serious problem that a number of agencies is criticised for not following rules on public procurement, the Financial Regulation, the Staff Regulations etc., and consider that the principal reason for this is that most regulations and the Financial Regulation are designed for bigger institutions rather than for small agencies. Therefore, it is necessary to seek a rapid solution in order to enhance the effectiveness of the legislation by grouping the administrative functions of various agencies together or by establishing implementing rules which are better adapted to the agencies. MEPs also insist that the Commission, when drafting the Preliminary Draft Budget, take into consideration the results of budget implementation by the individual agencies in former years and revise the budget requested by the particular agency accordingly. If the Commission does not undertake this revision, MEPs invite the competent committee to revise, itself, the budget in question to a realistic level. At the same time, MEPs recall that they expect the Commission to present every five years a study on the added value of every existing agency and to not hesitate to close an agency if it is deemed useless by the analysis. Such an assessment is

expected as soon as possible given that this type of assessment has yet to be presented. Furthermore, MEPs insist that recommendations of the Court of Auditors should be promptly implemented and the level of subsidies paid to the agencies should be aligned with their real cash requirements.

- **Presentation of reporting data:** noting that there is no standard approach among the agencies with regard to the presentation of information, MEPs recall that they already invited the directors of the agencies to accompany their annual activity report with a declaration of assurance concerning the legality and regularity of operations, similar to the declarations signed by the Directors General of the Commission. They therefore ask the Commission to amend its standing instructions to the agencies and to produce a harmonised model for presenting information, including: i) an annual report intended for a general readership on the body's operations, work and achievements; ii) financial statements and a report on implementation of the agency's budget; iii) an activity report of the Directors of the agency (as requested by the Parliament since 2005); iv) a declaration of assurance signed by the body's director.
- **General findings by the Court of Auditors:** MEPs refer to certain recurring findings by the Court, including the disbursement of subsidies paid by the Commission (not sufficiently justified estimates of the agencies' cash requirements), the non implementation of the ABAC accounting system by some agencies or the accrued charges for untaken leave which are accounted for by some agencies. They call for rapid measures in these areas as well as improvements to the internal audit procedures of the agencies. MEPs also calls on the agencies to consider an inter-agency disciplinary board, as some individual agencies have difficulty in setting up their own disciplinary boards due to their size.
- **Draft inter-institutional agreement:** MEPs recall the Commission's draft Interinstitutional agreement on the operating framework for the European regulatory agencies (see [ACI/2005/2035](#)), which intended to create a framework for the creation, structure, operation, evaluation and control of the European regulatory agencies and insist that it be completed as soon as possible. They particularly welcome the Commission's commitment to bring forward a Communication on the future of the regulatory agencies during the course of 2008.

2) Specific points concerning EUROJUST: MEPs criticise EUROJUST's high carryover rate of appropriations, as observed by the Court, for administrative expenditure (33%) and operational expenditure (30%), with a high number of transfers of appropriations between budget lines, so that the budgetary principle of specification was not strictly observed. They also criticise the lack of clarity in the implementation of procurement rules, notably as regards framework contracts.

In addition, they make the following observations, identified by the Court:

- an accumulated surplus of EUR 3.3 million for a balance sheet total of EUR 7.3 million;
- a review of the rental fee paid by EUROJUST for its premises, resulting in a recovery of EUR 952 403 for the period 2003 to 2005;
- a contingent liability for an amount of EUR 388 297 in respect of litigation before the Civil Service Tribunal;
- the non-respect of the principle of the segregation of duties at EUROJUST for the functions of the authorising officer and the financial verifier.

Lastly, MEPs express concern at certain statements in EUROJUST's annual report (statements which have a significant bearing on the fight against fraud, such as the fact that EUROJUST still does not have the capacity to deal with its assigned casework, that its cooperation with OLAF still requires much development, or that its cooperation with EUROPOL would have been more advantageous had it been possible to share its premises with EUROJUST in The Hague).