# 2013 discharge: European Railway Agency (ERA)

2014/2111(DEC) - 30/03/2015 - Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading

The Committee on Budgetary Control adopted the report by Ryszard CZARNECKI (ECR, PL) ) on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Railway Agency (ERA) for the financial year 2013.

The committee recommended that the European Parliament grant the Executive Directorr of the of the Agency discharge in respect of the implementation of the Agency's budget for the financial year 2013.

Noting that the Court of Auditors stated that it has obtained reasonable assurances that the annual accounts of the Agency for the financial year 2013 are reliable, and that the underlying transactions are legal and regular, Members called on the Parliament to approve the closure of the Centre's accounts. They made, however, a number of recommendations that needed to be taken into account when the discharge is granted, in addition to the general recommendations that appear in the draft resolution on performance, financial management and control of EU agencies.

- **Centre's financial statements**: Members noted that the final budget of the Centre for the financial year 2013 was EUR 25 858 799 representing an increase of 0.23 % compared to 2012.
- **Commitments and carry-overs**: Members noted that budget monitoring efforts during the financial year 2013 resulted in a budget implementation rate of 97.87% and that the payment appropriations execution rate was 88.12%. They pointed out, however, that the level of committed appropriations carried over to 2013 was EUR 2 398 742, and committed appropriations carried over to 2014 amounted to EUR 2 221 816. The decrease in the accrued amount carried over in comparison to the previous year occurred because of the underestimation/overestimation of the 2013 budgetary expenses.

Members also made a series of observations on transfers, procurement and recruitment procedures, and internal audit, and the prevention and management of conflicts of interests.

The committee expressed its deep disappointment that the Agency had still not adopted a clear, comprehensive and objective policy for the prevention and management of conflicts of interests, despite the discharge authority and the Court's special recommendations for consecutive years.

Lastly, Members deplored the fact that the use of two locations (Lille and Valenciennes) to carry out its activities exposed the Agency to additional costs. They acknowledged the efforts made by the Agency to minimise the negative impact of the decision on its seat but called for **a single location for the Agency**, in a place easily accessible by public transport in order to save scarce resources.