



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Brussels, 10.6.2011
COM(2011) 345 final

REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION

ANNUAL REPORT 2010

**ON RELATIONS BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION AND NATIONAL
PARLIAMENTS**

1. INTRODUCTION

The Commission's relations with national Parliaments in 2010 were marked by a series of significant institutional and political events.

2010 was the first full year of implementation of the new Lisbon Treaty. Following its entry into force in late 2009, the role of national Parliaments was strengthened considerably, in particular, with the new subsidiarity control mechanism, which features most prominently amongst the new rights of national Parliaments set out in Article 12 TEU (Treaty on European Union).

In addition, 2010 saw the new Commission taking office on 9 February, almost at the same time as the subsidiarity control mechanism started to be implemented. When the new College had a first thorough exchange of views on this issue, President Barroso and Vice-President Šefčovič underlined the importance of national Parliaments and stressed that this issue would be kept high on the Commission's political agenda¹.

Finally, 2010 was marked by the economic crisis and by the joint efforts to respond adequately to it. This issue regularly featured on the agenda of discussions between national Parliaments and the Commission, be it in the context of COSAC, Joint Parliamentary Meetings or the numerous visits by Vice-President Šefčovič to national Parliaments. Economic governance was another of the key subjects on which national Parliament opinions focused in the context of the political dialogue.

This sixth annual report looks at how the Commission has implemented the above-mentioned new provisions of the Lisbon Treaty and presents a first stocktake of the functioning of the subsidiarity control mechanism (section 2)². In section 3, the report gives an overview of how the political dialogue, launched by President Barroso in 2006, has evolved in 2010, as regards not only the main topics commented on by national Parliaments, but also the various contacts between national Parliaments and the Commission. Finally, the report looks at how the Commission sees its relations with national Parliaments developing in the near future (section 4).

2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LISBON TREATY: THE NEW SUBSIDIARITY CONTROL MECHANISM

The subsidiarity control mechanism ran very smoothly during 2010, thanks not only to thorough preparation on both sides during the preceding year, but also due to the excellent cooperation and constructive contacts between the Commission and national Parliaments throughout the year. Following on from the letter of 1 December 2009³, in which the Commission informed national Parliaments and the other institutions about how it intended to put the new mechanism into practice, the Commission, on 6 February, sent the first proposal

¹ PV (2010) 1920 final

² The Commission Report on subsidiarity and proportionality – 18th report on Better Lawmaking covering the year 2010, which is adopted in parallel to this report, will look in more detail into some cases, where subsidiarity concerns were raised by national Parliaments, and thus complements the analysis of the new subsidiarity control mechanism.

³ http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/relations/relations_other/npo/index_en.htm.

falling within the scope of the subsidiarity control mechanism to national Parliaments⁴. The first reasoned opinion formally raising concerns as to compliance with the subsidiarity principle was received on 29 April⁵.

Participation and focus of national Parliaments

During 2010, the Commission sent to national Parliaments 82 draft legislative acts falling under the subsidiarity control mechanism, and received a total of 211 opinions related to these proposals. About three quarters of these opinions were received within eight weeks after the formal transmission letter ('lettre de saisine') had been sent, which clearly shows that national Parliaments had upgraded their capacities in response to the new Treaty and were in a position to react much faster to Commission proposals than had been the case before. Out of these 211 opinions, 34⁶ (about 15%) were reasoned opinions concluding that a proposal, or some part of it, was in breach of the subsidiarity principle⁷. Almost all of these opinions (30 out of 34) were received during the last three months of the year.

Most of the opinions that raised subsidiarity concerns referred to legislative proposals adopted in the policy fields of Agriculture (13)⁸, Home Affairs (9) and Internal Market and Services (7). It should be noted that the opinions received during the first three months of 2011 confirm that the alignment exercise in the area of Agriculture is currently one of the key areas on which the national Parliaments raise subsidiarity concerns. The Commission proposal that has so far elicited most reasoned opinions on subsidiarity is the Seasonal Workers' Directive⁹, with a total of nine chambers¹⁰ flagging subsidiarity problems. That apart, national Parliaments' focus has tended to be more scattered and less coordinated than had been the case under the COSAC subsidiarity checks, which were discontinued after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty.

The chambers that raised most subsidiarity concerns in 2010 were the Polish Senate (4), the Swedish *Riksdag* (3), the UK House of Commons (3), the French Senate (3) and the Luxembourg Chamber of Deputies (3). The beginning of 2011 also shows that the two Polish chambers (*Sejm* and Senate) and the Luxembourg Parliament continue to be particularly active in terms of issuing reasoned opinions with regard to compliance with the subsidiarity principle.

Content and form of national Parliaments' opinions

⁴ Proposal concerning the European Union financial contributions to the International Fund for Ireland (2007-2010) - COM(2010) 12.

⁵ Opinion of the Polish Senate on the Commission proposal concerning the revision of the Frontex Regulation - http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/relations/relations_other/npo/poland/2010_en.htm.

⁶ These include 4 opinions that arrived after the 8 weeks deadline or were not adopted by the respective chambers according to their internal rules.

⁷ For a complete list see Commission Report on subsidiarity and proportionality – 18th report on Better Lawmaking covering the year 2010.

⁸ Most of these opinions concerned proposals aimed at aligning the agricultural acquis to Articles 290 and 291 of the Lisbon Treaty.

⁹ COM(2010) 379.

¹⁰ The two Dutch chambers sent a joint opinion, which makes a total of eight opinions from nine chambers.

As to the content of opinions given in the context of the subsidiarity control mechanism, the 34 reasoned opinions received during 2010 reflect, apart from very specific concerns, certain horizontal or institutional concerns. These relate on the one hand to the lack of or insufficient subsidiarity justification in the explanatory memoranda of the relevant proposals¹¹, which some national Parliaments see as a formal breach of the subsidiarity principle; and on the other hand to the new regime of delegated acts. On this matter, the national Parliaments question the objectivity of criteria underlying the choice of this empowerment to the Commission. They consider that in certain cases the use of delegated acts would transfer powers to the Commission which according to them should be kept under the control of Member States.¹² These comments have been reiterated in several of the reasoned opinions received during the first three months of 2011.

While some national Parliaments would rather send opinions under the subsidiarity control mechanism only in those limited cases where they see a breach of the subsidiarity principle (for example UK House of Commons and House of Lords, Swedish *Riksdag*, Polish Senate and *Sejm*, and French Senate), others (for example the Portuguese and the Romanian Parliament as well as the Italian Senate and Chamber of Deputies) also inform the Commission about their positive opinions.

Scope of the subsidiarity control mechanism

During the first half of 2010, several exchanges, both written and oral, took place between the Commission and national Parliaments as regards the scope of the subsidiarity control mechanism. In reply to specific questions raised by national Parliaments, the Commission was able to clarify that the new mechanism covers only draft legislative acts, i.e. proposals subject to either the ordinary or a special legislative procedure¹³, provided they do not fall within the Union's exclusive competence¹⁴. This interpretation is shared by the European Parliament and the Council.

However, the Commission, in its replies to national Parliaments, has made it very clear that in the context of the political dialogue it would, of course, also consider opinions on proposals which are not draft legislative acts, and would provide a political assessment and a reply to them also.

Cooperation between the institutions

As regards the other European institutions, close contacts and exchanges have been established with the Council and the European Parliament, who have both set up their own procedures to implement the subsidiarity control mechanism and to deal with opinions received from national Parliaments. Although the three institutions deal relatively independently with the new mechanism and maintain very specific relations with national Parliaments, it should be highlighted that in the revised Framework Agreement between the

¹¹ Protocol 2, Article 5.

¹² See also Commission Report on subsidiarity and proportionality – 18th report on Better Lawmaking covering the year 2010.

¹³ Article 289 establishes that legislative acts are legal acts adopted by legislative procedure, whereas a legislative procedure may be an ordinary legislative procedure or a special legislative procedure. Therefore, where the Treaty's legal basis makes no explicit mention of one of the legislative procedures, either ordinary or special, the act in question is formally speaking not a legislative act.

¹⁴ Article 3 TFEU.

Commission and the European Parliament of October 2010, both institutions commit themselves to cooperating on the implementation of Protocol 2 to the Lisbon Treaty.

Overlap between the subsidiarity control mechanism and the political dialogue

Given that in all the cases mentioned above the thresholds indicated in Protocol 2 for triggering the so-called 'yellow card' or 'orange card' were far from being reached, the Commission replied to each of the opinions, which raised subsidiarity concerns, individually, in the context of the political dialogue. The experience gained with the subsidiarity control mechanism during its first year of implementation shows that the Treaty requirements for national Parliaments to trigger the 'yellow card' or the 'orange card' are quite stringent, and confirms what has already been observed during past years: a relatively small percentage of opinions sent to the Commission raise subsidiarity issues, with the national Parliaments continuing above all to be interested in engaging into a dialogue with the Commission on the substance of its proposals and initiatives.

This clearly shows the importance and added value of continuing the political dialogue, which, as long as the Protocol 2 thresholds are not reached and the formal Treaty mechanism for reviewing proposals is not triggered, represents the main framework for the exchanges between the Commission and national Parliaments.

3. POLITICAL DIALOGUE

3.1. Opinions from national Parliaments and Commission replies

Participation

The Commission's relations with national Parliaments continue to centre on the political dialogue, of which the subsidiarity control mechanism is only one part. Launched by President Barroso in 2006, the process of written exchange of opinions and replies has been steadily intensifying over the years. The total number of opinions received from national Parliaments in 2010, including opinions sent in the context of the subsidiarity control mechanism, reached 387. This represents an increase of more than 55% compared to the previous year. This clear upward trend has continued into 2011, with over 250 opinions received by the end of May 2011.

As regards the degree of national Parliaments' participation in this dialogue during 2010¹⁵, and compared to the situation before the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, about one third of the chambers participated more actively in exchanges with the Commission, including some chambers that had not participated at all during the previous year (for example the two Polish chambers, the UK House of Commons and the Finnish Parliament). It should be noted that opinions, in particular from the Italian Senate, but also the Italian Chamber of Deputies and the Austrian *Nationalrat*, have multiplied during 2010, which also saw the Romanian and the Spanish national Parliaments participating for the first time in the political dialogue.

For another third of the chambers, the level of participation did not change considerably in 2010, while the remaining third participated less actively than before. The Commission continues to encourage those Parliaments which, for different reasons, have so far chosen not

¹⁵ See table in Annex 1.

to participate very actively in a direct exchange with the Commission, to engage in this political dialogue, which serves to complement the scrutiny of their own governments with a new dimension of communication and debate at European level.

Scope

The 387 opinions received in 2010 related to over 170 different Commission documents, which confirms what has already been noted in previous years, namely that the focus of national Parliaments is broad. The majority of documents elicited between 1 and 3 opinions, with only 25 proposals or initiatives being commented on by more than four chambers and only 10 by six or more chambers¹⁶.

In the context of the political dialogue, the most commented upon in 2010 included those, which also elicited the highest numbers of reasoned opinions in the context of the subsidiarity control mechanism, namely the seasonal workers directive¹⁷ and the directive on deposit guarantee schemes¹⁸. Other initiatives on which national Parliaments' opinions focused were, for instance, the Citizens' Initiative¹⁹, the Green Paper on the European pensions system²⁰ and Europe 2020²¹. Economic governance was another key issue on which national Parliaments' opinions focused in 2010, and equally in early 2011²².

The policy fields which, in 2010, were subject to the majority of the opinions from national Parliaments in the context of the political dialogue were Justice and Home Affairs, Internal Market and Services, and Agriculture²³. A little less than 10% of the 387 opinions referred to documents covering programming, institutional issues or interinstitutional relations, with very few national Parliaments expressing their views on the Commission Work Programme.

It should be noted that since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, national Parliaments seem to pay more attention to legislative documents. The share of non-legislative documents (such as Communications, Green Papers or White Papers) has dropped to less than a third compared to a half in previous years. The Czech Senate, the Italian Chamber of Deputies, the German *Bundesrat* and *Bundestag*, the UK House of Lords as well as the Swedish and Danish Parliaments however still comment more often on non-legislative documents than on legislative ones. The Commission explicitly invites national Parliaments to express their views also on pre-legislative documents, as well as to participate actively in open consultations²⁴, as it sees this as a particularly effective way for national Parliaments to contribute constructively and positively to the shaping of future EU initiatives and legislation. The Commission reiterates its commitment to take national Parliaments' contributions received during the pre-legislative phase into account.

¹⁶ See table in annex 2.

¹⁷ COM(2010) 379.

¹⁸ COM(2010) 368.

¹⁹ COM(2009) 622 and COM(2010) 119.

²⁰ COM(2010) 365.

²¹ COM(2009) 647 and COM(2010) 2020.

²² COM (2010) 250, COM(2010) 367 and COM(2010) 522-527.

²³ See table in annex 3.

²⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/yourvoice/consultations/index_en.htm.

In 2010 the Commission continued to reply, according to its well-established internal procedures²⁵, to all national Parliament opinions raising substantive comments or questions. The replies are signed by Vice-President Šefčovič within the framework of his interinstitutional responsibilities. The Commission does its utmost to reply within a self-imposed time-limit of three months.

The political dialogue on key topics:

Bearing in mind that there are still very few Commission documents on which more than four or five chambers have commented in the context of the political dialogue, the following overview focuses on selected key initiatives and policies which particularly caught national Parliaments' attention in 2010.

- European Citizens Initiative

National Parliaments overall expressed strong support for the initiative, both in their opinions on the Green paper and on the legislative proposal. As regards the minimum number of Member States from which signatories of a citizens' initiative must come, all chambers which provided comments via the political dialogue, stated that the threshold of one third was too high, and several of them wanted it to be lowered to one quarter, which was indeed the option retained in the final text. Moreover, according to a majority of national Parliaments commenting on this initiative, one year for the collection of signatures was sufficient, with only two chambers arguing for 18 months. The final regulation does provide for a deadline of one year. A clear majority of national Parliaments which sent opinions on the Green paper, also thought that a six-month time limit for the Commission to examine a citizens' initiative should be provided for, as it was then proposed by the Commission in its legislative proposal (including two months for the Commission to decide on the admissibility of the initiative). The time limit to examine a citizens' initiative and to submit a communication on intended measures has been further reduced by one month in the final regulation.

- Seasonal Workers

This is the proposal on which the Commission has received the highest overall number of opinions from national Parliaments. Nine chambers claimed a breach of the subsidiarity principle, as they found that the subject matter is already sufficiently regulated at national level, that the EU cannot adequately address national specificities and that the proposal may not achieve the goal of managing migratory flows, given that the Member States remain in control of the volumes of the admitted third-country nationals²⁶. At the same time, nine chambers expressed opinions in the context of the political dialogue²⁷, raising various other comments and questions on the substance of the proposal. These concerned mainly the residence permit requirements. One chamber called for further legal provisions, including a uniform description of the permit and a rule that it would apply only to one Member State. Another chamber called for disassociation of the validity of the residence permit from the work contract. Some chambers questioned the need for issuing a multi-seasonal permit. In

²⁵ See Annual Report on relations between the Commission and national Parliaments of 2009 (COM(2010) 291).

²⁶ See also Commission Report on subsidiarity and proportionality – 18th report on Better Lawmaking covering the year 2010.

²⁷ The two Spanish chambers sent a joint opinion, which makes a total of eight opinions from nine chambers.

addition, two chambers favoured an extension of the permit duration from 6 months to a maximum 9 months, while one chamber expressed the view that the third-country nationals should have the right to work in other Member States on the basis of the seasonal worker permit issued by another Member State. One national Parliament highlighted potential incompatibilities with its national labour legislation, employment services and social security systems. In the Council and the European Parliament so far only preliminary discussions have taken place, at working group and committee level respectively. These have reflected several of the issues raised by national Parliaments in their opinions, such as definitions, the duration of the permit or documents authorising the stay. Overall, it should be emphasised that some of the opinions received from national Parliaments on this proposal have served as an effective “early warning” for the Commission as regards issues likely to be raised in the course of the legislative process.

- Green Paper on Pensions

All six chambers commenting on this Green Paper pointed out that they had exclusive competence for defining the fundamental principles of the social security system, including basic principles of pension systems. Some of them also mentioned that in designing pension systems, financial and economic policy aims are not the only considerations to be taken into account. With one exception, all chambers rejected any attempt by the Commission to define standards for an adequate pension in Europe. Four chambers mentioned that their pension systems do not need further adjustments at this stage. One chamber explicitly recognised that the EU could have a role to play as far as sustainability is concerned, inviting the Commission to consider a system of specific cost reporting for pension reforms, which would not be included into the overall deficit of public budgets calculation in the Stability and Growth Pact. The idea of an automatic adjustment mechanism related to pensionable age provoked reactions on both sides of the argument, with one Parliament in particular preferring to stress the importance of improving EU rules on health and safety at work. All but one chamber agreed that ensuring the portability of pension entitlements as well as harmonising regulation of undertakings active in the pension market could be addressed at EU level. As a follow-up to the public consultation, the Commission has scheduled a White Paper on Pensions for the third quarter and a review of the IORP (Institutions for Occupational Retirement Provision) Directive for 2012. In this context, it will take into account the contributions received from national Parliaments.

- Delegated acts

It should also be noted that in its opinions on those proposals, which provide for delegated acts, one chamber systematically questions the fact that the delegated powers are conferred on the Commission for an undetermined period. In its view this is not in line with Article 290 TFEU (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union). Other national Parliaments share this view on specific legislative files. The Commission in its replies has stressed that the objectives of efficiency and speed, which justify the use of delegated acts in the first place, should prevail and that a too frequent review would be against the very purpose of the delegation. It has also to be noted that the Common Understanding agreed by the Commission, the Council and the European Parliament on delegated acts explicitly refers to the possibility to confer on the Commission delegated powers for an indeterminate period of time, which the Commission systematically proposes each time it presents draft legislation containing delegated acts. However, during the legislative process the legislators sometimes chose to limit the duration of the delegation to five years with a tacit extension for the same period subject to the presentation of a report by the Commission.

3.2. Contacts and Visits

As in previous years, a wide range of personal contacts and meetings, both at political and at services level, have complemented the exchange of written opinions and replies between national Parliaments and the Commission. From the beginning of the term of office of the new Commission in early 2009, President Barroso and Vice-President Šefčovič have encouraged the Commissioners to step up their contacts with representatives of national Parliaments during their visits to Member States²⁸ and a system has been set up internally to ensure that they are all kept informed of the numerous meetings taking place between Commissioners and national Parliaments.

It should be highlighted that since taking office, all the Commissioners have visited at least one national Parliament, with most of them regularly attending meetings of the different chambers. When he became Vice-President for interinstitutional relations, Mr Šefčovič announced his intention to meet all national Parliaments at least once during his term of office. By the end of May 2011, he had already visited around half of them.

The Commission was represented at political level at all the major interparliamentary meetings held during 2010, including the meetings of the COSAC, the Speakers' Conference as well as the Joint Parliamentary Meetings. As regards the COFACC²⁹, the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy/ Vice-President of the Commission is regularly invited to participate in these meetings. Commission services have also continued their practice of giving evidence before national Parliaments' committees, when requested, and of regularly meeting with the Brussels-based representatives from national Parliaments to discuss a variety of upcoming initiatives or ongoing files. Vice-President Šefčovič met with this network of national Parliaments' representatives twice in 2010.

Building on the already close and constructive contacts between the Commission and IPEX³⁰, the Commission accepted in October 2010 a formal invitation to become a permanent observer on the IPEX Board and since then regularly participates in the meetings of this body.

4. OUTLOOK

The role of national Parliaments on the European inter-institutional scene is growing. 2010 has clearly shown that they are well prepared and ready to assume their new responsibilities. The Commission very much welcomes this development. Not only does it ultimately strengthen the democratic dimension of the EU but it also supports better application and effectiveness of EU law. Thus, the Commission is fully committed to deepening the political dialogue with national Parliaments, with due regard for the institutional balance at EU level.

President Barroso and Vice-President Šefčovič have already made some concrete proposals in 2010 as to topics which could be the subject of more regular and in-depth discussions between the Commission and national Parliaments as well as to a more systematic and structured follow-up, pointing in particular to the issue of economic governance, including the European Semester and Europe 2020, but also to the Commission Work Programme.

²⁸ PV (2010) 1920 final

²⁹ Conference of Foreign Affairs Committee Chairs.

³⁰ Interparliamentary EU Information Exchange.

As regards economic governance, the Commission welcomes the fact that the Hungarian COSAC Presidency has agreed to focus discussions and deliberations during the first half of 2011 on this topic and welcomes the 15th biannual report which was discussed at the COSAC plenary meeting in Budapest in May. The Commission expects that the results of these discussions will pave the way for further optimising the cooperation between the Commission and national Parliaments, and in particular for strengthening the latter's role, in the context of the European Semester.

The Commission is also encouraged by the interest shown by national Parliaments in the issue of economic governance and Europe 2020, in the context of the political dialogue, and is convinced that their role is essential in making this system work. National Parliaments can contribute to ensuring that national measures are commensurate and consistent with the European commitments, and allow for delivering targets; they can encourage their own governments to be as ambitious as possible in setting up the National Reform Programmes; and they could use these programmes later on to monitor progress towards the targets, thus using them as a real tool for democratic involvement.

With regard to its Work Programme, the Commission wishes to reiterate its commitment to taking into consideration national Parliaments' priorities in the strategic planning. It is convinced that national Parliaments should be heard not only downstream, but also upstream. Individual opinions or collective contributions via COSAC should be submitted in time to feed into the preparations of the Commission's Work Programme, in parallel to the Commission's dialogue with the other EU institutions. National Parliaments could thus help to build a real consensus on where the EU should focus its policy and resources for the upcoming years.

The Commission also continues to count on the support of national Parliaments as regards the transposition of EU directives into national law and in this regard has started to raise their awareness on the importance of a proper transposition of EU law, so that the rights and obligations set out in a directive can be enforced harmoniously across the EU.

Finally, discussions and contacts between the Commission and national Parliaments on the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty as regards the provisions concerning Europol and Eurojust³¹ will certainly be intensified during 2011 and the following years. The Commission Communication on the democratic scrutiny of Europol of December 2010³², on which national Parliaments started to comment in early 2011 and which was also the subject of discussions during the Speakers' Conference in April 2011, paves the way for the envisaged adoption of a regulation in 2013. This Communication also confirms that, in the meantime, the Commission intends to already enhance the information of national Parliaments as regards the evaluation of Europol. As regards Eurojust, the Commission is expecting, by the end of 2011, the outcome of a study on the strengthening of Eurojust, which will also deal with possible options for the involvement of the European Parliament and national Parliaments in the evaluation of Eurojust's activities. The Commission will consider legislative proposals after careful analysis of this study and will keep national Parliaments regularly informed and closely involved during this pre-legislative phase.

³¹ Articles 88 and 85 TFEU.

³² COM(2010) 776.

Annex 1

Overall number of opinions received per country/chamber

National Parliament	Chamber	Total number of Opinions (political dialogue)	Reasoned opinions³³ (subsidiarity control mechanism)
Portugal	Assembleia da Republica	106	0
Italy	Senato della Repubblica	71	1
Czech Republic	Senát	29	1
Italy	Camera dei Deputati	25	0
Germany	Bundesrat	23	1
Sweden	Riksdagen	20	3
Austria	Bundesrat	13	2
Austria	Nationalrat	12	1
United Kingdom	House of Lords	12	2
Denmark	Folketinget	11	2
Romania	Senatul	9	0
Luxembourg	Chambre des Députés	7	3
Germany	Bundestag	6	1
Poland	Senat	5	4
Greece	Chamber of Deputies	4	0
Lithuania	Seimas	4	2
Spain	Congreso de los Diputados and Senado (both chambers)	4	0
Ireland	Oireachtas (both chambers)	3	0

³³ These include four opinions that arrived after the 8 weeks deadline or were not adopted by the respective chambers according to their internal rules.

National Parliament	Chamber	Total number of Opinions (political dialogue)	Reasoned opinions³³ (subsidiarity control mechanism)
Czech Republic	Poslanecká sněmovna	3	1
France	Sénat	3	3
United Kingdom	House of Commons	3	3
The Netherlands	Eerste Kamer Staten Generaal	3	0
Poland	Sejm	2	2
The Netherlands	Both Chambers	2	2
Romania	Both Chambers	2	0
The Netherlands	Tweede Kamer Staten Generaal	1	0
Cyprus	House of Representatives	1	0
Latvia	Saeima	1	0
Belgium	Chambre des Représentants	1	0
Finland	Eduskunta	1	0
Belgium	Sénat	0	0
Bulgaria	Narodno Sabranie	0	0
Estonia	Riigikogu	0	0
France	Assemblée Nationale	0	0
Hungary	Országgyűlés	0	0
Malta	Kamra tad-Deputati	0	0
Slovakia	Národná rada	0	0
Slovenia	Državni svet	0	0
Slovenia	Državni zbor	0	0
Romania	Camera Deputaților	0	0
	Total	387	34

Annex 2

Commission proposals and initiatives receiving the highest number of opinions in the context of the political dialogue (2010)

Commission document	Title	Number of opinions
COM(2010)379	Proposal for a Directive on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of seasonal employment	16
COM(2009)622 COM(2010)119	Citizens' Initiative (Green Paper and Proposal for a Regulation)	13
COM(2010)368	Proposal for a Directive on deposit guarantee schemes	11
COM(2010)537	Proposal for a Regulation on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)	8
COM(2010)61	Proposal for a Regulation establishing a European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union (FRONTEX)	7
COM(2010)539	Proposal for a Regulation establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers	7
COM(2010)486	Proposal for a Regulation as regards distribution of food products to the most deprived persons in the Union	7
COM(2009)647 COM(2010)2020	Europe 2020 (Consultation document and Communication)	7
COM(2010)365	Green paper towards adequate, sustainable and safe European pension systems	6
COM(2010)289	Proposal for a Regulation on credit rating agencies	6

Annex 3

Number of opinions received per policy area in 2010

Policy area	Total
Justice and Home Affairs	88
Institutional, legal and cross-cutting policies ³⁴	53
Internal Market and Services	45
Agriculture and Rural Development	30
Economic and Financial Affairs	18
Enterprise and Industry	16
Information Society and Media	16
Environment	14
Health and Consumer Policy	13
Mobility and Transport	13
Maritime Affairs and Fisheries	11
Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities	10
Eurostat	10
Education and Culture	9
Energy	7
Development	7
External Relations	5
Budget	4
Trade	3
Competition	3
Regional Policy	3
Taxation and Customs Union	3
Climate Action	3
Research and Innovation	2
Enlargement	1
Total	387

³⁴ Including Citizens' Initiative and Europe 2020.