



1. In your opinion, is the way in which EU legislation is negotiated through the trilogue process sufficiently transparent? Please give brief reasons for your answer.

Maybe better could be done, but the process seems more clear now.

2. Please explain how, in your view, greater transparency might affect the EU legislative process, for example in terms of public trust in the process, the efficiency of the process or other public interests.

Problems with EU rules in Italy are linked to the fact that people is aware of EU rules after they have been adopted and finds out that a certain series of problems specific of our country haven't been taken in proper attention a, so more transparency could help people to be aware of what is going to be regulate and ask for adaptation exception before rules are adopted.

3. The institutions have described what they're doing about the **proactive publication** of trilogue documents. In your opinion, would the proactive release of all documents exchanged between the institutions during trilogue negotiations, for example "four-column tables", **after the trilogue process has resulted in an agreement on the compromise text**, ensure greater transparency? At which stage of the process could such a release occur? Please give brief reasons.

In my opinion transparency has to be granted when the process is at a certain stage, and opinions and compromise are consolidated, even if not closed. In such a way when document has been made transparent there is still room to negotiate for external stakeholders, but a first step has been reached among the three main actors.

4. What, if any, concrete steps could the institutions take to inform the public in advance about trilogue meetings? Would it be sufficient a) to publicly announce only that such meetings will take place and when, or b) to publish further details of forthcoming meetings such as meeting agendas and a list of proposed participants?

Via P. Cossa, 41 - 00193 - ROMA
tel. 06 36003673 - fax 06 36004775
info@difesacivicaitalia.it - www.difescacivicaitalia.it



I think the second step is absolutely necessary so anyone could be able to consider whether he could attend meeting and also be aware of possible discrimination or of the contrary if not admitted among participants (a representative of an Association who finds out that no Associations has been invited to the meeting could be sure he hasn't been victim of a discrimination, vice versa she/he could pretend to be invited if she/he notice that other Associations are invited and his own hasn't) .

5. Concerns have been expressed that detailed advance information about trilogue meetings could lead to greater pressure on the legislators and officials involved in the negotiations from lobbyists. Please give a brief opinion on this.

Grey areas leaves major room to possible pressure, provided lobbying is transparent I think problems of pressure can be settled.

6. In your opinion, should the initial position ("mandate") of all three institutions on a legislative file be made publicly available before trilogue negotiations commence? Briefly explain your reasons.

Since all position for sure results from official documents I guess it's better that these have to be public from the beginning.

7. What, if any, concrete measures could the institutions put in place to increase the visibility and user-accessibility of documents and information that they **already** make public?

Probably they could be studied by European Ombudsman and Ombudsman Network to find out if regulation impact on some subject we have already treated and made proposal about.

8. Do you consider that, **in relation to transparency**, a distinction should be made between "political trilogues" involving the political representatives of the institutions and technical meetings conducted by civil servants where no political decisions should be taken?



I think that all meetings in which the so called “frankly exchange of opinion” among politician or among civil servants could be affected if becomes transparent could be kept confidential if afterwards decision taken in technical meetings and political meetings are made public and motivated in a transparent way without any referring to those opinions exchanged during such meetings that, otherwise have to be made public. I don't think there should be difference from technical meetings and political ones, since one of the mayor assessment to transparency are politician that refers to no better specified “technical issues” that limit their possibility to make certain choices or force them to do so.

9. Please comment on other areas, if any, with potential for greater trilogue transparency. Please be as specific as possible.

Maybe EU Ombudsman could be permanently involved in the procedure and be free to send his comments or be heard if she/he thinks there's something relevant for cases he dealt with. In Tuscany Region and at National Level sometimes Ombudsman's opinion is asked before issuing regulations.