

From: [redacted]@neon-ombudsman.org>
Sent: 30 November 2017 10:54
To: EO-CouncilConsultation
Subject: [EOWEB] Council consultation - OI/2/2017

Sender

Sender [redacted]@neon-ombudsman.org>
To Council consultation - OI/2/2017
Date Thursday, November 30, 2017 10:53:38 AM CET

Your data

Part 1 - Contact information

First name	[redacted]
Surname	[redacted]
Gender	[redacted]
E-mail address	[redacted]@neon-ombudsman.org
Language you would like to receive an answer in	en - English
Other language you would accept an answer in (if applicable)	fr - français

Part 2 - Data

To Council consultation - OI/2/2017
Subject Council consultation - OI/2/2017

I. Accessibility of information and documents

1. As does the European Parliament, it would be useful to know the name of the team working on the files (rapporteurs, shadow rapporteurs etc.), as well as a timeframe for the discussions. It is currently almost impossible to be aware of the various stages and therefore to understand and suggest amendments.
2. Yes, the Council website is extremely complicated to navigate, therefore even if the Council says it is providing information, it remains de facto confidential.

II. Transparency of discussions

- Content**
3. I've never been able to access any of the document discussed by the council.
 4. All those documents would be useful, but their diffusion is too confidential.
 5. Yes, when/if I find it!
 6. Yes! Transparency must prevail in ALL institutions, and therefore only accredited lobbyists (transparency register) should be able to get access to the COREPER discussions.
 7. Get rid of "limit" unless in concerns EU security.
 8. It would be extremely useful to be able to make an effective work with the delegations. Now the situation is too complicated and the overall debates lack transparency.

III. Other

9. A harmonised and higher level of transparency should apply to all institutions, including a single transparency register.