

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

FINAL  
**A6-0142/2007**

16.4.2007

## **REPORT**

on the conclusion of the Joint Declaration on practical arrangements for the  
codecision procedure  
(2005/2125(ACI))

Committee on Constitutional Affairs

Rapporteur: Jo Leinen

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
PROPOSAL FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT DECISION .....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.....	5
ANNEX: JOINT DECLARATION ON PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CODECISION PROCEDURE (ARTICLE 251 OF THE EC TREATY).....	10
PROCEDURE .....	16

## PROPOSAL FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT DECISION

### on the conclusion of the Joint Declaration on practical arrangements for the codecision procedure (2005/2125(ACI))

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to Article 251 of the Treaty establishing the European Community,
  - having regard to its resolution of 5 May 1999 on the Joint Declaration on the practical arrangements for the new codecision procedure<sup>1</sup>,
  - having regard to the decision of the Conference of Presidents of 8 March 2007,
  - having regard to the draft revised Joint Declaration on practical arrangements for the codecision procedure (hereinafter referred to as ‘the revised Declaration’),
  - having regard to Rule 120(1) of its Rules of Procedure and to point XVIII(4) of Annex VI of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs (A6-0142/2007),
- A. whereas the continual extension of the scope of application of the codecision procedure increases its importance in the EU law-making process and leads to a change in the nature of interinstitutional relations between Parliament, the Council and the Commission,
- B. whereas Parliament, the Council and the Commission have attempted to make EU law-making more transparent, coordinated, efficient and democratic,
- C. whereas, whilst the Joint Declaration on practical arrangements of the codecision procedure of 1999 has proven its worth, some practical developments in its application over time have shown the need for it to be amended,
- D. whereas the successive enlargements of the EU have created challenges affecting both streamlining procedures and the optimisation of resources,
- E. whereas the revised Declaration meets those expectations and allows future interinstitutional cooperation to develop in a constructive and flexible way,
- F. whereas interinstitutional agreements and framework agreements have significant consequences, and whereas it is therefore essential, in order to facilitate access to them, and to ensure transparency, to bring together all existing agreements and to publish them as an annex to Parliament's Rules of Procedure,
1. Reconfirms its commitment to the principles of transparency, accountability and efficiency, and the need to focus on the simplification of the EU law-making process

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 279, 1.10.1999, p. 229.

while respecting the legal order of the Union;

2. Welcomes the revised Declaration, which improves both the structure and the content of the 1999 Declaration by adding a number of important provisions which bring the document in line with existing best practices and which aims to strengthen cooperation between the three institutions, with a view to improving the efficiency and quality of EU legislation;
3. Calls for Parliament to adopt a method harmonising parliamentary committee practices at trilogues by laying down a number of rules concerning the composition of parliamentary delegations and confidentiality obligations in connection with their proceedings;
4. Welcomes, in particular, the following improvements contained in the revised Declaration:
  - (a) the new provisions concerning the attendance at parliamentary committee meetings by representatives of the Council Presidency and concerning requests for information on the Council's position, which, together, constitute a step towards the objective of improving dialogue between the two legislative branches;
  - (b) recognition of the practice of finalising agreements reached during informal negotiations between the institutions through an exchange of letters;
  - (c) confirmation of the principle that, in relation to legal-linguistic revision, Parliament's and the Council's services are to cooperate on an equal footing;
  - (d) the agreement to organise, as far as possible, the signing of important adopted texts at a joint ceremony in the presence of the media, as well as joint press releases and conferences to announce the successful outcome of the work involved;
5. Is convinced that the revised Declaration will further increase the transparency and public accountability of legislative work undertaken pursuant to the codecision procedure;
6. Approves the revised Declaration annexed to this decision and decides to annex the revised Declaration to its Rules of Procedure; calls for the revised Declaration to be published in the Official Journal of the European Union;
7. Instructs its President to forward this decision and its annex to the Council and the Commission.

## **EXPLANATORY STATEMENT**

### **Background**

The draft revised Joint Declaration on practical arrangements for the codecision procedure is the third interinstitutional agreement on this subject between the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission.

Since the entry into force, on 1 July 1987, of the Single European Act, which introduced the cooperation procedure, Parliament's legislative role has consistently expanded and its relations with the other institutions have become ever closer.

Following the introduction of the codecision procedure in the Maastricht Treaty in 1993, an interinstitutional agreement was negotiated, which set out in greater detail the functioning of the Conciliation Committee, but did not cover other aspects of codecision.

The Amsterdam Treaty, which came into force in 1999, further changed the situation, greatly extending the areas to which the codecision procedure applies as well as reforming the original codecision procedure, in particular by providing for the possibility of agreement between Parliament and Council at first reading, and also by streamlining the later stages of the procedure.

As a follow-up to the Amsterdam Treaty, a new interinstitutional agreement, the Joint Declaration on practical arrangements of the new codecision procedure, was concluded in 1999. The Joint Declaration has proven its worth. However, some practical developments in its application over time have shown the need for some amendment.

On 30 June 2005, the Conference of Presidents appointed five Members of the European Parliament - Mr Vidal-Quadras, Mr Trakatellis, Ms Roth-Behrendt, Mr Daul and Mr Leinen - to represent Parliament in negotiations on the amendment of the Joint Declaration on practical arrangements for the codecision procedure.

A revision exercise, in the form of a series of meetings at political and administrative level between the three institutions, began in December 2005. The positions of both the Council and Commission evolved considerably and allowed for a compromise to be reached with Parliament. Final agreement was reached on 13 December 2006 and endorsed by the Conference of Presidents at its meeting on 8 March 2007.

The proposed revised Declaration will improve the functioning of codecision and help to facilitate future interinstitutional cooperation in a constructive and flexible way. The text of the Declaration has been adapted to take into account the practical evolution of the codecision procedure and is in line with the attempts of Parliament, Council and the Commission to make EU law-making more transparent, coordinated, efficient and democratic.

### **Evaluation of the text**

The structure of the text has been improved and it now provides useful additional

explanations that build on the basic provisions of its 1999 predecessor, thus marking a step forward in interinstitutional cooperation.

#### SECTION ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES:

The new section on General Principles specifies the scope, objectives and underlying principles of the Declaration and replaces the old 'preamble', the new title thus better reflecting the expanded content of this section. The revised text of the 1999 Declaration reflects the practical evolution of interinstitutional cooperation throughout the codecision procedure, which is reflected in the wording of the introductory section.

The reference to the 2003 Interinstitutional Agreement (IIA) on 'Better Lawmaking', which the Declaration on practical arrangements for the codecision procedure complements, marks a further improvement to the old text, as it reconfirms the commitment of the European institutions to the principles of transparency, accountability and efficiency, and the need to focus on simplifying proposals while respecting the legal order of the Union (Point 3).

Significantly, the importance of reconciling the positions of the three institutions at an early stage of the procedure has been added to the text of the Declaration with a view to improving the efficiency of the decision-making process (Point 4).

The points regarding interinstitutional contacts and the coordination of working calendars are moved from the section on First Reading to the section on General Principles, thus taking into consideration the fact that they should apply to all stages of the codecision procedure (Point 5).

The establishment of an indicative timetable for the various stages of the procedure, suggested by a new point of the Declaration, is in line with the overall objective of improving the efficiency and timeliness of decision-making and is already enshrined in the IIA on 'Better Lawmaking' (Point 6).

Trilogues (tripartite meetings) are expressly referred to in the revised text in order to confirm their practical value in the course of finding agreement during the early stages of codecision and to encourage their further use. The new declaration establishes guiding principles for their organisation and suggests their advance announcement (Points 7, 8 and 9).

A new point on attendance of parliamentary committee meetings by the Council Presidency and requests for information on the Council's position constitutes a first step towards Parliament's objective of improving the dialogue between the two legislative branches (Point 10). Although it does not go as far as the original Parliament proposal, it is acceptable as part of a global compromise, as there is some improvement as compared to the IIA on 'Better Lawmaking'.

#### FIRST READING:

Regarding the structure, the innovative element of the revised text is the splitting up of the old section I (FIRST READING) into two sub-sections: – 'Agreement at the stage of first reading in the European Parliament'; – 'Agreement at the stage of Council common position'. This

corresponds to the two possible options in Article 251 TEC for an early conclusion of the codecision procedure at first reading.

The revised Declaration recognises the practice of informal negotiations between the institutions and the finalisation, through an exchange of letters, of agreements reached during such negotiations.

#### SECOND READING:

Unlike the previous section (FIRST READING), this section (SECOND READING) has only one sub-section after the general introductory remarks: 'Agreement at the stage of second reading in the European Parliament'.

Point 20 introduces the principle of consultation in view of setting a mutually suitable date for the transmission of common positions. Although the wording of the text is less binding than that envisaged by Parliament, it was considered acceptable as part of a global compromise. Even in its present form, the new provision demonstrates Council's readiness to take account of the parliamentary calendar when determining the date for the transmission of a common position.

Point 21 under the sub-section 'Agreement at the stage of second reading in the European Parliament' now reflects the already established and more central role of interinstitutional contacts and sets out a basic timeframe for their continuation (i.e. as soon as the common position is forwarded to the Parliament) in order to speed up the process.

As is the case in the previous section, under the sub-section 'Agreement at the stage of Council common position' (Point 18), a point is introduced to formally recognise the best practice of exchanging letters to finalise agreements reached through informal negotiations (Point 23).

#### CONCILIATION:

Two new points are added to the beginning of this section (CONCILIATION) of the Declaration. In accordance with the best practices which have evolved over time, it is suggested that trilogue meetings be convened as soon as it becomes clear that no agreement can be reached at second reading. Such meetings will continue to take place throughout the conciliation procedure to prepare the ground for reaching an agreement (Points 24 and 25).

A clarifying sentence is added to point 29 establishing the criteria for the joint setting of the dates and agendas for the Conciliation Committee meetings by its co-chairs (the President of the Parliament and the President of the Council).

Point 30 confirms the practice of the co-chairs of the Conciliation Committee of dealing with several non-controversial items (A-items) on the agenda without debate, which makes the process more flexible.

Point 32 now endorses the principle of equal sharing of the facilities of the Parliament and the Council.

Under point 33 the Commission's opinion on the Council's common position and Parliament's amendments has been added to the list of documents to be made available to the Committee. Point 33 also explains that the joint working document by the Parliament and Council delegations is needed in order to easily identify the key issues and handle them more efficiently. Moreover, the deadline for the submission of the Commission's opinion is extended from two to three weeks after the official receipt of the outcome of Parliament's vote to provide a more feasible timeframe.

Point 36 confirms the principle that legal-linguistic finalisation should take place prior to the formal approval of proposed texts by the two co-chairs, but it allows for a draft joint text to be submitted to the two co-chairmen of the Conciliation Committee prior to legal-linguistic finalisation in exceptional cases if necessary in order to meet the strict deadlines set in Article 251 TEC.

Point 37 adds the new provision that working documents used during the conciliation procedure will be made available in the Register of each institution involved once the procedure is over. This contributes to the improved transparency of decision-making.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS:

Point 40 of this section (GENERAL PROVISIONS) confirms the principle that in relation to legal-linguistic finalisation, Parliament's and Council's services cooperate on an equal footing. Point 41 explicitly prohibits any changes to an already agreed text without the agreement of both the Parliament and the Council representatives, at the appropriate level.

A further improvement to the Declaration is the specification provided in point 42 that the finalisation of agreed texts must be carried out with due regard to the different procedures of the two legislating institutions. In order to prevent any misuse of this procedure, the institutions may not use the time-limits for legal-linguistic finalisation of the document for reopening discussion on substantive issues.

In order to improve the consistency of documents, point 43 stipulates that the institutions are to agree on a common presentation of the texts and point 44 adds that they shall as far as possible attempt to use mutually acceptable standard clauses (in particular as regards provisions concerning the exercise of implementing powers, entry into force, transposition and application of the acts and respect for the Commission's right of initiative).

With a view to promoting transparency and avoiding unbalanced unilateral statements, the institutions agree to organise, as far as possible, joint press releases and press conferences to announce the successful outcomes of their work (Point 45). Also in this connection, point 47 now provides for the signing of important agreed texts at a joint ceremony on a monthly basis in the presence of the media. Furthermore, the Presidents of the two institutions shall receive the texts for signature in their own languages.

Point 48 has been revised to give more clarity as to when the agreed legislative texts are expected to be published in the Official Journal and stipulates that the normal timeframe is two months after the adoption of the legislative act by the European Parliament and the

Council.

Point 49 clarifies the procedure of handling identified clerical or obvious errors in the texts both before and after adoption of a text.

All in all, the revised Declaration submitted to Parliament for approval improves both the structure and the contents of the 1999 version by adding a number of important provisions, which adapt the document to the existing best practices and which aim to strengthen the cooperation between the three institutions with a view to improving the efficiency and the quality of EU legislation.

**ANNEX: JOINT DECLARATION ON PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE  
CODECISION PROCEDURE (ARTICLE 251 OF THE EC TREATY)**

**EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT  
COUNCIL  
COMMISSION**

**JOINT DECLARATION ON PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE  
CODECISION PROCEDURE (ARTICLE 251 OF THE EC TREATY)**

**GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

1. The European Parliament, the Council and the Commission, hereinafter referred to collectively as 'the institutions', note that current practice involving talks between the Council Presidency, the Commission and the chairs of the relevant committees and/or rapporteurs of the European Parliament and between the co-chairs of the Conciliation Committee has proved its worth.
2. The institutions confirm that this practice, which has developed at all stages of the codecision procedure, must continue to be encouraged. The institutions undertake to examine their working methods with a view to making even more effective use of the full scope of the codecision procedure as established by the EC Treaty.
3. This Joint Declaration clarifies these working methods, and the practical arrangements for pursuing them. It complements the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Lawmaking<sup>1</sup> and notably its provisions relating to the co-decision procedure. The institutions undertake fully to respect such commitments in line with the principles of transparency, accountability and efficiency. In this respect, the institutions should pay particular attention to making progress on simplification proposals while respecting the *acquis communautaire*.
4. The institutions shall cooperate in good faith throughout the procedure with a view to reconciling their positions as far as possible and thereby clearing the way, where appropriate, for the adoption of the act concerned at an early stage of the procedure.
5. With that aim in view, they shall cooperate through appropriate interinstitutional contacts to monitor the progress of the work and analyse the degree of convergence at all stages of the codecision procedure.
6. The institutions, in accordance with their internal rules of procedure, undertake to exchange

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 321, 31.12.2003, p. 1.

information regularly on the progress of codecision files. They shall ensure that their respective calendars of work are coordinated as far as possible in order to enable proceedings to be conducted in a coherent and convergent fashion. They will therefore seek to establish an indicative timetable for the various stages leading to the final adoption of different legislative proposals, while fully respecting the political nature of the decision-making process.

7. Cooperation between the institutions in the context of codecision often takes the form of tripartite meetings ('trilogues'). This trilogue system has demonstrated its vitality and flexibility in increasing significantly the possibilities for agreement at first and second reading stages, as well as contributing to the preparation of the work of the Conciliation Committee.

8. Such trilogues are usually conducted in an informal framework. They may be held at all stages of the procedure and at different levels of representation, depending on the nature of the expected discussion. Each institution, in accordance with its own rules of procedure, will designate its participants for each meeting, define its mandate for the negotiations and inform the other institutions of arrangements for the meetings in good time.

9. As far as possible, any draft compromise texts submitted for discussion at a forthcoming meeting shall be circulated in advance to all participants. In order to enhance transparency, trilogues taking place within the European Parliament and Council shall be announced, where practicable.

10. The Council Presidency will endeavour to attend the meetings of the parliamentary committees. It will carefully consider any request it receives to provide information related to the Council position, as appropriate.

## **FIRST READING**

11. The institutions shall cooperate in good faith with a view to reconciling their positions as far as possible so that, wherever possible, acts can be adopted at first reading.

### **Agreement at the stage of first reading in the European Parliament**

12. Appropriate contacts shall be established to facilitate the conduct of proceedings at first reading.

13. The Commission shall facilitate such contacts and shall exercise its right of initiative in a constructive manner with a view to reconciling the positions of the European Parliament and the Council, with due regard for the balance between the institutions and the role conferred on it by the Treaty.

14. Where an agreement is reached through informal negotiations in trilogues, the chair of Coreper shall forward, in a letter to the chair of the relevant parliamentary committee, details of the substance of the agreement, in the form of amendments to the Commission proposal. That letter shall indicate the Council's willingness to accept that outcome, subject to legal-linguistic verification, should it be confirmed by the vote in plenary. A copy of that letter shall be forwarded to the Commission.

15. In this context, where conclusion of a dossier at first reading is imminent, information on the intention to conclude an agreement should be made readily available as early as possible.

#### **Agreement at the stage of Council common position**

16. Where no agreement is reached at the European Parliament's first reading, contacts may be continued with a view to concluding an agreement at the common position stage.

17. The Commission shall facilitate such contacts and shall exercise its right of initiative in a constructive manner with a view to reconciling the positions of the European Parliament and the Council, with due regard for the balance between the institutions and the role conferred on it by the Treaty.

18. Where an agreement is reached at this stage, the chair of the relevant parliamentary committee shall indicate, in a letter to the chair of Coreper, his recommendation to the plenary to accept the Council common position without amendment, subject to confirmation of the common position by the Council and to legal-linguistic verification. A copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the Commission.

#### **SECOND READING**

19. In its statement of reasons, the Council shall explain as clearly as possible the reasons that led it to adopt its common position. During its second reading, the European Parliament shall take the greatest possible account of those reasons and of the Commission's position.

20. Before transmitting the common position, the Council shall endeavour to consider in consultation with the European Parliament and the Commission the date for its transmission in order to ensure the maximum efficiency of the legislative procedure at second reading.

#### **Agreement at the stage of second reading in the European Parliament**

21. Appropriate contacts will continue as soon as the Council common position is forwarded to the European Parliament, with a view to achieving a better understanding of the respective positions and thus to bringing the legislative procedure to a conclusion as quickly as possible.

22. The Commission shall facilitate such contacts and give its opinion with a view to reconciling the positions of the European Parliament and the Council, with due regard for the balance between the institutions and the role conferred on it by the Treaty.

23. Where an agreement is reached through informal negotiations in trilogues, the chair of Coreper shall forward, in a letter to the chair of the relevant parliamentary committee, details of the substance of the agreement, in the form of amendments to the Council common position. That letter shall indicate the Council's willingness to accept that outcome, subject to legal-linguistic verification, should it be confirmed by the vote in plenary. A copy of that letter shall be forwarded to the Commission.

## CONCILIATION

24. If it becomes clear that the Council will not be in a position to accept all the amendments of the European Parliament at second reading and when the Council is ready to present its position, a first trilogue will be organised. Each institution, in accordance with its own rules of procedure, will designate its participants for each meeting and define its mandate for the negotiations. The Commission will indicate to both delegations at the earliest possible stage its intentions with regard to its opinion on the European Parliament's second reading amendments.

25. Trilogues shall take place throughout the conciliation procedure with the aim of resolving outstanding issues and preparing the ground for an agreement to be reached in the Conciliation Committee. The results of the trilogues shall be discussed and possibly approved at the meetings of the respective institutions.

26. The Conciliation Committee shall be convened by the President of the Council, with the agreement of the President of the European Parliament and with due regard to the provisions of the Treaty.

27. The Commission shall take part in the conciliation proceedings and shall take all the necessary initiatives with a view to reconciling the positions of the European Parliament and the Council. Such initiatives may include, draft compromise texts having regard to the positions of the European Parliament and of the Council and with due regard for the role conferred upon the Commission by the Treaty.

28. The Conciliation Committee shall be chaired jointly by the President of the European Parliament and the President of the Council. Committee meetings shall be chaired alternately by each co-chair.

29. The dates and the agendas for the Conciliation Committee's meetings shall be set jointly by the co-chairs with a view to the effective functioning of the Conciliation Committee throughout the conciliation procedure. The Commission shall be consulted on the dates envisaged. The European Parliament and the Council shall set aside, for guidance, appropriate dates for conciliation proceedings and shall notify the Commission thereof.

30. The co-chairs may put several dossiers on the agenda of any one meeting of the Conciliation Committee. As well as the principal topic ('B-item'), where agreement has not yet been reached, conciliation procedures on other topics may be opened and/or closed without discussion on these items ('A-item').

31. While respecting the Treaty provisions regarding time-limits, the European Parliament and the Council shall, as far as possible, take account of scheduling requirements, in particular those resulting from breaks in the institutions' activities and from the European Parliament's elections. At all events, the break in activities shall be as short as possible.

32. The Conciliation Committee shall meet alternately at the premises of the European Parliament and the Council, with a view to an equal sharing of facilities, including

interpretation facilities.

33. The Conciliation Committee shall have available to it the Commission proposal, the Council common position and the Commission's opinion thereon, the amendments proposed by the European Parliament and the Commission's opinion thereon, and a joint working document by the European Parliament and Council delegations. This working document should enable users to identify the issues at stake easily and to refer to them efficiently. The Commission shall, as a general rule, submit its opinion within three weeks of official receipt of the outcome of the European Parliament's vote and at the latest by the commencement of conciliation proceedings.

34. The co-chairs may submit texts for the Conciliation Committee's approval.

35. Agreement on a joint text shall be established at a meeting of the Conciliation Committee or, subsequently, by an exchange of letters between the co-chairs. Copies of such letters shall be forwarded to the Commission.

36. If the Conciliation Committee reaches agreement on a joint text, the text shall, after legal-linguistic finalisation, be submitted to the co-chairs for formal approval. However, in exceptional cases in order to respect the deadlines, a draft joint text may be submitted to the co-chairs for approval.

37. The co-chairs shall forward the approved joint text to the Presidents of the European Parliament and of the Council by means of a jointly signed letter. Where the Conciliation Committee is unable to agree on a joint text, the co-chairs shall notify the Presidents of the European Parliament and of the Council thereof in a jointly signed letter. Such letters shall serve as an official record. Copies of such letters shall be forwarded to the Commission for information. The working documents used during the conciliation procedure will be accessible in the Register of each institution once the procedure has been concluded.

38. The Secretariat of the European Parliament and the General- Secretariat of the Council shall act jointly as the Conciliation Committee's secretariat, in association with the Secretariat-General of the Commission.

## **GENERAL PROVISIONS**

39. Should the European Parliament or the Council deem it essential to extend the time-limits referred to in Article 251 of the Treaty, they shall notify the President of the other institution and the Commission accordingly.

40. Where an agreement is reached at first or second reading, or during conciliation, the agreed text shall be finalised by the legal-linguistic services of the European Parliament and of the Council acting in close cooperation and by mutual agreement.

41. No changes shall be made to any agreed texts without the explicit agreement, at the appropriate level, of both the European Parliament and the Council.

42. Finalisation shall be carried out with due regard to the different procedures of the European Parliament and the Council, in particular with respect to deadlines for conclusion of internal procedures. The institutions undertake not to use the time-limits laid down for the legal-linguistic finalisation of acts to reopen discussions on substantive issues.

43. The European Parliament and the Council shall agree on a common presentation of the texts prepared jointly by those institutions.

44. As far as possible, the institutions undertake to use mutually acceptable standard clauses to be incorporated in the acts adopted under codecision in particular as regards provisions concerning the exercise of implementing powers (in accordance with the ‘comitology’ decision<sup>1</sup>), entry into force, transposition and the application of acts and respect for the Commission’s right of initiative.

45. The institutions will endeavour to hold a joint press conference to announce the successful outcome of the legislative process at first or second reading or during conciliation. They will also endeavour to issue joint press releases.

46. Following adoption of a legislative act under the codecision procedure by the European Parliament and the Council, the text shall be submitted, for signature, to the President of the European Parliament and the President of the Council and to the Secretaries-General of those institutions.

47. The Presidents of the European Parliament and the Council shall receive the text for signature in their respective languages and shall, as far as possible, sign the text together at a joint ceremony to be organised on a monthly basis with a view to signing important acts in the presence of the media.

48. The jointly signed text shall be forwarded for publication in the Official Journal of the European Union. Publication shall normally follow within two months of the adoption of the legislative act by the European Parliament and the Council.

49. If one of the institutions identifies a clerical or obvious error in a text (or in one of the language versions thereof), it shall immediately notify the other institutions. If the error concerns an act that has not yet been adopted by either the European Parliament or the Council, the legal-linguistic services of the European Parliament and the Council shall prepare the necessary corrigendum in close cooperation. Where this error concerns an act that has already been adopted by one or both of those institutions, whether published or not, the European Parliament and the Council shall adopt, by common agreement, a corrigendum drawn up under their respective procedures.

---

<sup>1</sup> Council Decision 1999/468/EC of 28 June 1999 laying down the procedures for the exercise of implementing powers conferred on the Commission (OJ L 184, 17.7.1999, p. 23). Decision as amended by Decision 2006/512/EC (OJ L 200, 27.7.2006, p. 11).

## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Conclusion of the Joint Declaration on practical arrangements for the codecision procedure
<b>Procedure number</b>	2005/2125(ACI)
<b>Committee responsible</b> Date announced in plenary	AFCO 23.4.2007
<b>Rapporteur(s)</b> Date appointed	Jo Leinen 6.6.2005
<b>Previous rapporteur(s)</b>	
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	19.3.2007 10.4.2007
<b>Date adopted</b>	10.4.2007
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+ 20 - 0 0 0
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Enrique Barón Crespo, Richard Corbett, Jean-Luc Dehaene, Andrew Duff, Maria da Assunção Esteves, Ingo Friedrich, Bronisław Geremek, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Timothy Kirkhope, Jo Leinen, Íñigo Méndez de Vigo, Rihards Pīks, Marie-Line Reynaud, Adrian Severin, Riccardo Ventre
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Elmar Brok, Carlos Carnero González, Klaus Hänsch, Jacek Protasiewicz, Mauro Zani
<b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>	
<b>Date tabled</b>	16.4.2007
<b>Comments</b> (available in one language only)	