

Green plan for transparency and integrity	Result after plenary vote in the new Rules of procedure
Mandatory lobby transparency for MEPs: No registration, no meeting	Progress! MEPs voted to adopt the systematic practice of meeting only with registered lobbyists. However, our proposal for MEPs to publish their meetings with lobbyists was rejected.
Legislative footprint: showing who the lobby is	No progress: - Whether MEPs compile a legislative footprint to show who lobbied them on their reports remains purely voluntary. - Shadow rapporteurs will not be required to be free of conflicts of interest.
Cooling off period for MEPs: close the revolving door	No progress: Cooling off: MEPs can still take lobby jobs directly after their mandate. A minimalist obligation to notify the Parliament will remain without effect because no one is called to check notifications on conflicts of interest.
Closing lobby loopholes	Strong progress: - Lobbyists who refuse to accept invitations to hearings before the European Parliament lose their entrance badges. And lobbyists will not be able to get EP entrance badges that disguise them as the entourage of an MEP. - More transparency about who finances EU Parliament's intergroups, formalised lobby meetings between MEPs and organised interest representatives.
Integrity with teeth: fixing Parliament's advisory committee to the code of conduct for MEPs	Some progress: Win: Allegations of conflicts of interest of MEPs have to be forwarded by the Parliament's President to the Advisory Committee if they are not manifestly vexatious. The President therefore has no room anymore to block such investigations. Loss: If the Advisory Committee finds that MEPs violated the code of conduct with a conflict of interest and recommends sanctions, the Parliament's President can still block the application as he did with all sanctions recommended to him so far. Furthermore, the Advisory Committee remains composed only of MEPs, no external experts will balance the de facto conflict of interest of MEPs who investigate into the conduct of colleagues. Loss: The Advisory Committee is not called to better define what constitutes a conflict of interest.
No financial ties between MEPs and lobbyists	Some progress: Win: The ban on lobby side jobs of MEPs is toughened by explicitly ruling out paid lobby work for MEPs. Loss: No clarification that payments for speeches, articles or extra functions of MEPs should be included in the ban on MEPs taking money for their political decisions. Loss: MEPs still only have to declare publicly income but not property and debt as Parliamentarians are required in France, Croatia and other countries.

<p>Reconnecting to citizens: Transparency has to be understandable</p>	<p>No progress: MEPs just declaring to work as “consultant” or “lawyer” can continue to hide their their clients who they lobby for.</p>
<p>Trilogue transparency: shedding light onto how legislation is negotiated</p>	<p>Some progress: Win: The results of trilogue meetings have to be made public in writing, not just in a minimalist and oral version in Committee. Loss: Despite some progress on reporting about trilogue results, most documents in trilogues will still be treated differently from other legislative documents and usually kept secret.</p>
<p>Strengthening minority rights as guardian of Transparency</p>	<p>No progress: Big groups can still veto inquiry committees or their proposed mandate when such a request passes through the Conference of Group Presidents before it has to be voted in plenary. The inquiry committee on the Luxembourg Leaks, for example, was blocked by the Conference of Presidents this way.</p>
<p>Strengthening Parliament: getting serious by following up on decisions</p>	<p>No progress: How Commission and others follow up on Parliament’s recommendations will not be listed by Parliament. Therefore, there will be no new pressure to take Parliament’s recommendations seriously.</p>
<p>Integrity for new Commissioners*</p>	<p>Strong progress: Candidates for the post as Commissioner can proceed in their hearings only when cleared by the Legal Affairs Committee (JURI) of any conflict of interest. The same rule applies for Commissioners once they are in office, should there be a change in their portfolio or changes in their financial interests.</p>