

**Question for written answer E-000035/2024
to the Commission**

Rule 138

Matjaž Nemec (S&D), **Mounir Satouri** (Verts/ALE), **Margrete Auken** (Verts/ALE), **Nora Mebarek** (S&D), **Pierre Larrourou** (S&D), **Ivan Vilibor Sinčić** (NI), **Francisco Guerreiro** (Verts/ALE), **Chris MacManus** (The Left), **Evin Incir** (S&D), **Irena Joveva** (Renew), **Sylvie Guillaume** (S&D)

Subject: Commission conclusions on the review of EU financial assistance to Palestine – extended screening of PEGASE

In its conclusions on the review of ongoing financial assistance to Palestine, the Commission has recommended to 'extend the screening of PEGASE Civil Servants and Pensioners and Cash Transfer Programme to 1st degree relative of beneficiaries, excluding minors, to be agreed with the Palestinian Authority'.¹

To date, PEGASE already includes checks on indirect beneficiaries, as the screening system takes into consideration the lists of detainees, families of perpetrators of terrorist attacks and security staff.

1. How does extending the screening process to all first-degree relatives of beneficiaries fall in line with EU guidelines and with the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the EU, in particular the judgment of the General Court in Case T-212/22 '*PrigozhinavCouncil*'?²
2. What is the evidential trigger and legal basis for such an extensive screening process, and what legal remedies will be available for the affected individuals?
3. How will the Commission ensure that such an extension does not disproportionately affect the most vulnerable groups, specifically women, people with disabilities and the elderly?³

Submitted: 9.1.2024

¹ <https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2023-11/Communication%20to%20the%20Commission%20on%20the%20review%20of%20ongoing%20financial%20assistance%20for%20Palestine.pdf>

² <https://curia.europa.eu/juris/documents.jsf?num=T-212/22>.

³ As stated in the conclusions on the review, in April 2023, of the 106 596 Palestinian families that benefited from social allowances, 91 261 were extremely poor, 41 266 were female-headed, 16 395 were headed by a person with a disability and 42 130 by an elderly person.