

**Question for oral answer O-000100/2013
to the Council**

Rule 115

**Jan Mulder, Ingeborg Gräßle, Jens Geier, Michael Theurer, Bart Staes, Inés Ayala Sender,
Søren Bo Søndergaard**

on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control

Subject: Croatian member of the Court of Auditors

According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the Council may appoint members of the Court of Auditors only after Parliament has been duly consulted. However, even if this consultation results in a negative opinion, the Council may legally still appoint members, as has happened on a few occasions in the past. Parliament therefore asks prospective members of the Court of Auditors what they would do in the event that Parliament issued a negative opinion on their possible appointment.

1. When the Council appointed the new member for Croatia, Neven Mates, did it take account of the fact that this candidate had stated, both verbally and in writing, that he would withdraw his candidacy if Parliament issued a negative opinion?
2. Given that this is the case, why did the Council appoint Neven Mates even though the outcome of the vote in plenary was 396 against, 231 in favour and 45 abstentions? Why did the Council take a decision opposite to that of Parliament?
3. What is the Council's opinion on the effectiveness and credibility of a member of the Court of Auditors who has broken the promise he made to a freely elected, democratic Parliament?

Tabled: 30.9.2013

Forwarded: 1.10.2013

Deadline for reply: 22.10.2013