

Parliament's right of legislative initiative

SUMMARY

The European Commission has a near monopoly on legislative initiative in the European Union (EU), with special initiative rights for other institutions applying only in certain specific cases. However, the European Parliament and the Council may invite the Commission to submit legislative proposals. Whilst this 'indirect' initiative right does not create an obligation on the Commission to propose the legislation requested, the Treaty of Lisbon codified the Commission's obligation to provide reasons for any refusal to follow a parliamentary initiative. Against this backdrop, some argue that Parliament could take the Commission to the Court of Justice of the EU if it fails to justify a negative decision.

Others see Parliament's increasing participation in overall political planning – particularly through negotiations on the Commission's annual work programme (CWP) – as a further channel for Parliament to increase its influence on EU legislation. It is thus argued that the increased role of Parliament in the legislative procedure should have reduced the need for its Members to make use of legislative initiatives. Notwithstanding that, there is a trend towards greater use of formal parliamentary legislative initiatives to assert greater influence on the political process.

Most recently, in her inaugural address in July 2019 and in her Political Guidelines, the then newly elected President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, pledged to strengthen the partnership with the European Parliament, inter alia, by responding with a proposal for a legislative act whenever Parliament, acting by a majority of its members, adopts a resolution requesting that the Commission submit legislative proposals. She added that this commitment would have to be in full respect of the proportionality, subsidiarity and better law-making principles. President von der Leyen also declared herself supportive of moves towards recognition of a right for Parliament of legislative initiative.

This briefing is an update of a European Parliament Library [briefing](#) from 2013, by Eva-Maria Poptcheva.



In this Briefing

- Parliament's initiative rights
- Right to initiate legislation
- New channels for Parliament's say on the legislative agenda
- Parliament's legislative initiatives in practice
- Recent developments
- Annex

Parliament's initiative rights

While in Member States, alongside governments, national parliaments are empowered to propose legislation, through either a certain number of Members of Parliament, a political party group, or even individual Members, at EU level, the Treaty on European Union (TEU) reserves the right to initiate legislation almost entirely for the European Commission ([Article 17\(2\) TEU](#)).

It is suggested that the Commission's monopoly of initiative was originally rooted in the mistrust of the political process in post-war Europe. As a consequence, European integration and the identification of the 'general interest' of the Communities were entrusted to a technocratic authority, whose decisions were to be legitimated by its expertise and performance.¹

The Treaty of Lisbon reinforced Parliament's right to request the Commission to submit a legislative proposal, in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). In line with the evolving institutional balance, many expect Parliament's role in the EU's political and legislative agenda-setting procedures to develop further in the coming years.

Article 225 TFEU

The European Parliament may, acting by a majority of its component Members, request the Commission to submit any appropriate proposal on matters on which it considers that a Union act is required for the purpose of implementing the Treaties. If the Commission does not submit a proposal, it shall inform the European Parliament of the reasons.

Right to initiate legislation

The right of the EP to initiate legislation (Article 225 TFEU) was first enshrined in the Treaties with the Treaty of Maastricht (Article 138b). However, Parliament was already influencing the legislative agenda even before then, by introducing items to the [budget](#) and through its – non-legislative – 'initiative reports' issued to put political pressure on the Commission. In [1990](#), Parliament demanded for itself a fully fledged initiative right, not dependent on the Commission, to address the alleged democratic deficit in the then Communities. This question was discussed again within the European Convention in 2002 and 2003. However, under pressure to confer the same right on the Council, which, it was feared, might dilute the initiative right of the Commission and complicate the legislative procedure, EP negotiators dropped their demands for a 'direct' initiative right.

Parliament's special initiative rights

Under the Treaties, the EP has a number of special initiative rights, where it can make formal proposals for legislation – mainly concerning its own organisation, functions and the European elections. These include: the determination of the existence of a clear risk that a Member State breaches the Union values (Article 7 TEU), provisions establishing the composition of the EP (Article 14 TEU), amendments of the Treaties (48(2) TEU), European electoral legislation (Article 223 TFEU), regulations and general conditions governing the performance of the duties of its Members (Article 223(2) TFEU), provisions governing the right of inquiry (Article 226 TFEU), and rules concerning the performance of the Ombudsman's duties (Article 228(4) TFEU).

Nature of the legislative initiative right

Parliament's initiative right under Article 225 TFEU applies to any EU act within the Treaties, and not only to policy areas where legislation is adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure. The only requirement is that the Commission must have the right to propose legislation in this area.

'Indirect' initiative right

Parliament's right to initiate legislation is an 'indirect' one, as it only gives Parliament the possibility to 'invite' the Commission to submit a legislative proposal. A similar 'indirect' initiative right is also conferred upon the Council ([Article 241 TFEU](#)), which may ask the Commission to undertake

pre-legislative 'studies' of, inter alia, economic, social and legal circumstances and to submit to it any appropriate proposals. For example, the Regulation on Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) was adopted after a Council initiative. The Lisbon Treaty also gave a similar indirect right of initiative to groups of at least 1 million EU citizens through a [European Citizens' Initiative \(Article 11\(4\) TEU\)](#).

The Lisbon Treaty strengthened Parliament's initiative right by introducing the obligation for the Commission to give **reasons** for any refusal to propose legislation following a request. However Parliament had previously managed to secure for itself a stronger position vis-à-vis the Commission through **interinstitutional agreements**. The Commission, for instance, committed itself to 'duly reason on a case-by-case basis' its decisions on Parliament's requests in a [1995 Code of Conduct](#).²

Is there an obligation for the Commission to submit a proposal?

The question whether the European Commission is obliged to submit a legislative proposal further to Parliament's 'invitation' has been disputed in the legal literature. Some argue that adoption of an initiative legislative report by the required absolute majority in Parliament, as well as the political accountability of the Commission vis-à-vis the Parliament, place an obligation on the Commission to react. The majority of academics, however, draw an analogy with the Council's initiative right, where no absolute obligation exists, as well as to the historical origins of the provision, and argue against the binding nature of the obligation.

Codification – in the Lisbon Treaty – of the Commission's **obligation to give reasons** for its decision not to submit a proposal establishes that the Commission is not bound to Parliament's initiative. The obligation to inform Parliament about the reasons for rejecting an initiative is however seen by some as a reflection of Parliament's increasing control powers vis-à-vis the Commission.³

Follow-up of Parliament's legislative initiatives

Despite the discretion conferred upon the Commission, Parliament has gained a commitment from the Commission on its follow-up to Parliament's legislative initiatives over the years.

The Commission committed itself in the [EP-Commission Interinstitutional Framework Agreement](#)⁴ of 2010 to report on the concrete follow-up of any EP legislative initiative within **three months** after its adoption in plenary. Moreover, the Commission agreed to come forward with a legislative proposal at the latest within **one year** or to include the proposal in its next year's work programme (recital 16). This has been assessed by many commentators as a decisive restriction of the Commission's discretion regarding Parliament's legislative requests. Some also stress that this commitment has effectively reduced the possibility of 'waiting games' with Parliament as far as controversial legislative initiatives are concerned.

Many commentators conclude that the Commission is obliged to take action on a parliamentary legislative initiative or at least has to explain its follow-up and any negative decision.⁵

As a consequence, many scholars argue that Parliament could lodge an action for **failure to act** pursuant to Article 265 TFEU with the Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU) if the Commission failed to take any action upon a Parliament request.⁶ Recourse to the CJEU could not result in obliging the Commission to submit the proposal requested, but would at least oblige the Commission to consider Parliament's request.⁷ It has also been argued that the political consequence of a failure by the Commission to reason sufficiently the rejection of Parliament's request could be cause for a motion of censure on the Commission's activities ([Article 234 TFEU](#)).⁸

Procedure

The Treaties leave the arrangements for the exercise of the initiative right with the Parliament. According to Parliament's Rules of Procedure ([Rule 47\(2\)](#)), the right to table a legislative proposal is conferred upon any Member, and a proposal can be tabled jointly by up to 10 Members. Rule 47(1)

establishes that a resolution to request the Commission to submit a legislative proposal is always adopted on the basis of a **legislative own-initiative report**.⁹ The proposal needs to specify the legal base for the proposed draft act. It is submitted to the President of the Parliament who, after verifying whether the legal requirements are fulfilled, may refer the proposal for an opinion on the appropriateness of the legal base to the Legal Affairs Committee.

If the proposal is admissible, the President announces it in plenary and refers it to the responsible committee for the subject matter. The committee must decide within three months whether to draft an initiative report. The Conference of Presidents must then authorise the committee to do so.

An **absolute majority** of all Members is necessary in plenary for adoption. The resolution includes recommendations on the content of the proposal requested, and its respect for fundamental rights and the principle of subsidiarity. Where a proposal has financial implications, Parliament indicates how sufficient financial resources could be provided. It may set a deadline for the Commission to submit such a proposal. The Conference of Committee Chairs is responsible for monitoring whether the Commission complies with the three-month rule to communicate its intended follow-up.

New channels for Parliament's say on the legislative agenda

Changes in the institutional balance

Neither the Treaty of Lisbon nor previous treaties introduced formal changes to the right of the Commission to initiate legislation. However, [many](#) argue that the expanded use and consolidation of co-decision – now the ordinary legislative procedure – has in practice led to the gradual erosion of the Commission's monopoly of initiative. It has been argued that even though the Commission possesses a quasi-monopoly over the formal right of legislative initiative, it shares the right of political initiative with the European Council, the Council and the EP.¹⁰

Some commentators, however, regard the reduction of the Commission's role as the only policy developer, inter alia in favour of an elected institution such as the EP, as a natural evolution of the democratisation process and as a 'maturing of the Union's institutional set-up'.¹¹

Role of the EP in legislative planning

Under the [2010 Framework Agreement](#), the Commission must take into account the priorities expressed by Parliament and justify any departure from the proposals set out in the Commission Work Programme (CWP). In this way, Parliament's contribution towards shaping the CWP results directly in greater political influence on the legislative initiatives to be submitted by the Commission. Calls have been made for further institutionalisation of this consultative process.

The timetable for the CWP is set out in [Annex IV](#) to the 2010 Framework Agreement (now included in the [Compendium](#) of the main legal acts related to Parliament's Rules of Procedure). It envisages a dialogue between the Commission and the corresponding parliamentary committees. On the basis of a summary report by the Conference of Presidents on the implementation of the CWP, Parliament adopts a resolution at the July part-session, outlining its position and including in it particular requests based on legislative initiative reports. Annual legislative planning is based on structured dialogue, covering both the ongoing and future CWPs, aimed at ensuring a common understanding between the EP and Commission.

Apart from requiring the Commission to give 'prompt and detailed' consideration to requests for proposals for Union acts made by the European Parliament (and Council) pursuant to Article 225 TFEU, the interinstitutional agreement between Parliament, Council and Commission on better law-making, which entered into force in April 2016 (the [2016 IIA](#)), details a number of further obligations in the hands of the Commission (e.g. the three-month deadline to state the follow-up it intends to give by adopting a specific communication; the obligation to justify abstention and provide, where

appropriate, an analysis of possible alternatives and address 'European added value' and the 'cost of non-Europe' (paragraph 10 of the 2016 IIA).

The 2016 IIA also places strong emphasis on interinstitutional cooperation in the phase of legislative programming, in which Parliament is involved along with the other two institutions, in particular as regards multiannual programming (paragraph 5 of the 2016 IIA). It provides for a structured exchange of views following the adoption of the CWP, leading to a [joint declaration](#) by the presidents of the three institutions (paragraph 7 of the 2016 IIA).

The European Added Value Unit (EAVA) within EPRS provides European Added Value [assessments](#) to set out in detail the justification for proposals made to the Commission by the EP under Article 225 TFEU. It may conduct specific follow-up research on major legislative requests made by Parliament for the CWP.

Parliament's legislative initiatives in practice

More legislation, fewer initiatives

Many scholars see a relationship between the number of initiatives (legislative and non-legislative) submitted by MEPs and Parliament's increasing legislative competences.¹² With Parliament more involved in pending legislative procedures, less time and resources are left for new proposals.¹³

Legislative initiatives and their follow-up

In May 2018, Parliament adopted a [resolution](#) on the interpretation and implementation of the 2016 IIA, welcoming the Commission replying, for the most part, within the three-month deadline. However, it observed that specific communications were not being adopted, thus the political response to Parliament's requests did not receive full transparency. Parliament also expressed dissatisfaction that several own-initiative reports have remained unanswered and called on the Commission to provide the co-legislators, within three months, the reasons why a proposal is withdrawn and with a reasoned opinion on requests for legislative or non-legislative proposals.

Parliament adopted 29 legislative initiatives during the past two legislative terms (see Annex). Commission's follow-up differs from case to case. Generally, it includes a reference to Parliament's call for legislation in its legislative proposal, should it make one. Of the 29 initiatives mentioned from the 2009-2014 and 2014-2019 terms, the request was successful, at least in part, in seven cases in which the Commission put forward a concrete legislative proposal.

Recent developments

The new President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, expressed in her [pre-election address](#) as well as in her [political guidelines](#), the intention to establish a strong partnership with the European Parliament. She expressed the intention to call for a [Conference on the Future of Europe](#), which would involve institutions and citizens, and with the objective of debating a wide range of issues. *Spitzenkandidaten* and transnational lists would be addressed by summer 2020.

Ursula von der Leyen also pledged, inter alia, to support Parliament, as the representative institution of citizens, gaining a stronger role in initiating legislation. In this respect, she committed to responding with a legislative act whenever Parliament, acting by a majority of its members, adopted resolutions requesting that the Commission submit legislative proposals, adding that this commitment should take into account the full respect of the proportionality, subsidiarity and better law-making principles. Ursula von der Leyen also declared herself supportive of the recognition of the right to legislative initiative of Parliament.

In February 2017, Parliament had adopted two comprehensive resolutions suggesting ways to improve the functioning of the EU, either by building on the potential of the Lisbon Treaty – without Treaty changes– ([2014/2249\(INI\)](#)) or by engaging in more substantial changes to the current set-up

([2014/2248\(INI\)](#)). Parliament in this way promoted an enhancement of its legislative powers, not only with respect to its right of 'indirect initiative' (Article 225 TFEU), but also with respect to a fully fledged 'stand-alone' right of legislative initiative. Parliament proposed the attribution of a true right of [legislative initiative to \(Council and\) Parliament](#) and expressed its intention to make [more use of the legislative initiative](#) under Article 225 TFEU.

In two resolutions of February 2019, Parliament reiterated its position (i.e. the Commission to take more serious account of its requests; more legislative requests translated into concrete proposals; and Parliament to be given, in the context of a future Treaty change, a true right of legislative initiative – Resolution [2018/2113\(INI\)](#)) and recalled the possibility of substantial modifications of the Treaties awarding Parliament the 'stand-alone' right to submit legislative proposals ([2018/2094\(INI\)](#)).

ENDNOTES

- ¹ P. Broin and P. M. Kaszinsky, [The Treaty of Lisbon: A Second Look at the Institutional Innovations](#), CEPS, 2010, p. 51 and f. Some argue that the main reason why – different from national practices – the EP was not conceived as the initiator of the legislative process, was that smaller Member States were not sufficiently represented in it to defend their interests. See e.g. P. Ponzano, C. Hermanin, D. Corona, [The Power of Initiative of the European Commission: A Progressive Erosion?](#) 2012, p. 7.
- ² The 1990 and 1995 Codes of Conduct have since been replaced by interinstitutional Framework Agreements between Parliament and the Commission.
- ³ R. Geiger, D.-E. Khan and M. Kotzur, [Kommentar zum Vertrag über die Europäische Union und Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union](#), Article 225, 2010, p. 736.
- ⁴ Interinstitutional Framework Agreements have been concluded bilaterally, rather than between the three institutions, to govern relations between the Commission and Parliament. See Y. Mény, [Building Parliament: 50 years of European Parliament history: 1958-2008](#), EUI, 2008, p. 196.
- ⁵ R. Streinz, [Kommentar zum Vertrag über die Europäische Union und Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union](#), 2012, Article 225, marginal number 4.
- ⁶ *ibid*, marginal number 5.
- ⁷ C. O. Lenz and K.-L. Borhardt, [EU-Verträge Kommentar](#), Article 225, 2013, p. 2512.
- ⁸ Grabitz, Hilf, Nettesheim, [Das Recht der EU](#), 2013, Article 225, marginal number 14.
- ⁹ Legislative own-initiative reports are one of several types of own-initiative reports. The procedure for authorising committees to draft own-initiative reports is set out in a [decision](#) of the Conference of Presidents of 12 December 2002.
- ¹⁰ P. Broin and P. M. Kaszinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
- ¹¹ *ibid*, pp. 53 and 54.
- ¹² C. von Buttlar, [Das Initiativrecht der Europäischen Kommission](#), 2003, p. 222.
- ¹³ *ibid*. See also A. Maurer, [The European Parliament after Lisbon: Policy-making and Control](#), Paper presented at the Federal Trust Workshop 'The European Parliament in an Enlarged European Union: Beyond the Lisbon Treaty'.

DISCLAIMER AND COPYRIGHT

This document is prepared for, and addressed to, the Members and staff of the European Parliament as background material to assist them in their parliamentary work. The content of the document is the sole responsibility of its author(s) and any opinions expressed herein should not be taken to represent an official position of the Parliament.

Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorised, provided the source is acknowledged and the European Parliament is given prior notice and sent a copy.

© European Union, 2020.

Photo credits: © European Union 2019 - Source: EP/Michel Christen.

eprs@ep.europa.eu (contact)

www.eprs.ep.parl.union.eu (intranet)

www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank (internet)

<http://epthinktank.eu> (blog)



Annex

Tables 1 and 2 show cases in which plenary decided to request the Commission to submit a proposal pursuant to Article 225 TFEU. Tables 3 and 4 show cases of legislative own-initiative reports submitted with regard to decisions (or legal acts) to be adopted uniquely by the Council or proposals for regulation according to Article 226 TFEU. (Data are from the Legislative Observatory (OEL) and the Legislative Coordination Unit, European Parliament.)

Table 1: Legislative own-initiative reports Article 225 TFEU only, 2014-2019 term

Legislative own-initiative report (INL)	Adoption in plenary	Votes	Committee	The Commission's response
Humanitarian visas 2018/2271(INL)	11 December 2018	For - 429 Against - 194 Abstained - 41	LIBE	The Commission responded (1 April 2019, SP(2019)149) that the objectives of Parliament's initiative are partially covered by the 2016 proposal for a regulation establishing a Union Resettlement Framework.
Expedited settlement of commercial disputes 2018/2079(INL)	13 December 2018	For - 521 Against - 35 Abstained - 14	JURI	The Commission responded (11 March 2019, SP(2019)129) that at this stage it does not seem appropriate to engage in preparatory action concerning the establishment of a European Commercial Court.
Statute for social and solidarity-based enterprises 2016/2237(INL)	5 July 2018	For - 398 Against - 78 Abstained - 44	JURI	The Commission responded (8 November 2018, SP(2018)630) that it has already undertaken number of initiatives and programmes linked with social enterprises. In some cases, the Commission does not share the same opinion as Parliament.
Odometer manipulation in motor vehicles: revision of the EU legal framework 2017/2064(INL)	31 May 2018	For - 577 Against - 32 Abstained - 19	TRAN	The Commission responded (26 September 2018, SP(2018)516) that it will study further possible solutions and review the relevant international standards, though it notes that the Parliament's recommendations are sufficiently covered by the existing legislation.
Common minimum standards of civil procedures 2015/2084(INL)	4 July 2017	For - 545 Against - 79 Abstained - 71	JURI	The Commission responded (16 October 2017, SP(2017)539) that the EU civil justice instruments already contain civil procedure rules. It notes that if further action is needed it intends to take the proposal into account.
Limitation periods for traffic accidents 2015/2087(INL)	4 July 2017	For - 558 Against - 69 Abstained - 73	JURI	The Commission noted (6 October 2017, SP(2017)540) that harmonisation of national limitation periods could not be limited to traffic accident cases in isolation and should be addressed in a future report on application of the Rome II Regulation.

Legislative own-initiative report (INL)	Adoption in plenary	Votes	Committee	The Commission's response
Protection of vulnerable adults 2015/2085(INL)	1 June 2017	For - 539 Against - 23 Abstained - 72	JURI	The Commission responded (30 August 2017, SP(2017)510) that a legislative initiative would produce desired effects only when a sufficient number of Member States had joined the 2000 Hague Convention on international protection of adults.
Civil law rules on robotics 2015/2103(INL)	16 February 2017	For - 396 Against - 123 Abstained - 85	JURI	The Commission responded (16 May 2017, SP(2017)310) that it intends to assess whether legislative action is necessary.
Cross-border aspects of adoptions 2015/2086(INL)	2 February 2017	For - 533 Against - 41 Abstained - 72	JURI	The Commission responded (10 April 2017, SP(2017)188) that it is aware of the existing problems. It nevertheless points out that an initiative needs to be evidence-based and waits for results of a consultation.
Establishment of an EU mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights 2015/2254(INL)	25 October 2016	For - 405 Against - 171 Abstained - 39	LIBE	The Commission noted (17 February 2017, SP(2017)16) the need to use the existing instruments. As regards the rule of law, on 2 May 2018, the Commission proposed a mechanism to protect the EU budget in case of deficiencies regarding the rule of law in a Member State.
Bringing transparency, coordination and convergence to corporate tax policies in the Union 2015/2010(INL)	16 December 2015	For - 500 Against - 122 Abstained - 81	ECON	The Commission responded (3 May 2016, SP(2016)180) that it addressed Parliament's request by submitting a 2016 legislative proposal regarding on mandatory, public country-by-country reporting. Later, in 2018, the Commission proposed rules to ensure that digital business activities are taxed in a fair and growth-friendly way in the EU.

Table 2: Legislative own-initiative reports Article 225 TFEU only, 2009-2014 term

Legislative own-initiative report (INL)	Adoption in plenary	Votes	Committee	The Commission's response
European system of financial supervision (ESFS) review 2013/2166(INL)	11 March 2014	For - 544 Against - 110 Abstained - 16	ECON	The Commission responded (11 August 2014, SP(2014)457) that it does not intend at this stage to accompany its report on the review of the ESFS/ ESAs with legislative proposals.
Review of the European Arrest Warrant 2013/2109(INL)	27 February 2014	For - 495 Against - 51 Abstained - 11	LIBE	The Commission responded (22 July 2014, SP(2014)447) that it does not share Parliament's view on revising the European Arrest Warrant, though it intends to monitor its operation.
Combating violence against women 2013/2004(INL)	25 February 2014	Adopted by show of hands	FEMM	The Commission noted (22 July 2014, SP(2014)447) ¹ that various legal measures were adopted in this field and that Parliament's proposal lack clarity in some aspects. As a result, the Commission does not consider it appropriate to submit a legislative proposal on prevention measures. Taking into account the ongoing efforts to improve statistics on gender-based violence, the Commission will consider the opportunity to submit further proposals to improve statistics in this area.
EU donor coordination on development aid (2013/2057(INL))	11 December 2013	Adopted by show of hands	DEVE	The Commission expressed (6 May 2014, SP(2014)260) its reservations in relation to the pertinence and timeliness of the proposed regulatory approach to improve EU coordination. The Commission proposed a number of steps as a follow-up to Parliament's recommendations.
Parliament's rights in the appointment procedure of future Executive Directors of the European Environment Agency 2013/2089(INL)	11 September 2013	Adopted by show of hands	ENVI	The Commission (19 December 2013, SP(2013)816) agreed with the proposed formalisation of the hearing procedure in the EEA Regulation. However, rather than putting forward at this stage a legislative amendment to the EEA Regulation solely for this issue, proposes to confirm, by letter, the Commission's agreement and its commitment to follow the current practice
Statute for a European mutual society 2012/2039(INL)	14 March 2013	Adopted by show of hands	JURI	The Commission replied (29 July 2013, SP(2013)442) that it intends to wait for results of consultation in order to address these issues. A proposal was withdrawn in 2006. No new proposal has since been scheduled in the CWP.

¹ The Legislative Observatory (OEL) includes identical numbers and dates for this file and the file noted above.

Legislative own-initiative report (INL)	Adoption in plenary	Votes	Committee	The Commission's response
Better governance for the single market 2012/2260(INL)	7 February 2013	For - 527 Against - 30 Abstained - 31	IMCO	The Commission replied expressing doubts (28 June 2013, SP(2013)304) as to whether Article 26(3) TFEU could be used as a legal basis to adopt a legislative act on the governance of the single market.
Towards a genuine Economic and Monetary Union 2012/2151(INL) (Follow up on 2010/2099(INL))	20 November 2012	For - 482 Against - 160 Abstained - 35	ECON	The Commission pointed (2 April 2013, SP(2013)110) to proposals already submitted and notes its intention to submit further proposals in this field. In July 2013 (and thereafter), the Commission publishes the Banking Union proposals, which include the Single Resolution Mechanism, the Single Supervisory Mechanism, the European Deposit Insurance Scheme (still in the legislative process) and a proposal on sovereign bond-backed securities.
Information and consultation of workers, anticipation and management of restructuring 2012/2061(INL)	15 January 2013	For - 503 Against - 107 Abstained 72	EMPL	Taking into account the clear lack of a possible agreement between Social Partners and in Council on further action to be taken, the Commission in its reply of 19 June 2013 (SP(2013)251) committed to propose a communication.
Law of administrative procedure of the European Union 2012/2024(INL)	15 January 2013	For - 572 Against - 16 Abstained- 12	JURI	Given the complexity of this subject and the importance of ensuring high administrative standards, the Commission SP(2013)251 will launch a detailed stocktaking exercise.
Access to basic banking services 2012/2055(INL)	4 July 2012	For - 585 Against - 68 Abstained - 5	ECON	The Commission intended (31 October 2012, SP(2012)636) to examine the results of a public consultation and to assess the need to bring forward a proposal. In May 2013, the Commission submitted a proposal (COM/2013/0266).
Equal pay for male and female workers for equal work 2011/2285(INL)	24 May 2012	Adopted by show of hands	FEMM	The Commission noted (24 September 2012, SP(2012)542) that before deciding on amending the existing legislation, it needed to submit a report to Parliament.
Law applicable to non-contractual obligations (Rome II) 2009/2170(INL)	10 May 2012	Adopted by show of hands	JURI	No written response available.

Legislative own-initiative report (INL)	Adoption in plenary	Votes	Committee	The Commission's response
Cross-border transfer of company seats 2011/2046(INL)	2 February 2012	Adopted by show of hands	JURI	The Commission noted (1 June 2012, SP(2016)260/2) that, based on the 2007 impact assessment, it decided not to present a legislative proposal in this matter, although it intends to reflect on further actions.
Insolvency proceedings in the context of EU company law 2011/2006(INL)	15 November 2011	Adopted by show of hands	JURI	The Commission observed (5 March 2012, SP(2012)55) that the Parliament's recommendations will be taken into account. Regarding insolvency, the Commission subsequently submitted proposals on 12 December 2012 (COM/2012/0744) and 22 November 2016 (COM(2016)723).
Improving economic governance and stability framework of the Union 2010/2099(INL)	20 October 2010	For - 468 Against - 61 Abstained - 45	ECON	The Commission pointed to (28 March 2011, SP(2011)609) several legislative proposals that were submitted in this regard in the area of fiscal policy and macroeconomic imbalances (six-pack) and two later legislative initiatives to ensure additional coordination and surveillance of budgetary processes for all euro-area members (two-pack).
Cross-border crisis management in the banking sector 2010/2006(INL)	7 July 2010	Adopted by show of hands	ECON	The Commission noted (29 November 2010, SP(2010)6850) that a legislative proposal was to be submitted. The proposal was submitted on 6 June 2012 (COM/2012/0280).
Proposed interim measures for freezing and disclosure of debtors' assets in cross-border cases 2009/2169(INL)	10 May 2011	Adopted by show of hands	JURI	The Commission pointed out (19 September 2011, SP(2011)6333) that a proposal was to be submitted. The proposal was submitted on 25 November 2011 (COM/2011/0445).

Table 3: Other legislative own-initiative reports, 2014-2019 term²

Legislative own-initiative report (INL)	Adoption in plenary	Votes	Committee
Reform of Statute of the European Ombudsman 2018/2080(INL)	12 February 2019	For - 573 Against- 29 Abstained -66	AFCO
Proposal for a Council decision concerning Hungary 2017/2131(INL)	12 September 2018	For - 448 Against- 197 Abstained-48	LIBE
Composition of the European Parliament 2017/2054(INL)	7 February 2018	For 400 Against- 183 Abstained- 96	AFCO
Reform of the electoral law of the European Union 2015/2035(INL)	11 November 2015	For- 315 Against- 234 Abstained- 55	AFCO

Table 4: Other legislative own-initiative reports, 2009-2014 term

Legislative own-initiative report (INL)	Adoption in plenary	Votes	Committee
Improving the practical arrangements for the holding of the European elections in 2014 2013/2102(INL)	4 July 2013	For- 507 Against- 120 Abstained- 18	AFCO
Composition of the European Parliament with a view to the 2014 elections 2012/2309(INL)	13 March 2013	For- 536 Against- 111 Abstained-44	AFCO
Jurisdictional system for patent disputes 2011/2176(INL)	11 December 2012	For- 483 Against- 161 Abstained- 38	JURI
European Parliament's right of inquiry 2009/2212(INL)	16 April 2014	For- 532 Against- 81, Abstained-7	AFCO

² Legislative own-initiative reports submitted with regard to decisions (or legal acts) to be adopted uniquely by the Council or proposals for a regulation according to Article 226 TFEU concerning the Parliament's right of inquiry.