

Public Consultation Results - user analysis of operations of the TR

Working Document - JTRS

A) Description of the Public Consultation and participants

A public consultation was set up in order to collect data to feed into the preparation of the Annual Report on the first year of operation of the Transparency Register. Target groups were organisations, authorities and individuals registered in the Transparency Register as well as those acting as independent persons active in influencing the development and implementation of EU policies and not (yet) registered. A total of 257¹ stakeholders took part in this public consultation through the questionnaire made available on the European Commission's Your Voice in Europe website from 8 June to 31 August 2012.

234 contributions (91%) were received from organisations already registered in the Transparency Register and 23 (9%) from non-registered organisations of which the majority were law firms. The level of contributions received from non-registered organisations was not very high, making it difficult to come to any real conclusions on this input. However, the JTRS will seek continued contact with non-registered organisations in order to receive ongoing feedback.

The consultation consisted of both quantitative and qualitative input. In total, 225 of the 257 respondents left between 1 and 12 comments to be taken into consideration. All of the input has been summarised and organised into the 5 following categories: Added Value of the TR; Registration process; JTRS & TR website; EP Accreditation; Recommendations.

Around 5% of the registered entities in the TR responded to the public consultation. This is not a very large proportion of all registrants contained in the register, but is a level of response that can give clear enough indications as to the operation of the TR from a users' viewpoint. This is especially true since all major horizontal organisations present in Brussels responded to the public consultation, thereby reflecting their members' positions.

Seven horizontal groups² sent ad-hoc contributions to the public consultation.

Out of all the contributions:

- 122 participations by trade/professional organisations (47%);
- 66 by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) (26%);
- 29 by professional consultancies/law firms/self-employed consultants (11%);
- 14 by organisations representing local, regional and municipal authorities, other public or mixed entities (5.5%);
- 13 by organisations having another status (not defined) (5%);
- 12 by think tanks, research and academic institutions (5%);
- 1 by an organisation representing churches and religious communities (0.5%).

¹ 4 of which were non-valid responses.

² Transparency International, CCBE, Business Europe, Orgalime, Ordre des Barreaux Francophones et Germanophones de Belgique, ALTER EU & Civil Society Contact Group.

Only 34% of the contributors have their head office in Belgium, but 66% have an office in Brussels. The distribution of responses, by category, clearly reflects the current proportions in the TR, where numbers of registrants are highest in category II, followed by III then category I.

B) Summary of results

1. Added Value of the TR: A vast majority of respondents clearly registered in the TR for the sake of transparency (92%). They wish to interact with the European institutions in a transparent and ethical way and esteem that being registered reflects positively on their image (93%). Receiving a timely alert on the Commission's legislative proposals and being granted access to the European Parliament appear to be slightly less important (69%).

- Why we actively promote the TR: Of the 55.56% of registered respondents who actively promote the register to other organisations, the most popular explanation was to promote transparency and accountability in the EU decision-making process. Input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- For the principles of transparency, openness and accountability in the EU decision-making process; (18%³)
- Increased representation at the EU level & visibility of our common cause; (13%)
- Increased transparency is beneficial to all; (11%)
- All interest representatives should be transparent to create a level playing field; (9%)
- To improve the image of lobbying; (9%)
- To participate in EC's public consultations; (9%)
- To conform with rules on ethics and transparency; (8%)
- Beneficial for our network/ clients; (7%)
- Business ethics/ credibility; (6%)
- EP accreditation & access to officials; (5%)
- Many organisations are not aware of the register; (3%)
- To increase the transparency of the EU institutions (2%).

- Benefits of registering on the TR: Some input was received from registered participants on the benefits of participating in the TR. A large majority of these think that participation promotes a balanced dialogue on the EU level, or shows the importance of transparency for their organisation. Input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- Promoting a balanced participation in the EU decision making process & helping to create a level playing field; (30%⁴)
- To show the importance of transparency for our organisation; (30%)
- It can help to improve democratic control and public scrutiny; (11%)
- To push for increased transparency (11%)
- It is a simple procedure; (11%)
- To raise awareness about our company and campaigns; (5%)
- To forge alliances with like-minded organisations (2%).

³ As a percentage of comments received on this issue, and not of total respondents.

⁴ See footnote 3

- **Motivation for registering a non-registered entity:** The level of contributions received from non-registered organisations was not very high, making it difficult to come to any real conclusions on this input. However, the JTRS will seek continued contact with non-registered organisations in order to receive ongoing feedback. The main reason cited by non-registrants for not being registered is that registration is not compulsory. Others felt that the practical benefits are limited or evoked the reasons detailed below. A major concern for law firms seems to be the need to protect the anonymity of clients, but an equal amount of non-registered entities showed willingness to reconsider registration. Input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- We are ready to reconsider it; (18.5%⁵)
- We wish to protect the anonymity of our clients and not disclose financial information about them; (18.5%)
- Registration is not compulsory; (15%)
- We do not consider ourselves to be lobbyists; (15%)
- The advantages of registration are not presented clearly enough; (11%)
- Physical access to all EU institutions would be a real advantage; (11%)
- Registration represents too much time and effort; (7%)
- Registration causes tax problems for our organisation (4%).

2. Registration process - difficulties providing the required information: While few registered respondents seem to have experienced technical difficulties⁶ during the registration process on the TR, many seemed to have difficulties providing the information required for registration. Of those experiencing difficulties, major problems seem to be evaluating financial data or the number of staff for representation activities, while selecting the correct category for registration is a more minor problem. In view of the general difficulties experienced, five horizontal organisations state that they have produced guidelines for their members on how to register: (FoEE, ALTER-EU, CSCG, SEAP and EFPIA).

- **Financial data:** Over a quarter of registered respondents had difficulty calculating the budget allocated to activities under the scope of the TR⁷. Qualitative input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- More explicit detail is needed on which costs to include; (27%⁸)
- We are unhappy with the structure of budget reporting in our category (mostly from think tanks, but also some NGOs and trade professionals); (17%)
- Comparisons of budgets is not possible while each organisation uses their own method of calculation, and with different reporting criteria cross categories; (15%)
- The structure of our organisation makes allocated budget difficult to calculate; (10%)
- EU funding is difficult to calculate and often does not correspond to FTS⁹ data; (10%)
- We would appreciate more space to explain how we made our calculations; (5%)
- Unclear how to incorporate administrative costs; (5%)
- We do not want to disclose our staff's salaries; (2.5%)
- Difficult to calculate office space pro-rata; (2.5%)
- Membership fees are irrelevant; (2%)

⁵ See footnote 3

⁶ A majority of which mentioned time-limits on the registration process.

⁷ 28.63% according to statistics produced by the consultation (quantitative results).

⁸ See footnote 3

⁹ http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/find_en.htm

- The difference in cost for staff based in Brussels and staff coming to Brussels from abroad is not reflected; (2%)
- We are concerned about double-counting (2%).

- **Number of staff active under the scope of the TR:** 20.51%¹⁰ of registered respondents had difficulty calculating the number of staff active under the scope of the TR. Qualitative input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- For staff with a wide range of tasks it is difficult to isolate activities under the scope of the TR, especially when relatively minor; (19%¹¹)
- It is misleading to equate EP access authorisation to one full-time member of staff active under the scope of TR; (19%)
- More guidance is needed for pro-rata calculation of staff time; (15%)
- Due to structure or size of our organisation it is difficult to determine number of staff involved, especially when activities take place on several levels (boards, committees, administration etc) or involve many people in discussions on isolated dossiers; (13%)
- Difficult to calculate input from voluntary experts or interns; (11%)
- More difficult to calculate level of activity for non-Brussels staff; (6.5%)
- We could only provide a random calculation; (6.5%)
- Guidelines should provide a way of calculating a Full-time Equivalent (FTE) ratio¹² (4%)
- Tasks and clients change relatively often for each staff member; (4%)
- Should administrative staff be included? (2%)

- **Other difficulties** Input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- It was not clear which category we belong to, description is unclear or does not take account of national specificities; (27%¹³ belonging to categories III, VI, II and IV)
- Need for more flexibility on membership details, especially concerning reporting of number of physical members; (20.5%)
- Activities difficult to define, or criteria is unclear; (18%)
- Registration was generally too complicated and criteria unclear; (16%)
- Problems encountered with updating, or the timing of update requests; (13.5%)
- It is too simple for an organisation to de-register and register again; (2.5%)¹⁴
- We had to re-register when we changed the name of our organisation (2.5%).

3. JTRS & TR website: Information on the TR website is generally considered to be clear by registered respondents (88%)¹⁵. Homepage, official documents, registration & update form all receive between 80 and 90%¹⁶ satisfaction rates from users. Statistics on the website could however be improved (only 55%¹⁷ find them clear enough). **Documentation** on the Transparency Register follows the same trend. Guidelines, FAQ, registration form, code of

¹⁰ according to statistics produced by the consultation (quantitative results)

¹¹ See footnote 3

¹² An FTE of 1.0 means that the person is equivalent to a full-time worker; while an FTE of 0.5 signals that the worker is only half-time.

¹³ See footnote 3

¹⁴ This issue has been resolved by the introduction of an IT tool to detect double registrations and re-registration for suspended organisations.

¹⁵ according to statistics produced by the consultation (quantitative results)

¹⁶ See footnote 10

¹⁷ See footnote 10

conduct and complaint mechanism are awarded between 70 and 80%¹⁸ satisfaction rates from users. 84%¹⁹ of those who contacted the **Helpdesk** (either by phone or by email) were satisfied with service. No distinction was made between Commission's or Parliament's services.

Input was received concerning the work of the JTRS and the TR website, mostly relative to Guidelines, the Helpdesk, statistics or the search function on the website. Qualitative input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- Better guidance should be provided on the scope of the register and what information should be provided; (17%²⁰)
- Quality checks should be performed and requirements actively enforced; (13%)
- One single document should be provided for guidance purposes for registration; (10.5%)
- The search function on the website should be improved, and made more visible; (10.5%)
- The website could be simplified/ streamlined/ made more user-friendly; (8%)
- A filled-out registration form could be provided as a useful guidance document, with examples of financial calculations; (7%)
- More information should be provided about the complaints procedure; (7%)
- The statistics provided on the TR could be more detailed; (6%)
- We did not find the helpdesk useful; (5%)
- There are pages in the TR website and links which are not active; (5%)
- We would like more information on ethics codes for officials and Members of the EU institutions to be provided; (4%)
- We would like a direct link to the FTS²¹ tool from the TR website; (3%)
- It should be possible to sort/list organisations, according to categories and spending levels; (2%)
- More information should be provided about the results of the quality check procedure (2%).

4. EP Accreditation & Accreditation Services of the European Parliament

EP Accreditation was the second most important reason given for registration (65.81%²² of *registered* respondents), clearly showing the importance of EP access. No major technical problems were underlined with the new online system, as of those who have used it, an overwhelming 77.63%²³ claim to be satisfied. Over half of those concerned are satisfied by the access provided to the online request form. 56.84%²⁴ claim that access to the new online form requesting EP accreditation is either straightforward (42.31%) or very straightforward (14.53%).

58.87%²⁵ of *registered* participants have introduced one or several requests for accreditation. 53.84% of *registered* participants consider the quality of information provided on how to

¹⁸ See footnote 10

¹⁹ See footnote 10

²⁰ See footnote 3

²¹ http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/find_en.htm

²² See footnote 10

²³ See footnote 10

²⁴ See footnote 10

²⁵ See footnote 10

request EP access as clear (44.87%) or very clear (8.97%). 55.98%²⁶ consider the request form to be clear (48.29%) or very clear (7.69%). In addition, 84.19%²⁷ of *registered* respondents do not want any additional information to be provided on these procedures.

48.5% of *registered* respondents gave feedback relative to the EP accreditation procedures, showing the importance of this concern for TR users. Around 9% of registered respondents would like to see a similar access procedure introduced to the European Commission.

EP access authorisation: Qualitative input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- Difficulty applying for online accreditation, or locating relevant webpage²⁸ (36%²⁹)
- The list of documents necessary for the application procedure should be made available before registration; (15%)
- Satisfaction with the new online procedures; (12%)
- Possibility of saving draft applications should be explored or online storage; (12%)
- Unhappy about the uploading system for documents; (12%)
- EP webpage³⁰ describing accreditation procedures needs improvement; (11%)
- Templates could be provided for the various letters requested (2%).

EP access passes: Qualitative input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- The former system of annual badges should be reinstated to TR registrants; (33%³¹)
- New procedure to collect one-day passes is cumbersome/ lengths of queues at peak hours (9-10am) are discouraging; (26%)
- Financial and environmental costs of producing plastic daily access passes are unnecessary; (15%)
- Access passes could be attributed for longer periods than 1 day, for example on a weekly or monthly basis; (7%)
- Access should be given to the EP buildings on days when MEPs are not present, such as constituency weeks and/or Fridays; (5%)
- Satisfaction with new counter at the EP to collect daily passes (5%);
- A certain number of annual badges could be attributed to each *registered* organisation, according to size (3%).
- Not clear how many passes can be attributed per organisation (3%);
- The desk could open earlier, at 7.45AM; (1%)
- A specific desk should exist at every entrance; (1%)
- There should be a possibility to order passes in advance (1%).

Assistance provided: Qualitative input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

²⁶ See footnote 10

²⁷ See footnote 10

²⁸ https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/restricted/ri/authenticate.do?locale=en&target_param=manageAccreditationsView

²⁹ See footnote 3

³⁰ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/0073710a27/Overview.html>

³¹ See footnote 3

- Need for more clarity as to the rules and procedures for accessing the EP buildings; and for the various services involved to provide consistent and up-to-date information; (50%³²)
- Unhappy with the handling of my request³³; (25%)
- Satisfied with the handling of my request; (15%)
- Automated telephone helpline, it was not clear who to address problems to; (7%)
- Unclear what are advantages of having EP accreditation (3%).

5. Recommendations: Respondents were asked to give recommendations on how to improve the TR, and input can be organised into two groups: technical recommendations on operations and recommendations for the 2013 political review. In general, 84% of respondents do not consider it useful to disclose more information than is already required in the TR³⁴. This runs in parallel however to a considerable level of input on how to tighten the reporting requirements to allow for comparisons between categories and registrants. It would also seem that a major concern for current registrants is that non-registered entities seem to get the same treatment vis-à-vis the EU institutions, as those who are registered on the TR.

- Recommendations on technical operations (technical level or JTRS): A wide variety of recommendations were received from various categories as to how to improve the operations of the TR (around 20% of respondents), an overwhelming majority of which concern increasing the advantages for those registered compared with non-registrants. Qualitative input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- Preferential treatment in terms of contact or access to the EU institutions, compared with non-registered entities; (25%³⁵)
- Networking opportunities with EU officials and Members & information about events and conferences for registered entities; (22%)
- More information about legislative proceedings and documents and more EP/ EC information tools available (which can be especially helpful to non Brussels-based organisations); (16%)
- Improved or better targeted alerts on EC consultations, or feedback on the results; (15%)
- More debate and exchange between EU institutions and registered organisations; (6%)
- A link from the TR to an improved FTS calculation of EU funding; (5%)
- Access to the EC expert groups for registered entities only; (5%)
- More precise information on NGO & think-tank funding; (3%)
- Details on updates performed by registrants should be made available, to allow comparison over time; (1%)
- A function to allow for listings of registrants according to date of entry, or last update date; (1%)
- A TR logo for registrants (1%).

- Recommendations for the 2013 political review: A variety of recommendations were received, mainly from NGOs, but also from public affairs consultancies or horizontal organisations as to how to improve the TR at the political level (around 20% of respondents). An overwhelming majority of those responding to this question suggested increasing

³² See footnote 3

³³ Nearly all comments received to the accreditation system prior to March 2012.

³⁴ See footnote 10

³⁵ See footnote 3

information provided by registrants, or making the register mandatory. Worth noting is while all NGOs contributing on this issue support a move towards more transparency, public affairs consultancies also do so, on the condition that any future tightening of these requirements should be mandatory and applied equally to all interest representatives. Input is broken down, in descending order of importance:

- Increase requirements for financial data & funding sources, and/or make information comparable across different categories; (20%³⁶)
- Make the TR mandatory for all interest representatives; (17.5%)
- Inclusion of the EU Council and other EU institutions or agencies in the TR; (13.5%)
- Provide names of individual interest representatives; (12%)
- Stricter requirements on legislation lobbied on; (11%)
- EU institutions should stop working with (or fund) non-registered entities, and demonstrate active use of the TR; (10%)
- Stricter requirements on client listings; (3%)
- Stimulate culture of transparency among public officials via training; (3%)
- Categories to be revised; (3%)
- Clarity on sanctioning powers (3%);
- Information to be provided on organisations' governing structures; (2%)
- Provide a possibility for client confidentiality; (1%)
- Stricter requirements on information about members/ membership; (0.5%)
- TR should provide links between registrants, to cover multiple representations (0.5%).

³⁶ See footnote 3

Response statistics for Registre de transparence

Status : Active

Start date : 2012-06-08

End date : 2012-08-31

There are 257 responses matching your criteria of a total of 257 records in the current set of data.

Search criteria

All data requested

Meta Informations

Informations à propos du participant à la consultation

Votre organisation est-elle inscrite au Registre de transparence ?

	Number of requested records	% Requested records(257)	% of total number records(257)
Oui	234	91,05%	91,05%
Non	23	8,95%	8,95%

A quelle catégorie d'activité appartient votre organisation ?

	Number of requested records	% Requested records(257)	% of total number records(257)
Cabinet de consultants spécialisés/ Cabinets d'avocats / Consultants agissant en qualité d'indépendants	29	11,28%	11,28%
Représentants internes et groupements professionnels	122	47,47%	47,47%
Organisations non gouvernementales, plates-formes, réseaux et assimilés	66	25,68%	25,68%
Groupes de réflexion, organismes de recherche et institutions académiques	12	4,67%	4,67%
Organisations représentant des églises et des communautés religieuses	1	0,39%	0,39%
Organisations représentant des autorités locales, régionales et municipales, autres entités publiques ou mixtes, etc.	14	5,45%	5,45%
Autre	13	5,06%	5,06%

Veuillez préciser :

	Number of requested records	% Requested records(29)	% of total number records(257)
Cabinets de consultants spécialisés	15	51,72%	5,84%
Cabinets d'avocats	8	27,59%	3,11%
Consultants agissant en qualité d'indépendants	6	20,69%	2,33%

Veuillez préciser :

	Number of requested records	% Requested records(122)	% of total number records(257)
Sociétés et groupes	38	31,15%	14,79%
Associations professionnelles	73	59,84%	28,40%
Syndicats	5	4,10%	1,95%
Autres organisations analogues	6	4,92%	2,33%

Veuillez préciser :

	Number of requested records	% Requested records(12)	% of total number records(257)
Groupes de réflexion et organismes de recherche	11	91,67%	4,28%
Institutions académiques	1	8,33%	0,39%

Veuillez préciser :

	Number of requested records	% Requested records(14)	% of total number records(257)
Autorités locales, régionales et municipales (au niveau sous-national)	12	85,71%	4,67%
Autres entités publiques ou mixtes, etc.	2	14,29%	0,78%

Où se situe le siège social de votre organisation ?

	Number of requested records	% Requested records(257)	% of total number records(257)
--	-----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

Allemagne	35	13,62%	13,62%
Autriche	8	3,11%	3,11%
Belgique	89	34,63%	34,63%
Bulgarie	0	0,00%	0,00%
Chypre	0	0,00%	0,00%
Danemark	6	2,33%	2,33%
Espagne	5	1,95%	1,95%
Estonie	0	0,00%	0,00%
Finlande	2	0,78%	0,78%
France	36	14,01%	14,01%
Grèce	2	0,78%	0,78%
Hongrie	1	0,39%	0,39%
Irlande	3	1,17%	1,17%
Italie	12	4,67%	4,67%
Lettonie	1	0,39%	0,39%
Lituanie	1	0,39%	0,39%
Luxembourg	3	1,17%	1,17%
Malte	0	0,00%	0,00%
Pays-Bas	6	2,33%	2,33%
Pologne	0	0,00%	0,00%
Portugal	0	0,00%	0,00%
République tchèque	1	0,39%	0,39%
Roumanie	1	0,39%	0,39%
Royaume-Uni	20	7,78%	7,78%
Slovaquie	2	0,78%	0,78%
Slovénie	0	0,00%	0,00%
Suède	7	2,72%	2,72%
Autre	16	6,23%	6,23%

Votre organisation a-t-elle un bureau de représentation à Bruxelles ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(257)	% of total number records(257)
Oui	172	66,93%	66,93%
Non	85	33,07%	33,07%

Questionnaire pour les non-inscrits au Registre de transparence

POUR QUELLE(S) RAISON(S) VOTRE ORGANISATION N'EST-ELLE PAS INSCRITE AU REGISTRE DE TRANSPARENCE ? (plusieurs choix possibles)			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(23)	% of total number records(257)
Aucune obligation d'enregistrement	8	34,78%	3,11%
Volonté de ne pas être lié à un code de conduite externe	5	21,74%	1,95%
Réticence à la divulgation des données financières	6	26,09%	2,33%
Volonté de protection de l'anonymat de clients	3	13,04%	1,17%
Manque de bénéfices pratiques en contrepartie	7	30,43%	2,72%
Ignorance jusque-là de l'existence de cet instrument	5	21,74%	1,95%
Insuffisance de l'information, ou manque de clarté des informations disponibles sur le registre et des données à déclarer	4	17,39%	1,56%
Charge administrative importante (lors de l'enregistrement ou des mises à jour)	3	13,04%	1,17%
Autre raison	7	30,43%	2,72%

QUESTIONNAIRE A L'ATTENTION DES INSCRITS AU REGISTRE

POUR QUELLE(S) RAISON(S) VOTRE ORGANISATION S'EST-ELLE INSCRITE AU REGISTRE DE TRANSPARENCE ? (plusieurs choix possibles)			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Volonté de transparence/de visibilité concernant la participation de votre organisation au processus décisionnel de l'Union européenne	217	92,74%	84,44%
Volonté de travailler en conformité avec les exigences en matière d'éthique et de transparence	207	88,46%	80,54%
Bénéficier des alertes relatives aux consultations publiques	178	76,07%	69,26%
Bénéficier des feuilles de route de la Commission européenne	162	69,23%	63,04%
Besoin d'accréditations pour faciliter des accès aux bâtiments du Parlement européen	154	65,81%	59,92%
Autre raison	27	11,54%	10,51%

J'APPARTIENS A UN RESEAU QUI A ENCOURAGE SES MEMBRES A S'INSCRIRE			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Oui	86	36,75%	33,46%
Non	148	63,25%	57,59%

Si oui, cet élément a-t-il joué un rôle accélérateur de votre inscription ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(86)	% of total number records(234)
Oui	29	33,72%	12,39%
Non	57	66,28%	24,36%

AVEZ-VOUS VOUS-MEME ENCOURAGE D'AUTRES ORGANISATIONS A S'INSCRIRE AU REGISTRE ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Oui	130	55,56%	50,58%
Non	104	44,44%	40,47%

ESTIMEZ-VOUS QUE LE FAIT D'ETRE INSCRIT A CE REGISTRE RENFORCE L'IMAGE DE VOTRE ORGANISATION ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Oui	219	93,59%	85,21%
Non	15	6,41%	5,84%

EST-CE QUE LES INFORMATIONS FOURNIES SUR LE SITE INTERNET POUR EFFECTUER L'INSCRIPTION SONT SUFFISAMMENT CLAIRES ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Oui	208	88,89%	80,93%
Non	26	11,11%	10,12%

S'IL VOUS PLAIT, EVALUEZ LA CLARTÉ/ VISIBILITÉ DES INFORMATIONS SUIVANTES SUR LE SITE INTERNET DU REGISTRE DE TRANSPARENCE

Page d'accueil			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	85	36,32%	33,07%
Clair	128	54,70%	49,81%
Peu clair	13	5,56%	5,06%
Pas clair	3	1,28%	1,17%
Non-concerné	5	2,14%	1,95%

Documents officiels			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	41	17,52%	15,95%
Clair	151	64,53%	58,75%
Peu clair	28	11,97%	10,89%
Pas clair	6	2,56%	2,33%
Non-concerné	8	3,42%	3,11%

Accès au formulaire d'inscription			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	69	29,49%	26,85%
Clair	149	63,68%	57,98%
Peu clair	8	3,42%	3,11%
Pas clair	4	1,71%	1,56%
Non-concerné	4	1,71%	1,56%

Accès à votre inscription pour mise à jour			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	72	30,77%	28,02%
Clair	129	55,13%	50,19%
Peu clair	25	10,68%	9,73%
Pas clair	3	1,28%	1,17%
Non-concerné	5	2,14%	1,95%

Accès au formulaire de demande d'accréditation pour l'accès au Parlement européen			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	34	14,53%	13,23%

Clair	99	42,31%	38,52%
Peu clair	52	22,22%	20,23%
Pas clair	17	7,26%	6,61%
Non-concerné	32	13,68%	12,45%

Documentation pour l'aide à l'inscription			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	31	13,25%	12,06%
Clair	134	57,26%	52,14%
Peu clair	43	18,38%	16,73%
Pas clair	11	4,70%	4,28%
Non-concerné	15	6,41%	5,84%

Consultation des organisations inscrites			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	68	29,06%	26,46%
Clair	126	53,85%	49,03%
Peu clair	21	8,97%	8,17%
Pas clair	7	2,99%	2,72%
Non-concerné	12	5,13%	4,67%

Formulaire de recherche			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	50	21,37%	19,46%
Clair	120	51,28%	46,69%
Peu clair	20	8,55%	7,78%
Pas clair	11	4,70%	4,28%
Non-concerné	33	14,10%	12,84%

Statistiques			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	32	13,68%	12,45%
Clair	100	42,74%	38,91%
Peu clair	35	14,96%	13,62%
Pas clair	12	5,13%	4,67%
Non-concerné	55	23,50%	21,40%

LA QUALITÉ DES INFORMATIONS SUIVANTES RELATIVES A LA DOCUMENTATION FOURNIE LORS DE L'INSCRIPTION AU REGISTRE D

Orientations			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	35	14,96%	13,62%
Clair	145	61,97%	56,42%
Peu clair	25	10,68%	9,73%
Pas clair	9	3,85%	3,50%
Non-concerné	20	8,55%	7,78%

Questions fréquentes			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	29	12,39%	11,28%
Clair	146	62,39%	56,81%
Peu clair	26	11,11%	10,12%
Pas clair	2	0,85%	0,78%
Non-concerné	31	13,25%	12,06%

Formulaire d'inscription			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	51	21,79%	19,84%
Clair	141	60,26%	54,86%
Peu clair	22	9,40%	8,56%
Pas clair	0	0,00%	0,00%
Non-concerné	20	8,55%	7,78%

Code de conduite			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)

Très clair	59	25,21%	22,96%
Clair	139	59,40%	54,09%
Peu clair	16	6,84%	6,23%
Pas clair	2	0,85%	0,78%
Non-concerné	18	7,69%	7,00%

Mécanisme des plaintes et sanctions			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	33	14,10%	12,84%
Clair	115	49,15%	44,75%
Peu clair	26	11,11%	10,12%
Pas clair	12	5,13%	4,67%
Non-concerné	48	20,51%	18,68%

LORS DE VOTRE INSCRIPTION, AVEZ-VOUS RENCONTRE DES DIFFICULTES POUR COMPLETER LES CHAMPS SUIVANTS :			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Choix de la catégorie d'activité	21	8,97%	8,17%
Nombre de personnes participant aux activités qui relèvent du champ d'application du registre de transparence	48	20,51%	18,68%
Activités	8	3,42%	3,11%
Données financières	67	28,63%	26,07%
Structure (uniquement pour catégories III et suivantes)	4	1,71%	1,56%
Autre(s) commentaire(s) :	18	7,69%	7,00%

Si oui, veuillez préciser :			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(67)	% of total number records(234)
Catégorie I - Chiffre d'affaire lié aux activités de représentations d'intérêts	9	13,43%	3,85%
Catégorie I - Déclaration de la part relative de chaque client dans ce chiffre d'affaire	0	0,00%	0,00%
Catégorie I ou II - Montant et source des financements reçus des institutions de l'Union (marchés et subventions)	6	8,96%	2,56%
Catégorie II - Estimation des coûts liés aux activités de représentation d'intérêts	33	49,25%	14,10%
Catégorie III - Budget global de votre organisme ainsi que sa ventilation entre ses principales sources de financement	8	11,94%	3,42%
Catégorie III - Estimation des coûts liés aux activités de représentation d'intérêts	11	16,42%	4,70%

AVEZ-VOUS EU RECOURS AU HELPDESK (PAR TELEPHONE OU PAR EMAIL) ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Oui	71	30,34%	27,63%
Non	163	69,66%	63,42%

Si oui, avez-vous été satisfaits des réponses données ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(71)	% of total number records(234)
Oui	60	84,51%	25,64%
Non	11	15,49%	4,70%

AVEZ-VOUS INTRODUIT UNE OU PLUSIEURS DEMANDES D'ACCREDITATION POUR L'ACCES AU PARLEMENT EUROPEEN ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Oui	138	58,97%	53,70%
Non	96	41,03%	37,35%

Si oui, avez-vous utilisé le formulaire en ligne ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(138)	% of total number records(234)
Oui	76	55,07%	32,48%
Non	62	44,93%	26,50%

Si oui, avez-vous été satisfaits par la gestion de votre demande ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(76)	% of total number records(234)
Oui	59	77,63%	25,21%

Non	17	22,37%	7,26%
-----	----	--------	-------

ALUER LA QUALITE DES INFORMATIONS SUIVANTES RELATIVES AUX DEMANDES D'ACCREDITATIONS POUR L'ACCES AU PARLEMENT

"Comment demander une accréditation pour l'accès au Parlement européen ?"			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	21	8,97%	8,17%
Clair	105	44,87%	40,86%
Peu clair	41	17,52%	15,95%
Pas clair	17	7,26%	6,61%
Non-concerné	50	21,37%	19,46%

Formulaire de demande d'accréditation pour l'accès au Parlement européen			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Très clair	18	7,69%	7,00%
Clair	113	48,29%	43,97%
Peu clair	35	14,96%	13,62%
Pas clair	16	6,84%	6,23%
Non-concerné	52	22,22%	20,23%

SOUHAITERIEZ-VOUS QUE LE REGISTRE DE TRANSPARENCE EXIGE D'AUTRES INFORMATIONS RELATIVES AU DECLARANT QUE CELLES DEJA DEMANDEES ?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(234)	% of total number records(257)
Oui	37	15,81%	14,40%
Non	197	84,19%	76,65%

CONFIDENTIALITÉ

Les contributions reçues, ainsi que l'identité du contributeur seront publiées sur internet, à moins que le contributeur ne s'oppose à la publication des données personnelles au motif que cette publication porterait atteinte à ses intérêts légitimes. Dans ce cas, la contribution peut être publiée			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records(257)	% of total number records(257)
Oui	159	61,87%	61,87%
Oui, mais anonyme	91	35,41%	35,41%
Non	7	2,72%	2,72%