

METHODOLOGY

PERCEIVED CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST ANALYSIS OF GREEN DEAL POLICIES

For the purpose of our analysis, we have examined all declarations of financial interests submitted by Members of the European Parliament that held the role of Rapporteur or Shadow Rapporteur in all legislative and non-legislative files related to the Green Deal policy area. This amounts to 35 green deal-related initiatives covering 217 MEPs. The period of our analysis covers June 2019 until October 2023.

We applied the threshold of a perceived conflict of interest to each side activity declared in any of the declarations of interests published since the beginning of the mandate in July 2019. According to Art 3, paragraph 1 of the Code of Conduct for Members of the European Parliament, a conflict of interests is defined as follows:

“A conflict of interest exists where the exercise of the mandate of a Member of the European Parliament in the public interest may be improperly influenced for reasons involving his or her family, emotional life or economic interest, or any other direct or indirect private interest”.

A perceived conflict of interest arises when an outside direct or private interest may be perceived to be able to influence the conduct of a public official.¹ This differs from actual or potential conflicts, where the likelihood of a breach of ethics rules is significantly higher. Nevertheless, perceived conflicts can severely impact citizen trust in the integrity of their decision makers.

MEPs are allowed to perform side activities, provided they declare these activities in declarations made available on their respective home page on the European Parliament website. Side activities with organisations or professions that might be impacted by green deal-related legislation and could therefore potentially influence the MEP in charge have been coded as reaching the threshold of perceived conflict of interest.

Please note: activities flagged as such do not constitute the existence of a conflict of interest as such.

This analysis highlights the inherent risks associated with certain types of activities on part of MEPs. It is up to the MEPs in charge to recuse themselves should they find themselves in a situation of conflict of interest. Some activities such as board memberships, those involving executive authority, those with high incomes or those involving client relationships have an inherent heightened risk.

For questions related to methodology and access to the dataset of collected side activities, as well as general press enquiries, please contact: eupress@transparency.org.

¹ Definition of CoI, Policy Department for Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs, Study on the Effectiveness of CoI policies in EU Member States, page 38:
[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/651697/IPOL_STU\(2020\)651697_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/651697/IPOL_STU(2020)651697_EN.pdf)