

**CERCLE II**

**Working document 06**

**"Discussion circle" on budgetary procedure**

**Subject: Answers from M. Sören Lekberg, Member of the Convention, to the questions put to "discussion circle" on the budgetary procedure**

Members of the "Discussion circle" on the budgetary procedure will find hereafter a paper from M. Sören Lekberg, Member of the Convention.

---

**Answers from Sören Lekberg to the questions put to the “discussion circle” on the budgetary procedure.**

1. I would prefer if the term ”financial perspective” could be changed to ”multi-annual budget ceiling”. This would facilitate understanding by more clearly indicating what it is really about.
2. No figures should be in the Constitutional Treaty. That would hinder flexibility and require amendments of the Treaty each time a new financial perspective is adopted or the current one is changed. Above all this would not fit in a constitutional text.
3. The numbers or names of the categories should not be established in the Constitutional Treaty. Flexibility is needed here (same argument as in item 2).
4. Not relevant because of 3.
5. The financial perspective could be set for a shorter period than today, for example for a five years term. This period does not necessarily have to coincide with the mandate period of the Commission and the Parliament.
6. The financial perspectives should be set unanimously by the Council and after consulting the European Parliament. It should also be stated that the Financial Perspective must be respected when budgetary decisions are taken in the annual budgetary procedures or elsewhere. If there is no agreement on a new Financial Perspective, the existing ceilings should be carried forward.

Sören Lekberg