

**Non-paper submitted by Germany, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Spain
on implementing the proposals of the Plenary of the
“Conference on the Future of Europe”**

The Conference on the Future of Europe is a special opportunity to further develop the EU at this time of epic challenges and fundamental change. Innovative dialogue formats have enabled citizens of different backgrounds from all across Europe to formulate specific ideas on how to further develop the EU.

The closing phase of the Conference on the Future of Europe is taking place at a time of massive upheaval. In the light of the Russian war of aggression, Europe’s entire security architecture is being called into question. Our values of democracy, freedom and self-determination and the rules-based international community championed by us and our partners are under severe threat. Our actions are focusing on supporting Ukraine as it stands up to Russia. Yet at the same time we must not lose sight of the goal of increasing Europe’s ability to act, strengthening its shared foundation of values, as well as making it more democratic, social and citizen-oriented. The Conference on the Future of Europe has drawn up many proposals here.

But the presentation of the final report on 9 May 2022 does not signal the end of the Conference on the Future of Europe. Quite the opposite. Now the institutions have the responsibility to examine with an open mind which proposals they can translate into concrete decisions and how. We advocate an ambitious and timely debate on implementation which should be held in a structured way in the relevant Council formations; the General Affairs Council is to take on a horizontal function here. The current Trio Presidency should firmly anchor this work in the Council in the calendar.

Differentiation should be made between proposals aiming to generate improvements in individual policy fields and those targeting long-term institutional reform. Furthermore, it must be considered which proposals are already being implemented, which can be implemented quickly within the framework of existing treaties and which would require treaty changes. We would ask the Commission to categorise the proposals in accordance. We remain in principle open to necessary treaty changes that are jointly defined.

An ad hoc working group could be set up in the Council to discuss and examine institutional proposals. An interinstitutional process could coordinate consensus-building in the Council, EP and Commission.

For us, it is crucial that we show the citizens involved that their specific proposals are being taken up, examined and, provided they are possible and can command a majority, quickly implemented.

In our view, it is furthermore essential for the EU’s citizens to remain closely involved in this process and to receive feedback on how their proposals are being implemented. We therefore propose that the stakeholders represented at the Conference Plenary meet once more after a year to report back to the citizens on progress made on implementing the Conference outcomes.