

Subject: FW: Bruegel's entry in the Transparency Register

From: [REDACTED]@bruegel.org>

Date: 22/04/16 16:54

To: marijke@corporateeurope.org

Dear Ms Vermander,

I think we have made an error in distinguishing between costs related to “direct lobbying” and costs relating to “activities covered by the register”. We have very few direct costs related to direct lobbying/advocacy, but given our mission, you are correct in pointing out that costs relating to activities covered by the register should be higher. We have corrected this on the register, and we will make a full update to our entry with the figures for 2015 after our accounts have been approved by our General Assembly next week.

I would like to take the opportunity to point out our commitment to transparency, (noted by <http://www.transparify.org/>, also funded by Open Society) as well as all the information covered in our annual report (<http://bruegel.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/2014-Annual-Report-English.pdf>) – all our activities, all funding sources, and spending lines. We are also bound by rules on research integrity (http://bruegel.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Bruegel_INTEGRITY_Statement.pdf) and publish declarations of outside interests for scholars who write for Bruegel as well as for the management team. Bruegel has a number of governance measures in place to limit the influence of funders from the output of scholars, and I invite you to examine them in the statute (http://bruegel.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Statute_Updated_November_2010.pdf) and bylaws (http://bruegel.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Bylaws_EN_UPDATED_NOV_2010.pdf). I think it’s also important to point out that Bruegel takes no institutional standpoint and Bruegel’s board has no responsibility for the editorial content of publications. Members are also excluded from trying to influence the results of research carried out at Bruegel or trying to obstruct its dissemination (Statute, Article 3, paragraph 5). The Annual Report for 2015, including detailed financial statements, will be published next week after approval by the General Assembly. I would be happy to forward you a copy, should you be interested.

We welcome initiatives to improve our transparency and regard as a public good, which we examine regularly. Should you have more questions or observations please don’t hesitate to get in touch.

Kind regards,



www.bruegel.org

Follow us on Twitter [@Bruegel_org](https://twitter.com/Bruegel_org)

FW: Bruegel's entry in the Transparency Register

Bruegel is an independent economic think tank. It seeks to contribute to European and global economic policy-making through open, fact-based and policy-relevant research, analysis and debate. Bruegel's unique governance and funding model is composed of [memberships](#) from EU governments, leading international corporations and institutions.

From: [REDACTED]@bruegel.org]
Sent: 22 April 2016 15:21
To: [REDACTED]@bruegel.org>
Subject: Fwd: Bruegel's entry in the Transparency Register

Dear [REDACTED]

can you answer this?

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

www.bruegel.org

Follow us on Twitter [@Bruegel_org](https://twitter.com/Bruegel_org)

Bruegel is an independent economic think tank. It contributes to European and global economic policy-making through open, fact-based and policy-relevant research, analysis and debate. [Membership](#) is composed of EU governments, leading international corporations and institutions.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Marijke <marijke@corporateeurope.org>
Date: 22 April 2016 at 15:19
Subject: Bruegel's entry in the Transparency Register
To: [REDACTED]@bruegel.org

Dear [REDACTED],

I am currently working on an article on think tanks, for which I am looking at various entries in the Transparency Register. I was wondering if you could pass on this question to the person responsible for Bruegel's entry? Thank you very much.

Dear Sir or Madam,

For an article on think tanks I am working on at the moment, I took a look at Bruegel's entry in the EU Transparency Register. I noticed that your institution has indicated to estimate its costs related to activities covered by the register for the year 2014 to be less than €9,999.

We see Bruegel has had at least 16 meetings with commission officials since December 2014 and in the Register entry you have indicated 18,8 Full Time Equivalent persons within your institution are involved in the activities covered by the Register.

On your website, one can read the following: "Bruegel's mission is to **improve the quality of economic policy** with open and fact-based research, analysis and debate. (...) Through a dual focus on analysis and impact, and dynamic **relationships with policymakers at every governance level**, it has also established itself as a vibrant laboratory for economic policies."

Activities covered by the Register, as can be read [here](#), include "lobbying, interest representation and advocacy. It covers **all** activities designed to influence - **directly or indirectly** - policymaking, policy implementation and decision-making in the EU institutions (...)".

Judging from the statement on your website and other indications, your activities seem to fall under this definition.

In the Register's [Guidelines](#) it is stated that costs attributable to activities covered by the Register cover direct and indirect lobbying. To calculate your total costs you would typically add up the following elements: staff costs, office and administrative expenses, in-house operational expenditure, representation costs, outsourced activity costs, membership and related fees and other relevant costs.

So we were wondering if could you explain why your institution declares its annual costs related to activities covered by the register to be below €9,999?

I kindly ask you to provide us with an answer within one week, as the article's drafting phase is coming to an end.

Thank you very much in advance.

Kind regards,

Marijke Vermander
Corporate Europe Observatory