



Secretariat of the Transparency Register

Annual priorities for the Transparency Register in 2025

In accordance with points (b) and (c) of Article 7(2) of the [Interinstitutional Agreement](#) (IIA) on a mandatory transparency register, the Management Board (MB) shall determine the annual priorities for the Transparency Register (TR) as well as the budget estimates and share required for the implementation of those priorities, and it shall issue general instructions to the Secretariat.

In 2025, the signatory institutions of the IIA should continue building upon the experience and lessons learned in the implementation of the IIA, with the objective of further increasing the use, visibility and prominence of the TR, as well as the reliability of its content. This is especially relevant in preparation for the review of the IIA which, according to Article 14 thereof, is to take place no later than 2 July 2025.

In its daily management of the TR, the Secretariat should take into account in particular the recommendations of the European Court of Auditors and the suggestions of the European Ombudsman concerning the TR.

1. Streamlining monitoring activities

The Secretariat shall continue to streamline its monitoring activities to ensure high data quality standards of registrations.

It shall in particular aim to allow for all registrations to be checked at regular intervals, such as once every three years following initial validation. In that context, the Secretariat should continue to carry out tailored screenings of the content of the register aided by automated controls and guided by prioritisation criteria such as an assessment of the suspected risks to a proper implementation of institutions' conditionality measures (for example, when receiving information outside a formal complaint on the possible lack of sufficiently declared lobbying activities and/or financial disclosures). The Secretariat shall also continue to engage constructively with applicants and registrants with a view of resolving in a satisfactory manner any data quality issues they may have questions about.

To further facilitate the data quality monitoring and to ensure an efficient documentation trail of its checks, the Secretariat shall continue its work on improving its new TR digital platform and should analyse the potential benefits of using advanced technologies, including artificial intelligence and/or data analysis tools and process optimisation methods. It shall also

explore the possibility to link the TR to financial reporting tools in order to align data reported on EU grants.

2. Improving the public experience of the TR

The Secretariat should explore options for integrating historical information on the TR, including on removed registrations. It should seek to improve communication related to the conditionality and transparency measures of the signatory institutions in order to foster a good understanding of the applicable transparency and behavioral standards expected.

The Secretariat should further continue its efforts to provide regularly updated guidance to registrants to raise awareness of the information requirements. It should also continue to improve the public look and feel of the new TR website by exploring the possibility to provide aggregated information on registrants in interactive dashboards and scoreboards.

3. Improving communication on complaints handling

When carrying out investigations into complaints, the Secretariat shall communicate clearly its investigative powers (and their limits), including how it checks the veracity of the information provided by the registrants concerned, with a view to inviting more meaningful cooperation from registrants and allowing the register to continue to stand up to public scrutiny.

4. Support for the 2025 review of the IIA

The Secretariat shall support the Management Board and the signatory institutions in the review of the IIA.

In particular, the Secretariat could provide assistance and support in the process based on its acquired experience in performing its assigned tasks by carrying out a mapping exercise identifying potential provisions which might require adjustment and including relevant stakeholder input it has received.