



2015/2052(INI)

5.6.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 25

Draft opinion
Janusz Lewandowski
(PE554.917v01-00)

The European Structural and Investment Funds and sound economic
governance: guidelines for the implementation of Article 23 of the Common
Provisions Regulation
(COM(2014)0494 – 2015/2052(INI))

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Welcomes the clarification of the application of specific provisions of paragraphs 1 and 6 of Article 23 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013;*

Amendment

1. *Expresses concerns that the Commission's guidelines about the application of macro-economic conditionality to the provision of ESI funding is incompatible with the aims of cohesion policy, as it may unreasonably impair its effectiveness;*

Or. en

Amendment 2
Isabelle Thomas, Jean-Paul Denanot, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Welcomes the clarification of the application of specific provisions of paragraphs 1 and 6 of Article 23 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013;*

Amendment

1. *Notes the clarifications regarding the application of specific provisions of paragraphs 1 and 6 of Article 23 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013;*

Or. fr

Amendment 3
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. *Agrees that a stable macroeconomic*

Amendment

2. *Believes that a sanctions-based system*

environment, including high-quality governance at all levels, is conducive to the successful implementation of the ESI Funds;

will very unlikely increase the level of compliance of Member States with the economic governance framework; highlights that, on the contrary, a Member State that is unable to meet its fiscal obligations has an even stronger need for ESIF support in the interest of its regions and citizens; warns that suspending this form of funding under macro-economic conditionality will unfairly affect the provision of public services at the local and regional level, which has no direct responsibility in the implementation of the country's specific recommendations;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Agrees that a stable macroeconomic environment, including high-quality governance at all levels, is conducive to the successful implementation of the ESI Funds;

Amendment

2. Agrees that a stable macroeconomic environment, including high-quality governance at all levels, is conducive to the successful implementation of the ESI Funds; *considers in addition that overlong and badly managed time lags between commitments and payments under the European budget could discourage project leaders; points to the importance of cohesion policy instruments and resources in maintaining the level of European added-value investment in Member States and regions, especially those with natural handicaps;*

Or. fr

Amendment 5
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Agrees that a stable macroeconomic environment, including high-quality governance at all levels, is conducive to the successful implementation of the ESI Funds;

Amendment

2. Agrees that a stable macroeconomic environment, including high-quality governance at all levels, is conducive to the successful implementation of the ***EFSI*** funds ***in line with European principles and values regarding social and environmental standards and territorial cohesion***;

Or. ro

Amendment 6
Isabelle Thomas, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that objective criteria must be used for assessing what constitutes ‘effective action’ on the part of a Member State; underlines the importance of respecting the principles of proportionality and equality of treatment when applying the provisions of Article 23, as well as the need for a timely and comprehensive dialogue with the Member State concerned;

Amendment

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 7
Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that objective criteria must be used for assessing what constitutes 'effective action' on the part of a Member State; underlines the importance of respecting the principles of proportionality and equality of treatment when applying the provisions of Article 23, as well as the need for a timely and comprehensive dialogue with the Member State concerned;

Amendment

3. Recalls that the EU payments under ESIF programmes are based on specific eligibility criteria linked to the level of development of EU regions; believes therefore that decisions regarding reprogramming or suspension of payments based on other criteria related to deficit and debt levels contradict the principles of proportionality and equal treatment as well as the rationale behind these funds;

Or. en

**Amendment 8
Victor Negrescu**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that objective criteria must be used for assessing what constitutes 'effective action' on the part of a Member State; underlines the importance of respecting the principles of proportionality and equality of treatment when applying the provisions of Article 23, as well as the need for a timely and comprehensive dialogue with the Member State concerned;

Amendment

3. Stresses that objective criteria must be used for assessing what constitutes 'effective action' on the part of a Member State; underlines the importance of respecting ***European principles and values regarding social and environmental standards and territorial cohesion, as well*** as the principles of proportionality and equality of treatment when applying the provisions of Article 23, as well as the need for a timely and comprehensive dialogue with the Member State concerned;

Or. ro

**Amendment 9
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 4**

Draft opinion

4. Recalls that the *National Reform Programmes (NRPs)* are instrumental for delivering on the Europe 2020 Strategy at Member State level and that they should be taken into account before requesting a Member State to review and amend its Partnership Agreement and relevant programmes;

Amendment

4. Recalls that the *frequent budgetary cuts decided by Member States in a context of widespread fiscal consolidation have significantly impaired the capability of local and regional authorities to autonomously provide basic public services and have led to a drop in public investment at the subnational level; believes that making the provision of ESI funding conditional on Member States' compliance with the rules of the Stability and Growth Pact will inevitably result in imposing an additional penalty on regional authorities and EU citizens, which have already been largely affected by the austerity measures adopted at the central level;*

Or. en

Amendment 10
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls that the National Reform Programmes (NRPs) are instrumental for delivering on the Europe 2020 Strategy *at Member State level and that they should be taken into account before requesting a Member State to review and amend its Partnership Agreement and relevant programmes;*

Amendment

4. Recalls that the National Reform Programmes (NRPs) are instrumental for delivering on the Europe 2020 Strategy; *points out that it is up to Member States and regions to choose their thematic objectives according to their needs and their smart strategy;*

Or. fr

Amendment 11
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Recalls that the National Reform Programmes (NRPs) are instrumental for delivering on the Europe 2020 Strategy at Member State level and that they should be taken into account before requesting a **Member State** to review and amend its Partnership Agreement and relevant programmes;

Amendment

4. Recalls that the National Reform Programmes (NRPs) are instrumental for delivering on the Europe 2020 Strategy at Member State level and that they should be taken into account before requesting a **community partner** to review and amend its Partnership Agreement and relevant programmes;;

Or. it

Amendment 12
Isabelle Thomas, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Considers that reprogramming is anything but easy and quick to do and that it would be very expensive and difficult to manage for national administrations and local and regional authorities, judging from the experience of the past five years as described in the Sixth Report on cohesion, which refers to the substantial outlay of human resources entailed for the eight Member States concerned and for the Commission;

Or. fr

Amendment 13
Isabelle Thomas, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Considers that the two-month time-frame allowed for Member States to submit their reprogramming proposals will rule out the necessary involvement of regional authorities and the partners specified in Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013; believes, therefore, that a reprogramming procedure would amount to recentralisation of cohesion policy, returning it to central government control and to that extent negating not only the decisions taken by some Member States to regionalise ESI Fund management, but also the subsidiarity and partnership principles at the heart of cohesion policy;

Or. fr

Amendment 14

Isabelle Thomas, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4c. Thinks it highly unlikely that partnership agreements and operational programmes will need to be reprogrammed before 2019, given that they have just been adopted in agreement with the Commission according to the letter and the spirit of the EU 2020 strategy; believes that any decision entailing reprogramming, which would be burdensome and costly from the administrative point of view, would indirectly call into question the quality of the work done by the Commission departments responsible for the relevant policy;

Or. fr

Amendment 15
Isabelle Thomas, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4d. Points out that the regions, on average, implement a third of public spending in the EU and play a key role in providing public services and expenditure leading to growth; considers it particularly counter-productive to suspend payments to Member States whose finances are already in deficit; believes that such a measure would only worsen the economic situation in those countries and cause macroeconomic instability within the wider area;

Or. fr

Amendment 16
Isabelle Thomas, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4e. Maintains that if the EU were to suspend payments to Member States already facing economic difficulties, its image would be further marred;

Or. fr

Amendment 17
Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls on the Commission to use the procedure under the first strand of Article 23 as a last resort and only in exceptional situations where the benefits of the proposed changes clearly outweigh their costs;

Amendment

5. Stresses that using ESI funds as a threat to achieve a better enforcement of the economic governance framework by Member States may unreasonably jeopardise the achievement of the EU goals for regional development and social cohesion, especially in times of economic crisis; believes that the decisions regarding reprogramming or suspension of ESI funds may worsen the economic and social situation in those countries who are already facing difficulties, by hindering the capability of the local and regional authorities to provide public services and raise investment for jobs and growth;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls on the Commission to use the procedure under the first strand of Article 23 as a last resort and only in exceptional situations where the benefits of the proposed changes clearly outweigh their costs;

Amendment

5. Calls on the Commission to use the procedure under the first strand of Article 23 as a last resort and only in exceptional situations where the benefits of the proposed changes clearly outweigh their costs **and solely for the purpose of targeting the implementation of ESI funding to more useful effect;**

Or. fr

Amendment 19
Isabelle Thomas, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls on the Commission to use the procedure under the first strand of Article 23 as a last resort and only in exceptional situations where the benefits of the proposed changes clearly outweigh their costs;

Amendment

5. Calls on the Commission to use the procedure under the first strand of Article 23 as a last resort and only in exceptional situations where the benefits of the proposed changes clearly outweigh their costs; ***considers that support measures and measures enabling regions to invest, as proposed in Article 24 of the regulation, are more credible and effective ways to bring about a return to growth in Member States experiencing economic difficulties;***

Or. fr

Amendment 20
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Warns, in particular, that any suspension of payment appropriations could disrupt financial planning at programme level and, more generally, undermine the predictability and planning of investments, with a potentially greater impact on economically vulnerable Member States, whose public investment relies more heavily on ESI funding;

Amendment

6. Maintains that the suspension of payments severely penalises initiators of projects as well as Member States as such; warns, in particular, that any suspension of payment appropriations could disrupt financial planning at programme level and, more generally, undermine the predictability and planning of investments, with a potentially greater impact on economically vulnerable Member States, whose public investment relies more heavily on ESI funding;

Or. fr

Amendment 21
Isabelle Thomas, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Warns, in particular, that any suspension of payment appropriations could disrupt financial planning at programme level and, more generally, undermine the predictability and planning of investments, with a potentially greater impact on economically vulnerable Member States, whose public investment relies more heavily on ESI funding;

Amendment

6. Warns, in particular, that any suspension of payment appropriations could disrupt financial planning at programme level and, more generally, undermine the predictability and planning of investments, with a potentially greater impact on economically vulnerable Member States, whose public investment relies more heavily on ESI funding; ***believes, as a matter of principle, that when the Member States concerned are economically vulnerable, suspension of payments should not be enforced;***

Or. fr

Amendment 22
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Warns, in particular, that any suspension of payment appropriations could disrupt financial planning at programme level and, more generally, undermine the predictability and planning of investments, with a potentially greater impact on economically vulnerable Member States, whose public investment relies more heavily on ESI funding;

Amendment

6. Warns, in particular, that any suspension of payment appropriations could ***substantially*** disrupt financial planning at programme level and, more generally, undermine the predictability and planning of investments, with a potentially greater impact on economically vulnerable Member States, whose public investment relies more heavily on ESI funding;

Or. it

Amendment 23
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Insists on the need to keep ESI funding clearly separated from the economic governance framework; stresses that local and regional authorities shall not be punished for the mistakes made at the national level of administration;

Or. en

Amendment 24
Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Considers it regrettable that Parliament is not involved in the decision-making process regarding the reprogramming or suspension of funds; ***requests that the budgetary aspects of any reprogramming and suspension cases be also part of the structured dialogue with the Commission on the application of Article 23 and that this dialogue take place before the Commission adopts a proposal to suspend funding;***

Amendment

7. Considers it regrettable that Parliament is not involved in the decision-making process regarding the reprogramming or suspension of funds; ***calls on the Commission to urgently reconsider the proposal to link the effectiveness of ESI Funds to sound economic governance under Article 23 CPR, in light of the negative impact that these sanctions may have on the investment and cohesion policies goals;***

Or. en

Amendment 25
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8d. Recalls the need to preserve social and

environmental standards, to support cohesion and development across the Union and to carry out an assessment of compliance with its political goals and values and with social and environmental standards.

Or. ro