



**2016/2045(INI)**

13.7.2016

# **AMENDMENTS**

## **1 - 26**

**Draft opinion**  
**Lefteris Christoforou**  
(PE585.432v01-00)

The European Union Solidarity Fund: an assessment  
(COM(2015)0502 – 2016/2045(INI))

AM\_Com\_NonLegOpinion

**Amendment 1**  
**Notis Marias**

**Draft opinion**  
**Recital A**

*Draft opinion*

A. whereas since its creation in 2002 the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) has responded to 69 disasters across Europe; whereas 24 countries have been assisted, receiving disaster relief funds amounting to a total of EUR 3.7 billion;

*Amendment*

A. whereas since its creation in 2002 the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) has responded to 69 disasters across Europe; whereas 24 countries have been assisted, receiving disaster relief funds amounting to a total of EUR 3.7 billion ***and the Fund will be required to contribute still more to the repair of public infrastructures and to compensation for those affected by natural disasters;***

Or. el

**Amendment 2**  
**Enrico Gasbarra**

**Draft opinion**  
**Recital A**

*Draft opinion*

A. whereas since its creation in 2002 the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) has responded to 69 disasters across Europe: whereas 24 countries have been assisted, receiving disaster relief funds amounting to a total of EUR 3.7 billion;

*Amendment*

A. whereas since its creation in 2002 the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) ***has served a very useful purpose and*** has responded to 69 disasters across Europe; whereas 24 countries have been assisted, receiving disaster relief funds amounting to a total of EUR 3.7 billion;

Or. it

**Amendment 3**  
**Victor Negrescu**

**Draft opinion**  
**Recital A**

*Draft opinion*

A. whereas since its creation in 2002 the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) has responded to 69 disasters across Europe; whereas 24 countries have been assisted, receiving disaster relief funds amounting to a total of EUR 3.7 billion;

*Amendment*

A. whereas since its creation in 2002 the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) has responded to 69 disasters across Europe; whereas 24 countries ***of the 28 Member States*** have been assisted, receiving disaster relief funds amounting to a total of EUR 3.7 billion;

Or. en

**Amendment 4**  
**Enrico Gasbarra**

**Draft opinion**  
**Recital B**

*Draft opinion*

B. whereas the 2014 revision of Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 establishing the EU Solidarity Fund improves and simplifies the procedures; whereas the deadline for the request for aid has been extended, advance payments have been introduced and certain provisions have been made clearer;

*Amendment*

B. whereas the 2014 revision of Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 establishing the EU Solidarity Fund improves and simplifies the procedures; whereas the deadline for the request for aid has been extended, advance payments have been introduced and certain provisions have been made clearer, ***in line with the numerous requests made over the years by the European Parliament and the local authorities***;

Or. it

**Amendment 5**  
**Victor Negrescu**

**Draft opinion**  
**Recital B**

*Draft opinion*

B. whereas the 2014 revision of Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 establishing the EU Solidarity Fund improves and simplifies the procedures; whereas the deadline for the request for aid has been extended, advance payments have been introduced and certain provisions have been made clearer;

*Amendment*

B. whereas the 2014 revision of Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 establishing the EU Solidarity Fund improves and simplifies the procedures; whereas the deadline for the request for aid has been extended, ***leaving the Member States to use the contribution within 18 months from the disbursement***, advance payments have been introduced and certain provisions have been made clearer;

Or. en

**Amendment 6**  
**Notis Marias**

**Draft opinion**  
**Recital C**

*Draft opinion*

***C. whereas until the revision almost all the rejections concerned regional disasters, while the new regulation clarifies rules on eligibility with one single criterion for regional disasters based on a threshold of 1.5 % of regional gross domestic product set at NUTS 2 level;***

*Amendment*

***deleted***

Or. el

**Amendment 7**  
**Victor Negrescu**

**Draft opinion**  
**Recital C**

*Draft opinion*

C. whereas until the revision almost all the rejections concerned regional disasters,

*Amendment*

C. whereas until the revision almost all the rejections concerned regional disasters,

while the new regulation clarifies rules on eligibility with one single criterion for regional disasters based on a threshold of 1.5 % of regional gross domestic product set at NUTS 2 level;

while the new regulation clarifies rules on eligibility with one single criterion for regional disasters based on a threshold of 1.5 % of regional gross domestic product ***or 1% for outermost regions*** set at NUTS 2 level;

Or. en

## **Amendment 8** **Victor Negrescu**

### **Draft opinion** **Recital D**

#### *Draft opinion*

D. whereas under the provisions of the revised EUSF Regulation the Commission received seven new applications in 2014 and three applications in 2015;

#### *Amendment*

D. whereas under the provisions of the revised EUSF Regulation the Commission received seven new applications in 2014 and three applications in 2015, ***compared to eight in 2013 which represents also the yearly average of applications per year;***

Or. en

## **Amendment 9** **Enrico Gasbarra**

### **Draft opinion** **Recital E**

#### *Draft opinion*

E. whereas the EUSF already existed in the previous programming period of the MFF Regulation, while its annual appropriations have decreased compared with the past; whereas in order to compensate for such a decrease (justified by the overall level of implementation) a carry-over of one year (N+1) has been introduced in the new regulation;

#### *Amendment*

E. whereas the EUSF already existed in the previous programming period of the MFF Regulation, while its annual appropriations have decreased compared with the past; whereas in order to compensate for such a decrease (justified by the overall level of implementation) a carry-over of one year (N+1) has been introduced in the new regulation; ***regards this decrease as a further demonstration of failure to understand the strategic***

*value of the EU budget, which can play a crucial role in response to risks and emergencies;*

Or. it

## **Amendment 10**

**Notis Marias**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Recital E**

##### *Draft opinion*

E. whereas the EUSF already existed in the previous programming period of the MFF Regulation, while its annual appropriations have decreased compared with the past; whereas in order to compensate for such a decrease (*justified by the overall level of implementation*) a carry-over of one year (N+1) has been introduced in the new regulation;

##### *Amendment*

E. whereas the EUSF already existed in the previous programming period of the MFF Regulation, while its annual appropriations have decreased compared with the past; whereas in order to compensate for such a decrease (justified by the overall level of implementation) a carry-over of one year (N+1) has been introduced in the new regulation;

Or. el

## **Amendment 11**

**Victor Negrescu**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Recital F**

##### *Draft opinion*

F. whereas exceptionally, in case of insufficient funds available in a given year, the following year's funds may already be used;

##### *Amendment*

F. whereas exceptionally, in case of insufficient funds available in a given year, the following year's funds may already be used *taking into consideration the annual budgetary ceiling of the fund for both the year when the disaster occurred and for the next year as well*;

Or. en

**Amendment 12**  
**Notis Marias**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

**1.** *Points out that use of the yearly threshold proves that the annual level of appropriations, after the new MFF programming period, is adequate;*

*Amendment*

*deleted*

Or. el

**Amendment 13**  
**Enrico Gasbarra**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**1a.** *Points out that, as far as the public is concerned, the European Union Solidarity Fund is one of the most concrete and tangible manifestations of the support that Europe can give to local communities;*

Or. it

**Amendment 14**  
**Victor Negrescu**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2**

*Draft opinion*

**2.** Welcomes in the new regulation the possibility of making advance payments of up to 10 % of the likely amount of aid, capped at EUR 30 million; considers, however, that the time taken between the application and payment is rather long;

*Amendment*

**2.** Welcomes in the new regulation the possibility of making advance payments of up to 10 % of the likely amount of aid, capped at EUR 30 million; considers, however, that the time taken between the application and payment is rather long;



recommends further improvements in the assessment phase and subsequent phases facilitating the execution of payments;

recommends further improvements in the assessment phase and subsequent phases facilitating the execution of payments;  
***recommends establishing a legal framework defining the length of the evaluation period;***

Or. en

**Amendment 15**  
**Notis Marias**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2**

*Draft opinion*

2. Welcomes in the new regulation the possibility of making advance payments of up to 10 % of the likely amount of aid, capped at EUR 30 million; ***considers***, however, that the time taken between the application and payment is rather long; recommends further improvements in the assessment phase and subsequent phases facilitating the execution of payments;

*Amendment*

2. Welcomes in the new regulation the possibility of making advance payments of up to 10 % of the likely amount of aid, capped at EUR 30 million; ***deplores***, however, ***the fact*** that the time taken between the application and payment is rather long; recommends further improvements in the assessment phase and subsequent phases facilitating the execution of payments;

Or. el

**Amendment 16**  
**Helga Trüpel, Ernest Maragall**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2**

*Draft opinion*

2. ***Welcomes in*** the new regulation the possibility of making advance payments of up to 10 % of the likely amount of aid, capped at EUR 30 million; considers, however, that the time taken between the application and payment is rather long; recommends further improvements in the

*Amendment*

2. ***Notes that*** the new regulation the possibility of making advance payments of up to 10 % of the likely amount of aid, capped at EUR 30 million; considers, however, that the time taken between the application and payment is rather long; recommends further improvements in the

assessment phase and subsequent phases  
facilitating the execution of payments;

assessment phase and subsequent phases  
facilitating the execution of payments;

Or. en

**Amendment 17**  
**Georgios Kyrtos**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Stresses that, contrary to Article 8(1) and (3) of the EUSF Regulation, the closing procedure for assistance from the fund appears to be remarkably long in some cases: in 2014 the Commission was still closing files from 2005, 2007 and 2010;

*Amendment*

3. Stresses that, contrary to Article 8(1) and (3) of the EUSF Regulation, the closing procedure for assistance from the fund appears to be remarkably long in some cases: in 2014 the Commission was still closing files from 2005, 2007 and 2010; ***underlines, therefore, the need to expedite procedures, given that the timely receipt of all aid requested and approved is of utmost importance;***

Or. el

**Amendment 18**  
**Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Nedzhmi Ali**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. ***Stresses*** that, contrary to Article 8(1) and (3) of the EUSF Regulation, the closing procedure for assistance from the fund ***appears to be*** remarkably long in some cases: in 2014 the Commission was still closing files from 2005, 2007 and 2010;

*Amendment*

3. ***Regrets*** that, contrary to Article 8(1) and (3) of the EUSF Regulation, the closing procedure for assistance from the fund ***is*** remarkably long in some cases: in 2014 the Commission was still closing files from 2005, 2007 and 2010;

Or. en

**Amendment 19**  
**Victor Negrescu**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4**

*Draft opinion*

4. Calls for clear criteria concerning the monitoring visit to the beneficiary states to evaluate the implementation system put in place;

*Amendment*

4. Calls for clear criteria concerning the monitoring visit to the beneficiary states to evaluate the implementation system put in place, *as well as monitoring of proper use of resources*;

Or. en

**Amendment 20**  
**Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Nedzhmi Ali**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**4a. For the sake of facilitating transparent use of funds, calls for a ECA special report on the functioning of the EUSF, especially as the latest report available is from the time before revised EUSF regulation; calls in particular for a study on the possible overlaps in the use of EUSF funds with structural funds and with national schemes;**

Or. en

**Amendment 21**  
**Victor Negrescu**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5**

*Draft opinion*

5. Points out that, despite built-in

*Amendment*

5. Points out that, despite built-in

flexibility (carry-over N+1), substantial funds are at risk of going unused each year; further proposes reflecting on how to limit the non-use of these amounts in the future, taking full account of the inherently variable nature of the subject matter (dependent on the fluctuating number of applications received and/or the financial needs in any given year).

flexibility (carry-over N+1), substantial funds are at risk of going unused each year; further proposes reflecting on how to limit the non-use of these amounts in the future, taking full account of the inherently variable nature of the subject matter (dependent on the fluctuating number of applications received and/or the financial needs in any given year); ***evaluate the possibility of supplying unused funds for ex-ante and ex-post activities and actions in areas affected by disasters.***

Or. en

**Amendment 22**  
**Lefteris Christoforou**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***5a. Calls for the threshold to be revised at 0.1% of the countries' GNI.***

Or. en

**Amendment 23**  
**Notis Marias**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***5a. Expresses its profound disagreement at the large number of claims rejected, principally owing to the introduction of an excessive damage threshold of 1.5% of regional GDP at NUTS 2 level, and calls for this threshold to be reduced to 0.5 %;***

Or. el

**Amendment 24**

**Monika Vana**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***5a. Welcomes that provisions have been introduced in 2014 to strengthen prevention of natural disasters; reminds that the number of extreme weathers leading to natural disasters has increased as a consequence of climate changes; underlines therefore, that efforts must be stepped-up to invest in climate mitigation and adaptation, while giving priority on preventive measures when supporting reconstruction and reforestation under the EUSF;***

Or. en

**Amendment 25**

**Monika Vana**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 5 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***5b. Recalls and regrets the game of Council in 2014, insisting on shifting EUSF payments to the 2015 budget, while DAB 3 2015 showed that payments could have been easily made from the 2014 budget. In this light regrets that Council has a tendency not to honour EUSF commitments, and prefers to take money away from other programmes rather than mobilising - as foreseen- additional resources by the special instruments. Insists that such shifting of payments should be prevented in the future.***

**Amendment 26**  
**Notis Marias**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***5b. Calls on the EU Solidarity Fund to take immediate measures to ensure full compensation for damage caused by severe weather conditions in Greece during the period 2014-2016;***

Or. el