



2016/2302(INI)

31.1.2017

AMENDMENTS

1 - 42

Draft opinion
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial
(PE595.760v01-00)

The right funding mix for Europe's regions: balancing financial instruments and grants in EU cohesion policy
(2016/2302(INI))

Amendment 1
Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;*

Amendment

1. *Deplores the uncontrolled proliferation of financial instruments (FIs) which, placed outside the EU budget, evade all forms of democratic scrutiny and lack the necessary transparency, in terms of both reporting and performance; stresses that by preventing the necessary competitiveness adjustments to asymmetric shocks, the euro is the primary cause of the social and economic divergences between Member States; points out that the adoption of socially responsible policies is, first and foremost, up to the Member States, which must be able to invest in the growth of their own economies, in support for their SMEs and in job creation;*

Or. it

Amendment 2
Jan Olbrycht

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;*

Amendment

1. *Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to provide a complementary way of financial support from the EU budget as compared to subsidies and grants with the aim of addressing one or more policy objectives of the Union; notes that in the 2014-2020 programming period the FI support under cohesion policy can be provided for all thematic objectives and all ESI Funds which constitutes an extension of the eligibility compared to the previous*

financial perspective; notes furthermore that the support can take form of tailor-made or off-the-shelf instruments;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Georgios Kyrtos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act *in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market*; insists that the funding *channelled* through the EU-supported FIs *should play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only*;

Amendment

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act *complementarily to grant financing from the EU budget in order to effectively address EU's policy objectives and to act as a catalyst for further investments*; considers that the funding *channeled* through the EU-supported FIs *can help towards the direction of mobilising financing for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market*;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises that the *ultimate* purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs *should* play a social role *and* not be limited to satisfying private interests only;

Amendment

1. Emphasises that the *main* purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs *must* play a social role *in support of the real economy, in accordance with the principles of sound financial management and the*

Europe 2020 strategy, and should not be limited to satisfying private interests only; stresses the importance of an independent ex ante evaluation of the projects to be funded, in order to identify real investment requirements and consequent added value; points out that the use of FIs must not be to the detriment of the normal monitoring procedures provided for when the EU budget is used directly;

Or. it

Amendment 5
Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;

Amendment

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; ***emphasises that FIs do not have the same aims as grant schemes and cannot fund the same investments efficiently***; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;

Or. fr

Amendment 6
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to

AM\1115819EN.docx

Amendment

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to

PE597.736v01-00

5/24

EN

act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;

act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that ***in order to successfully achieve Europe 2020 Strategy objectives*** the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should ***also*** play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;

Or. en

Amendment 7

Isabelle Thomas

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should play a social ***role*** and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;

Amendment

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should play a social ***and/or climate and environmental role***, and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;

Or. fr

Amendment 8

Alfred Sant

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making

Amendment

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making

it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;

it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should ***as a priority*** play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only;

Amendment

1. Emphasises that the ultimate purpose of financial instruments (FIs) is to act in situations of market failure or suboptimal investment as a catalyst making it possible to mobilise funding for projects which cannot secure adequate support from the market; insists that the funding channelled through the EU-supported FIs should play a social role and not be limited to satisfying private interests only, ***especially in the field of financial or non-financial services of general interest; emphasises that grant components are a major asset in encouraging beneficiaries to apply for additional funds from private investors; points out, furthermore, that the performance of FIs cannot be assessed on the basis of an appraisal of their financial impact alone;***

Or. fr

Amendment 10
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(1) *Regrets the fact that local public enterprises are being penalised under the current definition of SMEs at European level, under which they are not guaranteed access to the funding that they need in order to fulfil their general interest tasks;*

Or. fr

Amendment 11
Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. *Notes that FIs, both those subject to shared management and those subject to central management, have hitherto not managed to attract any private capital; calls on the Commission to provide an assessment regarding this shortcoming;*

Or. it

Amendment 12
Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. *Emphasises that the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI) must not substitute the EU's cohesion policy;*

Or. en

Amendment 13

PE597.736v01-00

8/24

AM\1115819EN.docx

Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 b. Believes that the main aim of projects financed under the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI) should be to deliver on the Europe 2020 targets by creating quality jobs, inclusive sustainable real-economy growth and a dynamic labour market in Europe that benefits society as a whole and is sustainable in economic, social and environmental terms, and hence to reduce inequalities and enhance the well-being of everyone;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Notes that, according to estimations, allocations in FIs from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund (CF) and the European Social Fund (ESF) would almost double between 2007-2013, when they amounted to EUR 11.7 billion, and 2014-2020, when they would amount to EUR 20.9 billion; ***notes that the FIs would therefore*** represent 6 % of the overall cohesion policy allocation in 2014-2020, compared with 3.4 % in 2007-2013;

2. Notes that, according to estimations, allocations in FIs from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund (CF) and the European Social Fund (ESF) would almost double between 2007-2013, when they amounted to EUR 11.7 billion, and 2014-2020, when they would amount to EUR 20.9 billion; ***is concerned about the increasing use of FIs which already*** represent 6 % of the overall cohesion policy allocation in 2014-2020, compared with 3.4 % in 2007-2013;

Or. it

Amendment 15

Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that, according to estimations, allocations in FIs from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund (CF) and the European Social Fund (ESF) would almost double between 2007-2013, when they amounted to EUR 11.7 billion, and 2014-2020, when they would amount to EUR 20.9 billion; notes that the FIs would therefore represent 6 % of the overall cohesion policy allocation in 2014-2020, compared with 3.4 % in 2007-2013;

Amendment

2. Notes that, according to estimations, allocations in FIs from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund (CF) and the European Social Fund (ESF) would almost double between 2007-2013, when they amounted to EUR 11.7 billion, and 2014-2020, when they would amount to EUR 20.9 billion; notes that the FIs would therefore represent 6 % of the overall cohesion policy allocation in 2014-2020 ***of 351,8billion***, compared with 3.4 % ***of the allocated 347 billion*** in 2007-2013;

Or. en

Amendment 16

Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. Notes that the allocations from the Cohesion Fund amounts to approximately 75 billion euros, representing 11,8% of the total FI's allocations in the 2014-2020 period; welcomes the allocation increase from 70 billion euros in the 2007-2013 period to 75 billion in the 2014-2020 period; highlights that allocation to the Cohesion Fund should not be diminished taking into consideration that approximately 34% of the EU's population live in a region that receives aid from the Cohesion Fund;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 b. *Calls on the Commission to study new ways of debureaucratization of the funds accessing procedure in order to increase the absorption rates and further provide easier and transparent access of Member States to the EU's financial instruments;*

Or. en

Amendment 18
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 c. *Notes that the Commission is working closely with its Member States to improve how the funds are invested and managed; calls on the Commission to further engage local authorities in consultations regarding the evolution of financial instruments;*

Or. en

Amendment 19
Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Takes note of the total volume of EUR 5 571.63 million of operational programme contributions committed to FIs

3. Takes note of the total volume of EUR 5 571.63 million of operational programme contributions committed to FIs

by 21 Member States by 31 December 2015 in the current Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), EUR 5 005.25 million of which are from the ERDF and CF;

by 21 Member States by 31 December 2015 in the current Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), EUR 5 005.25 million of which are from the ERDF and CF;

points out that in the previous programming period a significant number of ERDF and ESF financial instruments turned out to be excessive and, at the end of 2014, the disbursement of the appropriations assigned to them continued to be highly problematic;

Or. it

Amendment 20
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Notes that by 31 December 2015, only one Member State reported its intention to combine support from FIs with grants on the basis of Art.37 CPR and that Member State's intention for contribution to FI under Art. 38(1) and Art.39 CPR was very low. Observes that the correct implementation of FIs still causes challenges due to inconsistent rules (cohesion policy, state aid, public procurement regulations) and believes that there is scope for more synergies between the use of FIs and other types of support;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Welcomes that approximately 90% of the EIB available funding promotes sustainable growth and job creation in Member States; criticizes the EIB's treatment differences towards certain under developed regions taking into consideration that in 2015 Spain, Italy, France, UK, Germany and Poland were in the lead with approximately 365 EIB signed operations while the rest of the Member States, together, only amount to approximately 170 EIB signed operations;

Or. en

Amendment 22
Ivana Maletić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Is alarmed by the significant delays in the implementation of the programmes; urges the Member States *to tackle promptly all causes of delay, particularly late designation of managing authorities*, in order to avoid a repetition of the accumulated backlog of unpaid invoices in the second half of the current MFF, which could seriously impact other EU-funded policies as well;

Amendment

4. Is alarmed by the significant delays in the implementation of the programmes; urges the *European Commission to ensure tailor made technical assistance to the Member States and Regions for preparation of project pipelines, simplification and acceleration of the financial management and control system, for contracting and monitoring procedures and for structural reforms which will improve business and investment climate*, in order to avoid a repetition of the accumulated backlog of unpaid invoices in the second half of the current MFF, which could seriously impact other EU-funded policies as well;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Jan Olbrycht

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

AM\1115819EN.docx

13/24

PE597.736v01-00

EN

Draft opinion

4. Is alarmed by the significant delays in the implementation of the programmes; urges the Member States to tackle promptly ***all causes of delay, particularly late*** designation of managing authorities, ***in order to avoid*** a repetition of the accumulated backlog of unpaid invoices in the second half of the current MFF, which could seriously impact other EU-funded policies as well;

Amendment

4. Is alarmed by the significant delays in the implementation of the ***cohesion policy operational*** programmes ***under the current financial perspective***; urges the ***Commission to identify the causes of the delays and the*** Member States to tackle ***them*** promptly, ***particularly when it comes to the*** designation of managing, ***certifying and auditing*** authorities; ***is seriously concerned about the strong possibility of*** a repetition of the accumulated backlog of unpaid invoices in the second half of the current MFF, which could seriously impact other EU-funded policies as well;

Or. en

Amendment 24
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Is alarmed by the significant delays in the implementation of the programmes; urges the Member States to tackle promptly all causes of delay, particularly late designation of managing authorities, in order to avoid a repetition of the accumulated backlog of unpaid invoices in the second half of the current MFF, which could seriously impact other ***EU-funded*** policies as well;

Amendment

4. Is alarmed by the significant delays in the implementation of the programmes; ***takes the view that challenges such as migration and security, and current or future political developments in the EU, including the practical implications of Brexit, should not have an adverse effect on investments made under the cohesion policy***; urges the Member States to tackle promptly all causes of delay, particularly late designation of managing authorities, in order to avoid a repetition of the accumulated backlog of unpaid invoices in the second half of the current MFF, which could seriously impact other ***EU-funded*** policies as well;

Or. fr

Amendment 25
Nicola Caputo, Pina Picierno

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Is alarmed by the significant delays in the implementation of the programmes; urges the Member States to tackle promptly all causes of delay, particularly late designation of managing authorities, in order to avoid a repetition of the accumulated backlog of unpaid invoices in the second half of the current MFF, which could seriously impact other *EU-funded* policies as well;

Amendment

4. Is alarmed by the significant delays in the implementation of the programmes; urges the Member States to tackle promptly all causes of delay, particularly late designation of managing authorities, in order to avoid a repetition of the accumulated backlog of unpaid invoices in the second half of the current MFF, which could seriously impact other *EU-funded* policies as well; ***recalls the fact that delays in the 2007-2013 period contributed irreversibly to sub-optimal performance of ERDF and ESF financial instruments; emphasises that all necessary steps should be taken to mitigate the negative effects of delayed implementation, especially regarding the risk of limited use and impact;***

Or. it

Amendment 26
Claudia Tapardel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Is alarmed by the significant delays in the implementation of the programmes; urges the Member States to tackle promptly all causes of delay, particularly late designation of managing authorities, in order to avoid a repetition of the accumulated backlog of unpaid invoices in the second half of the current MFF, which could seriously impact other EU-funded policies as well;

Amendment

4. Is alarmed by the significant delays in the implementation of the programmes; urges the Member States to tackle promptly all causes of delay, particularly late designation of managing authorities, in order to avoid a repetition of the accumulated backlog of unpaid invoices in the second half of the current MFF, which could seriously impact other EU-funded policies as well; ***recognises that some Member States have limited experience in utilising financial instruments and***

involving the private sector and, as such, recommends that the Commission provide technical assistance with project writing and implementation.

Or. en

Amendment 27
Nicola Caputo, Pina Picierno

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Welcomes the Commission's actions in optimising regulation; emphasises that, despite the improvements, complexity still exists and issues such as the long set-up time and the administrative burden for recipients are disincentives to use financial instruments; calls on the Commission to work closely with the EIB and the EIF to make access to ESI Funds microcredit, loans, guarantees, equity and venture capital as easy as using grants;

Or. it

Amendment 28
Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Calls on the Commission to carry out a comparative analysis of the implementation costs of grants and financial instruments (in central and shared management) for the 2014-2020 programme period with a view to establishing their actual levels; notes that such information would be particularly relevant with a view to preparing the

legislative proposals for the post-2020 period; calls for a complete performance evaluation before the end of 2019 in order to consider the future of such instruments;

Or. it

Amendment 29
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. Invites the Commission to continue and present annual reports containing concrete information regarding the financing and implementing of financial instruments for the programming period 2014-2020, highlighting the areas that need improvement and offering recommendations in a timely fashion based on the evolutions of the programme;

Or. en

Amendment 30
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 b. Stresses the need for more information sessions to be provided to the managing authorities by the Commissions Expert Groups such as EGESIF to ensure better data coverage in reporting requirements, provide advice on tackling the issues causing significant delays in implementation of programmes, an exchange of experience and encourage

good practice in the implementation of the programme thus avoiding a high backlog of unpaid bills in the second part of the 2014-2020 MFF;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 c. Calls on the Commission to introduce the equal pay for equal work mechanism by amending the existing framework in order to eliminate the regional wage gap for European experts accordingly to their country of residence; deplores the existing differences that go up to 10 times in the payment schemes of researchers in Horizon 2020 and calls for a fair treatment;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Nicola Caputo, Pina Picierno

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; *emphasises that further harmonisation is needed for the rules that concern combining different ESI Funds, as well as for the rules that concern the funding mix of ESI Funds and instruments such as Horizon 2020 and EFSI*; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus

Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI).

regulation' could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI).

Or. it

Amendment 33
Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. ***Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the 'omnibus regulation' could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI).***

Amendment

5. ***Highlights the vulnerabilities which characterise FIs in terms of both democratic control and reporting, transparency and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the 'omnibus regulation' should necessarily be geared to restoring the central role of national parliaments, by establishing more stringent and effective control and assessment parameters for the evaluation of European public spending.***

Or. it

Amendment 34
Monika Vana

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the 'omnibus

Amendment

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the 'omnibus

regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, *particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI)*.

regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support.

Or. en

Amendment 35
Georgios Kyrtos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Points to the challenges that FIs represent for* democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI).

Amendment

5. *Notes that the use of FIs needs to safeguard the* democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI).

Or. en

Amendment 36
Alfred Sant

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus

Amendment

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability, *as well as in the implementation of rules governing FIs at*

regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI).

a local level; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI).

Or. en

Amendment 37
Marco Valli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, *particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI)*.

Amendment

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; *stresses the importance of having access to data concerning the use of budgetary resources by the ESI Funds and obtaining an assessment of the results achieved*; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support.

Or. it

Amendment 38
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely

Amendment

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, *in*

and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI).

particular by the European Parliament, as well as for timely and transparent reporting and *for* accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI).

Or. fr

Amendment 39
Ivana Maletić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI).

Amendment

5. Points to the challenges that FIs represent for democratic control, timely and transparent reporting and accountability; believes that the revision of the Financial Regulation and the ‘omnibus regulation’ could provide an opportunity to streamline the reporting on FIs and thus provide a better basis to assess additionality and complementarity between different forms of EU support, particularly between cohesion funds and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), *stresses the importance of active and efficient use of EU budget, therefore welcomes all measures to avoid overlapping between EU instruments and to insure full coherence and synergy.*

Or. en

Amendment 40
Jan Olbrycht

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

PE597.736v01-00

22/24

AM\1115819EN.docx

5 a. In view of preparing the proposal for the next MFF, encourages the Commission to conduct an in-depth analysis of the use of the financial instruments since the beginning of the current programming period; stresses that when assessing a financial instrument, the leverage dimension cannot be the only evaluation criteria; is of the firm opinion that the possibility of a combination of various EU resources under harmonised management rules would help optimise the synergies between available sources of financing at EU level; encourages the Commission to reflect on a proper balance between the grants and FI in the next financial perspective and underlines that increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 41
Georgios Kyrtos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

5 a. 5 a. Underlines that synergies and complementarities between EFSI and ESIF are instrumental in exploiting their full potential and maximising the impact of investments in the Member States and their regions; notes the Commission guidelines to combine EFSI and ESIF finances, but underlines the persistent difficulties linked to the eligibility criteria, timeframe for reporting and application of state aid rules that hinder their combined usage; welcomes the opportunities provided to further address these problems in the Commission proposals for the revision of the Financial

Regulation, as well as for EFSI 2.0;

Or. en

Amendment 42

Alfred Sant

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 a. Recalls that the upward social and economic convergence of the different regions in the EU should remain a main priority of the EU's Cohesion policy; points out that an assessment of the funding mix between FIs and other instruments should also be based on whether and how the mix contributes positively or negatively to the goal of reducing the cleavage between centre and periphery; in this spirit, emphasises on the need for further funding designed for the Union's peripheral regions aimed at slowing down the growing socioeconomic cleavage between the European centre and its peripheral regions.

Or. en