



2016/2045(INI)

20.6.2016

AMENDMENTS

1 - 29

Draft opinion

Marco Valli

(PE583.964v01-00)

The European Union Solidarity Fund: an assessment
(2016/2045(INI))

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Draws attention to its resolution of 3 April 2014 on the Court of Auditors' special reports in the context of the 2012 Commission discharge, which expressed support for the ECA's finding that 'around 30 % (EUR 144 million) of the EUSF contributions was earmarked for operations which were fully eligible under the EUSF Regulation; however, ***the CASE project (Italian acronym for 'Complessi Antisismici Sostenibili Ecocompatibili', i.e. seismically isolated and environmentally sustainable housing)***, while relevant to the actual needs, did not comply with specific provisions of the EUSF Regulation; ***this was because it constructed new permanent buildings instead of temporary houses; the CASE project took 70 % of the funding – EUR 350 million; the strategy chosen for CASE project addressed the housing needs of 15 000 of the earthquake-affected population, but did not respond in a timely manner and with sufficient capacity to the actual needs of the population; the CASDE houses were more expensive than standard houses; regrets that in many cases the quality of the CASE project has been found to be very poor and some houses have collapsed;*** asks the Commission to explain how, in the revised Regulation on the European Union Solidarity Fund that entered into force on 28 June 2014, the shortcomings identified by the Court of Auditors ***in the delivery of emergency aid to the Abruzzo region*** have been solved;

Amendment

1. Draws attention to its resolution of 3 April 2014 on the Court of Auditors' special reports in the context of the 2012 Commission discharge, which expressed support for the ECA's finding that 'around 30 % (EUR 144 million) of the EUSF contributions was earmarked for operations which were fully eligible under the EUSF Regulation; however ***some projects***, while relevant to the actual needs, did not comply with specific provisions of the EUSF Regulation; ***for example one*** project did not respond in a timely manner and with sufficient capacity to the actual needs of the population; asks the Commission to explain how, in the revised Regulation on the European Union Solidarity Fund that entered into force on 28 June 2014, the shortcomings identified by the Court of Auditors have been solved;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Draws attention to its resolution of 3 April 2014 on the Court of Auditors' special reports in the context of the 2012 Commission discharge, which expressed support for the ECA's finding that 'around 30 % (EUR 144 million) of the EUSF contributions was earmarked for operations which were fully eligible under the EUSF Regulation; however, the CASE project (Italian acronym for 'Complessi Antisismici Sostenibili Ecocompatibili', i.e. seismically isolated and environmentally sustainable housing), while relevant to the actual needs, did not comply with specific provisions of the EUSF Regulation; this was because it constructed new permanent buildings instead of temporary houses; the CASE project took 70 % of the funding – EUR 350 million; the strategy chosen for CASE project addressed the housing needs of 15 000 of the earthquake-affected population, but did not respond in a timely manner and with sufficient capacity to the actual needs of the population; the CASDE houses were more expensive than standard houses'; ***regrets that in many cases the quality of the CASE project has been found to be very poor and some houses have collapsed; asks the Commission to explain how, in the revised Regulation on the European Union Solidarity Fund that entered into force on 28 June 2014, the shortcomings identified by the Court of Auditors in the delivery of emergency aid to the Abruzzo region have been solved;***

Amendment

1. Draws attention to its resolution of 3 April 2014 on the Court of Auditors' special reports in the context of the 2012 Commission discharge, which expressed support for the ECA's finding that 'around 30 % (EUR 144 million) of the EUSF contributions was earmarked for operations which were fully eligible under the EUSF Regulation; however, the CASE project (Italian acronym for 'Complessi Antisismici Sostenibili Ecocompatibili', i.e. seismically isolated and environmentally sustainable housing), while relevant to the actual needs, did not comply with specific provisions of the EUSF Regulation; this was because it constructed new permanent buildings instead of temporary houses; the CASE project took 70 % of the funding – EUR 350 million; the strategy chosen for CASE project addressed the housing needs of 15 000 of the earthquake-affected population, but did not respond in a timely manner and with sufficient capacity to the actual needs of the population; the CASDE houses were more expensive than standard houses'; ***welcomes the fact that the new Regulation defines 'provisional accommodation', something that will help avoid misuse of funds;***

Or. es

Amendment 3
Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. *Regrets the lack of transparency regarding the use of the EUSF in Emilia Romagna and Sardinia, which received EUR 670 192 359 and EUR 16 310 467 respectively;*

deleted

Or. es

Amendment 4
Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. *Regrets the lack of transparency regarding the use of the EUSF in Emilia Romagna and Sardinia, which received EUR 670 192 359 and EUR 16 310 467 respectively;*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 5
Cătălin Sorin Ivan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Understands that disasters and the desire to help people in distress as swiftly as possible may put strain on national

4. Understands that disasters and the desire to help people in distress as swiftly as possible may put strain on national

administrations; believes, however, that Member States should implement EU legislation on disaster risk prevention and management, **which allows** the authorities concerned to receive EU assistance while respecting sound financial management; recalls the need to determine whether EUSF subsidies have been used in compliance with the principles of sound financial management, including the principle of economy, in order to identify and share best practices and lessons learned with respect to economic affordability;

administrations; believes, however, that Member States should implement EU legislation on disaster risk prevention and management **and establish programmes to deal with emergencies and natural disasters which enable** the authorities concerned to receive **rapid** EU assistance while respecting sound financial management; recalls the need to determine whether EUSF subsidies have been used in compliance with the principles of sound financial management, including the principle of economy, in order to identify, **develop** and share best practices and lessons learned with respect to economic affordability;

Or. ro

Amendment 6

Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Understands that disasters and the desire to help people in distress as swiftly as possible may put strain on national administrations; believes, however, that Member States should implement EU legislation on disaster risk prevention and management, which allows the authorities concerned to receive EU assistance while respecting sound financial management; recalls the need to determine whether EUSF subsidies have been used in compliance with the principles of sound financial management, **including the principle of economy**, in order to identify and share best practices and lessons learned with respect to economic affordability;

Amendment

4. Understands that disasters and the desire to help people in distress as swiftly as possible may put strain on national administrations; believes, however, that Member States should implement EU legislation on disaster risk prevention and management, which allows the authorities concerned to receive EU assistance while respecting sound financial management; recalls the need to determine whether EUSF subsidies have been used in compliance with the principles of sound financial management, in order to identify and share best practices and lessons learned with respect to economic affordability;

Or. es

Amendment 7
Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Deplores the fact that, as stated in Special report No 3/2008 of the Court of Auditors, payment was usually made one year after applications had been lodged;

Or. es

Amendment 8
Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Takes the view that the EUSF requires a certain amount of flexibility to enable it to respond to disasters more quickly and effectively; welcomes, therefore, the fact that countries are able to apply for advance payment of funds;

Or. es

Amendment 9
Cătălin Sorin Ivan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 – indent 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

verify that management and control arrangements have been set up and are being implemented in such a way as to

verify **rigorously** that **prevention**, management and control arrangements have been set up and are being

ensure that Union funds are being used efficiently and correctly, in accordance with the principles of sound financial management,

implemented in such a way as to ensure that Union funds are being used ***and absorbed*** efficiently and correctly, in accordance with the principles of sound financial management,

Or. ro

Amendment 10
Cătălin Sorin Ivan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 – indent 2

Draft opinion

verify that the financed actions have been properly carried out,

Amendment

verify that the financed actions have been properly carried out, ***and where they have not, identify the irregularities and take concrete and effective preventive measures.***

Or. ro

Amendment 11
Cătălin Sorin Ivan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 – indent 3

Draft opinion

ensure that expenditure funded is based on verifiable supporting documents, and is ***correct*** and regular,

Amendment

ensure that expenditure funded is based on verifiable supporting documents, and is ***used correctly and for the right purpose, transparent*** and regular,

Or. ro

Amendment 12
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 – indent 4

Draft opinion

prevent, detect and correct irregularities and recover amounts unduly paid together with interest on late payments where appropriate, to notify any such irregularities to the Commission *and to keep it informed of the progress of administrative and legal proceedings;*

Amendment

prevent, detect and correct irregularities and recover amounts unduly paid together with interest on late payments where appropriate, to notify any such irregularities to the Commission;

Or. el

Amendment 13
Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Calls for the EUSF be included in the next Multiannual Financial Framework so as to ensure the unity of the EU budget;

Or. es

Amendment 14
Raffaele Fitto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. Regrets the persisting difficulties in assessing whether the applications associated with regional disasters meet the exceptional criteria set out in the regulation; calls on the Commission to simplify and improve procedures on the occasion of the next EUSF revision;

7. Regrets the persisting difficulties in assessing whether the applications associated with regional disasters meet the exceptional criteria set out in the regulation; calls on the Commission to simplify and improve *administrative* procedures on the occasion of the next

Amendment 15
Cătălin Sorin Ivan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Regrets the fact that in many cases a serious lack of transparency has been noted regarding the use and the destination of the EUSF; asks for an improvement in the ex post monitoring system for spending and strongly believes that the final reports provided by Member States should be public and accessible;

Amendment

8. Regrets the fact that in many cases a serious lack of transparency has been noted regarding the use and the destination of the EUSF; asks for an improvement in the ex post monitoring system for spending, ***and accurate and coherent justification of that spending***, and strongly believes that the final reports provided by Member States should be public and accessible;

Amendment 16
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Regrets the fact that in many cases a serious lack of transparency has been noted regarding the use and the destination of the EUSF; asks for an improvement in the ex post monitoring system for spending and ***strongly*** believes that the final reports provided by Member States should be public and accessible;

Amendment

8. Regrets the fact that in many cases a serious lack of transparency has been noted regarding the use and the destination of the EUSF; asks for an improvement in the ex post monitoring system for spending and believes that the final reports provided by Member States should be public, ***objective*** and accessible;

Amendment 17
Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Regrets the fact that in **many** cases a serious lack of transparency has been noted regarding the use and the destination of the EUSF; asks for an improvement in the ex post monitoring system for spending and strongly believes that the final reports provided by Member States should be public and accessible;

Amendment

8. Regrets the fact that in **some** cases a serious lack of transparency has been noted regarding the use and the destination of the EUSF; asks for an improvement in the ex post monitoring system for spending and strongly believes that the final reports provided by Member States should be public and accessible;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Raffaele Fitto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Stresses the importance of the public procurement procedures followed by Member States in response to natural disasters with a view to identifying and **disseminating** best practice and lessons learned with regard to contracts in emergency situations;

Amendment

9. Stresses the importance of the public procurement procedures followed by Member States in response to natural disasters with a view to identifying and **harmonising** best practice and lessons learned with regard to contracts in emergency situations;

Or. it

Amendment 19
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Believes that necessary improvements to the regulation could include a request for mandatory updated national plans for disaster management, the preparation of agreements on emergency contracts, *the implementation of provisional accommodation measures in disaster areas and the transfer to the EU budget of any revenue generated by the use of the EUSF*;

Amendment

10. Believes that necessary improvements to the regulation could include a request for mandatory updated national plans for disaster management *and* the preparation of agreements on emergency contracts;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Believes that necessary improvements to the regulation could include a request for mandatory updated national plans for disaster management, the preparation of agreements on emergency contracts, the implementation of provisional accommodation measures in disaster areas *and the transfer to the EU budget of any revenue generated by the use of the EUSF*;

Amendment

10. Believes that necessary improvements to the regulation could include a request for mandatory updated national plans for disaster management, the preparation of agreements on emergency contracts, the implementation of provisional accommodation measures in disaster areas;

Or. el

Amendment 21
Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Believes that necessary improvements to the regulation could include a request for mandatory updated national plans for disaster management, the preparation of agreements on emergency contracts, the implementation of provisional accommodation measures in disaster areas ***and the transfer to the EU budget of any revenue generated by the use of the EUSF;***

Amendment

10. Believes that necessary improvements to the regulation could include a request for mandatory updated national plans for disaster management, the preparation of agreements on emergency contracts, the implementation of provisional accommodation measures in disaster areas;

Or. es

Amendment 22
Cătălin Sorin Ivan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Believes that necessary improvements to the regulation could include a request for mandatory updated national plans for disaster management, the preparation of agreements on emergency contracts, the implementation of provisional accommodation measures in disaster areas and the transfer to the EU budget of any revenue generated by the use of the EUSF;

Amendment

10. Believes that necessary improvements to the regulation could include a request for mandatory updated national plans for disaster management, ***the introduction of a concrete action plan***, the preparation of agreements on emergency contracts, the implementation of provisional accommodation measures in disaster areas and the transfer to the EU budget of any revenue generated by the use of the EUSF;

Or. ro

Amendment 23
Raffaele Fitto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Stresses that the Member States too must look at their own administrative procedures with a view to accelerating the mobilisation of aid for affected regions;

Or. it

Amendment 24
Cătălin Sorin Ivan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Emphasises, furthermore, that Article 11 of the amended regulation gives the Commission and the ECA the power of audit and allows the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) to conduct investigations *if* necessary;

Amendment

11. Emphasises, furthermore, that Article 11 of the amended regulation gives the Commission and the ECA the power of audit and allows the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) to conduct investigations ***whenever*** necessary;

Or. ro

Amendment 25
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Emphasises, furthermore, that Article 11 of the amended regulation gives the ***Commission and the*** ECA the power of audit and allows the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) to conduct investigations if necessary;

Amendment

11. Emphasises, furthermore, that Article 11 of the amended regulation gives the ECA the power of audit and allows the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) to conduct investigations if necessary;

Or. el

Amendment 26
Verónica Lope Fontagné

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Is of the opinion that the EUSF should, wherever possible, create synergies with other sources of financial assistance, in particular with the Structural Funds;

Amendment

12. Is of the opinion that the EUSF should, wherever possible, create synergies with other sources of financial assistance, in particular with the ***European Structural and Investment*** Funds; ***calls, therefore, with a view to ensuring the proper implementation of the EUSF, on the states to set out clearly what damage is to be covered by the EUSF and what action will be undertaken with the support of other funds;***

Or. es

Amendment 27
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Is of the opinion that the EUSF should, wherever possible, create synergies with other sources of financial assistance, in particular with the Structural Funds;

Amendment

12. Is of the opinion that the EUSF should, wherever possible, create synergies with other sources of financial assistance, in particular with the ***European Structural and Investment*** Funds;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Is of the opinion that the EUSF should, ***wherever possible***, create synergies with other sources of financial assistance, in particular with the Structural Funds;

Amendment

12. Is of the opinion that the EUSF should create synergies with other sources of financial assistance, in particular with the Structural Funds;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

12a. Believes that there should be additional requirements for higher visibility of EUSF assistance in supported areas in order to demonstrate its European added value;

Or. en