



2017/2053(INI)

31.10.2017

AMENDMENTS

1 - 52

Draft opinion

Nedzhmi Ali

(PE606.164v01-00)

Reform of the European Union's system of own resources
(2017/2053(INI))

Amendment 1
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas, in a situation of scarce resources, **greater** importance should be attached to **monitoring whether the revenues obtained from the EU's own resources are being spent efficiently and effectively, and if these payments are being used to address issues of concern to citizens;**

Amendment

A. whereas, in a situation of scarce resources, **new** importance should be attached to **the protection of the EU financial interests when increasing revenues in the EU budget from increased imputes from own resources, such increased importance should also be accorded to enhanced cooperation and joint work between the Commission and Member States;**

Or. en

Amendment 2
Barbara Kappel

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the EU budget is primarily an investment budget **with some redistributive functions between the Member States**, and serves mainly to support common EU policies and objectives, providing seed money for medium- to long-term investments;

Amendment

B. whereas the EU budget is primarily an investment budget, and serves mainly to support common EU policies and objectives, providing seed money for medium- to long-term investments;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the EU budget is primarily an investment budget with some redistributive functions between the Member States, and serves mainly to support common EU policies and objectives, ***providing seed money for medium- to long-term investments***;

Amendment

B. whereas the EU budget is primarily an investment budget with some redistributive functions between the Member States, and serves mainly to support common EU policies and objectives, ***and thus would benefit from an increased volume and share of own resources***;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the main goal of the EU budget should be to support accelerated growth in less developed regions to achieve an equivalent level of development within all Member States;

Amendment

C. whereas the main goal of the EU budget should be to support accelerated growth ***and jobs*** in less developed regions to achieve an equivalent level of ***social and economic*** development within all Member States ***to which an increased use of own resources should significantly contribute***;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Marco Valli, Laura Agea

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the main goal of the EU budget should be to support accelerated growth in less developed regions to achieve an equivalent level of development within all Member States;

Amendment

C. whereas the main goal of the EU budget should be to support ***sustainable growth, employment, economic recovery, migration, and security, as well as*** accelerated growth in less developed

regions to achieve an equivalent level of development within all Member States;

Or. it

Amendment 6
Petri Sarvamaa

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the main *goal* of the EU budget should be to support accelerated growth in less developed regions to achieve an equivalent level of development within all Member States;

Amendment

C. whereas *one of* the main *goals* of the EU budget should be to support accelerated growth in less developed regions to achieve an equivalent level of development within all Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Barbara Kappel

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the main goal of the EU budget should be to support *accelerated* growth in less developed regions to achieve an equivalent level of development within all Member States;

Amendment

C. whereas the main goal of the EU budget should be to support growth in less developed regions to achieve an equivalent level of development within all Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Marco Valli, Laura Agea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers that own resources should focus on projects that can generate the highest European added value (EAV); emphasises that expenditure should be focused on areas for which funding at European level is indispensable, or where funding at national level would be insufficient to achieve the European goal;

Amendment

1. Considers that own resources should focus on projects that can generate the highest European added value (EAV); emphasises that expenditure should be focused on areas for which funding at European level is indispensable, or where funding at national level would be insufficient to achieve the European goal, ***and that if programmes have to date not been shown to provide any added value, they should be thoroughly reviewed in order to be discontinued;***

Or. it

Amendment 9
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers that own resources should focus on projects that can generate the highest European added value (EAV); emphasises that expenditure should be focused on areas for which funding at European level is indispensable, or where funding at national level would be insufficient to achieve the European goal;

Amendment

1. Considers that own resources should focus on projects that can generate the highest European added value (EAV), ***while recognizing that some such areas, as for example the social impact, do not lend themselves to easily defined measurement;*** emphasises that expenditure should be focused on areas for which funding at European level is indispensable, or where funding at national level would be insufficient to achieve the European goal;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Barbara Kappel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers that own resources ***should focus on projects that can*** generate the highest European added value (EAV); emphasises that expenditure should be focused on areas for which funding at European level is indispensable, or where funding at national level would be insufficient to achieve the European goal;

Amendment

1. Considers that ***increasing the share of*** own resources ***on total expenditure is not the best way to*** generate the highest European added value (EAV): emphasises that expenditure should be focused on areas for which funding at European level is indispensable, or where funding at national level would be insufficient to achieve the European goal;

Or. en

Amendment 11
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment 12
Andrey Novakov

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Supports the introduction of new own resources, which will reduce the EU budget dependence on GNI-based contributions from the Member States and will permit better dedication of EU financing to EU policies and priorities; is of the opinion that the share of new genuine own resources should increase to at least 50% of the revenue side of the EU budget;

Or. en

Amendment

1a. Emphasises the need of creating

new genuine own resources system that will contribute to revenue sufficiency and stability, simplicity, transparency, fairness between Member States, equality among citizens, cost-effectiveness and EU financial autonomy;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Considers that the forthcoming negotiations of the next MFF, as well as Brexit, give an opportunity for the EU to reform its system of own resources; calls, therefore, on the Member States to undertake a real and in-depth reform of the system of own resources, and to make future EU financing more stable, sustainable and predictable, as well as more transparent and accountable to EU citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1c. Calls for using the reform for introducing incentives and for encouraging the Member States to invest in the European project; considers, in this regard, that national contributions to the EU Budget should be excluded from the

Amendment 15
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1d. Calls on the Member States to take into consideration the risks which the increase of own resources may entail to the system of collecting revenues, and thus requiring the necessary safeguards to be introduced in it;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1e. Draws attention to the need of strengthening the existing systems of control and of introducing new mechanisms for prevention of fraud and irregularities which may threaten the EU financial interests in the process of collecting new own resources; calls, in this regard, on the Commission to be prepared to propose relevant measures for protection of the EU financial interests when and if new own resources for the Union budget are introduced by Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points out that the use of own resources should be oriented to public **EU** goods that can benefit all Member States equally; notes two areas of increased EAV that also enjoy a high approval rating among citizens, namely research and development, and both internal and external security;

Amendment

2. Points out that the use of own resources should be oriented to **European** public goods that can benefit all Member States equally **and for which action at EU level is not only relevant, but indispensable, or where national financing possibilities are insufficient for achieving EU priorities and goals; underlines, in this regard, the importance of EU budget for supporting further EU integration and cohesion among Member States**; notes two areas of increased EAV that also enjoy a high approval rating among citizens, namely research and development, and both internal and external security;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points out that the use of own resources should be oriented to public EU goods that can benefit all Member States equally; **notes two areas of increased EAV that also enjoy a high approval rating among citizens, namely research and development, and both internal and external security;**

Amendment

2. Points out that the use of own resources should be oriented to public EU goods that can benefit all Member States equally;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Barbara Kappel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. ***Points out that the use of own resources should be oriented to public EU goods that can benefit all Member States equally;*** notes two areas of increased EAV that also enjoy a high approval rating among citizens, namely research and development, and both internal and external security;

Amendment

2. Notes two areas of increased EAV that also enjoy a high approval rating among citizens, namely research and development, and both internal and external security;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Marco Valli, Laura Agea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points out that the use of own resources should be oriented to public EU goods that can benefit all Member States equally; notes ***two*** areas of increased EAV that also enjoy a high approval rating among citizens, namely research and development, and ***both internal and external security***;

Amendment

2. Points out that the use of own resources should be oriented to public EU goods that can benefit all Member States equally; notes ***the*** areas of increased EAV that also enjoy a high approval rating among citizens, namely research and development, ***climate action***, and ***safeguarding land against man-made and natural disasters***;

Or. it

Amendment 21
Petri Sarvamaa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. *Points out that the EU should consider doing less in domains where the Union is perceived as having limited added value, or as being unable to deliver on promises; stresses, however, that where ambitious European aims are set, sufficient funds should also be allocated, and that where new goals are set, new resources should be presented;*

Or. en

Amendment 22
Marco Valli, Laura Agea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. *Expresses its conviction that own resources expenditure on internal and external security projects will meet with a positive response among citizens, therefore increasing their EAV; is concerned about the low level of expenditure in some key security areas, such as preparatory actions for defence and security cooperation and research;*

deleted

Or. it

Amendment 23
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Expresses its conviction that own resources expenditure on internal and external security projects will meet with a positive response among citizens, therefore increasing their EAV; is concerned about the low level of expenditure in some key security areas, such as preparatory actions for defence and security cooperation and research;

deleted

Or. en

**Amendment 24
Barbara Kappel**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Expresses its conviction that own resources expenditure on internal and external security projects will meet with a positive response among citizens, therefore increasing their EAV; is concerned about the low level of expenditure in some key security areas, such as preparatory actions for defence and security cooperation and research;

deleted

Or. en

**Amendment 25
Barbara Kappel**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 4**

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Welcomes the increased use of own resources in projects related to

4. Highlights that expenditure should be focused on projects that are profitable in

research and development, although doubts remain as to the types of projects financed; highlights that expenditure should be focused on projects that are profitable in the long-term and bring benefits to the EU, rather than on funding programmes that produce only short-term benefits;

the long-term and bring benefits to the EU, rather than on funding programmes that produce only short-term benefits;

Or. en

Amendment 26
Barbara Kappel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Expresses its concern about the low share of the Union budget devoted to climate-related spending; maintains that the revenues obtained from own resources should be spent on projects that generate higher EAV, including the fight against climate change;*

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 27
Marco Valli, Laura Agea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Expresses its concern about the low share of the Union budget devoted to climate-related spending; maintains that the revenues obtained from own resources should be spent *on projects that generate higher EAV, including the* fight against climate change;

Amendment

5. Expresses its concern about the low share of the Union budget devoted to climate-related spending; maintains that the revenues obtained from own resources should be spent *in order to* fight climate change *and depollute sites affected by industrial activities with a high environmental impact;*

Amendment 28
Marco Valli, Laura Agea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *Calls for an own resources system with no financial impact on national budgets, citizens, or SMEs; points out that the introduction of a tax – on as international a basis as possible – on financial transactions by the most aggressive and expert investors could be a way not just to finance the EU budget, but also to combat financial speculation; calls also for a tax on CO₂ emissions to be levied on multinationals;*

Or. it

Amendment 29
Andrey Novakov

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *Calls on open debate for maintaining the level of payments for Cohesion policy and CAP in the next programming period taking into account the additionally and high value-added from those policies for the European stability, competitiveness and economic growth.*

Or. en

Amendment 30
Marco Valli, Laura Agea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Deplores the disparities in the customs checks carried out within the EU and the large amounts involved in fraud affecting the own resource collection system; calls on the Commission to strengthen the common policy on customs checks by providing for genuine harmonisation with a view to improving the collection of traditional own resources;

Or. it

Amendment 31
Andrey Novakov

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Calls on targeted capacity building in those Member States experiencing difficulties with centrally managed programs like CEF, Horizon 2020, EFSI.

Or. en

Amendment 32
Barbara Kappel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Calls on the Commission to submit

6. Calls on the Commission to submit

a communication to Parliament explaining how it intends to reconcile long-term political objectives, such as the Europe 2020 Strategy, with the situation that will ensue after the 2020 multiannual financial framework (MFF), within the course of the next year; ***strongly believes that an EU agenda for the next decade should play a decisive role in the process of developing successive MFFs;***

a communication to Parliament explaining how it intends to reconcile long-term political objectives, such as the Europe 2020 Strategy, with the situation that will ensue after the 2020 multiannual financial framework (MFF), within the course of the next year;

Or. en

Amendment 33 **Georgi Pirinski**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Commission to submit a communication to Parliament explaining how it intends to reconcile long-term political objectives, such as the Europe 2020 Strategy, with the situation that will ensue after the 2020 multiannual financial framework (MFF), within the course of the next year; strongly believes that an EU agenda for the next decade should play a decisive role in the process of ***developing successive MFFs;***

Amendment

6. Calls on the Commission to submit a communication to Parliament explaining how it intends to reconcile long-term political objectives, such as the Europe 2020 Strategy, with the situation that will ensue after the 2020 multiannual financial framework (MFF), within the course of the next year; strongly believes that an EU agenda for the next decade should play a decisive role in the process of ***generating increased own resources for the EU budget;***

Or. en

Amendment 34 **Barbara Kappel**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. Recalls that ***long-term projects,***

Amendment

7. Recalls that Horizon 2020 should

such as Horizon 2020 and the Juncker Commission's 10 priorities, should be taken into account when own resources are allocated; calls on the Commission to orient its priorities towards the successful achievement of *these long-term projects*;

be taken into account when own resources are allocated; calls on the Commission to orient its priorities towards the successful achievement of *this long-term project*;

Or. en

Amendment 35
Marco Valli, Laura Agea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Recalls that long-term projects, such as Horizon 2020 *and the Juncker Commission's 10 priorities*, should be taken into account when own resources are allocated; calls on the Commission to orient its priorities towards the successful achievement of these long-term projects;

Amendment

7. Recalls that long-term projects, such as Horizon 2020, should be taken into account when own resources are allocated; calls on the Commission to orient its priorities towards the successful achievement of these long-term projects;

Or. it

Amendment 36
Barbara Kappel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Believes that simpler and clearer rules will contribute to a swift allocation of resources and will increase efficiency and transparency, with fewer errors occurring as a result; asks the Commission to draw up an action plan along these lines;

Amendment

8. Believes that simpler and clearer rules will contribute to a swift allocation of resources and will increase efficiency and transparency, with fewer errors occurring as a result; asks the Commission to draw up an action plan along these lines; *stresses that simpler and cleared rules should not lead to increased discretion and curbed scrutiny in the allocation of means*;

Amendment 37
Marco Valli, Laura Agea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Draws attention to the increasing instances of transnational VAT fraud, also known as ‘carousel fraud’, and calls on the Commission to further strengthen measures to prevent and avert fraud of this kind; considers it essential for the VAT resource to be optimised at the practical level without imposing an additional burden on EU citizens and Member States;

Or. it

Amendment 38
Barbara Kappel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Believes that simpler and clearer budgetary rules will make the need for more own resources obsolete;

Or. en

Amendment 39
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Points out that the policies which would benefit all EU citizens and provide more EAV are not attractive in terms of net balances; believes, therefore, that a new method of measuring the value of projects should be developed and streamlined reporting should be introduced;

Amendment

10. Points out that the policies which would benefit all EU citizens and provide more EAV are not attractive in terms of net balances; believes, therefore, that a new method of measuring the value of projects should be developed, ***including the social impact - positive and negative- of such projects***, and streamlined reporting should be introduced;

Or. en

Amendment 40
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Points out that the policies ***which would benefit all EU citizens and provide more*** EAV are not ***attractive*** in terms of net balances; ***believes***, therefore, ***that*** a new method of measuring the value of projects ***should be developed*** and streamlined reporting ***should*** be introduced;

Amendment

10. Points out that the ***EU-wide effect of policies that*** provide ***significant*** EAV are not ***adequately evaluated*** in terms of ***the*** net balances ***approach; urges the Commission***, therefore, ***to propose*** a new method of measuring the value of projects and streamlined reporting be introduced;

Or. en

Amendment 41
Petri Sarvamaa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Reiterates that it is crucial to allocate own resources to projects that can generate the highest EAV rather than

Amendment

11. Reiterates that it is crucial to allocate own resources to projects that can generate the highest EAV rather than

simply looking at each Member State's accounts; expresses concern about the zero sum game policy that some EU countries are currently applying.

simply looking at each Member State's accounts; expresses concern about the zero sum game policy that some EU countries are currently applying; *encourages the Commission to introduce ambitious proposals for new own resources; believes that this could reduce the relative share of GNI-based national contributions to the EU budget, and thus help to end the anti-European focus on mere fair return on net balances;*

Or. en

Amendment 42
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. *Reiterates that it is crucial to allocate own resources to projects that can generate the highest EAV rather than simply looking at each Member State's accounts; expresses concern about the zero sum game policy that some EU countries are currently applying.*

Amendment

11. Expresses concern *that the current system of own resources, dominated by the GNI own resource creates "contributors" and "beneficiaries" among the Member States putting them against each other;*

Or. en

Amendment 43
Petri Sarvamaa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

11a. Considers that the possibility to collect a CO2 levy through carbon pricing using either taxation or market-based instruments should be examined by the Commission as a way to strengthen the

Amendment

EU budget; believes that such an instrument could provide high EAV, as the levy could function as an incentive to change consumer and producer behaviour in favour of a less carbon-intensive future; considers, however, that any tax-based EU solution should be as neutral as possible for the total tax ratio of a given Member State; points out that such a levy would also have to take into account the current emission trading schemes to avoid overlapping and conflicting means and objectives;

Or. en

Amendment 44
Tomáš Zdechovský

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Stresses that the current system of own resources suffers from its excessive complexity; notes that current system places unequal emphasis on the net balances between Member States; believes that a reform based on clear and commonly agreed principles should be prepared by the Commission and the Member States to resolve this problem effectively;

Or. en

Amendment 45
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. *Is also concerned about the zero sum game policy that some EU countries are currently applying and that budgetary negotiations are not driven by the European added value principle, but by the national “fair return” logic and budgetary balances; insist, therefore, on abolition of all correction mechanisms and rebates;*

Or. en

Amendment 46
Petri Sarvamaa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11b. *Encourages the Commission and the Member States to consider also other tax-based resources available to the EU that could provide for more EAV in certain risk-related policy fields, while at the same time strengthening the EU budget;*

Or. en

Amendment 47
Tomáš Zdechovský

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11b. *Calls on the Commission to consider recommendations on new resources as presented by the High Level Group on Own Resources in its report on*

the future financing of the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 48
Tomáš Zdechovský

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11c. Encourages the Commission to examine and introduce concrete proposals for new resources in order to reduce GNI-based and VAT-based resources to the EU budget; considers that the current VAT-based of own resources should be replaced by a proper transfer of a share of VAT levied at national level; believes that new resources could come also from European policies such as environment, energy, climate or transport policies;

Or. en

Amendment 49
Tomáš Zdechovský

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11d. Considers that if any new resource will be adopted, it should follow three basic criteria: simplicity equity and democratic control; recalls that the principles mentioned by High-Level group on Own Resources should to be taken into account when considering new sources; points out that new system should be understandable and transparent for European tax-payers;

Amendment 50
Tomáš Zdechovský

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11e. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to omit all rebate mechanisms and corrections, which would provide more simple, democratic and transparent structure;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Tomáš Zdechovský

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 f (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11f. Stresses the importance of customs inspections and the related collection of customs duties; draws attention to the revenue losses due to the VAT gap and cross border VAT frauds; underlines that smuggling of heavily taxed goods means serious losses of revenue to the budget of the EU and the Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 52
Tomáš Zdechovský

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 g (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11g. Recalls the importance of facilitating and accelerating information exchange with authorities such OLAF and Europol in order to combat customs frauds and fight cross-border tax crime;

Or. en