



2019/2028(BUD)

AMENDMENTS

1 - 28

Draft opinion
Petra Kammerevert
(PE639.789v01-00)

General budget of the European Union for the financial year 2020 - all sections
(2019/2028(BUD))

Amendment 1
Dace Melbārde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recalls that the Erasmus+ programme is a strategic investment *in* Europe's young generation, social cohesion and building a European sense of belonging; reaffirms that a substantial increase in the budget for the Erasmus + programme *is critical and highly expected by citizens*, as demonstrated by the volume of applications received, which exceeds by far the available funding; calls therefore for an adequate increase of the funding over the draft budget for 2020 across all Erasmus+ budget lines; reiterates Parliament's support for a tripling of the budget for the Erasmus+ programme in the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) and its intention to stand up for that increase;

Amendment

1. Recalls that the Erasmus+ programme is a strategic investment *that, primarily for* Europe's young generation, *supports education and training opportunities across Europe, helps increase* social cohesion and building *of* a European sense of belonging; reaffirms that a substantial increase in the budget for the Erasmus + *is of vital importance in order to align it better with the demand for the* programme, as demonstrated by the volume of applications received, which exceeds by far the available funding; calls therefore for an adequate increase of the funding over the draft budget for 2020 across all Erasmus+ budget lines; reiterates Parliament's support for a tripling of the budget for the Erasmus+ programme in the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) and its intention to stand up for that increase; *highlights that Erasmus+ is a one of the most well known Union programmes, whilst its budget is relatively small, constituting less than 2 % of the current MFF; notes, therefore, that tripling of the budget would not undermine the priorities set for the next MFF and is also compatible with the moderated spending aims of the Council;*

Or. en

Amendment 2
Niklas Nienäß

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Recalls that the Erasmus+ programme is a strategic investment in Europe's young generation, social cohesion and building a European sense of belonging; reaffirms that a substantial increase in the budget for the Erasmus + programme is critical and highly expected by citizens, as demonstrated by the volume of applications received, which exceeds by far the available funding; calls therefore for an adequate increase of the funding over the draft budget for 2020 across all Erasmus+ budget lines; reiterates Parliament's support for a tripling of the budget for the Erasmus+ programme in the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) and its intention to stand up for that increase;

1. Recalls that the Erasmus+ programme is a strategic investment in Europe's young generation, social cohesion and building a European sense of belonging, **and therefore is an investment in the future of the Union**; reaffirms that a substantial increase in the budget for the Erasmus + programme is critical and highly expected by citizens, as demonstrated by the volume of applications received, which exceeds by far the available funding; calls therefore for an adequate increase of the funding over the draft budget for 2020 across all Erasmus+ budget lines; reiterates Parliament's support for a tripling of the budget for the Erasmus+ programme in the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) and its intention to stand up for that increase;

Or. en

Amendment 3 **Domènec Ruiz Devesa**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 1**

Draft opinion

1. Recalls that the Erasmus+ programme is a strategic investment in Europe's young generation, social cohesion and building a European sense of belonging; reaffirms that a substantial increase in the budget for the Erasmus + programme is critical and highly expected by citizens, as demonstrated by the volume of applications received, which exceeds by far the available funding; calls therefore for an adequate increase of the funding over the draft budget for 2020 across all Erasmus+ budget lines; reiterates Parliament's support for a tripling of the budget for the Erasmus+ programme in the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) and its intention to stand up for that

Amendment

1. Recalls that the Erasmus+ programme is a strategic investment in Europe's young generation, social cohesion and building a European sense of belonging; reaffirms that a substantial increase in the budget for the Erasmus + programme is critical and highly expected by citizens, as demonstrated by the volume of applications received, which exceeds by far the available funding; calls therefore for an adequate increase of the funding over the draft budget for 2020 across all Erasmus+ budget lines; reiterates Parliament's support for a tripling of the budget **and beneficiaries** for the Erasmus+ programme in the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) and its

increase;

intention to stand up for that increase;

Or. en

Amendment 4 **Dace Melbārde**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Deplores the cuts proposed by the Council to the Creative Europe programme, which undermine its **role** in supporting the Union's cultural and creative sectors and thus fostering a European sense of belonging, social cohesion, jobs and growth; insists that funding levels should match the ambitions of the programme and recalls that **it** has been **chronically underfunded**; consequently, in opposition to the cuts, asks for the budget lines corresponding to the Creative Europe programme to be restored and reinforced in order to boost the efforts to reinforce the creative and cultural sectors; reiterates Parliament's support for a doubling of the budget of the Creative Europe programme in the next MFF and its intention to stand up for that increase; calls on the Commission to continue to support the multilingual offer of European quality cultural TV programming across Europe through the Creative Europe programme;

Amendment

2. Deplores the cuts proposed by the Council to the Creative Europe programme, which **would further** undermine its **objective** in supporting the Union's cultural and creative sectors and **audiovisual works**, thus fostering a European sense of belonging, social cohesion, jobs and growth; insists that funding levels should match the ambitions of the programme and recalls that **the programme's budget** has been **very small and inadequate**; consequently, in opposition to the cuts, asks for the budget lines corresponding to the Creative Europe programme to be restored and reinforced in order to boost the efforts to reinforce the creative and cultural sectors; reiterates Parliament's support for a doubling of the budget of the Creative Europe programme in the next MFF and its intention to stand up for that increase; calls on the Commission to continue to support the multilingual offer of European quality cultural TV programming across Europe through the Creative Europe programme;

Or. en

Amendment 5 **Niklas Nienäß**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. **Deplores** the cuts proposed by the Council to the Creative Europe programme, which undermine its role in supporting the Union's cultural and creative sectors and thus fostering a European sense of belonging, social cohesion, jobs and growth; insists that funding levels should match the ambitions of the programme and recalls that it has been chronically underfunded; consequently, in opposition to the cuts, asks for the budget lines corresponding to the Creative Europe programme to be restored and reinforced in order to boost the efforts to reinforce the creative and cultural sectors; reiterates Parliament's support for a doubling of the budget of the Creative Europe programme in the next MFF and its intention to stand up for that increase; calls on the Commission to continue to support the multilingual offer of European quality cultural TV programming across Europe through the Creative Europe programme;

Amendment

2. **Condemns** the cuts proposed by the Council to the Creative Europe programme, which undermine its role in supporting the Union's cultural and creative sectors and thus fostering a European sense of belonging, social cohesion, jobs and growth; insists that funding levels should match the ambitions of the programme and recalls that it has been chronically underfunded; consequently, in opposition to the cuts, asks for the budget lines corresponding to the Creative Europe programme to be restored and reinforced in order to boost the efforts to reinforce the creative and cultural sectors; reiterates Parliament's support for a doubling of the budget of the Creative Europe programme in the next MFF and its intention to stand up for that increase; calls on the Commission to continue to support the multilingual offer of European quality cultural TV programming across Europe through the Creative Europe programme;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Acknowledges that the interinstitutional agreement on the funding of the European Solidarity Corps has been respected and an adequate budget for the functioning of the programme has been allocated;

Amendment

3. Acknowledges that the interinstitutional agreement on the funding of the European Solidarity Corps has been respected and an adequate budget for the functioning of the programme has been allocated; ***considers that the European Solidarity Corps should have considerably more funding in the next Multiannual Financial Framework, including for its promotion;***

Or. en

Amendment 7
Michaela Šojdrová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Acknowledges that the interinstitutional agreement on the funding of the European Solidarity Corps has been respected and an adequate budget for the functioning of the programme has been allocated;

Amendment

3. Acknowledges that the interinstitutional agreement on the funding of the European Solidarity Corps has been respected and an adequate budget for the functioning of the programme has been allocated; ***acknowledges that the volunteering strand of the programme has triggered great interests from participants and organisations;***

Or. en

Amendment 8
Niklas Nienäß

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Acknowledges that the interinstitutional agreement on the funding of the European Solidarity Corps has been respected and ***an*** adequate budget for the functioning of the programme has been allocated;

Amendment

3. Acknowledges that the interinstitutional agreement on the funding of the European Solidarity Corps has been respected and ***a sufficient, yet not really*** adequate budget for the functioning of the programme has been allocated;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Emphasises the value of the Europe for Citizens programme in enhancing citizens' understanding of the Union and fostering a sense of citizenship; therefore deplores the budget cuts proposed by the Council; asks to restore and reinforce the related budget lines in order to encourage civic engagement and democratic participation; stresses that the next Europe for Citizens programme needs proper funding in the next MFF covering the period 2021-2027, albeit under the framework of the Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values programme;

4. Emphasises the value of the Europe for Citizens programme in enhancing citizens' understanding of the Union and fostering a sense of citizenship; therefore deplores the budget cuts proposed by the Council; asks to restore and reinforce the related budget lines in order to encourage civic engagement and democratic participation; stresses that the next Europe for Citizens programme needs proper funding in the next MFF covering the period 2021-2027, albeit under the framework of the Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values programme; ***considers that further strengthening should be devoted to European and global citizenship education in order to provide the information required to understand the institutional framework of the Union and to engage as active citizens in tackling world challenges and current international socio-political shifts;***

Or. en

Amendment 10
Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls on the Commission to use the attention generated by the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) to build a coherent long-term strategy on promoting and safeguarding cultural heritage in Europe and to allocate necessary funds for this purpose in 2020 and beyond; calls, in that regard, for dedicated funds to be made available through relevant MFF programmes;

Amendment

5. Calls on the Commission to use the attention generated by the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) to build a coherent long-term strategy on promoting and safeguarding cultural heritage in Europe and to allocate necessary funds for this purpose in 2020 and beyond; calls, in that regard, for dedicated funds to be made available through relevant MFF programmes, ***including research and publications on the common European cultural heritage, memory and history;***

Or. en

Amendment 11

Niklas Nienäß

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls on the Commission to use the attention generated by the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) to build a coherent long-term strategy on promoting and safeguarding cultural heritage in Europe and to allocate necessary funds for this purpose in 2020 and beyond; calls, in that regard, for dedicated funds to be made available through relevant MFF programmes;

Amendment

5. Calls on the Commission to use the attention generated by the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) to build a coherent ***and sustainable*** long-term strategy on promoting and safeguarding cultural heritage in Europe and to allocate necessary funds for this purpose in 2020 and beyond; calls, in that regard, for dedicated funds to be made available through relevant MFF programmes;

Or. en

Amendment 12

Iuliu Winkler

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 c. Calls on the Commission to also address the overseas territories of the Member States, in which more than 5 million Union citizens are residing, considering that the sport component of the Erasmus+ programme has been a successful endeavour, contributing to the cohesion and development of a common European society;

Or. en

Amendment 13

Iuliu Winkler

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 d. *Calls in this regard for a realistic increase of the budget lines under the 2021-2027MFF for the distance bands on the sport chapter, including towards transnational meetings within the Erasmus+ sport programme, accounting also for distances larger than 3000 kilometres;*

Or. en

Amendment 14
Iuliu Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 e. *Considers therefore important an increased effort towards adapting the travel fees for the distance band of more than 3000 kilometres, in accordance with the budget of key action 1 in the Erasmus+ programme;*

Or. en

Amendment 15
Petra Kammerevert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. Urges to *maintain and* secure the **Commission's** draft budget **for** 2020 for multimedia actions, *including the* budget **of the** Euranet+ *network within the multimedia actions budgetary line;*

7. *Calls on the Commission to improve its external communication activities and its outreach to the citizens in order to tackle fake news and miscommunication about the Union; therefore urges the Commission to secure and increase the draft budget 2020 for multimedia actions; in that regard calls for additional commitments*

appropriations of 1 036 600 EUR (a 5% increase) on that budget line to secure the crucial work of Euranet Plus for the remainder of the MFF;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Niyazi Kizilyürek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Urges to maintain and secure the Commission's draft budget for 2020 for multimedia actions, including the *budget* of the Euranet+ network within the multimedia actions budgetary line;

Amendment

7. Urges to maintain and secure the Commission's draft budget for 2020 for multimedia actions, including the *budgets* of the Euranet+ network *and Euronews* within the multimedia actions budgetary line; *underlines that such institutions are helpful in developing a common european public space;*

Or. en

Amendment 17
Niklas Nienäß

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Urges to *maintain and secure the Commission's draft budget for 2020* for multimedia actions, *including the budget of* the Euranet+ network *within the* multimedia actions budgetary line;

Amendment

7. Urges to *increase the* budget for multimedia actions, *targeting this increase to other platforms and communication outlets such as* the Euranet+ network; *it is urgent that this* multimedia actions budgetary line *is made transparent by clearly setting the different projects benefiting from the funds deployed; a new set of budgetary lines should be proposed according to the actions;*

Or. en

Amendment 18
Petra Kammerevert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Is alarmed by the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, *stating that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer any reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest; therefore* urges the Commission to end its cooperation with Euronews.

Amendment

8. Is alarmed by the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, *which highlights that Euronews is now 85% owned by private investors and only 15% by Union and non-Union broadcaster and local public authorities, that Union financial support to Euronews lacks transparency and accountability, that monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are insufficiently robust and that Euronews is not accessible to most or all Union citizens; is particularly concerned by the finding that, following the 2018 revision of the Financial Regulation, which scrapped the reference to the notion of bodies pursuing a general Union interest, grants for Euronews are provided under points (c) and (f) of Article 195 of the Financial Regulation (de facto monopoly/specific technical competence) and not under Article 180 of the Financial Regulation (actions intended to support a Union policy objective/body forming part of or supporting a Union policy), thus implying that Euronews no longer pursues a general Union interest at all; in light of the above considerations,* urges the Commission to end its cooperation with Euronews *at the end of the current MFF; considers, furthermore, that no additional funds, beyond what is included in the 2020 draft budget, should be allocated to Euronews under the Multimedia Actions budget line;*

Or. en

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. ***Is alarmed by*** the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, ***stating that in*** the Financial Regulation ***there is no longer any reference to the fact*** that Euronews ***is pursuing a general Union interest; therefore urges*** the Commission to ***end its cooperation with*** Euronews.

Amendment

8. ***Takes note of*** the conclusions of the Rapid Case Review of the European Court of Auditors on ***“How the Commission monitors the EU support to Euronews”***; ***remarks that Euronews’ funding is based, according to*** the Financial Regulation, ***both on its support to Union policy in the field of information and its de facto monopoly for covering Union affairs with a European perspective on television and a strong specialisation in this field; notes that, as this is still the case and that all independent reports have always clearly shown*** that Euronews ***provides a service which can be considered value for money, Euronews should continue to receive funding from the Commission, especially in a context where unbiased information on the Union is more than ever needed; calls however on*** the Commission to ***answer all of the concerns raised by the Court of Auditors on its monitoring of the funds awarded to*** Euronews.

Or. en

Amendment 20
Niyazi Kizilyürek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. ***Is alarmed by*** the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, ***stating*** that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer any reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest; therefore urges the Commission ***to***

Amendment

8. ***Takes note of*** the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews; ***notes with concern*** that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer any reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest; ***is of the opinion that all the***

end its cooperation with Euronews.

current media under the multimedia action budgetary line are of great essence to European citizen's everyday life by promoting multilingualism and a common european public space; therefore urges the Commission and Euronews to answer to the concerns raised by the Court of Auditors on its monitoring of the funds awarded to Euronews; urges the European Parliament to organise a public hearing on the matter inviting all relative stakeholders.

Or. en

Amendment 21

Sabine Verheyen, Michaela Šojdrová

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Is **alarmed** by the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, stating that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer **any** reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest; therefore **urges** the Commission to *end its cooperation with* Euronews.

Amendment

8. Is **concerned** by the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, stating that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer **a** reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest; therefore **asks** the Commission to **conduct a full-scale review of the MultimediaActions budget line for Euronews in 2020, as requested in the CULT Committee's opinion on the 2019 budget, and put forward a solution to the situation according to the legal framework.**

Or. en

Amendment 22

Laurence Farreng, Judith Bunting, Irena Joveva, Shaffaq Mohammed, Bernard Guetta, Eva Kaili

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Is alarmed by the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, stating that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer any reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest; ***therefore urges the Commission to end its cooperation with Euronews.***

Amendment

8. Is alarmed by the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, stating that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer any reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Niklas Nienäß

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Is alarmed by the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, stating that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer any reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest; therefore urges the Commission to ***end its*** cooperation with Euronews.

Amendment

8. Is alarmed by the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, stating that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer any reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest; therefore urges the Commission to ***reassess its approach of the*** cooperation with Euronews.

Or. en

Amendment 24
Dace Melbārde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Is alarmed by the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, stating that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer any reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest; therefore

Amendment

8. Is alarmed by the conclusions of the Rapid case review of the European Court of Auditors on Euronews, stating that in the Financial Regulation there is no longer any reference to the fact that Euronews is pursuing a general Union interest; therefore

urges the Commission to **end** its cooperation with Euronews.

urges the Commission to **reassess** its cooperation with Euronews.

Or. en

Amendment 25
Petra Kammerevert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8 a. Points to the potential of Pilot Projects and Preparatory Actions (PPAs); believes that the pre-assessment of PPAs by the Commission leaves very limited time for opinion-giving committees in the European Parliament to address the ratings and comments; regrets, furthermore, that in some instances the ratings and comments provided by the Commission are not entirely objective, and appear to have been influenced by institutional or personal preferences; recalls that failure to enact a PPA inside the Commission can never be a reason for a low assessment grade; calls therefore on the Commission to consider revising the procedure on pre-assessment in order to give the committee adequate time to address the Commission pre-assessment results; furthermore, invites the Commission to provide feedback on the implementation of the committee PPAs with a focus on successful and unsuccessful projects;

Or. en

Amendment 26
Niklas Nienäß

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8 a. *Acknowledges that the European society needs strong and independent journalism that provides news, information and documentations from a European perspective and thus helps building a European identity; acknowledges massive technical developments as well as significant changes of consumers' habits in the area of media and broadcasting, and therefore urges the Commission to consider alternative ways of strengthening the media providing independent and comprehensive European information to European viewers.*

Or. en

Amendment 27

Laurence Farreng, Judith Bunting, Irena Joveva, Shaffaq Mohammed, Bernard Guetta, Eva Kaili

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8 a. *calls on the Commission to monitor more transparently and diligently the funds it grants to Euronews, while regularly verifying the independence of the journalistic production of this media; also encourages the Commission to consider further ways of strengthening the media providing independent and comprehensive European information to European viewers.*

Or. en

Amendment 28

Niklas Nienäß

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 b (new)

AM\1188309EN.docx

17/18

PE641.115v01-00

EN

8 b. Urges the Commission to take the necessary steps to a proper transparent internal monitoring of the way funding is given to Euronews, and ensure the independence of its journalistic production as well as a workable framework for multimedia actions in general, acknowledging that it is crucial to base the service contract between the Commission and Euronews on the results of such a monitoring; urges the Commission to evaluate whether Euronews is a reasonable solution for the future of European information broadcast with regards to the goals stated in paragraph 8a.

Or. en