



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs

2015/2052(INI)

26.5.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 62

Draft opinion
Georgios Kyrtos
(PE551.997v01-00)

the European Structural and Investment Funds and sound economic
governance: guidelines for the implementation of Article 23 of the Common
Provisions Regulation
(2015/2052(INI))

AM\1061886EN.doc

PE557.228v01-00

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1

Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Marisa Matias, Fabio De Masi, Miguel Viegas, Paloma López Bermejo, Matt Carthy

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment ***for jobs and growth*** for regions in the EU, ***also*** including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective ***and efficient by strengthening their link with the EU's economic governance framework***;

Amendment

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment, ***boosting jobs, reducing unemployment and promoting sustainable development*** for regions in the EU, ***particularly*** including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective;

Or. en

Amendment 2

Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient by strengthening their link with the ***EU's economic governance framework***;

Amendment

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; ***recalls their crucial role in strengthening the economic, social and territorial cohesion as well as in reducing the economic and social disparities within EU countries***; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more

effective and efficient by strengthening their link with the *Europe 2020 strategy's goals*;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed *investment* for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, *also including* those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient by strengthening their link with the EU's economic governance framework;

Amendment

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed *investments* for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, *particularly* those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient by strengthening their link with the EU's economic governance framework;

Or. hu

Amendment 4
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient by *strengthening their link with*

Amendment

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient by *taking into account* the EU's

the EU's economic governance framework;

economic governance framework;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient ***by strengthening their link with*** the EU's economic governance framework;

Amendment

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient, ***in the context of*** the EU's economic governance framework, ***but achievement of the ESI Funds' political objectives and goals is not to be jeopardised by this;***

Or. es

Amendment 6
Siôn Simon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and

Amendment

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for ***quality*** jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds

efficient by strengthening their link with the EU's economic governance framework;

more effective and efficient by strengthening their link with the EU's economic governance framework;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Ivana Maletić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient by strengthening their link with the EU's economic governance framework;

Amendment

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient by strengthening their link with the EU's economic governance framework; ***underlines that good economic governance is basic precondition for effective Cohesion policy and linkage between these two is crucial for reaching development potential of ESI Funds.***

Or. en

Amendment 8
Alfred Sant, Jonás Fernández, Costas Mavrides

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also

Amendment

1. Stresses the importance of the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds in providing urgently needed investment for jobs and growth for regions in the EU, also

including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient by strengthening their link with the EU's economic governance framework;

including those which are suffering most from the financial, economic and social crisis; welcomes the objective of making the use of these funds more effective and efficient by strengthening their link with the EU's economic governance framework;
regrets the ongoing erosion of the European social model; stresses the need to prioritise on smart, sustainable, long-term and inclusive growth; points out that projects funded by the ESI should as a precondition have a high societal and economic value, particularly a positive impact on quality job creation and EU added value, like spending in healthcare and education services as investment;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Emmanuel Maurel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Recalls that cohesion policy represents, through the structural funds, one of the most tangible, positive embodiments of EU action for European citizens;

Or. fr

Amendment 10
Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Expresses concerns that the

Commission's guidelines about the application of a macro-economic conditionality to the provision of ESI funding is incompatible with the aims of the cohesion policy, as it may unreasonably impair its effectiveness; believes moreover that a sanctions-based system will very unlikely increase the level of compliance of Member States with the economic governance framework; highlights that, on the contrary, a Member State who is unable to meet its fiscal obligations has an even stronger need for ESIF support in the interest of its regions and citizens; warns that suspending this form of funding under macro-economic conditionality will unfairly affect the provision of public services at the local and regional level, which has no direct responsibility in the implementation of the country's specific recommendations;

Or. en

Amendment 11
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Considers that the ultimate beneficiary of ESI Funds is the EU citizen and not the Member State; hence an increased emphasis on economic governance mechanisms cannot jeopardise the achievement of the ESI Fund's policy objectives and goals.

Or. en

Amendment 12
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Draws attention to the contradiction between the coercive nature of certain aspects of Article 23 of the Common Provisions Regulation and the flexibility envisaged under certain circumstances for implementation of the Stability and Growth Pact;

Or. es

Amendment 13
Sven Giegold
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Recalls the European Parliament position against the macro-conditionality attached to the cohesion funds; deems that such conditionality risks being counterproductive by affecting sustainable and socially inclusive investments required in regions which bear no or very limited responsibility on the fiscal stance of the general government of their Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Recalls that the EU payments under ESIF programmes are based on specific eligibility criteria linked to the level of development of EU regions; believes therefore that decisions regarding reprogramming or suspension of payments based on other criteria related to deficit and debt levels contradict the principles of proportionality and equal treatment as well as the rationale behind these funds;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Considers that the requirements of Article 23 of the Common Provisions Regulation have contributed to the significant delay in concluding partnership agreements and operating programmes;

Or. es

Amendment 16
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Emphasises the importance of cohesion policy instruments and resources in maintaining the level of European added-value investment in Member States and regions, including islands;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1c. Recalls that the frequent budgetary cuts decided by Member States in a context of widespread fiscal consolidation have significantly impaired the capability of local and regional authorities to autonomously provide the basic public services and have led to a drop in public investment at the subnational level; believes that making the provision of ESI funding conditional on Member State's compliance with the SGP rules will inevitably result in imposing an additional penalty on regional authorities and EU citizens, which have already been largely affected by the austerity measures adopted at the central level;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1c. Calls on the Commission to consider the impact on public opinion of a penalty such as those provided for in Article 23 of the Common Provisions Regulation and the opposition to European integration this could engender;

Or. es

Amendment 19

Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1d. Stresses that using ESI funds as a threat to achieve a better enforcement of the economic governance framework by Member States may unreasonably jeopardise the achievement of the EU goals for regional development and social cohesion, especially in times of economic crisis; believes that the decisions regarding reprogramming or suspension of ESI funds may worsen the economic and social situation in those countries who are already facing difficulties, by hindering the capability of the local and regional authorities to provide public services and raise investment for jobs and growth;

Or. en

Amendment 20

Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1d. Is of the opinion that implementation of the mechanism provided for in Article 23 of the Common Provisions Regulation will not contribute in general to better economic governance of the Member State concerned, nor to an improved rate of economic growth;

Or. es

Amendment 21

Hugues Bayet, Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses the need ***for a stable and predictable*** investment environment, ***not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of sound economic governance in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment;*** emphasises the need for an overall investment framework in the EU;

Amendment

2. Stresses the need ***to create a climate which will promote the development of public and private*** investment ***and*** emphasises the need for an overall investment framework in the EU;

Or. fr

Amendment 22

Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of ***sound***

Amendment

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of ***a proper***

economic governance in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment; emphasises the need for *an overall* investment *framework in the EU*;

incentives-based mechanism in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment *and the need to encourage effective actions to stimulate aggregate demand as well as to fight unemployment and inequalities*; emphasises the need for *a EU governance framework favourable to investment*; *calls on the Commission to introduce a broader investment clause with the aim to exempt co-financing under ESIF programmes as well as public productive investments from the deficit and debt calculations*;

Or. en

Amendment 23

Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Marisa Matias, Fabio De Masi, Miguel Viegas, Matt Carthy

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of *sound economic governance* in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment; emphasises the need for an *overall* investment framework in the EU;

Amendment

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; *expresses its concerns about the negative impact that reprogramming might have on the aforementioned but also on the undermining of the effectiveness of cohesion policy*; underlines the role of *strengthening aggregate demand* in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment; emphasises the need for an investment framework in the EU *that supports public and productive investment in order to contribute to social progress, to create full employment, reducing unemployment, strengthening quality public services and ecological sustainability*;

Or. en

Amendment 24
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of sound economic governance in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment; emphasises the need for an overall investment framework in the EU;

Amendment

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the ***importance*** of sound economic governance in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment; emphasises the need for an overall investment framework in the EU;

Or. it

Amendment 25
Krišjānis Kariņš

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of sound economic governance in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment; emphasises the need for an overall investment framework in the EU;

Amendment

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of sound economic governance in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment; emphasises the need for an overall investment framework in the EU; ***highlights that underlying structural challenges in Member States still impede growth;***

Or. en

Amendment 26
Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of sound economic governance in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment; emphasises the need for an overall investment framework in the EU;

Amendment

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of sound economic governance in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment ***and calls on the Commission to monitor the practices of individual Member States and, where necessary, make proposals aimed at improving their predictability and stability***; emphasises the need for an overall investment framework in the EU;

Or. hu

Amendment 27
Alfred Sant, Jonás Fernández, Costas Mavrides

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of sound economic governance in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment; emphasises the need for an overall investment framework in the EU;

Amendment

2. Stresses the need for a stable and predictable investment environment, not least with a view to attracting private investment; underlines the role of sound economic governance in the creation of this kind of favourable investment environment; emphasises the need for an overall investment framework in the EU, ***while taking into full account the special situation of peripheral islands and regions and avoiding one-size-fits-all approaches***;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Stanisław Ożóg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Stresses not only the importance of sound economic governance, but also the fundamental role cohesion policy has to play in attracting investment to regions in the EU and in tackling economic, social and territorial disparities; urges that the application of Article 23 should not, under any circumstances, lead to economic instability or aggravate the situation in regions which are already experiencing difficulties;

Or. pl

Amendment 29
Hugues Bayet, Jonás Fernández, Maria Arena

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Calls for neutralisation in the calculation of debt and deficit in public investment carried out by Member States' public operators, particularly with regard to the impact of the new ESA 2010 system of accounts, which prevents Member States from paying their co-financing share to the structural funds (in particular the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative) and thus using these funds to escape from the economic crisis and re-launch growth and employment;

Amendment 30
Stanisław Ożóg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Calls on the Commission always to take each Member State's individual economic and social situation into careful consideration when applying the provisions of Article 23 of the Common Provisions Regulation; urges that macroeconomic failings at other levels of government should not automatically create financial instability for local and regional authorities;

Or. pl

Amendment 31
Emmanuel Maurel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Welcomes the Commission's intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results;

3. Calls on the Commission to prioritise stability and, given the constant delay in budget implementation of the structural funds, the facilitation, simplification and predictability of payments; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results;

Or. fr

Amendment 32

Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Marisa Matias, Fabio De Masi, Miguel Viegas, Matt Carthy

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes the Commission's intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over ***too frequent reprogramming***; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results;

Amendment

3. Welcomes the Commission's intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over ***reprogramming; expresses its concerns that the application of Article 23 CPR may lead to economic instability and uncertainty, deteriorating the situation in Member States and regions which confront problems and have been most affected by the crisis***; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results ***and to ensure all the other possible available options***;

Or. en

Amendment 33

Stanisław Ożóg

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes the Commission's intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, ***with*** a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results;

Amendment

3. Welcomes the Commission's intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, ***which must be used only when strictly necessary and should be accompanied by*** a detailed assessment of why it ***clearly*** delivers more effective and efficient results ***in the area of cohesion policy; emphasises the importance of avoiding situations in which instability***

*and local and regional governments’
inability to act aggravate the situation in
their regions;*

Or. pl

Amendment 34
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes the Commission’s intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results;

Amendment

3. Welcomes the Commission’s intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, **together** with a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results;

Or. it

Amendment 35
Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes the Commission’s intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it **delivers** more effective and efficient results;

Amendment

3. Welcomes the Commission’s intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it **might deliver** more effective and efficient results;

Or. hu

Amendment 36
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes the Commission's intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results;

Amendment

3. Welcomes the Commission's intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, ***avoiding this step insofar as is possible,*** preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results;

Or. es

Amendment 37
Ivana Maletić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes the Commission's intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results;

Amendment

3. Welcomes the Commission's intention to use its reprogramming powers carefully, preferring stability over too frequent reprogramming; stresses the need for a well-founded and detailed justification for reprogramming, with a detailed assessment of why it delivers more effective and efficient results; ***therefore calls on Commission, while taking decision on reprogramming, to focus more on efficiency and implementation of CSRs than on indicators if influenced by trends outside the Member State;***

Or. en

Amendment 38
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Considers that macroeconomic conditionality cannot be used to exclude from cohesion policy those public administrations in greater need of ESI Funds on account of their socioeconomic circumstances;

Or. es

Amendment 39
Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Marisa Matias, Fabio De Masi, Miguel Viegas, Paloma López Bermejo, Matt Carthy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Expresses its disapproval for the institutionalisation of the principle of macroeconomic conditionality and the link between cohesion policy and Structural Funds on the one hand and Stability and Growth Pact, package of economic governance and any economic agreement of Member States, on the other; the assumptions underlying them are undeniably different and their objectives diametrically opposed; emphasises that the purpose of cohesion policy should not be to impose stringent macroeconomic and financial conditions necessitating austerity measures or to penalise Member States and regions; stresses that cohesion policy is designed to ensure balanced growth and eliminate inequalities with a view to achieving genuine convergence; indicates that

funding for European regions cannot be suspended for non-compliance by Member States with macroeconomic conditions and suspending funding for Member States in difficulties will make the situation worse;

Or. en

Amendment 40
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Recalls that suspension of payments is a last resort mechanism; it is a matter decided by the Council on the basis of a proposal that the Commission may adopt in the event that the Member State concerned fails to take effective action; hence asks the Commission to, in the event, use its discretionary power to propose the suspension of payments with utmost caution and strictly in line with Article 23(6) CPR, after due consideration of all relevant information and elements arising from and opinions expressed through the structured dialogue. In this regard, welcomes the cautious approach adopted in the guidelines whereby account will be taken of the economic and social circumstances of Member States by considering mitigating factors similar to those envisaged in the suspensions under Article 23(9) CPR;

Or. en

Amendment 41
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Asks the Commission to present a white paper on cohesion policy to relaunch the debate on measuring economic growth, establishing in the former a typology for quality of public investment in terms of its long-term effects;

Or. es

Amendment 42
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3c. Calls on the Commission to encourage the setting of sound priorities in the use of ESI Funds to avoid Article 23 of the Common Provisions Regulation being applied, and asks therefore for a high degree of coordination to be ensured between the main bodies responsible for the economic governance process and those responsible for implementation of ESI Funds;

Or. es

Amendment 43
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3d. Considers that the Commission ought to focus its efforts on preventing fraudulent or inefficient use of the ESI Funds rather than on linking their use to shortcomings in economic governance, as EU citizens, the end beneficiaries of cohesion policy, ought not to be penalised for these shortcomings;

Or. es

Amendment 44

Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Marisa Matias, Fabio De Masi, Miguel Viegas, Matt Carthy

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission to give careful consideration to the economic and social effects on the regions affected by a suspension of payments; underlines ***the importance*** of the ***principles of proportionality and effectiveness when the Commission proposes such a suspension of payments;***

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission to give careful consideration to the economic and social effects on the regions affected by a suspension of payments ***but also the social and economic conditions prevailing in the Member State concerned before taking any decision;*** underlines ***that decisions to suspend payment should not be linked to the economic policies of Member States but only to the detection of serious infringements of the system of project management, control and monitoring and spending irregularities concerning Member States which have failed to take corrective measures;***

Or. en

Amendment 45

Cora van Nieuwenhuizen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission to give careful consideration to the economic and social effects on the regions affected by a suspension of payments; underlines the importance of the principles of proportionality and effectiveness when the Commission proposes such a suspension of payments;

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission to give careful consideration to the economic and social effects on the regions affected by a suspension of payments, ***as well as the Member State's overall implementation record with respect to country-specific recommendations, recommendations to correct excessive macroeconomic imbalances under Regulation No. 1176/2011, provisions of a macroeconomic adjustment programme under Regulation No. 472/2013, measures and guidelines set following a decision by the Council in accordance with Article 136(1) of TFEU, and any conditions attached to financial assistance provided to a Member State under Council Regulation No. 407/201 or Council Regulation No. 332/2002, as considered over an appropriate period of time;*** underlines the importance of the principles of proportionality and effectiveness when the Commission proposes such a suspension of payments;

Or. en

Amendment 46
Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission to give careful consideration to the economic and social effects on the regions affected by a suspension of payments; underlines the importance of the principles of proportionality and effectiveness when the

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission to ***take into due account the disproportionate administrative burden and financial costs of reprogramming for the local and regional authorities; insists on the need to*** give careful consideration to the economic

Commission proposes such a suspension of payments;

and social effects on the regions affected by a suspension of payments; underlines the importance of the principles of proportionality and effectiveness when the Commission proposes such a suspension of payments *except if there is a clear evidence of fraud, corruption, criminal infiltration and terrorism financing*;

Or. en

Amendment 47
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission to give careful consideration to the economic and social effects on the regions affected by a suspension of payments; underlines the importance of the principles of proportionality and effectiveness when the Commission proposes such a suspension of payments;

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission to give careful consideration to the economic and social effects on the regions affected by a suspension of payments; underlines the importance of the principles of proportionality and effectiveness when the Commission proposes such a suspension of payments, *while making the suspension of payments the ultimate sanction measure imposed on Member States of the EU*;

Or. el

Amendment 48
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission to give careful consideration to the economic and social effects on the regions affected by a suspension of payments; underlines the

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission to give careful consideration to the economic and social effects on the regions affected by a suspension of payments; underlines the

importance of the principles of proportionality and effectiveness when the Commission proposes such a suspension of payments;

importance of the principles of proportionality and effectiveness when the Commission proposes such a suspension of payments, *as well as possible other exceptional circumstances such as natural disasters or emergencies;*

Or. es

Amendment 49
Emmanuel Maurel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Asks the Commission to integrate fully regions into the reprogramming procedure if they have been designated as new authorities responsible for managing structural funds for the 2014-2020 programming period;

Or. fr

Amendment 50
Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Insists on the need to keep ESI funding clearly separated from the economic governance framework; stresses that local and regional authorities shall not be punished for the mistakes made at the national level of administration;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Asks the Commission to draw up some guidelines on application of the second part of Article 23 of the Common Provisions Regulation;

Or. es

Amendment 52
Hugues Bayet, Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Calls for the continued investment of structural funds in transition regions to ensure continuity in their effects and in the efforts made so far;

Or. fr

Amendment 53
Ivana Maletić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Highlights that important part of good economic governance is sound financial management and timely payments; therefore calls on the Commission to solve problems with backlog and to take into account negative effects of late payments and caused liquidity problems in the Member States when assessing link

between ESI Funds and good economic governance;

Or. en

Amendment 54
Marco Valli, Marco Zanni

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that Parliament *will carefully* apply its scrutiny *rights in the decision-making process via the structural dialogue*.

Amendment

5. Stresses that *the number of concerns posed by the Commission's guidelines cannot be properly solved solely by granting the Parliament the right to* apply its scrutiny *on the decisions regarding reprogramming or the suspension of payments; calls on the Commission to urgently reconsider the proposal to link the effectiveness of ESI Funds to sound economic governance under Article 23 CPR, in light of the negative impact that these sanctions on the investment and cohesion policies goals;*

Or. en

Amendment 55
Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that Parliament will carefully apply its scrutiny rights in the decision-making process via the *structural* dialogue.

Amendment

5. Stresses that Parliament will carefully apply its scrutiny rights in the decision-making process via the *structured* dialogue.

Or. hu

Amendment 56
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that Parliament will *carefully* apply its scrutiny rights in the decision-making process via the structural dialogue.

Amendment

5. Stresses that Parliament will apply its scrutiny rights in the decision-making process via the structural dialogue.

Or. en

Amendment 57
Sven Giegold
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that Parliament will carefully apply its scrutiny rights in the decision-making process via the structural dialogue.

Amendment

5. Stresses that Parliament will carefully apply its scrutiny rights in the decision-making process via the structural dialogue; *asks in particular the Commission to provide details regarding the process which will deliver the assessment foreseen in the Common Provisions Regulation regarding the macro-conditionality attached to the cohesion funds and in particular the involvement of all concerned stakeholders in such assessment;*

Or. en

Amendment 58
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that Parliament will carefully apply its scrutiny rights in the decision-making process via the structural dialogue.

Amendment

5. Stresses that Parliament will carefully apply its scrutiny rights in the decision-making process via the structural dialogue, *thereby ensuring how power should be exercised at European level, particularly as regards transparency, participation, control, effectiveness and consistency.*

Or. en

Amendment 59

Ivana Maletić

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that Parliament will carefully apply its scrutiny rights in the decision-making process via the structural dialogue.

Amendment

5. Stresses that Parliament will carefully apply its scrutiny rights in the decision-making process via the structural dialogue; *therefore asks the Commission to formalise in the guidelines the involvement of the Parliament in line with CPR;*

Or. en

Amendment 60

Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Marisa Matias, Fabio De Masi, Miguel Viegas, Paloma López Bermejo, Matt Carthy

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Calls on the Parliament to submit a proposal concerning the review of the implementation of Article 23 CPR as defined in paragraph 17 of this Article;

Amendment 61
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Regrets that the guidelines do not make any reference to the role of Parliament, despite the fact that the CPR was adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure and despite the consistent calls of Parliament to reinforce democratic accountability and control in the context of economic governance;

Or. en

Amendment 62
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Considers that the involvement of Parliament in line with Article 23 (15) CPR should formalised, by way of a clear procedure allowing Parliament to be informed at all stages as regards the adoption of reprogramming requests or of any proposals and, in the event, decisions on suspension of commitments of payments;

Or. en