



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on Employment and Social Affairs

2014/2150(INI)

30.3.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 161

Draft opinion
Anthea McIntyre
(PE549.312v01-00)

on Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT): State of Play and Outlook
(2014/2150(INI))

AM\1055589EN.doc

PE552.109v01-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1

Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a first step towards reducing the burden of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 2

Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a first step towards reducing the burden of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 3

Jean Lambert

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a first step towards reducing the burden of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;

1. Expresses strong concerns about REFIT serving as a tool to achieve deregulation without acknowledging the positive aspects of regulation and taking full account of the

benefits of regulation in social or other terms, or the fact that in many instances, EU legislation harmonizes or replaces different rules in the 28 Member States, making national markets mutually and equally accessible and reducing administrative costs overall to realize a fully functional internal market.

Recognises that REFIT should represent a step towards job creation;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a first step towards reducing the burden of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the Commission's REFIT communication and considers REFIT to be an important instrument for better regulation;

Or. de

Amendment 5
Miapetra Kumpula-Natri

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a first step towards reducing the burden of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;

Amendment

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a welcome effort to ensure that European legislation serves its purpose efficiently, without unnecessary burden on European citizens and businesses and reduces administrative burden when European legislation replaces 28 national legislation benefiting especially SMEs operating

cross-border;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a *first* step towards reducing *the burden of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;*

Amendment

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a step towards reducing *barriers to growth and job creation but insists that it should not be used as an excuse for delaying vital legislation in the interest of European citizens;*

Or. en

Amendment 7
Siôn Simon, Glenis Willmott

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that *REFIT represents a first step towards reducing the burden of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to* growth and job creation;

Amendment

1. Recognises that *good regulation can benefit businesses and workers alike and help promote economic* growth and job creation;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Pavel Telička, Marian Harkin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a first step towards reducing the **burden** of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;

Amendment

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a first **important** step towards reducing the **administrative burdens** of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to growth, **competitiveness** and job creation;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Maria Arena

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. **Recognises** that REFIT **represents** a first step towards reducing the burden of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;

Amendment

1. **Considers** that REFIT **should represent** a first step towards reducing the burden of regulation on businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Claude Rolin, Ivo Belet, Georges Bach, Pascal Arimont

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a first step towards **reducing the burden of** regulation **on** businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;

Amendment

1. Recognises that REFIT represents a first step towards **simplifying** regulation **for** businesses and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation;

Or. fr

Amendment 11
Siôn Simon, Glenis Willmott

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Calls for REFIT to focus less on reducing regulation and concentrate on quality legislation and its ability to protect and promote the interests of EU citizens. Impact assessments should also evaluate the social and environmental consequences of non-legislation and its impact on the fundamental rights of citizens at EU level. Financial cost-benefit analysis should not be the only criteria applied. When fitness checks are carried out, fundamental rights and employment and health and safety considerations should be given the same weight as financial considerations, and when there is conflict, fundamental rights must take precedence;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Jean Lambert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Recalls that four Members of the High Level Group on Administrative Burden, those representing the views of workers, public health, the environment and consumers, adopted a dissenting opinion with regard to the Final Report of the High Level Group of 24 July 2014¹;

¹<http://www.eeb.org/EEB/?LinkServID=93589C92-5056-B741-DBB964D531862603>

Amendment 13
Claude Rolin, Georges Bach, Pascal Arimont

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Stresses that the improvement of regulation should be on the basis of quality, not quantity;

Or. fr

Amendment 14
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Insists that better regulation should focus on the quality and not quantity of legislation by prioritising the aim and purpose for which obligations were put in place and make society benefitting at large;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Underlines that when evaluations and

regulatory fitness checks of legislation are carried out, fundamental and social rights should be given more weight over economic considerations;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ia. Hopes, however, that the lighter EU laws proposed and applied by the Commission will not be called into question during the TTIP discussions;

Or. fr

Amendment 17
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that cutting red tape should deliver proportionate, evidence-based protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 18
Jean Lambert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. *Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that **cutting red tape should deliver proportionate, evidence-based** protection for workers, **while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;***

Amendment

2. *Notes the Commission's intention of cutting **unnecessary** red tape and better regulation; believes that , **full** protection for workers **should remain the highest priority,***

Or. en

Amendment 19
Claude Rolin, Ivo Belet, Georges Bach, Pascal Arimont

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; *believes that cutting red tape **should deliver proportionate, evidence-based protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;***

Amendment

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; ***fears, however, that cutting red tape will lead to deregulation, in particular as regards legislation on employment and health and safety at work; stresses that this improvement of regulation should encourage the development of businesses, make them more competitive and create jobs, whilst ensuring that employees have sufficient and appropriate protection;***

Or. fr

Amendment 20
Siôn Simon, Glenis Willmott

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Supports *the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and* better regulation; *believes that cutting red tape should deliver proportionate, evidence-based protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;*

Amendment

2. Supports *in principle the Commission's commitment to* better regulation; *emphasises, however, its concern about the threat of deregulation, in particular in the fields of employment and health and safety legislation, under the guise of 'cutting red tape', and the importance of the precautionary principle in these areas;*

Or. en

Amendment 21
Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape *and better regulation*; believes that cutting *red* tape should *deliver proportionate, evidence-based protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;*

Amendment

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape; believes that cutting tape should *be* evidence-based *and under no circumstances diminish the protection for workers;*

Or. en

Amendment 22
Evelyn Regner

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that cutting red tape ***should deliver proportionate, evidence-based*** protection for workers, ***while ensuring*** that businesses can grow, ***create jobs*** and boost competitiveness; ***notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;***

Amendment

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that cutting red tape ***must not lead to reduced*** protection for workers, ***and that it should at the same time ensure*** that businesses can grow and boost competitiveness, ***in order to create high-quality permanent jobs;***

Or. de

**Amendment 23
Maria Arena**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. ***Supports the Commission's*** commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that cutting red tape should ***deliver proportionate, evidence-based*** protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that deregulation ***and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;***

Amendment

2. ***Acknowledges the Commission's*** commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that cutting red tape should ***not reduce*** protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that deregulation ***should not be the hidden objective behind better regulation;***

Or. en

**Amendment 24
Anne Sander, Elisabeth Morin-Chartier**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that ***cutting red tape should deliver proportionate, evidence-based protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;***

Amendment

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that ***better regulation that is clearer, more effective and with less red tape would enable businesses to grow, to create jobs and to boost competitiveness, without calling into question a good level of protection for workers;***

Or. fr

Amendment 25

Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Pavel Telička, Ivo Vajgl, Enrique Calvet Chambon, Marian Harkin

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that cutting red tape should deliver proportionate, evidence-based protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that ***deregulation and better regulation*** are not mutually exclusive;

Amendment

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and ***for providing*** better regulation; ***welcomes the effort of the Juncker Commission to a strengthened Better Regulation Agenda and calls for the need for it to deliver an efficient system and actual progress;*** believes that cutting red tape should ***aim to*** deliver proportionate, evidence-based protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that ***better regulation and high protection of employees*** are not mutually exclusive;

Or. en

Amendment 26

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that cutting red tape should deliver ***proportionate, evidence-based*** protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; ***notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;***

Amendment

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that cutting red tape should deliver protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness;

Or. en

Amendment 27
Jeroen Lenaers

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that cutting red tape should deliver proportionate, evidence-based protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;

Amendment

2. Supports the Commission's commitment on cutting red tape and better regulation; believes that cutting red tape should deliver proportionate, evidence-based protection for workers, while ensuring that businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; ***calls in the process for particular attention to be paid to cutting red tape for young and start-up entrepreneurs so that they gain the confidence to be enterprising;*** notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive;

Or. nl

Amendment 28
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Considers REFIT a first step towards reducing unnecessary regulatory burden and eliminating barriers to growth and job creation; stresses however that 'better regulation' must not be used as pretext for deregulation in order to subvert worker's or consumer's rights;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Points to the horizontal clauses in Article 9 and 11 of the TFEU, which shall be taken into account when defining and implementing policies and activities at EU level; underlines the need to not only assess financial factors and short-term effects but also the long-term value of legislation, such as the reduction of adverse health effects or the preservation of ecosystems, which are often difficult to quantify; deplores that as a consequence, social and environmental benefits and costs are often not taken into account;

Or. en

Amendment 30
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2c. Is worried, that the large number of Commission initiatives and titles regarding 'better regulation' is leading to confusion for citizens and businesses;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2d. Urges the Commission to provide clear definitions regarding REFIT related activities such as 'evaluation', 'simplification', 'consolidation' and 'targeted review' of existing legislation in order to ensure greater transparency;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules that remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly in the area of

3. Stresses the need for clearly-worded legislation in order to facilitate compliance;

health, safety and employment legislation;

Or. en

Amendment 33

Anne Sander

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes efforts to *identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation*; stresses the need for *simpler, clearly-worded* rules that *remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly in the area of health, safety and employment legislation*;

Amendment

3. Welcomes efforts to *simplify the legislative procedure as a whole*; stresses the need for rules that *are clear and comprehensible to all, so that they can be quickly and easily implemented, thereby improving compliance. That is how we will support our businesses more effectively and better protect our workers*;

Or. fr

Amendment 34

Jean Lambert

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for *simpler, clearly-worded* rules that *remove complexity and* can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, *particularly in the area of health, safety and employment* legislation;

Amendment

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for clearly-worded rules that can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance. *Points out that the widespread existing use of exemptions and exceptions under EU legislation is itself a major contributing factor to regulatory complexity*;

Or. en

Amendment 35
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules ***that remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly*** in the area of health, safety and employment legislation;

Amendment

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules, ***including*** in the area of health, safety and employment legislation;

Or. de

Amendment 36
Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, Ole Christensen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules that remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, ***particularly in the area of health, safety and employment legislation;***

Amendment

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules that remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance;

Or. en

Amendment 37
Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules **that remove complexity and** can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly in the area of health, safety and employment legislation;

Amendment

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules **that** can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly in the area of health, safety and employment legislation;

Or. en

Amendment 38

Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Pavel Telička, Ivo Vajgl, Enrique Calvet Chambon, Marian Harkin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules that remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly in the area of health, safety and employment legislation;

Amendment

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification **and adaptability** of legislation **whilst maintaining high standards**; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules that remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly in the area of health, safety and employment legislation; **recalls the importance of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**;

Or. en

Amendment 39
Siôn Simon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules that remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly in the area of health, safety and employment legislation;

Amendment

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules that remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly in the area of health, safety and employment legislation; ***notes with concern, however, that four members of the High Level Group on Administrative Burdens opposed several of the Group's conclusions presented in its final report and produced a dissenting opinion; expects the Commission to take into account the concerns of all parties involved;***

Or. en

Amendment 40
Ivo Belet, Claude Rolin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules that remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly in the area of health, safety and employment legislation;

Amendment

3. Welcomes efforts to identify genuine opportunities for simplification of legislation; stresses the need for simpler, clearly-worded rules that remove complexity and can be implemented in a simple manner in order to improve compliance, particularly in the area of health, safety and employment legislation; ***underlines that social dialogue and social impact assessments in accordance with art. 9 TFEU and art. 152 TFEU shall be taken into account when defining and implementing policies at EU level;***

Amendment 41
Anne Sander

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Stresses the need, moreover, to apply the ‘Think Small First’ principle, which should underpin all rules, given that around 99% of European businesses are SMEs. By adhering to this principle, European legislation should no longer cause additional administrative and regulatory burdens that all too often impede the proper functioning of our SMEs, hinder their competitiveness and restrict their capacity for innovation and job creation; European legislation should, on the contrary, be a pillar for their development, ensuring they have regulatory stability and legal certainty;

Or. fr

Amendment 42
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Welcomes the principle ‘Think Small First’, used by the Commission, which gives priority to SMEs and their interests;

Or. fr

Amendment 43

Ulla Tørnæs, Enrique Calvet Chambon, Ivo Vajgl

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses the need for a bottom-up approach to better regulation; therefore calls on the Commission to establish a "European Stakeholder Forum" on better regulation and less bureaucracy with a quantitative goal of reducing administrative burdens by 20 % by 2020; emphasizes that the Forum shall consist of relevant stakeholders, including official representatives from the civil society, the social partners, consumer organizations and the business community especially SME's which represent 80 % of European job-creation, stresses that proposals from this forum should be actively considered by the Commission, and that the Commission should address the proposals in accordance with the "comply or explain principle; believes the Forum could serve as a platform for businesses or collective groups working both nationally or across Europe to submit inputs supporting the better regulation principles or contributing to achieving less bureaucracy in the regulation applying in their sector;

Or. en

Amendment 44

Anthea McIntyre

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Considers that, where the need for

action at EU level in the area of employment and social affairs has been clearly identified and fully respects the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality, that a set of indicators to identify the full compliance costs as well as administrative costs of any such legislative act should be applied in order to better assess its impact;

Or. en

Amendment 45
Amjad Bashir

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Recalls that gold-plating by the Member States can add complexity to regulation and further reduce compliance; Recommends that Member States avoid adding to the administrative burden when transposing EU legislation to national law as a complementary action to the REFIT programme;

Or. en

Amendment 46
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses that smart regulation must comply with the social dimension of the internal market as provided for by the Treaty; underlines that the REFIT agenda should not be used in order to

undermine agreements reached by social partners at the European level; stresses that the autonomy of social partners needs to be respected; recalls that Article 155 of the TFEU guarantees that social partner agreements become European legislation at the joint request of the signatory parties; welcomes in this respect the statement by Commission President Juncker that the social market economy can only work if there is social dialogue and that he would like to be a President of social dialogue;

Or. en

Amendment 47

Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Insists that legislation on employment and Health & Safety represents minimum standards of protection of workers which Member States can go beyond. The EU legislation will not be interpreted as maximum standards in situations in which these regulations can be seen as obstacles for competition in the single market;

Or. en

Amendment 48

Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Insists that a worker have the right to occupational health and safety protection and minimum working conditions regardless whether the workplace is in a small, medium-sized or large enterprise.

Or. en

Amendment 49
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 50
Anne Sander, Elisabeth Morin-Chartier

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal;

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 51
Claude Rolin, Ivo Belet, Pascal Arimont

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal; *deleted*

Or. fr

Amendment 52
Marian Harkin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal; *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 53
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal; *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 54
Siôn Simon, Glenis Willmott

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. *Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal;*

Amendment

4. *Remains strongly opposed to the Commission's intention to withdraw a number of legislative proposals, in particular the directive on musculoskeletal disorders and the revision of the carcinogens directive; deplors the fact that the proposal for the withdrawals was announced without justification and in the absence of consultation with the partners involved;*

Or. en

Amendment 55
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. *Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal;*

Amendment

4. *Draws attention to Parliament's decisions of 15 January 2015 not to withdraw the maternity leave directive;*

Or. de

Amendment 56
Maria Arena, Siôn Simon, Javi López, Glenis Willmott

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. *Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be*

Amendment

4. *Deeply regrets the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive*

considered for withdrawal;

should be considered for withdrawal; ***calls also on the Council to speed up the adoption of the directive concerning the implementation of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of pregnant workers, workers who have recently given birth and women who are breastfeeding and reiterates the European Parliament's will to negotiate in a pragmatic way;***

Or. en

Amendment 57
Jean Lambert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. ***Welcomes the Commission's*** indication that the maternity leave directive ***should*** be considered for withdrawal;

Amendment

4. ***Regrets the Commission's*** indication that the maternity leave directive ***might*** be considered for withdrawal; ***reiterates its call on Member States to do their utmost to reach an agreement on this health and safety legislation without delay;***

Or. en

Amendment 58
Sofia Ribeiro

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. ***Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal;***

Amendment

4. ***Urges the Commission to resume discussions with the European Parliament and the Council on maternity leave, and highlights the need to include paternity***

and parental leave, with equal rights for both parents, as a key factor in combating gender discrimination at the workplace;

Or. pt

Amendment 59

Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. *Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal;*

Amendment

4. *Calls on the Commission to continue negotiations on the maternity leave directive;*

Or. en

Amendment 60

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. *Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal;*

Amendment

4. *Deplores the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal;*

Or. en

Amendment 61

Ulla Tørnæs, Pavel Telička, Martina Dlabajová

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. **Welcomes** the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive **should** be considered for withdrawal;

Amendment

4. **Notes** the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive **could** be considered for withdrawal; ***underlines that any new proposal from the Commission in this area must be in full compliance with the principle of subsidiarity;***

Or. en

Amendment 62
Anthea McIntyre

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal;

Amendment

4. Welcomes the Commission's indication ***in their Work Programme 2015*** that the maternity leave directive should be considered for withdrawal; ***Believes that considerations should be given to a broader non-legislative initiative to promote the reconciliation of work and family life in Member States;***

Or. en

Amendment 63
Georges Bach

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be

Amendment

4. Welcomes the Commission's indication that the maternity leave directive should be

considered for withdrawal;

considered for withdrawal; *urges it, however, to submit a new proposal as soon as possible;*

Or. fr

Amendment 64
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Strongly disagrees with the intention of the Commission to withdraw the directive on maternity leave. Believes that the refusal of the Council to open negotiations with the EP must not impede the provision of effective protection for pregnant or breastfeeding women, and for women re-entering the labour market after pregnancy;

Or. en

Amendment 65
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Opposes the intention of the Commission to withdraw legislative proposals, in particular the directive on maternity leave; without adequate consultation with co-legislators and stakeholders, which constitutes an essential element of policy making;

Or. en

Amendment 66
Anne Sander, Elisabeth Morin-Chartier

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Notes that the Commission is considering withdrawing the maternity leave directive; calls on the Commission to draw up a new proposal, which should take account of social developments and result in an ambitious directive which would encourage the rate of employment among women and the birth rate in Europe;

Or. fr

Amendment 67
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Appreciates that, given that this proposal for a directive has been blocked during the legislative procedure since 2008, and is thus inoperative, its withdrawal might lead to a fresh departure or to new ways of achieving these goals;

Or. fr

Amendment 68
Claude Rolin, Pascal Arimont

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Remains strongly opposed to the Commission's intention to withdraw a number of legislative proposals, particularly the directive on maternity leave, the directive on musculoskeletal disorders and the revision of the carcinogens directive; regrets that these withdrawal proposals were announced without any supporting analysis and without the prior consultation of co-legislators and stakeholders;

Or. fr

Amendment 69
Maria Arena

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Regrets Commissions' reluctance to present any legislative proposal to support the fight against musculoskeletal disorders that are, according to the European Agency for Safety and Health at work (OSHA) research, costly conditions for companies due to their direct – insurance, compensation, medical and administrative costs - and indirect costs of lost productivity;

Or. en

Amendment 70
Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Calls on the Commission to increase the protection of workers; in particular, calls the Commission to present a proposal on muscular skeletal disorders, environmental tobacco smoke and make necessary updates to carcinogens and mutagens.

Or. en

Amendment 71
Siôn Simon, Glenis Willmott

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Asserts that REFIT should not be a pretext for undermining agreements reached between social partners at the European level and that the autonomy of the social partners needs to be respected; underlines that Article 155 TFEU guarantees that social partner agreements become European legislation at the joint request of the signatory parties; calls therefore for the hairdressers social partner agreement on occupational health and safety to be adopted;

Or. en

Amendment 72
Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Encourages the Commission to present a proposal on the health & safety hairdressers' agreement to respect the experience of European Employers' associations and European workers representation in this sector and their decision of protecting of workers and to respect the possibility provided by the Social Dialogue based in the Treaties.

Or. en

Amendment 73

Maria Arena

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Regrets the Commission refusal to turn into law the hairdresser's sector agreement damaging thus the trust of the social partners into European social dialogue and the Commission support function of it;

Or. en

Amendment 74

Georges Bach

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Calls on the Commission to consult Parliament and stakeholders before withdrawing any legislative proposals;

Amendment 75
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Stresses the need to ensure predictability, legal certainty and transparency in order for REFIT not to become a source of permanent legal uncertainty; underlines that any changes to legislation must be thoroughly considered also in a long-term perspective; notes that the principle of political discontinuity and the withdrawal of existing legislation should not give rise to doubts regarding political desirability of social goals;

Or. en

Amendment 76
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4c. Regrets that the Commission is reluctant to scrutinise the proposed directive on the single member company with limited liability (SUP) in the context of REFIT; warns that the proposed directive might create serious problems by providing new and easy ways to establish letterbox companies as well as by undermining workers' social rights and avoiding the payment of social contributions;

Amendment 77
Maria Arena

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4c. Is concerned about the ongoing evaluation of Working time legislation for simplification; Suggests improvement of efforts for correct implementation instead;

Or. en

Amendment 78
Maria Arena

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4d. Is concerned about the ongoing evaluation of Temporary Agencies legislation for simplification; Requires instead that any revision of it should broaden its scope to include mobile workers;

Or. en

Amendment 79
Sofia Ribeiro

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Rejects the proposal to withdraw aid schemes for the distribution of fruit and vegetables, bananas and milk in schools;

Or. pt

Amendment 80

Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 81

Siôn Simon, Glenis Willmott

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

5. Calls on the Commission to *review the SME test to ensure this does not risk lowering the health and safety and employment rights and protections of workers in SMEs;*

Or. en

Amendment 82
Maria Arena

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis*, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. *calls on the Commission to consider that, as stated in its opinion by the European Economic and Social Committee, the Think Small First principle is not intended to exempt micro-enterprises and SMEs from the application of the legislation and cannot be used for this purpose but rather to ensure that when legislation is drawn up, the fact that it will also apply to small enterprises is taken into account, without affecting its intended objective*, while not compromising on health, safety and employment **high** standards;

Or. en

Amendment 83
Jean Lambert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising* on health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. *Notes the SME test; Warns at the risk of using lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs or to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, as these should never compromise* on health, safety and employment standards; *Reminds that according to UEAPME, the exemption of SMEs or micro enterprises of European legislation goes against SME interests;*¹

Or. en

Amendment 84
Claude Rolin, Ivo Belet, Georges Bach

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis*, while not compromising on health, safety *and employment* standards;

Amendment

5. Calls on the Commission to *take account of the specific features of SMEs and* micro-enterprises *when drafting legislation*, while not compromising on *workers' rights, especially on health and safety standards in the workplace*;

Or. fr

Amendment 85
Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis*, while not *compromising on* health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. *Takes note of the SME-test; believes that* micro-enterprises *could be considered for exemption on a case-by-case-basis*, while not *leading to lower* health, safety and employment standards;

Or. en

Amendment 86
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use *lighter* regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider *exemptions* for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, *while not compromising on* health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use *adapted* regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider *adapted regimes* for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, *without calling the level of* health, safety and employment standards *into question*;

Or. de

Amendment 87
Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Pavel Telička, Ivo Vajgl, Enrique Calvet Chambon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for *micro-enterprises* on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. Welcomes the SME test *and reminds the Commission on the commitment it has made in the Small Business Act to implement the "think small first principle" in its policy-making and considers that there is still an important margin of progress to be completed*; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises, *start-ups* and SMEs and to consider exemptions for *them* on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Or. en

Amendment 88
Anne Sander

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. Points out that some 99% of European businesses are SMEs and should therefore become the benchmark for all regulation; European legislation should be based on the ‘Think Small First’ principle; warmly welcomes the SME test, therefore, which should be mandatory and systematic at all stages of the legislative process; calls on the Commission to use, but only when necessary, lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Or. fr

Amendment 89
Miapetra Kumpula-Natri

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to ***use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to*** consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Or. en

Amendment 90
Sven Schulze

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards *or on standards designed to help in the fight against crime*;

Or. de

Amendment 91
Anne Sander

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use *lighter* regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use *more effective* regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Or. fr

Amendment 92
Jeroen Lenaers

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs, ***in particular for young and start-up entrepreneurs***, and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Or. nl

Amendment 93

Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards;

Amendment

5. Welcomes the SME test; calls on the Commission to use lighter regimes for micro-enterprises and SMEs and to consider exemptions for micro-enterprises on a case-by-case basis, while not compromising on health, safety and employment standards, ***or on established social rights***;

Or. fr

Amendment 94

Marian Harkin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Calls on the Commission to urgently consider measures to address the impact that recently implemented EU VAT rules

for digital services are having on micro enterprises, particularly the significant administrative burden, in order to allow the digital economy to thrive;

Or. en

Amendment 95
Anthea McIntyre

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Calls on the Commission to urgently review the Small Business Act to see how it can be improved to work more effectively, in line with the better regulation agenda;

Or. en

Amendment 96
Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Pavel Telička

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Reminds that Commissioner Biénkowska during her confirmation hearing committed the Commission to consider the withdrawal of any proposal that Members find that an impact assessment is flawed or that elements have not been considered in full, calls on the Commission to confirm its commitment to this in writing;

Or. en

Amendment 97
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Points out that legislation can have a different impact on large enterprises and SME's, which should be kept in mind during the drafting process; stresses that all employees have a right to the highest level of protection regarding health and safety in the workplace regardless the size of the employer or the underlying contract;

Or. en

Amendment 98
Anthea McIntyre

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Notes that social partner agreements apply to a wide range of policy areas that impact on both employees and employers; is concerned that negotiations have not kept pace with the EU better regulation agenda;

Or. en

Amendment 99
Anne Sander

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for further measures to check that *legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures*;

Amendment

6. Calls for further measures to check that *the new rules adopted do not conflict with existing rules, as this would require substantial and costly efforts on the part of our businesses to comply with the new rules; calls, moreover for verification on whether legislative texts have been transposed and applied in a uniform manner by the Member States and whether they are having the desired effect*;

Or. fr

Amendment 100

Siôn Simon, Glenis Willmott

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for further measures to *check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do* and to *identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures*;

Amendment

6. Calls for further measures to *ensure effective monitoring and enforcement of legislation* and to *deal with damaging loopholes where they arise*;

Or. en

Amendment 101

Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for *further measures* to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where *there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures*;

Amendment

6. Calls for *ex-post assessments* to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where *legislation is not having the intended*

effect;

Or. de

Amendment 102

Jean Lambert

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where *there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures*;

Amendment

6. Calls for further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where *more should be done at the EU level. Calls on the Commission to come forward with legislative proposals in these areas*;

Or. en

Amendment 103

Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for *further measures* to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and *ineffective measures*;

Amendment

6. Calls for *better impact assessments* to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and *room for improvement; stresses at the same time the need for better enforcement of current legislation*;

Or. en

Amendment 104

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, Ole Christensen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Calls for further measures* to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures;

Amendment

6. *Supports continuous work* to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures;

Or. en

Amendment 105

Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Pavel Telička, Ivo Vajgl, Enrique Calvet Chambon, Marian Harkin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures;

Amendment

6. Calls for further measures *such as carrying out independent impact assessments throughout the legislative process, further strengthening the independence, objectivity and neutrality of impact assessments and the SME-test, further facilitating citizens participation in the EUs legislative process, ensuring the adaptability of legislators and increasing transparency of inter-institutional negotiations as well as monitoring the transposition of the EU-legislation into national laws by including national gold-plating in the EU Regulatory Scoreboard* to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures;

Or. en

Amendment 106
Sven Schulze

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures;

Amendment

6. Calls for ***improved regulatory impact assessment and greater transparency with regard to the extent to which draft laws take account of comments submitted during consultations by the people who will be affected by those laws, along with*** further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures ;

Or. de

Amendment 107
Claude Rolin, Ivo Belet, Georges Bach, Pascal Arimont

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures;

Amendment

6. Calls for further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures; ***calls also for impact assessments to take account of the social and environmental impact, as well as the economic impact;***

Or. fr

Amendment 108
Jeroen Lenaers

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures;

Amendment

6. Calls for further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures;
calls furthermore, as part of the lawmaking process, for particular attention to be paid in this connection to consequences for cross-border regions;

Or. nl

Amendment 109

Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures;

Amendment

6. Calls for further measures to check that legislation is doing what it was intended to do and to identify areas where there are inconsistencies and ineffective measures;
as a consequence legislation needs to be better enforced;

Or. en

Amendment 110

Siôn Simon

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and to introduce sunset clauses to ensure that employment legislation is periodically reviewed;

Amendment

deleted

Amendment 111
Claude Rolin, Georges Bach, Pascal Arimont

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and to introduce sunset clauses to ensure that employment legislation is periodically reviewed; *deleted*

Or. fr

Amendment 112
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and to introduce sunset clauses to ensure that employment legislation is periodically reviewed; *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 113
Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, Ole Christensen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle **and to introduce sunset clauses to ensure that employment legislation is periodically reviewed**;

Amendment

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle;

Or. en

Amendment 114
Maria Arena

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and to **introduce sunset clauses to ensure that employment legislation is periodically reviewed**;

Amendment

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and to ensure that employment legislation is periodically **further strengthened**;

Or. en

Amendment 115
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and to **introduce sunset clauses to ensure that employment legislation is periodically reviewed**;

Amendment

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and **where appropriate to propose review** clauses;

Or. de

Amendment 116
Jean Lambert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and *to introduce sunset clauses* to ensure that employment legislation is *periodically reviewed*;

Amendment

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and *be more ambitious* to ensure that employment legislation is *in the core of the EU agenda and responding to the citizens' needs*;

Or. en

Amendment 117
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and to *introduce sunset clauses to* ensure that employment legislation is *periodically reviewed*;

Amendment

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and to ensure that employment legislation is *reviewed whenever necessary*;

Or. en

Amendment 118
Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative *cycle and to introduce sunset clauses to* ensure that employment legislation is periodically

Amendment

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative *protection of workers via employment and Health and Safety standards and that revision*

reviewed;

clauses ensure that employment legislation is periodically reviewed;

Or. en

Amendment 119

Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Pavel Telička, Marian Harkin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Urges the Commission to continue to improve the legislative cycle and to introduce sunset clauses to ensure that employment legislation is periodically reviewed;

Amendment

7. Urges the Commission *and co-legislators* to continue to improve the legislative cycle and to introduce sunset clauses *when justified and useful in concrete cases* to ensure that employment legislation is periodically reviewed;

Or. en

Amendment 120

Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Warns against the implementation of sunset clauses in legislation as they risk to create legal uncertainty and legislative discontinuity;

Or. en

Amendment 121

Anthea McIntyre

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Believes that better regulation principles should apply to decisions on secondary legislation as well as primary legislation; calls on the Commission to take appropriate steps to ensure all implementing and delegated acts in the area of employment and social affairs are open for wider scrutiny in a simple, clear and transparent manner;

Or. en

Amendment 122
Rina Ronja Kari, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Opposes the setting of a net target for reducing regulatory costs, as this ignores the aim pursued by regulation and its corresponding benefits;

Or. en

Amendment 123
Siôn Simon, Glenis Willmott

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the 'Top Ten' most

deleted

burdensome laws for SMEs, including the working time and temporary agency directives;

Or. en

Amendment 124
Claude Rolin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the 'Top Ten' most burdensome laws for SMEs, including the working time and temporary agency directives; *deleted*

Or. fr

Amendment 125
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the 'Top Ten' most burdensome laws for SMEs, including the working time and temporary agency directives; *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 126
Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the 'Top Ten' most burdensome laws for SMEs, including the working time and temporary agency directives;

Amendment

deleted

Or. de

Amendment 127
Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, Ole Christensen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the 'Top Ten' most burdensome laws for SMEs, including the working time and temporary agency directives;

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission, after 'Top Ten', to seek wider range of cooperation with different stakeholders, e.g. social partners and enterprises, to find ways to create jobs and to reduce burdens of SMEs;

Or. en

Amendment 128
Maria Arena

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the *fields of what have been identified as the* 'Top Ten' most burdensome laws for SMEs, *including the*

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the *field the* 'Top Ten' most burdensome laws for SMEs *consultation, starting with a review of its methodology*

working time *and temporary agency directives*;

to not consider a priori that any legislation is a burden for companies ; Is concerned about the results of this consultation highlighting very important workers' protection legislations such as the directives on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work or on Working time, as too burdensome on SMEs legislations;

Or. en

Amendment 129
Jean Lambert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of *what have been identified* as the ‘*Top Ten*’ most *burdensome laws for SMEs*, including the working time *and temporary agency directives*;

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of *implementation of legislation concerning casual work such as the temporary agency directive and health and safety legislation*, including the working time *directive*;

Or. en

Amendment 130
Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission *to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified* as the ‘*Top Ten*’ most burdensome laws for SMEs, *including* the working time and temporary agency directives;

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission *not to use* the ‘*Top Ten*’ most burdensome laws for SMEs *as justification to review* the working time and temporary agency directives *because the protection of workers must be guaranteed regardless*

whether the workplace is in a small, medium sized or large enterprise.

Or. en

Amendment 131
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields *of what* have been identified as the ‘*Top Ten*’ most burdensome laws for SMEs, *including the working time and temporary agency directives*;

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields *that* have been identified as the most burdensome laws for SMEs;

Or. en

Amendment 132
Marian Harkin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the ‘Top Ten’ most burdensome laws for SMEs, *including the working time and temporary agency directives*;

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the ‘Top Ten’ most burdensome laws for SMEs;

Or. en

Amendment 133
Anthea McIntyre

PE552.109v01-00

60/73

AM\1055589EN.doc

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the ‘Top Ten’ most burdensome laws for SMEs, including the working time and temporary agency directives;

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the ‘Top Ten’ most burdensome laws for SMEs, including the working time and temporary agency directives; ***Calls on the Commission produce its detailed impact assessment on the Working Time Directive as a matter of urgency;***

Or. en

Amendment 134
Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Pavel Telička

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the ‘Top Ten’ most burdensome laws for SMEs, including the working time and temporary agency directives;

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the ‘Top Ten’ most burdensome laws for SMEs, ***micro-enterprises and start-ups***, including the working time and temporary agency directives ***as well as national legislation which fragments the European Single Market;***

Or. en

Amendment 135
Anne Sander

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the ‘Top Ten’ most burdensome laws for SMEs, including the working time and temporary agency directives;

Amendment

8. Calls on the Commission to prioritise action in the fields of what have been identified as the ‘Top Ten’ most burdensome laws for SMEs, including the working time and temporary agency directives; ***is also concerned about the threats posed by the implementation of the REACH directive on employment in European SMEs in the chemical industry; calls for balanced solutions to be found between the protection of workers and unnecessary administrative burdens for SMEs;***

Or. fr

Amendment 136
Sofia Ribeiro

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Calls on the Commission to persist in its negotiations, at Council level, on combating late payments in commercial transactions, on company accounting requirements, on the collection of statistics, on coordination on VAT and simplification of VAT obligations, and on common rules to calculate the corporate tax base;

Or. pt

Amendment 137
Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. There are no satisfactory criteria to measure "efficiency" and "costs; these terms are not adequate in terms of occupational accidents and disease. This could lead to decisions taken by administration and controllers thereby circumventing the legitimate democratic legislators;

Or. en

Amendment 138

Rina Ronja Kari, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8b. Calls on the European Parliament to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review IMPAs analysis as early as possible in the legislative process, and to call for impact assessments on its own reports.

Or. en

Amendment 139

Anthea McIntyre

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Calls on the social partners to embrace better regulation tools, to increase the use of impact assessments in their negotiations and refer agreements proposing legislative action to the

Amendment 140
Anthea McIntyre

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8b. Reiterates Parliaments calls for an ambitious burden reduction target of 30% to be introduced in the costs to SMEs and microenterprises by administrative and regulatory burdens by 2020;

Or. en

Amendment 141
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Opposes the setting of a net target for reducing regulatory costs, as this ignores the aim pursued by regulation and its corresponding benefits;

Or. en

Amendment 142
Jutta Steinruck

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8c. Stresses that EU directives are meant to be implemented by Member States through national legislation; underlines that according to the Commission one third of the regulatory and administrative burden of EU legislation is a result of transposition measures undertaken by the Member States which do not flow from the legislation itself (also known as gold-plating); calls on the Commission to closely monitor the implementation of directives by Member States as regards gold-plating and to consider making greater use of regulations instead of directives, in order to have more consistent legislation and minimize gold-plating;

Or. en

Amendment 143

Agnes Jongerius, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8c. Stresses that EU directives are meant to be implemented by Member States through national legislation; underlines that according to the Commission one third of the regulatory and administrative burden of EU legislation is a result of transposition measures undertaken by the Member States which do not flow from the legislation itself (also known as gold-plating); calls on the Commission to closely monitor the implementation of directives by Member States as regards gold-plating;

Or. en

Amendment 144

Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review IMPA's analysis as early as possible in the legislative process, and to call for impact assessments on its own reports.

deleted

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 145

Evelyn Regner

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review IMPA's analysis as early as possible in the legislative process, and to call for impact assessments on its own reports.

Amendment

9. Urges Parliament's specialist committees to make more consistent use of in-house impact assessment instruments, particularly where substantial changes to the original Commission proposal are being envisaged.

Or. de

Amendment 146

Siôn Simon, Glenis Willmott

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the committee ***responsible to systematically*** review Commission impact assessments ***and review IMPA's analysis*** as early as possible in the legislative process, ***and to call for impact assessments on its own reports.***

Amendment

9. Calls on the committee ***to*** review Commission impact assessments as early as possible in the legislative process ***to ensure they have taken due consideration of the social and employment impact.***

Or. en

Amendment 147

Maria Arena

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 9**

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review ***IMPA's*** analysis as early as possible in the legislative process, and to ***call for*** impact assessments on its own reports.

Amendment

9. Calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review ***IMPA's*** analysis as early as possible in the legislative process, and to ***process to its own*** impact assessments on its own reports ***on a case by case basis, if changing the substance of the Commission proposals and if the Council fulfils its 2003 "better regulation" Inter Institutional Agreement commitment to conducting impact assessment of its amendments, as the European Parliament did.***

Or. en

Amendment 148

Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 9**

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review IMPA's analysis as early as possible in the legislative process, and to call for impact assessments on its own reports.

Amendment

9. Calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review IMPA's analysis as early as possible in the legislative process, and to call for impact assessments on its own reports ***in order to ensure that there is a real positive impact on employment and social affairs in the Member States;***

Or. fr

Amendment 149

Ulla Tørnæs, Martina Dlabajová, Pavel Telička, Marian Harkin

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 9**

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review IMPA's analysis as early as possible in the legislative process, and to call for impact assessments on its own reports.

Amendment

9. Calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review IMPA's analysis as early as possible in the legislative process, and to call for ***independent*** impact assessments on its own reports.

Or. en

Amendment 150

Jean Lambert

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 9**

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review IMPA's analysis as early as possible in the legislative

Amendment

9. Calls on the committee responsible to systematically review Commission impact assessments and review IMPA's analysis as early as possible in the legislative

process, and to call for impact assessments on its own reports.

process, and to call for *social* impact assessments on its own reports.

Or. en

Amendment 151
Marian Harkin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

In the area of public procurement, strongly supports further measures such as the promotion of smaller procurement parcels to assist SMEs and micro enterprises to compete for public procurement tenders.

Or. en

Amendment 152
Dominique Martin, Joëlle Mélin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Stresses, however, the limitations of these impact assessments which, even if conducted for each legislative proposal, will not prevent the introduction of regulations and directives which may have a serious adverse impact on employment and social affairs in the Member States.

Or. fr

Amendment 153
Siôn Simon, Glenis Willmott

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Stresses that EU legislation sets only minimum standards which can be improved by Member States through national legislation; emphasises that the Commission focus on 'gold-plating' as a negative practice for employment legislation runs contrary to the principles of the EU Treaty, including Article 151 for the protection and improvement of living and working conditions.

Or. en

Amendment 154
Claude Rolin, Ivo Belet, Georges Bach, Pascal Arimont

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Stresses that REFIT can in no way provide an excuse to question or refuse to recognise collective agreements that have been independently concluded by the social partners, nor may it hamper the development of consultation and social dialogue.

Or. fr

Amendment 155
Amjad Bashir

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Calls on the Commission to set annual targets to alleviate the problem of excessive administration for SMEs such as a burden reduction target.

Or. en

Amendment 156

Rina Ronja Kari, Lynn Boylan, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. "Simplification" and "burden reduction" are void of meaning in a situation which is ever more complex. New technologies and procedures could endanger the health of workers with requires new protection and this may be administrative burdens.

Or. en

Amendment 157

Rina Ronja Kari, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9b. Questions the balance of representation of the High Level Group of Administrative Burdens (HLG) and its recommendations (24 July 2014), rejects its recommendations and asks for recognition of the Dissenting Opinion of four members of the HLG;

Amendment 158
Anne Sander

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Reiterates the request of the European Parliament¹ to establish a new High Level Group on Better Regulation, consisting of stakeholders' representatives and national experts; this group should be visible and independent; proposes that the High Level Group should assess the administrative burden caused by legislative proposals throughout the negotiations, the cost of compliance and respect for the subsidiarity and proportionality principles; this group should also propose measures to improve regulation and supervise the implementation of EU legislation at national level.

¹ *European Parliament resolution of 27 November 2014 on the revision of the Commission's impact assessment guidelines and the role of the SME test (2014/2967(RSP))*

Or. fr

Amendment 159
Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Urges the Commission to better assess the social and environmental consequences, as well as the impact of its

policy on the fundamental rights of citizens, by keeping in mind the cost of non-legislation at European level as well as the fact that cost-benefit analyses are only one of many criteria.

Or. en

Amendment 160

Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9b. Is convinced that sound impact assessments constitute an important tool to support decision-making and play a significant role in better regulation; underlines, however, that such assessments cannot substitute for political assessments and decisions;

Or. en

Amendment 161

Agnes Jongerius, Jutta Steinruck, Marita Ulvskog

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9c. Questions the conversion of the Commission's Impact Assessment Board (IAB) into a 'Regulatory Scrutiny Board' and stresses the need for transparency and independence regarding this process.

Or. en