



**2016/2151(DEC)**

14.12.2016

# **AMENDMENTS**

## **1 - 21**

**Draft opinion**  
**Marian Harkin**  
(PE592.088v01-00)

Discharge 2015: General budget of the EU - European Commission  
(2016/2151(DEC))



**Amendment 1**  
**Notis Marias**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

1. Notes that the estimated error level in the policy area of economic, social and territorial cohesion is **5,2%, which represents a small decrease of 0,5% from last year but is** still unacceptably high;

*Amendment*

1. Notes that the estimated error level in the policy area of economic, social and territorial cohesion is still unacceptably high;

Or. el

**Amendment 2**  
**Amjad Bashir, Jana Žitňanská, Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

1. Notes that the estimated error level in the policy area of economic, social and territorial cohesion is 5,2%, which represents a small decrease of 0,5% from last year but is still unacceptably high;

*Amendment*

1. Notes **with concern** that the estimated error level in the policy area of economic, social and territorial cohesion is 5,2%, which represents a small decrease of 0,5% from last year but is still unacceptably high **and remains far from the target of 2%**;

Or. en

**Amendment 3**  
**Jean Lambert**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

1. Notes that the estimated error level

*Amendment*

1. Notes that the estimated error level

in the policy area of economic, social and territorial cohesion is 5,2%, which represents a small decrease of 0,5% from last year but is still *unacceptably* high;

in the policy area of economic, social and territorial cohesion is 5,2%, which represents a small decrease of 0,5% from last year but is still *rather* high;

Or. en

#### **Amendment 4** **Romana Tomc**

##### **Draft opinion** **Paragraph 2**

###### *Draft opinion*

2. Notes that the principal sources of error in this area are the inclusion of ineligible expenditure in the beneficiaries' cost declarations, *the selection of ineligible projects, activities and beneficiaries* and the infringement of public procurement and State aid rules;

###### *Amendment*

2. Notes that the principal sources of error in this area are the inclusion of ineligible expenditure in the beneficiaries' cost declarations and the infringement of public procurement and State aid rules;

Or. sl

#### **Amendment 5** **Jean Lambert** on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

##### **Draft opinion** **Paragraph 2**

###### *Draft opinion*

2. Notes that the principal sources of error in this area are the inclusion of ineligible expenditure in the beneficiaries' cost declarations, the selection of ineligible projects, activities and beneficiaries and the infringement of public procurement and State aid rules;

###### *Amendment*

2. Notes that the principal sources of error in this area are the inclusion of ineligible expenditure in the beneficiaries' cost declarations, the selection of ineligible projects, activities and beneficiaries and the infringement of public procurement and State aid rules *which can't always be categorised as an administrative error*;

Or. en

**Amendment 6**  
**Notis Marias**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2**

*Draft opinion*

2. Notes that the principal sources of error in this area are the inclusion of ineligible expenditure in the beneficiaries' cost declarations, the selection of ineligible projects, activities and beneficiaries and the infringement of public procurement and State aid rules;

*Amendment*

2. Notes that the principal sources of error in this area are the inclusion of ineligible expenditure in the beneficiaries' cost declarations, the selection of ineligible projects, activities and beneficiaries and the infringement of public procurement and State aid rules; ***stresses the need to take steps immediately to reduce these sources of error;***

Or. el

**Amendment 7**  
**Romana Tomc**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***2a. Notes that ineligible projects and activities carried out by ineligible providers are often selected; calls on the Member States to refrain from such practices;***

Or. sl

**Amendment 8**  
**Jean Lambert**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Is **very** concerned that Member States had sufficient information available to prevent and correct errors before claiming reimbursement and **if this information was used** the estimated errors would have been 2,4% lower and that, in addition, the error at Member State level contributed a further 0,6% to error levels;

*Amendment*

3. Is **highly** concerned that, **as was already the case in previous years**, Member States had sufficient information available to prevent and correct errors before claiming reimbursement and **stresses strongly that if Member States, as is their obligation, had used this information** the estimated errors would have been 2,4% lower and that, in addition, the error at Member State level contributed a further 0,6% to error levels; **stresses that combined that would bring the estimated error level below the material threshold of 2 %; stresses the utmost importance to strengthen the Commission's administrative support to the Member States;**

Or. en

**Amendment 9**  
**Notis Marias**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. **Is very concerned** that Member States had sufficient information available to prevent and correct errors before claiming reimbursement and if this information was used the estimated errors would have been 2,4% lower and that, in addition, the error at Member State level contributed a further 0,6% to error levels;

*Amendment*

3. **Deplores the fact** that Member States had sufficient information available to prevent and correct errors before claiming reimbursement and if this information was used the estimated errors would have been 2,4% lower and that, in addition, the error at Member State level contributed a further 0,6% to error levels;

Or. el

**Amendment 10**  
**Romana Tomc**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**3a.** *Notes that Member State laws too often further tighten the conditions for implementing projects, leading to less transparency and the selection of poorer projects, and making projects difficult to implement;*

Or. sl

**Amendment 11**  
**Jean Lambert**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

4. Notes that, by the end of 2015, fewer than 20% of the national authorities responsible for the European Structural and Investment Funds ("ESIF") had been designated and that, consequently, there is **a** risk that delays in budgetary execution for the 2014 to 2020 programming period will be greater than those in the 2007-2013 period;

4. Notes **with concern** that, by the end of 2015, fewer than 20% of the national authorities responsible for the European Structural and Investment Funds ("ESIF") had been designated and that, consequently, there is **an urgent** risk that delays in budgetary execution for the 2014 to 2020 programming period will be greater than those in the 2007-2013 period; **stresses that this delay poses a high burden for beneficiaries and therefore threatens stable financing for projects for e.g. the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative;**

Or. en

**Amendment 12**  
**Amjad Bashir, Jana Žitňanská, Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4**

*Draft opinion*

4. Notes that, by the end of 2015, fewer than 20% of the national authorities responsible for the European Structural and Investment Funds (“ESIF”) had been designated and that, consequently, there is a risk that delays in budgetary execution for the 2014 to 2020 programming period will be greater than those in the 2007-2013 period;

*Amendment*

4. Notes that, by the end of 2015, fewer than 20% of the national authorities responsible for the European Structural and Investment Funds (“ESIF”) had been designated and that, consequently, there is a risk that delays in budgetary execution for the 2014 to 2020 programming period will be greater than those in the 2007-2013 period; ***calls on the Commission to take necessary precautions to ensure that these foreseen delays do not give rise to the same budgetary complications that were seen at the end of the previous programming period;***

Or. en

**Amendment 13**  
**Romana Tomc**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4**

*Draft opinion*

4. Notes that, by the end of 2015, fewer than 20% of the national authorities responsible for the European Structural and Investment Funds (“ESIF”) had been designated and that, consequently, there is a risk that delays in budgetary execution for the 2014 to 2020 programming period will be greater than those in the 2007-2013 period;

*Amendment*

4. Notes that, by the end of 2015, fewer than 20% of the national authorities responsible for the European Structural and Investment Funds (“ESIF”) had been designated and that, consequently, there is a risk that delays in budgetary execution for the 2014 to 2020 programming period will be greater than those in the 2007-2013 period; ***calls on the Commission to take action and on those Member States which lag behind to act more swiftly;***

Or. sl

**Amendment 14**  
**Notis Marias**

**Draft opinion  
Paragraph 5**

*Draft opinion*

5. Notes the ECA recommendation that the Commission fundamentally reconsiders the design and delivery mechanism for the ESIFs when making its legislative proposal for the next programming period and takes into account the suggestions of the high level simplification group;

*Amendment*

5. Notes the ECA recommendation that the Commission ***immediately and*** fundamentally reconsiders the design and delivery mechanism for the ESIFs when making its legislative proposal for the next programming period and takes into account the suggestions of the high level simplification group;

Or. el

**Amendment 15  
Amjad Bashir, Jana Žitňanská, Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion  
Paragraph 5**

*Draft opinion*

5. *Notes* the ECA recommendation that the Commission fundamentally reconsiders the design and delivery mechanism for the ESIFs when making its legislative proposal for the next programming period and takes into account the suggestions of the high level simplification group;

*Amendment*

5. ***Welcomes*** the ECA recommendation that the Commission fundamentally reconsiders the design and delivery mechanism for the ESIFs when making its legislative proposal for the next programming period and takes into account the suggestions of the high level simplification group;

Or. en

**Amendment 16  
Amjad Bashir, Jana Žitňanská, Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion  
Paragraph 6 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***6a. Calls on the Commission to consider the possibility of including EU funding programmes in their Annual***

**Amendment 17**

**Amjad Bashir, Jana Žitňanská, Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 6 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***6b. Highlights that the introduction of Annual Burden Reduction Targets that include EU funding programmes would increase compliance and therefore contribute to a reduction in the error rate;***

Or. en

**Amendment 18**

**Amjad Bashir, Jana Žitňanská, Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 7 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***7a. Is concerned with the shortcomings in relation to information provided by the Member States concerning key aspects included in their national Youth Guarantee Implementation Plans; notes that examples of shortcomings include inadequate monitoring and reporting arrangements for the Youth Guarantee scheme;***

Or. en

**Amendment 19**  
**Claude Rolin**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 7 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***7a. Notes the European Commission's decision to set up a high level group of simplification in response to the significant administrative burden on beneficiaries caused by the increasing levels of control;***

Or. en

**Amendment 20**  
**Claude Rolin**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 7 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***7b. Welcomes the European Court of Auditors' recommendation to the European Commission to clarify the links between the Europe 2020 strategy, the multi-annual financial framework and the Commission priorities in order to report effectively on the contribution of the EU budget towards Europe 2020 objectives;***

Or. en

**Amendment 21**  
**Amjad Bashir, Jana Žitňanská, Anthea McIntyre**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 7 b (new)**

***7b. Welcomes the increased focus on results under the current programming period; considers, however, that further developing result indicators and monitoring systems would contribute to sound financial accountability and increase the efficiency of future operating programmes;***

Or. en