



2016/2024(BUD)

1.6.2016

AMENDMENTS

1 - 29

Draft opinion

Giovanni La Via

(PE582.104v01-00)

on the mandate for the trilogue on the 2017 draft budget
(2016/2024(BUD))

Amendment 1

Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion

Paragraph -1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1. whereas the credibility of decentralised agencies whose missions fall within the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety is repeatedly being called into question and whereas the stated reason for these doubts is that staff at these agencies are allegedly too closely linked to industry;

Or. de

Amendment 2

Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Frédérique Ries, Nils Torvalds

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Recalls that climate and resource efficiency mainstreaming is of horizontal importance in all EU policies for achieving the goals set by the Europe 2020 strategy; recalls, moreover, that moving the EU economies towards decarbonisation in order to fulfil the obligations arising from the Paris Agreement on climate change will be one of the main challenges that the European Union will have to face in the coming decades;

1. Recalls that climate and resource efficiency mainstreaming is of horizontal importance in all EU policies for achieving the goals set by the Europe 2020 strategy; ***underlines, therefore, that at least 20% of the MFF for years 2014-2020 – as much as €180 billion – shall be spent on climate change-related action;*** recalls, moreover, that moving the EU economies towards decarbonisation in order to fulfil the obligations arising from the Paris Agreement on climate change will be one of the main challenges that the European Union will have to face in the coming decades;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recalls that climate and resource efficiency mainstreaming is of horizontal importance in all EU policies for achieving the goals set by the Europe 2020 strategy; recalls, moreover, that moving the EU economies towards decarbonisation in order to fulfil the obligations arising from the Paris Agreement on climate change will be one of the main challenges that the European Union will have to face in the coming decades;

Amendment

1. Recalls that climate and resource efficiency mainstreaming is of horizontal importance in all EU policies for achieving the goals set by the Europe 2020 strategy; recalls, moreover, that moving the EU economies towards decarbonisation in order to fulfil the obligations arising from the Paris Agreement on climate change ***and to increase the competitiveness of the Union's economies effectively*** will be one of the main challenges that the European Union will have to face in the coming decades;

Or. nl

Amendment 4
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

1a. Stresses that green job creation and economic growth among EU SMEs stem not least from the implementation of environmental legislation; observes once again that Member States should view environment- and climate-friendly policies, measures and projects as an opportunity to improve public health and promote growth;

Amendment

Or. it

Amendment 5
Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Frédérique Ries, Nils Torvalds

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Stresses that the transition towards a circular, low-carbon economy is an absolute necessity; emphasizes that not only sufficient funds should be made available to facilitate and promote this transition, but that European funded projects should not have a negative impact on this transition;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Highlights the importance of the LIFE programme, which aims to promote implementation of both environment and climate objectives and their *integration into* other policies and Member State practice, and calls therefore for its resources to at least be maintained at the level of the 2016 appropriations;

2. Highlights the importance of the LIFE programme, which aims to promote implementation of both environment and climate objectives and their *coordination with* other policies and Member State practice, and calls therefore for its resources to at least be maintained at the level of the 2016 appropriations; *stresses with concern, in this context, that the LIFE programme must not be used by Member States and local authorities for the improper acquisition of land for environmental and nature conservation purposes by means of expropriation, unnecessary redesignation of the use to which plots of land may be put and other forms of policy-based coercion at the expense of the current area of farmland in Europe; calls, in this connection, for the inclusion of conditions to protect the*

rights of existing land users and land owners, particularly farmers, businesspeople, nature and wildlife parks and country estates, in the future implementation of the LIFE programme;

Or. nl

Amendment 7

Karin Kadenbach, Matthias Groote, Paul Brannen, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Susanne Melior

Draft opinion Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Highlights the importance of the LIFE programme, which aims to promote **implementation** of both environment and climate objectives and their integration into other policies and Member State practice, and calls therefore for its resources to at least be maintained at the level of the 2016 appropriations;

Amendment

2. Highlights the importance of the LIFE programme, which aims to promote **the achievement** of both environment and climate objectives and their integration into other policies and Member State practice, and calls therefore for its resources to at least be maintained at the level of the 2016 appropriations; **nevertheless notes that smaller programmes should also be kept in focus;**

Or. en

Amendment 8

Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Highlights the importance of the LIFE programme, which aims to promote implementation of both environment and climate objectives and their integration into other policies and Member State practice, and calls therefore for its resources to **at least** be maintained at the level of the 2016

Amendment

2. Highlights the importance of the LIFE programme, which aims to promote implementation of both environment and climate objectives and their integration into other policies and Member State practice, and calls therefore for its resources to be **mandatorily** maintained at the level of the

appropriations;

2016 appropriations;

Or. hr

Amendment 9

Karin Kadenbach, Matthias Groote, Paul Brannen, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Susanne Melior

Draft opinion Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Recalls the added value of *the* ecosystems and biodiversity *of* the European environment, *and* calls *therefore* for sufficient resources to be *allocated* in the 2017 budget *to preserve this* biodiversity, mainly in rural areas;

Amendment

3. Recalls the added value of ecosystems and biodiversity *to* the European environment, *therefore reminds the European Commission and the EU Member States of their obligation, under Article 8 of the Habitats Directive, to ensure an adequate level of financing for the conservation measures needed to restore the species and habitats in Natura 2000 sites to a favourable conservation status*; calls *in this regard* for sufficient resources to be *set aside* in the 2017 budget *for the preservation of* biodiversity, mainly in *Natura 2000 sites and* rural areas;

Or. en

Amendment 10 Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Recalls the added value of the ecosystems and biodiversity of the European environment, and calls therefore for sufficient resources to be allocated in the 2017 budget to *preserve this* biodiversity, mainly in rural areas;

Amendment

3. Recalls the added value of the ecosystems and biodiversity of the European environment, and calls therefore for sufficient resources to be allocated in the 2017 budget to *ensure the long-term stability of the* biodiversity, mainly in rural

areas;

Or. en

Amendment 11

Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Frédérique Ries, Nils Torvalds

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Recalls the added value of the ecosystems and biodiversity of the European environment, and calls therefore for sufficient resources to be allocated in the 2017 budget to preserve this biodiversity, *mainly* in rural areas;

Amendment

3. Recalls the added value of the ecosystems and biodiversity of the European environment, and calls therefore for sufficient resources to be allocated in the 2017 budget to preserve this biodiversity, *both* in rural *and urban* areas;

Or. en

Amendment 12

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Recalls the added value of the ecosystems and biodiversity of the European environment, and calls therefore for sufficient resources to be allocated in the 2017 budget to preserve this biodiversity, mainly in rural areas;

Amendment

3. Recalls the added value of the ecosystems and biodiversity of the European environment, and calls therefore for sufficient resources to be allocated in the 2017 budget to preserve this biodiversity, mainly in rural areas, *in close cooperation with the residents and users of those areas, particularly family farmers*;

Or. nl

Amendment 13

Karin Kadenbach, Matthias Groote, Paul Brannen, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu,

Susanne Melior

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses that only an appropriate level of financial support will bring about climate change mitigation, and therefore sufficient investments have to be made to guarantee competitiveness and innovation in low-carbon technologies especially renewable energy;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Kateřina Konečná

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Points out that, over the years, the Member States have faced a significant shortage of financial resources for the management of areas included in the Natura 2000 network (which in some cases represent a significant proportion of national territory), and this has compromised the instrument's effectiveness and overall coherence;

Or. cs

Amendment 15
Kateřina Konečná

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. *Calls on the Union to take greater responsibility for the protection of natural resources in the Natura 2000 network, in particular with regard to its financing; notes the difficulties experienced by several Member States in the management of areas that form part of the Natura 2000 network given that there is no specific financial instrument for that purpose to complement the inclusion of biodiversity into sectorial policies;*

Or. cs

Amendment 16
Kateřina Konečná

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. *Points out that it is necessary to help Europe recover from the several-year-long crisis; stresses that green job creation and economic growth among Union SMEs stem in part from the implementation of environmental legislation;*

Or. cs

Amendment 17
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *Recalls that the Union Civil Protection Mechanism is a cornerstone of*

Union solidarity; recalls that the primary responsibility for the protection of people, as well as the environment and property, including the cultural heritage, lies with Member States; underlines that the Union plays an 'enabling role' to support, coordinate or supplement the actions of Member States in the prevention of, preparedness for, and response to disasters; notes the importance of not reducing commitments for this programme;

Or. it

Amendment 18
Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for Parliament's delegation to emphasise the importance of full implementation of the budget lines dedicated to the environment, climate change, public health and food safety, *despite their size in budgetary terms;*

Amendment

6. Calls for Parliament's delegation to emphasise the importance of full implementation of the budget lines dedicated to the environment, climate change, public health and food safety;

Or. hr

Amendment 19
Kateřina Konečná

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls for Parliament's delegation to emphasise the importance of full implementation of the budget lines dedicated to the environment, climate change, public health and food safety, despite their size in budgetary terms;

Amendment

6. Calls for Parliament's delegation to emphasise the importance of full implementation of the budget lines dedicated to the environment, climate change, public health and food safety, despite their size in budgetary terms; *if the necessary funding is not available, those*

programmes should be complemented with other Union funds;

Or. cs

Amendment 20
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *Notes the EU's commitment that at least 20% of the EU budget under the multiannual financial framework for 2014-2020 should be climate-related expenditure; notes that the Commission's own mainstreaming methodology calculated that 12.7% of the 2014 budget was spent on climate change and 12.5% allocated in the 2015 draft budget; urges the Commission to provide further information on the prospective spending on climate action required in the 2017 budget and beyond to meet this 20% target;*

Or. en

Amendment 21
Benedek Jávor

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *In light of the urgency of global action and to show Union leadership, calls upon the Commission to increase the climate spending in the Union budget from 20 to 30% and to introduce an effective method of tracking such spending;*

Amendment 22
Benedek Jávor

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. Calls on the Commission to ensure Union financial resources do not contain subsidies that are harmful for the climate or lock in fossil fuel infrastructure, such as fossil fuel subsidies, or support activities which are harmful to biodiversity or damage ecosystems, or require increased use of resources and energy; furthermore calls on the Commission to introduce an effective method of tracking biodiversity spending in the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Benedek Jávor

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6c. On the basis of available evidence considers it very likely the Common Agricultural Policy - representing nearly 40% of the Union spending - will fail to deliver on its sustainable management of natural resources objectives; therefore calls for the Commission to start a Fitness Check of the CAP as soon as possible, on the basis of the five fitness check questions: EU value added, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and policy coherence;

Amendment 24**Julie Girling****Draft opinion****Paragraph 7***Draft opinion*

7. ***Points out*** that changes ***that reduce*** the budgetary programming for these lines ***must be rejected and*** that a proper balance between commitment and payment appropriations must be found in order to allow these policies to reach their full potential;

Amendment

7. ***Considers*** that changes ***in*** the budgetary programming for these lines ***should be considered if it is found that either the performance of certain programmes has been adversely affected by a lack of available resources and subsequent under-implementation, or the programmes themselves are not generating a sufficient level of EU added value; points out*** that a proper balance between commitment and payment appropriations must be found in order to allow these policies to reach their full potential;

Or. en

Amendment 25**Karin Kadenbach, Matthias Groote, Paul Brannen, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Susanne Melior****Draft opinion****Paragraph 8***Draft opinion*

8. Recalls that decentralised agencies whose missions fall within the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety play a major role, and stresses that their tasks are constantly growing and that those agencies must therefore be given the necessary financial and human resources to fulfil their mandate and execute such tasks; against this

Amendment

8. Recalls that decentralised agencies whose missions fall within the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety play a major role, and stresses that their tasks, ***which include better information-sharing with the public on decision-making, more access to documents and greater involvement in their activities,*** are constantly growing and

background, notes with concern that most of *those* agencies have absorbed significant staff cuts in recent years; strongly supports, therefore, a case-by-case approach to assessing the individual needs of decentralised agencies.

that those agencies must therefore be given the necessary financial and human resources to fulfil their mandate and execute such tasks; against this background, notes with concern that most of *the* agencies have absorbed significant staff cuts in recent years, *including the reduction of staff working on tasks financed by applicants' fees without regard to the workload involved*; strongly supports, therefore, a case-by-case approach to assessing the individual needs of decentralised agencies.

Or. en

Amendment 26
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Recalls that decentralised agencies whose missions fall within the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety play a major role, and stresses that their tasks are constantly growing and that those agencies must therefore be given *the necessary* financial and human resources to fulfil their mandate and execute such tasks; against this background, notes with concern that most of those agencies have absorbed significant staff cuts in recent years; strongly supports, therefore, a case-by-case approach to assessing the individual needs of decentralised agencies.

Amendment

8. Recalls that decentralised agencies whose missions fall within the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety play a major role, and stresses that their tasks are constantly growing and that those agencies must therefore be given *more* financial and human resources to fulfil their mandate and execute such tasks; against this background, notes with *serious* concern that most of those agencies have absorbed significant staff cuts in recent years; strongly supports, therefore, a case-by-case approach to assessing the individual needs of decentralised agencies.

Or. nl

Amendment 27
Kateřina Konečná

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Recalls that decentralised agencies whose missions fall within the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety play a major role, and stresses that their tasks are constantly growing and that those agencies must therefore be given the necessary financial and human resources to fulfil their mandate and execute such tasks; against this background, notes with concern that most of those agencies have absorbed significant staff cuts in recent years; strongly supports, therefore, a case-by-case approach to assessing the individual needs of decentralised agencies.

Amendment

8. Recalls that decentralised agencies whose missions fall within the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety play a major role, and stresses that their tasks **and duties** are constantly growing **and bringing new challenges**, and that those agencies must therefore be given the necessary financial and human resources to fulfil their mandate and execute such tasks; against this background, notes with concern that most of those agencies have absorbed significant staff cuts in recent years; strongly supports, therefore, a case-by-case approach to assessing the individual needs of decentralised agencies.

Or. cs

Amendment 28
Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Recalls that decentralised agencies whose missions fall within the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety play a major role, and stresses that their tasks are constantly growing and that those agencies must therefore be given the necessary financial and human resources to fulfil their mandate and execute such tasks; against this background, notes with concern that most of those agencies have absorbed significant staff cuts in recent years; strongly supports, therefore, a case-by-case approach to assessing the individual needs of decentralised agencies.

Amendment

8. Recalls that decentralised agencies whose missions fall within the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety play a major role, and stresses that their tasks are constantly growing and that those agencies must therefore be given the necessary financial and human resources to fulfil their mandate and execute such tasks; against this background, notes with concern that most of those agencies have absorbed significant staff cuts in recent years **and that this fact is being exploited to reject their scientific assessments as a basis for political decisions**; strongly supports, therefore, a case-by-case approach to assessing the

individual needs of decentralised agencies
*and observes that an appropriate staff
structure will help to make political
decisions objective.*

Or. de

Amendment 29
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Highlights the important work of the European Chemicals Agency given its expanding remit in recent years; notes with concern the difficulties experienced by the Agency in covering the expenditure for procedures associated with the implementation of Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 concerning the making available on the market and use of biocidal products^{1a}; urges the Commission to take measures to prevent a situation arising in which the Agency will be unable to deliver on all its non-fee related obligations in this regard;

^{1a} P8_TA-PROV(2016)0169

Or. en