



2017/2136(DEC)

19.1.2018

AMENDMENTS

1 - 14

Draft opinion

Kostas Chrysogonos

2016 discharge: EU general budget - Commission
(2017/2136(DEC))

Amendment 1

Auke Zijlstra, Nicolas Bay, Janice Atkinson, Gilles Lebreton, Lorenzo Fontana, André Elissen, Harald Vilimsky

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the opinion of the European Court of Auditors on the 2016 accounts of the Union; highlights especially the further reduction of payment errors in 2016 to the all-time low of 3.1 % and notes that this is the first time that the Court issues a qualified opinion on payments since 1994; regrets however that the payment error rate for Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) was not calculated by the Court as only 15 transactions have been audited;

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 2

Petr Ježek, Roberta Metsola

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the opinion of the European Court of Auditors on the 2016 accounts of the Union; highlights especially the further reduction of payment errors in 2016 to the all-time low of 3.1 % and notes that this is the first time that the Court issues a qualified opinion on payments since 1994; **regrets however** that the payment error rate for Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) was not calculated by the Court **as only 15** transactions **have been audited**;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the opinion of the European Court of Auditors on the 2016 accounts of the Union; highlights especially the further reduction of payment errors in 2016 to the all-time low of 3.1 % and notes that this is the first time that the Court issues a qualified opinion on payments since 1994; **notes** that the payment error rate for Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) was not calculated by the Court **due to the small sample size of audited** transactions;

Or. en

Amendment 3

Auke Zijlstra, Nicolas Bay, Janice Atkinson, Gilles Lebreton, Lorenzo Fontana, André Elissen, Harald Vilimsky

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. *Notes that shared management payments for Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund and Internal Security Fund was slow considering that 2016 was already the third year of the implementation of the current Multiannual financial framework (MFF); stresses the importance of reducing risks of delays in the implementation of national plans and in the correction of deficiencies in Member States control systems; highlights the importance of assessing Member States control systems based on sufficiently detailed information;*

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 4

Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that shared management payments for Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund and Internal Security Fund was slow considering that 2016 was already the third year of the implementation of the current Multiannual financial framework (MFF); stresses the importance of reducing risks of delays in the implementation of national plans and in the correction of deficiencies in Member States control systems; highlights the importance of assessing Member States control systems based on sufficiently detailed information;

Amendment

2. Notes that shared management payments for Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund and Internal Security Fund was *too* slow considering that 2016 was already the third year of the implementation of the current Multiannual financial framework (MFF); stresses the importance of reducing risks of delays in the implementation of national plans and in the correction of deficiencies in Member States control systems; highlights the importance of assessing Member States control systems based on sufficiently detailed *and relevant* information;

Amendment 5

Petr Ježek, Roberta Metsola

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that the overall amount mobilised for migration **and asylum** was not reported by the Commission in 2016 and is difficult to estimate; encourages therefore the Commission to develop a **coherent and comprehensive** reporting structure for **that** purpose; **recalls its call on the Commission to split up budget lines in order to enhance transparency;**

Amendment

3. Notes that the overall amount mobilised for **the refugee and migration crisis** was not reported by the Commission in 2016 and is difficult to estimate; encourages therefore the Commission to develop a **specific** reporting structure for **this** purpose;

Or. en

Amendment 6

Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that the overall amount mobilised for migration and asylum was not reported by the Commission in 2016 and is difficult to estimate; encourages therefore the Commission to develop a coherent and comprehensive reporting structure for that purpose; recalls its call on the Commission to split up budget lines in order to enhance transparency;

Amendment

3. Notes that the overall amount mobilised for migration and asylum was not reported by the Commission in 2016 and is difficult to estimate; encourages therefore the Commission to develop a coherent and comprehensive reporting structure for that purpose; recalls its call on the Commission to split up budget lines in order to enhance transparency **and the possibility of efficiency growth;**

Or. en

Amendment 7

Auke Zijlstra, Nicolas Bay, Janice Atkinson, Gilles Lebreton, Lorenzo Fontana, André Elissen, Harald Vilimsky

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reminds that special instruments were used extensively in 2015, 2016 and 2017 to respond notably to the humanitarian situation faced by asylum-seekers in the EU *and that there is therefore a risk that the amounts left until the end of the current MFF may not be sufficient to respond to unexpected events that may occur before 2020; requests the Commission to solve this structural issue in the next MFF;*

Amendment

4. Reminds that special instruments were used extensively in 2015, 2016 and 2017 to respond notably to the humanitarian situation faced by asylum-seekers *and illegal migrants* in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reminds that special instruments were used extensively in 2015, 2016 and 2017 to respond notably to the humanitarian situation faced by asylum-seekers in the EU and that there is therefore a risk that the amounts left until the end of the current MFF may not be sufficient to respond to unexpected events that may occur before 2020; requests the Commission to solve this structural issue in the next MFF;

Amendment

4. Reminds that special instruments were used extensively in 2015, 2016 and 2017 to respond notably to the humanitarian situation faced by asylum-seekers in the EU and that there is therefore a risk that the amounts left until the end of the current MFF may not be sufficient to respond to unexpected events that may occur before 2020; requests the Commission to solve this structural issue in the next MFF *and to inform the Parliament ;*

Or. en

Amendment 9
Roberta Metsola, Petr Ježek

PE616.695v01-00

6/9

AM\1143830EN.docx

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reminds that special instruments were used extensively in **2015, 2016 and 2017** to respond notably to the humanitarian situation faced by asylum-seekers in the EU and that there is therefore a risk that the amounts left until the end of the current MFF may not be sufficient to respond to unexpected events that may occur before 2020; requests the Commission to solve this structural issue in the next MFF;

Amendment

4. Reminds that special instruments were used extensively in **2016** to respond notably to the humanitarian situation faced by asylum-seekers in the EU and that there is therefore a risk that the amounts left until the end of the current MFF may not be sufficient to respond to unexpected events that may occur before 2020; requests the Commission to solve this structural issue in the next MFF;

Or. en

Amendment 10

Auke Zijlstra, Nicolas Bay, Janice Atkinson, Gilles Lebreton, Lorenzo Fontana, André Elissen, Harald Vilimsky

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Urges the development of a coherent and systematic strategy with clearer political and operational priorities for protecting the fundamental rights and freedoms, while ensuring its effective implementation also by granting sufficient funds for this purpose;*

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 11
Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Urges the development of a coherent and systematic strategy with clearer political and operational priorities for protecting the fundamental rights and freedoms, while ensuring its effective implementation also by granting sufficient funds for this purpose;

6. Urges the development of a coherent, **strong, long-term** and systematic strategy with clearer political and operational priorities for protecting the fundamental rights and freedoms, while ensuring its effective implementation also by granting sufficient funds for this purpose;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Péter Niedermüller, Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Urges the development of a coherent and systematic strategy with clearer political and operational priorities for protecting the fundamental rights and freedoms, while ensuring its effective implementation also by granting sufficient funds for this purpose;

Amendment

6. Urges the development of a coherent and systematic strategy with clearer **and long-term** political and operational priorities for protecting the fundamental rights and freedoms, while ensuring its effective implementation also by granting sufficient funds for this purpose;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Stresses that only one third of the projects examined had a performance measurement system with output and result indicators linked to the operational programme objectives, while the majority of the projects met their output objectives at least partially; highlights that for 42 % of the projects it was not possible to identify and measure a specific

Amendment

7. Stresses that only one third of the projects examined had a performance measurement system with output and result indicators linked to the operational programme objectives, while the majority of the projects met their output objectives at least partially; highlights that **the situation that needs to be rectified is that** for 42 % of the projects it was not

contribution to the overall programme objectives since no result indicators or targets were defined at project level.

possible to identify and measure a specific contribution to the overall programme objectives since no result indicators or targets were defined at project level.

Or. en

Amendment 14

Auke Zijlstra, Nicolas Bay, Janice Atkinson, Gilles Lebreton, Lorenzo Fontana, André Elissen, Harald Vilimsky

Draft opinion Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. *Stresses* that only one third of the projects examined had a performance measurement system with output and result indicators linked to the operational programme objectives, while the majority of the projects met their output objectives at least partially; highlights that for 42 % of the projects it was not possible to identify and measure a specific contribution to the overall programme objectives since no result indicators or targets were defined at project level.

Amendment

7. *Deplores* that only one third of the projects examined had a performance measurement system with output and result indicators linked to the operational programme objectives, while the majority of the projects met their output objectives at least partially; highlights that for 42 % of the projects it was not possible to identify and measure a specific contribution to the overall programme objectives since no result indicators or targets were defined at project level.

Or. en