



2017/2052(INI)

5.9.2017

AMENDMENTS

1 - 120

Draft opinion

Derek Vaughan

(PE606.230v01-00)

The next MFF: Preparing the Parliament's position on the MFF post-2020
(2017/2052(INI))

Amendment 1

Bronis Ropé

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas the multiannual financial framework (MFF) **needs** to be **agreed quickly** so that decisions can be taken on the future of cohesion policy;

Amendment

A. whereas ***Council Regulation No 1311/2013 laying down*** the multiannual financial framework (MFF) ***for the years 2014-2020 provides that the Commission should present its proposal for the future post-2020 MFF before 1 January 2018; whereas the legislative proposals for the next MFF need to be presented as soon as possible*** so that decisions can be taken on the future of cohesion policy, ***and delays in the next programming period can be avoided;***

Or. en

Amendment 2

Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion

Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas the multiannual financial framework (MFF) needs to be agreed quickly so that decisions can be taken on the future of cohesion policy;

Amendment

A. whereas the multiannual financial framework (MFF) needs to be agreed quickly so that decisions can be taken on the future of cohesion policy ***before the end of the current programming period, so as to prevent delays in programming for the new period;***

Or. en

Amendment 3

Tamás Deutsch, Andor Deli

Draft opinion

Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas the multiannual financial framework (MFF) needs to be agreed **quickly** so that decisions can be taken on the future of cohesion policy;

Amendment

A. whereas the multiannual financial framework (MFF) needs to be agreed **as soon as possible** so that decisions can be taken on the future of cohesion policy;

Or. en

Amendment 4

Tamás Deutsch, Andor Deli

Draft opinion

Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing Europe together **and** strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Amendment

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing Europe together, strengthening its economy **and helping to make the EU tangible and visible to its citizens through the concrete results it delivers on the ground**, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF, **so as to correspond to the challenges which the policy is expected to adequately address**;

Or. en

Amendment 5

Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion

Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Amendment

B. **whereas Article 3 of the Treaty on the European Union stipulates that the Union should promote economic, social and territorial cohesion and solidarity among Member States**; whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core

policies, bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy **and its social convergence**, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Daniel Buda, Iuliu Winkler

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing **Europe together** and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Amendment

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies **with a high added value, fostering solidarity and bringing the benefits of European integration directly to EU citizens in all regions** and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Younous Omarjee, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Martina Michels, Martina Anderson, Josu Juaristi Abaunz

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that **sufficient** funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Amendment

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing Europe together, **improving its economic, social and territorial cohesion** and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that funding for cohesion policy - **at least equivalent to that of the current period** - is provided for in the MFF;

Amendment 8

Bronis Ropé

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Amendment

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, *pursuing the objective enshrined in the Treaties of promoting economic, social and territorial cohesion and solidarity among Member States*, bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Or. en

Amendment 9

Marc Joulaud

Draft opinion

Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Amendment

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy; *whereas it must be able to reduce disparities between and within regions*, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Or. fr

Amendment 10

Victor Boştinaru

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Amendment

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, ***reducing development gaps***, bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy ***based on the principle of solidarity***, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Or. en

Amendment 11
Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Amendment

B. whereas regional cohesion policy is one of the EU's core policies, ***helping to eliminate interregional disparities***, ***thereby*** bringing Europe together and strengthening its economy, and it is therefore key that sufficient funding for cohesion policy is provided for in the MFF;

Or. ro

Amendment 12
Younous Omarjee, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Martina Michels, Martina Anderson, Josu Juaristi Abaunz

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas measures should be taken to ensure that the budgetary challenge deriving from the United Kingdom's departure from the EU does not disrupt regional policy, including by shifting to

Amendment

C. whereas measures should be taken to ensure that the budgetary challenge deriving from the United Kingdom's departure from the EU does not disrupt regional policy ***and does not reduce the***

new own resources for funding;

budget for cohesion in the next MFF,
including by shifting to new own resources
for funding;

Or. fr

Amendment 13
Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas measures should be taken to ensure that the budgetary challenge deriving from the United Kingdom's departure from the EU does not ***disrupt*** regional policy, including by shifting to new own resources for funding;

Amendment

C. whereas measures should be taken to ensure that the budgetary challenge deriving from the United Kingdom's departure from the EU does not ***have a negative effect on the budget for*** regional policy, including by shifting to new own resources for funding;

Or. it

Amendment 14
Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas measures ***should*** be taken to ensure that the budgetary challenge deriving from the United Kingdom's departure from the EU does not disrupt regional policy, including by shifting to new own resources for funding;

Amendment

C. whereas ***suitable*** measures ***must*** be taken to ensure that the budgetary challenge deriving from the United Kingdom's departure from the EU does not disrupt regional policy, including by shifting to new own resources for funding;

Or. ro

Amendment 15
Rosa D'Amato, Isabella Adinolfi, Marco Zullo

Draft opinion

PE609.636v01-00

8/55

AM\1133384EN.docx

Recital C a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C a. whereas some of the proposals for new own resources presented in the final report and recommendations of the High Level Group on Own Resources of December 2016, such as a financial transaction tax, a carbon tax imposed on all sources of greenhouse gas emissions, and a European corporate income tax are worth analysing in a broader context and would also be consistent with both the targets of the 2030 Climate and Energy Framework and the objectives of economic, social and territorial cohesion;

Or. en

Amendment 16

Bronis Ropé

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Recital C a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C a. whereas cohesion policy offers cross-border and other territorial cooperation tools for ensuring continued collaboration with the UK regions after Brexit, by maintaining contacts and working together with its citizens towards common objectives;

Or. en

Amendment 17

Ivana Maletić, Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion

Recital C a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C a. whereas the new challenges and global instability that the EU is facing today should be properly addressed, and it is essential that economic, social and territorial cohesion should remain a high priority for the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 18

Bronis Ropé

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Recital D

Draft opinion

D. whereas cohesion policy has contributed significantly to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy and to achieving its goals for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth; whereas the strategy should be reviewed for the post-2020 period, giving a major role to cohesion policy;

Amendment

D. whereas cohesion policy has contributed significantly to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy and to achieving its goals for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth; whereas *the EU is still at risk of falling short of these goals by 2020, especially when it comes to poverty reduction, the promotion of renewable energy and the fight against unemployment; whereas the strategy should be reviewed for the post-2020 period and contribute to the achievements of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals: whereas its financing should be secured in the next MFF*, giving a major role to cohesion policy;

Or. en

Amendment 19

Younous Omarjee, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Martina Michels, Martina Anderson

Draft opinion

Recital D

Draft opinion

D. whereas cohesion policy has
PE609.636v01-00

Amendment

D. whereas cohesion policy has

10/55

AM\1133384EN.docx

contributed significantly to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy and to achieving its goals for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth; whereas the strategy should be reviewed for the post-2020 period, giving a major role to cohesion policy;

contributed significantly to *economic, social and territorial cohesion*, to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy and to achieving its goals for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth; whereas the strategy should be reviewed for the post-2020 period, giving a major role to cohesion policy;

Or. fr

Amendment 20
Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Da. whereas cohesion policy has achieved important results and enabled the economic and social divide between European regions to be narrowed; whereas, however, 47 regions in eight Member States are still lagging behind in their development;

Or. it

Amendment 21
Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion
Paragraph –1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1. Confirms the high EU added value of cohesion policy, as it fulfils the Treaty's objectives of economic, social and territorial cohesion as well as of reducing disparities between the levels of development of various regions by:

- bringing growth and jobs to the regional and local level, especially in territories lagging behind, which contributes to convergence, spill-over effects, enhanced

economic cooperation, overall macroeconomic stability and the competitiveness of the Union as a whole;

- providing public goods of a European dimension by supporting transnational infrastructure;

- fostering cross-border cooperation and helping to create a stable ground for lasting peace and democracy in Europe;

- using shared management and subsidiarity in order to bring together various stakeholders from different levels of governance and effectively address socio-economic risks and opportunities;

Or. en

Amendment 22

Rosa D'Amato, Isabella Adinolfi, Marco Zullo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Amendment

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving *some of* the EU's political objectives; *underlines, in this regard, that cohesion policy is not supposed to be the solution and the funding instrument for every unforeseen event and that it should not contribute to the establishment of new programmes, such as EFSI or the Structural Reform Support Programme, which are manifestly inconsistent with the rationale and objectives of cohesion policy;*

Or. en

Amendment 23

Ivana Maletić, Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Amendment

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment ***and development*** policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives; ***considers, therefore, that a strong focus is needed on employment, skills, innovation, SMEs, social inclusion, and specific EU goals such as digitalisation and reindustrialisation, as well as on a reinforced social dimension, territorial cooperation and the urban dimension;***

Or. en

Amendment 24
Tamás Deutsch, Andor Deli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Amendment

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives ***and the benefits it brings to citizens; points out that new challenges should not undermine the traditional and long-term objectives of cohesion policy as laid down in the Treaties;***

Or. en

Amendment 25
Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Amendment

1. ***Notes that the European Parliament considers that cohesion policy is for all regions;*** states that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Or. en

Amendment 26

Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Amendment

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives; ***stresses that cohesion policy should remain an investment policy for all European regions;***

Or. en

Amendment 27

Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. States that cohesion policy ***should*** remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Amendment

1. States that cohesion policy ***must*** remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Amendment 28
Victor Boştinaru

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Amendment

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major **and indispensable** role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Amendment

1. States that cohesion policy should remain the EU's main **public** investment policy, but that more needs to be done to highlight the major role of cohesion policy in achieving the EU's political objectives;

Or. en

Amendment 30
Rosa D'Amato, Isabella Adinolfi, Marco Zullo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Asks the European Commission to present the proposal for the new regulation for the European Structural

and Investment Funds as soon as possible, so as to enable a proper discussion with the European Parliament and the Council and a timely approval of the new legislative framework;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Calls on the Commission to present its proposals for the future MFF and the post-2020 cohesion policy package without delay, and insists on a prompt start of negotiations in order to ensure the timely implementation of the ESIF in the post-2020 programming period;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Bronis Ropé
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Believes that the cohesion policy should continue to benefit citizens in all regions, while concentrating resources on the most vulnerable ones;

Or. en

Amendment 33
Bronis Ropé

PE609.636v01-00

16/55

AM\1133384EN.docx

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 b. Believes that a new set of social and environmental indicators complementary to GDP should be developed and introduced in order to allocate ESI Funds more fairly, and to better take into account different types of inequalities;

Or. en

Amendment 34

Andrey Novakov, Ivana Maletić, Pascal Arimont, Fernando Ruas, Daniel Buda, Franc Bogovič

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached; ***recalls that, in view of the late start of the period and the expected volume of payment claims towards the end of it, it is of considerable importance to increase the payment ceiling of Heading 1b in order to ensure liquidity and investment flow and to avoid the impact of potential political risks; notes that the creation of future, and the support to current, EU programmes and instruments should not take place at the expense of existing investment;***

Or. en

Amendment 35
Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Amendment

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached; ***recognises the important contribution of cohesion policy in facilitating structural reforms through incentives, such as ex ante conditionalities, rather than sanctions, and calls on the Commission to explore other positive means of supporting national and regional efforts;***

Or. en

Amendment 36
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens ***and*** ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Amendment

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens, ***and between the three dimensions of cohesion policy - economic, social and territorial - as well as*** ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached; ***believes that the share of the MFF for cohesion should be increased and that current commitments should not be reduced;***

Or. en

Amendment 37
Victor Boştinaru

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for *sufficient* funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Amendment

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to *continue to* provide for *the current share of* funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached; *underlines that a special focus must continue to be kept on less developed regions;*

Or. en

Amendment 38
Iskra Mihaylova

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Amendment

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached; *underlines that the MFF should support the priorities outlined in the European Semester, in particular by aligning spending to Country-Specific Recommendations;*

Or. en

Amendment 39
Tamás Deutsch, Andor Deli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Amendment

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached ***keeping in mind the objectives of cohesion policy enshrined in the Treaties; points out that the funding of new challenges cannot be at the expense of traditional EU policies;***

Or. en

Amendment 40
Raffaele Fitto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Amendment

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for sufficient funds for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached, ***taking into account the internal and external challenges the EU will have to face, without penalising those territories that are disadvantaged in the give-and-take relationship with the Union;***

Or. it

Amendment 41
Younous Omarjee, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Martina Michels, Martina Anderson, Josu Juaristi Abaunz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for *sufficient funds* for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Amendment

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for *funds that are at least equivalent to those of the current programming period* for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Or. fr

Amendment 42

Bronis Ropé

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to *provide for sufficient funds* for cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Amendment

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to *maintain funding* for cohesion policy post-2020 *at least at its current level*, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Or. en

Amendment 43

Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF to provide for *sufficient funds for* cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Amendment

2. Calls, therefore, for the MFF *not* to provide for *any cuts in* cohesion policy post-2020, striking a good balance between investments in citizens and investments for citizens and ensuring that the EU's political goals can be reached;

Amendment 44
Mercedes Bresso

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. *recalls that new priorities and initiatives of the EU should be financed with fresh money, and that cohesion policy should not be jeopardised by its current envelope being used as a source of funding for such new priorities and initiatives;*

Or. en

Amendment 45
Rosa D'Amato, Isabella Adinolfi, Marco Zullo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which *do*, however, have *an important* role to play in *certain* cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which *may*, however, have *a* role to play in *specific* cases, *but which should always undergo both an ex-ante and ex-post analysis; highlights the dangers of financial products such as equity, trust funds and other types of bonds, which have a high-risk profile and are always advertised as having a very high leverage effect; considers that it would be safer and more useful to promote other forms of low-risk instruments, such as easy-term loans, guarantees and forms of crowd funding*; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Amendment 46
Iskra Mihaylova

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and *should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases*; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Amendment

3. *In view of the major budgetary constraints of today, stresses the need to maximise the performance of public and private investments in EU priorities*; considers that regional funding should be protected and *at the same time stresses the necessity of combining grants with financial instruments after appropriate ex-ante assessment, with a clear strategy and a set of criteria to determine which type of financing is more appropriate for achievement of the desired objectives*; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Or. en

Amendment 47
Andrey Novakov, Ivana Maletić, Pascal Arimont, Fernando Ruas, Daniel Buda, Franc Bogovič

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required; *notes that binding targets for the use of financial instruments in the post-2020*

MFF cannot be considered a viable option; notes that increasing the share of financial instruments should not influence non-refundable financial contributions, as this would hinder the required balance;

Or. en

Amendment 48
Marc Joulaud

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly **take** the form of grants rather than financial instruments, **which do, however,** have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to **be targeted at all Union regions, by** predominantly **taking** the form of grants rather than financial instruments; **objects to any numerical and binding targets regarding the use of financial instruments, whatever the category of region, even if they do** have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Or. fr

Amendment 49
Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a

reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required; ***highlights the Commission's statement that financial instruments are only appropriate for revenue-generating projects; considers that grants and subsidies will therefore continue to be needed;***

Or. en

Amendment 50
Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required; ***considers that the role of the Member States should be emphasised through appropriate co-financing rates which ensure the commitment of the Member States;***

Or. en

Amendment 51
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do,

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do,

however, have *an important* role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

however, have *a* role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required, *with particular emphasis on stimulating growth and job creation and reducing inequalities and regional disparities*;

Or. en

Amendment 52
Ivana Maletić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; *considers that Member States should be free to choose between grants and financial instruments/guarantees*; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Or. en

Amendment 53
Bronis Ropé
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which *do*, however, have an important role to play in

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which *may*, however, have an important role to

certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, ***scarce resources need to be used smartly, for instance by applying the Energy Efficiency First principle to all EU-funded investments***; greater focus on the EU's core goals is ***also*** required;

Or. en

Amendment 54
Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and ***should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases***; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and ***that a balance between grants and financial instruments should be found***; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals ***and EU added value*** is required;

Or. en

Amendment 55
Mercedes Bresso

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases ***and should be properly integrated with grants where appropriate***; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the

EU's core goals is required;

Or. en

Amendment 56

Maria Spyraiki

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants ***rather than*** financial instruments, which ***do, however,*** have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants, ***which should be complemented by*** financial instruments, which have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that in the event of a reduction in the EU's budgets, greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;

Or. en

Amendment 57

Younous Omarjee, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Martina Michels, Martina Anderson, Josu Juaristi Abaunz

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that ***in the event of a reduction in the EU's*** budgets, ***greater focus on the EU's core goals is required;***

Amendment

3. Considers that regional funding should be protected and should continue to predominantly take the form of grants rather than financial instruments, which do, however, have an important role to play in certain cases; stresses that ***under no circumstances should the EU have its*** budgets ***reduced;***

Or. fr

Amendment 58

PE609.636v01-00

28/55

AM\1133384EN.docx

Andrea Cozzolino, Victor Boștinaru

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Reiterates its opposition to macroeconomic conditionalities and stresses that the relationship between cohesion policy and European Semester economic governance processes must be balanced, reciprocal, and non-punitive towards all stakeholders;

Or. it

Amendment 59
Iskra Mihaylova

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Considers that it is imperative that ESI Funds focus on areas where common action is most needed, such as to promote growth and competitiveness, or to contribute to climate change adaptation and resource efficiency;

Or. en

Amendment 60
Bronis Ropė
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Recalls its opposition to macro-economic conditionalities, and rejects any attempt to use cohesion policy as a punitive tool for non-compliance with

other EU policies;

Or. en

Amendment 61
Iskra Mihaylova

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 b. *Underlines that EU funding should complement national budgets, by offering real additionality and taking action in areas excluded from national budgets;*

Or. en

Amendment 62
Maria Spyraiki, Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period might be preferable;

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period might be preferable, *provided that the Commission ensures a smooth transition between programming periods, which would require stricter de-commitment rules, shorter procedures for closing programmes, and faster processes for the setup and start-up of programmes;*

Or. en

Amendment 63
Ivana Maletić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Considers that *a 5+5 year MFF* period *might be preferable*;

Amendment

4. Considers that *maintaining the current length (7 years) of the MFF is essential for cohesion policy, which needs a longer-term implementation* period, *given the time it takes to agree on sectoral legislation and operational programmes*;

Or. en

Amendment 64
Victor Boştinaru

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period *might be preferable*;

Amendment

4. Considers that *any solution meaning a short-term MFF is unacceptable, as it impedes long-term planning and the predictability of policies such as Cohesion Policy; believes that the only alternative to the current duration is a 5+5 year MFF period, with a mid-term review*;

Or. en

Amendment 65
Bronis Ropé
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period might be preferable;

Amendment

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period might be preferable *as long as a comprehensive and democratic mid-term revision process takes into account new challenges and political priorities without siphoning off from existing programmes*;

Or. en

Amendment 66
Tamás Deutsch, Andor Deli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period *might be preferable*;

Amendment

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period *should strengthen the long term predictability of EU programmes and should preserve the reliability of 7-year programming from the beneficiaries' point of view*;

Or. en

Amendment 67
Rosa D'Amato, Isabella Adinolfi, Marco Zullo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period might be preferable;

Amendment

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period might be preferable, *provided that some kind of revision within the five-year period is also provided for*;

Or. en

Amendment 68
Mercedes Bresso

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period might be preferable;

Amendment

4. Considers that a 5+5 year MFF period, *with a compulsory mid-term review*, might be preferable;

Or. en

Amendment 69
Bronis Ropé
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. *Calls for the future MFF to provide for greater citizen oversight, including by strengthening the partnership principle in cohesion policy and streamlining it with other policies, as well as by allowing pilot schemes for participatory budgeting;*

Or. en

Amendment 70
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. *Is of the opinion that no macroeconomic or fiscal ex-ante conditionalities should be allowed in the post-2020 cohesion policy;*

Or. en

Amendment 71
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 b. *Insists that cohesion funding should be used for cohesion policy priorities and objectives, rather than for*

tackling challenges in other policy areas, such as managing migration flows or the common defence policy;

Or. en

Amendment 72

Bronis Ropé

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 b. *Reiterates its request to apply gender mainstreaming across all parts of the EU budget and to provide for appropriate tools for gender budgeting;*

Or. en

Amendment 73

Bronis Ropé

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 c. *Is deeply concerned that the goal of spending at least 20% of the current MFF on climate-change-related action will not be reached; believes that, in light of the European commitments made at the COP21, this climate-related spending target should be substantially increased to reach 50% of the EU budget;*

Or. en

Amendment 74

Bronis Ropé

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

PE609.636v01-00

34/55

AM\1133384EN.docx

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 d. *Calls on the Commission to present a thorough evaluation of the possible impact of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change on the EU budget and to explore concrete ways of improving the current tracking methodology for climate-related spending ahead of its legislative proposal on the future post-2020 MFF;*

Or. en

Amendment 75

Andrey Novakov, Ivana Maletić, Pascal Arimont, Fernando Ruas, Franc Bogovič

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology; also considers that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges;

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology; ***calls for additional criteria for the allocation of non-refundable funding and for setting co-financing rates; considers the regional unemployment rates and regional social progress index to be appropriate criteria;*** also considers that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges; ***notes that challenges such as migration and security or political developments in the EU should not negatively affect the investments in Heading 1 or its goals and expected results, especially after the current programming period;***

Or. en

Amendment 76

Ivana Maletić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology; also considers that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges;

Amendment

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology; also considers that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges; ***stresses that financing for new priorities should be ensured in the EU budget from the savings and at the level of national budgets; Member States should be free to choose to use ESI Funds as a source of financing for new priorities;***

Or. en

Amendment 77

Maria Spyraiki, Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology; also considers that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges;

Amendment

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology; also considers that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges ***and that these new opportunities and challenges should be reflected in the specific indicators in order to measure EU's response to them;***

Or. en

Amendment 78
Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology; also considers that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges;

Amendment

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology; also considers that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges; ***underlines that the Commission's position is to strike the right balance between the stability and the flexibility of financing;***

Or. en

Amendment 79
Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology; ***also considers*** that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges;

Amendment

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology; ***is of the opinion that cohesion policy should aim in particular at enhancing the knowledge economy and stimulating innovation; also considers*** that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges;

Or. en

Amendment 80
Tamás Deutsch, Andor Deli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be ***updated in order to take changing conditions into account and to benefit from new technology***; also considers that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges;

5. Calls for the priorities of regional development programmes to be ***reconsidered, but that, traditional priorities deriving from the Treaties should be preserved***; also considers that more flexibility is required in the MFF to meet unforeseen challenges;

Or. en

Amendment 81
Ivana Maletić, Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 a. Stresses that the significant level of growth needed for job creation and development cannot be achieved without joint efforts for the implementation of a good economic policy mix, which consists of investment, structural reforms and fiscal consolidation; considers, therefore, that funding for structural reforms linked to the European Semester should be guaranteed in the national budgets, and Member States should be free to choose to use ESI Funds as an additional source for financing structural reforms;

Or. en

Amendment 82
Bronis Ropé
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 a. Emphasises the role of cohesion policy in achieving the objectives deriving from the COP21 Agreement and in ensuring the transition towards a low-

carbon and circular economy;believes that post-2020 cohesion policy should actively contribute to the financing of Member States' integrated energy and climate plans for 2030;asks the Commission to introduce further incentives to better align EU funding with the investment needs identified by Member States in their national Energy and Climate Plans for 2030;

Or. en

Amendment 83
Marc Joulaud

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Points out that, to ensure better implementation of the cohesion policy budget in future, this policy needs to be thoroughly simplified on the basis of the recommendations of the high level group, and a broader application of proportionality needs to be considered, in addition to differentiation between regions in the implementation of ESI Fund programmes;

Or. fr

Amendment 84
Younous Omarjee, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Martina Michels, Martina Anderson, Josu Juaristi Abaunz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses the importance of regional policy to protect the most vulnerable regions, such as the least developed and outermost regions;stresses

that under no circumstances should those regions be harmed by any reduction in the MFF;

Or. fr

Amendment 85
Raffaele Fitto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth;

Amendment

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth; *calls for the need to fund, as part of cohesion policy, programmes to internationalise businesses in order to establish a socio-economic background that promotes the growth of the areas concerned;*

Or. it

Amendment 86
Andrey Novakov, Ivana Maletić, Pascal Arimont, Fernando Ruas, Daniel Buda, Franc Bogovič

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth;

Amendment

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth; *underlines that the Connecting Europe Facility and the Cohesion Fund should remain the major source of infrastructure investment, and that funding appropriations should match the existing high demand and oversubscription;*

Or. en

Amendment 87
Bronis Ropé
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting *economic* growth;

Amendment

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting ***European integration as well as smart, sustainable and inclusive*** growth; ***calls therefore for the proportion of the cohesion policy budget dedicated to European Territorial Cooperation to be increased;***

Or. en

Amendment 88
Iskra Mihaylova

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth;

Amendment

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth; ***points out that European Territorial Cooperation (Interreg) is a key area of EU added value for ensuring the continuity of, and linkages between, common projects across borders and across the EU;***

Or. en

Amendment 89
Ivana Maletić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth;

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth; *states that specific measures for the outermost regions, disadvantaged regions and islands are also needed in order to reduce the economic, social and environmental disparities between regions;*

Or. en

Amendment 90
Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth;

Amendment

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth; *is of the opinion that these cross-border initiatives in particular show the added value of the European Union;*

Or. en

Amendment 91
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth;

Amendment

6. Stresses the importance of regional cross-border initiatives in promoting economic growth *and job creation;*

Or. en

Amendment 92
Louis-Joseph Manscour

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *Points out that Article 349 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) provides for specific access to structural funds for the outermost regions (ORs); calls, in this regard for ORs to be considered, under the next programming period, as 'least developed regions' and for their budget allocations to be continued in order to compensate for their structural disadvantages;*

Or. fr

Amendment 93

Andrey Novakov, Ivana Maletić, Pascal Arimont, Fernando Ruas, Daniel Buda, Franc Bogovič

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 a. *Recalls that investment in Heading 1a showcases a strong positive impact on policies; considers that programmes such as the successor programme to Horizon 2020 should receive twice the funding available under the current framework programme; notes that estimates, demand and success rates indicate that such an increase would relieve the research and innovation funding gap;*

Or. en

Amendment 94

Andrey Novakov, Ivana Maletić, Pascal Arimont, Lambert van Nistelrooij, Daniel Buda, Franc Bogovič

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI;

Amendment

7. ***Notes that combining grants and financial instruments has an unexplored potential owing to administrative burdens;*** calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI; ***notes that the take-up of financial instruments and synergies with grants can be improved by encouraging investment partnerships and public-private partnerships locally;***

Or. en

Amendment 95
Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI;

Amendment

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI, ***and to work towards the goal of setting up the same rules for similar projects, including when they are financed by different EU policies and instruments, as this would cut red tape and make the implementation of EU funds easier for beneficiaries;***

Or. en

Amendment 96
Bronis Ropé
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and **EFSI**;

Amendment

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and **CEF**, **while maintaining the specific rules necessary to provide for a funding environment tailored to the characteristics and goals of each fund**;

Or. en

Amendment 97

Daniel Buda, Iuliu Winkler

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI;

Amendment

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI **because similar projects should not be governed by different rules merely because they are implemented through different EU tools**;

Or. en

Amendment 98

Viorica Dăncilă

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI;

Amendment

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI, **so as to prevent different rules applying to similar project simply because they were implemented on the basis of different**

instruments;

Or. ro

Amendment 99
Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the Commission to ***look into the possibilities for*** greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI;

Amendment

7. Calls for the Commission to ***implement*** greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI; ***highlights, in this context, that special attention should be paid to state aid rules;***

Or. en

Amendment 100
Maria Spyraiki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the Commission to ***look into the possibilities for greater synergies*** between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI;

Amendment

7. Calls for the Commission to ***further facilitate synergies and complementarities*** between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020, ***the Connecting Europe Facility*** and EFSI;

Or. en

Amendment 101
Andrea Cozzolino

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI;

Amendment

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI, ***without prejudice to the integrity of the financial appropriations of the ESI Funds;***

Or. it

Amendment 102

Raffaele Fitto

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI;

Amendment

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between the different EU funds, including cohesion policy, Horizon 2020 and EFSI, ***in order to facilitate multi-fund options;***

Or. it

Amendment 103

Rosa D'Amato, Isabella Adinolfi, Marco Zullo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between ***the*** different EU funds, ***including cohesion policy***, Horizon 2020 ***and EFSI***;

Amendment

7. Calls for the Commission to look into the possibilities for greater synergies between ***cohesion policy and*** different EU funds, ***such as*** Horizon 2020;

Or. en

Amendment 104

Raffaele Fitto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Calls on the Commission to implement all necessary measures to ensure that ESI Fund resources have a real additionality, and not replacement, value;

Or. it

Amendment 105
Georgi Pirinski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7 a. Deems it necessary that all EU structural and investment funds be continued post-2020, including the Cohesion Fund and the European Social Fund;

Or. en

Amendment 106
Andrey Novakov, Pascal Arimont, Fernando Ruas, Lambert van Nistelrooij, Daniel Buda, Franc Bogovič

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified.

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified;**calls for the set-up of a simplification bonus for the Member States for effective measures cutting red tape and improving management of EU funding;calls for a**

level playing field for state aid rules concerning all financial instruments so as to avoid preferential treatment of certain sources of funding over others, especially in the field of SME support;

Or. en

Amendment 107
Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified.

Amendment

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified;*calls for the Commission to further explore the possibility of merging the current separate cohesion policy funds into a single fund, as this would provide an impetus to establish significantly clearer and lighter implementation rules and to ensure the integrated strategic planning of EU support;*

Or. en

Amendment 108
Ivana Maletić, Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified.

Amendment

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified *in order to positively impact the sustainability of the next MFF, as well as to reduce the burden on beneficiaries; underlines that, in the context of*

maximising the performance of the MFF as regards conditionality, it is important to find the right balance so as not to jeopardise investments;

Or. en

Amendment 109
Iskra Mihaylova

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified.

Amendment

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified;*underlines that the “Omnibus package” offers increased potential with regard to proposed simplification and flexibility;considers, therefore, that it should be implemented and further developed after 2020;*

Or. en

Amendment 110
Daniel Buda, Iuliu Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified.

Amendment

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified *so as to be beneficiary-friendly, result-oriented and flexible; calls on the Commission to extend the offer of capacity building support for local, regional and national administrations and beneficiaries;*

Or. en

Amendment 111
Maria Spyraiki, Lambert van Nistelrooij

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified.

Amendment

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified, *as well as to potentially adopt the "single rule book" approach in order to encourage more beneficiaries to apply for EU funding;*

Or. en

Amendment 112
Bronis Ropé
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified.

Amendment

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified *without undermining the horizontal principles of cohesion policy, including on partnership, and a place-based approach;*

Or. en

Amendment 113
Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified.

Amendment

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified **and urges the Commission to provide sustained support for programmes seeking to increase the effectiveness of local, regional and national administrations;**

Or. ro

Amendment 114

Marc Joulaud

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers **that it is** essential, in the context of the new MFF, **to ensure that** budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, **are** at last simplified.

Amendment

8. Considers **it** essential, in the context of the new MFF, **for** budgetary rules and rules on **state aid and** cohesion policy spending **to** at last **be more consistent and** simplified.

Or. fr

Amendment 115

Rosa D'Amato, Isabella Adinolfi, Marco Zullo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified.

Amendment

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure **not only** that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified, **but that a proper balance between simplification and controls is ensured;**

Or. en

Amendment 116

Daniel Buda

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified.

Amendment

8. Considers that it is essential, in the context of the new MFF, to ensure that budgetary rules, and rules on cohesion policy spending, are at last simplified *for beneficiaries by setting up a single investment fund for cohesion policy;*

Or. en

Amendment 117

Andrey Novakov, Pascal Arimont, Fernando Ruas, Daniel Buda, Franc Bogovič

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8 a. Recalls that the management of EU funding should maintain high levels of transparency and accountability; calls for the Commission to implement measures so that beneficiaries involved in cases of fraudulent spending of EU funding are banned from competitive offers and funding calls; calls for the Commission to implement rules so that Member States which deliberately limit or burden any of the four freedoms of movement are subjected to the interruption of EU funding;

Or. en

Amendment 118

Rosa D'Amato, Isabella Adinolfi, Marco Zullo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8 a. *Calls for an increase in the budget, and the further revision, of the European Solidarity Fund, especially concerning the maximum threshold of advances (currently capped at EUR 30 million) laid down in article 4a of the Revised EUSF Regulation, in order to effectively and promptly address a greater part of the damages caused by natural disasters;*

Or. en

Amendment 119

Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8 a. *Requests the Commission to build upon the positive elements of the ex-ante conditionality system, while reducing the corresponding administrative burden as regards to assessment and procedure;*

Or. en

Amendment 120

Derek Vaughan

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8 b. *Calls on the Commission to strengthen administrative capacity building actions in view of more efficient implementation of the funds; encourages a wider deployment of measures inspired by the Commission's recent report 'Competitiveness in low-income and low-*

*growth regions - the lagging regions
report'.*

Or. en