



2016/2064(INI)

10.2.2017

AMENDMENTS

1 - 46

Draft opinion

Inés Ayala Sender, Dominique Riquet

(PE594.092v01-00)

The implementation of the European Fund for Strategic Investments
(2016/2064(INI))

Amendment 1
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1. Notes with concern the Opinion 2/2016 on the Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulations (EU) 1316/2013 and 2015/1017 adopted by the European Court of Auditors on 11 November 2016^{1a}, concluding that at this stage there is little evidential base for proposing an extension and increase of EFSI, namely because:

(i) the proposal for the extension is launched without a comprehensive impact assessment and too soon for the economic, social and environmental impacts to be measured and to enable a conclusion whether EFSI is achieving its objectives;

(ii) it does not respect the better regulation principles;

(iii) there is a clear risk of exaggerating the achieved results and impacts;

(iv) there is a risk of creating incentives to use unnecessarily complex financing structures or to allocate a risk profile that does not correspond to the real risk of the operation;

(v) there is a recognized need to act on geographical imbalances and sectorial concentration;

(vi) there is a recognized need for increasing the transparency and clarity both in the EFSI governance and in the selection of EFSI operations;

^{1a} Opinion pursuant to Article 287(4) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The full text of the Opinion is available in the European

Or. en

Amendment 2
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1 a. Believes that it is a matter of legislative responsibility not to carry forward a Proposal for a Regulation that does not have enough evidential base and has received such an overall negative assessment by the European Court of Auditors;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1 b. Considers that the serious risks and weaknesses pointed out by the European Court of Auditors must be taken into account and deeply regrets that, when proposing to extend and increase the EFSI Funds without clear evidence of its pertinence, its achieved results and its potential impacts, the Commission has incurred in an example of bad regulation;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1 c. Calls on the Commission to withdraw the proposal on the extension of the duration of EFSI and properly take into consideration the findings of the European Court of Auditors, including the need of a comprehensive and cross-sectorial assessment of the EFSI economic, social, environmental and geographical impacts before carrying on any new legislative action;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1 d. Asks the Commission to take also into account the remarks made by the European Parliament in the present implementation report when making the assessment and drafting the new legislative proposal;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1 e. Expresses doubts about the final

added value of creating unnecessarily complex financing instruments and structures and requiring many financial intermediates that inevitably absorb part of the available funding; calls on the Commission to properly assess this cost, explore alternative policy options and only deliver a new proposal for the extension of EFSI if such an added value can be objectively proved, taking into account the current context of limited financial resources;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Welcomes the establishment* of the EFSI bodies and the transparent selection procedure for members of their governance structure;

Amendment

1. *Looks forward to see the result of the work by the* EFSI bodies and the transparent selection procedure for members of their governance structure *and asks that the European Parliament, the Council and public are regularly informed about their work;*

Or. en

Amendment 8
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Welcomes the establishment of the EFSI bodies and the transparent selection procedure for members of their* governance structure;

Amendment

1. *Notes that there is an urgent and important need for increasing transparency and clarity both in the EFSI governance structure and in the selection of EFSI operations;*

Amendment 9
Roberts Zile

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the Strategic Orientation approved by the EFSI Steering Board in December 2015, which includes indicative geographical concentration limits; notes an unbalanced geographical distribution among beneficiaries of the EFSI; recalls that the GDP ratio criterion is relevant, among other things to ensure economic, social and territorial cohesion, with a view to ensuring a balanced spread of projects;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the Strategic Orientation approved by the EFSI Steering Board in December 2015, which includes indicative geographical concentration limits; notes an unbalanced geographical distribution among beneficiaries of the EFSI ***as during the first year of operations 92 per cent of all investment has concentrated in EU-15 countries whilst only 8 per cent has reached the EU-13 countries and that to date 10 Member States, mostly in Central and Eastern Europe, had operations only under the SME Window (SMEW) of EFSI[1]***; recalls that the GDP ratio criterion is relevant, among other things to ensure economic, social and territorial cohesion, with a view to ensuring a balanced spread of projects ***and underlines that the concentration of capital in the EU-15 countries and underserving of EU-13 countries widens social and economic disparities between the EU's Western and Eastern regions;***
[1] EIB independent evaluation report "Evaluation of the functioning of the European Fund for Strategic Investments" (http://www.eib.org/infocentre/publications/all/evaluation-of-the-functioning-of-the-efsi.htm)

Amendment 10
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the Strategic Orientation approved by the EFSI Steering Board in December 2015, which includes indicative geographical concentration limits; **notes an** unbalanced geographical distribution among beneficiaries of the EFSI; recalls that the GDP ratio criterion is relevant, among other things to ensure economic, social and territorial cohesion, with a view to ensuring a balanced spread of projects;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the Strategic Orientation approved by the EFSI Steering Board in December 2015, which includes indicative geographical concentration limits; **regrets the** unbalanced geographical distribution among beneficiaries of the EFSI **that is in contradiction to EFSI's aim to foster further cohesion**; recalls that the GDP ratio criterion is relevant, among other things to ensure economic, social and territorial cohesion, with a view to ensuring a balanced spread of projects; **recommends the establishment of clear mechanisms to reject EFSI funding for certain projects**;

Or. en

Amendment 11 Maria Grapini

Draft opinion Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the Strategic Orientation approved by the EFSI Steering Board in December 2015, which includes indicative geographical concentration limits; notes an unbalanced geographical distribution among beneficiaries of the EFSI; recalls that the GDP ratio criterion is relevant, among other things to ensure economic, social and territorial cohesion, with a view to ensuring a **balanced** spread of projects;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the Strategic Orientation approved by the EFSI Steering Board in December 2015, which includes indicative geographical concentration limits; notes an unbalanced geographical distribution among beneficiaries of the EFSI; recalls that the GDP ratio criterion is relevant, among other things to ensure economic, social and territorial cohesion, with a view to ensuring a spread of projects **that takes into account the GDP ratio criterion**;

Or. ro

Amendment 12 Markus Pieper

Draft opinion

PE599.611v01-00

8/24

AM\1116491EN.docx

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Points out that high-risk investments cannot be imposed and, in a low-growth-rate and low-demand environment, are mostly not worthwhile; calls accordingly, in addition to balanced geographical distribution, for EFSI funding to be more closely tied to successful developments in economic and fiscal policy;

Or. de

Amendment 13

Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Regrets the lack of concentration limits in the initial ramp-up phase; recalls that the transport sector has made the largest contribution to the EFSI Fund, with EUR 2.2 billion out of EUR 8 billion, representing more than 25 % of the total guarantee fund; notes with concern that the transport sector has received only around 13 % of all the investment mobilised and made available to date under the EFSI's infrastructure and innovation window, which is far from the 30 % limit established for each specific sector; calls on the Investment Committee to pay particular attention to transport sector projects, since these are still very poorly represented in the investment portfolio;

3. Regrets the lack of concentration limits in the initial ramp-up phase; recalls that the transport sector has made the largest contribution to the EFSI Fund, with EUR 2.2 billion out of EUR 8 billion, representing more than 25 % of the total guarantee fund; notes with concern that the transport sector has received only around 13 % of all the investment mobilised and made available to date under the EFSI's infrastructure and innovation window, which is far from the 30 % limit established for each specific sector; calls on the Investment Committee to pay particular attention to transport sector projects, since these are still very poorly represented in the investment portfolio **and transport plays a significant role in economic growth and consumer safety;**

Or. ro

Amendment 14

Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. *encourages the Commission to introduce rules for the selection of sustainable projects, linking them to the main EU policy goals and targets, such as zero- and low-emissions mobility or to link them to existing initiatives like the trans-European cycling networks combined with rail travel and initiatives that aim to re-establish regional cross-border rail links that were abandoned or dismantled (www.missing-rail-links.eu);*

Or. en

Amendment 15
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. *Deplores that the current definitions of "additionality" and "risk" are mostly focused on financial aspects and believes that these definitions need to be reviewed for better reflecting the overall goal of supporting investments that are fully consistent with cross-sector Union policy priorities, namely high quality employment, resource efficiency, climate change adaptation, emissions reduction, sustainable infrastructures and research & innovation;*

Or. en

Amendment 16
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 b. Specifically calls on the Commission to introduce a mandatory climate action compatibility check applying to every operation prior to its approval;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 c. Recalls that the results for the scoreboard assessment of both approved and rejected operations shall be made public on a transparent and accessible way and on a regular basis;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Expresses doubts about the additionality of some of the first transport projects selected as they could most probably have been financed without the EFSI;

4. Expresses doubts about the additionality of some of the first transport projects selected as they could most probably have been financed without the EFSI **and urges compliance with the basic principle that funding be provided initially for projects with a significant economic impact and those for which funding from the banking system is harder to obtain;**

Amendment 19
Gabriele Preuß

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Expresses doubts about the additionality of some of the first transport projects selected as they could most probably have been financed without the EFSI;

Amendment

4. Expresses doubts about the additionality of some of the first transport projects selected as they could most probably have been financed without the EFSI; ***points out that, in line with EU transport policy priorities, intermodal solutions should be particularly eligible;***

Or. de

Amendment 20
Rolandas Paksas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Expresses doubts about the additionality of some of the first transport projects selected as they could most probably have been financed without the EFSI;

Amendment

4. Expresses doubts about the additionality of some of the first transport projects selected as they could most probably have been financed without the EFSI; ***believes that an ineffective regional policy makes it difficult to take proper advantage of the opportunities offered by the EFSI;***

Or. It

Amendment 21
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Expresses doubts about the additionality of some of the *first* transport projects selected as they could most probably have been financed without the EFSI;

Amendment

4. Expresses doubts about the additionality of some of the transport projects selected as they could most probably have been financed without the EFSI;

Or. en

Amendment 22

Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. Recalls that transport sector is not only a major greenhouse gas emitter but also the fastest growing sector in energy consumption since 1990; believes that in order to meet international commitments and Union targets, it is crucial to ensure that transport operations funded under the EFSI are clearly aligned towards shifting to sustainable transport modes, improving the energy-efficiency and reducing the high carbon-dependency of the sector; therefore stresses that the EFSI support to airport and motorways infrastructure must be minimized and always accompanied by the investments necessary to mitigate its negative environmental impact; on the other hand, stresses that attention must be paid to the proper maintenance of the comprehensive transport network and to strategic small investments with a high social and territorial added value;

Or. en

Amendment 23

Isabella De Monte

Draft opinion

AM\1116491EN.docx

13/24

PE599.611v01-00

EN

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. *Hopes that the EFSI will provide balanced geographical coverage in the EU, taking account of the overall economic activity of each country, in addition to job creation, and without imposing pre-allocated quotas;*

Or. it

Amendment 24

Roberts Zile

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 a. *However warns against the trend whereby investment funds based on public-private partnerships are replacing the EU's conventional funding mechanisms and within the context of EFSI are partly funded using money that has previously been earmarked for other purposes; Notes that as EFSI has thus far been incapable of contributing towards the EU's economic, social and territorial cohesion, the EU's structural funds are still the main funds capable of serving the EU's cohesion policy aims;*

Or. en

Amendment 25

Rolandas Paksas

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *Calls for resources to be concentrated on investment in advanced*

fields, while endeavouring to eliminate the fundamental obstacles to successful use of the EFSI and paying attention to the results of funded projects, more focused financing, the quality of national strategic planning documents, and ex ante analysis of projects' capacity to deliver;

Or. It

Amendment 26
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Asks for European Added Value to be considered as a major criterion in the selection process and for the EFSI to be in line with EU policy goals, in particular cross-border *projects and other projects pre-identified in the CEF and other EU flagship initiatives in the field of transport (such as ERTMS and SESAR)*;

Amendment

6. Asks for European Added Value to be considered as a major criterion in the selection process and for the EFSI to be in line with EU policy goals, in particular cross-border *rail sections as defined in Article 2 (2) of the regulation 1316/2013 between cohesion countries, projects that create synergies between different trans-European Transport, Energy and Telecommunication networks and horizontal projects*;

Or. en

Amendment 27
Gabriele Preuß

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Asks for European Added Value to be considered as a major criterion in the selection process and for the EFSI to be in line with EU policy goals, in particular cross-border projects and other projects pre-identified in the CEF and other EU

Amendment

6. Asks for European Added Value to be considered as a major criterion in the selection process and for the EFSI to be in line with EU policy goals, in particular cross-border *and intermodal* projects and other projects pre-identified in the CEF and

flagship initiatives in the field of transport (such as ERTMS and SESAR);

other EU flagship initiatives in the field of transport (such as ERTMS and SESAR);

Or. de

Amendment 28
Marie-Christine Arnautu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Asks for European Added Value to be considered as a major criterion in the selection process and for the EFSI to be in line with EU policy goals, in particular ***cross-border projects and other*** projects pre-identified in the CEF and other EU flagship initiatives in the field of transport (such as ERTMS and SESAR);

Amendment

6. Asks for European Added Value to be considered as a major criterion in the selection process and for the EFSI to be in line with EU policy goals, in particular projects pre-identified in the CEF and other EU flagship initiatives in the field of transport (such as ERTMS and SESAR);

Or. fr

Amendment 29
Dominique Riquet

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Asks for European Added Value to be considered as a major criterion in the selection process and for the EFSI to be in line with EU policy goals, in particular cross-border projects ***and*** other projects pre-identified in the CEF and other EU flagship initiatives in the field of transport (such as ERTMS and SESAR);

Amendment

6. Asks for European Added Value to be considered as a major criterion in the selection process and for the EFSI to be in line with EU policy goals, in particular cross-border projects, other projects pre-identified in the CEF and other EU flagship initiatives in the field of transport (such as ERTMS and SESAR);

Or. fr

Amendment 30
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 a. *urges the Commission to focus on investing in such projects that contribute to minimising external costs instead of generating more;*

Or. en

Amendment 31
Roberts Zile

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. Considers that blending EU grants with financial instruments can also ensure the additionality required and will mobilise investors to submit projects that otherwise might not have been carried out; asks the EIB and the Commission to promote the blending of EU grants (various EU mechanisms such as CEF, H2020, European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF)) with the EFSI in order to improve the infrastructure projects' financial profile providing European Added Value;

7. Considers that blending EU grants with financial instruments can also ensure the additionality required and will mobilise investors to submit projects that otherwise might not have been carried out; asks the EIB and the Commission to promote the blending of EU grants (various EU mechanisms such as CEF, H2020, European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF)) with the EFSI in order to improve the infrastructure projects' financial profile providing European Added Value, ***but at the same time stresses that it is important to coordinate various types of EU funding and not to promote PPP type Funds at the expense of Structural Funds in order to ensure that EU transport policy objectives are met across all of the EU;***

Or. en

Amendment 32
Rolandas Paksas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Considers that blending EU grants with financial instruments can also ensure the additionality required and will mobilise investors to submit projects that otherwise might not have been carried out; asks the EIB and the Commission to promote the blending of EU grants (various EU mechanisms such as CEF, H2020, European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF)) with the EFSI in order to improve the infrastructure projects' financial profile providing European Added Value;

Amendment

7. Considers that blending EU grants with financial instruments can also ensure the additionality required and will mobilise investors to submit projects that otherwise might not have been carried out; asks the EIB and the Commission to promote the blending of EU grants (various EU mechanisms such as CEF, H2020, European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF)) with the EFSI in order to improve the infrastructure projects' financial profile providing European Added Value; ***calls for measures to be less fragmented and for overlapping between the EFSI and other financial instruments to be reduced;***

Or. It

Amendment 33
Roberts Zile

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7 a. Notes that public-private partnership transport infrastructure projects generally should be based on user-pays principle in order to reduce the burden imposed on public budgets and taxpayers for the construction and maintenance of infrastructure;

Or. en

Amendment 34
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. ***Underlines the promising start to*** the European Investment Advisory Hub (EIAH); calls on the EIAH to increase its presence in countries in which the EFSI has had difficulties taking hold and where there is a lack of administrative capacity to submit viable projects, in particular in cohesion countries; calls on the EIAH, furthermore, to provide specific advice in order to help specific transport projects wherever there is high risk aversion or the risk is fragmented among investors (such as cross border/multinational projects, long term/revenue infrastructure projects);

8. ***Acknowledges that, in view of the extremely high sector and geographical concentration of investments so far,*** the European Investment Advisory Hub (EIAH) ***must improve its overall performance***; calls on the EIAH to increase its presence in countries in which the EFSI has had difficulties taking hold and where there is a lack of administrative capacity to submit viable projects, in particular in cohesion countries; calls on the EIAH, furthermore, to provide specific advice in order to help specific transport projects wherever there is high risk aversion or the risk is fragmented among investors (such as cross border/multinational projects, long term/revenue infrastructure projects);

Or. en

Amendment 35 **Rolandas Paksas**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 8**

Draft opinion

8. Underlines the promising start to the European Investment Advisory Hub (EIAH); calls on the EIAH to increase its presence in countries in which the EFSI has had difficulties taking hold and where there is a lack of administrative capacity to submit viable projects, in particular in cohesion countries; calls on the EIAH, furthermore, to provide specific advice in order to help specific transport projects wherever there is high risk aversion or the risk is fragmented among investors (such as cross border/multinational projects, long term/revenue infrastructure projects);

Amendment

8. Underlines the promising start to the European Investment Advisory Hub (EIAH), ***which must play a major role in correcting the sectoral and geographical imbalance***; calls on the EIAH to increase its presence in countries in which the EFSI has had difficulties taking hold and where there is a lack of administrative capacity to submit viable projects, in particular in cohesion countries; calls on the EIAH, furthermore, to provide specific advice in order to help specific transport projects wherever there is high risk aversion or the risk is fragmented among investors (such as cross border/multinational projects, long term/revenue infrastructure projects);

Or. It

Amendment 36
Marie-Christine Arnautu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Underlines the promising start to the European Investment Advisory Hub (EIAH); calls on the EIAH to increase its presence in countries in which the EFSI has had difficulties taking hold and where there is a lack of administrative capacity to submit viable projects, in particular in cohesion countries; calls on the EIAH, furthermore, to provide specific advice in order to help specific transport projects wherever there is high risk aversion or the risk is fragmented among investors (such as *cross border/multinational projects*, long term/revenue infrastructure projects);

Amendment

8. Underlines the promising start to the European Investment Advisory Hub (EIAH); calls on the EIAH to increase its presence in countries in which the EFSI has had difficulties taking hold and where there is a lack of administrative capacity to submit viable projects, in particular in cohesion countries; calls on the EIAH, furthermore, to provide specific advice in order to help specific transport projects wherever there is high risk aversion or the risk is fragmented among investors (such as long term/revenue infrastructure projects);

Or. fr

Amendment 37
Dominique Riquet, Pavel Telička, Inés Ayala Sender

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. In order to improve the performance of the EFSI at both national and regional level, there is a need to step up cooperation between the EIB, which steers the EFSI, and the national and regional promotional banks.

Or. fr

Amendment 38
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

PE599.611v01-00

20/24

AM\1116491EN.docx

Draft opinion

9. Notes with concern that the small number of transport projects in the EFSI would seem to be evidence of this sector's difficulty in obtaining funding mostly or exclusively from private investors, even where CEF funding has been almost exhausted and no alternative EU funding is available until 2020;

Amendment

9. Notes with concern that the small number of transport projects in the EFSI would seem to be evidence of this sector's difficulty in obtaining funding mostly or exclusively from private investors, even where CEF funding has been almost exhausted and no alternative EU funding is available until 2020; ***call on the Commission to pay particular attention to providing more support to local authorities as well as SMEs;***

Or. en

Amendment 39
Markus Pieper

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Notes with concern that the small number of transport projects in the EFSI would seem to be evidence of this sector's difficulty in obtaining funding mostly or exclusively from private investors, even where CEF funding has been almost exhausted and no alternative EU funding is available until 2020;

Amendment

9. Notes with concern that the small number of transport projects in the EFSI would seem to be evidence of this sector's difficulty in obtaining funding mostly or exclusively from private investors, even where CEF funding has been almost exhausted and no alternative EU funding is available until 2020; ***calls therefore for Connecting Europe facility funding to be boosted under the next financial framework;***

Or. de

Amendment 40
Dominique Riquet

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

Amendment

9. Notes with concern that the small number of transport projects in the EFSI would seem to be evidence of this sector's difficulty in obtaining funding mostly or exclusively from private investors, *even where* CEF funding has been almost exhausted and no alternative EU funding is available until 2020;

9. Notes with concern that the small number of transport projects in the EFSI would seem to be evidence of this sector's difficulty in obtaining funding mostly or exclusively from private investors, *while* CEF funding has been almost exhausted and no alternative EU funding is available until 2020;

Or. fr

Amendment 41
Tania González Peñas, Merja Kyllönen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Deplores the lack of data available on the total amount of the signed operations under 'SME Window' of the EFSI and related investments, especially with regard to the transport supply chain, in aeronautics and in the railway sector, and the fact that this makes the verification of projects, results, success stories and benchmarks difficult;

Amendment

10. Deplores the lack of data available on the total amount of the signed operations under 'SME Window' of the EFSI and related investments, especially with regard to the transport supply chain, in aeronautics and in the railway sector, and the fact that this makes the verification of projects, results, success stories and benchmarks difficult;
Recalls that the SMEs are not a sector, so the fact of supporting SMEs must be treated as a key added value to other concurrent specific sector and Union policy requirements;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Jill Seymour

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Deplores the lack of data available on the total amount of the signed operations under 'SME Window' of the

Amendment

10. Deplores the lack of data available on the total amount of the signed operations under 'SME Window' of the

EFSI and related investments, especially with regard to the transport supply chain, in aeronautics and in the railway sector, and the fact that this makes the verification of projects, results, success stories and benchmarks difficult;

EFSI and related investments, especially with regard to the transport supply chain, in aeronautics and in the railway sector, and the fact that this makes the verification of projects, results, success stories and benchmarks difficult; ***insists that the lack of data available be rectified immediately;***

Or. en

Amendment 43
Miltiadis Kyrkos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10 a. Suggests that the European Investment Advisory Hub (EIAH) enhances its information to SMEs and micro-enterprises in the tourism sector, so as to boost the development of projects, which would stimulate sustainable and accessible tourism, generate economic growth and create jobs; stresses that the information should focus on blending of different financial sources, as well as synergies between Member States.

Or. en

Amendment 44
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

Amendment

11. Suggests that the Commission should, in its regular reports, list the projects that benefit from blending CEF grants with the EFSI.

11. Suggests that the Commission should, in its regular reports, list the projects that benefit from blending CEF grants with the EFSI; ***also insists on the Commission to regularly publish detailed information of projects and the amounts***

of EU funding received per project.

Or. en

Amendment 45

Jens Nilsson

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Takes the view that projects should be rooted in, and carried out in cooperation with, the local and regional level in order to ensure optimum conditions for sustainability and success, bringing added value for Europe.

Or. sv

Amendment 46

Isabella De Monte

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Recommends raising the profile of EFSI funding by taking firm EU-wide action through an information campaign and by launching an EFSI logo.

Or. it