



2017/2136(DEC)

25.1.2018

AMENDMENTS

1 - 20

Draft opinion

Isabella De Monte

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

Amendment 1
Jill Seymour

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. **Welcomes** the finding of the Court of Auditors (the “Court”) that the consolidated accounts of the Union for the year 2016 are reliable and that the transactions underlying the accounts of the Commission for the 2016 financial year are generally legal and regular in all material aspects, except for cost reimbursement payments which are affected by errors; regrets that the overall estimated level of error of 3,1% is above the Court’s materiality threshold (2%); **notes that the estimated level of error is, however, not pervasive;**

Amendment

1. **Notes** the finding of the Court of Auditors (the “Court”) that the consolidated accounts of the Union for the year 2016 are reliable and that the transactions underlying the accounts of the Commission for the 2016 financial year are generally legal and regular in all material aspects, except for cost reimbursement payments which are affected by errors; regrets that the overall estimated level of error of 3,1% is above the Court’s materiality threshold (2%); **expects the Court to provide a detailed report of the errors to the Parliament;**

Or. en

Amendment 2
Jill Seymour

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Regrets that for the area of "Competitiveness for growth and employment", to which transport belongs, the Court did not provide any comprehensive information regarding the audits performed for transport sector, in particular regarding the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF);

Amendment

3. Regrets that for the area of "Competitiveness for growth and employment", to which transport belongs, the Court did not provide any comprehensive information regarding the audits performed for **the** transport sector, in particular regarding the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF); **expects, therefore, the Court to provide any comprehensive information for the transport sector to the Committee on Transport and Tourism immediately;**

Or. en

Amendment 3
Pavel Telička, Matthijs van Miltenburg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Regrets that *for the area of "Competitiveness for growth and employment", to which transport belongs*, the Court did not provide any comprehensive information regarding the audits performed for transport sector, in particular regarding the *Connecting Europe Facility (CEF)*;

Amendment

3. Regrets that, *at the time when the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) is under preparation*, the Court did not provide any comprehensive information regarding the audits performed for transport sector *under the area of "Competitiveness for growth and employment"*, in particular regarding the *CEF*;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Pavel Telička, Matthijs van Miltenburg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

3 a. Takes note of the Court's observation as concerns the risk of backlog of unpaid claims in the final years of the current MFF and in the early years of the next MFF; invites the Commission to present to the Parliament and the Council an assessment of the implications with sector-specific recommendations;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Pavel Telička, Matthijs van Miltenburg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Regrets the fairly limited progress made in the completion of the TEN-T strategic networks planned under the European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund; asks the Commission to investigate how problems related to implementation rates and imbalance between Member States could be improved;

Amendment

6. Regrets the fairly limited progress made in the completion of the TEN-T strategic networks planned under the European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund; asks the Commission to investigate how problems related to implementation rates and imbalance between Member States could be improved; ***invites the European TEN-T Coordinators to conduct a thorough assessment of the projects completed and the improvements achieved along the TEN-T corridors under the current programming period, and to present it to the Commission and the Parliament;***

Or. en

Amendment 6
Marian-Jean Marinescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Regrets the fairly limited progress made in the completion of the TEN-T strategic networks planned under the European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund; asks the Commission to investigate how problems related to implementation rates and imbalance between Member States could be improved;

Amendment

6. Regrets the fairly limited progress made in the completion of the TEN-T strategic networks planned under the European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund; asks the Commission to investigate how problems related to implementation rates and imbalance between Member States could be improved ***and to share with the Parliament the result of this evaluation; moreover asks the Commission to use this evaluation for the sectorial policies after 2020 in order to propose a mechanism to increase the added value of European Funds in completion of the TEN-T corridors.***

Or. en

Amendment 7
Tomasz Piotr Poręba, Kosma Złotowski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Regrets the fairly limited progress made in the completion of the TEN-T strategic networks planned under the European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund; asks the Commission to investigate how problems related to implementation rates and imbalance between Member States could be improved;

Amendment

6. Regrets the fairly limited progress made in the completion of the TEN-T strategic networks planned under the European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund; asks the Commission to investigate how problems related to implementation rates and imbalance between Member States could be improved; ***believes that technical assistance is necessary in order to maximise the added value of these instruments;***

Or. en

Amendment 8
Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Regrets the fairly limited progress made in the completion of the TEN-T strategic networks planned under the European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund; asks the Commission to investigate how problems related to implementation rates and imbalance between Member States could be improved;

Amendment

6. Regrets the fairly limited progress made in the completion of the TEN-T strategic networks planned under the European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund; asks the Commission to investigate how problems related to implementation rates and imbalance between Member States could be improved ***in order to avoid this limited progress;***

Or. ro

Amendment 9
Pavel Telička, Matthijs van Miltenburg

Draft opinion

PE615.581v01-00

6/12

AM\1142741EN.docx

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. **Regrets** that the number of financial instruments has increased considerably, creating a complex web of arrangements around the Union budget; is concerned that these instruments alongside the Union budget **risks** undermining the level of accountability and transparency, as reporting, audit and public scrutiny are not aligned; regrets furthermore that with the use of the EFSI funds, implementation powers are delegated to the EIB with more limited public scrutiny than for other instruments supported by the Union budget;

Amendment

9. **Notes** that the number of financial instruments has increased considerably **which allows for new blending opportunities in the transport sector, while at the same time** creating a complex web of arrangements around the Union budget; is concerned that these instruments alongside the Union budget **could risk** undermining the level of accountability and transparency, as reporting, audit and public scrutiny are not aligned; regrets furthermore that with the use of the EFSI funds, implementation powers are delegated to the EIB with more limited public scrutiny than for other instruments supported by the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 10

Tomasz Piotr Poręba, Kosma Złotowski

Draft opinion Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. **Regrets** that the number of financial instruments has increased considerably, creating a complex web of arrangements around the Union budget; is concerned that these instruments alongside the Union budget risks undermining the level of accountability and transparency, as reporting, audit and public scrutiny are not aligned; regrets furthermore that with the use of the EFSI funds, implementation powers are delegated to the EIB with more limited public scrutiny than for other instruments supported by the Union budget;

Amendment

9. **Notes** that the number of financial instruments has increased considerably, creating a complex web of arrangements around the Union budget; is concerned that these instruments alongside the Union budget risks undermining the level of accountability and transparency, as reporting, audit and public scrutiny are not aligned; regrets furthermore that with the use of the EFSI funds, implementation powers are delegated to the EIB with more limited public scrutiny than for other instruments supported by the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 11
Pavel Telička, Matthijs van Miltenburg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Calls upon the Commission to clearly present for the sector of transport an assessment of the impact of EFSI on other financial instruments, in particular with regard to the CEF as well as on the coherence of the CEF Debt Instrument with other Union initiatives in good time before the proposal for the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) and for the next CEF; requests that this assessment presents a clear analysis on the geographical balance of investments in the transport sector;

Amendment

11. Calls upon the Commission to clearly present for the sector of transport an assessment of the impact of EFSI on other financial instruments, in particular with regard to the CEF as well as on the coherence of the CEF Debt Instrument with other Union initiatives in good time before the proposal for the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) and for the next CEF; requests that this assessment presents a clear analysis on the geographical balance of investments in the transport sector; ***recalls, however, that the amount of money spent under a financial instrument should not be considered as the only pertinent criteria to assess its performance; invites, therefore, the Commission to deepen its assessment of the achievements completed under Union funded transport projects and measure their added-value;***

Or. en

Amendment 12
Jill Seymour

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Calls upon the Commission to clearly present for the sector of transport an assessment of the impact of EFSI on other financial instruments, in particular with regard to the CEF as well as on the coherence of the CEF Debt Instrument with other Union initiatives ***in good time*** before the proposal for the next ***Multiannual Financial Framework***

Amendment

11. Calls upon the Commission to clearly present for the sector of transport an assessment of the impact of EFSI on other financial instruments, in particular with regard to the CEF as well as on the coherence of the CEF Debt Instrument with other Union initiatives ***as a matter of priority*** before the proposal for the next ***MFF*** and for the next CEF; requests that

(MFF) and for the next CEF; requests that this assessment presents a clear analysis on the geographical balance of investments in the transport sector;

this assessment presents a clear analysis on the geographical balance of investments in the transport sector;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Marian-Jean Marinescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11 a. Calls upon the Commission, taking into account the low level of spending of CEF financial instruments budget line, to reallocate the available amounts to the CEF works line in order to allow full spending of the CEF funds;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Tomasz Piotr Poręba, Kosma Złotowski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11 a. Recalls that grants remain an essential tool in attracting private financing and in closing the gap between cohesion and other Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Jill Seymour

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Reiterates its request that the Commission, in view of the multiple sources of funding, provide an easy access to projects -in form of a one-stop-shop- in order to allow citizens to clearly follow the developments and funding of infrastructures co-financed by *Unionfunds* and by the EFSI;

Amendment

12. Reiterates its request that the Commission, in view of the multiple sources of funding, provide an easy access to projects - in form of a one-stop-shop- in order to allow citizens to clearly follow the developments and funding of infrastructures co-financed by *Union funds* and by the EFSI; ***asks, however, before a 'one-stop-shop' is set up, that a full cost and benefit analysis report is provided to the Parliament in order to ensure that Union funds provided for by Member States are not wasted;***

Or. en

Amendment 16

Pavel Telička, Matthijs van Miltenburg

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 13**

Draft opinion

13. Notes that research and innovation accounts for 59% of spending of the MFF sub-heading "Competitiveness for growth and jobs"; is concerned that the level of errors is high (4,1%); emphasises that innovation is a cornerstone to ensure sustainability of transport; calls on the Commission to put forward further simplification measures so that funding is adequately used and more participants, in particular SMEs, would profit from Union funds; reiterates the need to secure enough Union funds in the form of grants in the next MFF for research and innovation;

Amendment

13. Notes that research and innovation accounts for 59% of spending of the MFF sub-heading "Competitiveness for growth and jobs"; is concerned that the level of errors is high (4,1%); emphasises that innovation is a cornerstone to ensure sustainability of transport; calls on the Commission to put forward further simplification measures ***and ensure that a technical and financial support is provided*** so that funding is adequately used and more participants, in particular SMEs, would profit from Union funds; reiterates the need to secure enough Union funds in the form of grants in the next MFF for research and innovation;

Or. en

Amendment 17

Marian-Jean Marinescu

PE615.581v01-00

10/12

AM\1142741EN.docx

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

14. Welcomes the Galileo declaration of initial service in 2016; underlines the importance of EGNOS for the transport sector; notes in this respect that at the end of 2016 there were 219 EGNOS airports where EGNOS-based landing procedures had been implemented in the Union and that in road transport the number of trucks using EGNOS for tolling was EUR 1,1 million;

Amendment

14. Welcomes the Galileo declaration of initial service in 2016; underlines the importance of EGNOS for the transport sector; notes in this respect that at the end of 2016 there were 219 EGNOS airports where EGNOS-based landing procedures had been implemented in the Union and that in road transport the number of trucks using EGNOS for tolling was EUR 1,1 million; ***asks the Commission to provide in the next annual budgets the necessary financing to provide EGNOS coverage for entire EU territory;***

Or. en

Amendment 18
Marian-Jean Marinescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Calls on the Commission to evaluate the financial effectiveness of the agreement with Eurocontrol regarding the Performance Review Body (PRB) and to advance the proposal to establish PRB as a European economic regulator under the supervision of the Commission; moreover, taking in account the necessity to implement as soon as possible the Single European Sky and in order to increase the competitiveness of aviation industry, calls on the Commission to advance the proposal to designate the Network Managers as a self-standing service provider set up as an industrial partnership;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Marian-Jean Marinescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 16 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

16 a. Calls on the Commission to present an assessment of the impact of the projects financed by the Member States, in the area of transport under the Danube Strategy and to make a proposal to increase the added value of the future projects in order to contribute to the completion of this important transport corridor;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Tomasz Piotr Poręba, Kosma Złotowski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 17

Draft opinion

Amendment

17. Deeply regrets that, due to the lack of a specific budget line for tourism, there is a lack of transparency regarding the Union funds used to support actions for tourism; reiterates its request to add a budget line in future budgets of the Union dedicated to tourism;

deleted

Or. en