



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs

2014/2075(DEC)

13.1.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 7

Draft opinion
Sylvie Guillaume
(PE541.395v01-00)

on discharge in respect of the implementation of the European Union general budget for the financial year 2013, Section III – Commission (2014/2075(DEC))

AM\1038293EN.doc

PE541.400v01-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes the fact that the ***Court of Auditors*** calculated a residual error rate at year end of less than 2% in the area of justice and home affairs;

Amendment

3. Welcomes the fact that the ***Commission*** calculated a residual error rate at year end of less than 2% in the area of justice and home affairs;

(Correction: It was the Commission - rather than, as initially stated, the Court of Auditors - which calculated and established a 2% residual error rate for JHA.)

Or. fr

Amendment 2
Petr Ježek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Welcomes the fact that the Court of Auditors calculated a residual error rate at year end of less than 2% in the area of justice and home affairs;

Amendment

3. Welcomes the fact that the Court of Auditors calculated a residual error rate at year end of less than 2% in the area of justice and home affairs; ***emphasises, however, that there should always be a determination to further reduce the error rate within the budget;***

Or. en

Amendment 3
Petr Ježek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Welcomes Court of Auditors' Recommendation 2 to the effect that the Commission should make its control activities more risk-driven, focusing checks on high-risk beneficiaries (for example entities with less experience of European funding) and reducing the burden of checks on less risky beneficiaries;

Amendment

4. Welcomes, **therefore, the** Court of Auditors' Recommendation 2 to the effect that the Commission should make its control activities more risk-driven, focusing checks on high-risk beneficiaries (for example entities with less experience of European funding) and reducing the burden of checks on less risky beneficiaries;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Petr Ježek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes the conclusions set out in Court of Auditors Special Report No 3/2014, entitled 'Lessons from the European Commission's development of the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II)', in which the Court looks at the reasons why the Commission delivered SIS II more than six years later than initially planned and at a cost far higher than was initially estimated;

Amendment

5. Notes the conclusions set out in Court of Auditors Special Report No 3/2014, entitled 'Lessons from the European Commission's development of the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II)', in which the Court looks at the reasons why the Commission delivered SIS II more than six years later than initially planned and at a cost far higher than was initially estimated; **highlights that recommendations should be followed in order to ensure prudent and realistic budgeting in respect of large-scale projects;**

Or. en

Amendment 5
Tomáš Zdechovský

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the fact that the External Borders Fund has helped to foster financial solidarity; criticises, despite this, the fact that further EU added value was limited and the overall result could not be measured due to weaknesses in the responsible authorities' monitoring and serious deficiencies in the ex post evaluations conducted by the Commission and the Member States.

Amendment

6. Welcomes the fact that the External Borders Fund has helped to foster financial solidarity; criticises, despite this, the fact that further EU added value was limited and the overall result could not be measured due to weaknesses in the responsible authorities' monitoring and serious deficiencies in the ex post evaluations conducted by the Commission and the Member States; ***points out that there is considerable scope for improvement in terms of project selection and public procurement; encourages the Commission to ensure strengthened support to Frontex operations.***

Or. en

Amendment 6
Sophia in 't Veld, Judith Sargentini, Cornelia Ernst

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Notes that the Commission's expenses on action grants for setting-up national Passenger Name Record (PNR) schemes, in execution of the 2012 Working programme on the prevention of and fight against crime, have been made without the approval of the Parliament regarding the related proposal for an EU PNR Directive, whereas the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs rejected that proposal on 24 April 2013; questions the legality of Commission grants which are allocated ahead of, or against the spirit of, Parliamentary legislative decision;

Amendment 7
Sophia in 't Veld, Judith Sargentini, Cornelia Ernst

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. Notes that the Commission allocated a grant of EUR 5,7 million to the Netherlands for setting-up a national PNR scheme in execution of the 2012 Working programme on the prevention of and fight against crime, supposing that the relevant national legal requirements to set-up the PNR project would be adopted in due time; notes that the Dutch parliament rejected the introduction of a national PNR scheme on 4 September 2014; questions the legality of Commission grants allocated to Member States ahead of the adoption of the relevant national legal provisions;