



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Committee on Industry, Research and Energy

2011/2019(BUD)

11.5.2011

AMENDMENTS

1 - 38

Draft opinion
Reinhard Bütikofer
(PE460.864v01-00)

on mandate for the trilogue on the 2012 Draft Budget
(2011/2019(BUD))

AM\867185EN.doc

PE464.736v02-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Anni Podimata

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. **Welcomes** the European Semester process, which **is intended to achieve stronger** economic **governance**; believes that successful implementation of the EU 2020 strategy requires substantial, coordinated and appropriate financial commitments to be made to meeting its priorities at both EU and Member State level and that any limitation in the relevant EU budget appropriations would undermine its achievement;

Amendment

1. **Believes that** the European Semester process **should become a strong tool for enhancing** economic **and fiscal coordination**, which **should not be restricted to the supervision of fiscal programmes of Member States but should also assess the alignment of national budgets with the EU 2020 strategy commitments and goals**; believes that successful implementation of the EU 2020 strategy requires substantial, coordinated and appropriate financial commitments to be made to meeting its priorities at both EU and Member State level and that any limitation in the relevant EU budget appropriations would undermine its achievement;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Fiona Hall, Lena Ek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the European Semester process, which is intended to achieve stronger economic governance; believes that successful implementation of the EU 2020 strategy requires substantial, coordinated and appropriate financial commitments to be made to meeting its priorities at both EU and Member State

Amendment

1. Welcomes the European Semester process, which is intended to achieve stronger economic governance; believes that successful implementation of the EU 2020 strategy requires substantial, coordinated, **transparent** and appropriate financial commitments to be made to meeting its priorities at both EU and

level and that any limitation in the relevant EU budget appropriations would undermine its achievement;

Member State level and that any limitation in the relevant EU budget appropriations would undermine its achievement;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Points out that for speeding up the roll-out of high-speed internet and reaping the benefits of a digital single market for households and firms in line with the EU2020 digital agenda flagship initiative, financing of broadband infrastructure investments and infrastructure programmes should be better coordinated via improved planning at national, regional and local level and the EU should liaise more closely with regions to help them absorbing Structural and Rural Development funds for these purposes;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Algirdas Saudargas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Welcomes the Commission objectives for 2012 draft budget in line with the Europe 2020 strategy; regrets nevertheless that some of the acknowledged EU priorities are

underfinanced in particular energy policy;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Fiona Hall, Lena Ek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Is deeply concerned about the mismatch of the EU budget political priorities and actual financial allocations, in particular energy policy which represents only 0,5% of the EU budget;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Highlights the importance of the Risk Sharing Financial Facility under FP7 and of the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme under CIP that serve as models for European innovative financial instruments pooling EU Budget funds and EIB financial resources in assisting business development and in reaching the goals of the Innovation Union EU2020 flagship initiative; calls the Commission to enhance these instruments in the fields of research, innovation and energy;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Algirdas Saudargas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. ***Points out*** that ***improving*** the conditions for R&D&I, ***notably as regards sustainable energy priorities, energy storage technologies, resource efficiency and green technologies, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget increases but also for the introduction of more sustainability criteria in EU R&D&I programmes;***

Amendment

2. ***Recalls*** that ***investment in R&D&I is a long-term investment essential to achieve the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy; in this context points out the need to improve the conditions for R&D&I; believes that the EU should concentrate its spending on areas which stimulate our economic growth and competitiveness such as innovation and R&D; is convinced that at the same time thriving research, innovation and development must help in addressing major societal challenges of our times; welcomes the Commission proposal to increase the budget in EU R&D&I programmes; stresses that a thorough investigation is needed before the introduction of sustainability criteria in the projects selection procedure;***

Or. en

Amendment 8
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points out that improving the conditions for R&D&I, notably as regards sustainable energy priorities, energy storage technologies, resource efficiency and green technologies, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget increases but also for the

Amendment

2. Points out that improving the conditions for R&D&I, notably as regards sustainable energy priorities, energy storage technologies, resource efficiency and green technologies, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget increases but also for the

introduction of more sustainability criteria in EU R&D&I programmes;

introduction of more sustainability criteria in EU R&D&I programmes; ***underlines that although for the TEN-Energy programme the Financial programming foresees a significant increase of the 2007-2013 budget compared to the initial envelope, the planned sum of EUR 22 million is still very limited compared to the challenges and to the TEN-Transport program;***

Or. en

Amendment 9
Reinhard Bütikofer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points out that improving the conditions for R&D&I, notably as regards sustainable energy priorities, energy storage technologies, resource efficiency and green technologies, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget increases but also for the introduction of more sustainability criteria in EU R&D&I programmes;

Amendment

2. Points out that improving the conditions for R&D&I, notably as regards sustainable energy priorities, energy storage technologies, resource efficiency and green technologies, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget increases but also for the introduction of more sustainability criteria in EU R&D&I programmes ***in line with EU's energy and climates objectives and to phase out subsidies for fossil fuels and outdated technologies accordingly;***

Or. en

Amendment 10
Fiona Hall, Lena Ek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points out that improving the conditions for R&D&I, notably as regards sustainable energy priorities, energy storage technologies, resource efficiency and green technologies, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget **increases** but also for the introduction of **more sustainability criteria** in EU R&D&I programmes;

Amendment

2. Points out that improving the conditions for R&D&I, notably as regards sustainable energy priorities, energy **efficiency and** storage technologies, resource efficiency and green technologies, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget **reallocations** but also for the introduction of more sustainability criteria in EU R&D&I programmes; **in particular to implement the Strategic Energy Technology Plan, as called for in the European Council conclusions of 4 February 2011;**

Or. en

Amendment 11
Lena Kolarska-Bobińska

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points out that improving the conditions for R&D&I, notably as regards sustainable energy priorities, energy storage technologies, resource efficiency **and green technologies**, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget increases but also for the introduction of **more sustainability criteria** in EU R&D&I programmes;

Amendment

2. Points out that improving the conditions for R&D&I, notably as regards sustainable energy priorities, energy storage technologies **and** resource efficiency, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget increases but also for the introduction of **a greater focus on sustainable energy** in EU R&D&I programmes;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Zigmantas Balčytis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points out that improving the conditions for R&D&I, notably as regards sustainable energy priorities, energy storage technologies, resource efficiency and green technologies, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget increases but also for the introduction of more sustainability criteria in EU R&D&I programmes;

Amendment

2. Points out that improving the conditions for R&D&I, notably as regards **renewable and** sustainable energy priorities, energy storage technologies, resource efficiency and green technologies, is vital to progress towards the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; calls not only for budget increases but also for the introduction of more sustainability criteria in EU R&D&I programmes;

Or. It

Amendment 13

Silvia-Adriana Țicău

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Draws attention to the fact that the EU and the Member States have not invested sufficiently in measures to reduce CO₂ emissions or increase energy efficiency in the buildings and transport sectors; calls on the Commission, in cooperation with the Member States, to take measures to increase the energy efficiency of buildings and of centralised urban heating and cooling networks, and to allocate increased funding in 2012, also recalling the context of the review of the multiannual financial framework;

Or. ro

Amendment 14

Reinhard Bütikofer

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Deeply regrets that the proposed 2012 budget allocations in the energy policy area are actually decreasing and that support to sustainable energy priorities still represents only a very minor share of the R&D&I programmes (the lowest share of the Cooperation part in Seventh Framework Programme compared to all other policy areas);

Or. en

Amendment 15
Silvia-Adriana Țicău

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Calls on the Commission and the Member States, with a view to reducing the generation of polluting emissions in the transport sector, to prioritise investment in the development of an intelligent electricity network at pan-European level that can be fed by energy produced locally and regionally from renewable sources and can contribute to developing the infrastructures needed for the use of electric vehicles;

Or. ro

Amendment 16
Fiona Hall, Lena Ek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Regrets the proposal to reallocate funds from FP7 to the ITER project; recalls that it is imperative to focus on technologies that will be available in the foreseeable future, or are already available, to deliver the EU 2020 goals rather than longer-term projects such as ITER;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Silvia-Adriana Țicău

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses the importance of the Erasmus programme for young entrepreneurs, and calls on the Commission to ensure it a suitable level of funding in 2012 with a view to doubling the number of beneficiaries;

Or. ro

Amendment 18
Algirdas Saudargas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Regrets that the 2012 draft budget does not foresee financial allocation for the SET-plan technologies directly from the existing budgetary line;

Amendment 19
Silvia-Adriana Țicău

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Calls on the Commission, in cooperation with the Member States, to ensure the financing of projects contributing to the realisation of the objective under the Digital Agenda of achieving 100% broadband coverage by 2013;

Or. ro

Amendment 20
Fiona Hall

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Regrets that the draft budget suggests decreasing the already small Trans-European Energy Networks funding by 12,5% and calls for additional funds for this important EU programme;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Silvia-Adriana Țicău

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3c. Calls on the Commission to ensure a sufficient level of funding in 2012 for applied R&D in respect of specific GNSS services and applications;

Or. ro

Amendment 22
Reinhard Bütikofer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for further implementation of the Small Business Act, with the introduction of SME-related policy actions including measures to improve access and develop specific programmes and innovative financial mechanisms; calls for the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme – an SME flagship programme – to be upgraded;

Amendment

4. Calls for further implementation of the Small Business Act, with the introduction of SME-related policy actions including measures to improve access and develop specific programmes and innovative financial mechanisms; calls for the **specific programmes under the** Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme – an SME flagship programme – to be **substantially** upgraded **and the executive agency responsible for its implementation (EACI) fully supported;**

Or. en

Amendment 23
Zigmantas Balčytis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for **further** implementation of the Small Business Act, with the introduction of SME-related policy actions including

Amendment

4. Calls for **full** implementation of the Small Business Act, with the introduction of SME-related policy actions including

measures to improve access and develop specific programmes and innovative financial mechanisms; calls for the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme – an SME flagship programme – to be upgraded;

measures to improve **SMEs'** access **to financing, increase their participation in public contracts** and develop specific programmes and innovative financial mechanisms; calls for the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme – an SME flagship programme – to be upgraded;

Or. It

Amendment 24
Anni Podimata

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Supports the idea of issuing project bonds to finance Europe's significant infrastructure needs and structural projects in the framework of the 2020 agenda, anticipated new EU strategies, such as the new Strategy on Energy Infrastructure Development, and other large-scale projects; calls on the Commission and Member States to ensure that the European project bonds mechanism is in place as soon as possible, before 2014, which is the date stated as target in the Commission's relevant consultation document;

Or. en

Amendment 25
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Believes that investments in European energy infrastructure serve the best the aims of resource efficient Europe flagship initiative of the EU2020 strategy and that the SET-plan is the technology pillar of the EU's energy and climate policy; urges therefore the long-term financing of the development of this kind of innovative and sustainable energy technologies to be implemented immediately;

Or. en

Amendment 26
Anni Podimata

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Believes that clear goals in sustainable energy policy, energy efficiency and resource efficiency policy can deliver cost-efficient benefits for the European economy as a whole; calls for the allocation of EU and Member State public and private resources to investments in those priority sectors;

5. Believes that clear goals in sustainable energy policy, energy efficiency and resource efficiency policy can deliver cost-efficient benefits for the European economy as a whole; calls for the allocation of EU and Member State public and private resources to investments in those priority sectors; **welcomes in this regard the review of the Energy Taxation Directive, which can provide significant additional revenue and major incentives to shift towards renewable energy sources;**

Or. en

Amendment 27
Algirdas Saudargas

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

5. Believes that clear goals in sustainable energy policy, energy efficiency and resource efficiency policy can deliver cost-efficient benefits for the European economy as a whole; calls for the allocation of EU and Member State public and private resources to investments in those priority sectors;

Amendment

5. Believes that clear goals ***and sufficient financing*** in sustainable energy policy, energy efficiency and resource efficiency policy can deliver cost-efficient benefits for the European economy as a whole; calls for the allocation of EU and Member State public and private resources to investments in those priority sectors;

Or. en

**Amendment 28
Fiona Hall, Lena Ek**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

5. Believes that clear goals in sustainable energy policy, energy efficiency and resource efficiency policy can deliver cost-efficient benefits for the European economy as a whole; calls for the allocation of EU and Member State public and private resources to investments in those priority sectors;

Amendment

5. Believes that clear ***and ambitious*** goals in sustainable energy policy, energy efficiency and resource efficiency policy can deliver cost-efficient benefits for the European economy as a whole; calls for the allocation of EU and Member State public and private resources to investments in those priority sectors;

Or. en

**Amendment 29
Reinhard Bütikofer**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Welcomes the proposed strengthening

of the budget for the European Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER) in light of the adoption of the REMIT regulation and its overall growing responsibilities; does not support however that this increase results from redeployment of funds from TEN-E and Intelligent Energy Europe Programme and calls for more budgetary allocations to be devoted to the developments of EU energy infrastructure networks and technology, in particular smart-grids and a European super-grid;

Or. en

Amendment 30
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Recalls that figures in the financial programming regarding EURATOM for the year 2012 are very indicative; emphasises therefore that EU allocations to nuclear safety and security projects must be identified to be sufficient to cover the costs of the stress-tests in all EU nuclear facilities;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Algirdas Saudargas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Recalls the importance of integrated

EU energy infrastructure for energy security and common EU energy market; stresses that already low resources dedicated to TEN-E shall not be reduced, but increased in the draft budget;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that proper governance, accurate planning, sound financial management, clear limits on EU participation and a separate budget line must be ensured for large-scale projects before any additional funding is allocated; emphasises that EU allocations to such projects should not result from the redeployment of funds from other EU R&D programmes and that any additional costs that may arise must be covered by the Member States or private stakeholders; points out, in connection with Galileo, that users of the Public Regulated Service and the Commercial Service should contribute towards the costs.

Amendment

6. Emphasises that emergency solutions are likely to jeopardise the success and added value of strategic, large-scale EU projects and undermine the political momentum around them; long-term budgetary solutions must be found instead, together with sustainable financing solutions which do not dwarf the funding allocated to research in other areas and which will provide EU-level funding in keeping with the technical demands of these programmes and with a timetable that ensures their viability;

Or. en

Amendment 33
Algirdas Saudargas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that proper governance, accurate planning, sound financial management, clear limits on EU participation **and a separate budget line** must be ensured for large-scale projects before any additional funding is allocated; emphasises that EU allocations to such projects should not result from the redeployment of funds from other EU R&D programmes and that any additional costs that may arise must be **covered by the Member States or private stakeholders; points out, in connection with Galileo, that users of the Public Regulated Service and the Commercial Service should contribute towards the costs.**

Amendment

6. Stresses that proper governance, accurate planning, sound financial management, clear limits on EU participation must be ensured for large-scale projects before any additional funding is allocated; emphasises that EU allocations to such projects should not result from the redeployment of funds from other EU R&D programmes and that any additional costs that may arise must be **fully justified;**

Or. en

Amendment 34
Norbert Glante

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that proper governance, accurate planning, sound financial management, clear limits on EU participation and a separate budget line must be ensured for large-scale projects before any additional funding is allocated; emphasises that EU allocations to such projects should not result from the redeployment of funds from other EU R&D programmes and that any additional costs that may arise must be covered by the Member States or private stakeholders; **points out, in connection with Galileo, that users of the Public Regulated Service and the Commercial Service should contribute towards the costs.**

Amendment

6. Stresses that proper governance, accurate planning, sound financial management, clear limits on EU participation and a separate budget line must be ensured for large-scale projects before any additional funding is allocated; emphasises that EU allocations to such projects should not result from the redeployment of funds from other EU R&D programmes and that any additional costs that may arise must be covered by the Member States or private stakeholders; **calls on the Commission, in connection with Galileo, to analyse the extent to which future revenue from the Public Regulated Service and the Commercial**

Service *can* contribute towards the costs.

Or. de

Amendment 35
Reinhard Bütikofer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that proper governance, accurate planning, sound financial management, clear limits on EU participation and a separate budget line must be ensured for large-scale projects before any additional funding is allocated; emphasises that EU allocations to such projects should not result from the redeployment of funds from other EU R&D programmes and that any additional costs that may arise must be covered by the Member States or private stakeholders; points out, in connection with Galileo, that users of the Public Regulated Service and the Commercial Service should contribute towards the costs.

Amendment

6. Stresses that proper governance, accurate planning, sound financial management, clear limits on EU participation and a separate budget line must be ensured for large-scale projects before any additional funding is allocated; emphasises that EU allocations to such projects should not result from the redeployment of funds from other EU R&D programmes and ***thus rejects the Commission proposal to redeploy budget allocated to the Seventh Framework Programme to the ITER project; believes*** that any additional costs that may arise ***for large-scale projects*** must be covered by the Member States or private stakeholders; points out, in connection with Galileo, that users of the Public Regulated Service and the Commercial Service should contribute towards the costs;

Or. en

Amendment 36
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Underlines that Galileo and GMES

form an integral part of the industrial flagship initiative of the Europe 2020 strategy, as they are intended to push the EU to the forefront by developing innovative ways of exploiting satellite navigation, boosting economic activity in the market further downstream and generating knowledge; stresses therefore that proper financial measures need to be taken to facilitate the deployment of the Full Operational Capacity of Galileo and the development of GNSS-based products and services;

Or. en

Amendment 37
Reinhard Bütikofer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Asks to limit the budget for the Euratom Framework Programme to the level agreed under the existing multi-annual financial framework 2007-2013 and to limit its scope to supporting the decommissioning of nuclear facilities;

Or. en

Amendment 38
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. Opposes the planned redeployment from FP7 for the ITER program, suggests to finance the EUR 750 million, that is the

*share from the lacking EUR 1,3 billion
for the project in the year 2012, from the
remaining margins and not from FP7;*

Or. en