



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Committee on Regional Development

2011/2107(INI)

24.6.2011

AMENDMENTS

1 - 73

Draft opinion
Hermann Winkler
(PE465.040v01-00)

Green Paper 'From Challenges to Opportunities: Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding'
(2011/2107(INI))

AM\871588EN.doc

PE467.320v01-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Jean-Paul Besset

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes; calls on the Commission *to set out how this is to be achieved in practice;*

Amendment

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes; calls on the Commission to *ensure complementarities;*

Or. en

Amendment 2
Riikka Manner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes; calls on the Commission to set out how this is to be achieved in practice;

Amendment

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes *in order to strengthen the European innovation cycles;* calls on the Commission to set out how this is to be achieved in practice; *asks the Member States to pay attention to the implementation of these policies on national and regional level, especially when the responsibilities for different EU funds fall under different national ministries and authorities, in order to create better complementarity for the programmes;*

Amendment 3
María Irigoyen Pérez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes; calls on the Commission to set out how this is to be achieved in practice;

Amendment

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes, ***reiterates that this coordinated action must strive to involve regional and local authorities more in the design and execution of these policies and to tailor the priorities more to the specific needs of each region***; calls on the Commission to set out how this is to be achieved in practice;

Or. es

Amendment 4
Zigmantas Balčytis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes; calls on the Commission to set out how this is to be achieved in practice;

Amendment

1. Stresses ***the importance of cohesion policy in developing research and innovation in the regions***; believes that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes; calls on the Commission to set out how this is to be achieved in practice;

Amendment 5
Nuno Teixeira

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes; calls on the Commission to set out how this is to be achieved in practice;

Amendment

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes, ***in line with the principles and objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy and the ‘Innovation Union’ flagship initiative***; calls on the Commission to set out how this is to be achieved in practice;

Or. pt

Amendment 6
Alain Cadec

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes; calls on the Commission to set out how this is to be achieved in practice;

Amendment

1. Stresses that greater coordination is needed, ***plus synergies***, between the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for regional policy and the future ‘Common Strategic Framework’ for research and innovation programmes; calls on the Commission to set out how this is to be achieved in practice;

Or. fr

Amendment 7
Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Emphasises that regional aid for innovation, research and entrepreneurship has, rightly, grown in significance over the decades; notes that, in the current programming period, around 25% of all Structural Fund monies have been spent on such aid, and considers that, in view of the EU 2020 objectives, this proportion should in any case be maintained – a strong and well-resourced regional policy already being a fundamental requirement in that regard; takes the view, moreover, that no effort must be spared to make the outflow of funds to the regions more efficient;

Or. de

Amendment 8
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Recalls, in this respect, the possibilities offered by regional policy for creating synergies ensuring the success of general research policies;

Or. es

Amendment 9
Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Points out that, at times when financial resources are scarce, it is crucial that funding is allocated to intelligently selected priorities in the regions so as to reach a critical mass;

Or. de

Amendment 10
Riikka Manner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. In the light of the future gearing of cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on ***the*** regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated;

2. In the light of the future gearing of cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on ***all objective*** regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated; ***recalls, however, that setting targets for increased research, development and innovation spending alone will not lead to results, unless these measures are accompanied by the overall structural development in societies;***

Or. en

Amendment 11
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. In the light of the future gearing of

2. Recalls that research and innovation

cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on the regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated;

are vital motors if Europe is to respond to the challenges and maintain and strengthen its competitive position in the framework of globalisation; in the light of the future gearing of cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on the regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated;

Or. ro

Amendment 12
Iosif Matula

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. In the light of the future gearing of cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on the regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated;

Amendment

2. in the light of the future gearing of cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on the regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated; *stresses that the main challenge for the EU and for the Member States and regions is to create synergies between the different funding instruments for research and innovation in both public and private sectors, in order to support innovations in society based on ‘public-private-people’ partnerships in the context of achieving the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy;*

Or. ro

Amendment 13
Juozas Imbrasas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. In the light of the future gearing of cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on the regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated;

Amendment

2. In the light of the future gearing of cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on the regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated, ***believes that this is how the widely supported Europe 2020 objectives of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth based on research and innovation, as key drivers of social and economic prosperity and sustainable development, will be achieved;***

Or. It

Amendment 14
Jean-Paul Basset

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. In the light of the future gearing of cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on the regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated;

Amendment

2. In the light of the future gearing of cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority ***among others*** to be binding on the regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Petru Constantin Luhan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. In the light of the future gearing of

Amendment

2. In the light of the future gearing of

cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on the regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated;

cohesion policy to the Europe 2020 Strategy, calls for the ‘innovation’ priority to be binding on the regions, which must also be reflected in the funding allocated ***at all levels***;

Or. ro

Amendment 16
Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Calls on the Commission to propose, alternatively, further incentives for the use of Structural Fund subsidies in the field of innovation;

Or. de

Amendment 17
Rolandas Paksas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Considers that the regions should act as a testing ground for the work of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology and the ‘living labs’, and that local and regional authorities should consequently invest more in regional development and play an active part in implementing policy on science, technology and innovation;

Or. It

Amendment 18
Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; ***stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;***

Amendment

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; ***and, as part of those strategies, to specify how potential synergies between Structural Funds assistance and the future research and innovation programmes can be put to practical use to benefit the regions;***

Or. de

Amendment 19
Nuno Teixeira

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;

Amendment

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies ***which involve all stakeholders and can contribute to the creation of regional poles of excellence;*** stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions, ***the aim being to boost international competitiveness;***

Or. pt

Amendment 20
María Irigoyen Pérez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;

Amendment

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; ***calls on the Commission therefore to encourage the EU’s research programmes and funds to coordinate with the Structural and Cohesion Funds***; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;

Or. es

Amendment 21
Jean-Paul Basset

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;

Amendment

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies ***that are based on regional competences and assets***; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;

Or. en

Amendment 22
Iosif Matula

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;

Amendment

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions; ***advocates a ‘bottom-up’ approach to innovation at local level; stresses the need to develop partnerships between local and regional authorities and research centres with a view to identifying feasible development solutions; believes that local and regional authorities should be encouraged to innovate, notably via initiatives of the type ‘Regions of Knowledge’, ‘Living Labs’ and ‘Smart Cities’;***

Or. ro

Amendement 23
Juozas Imbrasas

Projet d’avis
Paragraphe 3

Projet d’avis

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;

Amendement

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions; ***believes that research and innovation should be better linked, that the EU needs to break away from traditional compartmentalised approaches and focus more on challenges and outcomes to be achieved, linking our research and innovation funding closer to our policy objectives, and that developing a simplified set of instruments and rules, while leaving room for flexibility where it is needed, is equally crucial;***

Amendment 24
Petru Constantin Luhan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;

Amendment

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions; ***calls on the Member States to support such moves on the part of the regions and create the necessary framework for realising such strategies;***

Or. ro

Amendment 25
Lambert van Nistelrooij, Hermann Winkler, Danuta Maria Hübner, Miroslav Mikolášik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;

Amendment

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions, ***calls in this regard for a better articulation and coordination between local, regional, national and European authorities;***

Or. en

Amendment 26
Francesco De Angelis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions;

Amendment

3. Calls on the regions, in line with the ‘smart specialisation’ approach, to develop tailored innovation strategies; stresses that territorial cooperation must be optimised with a view to greater complementarity between regions ***and in the context of the environmental sustainability criteria;***

Or. it

Amendment 27
Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Recommends at the same time that the regions candidly analyse, in particular, their strengths and weaknesses, and set realistic targets with a view to, on the one hand, developing current strengths (their comparative advantage) in order to establish strong, competitive international clusters and, on the other, to catching up with other regions, thus strengthening the regional economy;

Or. de

Amendment 28
Lambert van Nistelrooij, Hermann Winkler, Danuta Maria Hübner, Miroslav Mikolášik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Calls for a stronger intergovernmental participation of Joint Programming measures and under Interreg III B, which strengthens the cooperation in research, development and innovation throughout Europe, also with the view to increase participation and better involvement of new Member States in all European research programmes;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Considers that research and innovation programmes make a considerable contribution to the cohesion policy, and stresses that opportunities for cross-border cooperation in this field should be further developed; stresses that macro-regional cooperation has a useful function with regard to finding common scientific, technological and innovative solutions to shared regional problems;

Or. bg

Amendment 30
Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Points out, however, that in addition to the individual regions' interest in economic growth, the EU as a whole should be seen as an innovation area, which means that the regions should complement one another; therefore calls on the regions to work closely together in drawing up their research and innovation strategies; welcomes, in this regard, the assistance of the Commission, which can provide the regions with valuable pointers and should ensure that the strategies are of a high quality, without calling into question the principle of subsidiarity;

Or. de

**Amendment 31
Hermann Winkler**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

3c. Stresses that a fundamental requirement for such a synergy-generating, integrated strategy is for all authorities involved to be aware of all the funding possibilities; points out that awareness-raising in this regard is also financed from the Structural Funds;

Or. de

**Amendment 32
Hermann Winkler**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 4**

Draft opinion

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, ***without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods;***

Amendment

4. Points out that innovation ***is a broad concept, which*** above all lies at the interface with practice ***and concerns products, processes and services as well as systems and organisational structures;*** recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in ***technological*** research, placing the focus of regional support, on ***the one hand, on developing regional excellence, principally at universities and research centres, and, on the other, on*** support for applications, ***i.e. supporting companies – medium-sized businesses in particular – in making innovations in services and processes marketable, and fostering transfers of technology and exchanges of know-how;***

Or. de

Amendment 33
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with ***practice***; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, ***without preventing*** research ***capacity from being built up,*** in order ***above all*** to enable companies to develop innovative methods;

Amendment

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with ***introduction onto the market***; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support ***also*** on support for applications, ***in the context of a balance with basic*** research, in order to enable companies to ***encourage and*** develop innovative methods;

Or. es

Amendment 34
Riikka Manner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods;

Amendment

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice, ***as some 19/20 of innovations originate from interaction (demand and user based innovation, DUI); underlines for this reason, the increasing need for networks and connections for innovation, as they reinforce the importance of regional innovation systems;*** recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods;

Or. en

Amendment 35
Iosif Matula

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods;

Amendment

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods; ***is aware of the gap between new knowledge in the research field and the act of putting it into practice***

at ground level; calls for concrete measures in the context of the regional policy instruments with a view to transforming the results of research into innovation, of such a nature as to be adaptable to the local and regional levels and applicable Europe-wide;

Or. ro

Amendment 36
Petru Constantin Luhan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods;

Amendment

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods; ***advocates developing initiatives in fields having a practical applicability for the benefit of the community;***

Or. ro

Amendment 37
Francesco De Angelis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to

Amendment

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to

excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods;

excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods; ***considers furthermore that steps should be taken to promote the large-scale development of a growing number of pilot projects;***

Or. it

Amendment 38
María Irigoyen Pérez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods;

Amendment

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies, ***and especially SMEs,*** to develop innovative methods;

Or. es

Amendment 39
Nuno Teixeira

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice; recommends, therefore, as the necessary complement to

Amendment

4. Points out that innovation above all lies at the interface with practice ***and the market;*** recommends, therefore, as the

excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods;

necessary complement to excellence in research, placing the focus of regional support on support for applications, without preventing research capacity from being built up, in order above all to enable companies to develop innovative methods;

Or. pt

Amendment 40

Lambert van Nistelrooij, Hermann Winkler, Danuta Maria Hübner

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. wishes to have an action plan for the ‘Stairway to Excellence’, for the realisation of Research Infrastructures, under the Cohesion Fund and the ERDF; to boost the participation in these countries to the next Common Framework Programme on Research and Innovation;

Or. en

Amendment 41

Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Underscores the need for greater continuity in the financing of research projects and innovation, and for follow-up financing to disseminate the results of such projects and make them marketable; notes the importance, in this respect, of closer cooperation between the various European and national programmes and

the Structural Funds;

Or. bg

Amendment 42
Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Stresses the need to establish the concept of the stairway to excellence, which must entail improving regional networks linking research institutes, universities, SMEs and other relevant stakeholders, so as to create clusters, regional technology platforms and centres of excellence, with a view to helping such networks take part in EU cooperation projects and programmes for research and innovation;

Or. de

Amendment 43
Riikka Manner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Reminds, that through the cohesion fund some 86 billion Euros, 25% of the whole cohesion budget, have been earmarked for Innovations; regrets that only a fraction of the allocations has been effectively used to this end; asks the Commission to analyse, whether the innovations (e.g. DUI) funded under the cohesion funds could be given a similar prestige as currently under framework

programmes in order to make this funding more interesting and visible for the actors;

Or. en

Amendment 44
María Irigoyen Pérez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Believes that research and innovation play a fundamental role which creates a more sustainable urban development, promotes the wellbeing of the population and is based on environmental and social sustainability and energy efficiency; recommends therefore that regional aid promotes this goal;

Or. es

Amendment 45
Rolandas Paksas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Calls for enhanced priority funding to develop the knowledge triangle and 'living labs' concepts, given the importance of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology in implementing new concepts and in order to stimulate innovation at local and regional levels;

Or. It

Amendment 46
Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that ***this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship;***

Amendment

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that ***regional support for innovation should focus on medium-sized businesses; stresses in this regard the added value of the cohesion policy in making regionally oriented SMEs in traditional business fields more innovative by offering greater access to research oriented towards practical application, transfer of technology and innovation, as well as internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship by means of wider-ranging advisory services and easily accessible support;***

Or. de

Amendment 47
María Irigoyen Pérez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that ***this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship;***

Amendment

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, ***since they are the main providers of employment in the EU,*** considers that cohesion policy ***needs to support SMEs' access to funding and reduce the burden of bureaucracy to which beneficiaries are subjected;***

Or. es

Amendment 48
Francesco De Angelis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, *for example* in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship;

Amendment

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, *especially* in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship;

Or. it

Amendment 49
Jean-Paul Besset

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to *internationalisation* or promotion of entrepreneurship;

Amendment

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to *local and regional development* or promotion of entrepreneurship;

Or. en

Amendement 50
Zigmantas Balčytis

Projet d'avis
Paragraphe 5

Projet d'avis

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship;

Amendement

5. ***Stresses that SMEs are important to regional development in the EU and the industrial competitiveness of the Union as a whole; in the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship, by reducing administrative barriers and creating open, light and fast implementation schemes that will encourage SMEs to be open to considering new opportunities;***

Or. It

Amendment 51
Iosif Matula

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship;

Amendment

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship; ***believes that enterprises need to be encouraged to innovate on the basis of fuller use of the regional resources available to them; favours introducing 'one-stop shop' initiatives in the form of centres offering, under one roof, useful information to SMEs, universities, research centres, regional authorities and other potential beneficiaries of EU, national and local research and innovation funding;***

Amendment 52
Luis Paulo Alves

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship;

Amendment

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship, ***with the development of skills as the absolute priority and, as a horizontal priority, the reinforcement and dissemination of initiative capacity and entrepreneurship of various types;***

Or. pt

Amendment 53
Nuno Teixeira

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship;

Amendment

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship, ***the encouragement of an innovation culture and technology transfer in respect of member bodies of the Scientific and Technological System;***

Or. pt

Amendment 54
Petru Constantin Luhan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship;

Amendment

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship; ***calls for greater flexibility in the funding programmes with a view to involving SMEs;***

Or. ro

Amendment 55
Lambert van Nistelrooij, Hermann Winkler, Danuta Maria Hübner, Miroslav Mikolášik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship;

Amendment

5. In the light of the need to improve the extent to which SMEs are benefiting from support for research and innovation, considers that this should be made a focus of cohesion policy, for example in relation to internationalisation or promotion of entrepreneurship, ***stresses, in this regard, the need for KICs to focus more on SME participation;***

Or. en

Amendment 56
Lambert van Nistelrooij, Hermann Winkler, Danuta Maria Hübner

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

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 a. wishes to see the continuation and strengthening of the ‘Regions of Excellence’, in which the territorial dimension of Research and Development is fostered;

Or. en

**Amendment 57
Filiz Hakaeva Hysmenova**

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

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses that, in the interests of cohesion and of making Europe’s economy more competitive, measures – inter alia to simplify participation procedures and raise awareness – should be taken to improve access to research and innovation for SMEs, especially those located in underdeveloped, remote and rural regions;

Or. bg

**Amendment 58
Hermann Winkler**

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

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses that, in addition to convergence, regional competitiveness and employment, the European territorial

cooperation objective helps strengthen regional economic policy, in particular by fostering inter-regional cooperation with a focus on innovation, the knowledge-based economy and the environment; sees this as a further reason to welcome plans to increase funding for the territorial cooperation objective;

Or. de

Amendment 59

Alain Cadec

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Believes that the number of enterprises participating in the next framework programme should be higher; is of the opinion that the establishment of an accessible and transparent system would make it easier for project developers to take part in EU programmes;

Or. fr

Amendment 60

Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to achieve maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes;

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to achieve *as much* harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes *as possible; acknowledges the validity of both the centrally managed approach of*

FP7 and the CIP and the decentralised approach of the Structural Funds; emphasises, however, the need to harmonise, insofar as possible, rules processes and methods (with regard to eligibility criteria, standard unit costs and lump sums, for example);

Or. de

Amendment 61
Riikka Manner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to *achieve* maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim *for genuine actions for simplification and* to maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes, *leaving, where necessary, room for flexibility;*

Or. en

Amendment 62
María Irigoyen Pérez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to achieve maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to achieve maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes; *considers that, in line with the existing general framework for budgetary adjustments, there should be a commitment to optimising funding by encouraging international coordination*

between national and regional funding agencies in order to develop a strategic research and innovation agenda approve at European level;

Or. es

Amendment 63
Iosif Matula

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to achieve maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to achieve maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes; ***recommends that the Commission take measures for the consolidation of the single market, and especially the digital single market, and finance large-scale R & D initiatives for implementing the results of research at global level;***

Or. ro

Amendment 64
Juozas Imbrasas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to achieve maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to achieve maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes; ***stresses that funding for research and innovation at national and EU levels needs to be more efficient and effective;***

Amendment 65
Luis Paulo Alves

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to achieve maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes;

Amendment

6. Calls on the Commission, despite the differences in systems of governance, to aim to achieve maximum harmonisation of rules for the funding of programmes, ***on a basis of active participation and the involvement of all regions' key socio-economic agents***;

Or. pt

Amendment 66
Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Considers the excessive administrative requirements to be a serious impediment to achieving cohesion policy objectives and therefore calls for the processing of grants and the monitoring systems to be greatly simplified;

Or. de

Amendment 67
Lambert van Nistelrooij, Hermann Winkler, Danuta Maria Hübner, Miroslav Mikolášik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the synergy between different instruments and funds and to develop a multi-fund approach, while respecting the specific conditions set out in the respective legislation;

Or. en

Amendment 68
Luis Paulo Alves

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Recalls that research and innovation programmes should have a sufficient degree of flexibility to enable them to adapt to new frontiers and new challenges for knowledge, such as the sea-bed with its significant potential in the case of the Atlantic;

Or. pt

Amendment 69
Hermann Winkler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. Welcomes the Commission's and the EIB's ambitions to make further use of modern financing instruments, such as the revolving funds – in addition to the risk-sharing facilities – with a view to attracting more private investors and

using available public funding more efficiently; expressly recommends that regional stakeholders make use of these possibilities;

Or. de

Amendment 70
Jean-Paul Besset

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls on the Commission to examine whether it is appropriate *to make mixed financing legal and* to extend cross-financing.

Amendment

7. Calls on the Commission to examine whether it is appropriate to extend cross-financing *of Structural Funds;*

Or. en

Amendment 71
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls on the Commission to examine *whether it is appropriate to make* mixed financing *legal* and to extend cross-financing.

Amendment

7. Calls on the Commission to examine *the issues relating to* mixed financing and to extend cross-financing.

Or. es

Amendment 72
Jean-Paul Besset

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Calls on the Commission for sustainable development to be reflected in the allocation of funds to create green jobs, to promote local and regional development and to ensure well-being in European regions; calls on the Commission to orient Research and Innovation towards ecological conversion;

Or. en

Amendment 73

Lambert van Nistelrooij, Hermann Winkler, Danuta Maria Hübner, Miroslav Mikolášik

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Calls for a clear coordination between existing and new initiatives under the EU2020 strategy.

Or. en